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Ford’s arguably poor choice of titles means that of his seven independent plays, only 'Tis Pity has kept a place in the repertoire. However, 2014-16 brought us productions of The Lady’s Trial, 'Tis Pity She’s a Whore, The Witch of Edmonton and, extraordinarily, two each of The Broken Heart (one at RADA and one at the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse) and of Love’s Sacrifice (one at the RSC and one a staged reading at Gray’s Inn as part of the Globe’s John Ford Experiment). The same period also included staged readings of The Queen, The Lover’s Melancholy, Perkin Warbeck and The Fancies Chaste and Noble. 2015 in particular was a year in which, unimaginably, I had to decline an invitation to a performance of one Ford play on the grounds that I already had tickets for another Ford play on the same night, and in which I saw productions of two different plays by him on two consecutive days. It was even a year in which we almost caught a glimpse of what a Ford dedicatee might actually have looked like, with the announcement that a project in Paris has digitally reconstructed the face of Thomas Craven, to whose brother William The Broken Heart was dedicated.¹

If there was one thing clearly revealed by the period’s unprecedented rash of Ford productions, it was that Ford’s dominating impulse is not in fact sensationalism but the pursuit of the aesthetic. ‘Heart’ is important to him only insofar as it sits in natural apposition to ‘art’, as is indeed suggested by the opening couplet of the Prologue to The Broken Heart: ‘Our scene is Sparta. He whose best of art / Hath drawn this piece calls IT THE BROKEN HEART’, and one class of beings who must have been left very disappointed by the year of Ford was fight arrangers, for the duel avoided is a recurrent

¹ Adam Sage, ‘A noble tragedy stares out of history’, The Times, Tuesday 22 December 2015. Online: http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/news/world/europe/article4647177.ece
motif in his work; there is to be no release from tension that way. In The Queen Fernando, like Othello, is given a spare sword but doesn’t use it; in The Broken Heart Ithocles’s military prowess is rendered redundant when his arms are caught in a trick chair, and in The Lady’s Trial Auria and Aurelio flourish their swords at each other repeatedly but never actually use them. Velasco in The Queen is of course the ultimate example of this, and even when at the end of the play there are four men holding swords, there is still no fight (this was underlined in the staged reading in the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse by the fact that all four held their swords in their left hands, reserving the right for the scripts which they really did need). This on its own might for me have confirmed the place of The Queen in the Ford family, even without the debt to Othello (the surprise this time being that the Iago figure is well-intentioned), the motifs of the trial and of adherence to a vow, and the comedy retainers so reminiscent of Perkin Warbeck.

This interest in the aesthetic could be seen perhaps most clearly in one of the earliest offerings of the year of Ford, the co-authored The Witch of Edmonton, directed by Gregory Doran at the Swan. Seeing this in close proximity to ’Tis Pity She’s a Whore at the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse pointed up some unexpected similarities between the plays: Frank, like Giovanni, makes a bad decision about romantic partner which leads to the death of a woman, and both his actions and Giovanni’s are revealed to the community through what is on their knife (in both cases at an occasion which is meant to be about eating and comes to be about killing). However, the production also revealed similarities with the work of other dramatists: Mother Sawyer is a parody Titania (a character also to be found in another Dekker play, The Whore of Babylon), and there is a further parallel with A Midsummer Night’s Dream in that in each play a spirit (Tom/Puck) misleads young lover(s) in the dark. The reeds in the 2014 Swan production also emphasised the rural nature of seventeenth-century Edmonton and helped us to see that this was a play about a local community outside London in the same way that The Merry Wives of Windsor is. What may appear a relatively crude and simple story was thus shown as surprisingly self-conscious about its dramatic decisions.

Many of Ford’s plays are direct or indirect responses to Othello.² What fascinates Ford about the play is not just the story but its hermeneutic self-consciousness,³ which is also something Ford himself explores in ’Tis Pity.⁴ In The Lady’s Trial, there is an obvious

⁴ See my ‘Knowing their Loves: Knowledge, Ignorance and Blindness in ’Tis Pity She’s a Whore’, Renaissance Forum 3.1 (1998). Online: http://www.hull.ac.uk/renforum/v3no1/hopkins.htm
plot debt to *Othello* which is accentuated by two references to things specifically connected to Cyprus, setting for the last four acts of *Othello*, and/or to Shakespeare’s play. In the first place, Iago swears by Janus, and the Genoese setting of *The Lady’s Trial* might have reminded some in the audience that one of the Lusignan kings of Cyprus, King Janus, was said to be ‘so named, because he was born at Genua, which was founded by Ianus’. Moreover, Genoa was the home of Andrea Doria, victor of Lepanto, and that Ford might have based Auria on Andrea Doria is suggested by the fact that Ralph Carr of the Middle Temple calls him Andrea Auria. However, there is also a variation, for in the way that he constructs narratives Auria is Iago as well as Othello. Although he never explicitly says that his faith in Spinella remains unshaken, the rapidity with which he pounces on a chance to acquit her suggests that it has in fact held firm, and that the ‘trial’ is held not in order for her innocence to be decided by him but for it to be established and displayed in public. The fact that Auria has clearly prepared the ground for both Castanna’s surprise betrothal to Adurni and Benazzi’s threat of violence strengthens the suspicion that his primary concern is to manipulate public opinion. In the Edward’s Boys production, Auria simply relieved Benazzi of his sword, making it quite clear that the whole affair was a put-up job. *The Lady’s Trial*, then, reworks *Othello* not only in the obvious plot similarities but also in this more subtle interest in the ways in which opinions can be formed, and this subtlety was something nicely brought out in the Edward’s Boys production, which was characterised above all by its ability to capture nuance.

*The Lady’s Trial* is only one of Ford’s many experiments in style. *’Tis Pity*, for instance, includes a passage which seems to represent a sustained attempt on Ford’s part to imitate the style of the Italian poet Jacopo Sannazaro. At an early stage of *’Tis Pity She’s a Whore*, while Soranzo is still a suitor for Annabella, we see him alone ‘in his study, reading a book’ (II.ii.1 sd), which he later tells us contains Sannazaro’s encomium on Venice. Soranzo apparently both quotes from this and proposes a rewriting which would praise Annabella rather than Venice:

> Love’s measure is extreme, the comfort pain,  
> The life unrest, and the reward disdain.’  
> What’s here? Look’t o’er again: ’tis so, so writes  
> This smooth licentious poet in his rhymes.

---


6 Ralph Carr of the Middle Temple, *The Mahumetane or Turkish historie* (London: Thomas Este, 1600), p. 106.

7 This can be compared with Gervase Markham and Lewis Machin’s *The Dumb Knight*, which is a source for *The Queen*, in which Precedent quotes from *Venus and Adonis*. 
But Sannazar, thou liest, for had thy bosom
Felt such oppression as is laid on mine,
Thou wouldst have kissed the rod that made the smart.
To work then, happy Muse, and contradict
What Sannazar hath in his envy writ:
‘Love’s measure is the mean, sweet his annoys,
His pleasures life, and his reward all joys.’
Had Annabella lived when Sannazar
Did in his brief encomium celebrate
Venice, that queen of cities, he had left
That verse which gained him such a sum of gold,
And for only look from Annabell
Had writ of her, and her diviner cheeks.  

The Revels note points out that the lines attributed to Sannazaro have not been identified; however, the encomium to Venice must surely be that quoted by James Howell in a letter of 12 August 1621 to ‘Robert Brown at the Middle-Temple’. In the letter, which opens simply ‘Robin,’ Howell cites the verses as reading as follows in English translation:

When Neptun saw in Adrian Surges stand
Venice, and give the Sea Laws of Command:
Now Jove said he, Object thy Capitoll,
And Mars proud Walls: This were for to extoll
Tyber beyond the Main; both Towns behold,
Rome men thou’lt say, Venice the gods did mould.

Howell goes on to declare that ‘Sanzanaro had given him by Saint Mark a hundred zecchins for evry one of these Verses, which amounts to about 300 pounds. It would be long before the Citie of London would do the like’.  
Since Ford himself was a Middle Temple man, and since Howell also writes to Sir Kenelm Digby and mentions the Duke of Lerma (p. 53), subject of what seems to have been a play at least partly by Ford now surviving only in a Restoration palimpsest by Sir Robert Howard, it may well have been from him that Ford heard of Sannazaro’s verses on Venice, which seem not to have been widely known and are not included in the most recent edition of Sannazaro’s Latin poems.  
What Ford is not doing, though, is quoting them; the implication therefore seems to be that he is deliberately imitating the style of Sannazaro in a Sidneysesque

---

8 John Ford, *'Tis Pity She’s a Whore*, ed. by Derek Roper (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1975), II.i.1-17.
attempt to see to what extent poetry in English can reproduce the effect of poetry within a romance language, just as in *The Lover’s Melancholy* the story of the nightingale openly nods to the original in Famiamus Strada (a marginal note in the quarto points out the allusion).

In *Love’s Sacrifice*, as I shall discuss shortly, Ford drew on the story of the Italian composer Carlo Gesualdo Prince of Venosa. Might *Tis Pity* perhaps also show the influence of Gesualdo’s art? The lines ‘Morendo in gratia Dei, morirei senza dolore’, sung by Annabella during her confrontation with Soranzo, have no known source but could almost have come from Gesualdo, for the prince (who seems to have written his own lyrics and ties the extreme chromatic shifts of his music very closely to the sense of the words) stresses and dwells on words to do with emotion – love, sigh, torment, pain – and builds strong contrasts between life and death, as in perhaps his most famous composition ‘Moro, lasso, al mio duolo’ (I die, alas!, for my sorrow’), whose second line refers to ‘chi mi può dar vita’, ‘she who can give me life’. Perhaps we need to understand certainly Ford’s use of Sannazaro, and conceivably his possible use of Gesualdo, as part of a tradition of creative literary imitation without direct quotation going back to *Hamlet’s* apparent use of *Dido, Queen of Carthage* (itself a play which creatively imitates Virgil).

As well as experimenting with how emotion can be expressed through music, Ford also experiments with how it can be expressed through silence. The 2015 production of *The Broken Heart* at the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, though sadly disappointing in comparison with the other offerings of the year of living Fordianly, did at least throw this into stark relief. After years of confidently following the critical consensus that Ford’s comic scenes are not funny, I found it rather disconcerting to discover that in performance they actually can be. During the staged reading of *The Queen* at the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, the astrologer’s salaciously delivered invitation ‘Will you survey my lodgings’ got a huge laugh, as did the assurance to the condemned Salassa that the weather was likely to stay nice for her execution. I even laughed at the lithping lath in *The Lady’s Trial*, though when editing the play I was reduced almost to tears by constantly checking that I had the number of ‘th’s right, and Mr Justice Burton’s Mauruccio in the Gray’s Inn staged reading of *Love’s Sacrifice* was simply magnificent, stealing every scene in which he appeared. I am sure I am not wrong about *The Broken Heart*, though; of this play as well as of *Perkin Warbeck*, in which the lines appear, it is

---

11 For a particularly astute analysis of the interrelationship between *Dido, Queen of Carthage, Hamlet,* and Virgil, see Timothy D. Crowley, ‘Arms and the Boy: Marlowe’s Aeneas and the Parody of Imitation in Dido, Queen of Carthage’, *English Literary Renaissance* 38.3 (2008), 408-438, especially 437.
surely true that ‘nor is here / Unnecessary mirth forced, to endear / A multitude’ (Prologue, 22-4). I was therefore saddened to hear the audience at the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse constantly chuckling. The director Caroline Steinbeis, who had no previous knowledge of the play and had never before directed anything other than modern work, cheerfully opined in the programme that ‘Ultimately we are dealing with a Caroline soap opera’, and everything possible was played for laughs, with Nearchus channelling Lord Flashheart (‘Hello Sparta! Ding-dong!’), the second half opening with Penthea, Calantha and Euphranea coming out of three doors like a demented cuckoo clock, and Bassanes inadvertently sitting in the trick chair and having to be rescued from it by a solicitous Orgilus. There was even laughter as Orgilus bled to death, possibly because of the noise the blood made as it splashed into the metal basins placed to catch it.

Perhaps the business was intended to compensate for what was clearly felt to be the insuperable difficulty of the language, because the production was dogged from the outset by a sense that no one could possibly be expected to follow it. It opened with the backstory of how Penthea and Orgilus came to be parted, with a snatch of invented dialogue, and this freedom with Ford’s words extended to other aspects of the production too: there was no Christalla, Philema, Groneas or Hemophil – their parts were either excised entirely or given to Grausis and Prophilus respectively – and in another simplification Penthea (who appeared to be simply very cross rather than pathologically self-sabotaging) had only one thing to leave in her will, Ithocles. (Despite the fact that everyone else’s costume was ancient Greek, she also wore a Tudor headdress, presumably in the hope that it would offer an audience likely to have been recently watching Wolf Hall some way of latching onto events.) Only in one moment did the production briefly do justice to the austere beauty of the play, when Sarah MacRae’s excellent Calantha was strapped into a terrifying golden carapace in order to be crowned. This, together with the intriguing decision to have the corpse of Ithocles standing rather than lying, allowed us to see that what The Broken Heart offers is in a sense an inversion of The Winter’s Tale: instead of the statue coming to life, the characters freeze into statues, speechless, immobile, bloodless and ultimately lifeless. It was, however, much less satisfactory than the spring 2016 production at RADA, where compelling performances from Ithocles, Orgilus, and a Penthea whose black dress and plain headscarf gave her something of an Amish appearance, allowed the production to help us see the strange spare beauty of the play and to feel the chilling atmosphere of a calm which kills.

Collectively, the productions of his plays also showed that as well as experimenting with style, Ford also experiments with medium. This is perhaps most notable in Love’s Sacrifice, which has a very specific and very suggestive source. On 16 October 1590
Carlo Gesualdo, Prince of Venosa, murdered his wife, Donna Maria D’Avalos, called by the Venetian ambassador ‘the most beautiful lady in Naples’, and her lover Fabrizio Carafa, Duke of Andria, having first pretended to go hunting so he could catch them in bed together. According to contemporary accounts, the bodies of the two dead lovers were then displayed outside the Palazzo San Severo in Naples, with the Duke still clad in Donna Maria’s nightdress, which he had been wearing when Gesualdo burst into the bedroom. It was on this story that Ford based Love’s Sacrifice, though he reassigned the names so that ‘D’Avalos’, with its obvious suggestion of the diabolic, now belongs to the villain rather than the heroine, while ‘Caraffa’ is transferred from the lover to the husband (although Donna Maria, despite being still only 25 when she married Gesualdo, had already been twice widowed, and her first husband had also been called Carafa). It is a point of incidental interest that there is the hint of a connection between this factual source and the literary one which Ford clearly also has in mind while writing the play: Othello, to which Love’s Sacrifice so clearly nods, is set partly in Cyprus, and one of the bastions in Nicosia is called Caraffa. (Another bastion, D’Avila, could perhaps be heard as similar to D’Avalos.)

Carlo Gesualdo was born in 1566 and named after his uncle, Cardinal (later Saint) Carlo Borromeo (1538-1584), who took a considerable interest in his nephew and namesake: the painting which Gesualdo commissioned for the Capuchin church he had built includes the Cardinal as well as Gesualdo himself and his second wife Eleonora d’Este. Borromeo was most famous for his Instructiones Fabricae et Supellectilis Ecclesiasticae (Instructions for the construction and furnishing of churches), which shaped the appearance of Catholic churches such as the one in which the climax of Love’s Sacrifice takes place, so we might perhaps do well to bear in mind that Ford’s use of space in that scene might be significant. The third figure in the painting, Eleonora d’Este, was a scion of the ducal court of Ferrara whose cousin Alfonso II was the subject of Browning’s ‘My Last Duchess’ and who was presumably not therefore deterred by the idea of marrying a wife-murderer. It was his stay in Ferrara which led Gesualdo to compose madrigals as well as sacred music and ultimately to mix the two in spiritual madrigals which offer something of the same blending of the erotic and the holy as Ford does in Love’s Sacrifice: the Catholic poet Richard Crashaw, coupling the title of this play with that of another of Ford’s tragedies, wrote ‘Thou cheat’st us Ford, mak’st one seeme two by art. / What is Loves Sacrifice, but the broken Heart?’, clearly implying that he regards both plays’ titles as having religious overtones alongside their overtly amatory content. Such a tension between spiritual and carnal sorted nicely with the aesthetic of the Counter-Reformation, in which Carlo Borromeo had been particularly instrumental and which often blurred the distinction between divine and human loves.
Ford included music in several of his plays (including *Love’s Sacrifice*), and seems to have been sensitive to its potential for emotional expression. Gesualdo’s music is a series of intellectual and aesthetic experiments which privilege self-conscious variation from established norms and forms. The dissonance created by the tonal disjunction between Ford’s main plots and his subplots, not to mention such jarring departures from the aesthetic of tragedy as the flippant dismissal from the Cardinal which closes ‘*Tis Pity She’s a Whore*, is not unlike the extreme chromaticism and wild harmonic shifts of Gesualdo, and there are other parallels. As Alex Ross points out, ‘The text of “Moro, lasso,” … plays on the double meaning of morte, earthly and sexual release’, 12 just as the end of *Love’s Sacrifice* pairs bodily death with sublimated spiritual consummation.

Gesualdo published a major collection of his music at Naples in 1603 with other works including the *Tenebrae Responsoria*, his collection of spiritual madrigals, following in 1611. The *Tenebrae Responsoria* are specifically for Easter Week, and include several lines which resonate with *Love’s Sacrifice*. These include Feria Quinta, Response 4, ‘My friend betrayed me by token of a kiss’; Response 7, ‘I was led the sacrifice and I knew it not’; and Feria Sexta, Response 3, ‘How art thou turned to bitterness, that thou shouldst crucify me, and release Barabbas?’. This last is particularly interesting because there is some suggestive overlap between *Love’s Sacrifice* and Marlowe’s *The Jew of Malta*, which tells a story with strong associations with Easter (its hero, Barabas, takes his name from the thief whom Pontius Pilate spared from crucifixion instead of Jesus) and stages a parody resurrection. *The Jew of Malta* was passing through the press in the same year as *Love’s Sacrifice*, and by a strange coincidence also played at the Swan alongside *Love’s Sacrifice* in the main house, with a large intersection between the two casts. Ferneze says of Lodovico and Mathias,

> Then take them up, and let them be interred  
> Within one sacred monument of stone;  
> Upon which altar I will offer up  
> My daily sacrifice of sighs and tears.  

13

In *Love’s Sacrifice*, Caraffa echoes this closely when he says ‘Behold, I offer up the sacrifice / Of bleeding tears, shed from a faithful spring’ (5.3.42-3), and all three main characters of *Love’s Sacrifice* share a monument, just as Ferneze orders that Lodovico and Mathias should do.

---

12 Alex Ross, ‘The Rest is Noise’, *The New Yorker*, 19 and 26 December, 2011
Perhaps this parallel with *The Jew of Malta* is not wholly incidental, for *Love’s Sacrifice* itself can be seen as drawing on the Easter story, and indeed as offering of a form of Tenebrae Responsoria. Alex Ross observes of the Responsoria ‘Those services are known as the Tenebrae, or “shadows”; in the old Catholic rite, the candles were extinguished, one by one, until the church was enveloped in darkness’. As the 2014 production of *’Tis Pity She’s a Whore* in the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse showed, Ford was a master of this effect: as the Friar began to describe hell to the terrified Annabella, two attendants, studiously mirroring each other’s movements, slowly and systematically doused every candle in all four of the candelabras until the stage itself was the lightless space of which the Friar spoke, with only one taper burning. Hippolita and Vasques then played their brief following scene with hand-held candles, and the way was thus paved for the last candle to be extinguished so that the death of Bergetto could be played out in absolute darkness until the call of ‘Lights!’ was answered by appropriate characters rushing onto the stage with torches, before a strategic placing of the interval allowed the candelabras to be relit for the second half. Clearly the scenes are sequenced in this way precisely in order that this effect may be produced. Neither the hall of Gray’s Inn, the venue of the Globe’s 2015 Read Not Dead production, nor the Swan Theatre, where the RSC staged the play in the same year, lent itself to similar experiments with the lighting of *Love’s Sacrifice*, but the scene in which Fernando emerges from the tomb would certainly work best in near-darkness, and the pointed deferral of the funeral for three days seems deliberately calculated to evoke the idea of the Resurrection. As A.T. Moore notes, ‘a perceived allusion to Lazarus, or to the reanimated figures in English resurrection monuments, may... lend Fernando an air of triumph over mortality’, and the possibility of such an allusion is enhanced by the latent presence of the Lazarus story in *Othello*, since Robert Allott in *Wits theater of the little world* declares that ‘Lazarus, whom Christ raised from death, was the first Bishop of Cyprus’, and I have argued elsewhere that this is echoed in the apparent resurrection of Desdemona and the parallel between her greedy devouring of Othello’s narrative and the story of Martha and Mary, the sisters of Lazarus. (It is also suggestive that Desdemona should say to Othello of Cassio’s reinstatement ‘I prithee name the time, but let it not / Exceed three days’.) In *Love’s Sacrifice*, Bianca’s tomb thus becomes an Easter Tomb, with Fernando’s emergence from the tomb effectively

---

implying the question ‘Quem quaeritis?’, sometimes seen as the foundation of the English dramatic tradition.¹⁸

Moreover, as in the Easter story, *Love’s Sacrifice* stages a pattern in which from death comes life. The parody Annunciations afforded by the Ferentes subplot will in due course produce three births from Colona, Morona and Julia respectively. Collectively these three constitute an anti-trinity, in fact more a composite triple Hag (this is why Morona is old), but they do introduce a note of fertility and birth. The tomb too will ultimately contain a trinity when Fernando, Bianca and the Duke are all buried in it. In one sense, *Love’s Sacrifice* can thus be seen as a high-concept play about the difficulty of accommodating trinities in normal domestic and civic spaces, and as drawing on a sense of the incompatibility of sacred and secular imperatives similar to that which animates III, ix of *’Tis Pity She’s a Whore*, in which the civic justice of Parma cannot pursue the murderer Grimaldi once he has crossed into the territory of the Cardinal. Easter affords two ways of thinking about bodies, the corporeal and the spiritualised, and this is a division echoed in *Love’s Sacrifice*, in a way that seeing the play acted brings vividly home: the words speak of chastity, but the actions and body language speak of passion. Paradoxically, then, an unprecedented season of bringing Ford corporeally to life through the presence of bodies on stages ultimately helped us better understand his spiritual power.

¹⁸ For a succinct summary of the history of this idea, see Michael Kobalka, ‘The *Quem Quaeritis*: Theatre History Displacement’, *Theatre History Studies* 8 (1988), 35-51 (p. 38).
Appendix: Recent Ford Productions

The John Ford Story (supported by the Heritage Lottery Fund).

'Tis Pity She's a Whore at the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, 23 October - 7 December 2014. Directed by Michael Longhurst. With Max Bennett (Giovanni), Stefano Braschi (Soranzo), Fiona Button (Annabella), Sam Cox (Donado), Philip Cumbus (Vasquez), Noma Dumezweni (Hippolita), James Gannon (Bergetto/Cardinal), Michael Gould (Bonaventure), Alice Haig (Philotis), Dean Nolan (Poggio/Bandit), Edward Peel (Florio), Daniel Rabin (Richardetto), Morag Siller (Putana), Jethro Skinner (Grimaldi/Bandit) and Isla Coulter and Hannah Hutch (Virgins).

The Lady's Trial. Edward’s Boys, directed by Perry Mills, Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, and King Edward VI School, Stratford-upon-Avon, March 2015; the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, September 2015. With Abhi Gowda, Adam Hardy and Jamie Whitelaw (Prologue/Epilogue), Finlay Hatch (Auria), Pascal Vogiaridis (Adurni), James Williams (Aurelio), George Hodson (Malfato), Oliver Lloyd (Trelcatio), Myles Langley (Martino), Isaac Sergeant (Piero), Dominic Howden (Futelli), Dan Power (Guzman), George Ellingham (Fulgoso), Dan Wilkinson (Benazzi), Joe Pocknell (Spinella), Charlie Waters (Castanna), Ben Clarke (Y9) as Amoretta, Jack Hawkins (Levidolce), and Tristan Barford, Ed Beighton, Joe Coghlan, Ben Clarke (Y12), Felix Crabtree, Dominic Ellis, Patrick Ellis, Felix Gallagher, Nick Jones, Ritvick Nagar and Tom Woodland (mutes).

The Broken Heart, directed by Caroline Steinbeis at the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, 12 March - 18 April 2015. With Liam Brennan (Crotolon), Peter Hamilton Dyer (Tecnicus), Brian Ferguson (Orgilus), Patrick Godfrey (Amyclas), Joe Jameson (Nearchus), Adam Lawrence (Amethus/Phulas), Sarah MacRae (Calantha), Sanchia McCormack (Grausis), Amy Morgan (Penthea), Tom Stuart (Prophilus), Owen Teale
(Bassanes), Thalissa Teixeira (Euphrania), Luke Thompson (Ithocles), and Paul Whitchurch (Armostes).

*Love’s Sacrifice.* The Royal Shakespeare Company, directed by Matthew Dunster, 11 April - 24 June 2015. With Matthew Needham (Duke of Pavy), Catrin Stewart (Bianca), Jamie Thomas King (Fernando), Beth Cordingly (Fiormonda), Jonathan McGuinness (D’Avolos), Marcus Griffiths (Roseilli), Richard Rees (Petruchio), Guy Burgess (Nibrassa), Andy Apollo (Ferentes), Rhiannon Handy (Colona), Sheila Atim (Julia), Annette McLaughlin (Morona and nun), Matthew Kelly (Mauruccio), Colin Ryan (Giacopo), Geoffrey Freshwater (Abbot of Monaco), Julian Hoult (Courtier, guard and friar), Gabby Wong (Lady-in-waiting and nun), and Simon Hedger and Nav Sidhu (guards and friars).

*The Queen.* Read Not Dead, directed by Martin Hodgson. At the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, Sunday 17 May 2015. With Tom McCarron as Petruchi, Mark Oosterveen as Muretto, Michael Geary as Buffo, James Wallace as Pinto, Tim Treloar as Velasco, Sam Cox as Lodovico, Charlie Anson as Alphonso, Adam Cunis as the hangman and the groom, James Harrison as Columnello, David Meyer as Almada, Catherine Hamilton as the Queen of Aragon, Rosalind Steele as Herophil, Laura Cox as Shaparoon, Shaun Prendergast as Mopas, and Laura Darrall as Salassa. Excerpts on *Artsnight*, BBC2, 20 June 2015.

*The Lover’s Melancholy.* Read Not Dead, directed by James Wallace. At the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, Sunday 7 June 2015. With Alex Harcourt (Pelias), Patrick Walshe McBride (Menaphon), David Meyer (Sophronos), Ben Deery (Amethus), John Hopkins (Rhetias), James Wallace (Cuculus), James Askill (Grilla), Tim Frances (Corax), Laura Rogers (Thamasta), Madeleine Knight (Kala), Daisy Hughes (Eroclea), Elliot Fitzpatrick (Palador), Sam Cox (Meleander), Paul Clayton (Aretus), Aruhan Galieva (Cleophila), Luke Dale (Trollio), and Dr Will Tosh (Philosopher in the masque).

*Perkin Warbeck.* Read Not Dead, directed by Clive Brill. At the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, Sunday 28 June, 2015. With Daniel Weyman (Henry VII), Nigel Cooke (Lord Dawbney/Frion), Theo Fraser Steele (Sir William Stanley/Hialas), Charles Davies (Earl of Oxford/Heron/Post), Clive Brill (Earl of Surrey), Hugh Ross (Bishop of Durham), Michael Eaves (Urswick/Sketon), Chinna Wodu (Sir Robert Clifford/Astley/Lambert Simnel), Alec Newman (James IV), Christian Rodska (Earl of Huntley), Stuart McGugan (Earl of Crawford, Mayor of Cork/Marchmount), Dominic
Rye (Lord Dalieil), Joseph Kloska (Perkin Warbeck), Serena Jennings (Lady Katherine) and Alice Simone (Countess of Crawford/Jane).

*The Fancies Chaste and Noble.* Read Not Dead, directed by James Wallace. At the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, Sunday 6 September 2015. With John Sandeman (Troylo-Savelli), Elliot Fitzpatrick (Livio), Tim Frances (Octavio), Robert Head (Nitido), Jack Wharrier (Secco), Martin Hodgson (Spadone), Daisy Hughes (Castamela), Rhys Bevan (Romanello), Beth Eyre (Floria), Ella Road (Clarella), Lila Whelan (Silvia), Bella Heesom (Flavia), Joel Davey (Camillo), Adam Cunis (Vespuci), Théo Kingshott (Fabricio and servant), Howard Horner (Julio De Varana), and Virginia Denham (Morosa).

*The Broken Heart,* directed by Iqbal Khan at RADA, 10-19 March 2016. With Luke Brady (Amyclas/Tecnicus), Thomas Martin (Ithocles), Matt Gavan (Orgilus), Tom Edward-Kane (Bassanes), Jack Riddiford (Armestes), Abraham Popoola (Crotolon), Fehinti Balogun (Prophilus), Bart Lambert (Nearchus), Fraser Wall (Amelus), Evlyne Oyedokun (Calantha), Polly Misch (Penthea), Maisie Robinson (Euphranea) and Jordon Stevens (Grausis).