HAMLET TO HAMILTON

Season One, Episode Nine
The Rules of Emotive Formatting

EMILY. This is *Hamlet to Hamilton: Exploring Verse Drama*. I'm your host, Emily C. A. Snyder. You're listening to Season 1, Episode 9: "The Tool Boudoir, Part 4: Emotive Formatting," because formatting is soooo important.

[music]

HAMLET 1. To be…

HAMLET 2. To be…

HAMLET 1. … or not to be?

HAMLET 3. To be or not to be?

HAMLET 1. That is the question.

HAMLET 3. … or not?

EMILY. Hello, friends. We are finally into emotive formatting as part of our tool boudoir. Instead of a toolbox, we're doing verse drama, so we've got a tool boudoir. As a reminder, Season 1 is meant to be scaffolded. That is, it's meant to be listened to from the beginning. If you prefer to jump in here, you are more than welcome to. If you get lost at any point with any of the terminology that we use, you can always go to hamlettohamilton.com and check out our [glossary](#) link. Similarly, as we are doing emotive formatting, formatting is a visual medium. We're in an audio medium, so what we've done is we have all the texts available for you on hamlettohamilton.com. You can see it either on the webpage or you can download a PDF of the text on the episode page on hamlettohamilton.com. You can also get the transcript for the episode. The transcripts are usually up a few days after the episode drops, and you can see the text formatting there.

If you would prefer this podcast to basically be a YouTube channel, we have a goal set for us on Patreon, that's patreon.com/hamlettohamilton, and as soon as we hit 20 patrons, we will start releasing shorter video versions of these lectures on YouTube, so you can hear my dulcet tones but then see the text simultaneously as we're talking about it. If that's of interest to you, you can sign up for a monthly subscription over at patreon.com/hamlettohamilton, and you'll get not only warm fuzzies at supporting your favorite podcast, but you'll also get other goodies, which we'll talk about a little bit later on in the episode.

[music]

Thus far in the tool boudoir… I didn't mean to rhyme there, but thus far we've looked at meter and scansion. Meter is the interplay of rhythm and beat, and scansion is the study of what sort of meter is used. We've looked at lineation, which is line breaks, essentially where do you place the line; how do you perform a line ending; how do you perform a line beginning; and what that does to the actor in where you place your line; reasons to place a line. Today we're going to be looking at emotive formatting, which is going to bleed over into silences and stage directions.

The thing that I want you to know, especially in regards to… I expect that many listeners expected more, for example, from the meter and scansion episode, and what we're doing right now in this Season 1 is just an overview. We're more or less just looking at the thesis sentences. We know there's so much more to explore. We will be exploring it, but also with today, we're just looking at the basics of emotive formatting. As we go on, we will be going deeper into every subject.

Now, we're almost at the end of Season 1. We really only have emotive formatting left and then silences and stage direction, and then we'll be into Season 2, so keep an ear out for a little bit more on Season 2. It's called "Arthur Through the Ages," and we're going to be looking at the Lancelot/Guinevere scenes from every verse play – well, not every, there's so many – but from some significant verse plays about the King Arthur legend from 1587 all the way through 2019, and you'll be able to hear, therefore, how the whole tool boudoir is put into use when actors are actually reading this sort of material, as well as you'll get to hear a whole bunch of different playwrights, as well as my new favorite playwright who, alas, died far too young. But Season 2 will be that.

We're going to take a little break for the summer, and then we'll be back with Season 3, which you guys, which Patreons will be allowed to have a vote on what direction would you like to explore next? Because there's so many different ways that we can go, and we really want this podcast to serve you. Give some thought as you're listening to this – again, we are going to be taking the suggestions of our patrons on Patreon, so if you're interested in commissioning an episode, patreon.com/hamlettohamilton.

All right, that's enough of that. Let's get into the emotive formatting. Emotive formatting is one of the best ways that we can convey cadence. What is cadence? Cadence is the musicality of how to say a line of verse. What we're doing with emotive formatting is it's a way to convey musicality, a way to convey how you hear the line of verse being said and to honestly give some gifts, some clues, some direction to the actor. Now, the actor may decide to do something completely different with your verse. That's up to them. But this way, you can give them little gifts that they can either accept or refuse, or take and modify.

If you want to think about it this way, going to the sort of *Hamilton* part, the musical theatre-type part, emotive formatting is very similar to putting a fermata on top of a note and saying, "Hold this out longer." It's very similar to writing pianissimo or fortissimo, louder or softer. It's equivalent to saying allegro or presto, how fast or slow. All of the formatting that we use tells a little bit about how to perform. Then again, the performer can decide to do your piece as written or can essentially decide to do their cover of your piece.

The really interesting thing about emotive formatting as well is that because it's visual, it's something that actors, by and large, will be able to pick up immediately, just as they're glancing at the page. They will pick up that a word is spelled different or that a word is in italics or that there's something in parentheses or that there's a lot of white space on the page. It will immediately tell them something in the same way they can kind of glance at sheet music and see that the notes are going up and down or there's a very long section and then you're going to have three notes to sing. Or, for example, when I would sing the alto section of "Angels We Have Heard on High," that I was going to stay on one note for a very long time, and then go down, and then go back up to that same note. Emotive formatting can instantaneously tell the actor a little bit about what's going on inside their character.

What are the types of emotive formatting? Well, there are basically four groups. There's emotive spelling, emotive typography, emotive punctuation, and emotive spacing. Let me repeat those, and then we'll dive into each of them: emotive spelling, emotive typography, emotive punctuation, and emotive spacing. As Evan Sachs said a few episodes ago, basically when we're writing verse, since we're trying to capture the way that people actually speak, since we're trying to capture the inner emotional life of a character, it's not so much that we're writing things out grammatically perfectly, but rather that we're using a sort of emotive grammar, and so similarly we're using an emotive formatting. It's all about capturing, through the use of words and symbols and spacing on the page, what the character is like.

All right, so what we're going to do is a little exercise. Instead of going straight into text, let's actually take this phrase, and then we're going to put it through what it would be in emotive spelling, what it would be in emotive typography, what it would be in emotive punctuation, and with emotive spacing. The phrase is:

And I believed him, like a fool.

Now, if we were to write this out with just typical grammar, acceptable grammar, it would be

And I believed him, like a fool.

with only a capitalization on the first word, with a comma in the middle, with a period at the end. Fairly straightforward, and we wouldn't be changing any spelling. We would just write it out. "And I believed him, comma, like a fool, period." Capital A at the beginning, everything else lower case, with the exception of the word "I," since we do capitalize that in English. If we were to do this in a different language, there would be different rules about what words were capitalized or not, things like that.

I'm going to perform this line four different ways. What I'm going to invite you to do is to listen to it, to think about what tools you would use to write it out yourself, and then to take a look at the [show notes](#) on hamlettohamilton.com and see how I wrote it out, just so you can get a sense. I will also tell you what I did to each line. The first one is going to use emotive spelling. The second one will use emotive typography. The third will use punctuation, the fourth, spacing. The phrase, to read it neutrally again, is:

> And I believed him, like a fool.

[music]

All right, using emotive spelling, this is one way to deliver the cadence of the line:

> And I b-b-believed him, like a foooooool.

There, as you probably heard, I repeated the b on the line. I happen to have hyphens in between. Then I added extra o's to the word "fool."

> And I b-b-believed him, like a foooooool.

To use emotive typography, listen to it, and then we'll talk about it. Typography, again, is upper case, lower case, underlines, whatever you can do to the font. So, emotive typography:

> AND I believed him, like a <u>fool</u>.

For that, I capitalized the whole of the word "and," so capital A, capital N, capital D, and then I underlined "fool."

> AND I believed him, like a <u>fool</u>.

To use emotive punctuation, listen to it, think about how you would format it, then we'll talk about it.

> And I believed him(!)…like a fool.

For that, I actually put an exclamation mark in parentheses after the phrase, "And I believed him," and then ellipses – that's three dots – before the phrase, "like a fool."

> And I believed him(!)…like a fool.

To use emotive spacing, and this one might be easiest to think about of all of them. It'll be a little different when it's in dialogue, but to use emotive spacing, listen to it. How would you format it? Then we'll talk about it.

> And I believed him   like a fool.

As you can hear, there is a space between the two.

> And I believed him   like a fool.

Each of these does something different, and we will talk a little bit more about what ellipses versus dashes versus this versus that, etc. mean.

Now, can you mix and match these? Yes, of course, and actually some of this might seem incredibly basic to you because we use emotive formatting all the time. If you've ever written a text or a Facebook post or if you've ever tweeted or pretty much done anything on the internet, the likelihood is you're extremely fluent in emotive formatting. You're constantly deciding to put things in different lettering, to spell things differently to get a sense of something, to punctuate in a way that, again, expresses the cadence that you want your audience to hear, the musicality of how to say the line the way you want your audience to hear it. This is a tool that we can and do use in verse drama. Is it only used in verse drama? Heavens, no. It's used in anything that you can write down, as mentioned before. We do this in text all the time. The only thing that makes verse drama verse is that lineation, really, is that line break.

But spelling, typography, punctuation, and spacing – and spacing will actually be a little bit more specified to verse drama as opposed to any other drama – are all at our disposal, and were somewhat in use during Shakespeare's time, but also not really. If you listen to last episode, we started our talk about emotive formatting by actually talking about First Folio with our own Esther Williamson, so if you missed that, definitely go back. Wonderful conversation. Esther dives in as an actor to some of this stuff that we're talking about today. All that you need to know, to recap very briefly, is that essentially there's this method of acting called First Folio acting, which is predicated on the understanding that there are different emotive formatting clues in Shakespeare, that, for example, if a word is capitalized that is not normally capitalized, that you ought to give it some oomph. If a word has an e on the end of it, perhaps it means to expand the major operative vowel in the word, such as the word "towne" with an e on the end of it

might mean say it, "tooown." Similarly, a sense of, is something italicized? Does that mean something? Are there punctuation marks that tell you something? Esther especially went into the different punctuation between the Folio and modern versions, where, for example, they might have extra parentheses that actually kind of mess with the delivery of the line. So take a listen to the last episode for even more about Shakespeare.

The difficulty with First Folio acting technique is that, while it's very sound and helpful because emotive formatting is absolutely 100% a thing, we don't know to what degree it was really a thing for Shakespeare, and that's because spelling was a free-for-all in Shakespeare's time, until about a hundred and fifty years later when Johnson made the first dictionary. While there were some movements in Shakespeare's own time towards codifying spelling, it really wasn't until the 1700s and Johnson's dictionary, and then really only a handful of years after that, Webster in America did his American dictionary, which is why in America we don't have the word "colour" spelled with a u, for example. It's because of good old Webster, who actually knew Alexander Hamilton and was commissioned by Hamilton to help with The Federalist Papers. When he wrote his dictionary, it was that same sort of "Boo to England" spirit, which is why we spell "color" without a u. Anyway, there you go. A little bit of tidbit, which is to say if something is spelled "wrong" or different in a text that Shakespeare's friends published, which the First Folio was published by Shakespeare's friends, well, you kind of could spell things however you wanted. Similarly, there was no definitive grammar book. There were no definitive rules of punctuation for another hundred, hundred and fifty years.

Now, the lovely thing is that, at the time of this recording, we do have rules of grammar and rules of spelling and rules of punctuation, and that is actually helpful because so long as you know those rules, then any time that you break those rules, it becomes a little flag to the actor, whereas if it's a free-for-all all the time, then you don't know whether you should interpret something, or whether that's just how they felt like spelling the word "banana" that day.

To that end, I want to take a very quick look… We'll start with emotive spelling, because that's kind of the easiest one to wrap your brain around. Let's take a look at the master of emotive formatting, the poet e. e. cummings. e. e. cummings is an American poet who was born in 1894, died 1962, and is known as that guy, that poet who wrote in all lower case and used a bunch of punctuation in curious ways. Everyone who's ever done an Instagram poem in lower case on typewriter font and it's basically a fortune cookie that's been broken up into lines, they kind of are trying to look like e. e. cummings.

What e. e. cummings was doing, though, in breaking typography, especially, breaking punctuation, was he was attempting to convey cadence. He was attempting to convey feeling, and it's really interesting to both look at his work, but also to hear people interpret his work, including himself, because we do have

recordings of him doing his own work. He was influenced by Ezra Pound who is one of the major proponents of free meter poetry, among others. Ezra Pound, T. S. Eliot and others popularized using free meter, which is to say no repeated beat, no repeated rhythm. e. e. cummings played a little bit with that, but I would suggest that the things that he was breaking were more about formatting, and, again, doing so intelligently, with intention. If we think again about line breaks, the major thing is you need to place a line break with intention. Again, if we're talking about meter, it's not just about using this rhythm, this speech. Not just about doing nothing but, I don't know, anapestic trimeter, and it's going to magically do something. It's about using it with intention, with intelligence. In the same way, you want to use emotive formatting with intelligence.

Let's take a look at the poem "may I feel said he." I'm going to read it. I recommend that you read along with it. You'll notice immediately, at first glance, that the entire thing is in lower case, which does tell me something about how to perform this. You'll notice that there are parentheses all over it. To be honest, I'm not sure that the parentheses actually are as helpful as he thinks they are. I have some criticisms, but I cannot go back in time and say, "My dear mr. cummings, let us talk about your overuse of parentheses." But I think the thing that I want you to focus on is in the very last stanza, there's going to be emotive spelling. While you may not hear the parentheses, you will absolutely hear the spelling.

All right, I'm going to read this. Just to let you know, it is a little sexy. (laughs) Here we go. "may I feel said he," by e. e. cummings.

> may i feel said he
> (i'll squeal said she
> just once said he)
> it's fun said she
>
> (may i touch said he
> how much said she
> a lot said he) [SEP]
> why not said she
>
> (let's go said he [SEP]
> not too far said she
> what's too far said he
> where you are said she)
>
> may i stay said he
> which way said she
> like this said he [SEP]
> if you kiss said she

may i move said he[SEP]
is it love said she)[SEP]
if you're willing said he
(but you're killing said she

but it's life said he[SEP]
but your wife said she
now said he)[SEP]
ow said she

(tiptop said he
don't stop said she
oh no said he)[SEP]
go slow said she

(cccome?said he
ummm said she)[SEP]
you're divine!said he
(you are Mine said she)

And if you like that, Tom Hiddleston does a beautiful rendition. You heard the emotive spelling, I'm sure, on the word "come," which is written with three c's, no hyphens in between, so it's cccome, and definitely tells you how to perform that line. (laughs) Extremely effective, and actually was interesting walking through this piece, because I found, as much as I was against all the parentheses, about exactly half of them were helpful in terms of bracketing and saying, "These three lines ought to be said together with less space around them. Run these things together, even though they're on separate lines." Then there were other ones with parentheses where I was like, "Ugh, why is that there?" But there we go.

But things that were extremely helpful was that emotive spelling on the word "cccome," which again, it's interesting that he didn't put hyphens in between, but he does have a question mark immediately after the word, and then no spacing before the word "said." So it's "cccome?said," all as one word. Then similarly, two lines down, it's "divine!said." We do that in modern text, don't we? Then on the very last line, there's exactly one capitalization in this entire poem, and that's on the word "Mine." There are no italics. There are no underlines. But I also love – I love – that this entire poem is in lower case, because it is such an intimate poem, that if it were… There's no other punctuation. There's no commas. There's no periods. There's no quotation mark. There isn't even capitals at the beginning of each line, and so you get the sense of whispering the entire poem. The lines, too, are incredibly short, and so you get that sense of dialogue with yourself.

If we were to go on, I love the fact that the rhyme for each line is at the middle of each line, which is very cool, and you've got the repetition of "said he, said she, said he, said she," so you get this lovely ocean effect. There's so much

happening here that he has used from the tool boudoir in this, what looks like an incredibly simple poem, but very effectively changing the spelling of a word. Extremely effective. Good job, e. e. cummings.

So again, you can imagine, and you probably have. You've probably already done this. You've probably already changed the spelling of a word at some point in your life. This can include something like using DoggoLingo, which is like hooman, in order to sound like how a dog talks.

Something else that you can do with spelling, while it's not necessarily emotive, is, of course, you can also write in dialect. If we go back to *Hamilton*, we see this in Lafayette's verse of the very first song that they all have together. What Miranda has written for Lafayette in "My Shot" is

> I dream of life without a monarchy
> The unrest in France will lead to 'onarchy.
> 'Onarchy? How you say?
> How you say? "Anarchy."
> When I fight, I make the other side panicky.

The way he's written it out is "'onarchy." Then when we get to the word "anarchy," that's also in quotation marks, to give the sense that, oh, am I supposed to say it the correct way? Or the American pronunciation way? He talks a little bit about that in his collected lyrics. Apparently, one of his great delights is rhyming on dialect, which is very cool. That's something else that you can use spelling differences for.

One last little thing about spelling that I'd like to mention in regards to clarification, and this is really only true for English language, although I imagine that there are other variations of this in other languages, so please do let me know. But in English, one of the things that goes back and forth in regards to formatting is whether to say the -ed at the end of a verb. So, for example, we could say "changed," but way back when, you would say, "chang-ed." Now, in Shakespeare's time, because the proper thing to do was to always say the -ed unless you noted that it should be different was they would put an apostrophe to mark that there's an elision. That means that you run it together. If they put "chang'd," that would mean to say it "changed," and if they wrote out "changed," that would mean to say "chang-ed." Now, a lot of verse playwrights that I've seen, they've gone back and forth as to whether they… More or less, whether they want to be fan fiction-y, and I don't mean that in a pejorative towards actual fan fiction, but what I mean is trying to look like Shakespeare, basically, trying to make it look like you're writing in First Folio or something. What they'll do is they'll sort of haphazardly put apostrophes on some of the words where they mean for it to be the modern way to say the word "changed," and then sometimes they won't put an apostrophe and you're just supposed to know it's

supposed to be "chang'd," and then sometimes they won't put the apostrophe there and they'll expect you to know it's "chang-ed."

So the rule now for if you want the -ed to be spoken is if you come across a word like "changed," where you want it to be "chang-ed," you're going to put an accent grave - that's the downward little stroke – over the letter e. You put an accent grave over the e, and that will tell your actor to actually say that ending part, that it's "changèd." Otherwise, generally speaking, write it out the way you would in normal, modern English. You are a modern playwright. The people who are acting you are modern English speakers, so write it out in modern English. Then if you want that extra -ed sound, to put an accent grave, which is, it goes from high to low, over the letter e.

There are a couple other things, too. For example, people used to say "marri-age" or "occasi-on" in English. This is actually, it scans that way for the character of Paris in *Romeo and Juliet*. He says "marri-age" every time, is the way it scans. If you do want that, then put a circumflex - that's a little carat – over the i in, for example, the word "marrîage." We will otherwise say "marriage," but if you want that little "marri-age" type sound, put a circumflex over the i.

Those aren't so much emotive spelling things as they're very particular to the fact that a lot of modern, current verse playwrights are going to be trying to sound older, are going to be using older pronunciations, and for the sake of clarity, please, please do modern spellings. If you want the old sound, put an accent grave or put the circumflex over the i for slightly different sounds and pronunciations. (Scottish accent) All right?

[music]

Season 2 is coming to *Hamlet to Hamilton*, and we are looking at Arthur through the ages. What you may not know is that there are just a ton of verse plays written about King Arthur. To kick off Season 2, we are going to be having a super special party all over Zoom, and it's going to be open to any patron of *Hamlet to Hamilton*. What we're going to be doing is we're going to be taking a look, live, at some of the different pieces and reading them out loud to each other and talking about what we think about them. What do we think about the version from 1587? What do we think about the three different versions from 1895? If you're a patron, you will be able to participate and try out this verse for yourself, as well as say hello to the people that you've been listening to and trading messages with. You can join at any level. You can join for even just one month in order to joins us for the party. That's patreon.com/hamlettohamilton, and at any level, even for just the month. In February, we will be having a kickoff party for "Arthur Through the Ages." See you there.

That was a bit of emotive spelling, as well some clarifications. Let's turn our attention now to emotive typography. A reminder that typography is basically

anything that you can do to the font. A quick look at any Word document tells me that I can use capital letters, lowercase letters. I can make the font size smaller or larger. I can put things in bold, italic, underline, double underline, crossing out – which, actually, we're going to put a pin in later for silences - as well as now we could put words in a different font. For example, if we have something in a sans serif like Arial or Impact, we could then decide to put it in serif, such at Times New Roman or even Courier. Serif means that it has the little dangly bits at the end of the letter. One, perhaps, might look a little bit more fancy than another. We also could put certain words in color or we could choose to highlight certain words or certain phrases. Similarly, we could put, if we wanted to, an entire line in a color block or an entire scene in a color block. Again, I haven't particularly seen the use of color or the use of changing font purposely in a text, so those I might leave to the side. If anyone starts playing with that, I would love to know.

But let's keep an eye, instead, on capital letters, lowercase letters, on bold, italic, and underline, as well as making the font larger and smaller, and what those do to the cadence, to the performance of your line. Now, much like spelling and even the rules of grammar were not codified in Shakespeare's time, so there isn't really a written down rule that has been codified in our time until now. We're going to codify today, and rather like Johnson and others who came before him, what we're going to do, as we codify today what underline means, what a dash means, etc., etc., is, honestly this is being taken from just years and decades of working with Shakespearean verse and working with new verse, both as a director and a playwright and a dramaturg for other playwrights and an actor, and essentially taking what seems to be the consensus among everyone who is interpreting, essentially, emotive formatting, even without having the language prior to now. Groundbreaking stuff, friends.

We're going to have a lot to say in this section, so if you need to start and stop, feel free to do so. As best as we can, we will also add this to our glossary so that at any time, you can go and take a look at what any of this emotive formatting does.

Now, basically, what typography tends to give us is three different things. One, it tends to indicate volume; two, it tends to indicate intensity; and three, it can indicate pitch. What do I mean by volume, intensity, and pitch? Well, volume is how loud or soft you are, and even as you're thinking about it, you can imagine how you might use typography to get loudness or softness. Intensity means that there's an extra oomph to the word that you use emotive typography on. You use typography in order to indicate that this word should not be lost, should not just be dropped by the actor, that there's something intense about it, that something should be punched, that there should be some element of importance given to a certain word. Even with that sentence, you can think of different things you might do to the text in order to get the actor to have the cadence that I just had. Then pitch is where your voice lands. This is, again, coming back to musical theatre. While we don't as often, I think, as playwrights, even as actors, think about

playwrights telling us where to put our pitch, whether it should be high, whether it should be low, in fact, typography does give us that tool, should we need it.

Let's go one by one through the common forms of typography. We've got uppercase letters and lowercase letters, that is capitalized letters and small letters, basically. We have, in grammar – and again, this is going to vary depending on your country. For example, in German, there's a lot more capitalization than there is, for example, in French. In English, there are certain words that ought to be capitalized or certain times that a word ought to be capitalized, and so this is going to vary from language to language. Again, right now I'm going to focus on English. If you were to capitalize a word, just the first letter of a word that is not typically capitalized in English, that will tell your actor something. Generally speaking, since, again, most people that are going to be doing new verse drama have some Shakespeare under their belt and therefore have probably run across First Folio technique, that's going to be something that they notice. It's important not to just, I don't know, capitalize every noun, because you're trying to look old-timey – and even on that, you can imagine Olde with an e and a capital O and tyme with a y in it if you were trying to get the cadence of how to say "Olde-tyme-y."

But if you put something in upper case, so, for example, let's go back to the sentence that we're playing with, which is

> And I believed him, like a fool.

If you put "Fool" with a capital F, that would tell me, as an actor, not to lose that word.

> And I believed him, like a Fool.

There might be more… It's a little bit more nuanced. It doesn't tell me, as an actor, quite what to do, but it does tell me this word should not be dropped. That is absolutely something that you can do.

If you want to actually take a look, there's this great sketch by Fry and Laurie, the wonderful British comedic duo, and it's from their university days, where they're actually making fun of good old John Barton and the way that Barton worked with actors. Stephen Fry is playing the John Barton Shakespeare guru, and Hugh Laurie is playing his student. There's this wonderful bit where they're looking at a line from Troilus and Cressida, which is

> Time, my lord, has a wallet on his back.

All right? That's the line of verse. As they're analyzing it, Stephen Fry says (English accent),

STEPHEN. But Shakespeare's given us another clue, hasn't he there, Hugh? What do you see at the beginning of the line?"

HUGH. Uh, time.

STEPHEN. Right, but what is *done* to the word "time?"

HUGH. Uh, it's got a capital T on it.

STEPHEN. Right, and *why* is there a capital T on it, Hugh? Can you tell me why there's a capital T on it, Hugh?

HUGH. Uh, because it's the first word of the sentence?

STEPHEN. Yes, yes, for that reason, but also because Shakespeare is giving us time in a *conventional* sense.

So he's making, perhaps, a bit too much of the fact that it's the beginning of the line, so of course it's capitalized. But in fact, if you look at Shakespeare, he frequently capitalizes the word "time," and many people who have gone throughout his work tend to give that word a little bit more emphasis, a little bit more intensity whenever it is capitalized.

On the other hand, if something is put into lower case when it typically would not be lower case – think of that e. e. cummings poem that we just looked at where the entire thing was in lower case except for the word "Mine," which had an uppercase M – when you put something in lower case that's not typically in lower case, you're telling me something about the intimacy, about the intensity, about my pitch and my volume, that things might be a little smaller, a little quieter, a little bit more under the radar.

You can also – and we know this quite well, don't we, both from Twitter and Facebook, when an older relative doesn't know to keep the caps lock off and they put everything in all caps or if you're reading Harry Potter, and suddenly you've reached book 5, which is pure angst Harry Potter, and almost every single one of his lines IS ENTIRELY IN CAPS. I think it's fairly safe to say that if you put something entirely in caps, the actor is going to shout that.

Now, we do have the option of using the SMALLER ALL CAPS, which I would suggest doesn't mean shouting so much as it means "with great emphasis," but not necessarily "I'm shouting at you." Does that make sense? Terry Pratchett actually uses the ALL SMALL CAPS for when he writes the character of Death in his Discworld novels, and even as you're reading it, you can hear the cadence of EVERY WORD IS KIND OF GIVEN CHRISTOPHER LEE WEIGHT. Small all caps has a slightly different cadence than PUTTING SOMETHING IN ALL CAPS, which is just screaming, frankly. That, of course, something in all lower case would be

much more "may I touch said he." All right, so upper case, lower case, small upper case.

We also know, however – and we've seen this especially more on Tumblr and in memes and sometimes in tweets – is you can mix upper case and lower case to actually get the sense of where the pitch should go. For example, if I said, "crAAAAzy," you might put all the As in capitals and everything else in lower case. Now, you can overdo this. If you've seen people who essentially are trying to get the sense of complete nonsense and they put every few letters in capitals and it's just all sort of messed up, honestly, I might be a little daunted by that as an actor. That's a little bit easier to read than it is, perhaps, to perform, although any actors out there, let me know if you disagree. But generally speaking, I would suggest a rather smart use of upper case and lower case, particularly on vowels and particularly when you're also changing, perhaps, the spelling. For example, to get the idea of SOOOoooooo, you might have a bunch of uppercase O's to begin with and then lowercase o's following.

Similarly with a font, I frequently will see people – and I've used this myself – you'll make the font actually smaller if you want the actor to speak quieter. I tend to see people make the font smaller rather than make the font larger, and as someone who has printed many pages of script, I actually thank you for that. But if you make the font smaller, you can convey to the actor that this line, perhaps, either should be sotto voce, which is said under the breath, so, for example,

And like a fool, I believed him.

would all be, perhaps, in 8-point font rather than 12-point font. But it also can give a sense of mumbling, particularly if you combine it with spacing and, perhaps, take out all the spaces between the words. Put it all in a smaller font, and then you get a

Andlikeafool,Ibelievedhim.

It's both sotto voce and it's mumbled.

You can make the font larger or smaller. Again, we don't tend to make the font considerably larger, and I think that's mostly because putting something in a capital or using small capitals, even, does the work of the volume, because if you've got something in all capitals, if you're yelling… If it's in all capitals, not all small capitals, but all regular capitals, if you're yelling, generally your voice is going to get louder. You don't need to also make it 24-point font or something like that. I haven't seen that quite as much. Again, though, that may be something to experiment with. Especially, perhaps you're doing outdoor theatre. Perhaps you're doing theatre for young audiences and you're writing for a giant. I don't know. Play with it. Tell me what happens. Tell me how actors interpret it. Actors, tell me if that would be helpful or not.

Lastly, looking at underline, bold, and italic. Now, at first glance, these may all seem to be intensifiers, and they certainly are. But again, they also have to do with cadence. They have to do with pitch. They have to do with intensity and different types of intensity. I would suggest that if something is in bold, that they're slightly thicker and louder sound. If it's in bold, it has a similar quality, I would suggest, to putting something in all small caps, but if you have something in all small caps, that has gravitas, whereas something in bold has a bit of fieriness, I think, to it. But certainly you want to give it a bit of a thicker oomph.

If words are underlined, that frequently is an invitation to literally lower your pitch. If we were to bold the last word of "He said what?" versus underline the last word of "He said what?" it might be:

He said **what**? (more forceful)

versus

He said <u>what</u>? (lower and slower)

Bold

He said **what**? (more forceful)

versus underline

He said <u>what</u>? (lower and slower)

Underline, because it's heavy, right? It's bottom-heavy. Again, this is where we're trying to interpret with emotive formatting, and in this case, emotive typography, very similar to how musical notation works. Up means up. Down means down. Bigger means louder. Smaller means quieter. Things like that. It's fairly basic, but it's attempting to turn the art of the way that we put words on the page into something vocalized and actable.

Similarly, things that are italicized, I would suggest either stay on the same pitch but get a little oomph, rather similar to capitalizing the first letter. But it also can indicate that you might want to bring your pitch up a little bit. If we took "He said what?" and italicized the last word, you might get something like

He said *what*? (pitch rises)

Again, a bold might be

He said **what**? (more forceful)

Underline might be

Emily C. A. Snyder   © 2021   15

He said <u>what</u>? (lower and slower)

And italic might be

He said *what*? (pitch rises)

Slight differences, and again, this is still open to interpretation, so actors, I would love for you to go through old scripts that you have and see what your inclinations are in terms of using bold, underline, and italic.

For playwrights, you may want to take a look at the work of Lauren Gunderson. Lauren Gunderson is one of the, if not the most produced playwright at the time of this recording. She's an American playwright. One of the very cool things about her is that actually, while some of her pieces will employ verse – although I don't know that she's written an entire verse play, though I have not read her entire ouvre – but she certainly is influenced by the works of Shakespeare and recontextualizes them into modern drama, which is very cool. Another very cool thing that she does, which is really very clever, is if she plans to use any sort of emotive typography, she tends to put a key at the beginning of the piece, saying, "This means this. That means that." Same thing with emotive punctuation, which she'll use frequently.

I'm looking right now at her play on [New Play Exchange](#) and will make sure to drop all the links. Definitely check out Lauren Gunderson's work. This is a play from 2013 called *By and By*, and what's really interesting is that she not only gives what she means by different punctuations, but she also says that levels of intensity are indicated by dialogue font, by typography. She says:

Italics are more intense than things that are not italicized. Anything in all caps is very intense, and therefore all caps and italics are the most intense.

You can just skim her piece, and in fact see the places where people are yelling at each other. And you do, you get that sense of you can hear, certainly, the volume rising and the pitch rising since she's using italics and then italicized all caps. Once again, you can mix and match these, and once again, you're just trying to indicate to the actor something about the cadence of what you hear, and then the actor can take that and interpret it as they will. The same is going to be true for emotive punctuation.

But before we go on to that, let's just recap what we did with emotive typography, which is the use of upper case, if it's in all caps versus lower case. If all of a sudden it's in all lower case, that will change your volume. If you have just the first letter in upper case, that tells me that the word is important, not to lose it, especially if it's not the beginning of a line or not a place where there would

normally be a word that begins with an uppercase letter. If you mix and match them, that might tell me how to perform the word. If you're going to use all small caps, that tells me a bit about the intensity. Bold, italic, and underline all use different intensities in terms of volume, in terms of pitch – high, low, etc. – and similarly, making the font larger or smaller will also tell me a bit about how loud or soft, how intense or how sotto voce, how quietly, how under my breath something ought to be. That's emotive formatting.

Again, I'd be fascinated, especially if you wanted… I'm thinking this would be especially helpful if, for example, Feste the jester has the part in the very end of *Twelfth Night* where he apparently starts reading Malvolio's letter in a crazy voice. We know that because Olivia basically says, "Why are you reading this crazy?" And he says, "I have to read it crazy. You must allow vox." I wonder what Shakespeare would have heard. What happens if he had written out that letter, perhaps, in Comic Sans or in something that looks like someone clipped it out from newspapers?

I do want to also put in a word of warning to any playwrights that are listening to this, to always use your discretion and your judgment if a piece that you've written is going to be assisted and helped by putting in emotive formatting, or especially if you need an actor to nail a joke. For example, there's a running gag in *The Other, Other Woman*, a play that I wrote and we've looked at a little bit in previous episodes, where characters keep saying, "But *is he*?" (pitch rising) I think I used italics, and perhaps capital letters in order to indicate that. What was actually very cool was I then… I developed it with the cast to begin with, so I was there. I was directing it. I was developing it with the cast. I knew what their go-to jokes were. They knew me. They'd worked with me for a while on other plays. They knew what my jokes were. But then we had another reading a few months ago with a largely British cast, an entirely new cast and no direction whatsoever. It was just a cold read. I was so pleased to see that, in fact, that cadence was still picked up by the character that has that running gag. They also did, "But *is he*?" (pitch rising) each time they were supposed to say it. That's awesome and encouraging, and those of you who write comedies, you know that frequently pitch or length of time… I mean, timing, pitch, volume, all of it is crucial to landing a joke. Groucho Marx would not be half as funny without his cadence. But you don't want to overuse it, because then you run the risk, frankly, of not letting the actors play with you.

One of the many reasons I do believe that we come back to Shakespeare is that we can play with him. We can interpret him, as opposed to someone like Eugene O'Neil, or if you've read the version of *Our Town* where there are so many stage directions you can barely find the bits of dialogue. You can over-direct in your play as a playwright. I'm sure I'm guilty of this. I'm sure you're guilty of this. I'm sure everyone can think of a playwright who has been guilty of this at some time or another. Using emotive formatting, emotive typography, etc., etc., just be prudent. Be prudent. It is a tool for you to use, but it is also, in some ways, an

ornament. Therefore, perhaps just be prudent when you're using these. With that, onward to emotive punctuation after this break.

[music]

Hello. This is Emily popping in here to take a minute to tell you about Turn to Flesh Productions. Turn to Flesh is a New York City theatre company that develops new plays in heightened text with vibrant roles for women and those underrepresented in classical art. So basically, we create new Shakespeare shows for everybody that Shakespeare didn't write for. Since our founding in 2013, we've given various levels of development space to over 50 plays through playwriting workshops, such as our monthly MUSE Program, or through our in-person classes, through the staged readings of full works, and even workshop productions and world premieres of entire shows.

We love to feature actors of all ages, abilities, shapes and sizes, ethnicities and orientations, usually swinging swords and falling in love and having epic battles, or just being terribly clever, frequently, although not always, speaking in blank verse.

Now, Turn To Flesh is excited to being working internationally over audio programming and workshops and productions held via digital platforms like Zoom. And we'd like to hear from you. You can find us on all social medias @turntoflesh and to keep up with the latest events, such as our monthly MUSE

Program, where playwrights bring in the first draft of their new scenes and actors embody and give feedback. Right now, The MUSE Program is also being held virtually over Zoom. I mean, you can, from your own living room on your laptop, watch a new Shakespeare play get written and workshopped right before your eyes. You might even have your own piece workshopped. You might be the new Burbage playing in the new Shakespeare's show. That's pretty cool.

So make sure to like us on Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter @turntoflesh and join the Turn to Flesh community. If you want to do more, you can support us by visiting turntoflesh.org and hitting that Donate button. Or if you want to book a one-on-one session with me, Emily C. A. Snyder, make sure to listen to the end of the podcast for more information. Right, back to the show.

All right, friends. We have looked at emotive spelling. We've look at emotive typography. Now we're going to take a look at emotive punctuation. I want to remind you there is a fourth form of emotive formatting, which is emotive spacing, but since that has to do with silences, with stage directions, things like that, we are going to be saving that for the next episode, which will be the last episode of Season 1. How crazy is that?

But right now, we're going to be taking a look at emotive punctuation, and that will even tease a little bit of silences, because what punctuation can do for us is it actually gives us tempo. Almost more than anything, it gives us tempo. That is how fast, how slow. It gives us rests. It gives us pauses and beats, not full silences, but it tends to give us tempo. It also, again, can give us intensity, a little bit of pitch, a little bit of volume. It also, frankly, can indicate, essentially – this is the main form of punctuation, right? – that a question mark tells you something different than an exclamation point does, and that it is telling you, in fact, how to act the line.

Let's use "He did what" again, and let's put a period versus an exclamation point versus a question mark.

He did what. (fairly flat)

Period.

He did what? (pitch rises)

Question mark.

He did what! (more forceful)

Exclamation point.

That might actually sound familiar to bold, italic, underline. There's some overlap. Sometimes you can use punctuation a little bit more elegantly than, perhaps, underlining everything. Again, typography is more if you really need to drive home that this cadence absolutely must be hit in order for the music of this line to hit. A lot of that can also be done with punctuation, as we will soon see.

Now, a little bit, actually, about the history of punctuation, because this is actually going to be important. Basically, in the third century BCE, in the Hellenic Egyptian City of Alexandria, there was a librarian named Aristophanes. Now, this is not the same Aristophanes who wrote *The Frogs* and *The Clouds* and was the comic dramatist of Greece. This is a librarian in Alexandria and, yes, it still hurts, doesn't it?

What had been the norm prior to good old Aristophanes of Alexandria is that you would just write all the words together. There was no spacing whatsoever. That, of course, could mean that you might read it wrong. A reminder that language was oral first. It wasn't written down first, so the idea was we're writing it down more like a backup, but of course this is going to be orated to us, so it doesn't matter how we write it. Just as long as we get all the letters down, whatever. But Aristophanes, man after my own heart, said, "Well, that's absolutely absurd. We need to have some sort of spacing between these." He had begun by essentially

creating different uses of dots, a high dot, a middle dot, and a low dot, which have since become our periods, our commas, things of that ilk. If you've seen in Rome, for example, there are some carvings where there will be a dot in between each word. The Romans took up this idea from Aristophanes. Then they got rid of it and they were just like, "Let's just put spaces." Then that became the norm.

Now, what I want to drive home is that the idea was that the placement of each dot represented a different amount of time, different tempo, between each word. A mid-level dot, which was called a comma, was meant to be a short amount of time between words. A longer one is at the bottom, and that's become our colon or semicolon. That is meant to be a slightly longer pause. Whereas if you put the dot at the very top, for Aristophanes, that's the equivalent to our period, periodos. We'll link to a couple articles where you can read more about the invention of punctuation, but something that I'd like to point out, actually, is that as punctuation was being developed through the Middle Ages by the monks of Christianity, what they started to borrow from was actually the notation being used in music, that had been developed a few centuries prior, such as for Gregorian chant. But get this: the notation that was developed for Gregorian chant, which is the first form of writing down music in the West, they were looking at – get this – the metrical poetical forms of Greek. They were looking at things like the iamb and trying to translate that into musical notes. So, guys, poetry, verse, music, punctuation, all totally combined. It's all connected. The truth is out there.

Anyway, (laughs) let's take a look at how we now tend to interpret, with cadence, punctuation. Some of the common punctuation marks – and again, this is something that we can thank the people that have studied and come up with ideas for First Folio – we could thank them for quite a bit of this work, and I would like to add onto this work. Generally speaking, a period is a full stop, right? That might sound a little funny to my British friends who say "full stop" instead of "period," so a little bit of a tautology there for you. Anyway, a period is a full, complete pause between sentences. It is the end. You take a breath, usually, and then you continue on. That's why there frequently will be a caesura, which we've talked about before, in the middle of a line of verse if there is some sort of ending or terminal punctuation like a period.

An exclamation point means to give it some sort of intensity or vivacity or anger or passion, but of course, it's an interjective, right? Still, afterwards, there tends to be the sense of there is a full stop. Same thing for a question mark. A question mark means, of course, that it's an interrogation, that it is a question. And frequently, at least in English, it means that there's a slight inflection up, so your pitch might go up.

He did what? (pitch rises)

with a question mark is the way you would pronounce it in English. I don't know what other customs are in other countries in other languages. It's also about intention. Your voice could go up on an exclamation point.

He did what! (pitch rises)

and that's actually why we have, increasingly, the use of both a question mark and an exclamation point, sometimes multiple of them. Similarly, as you know, if you have more than one question mark, if you have more than one exclamation point, that increases the intensity, such as if you gave a double underline or if you had bold and underline or bold, underline, and italic. All these things sort of double up and compound, multiply the intensity, the volume, the pitch.

Generally speaking, just like in Aristophanes' time, a comma will give you a slight pause. A semicolon or a colon might give you a medium-sized pause. It's not quite a full stop. I really like how Esther puts it, and again, this is very common, the idea that a colon is going to also give you a sense of ta-da, so you've got a ramp-up on the one side to the colon, a ta-da on the other side of the colon. Whereas a semicolon has a sense of, "I could stop here, but I'm going to continue." There's a little bit less of

da-da-da-da-da: BA

which can change pitch, intensity, volume, as opposed to

da-da-da-da-da; da-da-da-da-da

which might be a semicolon. Again, it's about meaning – in this case, grammatical meaning – that a colon tends to mean, "I'm prepped for, and then ta-da." Semicolon tends to mean, "I could end here. No, I've got more to say." The sentence continues on. But both the semicolon and the colon get a slightly longer pause than a comma would.

Now, actually, a game that I did… I've done it in several different places, so I don't know who to credit it to. Perhaps you've done this game as well. It's to take any piece of text and play a physical game in order to get the tempo changes of the punctuation into your body. If you're reading a piece of text, the idea is you're going to walk in a straight line. As soon as you hit a comma, turn 90 degrees – right, left, doesn't matter – but you're going to turn 90 degrees and then continue on with the line. If you hit a colon, pause for a second, and then continue forward. It's like I walk, I walk, I walk, I go up on my toes, I continue walking. You might decide to also give that a 90-degree turn. If it's a semicolon, you might do a similar thing. I'm walking, I'm walking, I go up on my does, and then you might actually either to a 90-degree turn or an entire 180 turn. Now, if it's a period or an exclamation point, you would completely stop at the end of it. And again, it would be helpful to look at what the next line is to see whether you ought to turn right,

left, or completely all the way around. But essentially, it's playing with the punctuation in your body. Since you will let your body take a moment to actually enact the punctuation, you start getting a sense of the tempo, as well as getting a sense of, essentially, the schwumpf, because you're looking at, does this run together? All these words run together. There are places where you'll look for punctuation for forever and it's not for five lines down, and that will tell you something, that all of this is together.

It's very similar if you were to look at that e. e. cummings "may I touch said he," and if you were to run everything together if it's bracketed in parentheses. That would be a very interesting exercise to do with your body. I do think that the more you can get punctuation into your body, the better it will be for your body, for your voice, for your acting, for your character work. But then again, I'm kinesthetic. I like moving and doing and being and acting and thinking and feeling all at the same time.

We also have putting an exclamation point or a question mark, for example, in a place where it doesn't typically belong. There's two ways to do this. One, we can look at the way that e. e. cummings used it, where instead of a space, he would put in the question mark or the exclamation point.

you're divine!said he

There's no spacing between "divine," exclamation point, and "said." Another way that I've seen this, if you want to keep the spacing – because, of course, taking out spacing also tells you something about tempo, about how to run the words together or not – but something else you could do is to, for example, take a parentheses, put an exclamation point in it, end the parentheses. So it would be divine(!) and then a regular spacing, said he. I do think there's a difference. I think if you run it all together, that tells me it should be

you're divine!said he (running "divine" and "said" together)

Whereas if there's spacing, it might be more

you're divine(!) said he (separating "divine" from the other words)

It ends up working as an intensifier in either way, but it also tells me if I have, essentially, either an exclamation point or a question mark, that almost becomes part of the spelling of the word, whether it's in parentheses or not. That tells me that just that word gets the emotion of an exclamation point or a question mark.

Again, this is very similar to things that I've seen, actually, mostly in fan fiction forums, where it's like… Okay, for example, Henry Tilney in *Northanger Abbey* by Jane Austen… A friend of mine once wrote a very lovely review for one of my novels, which is a fan fiction sequel of Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey*, and she

called my version of Henry Tilney Action!Henry. Action!Henry, and you get the sense that the word "Action" gets the exclamation point. "Henry" might not get the exclamation point, so you can use punctuation in that way, to say, "Just this word gets the emotion of exclamation point, question mark."

Similarly, it's worth noting that if you put periods in between every single word, you get the sense that everything, in fact, ought to be separated. For example,

> He. Said. What.

ought to be:

> He. Said. What. (pointedly)

or:

> And I believed him. Like. A. Fool.

We've seen this. We've used this. It's very common. It's one of your tools.

We mentioned parentheses. Parentheses have become some of my new favorite forms of punctuation. Now, with all of this – and at another date, in another episode, we can talk about what standardized formatting for verse drama should look like, and that does include things like you're going to use parentheses and then stage directions all in italics, but its spacing is different than if it's part of a line of verse, etc. Right now, let's keep with emotive punctuation. Parentheses in a line of verse should not be italicized. That will be confusing, because if they're in the text and italicized, it's a stage direction.

But in a line of verse, if you put something in parentheses, it does two things. One, it basically says that this line of text is an aside. That is, it's a line that's given to the audience or kind of mumbled to yourself or maybe, as a character, mumbled to one other person on the stage. It can be extremely helpful, especially if you have longer lines of verse and it would ruin the lineation to also put in the word "aside." You can just put something in parentheses. What this also does, though, is you tend to drop your voice on anything that's a parenthetical, because a parenthetical, which an aside kind of is, it's going to sound like this. Let's go back to

> And I believed him, like a fool.

Let's say that we put the parenthetical around "like a fool." Whereas with a comma, it would be

> And I believed him, like a fool. (run together)

Actually, I might even take more of a pause there, right, because it's punctuation.

> And I believed him, like a fool. (with a pause after the comma)

You felt that small pause there. With a parenthetical, it would be

> And I believed him (like a fool). (with a bigger tonal shift)

All right? Your voice kind of goes softer, lower. It's to the side. That's why it's very helpful for asides. Certainly, I've been experimenting more with it in my own plays, and I do put a note like Lauren Gunderson at the beginning of my plays for anything that I think actors may not know, just because Shakespeare wouldn't have used them as much.

Now, it is interesting, if you look at the Folger's version of quite a bit of Shakespeare, I would suggest that rather like e. e. cummings, they tend to overuse the parenthetical, and they use it whenever there's a subclause. The problem is that as, again, listen to last week's episode, the parenthetical tends to be performed where your voice kind of goes off and to the side. It goes a little bit lower. It goes a little bit quieter, frequently. You can think also of a parenthetical will sound a little bit like a Groucho Marx punch line. For example, if you were talking to someone and then he said something in a parenthetical, it would sound like:

> And how are you today? (Isn't she looking very fine?)

You can hear that, right? A parenthetical really changes your cadence for that phrase. You don't actually want to put anything in a parenthetical just for the sake of grammar, because it really alters the delivery for the actor. It also tends to work in that schwumpf way where if it's in a parenthetical, you're saying that these things in brackets, however long it is, whatever it is, it's an entirely separate thought. It is a change in schwumpf entirely. It's not just a prepositional phrase. It's not just a different clause of the same sentence. Your brain, as you perform a parenthetical, will actually feel like it's shifted over to the side. I love parentheticals, but editors and playwrights and actors, but mostly editors, you need to know how it actually functions for an actor. Which is you're saying – fwoom – this is a different schwumpf, and now – fwoom – I'm back. All right? That's how a parenthetical works, works as an actual schwumpfed aside. If you don't know what schwumpf is, go back to the episode on schwumpf or take a look at the glossary.

Now, the other way to show a prepositional phrase or to show that we're sort of shifting thought, shifting schwumpf, is with a dash. The dash is an interesting old thing, and I think we're asking it to do too much right now. I would love some of your thoughts on how, perhaps, we could use other punctuation in order to let the dash only do a few things rather than all things I'm about to mention that it does right now. One of the questions many of my actors have asked me is, "All right,

I've got ellipses here and I've got an em dash here." An em dash is the longer dash (—), as opposed to an en dash, which is a slightly shorter dash (–), as opposed to a hyphen, which is a very short dash in between words (-). We will get to each of them. Right now, I'm talking about an em dash. They've asked me, "What does an em dash mean versus what do ellipses mean? What do you mean by them?" It's curious because up to this point, I've always felt it out naturally. It's been nebulous. I've just sort of felt it in my gut. "This is a dash. This is ellipsis." Ellipses are three dots. As I was working on this episode, I decided to look not only at my own work, but also look at just a slew of other plays, old plays, classical plays, plays that were written last year, verse plays that have been published, anything I can get my hands on. I just sort of ran my eye across looking for dashes versus ellipses and looking at it as an actor.

What I've come to is, frankly, this – which, again, Lauren Gunderson in *By and By* put very well – which is, essentially, a dash at the end of a line means that there's still forward momentum, that basically, while the thought or the speech or the line may be grammatically cut off, the energy, the tempo still continues. The other person coming in with their next line, for example, need to come in with that same velocity. Whereas if you have ellipses, whether with yourself or at the end of a line, there's a hesitation. There's a pulling back. Then the next person who comes in will pick up from that deceleration. Again, a dash means keep the acceleration. Keep the velocity wherever it was. Don't lose momentum. Ellipses means pull back your velocity a little bit. Again, this is true whether it's at the end of a line of verse or in the middle of a line of verse, mostly. This is where the dash is asked to do a lot.

The other thing about a dash is that it sometimes has been used as a way to show rest or silence or a quiet beat. This is especially apparent if you're in a highly regular repeated meter. Let's say you're using iambic pentameter, and you actually only want to vocalize or verbalize a few of those feet, a few of those syllables, and the other ones should be left silent. I did this, actually, in *Cupid and Psyche* for Psyche's Act IV scene 2 opening speech. At that time, I was writing in much more strict repeated beat, not necessarily repeated rhythm, but certainly repeated beat. The line is:

> There was — one moment — wordless.

In order to indicate, as you can hear, the pauses in between, I put in dashes. Now, the thing is, though, I do want you to still keep the energy, essentially to keep that uvriel, to keep that mmmm, that crackle going. I don't want you to lose it. I don't want you to have a hesitation. It's not "There was (hesitate, hesitate, hesitate) one moment (hesitate, hesitate)." It's not searching for the word. It's, I have the word there, but there's the crackling energy before I'm in again, that the silence and the words are connected. Again, it's not supposed to be a short line of

> There wás one móment wórdless.

which would be in trimeter. It's not meant to be hesitated with ellipses of

> There was… one moment… wordless.

which actually is a very cool way to play it. You want to play it that way? You want to play Psyche that way? Go for it. But the way I wrote it was meant to keep the intensity, so

> There was — one moment — wordless.

where hopefully she's more marinating in the sensation that she's in. But when we get into silences, other things I could have done, I could have put blank space in between. I could have used emotive spacing.

There are some practical difficulties with that. I wish, perhaps, I had some sort of punctuation that says, "This is a rest. Keep the intensity." But it's not dashing to the next thing. Because the other thing that, again, that dash, that em dash can do, is keep the intensity. I've changed my schwumpf. This is where scansion can be very helpful. If someone is writing in a very strict repeated meter, especially a strict repeated beat, you can notice if the dash is essentially taking the place of a foot, if it's taking a rest space. If it's not in a repeated beat, it's more difficult. Since we can use free meter, I'm wondering if we do need to maybe have something, maybe use an asterisk the way that, if you look at the transcripts – all hail Esther Williamson – she's been putting in an asterisk to mean breath, which I do kind of like. Another option that we could do is space, en dash, space. I don't know if that would read as well.

This is something for all of you out there to start experimenting with this week, is what are some of the ways that we can use emotive punctuation to mean rest, to mean silence? But it is worth noting an ellipsis ought to have some hesitation. Dash tends to mean there's some sort of switch but we keep the velocity. If we were to use en dashes or hyphens, generally it means these things are grouped together. It also is a good way to create new words. Maybe "you codswollop-ninnyknuckle," and that tells me that this whole thing ought to be said as one as if it were a new word. I have compounded these things together.

A few other quick things of note that are probably worth going over include we do use an apostrophe if we have left out a letter. An apostrophe essentially works as an elision. Grammatically, that's where we get "I'm, it's, they're," all with apostrophes. Rather than "I am, it is, they are," we throw it together. As mentioned, we are not using apostrophes for when we're eliding verbs such as blessed. We're not putting "blessed" to "bless'd." We are not putting that in. We are using, instead, the accent grave over an e to get the -ed sound. But for anything else that you need to elide, such as the word "o'er," or if you want to get any of those other sounds, "'tis" as opposed to "it is," right? Those are all helpful. Similarly, if you think back to Lafayette, by putting an apostrophe to rhyme "monarchy" with "'onarchy," right? That's where he took out the m. He put an

apostrophe so that you knew how it's supposed to sound. An apostrophe tends to be an elision, a running together, marking where the missing letter is, at least certainly in English and also many other languages, but we may as well note that.

This is going to go into next week, but increasingly in both prose and verse drama, there's the wonderful use of the slash, in this case of the forward slash. Leave the backslash at this time for coding, but the forward slash tends to be used in order to indicate when the next person is supposed to start speaking. We're going to talk about this even more next week when we talk about shared lines and emotive spacing. Again, to use that forward slash, you would have, for example someone would say… Let's use the sentences that we've been using thus far.

PERSON 1. And I believed him/ like a fool.

Then the next person has the line:

PERSON 2. He said what?

If there's a forward slash in the previous person's line, once the forward slash hits, that's when Person 2 is supposed to start their line of dialogue. Kudos, actually, to prose drama for pioneering that. Extremely helpful, and I would use that and just codify that and say that's what we're going to do. I know other people use asterisks in order to show this is where you're going to start. I think the forward slash is a bit more neat and intuitive, so that's what we are going to adopt, certainly, in verse drama. Although, as mentioned, we're also going to have emotive spacing at our disposal.

Lastly, let's talk for a moment about brackets, which are not really used as much but are at our disposal. There was something that was very interesting, certainly, when I was going through the e. e. cummings piece where he would put in parentheses – again, half effectively, half not – but he would put three lines of "he said, she said, he said" in parentheses, sort of bracketed those together to say that these should all be sort of schwumpfed together. They ought to have a velocity through them. There ought to be less space through them. I'd be very curious to see if the use, perhaps, first of square brackets […] and then of braces {…} and then of chevrons <…>, so basically we're going to use parentheses for aside thoughts, and then perhaps use square brackets, perhaps if two people are having a whole side conversation. That might be really interesting. Braces, which are the ones that are a little curly, that look like floop-bop, floop-bop. (laughs) We'll have them in the transcript. Take a look at it. But braces would be beyond that, and then chevrons, which are little sideways v's, would be beyond that.

Now, chevrons are used, I know, in several languages in place of quotation marks, which will be the last thing that we look at today, but a quotation mark – and this will vary according to country – in English, anything that is in double

quotation marks means that it is said or attributed to someone else. We also use that sometimes for scare quotes, and that's not a bad use. If it's a single quotation mark, essentially, the intensity of 'I'm quoting someone else' is a little bit lessened, I would say, regardless. I know in British grammar, it's reversed in terms of whether to use single or double quotation marks. That may be something that's worth normalizing between our nations. Perhaps not, though. Again, you would use it because it's attributed to someone else, because it's the way someone else would say it, but also if you're doing so in order to "say it." You can even hear it's similar to the underline. It's similar to the parenthetical. It's got a pitch element. You're saying it, but frequently, it comes with a bit of attitude, frankly, if it's in quotation marks, because you're trying to sound like someone else, whereas if it's underlined, you're emphasizing. If it's in parenthetical, it's still yourself, just as an aside, a completely separate thought. (exhales) That's a lot.

Now, I would love to know your thoughts and your own innovations, whether you're a playwright or whether you're an actor. Go through different texts and try these things out. Tell me, please, whether you find that your findings are matching with mine or if you would like to suggest something else or if you've made a discovery. I would love to know.

When we come back next time, we're going to be taking a look at emotive spacing, which includes, very much, silences, but we'll also be taking a very brief look at stage directions. For those of you who want us to talk about, let's say, soliloquies or dialogue or my favorite, stichomythia, or how to format that darned script, any of those sorts of things, well then do become a patron over on patreon.com/hamlettohamilton and let us know what you want us to cover. You can also definitely tweet at us @hamlet2hamilton with the numeral 2 as opposed to the word "to" in between, or with the hashtag #hamlettohamilton all spelled out, all one word. We would love to hear from you. If you're in our community, if you're interested, we want to make sure that this does stay open and available for all, because we ourselves come very much from a background of poverty, and we want education to be available to everyone, because whatever you have to say or write or direct or enact or produce is important, and you should have the tools at your disposal. That's why we're doing this podcast. We're really honored to have you with us.

Please, we would love to get this into the ears of more people, so spread the word, please, friends. Tell people about our podcast if you're enjoying us. Give us a good review on Apple Podcasts, please. Drop us a line. We would love encouragement. We get very excited whenever we meet fellow verse nerds from all over the world. We'll be back with the end of the tool boudoir and the end of Season 1, the Season 1 finale – whoo! how did we get here? – next week. And then we will be having a Zoom kickoff party with patrons as well as with many of our guests from this season and playwrights from this season, and hopefully you. So come on along. Join Patreon in order to get access to the party, which will be happening in February 2021 as we kick off Season 2: "Arthur Through the Ages." (sighs) This is good stuff, friends. Thank you so much for joining us. Bye.

[music]

Hamlet to Hamilton is a special project of [Turn to Flesh Productions](#) audio division. Turn to Flesh is a theatre company in New York City that develops new plays in heightened text with vibrant roles for women and those underrepresented in classical art. In other words, we create new Shakespeare plays for everybody Shakespeare didn't write for. *Hamlet to Hamilton* is hosted by [Emily C. A. Snyder](#) with audio engineering and sound design by [Colin Kovarik](#) and original music by Taylor Benson. Special thanks to our patron Madeleine Farley for helping to produce this episode. Special thanks to [Esther Williamson](#) for transcripts.

To learn more about us or to support the podcast, visit [hamlettohamilton.com](#) or sign up to become a monthly patron by visiting [patreon.com/hamlettohamilton](#). Other ways to support include leaving us a great review on Apple Podcasts or spreading the word about us with the hashtag #hamlettohamilton or #H2H, using the numeral 2 in between.

Are you a verse playwright, an educator, an actor, an interdimensional space traveler with a love of blank verse? Well, we want to hear from you. You can join the Turn to Flesh community and the community of *Hamlet to Hamilton* by finding us on Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram @hamlettohamilton or @turntoflesh.

Thank you for joining us, dear friends, for all things true, good, beautiful, and frequently in verse.