

actors as possible. The polygon itself is irregular, presumably to fit on a crowded site. That internal measurement of 14.13 meters (46 feet, 6 inches) is a standard medieval and Tudor measure of "a rod" (13.9 meters or 15.5 yards). When the carpenters had finished, the scene painters, plasterers, and decorators took over. The Rose was probably like the Swan which was described by DeWitt in 1596 thus: "There are in London four theatres of noteworthy beauty — the finest of these are situated to the southward beyond the Thames named from the signs they display the Rose and the Swan (DeWitt was writing three years before the first Globe was built). Of all the theatres, however, the largest and most distinguished is that whereof the sign is the Swan — since it has space for 3,000 persons and is built of concrete of flintstones which greatly abound in Britain and supported by wooden columns painted in such excellent imitation of marble that it might deceive the most prying."

Ordinary people as much as actors have identified with the Rose. It is alive. Leslie Garner in the *Daily Telegraph* of Wednesday, 17 May, wrote: "Buildings are more powerful than props in communicating the spirit of dramatic art which is why the Theatre Museum in Covent Garden is such a curiously dead place. Theatre exists in voice and movement, in the communication of ideas and emotions between performer and audience. This focussing of power can be felt in certain auditoria as though the intensity of human emotions is still trapped between stage and seating. You can feel it in the Greek theatres like Epidaurus, which have an almost tangible spirit of place."

So much for the intrinsic magic of the "wooden O" in which we are invited to let our imaginary forces work. But there are also the new discoveries about the shape and form of the Elizabethan theatre. For example, the central yard is sloped — why not, so as to allow the people at the back to see over the people in front? — but none of the hundreds of reconstructions have ever shown such a steeply raked yard. The stage tapers to the front just like the *Roxana* title page of 1632 (compressed to fit a title page obviously) and the hitherto discredited Globe reconstruction by Cranford Adam of 1942. (Every other scholar has followed the De Witt drawing and the four square Fortune contract to propose a square stage, which is so much less easy to handle as directors and designers know full well). The Rose also shows clear evidence that Henslowe's alterations of 1592 were directed chiefly to getting in

more people. The stage was pushed back over 1.8 meters (6 feet) to make it even less of a thrust and more of an end stage — eat your heart out Stratford, Ontario.

A hundred yards up the road Sam Wanamaker has started building the third Globe as accurate a copy of the second Globe as a few regulations and much research, that must now be re-written, will allow. Alongside the third Globe will be the Inigo Jones Theatre based on the drawings in Worcester College, Oxford, which I in *Tabs* (1973) and Professor John



The *Roxana* Title Page, 1632

Orrell in *Shakespeare Survey* (1977) identified as being the Cockpit in Drury Lane in 1616, suggesting also that this theatre was capable of being used as a scenic end stage. A hundred yards to the east of the Rose is a now empty site where stood the first and second Globes themselves. Excavation on a similarly tense timescale started there in June with an even chance that, if they have been spared by 18th and 19th-century basement builders, at least half of the foundations of the second Globe will be revealed. How much will depend on its exact position with regard to the Southwark Bridge Road. If the Globe is found and its owners relent, if Sam Wanamaker raises the rest of the money for his reconstruction and museum, if the developers at the Rose modify their office building sufficiently to allow a realistic museum below, the Bankside will live again thronged with people anxious to examine the clearly intelligible skeletons of the Rose and the Globe plus the conjectural reconstructions of the Globe and the Cockpit, all touchstones for theatregoers and theatre makers alike.

If, if, if. This article is being written on 7 June. There have been four major developments. First, an independent study was commissioned on a strategy for Rose and offices to co-exist. On Monday, 15 May, it seemed to me that if the office design was to be amended by the developer's design team it was important to distinguish between what their clients judged affordable and what technology judged feasible. As a Trustee of the Theatres Trust (set up by Act of Parliament "to provide the better protection of theatres for the benefit of the nation" but given no money to do so), I was able to persuade Ove Arup & Partners to study the engineering problem, the architectural section of Theatre Projects Consultants the planning consequences on the offices, Paul Gillieron the vibration concern over piling and Professor John Orrell the Shakespearean aspects -- all 'pro-bono'. Their report said it was possible to transfer the loads of the offices to the perimeter of the site with .9 x 27.4 meter long (3 x 90 feet) open girders running north/south from grid line five to Park Street. These girders would be 4.25 meters (14 feet) deep and would allow viewing walkways and service ducts to pass through them. On top of the girders would be the ceiling to the chamber, 11 meters (36 feet) above the excavation.

Car parking could be re-located and, if the planning authority gave permission for an extra floor, there would be a gain of 7.25% in lettable net area. A draft was shown to developers on 24 May and the report adopted by the Trust on 31 May.

Second, the developers produced their proposals on 2 June -- that the 2.4 meter (8 feet) diameter piles would pass within 45.7 centimeters (18 inches) of the Rose and up to 4.9 meters (16 feet) within the perimeter.

Third, the Rose Campaign launched their appeal on the same day. With an august list of supporters, they aim for purchase of the site and scheduling as a national monument.

Fourth, it was realised that the developers must lodge a fresh planning application. The authority, the London Borough of Southwark, after hearing evidence from all parties, will decide on 3 July whether the developer can proceed with his amended plans. Hopefully they will have been further improved by then.

Perhaps the last words can be left to Shakespeare and the question posed in *Henry IV Part 2*, Act I Scene 3: *What do we then but draw anew the model In fewer offices or, at least, desist To build at all?*