

VI

Shakespeare

GABRIEL EGAN, PETER J. SMITH, ELINOR PARSONS,
JONATHAN HARTWELL, ANNALIESE CONNOLLY,
RICHARD WOOD, STEVE LONGSTAFFE,
JON ORTEN AND EDEL LAMB

This chapter has four sections: 1. Editions and Textual Studies; 2. Shakespeare in the Theatre; 3. Shakespeare on Screen; 4. Criticism. Section 1 is by Gabriel Egan; section 2 is by Peter J. Smith; section 3 is by Elinor Parsons; section 4(b) is by Jonathan Hartwell; section 4(c) is by Annaliese Connolly; section 4(d) is by Richard Wood; section 4(e) is by Steve Longstaffe; section 4(f) is by Jon Orten; section 4(g) is by Edel Lamb.

1. Editions and Textual Studies

One major critical edition of Shakespeare appeared in 2007: Katherine Duncan-Jones and H.R. Woudhuysen edited *Shakespeare's Poems: Venus and Adonis, The Rape of Lucrece and the Shorter Poems* for the Arden Shakespeare series. An edition of the *Complete Works of Shakespeare* by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen appeared from an alliance of the Royal Shakespeare Company and Macmillan, but is of little scholarly interest. The parts of the Oxford *Collected Works of Thomas Middleton*, edited by Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino, that overlap with the concerns of this review are of considerable scholarly interest and will be noticed. Uniquely for an Arden edition, Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen's book is comprised of two major works, *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*, and they think that Shakespeare might well have conceived of them as a pair, albeit perhaps not until he began the second one. The title-page epigraph of *Venus and Adonis* is a quotation from Ovid about cheap shows pleasing the crowds, and this Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen think might be an allusion to Shakespeare's theatre work in an effort to distance the present book from it (pp. 11–13). There is an allusion to the story of Venus and Adonis in the induction to *The Taming of the Shrew* and it catches a moment very like one caught in the Venus and Adonis sonnets in *Passionate Pilgrim* [1599], so perhaps these were early

stabs at the theme done around 1590 when Shakespeare was writing *The Taming of the Shrew* (pp. 18–19). The titles of the narrative poems were attractive in indicating that they are about women, and in his early plays Shakespeare was daring in his representation of women, especially the active and devilishly attractive Katherine of *The Taming of the Shrew* and Margaret of Anjou in the Henry VI plays. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen ingeniously suggest that having his women be active and masculine was Shakespeare's way of overcoming the limitations of the boy actors (pp. 31–2). They see Shakespeare pondering republicanism in the waning years of Elizabeth's reign: not only *The Rape of Lucrece* (which shows the events that led to Rome's change from having kings to having consuls) but also *Julius Caesar*. In Shakespeare's poem, unlike his sources, Adonis is really just a boy and not ready for love, and Venus is scarily blind to that fact.

The publishing history and significance of *The Passionate Pilgrim* is discussed by Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen (pp. 82–91). This book of sonnets appeared in octavo in 1599 with Shakespeare's name on the title page, although of its twenty poems only five are by Shakespeare and of these three were from *Love's Labour's Lost*, which was already available in print. A third edition appeared in 1612 with some extra non-Shakespearian poems by Thomas Heywood that had been published by William Jaggard in 1609, and Heywood added an epistle to his *Apology for Actors* [1612] in which he wrote that Shakespeare was annoyed with Jaggard for pirating his (Shakespeare's) sonnets, which had appeared in a good edition in 1609. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen think it quite likely that Romeo appeared disguised as a pilgrim at the Capulets' feast, giving force to *The Passionate Pilgrim's* appearance as a kind of spin-off: one of its poems seems to give the reader Romeo's thoughts on the way back from the Capulet house after his first meeting with Juliet. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen discuss the biographical links that might connect people involved in *The Passionate Pilgrim* and Shakespeare, and how far Shakespeare might have been actively involved in the project, but on the possible manuscript copy for *The Passionate Pilgrim* Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen defer to Colin Burrow's Oxford edition of 2002 (reviewed in *YWES* 83[2004]). The discussion of *The Phoenix and the Turtle* puts the poem into a detailed context of what the book it appeared in, Robert Chester's collection *Love's Martyr* [1601], was trying to do for its dedicatee John Salusbury (pp. 91–123). Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen reject the idea that *The Phoenix and the Turtle* was about the execution of Catholic Anne Lyne, since Salusbury would not have welcomed such sympathies expressed in his name; they offer extensive new material on Salusbury and his connections with Shakespeare (especially via the Middle Temple) and his attempts to enter parliament (pp. 95–111). Perhaps, they suggest, the Phoenix is Elizabeth I and the Turtle is Salusbury. The introduction to this edition ends with the reflection that apart from the works already discussed, *Venus and Adonis*, *The Rape of Lucrece*, the bits of *The Passionate Pilgrim* by him, and *The Phoenix and the Turtle*, plus of course the sonnets, Shakespeare left us no substantial poetry.

So, to the texts themselves. There is little emendation to comment upon because Fields's editions of *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* were

well printed and Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen do not claim any startling new emendations. In *Venus and Adonis* they print 'And whe're he run or fly they know not whether' (line 304) in place of Q's 'And where he runne, or flie, they know not whether'. This is Edmond Malone's emendation for the sake of metre and sense, with *whether* meaning 'which of the two'. Oddly, there's a textual note justifying this emendation, but it has no preceding asterisk so it is hard to know just how big a change in meaning is necessary to warrant one. (Like all the current Arden series, the prefatory material promises that 'Notes preceded by * discuss editorial emendations ...' (p. xiii).) There is an asterisked note drawing attention to their printing of 'But blessed bankrupt that by loss so thriveth' (line 466) where Q has 'But blessed bankrout that by loue so thriueth', saying that *loue* was picked up from its use two lines earlier. The first edition to emend thus was Henry N. Hudson's American edition of 1886, based on a conjecture by Sidney Walker. There is an asterisked note too for 'With purple tears, that his wounds wept, was drenched' (line 1054) where Q has 'With purple tears that his woûd wept, had drencht'. This is an emendation (*had to was*) that first appeared in Q7. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen are not sure about it: Q's *had* 'may be correct', they write, if, as Richard Proudfoot suggests, the line was originally 'W^{ch} purple tears that his woûd wept, had drencht' and W^{ch} was misread as though it were Wth, or if the first word was *The*, as in 'The purple tears that his woûd wept, had drencht'.

The text of *The Rape of Lucrece* shows rather more intervention, and again the use of asterisks to highlight the relevant notes is either irregular or follows a system that this reviewer cannot infer. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen print 'As is the morning silver melting dew' (line 24) where the uncorrected state of Q (hereafter Qu) has 'As is the morning siluer melting dew' and the corrected state (Qc) has 'mornings'. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen see this as a miscorrection: the word is fine as an adjective, as in Qu. Another miscorrection explains their 'What needeth then apology be made' (line 31) where Qu has 'What needeth then Appologie be made' and Qc has instead 'Apologies'. At line 55 Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen defend their changing Q's *ore* to *o'er*, which was first actioned in Q5 but is really just a modernization of spelling. The real reason for their asterisked note at this point is that Malone wanted to emend here (to *or*, the heraldic name for gold) and they want to resist him. Further miscorrection explains why they print 'And every one to rest himself betakes, | Save thieves and cares and troubled minds that wakes' (lines 125–6) where Qu has 'And euerie one to rest himself betakes, | Saue theeues, and cares, and troubled minds that wakes' and Qc has 'And euerie one to rest themselues betake, | Saue theeues, and cares, and troubled minds that wake'. Punctiliously, at line 147 Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen give an asterisked note to explain that *altogether* (Q's reading) and *all together* (their preference, from Q8) have different meanings now even though they were not carefully distinguished when this poem was written. And yet they offer no note for their admittance of Q's 'To dry the old oaks' sap and cherish springs' (line 950), where most editors have wanted to do something with the last two words so that the springs are harmed, emending to such things as 'perish springs' or 'blemish springs'. Three readings from the corrected state of

Q follow: 'Which by him tainted shall for him be spent' (line 1182) where Qu has 'Which for him . . .', 'As lagging fowls before the northern blast' (line 1335) where Qu has 'northern blasts', and 'Even so this pattern of the worn-out age' (line 1350) where Qu has *this* and *the* the other way around. Unsurprisingly, Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen accept Walker's justly celebrated conjecture and print 'With sad-set eyes and wreathed arms across' (line 1662), where Q has 'wretched armes'. They accept too Edward Capell's conjecture (adopted by Malone) and print 'The face . . . | . . . carved in it with tears' (lines 1712–13) where Q has 'caru'd it in with tears'. In the last line of the poem, Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen punctuate to indicate the 'TARQUINS' everlasting banishment' whereas most editors make it a singular punishment (*Tarquin's*). As they rightly point out, even leaving known history aside for a moment the poem's Argument indicates that the whole family has to go.

There are no further emendations to discuss, although the remainder of this long edition (nearly 600 pages) has much more to say about the texts. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen's treatment of *The Passionate Pilgrim* (pp. 385–418) reproduces the two sonnets later to appear in Shakespeare's *Sonnets* [1609], plus two sonnets that had already appeared in *Love's Labour's Lost* [1598], plus one non-sonnet poem from *Love's Labour's Lost*. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen do not attempt major editorial work but rather their collations and notes aim to highlight the differences between the versions presented in *The Passionate Pilgrim* and the versions as they appeared elsewhere. This makes sense, as the differences are by no means certain to be printing errors that need correction: they might be authorial tweaks. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen have each edited one of the other books that these poems appear in (*Sonnets* and *Love's Labour's Lost* respectively) so there is little remaining editorial work to be done. Although they print all the other poems in *The Passionate Pilgrim*, Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen do not engage directly with the detail of the arguments for attributing some of them to Shakespeare, but simply refer the reader elsewhere. For the Shakespearean verses in *Love's Martyr* (that is, *The Phoenix and the Turtle*, pp. 419–28) Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen reproduce only the parts of the book thought to be by Shakespeare and there are no important textual matters to discuss. The last section of the edition that reproduces the poetry itself covers 'Attributed Poems' (pp. 429–69), meaning those that Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen do not guarantee are by Shakespeare. The first eleven are early attributions, starting with 'Shall I Die?', about which the editors declare themselves convinced by Brian Vickers that it is not Shakespeare. They are less explicit about 'Upon a Pair of Gloves', but do not sound convinced that it is authentic. Going into some considerable detail, Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen are in favour of accepting 'Verses on the Stanley tomb at Tong' because, when added to other circumstantial evidence, the fact that Milton's poem in the preliminaries to the Second Folio [1632] seems to allude to these verses 'strongly suggests that they may be by Shakespeare' (p. 445). Strangely, they do not give an explicit opinion on the four-line poem 'On Ben Jonson', but sound sceptical. The 'Inscription for the coat of Shakespeare's arms' (that is, the three words *Non sans droict*) is of course genuine.

Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen are avowedly undecided on 'An epitaph on Elias James' while accepting that the two epitaphs on John Combes might be genuine. Regarding 'Upon the King', Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen report that Vickers will in a forthcoming *Notes and Queries* article give this to John Davies of Hereford, but they hold the matter to be still open. (That article did not appear in 2007 or 2008.) The motto that Shakespeare wrote for the Rutland impressa is of course lost, and that Shakespeare wrote the curse upon his tomb in Stratford-upon-Avon strikes Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen as 'plausible'. Turning to the modern attributions, Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen start with 'The Lucy Ballad' and point out that Mark Eccles observed that Sir Thomas Lucy did not have a deer park at Charlecote (it was elsewhere) and that the story does not actually say Shakespeare stole deer, only that he fell in with a group that did and that he robbed a park. Presumably, if it is true, Shakespeare robbed Lucy's rabbit warren at Charlecote. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen are unconvinced that there is anything in the various seventeenth- and eighteenth-century ballads that are supposed to record the event in the oral tradition. The 'Skipworth verses' are now known to be not Shakespeare's but William Skipworth's and are not printed here. What Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen call 'the Stanford poem' is the epilogue that Juliet Dusinberre thinks is Shakespeare's and belongs to *As You Like It*, but Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen 'are not convinced' and it is not printed here. Everyone knows that 'A Funeral Elegy' is definitely not Shakespeare, and it is not printed here. Finally, of 'Tom O'Bedlam's song to King James' they give no view but mention that Stanley Wells rejected the attribution, and it is not printed here.

The appendices to the edition are substantial and deal with the textual situation of each of the major works included (*Venus and Adonis*, *The Rape of Lucrece*, *The Passionate Pilgrim* and *The Phoenix and the Turtle*) and provide the sources (extracts from Ovid and Livy), and also a photofacsimile reproduction of the part of *Love's Martyr* where *The Phoenix and the Turtle* appears. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen accept the view of the Oxford *Complete Works of Shakespeare* that *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* were well printed by Richard Field in 1593 and 1594, quite possibly from authorial papers. Field's printer's copy for two of John Harington's works survives, so we can get a sense of what his compositor(s) did but should be careful applying that knowledge to Shakespeare: Harington's poetry differs from Shakespeare's and his books were in folio and octavo while Shakespeare's were in quarto (p. 472). The compositor(s) of *Venus and Adonis* seem(s) different from the compositor(s) of *The Rape of Lucrece*, and indeed different from the compositor(s) of Harington's *Ariosto*, to judge by spelling and typographical preferences listed here (pp. 473–6). *Venus and Adonis* was entered to Richard Field in the Stationers' Register on 18 April 1593 and the Bodleian Library copy of Q1 printed later that year is the only extant exemplar. One of the problems that the text gave the printer was that the indentation of the last two lines of each stanza sometimes made a line that would exceed the measure if remedial steps were not taken. From the substitutions from other-sized founts, it looks like the printer was short of certain sorts, especially upper-case V. There are two sets of running titles,

distinguishable by an oversize V that first appears in the head title on B1r and recurs in the running title on each 2r in sheets B–F but then (presumably because the two skeletons were swapped) on G4r. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen conclude that it is at present impossible to tell whether the printer's copy was autograph or scribal copy.

The Rape of Lucrece was entered to John Harrison in the Stationers' Register on 9 May 1594, and thus while Field printed and published *Venus and Adonis*, for *The Rape of Lucrece* he printed for another man, Harrison, who was its publisher. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen note that when, as here, Field was printing for another man he tended to use arabic rather than roman numerals for signatures. There are ten copies plus one fragment of the book extant. Running-title evidence suggests two skeleton formes, one used for the inner and outer formes of sheets B, D, F, H, K and the other used for the inner and outer formes of sheets C, E, G, I, L (with M, the last full gathering, and the half-sheet N both being anomalous). Press variants were collated by Hardy M. Cook in an article reviewed in *YWES* 86[2007]. One forme, I(o), survives in two states of correction. The press corrections cannot, write Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen, be 'firmly attributed to Shakespeare' (p. 485). I think they mean we cannot be sure that they were made by reference to copy: the idea of the author being responsible for them does not, I think, extend to agency beyond the manuscript. As in *Venus and Adonis*, there was a problem getting the verse lines into the measure (especially in the indented final couplet of each stanza) and the same expedients of turn-over and turn-under and abbreviation were resorted to. Because B(i) is anomalous in its avoidance of capitals and small capitals for proper nouns, Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen think it was probably set first, when the compositor(s) had not established the practice then followed throughout the rest of the book (p. 486). As with *Venus and Adonis*, the printer was short of certain capital letters, which led to inconsistent capitalization and substitution of different sized sorts, and as before we cannot tell whether the printer's copy was autograph or scribal copy.

The Passionate Pilgrim first appeared in an edition, O1, of which only a fragmentary exemplar survives, giving eleven leaves from what were probably twenty-eight. There was no Stationers' Register entry for it and the printer was perhaps William Jaggard working perhaps in the year 1599; the missing title page makes it hard to know. O2 appeared in 1599, printed by Thomas Judson for Jaggard and sold by William Leake, and it survives in one fragment and two complete exemplars. Collation of O2 shows minor variants on D1r and D3r, and the recurrence of the 'flowers' ornaments in *The Passionate Pilgrim* can be treated like headline recurrence, giving a pattern that strongly suggests that O1 was set by formes (p. 493). Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen assert that O1's unknown printer was not the Thomas Judson who printed O2, but they omit to tell the reader how they know that; the English Short Title Catalogue speculates that Judson did set O1 (p. 494). Again, recurrence of the ornaments suggests O2 was also set by formes. It emerges by implication—Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen do not spell it out—that O2 was not a reprint of O1. In 1612 Jaggard printed O3 as a reprint of O2, but the two surviving exemplars show two states of the title page, and it seems that the first state (naming Shakespeare) was cancelled and the second (omitting him) was its replacement.

Notoriously, O3 also included some of Thomas Heywood's poems to which Jaggard had the rights, but to which Heywood objected the same year (1612) in his *An Apology for Actors*. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen try to untangle just what Heywood's objection should tell us, but do not get very far (pp. 497–8). *Love's Martyr* was not entered in the Stationers' Register but was first printed (Q1) in 1601 by Richard Field for Edward Blount, and a reissue of the unsold sheets with a new title page and new preliminaries was published in 1611 by Matthew Lownes; it is not clear how he got the sheets. It survives as two complete and one fragmentary Q1, and just one Q2. With one exception, the Attributed Poems have not survived in manuscripts or printed books before the 1630s, and Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen do not think it worth hazardous guesses about their early transmission.

A brief section of this first appendix explains Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen's editorial practices (pp. 504–14). The first printings of *Venus and Adonis*, *The Rape of Lucrece* and *Love's Martyr* were carefully done and present no problems; they are the bases of the poems presented here. *The Passionate Pilgrim* and the attributed poems are trickier. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen present a surprisingly long disquisition on the typographic feature of capitalization and on the modernization of punctuation and spelling, and how the early printings and previous editions are inconsistent in these matters. This edition uses initial capitals 'only when a personification seems to be clearly intended' (p. 505). Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen explain why they have retained in *The Rape of Lucrece* the quotation marks that begin lines of *sententiae*, even though they cannot be shown to be authorial: 'it seems possible Shakespeare would have known that they played a part in the volume' (p. 509). It is noticeable that Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen do not make clear whether Shakespeare knew beforehand about this feature and went along with it, or found out after and did not mind; there is subtly distinct agency at work in each case. In the event, they are so lightly marked in this edition—by an opening and closing pair of quotation marks rather than one at the start of each line—that a reader might easily miss them. Likewise, they retain *The Rape of Lucrece's* use of small capitals for proper nouns since Shakespeare might have approved their use, and having decided to retain them they naturally have to apply the feature consistently even where the early printing did not. Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen permit themselves a little self-deprecating irony in calling this 'a bold and probably controversial decision' (p. 510). *The Passionate Pilgrim* is printed here from O1 where possible and where not then O2.

The Royal Shakespeare Company *Complete Works* is edited by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen, with two dozen others acknowledged in various roles that contributed to the 'fifteen person-years of editorial labour' that made the book (p. 6). The edition is based on the 1623 Folio, and as if to forestall the obvious criticism that this foundational decision was bound to attract, Bate published an article in the *Times Literary Supplement* explaining the edition's rationale ('The Folio Restored: Shakespeare "Published According to the True Originall Copies"', *TLS* 5429(20 April)[2007] 11–13). The fundamental objection to be overcome is that one ought not to base an edition on a mere reprint of an extant book but rather prefer the original over

its derivative. For several plays, the Folio essentially reprints a surviving quarto, albeit with sporadic additional independent authority because its copy was first improved by consultation of an authoritative manuscript. It is the absence of evidence for extensive and consistent additional authority that makes editors prefer the quarto over the Folio for certain plays, and not (as Bate claims) their slavish adherence to an absurd rule that 'the earliest surviving text must be the one closest to the original authorial manuscript'. Instead of arguing case by case, Bate attributes to the Folio a general and thoroughgoing theatrical authority deriving from the actors Heminges and Condell working on it. In truth we do not know that they worked on the book, only that they signed an address to the reader at the front. All else is speculation. Thus while the Folio is a fascinating 'socialized' text embodying multiple labours, it is not the best text for every play. We get closer to Shakespeare (as writer and as sharer in the leading acting company) by choosing the most authoritative surviving text on a play-by-play basis.

A longer article on the same topic appeared on a website to accompany the edition (Jonathan Bate, "'The Case for the Folio": An Essay in Defence of the RSC Shakespeare' [2007] online at <http://www.rscshakespeare.org>). After a (not entirely up-to-date) survey of the editorial problem in Shakespeare, Bate gets to his defence of editing from the Folio. Here a basic fact of printing is wrongly stated: type is not placed in the stick 'upside down and back to front' (p. 37) but upside down only; were it back to front, it would be impossible to work from left to right through each line of the copy. Considering the evidence that for certain plays the quarto used as printer's copy for the Folio was itself first annotated by reference to an authoritative manuscript, Bate assumes that this was done out of respect for the theatrical manuscripts (p. 38). Perhaps, but it might also have been to evade the accusation of copyright infringement that might follow from reprinting someone else's book. Having established that the Folio is theatrically enhanced by this process of manuscript consultation, Bate leaps to the conclusion that 'It surely follows that a Folio-based' edition will be the more theatrical (p. 41). This does not follow: one needs to pick out the bits that are theatrical enhancements from the bits that are debasements, such as the untheatrical massed entry stage directions inserted by the scribe Ralph Crane making copy for the Folio. Bate is fully aware of the objection to the basis of his edition: 'The accusation is that the Folio should not be used when its copy-text is a derivative quarto, since it suffers from an accumulation of errors evolving through several quartos. The riposte is that it also has the benefit of accumulated improvements evolving through several quartos' (p. 52). The reply to this riposte is that where one thinks that these 'improvements' take us closer to Shakespeare, one should import them into an edition based on the earliest substantive text, rather than accept them all as a batch and thereby risk treating as Shakespearian things that are just artefacts of the reprinting process. Bate is forearmed for this answer too: 'We must cut the Gordian knot here. It is best not to over-fetishize the source of individual corrections' (p. 52). It is hard not to read this as a fancy way of saying that the editor cannot be bothered to make the distinctions on a case-by-case basis and would rather press on and get the work done. The result is an edition that

does not warrant close attention to the thinking that went on in those fifteen person years.

The Collected Works of Thomas Middleton, edited by Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino, was also a collaborative work, with sixty-one senior scholars listed as contributors to the project (p. 5). Only three plays in this edition are of relevance to this review: *Timon of Athens*, *Macbeth* and *Measure for Measure*. *Timon of Athens*, described as being by Shakespeare and Middleton (pp. 467–508), is edited and annotated by John Jowett and introduced by Sharon O'Dair. O'Dair's introduction is largely concerned with the relative lack of productions and the problems of the script, which co-authorship does not dissolve. She wants us to understand *Timon of Athens* in its own time and not as a simple lesson that the older ways of doing things (Timon's ways before his fall) are better ways: the play does not idealize Timon. In the text of the play, the notes are all explicatory, not textual. There is nothing in the text to mark the transition from the bits Shakespeare wrote to the bits that Middleton wrote. The text seems much as Jowett's 2004 Oxford Shakespeare *Timon of Athens* (reviewed in *YWES* 85[2006]), although stage directions that are simply given in the Oxford Shakespeare edition are here marked in square brackets as editorial additions, reflecting the editions' different rules on marking intervention. Also, the odd stage direction is phrased slightly differently and decisions on scene breaks have been revised. For example, the direction at 14.538 (equivalent to 14.536 in the Oxford Shakespeare) is rephrased and is also the end of scene 14 here while in the Oxford Shakespeare the scene carries on. It is a matter of staging, for F has a stage direction exit which implies that Timon goes back into his cave—he does not leave the stage—which the Oxford Shakespeare respects by sending him into his cave, while the Middleton edition emends to 'Exeunt' and is thereby obliged to start a new scene.

The edition of *Macbeth* is described as a 'Genetic' text and is edited by Gary Taylor and introduced by the late (and sorely missed) Inga-Stina Ewbank (pp. 1165–1201). Ewbank notes that 11 per cent of the words of the Folio text are Middleton's, and he might also have cut about 25 per cent or more of the Shakespearian words. Ewbank starts with the point that it is only our post-Romantic conceptions that make us see what Middleton did to the play as adulteration: back then it was normal. On the evidence of Simon Forman's eyewitness account and Raphael Holinshed's chronicles, Ewbank concludes that the weird sisters were quite possibly a lot less weird in Shakespeare's version of the play. Ewbank finds the addition of songs and dances to be an intelligent reworking, taking attention from Macbeth's self-destruction and celebrating the witches' relative autonomy and their subversive, liberatory anarchism. Moreover the songs and dances make *The Witch* an intertext of *Macbeth*: audiences would have seen the same actors in both and understood them as alternative 'takes' on the same phenomena. In the text of the play, passages added (or moved to their present location) by Middleton are in bold typeface and bits he cut (or moved from their present location) are in greyed-out type. Thus passages that have been moved appear twice: once in grey where they used to be and once in bold where they ended up. To see how these

distinctions were arrived at one must go to the edition's Textual Companion, reviewed below.

The edition of *Measure for Measure* is also described as a 'Genetic' text and is edited and introduced by John Jowett (pp. 1542–85). His introduction repeats the well-known argument from *Shakespeare Reshaped* that the song 'Take, O take' was brought in from *Rollo, Duke of Normandy*, that the 'O place and greatness' speech that covers the time in IV.i during which Isabella talks Mariana into sleeping with Angelo used to be at the end of Act III and the 'He who the sword of heaven will bear' speech at the end of Act III used to cover the time while Isabella talks Mariana into the plot, and that the first telling of Claudio's arrest (by Mistress Overdone to the gentlemen) was Middleton's interpolation intended to replace Shakespeare's dialogue (a little later in F) in which Pompey tells Mistress Overdone the same news. Since we know of these major changes, we have to suppose that there are others that are not so obvious, and Jowett lists what he thinks these are. Bringing Juliet on in two scenes where she has nothing to say might be one: she acts as 'silent moral comment' (p. 1543). Jowett does not say here why he thinks that silent moral comment was not part of the original composition but of the revision. Some of the Provost's lines in II.ii were given to Lucio, who also had new ones written for him by Middleton to make him more cynical and detached. Mistress Overdone was probably just called Bawd in the original: Overdone is a name that Middleton liked, and wherever it occurs in dialogue there is a disruption symptomatic of intervention. As mentioned in the Textual Companion, Pompey's speech about the inhabitants of the prison (in which Mistress Overdone is also mentioned) is a Middleton interpolation. Escalus's surprisingly intolerant assertion that Claudio needs to die (at the end of II.i) is another Middleton interpolation: it is entirely detachable, brings in a character (Justice) with no other purpose in the play, and it serves only a Calvinist point about the need to regulate behaviour. Jowett outlines the evidence that the play was originally set in Ferrara, and that to cover his tracks Middleton cut dialogue references to the Italian names Vincentio and Francisca. In the text of the play, greyed-out type and boldface are again used as in *Macbeth* to represent the changes made by Middleton in revision.

As with the Oxford *Complete Works of Shakespeare*, this Middleton edition wisely prints all the textual scholarship unpinning the work in a separate volume (*Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture: A Companion to the Collected Works*). For the three plays that concern this review, the parts of interest are the relevant portions of the section 'Works Included in This Edition: Canon and Chronology' (pp. 335–443) and the textual introductions to each play. Starting with the first of these, the section on *Timon of Athens* written by John Jowett (pp. 356–8) is essentially the same as the argument in his 2004 Oxford Shakespeare edition. The section on the adaptation of *Macbeth* in autumn 1616, written by Taylor, seeks to explain point by point how the adaptation occurred and how Taylor's edition of the play represents the 'before' and 'after' versions (pp. 383–98). Taylor's disentangling of the Shakespeare and Middleton parts is based on pursuing the logic of the definitely added Hecate material and the song-and-dance routines—that is, the dialogue and staging consequences of these additions—filtered through

knowledge of what kinds of phrasing, staging and source reading (especially Holinshed, of which Middleton seems ignorant) are typically Shakespearian and typically Middletonian. Taylor is uniquely well placed to make these calls, and does not pretend that there is any certainty in them. A distinctive Middleton habit is stage directions taking the form 'Enter X, meeting Y' which Shakespeare never used.

The adaptation of *Macbeth* must follow the writing of *The Witch* in spring 1616, but since that latter play was suppressed the reuse of its songs right away would make sense. (Obviously, the very latest they could have been added to *Macbeth* is shortly before the printing of the Folio in spring 1623.) Once it is admitted that Middleton worked on the play, the judgement of how much of it is his can proceed on the internal evidence. If the Folio text of *Macbeth* is all that Shakespeare wrote plus what Middleton added, then Shakespeare wrote what was for him an extraordinarily short tragedy; more likely Middleton cut lines that we will now never see. By comparison with the average lengths of his other plays, Taylor reckons that 700–1,200 lines of the Shakespearian play were cut by Middleton. Where there is a Middletonian 'Enter X, meeting Y' direction (as in 'Enter Duncan . . . meeting a bleeding captain', I.ii.0) an editor is entitled to suppose that what follows has been touched by Middleton too. Picking apart I.ii (because of its opening direction), Taylor finds plenty that echoes Middleton elsewhere and not Shakespeare. The Middleton bits cluster in lines 8–9, 15, 22, 27–9, and since dramatists were by the 1610s thinking battle scenes a bit old-fashioned, it is likely that the first thirty lines of I.ii (which tell the outcome of a battle) are Middleton's rewriting of an opening in which the battle itself was depicted.

Taylor reprints all of Forman's account of a performance of the play, and wonders if its reference to Macbeth and Banquo 'riding through a wood' means that in the original play at the Globe they were on horseback in I.iii and that Middleton cut this because the Blackfriars theatre had a smaller stage. One of Taylor's two pieces of evidence for horses, real or property, being used on the stage is the entrance of the apparently dead D'Alva 'carried vpon a horse couered with blacke' in *A Larum for London* (B1v). In fact, it is clear from the ensuing action that this is not a horse but a hearse (presumably spelt *herse* and misread by someone as *horse*). The second bit of evidence is that the skimmington in *The Witches of Lancashire* is 'on a horse', which is not terribly convincing as the whole point of such a procession is mockery and hence we should not imagine it as anything grand enough to be suitable for Macbeth and Banquo. For this evidence Taylor relies on the entry for 'horse' in Alan Dessen and Leslie Thomson's *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama, 1580–1642*, and indeed they have misread the *A Larum for London* stage direction.

Taylor notes that the casting needs of the 1623 text are heavy on boys: scene III.v needs three witches, three spirits, Hecate and a boy-as-cat (that makes eight), as does IV.i. It seems that adding the Hecate material made impossible demands on the cast if the witches were played by boys, and since Forman's account suggests that the witches are female and attractive Taylor proposes that Middleton, in adapting the play, changed these nymphs into gender-indeterminate hags by adding Banquo's reference to their beards

(in I.iii). That would save three boy actors by allowing adult men to play the witches. The bit after the witches leave in IV.i, in which Macbeth is surprised that Lennox did not see the witches pass him, is problematic as it ought not to surprise Macbeth that they vanish: he has seen them do that before. But this exchange with Lennox has an exact parallel in the Middleton canon and Taylor thinks it is his. By adding Hecate to this scene (IV.i) with a song and dance after the show of eight kings, Middleton prevented the exit of two boy actors needed for Lady Macduff and her son at the start of the next scene, so he had to write extra dialogue at the end of the scene—about the witches passing Lennox unseen and about his own intention to act without hesitation in future and about surprising Macduff's castle—to give these two boys time to change into Macduff's wife and son. The inclusion of Banquo in the show of eight kings is oddly phrased in F—'A shew of eight Kings, and Banquo last, with a glasse in his hand', yet the dialogue makes clear that the eighth king, not Banquo, has the glass—and Taylor thinks that 'and Banquo' was a Middletonian marginal addition. After all, nothing else in the play suggests that the witches have power over the dead. In that case, Macbeth's lines of horror at seeing Banquo ('Horrible sight! . . . is this so?') are also Middleton's interpolation.

Taylor finds the three apparitions rising from the cauldron in IV.i suspect too: Shakespeare originally had the witches speak the prophecies. Adding the apparitions required an extra boy or two to perform inside the cauldron. The show of kings was changed by Middleton: Shakespeare had them arise from the trap and go back that way. This effect Middleton transferred to the apparitions he invented, and that meant that in order to avoid an anticlimax (he could not have it come up the trap too) the show of kings had to be made into a parading across the stage. Perhaps the plan to surprise Macduff's castle, now stated in the soliloquy at the end of IV.i, was originally Macbeth's response to the scene's first prophecy ('beware Macduff'). This would make sense of his 'Then live Macduff' as a response to the second apparition (about no man of woman born hurting him): Macbeth changes his mind. In other words, the extra dialogue Middleton added to the end of the scene (to enable a couple of boys to double) was plundered from Shakespeare's original response of Macbeth to the first prophecy. Scene III.vi is sometimes said to have been moved from elsewhere, not least because it reports that Macbeth knows that Macduff has fled to England, and yet at the end of IV.i Macbeth receives news of that flight and reacts violently to it. But that bit at the end of IV.i is a Middletonian interpolation, so in fact III.vi is fine where it is and the problem has been created solely by Middleton's work on IV.i. Probably all or part of III.vi was meant by Middleton to be cut, and the 1623 printers ought not to have included it. Cutting III.vi would also remove a reference to Edward the Confessor, as Calvinist Middleton would no doubt have wanted to do. There probably was also a scene later for Edward the Confessor, turned by Middleton into an onstage report.

The phrase 'how wilt thou do for a father' is said twice, twenty-three lines apart, by Lady Macduff in IV.ii, and this is a known sign of insertion or deletion. For insertion, the logic is that the inserted material ended with a repetition of the next line of the original that should follow after the insertion,

but the printer included that line from the original before starting the insertion and included it again as the last line of the insertion. For deletion, the logic is that someone copied out at the start of the deletion the line that should follow next after the deleted material had been removed, but the deletion was not actioned and this line was printed before the stuff that was meant to be deleted (but was not) and printed it again after the stuff that was meant to be deleted. At least, this was W.W. Greg's view of how so-called 'repetition brackets' came about. In the present case, Lady Macduff's repetition in IV.ii, the material in between is Middletonian, most clearly because in it the words *i'faith* and *'em* collocate closely (thirteen words apart) and no one does this collocation as often as Middleton. Other collocations confirm the attribution. (This part of Taylor's argument demonstrates admirably just what a transformation of the field of attribution studies has been enacted by the creation of the Literature Online database.) The inserted lines allude quite clearly to the Overbury plot (topical in 1616 but not in 1606), and faults in the lineation just before and just after the alleged insertion are consistent with there being an insertion at this point. Finally, Taylor thinks that the witches calling to familiars (Grey Malkin and Paddock) in I.i is Middleton. The names are Middletonian, and without these calls the women retain their ambiguity—it is not entirely clear what they are—whereas Middleton makes them unambiguously witches. On this point, one small note of disagreement creeps in. Whereas Ewbank had argued that Middleton's addition of songs and dances allowed celebration of the witches' freedom, Taylor thinks that the witches' new references to their 'masters' makes them less autonomous than Shakespeare's women (p. 391). Perhaps Middleton gave with one hand and took with the other.

For the 'Canon and Chronology' section on the adaptation of *Measure for Measure* in October 1621 (pp. 417–21), Jowett is able to draw on his body of published research showing that the 'war news' material in I.ii makes no sense in 1603–4 when Shakespeare wrote the play but perfect sense in 1621 when Middleton adapted it. That aside, the case for Middleton doing the adaptation was already made in Taylor and Jowett's book *Shakespeare Reshaped* [1993], and Jowett does not have to argue that matter point by point as Taylor did for *Macbeth*. Jowett revises the view given in *Shakespeare Reshaped* that the lines after the song in IV.i were by John Webster. Reconsideration of the evidence (and especially a realization that Crane himself turned *has* into *hath* without authority, and that therefore one cannot rely on this word as a test of authorship) changed Jowett's mind, and he now gives those lines back to Middleton. Likewise Pompey's speech (about the population of the prison) at the start of IV.iii.

With so much of the textual evidence covered in the 'Canon and Chronology' section, there is little left to be dealt with in the textual introduction to each of the Shakespeare plays. For *Measure for Measure* (pp. 681–9), Jowett argues that there would be no point just representing the adapted version, since that is what every Shakespeare edition already has. This insight warrants boldness, and Jowett summarizes the new advances (beyond those in the Oxford *Complete Works* of 1986 and *Shakespeare Reshaped* of 1993) that are embodied in this edition, and tells the reader that

the evidence is in the Critical Introduction and the commentary. It is nonetheless odd that Taylor decided to put his argument in the 'Canon and Chronology' section while Jowett puts his into the Critical Introduction and commentary; on the face of it this makes the edition seem inconsistent. Equally, if *Macbeth* and *Measure for Measure* are parallel cases (as their shared designation as 'Genetic' texts and shared use of boldface and greyed-out type suggest) it is odd that they treat modernization in differing ways, as we shall see.

In the textual introduction to *Macbeth* (pp. 690–703), Taylor argues that the case for Middletonian adaptation is widely accepted and need not be presented afresh here. (It is in any case fully presented in the 'Canon and Chronology' section, as we have seen.) Taylor has decided to remove capitals from the beginnings of lines and to remove punctuation, since that is how both dramatists wrote their plays. Because 'speech directions' ('aside', 'To X' and so on) are rare in manuscripts from this period they are omitted here. Spelling is trickier as an editor cannot just leave it out, so because there is no authority to recover—we do not know Shakespeare's spelling and Middleton was not the main author—the least intrusive thing to do is to use modern spelling. This is defensible because modern spelling is standardized, so it does not draw attention to itself, and its use 'removes meaningless arbitrary variation' (p. 691). This seemingly counter-intuitive point is exceptionally well made by Taylor. And yet Taylor has chosen to add stage directions where necessary (marked by square brackets) and to emend F where he thinks it in error. This strange mix of editorial choices Taylor defends by pointing out that there is no shortage of editions of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, so one has no obligations to fulfil in preparing a new one and can instead 'deliberately' set out to make something 'alien and alienating' (p. 692). Here the lack of an overall editorial policy is most clearly marked, for if the case of *Measure for Measure* is parallel to that of *Macbeth*, as the edition seems to insist, it is peculiar that Jowett's *Measure for Measure* capitalizes the first letters of verse lines and deploys modern punctuation. Finally, for this edition, John Jowett's textual introduction for *Timon of Athens* (pp. 704–11) indicates that he has not started from scratch but only revisited his Oxford *Complete Works* text and that the textual notes are 'skeletal' as it has all been said in the Textual Companion to that edition.

The most important monograph this year is Sonia Massai's *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor*, and its thesis is striking. Massai sets out to challenge the idea that until Nicholas Rowe's 1709 edition each new edition of Shakespeare was just a reprint with errors and hence inherently worse than its predecessor. Massai is not referring to the injection of new authority into a reprint by the printer's copy (a previous edition) being first annotated by reference to an authoritative manuscript, but rather the idea that early readers could do such annotation using just their own wits. Necessarily, Massai needs to qualify her terms: their idea of 'authority' is not ours, and their editorial practices were different too (p. 2). We need, she argues, to widen our perspectives on seventeenth-century textual practices. The 1679 edition of the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio (a reprint of the first edition of 1647) contained a note saying that the publisher had got hold of a copy of the first edition that had been

annotated by someone who knew the authors and had attended early performances, and Massai notes that they called 'perfecting' the act of improving a manuscript or printed book so that it may serve as printer's copy for a reprint (pp. 4–5). In the preliminaries to the 1623 Folio, Heminges and Condell write that 'it hath bin the height of our care . . . to make the present worthy . . . by the perfection', which suggests that they did not (as they stated earlier) just collect them.

Massai implies that where a reprint has substantive variants, including in the case of Q2 *Richard III* (a reprint of Q1) a couple of lines not in the book being reprinted, we should suspect editorial improvement (in this case an injection of fresh authority from a manuscript). But what about the possibility that the Q1 used as printer's copy had press variants no longer witnessed in surviving exemplars? There are only four exemplars of Q1 *Richard III* in the world, after all. Massai finally admits this possibility when attributing the insight to Peter Davison in 1977 (p. 219 n. 5), but she rejects the objection as 'reductive' because Davison 'focused solely on press variants' (p. 219 n. 5). This is poor logic: the objection is not reductive, but rather Davison pointed out one vector by which reprints might differ from what we think is their copy. That Massai thinks she has found another possible vector does not invalidate his. A surviving exemplar of Q2 *The Contention of York and Lancaster* has proof marks on B(o) and they are concerned only with accidentals, so Massai takes this as evidence that proof-readers did not bother with the substantives (p. 12). Annotations of printed books for use in performance (of which there are a couple of examples) show that they did not bother normalizing speech prefixes or stage directions or altering dialogue unless they wanted to make a big change in the action, and we know from William Long's work that theatre people did not tidy their manuscripts for use in performance. Yet from readers' annotations of printed plays for reading purposes we find the errors in speech prefixes and stage directions corrected (p. 14). (It is awfully hard to say for sure that these printed books were annotated for reading rather than for performance, and Massai does not explain how she differentiates these classes of evidence.)

Massai notes that recent work by scholars such as Zachary Lesser and Gary Taylor has turned attention away from the author and towards publisher-centred approaches that consider how the publisher shaped meanings by functioning as a guarantor of quality in his specialized field. Yet, she argues, we have not taken on board the role of the publisher as the person who maintained that quality by perfecting copy or by securing copy that had been perfected (pp. 33–5). She begins her examination of this role by looking at John and William Rastell as early sixteenth-century publishers committed to humanist pedagogy through their association with Thomas More and his circle, which was itself shaped by continental publishing practice and the work of Erasmus (pp. 41–68). This fascinating section of her book has little relevance to this review, but it is worth noting that evidence derived from the printing of *Utopia* and Erasmus's role in it as editor or even co-author ought to be treated with circumspection. After all, the textual authority of the entire project (with Raphael Hythloday as its point of origin) is entirely a fabrication. Moreover, some of the principles she draws from the evidence seem peculiar.

For example, More came to prefer print over oral or handwritten communication because it was harder for others to misuse it: a speech might be misreported, a handwritten letter might be altered by others and then published, but a printed book cannot be interfered with without the reader spotting it, since handwritten alterations stand out (pp. 56–7). One might reasonably conclude from this that the marginalia in a book are of less value than the words printed in it, which is almost exactly the opposite of Massai's general view.

Having established that John and William Rastell's editions of More's work are punctilious, Massai hopes to show the same principle (punctiliousness) in the Rastells' publications of interludes, which comprise 'three quarters of the extant printed interludes from the period' (p. 58). Thus stated as a fraction, the Rastells' domination of the market seems significant, but when we realize that Greg's chronological *Bibliography of the English Printed Drama* (BEPD) has by this point (the mid-1540s) reached only play number 21, the total population of printed plays seems too small for us to make much out of the relative proportions by publisher. In the midst of this discussion of punctiliousness, Massai's book itself becomes surprisingly inaccurate (p. 60). Quoting the title page of John Rastell's *The Four Elements*, where the reader is told how it may be cut for shorter performance time, Massai fails to distinguish ordinary *p* without a bar (also used in the same sentence in *parte*) from the *p* with a bar that the printer uses as an abbreviation for *par*, as in 'the messengers p < ar > te': she just gives 'pte', using one modern sort for what in the book are two distinct sorts. Yet earlier (p. 7) she was conservative enough to preserve an early printer's use of two letters *v* to make a *w* in *vwho*. Also, she transcribes *playd* or *playde* or *playdt*—it is not clear which it is but editors usually choose the first as the last letter is indistinct and might not be meant to be there at all—as *plydt* which is definitely wrong in dropping the *a*. There are other mistranscriptions in quoting from this book: *matter* where the book has *mater* and *wyse* where the book has *wyle* (both on signature E6v but wrongly given by Massai as C6v). Massai quotes Roger Coleman claiming that the printing of music with movable type in one impression shown in *The Four Elements* had not yet been invented when this book was printed, which is clearly impossible and cannot be what Coleman meant (p. 61). Greg in BEPD dates the play after 1525 precisely because of the music thus printed. Massai reads the movement of speech prefixes from a central to a left-marginal position as indicating the temporary misrule of the disruptive characters (beginning with the entrance of Sensual Appetite) and the return of centred prefixes as indicating the containment of these subversives. By comparison, the interludes printed by Wynkyn de Worde are less sophisticated in *mise-en-page*, and that early readers cared about such things is shown by marginal annotations that correct Rastell's few printing errors (pp. 62–4).

In a chapter on 'Italian Influences on the Publication of Late Tudor Drama' (pp. 69–87), Massai reads the dearth of published plays in the middle of the sixteenth century as arising from a general decline in performed drama towards the end of Henry's reign, whereas in the second half of the century well-printed Italian plays by the likes of Ariosto and Cinthio began to come into England with the flood of Protestant exiles from the

Counter-Reformation. In these books, the level of editorial intervention and care was deliberately foregrounded as a selling point. She outlines the career of the publisher John Wolfe, the man mainly responsible for bringing Italian Renaissance texts to London readers and employer of ‘correctors’ (especially Gabriel Harvey) to improve copy before printing, and his use of false continental imprints to give his books extra kudos. She also describes the career of Richard Jones, who printed *Tamburlaine* and addressed its reader with a note about the ‘fond and frivolous gestures’ in the play as he received it and that he omitted. (This last point rather undercuts Massai’s argument that he was a conscientious ‘corrector’: from our point of view he was a meddling busy-body who should have printed what he received.) Massai suggests that Jones also lightly annotated his printed copy for *Tamburlaine* before reprinting it (so that the variants between the first three editions are not authoritative), and in this it feels like she is fighting her primary materials: she wants to suggest that printers were doing something to add authority and her evidence keeps contradicting her.

Massai’s study of Andrew Wise is, as she indicates, central to her argument (pp. 91–105). Although not the first to publish Shakespeare, Andrew Wise was the first to seriously invest in publishing him and had a series of hit Shakespeare books in the 1590s: two editions of *Richard III* and three each of *I Henry IV* and *Richard II*. Massai asks, ‘can we assume that Shakespeare himself corrected the texts of his popular history plays when Wise decided to, or was prompted to, reprint them? Or, are we to assume that he entrusted Wise with their transmission into print?’ (p. 91). She senses a means to test the New Bibliography, and claims that ‘The Wise Quartos, in other words, represent an ideal study case [*sic*] to test Pollard, McKerrow and Greg’s optimistic assumption that a direct line of transmission connected authorial manuscripts to the so-called “good” quarto editions of Shakespeare’s works, without any significant “interference” from the non-authorial agents involved in their publication.’ In fact, this last sentence is not the previous point (about the authority of reprints) expressed ‘in other words’ but rather concerns the New Bibliographical assumption that the copy for the first printing was a manuscript in Shakespeare’s hand rather than a theatrical document or a scribal transcript, which assumption in turn arises from prior assumptions about the textual economy of the early modern playhouse, and in particular the desirability of there existing no more than two manuscripts of each play, the author’s foul papers and the promptbook.

There is a way to link New Bibliography and the reprints that Massai is interested in, but it is not via the first-generational work of Pollard, McKerrow and Greg as she claims but rather in the compositor studies that began in the 1950s and to which she turns. Alan E. Craven used the evidence of how a particular compositor changed a text as he reprinted it from known printed copy to work out the compositor’s general habits. Massai is not convinced that compositors could make changes of the kind Craven attributed to them. For example, Craven claimed that for Valentine Simmes’s Compositor A to fix a faulty speech prefix in scene V.iii of *Richard II* Q1 (in which York rather than King Henry is made to say ‘Good aunt stand up’) requires him to have ‘worked out the degree of kinship and power relations among the four

speakers in this exchange' (p. 93). In fact it only requires him to follow the action and notice that York ought not to call his own wife 'Good aunt'. Massai objects that Craven assumed that the variants between Q1 *Richard II* and its reprint Q2 are all down to the compositor, but since she cannot show another vector she ought to be obliged on principle not to multiply the agents by speculation.

Massai summarizes Wise's career and speculates about how he came to publish three Chamberlain's men smash-hit plays. She reckons the link was that Wise knew writers under George Carey's patronage, which included Shakespeare (pp. 92–5). She makes the common mistake of giving the date that George Carey was made Lord Chamberlain as 17 March 1597, but in fact it was, as Greg long ago pointed out, actually 17 April 1597 (p. 100). Massai offers as one possible reason for the Chamberlain's men selling Wise the copy for three plays in 1597–8 their needing money to pay rent at the Curtain as the expiry of the lease on the Theatre drew near (p. 101). Since the company was in any case paying the Burbage family rent on the Theatre, it presumably made no difference to the company—only to the Burbages—if they moved to the Curtain and paid rent there. Moreover, they did not move to the Curtain when the lease expired but rather hung on at the Theatre for more than a year, and in any case it is likely that the Burbages owned the Curtain too.

In order to show that someone annotated the printed copy for Wise's Shakespeare quartos before he reprinted them, Massai starts with the line 'As thought on thinking on no thought I thinke' from II.ii in Q1 *Richard II* which was reprinted as 'As though on thinking on no thought I thinke' in Q2. She comments that the fact that some editors adopt Q1's reading and some Q2's shows that 'intervention in Q2 was not determined by an obvious misreading in Q1' and she gives as an example of a modern editor going for Q1's reading Charles Forker's Arden3 edition (p. 102). (Massai's bibliography entry for this edition wrongly gives the date as 1998 and the publisher as Athlone: it was 2002 and Thomson Learning.) Importantly, Forker himself was only repeating the reading from the Oxford *Complete Works*, which was the source of the innovation: no previous edition had gone for Q1's reading. Massai thinks this the kind of 'textual variation which seems to stem from light annotation' but she has not eliminated other reasonable possibilities. Obvious examples are that Q2 was printed from an exemplar of Q1 that had *though* as a press correction, or that the compositor of Q2 just missed off the terminal *t* by accident, or that the compositor read the Q1 line and believed it to be in error and tried to fix it. The variants of Q1–Q2 *1 Henry IV* are outlined by Massai, and she admits that scholars generally agree they are the kinds of things that can happen in the printshop, yet instead of offering reasons why that explanation must be abandoned she simply says she is 'more inclined' to the view that they require an understanding of 'the fictive world of the play' that was beyond a compositor's ken and thus they are more likely to be the work of an annotator (pp. 102–3). At this point argument becomes sheer assertion, and by referring the reader back to her introduction Massai gives the impression that the present example is the reinforcement of a case already made. But in fact the introduction promised that the case would be made here, so the rhetoric is circular.

Regarding the variants in Q1–Q2–Q3 *Richard III* Massai rather unfairly claims that John Jowett ‘attributes them to [the printer Thomas] Creede’ (p. 103) when the passage she quotes only says ‘Q2 may... have been corrected’ from the copy for Q1 retained by Creede. The bigger problem, not addressed by Massai, is that in the edition she is quoting, the Oxford Shakespeare text, Jowett wrongly claimed that Q1 and Q2 were published by Creede (p. 153 n. 102), but in fact Creede only printed (did not publish) Q2 and Q3 and Peter Short and Valentine Simmes printed Q1 *Richard III*. It is clear that a simple typo explains all this: Jowett meant to say that Wise published Q1 and Q2 (but he accidentally typed ‘Creede’) and that hence it is possible that Q2 benefits from a reading in the manuscript copy for Q1 that Wise retained. Massai points out that Wise the publisher and not Creede the printer would have held the manuscript copy for Q1, which is true and is exactly what Jowett wrote elsewhere in the same edition (p. 116 n. 3). Out of Jowett’s typo Massai constructs a straw man. Rather than offer a new theory, Massai picks holes in Jowett’s narrative and constructs a paragraph-long explanation of Creede’s generally not being a careful man and hence not likely to introduce the small and unobvious corrections in *Richard III*, and concludes that without Creede in the frame we are left with the agency of either Wise or Shakespeare in making the improvements. A more generous approach would have been to ask Jowett to clarify the glaring contradiction in his edition, but this would have denied Massai her straw man.

Massai’s chapter on the Pavier quartos of 1619 (pp. 106–35) does, however, offer a new and plausible interpretation of the facts. The standard narrative is that the letter of the Lord Chamberlain (William Herbert) to the Stationers’ Company of May 1619, in which it was ordered that no King’s men’s play was to be published without the players’ consent, was directed at suppressing Thomas Pavier’s plan for a collected Shakespeare, perhaps because the 1623 Folio was already in planning. Indeed Lukas Erne argued that Pavier’s quartos (and not the bad quartos) were the ones complained of by the Folio preliminaries. Massai is not buying this: the company order of 1619 was not directed at Pavier at all. The printers of the Pavier quartos were William and Isaac Jaggard, and it was Isaac—thus inspired by Pavier’s vision of a collected Shakespeare—who persuaded the King’s men to get the order stopping other stationers (not Pavier) from securing copy for the as yet unpublished Shakespeare plays. And it was Isaac who persuaded Pavier to falsify the title-page dates so that his partial collection (sold together or individually) would seem like a gathering of old and new material and thus ‘whet, rather than satisfy, readers’ demand’ for a collected Shakespeare (p. 107). Working with Jaggard and the players this way, Pavier got their protection and got to make money lending his rights to the Folio syndicate.

Massai thinks that her narrative answers previously hard-to-answer questions, such as why Pavier made such a poor attempt to fake title pages from twenty years earlier, and it also explains why Pavier was not punished by the Stationers’ Company for breaking its order (p. 108). (I would have thought that Pavier’s falsified title pages were fairly convincing, since it took Greg’s celebrated detective work with watermarks to reveal them.) To bolster her narrative, Massai looks to later repetitions of the Lord Chamberlain’s

intervention. In June 1637 and again in August 1641, successive Lords Chamberlain (Philip Herbert, William's brother, and then Robert Devereux) wrote to the Stationers' Company, invoking William Herbert's letter of 1619 as a precedent, asking it to protect court-patronized players from publication of their plays. The letter of 1637 asks the company to check with the players that for any of their plays already entered in the Stationers' Register they are content to have the play printed, and to do this for any more of their plays that come into Stationers' Hall for entry, but nowhere does it mention taking action against stationers who have already printed plays. The letter of 1641 lists plays that had never been printed. Thus, argues Massai, the two letters suggest that the players were not able to prevent the reprinting of plays, only to keep their as yet unprinted plays out of print (p. 109).

Thus, on the evidence of these letters, we cannot assume that the 1619 order was supposed to cover reprints (and of course all of Pavier's quartos were reprints) and hence the 1619 letter might not have been aimed at Pavier at all. A potential objection that Massai might have forestalled is that we cannot apply the 1637 and 1641 letters to the lost 1619 letter in this way because of what had happened in the meantime: the Folio had been published in 1623. This clarified and established the rights for virtually the whole Shakespeare canon, and the letters of 1637 and 1641 are thus clearly concerned with the non-Shakespearian plays of the companies named. In 1619 the rights to the Shakespeare canon had not been clearly established—as indeed the printing schedule of the Folio seems to show, with disruptions apparently due to disputes over rights—and the Lord Chamberlain's letter might well for that reason have had quite a different intent from the later letters. Massai points out that we can tell that the letter of 1637 had an effect because in the five years before the letter thirteen Queen's men's plays were published, of which seven were new (in the sense of being previously unpublished), while in the five years after the letter twenty were published, of which only two were new. For the King's men, the rates are seven plays published in the five years before the letter, of which three were new, while in the five years after the letter eight plays were published, of which only one was new. So, the letter did have the affect of keeping unpublished plays out of print (p. 110).

Massai reckons that it was the dramatists, such as Thomas Heywood, who seemed to want their stuff published and against whom the Lord Chamberlain's letter of 1637 was written. Massai admits a problem in applying the 1637 letter to the 1619 conditions, since in fact there had been a slump in the publication of previously unpublished plays in the 1610s (so there was little for him to prevent), and indeed the same was true in the later 1630s, just ahead of the letter of 1641. That the 1641 letter lists old unpublished plays to be protected presumably indicates that the players were planning a collection of previously unpublished plays and wanted to stop anyone pre-empting it, and indeed that may have been what the 1619 letter did, with even a similar list attached (pp. 111–12). Greg's claim that Pavier broke the Stationers' Company order of 1619 by his quartos, and that this is why he gave them false imprints, is undermined by the fact that of the ten plays (nine quartos, *The Whole Contention* being two plays in one) he owned the rights to five of them, that he worked closely with the owners of the rights to three of them,

and that the rights to the other two were derelict. Moreover two of the ones with false dates are ones Pavier himself owned the rights to (pp. 113–14). It was not the other stationers nor the actors Pavier wanted to deceive, it was the readers: he wanted to look like he had gathered some old printings with some new ones for a ‘nonce’ collection. Other ‘nonce’ collections had mixed title-page dates in them, and Pavier was successfully imitating those. Why do it? As a promotional build-up to the 1623 Folio.

We usually give Edward Blount the credit for coming up with the idea for the Folio, but the Jaggards had connections with the King’s men, and that Blount came into the project late is suggested by his name not appearing alongside Isaac Jaggard’s in the mention of the Folio in the Frankfurt book fair catalogue of 1622. Blount had the rights and the money, but Isaac Jaggard had the idea and got it from his father William’s involvement with Pavier in 1619 (pp. 117–18). Isaac persuaded Pavier to make his quartos collection look like a ‘nonce’ work ‘as a pre-publicity stunt’ for the Folio and to diminish its directly competing with the Folio when that came out. What would Pavier get out of it? By offering his quartos as both individual plays and a ‘nonce’ collection, Pavier would hedge his bets, and he would be able to lend his rights to the Folio consortium for a fee; he might even have been a potential member of that consortium (p. 119). That cashing in on the planned Folio was seen as a potential opportunity explains Matthew Law’s reprints of *Richard III* and *1 Henry IV* in 1622. The undated reprint of *Romeo and Juliet* in 1622 by John Smethwick, one of the Folio consortium, shows that he wanted to get a general Shakespeare boom going but not to compete with his other project, the Folio. (This reprint is now confidently dated to 1623—see below—but that does not harm Massai’s argument.) Thomas Walkley’s 1622 *Othello* was probably also permitted pre-publicity for the Folio: after 1619 it is hard to see Walkley getting away with printing a previously unpublished Shakespeare play without the syndicate’s agreement (p. 120).

Thus Massai makes a plausible and nuanced case that the Pavier quartos were not piratical but part of a careful plan and that is why their corrections of their printer’s copies are so good. Massai shows that, when taken as a group, the Pavier reprints show certain patterns of editorial improvement, with certain directions being amplified or clarified and others (especially those useful to actors rather than readers) cut. There is an overall tendency to make the things more literary and less theatrical. As before, Massai asserts but does not prove that the changes made to the copy happened before the copy was submitted to the printshop: she assumes that no one in the printshop was smart or careful enough to do it. Massai claims that there are similarities in the ways that stage directions are rephrased across eight of the ten plays and quotes a few examples, but without stating what she thinks is common in them; I cannot see a similarity (p. 124). In further examples, one habit is clear: the removal of redundantly repetitive *ands* in stage directions, but of course this is pretty easily attributed to an observant compositor. In the Pavier reprint of *Oldcastle* some lines amounting to a page and a half are omitted, and Massai reads this as an adjustment made to allow more white space around stage directions in order to make a prettier page. She argues that the cuts are clever in that they do not disrupt the sense, but is it really plausible

that someone who tweaked stage directions to make them read better would also countenance such massive cuts for the sake of a good-looking page? The major example of editing of the copy for a Pavier reprint is his Q3 *The Contention of York and Lancaster* which is based an edited form of Q1 in which York's mangled account of his own genealogy is unmangled (pp. 126–8). True, but this has long been recognized. Compared to other reprints of the period, Pavier's are in many ways improved over the books they reprint, so we should not consider his project shady (p. 132). He seems to have put money into perfecting his copy, but who did the perfecting?

On the evidence of his reprint (Q3, 1602) of *A Looking Glass for London and England*, it was Pavier himself. There too, as in the Pavier 1619 reprints of *A Yorkshire Tragedy* and *The Merchant of Venice*, the reprint adds pronouns to clarify and improve stage directions: 'Embrace him' becomes 'She imbraceth him', 'spurns her' becomes 'He spurns her', and 'open the letter' becomes 'He opens the letter'. (Since these are simply changes from the imperative to the indicative mood I cannot see the improvement, and even if we accept that the parallels—Massai has fifteen in all—are compelling evidence of the same man at work, why does it have to be Pavier rather than a man he hired in 1602 and again in 1619?) *Henry V* Q1 was reprinted in 1602 by Pavier (Q2) and again by Pavier from Q1 in 1619 (Q3), and the pattern of improvements each time was the same. What Pavier had done to improve the play for his Q2 he had done again independently to improve it for Q3 (rather than reprinting directly from Q2). Thus the same man was involved both times (in 1602 and in 1619) and the obvious candidate is Pavier himself (p. 134). Again, this we may call 'editing' after a fashion, but if it does not involve access to additional authoritative documents it does not transform the textual situation in the way that Massai seems to think: a clever guess by someone from Shakespeare's own time is still just a guess. For Massai, Pavier has thus been shown to be 'an integral part of the editorial tradition', and in the limited sense of 'editorial' she is right, since after all Nicholas Rowe's 1709 Shakespeare is typically called 'edited', although he too used only his own wits.

Massai turns next to the plays for which the 1623 Folio reprints an existing quarto (pp. 136–79). Massai thinks that the editors of the Oxford *Complete Works* of 1986 indulged in wish-fulfilment in their belief that the theatrical origins of certain Folio texts' departures from their printed Q copy were caused by annotation of that copy by reference to a promptbook. Why would a publisher collate his printed copy against the theatrical manuscript (one not known to be radically different from it) only to recover a handful of readings? We know that, for the purpose of printing, authors such as John Lyly cut out the songs and dumbshows, and that the first publisher of *Tamburlaine* removed what he thought were theatrical frivolities for the sake of his readership. So why would the Shakespeare Folio syndicate bother to make their copy 'better' by reference to a theatrical document? This rhetorical question of Massai's, and the analogues on which it is thus based, skate over some important differences that are worth pursuing for a moment. Where it is claimed that the Folio copy was a quarto that was first annotated by reference to a manuscript, the idea is to undo the harm done by the first printer. Richard Jones's printing of *Tamburlaine*, on the other hand, was made

from manuscript copy. Where the Folio is printed from foul papers and is our only text of the play (as in *All's Well That Ends Well*), no one supposes that these papers were made more theatrical by reference to a theatrical document, although if they were it is hard to see how we would be able to tell this kind of subsequent annotation apart from simple annotation of those papers for use in the theatre. Also, to annotate the printed copy by reference to the promptbook takes the Folio text away from being a simple reprint of a quarto, and this might be helpful if the publisher of that quarto were thought likely to claim that his rights were being infringed. For the Folio project the theatre texts were the authorities, but since it is easier to set type from printed copy it would have been handier to use that authority by having it modify an easily purchased quarto. In any case, the licensed theatrical texts ought not to be allowed out of the theatre.

Massai compares the Folio variants from its own printed copy with the kinds of annotation made by readers in a couple of quartos, and as they are unlike she concludes that annotation of the printer's copy quarto is not the cause of the Folio variants. However, she deals only with John Dover Wilson's claim that the quarto of *Love's Labour's Lost* used to print the Folio had itself once been the promptbook and had annotations for performance on it. She does not address the Oxford editors' claim that the quarto used as printer's copy was annotated by reference to a promptbook in order to bring it into alignment with that promptbook. Massai says she will show that the Folio departures from its printed copy in *Romeo and Juliet* and *Love's Labour's Lost* are not because Q was marked up for performance, but again no one since Dover Wilson has made that claim. Only after disposing of straw man Dover Wilson does she turn to the Oxford claim of quartos marked up by reference to a promptbook, although she is careful to choose as a test case a play about which the Oxford editors were uncertain and admitted alternative possibilities, such as the annotator of *Romeo and Juliet* having only his recollections of performance to guide him. Militating against the hypothesis that a theatrical manuscript or recollections of performance were used to improve Q3 *Romeo and Juliet* before it was used as copy for F is the fact that on a couple of occasions it worsens the stage directions, making them less accurate an account of what must have happened on stage. Likewise, the Folio flattens out the speech prefixes of the musicians from 'Fidler' and 'Minstrels' in Q3 to just 'Mu[sician]', thus reducing detail, not enhancing it, and on some occasions the Folio gets speeches wrong that Q3 gets right, or at least more right than the Folio does in any case. Massai lists some more things that this putative annotator must have got wrong, and agrees with S.W. Reid (albeit he does not say this on the page she cites) that the Folio departures from Q3 cannot be put down solely to a Folio compositor. But she cannot accept either—because of the textual harm that would have to be attributed to him—that the annotator's authority was either a promptbook or his memory of performance. This is straining at gnats, for the Oxford editors readily conceded that if the Q3 copy for Folio *Romeo and Juliet* was improved by consultation of an authoritative manuscript, the process was not thorough.

Regarding *Love's Labour's Lost*, Massai points out that John Kerrigan and Stanley Wells disagree on why the annotation of Q1 to make copy for F did

not produce a better text than we have: Kerrigan says the annotator was slovenly and Wells says the manuscript used for the annotation was not good. (This is something of a false opposition, for Wells too argues that the annotator was slovenly.) Massai deals with the tangled speech prefixes that conceal which lord will pair off with which lady in the story (pp. 147–8), but without mentioning Manfred Draudt's argument that these couples are supposed to switch partners early on in the play because these people are like that. Massai simply asserts that the Folio departures from its Q copy are largely a matter of that Q having been sporadically annotated by a reader using nothing but his wits, but she is forced to concede that the intrusion in F of the speech prefix 'Prin.' halfway through a speech already assigned to the Princess of France in II.i cannot be explained that way and must be as Wells describes it, the effect of looking at a different textual witness in which the first twenty lines of her speech were marked for omission (pp. 148–9). (Of course, having conceded that point there is no reason for her to persist in positing an additional vector of annotation since this one alone can account for all the problems.) Looking across the Folio texts printed from existing quartos, Massai notices that the variants are not of the same kind in each case, suggesting to her that they do not all come from the same process by the same people, the putative Folio editors. Some of them (such as the part-lines added to *1 Henry IV* and *2 Henry IV* when reprinted in F from quarto copy) look like the things she has previously observed as the habits of annotating readers (pp. 151–8). There is here much repetition of arguments made earlier, but now taking as a starting point certain moments from—not comprehensive surveys of—Folio texts printed from quarto copy and arguing that they are better explained as the effect of readers annotating their copy (to improve it) than as someone sporadically collating F's printed quarto copy with a manuscript.

Massai revives Eleanor Prosser's claim that an anonymous editor added bits to Q1 *2 Henry IV* before it was used to make F (p. 153), and describes the annotator working on copy for Folio *Much Ado About Nothing* as someone intent on removing unnecessary characters from stage directions, and going too far in some places and not far enough in others. Massai makes the mistake of claiming that 'Leonato's wife . . . is only mentioned once in the opening stage direction of both editions [Q and F]' (p. 157), but in fact she is mentioned again, in both editions, in the opening stage direction for the second act. If the F variants from its printed Q copy are all due to the prior-to-printing annotation of Q by comparison with an authoritative manuscript, why are the outcomes so different for different plays? Why is profanity based on the name of Jesus removed from *1 Henry IV* but allowed to stand in *Romeo and Juliet*? For Massai, this indicates different annotators with different tastes (p. 158), but of course it could just as easily reflect differences in the authoritative manuscripts, such as one being made for first performance or revival before the ban on stage oaths and one being made for a revival after the ban.

To discover which member of the Folio consortium engaged the annotator(s), Massai surveys each man's other projects (pp. 159–79). Edward Blount's 1632 edition of six Lyly plays, all reprints, shows no sign of this activity. To see if Isaac Jaggard might have engaged an annotating

reader Massai goes on a fairly lengthy detour through the works of, and attitude towards print held by, Thomas Heywood solely to evaluate if the Jaggard editions of *A Woman Killed with Kindness* [1607, 1617] show such a person at work. Answer: no. William Aspley gets the same treatment and answer, leaving just John Smethwick. Massai relies on Lynette Hunter's essay 'Why Has Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* Such an Intelligent Editor?' (reviewed in *YWES* 82[2003]) and agrees that an annotator was at work on the copy for Q3 *Romeo and Juliet* and for Q4 *Romeo and Juliet*, but unlike Hunter she does not think the same person was that annotator in both cases. Thus rather than being the annotator, Smethwick probably just engaged an annotator when he printed Q3 and Q4, and presumably he did the same as part of the Folio consortium.

The first half of Massai's last chapter, 'Perfecting Shakespeare in the Fourth Folio (1685)' (pp. 180–95), is a condensed reprint of her article "'Taking just care of the impression": Editorial Intervention in Shakespeare's Fourth Folio, 1685' reviewed in *YWES* 83[2004], and the second part is an argument for relative continuity between the seventeenth-century 'editors' of Shakespeare that she has identified—her annotating readers—and their eighteenth-century successors such as Alexander Pope and Thomas Hanmer. The conclusion (pp. 196–205) observes that correcting did not end with the printing of the book: readers were enjoined to carry on the process by correcting their books. Massai ties this to the idea of the text as infinitely perfectible, fluid and unstable. What are the consequences for editing? Massai finds fault with the New Bibliography and the recent campaign for un-editing, since both treat the book as a static object, which she thinks is an anachronistic approach since early moderns saw the book as an ongoing process. The important thing, she asserts, is to be historical about all this. Her own question remains unanswered, however, since she does not say what this historical approach would mean for editing.

John Jowett's book *Shakespeare and Text* displays its author's extraordinary capacity for explaining complex textual problems, and his solutions of them, in terms that anyone can understand and then drawing out the subtle philosophical correlatives that go with his approaches. He neatly sums up recent developments by observing that in general we used to think that Q1 and Folio *King Lear* were imperfect witnesses to a singular antecedent authorial version, and now we are in danger of deluding ourselves that they are perfect witnesses to two equally viable authorial versions, whereas in fact the truth lies between these positions: authorial revision and corruption separate these printings (p. 3). The work of Lukas Erne has clearly moved Jowett's position somewhat, for he writes that Shakespeare 'might have anticipated' that his plays would be printed but there is 'little evidence that he was actively concerned' with printing (p. 4). Jowett's first chapter, 'Author and Collaborator' (pp. 6–26), is a survey of the primary evidence and the recent stylometric discoveries. Throughout, the book is studded with insights that only someone stepping back from a long and close engagement with the textual detail is able to offer, as when observing that the attack on Shakespeare in *Greene's Groat'sworth of Wit* is necessarily a compliment too, since it does not name him directly and hence assumes that Shakespeare was well enough

known that readers could identify him merely by allusion (p. 7). Not every point need receive assent. Jowett claims that the spelling of *scilens* (for *silence*) in Hand D of *Sir Thomas More* is not known in any un-Shakespearean text 'of the period' (p. 13), but that rather depends how flexible you are about the period: it was an accepted late medieval spelling and is found in John Lydgate's poetry. The chapter 'Theatre' (pp. 27–45) is a survey of the textual economy of the theatre, including the creation and purposes of plots and parts and how revision and adaptation occurred. There is an odd slip here: quoting Arthur Brown on Heywood's *The Captives*, Jowett reports that the manuscript was annotated to guide the scribe 'for whom' the official 'book' was to be made, but of course Brown wrote 'by whom' (p. 28). Jowett reads the Master of the Revels Henry Herbert's demand (written into the licence for *The Launching of the Mary*) for 'fair copy hereafter' as meaning 'of this play', but since it can also be read as meaning 'in future send me fair copy' it would have been useful to know why Jowett excludes this possibility (p. 29).

Jowett urges textual scholars to retain the term 'promptbook' in favour of more recently proposed terms such as 'playbook' that are less loaded with nineteenth-century theatrical assumptions because it suggests the active connection with what is happening, minute by minute, on the stage. This he thinks these documents really are concerned with, especially as witnessed in their 'readying' notes, examples of which he usefully lists (pp. 32–5). He points out that taking the reference in *Romeo and Juliet* to 'two-hours traffic' as an indication of how long the performance will run is a bit over-literal, since after all no one would think that *Henry V* lasts sixty minutes because the Prologue says the events have been compressed into an 'hourglass' (p. 36). Jowett does not accept the recently floated idea that bad quartos are performance texts and the good quartos and Folio texts are authorial. Not only Shakespeare but also Jonson, Webster and Fletcher tended to write long plays whose early printings—*Every Man Out of His Humour* [1600], *The Duchess of Malfi* [1623] and Humphrey Moseley's preface to the 1647 Beaumont and Fletcher Folio—indicate that the author's text was cut for performance. Thus Folio *Hamlet* or *Henry V* may still represent the full author's script, as represented in the promptbook, from which the actors cut a few scenes to make their performances (p. 37). Regarding the purposes for which playhouse 'plots' were created, Jowett quotes David Bradley's interpretation (that they are casting documents) as an alternative to Greg's (that they were a backstage 'cheat sheet' for forgetful performers), but Bradley's quotation is assigned to his page 120 when it in fact appears on his page 126 (pp. 40, 206 n. 18).

In his chapter 'The Material Book' (pp. 46–68) Jowett explains the appearance of the long s as like 'f' without a forward crossbar', which is a little confusing for the reader as while the book-opening he presents in facsimile (from Q1 *Troilus and Cressida*) has long s as he describes it (with a crossbar to the left of the stem but not to the right of it) the modern typeface with which Oxford University Press has represented this sort has no crossbar at all (p. 48). Jowett offers a neat and succinct summary of the process of entry in the Stationers' Register, although he once (p. 51) treats 'authority'—which the entry for *Troilus and Cressida* needs more of—as a matter of 'trade regulation' rather than ecclesiastical permission; elsewhere he follows Peter Blayney's

accepted distinction of *allowance* = *authority* (= external approval from the church) and *licence* (= internal approval from the Stationers' Company). Jowett reckons that Blayney's estimates for the profitability of printing a play are a bit low: it cannot be the case that first editions did little more than break even, and all the profits were in reprints, since only 50 per cent of books achieved reprints (p. 53). Under these conditions, who would bother doing a first edition if there were a less than even chance of eventually making a profit on it? (I am not sure I agree with this logic: with nearly half the gambles paying off and the rest not losing any money, most gamblers would be happy to keep taking a chance.) Jowett makes the excellent point about the practice of compositors setting by formes rather than seriatim, and—one I have not heard before—that this brings about the completion of a quarto forme at regular time intervals (one after every four pages are set) whereas seriatim work completes them unevenly (one after seven pages, and then after one, and then seven, and so on). Jowett explains the workings of a printing press well, but the description is let down by a picture of a press that has no frisket in place so it is not clear just how this operates as a mask to keep unwanted ink off the sheet to be printed (p. 55).

In his chapter 'The First Folio' (pp. 69–92), Jowett gives an account of the Pavier quartos of 1619, including a reference to Massai's account of them but not crediting her with the new idea that Pavier was in league with the Folio syndicate: Jowett sticks to the old story that Pavier was working against their interests, but then at the end wonders if Pavier was, perhaps inadvertently, helping to get the Folio project started by showing what was possible in republishing Shakespeare. (For Massai, as we have seen, Pavier was doing just this intentionally.) Jowett makes the familiar assertion that without the Folio we would not know of sixteen of Shakespeare's plays, but actually this counterfactual is not necessarily so straightforward. If no one had thought to make the Folio then it is possible that publishers might have issued the unpublished plays in individual quartos over the succeeding years; after all, *The Two Noble Kinsmen* did not get its first quarto until 1634. Jowett's claim about the book's influence is well made, however. As he points out, as recently as Peter Alexander's 1951 *Complete Works*, *The Tempest* was printed as the first play for no other reason than that the Folio had it so. In 'Mapping the Text' (pp. 93–114) Jowett makes the point that the character commonly called Lady Capulet is merely an editorial invention: the Capulets are not aristocrats; he is just Capulet and she is his wife (p. 99). Editors could, he argues, synthesize the view of Barbara Mowat that editions should be concerned primarily about the needs of the reader (not so much the author) with Greg's distinction between the accidentals and the substantives, and so produce texts in which 'matters of incidence and presentation would be ceded to the interests of the reader, while the substantives of the text would be recognized as having integrity in terms of their origin' (pp. 113–14).

Jowett's chapter on 'Emendation and Modernization' (pp. 115–35) offers an excellent example of the obligation to undo assumed censorship even where we have no access to the uncensored version other than by inference. When Angelo says 'heaven in my mouth, | As if I did but onely chew his name' in Folio *Measure for Measure*, he must originally have been given the line

'God in my mouth'. Jowett concedes that there is idealism in emending in 'pursuit of a prior text', meaning the author's manuscript, but rightly insists that this is less pernicious than the idealism of being willing only 'to correct the errors in a document to no other criterion than an ideal version of itself' (p. 116). This prior manuscript was not necessarily a perfect expression of the mind creating it: Jowett gives examples of Hand D of *Sir Thomas More* not writing what he meant, as when making slips and also when forcing two verse lines into one because he has reached the end of the page and has no more room (pp. 117–18). Regarding 'Versification and Stage Directions' (pp. 136–57), Jowett makes the important point that, when originally written, the stage directions were meant to determine what would happen on the stage, while in a modern edition they are attempting to account for what might or must have happened on the stage, and hence these two kinds of writing are 'ontologically distinct' (p. 149). He might nonetheless be overstating the case. We could say that the modern stage directions are showing what the original ones would have looked like if the original writers and readers, the actors, had our modern sense of how much you need to tell someone about the action. Looked at in this way, old and modern stage directions belong in the same ontological category, and we can proceed by analogy with the modernization of spelling and punctuation.

There has been a recent demand that editors cease making explicit what they think the stage action should be, should cease being prescriptive in their invented stage directions, and should retain the multitude of possibilities latent in the incomplete or missing directions in the early printings. Jowett offers the splendid rejoinder that this view overlooks the distinct possibility that rather than experiencing such moments as a range of performance possibilities the unaided reader might well simply have no idea what is happening on the stage (p. 155). Jowett ends this chapter by quoting the opening moments of *Timon of Athens* from the Oxford *Collected Middleton* (reviewed above), but unfortunately not entirely accurately in terms of typography. The indenting of the second part of the split verse line is not properly aligned in the last line of the quotation. The fact that the Oxford *Collected Middleton* puts the speech prefix on a line of its own for a speech of verse (except where someone else completes a split verse line) is misrepresented. In the quotation here the speech prefix is on the same line as the first word of the speech, and indeed that is the cause of the misalignment of the final split verse line. A pair of square brackets around an editorial stage direction is italicized in the quotation and should not be for the brackets are not italicized in the Oxford *Collected Middleton*. Another slip: 'As noted in Chapter 5, John Dover Wilson's Cambridge series employed quotation marks to identify wordings taken from the base text' (p. 156) but in fact there is no such point made anywhere earlier in this book, so presumably this is a relic from an earlier state of the text. Jowett's last chapter, 'Texts for Readers' (pp. 158–69), is largely a survey of the digital future, especially the Internet Shakespeare Editions project.

Thomas Merriam's book *Co-authorship in King John* has the same thesis as his previous one on *Henry VIII* (reviewed in *YWES* 86[2007]): the play was co-authored and Shakespeare did not write the anti-Catholic bits. Merriam reports that most people accept that *King John* is based on the anonymous

two-part play *The Troublesome Reign of King John*. John Bale's *King Johan* and *Troublesome Reign* make John seem a proto-Protestant and portray Catholicism as bad, but Shakespeare seems to have evened the balance somewhat. Yet there remain three pro-Protestant speeches in *King John* and they are all in III.i, and also distinctly Catholic sentiments remain. Critics have seen this as another demonstration of myriad-minded Shakespeare seeing both sides of an argument, but for Merriam the contradiction comes from co-authorship. Merriam begins with a postulate: in a study of relative frequency of words by an author, the median frequency should be close to the mean frequency (p. 15). This principle is refreshingly well explained by Merriam, which is not always the case with such research. Merriam provides a table of the relative frequency of the word *and* in twenty-seven plays of undisputed Shakespearian sole authorship, ranked from *Henry V* (the highest, in which 3.7 per cent of all words are *and*) to *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (where only 2.35 per cent of all words are *and*), and as expected the mean frequency (about 2.8 per cent) is close to the median frequency (held by *Romeo and Juliet*, fourteenth out of twenty-seven plays in the list, with an *and* frequency of about 2.8 per cent) (p. 16). This principle of symmetry (median equalling mean) in relation to one word's relative frequency should exist too in the subdivisions of a play if it is all by one hand. Merriam divides *King John* into twenty-seven sections and puts each section into his ranking order table for twenty-seven plays. The outcome is that ten chunks of *King John* use *and* way more often than the Shakespeare play that uses *and* the most, which is *Henry V*, and thereby upset the median/mean symmetry (pp. 17–18). Likewise for the pronoun *I*, the adverb *not*, and the pronoun *it*, which are all used way too little in *King John* (pp. 19–24). Moreover, for these four tests (*and*, *I*, *not*, *it*) it is the same subsections of *King John* that are the outliers: the prime cases at the tops of the tables being units 1, 11a, 17 and 19 and at the bottoms being 14, 18 and 20. This suggests dual authorship. To refine the technique, Merriam brings in a further seventeen such test words and makes a combined table of all twenty-one test words' results, to which he applies Principal Component Analysis. This confirms that certain bits of *King John* are much unlike the rest of Shakespeare (pp. 25–6). Interestingly, the bits of *King John* that critics have praised as its core great scenes are well within the Shakespeare norm, and the really strong outlier is the crucial hinge speech of twenty lines by the Bastard in IV.iii, where he seems to take on responsibility for the future well-being of England. Take out the fifteen outliers (representing half the play) and the remaining chunks fit perfectly well into the Shakespeare profile (pp. 27–8).

Then comes a new approach to the problem (pp. 29–34). Merriam takes ninety-two words that occur 781 times in *Tamburlaine* but only eighty-three times in *As You Like It* and takes 104 words that occur 693 times in *As You Like It* but only thirty times in *Tamburlaine*. (Here Merriam makes the types/tokens distinction but does not explain it. A simple illustration is that this review contains 30,952 words (tokens) in total, but many of them are repetitions such as *and* and *the*, so that the number of different words (types) is only 4,428). Thus the *Tamburlaine* set comprises words favoured by Marlowe (and a lot of them seem to be about power), and the *As You Like It* set

comprises words favoured by Shakespeare. The words chosen for these two sets are not the usual filler words (like *and*), so we need to check if they are subject to authorial influence (one writer to another) or vary by a play's subject matter. Merriam does this by showing that for twenty-seven Shakespeare plays, three Marlowes, and three Peeles, the Shakespeare words occur way more often in the Shakespeare plays (always more often than they occur in the Marlowe or Peele) and the Marlowe words occur way more often in the Marlowe plays (always more often than in the Shakespeare or the Peele). Thus the frequency with which these words appear is a good discriminator of these authors. Merriam also puts usage of *and* in the same table and it follows the same pattern: all the Shakespeares (except *Henry V*) use *and* less often than the Marlowes and Peeles do. Apply the same test with the twenty-seven subsections of *King John* described above and they more or less fall into two camps: the sections that the previous tests suggested were Shakespeare are at the top of the table (with lots of uses of the Shakespeare words) and the non-Shakespeare sections are down the bottom because using lots of the Marlowe words, albeit two sections of each type are in the wrong camps. E.A.J. Honigmann noticed that the word *right* occurs more often in *King John* than any other Shakespeare play (3 *Henry VI* is next in rank), and using this instead of *and* in the comparison of the twenty-six sections of *King John* with the twenty-seven Shakespeare canon plays the same general outcome appears: mostly the non-Shakespearian sections are at the top (heavy users of *right*), then come the twenty-seven Shakespeare plays, then the Shakespearian parts of *King John* down at the bottom as infrequent users of *right*. In previous tests it was twenty-seven sections of *King John* not twenty-six, and the difference is that one of those twenty-seven was itself a sub-subsection, 11a, that Merriam has now left out of the argument without saying why. On page 17 Merriam promised he would later explain this 11a sub-subsection, but in fact the reason for its existence is never made explicit.

Merriam then turns from numbers to language, and especially the varieties of irony (pp. 35–44). Some ironies are hard to make sense of: the Bastard speaks favourably of the French war to support Arthur's claim while himself following King John loyally, he rails on commodity and then says he will follow it too, and he mocks Hubert's bombast and then emulates it. These incoherent ironies might come from co-authorship, while other ironies Merriam finds coherent as perhaps allusions to Elizabeth I's own official bastardy and suggesting little Arthur as a kind of Mary Queen of Scots figure. John is like Shakespeare's Richard III in being a younger brother claiming the throne at the expense of his nephews, and Shakespeare emphasized the link by making Arthur, who is a young man in Holinshed and in *Troublesome Reign*, into a child, and by making him (like Prince Richard in *Richard III*) be 'rhetorically precocious' (p. 42). Also, the suborning of Hubert is like the suborning of Tyrrell. All this is very daring on Shakespeare's part since it makes John look especially bad, whereas Holinshed made John an innocent victim of Rome and Bale made him a hero. The anti-Catholicism of *King John*, which is greatly attenuated from the source play *Troublesome Reign*, is concentrated in III.i.61–105, the arrival of the papal legate Cardinal Pandolf and his abuse by John (p. 45), and Merriam thinks it significant that some

particularly anti-Catholic lines in III.i were struck out in a copy of the second Folio used at the English Jesuit college at Valladolid in Spain (pp. 46–7). Merriam explains the Catholic distinction between a pardon (a release from the guilt of a sin) and an indulgence (a release from the temporal punishment for an already forgiven sin), and observes that section 11a of *King John* (III.i.91–3) mixes up these ideas. So too does *Doctor Faustus* when referring to ‘some ghost, newly crept out of Purgatory, come to beg a pardon of your Holiness’ since ghosts in Purgatory have already been forgiven.

Merriam thinks both this section of *King John* and *Doctor Faustus* mix up the idea in order to blackguard Catholicism by suggesting that the Roman Church sells forgiveness, which it does not. Round about the same part of *King John* there are words borrowed from John Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*, which itself may have got its account of King John from Bale, author of *King Johan*. Why would Shakespeare be Protestant around a time when he was also mocking Oldcastle? He would not: this bit is the work of another dramatist (pp. 47–54). The same bit of the play, Pandolf’s threat to John, contains an apparent advance promise of forgiveness (indeed, even canonization) for the sin of regicide, which is just what the Protestant extremists (and *Troublesome Reign*) claimed that Catholics were promised, but which in fact the Pope (in declaring her subjects’ duty to Elizabeth to be void in 1570) specifically avoided promising. The Pope did not call for regicide, only disobedience. That Pandolf in *King John* offers as reward for regicide the chance to be ‘worshipped as a saint’ (III.i.103) itself echoes anti-Catholic wilful confusion of the matter, for of course saints are venerated not worshipped, a distinction that Shakespeare himself makes in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (II.iv.142–51). Moreover, there is ample evidence in other plays that Shakespeare knew all these theological niceties backwards and forwards. (pp. 54–74). Merriam’s last chapter (pp. 75–83) is a response to Roland Mushat Frye’s *Shakespeare and Christian Doctrine* [1963], which claimed that Shakespeare’s art is essentially secular. Frye assumed that Elizabethans were by default Protestants and adherents of the ideas of Martin Luther and John Calvin, but Eamon Duffy has overturned this assumption. Frye relied upon the expurgation of a second Folio in Valladolid, which attended to theological matters clustered in *Henry VIII* and *King John*, but in both cases it was the non-Shakespearean bits (as established for the former by James Spedding and for the latter by this study) that attracted the Roman Catholic blue pencil. There’s also the deletion of a bit of *1 Henry VI*, but it is a bit that Gary Taylor attributes to Nashe. Also gone are the conjuring scene and the unmasking of Simpcox’s supposed miracle in *2 Henry VI*, which latter Merriam suspects is not by Shakespeare. Merriam’s conclusion is that in general *King John* is less anti-Catholic than *Troublesome Reign*, but in specific bits it is much more anti-Catholic, which is just the kind of evasion recusants had to practice. That is to say, co-authorship was a way to state your view without equivocation, since the other writer could give the opposing view. This sensible and well-argued ending is to my mind spoilt by a pointless application of Bayes’s Theorem to test the likelihood that *King John* is co-authored, based on plucking from the air certain variables such as 0.7 being the consensus likelihood of single authorship and ≤ 0.5 being the likelihood that

Heminges and Condell were telling the truth in describing the Folio as the works of one man.

The last relevant monograph this year is Brian Vickers's *Shakespeare, 'A Lover's Complaint', and John Davies of Hereford*. This is a study of Davies himself as a poet, and of the scholarship that has (wrongly) confirmed the attribution of *A Lover's Complaint* to Shakespeare, especially that done by Kenneth Muir and MacDonald P. Jackson. Refuting those, and introducing a battery of tests that show *A Lover's Complaint* to be typical of Davies but wildly untypical of Shakespeare, Vickers expands upon an argument first made in an article called 'A Rum "Do"' in the *Times Literary Supplement* in 2003 and reviewed in *YWES* 84[2005]. The book-length version uses literary-critical skills where the stylometric case is not proven, and as such can only deal in probabilities and need not detain us here. Three book-format collections of essays contain matter relevant to this review. The most important is Andrew Murphy's *Shakespeare and the Text*. Helen Smith's essay 'The Publishing Trade in Shakespeare's Time' (in Murphy, ed., pp. 17–34) is a fine introduction to the background for our topic, but has nothing new of direct concern to this review. In 'Reading and Authorship: The Circulation of Shakespeare 1590–1619' (in Murphy, ed., pp. 35–56) Peter Stallybrass and Roger Chartier track the popularity of Shakespeare as an author (especially of poetry) in his life and shortly thereafter, recording who bought what and what they said about him. They claim that the publishing of *The Rape of Lucrece* in octavo in 1598 was probably a way of signalling its high status, since a quarto was considered ephemeral whereas an octavo had class. (Actually, this is a tricky argument to make, since Stallybrass and Chartier stress Shakespeare's being known in print more as a poet than a dramatist; they ought not to remain silent on the fact that his *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI* appeared in octavo in 1595.) Stallybrass and Chartier repeat approvingly de Grazia's claim (from *Shakespeare Verbatim*) that 'Renaissance "quotation marks"' were the opposite of modern ones: they marked public property whereas ours mark private property. They ought to acknowledge Paulina Kewes's and Edmund G.C. King's independent demonstrations that in fact the use of the symbols in the modern way was common long before 1800, which is when de Grazia—for whom they exemplify the emergence of the Foucauldian 'author-function' around 1800—dates the change.

In 'Shakespeare Writ Small: Early Single Editions of Shakespeare's Plays' (in Murphy, ed., pp. 56–70), Thomas L. Berger reports that the word *promptbook* is not recorded before 1809, which is indeed what the print and old CD-ROM versions of the *OED* indicate, but in fact the online version now has examples from 1768 and 1772 (p. 65). Likewise Berger says that *prompter* in the theatrical sense is first used in *Othello*, but online *OED* has a use from 1585. Strangely, Berger here repeats, as if he accepts them, a number of putative rules about early modern performance that are not universally agreed upon: that the prompter sat on the stage, that entrances and exits were anticipatorily marked in the promptbook, and that only the first and last words of letters spoken on stage were recorded in the promptbook. Berger wrongly gives the date of the expiration of the lease on the site of the Theatre: it was 1597 not 1598 (p. 66). Anthony James West's 'The Life of the First Folio

in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries' (in Murphy, ed., pp. 93-108) is a history of the owners of the book, and includes a lament about the loss through theft of the exemplar with the longest recorded provenance, the Durham University copy. Since the publication of this essay that exemplar has been recovered and returned. In his 'The Birth of the Editor' (in Murphy, ed., pp. 93-108) Andrew Murphy implicitly rejects Sonai Massai's argument (reviewed above) by insisting that the editing of Shakespeare changed radically in the early eighteenth century, which development he reviews. Paul Werstine's ironically titled essay 'The Science of Editing' (in Murphy, ed., pp. 109-27) begins by pointing the reader to the few occasions when the Cambridge/Macmillan edition [1863-6] speculates about the printer's copy. In fact, Werstine's page-number references do not work for the 1863-6 edition, and he must be working from a reprint that repaginated the texts. His references fit the 1891 reprint so maybe Werstine used that without realizing that the pagination had changed from the first edition. Werstine thinks that in the first half of the twentieth century it was by no means agreed that there was a new and unified approach to Shakespearian bibliography: only retrospectively did it seem like a 'new' bibliography. (Werstine believes that the term New Bibliography came into being with F.P. Wilson's 1942 talk on the topic, but in fact Greg himself used it as early as 1919.) Werstine usefully surveys the disagreements within early New Bibliography, including Greg's later realization that his own 'memorial reconstruction' theory for Q1 *Merry Wives of Windsor* does not fit all the evidence perfectly. A.W. Pollard and John Dover Wilson's alternative and convoluted explanations of the origins of bad quartos (based on multiple revisions), outlined in 1919, were swept away by Peter Alexander's demonstration of memorial reconstruction lying behind *The Contention of York and Lancaster* and *Richard Duke of York*, for which Werstine here neglects to give a date: it was 1924.

Werstine credits E.K. Chambers with being the first to spot that Pollard was wrong about the relationship between non-entry in the Stationers' Register and publication of a bad quarto, although he gives the wrong reference: it is pages 186-7 of the second volume of *The Elizabethan Stage*. Strangely, Werstine declares himself convinced by Blayney's argument that playbooks were not terribly popular (and so were not worth a stationer's getting himself into trouble over by piracy) despite Alan Farmer and Zachary Lesser's demolition of it (reviewed in *YWES* 86[2007]). Werstine rehearses his familiar objection to the hypothesis that Hand D of *Sir Thomas More* is Shakespeare's, and renews his long-running attack on the means by which Greg derived the category 'foul papers'. Greg compared Edward Knight's transcript of John Fletcher's play *Bonduca* to the printed text and decided that certain differences (such as reordering of lines) were created by the difficulty Knight had in reading what must have been (Greg inferred) crabbed authorial papers. In rejecting Greg's article on *Bonduca* for publication in *The Library* (it did not reach print until 1990), Pollard rightly pointed out that we cannot extrapolate from *Bonduca* to anything else as it seems unique, especially since comparison of other two-text plays never produces the kinds of misplaced lines seen in *Bonduca*. Werstine rightly dates the entry of the word *promptbook* into the language to the late eighteenth century, and it is a pity that Murphy, as editor

of the volume, did not notice that this contradicts what Berger wrote earlier (p. 65) about its first being recorded in the early nineteenth century.

Leah Marcus's essay 'Editing Shakespeare in the Postmodern Age' (in Murphy, ed., pp. 128–44) is a loosely linked collection of assertions about how postmodernism's approval of everything discontinuous, inconsistent, fragmented, impure, unruly, borrowed and imbricated chimes well with how we now think about Shakespeare. From an editing point of view, this offers the fashionable nonsense that we should leave speech prefixes unregularized, not mark speeches as 'aside', and leave stage directions incomplete or productively imprecise. The speech prefix for Edmund in Q1 *King Lear* is uniformly some shortened version of *Bastard* so Marcus thinks that this 'almost nameless' character is 'chastely regularized' in modern editions that make him uniformly *Edmund* (p. 134). In pursuit of this postmodern anonymity, Marcus overlooks the fact that not only is he called *Edmund* in the stage directions but his name is uttered thirty times by characters on stage, including more than once by Edmund himself. In theatre someone's name is precisely what is spoken, not what is written in the script and least of all what is written in the speech prefixes. Another ironic slip is that Marcus quotes, she says, from the Folio *Hamlet* the lines 'whose griefes | Beares such an Emphasis? Whose phrase of Sorrow' and that thus 'unemended by modern editors' these lines display what we would think of as bad grammar (p. 138). In fact her quotation is emended, for in F it is 'whose phrase' not 'Whose phrase'. Marcus or a copy-editor or printer, presumably under the pressure of modern norms (in which an exclamation point ends a sentence and hence must be followed by a capital letter), has unconsciously emended.

In 'Shakespeare and the Electronic Text' (in Murphy, ed., pp. 145–61) Michael Best gives a history of electronic Shakespeares and a survey of some current projects, plus an indication of the current technical limitations. A small slip is that he claims that the Oxford *Complete Works* came out on CD-ROM in 1988 (p. 147), but in fact it was on what are now almost unreadable 5.25 inch floppy disks. Regarding the technical means for preventing users copying material that one makes available to them over the internet, Best notes that 'video clips can be streamed rather than downloaded' (p. 150). As the YouTube generation is well aware, streaming stops only the naive beginner from copying the stuff. The internet offers many pieces of software that will capture an incoming video stream and turn it back into a single file that can be saved and reused when offline. David Bevington's 'Working with the Text: Editing in Practice' (in Murphy, ed., pp. 165–84) surveys the textual problems of *1 Henry VI* (which he concludes are essentially intractable) and then *Othello* and *Troilus and Cressida*. Bevington thinks that in *1 Henry VI* Beaufort (the Bishop of Winchester) makes his 'first appearance, as he enters with his men to forbid access to the Tower of London' in I.iv (p. 169), but in fact he is already bickering with Gloucester in the play's opening scene. In a book aimed at textual non-specialists, it is confusing to write (of *Troilus and Cressida*) that editors have disagreed 'whether the quarto or the Folio text was derived, with changes, from the other' (p. 177) since the non-specialist is going to ask herself how a quarto made in 1609 could possibly derive from a Folio made in 1623.

Bevington is referring to the underlying manuscripts of these printings, and it is a shame to confuse the non-specialist by omitting to say so.

Sonia Massai's 'Working with the Texts: Differential Readings' (in Murphy, ed., pp. 185–203) is a history of *King Lear* editions from the seventeenth century to the present, and thus is somewhat repetitious of the historical narrative offered in Murphy's chapter. Samuel Johnson, she notes, thought that Shakespeare revised the text underlying Q1 *King Lear* to make the text underlying the Folio version, and yet, like R.A. Foakes in his 1997 Arden3 edition, Johnson kept in his edition things that he thought Shakespeare was quite right to cut when turning whatever underlay Q into whatever underlay F. Massai says that we have Rowe to thank, via a scene location note, for the 'heath' that people imagine Lear being mad upon. Or rather, Rowe probably got it from Nahum Tate's adaptation (represented in his 1681 edition) that first set Lear on a 'heath', which Rowe presumably saw in performance. (Perhaps I am underestimating the Restoration theatre's realism, but I have trouble imagining so distinctive a landscape as to permit the word 'heath' to travel, as it were, by sight; why might not Rowe simply have read Tate's text?) The last essay is Neil Rhodes's 'Mapping Shakespeare's Contexts: Doing Things with Databases' (in Murphy, ed., pp. 204–20), which explains how to teach using large-text corpora and does not really fit with the rest of the book except near the end, when Rhodes lists some of the outcomes of teaching projects, which are mini-surveys of the books that name Cuthbert Burby and Peter Short in their imprints. It also contains a couple of errors: the date of Q2 *Romeo and Juliet* is given as 1589 instead of 1599, and the printer of Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* is given as just John Danter despite the certainty that Edward Allde printed some of the sheets, as established by Chiaki Hanabusa in 1997.

Afterwords to collections of essays are usually innocuous and easily ignored, but John Drakakis's (in Murphy, ed., pp. 221–38) stands out for a number of reasons. It starts with irrelevant reflections on the recent interest in objects instead of subjects in early modern literary studies (deriving from the work of Hugh Grady and Jean Howard, whom Drakakis does not mention) and then turns to book history. Drakakis's attempts to weave a sentence or two about each of the preceding chapters into his own tedious account of textual variation is so clumsy as to constitute an insult to the contributors. Particularly egregious is the way that Anthony James West's work is tacked on to a point being made by Drakakis (p. 230), and with one essay Drakakis simply gives up and admits he can find no connection at all: 'But this is a different kind of epistemological discourse from that traversed by Michael Best, who in chapter 8 above is concerned to identify what is available electronically to readers of Shakespeare's texts.' Even on its own terms (that is, aside from the duty to argue for the chapters' coherence), Drakakis's argument is weak, and he gets wrong simple things like the Marxist notion of a commodity (p. 225). He thinks that it is the fact of being produced in order to be exchanged for money that makes something a commodity (and thus early books qualify), whereas in truth it is the attribute of being indistinguishable from another of its kind, as with, say, the notional barrel of Brent crude oil that is traded around the world. This matters because it is the realization that early books are not identical even within a single edition

(because of press variants) that has recently brought postmodernists and post-structuralists into the discipline.

Drakakis gets wrong the title of Honigmann's *The Stability of Shakespeare's Text* (p. 228), and surprisingly, having just glanced at Werstine's essay in this book in which the history of Greg's invention of the category 'foul papers' is given and Greg is shown to have extrapolated much too far from one document (the transcript of *Bonduca*), Drakakis nonetheless shamelessly uses the term 'foul papers' to describe the likely printer's copy for Q1 *The Merchant of Venice*. Drakakis bemoans the fact that no one has had the courage to print a modern edition of *The Merchant of Venice* with variable speech prefixes for *Jew* and *Shylock* as in the early printing, and claims that this is because we labour under 'some stable conception of dramatic "character"' (p. 229). Of course, he ought to know that dramatic characters are stable—not once is a character in an early modern play supposed to be played by more than one actor—and that this stability is reified in the single actor's 'part' for each character. The postmodern approach cannot destabilize the author and his characters at once, as Tiffany Stern's anti-authorial, 'part'-centred, research shows. Drakakis implicitly insults his fellow contributor Marcus by silently modernizing her American spelling when quoting her book *Unediting the Renaissance* and dropping a couple of her words ('to its'), and he seems to think that the Arden³ edition of *Hamlet* contains four texts: the edited one plus Q1, Q2 and F (p. 231). In fact it contains edited versions of Q1, Q2 and F.

Drakakis gives the date of 1594 for *Famous Victories of Henry V* but in fact it was published in 1598 and first performed 1583–8 according to Alfred Harbage's *Annals* (p. 233). He also seems to totally misunderstand the argument for putting Oldcastle into speech prefixes in *1 Henry IV* and he absurdly wonders aloud if Shakespeare's manuscript had 'Falstaff' in speech prefixes but that in writing the dialogue Shakespeare tried to gesture towards 'the model', that is the Lollard martyr. Drakakis gives a quotation about the Oldcastle controversy supposedly from the Textual Companion to the Oxford *Complete Works* of Shakespeare but it is not on the page he cites (p. 509), which is about *King Lear*. More misquoting follows (p. 234), this time of Greg ('comes so glibly' rendered as 'comes glibly'), and with the end of his contribution in sight he is not even grammatical: 'all the inconsistencies . . . is because' (p. 235). (In the ellipsis was a singular noun and that seems to have distracted him.) In a single sentence Drakakis manages to get wrong the working practices of the early modern printshop and of modern cinema in imagining compositors leaving sheets on the printshop floor just as directors leave rushes on the floor (p. 237). Of course, compositors did not handle sheets (that was the work of pressmen) and rushes are not discarded but used to make a workprint to be edited; only then are bits discarded, and by editors not by directors. In the bibliography to the book I noticed only one error: on page 254 there is a typo in the URL for the Text Encoding Initiative's wiki entry on how to deal with non-hierarchical textual structures. It should be <<http://www.tei-c.org/wiki/index.php/SIG:Overlap>> not <<http://www.teic.org/wiki/index.php/SIG:Overlap>> .

The annual *Shakespeare Yearbook* was this year themed *The Shakespeare Apocrypha* and contains essays relevant to this review. The title of John Jowett's essay, 'Shakespeare Supplemented' (in Brooks, Thompson and Ford, eds., pp. 38–73), comes from Jacques Derrida's work, and he shows how high French literary theory can illuminate textual studies. Jowett begins with Erne's point that for Heminges and Condell to be castigating the bad quartos in their Folio preliminaries would be odd, since none had appeared for a long time, but that they might be referring to the recent Pavier quartos. Jowett gives the narrative and chronology of the Pavier quartos which, because the seriously fake imprints begin only part-way through the manufacture of the collection, looks like a reaction to the Stationers' Company receipt of a letter from the Lord Chamberlain preventing publication of King's men's plays without the players' consent. Here, as in *Shakespeare and Text* reviewed above, Jowett considers the possibility that the players knew of Pavier's project and even tacitly approved for their own reasons. Jowett investigates just why seven more plays were added to the second issue of the third Folio [1664] and gives a history of the Shakespeare apocrypha in the eighteenth century, and then the nineteenth century (when a whole new slew of apocrypha was added by the work of Ludwig Tieck), and on into the twentieth century. His main point is that the hard boundaries of the canon are made by book production, not theatrical production, and that we do not need to accept them. Since we are sceptical of binaries such as good/bad quarto and foul papers/fair copy, why not the binary of 'canonical and' (p. 68)? That is how Jowett's essay ends, with what I take to be a Derridean joke, although it would be equally amusing if Jowett's typescript put the last words 'under erasure' and someone misread this as simple deletion.

Michael Egan's 'Woodstock's Golden Metamorphosis' (in Brooks, Thompson and Ford, eds., pp. 75–115) is literary criticism, based on Egan's false attribution of the play to Shakespeare; it reads a bit oddly coming as it does after Jowett's masterful account of the categorization of the apocrypha. Richard Preiss's 'A Play Finally Anonymous' (in Brooks, Thompson and Ford, eds., pp. 117–39) is a work about the theatre and publishing history of Anonymous's play *Mucedorus*. Likewise, 'A Fear of "Ould" Plays: How *Mucedorus* Brought Down the House and Fought for Charles II in 1652' (in Brooks, Thompson and Ford, eds., pp. 141–66), by Victor Holtcamp, explores Rowe's account of an illicit performance of this play (in which the floor gave way) in 1652. Scott Maisano's 'Shakespeare's Dead Sea Scroll: On the Apocryphal Appearance of *Pericles*' (in Brooks, Thompson and Ford, eds., pp. 167–93) is a literary-critical essay arguing that Q1 *Pericles*'s being a bad quarto is actually part of what the play dramatizes, its own status as a recollection, a retelling of sources. Paul Edmondson's "'Beyond the Fringe'?" Receiving, Adapting, and Performing *The London Prodigal*' (in Brooks, Thompson and Ford, eds., pp. 195–221) is literary criticism and theatre history of this play. In 'The Actors in *Sir Thomas More*' (in Brooks, Thompson and Ford, eds., pp. 223–40) Tom Rutter argues that, just as in other Munday plays (he considers *John a Kent and John a Cumber* and *The Downfall of Robert Earl of Huntingdon*), *Sir Thomas More* shows just how bad amateur actors are in

order to show how good the professionals putting on the play are (as indeed *The Taming of A Shrew* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* do).

The significance of Gerald Downs's essay is clear from its title, 'A Question Not to be Askt: Is Hand D a Copy?' (in Brooks, Thompson and Ford, eds., pp. 241–66). Downs revives some old claims that features of Hand D can be explained by eye-skip of a copyist and he works through each piece of evidence. Downs thinks it unlikely that the deletion in 'nor that the elamentes | wer not all appropriat to ~~the~~ yo^r Comfortes' is authorial (p. 246), but it seems to me that the author has forgotten that he is in the subjunctive mood (what if your case was as the strangers' case?) and thinks for a moment he is describing the strangers' case directly. Downs considers it quite impossible for an author to write 'ymagin that yo^u see the wretched straigners | their babyes at their backes, ~~and~~ w^h their poor lugage | plodding tooth portes and costes for transportacion' since luggage cannot plod (p. 247), but surely the subject (strangers) can be separated from the verb (plodding) by this parenthetical clause without damage to the meaning. Downs works through Giorgio Melchiori's readings of the evidence for *currente calamo* correction and tries to undermine each one (p. 248). Of course, this becomes a matter of how convincing one finds Downs's hypotheses versus Melchiori's, for neither has an absolutely irrefutable piece of evidence. If Hand D is a transcription, it is surely not one by which a scribe would want to advertise his work.

As for who actually composed the words, Downs thinks that styolmetry cannot go to work on a piece this short (p. 251). This is not so: MacDonald P. Jackson's 'The Date and Authorship of Hand D's Contribution to *Sir Thomas More*: Evidence from "Literature Online"' (reviewed in *YWES* 87[2008]) established conclusively that, leaving aside who owns the handwriting, the words in Hand D's contribution to the play were composed by Shakespeare. Perhaps, since they are not very different, Hands C and D are the same hand? If so, asks Down, why did the same man come back to his own writing (at line 237) to delete two and a half lines and replace them with a simple bridge 'tell me but this'? Because he realized he had botched the copying in the first place (pp. 252–3). As before, Downs's hypothesis relies on this being the work of an especially slovenly scribe. Throughout Downs's essay are infelicities of layout, such as the mechanical starting of a new paragraph after each inset quotation, even where there is no new idea but rather the continuation of an old one. Also, the occasional quotation of the manuscript in modernized form is unhelpful, as is the failure to mention that when quoting from Greg's Malone Society Reprints edition of the play, the corrections identified by Harold Jenkins in the 1961 reissue of that edition have been applied. It is hard to know to whom one should attribute these infelicities, as Downs himself is publicly on record as being in dispute with the journal *Shakespeare Yearbook*, which he claims published the article without his authority after it was accepted elsewhere and which did not give him the opportunity to make corrections in proof.

The remainder of the book contains essays of only tangential relevance to this review. In 'Apocryphal Agency: *A Yorkshire Tragedy* and Early Modern Authorship' (in Brooks, Thompson and Ford, eds., pp. 267–91), Michael Saenger offers literary criticism of the play, and its relation to the construction

of authorship via title pages. Jeffrey Kahan's 'Canonical Breaches and Apocryphal Patches' (in Brooks, Thompson and Ford, eds., pp. 293–316) is a tour through others' arguments about attribution, picking holes in them by selective quotation; it becomes increasingly bizarre as it progresses and ends with the suggestion that *Edward III's* entry into the canon was a reaction to the attacks of September 11, 2001, which made it topical. Nicola Bennett and Richard Proudfoot write about the Royal Shakespeare Company production of the same play, and the ways in which it failed to help make the case for Shakespearian authorship (''Tis a rightful quarrel must prevail': *Edward III* at Stratford', in Brooks, Thompson and Ford, eds., pp. 317–38).

Colin Burrow, whose Oxford Shakespeare edition of the sonnets was reviewed in *YWES* 83[2004], offers a defence of modern editing, as opposed to the fashionable un-editing, 'Editing the Sonnets' (in Schoenfeldt, ed., *A Companion to Shakespeare's Sonnets*, pp. 145–62). Burrow provides an excellent guide to the textual situation of the 1609 quarto and Benson's 1640 edition, and makes a convincing argument that Malone's driving impulse was not so much 'proud discovery of the biographical foundations of the sonnets' or anything else to do with the works themselves but rather the 'correction of the work of others' (p. 152). The un-editors (he identifies Margreta de Grazia and Randall McLeod) are too unsympathetic to the ordinary reader, who wants to hear the poetry without having her sense of what constitutes a sentence challenged by unfamiliar typography, orthography and punctuation. In the process they make a fetish of the object instead of a fetish of authorial intention, which is what they accuse their opponents of doing. McLeod's argument for retaining the reading 'They had still enough your worth to sing' (Sonnet 106) instead of the usual emendation to 'skill enough' was made on the basis of the *st* ligature—a compositor cannot select a *t* instead of a *k* by accident since they are linked to the *s*—but it overlooks the obvious objection that a compositor could simply have misread his copy, and in any case *skill* is the reading in early seventeenth-century manuscript copies that may descend independently of Q. In the same collection, Arthur F. Marotti, 'Shakespeare's *Sonnets* and the Manuscript Circulation of Texts in Early Modern England' (pp. 185–203), deals with the copying of sonnets from printed texts (especially the 1609 quarto and Benson's edition of 1640) into commonplace books, which happened rather less frequently for Shakespeare's poems than it did for others'. Interestingly, the abstractions or decontextualizations frequently left off the poet's name, giving credence to the idea that literary authorship was less important to the early moderns than it is to us.

So to the journal articles. The most important article this year is R. Carter Hailey's demonstration that Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* can be confidently dated 1623 and Q4 *Hamlet* can be certainly dated 1625 ('The Dating Game: New Evidence for the Dates of Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* and Q4 *Hamlet*', *SQ* 58[2007] 367–87). Of all the early printings of Shakespeare, only these two lack a date on the title page, and of course scholars want to know if they were printed early enough to be available to use in the setting of the Folio in 1623. Both were printed by William Stansby for John Smethwicke, which was a longstanding partnership; Stansby's initials are on Q4 *Hamlet* and his role as printer of Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* is inferred from the presence of one of

Stansby's ornaments. Hailey gives the history of the attempts to date these books (pp. 369–72), including Lynette Hunter's demonstration that George Walton William's dating of *Romeo and Juliet* on the basis of a deteriorating tailpiece was faulty, and Rasmussen's recent similar work dating *Hamlet* by deterioration in the title-page device (both reviewed in *YWES* 82[2003]). The key to Hailey's discoveries is that paper moulds lasted about twelve months, that paper made from a particular mould is detectable in surviving books, and that paper was bought for each printing job and rapidly consumed rather than held on to. Thus if one can show that two books are printed on the same stock of paper (that is, from the same mould) then they were printed no more than a year apart (p. 372). Hailey has been measuring the spaces between successive chain lines in a series of books, so for each stock of paper he has a 'fingerprint' of spacings, as well as his 'mugshots' of the watermarks. Having established his 'fingerprint' and 'mugshot' for Q4 *Romeo and Juliet*, Hailey went looking for other books using the same paper stock, starting in the likeliest year (1622) and looking at other books by the same publishing pair. He soon hit on the 1623 edition of Thomas Lodge's *Euphuus Golden Legacie*. Stansby is not named as the printer of this Smethwicke book, but shared ornaments and distinctive type between this book and known Stansby books prove it is his work. Since in multiple copies of this book the watermarks from Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* appear only in sheet A, the obvious inference is that there was a little of this stock of paper left over from the printing of *Romeo and Juliet*, thus we can date *Romeo and Juliet* to just before the printing of *Euphuus* in 1623.

Q4 *Hamlet* was a much harder case. It was printed from a mixed stock of two papers, both poor quality and so hard to see through. In nine Folger Library exemplars, sheets D, G and L were all printed on one of the papers and A and N were (almost) all printed on the other paper, with the other sheets being mixed in the sense that in some exemplars a given sheet was from one paper and in other exemplars the same sheet was from the other paper. With only nine exemplars this could happen by chance: in the whole print run the pattern may not have held. That is to say, the sheets that Hailey has identified (from nine exemplars) as being printed on either one or other of the papers might in fact have been printed from mixed stock, with the surviving exemplars (a random subset of the print run) just happening to all show one stock of paper for one set of sheets and the other stock of paper for the other set of sheets. Hailey found the same two papers in *Usury Arraigned and Condemned* [1625], which also has the same setting of type as Q4 *Hamlet* used for the imprint. Thus this imprint was kept as standing type, and therefore *Usury Arraigned and Condemned* must have been printed consecutively or concurrently with Q4 *Hamlet*. So how did Rasmussen get it wrong? He did not examine enough copies to properly establish progressive deterioration of the printer's ornament: Hailey shows that even in exemplars from the same edition the 'break' in the ornament comes and goes according to inking and press-pull variation. We can now say for sure that Q4 *Hamlet* had no effect on the Folio, but could itself have been influenced by the Folio, which would explain their occasional agreements against other witnesses. With a date of 1623 now established for Q4 *Romeo and Juliet*, it was probably not available before the

Folio text of that play was typeset. Hailey ends by answering the question ‘What is the significance of these Q4s appearing without dates?’ Answer: probably nothing, as 15 per cent of all books did.

In the same journal, Brian Vickers argues that only three dramatists, not four as Gary Taylor thought, composed *1 Henry VI*, and that the shares are not quite as Taylor divided them (‘Incomplete Shakespeare: Or, Denying Co-authorship in *1 Henry VI*, *SQ* 58[2007] 311–52). Vickers begins with a summary of the state of the art of co-authorship studies and makes a (rather long-winded) analogy between collaborative playwriting and collaborative Renaissance art. Using C.J. Sisson’s account of the lost play *Keep the Widow Waking*, and the evidence of Henslowe’s Diary, Vickers gives an account of a typical coming together for collaborative playwriting, the dividing up of shares in the work, and of how the ‘author-plot’ was used to pitch the project to the players and to control the collaboration. The unit of collaboration seems to be the act (measured in sheets, each being a folio folded in the middle to give two leaves and four pages) and the prime-mover dramatist in a group seems to be the one who writes the first act. Vickers’s history of Shakespearian stylometry includes the clearest account I have read of Marina Tarlinskaya’s analysis of proclitic and enclitic microphrases.

One way to explain the inconsistencies in *1 Henry VI* is to say that it was rushed out to capitalize on the success of *2 Henry VI* and *3 Henry VI*, but Vickers thinks that co-authorship, with imperfect agreement between the shares, is another. These are not mutually exclusive possibilities, of course, and indeed Taylor, cited here by Vickers as a supporter of the ‘prequel’ theory, also argues for co-authorship to (p. 325 n. 1). Taylor’s essay itself is wrongly cited as appearing in 1993 but it was in fact 1995. As examples of the chaos in *1 Henry VI* Vickers cites the poor placing of act intervals in the Folio and the confusion over whether Winchester is a bishop or a cardinal, but could not the former simply indicate that it was not written for intervals and had them imposed when printed? The latter was explained as no crux at all by Karl Wentersdorf in an article reviewed in *YWES* 87[2008]. In his history of attempts to work out who wrote what in *1 Henry VI*, Vickers charts the emergence of Thomas Nashe as prime candidate, and the clincher is that the sources of certain phrases are shown to be ones that Shakespeare nowhere else drew on, but that Nashe used in his published works. Turning again to Taylor’s article (and giving it the right date this time), Vickers is full of praise for its rightly using previous work that showed Nashe’s hand in *1 Henry VI* but castigates it for applying a set of inappropriate tests that led Taylor to posit two other hands too. Vickers agrees with Taylor that Act I is Nashe and that II.iv, IV.ii, IV.iii, IV.iv and IV.v are Shakespeare, but disagrees about IV.vi and IV.vii.1–32 which he sets out to show are not Shakespeare. In IV.v, Talbot Senior uses *thou* to address Talbot Junior, who replies with *you* as we would expect of a familiar father and a respectful son. But in IV.vi Talbot Junior starts to *thou* his father, which is wrong and un-Shakespearian, as is some particularly poor choice of words. Act IV, scene vi, is like IV.vii in its diction (‘bookish’, ‘portentous gestures and linguistic display’) and in its clumsy verse, and each contains a mention of Icarus, who is unknown elsewhere in Shakespeare (p. 342).

Tarlinskaya's work—which rejects Taylor's divisions and just has Act I Nashe, II.iv and IV.ii–IV.v Shakespeare, and the rest Y—shows that Nashe averages ninety-three enclitics per thousand lines while Shakespeare averages fifty-five per thousand lines, and Y just fifteen. Corroborating this are three clearly distinct rates of using feminine endings in these three shares in the play. All that remains to be done is find out who Y is (pp. 344–5). Vickers ends surveying the recent editions of Shakespeare and ranking them according to how open-minded they are about the facts of co-authorship. Andrew Cairncross's *Arden2 1 Henry VI* was particularly cavalier in its complex hypotheses about interference from scribes and others, and the wild cutting that followed, to avoid admitting co-authorship. At the close Vickers acknowledges Wentersdorf's article on the Winchester-as-bishop-or-cardinal crux, but only to say that it has no bearing on matters of authorship. In fairness he ought to have acknowledged that Wentersdorf argues that there simply is no crux at all, since once we properly appreciate the history being depicted there is no contradiction in the play as it reads in F.

In the same journal, Denise A. Walen argues that the Folio text of *Othello* IV.iii represents the original staging at the Globe playhouse while the shorter version in the 1622 quarto represents the scene as cut for the Blackfriars ('Unpinning Desdemona', *SQ* 58[2007] 487–508). The Willow Song is absent from Q, and Walen reckons it was used to cover the action of unpinning Desdemona, which refers not to her hair but to her clothes. This took a while, and if the two minutes or so of stage time allowed by the text of the Willow Song as we have it was not enough then the actor was to sing as many extra verses as were needed to get the job done. This version of the scene gives a reflective pause before the final violent action, but such a long pause was not needed at Blackfriars because there was an act interval (with its own music to replace the Willow Song) right after this scene, so IV.iii got cut down for the Blackfriars, whence Q.

Nina Levine offers a literary-critical reading of *Sir Thomas More* that tries to make analogies between the collective enterprises in the play (the outraged Londoners coming together to do something) and the collective enterprise of the dramatists writing it ('Citizens' Games: Differentiating Collaboration and *Sir Thomas More*', *SQ* 58[2007] 31–64). The play gives the 'mob' a lot of individuation, including personal names, and it was presumably in objection to this that censor Edmund Tilney crossed out the speech prefixes at the start of the play. (Well, he crossed out De Barde's as well as Doll's, which does not fit this supposed anti-rebels explanation.) Hand C reassigns to Lincoln specifically the line '[we will] by ruld by yo^u master moor yf youle stand our | freind to procure our pardon' that Hand D gave to 'all', and this makes Lincoln's execution (which is like More's at the end) all the more ironic, since he is the only rebel not to be pardoned. Equally, Hand C (whom McMillin says we should treat as a collaborator with D, maybe even the same man) individuates the speakers that Hand D leaves as 'others'. The last piece of relevance from this volume of *Shakespeare Quarterly* is by Stephen Orgel ('The Desire and Pursuit of the Whole', *SQ* 58[2007] 290–310), and it offers a short summary of the size and shape of the Shakespeare canon in print up to present day, literary-critical points about the plays themselves being not 'complete',

nor the performances, and a description of the Cranach Press edition of *Hamlet* of 1929.

Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America published three essays relevant to this review. In the longest and least rewarding, Lynette Hunter tries to explain the differences between Q1 and Q2 *Romeo and Juliet* by positing a whole set of slightly different manuscript readings arising over time as theatrical needs demanded ('Adaptation and/or Revision in Early Quartos of *Romeo and Juliet*', *PBSA* 101[2007] 5–54). It is tempting to stop reading Hunter's article when she lays her cards on the table about her approach to textual scholarship and says she 'does not seek truth or authorial intention' (p. 6). Hunter reports that all quotations will be from the edition of *Romeo and Juliet* that she and Peter Lichtenfels published with Ashgate in 2007, but neither the British Library, nor Amazon, nor indeed the Ashgate website, has any record of this book, although there is a similar-sounding title from Hunter and Lichtenfels forthcoming from Ashgate in 2009. The agenda set for this essay is to bring together the theatrical and the bibliographical, but Hunter immediately begs the question of agency by calling the differences between Q1 and Q2 'changes' (p. 7). To see why this is a logical error, one has only to imagine someone calling the differences between two photographs of the Empire State Building 'changes'. Certainly, the building might have changed in the interval between the taking of the first picture and the second, but this is not the only possibility: the pictures could differ merely because of different lighting, time of day and means of reproduction. Equally, in textual scholarship an argument about 'change' has to be made, not assumed.

A foundational hypothesis of the essay is that Q1 and Q2 *Romeo and Juliet* 'stem from an earlier manuscript' but via 'scripts for theatre production' (p. 8), meaning that there were multiple manuscript versions between composition and printed book; this is not a new hypothesis but it is one that is very hard to prove. Having noted that although an exemplar of Q1 was somewhat used in the printing of Q2 it cannot have been the main copy as there are far too many differences between Q1 and Q2 for them all to have been written onto an exemplar of Q1, Hunter out of the blue, and with no prior justification for it, simply prints her own proposed stemma with seven distinct manuscript versions leading in two lines of descent to Q1 and Q2 (p. 13). She uses a bizarre system of notation in which, for example, Q2P, Q2Pb and Q2C are three different manuscripts that lead eventually to the printing of Q2. Aside from any other objection, this requires that three intervening transcripts (intervening between the author's papers and the printed book) prior to Q2 failed to remove the very obvious false-start duplications whereby first Friar Laurence and then Romeo describe the dawn in precisely the same terms, and whereby Romeo gets to repeat himself at length in his soliloquy before dying.

Hunter wants to reject the commonly accepted idea that Q2 was set from foul papers, so she asserts that 'there is no evidence of the existence of Shakespeare's "foul papers"' (p. 14). However, since she must accept that there was at some time a first complete script in Shakespeare's hand (unless like Barbara Cartland he composed by dictation) then the point stands: Q2 shows no sign that it is based on an intervening transcript, since the duplications that seem plausibly part of authorial papers (but not plausibly

part of a transcript) are in Q2. One-quarter of the way into this long article, Hunter has not brought one new idea to the debate, nor adduced one new piece of evidence; she just keeps asserting things like 'Q2 itself may well have been affected by rehearsal' (p. 14) without a shred of evidence or argument to support it. Now Hunter starts to read Q1 and Q2 for theatrical differences, and observes that Q1 'is one of the earliest printed texts of Shakespeare's plays to present the part of a woman on stage alone' (p. 16). Indeed, but since the only printings of Shakespeare's plays before Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* were *2 Henry VI*, *3 Henry VI* and *Titus Andronicus*, this is the first of his plays with a woman in the title to be printed. It ought to be no surprise that it gives a female character significant stage time. Juliet has a lot more to say and do in Q2 than in Q1, so Hunter ponders whether a change in the personnel (the loss or acquisition of a good actor) caused this difference, and she quotes Q1 and Q2 to make an argument about cutting but using a modernized text of each. This modernized text is particularly unhelpful in that Hunter is trying to find evidence in Q1 of a rupture marking a cut, and such evidence is much easier to see if one has not first modernized the thing.

Hunter notices that many of the things that Q2 has that Q1 lacks 'occur at the end or toward the end of scenes' and (without saying why) she asserts that 'It is unlikely that an actor, dramaturge, or manager would have added this material to produce a script behind Q2' (p. 21). She seems ignorant of Scott McMillin's demonstration, given in his work on *Sir Thomas More*, that padding out the end of a scene is precisely what early modern actors would want to facilitate a reduction in casting, for it gives other actors a chance to change for the next scene. Hunter finds some things absent from Q1 and present in Q2 that are hard to explain as additions in the latter but easy to explain as omissions in the former, which is of course what the memorial reconstruction hypothesis was based upon. Regarding the moment in Q2 where Romeo and Friar Laurence describe the dawn in precisely the same terms, Hunter toys with the idea that the lines were for the Friar but someone accidentally added them to the part for Romeo. (Surely that would have been noticed once they started speaking their parts in rehearsal, and thereafter fixed.) Then she offers Randall McLeod's implausible suggestion that the repetition is intentional (p. 24). Nothing Hunter has written so far justifies her stemma that posits seven manuscript versions of the play, and all she has done is evaluate the evidence in Q1 and Q2 for what it would tell us about her stemma if indeed that stemma were correct. This is not scholarship but self-indulgent speculation. Amongst a group of things present in Q2 and consistently absent from Q1 is the act of retelling a story, and a slew of small references to law and justice; it is hard to see why these would be cut (or forgotten) so Hunter assumes they were added to the play. (Such cases can almost always be argued either way, and what is wanted to settle the matter is a conclusive example that everyone will agree goes only one way.) As well as shortenings in Q1 of what is longer in Q2, Hunter finds a few things expanded or adapted in Q1 from what Q2 has, but not done well enough to warrant the hand of a dramatist; therefore she says that 'managers, [or] actors' did them (pp. 29–32). Hunter looks at a long list of small variants where single words are altered, and reckons she can tell those that probably are important enough

to be the work of a dramatist and those that are not and hence are probably the work of 'an actor or a scribe or a compositor' (p. 36).

Hunter explores the possibilities for a memorial reconstruction explanation, on the basis of the main recollectors being the actors of *Romeo*, *Mercutio* and *Paris* (as Kathleen Irace conjectured) and including the possibility that there were other recollectors (maybe the whole company) recalling a different version of the play, and she repeats the old and inaccurate saws about Q1 being more suited to touring than Q2 because it is shorter and simpler. By this point, three-quarters of the way into the article, the hypotheses are so complex and so laboured that it is almost impossible to discern what Hunter is arguing. For example, she writes that there is 'evidence for manuscript copy for Q1' (p. 41), but unless someone were to be arguing for the existence of a lost Q0 that served as copy for Q1, what else could be the printer's copy but a manuscript? She genuinely seems to consider the possibility that the actors entered the printshop as a troupe and recited the play to the compositor, only to reject it: 'the text was not directly memorially transmitted at the printing house'. Apart from anything else, we know that Q1 was set by formes, so there had to be a written version for the printer to cast off. Against the argument for memorial reconstruction being the basis of Q1, she writes, is the fact that Q1 has extensive stage directions derived from dialogue in Q2. (Actually, that shows the weakness of her attack on memorial reconstruction on this score, since while actors trying to recall their performances are not likely to remember the precise wording of stage directions they certainly should remember instructions embedded in the dialogue.)

Not satisfied with her seven-manuscript stemma, Hunter hypothesizes some more manuscripts: a whole line of them from Q1P¹ to Q1Pⁿ. Actually, it has never been clear by these notations whether Hunter is referring to distinct manuscripts or distinct states of the same manuscript (as in Wilson and Pollard's notion of 'continuous copy'), but now the possibility emerges that a single manuscript might, without being changed at all, appear with different notations in Hunter's system (and occupy different places in her stemma) just because it is used for two productions: 'a text from one performance (say Q1Pb¹) may be in fact the same text used by the next production of the play (Q1P²)' (p. 42). More utterly implausible ideas are then considered, such as the printer being willing to accept (and the company being willing to hand over) the bundle of actors' parts as the basis for printing Q1, or his sending off to the company to find someone who could remember a scene that is present in Q2 but absent from Q1 (p. 43). Hunter harbours bizarre misunderstandings of the basic hypotheses at work in these problems, displayed when she writes that 'there are several bibliographical indications that Q2 was set from manuscript rather than from actors speaking the scripts' (p. 44). Of course no one supposes that the actors spoke their lines directly to the compositors; the memorial reconstruction hypothesis explains how the printer's copy manuscript was made and is not an alternative to there being such a manuscript. Hunter also knows little about printing, for she says that Q2's having '*Nerona*' where '*Verona*' is clearly the right word might be because the printer had printed, or would print, that same year a story with a character '*Neronis*' in it. More plausibly, of course, a letter '*N*' had fallen into the '*V*' compartment

(directly below it) in the capitals typecase. Surely someone at the journal could have told her this and saved her from making a silly suggestion. To establish that Q2 was not based on memorial reconstruction, Hunter locates in it things that memorial reconstruction would not produce. This is the wrong method: one needs to find things that only transcription could produce, for the things she has found might exist even in the printed version of a script recovered by memorial reconstruction.

When Hunter gets to the (ample) evidence for the copy for Q2 being authorial, she gives Randall McLeod rather than R.B. McKerrow the credit for noticing that the speech prefix variation for Capulet's Wife reflects her differing social function in different scenes (pp. 44–7). In a section of the article called 'Theatre Practice' Hunter argues that Q2 has post-theatrical elements, but she is relying almost entirely on hunches about such things as certain lines being improvisations and the guess that deliberate mislineation of verse as prose marks it off as lines that actor has been given licence to adapt. Hunter assumes that the actor playing Nurse was a specialist in 'straight comedy' and hence that the additional lines in Q2 (over what the Nurse has to say in Q1) were added by this comic. She seems unaware that this part must have been played by an apprentice, not a clown. The self-confusion that was bound to emerge from clumsy nomenclature is apparent in Hunter's claim that 'Q2 is not working [typeset] directly from Q1 but from Q2C' (p. 48). Since in her notation Q2C is defined as the printer's copy for Q2—that is what she means by this siglum—this claim is tautologous. She concludes that the Acts V of Q1 and Q2 show equally viable variants (as opposed to say Q1 just lacking something in Q2), so it looks like revision as well as garbling separate Q1 and Q2. This is not news: most cases of what used to be explained solely as memorial reconstruction are now treated as more likely to be cases of revision as well as memorial reconstruction. This entire article is weak in its logic and lacking in basic theatrical and bibliographical knowledge, and does harm to the reputation of the scholarly journal that elected to publish it.

In the same journal, Arthur Sherbo continues his work on Malone's textual scholarship with two pieces ('Restoring Malone', *PBSA* 101[2007] 125–48; 'Edmond Malone and the Johnson-Steevens 1778 *Shakespeare*', *PBSA* 101[2007] 313–28). In the first he records that Malone's debut publication as a Shakespeare editor was a 1780 two-volume supplement to the 1778 edition by Samuel Johnson and George Steevens, and that in 1783 Malone supplemented this supplement with what he called the *Second Appendix*. This was unknown to the New Variorum editors, as was part of the supplement, and only where bits of these made it into George Steevens's 1793 Shakespeare are they widely known to modern scholarship. The rest of the article is devoted to explaining exactly what Malone was up to in these books, reprinting the otherwise hard-to-find notes, and pointing out which notes the various Variorum editors missed. (An odd slip that someone ought to have caught in proofs is the reference to Shakespeare's play '4H4' (p. 128).) The second article is similar to the first, pointing out that there are lots of notes by Malone in the Steevens ten-volume edition of 1778 itself, and these too are largely unknown to modern editors because they turn to later books in the false assumption that all of Malone's notes were copied forward. Sherbo reprints in

an appendix all the ones connected to the plays; the ones for the poems are to come elsewhere.

The Review of English Studies published two pieces of interest to this review. In the first Christine Cornell and Patrick Malcomson argue that the Q2 ending of *Titus Andronicus* (four extra lines usually dismissed as non-Shakespearean patching to cover a lacuna in its copy text, Q1) is worth restoring as it might have had a place in early performances ('The "Stupid" Final Lines of *Titus Andronicus*', *RES* 58[2007] 154–61). The standard view is that Q1 *Titus Andronicus* was reprinted as Q2 but, because the exemplar of Q1 was imperfect, with a number of guessed readings and with four spurious lines at the end where the last leaf was mutilated. Q2 was reprinted as Q3 and F was set from an exemplar of Q3 that had been annotated by reference to a playhouse manuscript, hence the 'fly' scene, III.ii, was added for F. Modern editors use Q1 as their authority for the play except for III.ii, for which F is the authority. Cornell and Malcomson see an illogicality in accepting F's authority for III.ii but not for the extra four lines added in Q2. (Putting it like this muddies the waters somewhat, since even if the lines are admitted as authentic, F itself cannot be the authority for them as it is only a reprint of a reprint; if we think the lines are genuine, Q2 would be our authority.) According to Cornell and Malcomson, the four lines tacked on the end are, in Q2, Q3 and F: 'See Justice done on Aaron that damn'd Moore, | From whom, our heavy happes had their beginning: | Then afterwards, to Order well the State, | That like Events, may ne're it Ruinate' (pp. 155–6). They are mistaken, and this is not the ending in any of the texts: they have quoted from the execrable Applause modern-type edition of F, which illogically retains capitalization and punctuation, but modernizes u/v and i/j spellings and removes emphatic italics. Moreover, F is substantively different from Q2 and Q3, which have 'By whom[e]' not 'From whom'. It is sloppy of Cornell and Malcomson to get this wrong.

Cornell and Malcomson ask why, if Greg was right that a copy of Q2 was used as a promptbook, were the offending four lines not deleted from it? That is to say, how come they got into Q3 and F? The right answer, of course, is that no one is claiming that the particular exemplar of Q2 used as a promptbook—supposing for a moment that this indeed happened—was the one used to print Q3: the book-keeper could have struck them out in his exemplar of Q2 and they would still appear in a reprint of this edition. Cornell and Malcomson try to defend these four added lines by pointing out that *ruinate* is used in *3 Henry VI* in a scene, V.i, that also mentions the chopping off of hands (p. 157). Also, supposedly corroborating the 'mutilation' hypothesis is the fact that where Q2 reprints what would have been the other side of the supposedly damaged bottom of the last leaf of Q1, it has substantial rewording too. But this rewording Cornell and Malcomson also think intelligent and appropriate, and it has a phrase, 'tender spring', used by Shakespeare in *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* around the same time as *Titus Andronicus*. Their suggestion is that 'someone who knew the play well wrote the lines, which were then generally accepted' (p. 158). This last clause they put in, I think, to explain why the lines are in Q3 and F, but of course that does not indicate acceptance by the company. Here they also mix up their terminology, calling

Q1 'the manuscript [that] was damaged'. Their main point, though, is that even if we accept that Q1 was damaged that does not mean the lines invented have no place in the canon: the company might have accepted them into the play as performed. Cornell and Malcomson address Eugene Waith's rejection of Greg's claim that an exemplar of Q2 was used as the promptbook. How come, they ask, if the exemplar of Q3 used to make printer's copy for F was first collated with the promptbook, the spurious last four lines of Q3 were not deleted as being not found in the promptbook, and yet a missing line in I.i was recovered from the promptbook? It is possible to defend the added lines: they shift attention away from Tamora (on whom Q1 ends) and towards Aaron and towards the wider political scene, promising stability, and in particular seeming to hint at constitutional change so that the likes of Aaron will never succeed again.

The second article from *RES* is Roger Stritmatter and Lynne Kositsky's attempt to show that the Strachey Letter was, contrary to the date given upon its first publication, written later than *The Tempest* and therefore not a source for it ('Shakespeare and the Voyagers Revisited', *RES* 58[2007] 447-72). Malone thought that *The Tempest* was based on Sylvester Jourdain's *Discovery of the Bermudas* [1610] but this has been discredited: it was Henry Howard Furness who popularized the idea that *The Tempest* was based on a manuscript version of William Strachey's *True Reportory* [1625], the Letter, and hence must postdate the shipwreck that Strachey describes. As Stritmatter and Kositsky point out, we have no evidence that Strachey's text circulated in manuscript before publication, nor that if it did Shakespeare would have had access to it. Strachey's account seems to draw on other books that it is hard to imagine him having access to in Bermuda or Virginia, and it is hard to see how the account would have got back to London from the New World in time for *The Tempest*. Indeed, Stritmatter and Kositsky think that Strachey's Letter is most plausibly read as his response to a letter to him of 14 December 1610 from the Virginia Company asking for news, for Strachey seems to answer their questions in the Letter. Moreover, Strachey seems to describe the voyage back to London of Thomas Gates beginning on 15 July 1610, which is the one by which Strachey's account is itself supposed to have reached London, and this is logically impossible. In 1612 Strachey wrote of an as yet incomplete work about Bermuda that he was producing, and the logical referent of that is the *True Reportory*. Also, *True Reportory* seems to plagiarize books not published until November 1610 or later, and if it does it is too late to be a source for *The Tempest*.

At this point (p. 455), Stritmatter and Kositsky start to quote the parallels that they think prove Strachey a plagiarist, and indeed the same stories are told (of certain fruit and plants) but the wording is not close at all: these could be stories that were routinely circulating amongst the travellers. But for Stritmatter and Kositsky this 'borrowing', which required access to a library, must have been done after Strachey returned to London from Jamestown, and hence the Letter was not available to influence *The Tempest*. Indeed, since several works (including *The Tempest*) that were published before *True Reportory* have strong parallels with it, it were better not to assume that Strachey (in manuscript) was their source but that Strachey borrowed from

these works. Stritmatter and Kositsky quote the strong parallel between *True Reportory* and *True Declaration of the Estate of the Colony of Virginia* (entered in the Stationers' Register on 10 November 1610), but they acknowledge that the standard explanation is that this was added to Strachey's Letter before it was published in 1625 even though it was not part of the original writing (p. 457). Other examples of Strachey's alleged plagiarism depicted here are weak: they would not get a modern undergraduate into much hot water. At the close, Stritmatter and Kositsky mention the fatal flaw in their position: when first published (in Samuel Purchas's *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes* [1625]), the Strachey Letter is given the date 'July 15, 1610'. They simply assert that Purchas is not to be relied upon for this date. For an unexplained reason, their article is signed by Stritmatter but not Kositsky.

Carl D. Atkins makes a study of Benson's 1640 edition of Shakespeare's sonnets as a reprint of the quarto of 1609 ('The Importance of Compositorial Error and Variation to the Emendation of Shakespeare's Texts: A Bibliographic Analysis of Benson's 1640 Text of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*', *SP* 104[2007] 306–39). Benson's edition was the basis for subsequent editions in the eighteenth century. As we have the quarto that it reprints (albeit with editorial changes) we can learn about printing habits from Benson's edition. Atkins offers an appendix listing all the variants between the two, categorized by kind. Benson's compositor corrected almost all the obvious misprints of Q, missing only *emnity*, which Atkins says should be *enmity*. (In fact Literature Online contains thirteen occurrences of *emnity* in printings from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, so we might almost say that this counts as a minor alternative spelling although *OED* does not list it.) Using what he has learnt from Benson's compositor's mistakes, Atkins turns to the problem of emending *Sonnets* where Q seems in error. This is not a sound methodology: better to learn from other reprints, where we can compare source and output to infer habits and characteristic slips, produced around the time of Q and preferably coming from the same printshop and so likely to have been worked upon by the same people. Strangely, Atkins rejects Duncan-Jones's claim that the misprint in Q of having *lack* (where editors agree the word needed is *latch*) comes via the spelling variant *lach* because, he says, the *OED* gives no examples of that spelling (p. 137). It does: Wyclif's Bible has one. The date of Duncan-Jones's Arden3 *Sonnets* is here given as 1977 but should be 1997. Naseeb Shaheen makes a surprisingly belated claim for the Q1 *Henry V* deriving from a memorial reconstruction ('*Henry V* and its Quartos', *ShN* 57[2007–8] 43–4, 48). He summarizes the textual situation of *Henry V* and says that there are two main views of Q1: that it is a memorial reconstruction, or James Shapiro's new idea that it is a sanitized, depoliticized version put out by the players when they realized that the original was too politically provocative. Shaheen does not specify whether he means 'out on the stage' or 'out into print', and he does not address Andrew Gurr's argument that Q1 represents the simplified stage version, the 'minimal' text, nor Richard Dutton's recent argument (reviewed in *YWES* 86[2007]) that F represents revisions of the Q1 version in the light of events of 1601. Shaheen decides that Shapiro is wrong and Q1 *Henry V* is based on a memorial reconstruction because there are things missing in it that no one would deliberately leave out in a process of

sanitizing the play. This article is intellectually underpowered and widely ignorant of the state of the textual debate about this play.

Finally, to the round-up from *Notes and Queries*. Guillaume Coatalen points out that as a source for ‘Now is the winter of our discontent | Made glorious summer’ (*Richard III*), Philip Sidney’s Sonnet 69 from *Astrophil and Stella* is usually cited (‘Gone is the winter of my misery | My spring appears’), but that in fact both might come from the French poet Joachim du Bellay (c.1522–60), who in different works refers to ‘l’hiver de mes douleurs’ and ‘l’hyver de mes ennuis’ (‘Shakespeare, Sidney and Du Bellay’s Winters’, *N&Q* 54[2007] 265). John Peachman thinks that *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* was written in 1597 or 1598, draws on Nashe, and alludes to the *Isle of Dogs* scandal (‘Why a Dog? A Late Date for *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*’, *N&Q* 54[2007] 265–72). The only sure thing about the date of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* is that it was completed before Francis Meres referred to it in *Palladis Tamia* (entered in the Stationers’ Register on 19 October 1598), and the view that it is early is based on subjective interpretation of its weaknesses. J.J.M. Tobin pointed out *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*’s borrowing from Nashe’s *Have With You to Saffron-Walden* [1596], including the names of seven characters, and Tobin produced a list of significant collocations that the works share and that Peachman reproduces. This list has lots of commonplace words that really count for nothing except where they closely collocate, such as *cur*, *tongues* and *forest*. Peachman picks on a particular collocation that he thinks significant: “puling” is in close proximity to “wench” in only one play of the period, according to Literature Online, and that is *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (p. 267). Peachman is mistaken about this: there is also Samuel Daniel’s *The Queen’s Arcadia* [1605]: ‘there shall be found Fantasticke puling wenches in the world’.

It seems that Peachman does not know how to search Literature Online properly, and this exposes one of the dangers of this kind of work. The evidence on which his assertion rests is negative, that there are no other examples of X, but one is always afraid that what is really meant is ‘I failed to find other examples of X’, and that the scholar simply overlooked them. That Peachman thinks that the thing to search for is a play indicates another weakness in his methodology, since he should be searching all kinds of writing to see if these are common phrases in the literary-dramatic culture. A second collocation that Peachman thinks decisive is ‘water cast in an urinal’ in Nashe and ‘water in an urinal’ in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (p. 267). In fact, collocations of *water*, *cast* and *urinal* are not hard to find: there is ‘an urinall . . . you cast | The water’ in Dekker and ‘Casting their Water in his Vrinalls’ in John Davies of Hereford. And if we drop the word *cast* (since it is not in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*) then there are over a dozen collocations including the perfect match ‘water in an Vrinall’ in John Day’s play *Law Tricks* [1604]. The warnings about the evidential weakness of simple verbal parallels given by Muriel St Clare Byrne seventy-five years ago are still not being heeded. Peachman has several more one-word parallels but they prove nothing. He explains the presence in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* of a scandalous dog who is dry-eyed when he should be weeping and peeing when he should not be as an allusion to the play *The Isle of Dogs* by Nashe and

others in 1597, named after the wet peninsula in the Thames. Convinced he has got a 'hit', Peachman then reads *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* for its set of allusions to *The Isle of Dogs*, and finds a bit of Jonson's stubbornness in Crab too. He ends on even more tenuous links between *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and the publication of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* in 1598 and Jonson's *Every Man Out of His Humour* with its dog-related imagery.

Thomas Merriam, in a point also made in his book reviewed above, notes that *King John* is like *Richard III* in being about uncles ordering the deaths of their dispossessed nephews ('Parallel Nephews, Parallel Uncles', *N&Q* 54[2007] 272–4). Wolfgang Riehle thinks that Lysander's name in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is an allusion to the story of Hero and Leander and also a pun on 'lie-sunder', meaning sleep apart, as Hermia insists they do in the woods ('What's in Lysander's Name?', *N&Q* 54[2007] 274–5). Alan J. Altimont has a Hebraic source for the same play, since Nedar means 'absentee' in Hebrew, which suits this character—he is not there to prevent Demetrius breaking faith with Helena—and also means 'pledge, vow' ('The Meaning of Nedar in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*', *N&Q* 54[2007] 275–7). That *A Midsummer Night's Dream* has a source in the Talmud does not, Altimont reassures us, require that we imagine Shakespeare reading Hebrew: he might just have heard about it. According to Beatrice Groves, the idea of the wall between families coming down (as it does metaphorically in *Romeo and Juliet* and literally in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*) derives from the Bible, Ephesians 2, where it refers to the union of gentiles and Jews ("The Wittiest Partition": Bottom, Paul, and Comedic Resurrection', *N&Q* 54[2007] 277–82). A.B. Taylor notes that Bottom's allusion to the Bible, 1 Corinthians 2.9—"The eye of man hath not heard, the ear of man hath not seen, man's hand is not able to taste, his tongue to conceive, nor his heart to report what my dream was" (*A Midsummer Night's Dream* IV.i.208–11, wrongly given as Act V in this article)—was not the first time that Pyramus and 1 Corinthians 2.9 had been linked: John Gower did it in *Confessio Amantis* ('John Gower and *Pyramus and Thisbe*', *N&Q* 54[2007] 282–3). Also, Shakespeare borrowed from Gower the reference to a lion 'in wild rage' and there being a hole in the wall; in Ovid it is only a crack. Matt Baynham explains that Portia's calling mercy 'twice blest' (*Merchant of Venice* IV.i.183) alludes to the biblical Sermon on the Mount, for there only the merciful receive what they give; the peacemakers do not get peace, for example ('Why is Mercy "Twice Blest"?', *N&Q* 54[2007] 285).

Anthony Miller finds sources for the pointless war over a tiny patch of ground in *Hamlet* IV.iv, and for the reflections on a 'buyer of land' in *Hamlet* V.i, and for Lear's 'we came crying hither' (*King Lear* IV.v) in Pliny's *Naturalis historia* ('Fortinbras' Conquests and Pliny', *N&Q* 54[2007] 287–9). Thomas Festa thinks that Hamlet's comment that his father was a man 'take him for all in all' (I.ii.186) echoes the 'all in all' from the biblical Corinthians that was prescribed reading in the Book of Common Prayer for the burial of the dead ("All in all": The *Book of Common Prayer* and *Hamlet*, I.ii.186', *N&Q* 54[2007] 289–90). David Lisle Crane notes that, when Angelo asks incredulously if Isabella is talking about the Duke's deputy, and says 'The prenzie, Angelo?' (*Measure for Measure* III.i.92), *prenzie* is obviously wrong. Crane reckons that a *u* before the *p* might have been mistaken by the

composer for a flourish and that the word really was *upright* here, and three lines later when Isabella repeats it (*Measure for Measure* III.i.93, 96: Prentzie', *N&Q* 54[2007] 292). Andrew Hadfield claims that Isabella in *Measure for Measure* is a novice because she is meant to be like the St Ursula who had the same dilemma about choosing between life and virginity in the book *The Golden Legend* by Jacobus de Voragine. ('Isabella, Marina, and Saint Ursula', *N&Q* 54[2007] 292–3). He thinks the conversion of brothel-goers in *Pericles* might also be indebted to this account of St Ursula. Hadfield is right that *The Golden Legend* went through many editions, but the latest of those was in 1527 so was not quite so 'hard to avoid' (p. 293) in 1603 as Hadfield suggests. Rodney Stenning Edgecombe thinks that Othello's reference to being roasted in sulphur (*Othello* V.ii) has its source in Ovid's account in *Metamorphoses* of Phaeton's end being the reason that Ethiopians are black, and that this also was in Shakespeare's mind when Othello refers to 'medicinal gum' in the 'pearl away' speech, for Phaeton's sisters in Ovid weep tears that turn to amber that is later made into jewellery ('Ovid and the 'Medicinal Gum' in *Othello* V.ii', *N&Q* 54[2007] 293–4). David Womersley claims that certain passages from Heywood's *2 If You Know Not Me* (Stationers' Register entry 14 September 1606) echo *Macbeth*, which must therefore have been completed and performed by this date in order for Heywood to use it ('Heywood's *2 If You Know Not Me* and the Date of *Macbeth*', *N&Q* 54[2007] 296–8). Extraordinarily, Womersley quotes nothing from *Macbeth* to support this, apparently thinking the parallels so obvious that the relevant textual details need not be given. He also assumes, without giving reasons, that Shakespeare was the lender not the borrower.

According to Juan Christian Pellicer, the servant's word *saltiers* in *The Winter's Tale* IV.iv is not a rustic mangling of *satyrs* but a learned Latin coinage (to convey leaping satyrs) perhaps prompted by the phrase 'saltantis satyros' in Virgil's *Ecloques* ('Shakespeare's "Saltiers"/Satyrs in *The Winter's Tale* and Virgil's *Saltantis Satyros*', *N&Q* 54[2007] 303–4). MacDonald P. Jackson has a new way to date *Sir Thomas More* ('A New Chronological Indicator for Shakespeare's Plays and for Hand D of *Sir Thomas More*', *N&Q* 54[2007] 304–7). Using software that 'analyses various structural features', Hartmut Ilsemann has counted the length of speeches in Shakespeare and noticed that they get shorter over his career. Jackson does not say so, but presumably the point about analysing structural features means that the software does not just rely on punctuation to determine where speeches end, otherwise the method would be counting data from the printing/editorial processes, not from Shakespeare himself. Unfortunately, in a footnote citing Ilsemann's work, the URL—given twice albeit with the same real address, for the tilde is once given its ASCII code instead—points to a page no longer available on the worldwide web. Ilsemann's method more or less corroborates the Oxford *Complete Works* chronology, although *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *The Taming of the Shrew* seem on this evidence to be later than usually thought. (If accepted, this would corroborate John Peachman's article reviewed above.) On this evidence, Hand D of *Sir Thomas More* was composed around 1603–4, and the two halves of *Pericles* are once again shown to be highly distinct. Kevin Curran finds that Cleopatra's aversion to the

messenger's 'but yet' (leading up to the news of Antony's marriage) is an idea borrowed from Samuel Daniel's *The Tragedy of Philotas* ('Shakespeare and Daniel Revisited: *Antony and Cleopatra* II.v.50–4 and *The Tragedy of Philotas* V.ii.2013–15', *N&Q* 54[2007] 318–20). Finally for this section, Arthur Sherbo reprints some notes by George Steevens and Edmond Malone (from Steevens's 1793 edition) that ought to have appeared in the New Variorum editions of *Poems* [1938] and *Sonnets* [1944] by Hyder Edward Rollins, and many of them are about bits of the plays that are illuminated by usages in the sonnets and the narrative poems ('Corrections and Additions to Professor Rollins's Editions of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* and *Poems*', *N&Q* 54[2007] 483–90). I assume that this fulfils the promise made by Sherbo in his longer article reviewed above, but the textual situation is so tangled and the notes are coming out in such short bursts and in so many different places that it is hard to be entirely sure.

2. Shakespeare in the Theatre

While the title of Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern's collaborative *Shakespeare in Parts* acknowledges the canonical dismemberment of the supreme Bard on the one hand, it deftly engages with the excavation of 'original practice' theatre on the other. The 'parts' that it exhumes for autopsy are the constituent organs of the Shakespearian play-text: the individuated 'sides' (also 'lengths'), each separate speech of which is prefixed by a two- or three-word cue. Each role was physically a roll, committed to memory linearly, conned in isolation. None of the actors would, in advance of its first performance, have a detailed overall sense of what the play was about, how they fitted into its narrative nor even when or from whom their next cue was about to come. The advantage was a sense of spontaneity, a sustained engagement with the other actors prompted by an intense concentration on what was happening on stage: 'Because the cue just *might* come from anyone, the actor must always remain "on cue"' (p. 93).

Palfrey and Stern are adamant that the shared intimacy of actors and playwright was more than sufficient to compensate for this lack of ensemble rehearsal as well as the absence of the guiding presence of a director: 'Shakespeare really knew these actors; he worked with some of them for thirty years' (p. 41). The rapidly revolving repertory necessitated short runs so that the similitude of imminence which, in the modern theatre, paradoxically necessitates repetitive rehearsal over a sustained period, was, in the theatre of Shakespeare's time, less of an illusion than an actuality: one of the benefits of part-learning is the 'drip-feeding to the actor [of] strictly limited amounts of contextual information' (p. 134).

The authors are deft, sometimes over-ingenious, interpreters, proposing that minor cues provide the actor with intimations of his situation. In the case of the incarcerated Malvolio (pp. 111–13) they isolate c(l)ues such as 'darke'; 'obstruction'; 'fogge' (but they overlook 'Parson', 'fowle', 'opinion'). Most compelling is their exploration of 'repeated cues' which may bring other actor(s) in early and especially in crowd scenes, 'can be a useful means of creating the required polyphony' (p. 164). There are excellent readings of

The Merchant of Venice and *Macbeth*. Shylock's repeated cues invite others to talk over him and so demonstrate his 'refusal to listen' (p. 201), while *Macbeth*'s part 'fastidiously places the actor in uncertainties' (p. 488). Occasionally the perspicacious engagement with the prosody and arrangement of parts yields far-fetched psycho-biography: as Prospero tells Miranda to 'awake', the cue becomes a 'psychic chamber beyond capture or apprehension' (p. 281). Elsewhere the prioritization of vocabulary can lead to strained readings: 'Helena's pointed repetition of "I die"/"let me die" [constitutes] a "shared" and "perfect" rhyme that is at once bold, ominous, and an impudent invitation to imagine mutual orgasm' (p. 430). But in the main this is a lucid and persuasive study which successfully infuses academic Shakespeare with the vibrancy and insecurity of live performance: 'Shakespeare's actors had to play their parts *now*, perilously in the present' (p. 491).

Kent R. Lehnhof's 'Performing Woman: Female Theatricality in *All's Well, That Ends Well*' (in Waller, ed., *All's Well, That Ends Well: New Critical Essays*, pp. 111–23), confronts the exclusion from theatre history of 'early modern female performance' (p. 111). He claims that while women were absent from the professional stage, they frequently appeared in mountebank shows across Renaissance Europe, and he goes on to propose that there is a particular relevance in considering the similarity of Helena to 'a number of actual early modern female mountebanks' (p. 113). While Lehnhof considers the medical nature of Helena's role as making her a suitable parallel, he also stresses that both she and the mountebank enact forbidden or censored kinds of female sexual autonomy. While noting that the female mountebank was often associated with an erotic openness, he explores the equation of a 'woman's willingness to perform dramatic roles with a willingness to perform sexual ones' (p. 115). Indeed, the analogy of Helena and the mountebank allows one to 'begin to make sense of the strangely erotic nature of her characterization and comportment in the court of the King' (pp. 117–18). He concludes by alluding to David McCandless's proposal to cast two actors as Helena—'a woman to perform the passages when Helena displays desiring independence, and a man in drag to enact the "hyperfeminine" episodes when Helena adopts an idealized posture of meekness and subservience' (p. 122). Lehnhof asserts that such a double casting would have the virtue of complicating 'the concept of stable sexual identity by implying that masculinity and femininity are a function of costume, comportment, and custom' (p. 122).

Peter Holland moves us from the early modern theatre to that of the eighteenth century. In 'Hearing the Dead: The Sound of David Garrick' (in Corder and Holland, eds., *Players, Playwrights, Playhouses: Investigating Performance, 1660–1800*, pp. 248–70), he sets out to redress an imbalance in the prevailing method of performance history. The discipline is, he opines, 'tied to the visual rather than the aural' (p. 249) and he sets out in a mischievous parody of Stephen Greenblatt not to speak with but rather to listen to the dead, particularly David Garrick. The contemporary fad for original practices/original pronunciation such as that practised at the Southwark Globe will not do: 'I do not want to hear someone pretending to be Garrick; I want to hear Garrick' (p. 251). Inevitably, Holland has to admit that such an aspiration is 'doomed to failure... hopeless' (p. 248).

What Holland does produce, however, is an extraordinarily detailed set of contemporary audience responses which analyse Garrick's treatments of lines and even individual words. Thomas Sheridan (who went on to coach Sarah Siddons), John Henderson, J.W. Anderson, Roger Pickering et al. commented directly on Garrick's pronunciation and pitch as well as speed of delivery. Holland argues that Sheridan, in particular, brings 'an awareness of character and imagination to bear on processes of rhythm and emphasis' (p. 256). Joshua Steele actually drew up a notation, similar to sheet music, for documenting Garrick's delivery of specific speeches. Of course, without any independent evidence, such responses have to be taken on trust. Nonetheless, for all its incertitude, Holland is able to impute various qualities to the oral aspect of Garrick's performances: 'Difficult and abstruse though Steele's system may be, it is the most complex and considered notation of a moment of theatre speech available and Garrick's lightness and speed are conspicuously apparent' (p. 259). Holland concludes that in spite of the inherently capricious quality of such responses and their notations, 'Garrick's form of speaking allowed for multiple and complex emotions both to succeed each other rapidly and to co-exist within a single moment' (p. 267).

In 'Sowing the *Dragon's* Teeth: Amateurism, Domesticity, and the Anglophone Audience for Shakespeare, 1607–2007' (*Gramma* 15[2007] 27–45), Michael Dobson juxtaposes three canonical and three non-canonical moments from the long history of Shakespeare in performance. Alongside the publication of F1 in 1623, he places the first recorded amateur performance of a Shakespeare play, a production of *Henry IV* at the house of Sir Edward Dering. The year 1774 saw the publication of the first academic monograph on Shakespeare: William Richardson's *A Philosophical Analysis and Illustration of Some of Shakespeare's Remarkable Characters*. Dobson notes that the same year saw the first recorded all-female production of a play by Shakespeare—*The Winter's Tale*. And while 1932 is best remembered in Shakespearean circles as the year which saw the opening of the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, DC, as well as the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre in Stratford-upon-Avon, Dobson reveals that the same year saw the inauguration of the first playhouse to be designed and owned by a woman (Rowena Cade): the Minack in Cornwall. In making these comparisons, Dobson implies that the history of amateur Shakespeare is at least as important as that of its professional (scholarly and performative) counterpart. He asserts that amateur Shakespeare remains 'massively under-studied' (p. 43) and yet oddly empathic with Shakespeare's art. For instance, he notes that 'Shakespeare's own work never depicts professional playwrights but only schoolmasters who compose dramatic entertainments for particular groups and occasions' (p. 44). Indeed, with a remarkable degree of equanimity, he self-consciously suggests that even so-called professional scholarship is really nothing more than a kind of glorified amateurism: '*Shakespeare Survey* and *Shakespeare Quarterly* are only fanzines, and even the most august international Shakespeare conferences are only social gatherings of people who choose to participate in doing Shakespeare in whatever manner or capacity; people who, if they were primarily interested in making money or serving the status quo, would surely do something else instead' (pp. 44–5). In this way, Dobson neatly debunks

the dour materialist orthodoxy that Shakespeare is a bastion of cultural capital which acts as a bulwark in the defence of a capitalist or patriarchal hegemony: perhaps, he concludes, 'the history of this business called Shakespeare has all along been a story about amateurs' (p. 45).

Bridget Escolme's 'Living Monuments: The Spatial Politics of Shakespeare's Rome on the Contemporary Stage' (*ShS* 60[2007] 170–83) is an account of her direction of *Coriolanus* for Flaneur Productions in Minneapolis and Rochester, Minnesota, in April 2006. She reads her own production against Deborah Warner's *Julius Caesar* (Barbican, 2005) finding and condemning in the latter an over-eager search for parallels between the civil strife in Shakespeare's play and the contemporary crisis in Iraq. While such analogies are inevitable, Escolme is impatient with the ways in which the presentation of Warner's production (including photographs in the programme) shoe-horned audience reaction into a single and specific response. Preferable, she maintains, is the seeking of analogy through the art of others. For instance, she refers to the work of Minnesota photographer Paul Shambroom, who documented a series of council meetings of small towns across the States (three of his pictures are reproduced for us). Escolme explains that, for her, they capture 'how supremely unglamorous the workings of government are, how hedged about with contingency and tedium' (p. 178). Escolme is refreshingly candid about the contingencies of performance and the coincidental quality of many of her production's best effects. For instance, her actors were assembled in front of a row of TV sets which suggested the televisual quality of politics, although the presence of these televisions 'was entirely fortuitous: they were part of an artist's installation on display at the Art Center at the time' (p. 180). Elsewhere *Coriolanus* confronted Menenius in front of the American flag (which the gallery happened to have flying at the time). While in no way rejecting conventional theatre seating, Escolme is keen to foreground 'the live encounter between text, space, human figures acting and human figures recalcitrantly being themselves' in order to animate the relationship between the plays and 'our own political crises and concerns' (p. 183).

3. Shakespeare on Screen

The year 2007 marked a significant increase in the number of book-length publications which engage with Shakespeare on screen. Perhaps the December 2007 deadline for submissions from British universities for their Research Assessment Exercise offers a partial explanation for the greater quantity of material? Three monographs and one collaboratively authored book deal exclusively with Shakespearian film and television productions. A further four monographs and one edited collection embrace screen versions within performance-orientated studies. Both *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare in Popular Culture* and *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen* include essays which relate to Shakespeare on screen. The inclusion of three articles in *The Literature/Film Reader: Issues in Adaptation* signals the place that Shakespeare versions occupy within broader studies of cinematic adaptations. One edited collection (*Shakespeare and Childhood*, edited by

Kate Chedgzoy, Susanne Greenhalgh and Robert Shaughnessy) ranges beyond performance-orientated enquiries and embraces within its enquiry two essays analysing Shakespearian screen versions.

A significant contribution to screen-related reference material is made this year with two encyclopedic publications. Richard Burt's multi-volume *Shakespeares after Shakespeare: An Encyclopedia of the Bard in Mass Media and Popular Culture* combines detailed filmographies and interpretative essays. The listings in John O'Connor and Katharine Goodland's *A Directory of Shakespeare in Performance: 1970–2005, volume 1: Great Britain*, embrace stage, television and film versions. The arguments presented in several journal articles focus on Shakespeare on screen, with the greatest number appearing in the customary 'Shakespeare on Film' issue of *Literature/Film Quarterly* (LFQ 35[2007]).

The three Shakespeare on screen monographs published this year vary significantly in their approach and content. While part of the impulse behind Russell Jackson's *Shakespearean Films in the Making: Vision, Production and Reception* might be the author's experience as textual adviser on Kenneth Branagh's film sets, it is just briefly in the introduction that Jackson makes reference to personal experience in relation to *Hamlet* [1996]. The book's three chapters centre upon films which hold an acknowledged place in the canon of Shakespearian film versions. Chapter 1 focuses on Reinhardt's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* [1935], chapter 2 analyses Olivier's *Henry V* [1944] and chapter 3 focuses on three versions of *Romeo and Juliet*: MGM [1936], Castellani [1954] and Zeffirelli [1968]. Identifying the Reinhardt–Dieterle *Dream* through the name of the theatre director, Max Reinhardt, signals the interest that Jackson shows in the film's theatrical context. In contrast, connecting the 1936 *Romeo and Juliet* with the production company rather than George Cukor, the director, demonstrates Jackson's interest in the influence of 'the studio's self-image' (p. 4) alongside that of the director, the producer and the scriptwriter. A sense of each film's priorities is established through a detailed exploration of scripts and other production materials. Jackson seeks to assess the 'significance of the works for their makers (both corporate and individual) and the audiences of their own time' (p. 1). The approach is explicitly historical, and 'reception' does not, therefore, embrace later critical perspectives on the films. Jackson's exploration is strengthened by extensive quotation of promotional materials and reviews. The inclusion of twenty-two illustrations helps underpin the book's desire to temper a text-centred analysis with an awareness of these versions as motion pictures.

An interest in commercial pressures on film reinterpretations of Shakespeare's plays is shared by Mark Thornton Burnett. His *Filming Shakespeare in a Global Marketplace* considers the way that 'the films reveal themselves as acutely responsive to their own marketplace location' (p. 3). Burnett analyses a broad range of Shakespeare on film material. He chooses to begin with film and television productions which 'construct the enduring stability of Shakespearean theatre' (p. 4). The first chapter focuses upon *In the Bleak Midwinter* (Branagh [1995]), *Beginner's Luck* (Callis and Cohen [2001]), BBC2's *Indian Dream* [2003] and the Miramax teen picture *Get Over It* (O'Haver [2001]). The examples are used to consider 'vexed and unresolved

attitudes towards the relations between cinema, theatre and the global scene' (p. 8). While the four films construct theatre as 'a site of refinement, reformation and possibility' (p. 16), they also suggest that 'past beliefs and conventions have a niche in the present landscape' (p. 27).

Chapter 2 focuses on *Much Ado About Nothing* (Branagh [1993]) and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Hoffman [1999]). Burnett builds on recognized connections between the two films and he argues that Hoffman's film might productively be seen as a sequel to Branagh's *Much Ado*. The identification of a line of influence between the films produces the concluding suggestion that Hoffman's film 'gravitates back, ironically underscoring the limitations of the comedic form' (p. 46). Chapter 3 considers conversations between Shakespearian films with reference to versions of *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*. The plays are linked through location rather than genre, and the analysis considers ideas of what 'local' means in relation to a Shakespearian film. Chapter 4 investigates *Othello* (Parker [1995]) and *O* (Nelson [2001]) and considers race in relation to globalization. The historical and political implications of the more recent *The Merchant of Venice* (Radford [2004]) are considered in detail in chapter 5. The sixth chapter considers systems of belief and ideological implications of *Macbeth in Manhattan* (Lombardo [1999]) and *The King Is Alive* (Levring [2000]). Chapter 7 analyses twenty-first-century screen versions, and Thornton Burnett identifies a group of parodic versions: *The Street King* (Bedford [2002]), *In Othello* (Abel [2003]) and *Romeo and Juliet* (Lachapelle [2005]).

Maurice Hindle's *Studying Shakespeare on Film* focuses on films which have retained Shakespeare's dialogue, with exceptions made for silent films and Kurosawa's *Throne of Blood* [1957]. The study is divided into five parts, within which are multiple sub-sections. Hindle's organization of his material, the accessible style and the inclusion of a 'glossary of terms' (pp. 255–60) reinforces a sense of the text being targeted towards students studying Shakespeare's work. Part I considers 'Shakespeare and the Language of Film'. Brief introductory sections chart familiar Shakespeare-on-screen territory with consideration of the tension between theatre and cinema, the differences between the respective kinds of audience experience and the use of verbal and visual imagery in film. Part II moves chronologically through 'The History of Shakespeare on Film 1899–2005'. The section presents an annotated list of films, and while priority is given to films 'which at the time of writing are available on DVD or video' (p. xvii) some reference is made to less easily accessed versions, such as Charlton Heston's *Antony and Cleopatra* [1972]. Hindle supports his judgements of the film versions with reference to a range of critical voices. In Part III he self-consciously follows Jorgens's technique of identifying 'modes of representation' (p. 68). Subsections order brief descriptions of the respective style and offer examples which seem to fit within the theatrical mode, the realistic mode, the filmic mode and, finally, the periodizing mode. The concluding section of part II establishes the importance of film genre, but the rapid movement between examples prevents sustained analysis. The section ends with analysis of Kurosawa's *Macbeth* version, *Throne of Blood*. Hindle labels the film as a 'cross-cultural...adaptation' (p. 99), and makes a short examination of the film in the context of Noh theatre and the samurai movie.

The fourth part of Hindle's monograph seems perhaps most clearly student-focused. Fourteen short essays are offered on the best-known Shakespearian film adaptations. The essays are grouped by the play's genre. Three adaptations are analysed: *Much Ado About Nothing* (Branagh [1993]), *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Noble [1996]) and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Hoffmann [1999]). Four essays focus on what Hindle labels as 'histories': *Henry V* (Olivier [1944]), *Henry V* [1989], *Richard III* (Olivier [1955]) and *Richard III* (Loncraine [1995]). The section culminates with seven separate essays on tragedies: *Romeo and Juliet* (Zeffirelli [1968]), *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* (Luhmann [1996]), *Hamlet* (Olivier [1948]), *Hamlet* (Branagh [1996]), *Hamlet* (Almeryda [2000]), *Macbeth* (Welles [1948]) and *Macbeth* (Polanski [1971]). Part V marks a separation between types of screen Shakespeare by engaging with 'Shakespeare on Television'. Hindle states explicitly a dissatisfaction with the term, 'screen', because film and television 'differ greatly' (p. 221). One section engages with the BBC-TV Shakespeare, and that is followed by 'hybrid' stage-to-screen versions (p. 233). Here there is brief engagement with a couple of adaptations, including Andrew Davies's modernization of *Othello* (Sax [2001]).

While Thomas Cartelli and Katharine Rowe's *New Wave Shakespeare on Screen* seems to be similarly student-centred, their study benefits from a sharper focus. Their exploration focuses on work released in the past fifteen years and that enables more in-depth exploration of their chosen texts. They use 'screen' self-consciously because, they suggest, it 'marks the convergence of film and other audio-visual media . . . includ[ing] not just film, television, video, and DVD, domestic and global, but also web-based and cellular media, delivered via desktop, laptop and hand-held means' (p. x). Cartelli and Rowe give attention to their decision to label recent Shakespearian work on film as 'new wave'. Their primary justification is that of the experimental nature of recent screen Shakespeares and of recent scholarship. They organize their material into seven chapters. Chapter 1 signals the movement 'Beyond Branagh and the BBC'. The analysis focuses on Branagh's *Henry V* [1989] and *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* (Luhmann [1996]). Chapter 2 engages with 'Adaptation as a Cultural Process', and the films explored include *Richard III* (Loncraine [1995]), *Conte d'hiver* (Rohmer [1992]) and *Prospero's Books* (Greenaway [1991]). Chapter 3 focuses on 'Hamlet Rewound' and, accordingly, engages with Almeryda's 2000 film version of *Hamlet* and then rewinds to consider Olivier's 1948 version of the same play. Chapter 4 focuses on 'Colliding Time and Space' in *Titus* (Taymor [1999]). Chapter 5 uses three American adaptations to explore 'Vernacular Shakespeare': *Looking for Richard* (Pacino [1996]), *The Street King* (Bedford [2002]) and *Scotland, PA* (Morrisette [2001]). The penultimate chapter analyses Andrew Davies's adaptation of *Othello* (Sax [2001]). The representation of race on screen leads to the suggestion that 'performances of Othello "channel" a prevailing racial construction as much as they do a dramatic persona' (p. 121). The final chapter looks at *The King Is Alive* (Levring [2000]) as evidence of 'Surviving Shakespeare'. Cartelli and Rowe's organization of their material ensures that films with an established place in Shakespeare-on-screen scholarship are productively set against those that are more recent or less well known.

John O'Connor and Katharine Goodland jointly compiled *A Directory of Shakespeare in Performance*. So far, just volume one has been published and this text focuses on performances in Great Britain between 1970 and 2005. The introduction establishes the rationale behind what are acknowledged to be choices affected by 'a degree of subjectivity' (p. xii). The decision not to include versions which might be described as 'modern English adaptations, [and] spin-offs' (p. xii) justifies some omissions. Adopting the same typographical style and layout for the records of the screen versions and the theatrical productions helps signal a desire to move away from established oppositions between theatre and film. Richard Burt's *Shakespeares after Shakespeare* marks a neat contrast with the O'Connor and Goodland directory. Burt proclaims his interest in 'eccentric Shakespeare materials' (p. 5) and he seeks to establish his approach in contrast to that adopted by Rothwell and Melzer in the key reference work for *Shakespeare on Screen*. The ambitious publication is part edited collection of essays and part bibliography (or perhaps more accurately mass media-ography). The contributors include Michael P. Jensen, Courtney Lehmann, Douglas Lanier, Wes Folkerth, Annalisa Castaldo, Ellen Joy Letostak, Susanne Greenhalgh, Amy Scott-Douglass, Minami Ryuta and Fabio Ciaramaglia. The volume seeks to challenge established approaches to Shakespearian adaptation with the order of its nine chapters. The volumes are organized by type of cultural product and so chapter 1 engages with 'Cartoons and Comic Books' and 'Theater' provides the focus of chapter 9.

In contrast, David Bevington signals his priority is theatre in the title of his monograph. *This Wide and Universal Theater: Shakespeare in Performance Then and Now* does, however, embrace film and television work within its definition of 'performance'. The book seeks to engage with the original theatrical world of the plays and to relate those ideas to more recent performance choices. The pace is rapid, and so moments from screen productions are briefly sketched and set alongside choices made in productions staged in London, Stratford and regional theatres in England. The eclectic mix makes the book entertaining but, at times, frustrating when there is so little space to give any context for the chosen version's choices. In considering 'Stage Business in the Comedies', chapter 3 touches on a range of versions of *Shrew: Kiss Me Kate* [1953], *10 Things I Hate About You* [1999], Sam Taylor's film [1929], Zeffirelli's version [1967] and Miller's television production [1981]. Branagh's *Love's Labour's Lost* [2000] is commended and has the distinction of being accompanied with a double-page photograph by way of illustration. The following chapters are organized broadly by genre, and there is a similarly broad range of reference. The dominance of examples from television and film makes the language of Bevington's conclusion seem peculiar. He ends his survey by suggesting that it has provided evidence to affirm 'the theatrical world to which [Shakespeare's dramatic characters] belong and where they eternally dwell' (p. 224).

Lena Cowen Orlin and Miranda Johnson-Haddad's *Staging Shakespeare: Essays in Honor of Alan C. Dessen* combines essays which study Shakespeare on stage and on screen. The three essays relevant to 'Shakespeare on Screen' are grouped in part III, 'Recordings'. Edward L. Rocklin considers the 1964

screen record of Richard Burton's performance as Hamlet: "'That his heels may KICK at heaven": Exploring *Hamlet* through the Prompt-Script, Film, and Audio Recordings of the Gielgud–Burton Production' (in Orlin and Johnson-Haddad, eds., pp. 133–56). Rocklin explores the variations between the versions of the 1964 production. The discussion destabilizes discussions of 'a' production with details about the making of the screen record of the production. Burton's performances were recorded on three successive evenings with fifteen cameras. Rocklin analyses the film in relation to the studio-made audio recording of scenes and soliloquies, the introduction to the Folio Society's *Hamlet* [1954] and the stage production's Prompt Script.

In 'Fooling with Matches in Trevor Nunn's *Twelfth Night*: Or, Lines, Women, and Song' (in Orlin and Johnson-Haddad, eds., pp. 183–96), Caroline McManus makes the broad statement that there is an 'affinity between women and fools' within 'the canon as a whole' (p. 183). It seems strange that briefly sketched observations about a proposed 'Shakespearean paradigm' (p. 183) are then proven by applying them to a film version of *Twelfth Night*. The excisions and revisions in Nunn's screenplay are given little attention. McManus draws attention to the film's connections between Feste, Olivia, Maria and Viola. Nunn is unproblematically celebrated as 'an astute reader' (p. 183) and McManus seems on uncertain territory with a conclusion which suggests ideas of improvements for the film. She would have preferred the film to end with 'one more shot... to suggest that Illyria has not lost its truth-telling androgynous fool' (p. 195).

Michael D. Friedman focuses more explicitly on cinematic Shakespeare: "'This fearful slumber": Some Unacknowledged Sources of Julie Taymor's *Titus*' (in Orlin and Johnson-Haddad, eds., pp. 157–81). Friedman moves beyond the sources acknowledged in Taymor's numerous interviews and commentaries and identifies unacknowledged borrowings from Jane Howell's *Titus Andronicus* (BBC [1985]) and Adrian Noble's film (deriving from his stage production) of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* [1996]. Taymor's 1999 film follows both of these earlier Shakespearean adaptations by sifting the action through the consciousness of a child. The points of connection between the three screen versions are traced with close and detailed analysis of specific choices made by Taymor. Friedman concludes by suggesting that Taymor 'adopts the dreaming boy from Howell, refines him through Noble, and places him at the heart of her indictment of institutionalized violence in the postmodern world' (p. 176).

An interest in the role that children have played (and might potentially play) in performance is explored at more length in Carol Chillington Rutter's monograph, *Shakespeare and Child's Play: Performing Lost Boys on Stage and Screen*. Rutter is 'asking questions about the cultural location and valuation of children (then, now)... wondering what we "mean" by children in Shakespeare—and what children in Shakespeare "mean" by us' (p. xv). It is Rutter's second chapter which focuses in the most sustained way on one specific film version. The chapter explores *Titus Andronicus* and how, specifically 'in Taymor, young Lucius's looking frames the story' (p. 69). In the context of Michael Friedman's article, it is perhaps relevant to note the absence of any reference to Jane Howell's earlier screen version. Chapter 4

gives some attention to the British television film *Macbeth on the Estate* (Woolcock [1997]). The Weird Sisters become Weird Children, and that decision gives them a peculiar potency.

The collection of essays edited by Kate Chedgzoy, Susanne Greenhalgh and Robert Shaughnessy has a wide-ranging interest in *Shakespeare and Childhood*. A couple of essays in part II explore most directly the implications of an interest in 'childhood' for Shakespeare-on-screen scholarship. Susanne Greenhalgh's essay centres upon one play: 'Dream Children: Staging and Screening Childhood in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*' (in Chedgzoy, Greenhalgh and Shaughnessy, eds., pp. 201–17). Her argument seeks to explore the paradox that 'child performance becomes both the quintessence of artificiality and manipulation, and a fulfilment of adult desire to surrender to the pleasures of dramatic illusion' (p. 202). Greenhalgh focuses on the Dieterle–Reinhardt *A Midsummer Night's Dream* [1935] and *The Children's Midsummer Night's Dream* (Edzard [2001]). Detailed studies of both films are offered, and Greenhalgh identifies their choices as representative of different periods and cultures. The implicit comparison allows 'differences within and between historical childhoods [to] come into sharper focus' (p. 214).

Richard Burt's 'Shakespeare 'tween Media and Markets, in the 1990s and Beyond' (in Chedgzoy, Greenhalgh and Shaughnessy, eds., pp. 128–232). Burt's piece is characteristically eclectic and he identifies childhood-related Shakespearean examples in a range of advertisements, PBS puppet shows, cartoons, 'family' films, television film retellings of fairy tales, books and toys. The integration of children's Shakespeare into the Shakespeare industry is coupled with the place that Shakespeare has in the American education system. He focuses upon child-related 1990s and millennial films and television shows 'from a perspective derived from deconstruction and media theory' (p. 219). The edited collection is marked apart from other monographs and collections this year with its unusually helpful appendices. Appendix 1 is provided by Mark Lawhorn: 'Children in Shakespeare's Plays: An Annotated Checklist' (in Chedgzoy, Greenhalgh and Shaughnessy, eds., pp. 233–49). Lawhorn gives a play-by-play account of children's parts, and his introduction to the list prompts consideration of how performance choices (both on stage and screen) complicated the process of list-making. Chedgzoy, Greenhalgh and Edel Lamb provide, in appendix 2, a 'Bibliography of Shakespeare and Childhood in English' (pp. 233–49). Part III provides details of a useful collection of audio-visual resources.

Julie Sanders's study *Shakespeare and Music: Afterlives and Borrowings* directs attention to the often neglected audio element of films. Her study ranges between 'classical symphonies, operas, ballets, musicals, and film scores'. The fourth chapter considers 'contemporary' musical adaptations, and reference is made to the films of *Kiss Me Kate* [1953] and *West Side Story* [1961]. At times, there seemed a need for greater clarity about whether Sanders's analysis was of the stage musical or the film version, and distinctions between stage and screen versions were blurred in the 'Shakespeare at the Ballet' chapter too. One chapter is dedicated to 'Symphonic Film Scores', and Sanders draws attention to established collaborative relationships between Nino Rota and Zeffirelli, and Patrick Doyle and Branagh.

The Reinhardt–Dieterle film of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* [1935] receives attention in relation to its score, and its choreography is considered in the earlier chapter on dance versions. Sanders makes sustained reference to music in films in her penultimate chapter: "'You know the movie song": Contemporary and Hybrid Film Scores'. The chapter considers the compilation soundtracks of *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* (Luhmann [1996]), *O* (Nelson [2001]) and *10 Things I Hate About You* (Junger [1999]).

The journal *College Literature* provides an article which seeks to yoke an academic approach to Shakespeare on screen with practical guidance on teaching strategies. Martine van Elk's 'Criticism, Pedagogy and *Richard III* (*CollL* 34:iv[2007] 1–21) outlines an approach which focuses on identity in Shakespeare's early tragedy. Historical contextual material is used to inform analysis of three screen versions: Olivier [1955], Jane Howell's BBC Shakespeare [1983] and Richard Loncraine [1995]. The article suffers from confused distinctions between the versions—it is suggested that Howell's television production is a stage version. Martine Van Elk's claims that her ideas draw together historicist and performance-oriented approaches seem overstated.

The special Shakespeare issue of *Literature/Film Quarterly* includes eight essays which, in contrast with previous special issues, have no controlling theme or approach. An interest in genre emerges in several of the pieces, and it is perhaps Yvonne Griggs's two studies of *King Lear* films which demonstrate an engagement with cinematic genre most comprehensively. Griggs analyses two American films, Edward Dmytryk's *Broken Lance* [1954] and Jocelyn Moorhouse's *A Thousand Acres* [1997] in 'King Lear as Western Elegy' (*LFQ* 35:iii[2007] 92–100) and "'All our lives we looked for each other the way that motherless children tend to do": *King Lear* as Melodrama' (*LFQ* 35:ii[2007] 101–7), respectively. The analysis of *Broken Lance* directs deserved attention to a much-neglected cinematic reworking, and Griggs argues persuasively for the rewards of seeing the film in the context of the Western. The article signals that analysis of the film in relation to its genre helps identify its 'commentary on the hypocrisy, racism, and opportunism at the core of post-war America' (p. 93). A similarly complex perspective is prompted in Griggs's second article, which analyses the more recent *A Thousand Acres*. The piece makes connections with the melodrama genre by drawing specific links with Douglas Sirk's *Written on the Wind* [1955].

Kirk Melnikoff moves earlier in American cinematic history to analyse the Shakespearian allusions in Tay Garnett's film in 'Wartime Shakespeare: The Strange Case of *Bataan* (1943)' (*LFQ* 35:ii[2007] 129–39). The article is self-confessedly exploratory. *Bataan* is connected to *Hamlet* through its protagonist, Sergeant Bill Dane. The character's name and his contemplation in a graveyard at the end of the film signal Shakespearian connections which, Melnikoff suggests, contribute to the film's 'artistry' and its ability to 'develop complex themes' (p. 136). *Macbeth* features in the film too, and through the career of the film's writer, Robert Hardy Andrews, Melnikoff makes persuasive connections with Orson Welles's 1936 'Voodoo' stage production of the play. The analysis of *Bataan* helps qualify ideas that Shakespeare was

shunned by Hollywood in the 1940s, and instead Melnikoff suggests that his work 'was essentially repacked' (p. 136).

Elsewhere in the journal attention is directed towards the responses that Indian cinematic tradition provides to Shakespeare's work. In "'Filmi" Shakespeare' (*LFQ* 35:ii[2007] 148–58), Poonam Trivedi offers an overview of a recurring use of Shakespeare by Indian film directors. The breadth of the enquiry is ambitious, and consequently brief attention is given to Sohrab Modi's *Khoon-ka Khoon* (*Hamlet* [1935]), Kishore Sohn's *Hamlet* [1954], Gulzar's *Angoor* (*The Comedy of Errors* [1981]) and Jayaraaj's relocation of *Othello* to rural Kerala in *Kaliyattam* [1998]. More sustained analysis is given of *Maqbool* [2004], and Trivedi suggests that this film signals a more recent trend to 'play around' (p. 153) with Shakespeare. Her final, evocative image, is of a cultural practice which in the 'act of devouring is both a violation and an act of homage' (p. 157).

Alexander McKee seeks to establish a relevant historical context in his exploration of Peter Greenaway's 1991 cinematic reinterpretation of *The Tempest* in 'Jonson vs. Jones in *Prospero's Books*' (*LFQ* 35:ii[2007] 121–8). McKee makes reference to the Renaissance debate between Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones about the relative merits of the word and of spectacle in order to offer a perspective on the film's concern with 'the unstable relationship between word and spectacle' (p. 121). McKee offers brief analysis of Shakespeare's text before he considers *Prospero's Books*. In his discussion of the film, McKee shifts from identifying a tension between 'word' and 'spectacle' to consider 'text' and 'image'. Reference to Greenaway's later film *The Pillow Book* [1995] helps elide these two labels, and it seems surprising that McKee's analysis resolutely seeks to apply a perceived dichotomy to Greenaway's *Prospero's Books* and ultimately suggests that the film succeeds in 'refusing to allow either text or image to take precedence' (p. 127).

Simon J. Ryle's article also focuses on one film: 'Filming Non-Space: The Vanishing Point and the Face in Brook's *King Lear*' (*LFQ* 35:ii[2007] 140–7). His analysis of Brook's 1971 *Lear* follows critical tradition by focusing on the Dover cliff scene. Ryle acknowledges the debate between Catherine Belsey and Graham Holderness and pays tribute to Jack Jorgens's evocative description of this sequence in the film. Following Jorgens's lead, Ryle focuses on the camera's concentration on Gloucester's face (Alan Webb). Emmanuel Lévinas, Erwin Panofsky and André Bazin are deployed to help shape a complex argument about 'the potential of the face to encode the vanishing point... of Edgar's non-cliff of "proximity" with the infinity of the face' (p. 146).

In 'Michael Radford's *The Merchant of Venice* and the Vexed Question of Performance' (*LFQ* 35:ii[2007] 108–10), Laury Magnus explores 'what works and does not work' in the 2004 film (p. 108). The judgement of degrees of success in the film's choices seems to need more explicit explanation of the author's rationale. Magnus articulates an interest in the extent to which the film seeks to give an 'authentic' reading of the text, and this approach is contextualized through recent productions on original practice stages: the Blackfriars Playhouse in Staunton, Virginia, and the London Globe. Gaps between those theatrical experiments and early modern theatrical practice

could perhaps have been articulated more explicitly. Questions about the *mise-en-scène*, the actors' cinematic personae and the cutting of the text could perhaps have been pursued more persuasively.

L. Monique Pittman considers the same film in a more focused way: 'Locating the Bard: Adaptation and Authority in Michael Radford's *The Merchant of Venice*' (*ShakB* 25:ii[2007] 13–33). Her analysis of the 2004 film suggests that the version marks a cinematic 'return . . . to period setting and costuming' (p. 1). That observation establishes an engagement with authenticity, authority and legitimacy which acknowledges a debt to W.B. Worthen's analysis of the authority of performance. While Pittman laments the film's failure to problematize notions of 'authority', the emphasis she places on Radford's attitudes (in the DVD commentary and interview) seems to endorse rather than unsettle the importance of the 'author function' (p. 15). Olwen Terris's 'The Forgotten *Hamlet*' (*ShakB* 25:ii[2007] 35–9) draws attention to the potential for fascinating discoveries in research. The article discusses a 1956 live broadcast of Peter Brook's *Hamlet* performed at the Phoenix theatre, with Paul Scofield in the title role. An industrial dispute in February 1956 meant that the *TV Times* was not published, and researchers have therefore erroneously cited *The Comedy of Errors* as the first broadcast of a play by Independent Television. Terris's engagement with cultural context allows her to explore 'the friction between culture and commercialism in the very early days of ITV' (p. 37). Terris's article makes a persuasive case for an ambitious Arts and Humanities Research Council-funded project to create an International Database of Shakespeare on Film, Television and Radio, administered by the British Universities Film and Video Council. Terris's fascinating piece includes extensive quotation from reviews of the television broadcast. Ivor Jay, the *Birmingham Evening Despatch* reviewer, was disappointed by Scofield's performance because 'he is a most masculine actor and there is so much in Hamlet that is feminine' (p. 37).

Interpretations of Hamlet's gender are explored in greater detail in Tony Howard's monograph, *Women as Hamlet: Performance and Interpretation in Theatre, Film and Fiction*. Howard begins his introductory chapter with the observation that 'The first Hamlet on film was a woman, Sarah Bernhardt (1900)' (p. 1). He is concerned to explore the different ways of, and the different reasons behind, artistic exploration of 'the femininity of Hamlet' (p. 1). The examination ranges between stage performances, representations in art and screen versions. Sarah Bernhardt's performance is analysed in chapter 4, but instead of considering the reception of the film, Howard focuses on responses to her on stage and makes extensive use of detailed reviews from the London press. Chapter 5 gives brief attention to Bernhardt on screen and then directs more sustained attention towards Sven Gade's 1920 film: '"I am whom I play": Asta Nielsen'. Howard considers the relationship between the film and E.P. Vining's theory that Hamlet is really a woman, and observes that, rather than offer 'an act of male impersonation, Nielsen played a woman trapped in a life-long masquerade' (p. 140). Howard's celebration of the remarkable film concludes by suggesting that Nielsen's performance demonstrates 'the inseparability of gender politics from the political upheavals' of the time (p. 157). Howard returns to the 1920 film in chapter 9,

'Films and Fictions: Hamlet, Men's Eyes, and the Ages of Woman'. The chapter engages with the responses of American critics to Nielsen's performance and then progresses to consider a 'sub-genre of fiction films, chinese-box dramas about women who wished to play the Prince, or became him' (p. 240). Howard gives greatest attention to Katharine Hepburn's performance as Eva Lovelace in the early US sound film, *Morning Glory* [1933].

The concluding sequence of journal articles features in the British Shakespeare Association's journal, *Shakespeare*. Five essays deal exclusively with Shakespeare on screen and the journal's final issue of the year centres around the idea that 2007 marks a centenary no less important than 1999's commemoration of Beerbohm Tree's pioneering *King John* film. Judith Buchanan's 'Introduction' (*Shakespeare* 3.iii[2007] 283–92) refers to the release in 1907 of Méliès's *Hamlet* and *Shakespeare Writing Julius Caesar* and *Othello* from Italian production company Cines. Buchanan argues that these versions marked a shift by offering 'a sequentially unfolding Shakespearean narrative' (p. 283). The articles in this issue seek to direct attention towards Shakespeare in the cinema at the beginning of the twentieth-century. The publications in 2007 give weight to the issue's suggestion that early film is still a neglected area of screen scholarship.

James Ellison's '*King John* (1899): A *Fin-de-Siècle* Fragment and its Cultural Context' (*Shakespeare* 3.iii[2007] 293–314) provides a fascinating, detailed and provocative analysis of the layers of context behind the earliest surviving fragment of film. He asserts the importance of viewing the fragment in its theatrical context, in the historical context of the second Boer War and the Dreyfus affair and, most intriguingly, in a commercial context. Ellison suggests that the screening in London of the American-owned Biograph Company's short film, *The Kissing Scene between Trilby and Little Billee* [1897], might have articulated the potential power (and profit) posed through cinematic performance. Beerbohm Tree had enjoyed considerable success as Svengali in his own stage version of *Trilby* just two years earlier. Judith Buchanan's article also invokes Beerbohm Tree's theatrical reputation. She focuses on the Clarendon silent film of *The Tempest* [1908]. Her piece presents a detailed account of theatrical choices made by Beerbohm Tree in 1904/5 and seeks then to relate these choices to the Clarendon *Tempest*. The article offers a convincing account of the way the inner conflict between theatrical influences and cinematic possibilities ensures that the film 'plays host to a set of tensely revealing antagonisms' (p. 333).

Luke McKernan's '"A complete and fully satisfying art on its own account": Cinema and the Shakespeare Tercentenary of 1916' (*Shakespeare* 3.iii[2007] 337–51) argues persuasively for the importance of 1916 in Shakespearean cinematic history. McKernan analyses the form and function of films which featured within events commemorating the tercentenary of Shakespeare's death. At the Coliseum in March J.M. Barrie offered, as part of a variety of entertainments, a comic interpretation on film of *Macbeth: The Real Thing at Last*. The piece began with the actors in the film performing on stage and marked, therefore, a playful mixing of theatre and cinema. A royal gala performance in May at Drury Lane used dumb-show sequences, showed an awareness of its star names and used music in such a way as to show

'its unconscious alliance with strategies of the silent film' (p. 343). The reception of Beerbohm Tree's *Macbeth* film is analysed, and McKernan also engages with America and seeks to evaluate responses to Fox and Metro's competing feature-length versions of *Romeo and Juliet*. All three of these films are lost, and McKernan recognizes that this presents difficulties in judging their 'artistic worth or place in the filmed Shakespeare pantheon' (p. 347).

In 'Sex, Lies and Videotape: Representing the Past in *Shakespeare in Love*, Mapping a Future for Presentism' (*Shakespeare* 3:i[2007] 40–62) Cary DiPietro seeks to counter established notions of conflict between presentist interpretative styles and approaches adopted in historicist, materialist and postmodernist criticism. Some reference is made to Baz Luhrmann's *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* [1996], but greatest attention is directed towards Madden's *Shakespeare in Love* [1998]. Di Pietro traces a line of connections between Stephen Greenblatt, the two scriptwriters Marc Norman and Tom Stoppard, James Joyce, Freud and Shakespeare, and argues that these 'narrative encounters...produce a literary sedimentation that resonates through the film' (p. 47). Presentist readings are shown to complement rather than negate other theoretical approaches.

James Welsh and Peter Lev edited a collection of essays, *The Literature|Film Reader: Issues of Adaptation*, and three Shakespeare-focused pieces appear in part II, 'Classic and Popular Literature'. James M. Welsh asks 'What Is a Shakespeare Film Anyway? (in Welsh and Lev, eds., pp. 105–14). His article offers a direct challenge to recent trends in Shakespeare-on-screen scholarship and labels 'adaptations that ignore Shakespeare's language while exploiting his plots and characters' as 'misguided and corrupt' (p. 105). Welsh objects to serious study of cinematic reinterpretations such as *Joe Macbeth* (Hughes [1955]), *A Thousand Acres* (Moorhouse [1997]) and *Jubal* (Daves [1956]). He suggests that being influenced by Shakespeare ought not to qualify these versions as Shakespearian films. The article concludes with the assertion that 'A film that presumes to adapt poetic drama should at the very least be "poetic" in style and substance' (p. 112). Yong Li Lan offers a perspective upon the closing shot of four films in 'Returning to Naples: Seeing the End in Shakespeare Film Adaptation' (in Welsh and Lev, eds., pp. 115–24). The essay focuses on *Hamlet* (Branagh [1996]), *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* [1996], *Shakespeare in Love* (Madden [1998]) and *Prospero's Books* (Greenaway [1991]). Lan gives some consideration to 'looking structures in...situations of cinematic watching', but the analysis of a gap between the spectator's perspective and the camera's eye could be applied more directly to the chosen case studies. Elsie Walker's article gives more sustained treatment to the 1996 *Romeo + Juliet*: 'Pop Goes the Shakespeare: Baz Luhrmann's *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet*' (in Welsh and Lev, eds., pp. 125–48). Her argument centres upon the 'film as a kind of social document'. Walker explores the film's intertextuality and celebrates the film's ability 'to make strange the familiar' (p. 143).

Two essays in *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*, edited by Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan, focus on Shakespeare. Douglas Lanier considers 'William Shakespeare, Filmmaker' (pp. 61–74). His essay identifies the idea of Shakespeare as 'composer' with 'an imagination

fundamentally visual not verbal' (p. 61) in Méliès's *La Mort de Jules César* [1907] and Madden's *Shakespeare in Love* [1998]. The essay then pursues a broader enquiry into the position of the Shakespearian film in popular culture. Lanier considers the way screen versions of the plays are used in the classroom, and worries that 'textual fidelity remains a primary concern' (p. 68). Lanier explores his suggestion with reference to two adaptations of *Romeo and Juliet*: *Tromeo and Juliet* (Kaufman [1996]) and *Shakespeare in Love* (Madden [1998]). The analysis underlines the importance of 'the ideological implications of film adaptation' (p. 73).

The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare in Popular Culture contains four essays relevant to Shakespeare on screen. Barbara Hodgdon considers 'Shakespearean Stars: Stagings of Desire' (in Shaughnessy, ed., pp. 46–66). Her study crosses between film, television, stage and public roles in a consideration of what makes an actor a 'Shakespearean star'. The study begins with Michael Gambon and moves then to more detailed study of Laurence Olivier's 'ownership of Shakespearean roles' and the ones Hodgdon lists are, tellingly, those preserved on film: 'Henry V, Hamlet, Richard III and Othello' (p. 56). Branagh's career is considered, but it is suggested that he has not inherited Olivier's 'star status' (p. 59). Hodgdon interrogates the term 'Shakespearean star' and asks, in her study of Ian McKellen, 'what is the position, place and work of the star in the age of digital reproduction?' (p. 61). Brief reference to Patrick Stewart helps articulate the cross-over between status on stage, in Shakespearian films and more commercially successful ventures such as *Star Trek*. Douglas Lanier expands Hodgdon's consideration of a range of types of media in his engagement with Shakespeare and biography: 'ShakespeareTM Myth and Biographical Fiction' (in Shaughnessy, ed., pp. 93–113). Of interest to Shakespeare-on-screen scholars is Lanier's engagement with Al Pacino's *Looking for Richard* [1996] and 'the first talkie featuring Shakespeare as a character, *The Immortal Gentleman* (1935)' (p. 101). Lanier suggests that the latter film has its roots in nineteenth-century bardolatry. *Shakespeare in Love* [1998] gives evidence of 'how powerfully Shakespeare identifies with and functions as a mainstream icon for heteronormative sexuality' (p. 103). The characterization of Shakespeare in relation to Christopher Marlowe is explored in a brief analysis of ATV's 1978 TV mini-series *The Life of Shakespeare*.

Emma Smith directs attention to a neglected 1960 BBC television series: 'Shakespeare Serialized: *An Age of Kings*' (in Shaughnessy, ed., pp. 134–49). Smith seeks to start with the fifteen-episode series and use it to examine 'the functions of serial narrative in Shakespeare's play' (p. 134). While Smith makes the point that *An Age of Kings* has not been preserved, the language used in her analysis conceals that absence of direct contact with the production: 'Viewing *An Age of Kings* now...' (p. 136). More explicit engagement with the sources used might have helped create a more transparent sense of Smith's imaginative reconstruction of the broadcast. ITV's broadcast of *Coronation Street* in the same year shapes an exploration of the way that both series share 'narrative structures' and 'characterizations' (p. 141). The article seeks, therefore, to situate *An Age of Kings* in the context of other

television broadcasts, and Smith's final suggestion is that television is 'the medium that above all has defined the notion of "popular culture".' (p. 147).

It is perhaps fitting to conclude with W.B. Worthen's 'Performing Shakespeare in a Digital Culture' (in Shaughnessy, ed., pp. 227–47). Worthen considers the way that performance can now be viewed on 'the digital screen, the same screen that most of us use for reading and writing' (pp. 227–8). He focuses his analysis on Shakespeare on DVD, and suggests that the format 'paradoxically offers a considerably more bookish engagement with Shakespearean drama than earlier recording technologies' (p. 232). The DVD play-text might be identified as an edition and, as such, can be situated with the 'cultural framework of print' (p. 233). The limits imposed by region codes and subtitle language choices maintain another 'symmetry with print' (p. 239). Worthen's ideas help expand concepts about the types of cultural production that might be embraced within studies of Shakespeare on 'screen'.

4. Criticism

(a) General

Reviews of general Shakespeare work published in 2007 will appear in the entry in next year's *YWES*.

(b) Comedies

A Midsummer Night's Dream seems a good place to start this year, as it offers my only book-length study devoted to a single play, Henry S. Turner's *Shakespeare's Double Helix*. I deliberately avoid the term 'monograph', as Turner's study forms part of a series, *Shakespeare Now!*, which likes to think of itself as offering rather 'minigraphs'—short studies designed to fall somewhere between the standard academic article and monograph in both length and style, and which aim to be open-ended, alive, exciting, innovative and very much of the moment. Turner's volume certainly responds to this particular brief, not least through its title, which is both an eye-catching attempt to assert Shakespearian contemporaneity and a genuine reflection of aspects of the volume's content. The blurb on the back of my paperback edition grandly claims that 'this book focuses on one of the key questions for culture and science in both Shakespeare's time and our own', namely, 'What does it mean to make life?'. Turner's own opening gambit states slightly more prosaically that 'this book reads Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in order to explore the nature of creativity and experimentation in literature and in scientific research' (p. x). There is, as it were, a doubly double focus here, on science and literature, and on Shakespeare's time and our own. Thus the content of the book explores the influence of scientific developments on literature as well as the creative dimensions of scientific activity and discourse, while at the same time drawing parallels between the 'new science' of the Renaissance/early modern period and the latest scientific developments of modern genetics and genetic engineering.

All of these elements are consciously figured in the title's invocation of the double helix, which serves as an image not only for the doubly interweaving themes of the book, but also for its very structure. For to quote Turner's own description, his book 'consists of two separate but related essays that run parallel to one another on facing pages' (p. xii). The essays are said to wrap around each other like the double helix, available for reading in turn one at a time, or simultaneously with 'the eye wandering across the divide of the page to make spontaneous graftings among ideas and to generate new and entirely unanticipated arguments with each reading and re-reading' (pp. xii–xiii). There is in itself, of course, nothing particularly new in such structural experimentation, but it has to be acknowledged that it has a definite novelty value in the context of Shakespearian criticism, and it is raised above the merely gimmicky here by the highly apposite image that Turner finds for his title. Having said this, in the end the double helix of the study seems to me more Turner's than Shakespeare's. And having chosen for my purposes to read each essay separately in turn, which essentially creates the effect of having to read through the book twice, I felt little inclination or incentive in the process to let my eyes stray across the gutter to the other side, on either my first or second passage through.

The left-hand pages provide the more conventional literary-critical part of the volume, offering an essay focusing on the play itself, addressing issues relating to its literary and theatrical techniques and content, but pursuing throughout the idea that, read through 'the contemporary eye', *A Midsummer Night's Dream* offers us 'startlingly familiar scenes, organized around problems that continue to drive the scientific thought of our own era' (p. 2). The right-hand essay, distinguished by a different typeface, 'advances a series of arguments about *mimesis* in science, about language and naming, about the nature of experiment and how scientific knowledge gets produced, and about how contemporary biotechnology forces us to reconsider our normative definitions of the human and our ideas about life in general' (p. xii). This is not to say that the content of the two halves remains entirely distinct, for plenty of references to *Dream* find their way into the right-hand essay, and themes of metamorphosis, hybridity and so on are pursued throughout the discussion specifically focused on the play. I found the right-hand essay fascinating in many places, but ultimately a little unsatisfying. Turner provides what seems to me, writing as someone with little background in the subject, a very readable, clear and informative quick overview of the development of modern genetic research, covering the discovery of DNA through to current practices and ideas in the area of hybridization. There is an evident timeliness to Turner's work, with its links to ecocriticism and contemporary theories and philosophies of the post-human and the non-human, and his tracking of appearances of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* within the realm of contemporary genetic research is fascinating and entertaining. But other elements of the essay, such as his whistle-stop tour of textual instability in Shakespeare (pp. 71–85) or perfunctory invocation of the art/nature debate from *The Winter's Tale* (pp. 89–93), are rather more humdrum. And I would have preferred a little more engagement with or acknowledgement of some of the ethical and political dimensions and controversies of modern genetic science.

Yet there is much of interest here, crowded into a short space, and occasional moments startle with a penetrating turn of expression or juxtaposition of ideas.

The left-hand essay, too, with its more direct focus on Shakespeare's play, has plenty of interest in it, not least some of the extended discussions of particular passages, such as Titania's speech about the seasons. Themes relating to nature, metamorphosis, translation, magic and mimesis are all effectively pursued. I have to say, though, that the overall effect is partly spoiled for me by a certain carelessness in quotations and references; lines from Shakespeare lose or gain syllables (immediately noticeable in blank verse), while references assign quotations to the wrong scene, give completely wrong line numbers, or provide a range of line numbers far greater than the number of lines actually quoted (various examples can be found on pp. 38, 46, 60, with some of the errors congregating together). It's a minor point, but it nags, and of course might make one wonder about the accuracy of some of Turner's other quotations that are not so easily traceable to be checked. But despite such reservations, there is much interesting and stimulating comment in Turner's study, and the book itself is undeniably memorable and thought-provoking.

Certainly, moving from Turner's book to Stuart Sillars's "'Howsoever, strange and admirable:' *A Midsummer Night's Dream* as *via stultitia*" (*Archiv* 244[2007] 27–39) is like entering another critical world. Sillars's main concern is in elucidating the traditions of 'a vision other than the intellectual' (p. 30) that were available to Shakespeare and his audience, ranging from Ficino through to Julian of Norwich. The play's elevation of the idea of the *via stultitia*, 'the way of the foolish' (p. 29), or in a different formulation, of 'idiocy as a higher form of understanding' (p. 30), is allied to gender power struggles, figured particularly through Hippolyta's account in V.i of the events of the wood and the rejection of Theseus' intellectualizing position which this is seen to embody. Sillars has some useful things to say on the play's biblical and Erasmian intertexts and potential intertexts. But I would question the implicit assumption that the play-text or the dramatic action necessarily ratify Hippolyta's interpretation of events over that of Theseus. I also find problematic Sillars's virtually untrammelled confidence (doubt briefly emerges at one point) that the play's 'original performance' was 'at an aristocratic wedding' (p. 28), and his reliance on this idea to posit a particular audience for and reading of the play.

Tom Pettitt's "'Perchance you wonder at this show": Dramaturgical Machinery in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and "Pyramus and Thisbe"' (in Butterworth, ed. *The Narrator, the Expositor, and the Prompter in European Medieval Theatre*, pp. 211–34) seems to me a rather more successful piece of work. Pettitt's study is built around exploring some of the metadramatic elements of the play, and particularly the 'inwardly orientated procedures' of the dramatic action (p. 211), such as cues, internal prompts, entrance and exit directions etc., that contribute to making the drama 'work'. Connected to this approach is an emphasis on the 'Pyramus and Thisbe' playlet as 'essentially a revels interlude which (at least in rehearsal) is also associated with certain aspects of the Elizabethan stage', and on *Dream* itself as 'an Elizabethan

stage-play to which is also attributed certain features of medieval household revels' (p. 214). In this respect, for Pettitt, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* emerges as 'emphatically a stage-play' (p. 215), but one which 'successfully constructs for itself, within the playhouse, the ambience of aristocratic wedding revels it creates for "Pyramus and Thisbe" within its play world'; or to put it another way, 'revels are effectively the *implied* auspices of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*' (p. 216). This seems a much more profitable and nuanced approach than the assumption that the play must have been written for performance at a wedding.

The main body of Pettitt's essay is divided into sections discussing issues such as prompting, getting on (entrances), in-performance direction, getting off (exits), presentation, explication, narrative and taking leave. Most of these basic elements, inherent to the fabric of stage drama, are of course represented explicitly on stage during the course of the play through the rehearsal process for 'Pyramus and Thisbe'. Pettitt also takes pains to trace some of their antecedents in earlier forms of drama, though I think perhaps he overdoes references to folk-play traditions. There is much sensitive discussion of particular moments in the dialogue, with an awareness of the actions that might go with them, or the problems they might pose (or solve) for the actors themselves. Attention is drawn particularly to the way the 'junior' fairies seem to be stage-managed or overtly directed within the dialogue itself, in a way that is matched elsewhere in *Dream* only in the dialogue of 'Pyramus and Thisbe'. Pettitt also notes how devices that appear in crude form in the play-within-the-play are given more sophisticated treatment elsewhere in the drama. So whereas 'Pyramus and Thisbe' includes obvious exit lines for its performers, some apparent exit lines within the main action are actually '*misleading* exit signals' (p. 225). This leads to the suggestion that 'it would not be incompatible with Shakespeare's often playful dramaturgy for the "false" scripted directions... to be inserted deliberately to test, or demonstrate, his company's skills' (p. 226).

There has also been something of a spate of notes on *A Midsummer Night's Dream* this year. I found Steven J. Doloff's 'Bottom's Greek Audience: *I Corinthians* 1.21–5 and Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*' (*Expl* 65[2007] 200–1) anything but convincing in its attempt to suggest a further biblical context for Bottom's famous soliloquy at the end of IV.i, beyond its obvious associations with 1 Corinthians 2. The suggestion coming out of the perceived allusion is that the Greek foolishness Paul speaks of in chapter 1 of his epistle might be meant to reflect back on the Greek audience of the mechanicals' play in Act V of *Dream*. Wolfgang Riehle's discussion of 'What's in Lysander's Name?' (*N&Q* 54[2007] 274–5) quickly dismisses earlier comment on this subject with the confident assertion that, based on allusions to *Hero and Leander* in the play, 'there can be no doubt that the name Lysander is supposed to allude to Leander' (p. 275). Shakespeare apparently changed 'Leander' to 'Lysander' to allow a pun, 'lie asunder', in Lysander's and Hermia's dialogue as they lie down to sleep in the forest (as Hermia actually asks Lysander to 'lie further off' it is perhaps no surprise this pun has been missed by earlier commentators). And secondly, the change is seen to

reflect another aspect of Shakespeare's fusion of English and classical elements in the play.

Also ultimately perhaps rather strained in the argument it has to offer is Alan J. Altimont's contribution, following immediately on in the same volume, 'The Meaning of *Nedar* in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*' (*N&Q* 54[2007] 275–7). Altimont is aware of Terence Hawkes's discussion of this name in his *Meaning by Shakespeare* [1993], but is unconvinced by Hawkes's attempts there at identifying a possible source for the name. For someone aware of Hawkes's comments, though, Altimont is surprisingly confident in the identification of *Nedar* as 'the name of Helena's father' (p. 275). Altimont turns for an explanation to Hebrew, where *nedar* 'exists as a verb meaning "was missing; was absent"', as an adjective meaning "missing, absent", and as a noun meaning "absentee"' (p. 275). Pursuing further possible allusions, the name is also tentatively connected to the Hebrew plural *neder*, deriving from a noun meaning 'pledge' or 'vow'. Additional connections lead to the *Nedarim Tractate* of the Babylonian Talmud. The arguments are far from compelling, but at the same time the possibilities are intriguing, and Altimont may have a case in his closing statement that the issue is 'worthy of further scholarly interest' (p. 277).

Still on *Dream*, Rodney Stenning Edgecombe has a very brief note exploring a potential pun on 'tire' as in tiring house/attire ('A Player's Pun in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* III.1' (*N&Q* 54[2007] 275). Beatrice Grove's "'The wittiest partition": Bottom, Paul, and Comedic Resurrection' (*N&Q* 54[2007] 277–82) leads back again to Bottom's dream, and its intertextual Pauline and Erasmian associations. There are some good comments here on the physicality of Bottom and the mechanicals, their concern with the realm of the material—props, clothing, the constituents of their presented wall, etc. The focus of the discussion becomes Bottom-as-Pyramus's 'resurrection' after the play within the play to assure his audience that 'the wall is down' that parted the dead lovers' fathers. It is argued that the phrase used here is an echo of Ephesians 2. Finally in this group, A.B. Taylor's 'John Gower and "Pyramus and Thisbe"' (*N&Q* 54[2007] 282–3) has another take on the antecedents of Bottom's dream, claiming a previously unrecognized debt in Shakespeare to Gower's version of the Pyramus and Thisbe story in Book III of the *Confessio Amantis*. Gower is seen to have pre-empted Shakespeare in echoing 1 Corinthians 2.9 in connection with a Pyramus figure, and the detail is also picked up that there is a hole in the wall in Gower's version that is not described in quite the same terms in Ovid or other recognized sources for this sequence.

Staying with notes leads me on to *The Merchant of Venice*. Matt Baynham's 'Why is Mercy "Twice Blest"?' (*N&Q* 54[2007] 285) also claims to find an echo not noted in any previous edition of the play, seeing an allusion in the phrase under discussion to the beatitude about the merciful in Matthew 5.7. Charles R. Forker's 'Marlowe's *Edward II* and *The Merchant of Venice*' (*ShN* 57[2007–8] 65, 70), despite its title, actually spends a lot of its time noticing echoes of Marlowe in the Shakespeare canon in general, and particularly *Richard II*. The echo argued for with respect to *Merchant* links one of Gratiano's speeches in II.ii with an exchange between Spencer Junior and Baldock in II.i of Marlowe's play. To my mind, Forker sees a

'probable indebtedness' (p. 65) where his evidence suggests more an interesting parallel. Staying with notes, a quick mention for Richard Levin's 'Launcelot's and Huck's Moral Dilemmas' (*ShN* 56[2006–7] 83), which draws a parallel (not necessarily one of influence) between Gobbo's debate with himself about whether he should leave his master and a similar moment in Mark Twain's *Huckleberry Finn*. For Levin, both writers are making a serious point about attitudes to 'the subjugation of servants and slaves'.

Turning to more substantial studies of *The Merchant of Venice*, Jonathan Gil Harris's 'The Time of Shakespeare's Jewry' (*ShakS* 35[2007] 39–46) packs a wide range of reference—George Herbert, John Stow, Richard Hakluyt, John Dee, Hegel, St Paul, Alain Badiou, Dipesh Chakrabarty, the Bush administration and the *Left Behind* Christian apocalyptic novel series—into not many pages, with Shakespeare and the London district of Old Jewry in there as well, along with reflections on the nature of typological cosmopolitanism. In the end, there's not actually all that much of Shakespeare or *The Merchant of Venice* here, though the paragraph on the play's interest in typology (p. 42) is at the core of the argument, which takes off from the notion that this play 'makes explicit the workings of what we might call typological cosmopolitanism' (p. 42). Those workings are then pursued through explorations of the traces of the old Jewish community in the London of Shakespeare's time, at both a literal and a figurative level, and their possible implications for the present day. For according to Harris, 'we ignore at our peril the troublesome histories of the cosmopolitan if we understand it only in spatial and secular terms', because alongside these, 'in a literal as well as figurative way, it is about time' (p. 46).

M. Lindsay Kaplan's 'Jessica's Mother: Medieval Constructions of Jewish Race and Gender in *The Merchant of Venice*' (*SQ* 58[2007] 1–30) is an essay of a rather more conventional type than Harris's, but none the worse for that. Kaplan takes as a way into her subject the neglected figure of Leah and her significance in the play, leading on from here into a discussion of the relevance of gender and constructions of gender to the play's racial politics and its presentation of Jessica. Much of the essay is devoted to presenting material on medieval constructions of Jewishness, leading to the conclusion that 'the three central elements of modern racist thinking are present in medieval constructions of a Jew as an inferior religious and physical other whose nature, as his immunity to conversion testifies, is determined by his body, not his belief' (p. 13). But the key element in the argument is the influence of gender issues on this discourse, and the idea that gender prejudices, as it were, outweighed racial prejudices in relation to Jewish women.

The idea that comes out of all this is that, for the period, 'the Jewish woman is whiter in both flesh and blood than the Jewish man' (p. 20). This argument is reinforced by discussion of the theory of 'maternal imprinting', seen to be exemplified in the story of Jacob's sheep, which is used to illustrate the cultural lack of importance assigned to the mother figure (as evidenced by the case of Leah) in the creation/construction of the newborn child. Patriarchal prejudices and cultural beliefs mean that anxieties about Jewishness cluster much more around men than women—which for Kaplan is a factor that may be reflected in Jessica's particular discomfort with her masculine attire. In line with this

overall approach, Kaplan seeks to challenge critical readings that see Jessica at the end of the play as unassimilated into the Christian community, as retaining a 'racial residue' (p. 26). Racial anxieties are bypassed in the culture of Venice with respect to Jessica, due to the view that, 'as a woman she is "whiter" than her Jewish brethren and that as a mother, she contributes nothing to the race of her child' (p. 27).

Douglas A. Brooks's "'I'll mar the young clerk's pen': Sodomy, Paternity and Circumcision in *The Merchant of Venice*' (in Moncrief and McPherson, eds., *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England*, pp. 225–37) is a dense essay with a wide frame of reference that seeks to examine the way this play 'contributes to the project of reformulating traditions associated with Judaism, circumcision, paternal authority and maternity—a project that has been central to Christianity' (p. 225). Circumcision is a particular focus, located in the play primarily through an invocation of its images of paternity and cutting. There is a lot of historical and anthropological background invoked here, but there also seems to me a great deal of strain in the effort to apply much of this material to the play itself. So we learn, for example, in a line of reasoning that is not untypical, that when the main source for the play 'was first published in Italy, Jewish loans, sexual favors, sodomy and Christian marriage had all come to be part of a metonymic chain in which earrings linked circumcised Jewish financiers with pierced Christian prostitutes'. The application to *Merchant* is that being 'an avid cultural materialist, Shakespeare uses rings in the last scene of the play to rehearse these correspondences' (p. 231). Obviously, I am providing a very bald summary of a dense argument here, but on the face of it, it is hard to know how seriously one is meant to take such a comment. Yet a sense of humour is not one of the most obvious elements displayed by this article.

In many ways, Brooks's essay feels like an attempt at a form of bravura performance, linking together some of the standard themes of New Historicism, gender criticism and queer theory, picking up in particular on recent work on *Merchant* coming out of these traditions, and the insights they have provided, and pushing these themes and ideas in new directions or extending their frames of reference. But there is something in the application that just doesn't hold together. The arguments seem to be too divorced from the action of the play itself, too dependent on reading one thing as implying another as implying another and so on, and in the end the whole process seems to spiral out of control in the effort to pack too much in or to be too clever. Indeed, the essay quite literally goes out of control towards the end, where a bizarrely mangled sentence in the antepenultimate paragraph ends up saying that the Jason of Euripides' *Medea* was taught to read Latin aloud by George Buchanan during the reign of Henry VIII (see p. 236). I can't even work out what this sentence was trying to say. And in its final paragraph the essay then goes off on a completely new tangent with a sudden discussion of Joseph Papp's views on the play.

Of a very different nature is Mark Bayer's '*The Merchant of Venice*, the Arab–Israeli Conflict, and the Perils of Shakespearean Adaptation' (*CompD* 41[2007–8] 465–92). This is essentially an exploration of aspects of the afterlife of the play, and particularly how it has figured to competing ends in literary

adaptations and cultural discourse on either side of the Arab–Israeli conflict during the twentieth century. In this respect, Bayer’s work largely falls outside my remit, as most of the literary comment here is directed at texts that are appropriating Shakespeare. But there is some useful discussion of the nature of literary appropriation in relation to Shakespeare’s play here, and the essay offers a reminder of the way this play interacts with discourses that can lead far away from literary criticism.

Staying briefly in this area, the online *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory* devotes an entire edition (8:iii[2007]) to *The Merchant of Venice* in relation to continental philosophy, following on from a symposium held at Pomona College in November 2006. The nature of the journal and the focus taken by the essays again puts much of this work outside, or at least on the very edge of, English studies. But it seems worth recording that the papers include: Zdravko Planinc, ‘Reading *The Merchant of Venice* through Adorno’ (25 paras); Arthur Horowitz, ‘Shylock after Auschwitz: *The Merchant of Venice* on the Post-Holocaust Stage—Subversion, Confrontation and Provocation’ (32 paras); Julia Reinhard Lupton, ‘Shylock between Exception and Emancipation: Shakespeare, Schmitt, Arendt’ (19 paras); Paul A. Kottman, ‘Avoiding Tragedy in *The Merchant of Venice*’ (47 paras); Ken Jackson, ‘Shylock: The Knight of Faith?’ (40 paras); Oona Eisenstadt, ‘Heart’s Blood: Derrida and Portia on Translation’ (24 paras); and a response to the symposium by J. Aaron Kunin (12 paras). Perhaps not surprisingly given the nature of the journal concerned, the issue of Shylock’s forced conversion provides a major focus for discussion in most of these essays.

A collection of essays entitled *The Law in Shakespeare*, edited by Constance Jordan and Karen Cunningham, inevitably yields a number of contributions relating to *The Merchant of Venice*. First up is Charles Ross’s ‘Avoiding the Issue of Fraud: 4, 5 Philip & Mary c.8 (the Heiress Protection Statute), Portia, and Desdemona’ (pp. 91–108). This explores the legal issue of ‘fraudulent conveyances’ in the period in relation to both *Merchant* and *Othello*, with a specific focus on the law surrounding ‘the conveyance of women’ and the statutes in place ‘against seducing women for their money’ (p. 92). In discussing *Merchant* from this perspective, Ross obviously focuses on the situation in Belmont and the Portia–Bassanio relationship. For Ross, ‘part of the problem of understanding Portia is finding the right frame of reference for her’. He offers the suggestion that at least part of the appropriate frame of reference lies in the play’s interest in ‘the ethics of and remedy for financial fraud’—for Portia, as Ross neatly puts it, ‘is always on the verge of fraud’ (p. 98). Examples include the possible manipulation of Bassanio’s choice of caskets through the song, quibbling over the meaning of the pound of flesh, threatening to give away Bassanio’s money and so on. Ross also tries to tease out the implications of what Portia could do with her money after Bassanio has chosen correctly, arguing that the law of the time might have given her more power over disposing of her own money than is often assumed, or than she chooses to use.

Thomas C. Bilello’s ‘Accomplished with What She Lacks: Law, Equity, and Portia’s Con’ (in Jordan and Cunningham, eds., pp. 109–26) offers a rather more negative reading of Portia’s character. According to Bilello, ‘by inserting

herself by artifice into the legal proceedings to enforce the bond, Portia converts the law into an instrumentality of her will', thereby managing to appropriate to her own ends 'the mechanisms of the court' (p. 110). Analysis of Portia's role is initially conducted through an exploration of 'the notion of equity as understood in sixteenth-century England' (p. 110). However, the subject of equity is found to be 'conspicuously absent' from the play (p. 114), replaced by an emphasis on mercy in the trial scene. Bilello goes through the process of attempting to locate the play's action, and specifically the trial sequence, in relation to the law of the period. But he is also sensitive to the fact that if legal equity is actually absent, 'it should be remembered that this play is more about a sublegal desire for revenge than about the legal process that constrains and controls that desire; the legal process merely acts to mediate the desire' (p. 120). Revenge is the motivation all round, with legal processes serving as a cover for this according to how they can be used. And this does not just apply in relation to Shylock. For Bilello, analysis suggests that 'Portia's bias reduces the Venetian court to a forum of revenge rather than law' (p. 124).

Finally in this group, and on this play, there is Luke Wilson's 'Drama and Marine Insurance in Shakespeare's London' (in Jordan and Cunningham, eds., pp. 127–42), one of the more unlikely essay titles one might expect to encounter, but a fascinating essay nonetheless. Wilson starts off by analysing Antonio's sadness at the beginning of the play, which is interpreted as 'the wrong affect'—he seems sad when he should be fearful over the fate of his ships (p. 128); or is he 'sad because he is not fearful'? (p. 129). One of Wilson's suggestions here is that Antonio does not properly understand risk. This leads into a discussion of questions relating to marine insurance, picking up on an earlier comment from Marc Shell [1982] wondering why Antonio has not insured his ships. Wilson offers one possible explanation for this with the argument that Antonio 'has no insurance because he is sad—because, that is, he is unable to understand risk except as something wholly unmanageable' (p. 129).

It is only a tentative suggestion, and Wilson is well aware that questions of marine insurance may simply be outside the play's frame of reference or interest (see p. 130). But he uses the idea that a lack of insurance is actually 'the enabling condition of the play' (p. 131) to justify pursuing the issue further. If Antonio had insurance, he would have no problem paying his bond (though if one wants to pursue verisimilitude to this level, one might suggest that delays in paying up on that insurance could still have led him into difficulties with Shylock). Much of the rest of the essay discusses the enabling conditions of different types of marine insurance, including an interest in the subject of 'the evaluation of risk in relation to the probability of reports', an issue crucial to the maritime insurance business and also a subject in which Shakespeare was very much interested, 'especially when it came to maritime adventures' (p. 135). This leads in turn to an interrogation of the final report about the safe arrival of Antonio's ships in harbour—why does this information come to Portia, is the report necessarily true given that earlier reports of their miscarrying were assumed to be true, how much does any of this register with an audience, is there 'the generic equivalent of an insurance

policy' (p. 136) going on? If nothing else, marine insurance and the theatre of the time are seen to come together in their need for 'a sophisticated appreciation of risk and probability' and a shared focus on the business of calculating 'the probability of human testimony' (p. 138).

Staying on the subject of law and in the same collection leads me on to *Much Ado About Nothing*. Cyndia Susan Clegg's 'Truth, Lies, and the Law of Slander in *Much Ado About Nothing*' (in Jordan and Cunningham, eds., pp. 167–88) sets out in part to explore 'the complex legal and social dimensions of slander and libel in late Elizabethan England that inform Shakespeare's play' (p. 167). Clegg starts by citing case examples and general practice from the period to illustrate aspects of that legal background, including its gender expectations and topical resonances, which she sees as informing the play's engagement with issues of slander and defamation. The play's demonstrable interest in exploring issues relating to 'slander and the law that seeks to contain it' leads her to the idea that *Much Ado* seems almost to have been 'conceived, like a legal fiction, as an imaginative construction designed to clarify legal principles' (p. 170). Even the characters are seen to share an interest in legality, with Clegg suggesting that Don John's 'defamation displays a subtle knowledge of slander's legal definition that nearly allows his scheme to succeed' (p. 170).

In pursuing this idea, Clegg turns first not to perhaps the most obvious area of the slander against Hero, but to 'the slander Don John directs at Claudio' (p. 171), arguing that this is conducted with legal precision. She emphasizes the extent to which Claudio, within this particular culture of male honour, is actually himself being slandered through the imputation of cuckoldry that is inherent in the accusations against Hero. In this respect, 'Claudio's actions become if not justifiable at least understandable' (p. 173). Clegg also draws attention to the nature of slander's relationship to the law, through the idea, as evidenced in the play, that 'slander works immediately to destroy the fabric of social relationships; legal remedies for slander take time' (p. 174). And there is no guarantee that law can do much to remedy the effects of slander: the evidence against Hero is clear-cut for those who want to believe it, and Leonato's assurance that Claudio and Don Pedro would not lie on such a matter points to the difficulties of remedying such an issue. The problem of slander, then, 'is not the lie alone, but the readiness with which hearers, based on their cultural and social perspectives, embrace lies' (p. 176). In a sense, by providing for a particular social contextualization for their behaviour, Clegg is seeking to excuse or palliate the condemnation modern audiences tend to feel towards Claudio and Don Pedro for their public exposure of Hero.

The discussion moves on to address the way 'the relationship between truth, lies, and slander' (p. 176) is also interrogated in the play's two 'subplots'. Clegg notes, for example, that Benedick expressly articulates a fear of being cuckolded, and Beatrice a fear of being accused of infidelity (see pp. 176–9). There is also interesting comment on the language of the play here, the way Dogberry's malapropisms, while deriving from almost the opposite linguistic impulse or character traits to Beatrice and Benedick's controlled war of wits, still produce a form of linguistic humour that 'requires a similar effort on the audience's part' (p. 178). In this respect, Dogberry offers a lesson in linguistic

competence to the audience, and the play ‘concerns itself less with mistaking words than with discerning their legitimate meaning’ (p. 179). What Dogberry and the Watch do not do, however, is offer any grounds for confidence in the law and institutionalized legal proceedings. Rather, the play is said to find greater hope for resolution in the ecclesiastical courts than in the temporal courts, and in doing this, to be intervening in contemporary debates on this issue. Thus resolution in the play comes initially through the Friar, to be reinforced through the penance and ritual of the tomb scene. In this respect, *Much Ado* is seen as offering an essentially conservative, backward-looking solution to slander, ‘that reaffirms both chivalric honor and the older, more traditional ecclesiastical jurisdiction as the appropriate venue for mitigating slander’s damage’ (p. 184).

Similar aspects of the play are addressed in Nancy E. Wright’s ‘Legal Interpretation of Defamation in Shakespeare’s *Much Ado About Nothing*’ (*BJJ* 13[2006] 93–108), an article carried over from last year. Wright’s premise is that ‘study of characters’ use of judicial genres, rules, and norms to interpret utterances explains how Don John *in absentia* is condemned as “the author of all”’ (p. 93). There is a strong overlap of theme here with Clegg’s essay, though the approach and focus actually end up quite different. What Wright particularly seeks to negotiate around is the dissatisfaction that modern audiences and critics tend to feel with ‘the exculpation of Claudio and Don Pedro’ (p. 95) that is one of the consequences of shifting all the blame on to Don John. Guilt of defamation is seen to depend upon intentions, and the Friar decides that the intentions of Don Pedro and Claudio were honourable, whereas those of Don John are not. In this play, ‘intentions, whether honorable or malicious, are known only by means of interpretation in both judicial and extrajudicial contexts’ (p. 96). This is seen precisely as a legal problem, with the play demonstrating that legal rules ‘cannot resolve alternative interpretations of an utterance or the speaker’s intention’ (p. 98). Wright cites various instances from the text to illustrate this, particularly the dialogue in III.ii between Margaret and Hero, with Margaret’s accusation that Hero has placed an ‘illegitimate construction’ upon her words. She also traces various references to slander throughout the dialogue, and indeed, pays rather closer attention to the textual fabric of the play than Clegg does, with some telling comment on Hero’s role in the deception of Beatrice, or on Antonio’s challenge to Don Pedro and Claudio.

Next, Hugh Macrae Richmond’s ‘The Two Sicilies: Ethnic Conflict in *Much Ado*’ (*ShN* 57[2007–8] 17–18), which draws attention to the historical background of the play (both the Sicilian Vespers and the career of Don John of Austria) and ‘Shakespeare’s awareness of the multi-ethnic nature of Sicilian history resulting from the island’s position as a meeting point of Mediterranean cultures and styles’. For Richmond, the early scenes set up an opposition between ‘the archaic chivalric values of Spain’ and ‘the skeptical views of ironic Italians’ (p. 17). Emphasizing the importance of the historical background and the play’s concerns with ethnic identity leads to an interpretation of *Much Ado About Nothing* as presenting a world where ‘the confrontation of two equally incomplete ethics’ creates the necessity for compromise ‘for mutual survival’ (p. 18). Richmond then touches on the

possible implications of such a reading for contemporary performance, for example in the context of modern California.

Moving on now to *As You Like It*, I am afraid I can find little of value in Wendell Berry's 'The Uses of Adversity' (*SR* 115:ii[2007] 211–38). For me, this essay highlights by default many of the virtues of the mainstream critical tradition and the conventions of academic writing, because coming in from the outside, as it were, Berry seems all at sea. There is an unfortunate amateurism at work here, illustrative of someone writing outside their own field, which in this case is not compensated for by any freshness of vision that might come from offering a new perspective. Knowledge of the recent critical tradition would prevent or challenge many of the comments made. Berry begins from the position that he has found it useful 'to think of *As You Like It* and *King Lear* as versions of the same archetypal story belonging to human experience both before and after the plays' (p. 211). And this opening gambit seems to carry some promise. Coming out of this, though, what we are offered is a straightforward progress through the action of each play, read through the light of Berry's own particular philosophies and with characters and actions judged and interpreted according to these standards. It doesn't help that most of the comments and arguments advanced are little more than trite. So we learn, for example, that 'by the play's end all of its principal characters have been changed, and for the better, by their time in the forest', and that 'Shakespeare saw, and wants us to see, that the forest can be corrective and restorative to disordered human life' (p. 223).

Much Ado About Nothing and *As You Like It* are brought together, along with *Twelfth Night*, in Carolin Biewer's 'The Semantics of Passion in Shakespeare's Comedies: An Interdisciplinary Study' (*ES* 88[2007] 506–21). Biewer's approach is to try to locate the contemporary Elizabethan 'semantic fields' and resonances for Shakespeare's language of passion in the comedies. This involves an extended discussion of the theory of humours and ideas relating to the location of passion within the body, and the vocabulary associated with these topics. Particular semantic fields discussed include 'passion, organs, eyes and humours', with examples cited as appropriate from the three plays concerned, in an approach that is said to give 'insight into how Shakespeare uses language to create different characters of lovers who represent three different types of love' (p. 520). In the end, though, interesting ideas and comment on individual sequences lead to some fairly dull conclusions, and again there is a sense of somebody writing outside the main critical tradition, in a way that is limiting rather than liberating. This outsider status is reflected, if nowhere else, in Biewer's use of the (surely now largely outmoded and certainly unhelpfully ambiguous) term 'late comedies' to describe the three plays on which she focuses.

Staying with general studies on the comedies leads me on to Loreen L. Giese's monograph, *Courtships, Marriage Customs, and Shakespeare's Comedies*, which though it carries a publication date of 2006 seems actually to have first appeared only early in 2007. Giese's title promises rather more than it delivers, because she actually focuses on only two of Shakespeare's comedies, *Twelfth Night* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. The basis of her study is her work on court depositions from the period, specifically cases

from the London Consistory Court relating to courtship and marriage customs. Giese presents a wealth of details from the records she has consulted, illuminating many aspects of courtship, marriage and sexual behaviour and conventions from the period, in ways that often work against what casual assumption might have taken to be the case. Her approach is to focus on different aspects of behaviour across different chapters, and then to use the second half of each chapter to relate the issues raised to the situations found in *Two Gentlemen* and *Twelfth Night*.

Individual chapters cover topics related to choosing a spouse, determining marital suitability, courting behaviour (including a consideration of talking, tokens and touching) and the making of contracts (covering issues such as vows, hand-holding and gift-giving). These four principal chapters are bookended by an introduction and postscript setting out the general situation, explaining the nature of the records consulted and how they have been used, and providing some brief concluding comments. Much of the work on the records themselves and the cases described is fascinating stuff, and Giese's attention to detail is very impressive in these sections. At times, her knowledge of the material she is dealing with can lead her to expect too much familiarity from her audience, as she has a habit of referring back to cases discussed earlier in the book with a casual ease which doesn't always help the reader to remember the case concerned. But this is a minor cavil. When it comes to the discussion of the two Shakespeare plays themselves, however, I must admit to finding the book a little disappointing. There is obviously material that can illuminate the plays here, but the application becomes repetitive after a while, and a wider focus, taking in more of the comedies, might have helped to ameliorate this. Much of the time, Giese is reduced to virtually formulaic contrasts—one play does this, the other does that, and so on. And her conclusions are often just bland, as in: 'the differences in the kinds of marriage arrangements that the plays under discussion exemplify suggest we cannot make any definitive statements regarding Shakespeare's portrayal of marital forms, apart from acknowledging the emphasis that seems to be placed on the reciprocal consent of individuals as the basis of marriage' (p. 157). Giese does have some interesting things to say about both *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *Twelfth Night*—with the latter, I particularly liked the focus on Olivia's role that comes out of the approach adopted—but her engagement with the historical records is much the more valuable part of her study.

Continuing with work on *Twelfth Night*, Laura Sarnelli's 'Staging the Space of Desire: A Queer Reading of *Twelfth Night*' (*Textus* 20[2007] 617–32) does live up to the expectations raised by its title. Sarnelli's is essentially a straightforward, albeit fairly derivative, reading of *Twelfth Night* as a play where 'homosocial and homoerotic relationships alternate in a dynamic interplay according to the contingent identifications characters take on' (p. 630). Sarnelli begins by providing an overview of the broad trends of feminism, gender criticism and queer theory in Shakespeare studies in recent years (i.e. the 1990s onwards), with a particular focus on cross-dressing. For me, the length of this section rather overbalances the rest of the essay, and Sarnelli is led at times into questionable generalizations about Renaissance thought, such as the idea that 'sexual behaviours were considered as acceptable

only insofar as they did not compromise patriarchal power-structures' (p. 619). The broad sweep of this idea may hang true, but expressed in these terms I would say it oversimplifies the situation rather. And it is against a background of certainty about what the period believed that Sarnelli is able to pursue the idea of how the theatre of the time, 'in both its literary and meta-dramatic dimension, becomes a powerful space of desire which resists and transgresses the contained, oppressive discourses of patriarchy and social norms' (p. 623).

Sarnelli moves from this background to the play itself through the argument that '*Twelfth Night* is the Shakespeare comedy that best illustrates the thematic and dramatic convention of the boy heroine in male disguise' (p. 623). Yet it is tempting to suggest that what she actually means is that *Twelfth Night* is the play where the treatment of the disguised heroine best lends itself to her particular concerns. Which is not necessarily the same thing at all. A similar tone of definitiveness mars other elements of the essay for me. Certain standard emphases of gender-based approaches to this play recur here—reading Antonio as displaying an 'exclusive homoerotic attraction to Sebastian' (p. 625), making great play out of the fact that Viola is still dressed in male attire at the end. But they are taken as givens, applied with a lack of subtlety. So while the readings put forward are entirely plausible and can be made to signify in all sorts of interesting ways, they are not the only readings available, and a greater sensitivity to the possibilities of interpretation would have helped. Without this, the essay becomes in the end, for me, very much reading by numbers.

Working in a similar area is Nancy Lindheim's 'Rethinking Sexuality and Class in *Twelfth Night*' (*UTQ* 76[2007] 679–713). In general, I much preferred Lindheim's article to Sarnelli's, and this essay, though in the end it probably fails to live up to its initial promise, does cover some of the areas that are missing from Sarnelli's approach. Lindheim sets out to explore the ways in which 'Shakespeare's calculations in *Twelfth Night* are geared throughout towards the formal need for a comic ending plausible enough to be satisfying, yet still sensitive to the erotic and social problems his fable creates'. And she specifically sets out to interrogate some of the recent orthodoxies behind many of the recent gender-based studies of this play, but to what I would see as at least initially positive ends. In Lindheim's words, 'although my argument tactically sets itself against certain critical positions for purposes of clarity, its aim is a more inclusive understanding of the play' (p. 679).

Lindheim starts with the final scene, and seeks to set out the elements in this that work towards satisfactory generic closure, emphasizing for example the similarities Shakespeare creates between Sebastian and Viola, even down to their parallel modes of speaking, which render more plausible the love between Sebastian and Olivia. There is also good analysis of the Antonio–Sebastian relationship here, its potential erotic dimensions and its potential non-erotic dimensions. In Lindheim's words, '*Twelfth Night* gives strong, sympathetic expression to Antonio's passion—especially when he feels that it has been abused—without necessarily sexualizing it' (p. 691); and as she also notes, at the end, 'Antonio need not be desolate and is certainly not excluded from the feast' (p. 693). Similarly, Antonio's silence after his reconciliation need not

be significant—I liked Lindheim’s suggested comparison here of Antonio’s silence to that of Florizel after V.i in *The Winter’s Tale*. Similarly, Lindheim seeks to emphasize that the dominant audience experience in the period in relation to the boy player was to accept ‘women characters as female’ (p. 695), suggesting that the claim that the presence of the boy-player beneath the female character is always a factor in the dramatic action is a distortion of that dominant experience. Thus the fact that Viola is still dressed as Cesario at the end of the play need not be a ‘sexual issue’ (p. 694); indeed, as Lindheim points out, it has a dramaturgical explanation deriving from the action relating to Antonio and Malvolio.

The tone of Lindheim’s approach, then, is to question just how much certain elements in the play, now almost conventionally read as ‘disturbing’, really work to compromise the generic movement to a happy ending. She extends this to discussing two elements more related to class issues than gender issues, ‘Malvolio’s angry refusal of a comic resolution, and the marriage between Maria and Sir Toby’ (p. 696). The argument questions the extent to which the subplot characters can be thought of as ‘lower class’, given the ‘claim to gentility’ of most of them (p. 698). Malvolio emerges from this reading as a carefully delineated character, who does not conform to any of the obvious types—servant, Puritan, social upstart—that seem to circulate round him. He is also seen to be obviously balanced against Sir Toby, in a reading which highlights the unsavoury aspects of the latter’s character and teases out a possible path to reformation. Lindheim also questions readings of Maria that interpret her marriage as ‘a triumph of the scheming female underclass’ (p. 704). In the end, the argument, or the presentation of the argument, goes much too far in the other direction. Lindheim’s initial claim to be setting herself against certain positions for tactical reasons seems to disappear, so that what we are actually given comes close to being an old-fashioned straightforward reading of *Twelfth Night* as a comedy with no problematic elements in it at all. Where Lindheim is questioning the way certain ‘new’ readings of the play have established themselves as orthodoxies, I find her work a valuable corrective; but when it can seem that she is essentially looking to debunk or ‘contain’ such new readings, that becomes much more problematic.

Finally on this play, we have Gabriel Josipovici’s ‘The Opinion of Pythagoras’ (in Poole and Scholar, eds., *Thinking with Shakespeare: Comparative and Interdisciplinary Essays for A.D. Nuttall*, pp. 23–32). Josipovici’s essay sites itself as part of an old philosophical debate, pursuing the idea that works of art can help bridge the gap between life and thought, ‘and so help us in our philosophical task of understanding ourselves and the world’. *Twelfth Night* again emerges here as an exemplary text in the Shakespeare canon, ‘the play that shows up, perhaps more so than any other he wrote, the difficulty discursive thought has when faced with a work of art’ (p. 23). The difficulties lie not in our immediate response to the play, but in how we try to make sense of the experience after the event. Much is made of Shakespeare’s transformation of his sources, his ability to create protean characters, or to shift into another gear. And there are recurrent comparisons of Shakespeare to Mozart that are obviously meant to be meaningful but

really just serve to obscure. Occasional passages spark interest, such as the comparison of the sequence of dialogue that furnishes Josipovici's title to a moment from the world of Ionesco or Pinter. But the essay does little to justify its own premise, because in the end it has little to say about the vision the play offers beyond superficialities or obscure images, such as the comparison of Feste's closing song to a firework that 'rises up into the sky and then spreads, as it falls, over the whole of the play we have just experienced'. In the end, what this work of art can apparently contribute to philosophy is the ability to make us realize 'the possibilities of human life, more fully and with more intensity than ever before or after' (p. 31).

I turn back now to the other play discussed in Giese's monograph, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and, first of all, Stephen Guy-Bray's 'Shakespeare and the Invention of the Heterosexual' (*EMLS* 13:ii[2007] 28 paras). This opens with the statement that 'the currently conventional view of heterosexuality typically presents it as the happy ending of a narrative beginning with an infant's attachment to his or her mother and progressing from close attachments to members of the same sex to a single attachment to a member of the opposite sex' (para. 1). Some framework would have been helpful here to indicate where this currently conventional view is coming from, and which particular discourse or whose particular attitudes Guy-Bray is invoking—it's not exactly a dictionary definition that he's presenting. This description of the heterosexual norm is then contrasted to the situation in the Renaissance, presented as a culture where male–male friendships/bonds were regarded as those of full maturity, and where effectively 'homosociality' was 'more important than married love' (para. 2). Guy-Bray sets out to challenge what he sees as the typical view that Shakespeare's plays support 'a view of mixed-sex affection as the most important affective bond in a person's life', with *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* invoked as a play that 'makes such an interpretation problematic' and that 'presents heterosexuality as something that is made up, rather than as something that is an essence or as something that the characters naturally do' (para. 5). Issues given prominence in the course of the argument are the idea of sexuality as a form of performance, of heterosexuality as a kind of prosthesis, and a view of character and selfhood as something that is always in process. Attention is also given to the prominence of letters and the theme of substitution within the play. The overall conclusion is that 'Shakespeare's achievement in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* is to produce a narrative in which same-sex and mixed-sex relationships can co-exist' (para. 28).

Next an article that seeks to call into question the very name by which we know this play. David M. Bergeron's 'Wherefore Verona in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*?' (*CompD* 42[2007–8] 423–38) takes Shakespeare's titles in general, particularly the titles of the comedies, as the basis for an argument that this play 'has an inappropriate title, based on a faulty location' (p. 423). I say Shakespeare's titles, but as Bergeron comments, 'if we think about the matter, we have to admit that we do not know where the plays' titles come from' (p. 423). Yet Bergeron is surely on a hiding to nothing when he attempts to suggest that Francis Meres's mention of Shakespeare's '*Gentlemen of Verona*' in his *Palladis Tamia* [1598] is not actually a reference to the play we now know as *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. The suggestion is made, perhaps

not entirely seriously, that Meres is actually referring to *The Taming of the Shrew*, not otherwise included in his list of Shakespeare's plays.

Of course, there is a well-known problem with location in *Two Gentlemen*, and Bergeron pursues all the evidence relating to this, not just the few (and occasionally problematic) references to Verona within the dialogue, but also, perhaps most interestingly, moments where Verona is not named in the dialogue when one might expect it to be. This leads to some interesting comments on the role of 'home' in the play, but the main conclusion drawn from such moments is that Shakespeare had not actually decided where Valentine and Proteus were from at the time of writing. In this respect, '*The Two Gentlemen of Verona* is the story of a playwright who has not made up his mind' (p. 436). Yet Bergeron himself seems to struggle to make up his own mind about what his actual theory is here. He has apparently dropped the *Shrew-as-Two-Gentlemen* argument entirely when he writes, with a logic that escapes me, 'I think that Shakespeare included Verona in the title because he had not yet decided what to call the city from which the characters move.' In the end, the essay seems to come down to the fact that Bergeron just doesn't like the Folio title, and would prefer something like '*The Two Gentlemen FROM Verona*' (p. 436). Any possible reason for challenging the Folio title is invoked, even where those reasons are mutually incompatible.

From a challenge to conventional naming to a challenge to conventional dating. John Peachman's 'Why a Dog? A Late Date for *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*' (*N&Q* 54[2007] 265–72) claims that the date of this play 'is one of the most uncertain in the canon' (p. 265). This is something of an exaggeration given that, *pace* Bergeron, a clear *terminus ad quem* is established by Meres's reference to the play in 1598, whereas of course other plays (*All's Well*, *Timon of Athens*) offer no external evidence at all for dating before their appearance in the First Folio. Peachman, obviously aware of Meres's comments, seeks to place *Two Gentlemen* around 1597, and therefore make it not anticipatory of works such as *Romeo and Juliet* or *The Merchant of Venice*, but borrowing from them. The theory turns on reviving an old argument about the influence of Thomas Nashe's *Have with You to Saffron-Walden* on Shakespeare's play, particularly on its names. The key point here is that Nashe's work was first printed in 1596, though the possibility (mentioned by William C. Carroll in his Arden3 edition [2004], p. 128) that it might have circulated earlier in manuscript is not considered by Peachman.

Another note provides the only contribution on *Love's Labour's Lost* to have come my way this year (I have not seen Juliet Dusinberre's '*Love's Labour's Lost* and the Pursuit of Fame' (*ShStud* 45[2007] 1–25)). Gillian Woods's 'The Contexts of *The Trial of Chivalry*' (*N&Q* 54[2007] 313–18) is largely a discussion of this anonymous dramatic romance, printed in 1605, but gains a place here through the connections it seeks to draw between this play and *Love's Labour's Lost*. The comparison is based not so much on the idea of a direct or conscious influence (though Woods seems to want to keep this option open), but more on the notion of the 'timeliness' of their connections. In terms of Shakespeare's play, Woods picks up in particular on the potential topical relevance of the names of the male characters, especially that of Navarre, a name that also figures in *The Trial of Chivalry*. Woods places the

date of *The Trial of Chivalry* in the late 1590s, and pursues some tenuous connections between this date and the first printing of *Love's Labour's Lost*, as well as between the publication of *The Trial of Chivalry* and the recorded performance of *Love's Labour's Lost* at court in 1604–5. Rather more interesting is the exploration of the potential historical ‘timeliness’ of both plays in relation to French politics and English topical interest in French affairs.

Staying with the early comedies, we come next to *The Comedy of Errors*, and Kent Cartwright’s ‘Language, Magic, the Dromios, and *The Comedy of Errors*’ (SEL 47[2007] 331–54). This is another article interested in aspects of experience beyond the rational, which argues specifically that ‘words and thoughts in *The Comedy of Errors* unexpectedly acquire a certain magical agency and that the magical and the fantastical also acquire a certain potential for truth’ (p. 331). Cartwright obviously has a firm textual basis to work from here with the various references to magical experience made during the course of the action and the appearance of Doctor Pinch. Against this background, he focuses particularly on three aspects of magic, ‘sympathy, language, and possession’ (p. 332). Ideas of demonic possession, sympathy of experience, the way language seems to take on a magical life of its own as words and images ‘migrate and double’ (p. 334), are all pursued across the different strands of the action. Cartwright also seeks to draw a correspondence between the realm of magic and ideas of *copia* and amplification, as reflected in particular in images of doubling, clowning, festive misrule and linguistic exuberance.

While the principal focus for the discussion becomes the Dromio twins, the way in which words seem to move between characters and get picked up on again from earlier scenes is explored across the whole cast. Cartwright is sensitive to the fact that he could just be picking up on a standard Shakespearian technique of verbal reiteration here, but the way he connects that technique to the thematic relevance of magic is totally plausible. And his work here is a reminder of the richness of the verbal texture of this play that is so often dismissed as *just* a farce. In the end, it is the Dromios that best exemplify the elements of the play that Cartwright is seeking to emphasize, for they ‘evinced the wildest imaginations’, ‘enlarge the imaginative dimension of the play’ (p. 345) and respond to events through ‘two seemingly contradictory mentalities: realism and fantasticality’ (p. 344). Enchantment for the Dromios breeds ‘the unexpected correlative of excitement, intensity, and vividness, a new immediacy of experience that might be taken as a value in its own right’ (p. 346). In this respect, they come to symbolize the recuperative energies of farce, for which they are ‘the prime agents’ (p. 348) in *The Comedy of Errors*.

Also covering this play is Marissa Greenberg’s essay, ‘Crossing from Scaffold to Stage: Execution Processions and Generic Conventions in *The Comedy of Errors* and *Measure for Measure*’ (in Cohen, ed., *Shakespeare and Historical Formalism*, pp. 127–45). This picks up on issues relating to the correlation ‘between theatrical representations and their real-world counterparts’ (p. 127), as Greenberg tries to ‘formulate a response to the question of the theater’s distinctiveness by focusing on the interaction of generic and punitive forms—specifically, on what happens when Shakespeare’s comedies represent execution processions’ (pp. 127–8). Greenberg is concerned with the

nature of forms, the familiarity they create, and what happens when that familiarity is reproduced on stage. *Measure for Measure* is given the more extended treatment, in a section of the essay that falls outside my remit. The discussion of *The Comedy of Errors* inevitably focuses primarily on the frame-story, with the opening entry of the play read specifically as 'an execution procession' (p. 132). I.i is seen to present 'juridical sentences in conjunction with generic clues' (p. 133), so that an expectation of extenuation is created. This process is paralleled in the final scene, where repeated delays to the execution procession 'signal and draw out the shift from deferral to pardon' (p. 134), and theatrical and generic momentum takes over to sweep aside the power of the law.

Helga Ramsey-Kurz's 'Rising Above the Bait: Kate's Transformation from Bear to Falcon' (*ES* 88[2007] 262–81) begins its discussion of *The Taming of the Shrew*, like so many other essays, with Katherine's 'obedience speech' (p. 262), emphasizing its potential for ambiguity and irony. Ramsey-Kurz is concerned particularly with the idea of taming as a form of performance, 'a performance undertaken to coerce further performance' (p. 263). And she seeks to distinguish between different forms of taming, contrasting the more 'gentle' approach required in taming falcons, for example, with the more extreme or cruel methods required for the kind of 'animal subjection underlying the wild-beast shows which formed an integral part of [the] Elizabethan entertainment industry' (p. 263). Ramsey-Kurz writes well on the play's interest in performativity and its various uses of disguise and show. I also like the idea that Petruchio's appearance alters Kate's dramatic status, changing her from an obstruction to the marriage plot to 'the cardinal cause of every subsequent major action' (p. 272). Kate's progress through the action becomes one of learning that she is performing in a play in which Petruchio belongs to the same cast, and this collaborative, learning process is felt to elevate her 'taming' from its more brutal, more beastly associations. Their relationship is ultimately imaged, positively within the context of the essay, in the 'bond between falconer and falcon'. Productions and readings that emphasize Petruchio's brutality in his taming methods 'routinely ignore that the manning methods applied in falconry were devised in the interest of the bird, to reduce the stress of captivity, protect the raptor from self-injury, and, most importantly, to preserve its predatory instincts' (p. 278). I doubt I am the only one who would find in this description images of captivity and exploitation that are far more disturbing when applied to women than to falcons. I would also note that the essay is slightly marred by inaccuracies in citing critics' names ('Jeane Howard' (p. 265) and 'Jeane Addison Roberts' (p. 279) both make an appearance).

Still on *Shrew*, Patricia Parker's 'Construing Gender: Mastering Bianca in *The Taming of the Shrew*' (in Callaghan, ed., *The Impact of Feminism in English Renaissance Studies*, pp. 193–209) concerns itself with the role of Bianca rather than that of Katherine. Parker's principal focus is the scene between Bianca and the disguised Lucentio and Hortensio in III.i; the use of the phrase 'preposterous ass' in this scene will strike immediate resonances with anyone familiar with Parker's earlier work, and the ramifications of this phrase are certainly explored. But Parker is also concerned with the rivalry of

the arts (*ars*) that is being evoked at this point, suggesting that the way ‘the proper ordering of rival arts appears to be the subject of the debate in this scene is consistent with the emphasis on arts and learning that pervades *The Taming of the Shrew*’, an emphasis, as Parker notes, that has often been submerged under a reading of the play as ‘simply an early Shakespearean farce’ (p. 194). Tracing the background to this sequence, including contemporary theories of music and teaching, and noting its echoes of the ceremony of matrimony, provides Parker with a way of teasing out important thematic significances present in this part of the action. In a scene where Bianca starts to emerge more fully as a rounded dramatic character, gender structures are overturned as she becomes ‘not a submissive female but director of both masters’ (p. 200).

This overturning is played out very precisely through the pedagogical sequence of the mock-construal of lines from Ovid’s *Heroides*, where Bianca offers her own construing that redefines the terms of the pedagogical situation and deliberately eschews a subordinate position within the dialogue. The final section of the paper pursues the ‘intertextual markers’ (p. 202) that have frequently gone unnoticed in this section, even by feminist critics (a point Parker rather unnecessarily repeats a couple of times). Parker pursues in detail the implications of the citation from Ovid, the fact that the text from which this comes is ‘Penelope’s anything but submissive or silent complaint against her own husband and master for taking so long to return home’ (p. 203). She also notes the presence of the *Metamorphoses* behind the dialogue that follows on from the construing of the quoted Ovidian text, arguing that Bianca again comes out best from this exchange with her ‘master’. For Parker then, this scene is a key moment in the characterization and presentation of the younger sister, as we already see her emerging here as a ‘much less tractable figure’ than the ‘wifely ideal’ she is initially perceived to be by her various suitors (pp. 205–6).

Patricia Parker’s work in general provides a link that leads me on to the final play in my group, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and Will Stockton’s article, avowedly influenced by Parker’s work on this play and elsewhere, ‘“I am made an ass”: Falstaff and the Scatology of Windsor’s Polity’ (*TSL* 49[2007] 340–60). Stockton takes exploration of the bodily and scatological punning of this text to new lengths (or perhaps that should be new depths!). And, as his work clearly shows, the many different strands of puns and the acts of humiliation that run throughout this play all interlink in a wide network of associations and signifying chains. Stockton’s principal focus is on the ramifications of the word ‘ass’ and its various applications, and the process by which Falstaff ends up as the butt of everyone’s joke, the ultimate ‘ass’. As always in discussions that seek to pull out hidden meanings, the occasional suggestion of a buried pun can seem to go a little too far down the path of implausibility, but at the same time the sheer linguistic richness and exuberance of this play, demonstrated time and again through Stockton’s careful analysis, can indeed give the impression that anything goes.

Stockton’s work is not just an exploration of linguistic exuberance and excess. These themes are also very much related to issues of class, social cohesion, scapegoating, national differences, gender and so on, as part of

a general process of exploring the nature of the Windsor community that Shakespeare creates. In this respect, his essay has some similarities to Michael Steppat's 'In Mercury's Household: *The Merry Wives of Windsor*' (*CahiersE* 72[2007] 9–19), though whereas the density of Stockton's prose generally serves the purposes of his argument, Steppat's writing style (and the length of some of his paragraphs) seems to me too often to obscure what he is trying to say. Steppat's primary concerns relate to issues of property and the domestic, and what he sees as a theatrical interrogation of 'a middle-class obsession with matters of ownership' (p. 9), in contrast to the celebration of middle-class values he feels earlier critics have tended to find in the play. He also discusses in some detail aspects of the overlap between property and desire in the *Merry Wives*, finding a locus for this theme in the Latin language scene, amongst other places. In the end, though, Steppat almost seems to resist the seriousness of his own approach, suggesting disappointingly for me that perhaps one should not try to read too much into the 'playful mood' (p. 14) of *Merry Wives*, and not look for it to be 'overly profound' (p. 17).

Finally this year we have Timothy Billings's 'Masculine in Case: Latin and the Construction of Gender in *Hic Mulier* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*' (in Huang, Wang and Theis, eds., *Class, Boundary and Social Discourse in the Renaissance*, pp. 63–86). This begins by discussing Walter Ong's famous 1959 article on Latin pedagogy, using this to lead into a discussion of the language lesson in *Merry Wives* as 'based on a logic of exclusion that would have affected audience members who had not been "initiated" into the male community of grammar school' (p. 65). From here, Billings goes on to discuss in rather more detail *Hic Mulier* and *Haec Vir*, in sections of the essay that I shall not review. Much of what Billings has to say about the Latin lesson in *Merry Wives* is familiar from other treatments, notably the work of Elizabeth Pittenger and (again) Patricia Parker. And he also is touching on areas covered by Stockton and Steppat. What perhaps most characterizes Billings's approach to the language scene is an emphasis on the sense of exclusion that it creates, as reflected in his suggestion that while no knowledge of Latin is required to appreciate the bawdy humour of the scene, knowledge of the Latin meanings can allow a sense of superiority for those who have it over those without such privileged access. In this respect, the scene would function to interpellate the initiated spectator into a position of superiority to all four characters on stage (see pp. 69–70). The final dimension of the sequence that Billings seeks to emphasize is its transvestism (even to the extent of claiming that 'Evans as an actor' is in 'effeminating Welsh drag' (p. 72)), and the various gender issues and sexual anxieties this can set off or put into play. And Billings is adamant, to bring me back finally to a recurring issue in this year's work, that this 'sexualization of the scene' is not something that can 'simply be dismissed as conventionally irrelevant' (p. 73).

(c) Problem Plays

The only book-length study of the problem plays this year was Ira Clark's *Rhetorical Readings, Dark Comedies and Shakespeare's Problem Plays*.

This work is an example of an emerging critical trend in literary studies which has been labelled 'historical formalism' and attempts to combine consideration of form and genre with historicist criticism. Although Clark does not use this label himself, his introductory comments indicate this critical affiliation: 'In pursuit of the potential contribution to the study of literature and culture that understanding the forms of figures and stylistic traits might make, I take comfort in a recent resurgence of rather formal analyses of literature that make use of the many gains of historicist projects of the last quarter century' (pp. 2–3). This critical position is reflected in the book's organization, as it begins with a chapter which considers the problem plays and their stylistic features in the context of other contemporary examples of comedy, while surveying the critical history which has attempted to account for the particular qualities of Shakespeare's late comedies. The chapters on each of the plays focus on a specific rhetorical device, including chiasmus in *Measure for Measure*, aphorism in *All's Well That Ends Well* and wit and reflexivity in *Troilus and Cressida*.

This year the play which received the most attention individually was *All's Well That Ends Well*, having been the subject of four essays. Three of the four essays examine questions about female agency in the play from a number of different critical perspectives. The first of these is Kathryn M. Moncrief's "'Show me a child begotten of thy body that I am father to': Pregnancy, Paternity and the Problem of Evidence in *All's Well That Ends Well*' (in Moncrief and McPherson, eds., pp. 29–43). This fascinating collection focuses on the cultural representation of maternity between 1540 and 1690, and Moncrief reads Helen's presentation of her pregnant body against contemporary guides to midwifery and gynaecological manuals. The overriding attitude expressed towards pregnancy in these manuals is one of uncertainty and that both the body and the pregnant woman herself are unreliable sources of information regarding the pregnancy or the paternity of the child. Moncrief argues that Bertram's scepticism towards Helena and her claim that he is the father of her child, rather than simply characterizing Bertram as an unfeeling cad reflects a cautious, even prudent, attitude, in the light of the problematic evidence he is presented with. Moncrief concludes that Helena's pregnancy should signal uncertainty rather than point to Bertram's reformation and closure: 'When viewed through the lens of pregnancy and its ambiguities, the neat conclusion upon which the title of the play depends remains elusive—the promised happy ending that Helena and the audience desire still to be delivered' (p. 43). The second essay "'One that's dead is quick": Virgin Re-birth in *All's Well That Ends Well*' is to be found in another important edited collection, Buccola and Hopkins, eds., *Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama* (pp. 35–46). Here Alison Findlay considers the play's Marian allusions, specifically the role of Helena as mediatrix and the roles of the Countess and the widow as intercessors, to argue that 'moments which celebrate virginity and maternity can be read as a secular refashioning of the cult of relics, images, and rituals in which Mary had assumed a tangible authority of her own in the lives of Christians' (p. 37). Meanwhile, in "'My intents are fix'd": Constant Will in *All's Well That Ends Well*' (*SQ* 58[2007] 200–27), Katherine Schwartz returns to an aspect of the play which continues

to exercise critics: Helena's pursuit of Bertram. Schwartz argues that it is Helena's quality of devotion or constancy to Bertram that strains the limits of both genre and gender since it is not merely a passive virtue 'Constancy intervenes into masculine homosocial privilege in a way at once vital and unsettling, its guarantees securing a hierarchy that they expose as a structure of need. Aggressively directed to an admirable end, Helena's unruly virtue reveals a patriarchal ideology both functional and contingent, its efficacy as practice articulated through women's work and will' (p. 201).

The final essay which deals exclusively with *All's Well* is Maurice Hunt's article "'O Lord Sir!'" in *All's Well That Ends Well* (*ES* 88[2007] 143–8), which examines the editorial gloss for Lavatch's phrase 'O Lord Sir!' deployed by the Clown in a series of exchanges with the Countess in Act II, scene ii, as he demonstrates 'an answer [that] will serve all men'. Hunt explains that the phrase 'O Lord Sir!' had a specific stage history, having been employed by Ben Jonson in *Every Man Out of His Humour*. In Jonson's play the phrase 'identifies a courtier simpleton, a fool for whom the phrase becomes a knee jerk response covering ignorance' (p. 145). Hunt reads Shakespeare's use of the phrase in *All's Well* in the wider context of Jonson's attacks upon Shakespeare in *Every Man*, to suggest that in the problem play Shakespeare capitalizes upon Jonson's use of the phrase and that its inclusion provides Shakespeare with 'another opportunity for transcending the limits of Jonsonian satire' (p. 146). This point is demonstrated by examination of the way the phrase is subsequently given to Parolles when sentenced to death for his treachery, 'who unintentionally reclaims the significance of a virtually meaningless faddish utterance, informing it with its original prayerful meaning' (pp. 146–7).

Martha Widmayer's essay "'To sin in loving virtue": Angelo of *Measure for Measure*' (*TSL* 49:ii[2007] 155–80) reads Shakespeare's characterization of the play's precise deputy against the details of a specific lawsuit found in the Essex Records Office in 1578. The Records Office outlines a dispute between two justices of the peace, Lord Morley and Mr Leventhorpe. Morley had intervened on behalf of his tenant, a man called Smith who had fathered a child by Morley's maidservant. The woman had been sent away to a village which came under Leventhorpe's jurisdiction, but she had been returned to Morley since the villagers refused to support the woman and her child. Morley used a warrant to send the woman back again to the village of Ashwell, but here Leventhorpe intervened, refusing to honour Morley's warrant and in effect forcing Morley and Smith to support the maidservant. Widmayer uses this legal dispute to frame her discussion of Angelo, whose behaviour she argues 'bears a striking resemblance to godly magistrates like Leventhorpe' (p. 156). A second essay on *Measure* by Marissa Greenburg also begins by considering the play's depiction of the law and the punitive measures it performs. 'Crossing from Scaffold to Stage: Execution Processions and Generic Conventions in *The Comedy of Errors* and *Measure for Measure*' (in Cohen, ed., pp. 127–45) considers two plays which both begin with a condemned character crossing over the stage and conclude with the thwarting of the death sentence. The comparison between *Errors*, as an early comedy, and *Measure*, a later 'dark comedy', permits discussion of the ways in which

each of the plays introduces and subverts the audience's punitive and generic expectations.

There were two notes on *Measure for Measure* this year. In 'Measure for Measure III.i.93, 96: Prenzie' (*N&Q* 54[2007] 292) David Lisle Crane offers a solution to the crux in this scene by suggesting that the word 'Prenzie' is in fact a misreading by the compositor of the secretary hand with the flourish used to denote the 'P' in fact a 'u'; he argues that consequently it is possible to read 'Prenzie' as 'Upright'. In the second note (*N&Q* 54[2007] 292–3) 'Isabella, Marina, and Saint Ursula' Andrew Hadfield considers the story of St Ursula found in Jacobus de Voraigne's *Golden Legend* [c.1260] as a possible source for Isabella in *Measure for Measure*, and accounts for her depiction as a novice in the play. Hadfield also suggests that stories about the saint may have influenced the brothel scenes in *Pericles*.

The only work dealing exclusively with *Troilus and Cressida* can be found in *The Whirligig of Time: Essays on Shakespeare and Czechoslovakia* by the Czech Shakespearian scholar Zdeněk Stříbrný. The essay, 'Time in *Troilus and Cressida*', was first published in 1976 and together with essays on the history plays and *The Winter's Tale* explores the concept of 'double time', the different speeds at which simultaneous dramatic events take place. In the problem play Stříbrný examines the ways in which Shakespeare complicates the relationship between the love story and account of the Trojan War through the time-frames he employs. The collection provides fascinating insights into life in Czechoslovakia under the Russian regime and the way it shaped Shakespeare's place in that society.

(d) Poems

Two major publications on Shakespeare's sonnets (an essay collection and a single-authored volume) and one on Shakespeare's poetry in general were published in 2007: *A Companion to Shakespeare's Sonnets*, edited by Michael Schoenfeldt; Dymphna Callaghan's *Shakespeare's Sonnets*; and *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's Poetry*, edited by Patrick Cheney. The first of these, *A Companion to Shakespeare's Sonnets*, is divided into nine sections. Each section contains between two and four essays by leading scholars in their chosen subjects. They vary from original readings to provocative surveys of a particular field of scholarship. The volume serves as an authoritative first port of call for students of Shakespeare's sonnets. Without discussing every one of the twenty-five essays, what follows will give an indication of the importance of this collection. The first section, entitled 'Sonnet Form and Sonnet Sequence', contains two essays that have been published previously (an excerpt from *An Essay on Shakespeare's Sonnets* [1969] by Stephen Booth and another from *The Art of Shakespeare's Sonnets* [1997] by Helen Vendler) and two essays composed specifically for this volume. James Schiffer's contribution, 'The Incomplete Narrative of Shakespeare's Sonnets' (pp. 45–56), assumes, for the purposes of his essay, that the sonnets were shaped into a collection and that the narrative structure is as the author intended. He then addresses the following question, based on A.C. Bradley's

assessment of the poems (*Oxford Lectures on Poetry* [1909]), ‘why did Shakespeare present in the sonnets’ “final form” the story of and behind these poems . . . in an “obscure,” at times “unintelligible,” inconsistent, incomplete, unsatisfying . . . way?’ This ‘anti-narrativity’, as Schiffer terms it, might have been the result of one of several literary motivations, all of which are discussed: ‘dramatic effect’, ‘voyeuristic pleasure’, ‘pleasures of detection and invention’, ‘replication’ and ‘deflection’. The other essay in this section, Margreta de Grazia’s ‘Revolution in *Shake-speares Sonnets*’ (pp. 57–69), reads the 1609 quarto containing the sonnets and *A Lover’s Complaint* according to the putative tripartite structure which separates Sonnets 153 and 154 from the previous 152 on the basis of their peculiarly epigrammatic character. According to de Grazia, the 152 sonnets, the epigrammatic pair and the *Complaint* all ‘rehearse programs of return’. The sonnets are ‘stuck in the cycle of hating-after-loving and loving-after-hating’; the epigrams are locked in a round of ‘rekindling-after-quenching and quenching-after-rekindling’; and the *Complaint* cannot escape from ‘perversion-after-reconciliation and reconciliation-after-perversion’. The second section, entitled ‘Shakespeare and his Predecessors’, contains three essays. Richard Strier’s essay, ‘The Refusal to be Judged in Petrarch and Shakespeare’ (pp. 73–89), highlights significant dissimilarities between Petrarch and Shakespeare in terms of their poetic representation of the relationship between the physical and spiritual. Nevertheless, Strier’s main contribution to this area of scholarly debate is in his elucidation of the ‘continuity between Petrarch’s sonnets and some of Shakespeare’s’ on such issues. Heather Dubrow’s essay from the same section, “‘Dressing old words new’? Re-evaluating the “Delian Structure”” (pp. 90–103), turns, like de Grazia, to the tradition (nominally associated with Samuel Daniel’s collection, *Delia*) of the tripartite structure: a sonnet sequence followed by a short poem, often in tetrameters, followed by a longer poem, often a complaint. Dymna Callaghan (‘Confounded by Winter: Speeding Time in Shakespeare’s Sonnets’, pp. 104–18) addresses Shakespeare’s ‘accelerated sonnet temporality’ and notes that, again relative to Petrarch, he brings a new contemporariness to the previously timeless lyric. Part III, entitled ‘Editorial Theory and Biographical Inquiry: Editing the Sonnets’, contains Stephen Orgel’s piece, previously published in the *London Review of Books* [8 August 2002], ‘Mr. Who He?’ (pp. 137–44), as well as new essays by Richard Dutton (‘*Shake-speares Sonnets*, Shakespeare’s Sonnets, and Shakespearean Biography’, pp. 121–36), Colin Burrow (‘Editing the Sonnets’, pp. 145–62) and Lars Engle (‘William Empson and the Sonnets’, pp. 163–82). Dutton surveys recent changes (from the 1970s onwards) in the mutual relationship between biographical and literary-critical responses to Shakespeare’s sonnets, ending with a brief assessment of the consequences for our view of Shakespeare’s ‘life’ of Patrick Cheney’s work (*Shakespeare, National Poet-Playwright* [2004]) on what may be more narrowly termed his ‘literary career’. Burrow’s essay is similarly constructed as a survey of his chosen topic over time, culminating with a cautionary passage subtitled, ‘A Very Woe: Editing the Sonnets Today’. Burrow would prefer that editors ‘regard themselves as part of a conversation about a text that will continue after they are dead’ rather than anything more definitive. Engle charts the relationships between William Empson’s readings

of the sonnets and those of Laura Riding, Robert Graves, Stephen Booth and Helen Vendler, before reflecting, like Dutton, on the area of 'speculative biography'. There are two essays, by Arthur F. Marotti and Marcy L. North, in a section headed 'The Sonnets in Manuscript and Print' (pp. 183–222). Part V, 'Models of Desire in the Sonnets' (pp. 223–90), includes four essays, written by Douglas Trevor, Bradin Cormack, Rayna Kalas and Jyotsna G. Singh, that touch on the anti-Platonic nature of the sonnets, offer a reading of their Latinity based on Colin Burrow's reading of the Latinate vocabulary of the plays ('Shakespeare and Humanistic Culture', in Martindale and Taylor (eds.), *Shakespeare and the Classics* [2004]), expand on the significance of the curved brackets (or lunulae) at the end of Sonnet 126 and view Shakespeare's sonnets through the prism of 'early modern taxonomies of passion and affection', respectively. The remaining four parts, VI–IX, deal with 'Ideas of Darkness in the Sonnets', 'Memory and Repetition in the Sonnets', 'The Sonnets in/and the Plays', and 'The Sonnets and *A Lover's Complaint*', the last of which is discussed below with other publications dealing with the *Complaint*.

Dympna Callaghan's *Shakespeare's Sonnets* is another invaluable guide to the sonnets that includes several features that will be of particular help to students daunted by the complexity of an early modern sonnet sequence. The introductory chapter deals with the collection in its literary and historical context, examining the issues of authorization, publication and the identity of the sonnets' addressees. Callaghan then in a further five chapters seeks 'to engage the poems themselves and to clarify and elucidate the most significant interpretive ideas that have circulated around these complex poems since their first publication'. The chapter on 'Identity' expands on the ideas discussed in the introduction around the 'love triangle' of personae in the sonnet sequence. In sections with the sub-headings, 'Lyric Identity', 'Who's That Lady?' and 'My Lovely Boy', the author discusses the issue in both literary and biographical terms. The chapter on 'Beauty' emphasizes the 'unequivocally... masculine' nature of the ideal beauty presented in the sonnets. This idealization is not without 'a twist', for Callaghan, in that 'the beautiful young man looks like a woman'. A chapter entitled 'Love' charts the 'sexual, complicated, messy, and unsettling' course of love in the poems, culminating with a discussion of venereal disease. Further chapters discuss 'Numbers' and 'Time' in the sonnets, and the volume concludes with a particularly useful appendix, 'The Matter of the Sonnets', in which Callaghan, while recognizing that the 'sonnets cannot and should not be *reduced* to their paraphrasable content', offers the reader what is indeed a paraphrase of all 154 poems. The author, 'without trying to force the sonnets into a definitive pattern', shines a guiding light on the still contestable sequence.

The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's Poetry, another volume that will be of importance to new (not to mention older) students of Shakespeare, has fourteen chapters and an introduction (by the editor, Patrick Cheney) that together tackle the poetry of William Shakespeare in all its forms, whether in the poems or the plays. Each chapter is written by a leading international scholar, but these essays, rather than offering original readings of the texts under discussion (as is often the case with the Blackwell collection discussed above), conform to the rubric of a general companion volume. Organized

along similar lines to other volumes in the same series, it has three informally differentiated sub-sections dealing with, in turn, the literary and cultural foundations on which Shakespeare was building, the poetry itself (including its contribution to the culture discussed in earlier chapters), and, in the third section, a more wide-ranging discussion of the ways of reading the poetry and its themes, as well as chapters on its reception and life in performance. Michael Schoenfeldt (the editor of the Blackwell *Companion to Shakespeare's Sonnets* discussed above) contributes the chapter on the sonnets. There are also authoritative chapters on *Venus and Adonis* (by Coppélia Kahn), *The Rape of Lucrece* (by Catherine Belsey), *The Passionate Pilgrim* and 'The Phoenix and Turtle' (by James P. Bednarz), and *A Lover's Complaint* (by Katherine Rowe). There are also select reading lists for all the chapters, together with a chronology and a notably up-to-date list of reference works on Shakespeare's poetry.

Of the articles dealing specifically with Shakespeare's sonnets, five restrict their discussion to a single sonnet. Amy D. Stackhouse, in her article, 'Shakespeare's Half-Foot: Gendered Prosody in Sonnet 20' (*Expl* 65:iv[2007] 202–4), highlights the significance of the sonnet's feminine endings, adding an extra unstressed half-foot, for reading the sexual ambiguity of the poem's theme, made more explicit in the twelfth line: 'By adding one thing to my purpose nothing'. McDonald P. Jackson, 'Shakespeare's Sonnet CXI and John Davies of Hereford's *Microcosmos* (1603)' (*MLR* 102:i[2007] 1–10), finds a notable literary 'occasion' on which Shakespeare might have been provoked to write his Sonnet 111. The 'long and tedious poem', *Microcosmos*, by John Davies of Hereford (whose credentials as the author of *A Lover's Complaint* are discussed below), appears, in the light of Jackson's article, to have 'touched a nerve' with Shakespeare sufficient for a shorter and less tedious poetic reply. An unusual reading of Sonnet 129 forms part of Kit Fryatt's article, 'Shakespeare and Berryman: Sonnet 129 and Dream Song 1' (in Coleman and McGowan, eds., *After Thirty Falls': New Essays on John Berryman*, pp. 81–6). Following the Jewish hermeneutic tradition of midrash, which emphasizes non-literal interpretations (highlighted by Deborah L. Madsen in her work, *Re-reading Allegory: A Narrative Approach to Genre* [1995]), Fryatt argues that a 'mood of perversion and illogic...and erotic anger' is present in both Shakespeare's sonnet and Berryman's 'Song'. Regula Hohl Trillini's article, 'Tom, Dick and... Jack in the *OED* and in "Sonnet 128"' (*ShJW* 143[2007] 177–9), suggests a fortieth entry in the *OED* for the meaning of the word *jack*, not least on the grounds that it 'completely determines Shakespeare's "Sonnet 128"'. The jack in question is an 'upward-thrusting' wooden object attached to the back of the key-lever of a virginal or harpsichord, and has no little part to play in Shakespeare's lines: 'Do I envy those jacks that nimble leap, | To kiss the tender inward of thy hand' (ll. 5–6). A more substantial article by Alan Sinfield, 'Coming on to Shakespeare: Offstage Action and Sonnet 20' (*Shakespeare* 3:ii[2007] 108–25), offers the reader a new interpretation of the speaker, in Sonnet 20, who 'suddenly [finds it] necessary...to clarify...his relation to the Boy's gender, gender in general and the Boy's penis in particular'. For once, as Sinfield suggests, the 'queer-identified critic' may be considered the 'ideal reader'. He posits an offstage encounter between the

speaker and the Boy in which the latter ‘has claimed the “active” role’ and provoked the former into his hasty clarification.

Lynne Magnusson, in ‘A Pragmatics for Interpreting Shakespeare’s Sonnets 1–20: Dialogue Scripts and Erasmian Intertexts’ (in Fitzmaurice and Taavitsainen, eds., *Methods in Historical Pragmatics*, pp. 167–83), makes a specific case for the interpretation of certain linguistic features within Shakespeare’s Sonnets 1–20. In particular, Magnusson plots the *thou/you* shifts in the sonnets relative to a ‘dialogue script’ that Shakespeare imitates and transforms: Erasmus’s *De conscribendis epistolis*, a textbook in use in sixteenth-century English grammar schools. Beatrice Groves reads Shakespeare’s sonnets in parallel with the marginalia of the Geneva translation of the Bible, drawing inspiration from their shared readerly character. Groves’s article, ‘Shakespeare’s Sonnets and the Genevan Marginalia’ (*ELC* 57:ii[2007] 114–28), turns up such gems as the Genevan annotator’s gloss on Psalm 77: God is found culpable for the psalmist’s loss of sleep, but the annotator, ‘unwilling to blame God for his wakefulness’, glosses ‘thou Keepest mine eyes waking’ and declares that ‘his sorrows were as watchmen’. This adds new meaning to Shakespeare’s Sonnet 61: ‘It is my love that keeps mine eyes awake’ (l. 10). Danijela Kambasković-Sawers, in an essay entitled, ‘“Three themes in one, which wondrous scope affords”: Ambiguous Speaker and Storytelling in Shakespeare’s *Sonnets*’ (*Criticism* 49:iii[2007] 285–305), eschews ‘the current scholarly debate’ on the sonnets’ ‘Delian’ structure (that is present in other works discussed here) in favour of a discussion of certain cohesive aspects of the sonnet sequence, especially the role of ambiguous characterization. This feature, Kambasković-Sawers argues, is central to reader involvement and the ‘perception of [Shakespeare’s] sequence as an integral work’. Sasha Roberts’s essay, ‘Shakespeare’s *Sonnets* and English Sonnet Sequences’ (in Cheny, Hadfield and Sullivan, eds., *Early Modern English Poetry: A Critical Companion*, pp. 172–83), is the first of three on Shakespeare’s poetry from this collection. Roberts places Shakespeare’s sequence ‘against’ the sonnet tradition in terms of his ‘sonnet mistress’, who is ‘notoriously attainable’, and in terms of the ‘unconventional’ relationship of the male speaker and the male beloved, before anatomizing the sonnets’ wit and their relationship with ‘the last English sonnet sequence to be published in the Elizabethan-Jacobean period’, Mary Wroth’s *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*. In the Ashgate collection, *Shakespeare and Historical Formalism*, edited by Stephen Cohen, R.L. Kesler, in ‘Formalism and the Problem of History: Sonnets, Sequence, and the Relativity of Linear Time’ (pp. 177–93), otherwise concerned with history, formalism and the English poetic form in general, describes Shakespeare’s particular innovations in ‘a field crowded with competition’. By extending the limits of the sonnet sequence, however, Shakespeare is, in Kesler’s reading, ‘hastening its decline’ by superseding and ‘undermin[ing] the functional credibility of the older form’. In a discussion with a very different methodology from that of Kesler, Patricia Phillippy, ‘Procreation, Child-Loss and the Gendering of the Sonnet’ (in Chedgzoy, Greenhalgh and Shaughnessy, eds., pp. 96–113), compares the sonnet sequence, the ‘Foure Epytaphes’, attributed to Anne Cecil de Vere, countess of Oxford, and published in John Soowthern’s *Pandora* [1584], with

Shakespeare's 'procreation sonnets'. As memorials to Anne's son, who died in 1583, the 'Foure Epytaphes' 'construct gender as predicated upon procreation and child-loss' and serve as a sequence of notable comparison for Shakespeare's sonnets, that, in Phillippy's terms, construct gender along similar lines.

In another essay from *Early Modern English Poetry: A Critical Companion*, Patrick Cheney draws on his recent larger work, *Shakespeare, National Poet-Playwright* [2004]. In this shorter work, 'Shakespeare's Literary Career and Narrative Poetry' (pp. 160–71), he posits 'a historical model' for Shakespeare's career that has the poet-playwright mapping an 'aesthetic opposition' between the rival career models of Marlowe (following Ovid) and Spenser (following Virgil) onto the erotic, political and religious conflicts of his narrative poems: *Venus and Adonis*, *The Rape of Lucrece*, and *A Lover's Complaint*. The first of these poems, according to Cheney, provides the outline, the second the development and the third the crystallization of this model. In a series of dense readings, Cheney argues that the erotic, political and religious conflicts the poems interrogate are unified by the poet's preoccupation with 'the Protestant queen's Cult of the Virgin'.

A further essay from *Early Modern English Poetry* discusses 'The Phoenix and the Turtle'. Lynn Enterline, in "'The Phoenix and the Turtle'", Renaissance Elegies, and the Language of Grief' (in Cheney, Hadfield and Sullivan, eds., pp. 147–59), places Shakespeare's poem in the contexts of Renaissance humanist pedagogy, the long history of elegiac forms and the history of grief, including pertinent religious controversies. Enterline concludes that the poem engages with the Erasmian precept which puts words before truth. In doing so, the poem stakes a claim for the poet's skill in 'eternizing' the poem's subjects, before 'turn[ing] the elegy's symbolic labor over to its readers' and inaugurating a new 'proto-secular' form of prayer for the dead.

Judith Luig's article, 'Sonic Youth—Echo and Identity in *Venus and Adonis*' (*Wissenschaftliches Seminar Online* 5[2007] no pagination), is a Lacanian reading of Echo in Shakespeare's poem, in which the author coins the term 'echo stage' as an equivalent to Lacan's mirror stage of psychological development. Shakespeare's Venus, at least before the verses in which Echo is heard, is compared to a child prior to the mirror stage, lacking in a coherent, though alienating, identity; when the goddess 'starts beating her breast and venting her frustration merely with an acoustic element, for the first time in the poem she gets some lasting satisfaction'. The echoing of Venus's moans is, for Luig, the 'echo stage': 'Passion on passion deeply is redoubled' (line 832). Nevertheless, Echo, 'the mythological archetype of scorned female wooers', provides a less than satisfactory metamorphic identity for Venus, a merely imitative poetic voice that also brings the author's vanity of poetic achievement into question. Susan C. Staub, in an essay from a collection she also edits, "'My throbbing heart shall rock you day and night'": Shakespeare's Venus, Elizabeth, and Early Modern Constructions of Motherhood' (in Staub, ed., *The Literary Mother: Essays on Representations of Maternity and Child Care*, pp. 15–32), sees Shakespeare's Venus as a paradoxically constructed, both benevolent and malevolent, mother figure.

Eschewing the modern theories that have been previously employed to examine Venus's 'maternal aspect', Staub shows that the Venus of the poem reflects the early modern 'ambivalent construct of maternity', the threatening combination of maternal nurturance and female authority being complicated by an aggressive erotic desire. For Staub, Venus is a troubling figure, especially when occasionally seen as a "'refracted" vision of Elizabeth'. The monarch's adoption of the metaphorical role of mother to the nation, to justify her rule and mitigate any perceived threat to male hegemony, is undermined by Shakespeare's construction of an overtly sexualized Venus as sometime mother to Adonis.

Kenji Go had two significant essays on *A Lover's Complaint* published in 2007. The first of these, 'Samuel Daniel's *The Complaint of Rosamond* and an Emblematic Reconsideration of *A Lover's Complaint*' (*SP* 104[2007] 82–122), as well as 'propos[ing] an emblematic reinterpretation of *A Lover's Complaint*', also 'presents a fresh case for its Shakespearean attribution'. Engaging with the recent work of Brian Vickers, Go rejects the charges that the poem contains a 'grotesque episode', is psychologically improbable and bears 'a confused narrative line'. Central to this reappraisal is the seemingly grotesque scene in which the love tokens that the young seducer has acquired from earlier conquests are given to the maid he now pursues. Go places this episode in the context of 'the pervasive religio-cultural influence of Scripture and the emblem in Shakespeare's England', and, in doing so, uncovers its 'covert emblematic significance' and its centrality to the poem's 'intricately wrought [hitherto confused] narrative line'. For Go, the tokens allude to the biblical 'parable of the talents', which suggests one or two significant parallels between *A Lover's Complaint* and Samuel Daniel's *Rosamond* (Daniel being an author to whom Shakespeare is significantly indebted in general), as well as providing a means for rehabilitating the poem's apparent grotesquerie and justifying the maid's psychologically improbable fall. During this reading, Go also finds several correspondences between *A Lover's Complaint* and Shakespeare's other works, including the sonnets (with which it was collected in the quarto of 1609), *Cymbeline*, *Othello* and *Macbeth*, before concluding that this 'quite weighty' evidence substantiates the attribution of the poem to Shakespeare. In "'Religious Love" and Mocking Echoes of the Book of Common Prayer in *A Lover's Complaint*' (*N&Q* 54[2007] 298–303), Kenji Go continues his insightful critical engagement with *A Lover's Complaint*, this time focusing on the seducer's tale of his seduction of a nun. Here, the critic expands on John Kerrigan's gloss (in Kerrigan ed., *The Sonnets and 'A Lover's Complaint'* [1986, 1995, 1999]) of the seducer's reference to the 'Religious love put out religion's eye' (line 250). Kerrigan notes the 'tasteless quibble... Not the eternal love of line 238 but secular love that is *Religious* in the sense devoted, committed, assiduous'. Go, in a similar critical move to that achieved in his *SP* essay, also sees the seducer as invoking the biblical epistles of St Paul and St John, 'as read in the Book of Common Prayer', to disguise his profane love as genuinely Christian in origin. Go's reading encompasses the seducer's whole argumentative strategy for concealing the true nature of his love, and, as in his other essay, includes arguments in favour of attributing the poem to Shakespeare. The stylistically 'weak', repeated use of "'gainst" in line 271 has

led critics to doubt the conventional attribution, but Go persuasively points to Paul's letter (Ephesians 6), in which the saint declares that 'wee wrestle not *against* flesh and blood, but *against* rule, *against* power, *against* worldly rulers', in order to strengthen his argument. Moreover, for Go, an allusion to Ephesians brings to mind *The Comedy of Errors*, a play set in Ephesus that is also profitably read in the light of Scripture, and was, appropriately for Go's purposes, written by Shakespeare.

The same year also saw the publication of a book-length work in which the author argues for John Davies of Hereford's authorship of *A Lover's Complaint*. Brian Vickers's *Shakespeare, A Lover's Complaint, and John Davies of Hereford* is divided into two parts, the first of which, entitled 'Background', is further subdivided into three chapters, dealing sequentially with the life and work of John Davies, the Spenserian nature of the *Complaint* (which, Vickers contends, favours Davies's authorship above that of Shakespeare) and the poetic tradition of 'Female Complaint'. In the chapter on John Davies's life, Vickers does a thorough job of placing what he terms a 'mediocre poet' in the literary and social context of the late Elizabethan and Jacobean periods. Among numerous other instances, Davies appears in the historical record, in 1599, as the calligrapher commissioned by the countess of Pembroke to make a copy of the Sidney Psalms for presentation to Elizabeth, and, in 1609, publishing a volume of poems addressed to Algernon, Lord Percy, to whom he was tutor, and living in the Tower with his pupil's father, Henry (ninth earl of Northumberland), who was imprisoned on suspicion of complicity in the Gunpowder Plot. Vickers's aim is to reconstruct a milieu for Davies that makes the inclusion of a poem by him, 'presumably by mistake', in the same volume as Shakespeare's sonnets less unlikely than it first appears. Davies, Vickers argues, was much more of a Spenserian than Shakespeare, and the chapter on the *Complaint*'s Spenserian nature is intended to further the former's claim to authorship. The chapter on the 'Female Complaint' identifies the 'simultaneously moralizing and misogynistic' character of *A Lover's Complaint*, and finding such attitudes absent from Shakespeare's work but pervasive in Davies's, again rules in Davies's favour. The second part of the book, 'Foreground', contains two chapters, one making the case against Shakespeare, the other the case for Davies. The first of these looks in detail at the diction, use of rhetorical figures (and one trope, metaphor), syntax and verse form of the poem. The choices on all these counts are found to differ from Shakespeare's usual preference. The chapter which follows includes a similar exercise, finding a close correspondence with Davies's practice on this occasion. Indeed, Vickers presents a great deal of evidence linking Davies's poetic habits to the text of *A Lover's Complaint*, and, similarly, shows the poem to be outside Shakespeare's favoured method, at least in terms of the chosen parameters. Nevertheless, there remains sufficient room for other scholars, Kenji Go perhaps, focusing on other criteria and other aspects of either author's works, to reach different conclusions. Vickers also includes appendices containing the text of *A Lover's Complaint* and six uncollected examples of poetry attributed to Davies.

A Companion to Shakespeare's Sonnets, edited by Michael Schoenfeldt (discussed in more detail above), also contains two essays that discuss

A Lover's Complaint. Margaret Healy's essay, "'Making the quadrangle round": Alchemy's Protean Forms in Shakespeare's sonnets and *A Lover's Complaint*' (pp. 405–25), connects the sonnets with the *Complaint* through the suggestion that the youth of the latter corresponds with the 'lovely Boy' of the former. Healy highlights the continuation of alchemical language (associated with the analogous characters) from the sonnets into the *Complaint*, and, as such, provides another counterpoint to Vickers's arguments against their common authorship. It must be emphasized, however, that this essay, along with the other essays in this collection, does not engage with Vickers's book directly, probably due to the collection's earlier date of publication. Catherine Bates, in her essay, 'The Enigma of *A Lover's Complaint*' (pp. 426–40), discusses the authorship question, but, less interested in deciding the issue, she investigates what 'nags, troubles, and complains—that piques and irritates' critics about the poem such that they continually return to the question of its status. She ultimately concludes that the answer lies in psychoanalytic theory. More specifically, she draws attention to 'recent developments... which suggest that an originary masochism is constitutive of all human subjectivity', and that 'the poem begins to make sense when it is seen to anticipate recent suggestions that the figure of the seduced girl might, perhaps, be the prototype of all human sexuality, "male" no less than "female"'. This approach allows Bates to draw an illustrative parallel between the *Complaint* and another early modern text: Sir Philip Sidney's *New Arcadia*. In Bates's reading of Sidney's romance, more specifically the story of Dido and Pamphilus from Book II, 'a group of women are driven to erotic frenzy by a callous youth who manipulates them in exactly the same way as the youth of the complaint: in "the stirring of our own passions"'. Sidney's women (and by extension, the women of the *Complaint*), despite being fully aware of the youth's duplicity, 'enter [masochistically] with full gusto and enthusiasm into the spirit of the game'.

In an essay, 'The Rape of Clarissa and *The Rape of Lucrece*: The Performance of Exemplarity and the Tragedy of Literary Allusion from Dramatic Poem to Dramatic Narrative' (*Textus* 20:iii[2007] 581–602), which elucidates Samuel Richardson's debt to Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece* in his novel *Clarissa*, Sylvia Greenup reinforces the earlier criticism of Katharine Eisaman Maus on Shakespeare's dramatic poem. Greenup sees Richardson drawing on the misogyny and brutality revealed, by Shakespeare, at the heart of courtly love poetry for his representation of the rape of Clarissa. In what in places amounts to a parallel reading of both texts, Greenup contributes to the study of Shakespeare's literary reception as well as to the study of the history of the novel.

(e) *Histories*

A.D. Nuttall's *Shakespeare the Thinker* is a book for when you think you are bored with Shakespeare: beautifully written, ranging widely across the canon, intelligent and alert. The early histories are read for themselves ('the closer one comes to the human material, the more it shimmers') and proleptically, as part of defining the 'Shakespearean' (or proto-Shakespearean). There are vividly

mediated engagements with scenic architecture and artistry—the ‘astonishing thing’ of the rose scene in *I Henry VI*, the ‘unexpectedly believable’ scene between Anne and her husband’s killer at the opening of *Richard III*, from which the ‘abrupt movements of Richard’s mind, oscillating between smart denial and horror’ in his despair before Bosworth ‘derive, with a coherence that is frightening’. The chapter on the major histories includes an assessment of Richard II as ‘a man with ideals but no convictions, a walking congeries of images, poses, pretences, who, because he is intelligent, ironically perceives what is afoot, but from the side, in narrative profile. This contemplative observer is really at the heart of the action, is its sacrificial victim.’ Nuttall contrasts Richard’s ‘high-fantastical’ player-king with the ‘great study of *invisible acting*’ in the Henriad. In *Hal/Henry V*, Shakespeare moves away from the notion of historical causation as a ‘nexus of relations’ dissolving ‘central agency’ towards this distinctive personality as ‘*central*, unified cause’. However, this unification is never either complete or secure; Nuttall’s blow-by-blow account of the Williams episodes draws out the ways in which even Henry’s acting can go wrong. The major histories are much-worked-over territory, and Nuttall’s work here contains few surprises; you should read it not for decisive interventions in individual debates but because, like the best monographs of recent years on the histories (Holderness, Grady, Goy-Blanquet), it combines fascinating close reading of individual scenes with an original synoptic overview.

The most substantial full-length work this year on the histories is Catherine Grace Canino’s monograph *Shakespeare and the Nobility*, which begins from the insight that ‘virtually every English character in the plays is the ancestor of descendants living in Shakespeare’s time’, whether directly or through conferred title. This is not simply a matter of avoiding upsetting the powerful, à la Oldcastle affair; Canino points out that the family histories of the powerful potentially offered a challenge to the top-down Tudor myth of the chronicle, both in their alternative perspective on winners and losers and their refusal of the reign as the building block of history. So in providing not merely regnal but family histories in the first tetralogy, Shakespeare was entering sensitive territory requiring attention to both chronicle ‘source’ and contemporary social rankings. Canino argues that he ‘consistently modified and revised the portrayal of . . . ancestors with the status of their descendants in mind . . . deliberately and carefully [creating] individuals who, in some way, reflected the position or activities of their Elizabethan descendants’. There then follow chapters on the Staffords, the dukes of Suffolk, the Nevilles, the Talbots, the Cliffords, the Stanleys and ‘the gentry’ (via Lord Saye). The chapters offer detailed cameos of the relevant Elizabethans, as well as considering a variety of chronicle and other portrayals of the families; Canino’s typical approach is to look at the changes Shakespeare made to his sources and investigate a possible relation—not always approbatory—to the contemporary bearers of the name. However, though the parallels explored are frequently fascinating, and persuasive with regard to Shakespeare’s compositional processes, the conclusions are frustratingly limited to Shakespeare personally, so that the positive representation of the Stanleys ‘may well have been Shakespeare’s acknowledgement of sympathy for the Stanley family’.

for example. Shakespeare may well, to an extent under-appreciated heretofore, 'use the plays to comment on the status and activities of descendants', but the status of that comment itself awaits another investigation.

Lorna Hutson's wide-ranging *The Invention of Suspicion: Law and Mimesis in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama* proposes a relationship between 'popular legal culture' and popular dramaturgy. Quintilian's and Cicero's rhetoric addresses not simply arguments, but judicial (or forensic) ones; Hutson argues that legal rhetoric's concern with probabilities and likelihoods was incorporated into late sixteenth-century developments in dramaturgy. In particular, Shakespeare's 1590s plays incorporate a sense of speeches as 'attempts to prove a set of dubious "facts", or to test one's suspicions about the motives of others', consequently allowing an audience, via inference, to imagine what they cannot see, and thus promoting a drama of 'inwardness'. This is especially true of histories, which refer not merely 'offstage', but 'back' to events of previous plays. Hutson demonstrates this by comparing *2 Henry IV* with its source-play, the Queen's men's *Famous Victories of Henry V*, noting that the former play involves 'less action as such than a series of diagnoses, or conjectures' involving inferences about the minds of those who in their various ways are pursuing power. This in turn leaves us in the place of Hal, the arch-anticipator and suspector, so that 'we are complicit in the process that produces his friends as "shallow", easily-sounded'.

Hutson then turns to *The Contention*, a play which features more than one investigative 'case', with Eleanor's magic forming part of the case against Duke Humphrey, as does the Simpcox episode; Humphrey's death in turn links to Cade's 'legal carnival' (Craig Berntal's phrase) which parodies the corrupt forensic strategies of legal procedures on display earlier in the play. The first half of the play, in fact, is a sequence of 'cynical manipulations of judicial procedure', interrupted by the 'popular forensic activity' initiated by Humphrey's death, after which the commons are themselves constructed as 'an audience capable of judging', and rumour is turned into 'a forensic scenario'. As these are Hutson's last words in the chapter, it seems that this positive construction of the commons survives the Cade scenes themselves. There is significant overlap between this material and Hutson's chapter 'Noises Off: Participatory Justice in *2 Henry VI*' (in Jordan and Cunningham, eds.).

Oliver Arnold considers the representation of parliament in the first tetralogy in *The Third Citizen: Shakespeare's Theater and the Early Modern House of Commons*. Three parliaments are crucial: in London at *1 Henry VI* III.i, Henry restores Richard Plantagenet's lands and titles; again in London (in *3 Henry VI*), he bars Edward Plantagenet from the succession; and at Bury St Edmunds in *2 Henry VI* ('the king's Waterloo') he allows the arrest of Duke Humphrey by Suffolk before allowing the parliament to continue without him. Arnold argues that in doing so Henry (a 'serial abdicator') transforms himself into a commoner, satisfactorily present through his representatives, by splitting the king's two bodies. For Tudor constitutionalists, as (perhaps) to commonsensical laymen, this assumption could not work. Jack Cade's claim that his mouth shall be the parliament, just a few scenes later, ironically reunites the body politic and body natural Henry had sought to sunder (and in terms used by both Wat Tyler and Richard II in his tyrannical phase).

This in turn confirms Cade's ambition to himself become king, as his 'Ricardian usurpation of Parliament simultaneously conjures up both the tyranny of absolute monarchism and of absolute representation'. Arnold is more positive about Salisbury's representation of the national mood over Suffolk—though he notes that Shakespeare elides the role of the House of Commons in pursuing him—but also points out that the question of representation never comes up regarding Cade, because he rests 'entirely and openly on the people's support' rather than ventriloquizing their concerns, practising a 'politics of total presence'.

Simon Barker's wide-ranging and lucid study of *War and Nation in the Theatre of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* includes a chapter on Shakespeare's histories as a 'kind of compendium of conflict'. Even the many guises of Richard III are bookended by those famous opening words—for Barker the classic theatrical articulation of masculine militarism's position on the decadence of peace—and Richard's final reinscription as a soldier on the battlefield. The militarism Richard embodies—at these moments, at least—had, in theory been swept aside by the eirenic Tudors, making its links to contemporary advocates of 'English remilitarization' all the more unsettling. Richard's pre-Bosworth speech ticks many of the boxes recommended by conservative military theorists—contrasting the Breton 'vagabonds' in Richmond's army with the 'yeomen' in Richard's, like Richmond appealing to God and St George, informal and colloquial.

More straightforward critiques of militarism are found elsewhere in the histories. Barker points out that the doubled father/son scene in *3 Henry VI* ends with the dead son returning to the private sphere, with the obsequies—winding sheet, sepulchre, funeral bell—provided by the father; there is no formulaic tragic public remembrance to gloss over wasteful death. *Richard II* too critiques militarism's 'waning chivalric code'. *King John* provides an 'excessive display of war's moral ambiguity and susceptibility to fortune'. Hal leaves 'civilian life' when he returns to his father's court, and Henry's later Harfleur rhetoric (invented, as the killing of the French prisoners at Agincourt was not, by Shakespeare) shows the distance between military conflict and civilian ethics.

Michael Harrawood, in 'High-Stomached Lords: Imagination, Force and the Body in Shakespeare's *Henry VI* Plays' (*JEMCS* 7:i[2007] 79–95), begins from the five uses of the word in *1* and *2 Henry VI* by the mayor of London, Henry (twice), Talbot and Cade to consider 'digestion and alimentation'. The stomach was not only seen as the body's 'cook' (in its relation to food), assimilating the world into itself, but as jockeying for primacy amongst the other organs, drawing food to itself. So 'high stomachs' seek, as it were, to draw others into them. There is a lot about early modern digestive theory in this piece, and it does successfully demonstrate that, as Empson would have it, 'stomach' is a complex word.

Jean Howard's 'Stage Masculinities, National History, and the Making of London Theatrical Culture' (in Orlin and Johnson-Haddad, eds., pp. 199–214) sees the early histories as in a sense workshop pieces, during the course of which Shakespeare was learning 'how to create compelling and diverse stage masculinities'. The 'problem' was exacerbated, Howard reminds us, by the

very high number of men in them (3 *Henry VI* has forty-two men and three women). Henry VI is the 'foil' for a variety of opposing masculinities, including the 'warrior hero' Talbot. Suffolk in 2 *Henry VI* represents the 'masculinity of modernity', here cast as mastery of Castiglione's arts of the courtier. Cade's 'artisanal physical vigor' distinguishes him from both, and Richard is 'the medieval vice refashioned to encompass the skills and glamour of the modern tragedian'. In the same volume, Raphael Falco provides a fascinating and persuasive account of 'Charisma and Institution-Building in Shakespeare's Second Tetralogy' (pp. 215–37). Falco's central point is that the *Henry IV* plays show the failure of personal charismatic authority to build or sustain institutions, or indeed social order. However, he also proposes *Henry V* as a 'proof text' of those revisions of the original Weberian charismatic hypothesis, taking it away from its focus on the founding 'missionary moment' into a vision of 'normal' charisma as 'attenuated and dispersed'. Falco argues, challenging David Scott Kastan in *Shakespeare After Theory*, against the comic flexibility/charismatic kingship binary many critics see behind the subversiveness of Falstaff. In fact, the still overlapping elements of charisma (personal/lineage/office) deny the notion, which Falstaff's prominence in many accounts demands, of Henry V's kingship as 'a petrified set of charismatic symbols'.

Mary Polito, on the other hand, begins not from Weber but from the use of Shakespeare by a variety of business 'self-fashioning' handbooks, in "'Warriors for the working day": Shakespeare's Professionals' (*Shakespeare* 2: [2006] 1–23). She proposes that this is not appropriation so much as recognition: Henry V is 'a liberal subject and a pastoral governor who is learning to perform his profession as he works to teach others to do so as well'. Polito compares a modern 'Shakespeare self-help' book with Elyot's *Governor* as 'catalogues of secular virtue', and proposes the readers of the former as 'liberal descendants' (immune to irony, it seems) of the readers of the latter; Falstaff, of course, resists both productivity (through pastoral self-government) and professionalism of any kind, preferring to labour in his vocation. Ewan Fernie, too, addresses, as does Polito, the 'uses' of *Henry V*, here specifically in regard to contemporary military self-fashioning, in 'Action! *Henry V*' (in Grady and Hawkes, eds., pp. 96–120). Hal's 'I know you all' speech is a specimen of 'fiercely concentrated agency', opposing a 'non-chalantly incorruptible, absolute will' against (our) consciousness of identity as historically/culturally determined. What this 'fierce agency' means for others is not worked out on the battlefield; rather, it is in Falstaff's 'suffering' and death that heroic agency's characteristic of severing itself from 'unnecessary' relationships is anatomized. Henry's wooing of Katherine, though it has plenty of improvisational brio, is 'a form of instrumental action rather than exploratory, self-extending play'. There isn't much 'action' in the play, though; Fernie notes that *Henry V* tends to 'freeze the horrible flux of war into strangely still, heightened images' rather than descriptions (still less, representations) of actual violence. Action itself, Fernie argues, does not signify; only when shaped by the 'muse of fire' does it, as it were, 'find the name' of action. But Henry's agency still holds because it stands, in concentrated form, for 'the sovereign human subject's desire and power to

act'. John S Mebane's "'Impious war": Religion and the Ideology of Warfare in *Henry V* (SP[2007] 250–66) sees the play as working to undercut the cultural work of 'making warfare acceptable to Christians' (by which he means New Testament-focused Christians). Shakespeare does this by ironically deflating patriotic rhetoric, providing in the Chorus and other characters a comic parody of chauvinism, and by juxtaposing pro-war statements with antithetical biblical/theological allusions. Where this leaves nationalism, however, is unclear, and Mebane doesn't engage with Norman Rabkin's 'duck/rabbit' reading of the play in order to demonstrate how such deflation, parody and juxtaposition would neutralize those other elements of the play Rabkin, and many others, have seen as working against this.

Steve Sohmer's *Shakespeare for the Wiser Sort* ingeniously proposes a variety of 'esoteric' allusions in the plays. These include 'tributes' to William Brooke in *Henry V* and Henry Carey in *King John*. The Brooke 'allusion' seems to me to be weak; its strongest point is that both Brooke and Falstaff died at the same time during the night, and that the description of Falstaff's death appears in Shakespeare's play at the point at which a marginal note alluding to Oldcastle (Brooke's ancestor) appears in Holinshed. This allusion was made for a 'coterie' consisting of those present at, or with exact knowledge of, Brooke's death. Sohmer suggests that *King John* was written in 1596 to commemorate the death of Henry Carey, but the 'minute details' and 'barely detectable nods' again seem slight. Sohmer traces the name of Lady Falconbridge's companion 'Gurney' to 'the Normandy, the ancestral home of the Careys'; Prince Henry's reference to a cygnet mourning a swan is a reference to Carey's son mourning his father (whose crest was a swan). If these are problems, they are scarcely susceptible to only one interpretation, as Sohmer acknowledges. More interesting is his demonstration that Constance's lament, at the start of Act III, is placed on a solstice day, when 'the glorious sun | Stays in his course'; and the Magna Carta was signed on the longest day of 1215—15 June. Constance's anger, then, is a buried allusion to the Magna Carta. Given the inexhaustibility of Shakespeare's language, it would be foolish to dismiss out of hand Sohmer's work, but his picture of a Shakespeare writing for the 'wiser sort' depends on a repressive and detailed censorship regime which would be unrecognizable to those acquainted with the recent work of Clegg or Dutton on the topic. The persuasiveness of Sohmer's points depends to a large extent upon the persuasiveness of the contexts he produces for them, and the book does not present compelling evidence that such coteries existed—in other words, just because it's 'barely detectable' doesn't mean that it's a 'nod'.

Rebecca Lemon reads *Richard II* alongside Persons's and Hayward's representations of that king in *Treason by Words: Literature, Law, and Rebellion in Shakespeare's England*. Richard in Shakespeare's play, Lemon argues, functions as a kind of ham-fisted Hal, producing, and (crucially) exonerating, the opposition which will actually topple him; he has a 'perverse productivity in generating traitors'. This agency means that 'sanctified' readings of Richard's position as monarch never really take hold. Though the play argues against both tyranny and armed resistance, giving us both a culpable tyrant and a martyred anointed king, Lemon sees it as coherent

rather than fractured, a ‘meditation on rulership itself’; the alternative, she implies, is a polemic along the lines of Persons’s *Conference* which polemically misreads multivalent chronicle accounts in the service of a definite political thesis on deposition. The play’s complex shifting of sympathies is closely delineated, and Lemon’s exploration of the role of York as (further) distraction from Bolingbroke, even as he achieves power, shows that this switching between positions continues right up to the play’s end. Robert M Schuler’s ‘Holy Dying in *Richard II*’ (*Ren&R* 30:iii[2006/7] 51–88) continues his engagement with the ‘demonically inflected’ elements in the play begun in his 2005 *Exemplaria* article. I still find his insistence on the specifically demonic nature of inversion in the play unconvincing—for example, that Richard’s ‘sacrilegious’ oath-giving and his ‘blasphemous’ reversal of the prayer for the dying ‘exemplify the demonic politics of his upside-down world’, that his pride is ‘Luciferan’, and so on. As with the earlier article, along with the broad-brush reading of intellectual and cultural history which enables such confident generalizations about the place of the ‘demonic’ in the world, there is some subtle and perceptive close reading, particularly of Richard’s progress towards a truly ‘holy dying’.

Charlotte Scott finds in *Richard II* Shakespeare’s most complicated ‘idea of the book’ in her monograph on *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Book*. At the heart of Richard’s reign is ‘the book of heaven’, which he ‘harnesses . . . to his body’. Scott insists that ‘Richard’s rather nebulous identification with the book becomes central to how he isolates and represents his own narrative of meaning’, as ‘Richard projects himself on to the idea of the book’. Thankfully, the chapter then moves into the far less nebulous territory of a sequential consideration of the play’s direct and indirect deployments of the book as both metaphor and object, initially by Mowbray (‘the book of life’) and Gaunt (‘inky blots and rotten parchment bonds’). Richard’s focus on substance and shadow, word and image, Scott argues, has as its basis the ineffable truth of the ‘heavenly ledger’ (Scott’s phrase) to which he later explicitly refers. But the book was a particularly charged Reformation symbol, and Scott interestingly teases out the ways in which Richard’s ‘book’ partakes of both a pre-Reformation ‘celebrating and defending the divine right of kings’ and a post-Reformation ‘inward and protective faith’ with a particular relationship to subjectivity, contextualizing the image of the book using a variety of religious writings. Richard eventually claims he is his own book, ‘where all my sins are writ’, calling for a glass in which to read himself (and the audience can see neither Richard’s heavenly book nor his reflection). The self-deposed king’s shattering of the mirror divorces symbolic from bodily self. Scott gives us close reading of a particularly intense kind, moving between literal reference to books and the larger semantic fields of making meanings of which the book is part, and a fresh approach to the worked-over topic of the king’s several ‘bodies’. Philip Lorenz also approaches the nature of Richard’s sovereignty in ‘“Christal mirrors”: Analogy and Onto-Theology in Shakespeare and Francisco Suarez’ (*R&L* 38:iii[2006] 101–19). Both Suarez and Shakespeare prefigure a new ontology of sovereignty; in Shakespeare’s play this is especially noted in the Queen’s tears in II.ii, and Richard’s destruction of the mirror which ‘marks the end of a world order built on analogical correspondence’.

The historical claims in the article are based on a broad-brush approach to intellectual history; whether this 'ontology' is new or not, and whether a few key moments in Shakespeare's play can be said to mark it, needs more argument for this reader.

Sandra Logan spends a lot of time in her *Texts/Events in Early Modern England* on various representations of the reign of Richard II. Her perspective on Shakespeare's play is thus informed by its differences from and similarities to other accounts. For example, Shakespeare's vision of Richard's 'unnatural' relationship differs from *Woodstock's*—which is predicated on Richard's 'foreignness'—in its use of a variety of maternal imagery (including some from Richard). Logan does tend towards descriptive-assertive writing, and though her account of the play is coherent it does not appear to offer anything new on such topics as Richard's loss of monarchical authority (his dismissal of the law has destabilized society), his unsuitability as a moral model (which Logan says was the 'usual perception' of the monarch), or the function of the garden scene (which again inverts the 'traditional assumption' of Richard's level of society being seen as a moral model, with the formality of their speech ensuring any social inversion is mitigated).

Ava Zilberfain's chapter on *Richard II* in *Stealing the Story: Shakespeare's Self-Conscious Use of the Mimetic Tradition in the Plays* is also predominantly descriptive-assertive, and appears to come from a parallel universe in which it is the first critical attempt to engage with the play. It is entirely ignorant of critical work (referencing only one book article and one book chapter, both from two decades ago), and thus devotes a great deal of energy to arriving at a station most people will have started from. While it could function adequately as an introduction to the play, its usefulness even here is vitiated by its lack of critical sophistication and sometimes clunking style ('Against history, Shakespeare's tragic depiction of structural demolition speaks volumes for revision over deconstruction', p. 74). In similar vein, Kristin Smith's 'Martial Maids and Murdering Mothers: Women, Witchcraft, and Motherly Transgression in *Henry VI* and *Richard III*' (*Shakespeare* 3:ii[2007] 143–60) discusses the representation of 'corrupt femininity' in Joan and Margaret, and the redeeming masculinity of Richmond, without once mentioning Rackin and Howard's great book on the histories—indeed it is not even in her bibliography. For those of us who have read this groundbreaking work (published now more than a decade ago) Smith's reinvention of the wheel has nothing to offer.

Beatrice Groves's *Texts and Traditions: Religion in Shakespeare 1592–1604* includes, as well as a slightly revised version of the piece on Hal and the Harrowing of Hell published in *Shakespeare Survey* in 2004, a chapter on religious imagery and succession in *King John*. Her central point is, *pace* those insisting on John's status as proto-Protestant assassinee, that Arthur, not John, is the 'locus of holiness' in the play, the subject of a 'relocation of religious imagery from the king to the child'. This is not because Shakespeare challenges the conventional linkage between divinity and royalty, but because John has, effectively, lost his royalty. In earlier representations such as Foxe's or Bale's, John's death had taken on sacrificial, Christlike, aspects, which in Shakespeare's play are transferred to Arthur. This realignment of sacredness

with powerlessness is in itself a critique of conventional royal panegyric. Groves shows how Shakespeare reshaped the characters inherited from *The Troublesome Reign* to bulk out Arthur's importance relative to John (for example, by his focus on Constance), and carefully delineates the typological resonances (principally to Isaac, and therefore to Christ) of Arthur's victim status, particularly in his 'near-blinding' scene with Hubert. Groves writes clearly and persuasively, and her comparative method helps bring these aspects of Shakespeare's play more clearly into view.

Ken Jackson covers similar ground in "'Is it God or the sovereign exception?": Giorgio Agamben's *Homo Sacer* and Shakespeare's King John' (*R&L* 38:iii[2006] 85–100). Jackson begins from the contemporary Italian philosopher's exploration of *Homo Sacer*, the sacred man; counter-intuitively, this designation is legal rather than religious, referring to a figure who may be killed outside the law with impunity but whom human and religious law cannot touch, 'a form of bare life . . . exposed to the violent force of sovereign power outside both human and religious law' (and hence analogous to the modern 'refugee'). Arthur's actual death (as opposed to the much more obviously sacrificial 'persuasion' scene before it) is a 'thwarted or failed sacrifice', visible only to the audience, and thus 'outside the particular juridical-political world order of the play', which inscribes him as *Homo Sacer*. Agamben's analysis of sovereignty suggests a trans-historical grounding for it in acts of structural exclusion and inclusion, linking the Greeks, early modern/medieval 'sacred' kingship, and the present day, and Jackson's article concludes with the suggestion that this aspect of Shakespeare's play suggests to us 'our disturbingly and apparently timeless political situation'. Joseph Campana's 'Killing Shakespeare's Children: The Cases of *Richard III* and *King John*' (*Shakespeare* 3:i[2007] 18–39) is much more sceptical about Arthur, and about critics, arguing that a 'pervasive sentimentality' covers up 'complex and often discomfiting erotic and emotional investments in childhood innocence'. Campana doesn't attend to the religious/sacrificial reading noted above, seeing Arthur's impact as due to adult fantasies about childhood (he is a child, not a child-king, for Campana). John's suborning of Hubert is an 'erotic pact'; Arthur 'seduces him away from his intent' into an 'erotic compact' based on the 'magnetism associated with physical care'. Arthur is subject, rather than object, in this process; however, Constance's speeches grieving for him show perverse and unmanageable affect, revealing more about her than him, and spreading to other characters via 'affective contagion'. *Richard III*, on the other hand, while it too displays the unmanageability of affect in respect of children, counterweights it with Richard's utter detachment from the 'childish foolish'.

Anny Crunelle-Vanrigh writes on '*Henry V* as a Royal Entry' (*SEL* 47[2007] 355–77). She is committed to an evolutionary model of the drama, and therefore is puzzled by Shakespeare's use of an 'outdated dramatic form' like the chorus in an 'otherwise groundbreaking play'. She rescues the bard from this by proposing that the choruses 'originate' in the non-dramatic form of the royal entry (oddly, choosing a very old royal entry—Elizabeth's into London in 1558/9—as her example of the presumably non-outdated alternative origin, to which she traces several features of the play). If the play is a royal entry,

then the choruses, structurally, are ‘the textual equivalent of a triumphal arch’, and the presence of so many national voices/accents mimics the allegorical figures of a royal entry. She then goes on to consider the ways in which the play contains ‘antipageantry’ (in a phrase which makes perfect sense but has a wonderfully surreal quality, ‘the plot has its own ducks to marshal against the rabbits that the Chorus and the king so deftly conjure out of their hats’), but the ‘royal entry’ trope commits her to a fairly swift dismissal of it. I find the parallels between *Henry V* and Elizabeth’s entry (a recently republished account of which would have been available to Shakespeare) to be rather weak, and can’t see how a royal entry from the 1550s is an adequate model for Shakespeare when a play from the 1580s using a chorus isn’t. Nonetheless, this new perspective does allow some interesting interpretations of scenes, and offers an addition to the many Foucauldian readings of the play.

Literary critics may consider themselves close readers, but they have nothing on stylisticians. Two extremely interesting books devoted themselves more or less to Shakespeare’s use of one kind of word—Beatrix Busse’s massive *Vocative Constructions in the Language of Shakespeare* and Penelope Freedman’s *Power and Passion in Shakespeare’s Pronouns: Interrogating ‘You’ and ‘Thou’*. Freedman’s is the easier read, Busse’s the more profound in coverage, but both books offer extremely detailed narratives of shifting usage within and between scenes and characters—the shift between ‘thou’ and ‘you’, for example, requires a sophisticated sense of which of the many different usages of both is being brought into play. Busse’s focus on vocatives extends this analysis to all sorts of ways of addressing others. I found the level of detail, particularly in Busse’s work, astounding, and there is plenty in both books to stimulate Shakespearians for some time to come.

The representation of commoners in *2 Henry VI* continues to attract a great deal of attention. William Leahy focuses on the constant threat (and frequent use) of violence against commoners in ‘“For pure need”: Violence, Terror and the Common People in *Henry VI, Part 2*’ (*ShJE* 143[2007] 71–83). However, Leahy’s analysis is not particularly original (‘it is possible that many [of the audience] would have found Cade a sympathetic character to some extent’), features some circular reasoning (‘he is violent, angry and forceful as well as being articulate, rational and charismatic, because this would, in all probability, represent a believable character to Shakespeare’s audience’), and is based on some rather sweeping statements about what all previous criticism has missed. Maya Mathur writes on the Cade scenes in a more nuanced fashion in ‘An Attack of the Clowns: Comedy, Vagrancy, and the Elizabethan History Play’ (*JEMCS* 7:i:[2007] 33–54). Mathur finds in scenes of commons rebellion ‘strategic jesting’ seeking to blur social borders, and that unmasking the roguish protestors’ imposture simply confirms them as ‘victims of economic inequality’. Unlike many writers on the scenes, Mathur sees Cade’s linkage between the articulation of dearth and comedy as destabilizing neo-classic didactic theories on the laughable rather than undermining his ‘social criticism’ function. She points out that Iden kills Cade for trespass rather than for his political actions (he does not know who Cade is until he is dead). Simon C Estok’s ‘Theory from the Fringes: Animals, Ecocriticism, Shakespeare’ (*Mosaic* 40:i:[2007] 61–78) claims the play ‘participates in and subverts a

popular radical vegetarian environmentalist ethic and offers “the garden” as part of a continuum of social control’, but also offers the familiar line that once Cade turns up we are left with the contained comic and carnivalesque. To call Cade vegetarian is stretching it a bit, though it does enable Estok’s interesting contrast between Cade’s end and the butchery metaphors (and stagings) earlier in the scenes; the notion of Cade’s death as a kind of pruning is also thought-provoking. Nina Levine’s ‘Citizens’ Games: Differentiating Collaboration in *Sir Thomas More*’ (*SQ* 58[2007] 31–64) stresses that the early scenes of the play offer an ‘individuated commonality’ engaged in the ‘shared labour of protest’; this sense of ‘horizontal’ commonality is the basis for More’s successful appeal to their sympathies for the ‘strangers’ case’, though only once the vertical link to the monarch (hence, nation) has been removed by ‘banishment’. But, Levine points out, this commonality has a deeply compromised past.

Stephen Dickey teases out the meanings of a variety of props in ‘The Crown and the Pillow: Royal Properties in *Henry IV*’ (*ShS* 60[2007] 102–17). These include Falstaff’s cushion-crown (nicely topsy-turvy, not least because the crown is usually placed on a cushion), his sceptre/dagger (the violence *Henry IV* must rely on to rule), and his throne/tavern chair. Crown and pillow, crown and mock-crown, reappear in Act IV of 2 *Henry IV*; though Hal’s choice is long since made, ‘the moment registers that action as the ghost of a chance, the road not taken’. Hal’s taking the crown, though, bequeaths his father the pillow—fittingly, in a sense, as Henry is, according to Dickey, one of ‘the parade of false or surrogate kings to be purged on behalf of Henry V’. The actor playing Falstaff, like the cushion, is stuffed. Dickey’s fascinating article also brings to bear a sensitivity to the structural parallels, particularly around crowning, within the play. Frances K. Barasch (in Marrapodi, ed., *Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries: Rewriting, Remaking, Refashioning*) begins from Quickly’s ‘harlotry players’ to suggest the influence of the harlequin and other elements of *commedia all’improvviso*. Falstaff himself recalls *commedia*’s Capitano, and his ‘play extempore’ resonates with one of the stock scenes collected in Flaminio Scala’s early seventeenth-century *Scenarios*; harlequin’s links to the devil also echo with the ‘white bearded Satan’. Ellen Caldwell, in a scholarly and careful analysis, “‘Banish all the wor(l)d’”: Falstaff’s Iconoclastic Threat to Kingship in 1 *Henry IV*’ (*Renascence* 59:iv[2007] 219–45), proposes Falstaff’s subversiveness as a proto-Protestant distrust of and scorn for ceremony and image, offering ‘Reformationist commentary’ rather than carnivalesque subversion. Princely power is ‘representational, iconic, and false’, and here the state is the ‘false religion’ targeted by reformers. Others have seen Falstaff as a satirical attack on Puritanism; Caldwell, while not directly engaging with this argument, offers a range of quotations from Reformation figures to show the (proto-)orthodoxy of Falstaff’s position. Jessika Wichner’s ‘The Flying Falstaff’ (*Folio* 14:i[2007] 37–43) attempts to understand one M. Prosser’s peculiar eighteenth-century project to construct a giant balloon in the shape of Falstaff. The only evidence for this project is the 1785 call for subscriptions, complete with illustration, and Wichner thinks this means the project did not come off. She goes on to explore the ways in which the character of Falstaff is

balloon-like (hot air and the like) before pointing to the ways in which the union flag wielded by the balloon-buffoon blurs the boundary between Falstaff and John Bull.

Joel Elliott Slotkin proposes a new approach to *Richard III* in 'Honeyed Toads: Sinister Aesthetics in Shakespeare's *Richard III* (*JEMCS* 7:i[2007] 5–32). Audience identification with the evil Richard is enabled by a 'sinister aesthetics' rather than the character's deceptiveness or, indeed, a moral flaw in themselves. Seeking to avoid this demonization/pathologization of audience response, Slotkin proposes a poetics of malevolent theatricality and deformity to explain characters who see Richard's evil 'yielding' to him anyway (and, therefore, an audience doing the same thing). Much of the article provides close readings of the 'seduction' of Anne as emblematic of the whole process. This relies on the 'ironic effect' of 'the spectacle of a villain who has mesmerized his victim so completely that he can provide her with the means to defeat him, and urge her to do so, knowing that she will not listen'. However, Slotkin seems to contradict this at a later point when he grants Anne much more agency, claiming that Anne's 'erotic attraction' to Richard is generated by 'the dark, ironic beauty of Richard's carefully constructed self-presentation as a creature of deceptive malevolence'. Slotkin claims that the entire political realm follows Anne's example, and that though Richard is destroyed, the play 'makes no serious attempt to repress or refute the sinister poetics that make Richard such a powerful figure in the first place, allowing them to persist beyond his death'. It's a bold claim, and certainly enables a fresh look at the play, but the focus on seduction and (erotic) attractiveness does seriously underplay the operations of political power within the play for this reader; the focus on Richard 'in quest to have' underplays 'this hell' the nation soon finds itself in. Murray Levith, in *Shakespeare's Cues and Prompts*, suggests that monstrosity of Richard allows the play to draw on the 'St George and the dragon' myth for its closure.

Christopher J. Cobb's *The Staging of Romance in Late Shakespeare: Text and Theatrical Technique* includes some short considerations of *Henry VIII*. The opening scenes in this and other late plays (*The Tempest*, *Two Noble Kinsmen*) do not introduce the story, and thus are more likely to be seen (and ironized) as theatrical spectacle. The Field of the Cloth of Gold evokes romance only to bring it swiftly into contact with a suffering with which it has no transformative relationship. Spectacle in this play is the grounds for Cobb's claim that it, along with *Two Noble Kinsmen*, is Shakespeare's 'least dramatic but most theatrical' play. The coronation scene has a set-up and postscript which discourage an audience from seeing it as a romance plot climax; however, it functions to 'order the realm' via a kind of gift-exchange between citizens and royalty, and the display of nobility around the monarch. This disjunction between the function of the coronation within the play world, and as a plot element within the play itself, is 'a test of romance . . . for which the play provides no answer key'.

Finally, to student-focused work and reprints. Warren Chernaik's *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's History Plays* is a clear survey of all the Folio histories. Those new to the histories will find it contains plenty of useful narrative; though it does not dwell overmuch on particular critical

approaches, it is imbued with a sure sense of what critics have found to talk about over the years. Jonathan Baldo's 'Forgetting Elizabeth in *Henry VIII*' (in Hageman and Conway, eds., *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*) is a shorter version of his 2004 *ELR* essay on the play, placing it as part of a patron-sensitive attempt to manage the memory of Elizabeth and other Reformation figures. Kevin Ewert's volume in the student-focused Shakespeare Handbooks series on *Henry V, A Guide to the Text and its Theatrical Afterlife*, does several jobs very well, offering commentary on the play itself, an introduction to key modern productions and films, and a guide to contemporary critical thinking and Shakespeare's own theatrical and cultural contexts. Ewert is particularly interesting on performance, and his lucid and stimulating prose manages to be both accessible and challenging.

(f) *Tragedies*

The year 2007 has been an active one in Shakespeare scholarship. Writers on Shakespearian tragedy continue to develop old and explore new avenues to the dramatic texts. It is not only the 'great' tragedies that attract scholarly attention. Several impressive analyses deal with texts that earlier received little attention, such as *Titus Andronicus* and *Coriolanus*. The increased interest spurred by the RSC's devotion to the complete works of Shakespeare, both theatrically and editorially, may have increased the focus on texts that naturally include the tragedies. *The RSC Shakespeare*, edited by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen, is a major new edition of the complete works which is of particular interest in that it is the first edition to be based on a modern-spelling version of the 1623 first Folio. The following survey of publications on Shakespeare's tragedies starts with the more general studies, and studies covering more than one play, before dealing with particular tragedies in the order in which they are thought to have appeared.

Surveying the field of Shakespearian tragedy, one should include Jennifer Wallace's *The Cambridge Introduction to Tragedy* in the Cambridge Introductions to Literature series, as chapter 2 of the book devotes some twenty pages to Shakespeare. In her discussion, Wallace notes the sense of mystery that critics tend to find in Shakespeare, and that makes it easier to consider the various tragedies than to find their quintessential components. She suggests that the difficulty in defining Shakespearian tragedy could stem from the fact that all Shakespeare's tragedies challenged existing generic conventions. Another reason why writing about Shakespearian tragedy is complicated is that Shakespeare combined tragedy and comedy in his plays. Finally, critics find it difficult to write about Shakespeare's tragedies because of the at once creative and destructive vision which inheres in the language of the plays. Characters create what Coriolanus calls a 'world elsewhere'. The author finds, however, that it is in these difficult areas in Shakespeare that we paradoxically see the source of his power. 'It is in the nature of his tragic sense to defy explanation and to confound categorisation' (p. 44). In her discussion, Wallace relates Shakespeare's challenge to the traditional concept

of tragedy to transformation on the political, religious and philosophical scene of his day.

The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare, by Emma Smith, has also appeared in Cambridge Introductions to Literature. This relatively short book is packed with useful information and is divided into seven subject-based chapters devoted to character, performance, texts, language, structure, sources and history. According to the author, each chapter includes a range of examples with a focus on the plays most frequently studied. As to the tragedies, they are all referred to at some point, but it is partly for its introduction to the dramatic world of Shakespeare, and partly for the more extensive references to the 'great' tragedies that the book is useful reading to the student of Shakespearian tragedy. The first chapter starts out, invitingly, at Juliet's balcony in Verona. Among many interesting observations on the tragedies, one can note valuable commentary on several characters, including Hamlet, Macbeth and Othello. Importantly, the emphasis of the book is less on facts than on critical approaches. 'Where Next?' sections at the end of each chapter are encouraging guides to further reading. As a general introduction to Shakespeare's work, with an emphasis on making readers meet his plays, Emma Smith's book forms a firm basis for further study.

In 2007 yet another relevant study appeared in Cambridge Introductions to Literature, namely Janette Dillon's *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Tragedies*. The book includes a separate chapter on tragedy before Shakespeare, which points out classical influences, the mixed tradition of early English tragedy, the influence of Kyd and Marlowe, and comments on Elizabethan tragic practice and theory. The plays covered are those placed in the group named 'Tragedies' in the first Folio, with the exception of *Cymbeline*. As Dillon observes, at least three of the tragedies, *Titus Andronicus*, *Timon of Athens* and *Macbeth*, 'have possible links with other dramatists' (p. 6). Interestingly, Shakespeare's first tragedy, *Titus Andronicus*, and his last, *Coriolanus*, receive slightly more attention than the others. One of the approaches in the book is to give close analysis of particular moments, sometimes peripheral ones, to show how they reveal the play's particular concerns. In the case of *Romeo and Juliet*, the core scene commented on is I.v, a feast scene bringing together the comic dimension and lurking tragedy, in *Othello* it is the willow scene (IV.iii), and in *King Lear* it is the blinding of Gloucester (III.vii). The author argues that Shakespeare's approach to tragedy was experimental, that he set himself new challenges in each play. In her study, Dillon seeks to explore Shakespeare's range of experimentation and to give room for the distinctiveness of each play. Admittedly, it is a daunting task in a book of limited length to try to cover ten plays so much discussed in earlier publications. It is to the credit of the author that she gives insightful background information while revealing specific concerns in each of the tragedies.

Daniella Jancsó's *Excitements of Reason: The Presentation of Thought in Shakespeare's Plays and Wittgenstein's Philosophy* is a study of moments of uncertainty in Shakespeare's plays. In doing this she draws on the philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein. The reason for using Wittgenstein is that he ascribes importance to the moment of uncertainty and wonder, the state of being at

a loss. Wittgenstein's philosophical activity is construed as an ongoing attempt at achieving clarity. In this respect Jancsó finds it instructive to focus on the study of *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*, as well as *Much Ado About Nothing* and *The Tempest*. The author sees the opening of the night scene in *Hamlet* as being dominated by a figure of uncertainty, the ghost, while the day scene begins with the entrance of a figure of certainty, Claudius. In his oration (I.ii.1–17), Claudius establishes an opposition between culture and nature, or, in Wittgenstein's terminology, a language game in which he plays the part of the ruler, while automatically casting the others in the role of the ruled. To Jancsó, Hamlet's inability to act and Wittgenstein's observations on the interconnection between thoughts, doubts and action lead to the realization that, in the moment of action, thinking must be suspended. To Wittgenstein, thinking comes to a halt when previous problem-solving strategies fail. In Jancsó's view, such moments of confusion in Shakespeare are mainly evoked by figures of uncertainty, such as ghosts, fairies and witches. In Hamlet's case, he acts when he is overpowered by fear and astonishment, when he is in a state of shock. In her analysis of *Macbeth*, the author sees the play as developing from a godless rite and presenting a world from which the divine has been eliminated. Just as in *Hamlet*, the beginning of the play displays figures of uncertainty. The Wittgenstein-inspired discussion of *Macbeth* involves the question of free will and the philosophical problem of causality. The interpretation involves the role of figures of uncertainty, the lack of objective certainty and the plight created by mental operations in the God-forsaken world of the play. The book is an intriguing study of ways in which Wittgenstein's style of reasoning resembles Shakespeare's thinking in drama. It is also enlightening for readers who struggle with the question why Shakespeare's plays, as well as Wittgenstein's philosophical writings, continue to generate such contradictory interpretations.

Shakespeare in Parts by Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern is a stimulating in-depth study combining a consideration of actors' parts and the vertiginous dramatic moment. The book is divided into four main parts, the first dealing with the actors and their parts and with rehearsing and performing, the second with interpreting cues, the third considering repeated cues, and the fourth discussing aspects of dramatic prosody. Of the tragedies, *Romeo and Juliet* is seen as having perhaps the most extravagant use of repeated cues in all of Shakespeare. The scene of mistaken mourning for the presumed-dead Juliet is considered tragedy with a twist, mixing pathos with bathos. In Shakespeare's mature tragedies, the authors contend, repeated cues are employed at the moment of the most serious or terrifying or finest climax, such as at the time of Desdemona's murder, the sleep-walking of Lady Macbeth, the reconciliation of Lear and Cordelia, the exit of the mad Ophelia and so on. In *Julius Caesar* such repeated cues are used to evoke popular turbulence, for example when Mark Antony inflames the Roman crowd, and to call forth subjective loneliness when Brutus is preparing for death. In *Hamlet*, the leave-taking of the mad Ophelia receives detailed comment, in which she is regarded as the chief subject of the climactic echoing cue. In their discussion of *Othello*, the authors focus particularly on the time preceding Desdemona's murder, showing that in the frantic exchange over the handkerchief, she struggles for

entrance into her husband's foreclosed mind. What marks the tragedy at this point is the impossibility of Desdemona getting a word in. The mutual isolation of Othello and Desdemona can truly be felt only by separating them into a 'linear' exchange. In *Macbeth*, Lady Macbeth's final scene is considered 'perhaps the most striking instance where the premature cue is used as a sign of existential separation' (p. 237). As the authors point out, *King Lear* uses repeated cues throughout and is a good example of Shakespeare's manipulation of cues, for example in Gloucester's early scenes. Similarly, different kinds of echoing cues are commented on in Edgar's 'part within the part' of Poor Tom, when Gloucester enters and seems to prompt another of Edgar-Tom's horrid repeated cues, and when the repeated cue is described as being used by Shakespeare to represent the 'mad' Lear in particular ways. The quite extensive discussion of *King Lear* includes references to repeated cues in Cordelia's speech, with informative comments on differences between the Folio and the quarto. Many of the uses of cues in the play recur in the scene of Lear's death, where repeated cues or repeated 'refused' cues abound. In the authors' view, the echoing repetitions are designed to enable, protect and strengthen Lear's state of grief. All in all, the book represents a fresh view in an exciting field of Shakespeare study. It reveals how intimate and important working in parts is to Shakespeare's recurring preoccupations.

Shakespeare Quarterly (58:iii[2007]) is a special issue devoted to the RSC's *Complete Shakespeare*. Among its interesting articles, we note Stephen Orgel asking, in 'The Desire and Pursuit of the Whole' (pp. 290–310), whether we now really have The Complete Works. As he observes, 'Surely the impulse to conflate quarto and folio texts of *King Lear*, *Hamlet*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and *Othello* springs from a conviction that none of the individual texts is complete. *Macbeth* is obviously incomplete, indicating several of its witches' songs only as incipits ("Come away, come away &c."; "Blacke spirits &c.")' (pp. 292–3). Orgel also has many pertinent observations concerning *Hamlet* as, for example, 'The play has often been felt to be incomplete, despite its immense length' (p. 307). He further observes that while it has been frequently argued that Hamlet is the first dramatic character with a genuine psychology, his motivations are missing. Orgel notes that it increasingly became the task for the actor to provide that part of Hamlet's psychology.

'From Revels to Revelation: Shakespeare and the Mask' is Janette Dillon's contribution to *Shakespeare Survey*'s volume on 'Theatres for Shakespeare' (*ShS* 60[2007] 58–71). She initially observes that Shakespeare's late plays are frequently said to be influenced by masque, the context for such influence being the sumptuous Jacobean masque encouraged by Queen Anne from 1604. This type of masque is linked with the literary and classically inspired writing of, for example, Ben Jonson. As Dillon notes, the influence of this form of masque on Shakespeare is often associated with the King's men's move to the Blackfriars in 1609. She interestingly maintains that Tudor mask has been the poor relation in Shakespeare studies as well as in studies of court theatre more widely. The distinction in spelling ('mask' versus 'masque') seems to signal a felt need to distinguish a boundary between Tudor mask and the newer masque, the latter implicitly being associated with greater sophistication. Rather than overlooking the influence of Tudor mask on Shakespeare,

Dillon makes an attempt at giving it the place it deserves. As she suggests, Shakespeare's knowledge of masking could have come from a variety of written sources, including Hall's *Chronicle* and possibly anecdotal reports from people travelling in Europe. Masking elements might also be suggested by the plays' immediate source, such as in the case of *Romeo and Juliet*. To show the influence of mask, Dillon considers scenes from several early Shakespearian plays, including *Titus Andronicus*, V.ii and *Romeo and Juliet*, I.iv and v. *Timon of Athens* is also briefly considered. Dillon's view of the use of masking in Shakespeare is that the distinction between 'mask' and 'masque', i.e. between the Elizabethan and Jacobean forms of this type of court entertainment, cannot be absolute. It follows that there can be no clear separation between Shakespeare's early and later uses of the form.

ELR (37:iii[2007] 337–59) contains an article by Richard Levin on 'Protesting Too Much in Shakespeare and Elsewhere, and the Invention/Construction of the Mind'. Levin takes as his point of departure *The Murther of Gonzago*, during which Gertrude protests that 'The lady doth protest too much, methinks' (III.ii.230), one of the best lines in *Hamlet*. The statement reflects ironically on Gertrude's own behaviour. Levin goes on to comment on the literary tradition of over-protesting and then succumbing widows going back 'at least as far as Petronius' tale of the Ephesian widow' (p. 337). The author's succeeding comments include references to several plays, such as Chapman's *The Widow's Tears*. Levin also mentions *The Puritan, or The Widow of Watling Street*, 'an anonymous play once attributed to Shakespeare' (p. 339). References to Shakespeare's tragedies include *King Lear*, in which a serious example of over-protesting is evident in the love test at the play's beginning, where Goneril and Regan express their devotion to their father in hyperbolic terms. Levin further notes that over-protesting is not limited to women. In *Romeo and Juliet*, Romeo's behaviour is described by Benvolio and Montague as a kind of over-protesting, even before the audience see him. From his survey of twenty-one characters who exhibit over-protesting, Levin finds certain shared characteristics. Their over-protesting is shown early in the play, it is always exhibited in the presence of other characters, and their over-protesting collapses suddenly and completely. Following this, they take an action directly opposed to it—the widows quickly remarry, the daughters spurn their father, the Petrarchan lovers fall out of love, and so on. Further commenting on *Hamlet's* Gertrude, Levin notes that while we initially are led to believe that Gertrude is just another of the over-protesting and then succumbing widows, it soon becomes clear that her show of love for her husband was dissembled, causing the Ghost to call her 'my most seeming virtuous queen' (I.v.46).

In *Shakespeare Newsletter* (57:ii[2007] 43, 48, 52, 58, 60) David Thatcher, in "'The manner of their deaths": Causality in *Romeo and Juliet* and *Antony and Cleopatra*', initially reminds the reader that in Shakespeare's time medical knowledge was still in its infancy. Some explanations ask for the willing suspension of disbelief. As Thatcher remarks, *Hamlet* provides several examples of confusion and ambiguity on the subject, for example when Laertes returns from France vowing revenge for his father's death before he knows how he died (IV.v.131). In his discussion Thatcher makes reference to

several Shakespeare plays, noting that there are many cases in Shakespeare's work where the cause of death is not initially communicated or requested. His comments on *Romeo and Juliet* in this respect are quite extensive. Turning to *Antony and Cleopatra*, the author notes the fact that this play represents death coming to a generation older than Romeo and Juliet. In its attempts to clear up mysteries, Thatcher shows, *Antony and Cleopatra* in its denouement structurally resembles the ending of *Romeo and Juliet*, with Octavius replacing Prince Escalus as principal investigator. Indifference to the causes of Fulvia's death and the supposed death of Cleopatra is now replaced by a determination to establish the whole truth. In the author's view, Shakespeare chose to omit or suppress, until the denouement, enquiries into the cause of death in order to exploit the gulf between what the audiences know and what knowledge the characters get access to. It is through laborious (re)construction or misconstruction that the characters seek the truth.

Rebecca Ann Bach has written a special kind of book, *Shakespeare and Renaissance Literature before Heterosexuality*. Its main argument is that the playwright has been misread as having modern ideas about sex and gender. In her study Bach attempts to show how Shakespeare's plays, among others, were rewritten and adapted editorially in the Restoration and the eighteenth century to make them conform to modern views, or to what she terms an emerging heterosexual imaginary. The reason why Shakespeare's plays and Renaissance literary culture are the object of the book's primary discussions is that those plays have been considered to reveal natural human behaviour, and this would include what has been regarded as natural male-female sexual relations. In Bach's view, the homosocial imaginary gradually lost its dominance from the Restoration until the end of the eighteenth century. During the years following the early modern period, Bach maintains, Shakespeare's texts, among others, were rewritten and edited. This was the formative period for heterosexuality, and writers and editors considered the homosocial, aristocratic values of the past to be primitive. According to Bach, it became imperative to erase the traces of the homosocial past in plays, including Shakespeare's. Of Shakespeare's tragedies, Bach's study includes comments on *King Lear*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Othello* and portrays a world before heterosexuality. The author's chapter-long discussion of *King Lear* builds on the view that the play evokes chastity as an ideal, possibly the only ideal that is kept unpolluted throughout the play, and at a time preceding the valorization of lust and greed its hatred of male-female sex is pervasive. In the three following chapters, Bach focuses on aspects of Restoration Shakespeare, including effects on the plays of an emerging heterosexuality, and including in her analysis references to several of the tragedies. The fifth chapter is devoted to *Othello* as it was regarded in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and it explores the colonial origins of heterosexuality. Bach's study presents insight into a field seldom discussed in Shakespeare studies. The book demonstrates discerningly how criticism and revisions of Renaissance drama helped the emergence of heterosexuality. According to Bach, changing views on status, friendship, adultery and race represented aspects of that emergence.

Richard Levin makes some comments (*N&Q* 54[2007] 294-5) on the stereotype that he calls 'The Lady and her Horsekeeper', the idea that some

upper-class women were attracted to lower-class men. Levin's application of this stereotype includes the relationship of Tamora, the newly crowned queen, to Aaron the Moor in *Titus Andronicus*. Although Aaron is not a manual labourer, he is connected to the stereotype as a 'coloured' man. In *Titus Andronicus*, Levin points out, Tamora's adultery with a 'coloured' man is considered a sign of her shameless lust. This is focused on in II.ii.10–29, where she invites Aaron to their sexual 'pastimes' and he puts her off. Levin also finds race to be crucial in linking this stereotype to the relationship between Desdemona and Othello at the beginning of the play. While our initial impression is that the marriage of Desdemona and Othello is another version of 'The Lady and her Horsekeeper', this stereotype is decisively rejected when the truth about their marriage is finally established at the end of Act I.

Comments on *Titus Andronicus* are numerous this year. In a lengthy article, 'Racial Impersonation on the Elizabethan Stage: The Case of Shakespeare Playing Aaron' (*MRDE* 20[2007] 17–45), Imtiaz Habib refers to Donald Foster's stylometric SHAXICON test concerning specific roles Shakespeare may have played, with special focus on the roles of Aaron in *Titus Andronicus*, Morocco and Antonio in *The Merchant of Venice* and Brabantio in *Othello*. The author argues that a consideration of the psychosocial transactions involved in such possibilities may give new insight into the complexities of racial discourse in Shakespeare. In his discussion, Habib points out that 'Shakespeare's racial impersonation in his playing of Aaron may issue from an obscure instinct of racial solidarity but may also involve an instinct of racial critique deployed across the triple agendas of ethnic control, surveillance, and programming' (p. 27). He finds that *Titus* possibly may constitute a more complex case of impersonation than *Othello* and even *Antony and Cleopatra*. But the question whether Shakespeare actually played the role of Aaron cannot be answered.

Christopher Crosbie has an article on 'Fixing Moderation: *Titus Andronicus* and the Aristotelian Determination of Value' (*SQ* 58[2007] 147–73). He observes that *Titus Andronicus* has elicited criticism for being 'excessive in its sensationalism yet lacking in its stylistic organization' (p. 147). Crosbie asks several questions concerning the basis for the criticism of Titus's excesses, and questions whether the reason for such views lies in a chaotic internal structure. Crosbie argues that the play's excesses 'signal instead the play's use of extremity to define the ethical, a representational strategy that exhibits sophistication and nuance amid, even through, sensational display' (p. 147). As Crosbie maintains, excess and moderation, themes present throughout *Titus Andronicus*, were established conceptual categories in early modern England. Situating the play within Aristotelian ethical theory of the late 1590s reveals a coherent underlying structure. What follows in Crosbie's article is a rereading of *Titus Andronicus* based on the view that the ethical mean allows a theoretical range of action as 'moderate', depending upon the circumstances. The result of the argument is flexible rigidity, which helps place Titus as noble yet savage, horrifying yet just. While the play causes us to consider the moral ambiguities inherent in the conflict between Roman and Goth, its Aristotelian framework also prompts us to contemplate ethical values through its constant appeal to equity.

Being devoted to one tragedy only, Marvin W. Hunt's volume on *Looking for Hamlet* is of particular interest. The author initially notes that Hamlet is an unlikely masterpiece, ungainly and extremely long if uncut. Moreover, there is little action in it until the end. Hunt further observes that the artistic merits of the work have been questioned, not least by T.S. Eliot, who failed to find any objective correlatives in it. Yet reality refutes all complaints against it, since *Hamlet* is the most frequently staged play in any language. Hunt argues that Shakespeare's greatest tragedy acts out an extreme and extraordinary internalization of reality. He then 'attempts to show how the resulting sense of a palpable interiority has reflected and shaped the intellectual history of the West, making *Hamlet* the single most important work in constructing who we are, especially in how we understand our psychological, intellectual, and emotional beings' (pp. 7–8). This is a daunting task. He starts by exploring the sources of the play, before considering its complex printing history. As Hunt notes, *Hamlet* appeared in three different versions. Two of them (in 1603 and 1604) were printed during the playwright's lifetime, while the third did not appear until 1626. These three versions coalesced into the relatively stable version of *Hamlet* published and produced since. Next Hunt discusses the great fifth act, trying to demonstrate why *Hamlet* is such a central work. In Hunt's view, the play takes reality from outside the human mind to within it, relocating us from an anterior and objective medieval mindset to an early modern outlook that largely sees reality as a function of subjective experience. The result of this new belief is the realization that what goes on inside our heads is, in the final analysis, real. The rest of Hunt's study presents a history of reception, noting that while the play should seem quite old, even antiquated, with the swordplay, the Ghost and the ornate language, it really, from most perspectives, defies ageing. In Hunt's view, *Hamlet* is currently more central to the world than ever. He argues that Hamlet the character 'is the collective dead son of Western history, the lost child that haunts our culture, perpetually killed and resurrected again in each performance before succeeding generations' (p. 9). The reader may or may not embrace every bit of Hunt's appreciative wording; however, he nevertheless presents a fresh, incisive and greatly informative study of this unique play.

In "'But I have that within which passeth show": Shakespeare's Ambivalence toward his Profession' (*ShN* 56[2006–7] 85–6, 100, 106, 110, 116–17), R.W. Desai argues that there is evidence in the sonnets to suggest that Shakespeare disliked his profession as actor and playwright. Corroborative evidence, especially from *Hamlet*, 'might help to explain why the three tragedies written after *Hamlet* are so different from *Hamlet*' (p. 85). Desai's argument is that although *Hamlet* is a unique theatrical success, it encapsulates a conflict within the author and marks the turning point towards tragedies with a different direction. In Desai's view, all the great tragic figures following Hamlet—Othello, Macbeth, Antony, Cleopatra, Lear, Timon and Coriolanus—are 'simple-minded, non-intellectual, non-complex characters' (p. 85). To Desai Hamlet is Shakespeare's alter ego, the critic concealed within the dramatist. He further comments on Hamlet's scathing critique of the contemporary stage. In Desai's view, Shakespeare's drama after *Hamlet* takes

a turn towards a direct, less complex style with mass appeal, a repudiation of Hamlet's ideal critic.

Antony Miller, in his article 'Fortinbras' Conquests and Pliny' (*N&Q* 54[2007] 287–9), quotes *Hamlet* IV.iv.15–26 and remarks that Hamlet's incredulous exchange with the Norwegian captain has been compared with two passages in Montaigne. Miller quotes from the essay 'Of bad meanes employed to a good end' (II.xxiii), in which Montaigne considers the behaviour of Roman gladiators, who killed each other to instruct the Roman people in valour and contempt for death. To Montaigne, the willingness of men to die in this manner is strange and incredible. Miller points out that although there is a general similarity between Montaigne's thought and that of Hamlet, 'their tenor is quite different' (p. 287). Miller also refers to Montaigne's essay 'How one ought to governe his will' (II.x). To Miller, Montaigne's examples, like the war in *Hamlet*, are all instances of trivial causes giving rise to great effects. To the author, Pliny's *Naturalis historia*, which was familiar to Renaissance schoolboys, represents a closer parallel to the passage in *Hamlet* than either of Montaigne's passages. Pliny discusses the limits set on human habitation by the earth's climate and then reflects on the melancholy fact that it is on the *mundi puncto* that men seek glory and power.

In *Shakespeare Survey* (*ShS* 60[2007] 223–36) Graham Holderness comments on "'I covet your skull'": Death and Desire in *Hamlet*'. The article focuses on the appearance of the skull in *Hamlet*. This human skull, also known as Yorick's skull, is not merely an anonymized object serving to create a memento mori, lamentation or satire, but an individualized skull, the remains of a known and loved person. Skulls on stage are awesome or weird because of the oscillation between subject and object. In Holderness's view, Hamlet's commentary is at once scientific, religious, sceptical and Protestant as well as Catholic.

Notes and Queries (*N&Q* 54[2007] 289–90) has an article by Thomas Festa on 'All in All: The Book of Common Prayer and *Hamlet*, I.ii.186'. According to Festa, the precise meaning of Hamlet's reply to Horatio's recollection of Old Hamlet following Hamlet's first soliloquy has not yet been understood, due to a misconception about the source and function of Hamlet's idiom. Scholars and critics have missed the primary allusion, in Festa's view. He argues that Hamlet's phrase alludes to a verse from the first epistle to the Corinthians: 'When all thynges are subdued vnto hym, then shall the sonne also hym selfe be subiect vnto hym that put all thynges vnder hym, that God may be all in all' (1 Cor. 15.28). The likelihood that Shakespeare had this text in mind when writing this line is increased by the fact that it was a part of the lesson read during the ceremony for the burial of the dead in the Book of Common Prayer.

Gene Fendt discusses "'The time is out of joint": Medieval and Roman History and Theology in *Hamlet*'s Act I Temporal Disturbances' (*N&Q* 54[2007] 290–2). Seeing the Ghost as both *res* and *signum*, Fendt initially describes it as the dark sacrament of the play. Act I of *Hamlet* closes with Hamlet, disturbed by the ghost of his father, considering its presence a sign of the disturbance of the temporal order. Fendt questions whether the darkness is in the sacrament or in the times, and refers to saints behind the names of the

central characters in Act I, Francisco (St Francis) and Barnardo (Bernard of Clairvaux), and two martial names from earlier Roman history, Marcellus and Horatio. In Act I, the author sees history as reversing itself and flowing backwards to a time before the empire (Marcellus), past the earliest republic (Horatio). 'Marcellus presents, as the first act's first disturbances wash over us, the counter-image of . . . time at peace as the Eternal enters it at the season of our Saviour's birth' (p. 291). However, *Hamlet's* Horatio does not come from Rome but from Wittenberg, and he does not believe in ghosts. In Fendt's view, the question of the Ghost's true nature divides Hamlet from Horatio, until the latter at the end seems to have been converted to Hamlet's view.

In a short article entitled 'Shakespeare's *Hamlet*' (*Expl* 65:ii[2007] 68–71) David McInnis comments on the royal plural in III.ii.324–5. McInnis discusses this occurrence of the royal plural salutation and comments on several critical interpretations by different scholars. The author further explores the thematic implications of the royal plural.

“‘Try what repentance can’”: *Hamlet*, Confession, and the Extraction of Interiority’, by Paul D. Stegner (*ShakS* 35[2007] 105–29), uses Kenneth Branagh's inclusion of the confessional in the film adaptation of *Hamlet* [1996] as a starting point for a discussion of ritual confession and the problem of assurance in early modern England. Stegner goes against the Foucauldian emphasis on the connection between confession and social control. Rather, in his essay he posits that confessional rituals and language indicate the diffuse tension between traditional rituals and inwardness persisting throughout the early modern period and enacted on the English stage. Stegner seeks to demonstrate that *Hamlet* reveals changes taking place in confessional practices by providing Catholic as well as Protestant confessional rites that promise consolation and reconciliation, while indicating that in the theological world of the play these promises cannot be realized. The author examines the changes in penitential practices during the early modern period. Hamlet's role as confessor is a reminder of the ongoing theological and theatrical problem of deciding the authenticity of another's confession. Stegner discusses in what ways Hamlet's role as confessor complements his position as avenger and influences his approach to the tensions between thought and action. Hamlet's attempts at taking on the role of father confessor are part of his efforts to avenge the crimes against his father and himself.

In *Interpretation* (34:iii[2007] 207–74) Mark A. McDonald has written a lengthy article entitled ‘On *Hamlet* and the Reformation: “To show the very age and body of the time his form and pressure”’. To the author *Hamlet* is a tragedy about a thinker. While *The Tempest* is the autobiographical play, the author sees a possible autobiographical element in *Hamlet* in that the play exemplifies what people, including Shakespeare, might have become had they not avoided a tragic alternative. Another autobiographical element, according to McDonald, may be represented by Horatio, who tells the story of Hamlet to the world, and who also relates to the theatre. The author sees in *Hamlet* an analogy between the action and the crisis in the ordering of the West around the Reformation. This analogy represents the foundation for the meaning of the play. In the author's analysis, Shakespeare rejects the Lutheran response to the Reformation while favouring a more remote, independent response.

The Wittenberg response to the crisis is regarded as noble yet tragic, but the response to the disturbance in the soul of the West is with philosophy and drama.

Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England (MRDE 20[2007] 111–35) contains an article by Alison A. Chapman on ‘Ophelia’s “Old Lauds”’: Madness and Hagiography in *Hamlet*. Chapman initially notes that recent scholarship shows that *Hamlet* raises questions about early modern religion. She finds, however, that recent critics have mainly attached the religious questions of the play to the character of Hamlet. But Shakespeare did not limit himself to Hamlet’s character when probing religious questions. As Chapman argues, ‘Ophelia’s ravings also display a complex awareness of England’s medieval Catholic past’ (p. 111). In Chapman’s view, Ophelia’s network of religious allusions is not in conflict with the sexualized nature of her madness. Ophelia finds herself caught between two models of female behaviour: one, embodied by the girl of the song, is both realistic and tragic. The other, represented by St Charity, is unrealistic and yet empowering. Both positions are equally untenable. The task of accommodating the two irreconcilable religious positions of English Protestantism and Catholicism can result in madness, according to Chapman. In the play, Hamlet and Ophelia reconcile the religious past and present in different ways, Hamlet seemingly shaking free of the spectre of Catholic purgatory, Ophelia seeming to slip entirely into the past.

Turning to *Othello*, we find John Drakakis’s article ‘*Othello* and the Barbarians’ (RCEI 54[2007] 101–17), which analyses the role of ‘barbarians’ in a civilization’s definition of itself. The author is concerned ‘with the ways in which particular texts negotiate the difficult territories of ‘self’ and ‘other’ (p. 104). He notes that, in the case of Shakespeare, a number of texts have appeared fruitful to postcolonial studies, including *The Tempest*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Othello*. Barbarians are at the same time ‘other’ and symbolically central to the process of self-definition, being ‘outside’ as well as ‘within’ society. In Drakakis’s view, this dynamic can be explored in a comparison between Shakespeare’s *Othello* and J.M. Coetzee’s *Waiting for the Barbarians*. The author makes these two texts, which are chronologically and culturally wide apart, part of a discussion on empire and colonization. Drakakis concludes that Shakespeare’s *Othello* is at the beginning of a process of historicization that ideologically preserves boundaries, while Coetzee’s *Waiting for the Barbarians* represents complexities inherent in the uncritical dissolution of boundaries. Both texts prompt fundamental questions of identity.

Explicator (Expl 65:iv[2007] 197–9) has a commentary by C. Harold Hurley on ‘Shakespeare’s *Othello*, IV.iii.60–105’. The author discusses the integration and influence of Christopher Marlowe’s poem ‘The Passionate Shepherd to his Love’ in *Othello*. C. Harold Hurley describes the references to chief motives found in Marlowe’s poem in Act IV, scene iii, of *Othello* and analyses the implications of the theme for Desdemona’s and Emilia’s ethical standards.

Rodney Stenning Edgecombe has commented on ‘Ovid and the “Medicinal Gum” in *Othello* V.ii’ (N&Q 54[2007] 293–4). The author considers *Othello* V.ii.347–52 and notes the presence of *Metamorphoses* 64, a resemblance that

according to Stenning Edgecombe has so far not been remarked. He further observes that the *Liebestod*-type speech that is uttered over the corpse of Desdemona (V.ii.280–2) ends in imagery as much Phaeton-like as hellish. Admitting that commentators are right in focusing on Pliny when expounding the medicinal gums as coming from myrrh trees, Stenning Edgecombe argues that the simile serves the idea of grief rather than healing. Being vague about the boundaries between Araby and Ethiopia, Shakespeare probably had *Metamorphoses* 64 in mind. In Stenning Edgecombe's view, Shakespeare would have assumed some sort of continuity between amber and myrrh in incense mixtures. 'He would also no doubt have known that Galen discoursed on the curative properties of the gem—hence "medicinal"' (p. 294).

A survey of studies of *King Lear* begins with a look at *CahiersE* (71[2007] 37–47), where David Stymeist writes on "'Fortune, that arrant whore, ne'er turns the key to th' poor": Vagrancy, Old Age and the Theatre in Shakespeare's *King Lear*'. The author notes that Shakespeare wrote in an era in which vagrancy was criminalized. In this light he considers *King Lear*, arguing that Shakespeare presents a radical deconstruction of the discourses of homelessness. Stymeist considers the tragedy a commercial exploitation of the social anxieties around homelessness and abandonment of the old. Still the play presents a public contestation of the governmental rhetoric employed to justify the persecution of vagrants. *King Lear* uncovers the social and economic roots of vagabondage, shows familial constructions that obscured vagrancy and parodies the stereotype of the dissembling beggar. In *King Lear* Shakespeare 'exposes vagrancy as "the classic crime of status, the social crime par excellence"' (p. 45). In Stymeist's view, Shakespeare's subversive representation of vagrancy was partly motivated by his concern to disconnect problematic links between players, the homeless poor and dissimulating rogues.

Religion and the Arts (ReAr 11[2007] 436–53) contains an article by Sean Benson entitled 'Materialist Criticism and Cordelia's Quasi-Resurrection in *King Lear*'. It is an examination of Lear's conviction that the dead Cordelia is resuscitated near the end of the play. This quasi-resurrection is included only in the first Folio [1623]. As Benson shows, some critics consider the moment to be delusion and others a moment of blessed release. The author then explores the materialist interpretations of Stephen Greenblatt and Jonathan Dollimore, who both insist that Cordelia's quasi-resurrection, as it is never realized, frustrates a religious interpretation of the play. To Benson, Cordelia's quasi-resurrection points towards a possible otherworldly redemption, while reminding the audience of the resurrection that cannot take place in Lear's pagan world.

Naomi Conn Liebler writes on 'Pelican Daughters: The Violence of Filial Ingratitude in *King Lear*' (*ShJE* 143[2007] 36–51). As she notes, Lear's 'pelican daughters' (III.iv.74), Goneril and Regan, pluck out the heart of their father. The death of the third daughter, Cordelia, breaks his heart, so unintentionally she too is one of the pelicans. The essay analyses different aspects of violence and cruelty in *King Lear* with reference to two of the most influential theatre critics of the twentieth century, Brecht and Artaud. Both called for a theatre that disturbed people's complacencies.

The political setting of *Macbeth* is approached in Sharon Alker and Holly Faith Nelson's article, 'Macbeth, the Jacobean Scot, and the Politics of the Union' (*SEL* 47[2007] 379–401). It is often argued that *Macbeth* presents a certain position on Anglo-Scottish politics that defines itself in relation to the belief system of one small political body. In opposition to this, Alker and Nelson present three models of the Union recorded in the pamphlet literature of the period and dramatized on the Jacobean stage. The overall construction of the drama, according to the authors, including character, form and genre, as well as the use of space, adds up to several competing positions on the Union. *Macbeth* thus 'leaves us with a sense of the contradiction and multiplicity of the discursive formation of the nation' (p. 396). The construction of *Macbeth* reflects the complexity of its relationship to the Court as well as to the marketplace.

Richard Wilson, "'Blood will have blood'": Regime Change in *Macbeth*' (*ShJE* 143[2007] 11–35), points out that *Macbeth*, which was first presented on 7 August 1606 in Hampton Court following the Gunpowder Plot, was considered a propaganda piece for King James. His image, distantly reflected, may have been mirrored in the masque. But in view of the ambiguity about which 'great king' the witches served to welcome, the presence of the witches may call for another reading, according to Wilson. In the background there is the anti-Catholic war on terror. The superimposition of *Macbeth*'s face over that of James in the witches' ball would carry an ominous twist when the old agents of terror are unpunished in the new order. James may have seen his own head reflected beside *Macbeth*'s, and the mirror masque might expose *Macbeth* as yet another Herod.

Jonathan Gil Harris's 'The Smell of *Macbeth*' (*SQ* 58[2007] 465–86) is an examination of gunpowder in *Macbeth*. The purpose is to cast light on ways in which smelly materials in early modern theatrical performances worked on their audiences, or their olfactors. According to Gil Harris, the smell of *Macbeth*'s 'thunder and lightning' was of theatrical importance and was of significance because of its visual and acoustic impact. Play-goers' responses to the odour of the squib were not just physiologically conditioned, but part of larger cultural syntaxes of olfaction and memory. The author is also interested in how the play's smells put pressure on the very notion of a self-identical moment as the true basis of historical interpretation. What he locates in smell he terms a polychronicity, i.e. a palimpsesting of diverse moments in time, as a result of which past and present coincide with each other. 'In the specific instance of Shakespeare's play, smell's polychronicity generates an explosive temporality through which the past can be made to act upon, and shatter the self-identity of, the present' (p. 467). As Gil Harris sees it, the stink of *Macbeth*'s squibs must have generated experiences on the part of the audience that to us are culturally elusive and not easily legible.

Turning to *Antony and Cleopatra*, we find an interesting article, 'Lives and Letters in *Antony and Cleopatra*' by Alan Stewart (*ShakS* 35[2007] 77–104). The essay is a literary criticism of the play which contests Linda Charnes's argument (in *Notorious Identity: Exceeding Reputation in 'Antony and Cleopatra'* [1993]) that the play represents the triumph of Octavius. According to Stewart, such a claim does not address the complexities involved

in the characters' bids for posterity. The author argues that the play challenges the foundation of Roman historiography. However attractive the binary of letter-bound Rome versus oral Egypt may be, it is impossible to support strictly dichotomous models of message-bearing, since the carrying of messages is transactive, moving across the play's two cultures.

Kevin Curran writes on 'Shakespeare and Daniel Revisited: *Antony and Cleopatra* II.v.50–4 and *The Tragedy of Philotas* V.ii.2013–15' (*N&Q* 54[2007] 318–20). This is an intertextual short study on links between Shakespeare and Daniel, a connection that has been well documented. As noted by Curran, *Antony and Cleopatra* is of particular interest in that it shows borrowings in both directions. Daniel's closet drama *Cleopatra* [1594] influences *Antony and Cleopatra*, while Daniel's 1607 revised and expanded *Cleopatra* seems to have been influenced by Shakespeare's play. In his essay Curran explores another link, namely between *Antony and Cleopatra* and Daniel's Senecan political drama, *The Tragedy of Philotas* [1604–5]. He notes that Shakespeare's borrowing from *The Tragedy of Philotas* in II.v.50–4 of *Antony and Cleopatra* has so far gone unnoticed. Having particularly considered Act II, scene v, of Shakespeare's play, Curran concludes that if *Antony and Cleopatra* was composed between 1606 and 1607, he finds it plausible that the text of Daniel's *Cleopatra* that Shakespeare was influenced by was the one found in the collection *Certain Small Poems lately printed: with the tragedie of Philotas*. 'In this collection Shakespeare would not only have found *Cleopatra*, but also the first printed edition of *The Tragedy of Philotas*, which provided the source for *Antony and Cleopatra* II.v.50–4' (p. 320).

Mary Rosenberg has an article entitled 'She Here—What's Her Name?' (*ShN* 57[2007–8] 5–6). The author is puzzled by *Antony and Cleopatra* IV.xv and wonders why Antony, at a moment of great intimacy, twice addresses Cleopatra by the name of her country: 'I am dying, Egypt, dying.' In her discussion, Rosenberg remarks that even at this final moment the lovers are not alone. But, as she notes, these lovers seldom are alone. She observes, though, that this is not the only occasion on which Cleopatra is identified with her country. To herself she is 'Egypt's queen'. As the author observes, Egypt to uncomfortable Romans is a place of soft licentiousness. But it is also a place of beauty and delight, as well as mystery and domination. The significance of the term depends on the user and the context. While Antony is clear about Cleopatra's royal status, he is angry with her and disgusted with himself when he first addresses her as 'Egypt' (III.xi) after his defeat at sea. And in III.xiii, when finding Cleopatra submitting to the courtesies of the messenger Thidias, Antony offers cruel lines that strip her of both title and identity: 'what's her name | Since she was Cleopatra?' As Rosenberg points out, the complete lack of confidence is heartbreaking. Antony fears the loss of Roman authority, being at this moment all Roman, while Cleopatra has become the representative of opposing values. Perhaps the fact that Antony lashes out at the woman closest to him is a token of his love, the author suggests. To the dying Antony, Cleopatra is simple woman, 'sweet' and 'gentle', as well as Egyptian queen, 'Egypt'.

A study of *Coriolanus*, by Anita Pacheco, has appeared in the Writers and their Work series. In a limited space the author manages to give an interesting

introduction to Shakespeare's last play. *Coriolanus* is placed within its proper historical period in a chapter on antique Romans in Renaissance England. The author then considers the way class conflict is represented in the play. Pacheco notes that Shakespeare departs from Plutarch's 'Life of Caius Martius Coriolanus', as translated by North, in ascribing military service primarily to the patrician class, and that Coriolanus's martial prowess is exaggerated. In a chapter on contradictions in the concept of honour, she points out that Shakespeare deviates from North's description of Coriolanus as a political animal in that he is happy only in battle and is dissatisfied with Roman civic life. A separate chapter discusses the mother and son dichotomy, with the play's portrait of Volumnia as Martius's principal teacher. The study finally considers later appropriations of the play. Pacheco's *Coriolanus* is an informative guide to the play. It clearly displays Shakespeare's craft of reworking the source material to make it suit his purposes. The study is admirably suitable as a first introduction to the play.

Coriolanus is also approached in James Kuzner, 'Unbuilding the City: *Coriolanus* and the Birth of Republican Rome' (*SQ* 58[2007] 174–99). According to Kuzner, much recent criticism is involved with the degree to which early modern texts can be considered republican. A case in point would be Annabel Patterson's reading (recuperation) of *Coriolanus* (in chapter 6 of her *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice* [1989]), in which she sees the play as one that avoids absolutism and advocates an English republic that would encourage bounded and discrete subjects. Kuzner questions such a reading of *Coriolanus*, both with a view to textual accuracy and its attention to bounded selfhood. Many recent theoretical works have noted dangers inherent in the idea of personal boundaries central to republican arguments. Kuzner argues that Shakespeare represents the birth of Roman republicanism as the birth of a state that uses law to place people outside the law. Life within the city thus becomes life that can be killed without the use of ordinary legal channels. Accordingly, *Coriolanus* cannot be read as a pro-republican document, but the play may still be politically appealing. Kuzner's subsequent analysis involves, among other aspects, a discussion of *Coriolanus* in relation to early modern concepts of the bounded self, recent theory and forms of self-undoing, the Rome of the play as the state of exception, and the Coriolanian being seeking self-undoing.

It is somewhat surprising that there was no work this year focusing solely on *Romeo and Juliet*, *Julius Caesar* or *Timon of Athens*. And it is striking that many critics have given *Titus Andronicus* a great deal of critical attention. The types of critical approaches to Shakespeare found in these texts are truly manifold.

(g) *Late Plays*

Of the work on Shakespeare's late plays in 2007, one of the most substantial and notable studies is one that, in fact, claims not to be a book about Shakespeare's late plays. Instead, Gordon McMullan's *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing: Authorship in the Proximity of Death* is a book 'about a

particular critical *idea* of Shakespeare's late plays and, by extension, about the late work of a highly select cohort of writers, artists and composers' (p. 5). This book thus insists on the necessity of considering what we mean when we use the term 'late' Shakespeare to refer to the playwright's late romances or tragicomedies. This term, McMullan points out, does not simply affirm chronology or reflect a creative process that Shakespeare would have been familiar with; nor is it a concept that applies only to Shakespeare. It invokes, McMullan claims, 'a general history of critical analysis, a history that starts with the establishment of style as the organic product not of an epoch but of the life and will of a given artist. (p. 2). This book is about this approach to late style across the disciplines, and it aptly demonstrates its interdisciplinary approach by moving fluently between analyses of the emergence of the idea of late work in musicology, art history and literary studies. McMullan's central argument is that it is impossible to separate late Shakespeare from this wider concept of lateness, which, despite being perceived as transcultural and transhistorical, is a critical construct. *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing* thus offers a detailed examination of the place of an understanding of 'late Shakespeare' in this critical history.

Although McMullan emphasizes that this could be 'a book about any given set of plays as they are assessed in relation to period of the playwright's life in which they were written' (p. 6), in choosing Shakespeare's late plays as a case study to interrogate this discourse, he provides a comprehensive and lively evaluation of the reception history of the late plays. Commenting on the tendency of criticism to focus on *Pericles*, *The Winter's Tale*, *Cymbeline* and *The Tempest* and to exclude *Henry VIII*, *Cardenio* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* which postdate them, McMullan demonstrates the limitations of critical approaches to these plays. He revisits debates on the dating and evidence on the material production of the plays. Yet, instead of suggesting conclusive new groupings, he demonstrates the problematic critical assumptions that underpin such conclusions. Arguing that the late plays have become associated with the aesthetic at the expense of the historical, McMullan reintroduces a historical element to the discourse of lateness by combining a consideration of the way in which an understanding of late style has emerged historically with an evaluation of attitudes towards lateness, last words and endings of lives in early modern England and the contexts of production in early modern theatre. Through an analysis of role of the acting company and collaborative authorship in the production of early modern play texts, he offers a fresh consideration of the collaboratively authored late plays and convincingly illustrates the ways in which an ascription of late style 'misunderstands the conditions of production for early seventeenth-century theatre' (p. 225). This book thus exposes the limitations of the tendency of the majority of studies of late Shakespeare that utilize, to some extent, a biographical approach and insists upon the necessity of rethinking the plays in their historical and institutional contexts. McMullan also offers an interesting analysis of the ways in which old-age style and late style have been conflated in Shakespearian criticism, and explores the subsequent interpretation of *King Lear* as a late play. Noting the connections between this play and *The Tempest* sustained by theatrical performances, McMullan proceeds to demonstrate the ongoing

utility of the idea of 'late Shakespeare', particularly in recent films and performances of the latter. This is achieved through an examination of the ways in which Sir John Gielgud and Mark Rylance have deployed Prospero as 'a figure both of late Shakespeare and of the late career in general' (p. 320), and the study thus concludes with a new analysis of performances of *The Tempest* and the ways in which it has been appropriated in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

In critically re-examining the concept of 'late Shakespeare', McMullan's study raises important questions about Shakespeare's late plays, their original theatrical contexts, and responses to them, as well as about early modern attitudes to old age and the ending of lives and the construction of an idea of late style, late writing or late work across the disciplines of musicology, art history and literary studies. Above all, *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing* insists upon a new critical awareness when thinking about and using the terminology of 'lateness' in relation to the plays known as Shakespeare's late work. It is, therefore, with caution that I proceed to look at the other work on Shakespeare's 'late' plays this year.

This includes Christopher Cobb's ambitious study of the power of performance to bring about change in Shakespeare's romances, *The Staging of Romance in Late Shakespeare: Text and Theatrical Technique*. Positing a fundamental relationship between dramatic technique, performance and personal and social change, Cobb argues for the 'power and value of staging romance' (p. 13), which in the late plays, he suggests, brings characters, actors and audiences to the 'boundary between humanly producible transformations and supernatural ones, exploring the extent to which human change can be understood as a theatrical event' (p. 12) and ultimately effects 'human transformations' (p. 11). Cobb makes his case persuasively through a close analysis of *The Winter's Tale*. While providing examples from Shakespeare's other late plays, and indeed some non-Shakespearian romances, he suggests that a detailed case study is the most effective way of demonstrating the transformative power of the genre and that *The Winter's Tale*, as a turning point in the history of the staging of romance and in Shakespeare's engagement with this genre, is the most appropriate example. The centrality of *The Winter's Tale* to the genre of romance is further conveyed through the structure of Cobb's book, which moves between detailed case study and a broader survey of the genre. Chapters 3 and 6 look at a range of other plays, offering an interesting context for the original and thorough readings of *The Winter's Tale* in the other chapters. Chapter 2 offers a detailed account of the potential interpretations of Act I, scene ii, in terms of how the characters, and the audience, are offered various methods of dealing with Leontes' uncertainty. Beginning with close textual analysis of this example, Cobb then moves fluently to a consideration of the staging of this scene in the 1994 Royal Shakespeare Company performance directed by Adrian Noble, and in the 1988 National Theatre production directed by Peter Hall. Chapter 4 focuses on the dramatized response of onstage audiences in the play to the destructive force of Leontes' jealousy, and chapter 5 explores the play's attempt to redirect the audience through a series of interpretative challenges. As the title and these chapter synopses suggest, the history and possibilities of the genre of

romance are central to the book's examination of the late plays, as is the representation of theatricality. Indeed, *The Staging of Romance in Late Shakespeare* engages intriguingly with more general questions of theatrical mimesis, early modern acting techniques and the relationship between the audience and the performance, and sheds new light on these issues through the example of *The Winter's Tale*. In Cobb's own words, the book examines 'the transactions between artists—playwrights, actors and characters—and their observers' (p. 13) and contends that through such transactions characters, and even the audience, gain a 'power of action' and 'find themselves changed' (p. 201). While this is an ambitious claim for the power of theatre, Cobb's carefully informed and detailed account of genre, language, theatricality and performance convinces.

In contrast to this focus on genre and performance, the third book-length study of Shakespeare's late plays in 2007, Raphael Lyne's *Shakespeare's Late Work*, takes a thematic approach to the plays. As part of the Oxford Shakespeare Topics series, Lyne's book addresses a range of issues pertinent to the late plays in an accessible and lively manner. Focusing on *Pericles*, *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*, Lyne's aim is 'to characterize and analyse the similarities between the four romances, but also to open up the idea of late Shakespeare and thereby to consider a wider range of works' (p. 11). He begins by emphasizing that Shakespeare's metamorphosis into a new style in his late years can be and has been overstated, and while this book highlights some distinctive features of these plays, Lyne's approach is largely comparative in order to demonstrate the ways in which the key interests of many of Shakespeare's earlier works are reworked in the late plays. The book opens with a useful overview of some of the recurrent features of the late plays (romance, irony and metatheatricality), a brief critical history and an account of textual production. The remaining chapters are dedicated to examinations of particular features or themes in the late plays and consider how these relate to other early modern and earlier literature. This includes an examination of the interactions between seeing and believing in *The Tempest*, *The Winter's Tale* and *Cymbeline* in comparison with *Antony and Cleopatra*; a reading of the themes of finding and discovery in *The Tempest*, *Pericles* and *The Winter's Tale* alongside *Hamlet*, early modern poetry, classical literature and the Bible; a comparison of the relationships between fathers and daughters in the late plays, and of family bonds, in *Hamlet*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *King Lear* and *Othello*; the parallels and alternatives to James I's promotion of his family as the new dynasty offered by the conservative endings of the romances; and an analysis of non-Shakespearian literature to assess the extent to which the late plays re-present older tales. Through this approach, Lyne provides useful insights for students into the key themes of Shakespeare's work, the development of these themes across his plays and fresh readings of the late work's thematic concerns. In addition, Lyne offers an interesting examination of collaborative authorship in the late plays and extends this to a consideration of the ways in which Thomas Middleton and John Fletcher used similar styles in their own drama as a further basis for considering late Shakespeare as part of 'a wider cultural tendency' (p. 137).

The diverse approaches taken in these three new monographs on Shakespeare's late work build on Russ McDonald's 2006 study, *Shakespeare's Late Style*, not included in last year's review. McDonald begins, as this year's studies do, by clarifying what he interprets as Shakespeare's late plays. He includes all of the plays post-1607, and, in contrast to Lyne, emphasizes the distinct elements of this group. His argument is that 'late Shakespeare' defines a particular style of writing which is the product of 'Shakespeare's increasingly sophisticated way of thinking about the world' (p. 32). This is different from McMullan's concept of the idea of late writing put forward in his 2007 study. Indeed the two books' differing approaches to the concept of a late style are complementary. McMullan himself draws attention to this, distinguishing between his recognition of a stylistic shift in late Shakespeare that stems from and produces an overarching understanding of late style and McDonald's focus on the minutiae of style (p. 7). McDonald clarifies his own approach claiming that he begins with the specific, with 'microscopic units such as syllables and lines' (p. 2), rather than trying to characterize plays according to theme or genre, before 'moving outward' in order to 'define the principle properties' of the style adopted by Shakespeare in his late plays and to 'explore the relation of that style to the dramatic forms it was devised to serve' (p. 2). McDonald achieves this by first evaluating the origins of this style in *Macbeth*, *Coriolanus* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, and then through a detailed analysis of the use of ellipsis, syntax and repetition in Shakespearean drama post-1607. In doing this, he comments on the compression of complex ideas into a few words as the most distinctive feature of Shakespeare's late style; notes the correspondences between the structure of the sentences of Shakespeare's dramatic verse and the dramatic action and the ways in which sentences become a kind of 'miniature romance' (p. 169) in these plays; examines the musical effects of the auditory combinations in the plays; and explores the ways in which Shakespeare's poetry promotes uncertainty and ambiguity. Ultimately, McDonald addresses the question of how an acquaintance with these technical features helps us to understand the plays, and in the book's final chapter he reviews some commonly addressed themes with the advantage of his detailed attention to style.

The publication of these four monographs on late Shakespeare indicates, perhaps, a revived interest in Shakespeare's late works, and, through their different approaches and alternative readings, these texts demonstrate the continuing significance of the plays as sites for revisiting questions of genre, style, performance and history. This is further evidenced by the attention given to Shakespeare's late plays in another two monographs in 2007. Gina Bloom's *Voice in Motion: Staging Gender, Shaping Sound in Early Modern England* and Michael Witmore's *Pretty Creatures: Children and Fiction in the English Renaissance* both include lengthy chapters on the late plays. Bloom offers an entirely fresh reading of Shakespeare's late plays, and particularly of the female characters, in a chapter at the centre of her innovative study of the voice as a literary, historical and performative motif in early modern English drama and culture. In this material history of the voice and of how early moderns represented its production, transmission and reception, Bloom ably

demonstrates that the human voice is represented as possessing material attributes in early modern culture through an analysis of a range of texts, including medical treatises, song books, pronunciation manuals, acoustic studies, religious sermons and plays. Chapter 3, which focuses on the late plays, is one of a number of chapters that look at play texts and performance contexts, from boy actors' unmanageable voices to the differences between the written text and live performance in George Gascoigne's treatment of Echo in his entertainments at Kenilworth Castle. This chapter examines the representation of ears and hearing in early modern texts, or, as Bloom states, considers 'what happens to vocal communication when the voice reaches its most unpredictable destination, the listener' (p. 18). In a theoretically-engaged analysis, Bloom marks out her unique critical position in attending to gender in this context, an issue that is not considered in previous work on hearing and sound in early modern culture. While recent critics have argued for a relationship between sound and subjectivity, the emergent subject's relationship to sound is, Bloom points out, often figured as one of subordination. Yet, when these models of acoustic subjectification are applied to *Cymbeline*, *Pericles*, *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*, as they are in this study, their limitations become evident. The late plays, Bloom claims, 'explore most intently the transformative power of hearing' (p. 122). She demonstrates this through an analysis of the representation of receptive ears as crucial for salvation and of open ears as a liability in Protestant sermons. A reading of the late plays alongside these texts leads to an original interpretation of the salvation of the male characters in the late plays. In *Cymbeline*, Bloom argues, auditory acts induce the collapse and the restoration of the king's family and state; in *Pericles* and *The Winter's Tale*, the male protagonists undergo the process of salvation through aural receptivity. However, it is Bloom's analysis of the female characters of the late plays in these terms that it is most significant and interesting. Engaging with the critical tendency to focus on the late plays' valorization of feminine and maternal virtues and on female speech, Bloom questions the extent to which these signify a more generous portrayal of women. Stating that 'although Marina, Innogen and Paulina speak persuasively at crucial moments, their vocal power has diminished currency in plays that figure salvation as aural, rather than oral' (p. 132), Bloom points out that while aural openness signifies heroic capacity for the men in the late plays, it signifies lasciviousness for the women. Hearing therefore, Bloom suggests, functions as a site of gender differentiation in the late plays. Yet she goes on to argue convincingly that this does not mean that women are denied power; rather, the plays dramatize a provocative model of female agency, albeit one that locates agency in aural acts. Bloom utilizes the theories of Judith Butler and Pierre Bourdieu to argue that the plays illustrate the potential transformation of constructive aural defence into disruptive deafness. In other words, if female auditors are expected to practise aural defence, then it is possible that they will use these skills when they should be listening, and Bloom explores the relationship between Prospero and Miranda as a key example. Ultimately, she extends this exploration of listening in the late drama to consider an audience who may also choose not to listen. Concluding with an entirely new slant on *The Tempest's* representation of the

power of the theatre, Bloom suggests that if Miranda resists Prospero's performance this problematizes the play's representation of the spellbinding effect of theatre. This original examination of the late plays thus offers a fresh interpretation of the plays' representations of gender, subjectivity and of theatre itself.

A chapter on Shakespeare's late plays is also central to Michael Witmore's study of the child as a metaphor for, and producer and consumer of, fiction and the imagination in *Pretty Creatures*. Noting the ways in which scholars have associated Shakespeare's late plays with childhood, Witmore offers a fascinating interpretation of one of Shakespeare's most famous child characters, Mamillius, and delivers a new reading of Shakespeare's meditation on his art in his late career through a lively analysis of childhood and storytelling in *The Winter's Tale*. Positioned within the wider exploration offered by Witmore's study of the associations between the child, imagination and fiction in the period, this chapter draws 'Shakespeare and his late writing into the larger conversation about children and fictional agency in the seventeenth century' (p. 138). Beginning with a brief survey of the function of child characters in Shakespeare's earlier work, Witmore argues that the Shakespearian child often symbolizes the origin of a story or serves as a medium of exchange between adults, and that Shakespeare turns more intently to nature and children in his late plays to interrogate methods of storytelling and the nature of his art. He reads the representation of childhood, storytelling and the imagination in *The Winter's Tale* as exemplary of the late plays in order to get a 'more precise sense of their dramaturgy and distinctive representation of the agency of fiction' (p. 140), and suggests that a consideration of these motifs in this play provides a fresh perspective to debates on Shakespeare's interrogation of his own art. His analysis of Mamillius's dramaturgical role in carrying the story, of his associations with origins and imaginative generativity and of the links between this child figure and Autolycus in the representation of storytelling constitutes a novel examination of the representation of fiction and theatre in the late plays, moving away from the usual focus on the play's statue scene. In contrast to the common conclusions of critical examinations of the representation of art in the late plays, Witmore concludes that *The Winter's Tale* stands as one of the most focused explorations of the nature of fiction, and that the 'writer of the late plays was not so much interested in explaining the causes of the theatre's power as he was in illustrating its effects' (p. 170).

Shakespeare's late plays are also used to explore further questions of genre in two edited collections this year. In *Early Modern Tragicomedy*, edited by Subha Mukherji and Raphael Lyne, Gordon McMullan returns to the question of the terminology used to describe this group of plays, querying the neutrality of the term late and comparing it to other tags such as romance and tragicomedy. This essay, "'The Neutral Term": Shakespearean Tragicomedy and the Idea of the "Late Play"' (pp. 115–32), as its title suggests, extends the arguments of McMullan's monograph to explore tragicomedy as a 'late' genre in theatrical history. He interestingly considers Shakespeare's late works in conjunction with those of John Fletcher and Ben Jonson, reaching the conclusion that tragicomedy is 'a logical corollary of and development

from... the primitive forms of tragedy and comedy' (p. 132). This is one of four essays on Shakespeare's late plays in this collection of work that consider concepts of tragicomedy from Aristotle to early modern Irish theatre. Ros King's contribution, 'In Lieu of Democracy, or How Not to Lose Your Head: Theatre and Authority in Renaissance England' (pp. 84–100), considers the political import of tragicomedy. It reads *Cymbeline* as an example of this genre alongside *Damon and Pythias*, *The Comedy of Errors* and *Dr Faustus*, and focuses on the duality within these plays and the careful balancing of tragedy with comic moments. One of most interesting aspects of this essay is its analysis of specific moments in *Cymbeline* and its readings of the potentially different generic effects of these moments on those watching the play in contrast to those reading it. One example is King's account of Imogen's clasping of the headless body. When reading the play, she suggests, this is a tragic moment, with the emphasis on the pathos of the speech. However, in performance the audience might be reminded that Imogen has got the wrong person and this has the potential, King proposes, to function as a comic moment as the intensity of character's emotions becomes embarrassing and liable to provoke laughter. According to King, therefore, this play's balance of tragedy and comedy may depend on the presentation medium.

Another essay in this collection, 'Taking *Pericles* Seriously' by Suzanne Gossett (pp. 101–14), focuses on Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher's attempts at tragicomedy in the context of the development of the genre in the early years of the seventeenth century. *Pericles* is central to this discussion as Gossett insists on its popularity and points to repeated productions of the play to argue for its influence on the work of Beaumont and Fletcher, particularly *Philaster*, *A King and No King*, *Cupid's Revenge* and *The Faithful Shepherdess*. Rather than the archaic flavour, episodic sweep or language of Shakespeare's late play, 'what the young collaborators modelled from *Pericles* as they moved to the King's Men', Gossett argues, 'was the power of sexuality to disturb the state, the mixture of social classes, the strong, virtuous heroine, and most of all the ability to move audiences' (p. 114).

Michael Witmore and Jonathan Hope's essay in this collection, 'Shakespeare by Numbers: On the Linguistic Texture of the Late Plays' (pp. 133–53), takes an unusual but intriguing approach in the writers' account of their attempts to make quantitative assessments about the late plays, or to do Shakespeare by numbers. In this essay they outline their methodology in using a computer text analysis tool, Docuscope, to analyse this group of late plays, romances or tragicomedies in an effort to identify linguistic features that might be used to separate this group from the tragedies, comedies and histories and to define a fourth Shakespearian genre. Their findings include interesting original evidence on the linguistic differences between the late plays and other genres, such as an increase in direct representations of the past. They acknowledge that language in the theatre is influenced by material factors, such as the number of actors, the size of stage and staging technologies, and note that when counting the use of linguistic features it is necessary to account for the degree to which 'texts of plays are saturated with dramaturgical exigencies—the need to do something with

language in a particular way in a particular set of circumstances' (p. 152). Nonetheless, their conclusion that genre is a 'coordinated pattern of various types of dramaturgical and linguistic effects' (p. 152) that might be defined through this form of statistical analysis not only sheds new light on the features and linguistic composition of the late plays but also gestures towards the potential impact of computer text analysis on our understanding of genre.

Genre is also a key issue in the examination of Shakespeare's late plays in two essays included in *Shakespeare and Historical Formalism*, edited by Stephen Cohen. Emphasizing the displacement of an examination of formal techniques in New Historicism, the essays in this collection exemplify a new body of work that returns to matters of form but also retains the theoretical and methodological gains of historicism and they thus 'fulfil the promise of a historical formalism' (p. 3). Shakespeare's late plays figure prominently in part I of this volume, specifically in Heather Dubrow's "'I would I were at home": Representations of Dwelling Places and Havens in *Cymbeline*' (pp. 69–93) and Christopher Cobb's 'Storm versus Story: Form and Affective Power in Shakespeare's Romances' (pp. 95–124). Dubrow's chapter is a lively exploration of the interplay of generic norms and cultural tensions in *Cymbeline*. Comparing Shakespeare's play with contemporary cinema, especially the films of the Coen brothers, Dubrow suggests that these performances share a delight in parody and an emphasis on the centrality of dwelling places, and she explores the ways in which the invasion of spaces perverts and pays homage to traditional structures, specifically generic types. Dubrow moves fluently between an outline of the potentialities of the genres of romance and pastoral for exploring the loss and recovery of dwellings and an investigation of historical context, specifically of the significance of dwellings, Wales and coinage in early modern culture, and she brings both to bear on *Cymbeline* through close textual analysis. The essay's main argument is that the genres of romance and pastoral become metagenres in this play, as Shakespeare subjects their conventions to ironic critique, and it offers an interesting insight into this possibility. However, Dubrow concludes that, in spite of the play's reinterpretation of the genres, its final scene returns to a traditional use of the forms.

Christopher Cobb's excellent essay is a version of chapter 6 of his monograph discussed above. It begins with a comparison between the features of romance used to open the three early late plays (*Pericles*, *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale*) and those used to open *The Tempest*, *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. The former group, he argues, emphasize narrative forms of romance, while the latter, on which he focuses here, use elaborate theatrical spectacles of the romance genre that are also employed in forms of political theatre. Cobb's essay offers a dense analysis of the ways in which Shakespeare's late plays become overtly involved in theatrical politics via this use of the romance genre. Examining how these plays ironically represent the pretensions of royal spectacle and undermine the power of such spectacles to induce belief, this is a welcome engagement with *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. Furthermore, as one of many studies of the representation of theatre in *The Tempest*, this is innovative and moves forward from previous

work on this topic. To comment on the use of masque in the play as means of affirming power or the monarch, Cobb acknowledges, would be nothing new; but what he offers is a consideration of the ways in which the use of masque is interrupted by a range of theatrical forms, including the techniques of the public theatres, which results in a tension between the representation of the theatrical means used and the desired political ends. This reading of Shakespeare's late plays also has wider implications for theoretical approaches to drama, as Cobb illustrates how a careful consideration of the romance framework of these plays can 'reveal aspects of the politics of these forms inaccessible to intertextual and topical studies enabled by New Historicist methodologies' (p. 96) and proposes that, in order to reconsider forms of romance in the theatre, it is necessary to reconsider form, especially theatrical form, in historicist methodology.

Performance contexts of *The Tempest* form the basis of further studies of this late play this year. It is considered in relation to music in Daniel Albright's *Musicking Shakespeares: A Conflict of Theatres*. The introduction to this noteworthy study of the ways in which composers have responded to the distinctive features of Shakespeare's plays includes an analysis of the music in the original Jacobean performances of *The Tempest* and in Restoration operatic appropriations. Outlining the types of music and songs incorporated by the playwright into his drama, Albright suggests that at the end of his career, and illustrated by *The Tempest*, Shakespeare's attitude to the dramatic possibilities of music changed. Via an examination of the play's text, Albright comments, as others have, on the influence of the court masque on the play and the cues given by the stage directions for dances, music and singing. However, Albright goes further than other commentaries on this topic and considers two songs written for the play by Robert Johnson. Examining the extant manuscript copies of these songs from c.1660, Albright imagines a 'nonexistent *Tempest* opera that might have been produced in James I's or Charles I's England' (p. 16) before looking at Restoration operatic versions of the play. He is thus in a position to suggest new ways in which the play might be read as a meditation on the technical evolution of the stage and fresh interpretations of the masque-like structure of the play. Arguing that *The Tempest* calls for a sophisticated code of analysis, Albright uses this example to establish his method of reading opera and drama in this study. This method collapses the boundaries between the two performance forms to offer innovative readings of Shakespearian appropriations by Purcell, Berlioz, Verdi and Britten which, Albright convincingly argues, push the boundaries of theatre and the operatic medium.

This reading of *The Tempest* develops a critical interest in the play's musical elements also evident in David Lindley's 2006 study, *Shakespeare and Music*. This introductory guide evidently offers less specialist analysis, but nonetheless provides a comprehensive commentary on the potential use of music in the play in Shakespeare's time. Arguing that musical moments in Shakespearian drama can only be fully comprehended when located in a wider cultural concept of music in the early modern period, Lindley considers the various musical moments of the play in this context. In the final chapter he reads the play alongside *Twelfth Night*, commenting on how the music and songs might

have been performed and on their effects, and suggesting ways in which songs explore the limits of Shakespeare's art.

Another student guide to *The Tempest* is Trevor Griffith's *The Tempest: A Guide to the Text and its Theatrical Life*, included in Palgrave's new series, The Shakespeare Handbooks. Like the other books in this series, this is a detailed examination of the play's text, original performance conditions, appropriations on stage and screen and critical history, and includes a scene-by-scene commentary. This focused analysis highlights a range of potential readings of the play for students, and, in addition to the necessary comments on action, language and dramatic structure, offers informative remarks on staging issues. The section on sources and cultural contexts also includes some interesting information on the contexts of the Sea Venture, representations of the New World, slavery and early modern concepts of genre, and provides relevant extracts from contemporary documents, making this a particularly useful source for the classroom. Teachers and students will appreciate the well-presented insights into the play and its historical, performance and critical contexts.

The Winter's Tale is, as usual, also considered in a number of other books and journals this year. Catherine Belsey's captivating study, *Why Shakespeare?*, examines the play in the context of tale-telling and oral culture in Renaissance England. Belsey explains the play's unlikely occurrences by approaching it as 'an old wives' tale, although one with a considerable difference in the telling' (p. 67), and contrasts the realism of the first three acts with the fairy-tale elements of Perdita's story. Highlighting the significance of changing costume and adopting new identities with ease for Perdita's character, Belsey suggests that 'like any fairytale princess, Shakespeare's figure has no identity, only a succession of identifications, and she inhabits each of them without indications of serious anxiety' (p. 79). Belsey also identifies fairy-tale elements to Hermione's story, but, arguing that this is a mimetic representation with elements of folk tale while Perdita's is predominantly a fireside tale with elements of realism, she asks: 'what are we to make of the moment when the two stories converge?' (p. 79). Having worked through the potential interpretations of the statue scene in the context of this combination of realism and fairy tale, Belsey concludes that to settle on one reading of the final scene does an injustice to a play that sustains its own mystery. The effect of this, she proposes, is a generic undecidability that leaves play's happy ending in question. What initially appears to be a gentle interpretation of the play as fairy tale, therefore, is in fact a serious theoretical analysis of the complexities of play's final moments, which exposes the darker undercurrents of the play's apparently happy ending. Of course, we would expect nothing less from Belsey's study, and this is typical of the book as a whole. *Why Shakespeare?* attempts to answer the momentous question of why Shakespeare continues to be so popular, and proposes that one reason is the way in which his plays rewrite familiar stories that have always held a wide-ranging appeal, especially fairy tales. Through this examination of the fairy-tale heroine in *The Winter's Tale*, of the relationship between folk tales and *As You Like It*, of fairies in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, of riddles in *Twelfth Night*, of riddles and villains in *The Merchant of Venice*, of ghosts and

fools in *Hamlet*, and of fathers and daughters in *King Lear*, Belsey offers a close analysis of language and carefully theorized readings of the plays that introduce questions of identity and gender in an accessible manner for students, and gives a lively and convincing account of the position of Shakespeare's plays in a history of storytelling and popular culture.

A reading of *The Winter's Tale* is also provided in the final chapter of David Hillman's *Shakespeare's Entrails: Belief, Scepticism and the Interior of the Body*. Drawing on psychoanalytic, philosophical, historicist and literary-critical methodologies, this book examines the emergence of modern subjectivity in relation to changing attitudes towards the interior of the human body in the Renaissance and the connections between embodiment, knowledge and acknowledgement in *Troilus and Cressida*, *Hamlet*, *King Lear* and *The Winter's Tale*. In the example of *The Winter's Tale*, Hillman examines the images of the interior body, specifically Hermione's pregnant body and its depiction of the possibility of bodily inhabitation, Leontes' reading of his wife's body as his own, his desire to purge his body and the imagery of eating and breathing. Relating Leontes' scepticism to these representations of the body, this chapter examines the gendering of scepticism in the play and in this culture to offer a detailed examination of Leontes from a psychoanalytic perspective. Hillman additionally reads the play in an original manner through a comparison with *King Lear*; indeed, his overall argument is that this late Shakespearian play might be interestingly re-read as a return to *King Lear* and 'an attempt to revisit, and to escape from, the intensity of that play's engagement with the terrors and hopes regarding who or what can inhabit the human body' (p. 153). Through this approach he offers new interpretations of oft-examined lines and moments in *The Winter's Tale*.

Finally, Ros King's 'Reading Beyond words: Sound and Gesture in *The Winter's Tale*' (*Pedagogy* 7:iii[2007] 385–400) also focuses on *The Winter's Tale* and addresses the topics of oral and aural culture in relation to the late plays—topics that are, of course, central to Bloom's study discussed above. However, in contrast to Bloom's focus on early modern concepts of the voice, King addresses the importance of reading aloud in her article on teaching the aural aspects of Shakespeare. Demonstrating the ways in which close attention to sound might alter the way we critically approach the late plays and outlining the implications for teaching Shakespearian drama, King concludes with a case study of *The Winter's Tale*, indicating some ways in which it might be read and taught with an emphasis on speaking, silence and listening that offers a creative interpretation of Leontes' jealousy.

Books Reviewed

- Albright, Daniel. *Musicking Shakespeare: A Conflict of Theatres*. URP. [2007] pp. x + 317. £45 ISBN 9 7815 8046 2556.
- Arnold, Oliver. *The Third Citizen: Shakespeare's Theater and the Early Modern House of Commons*. JHUP. [2007] pp. xiv + 308. £36.50 ISBN 0 8018 8504 3.

- Bach, Rebecca Ann. *Shakespeare and Renaissance Literature before Heterosexuality*. Palgrave. [2007] pp. xi + 243. \$74.95 ISBN 1 4039 7654 6.
- Barker, Simon. *War and Nation in the Theatre of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*. EdinUP. [2007] pp. viii + 239. £50 ISBN 9 7807 4862 7653.
- Bate, Jonathan, and Eric Rasmussen, eds. *The Complete Works (The Royal Shakespeare Company Complete Works)*. Macmillan. [2007] pp. 2,576. £35 ISBN 9 7802 3000 3507.
- Belsey, Catherine. *Why Shakespeare?* Palgrave. [2007] pp. xii + 190. £9.99 ISBN 9 7814 0399 3205.
- Bevington, David. *This Wide and Universal Theater: Shakespeare in Performance Then and Now*. University of Chicago Press [2007] pp. 256. hb \$25. ISBN: 0 2260 4478 5.
- Bloom, Gina. *Voice in Motion: Staging Gender, Shaping Sound in Early Modern England*. UPennP. [2007] pp. 277. £39 ISBN 9 7808 1224 0061.
- Brooks, Douglas A., Ann Thompson and John Ford, eds. *Shakespeare Yearbook 16: The Shakespeare Apocrypha*. Mellen. [2007] pp. 568. \$140 ISBN 0 7734 5421 7.
- Buccola, Regina, and Lisa Hopkins, eds. *Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama*. Ashgate. [2007] pp. 177. £50 ISBN 9 7807 5465 6371.
- Burnett, Mark Thornton. *Filming Shakespeare in a Global Marketplace*. Palgrave Macmillan. [2007] pp. 227. hb £45 ISBN 1 4039 9215 0.
- Burt, Richard, ed. *Shakespeares after Shakespeare: An Encyclopedia of the Bard in Mass Media and Popular Culture*, 2 vols. Greenwood Press. [2007] pp. 888. hb \$299.95 ISBN 0 3133 3116 2.
- Busse, Beatrix. *Vocative Constructions in the Language of Shakespeare*. Benjamins. [2006] pp. xviii + 525. £117 ISBN 9 0272 5393 5.
- Butterworth, Philip ed. *The Narrator, the Expositor, and the Prompter in European Medieval Theatre*. Brepols. [2007]
- Callaghan, Dympna. *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Blackwell. [2007] pp. 176. £15.99 ISBN 1 4051 1398 7.
- Callaghan, Dympna ed. *The Impact of Feminism in English Renaissance Studies*. Palgrave. [2007]
- Canino, Catherine Grace. *Shakespeare and the Nobility*. CUP. [2007] pp. x + 266. £50 ISBN 9 7805 2187 2911.
- Cartelli, Thomas, and Katherine Rowe. *New Wave Shakespeare on Screen*. Polity Press. [2007] pp. 201. hb £55, pb £16.99. ISBN 0 7456 3392 7, 0 7456 3393 5.
- Cartmell, Deborah, and Imelda Whelehan, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. Cambridge UP. [2007] pp. 288. hb £48, pb £15.99. ISBN 0 5218 4962 4.
- Chedzoy, Kate, Susanne Greenhalgh and Robert Shaughnessy, eds. *Shakespeare and Childhood*. Cambridge UP. [2007] pp. 296. hb £50 ISBN 0 5218 7125 5.
- Cheney, Patrick, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's Poetry*. Cambridge UP. [2007] pp. 316. £16.99 ISBN 0 5216 0864 3.
- Cheney, Patrick, Andrew Hadfield and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr, eds. *Early Modern English Poetry: A Critical Companion*. OUP. [2007] pp. xxiii + 342. £21.99 ISBN 9 7801 9515 3873.

- Chernaik, Warren. *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's History Plays*. CUP. [2007] pp. ix + 210. £11.99 ISBN 9 7805 2167 1200.
- Clark, Ira. *Rhetorical readings, Dark Comedies, and Shakespeare's Problem Plays*. UPFlor [2007] pp. 144. £54.62 ISBN 978-0813030401.
- Cobb, Christopher J. *The Staging of Romance in Late Shakespeare: Text and Theatrical Technique*. UDeLP. [2007] pp. 304. £51.50 ISBN 9 7808 7413 9716.
- Cohen, Stephen, ed. *Shakespeare and Historical Formalism*. Ashgate. [2007] pp. ix + 252. £50 ISBN 9 7807 5465 3820.
- Cordner, Michael, and Peter Holland, eds. *Players, Playwrights, Playhouses: Investigating Performance, 1660–1800*. Palgrave. [2007] pp. xiii + 300. £50 ISBN 9 7802 3052 5245.
- de Grazia, Margreta. *'Hamlet' without Hamlet*. CUP. [2007] pp. 280. \$91 ISBN 0 5218 7025 9.
- Dillon, Janette. *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Tragedies*. CUP. [2007] pp. vi + 169. £11.99 ISBN 9 7805 2167 4928.
- Duncan-Jones, Katherine, and H.R. Woudhuysen, eds. *Shakespeare's Poems: Venus and Adonis, The Rape of Lucrece and the Shorter Poems*. Thomson. [2007] pp. 593. £9.99 ISBN 9 7819 0343 6875.
- Ewert, Kevin. *Henry V: A Guide to the Text and its Theatrical Afterlife*. Palgrave. [2006] pp. vii + 166. £9.99 ISBN 9 7814 0394 0773.
- Freedman, Penelope. *Power and Passion in Shakespeare's Pronouns: Interrogating 'You' and 'Thou'*. Ashgate. [2007] pp. xiv + 294. £50 ISBN 9 7807 5465 8306.
- Fryatt, Kit. 'Shakespeare and Berryman: Sonnet 129 and Dream Song 1', pp. 81–86. In Coleman, Philip, ed. and introd., McGowan, Philip, ed. and introd., Kelly, Richard J., preface. *'After Thirty Falls': New Essays on John Berryman*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007.
- Giese, Loreen L. *Courtships, Marriage Customs, and Shakespeare's Comedies*. Palgrave. [2006] pp. xiii + 217. £38.99. ISBN 0 3121 6604 5.
- Grady, Hugh and Hawkes, Terence, eds. *Presentist Shakespeare*. Routledge. [2007] Hb £60 ISBN 0 415 38528 8 Pb £18.99 ISBN 0 415 38529 6.
- Griffiths, Trevor. *The Tempest: A Guide to the Text and its Theatrical Life*. Palgrave. [2007], pp. xi + 160. £9.99 ISBN 978 1 4039 3478 9.
- Groves, Beatrice. *Texts and Traditions: Religion in Shakespeare, 1592–1604*. OUP. [2007] pp. 244. \$55 ISBN 0 1992 0898 0.
- Hageman, Elizabeth H., and Conway, Katherine, eds. *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*. FDUP. [2007] pp. 292. £46.95 ISBN 9 7808 3864 1156.
- Hillman, David. *Shakespeare's Entrails: Belief, Scepticism and the Interior of the Body*. Palgrave. [2007] pp. xiii + 263. £50 ISBN 9 7814 0394 2678.
- Hindle, Maurice. *Studying Shakespeare on Film*. Palgrave Macmillan. [2007] pp. 272. hb £50. pb £16.99. ISBN: 1 4039 0673 4, 1 4039 0672 6.
- Howard, Tony. *Women as Hamlet: Performance and Interpretation in Theatre, Film and Fiction*. Cambridge UP. [2007] pp. 341. hb £50, pb £16.99. ISBN 0 5218 6466 6.
- Huang, Alexander C.Y., I-Chun Wang and Mary Theis, eds. *Class, Boundary and Social Discourse in the Renaissance*. National Sun Yat-Sen University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan. [2007]

- Hunt, Marvin W. *Looking for Hamlet*. Palgrave. [2007] pp. vi + 230. £27.95 ISBN 1 4039 7036 X.
- Hutson, Lorna. *The Invention of Suspicion: Law and Mimesis in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama*. OUP. [2007] pp. x + 382. £50 ISBN 9 7801 9921 2439.
- Jackson, Russell. *Shakespearean Films in the Making: Vision, Production and Reception*. Cambridge UP. [2007] pp. 292. hb £50. ISBN 0 5218 1547 9.
- Jancsó, Daniella. *Excitements of Reason: The Presentation of Thought in Shakespeare's Plays and Wittgenstein's Philosophy*. Winter. [2007] pp. 257. ISBN 9 7838 2535 4107.
- Jordan, Constance, and Cunningham, Karen, eds. *The Law in Shakespeare*. Palgrave. [2007] pp. x + 286. £53 ISBN 1 4039 9214 2.
- Jordan, Constance and Karen Cunningham, eds. *The Law in Shakespeare*. Palgrave. [2007]
- Jowett, John. *Shakespeare and Text*. OUP. [2007] pp. 229. £12.99 ISBN 9 7801 9921 7069.
- Kathryn M. Moncrieff and Kathryn R. McPherson, eds. *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England*. Ashgate. [2007]
- Lemon, Rebecca. *Treason by Words: Literature, Law, and Rebellion in Shakespeare's England*. CornUP. [2006] pp. ix + 234. £28.50 ISBN 9 7808 0144 4289.
- Levith, Murray. *Shakespeare's Cues and Prompts*. Continuum. [2007] £45 ISBN 0 8264 9597 4.
- Lindley, David. *Shakespeare and Music*. Arden. [2006]. pp. xii + 284. £22.99 ISBN 9 7819 0343 6189.
- Lloyd, Megan S. *Speak It in Welsh: Wales and the Welsh Language in Shakespeare*. Lexington. [2007] pp. 209. \$60 ISBN 0 7391 1760 2.
- Logan, Sandra. *Texts/Events in Early Modern England*. Ashgate. [2007] pp. viii + 360. £50 ISBN 9 7807 5465 5862.
- Lyne, Raphael. *Shakespeare's Late Work*. OUP. [2007] pp. 173. £12.99 ISBN 9 7801 9926 5954.
- Magnusson, Lynne. 'A pragmatics for interpreting Shakespeare's Sonnets 1–20: Dialogue scripts and Erasmanian intertexts', pp. 167–83. In Fitzmaurice, Susan, ed. and introd., Taavitsainen, Irma, ed. and introd. *Methods in Historical Pragmatics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2007.
- Marrapodi, Michele, ed. *Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries: Rewriting, Remaking, Refashioning*. Ashgate. [2007] pp. 302. £55 ISBN 9 7807 5465 5046.
- Massai, Sonia. *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor*. CUP. [2007] pp. 266. £50 ISBN 9 7805 2187 8050.
- McDonald, Russ. *Shakespeare's Late Style*. CUP. [2006] pp. x + 260. £54 ISBN 9 7805 2182 0684.
- McMullan, Gordon. *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing: Authorship in the Proximity of Death*. CUP. [2007] pp. xii + 402. £55 ISBN 9 7805 2186 3049.
- Merriam, Tom. *Co-authorship in King John*. RenI. [2007] pp. 92. No price, no ISBN.

- Moncrief, Kathryn M, and Kathryn R. McPherson eds. *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England*. Ashgate. [2007] pp. 247. £50 ISBN 9 7807 5466 1177.
- Mukherji, Subha, and Raphael Lyne, eds. *Early Modern Tragicomedy*. Brewer. [2007] pp. x + 216. £50 ISBN 9 7818 4384 1302.
- Murphy, Andrew, ed. *Shakespeare and the Text*. Blackwell. [2007] pp. 280. £55 ISBN 9 7814 0513 5283.
- Nuttall, A.D. *Shakespeare the Thinker*. YaleUP. [2007] pp. xiv + 428. £19.99 ISBN 9 7803 0011 9282.
- O'Connor, John, and Katharine Goodland, *A Directory of Shakespeare in Performance 1970–2005*, vol. 1: *Great Britain*. Palgrave Macmillan. [2007] pp. 1760. hb £140. ISBN 1 4039 1734 5.
- Orlin, Lena Cowin, ed. *Center or Margin: Revisions of the English Renaissance in Honor of Leeds Barroll*. SusquehannaUP. [2006] pp. 318. £46.95 ISBN 978 1 57591 098 7.
- Orlin, Lena Cowen, and Miranda Johnson-Haddad, eds. *Staging Shakespeare: Essays in Honor of Alan C. Dessen*. UDelP. [2007] pp. 274. hb \$53.50. ISBN 0 8741 3987 2.
- Pacheco, Anita. *William Shakespeare: Coriolanus*. Northcote. [2007] pp. viii + 120. £12.99 ISBN 9 7807 4631 1478.
- Palfrey, Simon, and Tiffany Stern. *Shakespeare in Parts*. OUP. [2007] pp. xiv + 545. £20 ISBN 9 7801 9927 2051.
- Poole, William, and Richard Scholar, eds. *Thinking with Shakespeare: Comparative and Interdisciplinary Essays for A.D. Nuttall*. Legenda. [2007] pp. 200. \$38 ISBN 1 9043 5084 4.
- Poole William, and Richard Scholar, eds. *Thinking with Shakespeare: Comparative and Interdisciplinary Essays for A. D. Nuttall*. Legenda. [2007]
- Rutter, Carol Chillington. *Shakespeare and Child's Play: Performing Lost Boys on Stage and Screen*. Routledge. [2007] pp. 250. hb £65, pb £19.99. ISBN 0 4153 6518 X, 0 4153 6519 8.
- Sanders, Julie. *Shakespeare and Music: Afterlives and Borrowings*. Polity. [2007] pp. 248. hb £50, pb £15.99. ISBN 0 7456 3296 3.
- Schoenfeldt, Michael, ed. *A Companion to Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Blackwell. [2007] pp. 536. £85 ISBN 1 4051 2155 6.
- Scott, Charlotte. *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Book*. OUP. [2007] pp. 216. £53 ISBN 9 7801 9921 2101.
- Shaugnessy, Robert, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Popular Culture*. CUP. [2007] pp. 304. hb £45, pb £15.99. ISBN 0 5216 0580 6.
- Smith, Emma. *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare*. CUP. [2007] pp. 176. \$20 ISBN 0 5216 7188 4.
- Sohmer, Steve. *Shakespeare for the Wiser Sort*. MUP. [2007] pp. xv + 192. £50 ISBN 9 7807 1907 6671.
- Staub, Susan C. "'My throbbing heart shall rock you day and night': Shakespeare's Venus, Elizabeth, and Early Modern Constructions of Motherhood", pp. 15–32. In Staub, Susan C, ed. *The Literary Mother: Essays on Representations of Maternity and Child Care*. McFarland: Jefferson, NC, 2007.

- Stephen Cohen, ed. *Shakespeare and Historical Formalism*. Ashgate. [2007]
- Stříbrný, Zdeněk. *The Whirligig of Time: Essays on Shakespeare and Czechoslovakia*. UDeLP. [2007] pp. 258. £44.95 ISBN 9 7808 7413 9563.
- Taylor, Gary, and John Lavagnino, eds. *The Collected Works*, by Thomas Middleton. OUP. [2007] pp. 2,018. £89 ISBN 9 7801 9818 5697.
- Taylor, Gary, and John Lavagnino, eds. *Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture: A Companion to the Collected Works*. OUP. [2007] pp. 1,184. £105 ISBN 9 7801 9818 5703.
- Turner, Henry S. *Shakespeare's Double Helix*. Shakespeare Now! Continuum. [2007] pp. xiii + 129. £50. ISBN 0 8264 9119 0.
- Vickers, Brian. *Shakespeare, 'A Lover's Complaint', and John Davies of Hereford*. CUP. [2007] pp. 342. £50 ISBN 9 7805 2185 9127.
- Wallace, Jennifer. *The Cambridge Introduction to Tragedy*. CUP. [2007] pp. viii + 243. £15.99 ISBN 9 7805 2167 1491.
- Waller, Gary, ed. *All's Well That Ends Well: New Critical Essays*. Routledge. [2007] pp. xx + 258. ISBN 9 7804 1597 3250.
- Welsh, James M. *The Literature/Film Reader: Issues of Adaptation*. Scarecrow. [2007] pp. 392. pb \$45 ISBN 0 8108 5949 1.
- Witmore, Michael. *Pretty Creatures: Children and Fiction in the English Renaissance*. CornUP. [2007]. pp. ix + 233. £20.50 ISBN 978 0 8014 4399 2.
- Zilberfain, Ava. *Stealing the Story: Shakespeare's Self-Conscious Use of the Mimetic Tradition in the Plays*. Continuum. [2007] pp. 181. £58 ISBN 9 7808 2641 7367.