

VI

Shakespeare

GABRIEL EGAN, PETER J. SMITH, ELINOR PARSONS,
CHRIS BUTLER, DANIEL CADMAN, RICHARD WOOD,
STEVE LONGSTAFFE, KATE WILKINSON AND
NAOMI McAREAVEY

This chapter has 4 sections: 1. Editions and Textual Matters; 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 (a) is by Chris Butler; section 4(b) is by Daniel Cadman; section 4(c) is by Richard Wood; section 4(d) is by Steve Longstaffe; section 4(e) is by Katherine Wilkinson; section 4(f) is by Naomi McAreavey.

1. Editions and Textual Matters

It was a busy year in this corner of Shakespeare studies. Depending on your point of view, three or four major critical editions of Shakespeare appeared in 2010: Brean Hammond edited *Double Falsehood, or The Distressed Lovers*, John Drakakis edited *The Merchant of Venice*, Barbara Hodgdon edited *The Taming of the Shrew* and John Pitcher edited *The Winter's Tale*, all for the Arden Shakespeare. There were also seven monographs and more than the usual number of articles. In 'A Note on this Edition' Brean Hammond writes 'The inclusion, for the first time, of Lewis Theobald's *Double Falsehood, or the Distressed Lovers* (1728) in the Arden Shakespeare (or indeed in any other edition of the plays and poems) reflects the unique interest of this avowedly thorough eighteenth-century adaptation as containing what may be the sole surviving textual evidence for a lost Shakespeare-Fletcher collaboration' (p. xvi). Since all we have is the eighteenth-century adaptation and it raises no interesting questions about the theory and practice of editing Shakespeare, it is excluded from this survey.

John Drakakis's introduction to *The Merchant of Venice* (pp. 1–159) is resolutely committed to the phraseology of 1980s cultural materialism: the word *recuperate* and its cognates (not in the sense of getting well but of recovering something lost) is used five times, *ideology* and its cognates nineteen

times. Each section of the introduction is a short essay on a theme, and many of them can be rather too easily summed up in a sentence that Drakakis draws out into several pages. Thus 'Venice: Myth and Reality' (pp. 3–8) tells us how Elizabethans perceived this exotic place, 'The Menace of Money' (pp. 8–12) gives a general introduction to the play's ideas about what money is and what it can do, and 'Usury or the Butler's Box' (pp. 12–17) offers more on what early moderns thought of usury, although with no explanation of the term Butler's Box, which comes up in an early book that Drakakis quotes. More substantial is the section 'Marlowe, Shakespeare and the Jews' (pp. 17–30) on the religious and economic contexts. Drakakis refers to Shylock as 'the Jew', Lancelot Gobbo as 'Clown' and Old Gobbo as 'Giobbe' without referring the reader forward to a place where these choices are explained. Drakakis's argument is much concerned with 'otherness', the idea that what Jewishness represented was the troubled incapacity of Christianity to do all that it would—especially in relation to economic development—for which the Jews as scapegoats had to be punished. No explanation is offered for a reference to 'the allegedly sexually inadequate Lancelot' (p. 26), nor why he here becomes 'Lancelot' instead of Clown or Lancelot.

A note at the beginning of the book indicates that Drakakis is general editor of a revision of Geoffrey Bullough's monumental *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare* that appeared between 1957 and 1975, although Drakakis misdates the first volume to '1977' (p. 437). Using Bullough, Drakakis relates some of 'The Con-Texts' of the play (pp. 31–40), descending into mere plot-telling towards the end. For a historicist, Drakakis is cavalier about dates, assigning composition of the play to 'some time after the midsummer of 1596 and the date of its appearance in the Stationers' Register in July 1598' (p. 35); presumably he means before 'its appearance in' the register. He then observes that its first performance must have occurred within the same span, which seems obvious. Drakakis thinks that Stephen Gosson's reference to a play *The Jew* being performed at 'the Bull' refers to 'the Red Bull theatre in Clerkenwell' (p. 31) but it does not: it refers to the Bull inn in Bishopsgate Street. It is not clear which out-of-date theatre historian has misled him, but it is not Bullough, who avoids this error. Drakakis quotes Robert Wilson's play *The Three Ladies of London* in modernized spelling yet he attributes the quotation to 'sig. B1v' of the play and without indicating whether he is quoting the 1584 or 1592 edition (p. 33n1). Worse, he misquotes the play by giving 'serve you instead' where both editions have 'serue you in her stead' and again, the error is not from Bullough, who omits this part of the play. Strangely enough, although this footnote uses modern spelling Drakakis's body text quotes the play in original spelling. Drakakis does not notice when he repeats himself almost verbatim: 'a patriarchally controlled "lottery" echoes the procedures of election to political office that were followed in Venice, which Contarini outlines at considerable length in his *Commonwealth and Government of Venice* (1599)' (pp. 39–40) repeats 'a patriarchally controlled "lottery" recalls the practice of election to political office in Venice that Contarini described in his *Commonwealth and Government of Venice* (1599)' (p. 32).

In the section 'What's in a Name?' (pp. 40–3) it becomes clear why Drakakis uses unfamiliar names for characters: an article by Richard F. Kennedy, 'Speech Prefixes in Some Shakespearean Quartos' (*PBSA* 92[1998] 177–209), has convinced him that the names used in the speech prefixes and stage directions of the first quarto (1600) were dictated by type shortage. As we shall see, Kennedy's methodology was flawed, yet on the basis of it Drakakis prefers *Jew* for *Shylock*, *Clown* for *Lancelot*, and *Giobbe* for *Old Gobbo*, the last even though, as Drakakis admits, Kennedy had nothing to say on this character's speech prefixes. Relying on outdated tests (the originators of which he does not mention), Drakakis asserts that Q1's 'descriptive stage directions' and 'vague instructions' (such as 'with three or foure followers') are characteristic of 'foul papers' (p. 43), which term he introduced on the previous page without defining it. More surprising still is Drakakis's attempt to explain Q1's doubled entry of Tubal in III.i as perhaps Shakespeare 'imagining a particular detail of stage blocking' (p. 43), meaning that Tubal enters and is encountered by the exiting Salanio and Salarino near a stage door and then is given another entrance direction for his walking on further to meet Shylock elsewhere on the stage. It would be most unusual for Shakespeare to attempt to represent such staging by doubling the entrance direction, since there are lots of comparable moments—in his drama and everybody else's—that do not double the entrance directions. For now, this short section is all Drakakis has to say on matters textual; the detail appears in appendices.

There follows a series of short sections. 'From Jew to Shylock' (pp. 44–8) is about the self-contradictions of Christian Venetian society and how its dependence upon a form of economic activity that it officially repudiates—usury—leads to self-alienation in people like Antonio, who then impose their alienation on Shylock. 'The Comic Structure of the Play' (pp. 48–51) is just a brief survey of some traditional criticism. 'The Historie of the Merchant of Venice' (pp. 51–63) starts with familiar stuff about Antonio–Bassanio's relationship being homosexual even though as a subject position this was only emergent in the period. Drakakis uses Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's idea about the homosocial bonding of two men of unequal status being threatened by a woman, and the threat being most keenly felt by the socially inferior man, finding in it an analogue for the two threats faced by Antonio: to his love life and to his economic life. This analogy only works if Antonio is socially inferior to Bassanio, and Drakakis thinks he is: 'Antonio is a member of a subordinate class who by virtue of his access to money is able to hold a social superior in thrall' (p. 55). I suppose one might infer such social inequality from the titles of Lord Bassanio and Signor Antonio, but would an Elizabethan know their relative statuses? Drakakis finds Antonio a kind of Christ figure who (nearly) expiates for the evils of proto-capitalism by giving up his life, or at least being willing to do so. Or perhaps he is a Job and the role of sacrifice is passed to Shylock. This could be a rewriting of the Christian narrative: Christ gets off and the wrongdoer receives his deserved punishment. In choosing a casket, Bassanio, like Antonio, 'is brought face to face with the prospect of death' (p. 61). I do not remember that bit: I thought the rules of the game were that the loser cannot marry or tell anyone how he chose.

In 'Parents and Children' (pp. 64–8) Drakakis makes much of Old Gobbo (whom he calls Giobbe) being like Job. Q1 does have Lancelot say that his last name is 'Jobbe' (five times), although in speech prefixes and stage directions his father is Gobbo (twenty times). Following Q1 (where he is consistently *Launcelet*), Drakakis prefers the name *Lancelet* to *Lancelot*. 'The Generation Game' (pp. 68–80) develops a thesis that Antonio is aware that his control over his own fortunes is limited, so by fathering the ambitions of his social superior Bassanio he gets the patriarchal authority he craves. The mercantile world becomes sublimated to the romantic one by the casket lottery that explicitly rejects commodity values so that gold is worthless and lead is precious. 'Caskets and Rings' (pp. 81–7) has more about the caskets (and Bassanio's meditation on them) showing 'not just Bassanio . . . in denial here', because he came to win wealth, 'but possibly an entire culture' (p. 84). Drakakis veers off into a discussion of the play's mockery of Morocco and Arragon, which shows that Belmont is as intolerant as Venice (but both pretend not to be). The section 'Identities' (pp. 87–96) has interesting ideas about Jessica's giving away a ring as a reversal of the Christians' holding on to rings (only to give them away again), her absconding with a casket as a parody of the Christian casket test, and Portia's future being subject to a lottery rather than Antonio's chances all to marine freightage. Interesting too is the idea that 'unlimited circulation' (p. 95) is essential to money creating more money in the economic sphere but in the marriage sphere such circulation (adultery) has to be stopped, and the wedding rings are supposed to do that with their 'do not give me away' vows. However, Drakakis points out, Shylock's wedding ring does enter the circuit of circulation, because Jessica exchanges it, and then Bassanio's and Graziano's rings do too when they give them in payment for the doctor and his clerk's services. The latter circulation is comically prevented (short-circuited) by each of their wives embodying both giver and receiver of the rings.

Turning to the trial, 'Before the Law' (pp. 96–106) sees it as the necessary outcome of the Venetian republic's own internal contradictions, and 'The Politics of Harmony' (pp. 106–12) finds that attractive images of harmony do not quite erase the troubling threats that linger at the end, and in fact we are supposed to spot that images of harmony are failed politico-ideological manoeuvres attempting this erasure. Finally, and without having added up to a coherent whole, the literary criticism gives way to a survey of the play in performance (pp. 112–59), although noticeably the introduction has yet to offer anything substantial about the date of composition or the playing company it was written for (and the appendices do not fill these gaps). When Drakakis writes 'After 1603, however, there is no evidence of performance of the *Merchant of Venice* until 1701 . . .' (p. 113) he means after 1605, since he has just described two performances in that year. Drakakis moves quickly to describe the famous productions of each century, focusing more on the reports of how actors fulfilled their obligations than the trickier subject of what happened to the script. Thus he mentions productions that put back bits that had been cut, without first having mentioned the cuts. For example, William Macready (1823) 'restored the part of Portia' and Charles Kean (1858) 'restored for the first time . . . the roles of Morocco and Arragon' (p. 115).

Drakakis has a habit of syntactically joining for no obvious reason productions from different times, using synonyms for *and* as the glue. For example, 'Max Reinhardt's 1905 production of the play emphasized the festive atmosphere of Venice and Belmont (Edelman, 31–2), although in the Deutschestheater production of 1985 the carnivalesque elements were endowed with a contemporary political significance that extended well beyond the formal confines of the play itself' (p. 118). What is the link? Both German and a bit festive? Drakakis confuses the reader by referring to a 1932 production at 'the newly built Shakespeare Memorial Theatre' (p. 123) in Stratford-upon-Avon, without explaining that this name was taken over from the previous theatre on an adjacent site that opened in 1879 and burnt down in 1926. Making matters worse, he earlier calls this same theatre, opened in 1932, by the name 'Royal Shakespeare Theatre' (p. 121), which it did not acquire until 1961. Describing Laurence Olivier's 1970 Shylock, Drakakis refers to an accent that enabled 'an obscene pun when he first drawls out 'Bassainio's name' (p. 132). In fact, Shylock only once says Bassanio's name (in II.v) so 'first' makes no sense, and it would have been helpful to explain the pun for readers (like me) who cannot detect it.

Repetitions arise here too. Regarding the 1985–6 East Berlin Deutschestheater production of *Der Kaufmann von Venedig*, the comments 'played with extraordinary sympathy by Fred Düren, himself a Jewish survivor of the Holocaust... the carnivalesque Venetians... represented capitalism in its most decadent form' (p. 136) add nothing to the earlier 'cast Holocaust survivor Fred Düren as Shylock, whose tragedy was played out against the carnivalesque decadence of a capitalist Venice' (p. 110). Repetition in successive sentences looks like failure in final drafting: 'the transformation in Shylock's behaviour that the elopement of Jessica effected' is followed by 'locating the motivation for the shift of Shylock's behaviour in Jessica's elopement' (p. 141). The reader's attention is drawn to Figure 10 as a picture of David Thacker's 1993 Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC) production (p. 143), but that is not the date given in the picture's caption (where the date is 2001) and that is not what the picture shows. Figure 10's caption identifies it as 'The Royal Shakespeare Company production at Stratford-upon-Avon, directed by David Thacker (2001), IV.i', but in fact Thacker's production for the RSC was in 1993 and this is not it since the picture shows Shylock with his knife drawn about to cut into the flesh of an Antonio who is lying on the floor, while Thacker had Antonio being pinned to a chair at this moment. There was an RSC production in 2001 directed by Loveday Ingram, and to judge by what can be seen of the actors' faces this is probably what Figure 10 shows. And yet more repetition: 'In Michael Radford's 2004 film... the final shot of Leah's ring on Jessica's finger suggests that Tubal... has himself been the victim of scurrilous gossip' (p. 158) repeats 'In the Michael Radford film (2004) the final shot is of Jessica... fingering the ring that she is alleged to have exchanged for a monkey [which] suggests that Tubal's earlier account has the status of gossip...' (p. 79nl).

The text of the play starts on page 161, before the reader has been told about the choice of early editions upon which to base a modern one, the relationship between them, which one was used here, or where to go to find this

information. (Appendix 3 gives brief, unsatisfactory answers to these questions.) What follows here is a selection of the edition's more interesting editorial choices. The main interventions are in names used in speech prefixes and stage directions, so in performance Drakakis's text would not draw attention to itself except in Lancelot Gobbo's soliloquy about his good and bad angels (II.ii.3-8) where he calls himself 'Lancelet Giobbe', that last word pronounced as a trisyllable according to Drakakis. Drakakis goes for Salanio and Salarino as the names for the two friends of Bassanio and Antonio, on the grounds that the character that Q1 calls Salarino who appears in III.i with Salanio cannot be the same man who arrives (with Lorenzo and Jessica) in Belmont in the following scene, a character that Q1 calls Salerio. So, since those two men have to be distinguished, Drakakis combines Salanio and Salerio into his Salanio and reserves the name Salerio for a minor messenger from Venice in III.ii who also fetches people for the Duke in IV.i. That is one way to do it, but does Q1 really 'maintain an absolute distinction between' (p. 163n7) the friend of Salanio in III.i and the man who arrives with Lorenzo and Jessica in III.ii? I would have thought these could be the same man.

In the dramatis personae, Drakakis gives Shylock's name as 'Shylock the JEW' and he uses just JEW as his speech prefix, even though Bassanio, Antonio, Lancelot, Salanio, the Duke, Portia, and Shylock himself use his personal name, the last two having an exchange 'Is your name Shylocke?', 'Shylocke is my name'. Drakakis renames the character usually called Lancelot Gobbo as 'Lancelet Giobbe, a CLOWN' and uses just CLOWN as his speech prefix, despite the fact that his father, Jessica, and Lorenzo all call him Launcelet in Q1, and the modern form of that is Lancelot. Drakakis reckons that he is a lancelet (= lancet) who pricks pretences and pricks the boils of his father's Job-like afflictions. Drakakis renames the character usually called Old Gobbo as GIOBBE, on the grounds that in one run of four lines of Q1 Lancelot says that his last name is *Iobbe* or *Jobbe* six times. True, but that is one localized part of the text and there are nineteen speech prefixes and stage directions that give his father's name as Gob[bo] and one that gives it as Gobbe. It seems far-fetched that such a minor character in the play, present in just one scene, should bear the significance of being Job-like.

Salarino imagines himself as a merchant, appalled to 'see my wealthy *Andrew* docked in sand' (I.i.265) where Q1 has '...docks in sand' which editors generally emend to 'decks in sand'. Drakakis is right that a *dockt* > *docks* error is plausible, but wrong to think that a stranded ship could be said to be docked since docking requires a dock. In the line 'keep me company but two years more' (I.i.108) Drakakis treats use of *more* instead of Q1's *moe* as an emendation since *moe* means 'more in number' whereas here the meaning, given by *more*, is increased 'size or quality'. Do they have these distinct meanings? I thought the line just meant an additional two years (a countable amount), and how could that evoke notions of size or quality? In any case, *moe* is just another spelling of *mo* which means greater in quantity. After Graziano and Lorenzo's exit, Drakakis follows Nicholas Rowe in having Antonio say 'Is that anything now?' (I.i.113) instead of Q1's 'It is that any thing now'. The Oxford *Complete Works* emended to 'Yet is that anything now?' on the supposition that *Yet* can be misread as *Yt*, as Drakakis

acknowledges in a Longer Note. Glossing the line ‘Which he calls “interest”. Cursed be my tribe’ (I.iii.47) Drakakis writes that *interest* ‘is pronounced here as a trisyllable implying deliberate emphasis; the rhythm of the line demands that “Cursed” be pronounced as a disyllable’. It seems to me that either *interest* is disyllabic and *Cursed* disyllabic or else *interest* is trisyllabic and *Cursed* monosyllabic. If Drakakis really thinks *Cursed* is disyllabic then according to the General Editors’ Preface (‘Where the final -ed should be given syllabic value . . .’, p. xii) there is supposed to be a note showing it as *Cursèd* but I suppose a discursive one like this is just as good.

Jessica says she will gild herself with ‘some moe ducats’ (II.vi.51) where Q1 has ‘some mo ducats’ and again Drakakis insists that *mo/moe* means ‘more in number’ while *more* (F’s reading) meanings greater in ‘size or quality’. He does this again at IV.i.80 with ‘Make no moe offers’. At II.viii.0.1n Drakakis has an unresolved internal cross-reference ‘see p. 000’. Portia suggests as a solution to Antonio’s problem to ‘Pay him six thousand and deface the bond’ (III.ii.298) and Drakakis glosses *deface* as ‘cancel or demolish . . . rather than the more modern disfigure’. In fact the meaning really is disfigure: the sure way to cancel a bond was to tear it, which made it unenforceable, as indeed Portia offers to do at IV.i.231. Q1 has Portia say to Lorenzo and Jessica ‘heere other things’ and Drakakis modernizes to ‘Hear other things’ (III.iv.23), but he seems to think this an emendation (‘emending to “hear”’) rather than just a modernization. Q1 has Portia tell her man Balthazar to take a letter ‘In speede to Mantua’ (III.iv.49) and give it to Bellario, although Bellario is later said to live in Padua. Drakakis decides not to emend to Padua here, on the grounds that ‘Shakespeare’s own sense of Italian geography was imperfect and as a probable instance of Shakespearean confusion it should be allowed to stand’. An imperfect sense of geography is not the point: you can have no idea about geography and still recognize that a person should not be said to live in one place in Act III and another in Act IV unless he has moved in the meantime. The crucial question is how far we go in fixing Shakespeare’s errors: most editors take the line that they should fix the errors that they think Shakespeare himself would have fixed had he noticed them, and this one surely falls into that category.

At III.iv.50, Q1 has Portia say that the letter should be delivered ‘into my cosin hands Doctor *Belario*’ and Drakakis comments that ‘“cosin hands” transposes the possessive “s”’, that is it takes it from *cosin* and gives it to *hand*. Does it? Why should we not say that ‘cosin hands’ rather drops the possessive *s* from *cosins*? That is, why assume that Shakespeare meant *hand*, especially since twenty-six lines earlier he had Portia ‘commit in your hands’ (plural) the running of her house? For Q1’s ‘we were Christians enow before’ (III.v.19–20) most editors change *enow* to *enough* on the grounds that it is just an archaic spelling, but Drakakis retains *enow* because (rather as he argued in connection with *moe/more*) *enow* refers to ‘numbers rather than quantity’. The *OED* does not support this: other than as an archaic spelling *enow* is distinguished only as a lost plural form. In Q1 Jessica talks of Bassanio’s being blessed with a good wife: ‘And if on earth he doe not meane it, it | in reason he should neuer come to heauen?’ (III.v.70–1). Many editors follow Alexander Pope’s inspired emendation ‘. . . do not merit it | In reason . . .’, but Drakakis makes only the

minor emendation to read ‘... do not mean it, it | Is reason’ based on an *OED* entry for *mean* (v.¹ 1f ‘To be (*well, ill, etc.*) intentioned or disposed’). But he misquotes the *OED* definition as ‘to be well-intentioned or disposed’, ignoring the fact that this sense relies on the word *well* or *ill* or some other adverb being supplied—as in ‘they meant well’ or ‘your cousin means kindly’—and that on its own *mean* cannot confer the sense needed here of well-intentioned. (This case is complicated by the online *OED* having a rewritten entry for this word that makes the—essentially unchanged—definition appear at *mean* v. 2.)

Drakakis is not scrupulous in his collation notes. Q1 has Jessica say ‘Nay, let me praise you while I haue a stomach?’ but Drakakis’s note reads ‘3.5.80 stomach.] Q2; stomach: Q; stomacke? F’ thereby misreporting Q1 by changing its question mark to a colon. More inaccuracy in Drakakis’s collation: Q1 has the Duke say that pity of Antonio’s losses should ‘pluck comiseration of this states’ which Drakakis rightly emends to ‘... of his state’, but his note reads ‘4.1.29 his state] Q2; this state Q’ thus misrepresenting Q1’s use of the plural. Q1 has Shylock say that ‘affection. | Maisters of passion swayes it to the moode | of what it likes or loathes’ which Drakakis emends to ‘affection, | Maistrice of passion, sways it to the mood | Of what it likes or loathes’ (IV.i.49–51) with a textual note that begins ‘50 Maistrice of passion] (Maisters of passion); ...’. The note is wrong because the General Editors’ Preface spells out the meaning of the italic brackets Drakakis here uses: ‘Distinctive spellings of the basic text (Q or F) follow the square bracket without indication of source and are enclosed in italic brackets’ (p. xiv). The word *maisters* is, of course, the plural of the noun *maister* (modern spelling *master*) and the third person singular form of the verb *maister* (modern spelling *master*). The word *maistrice* is certainly not a distinctive spelling of *maisters*, as Drakakis’s note claims it is, but is either an old spelling of the noun *mistress* or a wholly different word denoting the abstract notion of mastery (*OED* †*maistrice*). Drakakis has emended *maisters* > *maistrice* and passed it off in the textual note as a mere modernization of a distinctive original spelling, which it is not.

In the explanatory comment Drakakis gives the *OED* definition of *maistrice* (the abstract notion of mastery) and suggests that ‘Shakespeare may have been attracted to this spelling because of its phonetic ambivalences in combining “master”/“mistress”’. But just what spelling of which word is Drakakis referring to here? He appears to mean that Shakespeare liked the slipperiness of a sound that suggested both the abstract notion of mastery and the concrete notion of a mistress, but because on ideological grounds Drakakis refuses to speculate on what Shakespeare actually wrote he ends up inventing a reading because it appeals to him critically. By using in his edition the word *maistrice* Drakakis is either invoking the word that denotes the abstract notion of mastery (in which case he is emending) or he is invoking the old spelling of *mistress* (in which case Drakakis should have modernized it) or he is asserting that Shakespeare coined a new word that combined these meanings, in which case he should say so explicitly. (The case for such a coinage would be weak, since this hypothetical usage would be the only one on record.) Indeed, Drakakis seems to end up convincing himself that Q1 actually has the word *maistrice* here, for he writes ‘There is no reason to depart from the Q1 reading’. Quite right, yet he has.

At IV.i.72–3 there is a press variant in Q1, with one state having Antonio comment ‘well vse question with the wolf, | the Ewe bleake for the Lambe.’ while another has ‘you may as well vse question with the Woolfe | why he hath made the Ewe bleake for the Lambe.’ There is general agreement that the former is the uncorrected state of the text and that the latter reflects stop-press correction made during the print run. An added problem is the line’s use of the word *bleake* where we would expect a ewe to bleat. Drakakis thinks these problems are connected, writing of *bleake* that ‘this error seems compositorial rather than authorial . . . and the existence of variant states of these lines in Q1 indicates some difficulty in deciphering the MS at this point’. In fact, if one accepts that the difference between the two states is due to intentional stop-press correction, as Drakakis’s note shows he does, then the printers misreading their copy to set *bleake* for Shakespeare’s *bleat[e]* becomes harder to accept, since they must have consulted the manuscript a second time to recover the omitted phrases—‘you may as well’ and ‘why he hath made’—and yet still failed to fix the nonsense word *bleake*. Needlessly, Drakakis has textual notes for the simple modernizations *bankrout* > *bankrupt* (IV.i.121), *soule* > *sole* (IV.i.122), and *tenure* > *tenor* (IV.i.231).

At IV.i.146–63, Drakakis decides that the Duke not only introduces the letter from Bellario (‘DUKE . . . Meantime the court shall hear Bellario’s letter’, IV.i.146–8) but goes on to read it aloud to the court himself (‘[Reads.] *Your grace . . .*’) and to follow his recitation with the comment ‘DUKE You hear the learned Bellario what he writes’ (IV.i.163). Drakakis follows Q1 in providing a speech prefix for the Duke after he has recited the letter, even though there is no change of speaker. Editors have taken the Duke’s speech prefix for his comment on the letter as evidence that someone else (Nerissa?) actually reads the letter. Drakakis offers no explanation for the repeated speech prefix, and the proper context here would be Tiffany Stern’s claim that speech prefixes after letters are there to guide the playhouse scribe in the creation of the property document needed to accompany the actors’ parts. Left undefended, Drakakis’s decision to follow Q1 just looks like editorial error, introducing a spurious speech prefix in the midst of a character’s continuous speech.

Upon his entrance in the last scene, Q1 has Lancelot say ‘Sola, did you see M. Lorenzo, & M. Lorenzo sola, sola’ (V.i.41–2). Drakakis prefers the reading of F2 which is ‘Sola, did you see M. Lorenzo, and M. Lorenza, sola, sola’, the second name indicating Jessica and emphasizing her new role as wife. Thus Drakakis’s edition reads ‘Sola! Did you see Master Lorenzo and Mistress Lorenza! Sola, sola!’. (Grammatically, one would expect Drakakis’s second exclamation mark to be a question mark of course.) However, Drakakis’s collation note misreports the readings in the early editions, as it begins ‘41–2 Mistress Lorenza!] F2 (M. Lorenza); & M. Lorenza Q . . .’. If the note were correct and we tried to reconstruct Q1’s reading from it by substituting for Drakakis’s lemma ‘Mistress Lorenza!’ the reading ‘& M. Lorenza’ that he says appears in Q1, we would conclude wrongly that Q1 reads ‘Lorenzo and & M. Lorenza’. The same error confuses the explanatory note, which begins ‘41–2 *Mistress Lorenza Q has “& M. Lorenzo”, but . . .’; again Drakakis fails to include in the lemma the word *and* as an expansion of the ampersand in Q1’s

reading. Regarding this ampersand, Drakakis comments that it is 'a familiar compositorial space-saving device for "and" in a long line'. Indeed it is, but the line in question in Q1 is not as long as the one three lines earlier or the one four lines later, so if the compositor thought he was going to have insufficient room to set *and* in full he was perhaps mistaken. However, to judge from the alignment of the two longest lines preceding this one on this page ('... you friend?' and '*Enter Clowne.*'), the compositor may have been using multi-line quads to indent his stick rather than resetting it to a narrower measure for stretches of verse and the presence of such a quad would have left him less room to set the line in question than at first appears from the wider lines below it. The question of the ampersand being a necessary abbreviation of *and* is of some importance, since an alternative explanation is that it is a compositorial misreading of a question mark so that Lancelot is simply asking for Lorenzo then calling out his name, as in 'Did you see Master Lorenzo? (*Calling*) Master Lorenzo!' as the Oxford *Complete Works* has it.

The edition's 'Longer Notes' (pp. 392–401) are essentially literary-critical. Glossing Shylock's 'How like a fawning publican he looks. | I hate him...' (I.iii.37–8), Drakakis comments that '[Brian] Vickers, basing his observation upon a humanist conception of "character", regards this as offering entry into an emotional inner life'. Evidently Drakakis does not expect his edition to be much used by actors, who also tend to think in terms of character and emotional inner lives. In Appendix 1 (pp. 402–7) Drakakis tries casting the play among the Chamberlain's men, guided by the work of William A. Ringler Junior and T.J. King. Drakakis presents a doubling chart showing that ten men and three boys can do the whole thing, but (he privately confirms) it has been erroneously printed and its extraordinary assumptions are not his. The chart shows that Antonio doubles as Salarino, the latter role being shared with another actor who doubles it with a couple of other roles, and it has one of the boys double Nerissa and Jessica even though they appear together in III.ii (where one of them is told to welcome the other) and V.i. Compounding the multiple printing errors is the chart's lack of a guide explaining its conventions, such as what a box with an X in it means. Because the play can be dated 1596–7 Drakakis thinks it one of the last plays at the Theatre or the first at the Curtain, but he does not state just when he thinks the Chamberlain's men moved to the Curtain and the right date is no earlier than the summer of 1598, so in fact *The Merchant of Venice* pre-dated the move. Drakakis is probably just confusing father and son when he asserts that James rather than Richard Burbage 'might reasonably have been expected to take the role of Antonio' (p. 403); James died in February 1597. On the basis of Salarino's 'chance remark' (does drama have those?) that 'There is more difference between thy flesh and hers than between jet and ivory' (III.i.34–5), Drakakis speculates that the roles of Shylock and Morocco were doubled as they are both dark-skinned men, possibly in black-face makeup (p. 404).

Appendix 2 (pp. 408–16) is concerned with 'Type Shortages' during the setting of Q1 and their significance for the editor, relying on Kennedy's article that itself depends on one by John Russell Brown from 1955 that used spelling habits to determine that two compositors, labelled X and Y, set Q1 and to apportion their stints. Importantly, Kennedy assumes that the compositors

worked through their sheets in alphabetical order (X doing C, E, G, I, K and Y doing A, B, D, F, H), but in fact that has not been proved and Brown did not even attempt to establish it. That the book was set by formes has not been shown, nor has been established the order in which the formes were set, machined, and printed. Kennedy simply assumes the order of setting needed for his argument and hypothesizes partial distribution of certain formes to fit his model of where shortages occurred. For example, there is no evidence for Kennedy's assertions 'Then he [Compositor Y] distributed A2v and A3 to get 20 I's and 1 I, so he was able to set 13 I's on the last page of B(o), B4v, with no substitutions. . . . Beginning B(i), B1v, he set 7 I's (which he had left from the 20 minus 13 used on B4v) . . .' (p. 193). Where is the evidence that at this point A2^v and A3^r were distributed to release twenty roman I's yet the other pages on this forme were not distributed, and in particular that A4^v was not distributed, which would have freed up many more? The evidence, it turns out, is the ensuing type shortage itself: the fact that after using thirteen of those twenty he had seven left and then ran out. Thus the whole argument is circular.

What is more, the running out after using these seven pieces of type is not quite clear-cut: on B1^v 'he set 7 I's (which he had left from the 20 minus 13 used on B4^v) mixed with 8 I*s's' (that last term means italic *I* set were roman I was wanted). But what does 'mixed with' mean? It means that there is no clear point of total depletion, since in fact on B1^v the compositor started setting italic *I* where roman I was wanted even before using up the seven roman I's that Kennedy thinks were all he had, as in '*I* will die as chaste as Diana, vnlesse I be obtained'. If one cannot show total depletion, one cannot reliably reconstruct how many pieces of type were in the sort box at a particular moment and one has no compelling argument. All Kennedy has shown is that if distribution of A2^v and A3^r took place at this point, then their twenty pieces of type would have lasted until a certain point in the job, around which point some substitutions take place. That is, he has found some numbers that add up and perhaps point to what was done.

The argument becomes weaker still when the numbers cease to add up and Kennedy has to fudge the reconstruction with a claim that to set B2^r the compositor 'did a partial distribution of A4v to get 6 I's' (p. 193). What is the evidence that he performed only a partial distribution? It is the fact that he used six roman I's and seven italic *I*'s standing in for roman ones on B2^r, and again he did not run out of the former before resorting to the latter, since he set '*I* should be glad . . . I had rather'. There is no independent evidence of these claimed distributions (such as recurrence of distinctive types) and Kennedy simply hypothesizes partial distribution that replenished the sort boxes wherever an expected shortage does not occur. The patterns that Kennedy wants to show are also disrupted by a strange phenomenon: the compositors were short of upper-case letters A, B, C, F, H, L, M, O, P, S, and T and set lower-case ones instead—for example at the beginnings of verse lines—but not evenly throughout the book: sheets A and B are almost entirely unaffected and sheets D, F, and H are heavily affected. Kennedy is forced to resort to the hypothesis that part-way through work on *The Merchant of Venice* 'another job was undertaken' (p. 194). But if he believes that then all

bets are off because he has no way to establish pressure on particular sort boxes since the demands of this other job are unknown.

Kennedy employs this hypothesized other job to account for the fact that without it compositor Y would seem resort to substitutions long before he needs to. Kennedy writes that this other job has 'important consequences' (p. 194) for the compositor's behaviour, but they are not truly consequences but, rather, awkward facts that the other job was invented to explain. At this point in his argument, Kennedy tries to track particular pieces of type, but except where they are damaged and hence uniquely identifiable we cannot be sure of the reuse. He writes: 'That B1 and B3 were the pages first distributed from B(o) is shown because the 2 swash P's on B3 (lines 6 and 13) are reused on D1 and D2v (lines 36 and 31); and the "F" in "Fauconbridge" on B1 (line 33) reappears on D1 (line 28) in "Fiffe"' (p. 195). That last point about the F might be right—it appears to be damaged and is trackable—but the swash P's could be any swash P's that the compositor had available: they are not necessarily the earlier ones reused. Is it significant that a distinctive letter F reappeared? Certainly it shows that pages B1^r and D1^r were not in type at the same time, but it does not show that B1^r was one of the two 'pages first distributed from B(o)' since setting of D(o) might not have started until all of B(o) had been distributed, and indeed all of B(i) for that matter, or indeed any forme—including formes from the other job that Kennedy thinks was concurrent with *The Merchant of Venice*—since we simply do not know the order of setting. That is, even if B1^r and B3^r were not the first pages distributed from B(o), it would still be possible for this distinctive F (or indeed the swash P's if they were distinctive) from B(o) to turn up again on D(o). We do not know if the swash P's were kept in a separate sort box or were indiscriminately mixed with the other P's, nor how many of them there were.

As before, the most we can say is that if the setting of D(o) began with just B1^r and B3^r distributed then, yes, the numbers of certain sorts newly released matches the numbers newly set, but the fact that these numbers match is not proof that this is what happened. Kennedy is slippery with the data, presenting as additional evidence the fact that not only the number of P's but also the number of I's match between distribution of B(o) and setting of D(o): 'From B1 and B3 he also got 11 P's, and, with the 4 in hand, he set 15 I's on D1 and D2v' (p. 195). This sounds convincing until you realize that the '4 in hand' is not a number emerging from any previous counting, but arises simply because Kennedy arbitrarily decided that of the 28 available '24 were being used at another job' (p. 195). Kennedy cannot show that 24 were being used on another job—since he does not know what that job was—but deduces that number 24 from the behaviour on D1^r and D2^v where 15 I's were set and he wants to believe that 11 of them came from B1^r and B3^r. In other words, this other job is hypothesized to account for the compositor's behaviour in *The Merchant of Venice* and then that behaviour is explained in terms of the needs of the other job. Again, this is pure circularity of logic.

There is no need to pursue this critique for the rest of Kennedy's reconstruction of the ebb and flow of type in the compositor's sort boxes: the key point is that he can make the numbers add up only by picking for himself which pages got distributed and when, and even then he has to resort

to exigencies such as claiming that to set H3^v the compositor 'partially distributed lines 3–19 on F4' (p. 197) to collect enough type. There is no corroborating evidence of this partial distribution, only the fact that distributing those seventeen lines would indeed release enough of the right pieces of type. This kind of gerrymandering goes on throughout the argument: 'he distributed lines 22–5 of F4 to glean . . . Then he collected 2 more I's from the bottom of F4' (p. 197). The same weakness vitiates Kennedy's reconstruction of compositor X's work on sheets C, E and G, although the argument (and provision of evidence) is more scant and requires the reader to take even more on trust. For example, when planning to set sheet E the compositor would have noticed that he needed fifteen speech prefixes for Shylock, so if he followed his copy and set them as *Iewe* he would need fifteen I's, but 'Even if the outer forme of C became available to him' its fifteen I's would be used up on those speech prefixes, leaving him none to stand in for roman I, which need he could predict. (Actually, if he made that prediction he was wrong: C(o) would yield 56 I's, more than enough for E(i)'s need.). In any case, why take as a premise only C(o) being available to him as he set sheet E? Why might not C(i), with its further 11 I's and 41 I's have by then been distributed too? If we grant that possibility—and Kennedy offers nothing against it—the compositor's decision to set *Shy[lock]* as sheet E's speech prefix for him was not driven by type shortage. The type shortage that Kennedy thinks explains the speech-prefix variation *Shy[lock]/Iewe* exists only if we grant Kennedy a tightly prescribed set of unwarranted assumptions.

Ironically, Kennedy's argument next requires that the compositor ran out of italic S's because of all those *Shy* speech prefixes, so he had to switch back to *Iewe* for sheet G. The way Kennedy argues this is that setting sheet E, sixteen italic S's were tied up in E(o) so that setting E(i) the compositor used up four on E1^v and then sixteen on E2^r, at which point (with E2^r not complete) he was out of italic S's and so started using roman S's instead and finished E2^r with six roman S's in speech prefixes. Thus Kennedy counts that the compositor possessed thirty-six italic S's, since once that number were used he resorted to the exigent of making roman S's stand in for them. However, sheet E(i) was not complete, and although page E3^v needed no italic S, page E4^r needed one and somehow—despite the compositor supposedly having exhausted his supply of thirty-six of them—he managed to set this italic S, 'which perhaps he took from E1' (p. 198). Of course, once we admit the possibility that the compositor could raid E(o) to finish setting E(i) all the preceding counts of how much type was available are invalidated. According to Kennedy, it was this experience on sheet E that made the compositor switch speech prefix again and follow his copy in calling Shylock *Iewe* in sheet G. Regarding the claimed *Clown* > *Launcelet* speech-prefix and stage-direction substitution, Kennedy is skimpier still with the evidence and argument, which is given in just twenty-one lines of discursive prose argument (pp. 199–202). Here he presents no evidence that the compositor was short of upper-case C's other than the very fact that at a couple of points the speech prefixes switch to *Launcelet* (and abbreviations thereof) until 'he distributed some type' (p. 200), 'he did some more distribution' (p. 200) and 'he distributed more type' (p. 202) to relieve the shortage. There is no mention of where it was distributed from and no real

evidence of type shortage other than the switch itself, which is the very fact the shortage is supposed to explain.

As before, Kennedy's argument is entirely circular here and ought to convince no one. Unfortunately, it convinced Drakakis and his edition is disfigured by its consequences, not only for the choice of names for speech prefixes and stage directions (which at least do no harm in performance) but also for the name 'Lancelet Giobbe' that this character calls himself in II.ii. Drakakis prints a set of tables regarding the supposed type shortage, and there is no explanation of the symbols used. 'X' and 'Y' are the compositors, presumably, but what does a box with an asterisk in it mean and why are they always in the second row down, which is unlabelled? Appendix 3 is concerned with 'The Quarto of 1600, Its Instabilities, and Editorial Practice' (pp. 417–31) and in it Drakakis shows himself confused about the play's Stationers' Register entries, thinking that the second one (on 28 October 1600 to Thomas Heyes) might have been for 'the actual 'booke' that Roberts had already printed' (p. 419), that is Q1. Of course, the Stationers' Register records possession of manuscript copy, not printed books; a stationer who had already printed a book had no reason to present an exemplar for registration or transfer of rights (p. 419). Drakakis writes that 'In quarto printing compositors setting was by formes', but of course that is not a hard rule: some books were, some were not. Drakakis thinks that Kennedy's argument—which at best is only a balance of probabilities arising from the question 'why vary names unless you are short of type?'—is stronger than it really is, and writes that it leads 'inescapably towards the conclusion that the dramatic character that we have come to know as Shylock was designated throughout the manuscript by the speech prefix "Jew"' (p. 422).

Drakakis goes beyond Kennedy's argument in his consideration of Q1 compositor X's setting in sheet C, arguing that he had 'a limited supply of italic and roman capital 'I' sorts' (pp. 426–7). This is not at all what Kennedy's counts show. Rather, the compositor used fifty-six roman I's and fifteen italic I's on C(i) and forty-one roman I's and eleven italic I's on C(o), and indeed it is this abundance of both kinds of upper-case I, locked up in sheet C, that makes Kennedy think that it was on his next sheet, E, that the compositor ran short. Like Kennedy—that is, with no explanation at all—Drakakis asserts that 'He replenished his stock after setting sig. C3r' (p. 427), but where is the evidence for that, other than the fact that he did not run out? And 'replenished' it from where, since in Kennedy's analysis—based on Brown's and accepted by Drakakis—this forme, C(o), was this compositor's first bit of work on the book? On the basis of this supposed shortage of letter I's (in a sheet that actually contains 97 I's and 26 I's) Drakakis claims that the name *Gob[bo]* appears in the book only because this shortage forced the compositor to depart from his copy's readings of *Iob[be]*. (The evidence for the terminal -e where the printed book has -o? Convinced that Shakespeare really meant us to think of biblical Job, Drakakis just assumes that the compositor misread his manuscript's -e endings.) Now, all this may be true—that is, the names that Drakakis prefers in his edition (Jew, Clown, Giobbe) might be the ones Shakespeare wanted his actors to understand as their roles—but Kennedy and Drakakis cannot claim to have established such things bibliographically.

Rather, they have arranged the available evidence in a way that is consistent with their hypotheses. The evidence may also be arranged in other ways that are not consistent with their hypotheses: the conclusion is not a necessary outcome of the evidence adduced and is not proved by it. Drakakis ends by restating the 'three Sallies' problem in terms of signatures and formes (pp. 428–30), but nothing new emerges to advance upon the argument given earlier in the notes to the dramatis personae list.

As we shall see, Barbara Hodgdon's Arden edition of *The Taming of the Shrew* also unwisely attempts bibliographical analysis, but without such harm to Shakespeare's text. Her introduction (pp. 1–131) is divided into fairly long sections that enable her to get to grips with substantial topics, and after 'What Kind of Play' (pp. 1–7) about genre comes 'A Kind of Historie' (pp. 7–38) that summarizes the evidence for a play called *The Taming of a Shrew* and its possible relationship to *The Taming of the Shrew*. Unfortunately, Hodgdon does not simply summarize the differences—*A Shrew* is set in Athens not Padua, characters' names are different, its framing device is completed, and so on—but she does point the reader to Appendix 4 covering these matters. Simple printing errors include an internal cross-reference to a facsimile at the end of the book that is out by one page—'see p. 345' (p. 9) when it should be 344—and a transcription of the title page of *A Shrew* that italicizes part of the imprint ('and') that is set in roman type in that book. Hodgdon's description of the transfer of rights to *A Shrew* is rather hard for the non-specialist to follow (p. 9): what does it mean for a play to be entered in the Stationers' Register 'to' a particular man, and what is meant by 'a court order' that decides upon an entry? What, indeed, is a stationer, what is the Stationers' Register for, and who is 'Burby' whose forename Hodgdon omits when first mentioning him? The textual history gets garbled: Hodgdon writes that it seems (from the entry for the plays for the 1623 Folio) 'that [John] Smethwick's rights to *A Shrew*, following its transfer to him from Nicholas Ling in 1596, also extended to *The Shrew*' (p. 10). In fact the transfer of rights from Ling to Smethwick happened in 1607, not 1596; pity the poor non-expert reader trying to follow the argument using only Hodgdon as her source.

Hodgdon thinks that the 'title-pages of two quartos without Shakespeare's name, *1 Contention* and *The True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York* . . . also cite Pembroke's Men' (p. 13). Actually, there is no mention of Pembroke's men or any other company on the title page of *1 Contention* [1594]. She assumes that the list of plays performed at Newington Butts recorded in Henslowe's Diary under the heading 'begininge at newington my Lord Admeralle men & my Lorde chamberlen men As ffolowethe 1594' shows these actors performing as 'an amalgamated company' (p. 14). The companies could just as likely have been taking turns to use the venue. Regarding the titles *The Taming of a Shrew* and . . . *the Shrew* Hodgdon is scathing about the argument that 'the linguistic difference between "a" and "the" was so minimal that substituting one for the other occurred regularly', calling it part of an 'invent[ed] theatre history' created to serve the desire to link the two plays in 'a master narrative of origins' (p. 14). Yet on page 18 she cites the Second, Third, and Fourth Folios switching between '*a Shrew*' and '*the Shrew*' within a single edition; rather than

acknowledge that the linguistic claim she rejected is thus validated, she chooses to see this as 'an uncanny premonition of future confluations'.

Hodgdon writes that 'Subsequent reprints of *A Shrew*—recorded in the Stationers' Register on 22 January and 19 November 1607—could also have coincided with revivals of a *Shrew* play' (p. 15). In fact there was only one seventeenth-century reprint of *A Shrew* (in 1607), since the 1631 edition is *The Shrew* reprinted from the Folio text. Moreover, the Stationers' Register does not record printings but rights to print, so naturally there could be two entries in 1607 but only one connected edition, or indeed none. Summing up the various editorial theories for the *A Shrew*–*The Shrew* relationship (pp. 18–23), Hodgdon mentions memorial reconstruction but neglects to give Peter Alexander's arguments for it, including *A Shrew* being further from the source, Ludovico Ariosto's *I Suppositi*, than *The Shrew* is. This suggests that *A Shrew* is derivative of *The Shrew*, else Shakespeare took over *A Shrew* and somehow revised it back towards its source. Also, there is at least one pun in *The Shrew* (on the tailoring sense of *face* and the aggressive verb *outface*) that seems mangled in *A Shrew*, so unless *A Shrew* were a garbled derivative of *The Shrew* it would seem to have a latent pun in ruins that *The Shrew* fixed up, which would be unlikely.

Hodgdon claims that the 'Q and F texts of *2 Henry IV* label Rumour's prologue-like speech "Induction"—the only time the word labels a scene before 1600' (p. 24). No, the quarto does not label this speech an Induction and even if it did this would not be 'before 1600' since the quarto was published in 1600; as before, Hodgdon's explanations are error-ridden and hard for a non-expert to follow. She suddenly refers to 'Compositor B' without mentioning that she is discussing the 1623 Folio or that analysis has divided the work of typesetting the Folio into a number of stints by unknown men identified as compositor A, compositor B, and so on. Hodgdon makes the interesting claim that 'From 1565 to 1592, ninety per cent of printed plays had some sort of framing device' (p. 24) without giving a reference for this claim, nor assuring the reader that she checked all the plays in that period herself.

One of the mysteries of the play is its mention of the character Soto who appears in John Fletcher's play *Women Pleas'd*, which 'clearly post-dates Shakespeare's death' (p. 30). Hodgdon does not mention the evidence for dating *Women Pleas'd*, which is the appearance of actor Joseph Taylor's name in the play's cast list in the 1679 Beaumont and Fletcher folio. Since Taylor replaced Burbage on the latter's death in 1619, the assumption that the list gives the first-performance casting provides an earliest date for the play's composition and performance; that assumption, however, is not secure. Hodgdon gets wrong the date of the first edition of *Women Pleas'd*, which is in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647 not '1627' (p. 30). This basic flaw in the logic of Hodgdon's reasoning about Soto vitiates her discussion of the problem (pp. 30–5). Hodgdon is reluctant to conclude much about the *A Shrew*–*The Shrew* relationship, but decides that the latter postdates the former and was written some time after 1594 and got revised over the years between its composition and its publication in the Folio in 1623. This leads Hodgdon to the conclusion that because they got revised the plays *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Mucedorus* 'might be considered "Jacobean" rather than

“Elizabethan” (p. 36) despite the fact that they were first published in 1592 and 1598 respectively. By this logic, their being revised in the 1630s and 1880s would make them Caroline and Victorian plays and the standard nomenclature becomes meaningless. Hodgdon gives an Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Internet Shakespeare Editions website and indicates that Alan Galey’s article about a digital edition of *The Taming of the Shrew* called ‘Signal to Noise’ (reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011]) is there, but when this review was written in December 2011 it was not (p. 37).

In ‘*Shrew-Sources*’ (pp. 38–71) Hodgdon explores the debts to Ovid and usefully points out that Katherina is virtually preaching in her long final speech (which was against the rules for women) and that taming a hawk could be quite a sensitive matter. ‘Performance and Critical Histories’ (pp. 71–131) works chronologically, surveying responses to the play such as Fletcher’s *The Woman’s Prize*. The main trajectory is a tendency to rework the story in favour of an egalitarian outcome of domestic bliss eventually achieved by compromise on both sides. As one might expect, all sorts of adaptations dominated the eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century stages, and then the original text was restored.

For the text itself there is only the authority of the 1623 Folio, and in general Hodgdon rethinks afresh each emendation in the editorial tradition and in a number of cases sticks with F where others have departed from it. She adopts C.J. Sisson’s emendation of F’s ‘Brach *Meriman*, the poore Curre is imboſt’ to ‘Breathe Merriman . . .’ (Induction, 17) since an embossed dog is an exhausted one, but wonders if F might be right since a brach is a female dog. Where F has ‘Perswade him that he hath bin Lunaticke, | And when he ſayes he is, ſay that he dreames’ (Induction, 61–2) Hodgdon accepts it with its meaning that the Lord is telling his servants to confirm Sly’s suspicion that he is mad, although she acknowledges the attraction of Samuel Johnson’s emendation ‘. . .when he ſays he is Sly, ſay that. . .’. At I.i.105–7 after Katherina exits, Gremio calls after her ‘your guiſts are ſo good heere’s none will holde you: Their loue is not ſo great *Hortensio*, but we may blow our nails together, and faſt it fairely out’ (F). The problem is figuring out who is meant by ‘Their loue’, and editors often emend, for example by moving the punctuation to produce ‘. . . none will hold you there. Love is not so great . . .’ but Hodgdon suggests (none too certainly, putting a question mark after it) that ‘Their love’ is women’s love.

Describing how Petruccio will treat Katherina when he meets her, Grumio ſays ‘hee’l raile in his rope trickes’ (I.ii.110), the laſt two words of which are obſcure. Hodgdon ſticks with F, but in a note documents the ample evidence that the alluſion is to rhetoric. One of Hodgdon’s explanatory notes is mangled and makes no ſenſe as it ſtands: it begins ‘I.ii.220 He . . . daughters Oxf conjectures (but does not emend to) “He, Bianca’s father, Biondello” . . .’. In fact, the Oxford *Complete Works* conjecture applies not to this line but the next, arguing that F’s ‘Euen he *Biondello*’ might be emended to (in modernized form) ‘Even he Bianca’s father Biondello’ on the grounds that ‘Bianca’s father’ dropped out as the compoſitor’s eye ſkipped from the firſt *Bi* to the ſecond. One can tell that Hodgdon has confused herſelf about this as ſhe (wrongly) quotes the Oxford *Complete Works* conjecture as beginning ‘He’, becauſe ſhe

thinks it applies to line 200, which begins with that word. At II.i.185, F has 'you are call'd plaine *Kate*, | And bony *Kate*, and sometimes *Kate* the curst' and Hodgdon follows the editorial tradition in adopting F4's *bonny* instead of *bony*. But as she points out, *bony* meaning big-boned has the advantage of agreeing with *plain* and *curst* in that all three are insulting, and so making this line form a consistent contrast to what comes next, the flattering terms *prettiest*, *Kate of Kate Hall*, and *super-dainty*.

Hodgdon follows Alexander Dyce's emendation of 'Hee'll wooe a thousand, point the day of marriage, | Make friends, inuite, and proclaime the banes' (III.ii.15–16) to 'He'll woo a thousand, 'point the day of marriage, | Make feast, invite friends, and proclaim the banns', which improves the sense but is not really necessary. She does not explain what wooing a thousand might mean. At III.ii.30–2, F has '*Bion*. Master, master, newes, and such newes as you neuer heard of, *Bap*. Is it new and olde too? how may that be?', and the problem of course is that Baptista responds as though the news had been described as old, and it has not. Hodgdon adopts Edward Capell's emendation to 'BIONDELLO Master, master, news—old news . . .' and points out that *old* could mean abundant. In F Petruccio is described as wearing 'a paire of bootes that haue beene candle-cases, one buck-led, another lac'd: an olde rusty sword tane out of the Towne Armory, with a broken hilt, and chapelesse: with two broken points: his horse hip'd . . .' (III.ii.44–8). A sword cannot easily be described as having two broken points whereas the laces of boots can be, so Hodgdon (following Johnson) moves 'two broken points' to after *laced* to give 'a pair of boots . . . one buckled, another laced with two broken points'. Presumably we are to suppose the manuscript was untidy at this point and misled the compositor. Confusingly, Hodgdon glosses *points* by reference to the metal tips (= *aglets*) of cords that tie a doublet to hose rather than the alternative sense, applicable here, of bootlaces (*OED* point *n.*¹ 5). In response to an objection to his appearance, F has Petruccio say 'Were it better I should rush in thus:' (III.ii.90), to which editors often add a word in order to improve sense, such 'Were it not better . . .'. But Hodgdon adopts Joseph Rann's alteration of the colon to a question mark, suggesting that Petruccio might at this point indicate Tranio, who is 'more suitably dressed or overdressed'.

At III.ii.127, F has Tranio say 'But sir, Loue concerneth vs to adde | Her fathers liking' and Hodgdon follows the previous Arden editor in adopting Sisson's emendation to 'But sir, to love . . .' with 'concerneth us' understood as 'it concerns us'. Tranio reminds Lucentio that they have already spoken of the need for Baptista's approval of the marriage using the phrase 'As before imparted to your worship' (III.ii.129), which Hodgdon thinks 'makes sense (and scans)'. Yet simply because 'modern editors . . . accept Pope's emendation' to 'As I before . . .' she adopts it too. The Folio lines Gremio's speech 'Trembled and shook . . . the minstrels play' (III.ii.166–82) as prose and Hodgdon wonders if this is because 'the lines had been cast off as prose and F didn't have room to reline them'. It is unclear what she means by 'as prose' since in casting off there would ordinarily be no value in treating prose as anything other than prose, and verse as anything other than verse; perhaps she means that the underlying manuscript had these lines mislined as prose instead of verse. In any case there is no evidence of crowding on this page of the Folio

(T2^v), and indeed there are five blank lines around entrance directions that could have been used if space were tight, and setting Gremio's speech as prose instead of verse saves only three lines (fourteen instead of seventeen). Hodgdon leaves F unemended to print 'Sit down, Kate, and welcome. Soud, soud, soud, soud' (IV.i.128), resisting the temptation to emend the last four words to 'Food, food, food, food' on account of Petruccio demanding his supper; instead she treats them as a sort of humming. She might also have mentioned that composers do not generally misread ordinary words to set nonsense, as *food* > *soud* would require. Hodgdon explains that a cockle is 'a small edible mollusc' (IV.iii.68), which I suppose helps someone who already knows what a mollusc is.

At IV.iv.3–5 Hodgdon prints 'MERCHANT Signor Baptista may remember me. | Near twenty yeare ago in Genoa— | TRANIO Where we were lodgers, at the Pegasus', which aside from repunctuation is what F has. Tranio's line seems to belong to the Merchant and many editors reassign it to him, but Hodgdon argues that Tranio might be completing the Merchant's rehearsal of his story. The trouble with this theory is that the Merchant does not seem to be reciting a made-up story but actually recollecting the facts. She might have argued that Tranio is completing the Merchant's umpteenth repetition of a fear he has about a flaw in the whole deception. F has Petruccio say, after his reconciliation with Katherina, 'At last, though long, our iarring notes agree, | And time it is when raging warre is come' (V.ii.1–2) and Hodgdon follows Rowe in changing the last word to *done* to agree with the wider sentiment that marital peace has broken out. Lastly, in F Lucentio complains that Bianca's failure to respond to his summons has cost him 'fiue hundred crownes' (V.ii.134) and yet the agreed wager was for 100 crowns. Hodgdon notes Sisson's argument that the manuscript read 'a hundred' and that the *a* was mistaken for a *v* (easily done), but she prefers the idea that 'Lucentio exaggerates his losses'.

There is only one 'Longer Note' (pp. 306–8) and it is concerned with the Folio text's ending, which has an exit direction for Petruccio before the play's penultimate line (spoken by Hortensio) but no other exits before 'FINIS'. Hodgdon herself adds [*Exeunt.*] at the end of the last line (spoken by Lucentio). Exploring the lack of a period at the end of Petruccio's final exit, Hodgdon considers 'the three sheets containing the final page of TS and seven pages of the early acts of AW (sheets V1:6 and V2:5)' (p. 306)—TS meaning *The Taming of the Shrew* and AW meaning *All's Well That Ends Well*—but of course that is two sheets not three. Hodgdon does not mention it, but the reason she is concerned with the two outermost sheets of this gathering is that compositor B alone set them, while the inner sheet was set by other men. Specifically, she is concerned with pages V1^r (the last page of TS), V1^v (first page of AW), V2^r (second page of AW), V2^v (third page of AW), V5^r (eighth page of AW), V5^v (ninth page of AW), V6^r (tenth page of AW), and V6^v (eleventh page of AW). Ignoring the middle sheet (V3:4) of this gathering, she finds that in two sheets (= eight pages) nine out of ten exit directions lack a closing period. By my reckoning, the directions are 'Exit Petruchio' (V1^r), 'Ber. . . . Exit' (V2^v), 'La[dy]. . . Exeunt' (V5^r), 'do's erre. Exeunt' (V5^v), 'me leaue. Exit.' (V6^r), 'I leaue you. | Exit' (V6^r), "'tis so. Exit' (V6^r), 'it so. Exit

Par.' (V6^v), 'come sirrah. *Exit*' (V6^v) and 'Monsieur, farwell. *Exit*' (V6^v). Hodgdon reports that only '*Exit Par.*' (V6^v) has as a closing period and only because it abbreviates Paroles' name, but she seems to have overlooked 'me leaue. *Exit.*' (V6^f).

From her (mis)counting, Hodgdon develops the theory that leaving off the period at the end of a stage direction was a habit of compositor B, but the danger here is that compositors could be notoriously inconsistent in their habits. Even on this small sample of evidence he was inconsistent, omitting/including the closing period in the ratios 9:1 (if we exclude '*Exit Par.*' on the grounds that the period abbreviates the name) or 4:1 (if we include it). It never becomes clear why Hodgdon counts the periods at the ends of compositor B's stage directions, for she drops the subject without drawing a conclusion about it and turns to missing exit directions instead. Indeed, she ends this bibliographical excursus without drawing any conclusions and the long note does not earn its place in the book. Hodgdon celebrates the incoherence of there not being a final exit direction to the play and finds that performance solutions—getting everyone off somehow—are 'projections of . . . time-bound socio-political and ideological investments' (p. 307). She appears to regret the editorial responsibility to decide on some form of exit—perhaps Katherina follows Petruccio off, then the others exit, or Katherina is the last of the group to leave—preferring 'productive ambiguity' (p. 308). It is worth reflecting, however, that the editorial tradition has not stopped theatrical practitioners performing the end of the play any way that they want; practitioners routinely ignore stage directions and no real harm is done by editors putting in the necessary directions for the guidance of readers.

Appendix 1 (pp. 309–27) is about 'Textual Analysis' and starts by reporting the facts of F's printing. We do not know where its act and scene divisions come from, but the definite errors in F are few and it 'seems satisfactory as it stands' (p. 313). That said, just who knows what and when can be problematic: in IV.v Petruccio and Hortensio tell Vincentio that Lucentio has married Bianca but it is not clear how they know this. Tranio seems to take over Hortensio's role as an intimate of Petruccio, familiar with his habits despite hardly knowing him. There are also speech-prefix errors in III.i and IV.ii. Hodgdon sketches the problems and a couple of editorial diagnoses, but refuses to come to any conclusion. In general she thinks that perceived problems of inconsistent or impossible stage directions are less severe in performance than they appear on the page, and she is not in favour of trying to divine the readings of, and causes of errors in, the manuscript underlying F. However, IV.iv presents a particular problem since it begins with the direction '*Enter Tranio, and the Pedant drest like Vincentio*' and yet nineteen lines later comes what appears to be a repetition of the Pedant's entrance: '*Enter Baptista and Lucentio: Pedant booted and bare headed*'. Hodgdon's solution is to treat the second direction as an entry for Baptista and Lucentio but not for the Pedant, to whom it simply gives some business: he takes off his hat. But what about '*booted*'? Hodgdon moves that adjective back to the first direction, but without explaining how she thinks it got wrongly attached to the second. The alternative theories she discusses, including the idea of a Shakespearian false start, seem like more reasonable responses.

Appendix 2 (pp. 328–42) is on ‘Editorial Principles’, and Hodgdon presents herself as a conservative modernizer. She rejects the recently revived claim that F’s punctuation has something worth preserving, and says she punctuates lightly and uses fewer periods than other editors because she wants to preserve ‘the forward movement of a speech’ that F achieves with commas and colons (p. 332). Hodgdon makes the unexpected and unsupported assumption that ‘compositors habitually punctuated the beginning of a long sentence before reading to the end of it’ (p. 331), which on the face of it seems rather slapdash of them. She prefers to interfere minimally in lineation, giving examples of where she has resisted the temptation to fashion part-lines spoken by different speakers into regular full, shared lines. She is particularly interested in transitions from verse to prose and back again. Regarding stage directions, Hodgdon aims not to interfere too much and relies on William B. Long’s 1980s work on the limited theatrical alteration of authorial stage directions in the early modern theatre. Like M.J. Kidnie, Hodgdon fears that editorial interventions to supply and fix stage directions ‘close off other options’ (p. 336). Appendix 3 (pp. 343–94) provides a photographic facsimile of the Huntington Library’s exemplar of *A Shrew* and Appendix 4, on ‘Two *Shrews*’ (pp. 395–8), begins with the metaphor for textual relatedness that ‘*A Shrew* and *The Shrew* obviously know one another’. This is an unhelpful way of putting it, since it obscures the agency by which they come to have features in common as well as differences, as does her reference to ‘some kind of dependence between the two plays’ (p. 395). In Appendix 5 on ‘Casting’ (pp. 399–402) Hodgdon reckons fifteen actors could do it (fourteen at a push), but her casting chart lists not actors and the parts they take but characters and the scenes they are in.

Like Hodgdon, John Pitcher has only the Folio to go on for his edition of *The Winter’s Tale*. A literary critic of the highest order, Pitcher offers a long introduction (pp. 1–135) giving a finely argued and persuasive reading of the play. He is not much concerned with portraying the range of critical responses, nor with the details of how the play came to be printed. Thus his sections have headings such as ‘Death and Art’ (pp. 2–10), ‘Tragedy into Romance’ (pp. 10–24), ‘Childhood’ (pp. 23–38), ‘Knowledge’ (pp. 38–48), ‘Pastorals’ (pp. 48–53), ‘Nature and Art’ (pp. 53–8), ‘Rules and Types in Drama’ (pp. 58–69), ‘Wonder’ (pp. 69–72), ‘Disguising’ (pp. 72–6), and ‘Time’ (pp. 76–83). These all offer superb literary criticism outside the scope of this review, until ‘Making and Remaking the Play’ (pp. 83–135) turns attention to the play in performance in its own time and since then. The modern tendency to group *The Winter’s Tale* with *Cymbeline* and *The Tempest* is not unreasonable, Pitcher points out, since Ben Jonson did that in the Induction to his *Bartholomew Fair*. Pitcher visualizes Jonson and Shakespeare competing on speed of composition, and he accepts Leeds Barroll’s argument that Shakespeare wrote in frenzied bursts between plague closures, which also tends to push the romances together as a group.

The source for *The Winter’s Tale* was Robert Greene’s *Pandosto* that was a huge hit in its own day and for a couple of centuries after (p. 94). But of *The Winter’s Tale* there are no known performances between one at court in 1634 and a revival of 1741 that flopped. The play’s eighteenth-century stage history

is essentially only in the form of butchered versions comprising the last two acts, and when in the nineteenth century the text was restored great harm was done by the quest for historical authenticity in staging. Pitcher takes the stage history up to the twentieth century and gets it all into just eight pages. He is rather too dependent on out-of-date theatre history, thinking that 'men and older boys' (p. 115) played women when in fact only boys did. This leads him to suggest some unlikely doubling in the first performances: 'The actors playing Hermione, Antigonus or Paulina could double as the Shepherd or Clown, and the doubling of Hermione and Autolycus or Antigonus and Autolycus was also feasible' (p. 117). His suggestion that Richard Burbage doubled Leontes and Autolycus also contradicts the orthodoxy that sharers taking the largest parts did not double. For some reason Pitcher thinks that doubling is now seldom used in the theatre (p. 120). The remainder of the introduction (pp. 121–5) is concerned with sound and wordplay.

Pitcher makes so few emendations of the dialogue that it is possible to consider all of them here; I leave aside alterations to stage directions, speech prefixes, and lineation. At I.ii.207 Mamillius says 'I am like you, they say', using the *they* that is in F2 but omitted in F; yet on page 363 Pitcher makes a good argument for inserting not *they* but *you*: 'I am like you, you say'. Pitcher follows Rowe's convincing emendation so that instead of Leontes saying his wife is a 'Holy-Horse' (as F has it) he says she is a 'hobby-horse' (I.ii.274). He interprets F's ambiguous marginal '*Silence*' (III.ii.10) as a command spoken by the Officer of the court, not as an unusual stage direction; the only parallel would be '*Holds her by the hand silent*' in *Coriolanus* V.iii. Pitcher adopts F2's reading in having Leontes refer to Camillo's flight as 'to the certain hazard | Of all incertainties himself commended' (III.ii.165), where F lacks 'certain' and follows Rowe's emendation so that, seeing the gold left with Perdita, the Clown says 'You're a made old man' (III.iii.117) instead of F's 'You're a mad olde man'. Pitcher uses F2 for Perdita's 'Digest it with a custom' (IV.iv.12) where F lacks the 'it', and adopts Theobald's emendation to have Perdita say to Florizel 'I should blush | To see you so attired; swoon, I think, | To show myself a glass' (IV.iv.12), where F has *sworne* instead of *swoon*. F's reading could be defended if Perdita is saying that she would blush to see Florizel dressing above his station (as she is) since by instead dressing down it is as if he has sworn (vowed) to show how she should look to suit her station; that is more or less Sisson's admittedly rather awkward defence of F's reading. Pitcher uses F2 for Polixenes' advice 'Then make your garden rich in gillyvors' (IV.iv.98) where F has 'you' for 'your' and again follows Theobald in having Camillo observe of Florizel and Perdita that 'He tells her something | That makes her blood look out' (IV.iv.160) where F has *on't* instead of *out*. As Sisson argued, both readings describe her blushing and *on't* has the stronger poetic sense of the blood coming to the surface of the skin in order to look upon the thrilling thing Florizel has said.

Pitcher adopts Rowe's emendation so that the hairy dancers are said to be able to jump twelve-and-a-half feet 'by th' square' (IV.iv.344) instead of F's meaningless 'by th' squire' and uses F2 for 'Thou art too base | To be acknowledged' (IV.iv.424) where F has 'acknowledge'. He rejects F's 'That thou no more shalt neuer see this knacke' (IV.iv.433) by dropping 'neuer', as

Rowe did. Here F could be defended as the overdoing of negatives by an excited Polixenes. Pitcher gives Pope as the precedent for emending Polixenes' warning to Perdita to no more 'hope his [Florizel's] body' (IV.iv.444), as F has it, so that it reads 'hoop his body'; in fact *hope* > *hoop* is just a modernization of spelling so it does not need to be collated. Pitcher uses F2 to provide Camillo's 'You know your father's temper' (IV.iv.472) where F has 'You know my Father's temper' and Theobald's emendation so that Florizel's reckoning a boat being ready for them to escape Bohemia is 'most opportune to her neede' (IV.iv.505) becomes the more reasonable '... our need'. In F, Autolycus boasts that as his customers gathered around him 'I would have' (IV.iv.616) filed keys off their key-chains, but Pitcher goes for the 1863–6 Cambridge–Macmillan edition's 'I could have', which makes better sense. Encouraging Autolycus more quickly to undress to swap clothes with Florizel, Camillo says in F 'the Gentleman is halfe fled already' (IV.iv.645) but Pitcher follows Rowe in changing 'fled' to 'flayed' (meaning half undressed) but admits that this is just a matter of modernizing spelling and that the change suppresses the sense of Florizel being in hurried flight.

In F the Clown says to his father that were Perdita and Florizel married 'then your Blood had beene the dearer, by I know how much an ounce' (IV.iv.708), and Pitcher follows Thomas Hanmer in emending 'know' to 'know not'. However, F is defensible as the Clown's mistaking: he wants to express certainty—that the marriage was not their fault—and gets the expression wrong (compare the increasingly heard 'I could care less' where its opposite is meant). At IV.iv.738–40 Pitcher adopts Capell's emendation so that Autolycus asks the Shepherd and Clown 'Think'st thou, for that I insinuate to toze from thee thy business, I am therefore no courtier?' where F has 'at toaze' instead of 'to toze', but wonders whether F2's 'or toaze' might instead be right. In F Leontes says that taking a new wife 'would make her [Hermione's] Sainted Spirit | Againe possesse her Corps, and on this Stage | (Where we Offendors now appeare) Soule-vest, | And begin, why to me?' (V.i.56–9). The problem is that Leontes seems to say that he and Paulina are at this moment offenders against Hermione's memory, yet the whole point of their conversation is that he should not remarry, should not offend her memory. Also, it seems clear that *appeare* has to apply to Hermione's ghost not to Leontes and Paulina. Benjamin Heath's emendation, first adopted by Rann for his edition, was to change *Where* to *Were*—meaning, 'if we agreed I should marry'—and to move the closing bracket to after *now*, so that the subject of *appeare* is Hermione's spirit. Pitcher's reading is simply a modernization of Heath's solution, although he collates lots of others.

Pitcher adopts Capell's transference of the last three words of Cleomenes' 'Good Madame, I haue done' (V.i.75) to Paulina to start her next speech with, which is not necessary or even terribly plausible. Cleomenes is trying to stop Paulina from making Leontes take an oath not to remarry anyone who does not look like Hermione and perhaps at this point he gives up since he makes no further objections. He plausibly can say 'I have done', whereas Paulina is most certainly not done: she goes on to make Leontes take an altered vow that she, Paulina, will choose his wife for him. Naturally, Pitcher goes for Hanmer's emendation that makes Paulina say that she keeps Hermione's statue

'Lonely' and apart rather than 'Louely' as F has it (V.iii.18). F has Paulina say 'It is requir'd | You doe awake your Faith: then all stand still: | On: those that thinke it is vnlawfull Businesse | I am about, let them depart' (V.iii.94-7) but Pitcher follows Hanmer's emendation of 'On' to 'Or' saying it is 'almost certainly right'. Again, F could be defended here: Paulina stops everyone while they awake their faith, as she just told them to do, and then once the mood is right she says 'On'. Pitcher stops Paulina's interrogation of Perdita with 'There's time enough for that, | Lest they desire upon this push to trouble | Your joys with like relation' (V.iii.129-30), meaning 'let's not start everyone off telling their stories as that will spoil your joy', using 'Lest' for F's 'Least'. He considers F's reading possible—meaning 'no one wants to spoil your joy by telling their stories'—but does not mention that *least* was simply a possible spelling of *lest* in this period; if it is here then this is not emendation and Pitcher need not have collated or given a textual note.

Pitcher's appendices are not explicitly given that title. The first, on 'The Text' (pp. 349-81), surveys what we know about the King's men's scribe Ralph Crane and his professional habits and mentions that doing a transcript of a masque for Jonson in 1618 probably gave him his opening with the King's Men. Pitcher notes that the Folio text of *The Winter's Tale* has not got 'the telltale signs of the theatre about it (e.g. detailed, practical directions for staging)' (pp. 351-2), which of course is an old-fashioned view about stage directions; more pertinent would be its lack of flourishes. In 'Licensing the Manuscript' (pp. 357-60) are speculations about Henry Herbert's agreeing to license *The Winter's Tale* again since 'the allowed booke was missinge' on John Heminges's promise that the company had not changed the play since George Buc licensed it. Without giving anything to support the idea, Pitcher suggests that Herbert was in fact licensing the publication of *The Winter's Tale* in the 1623 Folio and was given printed unbound sheets to peruse. Surely if Herbert had the right to stop the play being published—we have no evidence he did and the play's Stationers' Register entry of 8 November 1623 makes no mention of needing further authority—then the company would have shown him a manuscript for his approval before committing to the cost of printing it.

Pitcher's account of 'Typesetting and Printing the First Folio' (pp. 360-6) shows no awareness of progress since the 1960s on the subject, and 'From the First Folio to This Edition' (pp. 366-9) simply surveys the unauthoritative changes in F2-4 and from then on to the twentieth century. In 'The Text in this Edition' (pp. 369-81) Pitcher gives an insightful account of just what is lost in the process of modernization, about which he is so unhappy that he prints a table of 'Archaic and unusual spellings and word forms in F', once alphabetically and once by order of appearance. He then does the same again for punctuation, highlighting the ambiguities and the challenge of modernization, and even provides a table of all the Folio text's hyphens except those that split lines. Pitcher's section on 'Music' (pp. 382-404) makes the peculiar suggestion that for the music to accompany the awakening of the supposed statue 'the musicians may have performed invisibly from beneath the stage' (p. 384). The only parallel for that would be the hautboys under the stage in Folio *Antony and Cleopatra*, also apparently set from a transcript of authorial papers, and it has the necessary stage direction. Would Crane really suppress

such an interesting detail? Pitcher thinks that Hermione's call to the gods to 'from your sacred vials pour your graces | Upon my daughter's head' (V.iii.121–3) suggests supernatural music (*vials* sounds like *viols*) and hence it would be appropriate for the musicians to be under the stage. I would have thought the image of pouring something down would, if anything, suggest music from above. Pitcher misses that the Clown twice calls for musicians to 'strike up' in the feast scene, although there are none on the stage: their presence is liminal, and the best place for them is the stage balcony, especially as the Globe's music room was moved there as part of the regularizing of practices at the Globe and the Blackfriars. The remaining ancillary material provides texts of the various sources, early modern and classical.

Of the books published about Shakespeare's texts and their editing, three need not detain us long. This reviewer's *The Struggle for Shakespeare's Text: Twentieth-Century Editorial Theory and Practice* gives a history of the problems and solutions, paying particular attention to the New Bibliographers and arguing for the continuing relevance of most of what they achieved. Bias rather than modesty forbids further description here. In 2008 and 2009 Charles Adam Kelly published a pseudo-book about, and a pseudo-edition of, *Hamlet* that were previously overlooked here. The book came first and is called *The Evidence Matrix for the First Quarto of Shakespeare's Hamlet: An Examination of the Details of Conflicting Theories*. It has no page numbers, so everything will be referenced by the section headings. The prose is poorly constructed with commas frequently obtruding between verbs and their subjects and words frequently misspelled, such as *principle* for *principal*. In 'To the Reader' Kelly summarizes what he thinks the orthodoxy: that Q1 *Hamlet* [1603] 'is an unauthorized printing of an unauthorized abridgement' and that the actor playing Marcellus was involved. Actually, almost no one still believes that the printing was unauthorized—although Kelly needs to explain just what he means by that word—and few that the abridgement was. Kelly believes that Q1 is a predecessor text and that there is another lost text between Q1 and Q2 (1604–5). Part I begins ominously with a section labelled 'The Enigma' where Kelly anachronistically identifies the play's Stationers' Register entry as 'James Roberts files for copy'. He refers to a 'probable' performance of *Hamlet* 'for King James I' between May and July 1603 without mentioning where he thinks the king was and he quotes A.W. Pollard's classic study *Shakespeare Folio and Quartos* without giving page numbers.

In 'The Bad Quarto of *Hamlet*' Kelly makes broad generalizations about the relationships between Q1, Q2, and F, frequently using the formula 'it is thought' without indicating who thinks it. In 'Reconsidering the Bad Quarto' Kelly refers to his previous publication on the printing of *Hamlet*, but without giving anything but the title, and in 'Judgement Suspended' he sets out a long list of rhetorical questions about the provenance of Q1, asserting all sorts of supposed facts—such as Thomas Kyd writing the ur-*Hamlet*—without offering supporting citations or reasons to believe them. Among what he claims are the 'Scholarly Traditions' are that 'Short less sophisticated texts were developed as touring texts' and 'Shakespeare never revised the texts of this plays', which straw men Kelly knocks down. In 'Types of Evidence' Kelly starts to explain how the colour coding of his three-text *Hamlet* transcription

works: Q2 apparently is the 'control text' and in it 'each Q1 variant word appears in blue. Folio variants appear in red. The red variants appear in the Q2 text only when the words have no concordant words or passages in the Folio'. It is not clear why Q2/Q1 and Q2/F variants are not treated the same typographically. Kelly does not explain just what two lines being 'concordant' means, and it seems that here subjectivity creeps into a project whose title words 'evidence matrix' imply objectivity.

Kelly is aware of recent work that has challenged what he calls the scholarly traditions: Lukas Erne and Peter Blayney on printing, and Laurie Maguire on bad quartos. He is disarmingly frank about not knowing where the memorial reconstruction theory of *Hamlet* came from: it 'might have been put forward by James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps in about 1880'. The title of the section 'Scholarly Traditions Under Siege' betrays its author's hyperbole: generally scholars hold views based on attempts to interpret the evidence and give up those views when new evidence seems incompatible with them; siege mentalities are rare and unscholarly. Kelly's sections are very small, typically 500 words decked out with tabulations (on theory versus evidence) that get repeated many times with slight adjustments; there are no tips on how to read these tabulations nor what they are showing; this reader did not find them self-explanatory. The weakness arising from Kelly's lack of scholarly apparatus becomes starkly apparent in 'Scholarly Traditions—Players and Printing' when he writes that 'As early as 1592, when Henry Chettle and Thomas Nashe were involved in a publication overtly insulting to Shakespeare, one can only speculate which powerful nobleman sent an emissary, but both Chettle and Nashe published abject apologies.' Even the expert reader is quite in the dark about what Kelly means; it is something to do with *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit*, presumably, but where is the evidence for a powerful nobleman being involved?

In 'From Saxo to Shakespeare' Kelly treats the idea of Q1 being based on an abridgement of the text that got printed as Q2 as totalizing, as if nothing but abridgement took place. In fact everyone knows that not to be the case since some of the character names differ, most noticeably Polonius and Corambis, and since this is not an effect of abridgement there has to be more going on. In the time-honoured fashion of amateur writers, Kelly assumes that a nobleman must have forced Chettle and Nashe to apologize to Shakespeare for some printed insult; cannot writers just regret insults? Kelly gets the year of the formation of the Chamberlain's men wrong, giving 1593 instead of 1594, and betrays another amateur fixation in supposing that the 'Queen's declining health may have been a factor in the timing' of the Stationers' Register entry of *Hamlet*. Kelly asserts that Q2's title-page claim to be printed from 'true and perfect copy' indicates publication 'with the playwright's authority'. In 'From Foul Papers to Publication' Kelly attempts to write a stemma for all the editions of *Hamlet* and it runs to fifteen texts. That he does not understand stemmata is indicated by his including 'Compositors' Alterations' and 'Proof Reader's Alterations' in a single line of descent leading to 'Quarto and Folio Play Texts', thus ignoring the influence of Q1 on Q2 and perhaps Q3 on F. In 'Shakespeare and Revision' Kelly discusses some already known Q2/F differences and attributes them to authorial revision, citing an essay by Paul

Werstine from 1988 but without noticing that Werstine ends his essay by refusing to attribute the revision to Shakespeare.

Finally Kelly gets to what he considers his contribution to the debate in 'New Tools—New Realization', where he starts to count lines that are 'identical or nearly identical' between Q1 and Q2. Unfortunately, defining what qualifies as identity is crucial since one cannot just count the words in common between two lines because some words matter more than others; having function words like *the*, *a*, *of*, and *in* in common is less significant than having lexical words in common. He reports that three-quarters of Q1's lines are identical or 'closely related to' lines in Q2, but that last quarter must come from somewhere and Kelly proposes it is a lost early version of the play. (An analogous claim is pursued on firmer evidence in Paul Menzer's book reviewed below.) There are things in Q1 such as Ophelia being told not to receive Hamlet's letters and Laertes being popular with the people that have consequences present in Q2 (she refers to not receiving Hamlet's letters, he bursts in with supporters) even though Q2 lacks the earlier moments that prepare us for these consequences. Kelly reasonably enough argues that a memorial reconstructor could not be responsible for this problem. Likewise Q1/F agreements against Q2 are hard to explain. Kelly is essentially right here, but needs to go beyond merely reiterating the known perplexities of Q1/Q2/F.

In 'Q2 vs. F—Lines Unique to Each' comes the key contribution. If the memorial reconstructor making the script behind Q1 was trying to recollect all the play, and if all the play is represented by Q2+F—that is, where Q2 or F lack a line in the other, it is merely an omission in that printing—then it is statistically unlikely that he would consistently fail to remember parts that are Q2-only or F-only. But that is precisely what he does, and the only plausible explanation is that in fact the Q2-only and F-only parts were not present in what he was trying to remember. Kelly thinks it follows 'that the entire text of Q2 was not yet written when Q1 was created'. No, the logic has slipped a gear there: the memorial reconstructor making copy for Q1 (if that is how it was done) could equally be trying to remember some other text related in a complex way—including authorial or non-authorial revision—to the manuscripts underlying Q2 and F and in which the Q2-only and F-only passages were not present. The next key assertion Kelly has to make is that for the memorial reconstruction hypothesis to stand the recollecting actor would have to have recalled his lines out of sequence and do so in bunches, and actors never do that, so in fact this must be authorial rearrangement. Kelly is mistaken about actors—they do accidentally move chunks of text around—and in any case no one thinks that Q1 is separated from Q2/F solely by memorial reconstruction; all accept that revision must also play a part. Kelly compounds his mistake by insisting that there existed a specific version of the play (best represented by Q2) that was licensed and performed in 1603, so that Q1 represents the authorial draft and Q2 the authorial revision—including the rearrangement of lines just discussed—made prior to first performance. The glaring error in all this is that we have strong independent evidence that Shakespeare's play was first performed in 1600.

Usefully, in 'Evidence in a New Light' Kelly gives the statistical likelihood that a memorial reconstructor would miss all the Q2-only and F-only lines,

and it is very small. Kelly reckons that the actor of Marcellus must have been a sharer not a hired man since he is important to the opening of the play, and since Barnardo and Francisco probably were hired men the company surely would not have a third one there too (Marcellus) since that would leave Horatio as the only part played by a sharer in the opening section. From the evidence of a few periods set where commas or nothing at all would be preferable, Kelly's 'Oral Transmission—Reporter vs. Compositor' concludes that Q1 was set by dictation in the printshop (arising because the manuscript was hard to read) and that no proofreading was done. (I cannot see how dictation would help if the manuscript was hard to read.) 'There's the Point' makes the valuable observation (although David Scott Kastan made it first) that Q1's 'I there's the point' is not bad Shakespeare but only sounds bad because we expect 'that is the question' to come after 'To be or not to be'. 'Shakespeare's Other Great Tragedies' offers a weak argument that *Hamlet* was more likely written in 1603 than in 1600 because that puts it closer to his other great tragedies *Othello* [1604], *King Lear* [1605], and *Macbeth* [1605]. Kelly provides his own 'Afterword', twice.

Kelly's other book is a highly unusual edition called *The Hamlet 3×2 Text Research Toolset*. Again there are no page numbers, although openings are numbered within the section 'The Texts'. The rivals for this book must be the Paul Bertram and Bernice Kliman's *Three-Text Hamlet* and Jesus Tronch-Perez's *Synoptic Hamlet*, both of which are more scholarly. The section 'Shakespeare's Plays—Printers & Publishers of the Early Quartos' begins with a large chart that tries but fails to summarize the entire early publishing history. It fails because one cannot cram it all into a single graphic, and Kelly is forced to use awkward footnotes and irregular explanatory callouts. The discursive prose of this section claims several odd things about *Hamlet*, such as 'in the *Brudermord* text, the suspicion that the ghost of old King Hamlet might be the devil tempting Prince Hamlet, comes from Horatio, not from within Hamlet'. But in Shakespeare's version Horatio has much the same thought: 'What if it tempt you toward the flood, my lord . . . And there assume some other horrible form | Which might deprive your sovereignty of reason' (Liv.50–4). In essence the argument in this section is the same as in Kelly's previous book reviewed above, with the same problems. The colour-coding system is again explained, but so poorly that I still do not understand it. For example, the reader is told that 'The text of Q2 was selected as the control text, and Q1 variants appear in blue.' Yes, but in blue in which text? Confidence in Kelly's grasp of early printing is not inspired by his large illustration showing the Folio's inner and outer 'Forms' (instead of formes) and by his comment about Q2 that 'the type was likely marked according to anticipated page breaks in a process known as casting off'. (A manuscript might be so marked, but not type.) Because Q2 is Kelly's 'control text' the corresponding Q1 and F texts that flank it are made from bits pieced together 'from one or more pages'. So, he says, the reader needs facsimiles of Q1 and F too: the latter can be bought and the former can be downloaded from Kelly's website. However, the URL given did not work at the time of reviewing (December 2011) and a manual exploration of the website shows that this facsimile is no longer there.

The core of the book is 'The Texts' with parallel columns showing Q1, Q2, and F. For each opening (read with the book's spine horizontal) these appear first in facsimile (in the top page) and then in transcription (in the bottom page), with colour coding in the latter to summarize the relationships between the texts. No mention is made of press variants and Kelly seems unaware of them. Appendix A gives various graphics and charts showing which chunks of text are unique to Q1, Q2, and F, and listing 'Selected' variant words. Nowhere in his discussion does Kelly seem to acknowledge that deciding on what is a variant is a subjective process. For example, how many variants are there between Q1's 'Madam, how do you like this play?' and Q2's 'Madam, how like you this play?' We could divide the lines as 'Madam, | how | do you like | this | play?' and 'Madam, | how | like you | this | play?' and decide that there is one variant: 'do you like' versus 'like you'; this exemplifies the choice between modern auxiliary *do* and old-fashioned word-order inversion to make a question. Alternatively, we could mark them up as 'Madam, | how | do | you | like | this | play?' and 'Madam, | how | like | you | | this | play?' and say that there are two variants: *do* versus *like* and *like* versus a blank. It is not obvious which division is better and both have demerits: the former marks as variant a pair of phrases that actually have two words, *like* and *you*, in common, and the latter makes no allowance for *like* jumping location in the sentence.

This problem of determining how to demarcate variants corresponds to a problem in Kelly's calculations of just which lines are unique to each edition, since the allegedly unique lines will nonetheless contain words such as *the*, *a*, *in*, *on* and so on, that have counterparts in the other editions but which are subjectively disqualified because these words are so frequent in the language. The whole project is either fraught with subjectivity or else firm rules have to be applied and explained to the reader. Kelly has not done the latter. The problem applies also to Kelly's charts showing how lines and passages appear in different places in Q1 and Q2: sometimes there is correspondence of almost all the words in a line, sometimes less, so not all the arrows carry the same weight and the threshold for commonality is never clear.

Kelly gives an inaccurate account of the making of the Folio, thinking that all twelve pages in a gathering were cast off, but in fact the usual procedure was to cast off the first six and then set the first half of the gathering in reverse reading order and the second half seriatim, although some approximation of how many gatherings were needed for each play must also have taken place. In Q1 the gravedigger says that Yorick's skull has been in the ground 'this dozen year' and in Q2 he says '23. yeeres' and Kelly thinks this significant since Burbage would have been about a decade younger in 1594, when the ur-*Hamlet* played, than he was in 1603 when Kelly reckons Shakespeare's version was first performed. But why alter the time that has elapsed since Yorick's death: could he not have died a dozen years ago just as well with Hamlet being played by a 26-year-old Burbage as by a 35-year-old?

The book was delivered with the typescript of an essay, apparently unpublished, called 'The Recognition of a Statistical Anomaly Showing that the Text of Q1 *Hamlet* Cannot be Demonstrated to Derive from Q2 or the Folio Text and Notes on the Role of *The Hamlet 3x2 Text Research Toolset* in that Recognition' by Charles Adams Kelly, which is considered here.

The essay repeats what was asserted in Adams's book reviewed above: Q1 cannot have been made by memorial reconstruction of the play underlying Q2/F because it consistently leaves out the 6 per cent of Q2/F that comprises lines in Q2 that are not F or in F but not in Q2, and that is a statistically unlikely habit of selective forgetting. Here Kelly makes the same erroneous leap that his discovery proves that 'Q2 *Hamlet* did not exist when Q1 was created'. The phrasing betrays the lack of rigour: of course Q2 (printed 1604–5) did not exist in 1603 when Q1 was created; what he means is that the manuscript underlying Q2 did not exist when the manuscript underlying Q1 was created. Actually, all his discovery proves is that if the manuscript underlying Q1 was made by memorial reconstruction then the recollector was not trying to recollect the plays represented by Q2 or F. Kelly has not eliminated the possibility that a recollector was trying to recall something rather like the manuscript underlying Q2 or the one underlying F but with certain differences, such as its having the king's counsellor be called Corambis instead of Polonius.

Kelly comes close to spotting his logical fallacy when using an essay by Roslyn Knutson on the Folio-only 'little eyases' passage being an interpolation written in 1606–8. If such F-only passages are additions to the play after the manuscript underlying Q2 was made (and then put into performance), that would explain those F-only passages not being in Q1 despite Q1 being made by memorial reconstruction. Could the memorial reconstruction hypothesis also encompass Q2-only passages not being in Q1? Yes: it only takes those passages being left out of the performances that the recollector was trying to reconstruct. But then, how come those cut passages were left out of F too? Simple: the play was written more or less as it appears in Q2, then it was cut for performances (from which Q1 derives by recollection), and then additions were made before it got printed as F. To point this out is not to contend that Q1 was made by memorial reconstruction, only to demonstrate that Kelly's analysis does not eliminate this possible origin of Q1. What really needs to be examined is the dramatic relationship, if any, between the Q2-only passages and the F-only passages, since if they are artistically connected—say, an F-only passage replaces a Q2-only passage—then it becomes hard to see Q1 being based on a memorial reconstruction. Kelly does not pursue this possibility.

Paul Menzer's book—which would have been reviewed two years ago had University of Delaware Press been able to supply a copy—is also concerned with the origins of the texts of *Hamlet*, and he thinks the cues (the last two or three words of a speech that the next actor to speak is listening for) can throw new light on the topic (*The Hamlets: Cues, Qs, and Remembered Texts*). His key idea is that no matter what happens to the middles of speeches when plays get altered (whether by authors or others, intentionally or by accident) the cues that link the speeches tend to be preserved because two actors, the one saying the cue and the one listening for it, will have remembered them as essential connective tissue holding the play together. Thus the manuscript underlying Q1 *Richard III* cannot have been made by memorial reconstruction of the play later printed as F, since 15 per cent of the cues differ between Q1 and F, yet overall the dialogue differs by only 10 per cent. 'If we agree that cues ought to observe greater not lesser fidelity than the rest of the text in a communal

reconstruction, cue variation indicates that Q1 [*Richard III*] is no such text' (p. 19). However, we need not permit Menzer his premise if we think that once rehearsals had taken place the actors remembered not so much the precise words of their cues but more simply the flow of their characters' conversations and who speaks when. In counting the lines that differ between various early editions of plays in order to diagnose the means of creation, Menzer's methodology is effectively a subset of Kathleen Itrace's in *Reforming the 'Bad' Quartos*, yet her book is nowhere mentioned by him.

Menzer's study concludes that Q2 *Hamlet* was set from authorial papers and F from a manuscript documenting a set of changes to the play over time, not necessarily by Shakespeare, which Menzer thinks is a revival of the 'continuous copy' theory. Q1 *Hamlet*, his method concludes, represents not a memorial reconstruction of Shakespeare's play but an attempt to make a new play using 'previously available *Hamlet*-related materials' (p. 21), including memories of *Hamlet* plays (including Shakespeare's), and that this new play was not intended for performance but for print publication. It cannot have been for performance because 'its cues render it virtually unactable' (p. 24). Since many of us have seen performances of the script in Q1 this cannot literally be true and the assertion casts doubt on Menzer's judgement of the role cues play in performance. Like the New Textualists, Menzer rejects the categories of manuscript wielded by the New Bibliography: the term 'foul papers' 'invariably invokes an autonomous, "closed" manuscript bearing the author's hand' (p. 26) and 'fair copy' is problematic too, since it works to 'confine scribal copies to the playhouse' (p. 27). Actually, in letters to Philip Henslowe the dramatist Robert Daborne repeatedly referred to himself making fair copies and the idea that New Bibliography insisted upon too few classes of manuscripts is mistaken: Fredson Bowers enumerated at least eight categories in *On Editing Shakespeare*. Menzer's own preferred terms are 'pre-text' for 'a script anticipating publication on stage, whether first rehearsal or public performance' and having, for that reason, to 'take care with cues' and 'post-script' for something 'subsequent to at least one initial rehearsal' (p. 28) and therefore not having to take care with cues. Menzer does not immediately explain what he means by taking care of cues, but it turns out that he believes that if a particular phrase is used as a cue in one part of a scene it must not also be used nearby lest the actors lose their sense of who speaks next.

In Menzer's taxonomy, Q2 was set from a 'pre-text' and Q1 and F from a 'post-script'. John Jowett's MSQ/MSF shorthand (for 'the manuscript underlying Q' and 'the manuscript underlying F') is used to make a key assertion of the book: 'if parts were set from MSQ2, both Q1 and F (and the manuscripts behind them, MSQ1 and MSF) are "post-scripts", and they "remember" MSQ2 in different ways' (p. 30). Leaving aside the confusing terminology—surely parts are transcribed not 'set'—the logical leap here is unwarranted: why should the reader agree that if the manuscript underlying Q2 was used to make parts then the manuscripts underlying Q1 and F must be 'subsequent to at least one initial rehearsal' (Menzer's definition of a 'post-script' from page 28)? Why cannot they be, say, derivatives of copies of MSQ2 made before rehearsals began? Menzer's investment in the

'continuous copy' theory runs counter to his desire to mark as a crucial dividing point—the one that makes the difference between his 'pre-' and 'post-' categories—the first rehearsal; indeed the limitations imposed by his revised taxonomy seem as problematic as those the New Bibliographers encountered with theirs.

Menzer's chapter 1, 'Cue Report on *Hamlet's* Three Texts' (pp. 40–70), reports on the differences between the cues in the three early editions. Menzer reports that only twenty cues 'significantly differ' (p. 41) between Q2 and F, and compares to this the latest Arden editors' estimate that only 220 lines in Q2 are identical with their counterparts in F. Thus 94 per cent of the lines differ yet almost all the cues remain the same. (This is hardly a fair comparison, since he looks for significant difference in the cues while the Arden editors were looking for exact identity including punctuation and typographical styling.) Q1's cues, on the other hand, are in most cases significantly different from Q2/F's but sometimes are the same. At this point (pp. 42–3) Menzer lists what he claims are all forty-five of the cue variants between Q2 and F, on the assumption that cues comprise three or four words and spelling, typographical styling, and punctuation do not matter: sound is all. Menzer includes as a cue the words spoken by Horatio just before the Ghost enters in the first scene (and these words are different in Q2 and F because the latter omits eighteen lines that are in Q2), but in fact we do not know how entrances were cued: instead of the words just before the Ghost enters, the words just after ('But soft, behold') would do, and they are identical in Q2/F. This happens again the second time the Ghost enters, in scene 4. Some of Menzer's judgements could be challenged, as when he counts as a variant 'is the time' versus 'is that time' although aurally these may be indistinguishable.

Most importantly of all, Menzer seems simply to have overlooked a great deal of evidence. The following variants (first Q2 then F reading) are missing from his list: 'twill walke againe' / 'twill wake againe', 'of your hands' / 'off your hand', 'with imagion' / 'with imagination', 'O God' / 'O Heauen!', 'name of God?' / 'name of Heauen?', 'I Amen' / 'Amen', 'thinke this?' / 'thinke 'tis this?', 'be very like', / 'be very likely', 'he dooes indeede' / 'he ha's indeed', 'reade my Lord' / 'meane, my Lord', 'of her fauors' / 'of her fauour?', 'strumpet, What newes?' / 'Strumpet. What's the newes?', 'his swadling clouts' / 'his swathing clouts', 't'was then indeede', / 't'was so indeed', 'prethee no more' / 'Pray you no more', 'while you liue' / 'while you liued', 'thanke you well' / 'well, well, well', 'I my Lord' / 'will my Lord', 'off mine edge' / 'off my edge', 'cry of players?' / 'crie of Players sir', 'Lord, with choller' / 'Lord, rather with choller', 'into more choller' / 'into farre more choller', 'Out of his browes' / 'Out of his Lunacies', 'with a wicked tongue' / 'with an idle tongue', 'she beene thus?' / 'she bin this?', 'this ô God' / 'this, you Gods?', 'call't in question' / 'call in question', 'haue aym'd them' / 'had arm'd them', 'that brought them' / 'he receiu'd them', 'you deuise me?' / 'you aduise me?', 'all the Nation' / 'all our Nation', 'folly drownes it' / 'folly doubts it', 'in graue-making' / 'at Graue-making?', 'hold off thy hand' / 'Away thy hand', 'els for's turne' / 'else for's tongue', 'Come my Lord' / 'Come on sir', and 'I doe confest' / 'I do confesse'. (Because all these can most easily be found using the online

transcriptions of Q2 and F at sites such as Internet Shakespeare Editions, I have not given the line references.) The above list totals thirty-seven variants to add to Menzer's list of forty-five: there are nearly twice as many as he counts. It might be objected that many of these are small differences, but they are no smaller than some of the variants that do make Menzer's list, such as 'in the Lord' / 'in my Lord'. Also, Menzer's line number '2255+1' on page 43 is wrong and it puts that variant in the wrong place in the list; it belongs after the next one in the list.

Menzer notices that in his lists there is a cluster of cue variants around the Ghost's appearances in Act I and Laertes' return in Act IV, and wonders if perhaps these moments got changed substantially in rehearsal. Of course, the cue variants simply cluster where there is textual variation between Q2 and F, and why Menzer thinks these moments particularly likely to change in rehearsal is not apparent from the data. For the cues needed to be heard by the Ghost under the stage, Menzer reckons that F's text, in which the cues repeatedly involve the word 'swear', allows Richard Burbage as Hamlet to shout more than Q2 does ('you haue heard', 'neede helpe you') and shouting would make it easier for the actor under the stage to hear his cue. At this point Menzer makes a surprising assertion: 'It is worth noting that repeated cues in F [*my sword . . . my sword . . . my sword*] do not threaten continuity since the text is a 'post-script,' one that does not have to vary the cues since it will not be fractured and rejoined on stage' (p. 49). This is surprising for three reasons. The first is that Menzer has not indicated how continuity could be threatened when successive cues are not varied. The actor listening for those cues knows which of his speeches comes next, so where is the danger? Menzer's earlier examples where the same words being used in successive cues might lead to confusion were occasions when the cue timed an entrance and the entering actor might not know which occurrence (first, second, or third) to react to. But here the actor waiting for the cue responds to each cue by giving his speech, so there is no problem to be solved. The assertion is also surprising in that Menzer writes as if he had established that F is a 'post-script' when in fact that is precisely what the reader is expecting him to establish at this point in the argument. Lastly, having argued that F represents a version of the play that solves practical problems that emerged in rehearsal—such as the inaudibility of the cues for the actor under the stage—he now claims that a practical problem in F (one that I happen to think illusory) is not a problem because the resulting script would not be put to the usual practical purpose of the making of parts. It is not at all clear who, according to Menzer, would have a problem if F were used to make parts, the parts-scribe or the actors?

Another such spurious 'problem' emerges when, in one exchange, Barnardo and Horatio are both waiting for the cue 'speak to it Horatio'. However, they are not waiting for it at the same time: when Barnardo is waiting for 'speak to it Horatio', Horatio is waiting for 'marke it Horatio', and when Horatio is waiting for 'speak to it Horatio', Barnardo is waiting for 'It is offended'; no problem exists. Yet Menzer thinks that F 'solves' this problem by varying the cues (p. 50). At this point Menzer simply starts to assume that where F differs from Q2 in its attribution of lines or wording of cues, that is because they were reattributed/reworded in rehearsal or accidentally by the parts scribe. Menzer

finds some cues concerning the off-stage sounds for Laertes' rebellion, and reactions to them, that make a little more sense in F than Q2. But more often Menzer gets his evidence back to front: 'The Folio *Hamlet* also omits Hamlet's lengthy disquisition on Danish drinking habits, and the cut includes the Ghost's entry cue, "-in the obseruance" (Q2 TLN 621) and substitutes "-his owne scandle"' (pp. 54-5). He is right that F omits Q2's speech about drunkenness, but the effect is that Q2's cue '-his owne scandle' is cut and in its place is left the cue '-in his obseruance' (common to Q2 and F). Menzer has other examples of cues differing between Q2 and F, and since he has no explanation for them all he can do is say that they must have had the assent of all the players (generated in rehearsal) since they cannot be any one person's doing. But their very motivelessness is evidence against his core thesis that the Q2/F differences reflect the differences between a 'pre-text' and a 'post-script'.

Menzer thinks that play revision that altered cues would 'require the remastery' (p. 56) of those cues, but it would not if the revision were made years later, when the play would have to be learnt over again in any case. Menzer commits one of the cardinal sins of this kind of study in being unclear about how two editions differ: 'The "ayrie of Children" . . . passage, exclusive to F . . . expands Q2 by twenty-six lines' (p. 56). He means that F has twenty-six lines not in Q2, but he actually writes that the passage 'expands Q2', the one it is not in. Menzer credits 'W.H. Widgey' (p. 62) with being the 'nineteenth-century originator' of the theory that Q1 has a memorial origin, yet there is no Widgey in his bibliography or footnotes and Tycho Mommsen is more usually given this credit. Q1, Menzer claims, cannot reflect a cut-down version of the play better represented in Q2/F, since in doing such a cutting the actors would preserve the cues but largely Q1 does not. The book is full of such over-emphasis on the importance of cues, giving the impression that Menzer thinks of actors behaving like Ivan Pavlov's dogs. He insists that a cue spoken too early will prompt another actor to speak his corresponding speech out of sequence, but in reality this would happen only if the second actor were waiting for that cue at that moment. Generally actors know which cue they are waiting for and will not react to other cues that will rightly come up later. Menzer's concrete example is Ophelia waiting to hear 'quickly to, farewell' but instead getting the cue 'to a Nunry goe', which she will be listening for a moment later, and reacting to it by speaking the wrong speech. Because in Q1 *Hamlet* five times gives Ophelia the cue 'to a nunnery go', each time prompting her to give a different speech, Menzer thinks this script 'virtually unplayable' (p. 65). His erroneous assumptions are that an actor responds mechanically to a cue by uttering its associated speech (not remembering which cue he is waiting for and what order his speeches appear in) and that even after rehearsal the cues are essential to continuity. (These mistaken assumptions are among the harmful effects of the widespread acceptance of Tiffany Stern's claim that there was little or no rehearsal.) From this Menzer concludes that Q1 cannot be a 'pre-script'.

Menzer finds in the not-quite-repeated cues that *Hamlet* gives in Q2/F 'what make you from Wittenberg Horatio? Marcellus' and, next cue, 'in faith make you from Wittenberg?' a deliberate variation in the cues so as not to confuse the actor who plays Horatio, who has to let Marcellus make his greeting

before he can answer. In Q1, however, there is a repeated cue when 'what is your affaure in Elsenoure?' appears in the middle of a speech (while Horatio is waiting for a different cue, 'ere you depart') and then appears as a cue. Of course, this can also be explained as a memorial-reconstruction anticipation or as an authorial false start, or indeed left without explanation as the script does not cause confusion unless you believe, as Menzer does, that actors cannot remember what order their speeches come in and just blurt them out when the cue is heard. Menzer confronts a section of Q2—supposedly 'pre-script' and hence careful to distinguish its cues—that uses five very similar cues in close conjunction, and he decides, 'Perhaps a pronominal shift is enough to distinguish cues; perhaps cue repetition did not disturb actors; perhaps learning by parts did not depend on cue memorization as much as we may think' (pp. 67–8). Granting all those things (as I would), the argument of the book collapses, since what Menzer considers to be the defining characteristics of differing early modern editions are not present in them; moreover, there is no reason for them to be present as his taxonomy of 'pre-script' and 'post-script' is false not only to the texts but to the theatrical practices too.

In chapter 2 Menzer attempts to show that MSQ2 was used to make the actors' parts. There is some evidence that plays went into rehearsal before being licensed, although Menzer rather overstates the certainty with which we can interpret that evidence. For example, he cites Master of the Revels Henry Herbert's famous note 'Purge ther parts, as I have the booke' and assumes that it means 'go back and do this', indicating that the parts were already in existence prior to licensing. In fact Herbert might only have meant that when the parts were being made they should adhere to his excisions (respect his deletions and alterations) in the licensed book. Menzer quotes a quite separate note by Herbert—making it seem part of the same one by introducing it with 'He testily concludes' (p. 74)—concerning the need to relicense revivals of old plays (already licensed by his predecessors), which ends 'The players ought not to study their parts till I have allowed of the booke'. This Menzer treats as further evidence of part-making before licensing, but in this case the parts were already in existence because they were made long ago for the first runs, not because they have just been made ahead of licensing. (It is difficult for the reader to pursue this point because Menzer cites the wrong page of N.W. Bawcutt's edition of Herbert's office book: he gives '154' but in fact it is 183.) Menzer rightly quotes Scott McMillin observing that Henslowe's Diary suggests that actors began rehearsing plays before they were complete, and hence before they were licensed. But he also quotes Robert Daborne writing to Henslowe that 'I have took extraordinary payns wth the end & altered one other scean in the third act which they have now in parts' which, since he is writing and sending on fragments of his composition, might simply mean that the players have the play in fragmentary form ('in parts'), not that they have made actors' parts out of what they have received.

The significance of all this? 'If indeed the original parts for Shakespeare's *Hamlet* were generated by the manuscript from which Q2 was set, it would go a long way toward explaining Q1's record of exclusive readings from the second quarto that do not appear in F' (p. 80). All this means is that there were two versions of *Hamlet* separated by conscious revision and reflected in Q2

and F and that Q1 reports in some way the first of these. That is pretty much the orthodoxy on *Hamlet* anyway. Menzer couches it in terms of MSQ2 itself being used to make the parts, but in fact the point is merely that the version it represents was their origin since it would not matter if a scribal copy of MSQ2 was used. Q1/Q2 agreements against F strike Menzer as strong evidence, but he does not mention direct use of Q1 in the printshop making Q2. Again the cardinal sin of obscurity: 'Q1/F correspondence also raises the possibility that MSF provided parts-copy, in which case material omitted from Q2 never made it into the hands of the players' (p. 81). What omitted material is he referring to? Lines in Q1 that are not in Q2? Lines from F that are not in Q2? Actually, he seems to mean lines that are in Q2 but not in F and that their not being in F is connected to MSF being used to make the parts. Yet he writes 'omitted from Q2' when he means omitted from F. An example: Q2 has a long version of IV.iv (Fortinbras with his army), while Q1 follows F in having a much shorter one yet follows Q2 in having Fortinbras call himself nephew of old Norway, which in F he does not. How come Q1 follows F in having the short version but follows Q2 in mentioning the relationship? According to Menzer, the best explanation is that someone making MSQ1 remembered that Fortinbras called himself a nephew here, and most likely remembered it because Q2's version was at one time played. Elsewhere in the play the uncle-Norway/nephew-Fortinbras relationship is stressed, so the maker of MSQ1 might I suppose simply have remembered that, although using exactly Q2's words 'nephew to old Norway' is, one has to admit, quite a coincidence.

Another Q2-only fragment that makes it into Q1 despite F/Q1 not having the part of Q2 where it appears is the phrase 'comming downe', and another is Q2's 'A man may fish with the worme that hath eate of a King, & eate of the fish that hath fedde of that worme' which is not in F but a version of which appears in Q1. However, as Menzer acknowledges, Q2 might simply depend directly on Q1 here. From Q1/Q2 agreements against F, Menzer argues that parts were made from MSQ2 and their oral delivery was remembered by the maker of MSQ1. At the point where Q1/Q2/F read 'horrors/horrowes/harrowes' respectively Menzer tries to weigh up the likelihood of various kinds of garbling or mistranscription that would explain the three readings. However, his arguments are based on the misconception that two of the readings must be wrong, where in fact 'horrows' and 'harrowes' can both be right (and even 'horrowes' might be) so we have to include revision as a possible explanation.

Menzer finds a bunch of other Q1/Q2 agreements or near-agreements that are best explained as MSQ2 being the source for the parts for performance, which performance Q1 reflects. (This is essentially what the stemma given by the Oxford *Complete Works* editors shows, although they treat the prompt-book as the source of the performance whereas Menzer more precisely says the parts were.) Discussing the variant 'It waues you' (Q1/Q2) versus 'If wafts you' (F), Menzer asks why, if F represents a revision in the prompt-copy (as W.W. Greg suggested), 'does Q1 not accord with F's "waues"?' (p. 86). The answer of course that F does not read 'waues', it reads 'wafts'. What about the many Q1/F agreements against Q2? Menzer's answer is that Q1 records what was in the parts, and those parts were made from MSQ2 but then they were reshaped

in rehearsal (which reshaping is reflected in F) hence sometimes Q1 agrees with Q2 against F and sometimes Q1 agrees with F against Q2. This explanation obviously will not do since the problem is to explain why sometimes the former agreement happens and sometimes the latter. What is driving the switch?

Chapter 3 argues that F incorporates changes made in rehearsal and performance (including actors' interpolations) recorded from the actors' memories by dictation. Menzer aims to show that MSF was 'continuous copy': a manuscript used backstage for the first performances in the early 1600s and much altered over the following two decades until printed in F. One obvious objection is that F contains scene divisions that would not be marked in a document used in the theatre, which points to its being set from a transcript. At this point, Menzer slips in a transcript: 'the manuscript playbook of *Hamlet*—or a transcript thereof—that eventually reached William and Isaac Jaggard's printshop' (p. 89). But if MSF was a transcript, then the 'continuous copy' hypothesis collapses unless it was an absurdly literal transcript, since the 'additions flown in and passages crossed out' (p. 89) would be tidied up, that being the whole point of making a transcript. F has more stage directions for offstage sounds than the other editions, which Menzer finds to be evidence that it was printed from a manuscript used to run the play. He now embraces the idea that MSF was a transcript, thinking of it as a snapshot of how the ever-changing continuous copy backstage playbook looked at one moment in time. Discussing just when MSF was made, Menzer repeatedly elides the difference between the backstage playbook that was the source for the transcript and the transcript itself (only the latter is actually MSF), as in 'MSF may have been copied in a day but it certainly was not written in one' (p. 92). What he means is that the material copied to make MSF was accumulated over time, but in fact MSF itself may well have been written in a short period of time.

How come Q1 seems to 'remember' lines that are in F (and not in Q2) but not fully remember them? Because, argues Menzer, these lines were added in rehearsal and/or performance (so Q2 lacks them and F has them) but were not fully captured in the making of MSQ1 after those rehearsals/performances. Some of these additions to the play were added before MSQ1 was produced (hence Q1 has them, or remnants of them) and some were added after MSQ1 was produced (hence Q1 lacks them). This is all plausible, but it is entirely compatible with the stemma produced by the Oxford *Complete Works* twenty-five years ago rather than being new. In some ways F seems to soften the swearing, so presumably its underlying manuscript reflects alterations to the play made after the 1606 Act to Restrain Abuses of Players, but again Menzer muddies the argument by referring to F itself rather than the manuscript used to set it: 'F was combed for oaths and brought into compliance . . . F was therefore purged of some but not all oaths'. Menzer uses Jowett's terminological distinction between F and MSF only to abandon it at precisely those moments where it is needed most. Menzer reckons that MSF was made by the actors dictating their parts to a scribe (including all the alterations they had made to them during rehearsals and various runs), or perhaps they just did this for the bits where they had added a lot of new material in rehearsal or performance. The dictation need not have been from

memory: they could have had their parts in hand. The actors' part, once a neglected document, is now at the centre of textual theorizing, so it is a pity that only one professional part from the period survives.

Menzer's discussion of the significance of variation in spellings of the name Guildenstern is vitiated by his spurious claim that *ui* (or *uy*) is a diphthong when in fact it is now and was then a monophthong (see *OED* on pronunciation of *guild* which could also be spelt *gild*). Sometimes F gives a metrical rewriting of an unmetrical line in Q2, and sometimes it does the opposite: should we credit Shakespeare when F improves on Q2 but blame the actors when F messes up what Q2 has? In these discussions, Menzer leaves out the possibility that the compositor damaged or improved the metre in the printshop. If the author is responsible for such improvements in Hamlet's lines, 'how did Burbage learn of the change since the players already had their parts?' (p. 102). Here again we see the harm done by over-emphasis on parts: Menzer seems to treat them as holy writ, once given out never rescinded. One possible answer to his rhetorical question is that Shakespeare simply told Burbage, in rehearsal. Because within eleven lines F alternates between *my* and *mine* before words beginning with *hon-* ('My Honourable' and 'Mine honour'd'), Menzer reckons that 'a universal change by a scribe or compositor' (p. 104) is unlikely and decides instead that F may preserve the different pronunciation of two actors. He does not explain why he rules out a change in compositor causing this difference, since although the lines are close together in the final book they are on different pages set by different men: oo3^f set by compositor B and oo3^v set by compositor I respectively. Then again, since one of these two examples is in an F-only line it might be that MSF contained two different writers' (rather than speakers') preferences here: original writing and later addition to the play. This would agree with Menzer's own claim that F reflects the play's accretion of the material over many years, his 'continuous copy' hypothesis. In other words, we have here more hypotheses than are needed to account for the phenomena.

Menzer cites a bunch of Q2/F differences where the latter is 'more idiomatic' (p. 104) and attributes them to the players. However, one is just a variant of pronunciation where either can be metrical depending on whether *brevity* is made disyllabic or trisyllabic: 'Therefore breuitie is the soule of wit' versus 'Therefore since Breuitie is the Soule of Wit'. Another is just a modernization a printer or scribe might impose: *dulleth* versus *duls*. While not denying that these could be authorial tweaks, Menzer claims (without offering reasons) that 'the best source of this material was the players themselves' (p. 105). Menzer asserts that 'One of the few things that is quite clear about the early English theatrical environment is that playbooks belonged to companies, not authors' (p. 109) but in fact since his book appeared Andrew Gurr has published an article challenging that very point of faith (reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011]).

Chapter 4 is about Q1's being no more than loosely linked to Q2 or F. Because there was a Hamlet play as early as 1589, when Nashe alluded to it, Menzer wonders about the extent to which Shakespeare 'rewrought' it to make his play and whether Q1 was a 'stem to stern overhaul' (p. 112) of it. Of course, the plays may have had very little in common beyond the hero's name and the broad strokes of the plot, just as *King Leir* and *King Lear* do. Out of nowhere,

Menzer makes the surprising assertion that 'the Q1 author has done what many other jobbing playwrights of the period did, which was rework a stock repertory play, patching it with the scraps of other literary artifacts' (p. 114). In truth we do not know that Q1 is a reworking of anything existing before itself; the only texts we know it has some relation to are Shakespeare's Q2 and F, and more loosely the story's sources. That there are echoes of other works could be simple homage or plagiarism in the composition, or deliberate allusion. Menzer accepts Jeffrey Masten's depiction of early modern collaborative writing as a mode that did not recognize intellectual property, so that what we would see as lifting from another writer (as in Q1 having 'I will conceale, consent...' taken from *The Spanish Tragedy's* 'I will consent, conceale...') they saw as just writing. In certain parts of the play, the cues and dialogue for Corambis in Q1 are disproportionately often the same as, or close to, those for Polonius in Q2/F, and Menzer thinks this may be because the writer of MSQ1 either had the part itself in hand (left over from performances of an existing Hamlet play), or had access to the actor who played Corambis in that existing Hamlet play. If either of those things were true, we might ask, why does this Corambis/Polonius synching up happen only in certain parts of the play? Menzer quotes bits of Q2-Polonius that could plausibly be explained as rewrites of Q1-Corambis.

Why, asks Menzer, does Q1 use the names Corambis for Polonius and Montano for Reynaldo? Perhaps because, as G.R. Hibbard suggested, the Q2/F names were too close to the name of Robert Pullen (in Latin, Polenius), the supposed founder of Oxford University, and John Reynolds, president of Corpus Christi College; when the play was performed at Oxford, the names were changed. But why would the maker of Q1 remember these nonce-names rather than the regular ones the company normally used? Menzer notes that Q1 does not use the name Claudius, which is in the speech prefixes and stage directions of Q2/F but not in the dialogue—further evidence that Q1 derives in some way from performances—and wonders if the names Corambis and Montano were in a version of the play that the Chamberlain's men played at Cambridge and Oxford in the mid-1590s. Here Menzer brings in the German play *Der Bestrafte Brudermord* and everything becomes entirely speculative so that all he can do is rearrange the same pieces of the puzzle available to everyone else. Menzer wonders if Polonius and Reynaldo might deliberately glance at Pullen and the anti-theatricalist Reynolds, but he neglects to mention that Shakespeare has Polonius talk about his own acting days at university, which could strengthen the claim for a personal allusion here. Menzer reckons that the name Montano (used in Q1) comes up again in *Much Ado About Nothing*, where it does not—there the name is Montanto or Mountanto not Montano—and misses that the name Montano recurs as the governor of Cyprus in *Othello*. Menzer tries to figure out if it was even possible for someone to memorially reconstruct the whole of a play to make something as good as Q1, but without mentioning that Jesús Tronch-Pérez has documented a memory-man doing precisely that in the Spanish theatre of the same time.

Because there is a play called *Hamlet* in the Chamberlain's men's repertory in 1600, Menzer assumes that the pre-1594 play entered their repertory in 1594. This is unsafe: there is no evidence that the pre-1594 play shared more

than a title and a revenge theme with *Hamlet*. Q1 has Hamlet return to Denmark because of ‘contention of the windes’ (as in François de Belleforest) rather than pirates. Menzer’s theory is that the maker of Q1 recollected the old Hamlet play (or plays) that had been knocking around for ages, including Shakespeare’s. Menzer repeats at length (pp. 145–63) the argument of his 2006 article (reviewed in *YWES* 87[2008]) that the Q1 title-page claim that the play was performed ‘in the Cittie of London’ is probably true of Shakespeare’s play because illicit inn playing carried on after 1594. (Oddly, Menzer’s acknowledgements do not mention that this part of the argument has appeared in print before.) In the reprinting, Menzer does not correct his article’s gaffe of having James I process into London on 1 March 1603 (it was 1604). Q1, he notices, seems to require fewer heavy properties than Q2/F, which would make sense if Q1 reflected a touring version: no partizan in the first scene, no state in the second, no bank of flowers for the play-within-the-play, no shots fired. The references to the Globe theatre itself are absent from Q1 too, as are allusions to London and to the workings of the theatre industry.

Having given the evidence that Q1 reflects a version of the play that toured, Menzer suddenly announces the ‘total unfitness of the text for performance (as argued above in “*as it was acted*” (p. 172), meaning his earlier section with that heading. Trouble is, there is no section with exactly that heading: there is ‘*as it hath been . . . acted*’ on page 140 and ‘AS IT HATH BEENE DIUERSE TIMES ACTED’ on page 134. Neither is followed by an argument that the text is not suited for performance, although the former is followed by a discussion of whether a manuscript holding a cut-down version of the play would be any use to the players without the Master of the Revels’s licence required to appease provincial officials. Menzer argued much earlier in the book that Q1 is unactable because of cue-confusion, but that is not actually true. Menzer offers the (now familiar) arguments against Q1 being based on a memorial reconstruction. The main reason Menzer is against the idea that Q1 represents a cut version of the play seen in Q2/F is that it does not retain the longer versions’ cues. Also, Q1 does not eliminate the need for a trap (for the ghost and for Ophelia’s burial) and Menzer thinks that would be something they could not be sure to find on tour. (Menzer’s footnoting goes astray here: his endnote 149 supports a quotation of Hibbard’s Oxford Shakespeare edition of the play with ‘*Ibid.* 190’ but that points the reader back to Robert Burkhart’s book *Shakespeare’s Bad Quartos* referenced in endnote 147.) Strangely, Menzer scarcely concludes this chapter, let alone the whole book: he just ends by saying that Q1 reflects a range of *Hamlets* over many years. There are six appendices: four list the variants between the three early editions, one gives ‘Cue Similarities’, and one reproduces the whole of Corambis’s part from Q1.

Another late-arriving University of Delaware Press book that can now be reviewed is Adele Davidson’s *Shakespeare in Shorthand: The Textual Mystery of King Lear*. The idea that early modern plays were copied by various forms of dictation is currently enjoying a revival: Andrew Gurr’s *Henry V* and Scott McMillin’s *Othello* for the New Cambridge Shakespeare made a case for it, and so did Adrian Kiernander in an article on *Richard III*, reviewed in *YWES* 84[2005]. Davidson begins by observing that the phrase ‘to be, or not to be’

appeared in John Willis's *The Art of Stenographie* [1602] and that it was Alexander Schmidt who first proposed stenographic transmission of Q *King Lear* in 1861. E.K. Chambers and Greg later supported it until G.I. Duthie's influential *Elizabethan Shorthand and the First Quarto of King Lear* [1949] convinced most people against it. A large part of Davidson's book is meant to be a demolition of Duthie's argument. By way of introduction, Davidson mentions that Folio *King Lear* lacks 300 lines that are in Q and has 100 lines that are not in Q, and that the problems in Q are most often attributed to its printer Nicholas Okes being inexperienced. However, as soon as she focuses on the anomalies in Q that seem aural she makes the mistake of treating the corresponding F reading as unequivocally correct, calling its reading the 'emended' version, which is more than we know.

As well as his treatise on stenography Willis wrote a book on mnemonics, seeing these as complementary activities—remembering what he had heard helped a stenographer expand his shorthand notes—while Shakespearian textual theory has wrongly treated them as competing modes of transmission. Davidson reports that John Dover Wilson used a 'derogatory racial epithet' (p. 26) to dismiss claims that stenography played a part in surreptitious play printing, and her sentence becomes almost incomprehensible because she is too squeamish to identify 'nigger in the woodpile' as Wilson's phrase. It is hard to see the relevance of Wilson's racism. Blayney reckons that the printer's copy being messy and hard to read was the reason Q *King Lear* was set seriatim rather than by formes (which would require reasonably accurate casting off), and while not ruling out the other causes of what is in Q, Davidson promises that her book will look at those features attributable to 'transcription in abbreviated writing' (p. 29).

Davidson reviews the three important systems of shorthand writing: Timothy Bright's *Characterie* [1588], Peter Bale's *The Arte of Brachygraphie* [1590], and John Willis's *The Art of Stenographie* [1602]. Henry Chettle, John Danter, and Valentine Simmes were involved in the publication of sermons taken down by shorthand. There had been previous shorthand systems, and Bright's and Bale's systems seem to have been published after they had been used for some time. Bright had a fifteen-year monopoly that prohibited publication or teaching of new (that is, not yet invented by 1588) systems of shorthand, but that did not stop them being practised. Davidson lists the eleven distinct shorthand systems in use by 1623, spanning the whole Shakespearian period, and gives the evidence from allusions to them that the systems were widely known. Unfortunately she confuses the reader somewhat by referring to Bale's book as *Brachygraphie* [1590] and also as *The Writing Schoolmaster* [1590] without indicating that the former was a subsection within the latter. One direct Shakespearian link is that the third edition of Bale's *Brachygraphie* was printed in 1600 by Shakespeare's old friend Richard Field, who also printed shorthand-taken sermons. Bright and Willis were both Cambridge men, and interest in shorthand seems to have been especially high at the university. In 1603 Valentine Simmes, who printed Q1 *Hamlet* that year, reprinted for Walter Burre a sermon 'Taken by characterie' fourteen years earlier and 'perused, corrected and amended by the Author', indicating that he considered it essentially accurate. Davidson lists some links

between theatre people and Cambridge and stenography (all pretty tenuous), including Nashe being a press-corrector (and advised not to be in one of the Cambridge *Parnassus* plays) and links with the Inns of Court.

Chettle is the best link: he copied (as he claimed), or actually authored, *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit*, he apologized to Shakespeare in *Kind-Heart's Dream*, his name is in the imprint of Henry Smith's *A Fruitful Sermon* printed in 1591 as 'taken by characterie', and he was involved with men who later were involved in the publication of Shakespearian bad quartos. Davidson points out that Chettle was free of the Stationers' Company, but does not quite pin down what he did—printing, and/or publishing and/or editing the books his name appears in—and mostly she treats him as a publisher. Chettle might be the target of William Cupper's complaint of 1592 about men who sell other men's sermons to 'vaunt themselves with other mens feathers', which complaint Jowett thinks Chettle might have projected from himself onto Shakespeare in *Groatsworth*. In support of a complex argument about Chettle, Davidson's footnoting becomes imprecise: she introduces a claim from a two-part article by Jowett without giving its title or page-span, just the journal name, volume, year and the page she is citing. For quite a few of the quotations from early books, Davidson neglects to give page references at all. This matters because the interested reader is likely to want to follow up some of the claims. Where, for example, in Willis's *Mnemonica* does he refer to sitting on the stage in 'publique' theatres? Private communication with the author on this point revealed that in fact this comes up not in *Mnemonica* at all, but in his *The Art of Stenography . . . [and] the Schoolemaster to the said Art* [1628].

The 1609 quarto of *Pericles* has a decorative element used for Willis's *The Art of Stenographie* [1602], which Davidson calls her Figure One although in fact her figures are not numbered. The important question she does not address is whether it is the same piece of wood used in both books, or just a shared design. Davidson uses Nashe's claim in *Lenten Stuffle* to having been called to the press to correct errors as evidence that this was common, apparently without noticing that in the address 'To his readers' where he makes that claim, and indeed in the whole book, Nashe is self-consciously unreliable about his role as an author. Willis seems to have understood printing well and if he had a close relationship with his publisher Burby then he might well have had one with Burby's theatrical associates. Davidson has uncovered a considerable amount of circumstantial evidence linking the men she is interested in with the theatre and with stenography. Nathaniel Butter, who published Q1 *King Lear* in 1608, published Thomas Heywood's *If You Know Not Me* in 1605, the play that Heywood complained had been 'copied by the ear'. In other words, Butter had what the police call 'form'. Davidson's history of the stenographic systems and their growing importance is detailed (pp. 54–61), but this does not establish their relevance to the problems of Q1 *King Lear*.

The argument becomes much more relevant once Davidson reviews Duthie's work on shorthand and lists his main failings in assessing its possible use for Q1 *King Lear* (pp. 61–5). Duthie assumed use of a standard system (whereas writers were encouraged to customize), he overlooked the phonetic aspects

(concentrating only on words), he assumed that the stenographic claim requires that it was done in the theatre (whereas shorthand might simply have been used to transcribe the play at some point) and he assumes that the choice was between longhand or shorthand (whereas both could be used in one text). Willis stressed that there were many ways to represent one word in his system, and this invalidates Duthie's methodology of learning Willis's system and then showing that the stenograph for a particular word in *King Lear* would not produce the anomaly in Q1, since Duthie did not consider all the ways a word might be represented using Willis's system. Duthie thought impractical Willis's idea of using single letters from different handwriting styles (roman, italic, secretary) as abbreviations for frequently occurring groups of letters, but in fact professional scribes had no trouble learning lots of different styles. Duthie dismissed stenography because he thought it could not be done fast enough during live performance, but he overlooked the fact that Willis's phonetic system would produce what seem like mishearings even if used simply to transcribe a manuscript. He also overlooked the possibility of the system's use in dictation of the script. Davidson quotes Willis advising that a stenographer taking in shorthand the words of a speaker who is going too fast should omit the non-essential material, leaving space that can be filled from memory at the earliest opportunity. This neatly encapsulates Davidson's important point that stenography was itself a mnemonic art, not an alternative to memory. Because scholars have wanted to find a single explanation for the bad quartos, they have focused on Bright's [1588] and Bale's [1590] systems, thinking Willis's [1602] too late, but Bright's fifteen-year patent probably kept systems that were in use (such as Willis's) from being published, so despite his 1602 publication date Willis's system might have been used in the 1590s.

The essence of Willis's system is to record the consonants as normal and represent their intervening vowels by placing the consonants in certain positions relative to one another. He also built upon the *Tironian notae*, an ancient Roman system of shorthand. Willis recommended single letters (majuscule and minuscule) for whole words, leaving the stenographer to choose abbreviations to suit the text being abbreviated. Duthie's analysis of Willis's system concentrated on abbreviating words and neglected the equally important aspect of abbreviating whole sentences. In *Love's Labour's Lost* Holofernes has a speech about pronunciations that omit syllables that he says should be sounded (like the *l* in *half* and the *b* in *debt*), which are omissions that stenographic systems encourage writers to make (so, write *det* for *debt*). Willis shows awareness of the contemporary movements for spelling reform: he points out that working phonetically you never need the letter *c* since its sound is always that of *k* or *s*. After much introduction, Davidson finally gets to summarizing Willis's system in one place (pp. 83–8). Having recorded the main part of a word (usually the first syllable) with a single symbol (the 'Great Participle'), the writer then puts the other parts around it in a 360-degree field with the position indicating the intervening vowel, thus *p'* is *pot* because the one o'clock position indicates an *o*, whereas *p* is *pat* because the seven o'clock position indicates an *a*, and *'p* is *pit* because the eleven o'clock position indicates an *i*, and so on. The 5 o'clock position is reserved for consonants,

and since vowels are indicated by position some syllables (such as *pi*, *pa* or *po*) can be indicated by just a dot around the *p*.

Relatively rare words that Willis gives abbreviations for are *carbonado*, *whirlwind*, *flickering*, *beadle*, *twinkle*, *lugged*, *superfluous*, *Gloster*, *Edgar*, *Kent*, *France*, and *Ajax*, all of which appear in *King Lear*, plus also the word *Hamlet*. Davidson does not advise the reader what to make of these coincidences, but implies a Willis–Shakespeare link. Another coincidence we are not told what to make of is that one of the rare examples of extant Elizabethan shorthand writing is by Jane Seager, sister to William Seager, deputy to Master of the Revels George Buc. Bright's *Characterie* system used symbols to represent whole words so one had to remember a lot of abbreviations and then add one's own synonyms and antonyms, and Bales's system is essentially just a refinement of Bright's with single letters standing for words and small marks placed around them to create synonyms and antonyms. Bales's and Bright's systems died out after Willis's system took off. Davidson also briefly covers a system called Radiography and then helpfully leads the reader through decoding a couple of sentences coded in Willis's system.

Davidson is aware of Erne's arguments about Shakespeare wanting to be a published author and Vickers's about authorship being a recognized and (morally, if not legally) protected status. Stenography, she argues, moved discourse from the private or semi-private to the public sphere: speakers could not prevent listeners recording their speeches and publishing them afterwards. The evidence of sermons is that their authors put out good ones after bad ones had appeared, and wrote prefaces suggesting that the only reason they got involved in publication was that the publisher already had a bad script and was going to publish it anyway, so they thought they might at least help improve the wording. To take shorthand in a live performance one need not risk carrying ink: a table-book of paper or parchment covered in gesso could be etched with a metal stylus. Prefaces by sermon writers complaining that their speeches have been injuriously (in a bodily sense) put in print without their knowledge or consent read like the preliminaries to the 1623 Folio by John Heminges and Henry Condell and the preliminaries to Fletcher's *Philaster* which also uses the phrase 'maimed and deformed'.

Davidson suggests that John Marston's *The Malcontent* was perhaps copied by stenography, and indeed Sly in the Induction claims to have already, as an audience member, written in his table-book 'most of their jests' and he boasts of prodigious feats of memory. Davidson has a batch of smaller and highly tentative connections between the play and the art of stenography, such as the Trojan Horse joke Sly makes being a reference to someone secreted in a playhouse audience to take down the script on behalf of a rival company. Where she references early books only indirectly via critics such as Douglas Brooks, Davidson gets attributions wrong: she quotes Marston's prefatory note to the reader of his *Parasitaster* or *The Fawn* on 'it cannot avoid publishing' but misattributes the quotation to his *Sophonisba*, or *the Wonder of Women*. The phrases on Shakespeare quarto title pages about their being augmented or corrected by the author have parallels in the phrasing on printed sermons. Stenography from oral performance would account for the Shakespearian bad quartos' shortness and their compressing and garbling of

things said at greater length and more clearly in the good editions: This is just what stenographers do when they cannot keep up.

The title of Davidson's chapter 4, "Unnecessary Letters": *King Lear* in the Age of Stenographical Reproduction' (pp. 136–66), simultaneously alludes to Kent's speech about the pointlessness of *z* and Walter Benjamin's classic essay. This chapter and the following ones repeat much of what is argued in Davidson's previous published articles: not just the logic but the examples too are the same. Davidson is not claiming that stenography accounts for all the Q/F *King Lear* differences, only for some of them. As Duthie noted, there are several long-*s/f* mistakings in Q *King Lear* that are possible in longhand but not in shorthand, and Davidson concedes that the printer's copy for Q was in longhand. In Willis's system it is easy for *sr/f* errors to occur, and since vowels are arranged around, not between, consonants then mistakings of *s . . . r* for *f* are also possible. Davidson lists a hosts of these in Q such as *stir/fire*. (The trouble is, of course, that *s/f* errors are common in longhand too.) The only pure *sr/f* error in the play is the uncorrected quarto's *Sriberdegibit* for the corrected quarto's *fliberdegibek*, where F has *Flibbertigibbet*. Davidson lists what she (following P.W.K. Stone) calls some 'homonymous or near homonymous' (p. 140) errors in Q, such as *experience/esperance* and *spiritual/spherical*. Since these are not homonyms, I assume what she and Stone mean is homophones. Willis advises recording *thine* and *mine* as *thy* and *my* and then putting back the *-ne* ending wherever the next word starts with a vowel (that is, using a rule to save a bit of transcribing), and notably Q has a lot of *thy* and *my* where F has *thine* and *mine*. Similarly, rules may take care of verbs' conjugated endings since these may be inferred from context. Willis's system places more stress on consonants than vowels, and Davidson shows a series of consonant outlines that could account for vowel errors in Q, such as the outline *prs* which can account for *peruse/pierce*, or *t-k-p-t-k* which could be expanded to 'take up to keep' (the uncorrected quarto reading), 'take up the king' (the corrected quarto reading), and 'take up, take up' (F's reading).

The letter *c* has not got its own Willis symbol but rather when sounded hard is recorded by a *k/c/q* sign and when soft by an *s/t/c* sign, and there are a lot of odd spellings in Q that could be accounted for this way, like *reskue*, *nisely* and *scip* (for *skip*). Willis's recommendation to omit unsounded *b* would account for *crum/crumb*, and the same for unsounded *u* and *h* would account for *gests/guests* and *caracter/character*. Davidson has lots more examples of these, and in each case she says that transcription in Willis's system 'may account' (and similar phrases) for a Q reading, but she concludes that this on its own is not sufficient explanation for the orthographic oddities in Q. Willis's recommendation of diphthong and triphthong reduction to representation as just A, E, I, O, or U would account for some unusual spellings in Q, listed by Davidson. Here there is some logical slippage between diphthongs and mere digraphs, since Davidson's list of examples from Q includes the latter, such as *toast/tost* and *roaring/roring*. As well as shortening a digraphic vowel (say, *oa* to *o*) in the encoding, stenography could lengthen it by mistaken expansion in the decoding, and Davidson has examples of what looks like that in Q. In order to judge the rarity of odd spellings in Q, Davidson turns to what she admits is the faulty scholarship on Shakespeare's rare spellings in William S. Kable's

1970 book on the Pavier quartos. Why not just do some searching in Literature Online (LION) and Early English Books Online (EEBO-TCP) to see if the spellings really are rare?

Willis recommends not recording double consonants that do not contribute to the sound, so *abot* for *abbot* and *folow* for *follow*, and Davidson lists the many examples of such consonantal shortening in Q. But to see if stenography is the cause, one would have to weed out the examples such as *oprest* for *oppressed* that are simply common spelling variants of the period. Had Davidson done this and presented statistical data—showing how likely it is that random corruption would produce the genuinely rare and unique spellings in Q—then her argument for stenography would be more convincing. Willis recommends omitting medial and terminal syllables where the rest of the word makes them obvious, and Davidson has examples of this in Q. Same for the aspirates *h*, *w*, *y*, and *gh*: Willis says omit, Q shows some omissions. Again, weeding out simple spelling variants and then doing the statistics to show true rareness might have clinched the argument. The play has a variant in which Edgar says to Oswald that he will find out which is harder, Oswald's head or his, Edgar's, *battero* (uncorrected Q), *bat* (corrected Q), or *ballow* (F). Davidson reckons that the right reading is *battery*—a flurry of blows directed to Oswald's head—since there is no indication of a property stick being used (as required by the common emendation to *baton* or retention of *bat*) and the confusion arose because the *-y* ending is marked only by a small dot in Willis's system. In making this claim Davidson is introducing a new kind of much more speculative argument in which one has to accept her emendation and the presence of stenographic corruption. She would be on stronger ground if each variant involved a clearly bad reading and a clearly good one, and stenography was the most plausible cause of the difference. Another such example is 'threatning dark ey'd night' (Q) versus 'thredding darke ey'd night' (F), which Davidson thinks should be 'treading dark eyed night' and she argues that stenography reduced the correct reading's *ea* to *e* and added the unwanted *h* in F. The obvious questions are why stenography would affect F in this way rather than Q, and where does Q's reading come from? Davidson gets to this point in the final chapter, but some internal cross-reference is wanted to put the reader's mind at rest that the questions will be answered.

Davidson also considers an alternative emendation earlier in the same line—as used in Stanley Wells's Oxford Shakespeare quarto-based edition—and finds the corruption that it seeks to undo to be also explicable by stenography. This highlights a problem with Davidson's approach: an explanation that can account for competing and incompatible theories—her emendation versus Wells's—is necessarily useless for finding out which is right. Along the same lines, some Q/F variants are explicable by word-boundary errors induced by stenography, but they rely on emendations that have not won universal support. For the famous variant 'Come on, be true' (uncorrected Q) versus 'Come, vnbutton here' (F) Davidson suggests that because Willis's system uses *b* for *be* and *B* for *but* the problem could have arisen from faulty expansion. I would have thought only a very poor stenographer would be unable to tell a capital letter from a small one in his own transcription. Davidson's chapter 5 gives more abbreviations that might account for Q/F variants (nothing that

clinches that argument), and so does chapter 6; it is not clear what principles are structuring the division of her materials. For the famous variant 'this crulentious storm' (uncorrected Q), 'this tempestious storm' (corrected Q), 'this contentious storm' (F), Davidson looks to an additional stenographic system, William Folkingham's of 1620, in which *temtus* is the abbreviation for *tempestious*. Thus if the correct reading were *contentious*, the *con* would in Willis's system be represented by a symbol that could also expand to *cru* and the *tentious* would be close to the abbreviation for *tempestious*. Thus the corrected quarto reading could be not so much the result of the stop-press proof-reader making something up as his simply ignoring the meaningless separately written *cru* and misinterpreting the next word as an abbreviation for *tempestious*. Or perhaps, says Davidson, this happened before the play got to the printshop. Therein lies a problem. Davidson does not want to assert that the misunderstandings of the stenographic abbreviation definitely happened in the printshop—since it would be strange to set from such difficult, abbreviated copy—but nor does she want to assert that it definitely happened in a process of transcription before the play reached the printer else there being two readings in Q is hard to explain. She later deals with this by supposing, rather awkwardly, that the proof-reader had access to both the longhand manuscript copy for Q and its abbreviated source manuscript and took a second go at doing the expansion himself.

Willis says to use arabic numerals rather than write out numbers longhand, and Davidson points out that Q has lots of these. True, but it also has 24 occurrences of *two*, 7 of *three*, 3 of *four*, 9 of *five*, 2 of *six*, 3 of *seven*, 2 of *eight*, and 2 of *nine* that she does not account for. Willis recommends spelling out the syllables of unfamiliar polysyllabic words (especially names) that happen to be made of syllables that are themselves single words, like *pil-grim*, *lap-wing*, *pick-purse*, using one abbreviation for each. This might explain such anomalies as Q's *my rackles* for *miracles* and *in sight* for *incite*. Willis has a symbol to abbreviate dittography, misrecognition of which might explain why Q lacks some repetitions that are in F such as 'this would make a man of salt' versus 'this would make a man a man of salt'. And so on for extrametrical expletives—which may, Davidson writes, just be filling' where the correct reading was impossible to recover from the shorthand—and for Q's excessive use of commas that might arise from misreading of Willis's comma-like stroke for ending clauses. Davidson notices that a lot of the speech-ending commas happen where we may reasonably expect some stage business to follow, and suggests that the commas may indicate that the dramatic moment had not quite passed: an action was still to happen. She offers no explanation for how these commas marking otherwise only implied action got into the script. Are we to suppose a previously unobserved Shakespearian habit, or someone's encoding of what he saw in performance?

Chapter 6 begins with the observation that *King Lear* is Shakespeare's play most obsessed with writing, and thereafter it is more of the same: Davidson comes up with quarto emendations of her own (or, less frequently, backs one of the existing claimants) based on supposed stenographic transmission. She explains both the uncorrected *Tuelygod* and the corrected *Turlygod* as misunderstandings of the author's *two-legged*, yet unless the stenographic

version was examined in the printshop and reread to make the (faulty) 'correction', it is impossible for stenography to account for both. Since she has already discounted the possibility that the printer's copy was in shorthand (p. 31), she must think that the compositors had both the longhand and the shorthand versions and consulted the latter when they thought the former faulty. That assumption should be made explicit when it is relied upon. Davidson represents bars over vowels by placing a tilde after them (so *cōmfort* she transcribes as *co~fort*), which is not obvious and is not explained. It appears that Davidson is shaky on the basic textual history of the play, for she writes that uncorrected Q's word *slayer* 'receives at least a small degree of ratification in Q2's "slaier"' (p. 215). Since Q2 is simply a reprint of Q1 there is no ratification in its use of this word. It is noticeable that in this chapter Davidson gets increasingly interested in editorial use of contextual knowledge and literary criticism as aids to solving cruxes. Her literary-critical skills are extremely good and shown off to advantage in the second half of this chapter.

Davidson's last chapter is concerned with 'The Textual Interrelation of Quarto and Folio *Lea*r' and offers evidence that Q/F differences that have been attributed to authorial revision are in fact due to 'longhand reconstruction of abbreviated writing' (p. 228). Davidson prints a list of Q/F differences that she thinks too small to be deliberate changes by the author, and surveys the problem that F seems to introduce lots of small changes to the play (compared to Q) but in the same places as these changes occur there are Q errors that persist in F. This she finds to be evidence against authorial revision, on the grounds that when revising the author would have fixed the errors too. Missing from her account is an appreciation of Gary Taylor's work on the play, and in particular his suggestion that Shakespeare began his revision of the play on a copy of Q1 and worked around its errors rather than fixing them. Davidson's discussion of the provenance of F's copy makes no mention of Taylor's argument that F's marking of scene divisions indicates that it was set from a literary transcript. It becomes apparent at this point why Davidson was earlier trying to explain F readings in terms of stenography: she thinks it likely that whoever prepared printer's copy for F knew that MSQ was corrupted by stenography and knew just what it would do, and tried to undo its effects when making MSF. This is, of course, just speculation. Davidson considers the problem that F seems to have access to a manuscript authority 'anterior to Q1' (p. 240), which has been taken to show that MSQ and MSF cannot have been the same manuscript (as Stone claimed). However, she counters, if this anterior manuscript contained abbreviated writing then Q and F could both represent attempts to decipher it, the latter being the more successful; she has an example of this from the printing of sermons from abbreviated writing.

The frequently made claim that Q has 300 lines not in F and F has 100 lines not in Q is based on modernized lineation: counting type lines on the early printed page F is 316 lines longer than Q1, not 200 shorter. Davidson wonders if the casting-off of copy for F was in fact done from the quarto (since this was to be used as copy) with a decision to allow one more Folio page-worth than is in Q (to allow for the additions), hence 133 lines (one Folio page) of additions were admitted. To get this number, Davidson drops the numbers she used previously and takes Kiernan Ryan's calculation that F adds 133 lines or

part-lines to the play represented by Q. Davidson is trying to construct an argument that the amount of additional material added to the play to make Folio copy was constrained by the casting off, but she has overlooked the considerable evidence that F was printed from a literary transcript and she makes no mention of the fact that the casting off turned out to be inaccurate: the last page of the Folio text of the play is one-third blank but for the word 'FINIS' and some space-wasting rules. Most importantly, Davidson does not set her discussion of casting off in the context of how Joseph Moxon said it ought to be done and recent scholarship—especially Charlton Hinman's—on how it seems to have been done for the Folio.

As not infrequently happens in this kind of under-informed analysis, a misunderstanding of probability compounds misreading of the evidence. Davidson notices that Folio page rr5^r begins with the same line that begins Q1 page H3^r, and ends at almost the same line that ends Q1 page I1^r. This Folio page lacks ninety of the lines in the corresponding five pages of the quarto (out of a total of 288 quarto lines that the Folio lacks), and with those lines removed the Folio gets onto exactly one page the material that took exactly five pages in the quarto. Davidson thinks this correspondence is unlikely to be coincidental and that the cutting can have been done only in the printshop, not by Shakespeare or anyone else connected with the theatre. She does not address just why the printers would care that the pagination of this one Folio page exactly matched pagination in the quarto, even though the pagination of the other twenty-six Folio pages does not (at least not exactly); she implies that it somehow it made casting off easier, but never says how. Moreover, it would be barbarous for the printers to cut the play like this to make the pagination coincide, especially as they had a third of a page free at the end of the play.

This Folio page, rr5^r, omits scene IV.iii of the quarto and F goes on to mislabel scene IV.vi as 'Scaena Septima', suggesting to Davidson that scene IV.iii was in fact in the copy for F and hence the printshop (not Shakespeare, not the theatre) omitted it. Actually, it does not follow that the cut was necessarily made in the printshop. If scene IV.iii was marked for deletion in the copy for F—printed quarto or transcript—the scene numbering applied in that copy need not have been updated to reflect the deletion, so scene IV.vii might still be numbered IV.vii in the copy (hence the Folio error) even though the cutting of scene IV.iii was authorial or theatrical. Moreover, F numbers the scenes IV.i, IV.ii, IV.iii, IV.iv, IV.v, IV.vii, where if the printshop simply omitted scene IV.iii but retained the numbering of its copy we would expect F to number the scenes IV.i, IV.ii, IV.iv, IV.v, IV.vi, IV.vii. Davidson's hypothesis requires that having cut IV.iii from the play the printers correctly renumbered the next three scenes (IV.iv > IV.iii and IV.v > IV.iv and IV.vi > IV.v) but then screwed up and left IV.vii as it was rather than changing it to IV.vi. This is not impossible since there was a break in printing between IV.i–IV.v (as numbered in F) and the setting by compositor E of IV.vii (as numbered in F), but it seems rather far-fetched.

Davidson tabulates the inexact but near alignment of pagination of Q/F, and for eight of the Folio's twenty-seven pages there is an approximate alignment (within one to four lines out) with a page break in Q1 and for seven of the Folio pages there is an approximate alignment (within one to five lines

out) with a page break Q2. Davidson is mistaken in finding this statistically significant. There are thirty-eight (Q1) or thirty-seven (Q2) lines per quarto page and her up-to-four-quarto-lines-out rule gives an eight-line overlap zone, since a hit counts if it happens within four lines of the bottom of a page or within four lines of the top. There is a ten-line overlap zone for her up-to-five-lines-out rule. Thus if we choose random lines on quarto pages we would expect to hit this overlap zone about a quarter of the time (the zone being eight out of thirty-eight lines for Q1, and ten out of thirty-seven lines for Q2). The Folio pagination lines hitting this overlap zone about a quarter of the time—eight Folio pages out of twenty-seven for Q1 pagination and seven Folio pages out of twenty-seven for Q2 pagination—is exactly what we would expect by coincidence. Davidson gets the mathematics wrong by adding the eight Folio pages whose page breaks roughly match Q1's to the seven Folio pages whose page breaks roughly match Q2's, throwing out the one Folio page that is common to both lists, and concluding that fourteen Folio pages (over half the play) match the quarto pagination. Of course if a Folio page is allowed to hit either quarto's overlap zone then we have doubled the target area and the chances of getting a hit are doubled, and we would expect chance to produce the roughly 50 per cent hit-rate that Davidson reports. All that follows from Davidson's view of the alignment of page breaks—her attempts to see whether F agrees with Q1 or Q2 around the places where F shares a page break with Q1 or Q2 and so determine whether Q1 or Q2 was F's copy at this point—is mistaken because of this mathematical misunderstanding. Her faulty conclusion is that F was set from exemplars of Q1 and Q2 with additional material from something else.

At pages 249–51 Davidson discusses the phrase 'and appointed guard' in the lines 'Sir I thought it fit, | To send the old and miserable King to some retention and ap- | pointed guard' (corrected Q1) being absent from the uncorrected Q1, present in corrected Q1, present in Q2, and absent from F. Her statement of the puzzles this throws up does not address Taylor's explanation that authorial revision of the play was begun on an exemplar of Q1 having this line in the uncorrected state. Instead she focuses on the unusual stenographic symbol for *appointed*, which may have been hard to expand. Her explanation for the stop-press correction of Q1 is that the printer's copy was a longhand manuscript expansion (lacking 'and appointed guard') of an abbreviated manuscript (that included the abbreviation for 'and appointed guard'), and that the proof-reader possessed both manuscripts. Finding something missing from the longhand manuscript, he turned to the abbreviated manuscript and was able to expand the abbreviation for 'and appointed guard' that had previously been missed in the longhand manuscript and in the type set from it. The obvious objection to this explanation is that the proof-reader would have no reason to suppose that anything was missing from this line: without 'and appointed guard' the line still makes perfect sense.

Davidson finds in F some abbreviated spellings that she reckons might come from consultation of a manuscript expanded from shorthand, but in fact they might as easily come from a literary transcript used to set F. She explains a couple of fifth-act Q/F variants the same way: stenography caused the wrong reading. She sees in F's 'Ile ma ke it on thy heart' (in Albany's threatening of

Edgar near the end) a gap where a *r* has dropped out from *marke*, which she thinks a much better reading. To my eyes (and using only a reproduction of the book), the gap between *ma* and *ke* is not big enough to contain one of the letters *r* as they appear elsewhere on this page; the problem looks more like type slippage. Davidson sees compression and space-saving towards the end of Q, evidenced in the rise in use of medial speech prefixes, by which she means a type line being shared by the end of one speech and the start of the next. She acknowledges that space is wasted by the large '*FINIS*' at the end of Q, but persists with the idea that because Okes was given by Nathaniel Butter a batch of paper to print *King Lear* he was constrained towards the end, and that this constraint (and not authorial revision) is why Q lacks some lines in F. That is, the printer cut them to make the play fit. Surely someone trying to make a good impression with his first play, as Okes was, would not cut lines at the climax in order to have room for a '*FINIS*'. She also argues that Lear's speaking 'Breake hart, I prethe breake' (as Q has it) just cannot be right but must be a printer's mistake (perhaps related to the printer's cutting of lines towards the end) and that F is right to attribute these lines to Kent. Thus the reassignment of these lines from Lear (in Q) to Kent (in F) is not authorial revision but textual corruption in Q.

The weaknesses of Davidson's book are threefold. She takes no serious account of the likely Q/F revision hypothesis until her last chapter although it is germane to all her arguments. She has discovered a means by which some corruption in Q may be explained, but her means is not the only one possible and she has no compelling examples where her means is indisputably the right one. If she had just one clinching example where stenographic corruption was the only possibility then of course lots of other examples of corruption would have to be considered potentially stenographic; but she has not. Lastly, the freedoms that Willis's system of stenography allows the writer are so great that Davidson can more or less invent any emendations she likes and defend them by saying that perhaps her favoured terms got corrupted by stenography into what appeared in the early editions. In that way, the problem resembles the Bacon ciphers, and it's perhaps significant that Davidson has also written on acrostics and anagrams in George Herbert's poetry.

The last of the monographs this year is Lene B. Petersen's *Shakespeare's Errant Texts: Textual Form and Linguistic Style in Shakespearean 'Bad' Quartos and Co-authored Plays*. Petersen describes her approach to the textual histories of Shakespeare's plays as attending to 'the many formal and stylistic synergies, interchanges and reciprocities between oral/memorial and authorial composition' (p. xi). She revisits Maguire's classic study of the bad quartos using knowledge of oral transmission in the folk-ballad/folktale tradition, and attempts new kinds of stylometry on the texts. As well as Literature Online (LION) she deploys a new tool in KEMPE, a database of grammatically annotated electronic texts of plays in which is given the part of speech to which each word of the play belongs. Attribution studies, she thinks, needs to combine the oral with the literary and use knowledge of theatre practices. This book aims to do that for the Shakespeare plays with multiple early editions, in particular *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*. It is important to be able to isolate 'common, formulaic or mundane phraseology' (p. xix) in plays and distinguish

it from the writing that really does betray the identity of the writer. The short quartos, it turns out, approximate to what Max Lüthi called 'goal-form' (in German, *Zielform*), the text after it has been streamlined for and by repeated speaking.

Petersen's first chapter is a survey of where we are in defining early modern dramatic authorship, leading to the conclusion that dramatists were not so much like their Graeco-Roman predecessors but more like modern film scriptwriters, particularly in having to conform to their art form's traditions. In the possibility that Edward Alleyn wrote the marginalia for his part as Orlando Furioso, Petersen sees a blurring of the boundary between creator and performer (pp. 21–2), and in the transmission of plays between companies (especially Queen's men > Chamberlain's men), and in the things these plays have in common, Petersen sees the development of a tradition based on formulas (pp. 23–4). Petersen makes a surprising slip in writing that 'the surviving plot of *2 Seven Deadly Sins* ([is] thought to be a Queen's Men's play, published in the early 1590s)' (p. 25) since it was not published until 1780 and David Kathman has securely reassigned it to the Chamberlain's men in the late 1590s. Petersen thinks that in the big shake-up of 1594 the ownership of a number of plays got dispersed, and she lists a bunch of them that seem to belong to several companies at once (p. 26). So, plays were recycled matter, not the exclusive property of their writers or even the playing companies. (Well, perhaps at a time of upheaval such as 1594 that may be true, but for most of the time it is not: they were usually company property.) Petersen reckons that not until his company got the Globe in 1599 was Shakespeare's work strongly associated with one venue; I wonder why she thinks their residency at the Theatre in Shoreditch from 1594 to 1598 would not have built the same association. Petersen mentions that Shakespeare's work was performed at the Swan but gives no evidence for this. Multiple venues and touring may well have produced multiple versions of individual plays. Peculiarly, Petersen seems to think that to make actors' cue-scripts a manuscript of the play was literally 'cut into parts' (p. 33) rather than copied out again.

Chapter 2 is concerned with the oral transmission and the theory of *Zielform*. Studies of how folk-ballads evolve use a kind of Darwinist approach: those that are copiable do better than those that are not, and those that are not change to become more copiable. Petersen thinks that the multiple versions of ballads that existed in a mixed oral and print tradition offer a good analogue for the multiple versions of early printed plays. One obvious objection here is that early modern plays were mainly transmitted not by retelling from memory but by recourse to the written script, which got copied textually. In the terms invented by Susan Blackmore to account for meme transmission, plays were transmitted by copy-the-instructions as opposed to copy-the-product reproduction. Oddly enough, Petersen sees her own analogy breaking down after the Commonwealth since in the Restoration 'unstable versions were no longer practically or financially tenable' (p. 46). I would have thought that Restoration adaptations of pre-Commonwealth drama (especially Shakespeare's) differed so markedly from the canonical print versions that Petersen's ideas would have more purchase there, especially as these adaptations themselves were printed as records of the current performances.

In order for plays to be as malleable in performance as folk-ballads, Petersen has to accept Stern's claim that companies undertook little if any rehearsal before the first performance and that 'The playwright was not normally involved at the stage of rehearsal' (p. 49n45). For this last point she gives as her source Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern's *Shakespeare in Parts*, but in fact they say nothing about playwrights' presence at rehearsal at that point in their book (p. 76). Certainly Petersen is right to see open-air performance conditions and those on tour as tending to mingle actor and audience in a way analogous to the public singing of ballads, but acknowledging this only prompts the reader to worry that the different conditions at indoor hall performances present a barrier to her thesis. In the oral tradition, narrative material is subject to 'repetition, omission and transposition of textual segments' (pp. 54–5) and that is clearly true of folk-ballads and, claims Petersen, of Shakespeare's bad quartos. She is right: that is how memorial reconstruction was diagnosed in the first place. Petersen gives some concrete examples of repetition, omission, and transposition in folk-ballad oral transmission.

The long third chapter offers detailed evidence and an argument that what happens to folk-ballads happened to Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet*. Petersen chooses these two plays because for each there exist not only Q1/Q2/F versions but also a seventeenth-century German derivative: *Der Bestrafte Brudermord* and *Romio und Julietta* respectively. For *Hamlet* Petersen takes F as her 'authorial base text' (p. 66) and for *Romeo and Juliet* she uses Q2 and F 'as author-texts'. She glances obliquely at, but does not resolve, the problem that Folio *Hamlet* was probably in some way contaminated by a Q2 derivative and that Folio *Romeo and Juliet* was actually printed from an annotated Q2 derivative, so things they have in common might be due not to common origins but direct transmission. The internal repetitions that New Bibliography took for signs of memorial reconstruction's corruption of texts are in fact, according to Petersen, just the kind of strengthening by patterning that happens in the oral tradition to make the thing more easily remembered and more effectively told. Thus one could see *A Midsummer Night's Dream's* *Pyramus and Thisbe* as the goal-form of *Romeo and Juliet*: the family feud reduced to a wall and Tybalt the king of cats made into a lion. In Q1 *Hamlet* Claudius is both inventor and victim of all three means of death in the final duel—unbated foil, its poisoned tip, and the poisoned drink—whereas in F it is Laertes who comes up with the poisoned tip idea. The poisoner-poisoned motif (or hoist-with-your-own-petard motif) is common in folk narratives, and Q1's ending is more folktale-like in that regard as the scene reaches its goal-form. One could make the case too for Gertrude's explicit allegiance to Hamlet's cause in Q1 being goal-formish.

Petersen quotes *Der Bestrafte Brudermord* in German without offering an English translation, but Google Translate makes a good enough fist of it for Petersen's point to come through: in this version, the king offers to be a surrogate father to Leonhardus (= Laertes). There is more streamlining of the hoist-with-your-own-petard type in *Hamlet* getting his captors to shoot one another by ducking in the German version. As an example of goal-form in Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* Petersen offers the fairly small additional death of Benvolio

in that version, so that the annihilation of the Veronese youth is complete. Also, in Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* the thumb-biting scene is much more patterned with simple repetitions of 'I bite my thumb'. In folktales and legends there are seldom more than two people in a scene, as it is hard for the listener to follow the doings of large groups, and noticeably Q1 *Hamlet*, Q1 *Romeo and Juliet*, and their German versions eliminate people from scenes. Compared to F, Q1 *Hamlet* has less of the cut and thrust of dialogue, and instead each person gets to complete relatively long speeches without interruption. The point of this is contrast: even where there are more than two people on stage, Q1 tightens the audience's focus onto just two of them, such as Hamlet and the king in the first scene. Likewise in the scenes where Hamlet's madness is first assessed and in Laertes' revolt: the queen fades into the background, relative to her role in these scenes in F. In Ophelia's first mad scene, Q1's queen is absent so it is just the girl and the king. Scenes that in F contain Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are, in Q1, without them. The lead-up to the climax has in Q1 a simpler binary opposition between the king and his followers and Hamlet and his (including the queen). Likewise, with certain qualifications, in the German version. Q1 *Hamlet* of course lacks lots of Q2/F lines in which descriptions are extended, which is just what happens to ballads in oral transmission, and so does the German version.

In the same way Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* shows a streamlining by elimination of 'extensive monologues, character-building descriptions or highly figurative language' (p. 85), and it too strives towards scenes of just two people, as does its German version. On internal repetition of phrases, Maguire in *Shakespearean Suspect Texts* was excessively cautious in requiring that such things count only if they are long and use distinctive vocabulary so that she found virtually none in Q1 *Hamlet* and Q1 *Romeo and Juliet*. Petersen starts to list small repetitions of words and phrases within Q1 *Hamlet* that are not in F, and particular moments where Q1 regularizes variations in F, such as F's 'It waues me forth againe; Ile follow it. . . . It wafts me still; goe on, Ile follow thee. . . . I say away, goe on, Ile follow thee' becoming Q1's 'Still I am called, go on, Ile follow thee. . . . Go on, ile follow thee. . . . Away I say, go on, ile follow thee'. The latter reduces the variation so Hamlet three times says 'I'll follow thee'. Likewise F's 'Let us goe in together. . . . Nay, come let's goe together' becomes 'Nay come lett's go together. . . . Nay come lett's go together'. Petersen shows repetitions too in the German version of *Hamlet*. One particularly characteristic feature of folktales is repetitions that form triplets, and Q1 shows several of these that are not in F. Most striking of all is the fact that Q1 *Hamlet* has exactly the phrase 'to a Nunnery goe' eight times, where F has variations. As Petersen acknowledges, Thomas Pettitt pointed this out some years ago and made the folktale connection. Petersen then considers repetition at a wider distance, as in Q1 *Hamlet*'s tendency to call him 'son Hamlet' (seven times in Q1, none in Q2/F), and again, likewise in the German version. At pages 104–11 are sketched the repetitions in Q1 *Romeo and Juliet*, including those that harmonize variations in F/Q2 such 'This is that very Mab that . . .' becoming 'This is that Mab that . . . This is that verie Mab that . . .' and 'o hony Nurse what newes?' becoming 'Tell me sweet Nurse, what says . . . tell me sweet Nurse, what says . . .?'. And, as expected, there are similar repetitions

in the German version. (Where repetitions result in successive cues being the same phrase, a stark difference between Petersen's ideas and Menzer's, reviewed above, becomes plain: she sees such repetition as the effect of performance, he suggests that it makes the script unperformable.)

Turning from repetitions to transpositions, Petersen finds that the various Q1 *Hamlet* transpositions—most famously 'To be or not to be' occurring much earlier in Q1 than in Q2/F—are arguably not corruption but improvements made in performance. While Petersen can plausibly treat verbal repetitions and similar patternings as things that spontaneously arose during particular performances and somehow got written down, it is unlikely that transpositions of whole speeches and scenes could arise this way. An actor who starts doing his 'To be or not to be' speech half an hour earlier than the rest of the company expect him to is likely to stop the show. The transpositions in Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* and its German version are fewer and smaller than those in *Hamlet* and Petersen concludes that we cannot really say that Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* shows itself streamlined by performance. In Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* Capulet says to Paris at the end of the family feast 'but for your company, I would haue bin a bed an houre agoe', which most people take to be misplaced since this is, in Q2, what he says to Paris much later in III.iv. But Petersen thinks 'The Q1 reading is neither garbled nor misleading' (p. 120). Perhaps not, but it is nonetheless a very odd thing for Capulet to say, since had he gone to bed an hour before that would have been in the middle of the feast he clearly enjoys hosting. Petersen considers just how matter might have got inserted into performances by ad-libbing clowns or star players confident enough to do it, but does not address the problem of how such things would have got written down. Petersen notices that for both plays the variations figure more strongly in the second half, and she likens this to the variations in the second half of a sung ballad, which emerge because the singer is not sure he still has his audience's attention (granted fully at the beginning) and will either string out the performance if he has or cut it short if not. It is hard to see early modern play performances being quite so impromptu.

So concludes the first half of Petersen's book: what happens to folktales and folk-ballads in the oral tradition helps explain why the bad quartos of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* are the way they are. Noticeably, though, Petersen has left out of the discussion the clear cases of garbling in these bad quartos, although they would fit into her hypothesis since actors do make mistakes. Also, she has not hypothesized a vector whereby the changes made by streamlining-through-performance (as they were 'played into shape', p. 126) got into a written text and thereby into the bad quartos. Presumably she supports memorial reconstruction as one possible vector. On the evidence presented here, Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* represents that play after it had undergone less playing into shape than happened to *Hamlet* to produce its Q1.

The second half of the book is stylometrics. Petersen starts with a (not terribly clear) account of the neuroscience of language production, leading to the point that function words seem to be handled differently and rather more unconsciously than words that can be imaged and bear semantic weight (pp. 147–56). Then she surveys the stylometric work done so far (pp. 156–9). Petersen reveals that she will use function-word counts and indicates that she is

aware of recent warnings about bad stylometric methodology (pp. 160–3). The main problem with this chapter is that Petersen does not give enough detail of just how her tests were run: what was each one looking for? It emerges that the database used in the recent research by Brian Vickers and Marcus Dahl is a version of KEMPE without the parts-of-speech tagging. Petersen gives the URLs for all the software packages she refers to (p. 164n53). This is a bad idea since they will almost certainly not work as addresses in five years' time. She seems not to have tested them since the unwanted @ symbol in `www.Pl@giarism.tk` breaks the URL into a username (`www.Pl`) and a domain name (`giarism.tk`) that are clearly not what is intended.

Aside from KEMPE, Petersen knows of three projects developing 'grammatically parsed (lemmatized, annotated and tagged)' (p. 166) electronic texts of Shakespeare, none of which is completed. She does not include the Wordhoard Shakespeare from Northwestern University, which has been available for years now; if it does not meet her definition of 'grammatically parsed' she ought to say why not. Petersen describes the limitations of the electronic tagger that parses the source texts in her experiments, especially in relation to the modernization of spelling used in early modern plays. (Hugh Craig and R. Whipp have developed a system for dealing with this problem, reviewed below.) She employed a 'file of normalizations of Elizabethan spelling forms' and promises that 'any modernisations made to texts in order for the ENGCG tagger to parse them are carefully noted' (p. 169). She came up with eighty-seven tests, seventy-five of which look for simple function words and twelve of which seek 'functional grammatical/syntactical complexes' (p. 169). Here are sketched the statistical techniques that Petersen used, Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and Discriminant Analysis (DA), but she simply quotes the fairly unhelpful explanations of these ideas given by other scholars. Each of 257 texts by Shakespeare and his contemporaries was subjected to these eighty-seven tests and the Principal Components of these results were given to DA to see if it could rightly assign the text to the author group it came from based solely on the test data. Petersen gives some detail of her counting methods, but comes nowhere near the standard of methodological clarity of *Shakespeare, Computers, and the Mystery of Authorship* by Hugh Craig and Arthur F. Kinney (reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011]). I am not sure I understand exactly what Petersen did.

Petersen divides the Shakespeare plays into Folio and quartos, but for the latter uses a cut-off date of 1619 to isolate the 'quasi-lifetime editions' (p. 175). Thus for these purposes Shakespeare appears as two writers, one the author of the quartos and one the author of the Folio. The other writers tested were (in order of corpus size) Fletcher, Ben Jonson, Thomas Middleton, Thomas Dekker, and fourteen more playwrights down (in terms of corpus size) to Fletcher and Nathan Field, Nicholas Breton, Thomas Goffe, Robert Wilson, and Thomas Kyd. Petersen reckons there are four plays in the Kyd canon, so clearly she is accepting the recent claims by Vickers to have expanded the Kyd canon. Using just the raw test results—that is, how many times each of the eighty-seven features (one per test) was found in each of the 257 plays, expressed as a proportion of the play's size—DA was able to put them into groups that matched the actual canons they derive from just over 61 per cent

of the time. In other words, nearly half the time DA was wrong, with Shakespeare's quartos being placed in their correct group (that is, identified as Shakespeare's quartos) around 43 per cent of the time and the Folio plays placed in that group around 70 per cent of the time. The commonest misplacing of the Shakespeare quarto plays was into the Shakespeare Folio group and vice versa, and if we treat these two groups as one author DA put Shakespeare's plays in the Shakespeare group 92.2 per cent of the time. Mind you, more than a fifth of the whole test corpus, 57/257 plays, was Shakespeare, so putting a play in that group is more likely to be right than putting it somewhere else. As if anticipating this point, Petersen asks how likely is it that these classifications by DA are just chance; she does the mathematics and the DA results are, statistically speaking, significantly better than chance.

Graphing how alike (in the raw scores on the eighty-seven tests) are the various canons, Shakespeare's Folio plays and Shakespeare's quarto plays sit close together, and distant from the other playwrights' plays. The Shakespeare Folio texts misidentified by DA as Shakespeare quarto texts were ones where Q and F are textually similar or where the play is already suspected of co-authorship, as with *Measure for Measure* and *All Is True*. *Timon of Athens* was misclassified by DA as a Chapman play, perhaps because it is co-authored, and Petersen explores briefly the possibility that Chapman was in fact the co-author. She seems not to notice that co-authorship might make DA pick the wrong man because it dilutes the literary effect her analysis is counting—say, the frequency of occurrence of a particular function word—and pushes it along the spectrum from Shakespeare towards, say, Middleton but reaching only half-way to where Chapman lies. Unless she has in her corpus pieces of work that are definitely attributed to the collaboration of Shakespeare and Middleton then DA will not be able to assign a play to that group. Four Shakespeare quarto plays were misidentified by DA as being by someone else: *The Contention of York and Lancaster* was identified as Christopher Marlowe's, whose role as its part-author has been claimed on other grounds and was explored in Craig and Kinney's book reviewed last year. *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is identified as Fletcher's, and it would have been better if DA had shown it to be between the Shakespeare and Fletcher zones, since its being wholly Fletcher's is most unlikely. It is not clear what *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is doing in the Shakespeare quarto group since it was not printed until 1634, long after Petersen's 1619 cut-off. *Pericles* is identified as William Rowley's, and Q2 *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is given to Beaumont; Petersen's account of the latter is rather garbled, seeming to confuse Q1 (1602) and Q2 (1619).

Petersen's theatre-historical knowledge has weaknesses, evident in comments such as 'Shakespeare is directly linked with only one company throughout his life—that which is known successively as Lord Strange's, Lord Derby's, Lord Hunsdon's, the Lord Chamberlain's, and the King's [men]' (p. 184), which idea she gets from C.F. Tucker Brooke writing a century ago. Of course, the Chamberlain's men was not a successive name for the preceding companies in her list, but was a wholly new entity formed in 1594 from a complex reorganization of the industry. Next, instead of using the raw data Petersen uses the Principal Component (PC) for each test. It is not

entirely clear how this is 'as described earlier' (p. 185) since the earlier description used the familiar idea that one might abstract from data pairs of, say, individuals' weight and height a combined metric called size, but just how this many-into-oneness works in relation to the plays is not fully explained. It appears that the eighty-seven data points for each play were reduced to the fifty PCs that give the DA the best data to work on. Even with this improvement, DA misclassifies one in ten Shakespeare plays. Petersen seems to think this not a bad outcome and spends some time poring over how the misclassifications in this analysis differ from the previous ones based on raw scores. Here Petersen writes that 'there are only three texts in the Kyd canon' (p. 189), yet in prose on page 175 and in a table on page 178 there are four in her test data. Petersen offers a 'boxplot' graphic representation of the DA results but neglects to explain what the symbols on the graph (which comprise circular blobs and rectangular boxes) actually mean. Readers who are baffled should not blame themselves.

The problem of Petersen just not explaining what she is doing becomes acute in chapter 5, on 'Contextual Stylistics and the Case of *Titus Andronicus*'. Petersen sees value in 'generating vocabularic profiles' of texts and says that doing this for Q1/F *Hamlet* 'one finds that there is about 86 per cent total matching phraseology across the two variants' (p. 194). But just what is being compared here, and what is meant by a 'profile'? If she means that of the total pool of words that appear in one or other of the plays 86 per cent of them appear in both (as I think she does) why does she not just state that? Petersen goes on to look at 'matching consecutive lines' in the two plays, but unfortunately she is reporting the results of using plagiarism detection software and the reader has not been told just how alike the lines have to be for the software to declare them to be matches. Do different spelling or punctuation count here? Petersen is concerned that a lot of the 'formulaic phrases' such as 'how now' and 'see where he comes' in Q1 *Hamlet* also appear (albeit less frequently) in Folio *Hamlet*, and she seems to have decided that these come not from the author but from the actors and hence are skewing the stylometric results. At pages 196–8 there is a rather tedious rehash of a debate had on the STYLO-SHAKE electronic mail discussion list in 2003—the online archives of which are cited here, but are in fact no longer publicly accessible—about the notion of 'purity of sample', leading to the conclusion that 'Gabriel Egan's argument that authorial manuscripts were normally faithfully textualized by printers (according to a single allowed authorial copy), therefore, if nothing else, stands to be further substantiated' (p. 198). In fact all that Egan claimed was that we need not be too despondent about printing always taking us a long way from the author's style: if authorial papers were the printer's copy and the printer was being careful, the printed book should be fairly pure for stylometric purposes. Egan of course claimed nothing about 'a single allowed authorial copy' since allowance (by which Petersen presumably means approval by a censor) is not the issue here.

Petersen turns to the problems of applying stylometry to *Titus Andronicus*, and comments that 'The title page of Q1 indicates the likelihood of prior performance by no fewer than four companies: "The righte honourable The Earle of Derby, The Earle of Pembroke, and Earle of Sussex their Seruants"'

(p. 199). That is three, not four, companies; errors in counting are particularly unwelcome in stylometric studies. Studies of Peele's hand in *Titus Andronicus* have tended to take internal repetition as a sign of his work and not Shakespeare's, but Petersen thinks it could instead be a sign of 'oral-memorial transmission' (p. 201). Attempting, rather long-windedly, to explain how stylometry might overcome the problem of 'impure' texts—that is, ones containing not only the author's writing but the effects of its being performed such as interpolated patterns of repetition—Petersen suggests asking new questions such as 'If, for instance, discriminant analysis (or other related statistical examination) of stylistic data categorizes *Titus* Act I as "Peele", or indeed as Shakespeare, is there a similar stylistically detectable "band width" for the two authors in this play?' (p. 203). This sentence is incomprehensible because she has not indicated what she means by 'band with'. Maxima and minima for quantities, perhaps? The term has a precise meaning within Shannonian information theory, but it does not apply here.

One of the markers for Peele's authorship of *Titus Andronicus* used by Vickers is repetitions of the kind 'Come, come', and Petersen points out that these occur across the allegedly Shakespearian bits too. Petersen thinks them as likely to arise from alterations by performers, which got into Q and F 'through either promptbook additions or memorial report' (p. 204). But no one has ever claimed a memorial-reconstruction origin for *Titus Andronicus* (aside from the F-only 'Fly Scene') and what exactly does she mean by 'promptbook additions'? There is a possible argument for improvised matter getting written down—Eric Rasmussen made the case for this in *Sir Thomas More* in 1991—but Petersen seems unaware of it. In fact, 'Come, come' is common across the drama, occurring in 220 plays from 1515 to 1640, which is itself good evidence that this is not a marker of orality, unless one thinks that orality is virtually ubiquitous in these printings. However, by Petersen's counts, 'Come, come' repetitions, and related signs of orality such as repetitions like 'See where . . .', are more frequent in the bad quartos of *The Contention of York and Lancaster* and *Hamlet* than in their related good quarto or Folio texts. Specifically, Folio 2 *Henry VI* has two occurrences of 'Come (come) /lets go/away/haste' while *The Contention of York and Lancaster* has seven, and Q2 *Hamlet* has no occurrences of 'See where he/she goes/is/comes' while Q1 *Hamlet* has six. Repeatedly, the matter of just how the words invented on the stage got back into the written script is fudged by Petersen using phrases such as 'the majority of extant play texts of this period will have had some contact with the stage' (p. 208).

Repetition, then, is not a useful test for authorship as orality generates it. Petersen has put together a number of texts including ones in Maguire's *Shakespearean Suspect Texts*, some Shakespeare apocrypha, the plays of University Wits, and the Shakespeare quartos and Folios in order to see if stylometric tests will group them by author or by 'textual quality'. The tests were ones looking for function words, 'functional syntactic compounds and grammatical sentence types' (p. 209). Those last two types could usefully have been glossed with examples. Petersen explains her experiment, but not in sufficient detail or with sufficient clarity. The key idea seems to be that one takes out of the dataset a single play then calculates the 'classification

function' using the remaining plays and then asks DA to say which group (Shakespeare bad quartos, Maguire's suspect texts, and so on) the removed play belongs to. The result was that fewer than a third of the plays were correctly identified by this method, which tells Petersen that perhaps 'the categories so far assigned by critics could be arbitrary' (p. 211). Yes, that is a possibility, but equally likely they are real and Petersen's methodology simply fails to discriminate between them.

Despite reaching what most people would consider a useless core finding—that DA cannot reliably assign these plays to the groups scholars use—Petersen proceeds to detail what got misclassified as what, as though the misclassifications might tell us where these texts really belong. It here emerges that Petersen's first experiment did not include the University Wits' plays and Shakespeare apocrypha, so now we hear of a rerun using those. At least Petersen makes no grand claims here: 'certain *tendencies* are revealed that may provide food for thought' (p. 214). I would say the dominant thought is that this methodology tells us nothing, and it is a wonder Petersen stuck with it. Graphing the data does not make these results any more convincing, but Petersen finds in her graph a clustering that this reviewer just cannot see; to me it looks like a fairly random distribution of dots. The cluster shows Petersen that 'there *is* provable stylistic overlap between so-called "suspect" collections of early modern play texts and those canons presumed to be authorial' (p. 216), meaning that all the texts are somewhat oral and somewhat authorial at the same time.

In chapter 6 Petersen attempts to discover whether the Q1 texts of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet* can be quantitatively distinguished from their good texts, and in particular if breaking the bad quartos into particular scenes (on the principle that some scenes may have different provenance from others) and testing them together makes them 'cluster together' by getting similar scores on Petersen's tests. Treated at the scene level, the good/bad text distinction disappears because many scenes are very alike in the good and bad texts. (True, but the good/bad distinction was not meant to apply to every scene in a text, but to the whole text; if we discovered a lost version of *Hamlet* into which someone had spliced the ending of *King Lear* it would, for almost all its scenes, pass tests that suggest it is a good text of *Hamlet*, but it would still be a particularly bad text of *Hamlet* because of that ending. We may think of this as the curate's egg principle in its original sense.) Petersen finds that most scenes in one of the three texts of *Romeo and Juliet* come out as being like the same scene in the other two. That is, her DA technique cannot assign the scene its correct category of good quarto, bad quarto, or Folio, so she decides that Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* is not really a bad quarto. By contrast, most scenes of Q1, Q2, and Folio *Hamlet* are correctly assigned by DA to their correct category of bad quarto, good quarto, or F, so Q1 *Hamlet* is a bad quarto.

Petersen gives the graphs and narrative that underpin that conclusion, including the statistics of interquartile range (a measurement she does not explain) and associated box-plots. Where one scene in different versions scores the same numbers on Petersen's tests she fails to mention the relevant fact that in places Q2 *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* were typeset from their respective Q1 predecessors, so the likeness in those places is unexceptional. Again,

Petersen goes through the DA misclassifications of particular scenes as if this might tell us something. Finally Petersen mentions the possibility of the Q1/Q2/F editions being 'interlinked mechanically (i.e. as copy texts in the print-shop)' (p. 231), but not in connection with the known instances of such a mechanical link. Petersen concludes that her work has shown that 'the experiment of analysing authorial style on the basis of certain frequent functional elements works' (p. 236), and extraordinarily it is the fact that DA misclassifies plays that 'are either suspected collaborations or multiple-text cases' that gives her comfort. It is impossible to share her conclusion because Petersen has described no procedures by which she validated her method's ability to make any reliable classifications at all.

The first part of Petersen's book is much more convincing than the second, and she provided useful evidence that (as her Epilogue claims) the plays contain an important element arising from mutation in oral repetition. She rightly concludes that stylometrics should not be applied to a play as if it were an established entity, but should attend to the fact that for many plays we have multiple versions, which may or may not be alike for the purposes of counting. Appendix 1 usefully shows the narrative contents of each scene in each version of *Romeo and Juliet* and positions them on the page so that scenes with similar content are horizontally aligned. Appendix 2 summarizes what matter in the F versions of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* is omitted in the bad quartos (the missing extended descriptions, flourishes, imagery, and so on), and gives the oral patterns Petersen is concerned with (repetitions, transpositions, and so on). Appendix 3 gives the detail of how DA misclassified the plays, with 'particularly interesting or thought-provoking' cases highlighted. Appendix 4 has some graphs but unfortunately Petersen gives no explanation of what a 'scree plot' is, nor of the notion of eigenvalues that these graphs give visualizations of, other than saying they are 'the variances of the principal components', which will make sense to those who already know about eigenvalues, variances, and principal components but is useless to anybody else. Petersen's bibliography starts with 'Electronic Resources and Software' and she appears not to have checked the URLs lately: the site www.totus.org cited by Petersen was maintained by the present reviewer and discontinued in 2003 when its contents were moved to www.gabrielegan.com. Around a third of the other URLs were also broken links at the time of review, December 2011.

Part of the labour of reviewing Shakespeare editions and textual studies is deciding just what counts as a relevant publication. Much work in this field relies upon the assumption that William Shakespeare of Stratford-upon-Avon wrote the plays attributed to him (accepting of course that the edges of the canon are arguable), so studies that challenge this basic position are potentially relevant here. This year William Leahy edited a collection of essays on the anti-Stratfordian position called *Shakespeare and His Authors: Critical Perspectives on the Authorship Question*. Most of the essays are academically introspective in the way that appeals to literary theorists but almost no one else—asking such questions as why Sigmund Freud was a Shakespeare doubter, why the Monty Python comedians found Stephen Greenblatt's name funny, and why anti-Stratfordianism is derided by real

scholars—and they may safely be ignored. However, since Leahy's introduction attempts to argue that precisely such dismissal by reviewers is part of the authorship-doubting problem, it should briefly be addressed. Leahy begins with the important but untrue assertion that 'questioning of the authorship of the plays attributed to William Shakespeare has existed—contrary to received knowledge—since 1592' (p. 3). This claim is a fairly new development in anti-Stratfordianism, responding to a widely held view that if there were a conspiracy it ought to have been suspected rather sooner than it was. (As Michael Dobson wittily puts it, by the Victorian era the authorship controversy was an accident waiting to happen.) Leahy relies on Diana Price's reinterpretation of the well-known lines from *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* about 'Shakes-scene' having a 'Tygers hart wrapt in a Players hyde', seeing them as an accusation of plagiarism rather than uppitiness, and brings in her version of the familiar claim (based on nothing at all) that Jonson's complaint about plagiarism in 'On Poet-Ape' was directed at Shakespeare. Leahy also asserts that the William Shakespeare who lent £7 to John Clayton in 1592 was the man from Stratford (p. 5), although most Shakespearians ignore this loan because the record of it gives no indication of the lender's place of residence or origin and there were plenty of other William Shakespeares about, including one living near the borrower.

Having repeated these groundless anti-Stratfordian claims, Leahy disingenuously asserts that he raises them (and produces his book) 'not in any way in order to suggest that someone other than Shakespeare wrote the plays attributed to him' but instead to show that 'the Shakespeare authorship controversy is a historical, social and cultural phenomenon worthy of research and analysis in academia' (p. 6). This is rather like raising the groundless arguments for Intelligent Design and then claiming that you do not mean to suggest that Darwin was wrong. We cannot have it both ways: if there is anything in what Price claims about *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* and Jonson's 'On Poet-Ape' then these are reasons to doubt that the Stratford man was a playwright, not evidence that it is worth researching and analysing why people doubt it. Of course, everyone (Stratfordians included) think it is worth understanding why people believe such nonsense, but this is a matter for the history of science, scholarship, and popular belief, not for Shakespearians. By analogy, understanding why people believe that NASA faked the Apollo moon-landings is not a problem to be explored by astrophysicists nor disbelief in evolution a problem to be explored by zoologists.

Only one relevant chapter in a book-form collection of essays appeared this year, although the entire collection is highly recommended to early modern book historians, namely Joseph A. Dane and Alexandra Gillespie, 'The Myth of the Cheap Quarto' (in King, ed., *Tudor Books and Readers: Materiality and the Construction of Meaning*, pp. 25-45). Commonly in Shakespeare studies one hears that his plays were published in his lifetime in cheap, throwaway quartos, but Dane and Gillespie show that the quarto was not necessarily a cheap format and did not connote ephemerality in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It is not clear how publishers priced early books, or if they were even rational in doing so, so this study focusses not on price but on the costs entailed in making a book, and assumes that this is a 'direct function of the

cost of the paper it contains' (p. 31) and that books were made as Moxon says. In folio printing, the type-page can be as big as the platen—two pages and two pulls per forme—whereas in quarto and even more so in octavo some platen space is lost to the book's margins, so folios make more efficient use of paper. Looking at actual texts (of uniform length) printed in quarto and folio and comparing the number of sheets needed, the early sixteenth-century evidence is equivocal: Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* used fewer sheets in quarto than in folio, while *The Assembly of the Gods* used more.

The authors systematically checked the Huntington Library catalogue of early books, which lists formats and leaf/page counts, for books frequently reprinted, and tabulated the results. It turned out that the differences in sheet-use within editions of the same format (folio, quarto, octavo, 16mo) are as big as the differences in sheet-use between editions of different formats. It seems that folios were popular in the first few decades of English printing, and then quartos took over. The authors admit that in fact the texts they compared were not exactly of a uniform length, since some editions had paratextual matter not in others, but then again a sheet is not a uniform unit either since some were bigger than others. In other words, it is impossible to control the variables and to see if quartos were, in general, more economical than other formats in their use of paper. Certainly printers seem to have chosen quarto rather than folio for fairly short (and hence cheap-per-copy) texts, but that might well be because had they used the folio format there would be few leaves and such a flimsy object would not last too well; quarto made for something more durable. Folio books such as collected works were often broken up into smaller units, and quartos were bound together to make multi-work anthologies, so there is no reason to suppose that readers considered the quarto format itself to connote cheapness. There is some evidence from contemporary writers' characterizations of them that quartos were considered culturally slight publications, although not necessarily cheap.

There were nearly two dozen journal articles on our topic published in 2010. The one with the highest public profile was Brian Vickers's argument, in 'Disintegrated: Did Thomas Middleton Really Adapt *Macbeth*?' (*TLS* 5591(28 May)[2010] 14–15), that Middleton did not, as Gary Taylor argued he did, adapt Shakespeare's *Macbeth* to produce the play we find in the 1623 Folio. Vickers approves of Grace Ippollo's objection to the idea that because, in *Macbeth*, appear a few words from the opening lines of two songs that also appear in full in Middleton's *The Witch*, Middleton must have adapted *Macbeth*. After all, 'their original author, who was completely knowledgeable about them . . . would, presumably, have rewritten them out in the body of the text rather than offering quick cues to them in stage directions' (p. 14). Stern's work on what happened to songs and why they often do not appear in full in playscripts should have been referred to on this point. Vickers objects to the *Oxford Collected Middleton* using varying weights of type to try to show in one place how the play was before and after adaptation by Middleton, and to Taylor's decision to unpunctuate and to start sentences and verse lines without a capital letter. One of the known habits of Middleton is to write stage directions in the form 'Enter X meeting Y' and Vickers complains that Taylor misreports the scholarship of R.V. Holdsworth on this point by writing that in

the Shakespeare canon such stage directions occur only in *Macbeth* and the Middleton scene in the co-written *Timon of Athens*. Vickers thinks that Taylor overlooked 'the decisive one coming in the 1608 Quarto of *King Lear*: "Enter Bast[ard] and Curan meeting"' (p. 15). Taylor is right here and Vickers wrong: 'Enter X and Y meeting' is not the same as 'Enter X meeting Y' and it is the latter that Taylor was referring to. With this point Vickers thinks 'a large part of his [Taylor's] argument collapses' (p. 15) but it is the objection that collapses.

Vickers then turns to his own research looking for three-word phrases (trigrams) in the bits of *Macbeth* that Taylor assigns to Middleton to see if they also occur elsewhere in Middleton and elsewhere in Shakespeare. He claims to have found (but does not list) fifty-five such trigrams that occur in the supposedly Middletonian parts of *Macbeth* and elsewhere in Shakespeare but nowhere in Middleton. There are also eleven trigrams in the supposedly Middletonian parts of *Macbeth* and elsewhere in Middleton but not in Shakespeare but this 'elsewhere' is Middleton plays later than *Macbeth*. (It is not clear why Vickers thinks the date relevant, and it should be borne in mind that by 'later than *Macbeth*' Vickers means after 1606, when it was first composed and performed, although of course everyone who thinks that Middleton adapted *Macbeth* thinks he did it at the end of the 1610s.) Vickers also reports that Marina Tarlinskaja's verse tests for frequency of feminine endings and run-on lines and the location in the verse line of the syntactic break also show that the supposedly Middletonian parts in blank verse are more like Shakespeare than Middleton. Hecate speaks unlike the other witches, but Vickers finds subjective parallels with other supernatural characters in Shakespeare. Vickers notes that the Hecate material is different 'from the previous presentation of "the weird sisters"' (p. 15) and proposes that it was added by Shakespeare for a revival around 1610–11 that used the descent machine that Shakespeare began to take advantage of towards the end of his career, as with Jupiter's descent in *Cymbeline* and Ariel's in *The Tempest*.

Vickers's article does not provide the detailed evidence to support its argument but instead refers the reader to a supplementary document on the website of the London Forum for Authorship Studies called 'An Enquiry into Middleton's Supposed "Adaptation" of *Macbeth*' by Marcus Dahl, Marina Tarlinskaja, and Brian Vickers. Unfortunately, in the version available at the time of this review, its pages were not numbered. In Part I, Dahl, Tarlinskaja, and Vickers start with some trigrams in the supposedly Middletonian bits of *Macbeth* and aim to show that they are also found in Shakespeare but seldom if at all in Middleton. But their third one, 'Shew'd like a' which they record as 'Not Mid[dleton]' is in fact in Middleton's *A Yorkshire Tragedy* iv.71 and *Honourable Entertainments* 1.8. Likewise they claim that 'him till he' occurs only once in Middleton, but I find it in *The Roaring Girl* vi.191–2, *Wit at Several Weapons* IV.i.23, *A Fair Quarrel* IV.iv.94, and *Any Thing for a Quiet Life* V.ii.192. They claim that 'him from the' occurs only once in Middleton, but I find it in *The Widow of Watling Street* I.iii.29, *Your Five Gallants* II.iv.224, *The Ladies' Tragedy* I.ii.86, *Wit at Several Weapons* V.ii.170, and *The Owl's Almanac* 2358–9. They claim that 'and fix'd'—it is not clear why

they consider this a trigram—occurs nowhere in Middleton, but I find it in *The Triumphs of Truth* 420, *The Old Law* II.ii.152, *The World Tossed at Tennis* 284, *The Nice Valour* III.iii.43, and *The Triumphs of Honour and Virtue* 93. They claim that ‘the other and’ is not in Middleton but I find it in *Plato’s Cap* 264. They claim that ‘here’s another’ is not in Middleton but I find it in *The Phoenix* xii.128, *The Patient Man and the Honest Whore* v.39 and vi.81, *The Yorkshire Tragedy* v.58, *Your Five Gallants* I.i.27–8, and *The Phoenix* xii.128.

At this point I stopped checking their claims systematically and resorted to spot-checking as it is clear that either most of the Middleton canon is not in whatever database Dahl, Tarlinskaja, and Vickers use for their searches or else their search methodology is failing to find the matches. Another one: they claim that ‘a crew of’ occurs nowhere in Middleton but I find it in *The Owl’s Almanac* 1804, *The World Tossed at Tennis* 683, *The Spanish Gipsy* III.ii.54, and *Satire 4 Cheating Droone* 46. And another: ‘here remain’ is not absent from Middleton but rather is in *The Bloody Banquet* I.iii.89. In the main article Vickers describes as particularly significant ‘collocations involving four words (far rarer than trigrams)’ (p. 15), so it is particularly damaging to his argument that Dahl, Tarlinskaja, and Vickers report ‘I have seen him’ to be absent from Middleton when in fact it is in *The Widow of Watling Street* I.iii.75. Another one: ‘to the eye’ is not in Middleton according to Dahl, Tarlinskaja, and Vickers but in fact it occurs in *The Travels of Sir Robert Shirley* 257 and *The Sun in Aries* 276 plus a couple more times in the form ‘to the eyes’.

The next section of the essay, Part II, is essentially discursive, but it still uses word counts and they continue to be wrong, for example in claiming that *hover* never occurs in Middleton’s plays when it appears in *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside* as *hovers* (V.i.75) and *A Fair Quarrel* has *hovering* (III.iii.4) and the non-dramatic works have it too: *News from Gravesend* 544 and 609, *The Wisdom of Solomon Paraphrased* v.104, xiv.47 and xvii.218, and *The Ghost of Lucrece* 215. They claim that ‘and choke’ occurs in Middleton only in *A Fair Quarrel* but in fact it is also in *The Black Book* 351, *Hengist King of Kent* I.i.17, and in *Women Beware Women* as ‘and chokes’ II.ii.292, so in fact it is more common in Middleton than in Shakespeare. The rest of the argument here just shows that things in the bits of *Macbeth* that Taylor attributes to Middleton are like things in Shakespeare. True, but to counter Taylor would require that they are not present in Middleton and the essay does not attempt to show that. Part III of the essay is Tarlinskaja’s, and she uses her usual verse tests (including those for proclitic and enclitic microphrases) on the 105 iambic pentameter lines that Taylor gives to Middleton. By her counts of feminine endings, the bits of *Macbeth* that Taylor attributes to Middleton are just like the rest of Shakespeare and unlike Middleton. Likewise the percentage of run-on lines, the location of the caesura, the relative rates of stressing of certain syllables in a line, the rates of pleonastic *do*, and the rates of unstressed monosyllables occurring in the tenth syllable slot. These claims are rather more subjective than the word counting in the previous parts of the article. For example, Tarlinskaja claims that in ‘The very firstlings of my heart shall be | The firstlings of my hand’ the word *be* has to be unstressed. It seems to me that this is within the actor’s gift, not the poet’s or the analyst’s; there would be nothing inherently wrong with stressing it.

Ward E.Y. Elliott and Robert J. Valenza have a long track record of scrupulous stylometric analysis of Shakespeare, executed to scientific standards of transparency and replicability, and a new pair of linked articles answer the questions in their titles: 'Two Tough Nuts to Crack: Did Shakespeare Write the "Shakespeare" Portions of *Sir Thomas More* and *Edward III*? Part I' (*L&LC* 25[2010] 67–83); 'Two Tough Nuts to Crack: Did Shakespeare Write the "Shakespeare" Portions of *Sir Thomas More* and *Edward III*? Part II: Conclusion' (*L&LC* 25[2010] 165–77). Elliott and Valenza's battery of authorship tests are well known and well described in their previous publications, to which they point readers rather than repeating themselves, although they now also include Tarlinskaja's tests for proclitic and enclitic microphrases, of which they give a useful account in plain English using Shakespearian verse. The parts of *Sir Thomas More* commonly attributed to Shakespeare are Hand D (in his own handwriting) plus Addition III, and Elliott and Valenza find that taken together these sections (but not the play as a whole) score fairly closely to plays in the agreed Shakespeare canon, especially those of the early 1600s rather than the early 1590s. Shakespeare's contributions do not appear exactly like his other dramatic works, but Elliott and Valenza acknowledge that this might be due to the small size of the sample, making a number of their tests inapplicable. They remain perturbed by the sample's failure on a couple of their tests and conclude overall that it is not by Shakespeare but they would not bet heavily on this. Surprisingly, they do not consider the possibility of its coming to us in manuscript form rather than print (as with the rest of the canon) being a possible cause of the discrepancies.

Elliott and Valenza also confirm the consensus on the extent of the reliable Shakespeare canon—it is the Folio plays plus *Pericles* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and bits of *Sir Thomas More* (maybe) and *Edward III*—since all the other apocrypha are way outside the habits measured by their tests, and they confirm too the agreed divisions of *Pericles* between Shakespeare and George Wilkins and *All Is True* between Shakespeare and Fletcher. In the spirit of proper scientific enquiry they are ever alert to possible weaknesses in their methodology and regarding their verdict on *Sir Thomas More* they comment that 'the quantitative case is a close enough call that convincing qualitative responses could make a difference' (p. 77). In their second article they test the scenes of *Edward III* usually attributed to Shakespeare (I.ii, II.i, II.ii, and IV.iv) and find them much more like agreed Shakespeare than the other scenes in the play are, although taken together they do not seem highly Shakespearian. However, by taking scene IV.iv from Shakespeare and giving him instead scenes IV.v to IV.ix the whole of his supposed contribution becomes much more like known Shakespeare. By Elliott and Valenza's tests there is no chance of Shakespeare having written the whole of *Edward III*. Their appendices give all the raw score counts for the tests whose results are summarized and tabulated in the two articles.

Charles R. Forker, in '*The Troublesome Reign, Richard II, and the Date of King John: A Study in Intertextuality*' (*ShS* 63[2010] 127–48), reckons that *Richard II* and *King John* were written around the same time—the second half of the 1590s—and hence that where *King John* and the anonymous two-part

play *The Troublesome Reign of King John* [1589–91] show clear signs that one influenced the other, Shakespeare must be the borrower. The intermediate step to this conclusion is to show that *Troublesome Reign* influenced *Richard II*, and Forker prints a table of nineteen close parallels of phrasing including seven that appear in ‘no other . . . plays anterior to 1596’ (p. 129), according to the Chadwyck-Healey English Drama Database. It is not clear why Forker is interested only in parallels with other drama: would not a common connection in prose or poetry also throw light on the problem? Importantly, Forker has missed some parallels. He claims that *Troublesome Reign*’s ‘his knee . . . shall cleave | Unto . . . the earth’ has no parallel other than *Richard II*’s ‘may my knees grow to the earth’ and ‘Our knees still kneel till to the ground they grow’ but in fact there is also ‘let these knees be wedded to the earth’ in *A Knack to Know an Honest Man* (first performed 1594). Forker claims that *Troublesome Reign*’s ‘staine the beautie of our garden plot’ has no parallel other than *Richard II*’s ‘stained the beauty of a fair queen’s cheeks’ (the important features being *stain* as a verb followed by *the* and *beauty* in that order) but there are parallels outside drama: George Gascoigne in *A Hundred Sundry Flowers* [1575] has ‘How farre hir louelie lookes do steine, the beauties of them both’, and John Lyly, in *Euphues* [1578], has ‘his daughter heire to his whole reuenews, stained the beautie of them all’. Forker claims that *Troublesome Reign*’s ‘I know not, nor I care not’ has no parallel other than *Richard II*’s ‘I know not, nor I greatly care not’, but it does outside drama: Robert Greene’s *Gwydonius* [1584] has ‘what you are by discent I knowe not, nor I care not’. He claims that *Troublesome Reign*’s ‘a cattalogue of sinne, | Wrote . . . in Marble characters’ has no other parallel than *Richard II*’s ‘Where all my sins are writ’ but it does outside drama: in Nashe’s *Piers Penniless* [1592] is ‘when a mans sinnes are written on his ey browes’. Thus out of the seven *Troublesome Reign*/*Richard II* parallels that Forker thinks appear in no other works before 1596, four are in fact found in other works already in print by then if we broaden our purview beyond plays.

The parallels between *Troublesome Reign* and *Richard II* are striking, but not as significant as Forker thinks. Parallels that he admits are not unique to these two plays—such as ‘King annoynted’ with ‘anoointed king’ and ‘Till time’ with ‘Till time’—are, of course, found in other works (in some cases, in many dozens of other works) and it is odd that Forker thinks these commonplace phrases worth listing. Forker wrongly calls *unsay* a ‘rare verb’ (p. 130)—Literature Online shows two dozen sixteenth-century occurrences—and he makes the classic error of finding significance in the accumulation of parallels that are merely commonplaces: ‘Simple chance might account for some of these parallels, but their density suggests a more than coincidental relationship’ (p. 130). In truth, it does not. Forker finds significant the phrase ‘some notorious ill’ occurring within a couple of lines of the word *day* in *Titus Andronicus* and *Troublesome Reign*, but in fact ‘some notorious ill’ had appeared in Barnabe Barnes’s *Brusamus* [1592] so the collocation is not quite so striking. Likewise Forker’s observation that ‘hopeless and helpless’ appears in *The Comedy of Errors* and *Troublesome Reign* is not so striking when you realize that ‘hopeless, helpless’, ‘helpless, hopeless’, and indeed ‘hopeless and helpless’ were used by seven poets of the period, the exact match being with

John Trussel's *The First Rape of Fair Helen* [1595]. By confining his search for parallels only to plays, Forker has cut himself off from the other reading that might affect a playwright's phrasing. Forker thinks that 'piercing sight' appears only in *Troublesome Reign* and *King Lear* and later plays, but in fact Barnabe Rich used it in *Don Simonides* [1581] and, probably more significantly for Shakespeare's knowledge of it, Arthur Golding used it in his translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

Forker turns to parallels between *Troublesome Reign* and *King John*, the debate about which (that is, who copied whom) he sketches before deciding that Shakespeare was the borrower not the lender. Listing the twenty-seven close parallels, there is of course no need to go searching in databases: there are many with proper nouns that cannot be commonplace sayings and others that have just too many terms to be coincidental, for example *Troublesome Reign*'s 'Tell...of England...never an Italian Priest... shall... tythe, tole... under God, supream head' and *King John*'s 'Tell...of England...no Italian priest | Shall tithe or toll... under God, are supreme head'. For Shakespeare to be the lender we would have to date *King John* no later than 1591, yet all sorts of stylometric tests put it close in date to *Richard II*, which cannot be moved earlier than the second half of the 1590s because of its clear debt to Samuel Daniel's *Civil Wars* that appeared in 1595. Rather pointlessly, Forker finally sets out to show what *King John* and *Richard II* have in common, which of course proves nothing since we know them to be by the same author and commonalities will not help us tie them together chronologically: only stylometric tests of gradually drifting habits can do that. Yet Forker specifically denies this, asserting without argument that: 'it seems likely that plays exhibiting so many linguistic parallels... were composed close to each other in the playwright's career' (p. 143). Still, the parallels are themselves most interesting and insightful.

One of the main barriers to stylometric analysis of Shakespeare and early modern drama generally is the differences between early modern spelling and modern spelling throwing off counts of word frequency. What we need is an automated system for determining which modern word is meant by a given spelling in an old text, and Hugh Craig and R. Whipp have built such a system, outlined in 'Old Spellings, New Methods: Automated Procedures for Indeterminate Linguistic Data' (*L&LC* 25[2010] 37–52). To find 'the dictionary rather than the surface form' (p. 37) of a word requires seeing past the variations in spelling and number and in conjugations of verbs and archaic typographic conventions such as *vv* for *w* and tilde for missing *m* and *n*, as well as telling apart spelling variants (*banket/banquet*, *murther/murder*) and distinct words and telling which word is meant by a string that could correspond to more than one modern word, to see (for example) whether a particular instance of *hart* means the animal or the organ. Stylometrics cannot simply use a modernized text because for most writers these do not exist and where they do they follow different rules of modernization. In analysing words, Craig and Whipp see four levels of what they call 'compression': (1) the word as it appears in the copy text, (2) a standardized orthographic version of that word, (3) the dictionary headword it belongs under, (4) the word-class or semantic group it belongs in. They are interested in level (2).

They start with 200 function words that comprise 56 per cent of all the literature and use text search-and-replace (within XML) to bring them all to a standard form, such as '<reg orig='bee'> be </reg>'. For the lexical words they used the *OED* variant spellings lists (supplied to them as electronic text) and an automated comparison of original Shakespearian electronic texts with modernized electronic texts and a set of simple rules (such as *u* being possibly represented by *v* and vice versa) to produce libraries of word-forms. What about ambiguous words where the sense can be determined only by context, as indeed with the *bee* example above? Craig and Whipp tried to automate the context-checking by looking for other words that collocate with the one in question within the electronic British National Corpus (BNC): the headword in BNC that has the most close collocates with the word in the early modern text is deemed to be the headword for the early modern usage. The process was quite mechanical: to work out if *prey* in Q2 *Hamlet*'s 'And prey on garbage' is the verb to commune with God or the verb to chase and consume (*pray* or *prey* in modern spelling), their approach asks how often *prey* and *pray* are preceded by *and* in BNC (answer: *pray* is much more often preceded by *and* than *prey* is) and then asks how often *prey* and *pray* are followed by *on* (answer: *prey* is much more followed by *on* than *pray* is) and then weighs these results (*on* being rarer than *and* and hence more significant) to decide that predation is the sense here. As Craig and Whipp admit, Shakespeare might of course have meant both *prey* and *pray* at once, and a theatre audience hears no difference.

Craig and Whipp tested their context-checking routine using modern literature by asking whether in cases of ambiguity their system assigned the ambiguous word to the right headword. Tabulating their result according to how much context was looked at (from one word either side up to nine words), they settled on a window of three words either side of the headword. Then they set up tests to compare how well their system performs on disambiguation of words when (i) using only the context words, (ii) using only the assistance of a modernized Shakespeare (the *Moby* electronic text) compared to old-spelling Shakespeare to automatically work out which old spelling maps onto which modern word, (iii) using only the *OED* spelling variant lists, and when using automatic substitutions (*u/v*, *i/j*, and so on) to do the old-to-modern mapping, and (iv) when applying these methods in various combinations. Craig and Whipp conclude that they now have a tool, the Intelligent Archive, at which anyone can throw some early modern English writing and get accurate counts of word frequencies. The counts are not perfectly accurate, but much better than just ignoring the difference between old and modern spelling. Unfortunately they give no indication of how interested users may access the Intelligent Archive; the obvious means would be a publicly available web service.

In a sole-authored article, 'Style, Statistics, and New Models of Authorship' (*EMLS* 15:i:[2009–10] 41 paras.), Craig attempted to show that stylometry—or as he prefers to call it, computational stylistics—reveals postmodernism to be wrong about authorial individuality: it does not disappear in collaboration, it is not reducible to an effect of period or genre, the ventriloquism of drama does not dissipate it, nor does the use of source materials, nor does the collaborative activity of a playing company. In particular, Masten's influential

book *Textual Intercourse* was wrong to claim that collaboration blends individual authorial style out of existence. Gordon McMullan usefully listed the aspects of early modern play composition that might throw off attribution studies: (i) authors write differently in different genres and at different stages in their careers, (ii) dramatists individualize their characters, (iii) playing is a collaborative art form that disperses authorial agency among the whole company, (iv) individualized writing was not the norm in the period, (v) authors use others' writing as sources, (vi) co-authors blend their styles, and (vii) characters may change during the course of a play. Craig reckons he can show that computational stylistics can meet each of these challenges. He does some function-word-frequency stylometry on known Shakespeare and Fletcher sole-authored plays, and they come out as clearly distinguishable by the numbers. Repeating the analysis for bits of *All Is True* as divided by James Spedding also produces a clear numerical distinction, even when the same character is speaking: Fletcher's Woolsey, Queen Katherine, and King Henry are easily distinguishable from Shakespeare's. What is it about authorship that explains this? Probably the effects of the unconscious, as understood not by Sigmund Freud but by cognitive science. Craig thinks his conclusion is not quite so anti-postmodern as it may seem: we are not re-establishing the Romantic sovereign lone creator but rather showing that within the shared code of language the mind does strive to individuate itself but with a largely unconscious component.

Richard Knowles responds to three of Adele Davidson's essays on Q1 *King Lear* being made by stenography, writing before the appearance of her book reviewed above (in which the same evidence and arguments are used) but published after it; he thinks she is wrong, in his essay 'Shakespeare and Shorthand Once again' (*PBSA* 104[2010] 141–80). He finds that Davidson overstates the amount of stenography going on since some of the aural copying of sermons was undoubtedly longhand not shorthand. The only links with plays are Heywood's two complaints ('coppied onely by the eare' and 'some by Stenography') and Master of the Revels George Buc's remark that brachygraphy enables its user to 'take a Sermon, Oration, Play, or any long speech, as they are spoke < n >, dictated, acted, or vttered'. The first of these ('by the eare') need not indicate stenography but might refer to longhand, and both of Heywood's complaints suggest the kind of mess that a good stenographer would not create; Buc might be referring only to what was possible, not what was done. Davidson can show that some people connected with the theatre took down sermons but not that they did it with shorthand (longhand would do) and not that they did it with plays. The phrase 'taken by charactery' itself, used to describe the copy for some early books, does not necessarily mean shorthand but could also mean longhand. All Davidson has, according to Knowles, is a series of unsurprising coincidences, such as that Willis's *Stenographie* was entered in the Stationers' Register the same day that Thomas Millington transferred to Thomas Pavier his rights to *The Contention of York and Lancaster*, *Richard Duke of York*, and *Titus Andronicus*, and her example of 'to be, or not to be' appearing in Willis's book is not itself proof of a Shakespearian connection since the phrase occurs in other writers' works too, and Knowles lists two of them.

To see how often the terms *charactery*, *brachygraphy*, and *stenography* occur in common usage, Knowles searches EEBO for them, but he mistakenly thinks that he is searching all 120,000 books when in fact he is searching only the TCP subset of around 25,000. In his searches, Knowles finds that *charactery* meant shorthand in only a very few cases, and mainly it just means expressive writing or characterization. *Brachygraphy* does exclusively mean shorthand, but it is not very common until the 1620s, yet part of Davidson's argument is that the new technology was widely known and talked about in the period 1590–1610. The term *stenography* crops up now and again, but never in connection with putting plays into print (except the famous Heywood claim) and not around the time that Shakespeare's quartos were printed. (I have checked Knowles's EEBO-TCP searches on LION and agree with these conclusions.) Davidson does not propose that a stenographer stood in the audience of *King Lear*, writing shorthand notes. She thinks rather that a good manuscript was copied this way, using stenography to be quick and secret. Knowles objects that plays were not a good prospect for publishers—this he thinks Blayney has proved—so they would not bother pirating them. Davidson could well retort that research by Alan Farmer and Zachary Lesser has proved that Blayney understated the popularity of playbooks.

Davidson thinks that the copy for Q1 *King Lear* was a shorthand record made from the authorized promptbook, but since this promptbook would be a clean scribal copy it is hard to see why F (based on the promptbook) has *Reuenge*, which is wrong, whereas Q1 (supposed by Davidson to derive stenographically from the same promptbook) has *Reneag*, which is right. Likewise for F's erroneous *spirits*, *sword*, and *crying* which Q rightly gives as *spurres*, *foord*, and *coying*. These are good evidence and Knowles says that there are 'many other instances like these' (p. 160) but does not list them, which is a shame as they are highly relevant to the problem. The famous aural errors in Q1 such as 'a dogge, so bade in office' for F's 'a Dogg's obey'd in Office' are best explained by poor memory during copying or typesetting and the mislineation in Q1 by an inexperienced compositor, especially as this was Okes's first play. Use of Willis's system of stenography ought to have entirely wrecked the lineation, yet Q1 seems to recover after each slip. Davidson is right that some of the readings in Q1 can plausibly be explained as essentially the F reading put through the mangle of Willis's system, but they can also plausibly be explained in other ways and she has no clinching case that can only be explained by use of Willis's system. Davidson explains by use of Willis's suggestions for abbreviations the Q1 abbreviations that occur within the artificially narrowed measure that D.F. McKenzie and others spotted, but Knowles reckons that spellings in Q1 she attributes to use of Willis's system are in fact known variant spellings of the period.

Knowles explains as compositorial or scribal memory failure the transference of a letter from the end of one word to the beginning of the next, as in *may know/make knowne*, which Davidson explains as something encouraged by Willis's rules for saving letters, which indeed also explains the phenomenon. He finds that a number of the pieces of evidence that Davidson uses for an argument that Q1/F variants are best explained by stenography behind Q1 are imaginary: the words she quotes are not in one or other of the editions.

The rest, he claims, are as easily explained as misreadings of their copy by Q1's compositors as by stenography. In places Davidson's explanations seem to betray a misunderstanding of Willis's system, and Knowles works through her examples showing that the system would not produce the errors she attributes to it. In an appendix Knowles examines the evidence for certain sermons being taken down by shorthand: Davidson assumes that being taken 'by charactery' means shorthand, but it does not. In particular, Davidson misrepresents the leading legal figure Henry Yelverton as a stenographer, which he was not.

In the first of two of his articles published this year, 'The Roberts Memoranda: A Solution' (*RES* 61[2010] 711–28), Michael J. Hirrel argues that stationer James Roberts tried to print several of the Chamberlain's men's plays without the company's permission and they resisted him, once losing and once winning. On a fly-leaf of Register C of the Stationers' Register are two memoranda, the first dated 27 and 29 May 1600 and recording that the Chamberlain's men's plays *A Moral of Cloth Breeches and Velvet Hose* and *A Larum for London* are entered 'To mr Robertes', and the second dated 4 August 1600 recording that *As You Like It*, *Henry 5*, *Every Man in his Humour*, and *Much Ado About Nothing* are 'to be staied'. These memoranda used to be widely interpreted as part of the playing company's attempt to keep its plays out of print, but more recent interpretations by Richard Knowles and Peter Blayney read the memoranda as the Chamberlain's men ensuring that they get to control the publication of their plays. Hirrel's reading, however, is that the Chamberlain's men fought, in the Stationers' Company's Court of Assistants, James Roberts's attempts to register their plays, losing the first time and winning the second. The reason the Stationers' Company clerk Richard Collins wrote the memoranda into the register itself was that he brought it to the court because Roberts wanted to enter the books in it. Hirrel has no direct evidence that these court cases took place, only powerful circumstantial evidence.

Judging by the changes in ink and pen used by Collins, the first case was held on 27 May 1600 and Collins recorded the decision to grant Roberts the right to publish *Cloth Breeches and Velvet Hose* but did not enter the other play, just leaving a blank beside its date '27 May' until Robert returned with copy for *A Larum for London* two days later and then Collins altered '27' to '29' and entered *A Larum for London*. The second case was held on 4 August 1600 when the other memorandum was made, and two of its plays, *Every Man in His Humour* and *Much Ado About Nothing*, were subsequently entered into the Stationers' Register, the first to Cuthbert Burby and Walter Burre on 14 August and the second to Andrew Wise and William Aspley on 23 August. Why should we suppose the memoranda relate to court proceedings? Because 4 August 1600 was the first Monday of the month, which was when the Court of Assistants routinely sat, which is unlikely to be coincidence, although as Hirrel admits 27 May 1600 was not a first Monday. Also, in the first memorandum the word 'Entred' is not aligned with the preceding words 'my lord chamberlens mens plaies' so it was not written in until later: Collins wrote the latter as a heading (as the case started) and then added 'Entred' as the verdict. Likewise he wrote down the two plays' names *A Moral of Cloth Breeches and Velvet Hose* and *A Larum for London* first and then wrote to their

left (and misaligned) the date and that they were given 'To mr Robertes' as the verdict. Misalignment in the second memorandum suggests that Collins wrote the date '4 Augusti' and the names of the first two plays *As You Like It* and *Henry 5*, and only later added *Every Man in His Humour* and *Much Ado About Nothing* and then bracketed all four and added 'to be staied'. The final reason to suppose these fly-leaf memoranda relate to proceedings in the Court of Assistants is that Roberts's permitted Stationers' Register entry of *Troilus and Cressida* on 7 February 1603 is explicitly recorded as a court decision.

We can be sure that it was the Chamberlain's men that were fighting Roberts because in each case the plays were theirs and no other stationer is named, and unusually the playing company is named in the memorandum. (Normally the Stationers' Company would not care about the source of a manuscript, only the possession of it.) Furthermore the preliminaries to the *Troilus and Cressida* edition of 1609 actually refer to its getting into print despite 'the grand possessors wills'. Roberts's Stationers' Register entry for *The Merchant of Venice* on 22 July 1598 requires him to get 'lycence' from the Lord Chamberlain himself before printing it, so the playing company patron was clearly protecting his players' interests, or at least they were using his name to do so. How did Roberts get these manuscripts that the playing company did not want him to have? Hirrel speculates that in the move from the Curtain to the Globe playhouse in the summer of 1599 these manuscripts were stolen by a courier. The playing company had constant recourse to Roberts because he held the monopoly on printing playbills and Hirrel reckons their courier offered him the plays. Getting the manuscripts back would not stop Roberts publishing the plays if he had time to get them copied, so the players went straight to the Stationers' Company to stop him, claiming that the manuscripts were not his property and hence could not be legitimately registered or published by him. Since the courier would have been authorized to transact some of the players' business (in respect of playbills) it would be a nice legal question whether Roberts got good title to the play manuscripts by reasonably assuming that the courier had the right to sell them. Thus it is plausible that the first case (recorded in the first memorandum) went in Roberts's favour and the second (recorded in the second memorandum) went against him; most likely because the first case meant he could no longer claim to be unaware that couriers were not authorized to sell playscripts they were carrying.

How come the Chamberlain's men did not object to *Every Man in His Humour* and *Much Ado About Nothing* being registered to other stationers shortly thereafter and printed, apparently from authorial papers and so presumably provided by the players? Hirrel rejects Blayney's idea that publication was a form of promotion for revivals, on the grounds that even if the performance and publishing schedules could be co-ordinated the entire readership of an edition would not fill the Globe for one performance. Good point. The key is the apparently later addition of *Every Man in His Humour* and *Much Ado About Nothing* to the staying order (to judge by their different slope as writing): these needed further discussion in the court because Roberts had had time to get them copied and although he had to return the original stolen manuscripts to the players he had a legal right to publish his copies of

them. The fix that the Stationers' Company and the players came up with was to get other stationers to register *Every Man in His Humour* and *Much Ado About Nothing* and print them, thus frustrating Roberts of any profit from his actions. If Hirrel's account of antagonism between the Chamberlain's men and Roberts is correct, then the usual story that Roberts registered *Hamlet* in 1602 at their behest (to block other stationers publishing it) cannot be right, and the manuscript he registered cannot have been a good one originating with the company. Hirrel reckons that Roberts registered the manuscript that went on to be printed as Q1 *Hamlet* and then sold the right to publish the play to Nicholas Ling and John Trundle—we know Ling got the right as he transferred it to John Smethwick in 1607—who then published Q1. Part of the deal was that Roberts would have the right to be used by Ling as the printer for any subsequent edition, as indeed he was when Ling published Q2 *Hamlet* in 1604–5. Roberts did not exercise his right to print Q1 *Hamlet*, and Valentine Simmes got the job. Why would Roberts as printer not want to print Q1 but want to print Q2? Because printers got paid by the length of the book, and Q2 is much longer than Q1.

Hirrel's second article this year, 'Duration of Performances and Lengths of Plays: How Shall we Beguile the Lazy Time?' (*SQ* 61[2010] 159–82), argues that playing companies allowed four hours for a theatrical entertainment, only some of which (a variable amount) was set aside for the play and the rest filled with other entertainments. Thus the idea that Shakespeare and Jonson's long plays (those over 3,000 lines) were unperformable—as argued by Erne amongst others—is mistaken: they cut the non-dramatic entertainments to make time. Hirrel begins by deciding that Alfred Hart's approximation that players spoke around twenty lines a minute is about right, to judge by what modern actors at the American Shakespeare Center in Staunton Virginia can do. Before the mid-1590s, performances began after evening prayers (occurring at 2–3.30 p.m.) and ended between 7.30 and 8 p.m., giving a good four hours' performance time. Around the mid-1590s performances started to begin at 2 p.m., despite the encroachment upon evening prayers, presumably because it cut down night-time disturbances associated with playing. Thomas Platter mentions plays starting around 2 p.m. and Dekker writes that after the midday meal gallants go to plays. Before the play there could be up to an hour of pre-entertainment. Hirrel cites other miscellaneous evidence for 2–6 p.m. playing, including the real-time references in *The Tempest*, although he acknowledges that Henry Carey's letter to the Lord Mayor asking for the Chamberlain's men to be allowed to play at the Cross Keys promises that they will run from 2 p.m. to 4–5 p.m. The use of cresset lights at outdoor theatres suggests playing into the late afternoon after sundown. Just as we tend to say that cinema films last two hours—Hirrel has examples from newspapers—although they actually range from one-and-a-half to four hours, so the early modern claim about two hours' traffic should not be taken literally.

Hirrel finds that Hart and Erne were wrong to claim that Jonson and Shakespeare were exceptional in writing plays over 3,000 lines long. Here Hirrel's evidence is weak since he finds seven other examples of long plays but admits that Jonson and Shakespeare wrote eleven such long plays each. Hirrel

asks why, if Shakespeare wrote the extra lines for print, had he no discernible hand in getting them printed? The eighteen play manuscripts used in the theatres—Hirrel relies on William B. Long's identification of these—include plays up to 2,910 lines long. Hirrel seems to find this confirmatory of his position, but since none reaches 3,000 lines I would have thought this confirms Hart and Erne's position. On the other hand, the 318 lines of additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*, called for by the actors, took it to 3,143 lines. Hirrel lists the contemporary references to plays lasting three hours and supposes that to accommodate the longer plays the other entertainments filling the time were proportionally cut. This other matter was the music and 'tumbling, juggling, rope and sword dancing, singing, clowning, and contests of wit' (p. 176), which could happen before and/or after the play.

On the subject of Shakespeare's interest in print, touched upon by Hirrel, E.A.J. Honigmann believes that the 1623 Folio was quite possibly Shakespeare's own idea, in 'How Happy Was Shakespeare with the Printed Versions of His Plays?' (*MLR* 105[2010] 937–51). Compared to other similar projects, the Shakespeare Folio consortium left it rather late to make the necessary Stationers' Register entries, registering the plays on 8 November 1623 although printing had begun in 1622. Honigmann takes this as a sign that 'the syndicate may have been in some confusion as to what had been done and what still needed to be done' (p. 938), which confusion might also be witnessed in the stop-start nature of the printing itself. By contrast, Jonson seems to have taken from 1612 to 1616 to get his folio copy ready, to judge from the fact that nothing in it can be dated later than 1612 and there are no allusions in it to events after 1612. Honigmann sticks to the old fight-with-the-pirates line: the bad quartos are bad (including bad for the author's reputation), and the claim on the good quartos' title pages to be newly corrected shows a desire to improve on their predecessors. He takes the same line as Vickers (whom he does not mention) on the moral rights of authors being acknowledged in the period. Honigmann reckons that Shakespeare and his fellows kept the pirates at bay until 1609, when three piracies appeared: *Pericles*, *Sonnets*, and *Troilus and Cressida*. In 1608 *King Lear* appeared, and Stationers' Register entries were made for *Pericles* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, which Honigmann thinks Shakespeare would have tried to stop had his attention not been distracted by the need to attend to affairs in Stratford-upon-Avon arising from the death of his mother. Of course there were piracies before then, indeed one 'almost every year' (p. 941), since Honigmann now starts counting good quartos as essentially unauthorized. But there were none from 1610 to Shakespeare's death.

Honigmann wonders if the key figure in protecting Shakespeare's output from piracy was William Herbert, Lord Pembroke, perhaps the young man of the sonnets, which could help explain the sonnets' dedication to 'W.H.', their being left out of the Folio, and why the Folio was not titled *The Works of...* (that is, because the poems had to be left out). Honigmann reckons that Shakespeare resolved to spend his last years readying copy for a collected works edition, as evidenced by his cracking down on pirates after 1609 and his buying the Blackfriars Gatehouse on 10 March 1613, which put him near the printers as he had to be since the company would not let him take the

manuscripts away to Stratford. It would behove Shakespeare to suppress quartos while trying to get a stationer (or group of them) interested in publishing his collected works. The gestation of the Folio might have been prolonged by the distractions of Burbage's death in 'March 1618'—1619 by modern reckoning—and the Pavier quartos appearing in 1619. In an interlined addition to his will, Shakespeare paid for rings for Heminges, Condell, and Richard Burbage—but not Cuthbert Burbage, we notice—perhaps because they were taking on the grand task of the collected works he envisaged. The first of his badly printed plays that Shakespeare sought to have replaced with a good text was *Love's Labour's Lost*, and Honigmann thinks that it was special to him because it was written for Ferdinando Strange (king of Man), hence the play's Ferdinand, it was written for a sophisticated audience (Q1 says it was performed for the queen), it has allusions to 'strangers' and it has a French king Navarre whose relationship to France is like the king of Man's relationship to England. Thus a bad quarto of *Love's Labour's Lost* was intolerable to its author. Shakespeare collaborated in 1612–13 because he was already getting ill and he set his mind to a collected works. Thus F is rather 'more 'authorized' than previous generations have dared to think possible' (p. 951).

Emma Smith finds that editors of *Richard II* (perhaps unconsciously) resist the transfer of power in the play by including the deposition scene and in their choices of speech prefixes for Richard and Bolingbroke, in her essay '*Richard II's Yorkist Editors*' (*ShS* 63[2010] 37–48). *Richard II* was joint equal in print popularity with *1 Henry IV*, getting five quarto editions. Everyone agrees that Q1 is very good, yet no editor uses it exclusively: they always import the deposition scene (which first appeared in Q4) using its appearance in F. Editors frequently describe Q1 as a censored and therefore less radical text, but Smith thinks it is the more radical because Richard is shown to be deposed without having publicly given in. Part of the problem, Smith diagnoses, is that we call it the deposition scene (suggesting something improper) whereas Q4 that introduced it called it the 'Parliament Sceane' (suggesting a democratic victory). I would have thought that since the Q4 title page refers to itself as being made 'With new additions of the Parliament Sceane, and the deposing of King Richard' the label 'deposition scene' is not unreasonable.

Smith tracks the speech-prefix and stage-direction forms of the names for Richard and Bolingbroke to see if it is clear just when one ceases to be king and the other starts, and finds Q1 shuffling its feet on the matter. In particular, Q1 uses the speech prefix '*King H.*' which implicitly acknowledges the problem that in practice the supposedly unitary state of kingship (there can only be one at a time) fails to live up to the theory: Richard and Henry are both kings and deposition is a process not an instantaneous event. For Smith the fact that '*King X.*' occurs in no other early edition of a play by Shakespeare is significant, although she might be reading too much into this. Speech prefixes are not authorized in the way that dialogue is and the convention is not entirely unknown: *Mucedorus* has '*King A.*' twice and '*King V.*' once (in the 1610 edition), albeit of course to distinguish kings of different places not rival kings of one place. Smith tracks what certain editors have done about these problems—does kingship fly instantaneously from one man to another? can two men be king at the same time? can there be an interregnum?—and in their

responses she diagnoses their attitudes towards kingship. This seems a little unfair, since if they are being scrupulous editors their responses might reflect only their sense of the play's attitudes towards kingship, not their own. In general she finds editors to be on Richard's side, keeping him king until the end and not acknowledging Bolingbroke's legitimacy.

Tom Reedy provides further reasons to suppose that the Strachey letter (a source for *The Tempest*) was written in Virginia and sent to London in July 1610, and not (as anti-Stratfordians think) a plagiarized account written later in London, in his article 'Dating William Strachey's "A True Reportory of the Wracke and Redemption of Sir Thomas Gates": A Comparative Textual Study' (*RES* 61[2010] 529–52). In an article reviewed in *YWES* 88[2009], Roger Stritmatter and Lynne Kositsky claimed that Strachey's letter draws on the anonymous pamphlet *A True Declaration of the Estate of the Colony in Virginia* published by the Virginia Company in November 1610, but Reedy shows that the direction has to be Strachey > *True Declaration*. He also refutes their contention that Strachey drew on John Smith's *Map of Virginia* published in 1612. At the end of the published version of the Strachey letter is an extract from *True Declaration*, but it is introduced in such a way that it was obviously not (as Stritmatter and Kositsky claim it was) present in the manuscript of Strachey's letter: Strachey clearly signs off and then the compiler of the published version steps in and excerpts *True Declaration* to continue the story. The clincher is that the draft of the Strachey letter (found in Bermuda in 1983) reads 'how willing they were to make the greatest exertions, though almost drowning amidst them' while the published version of the letter reads 'how mutually willing they were yet by labor to keep each other from drowning, albeit each one drowned whilst he labored', while *True Declaration* reads 'those which labored to keep others from drowning were half-drowned themselves in laboring'. As Reedy points out, the description gets improved in each of these readings, becoming fine anti-metabole as it moves from draft to final letter to *True Declaration*. Thus clearly *True Declaration* was copying Strachey: 'It is very doubtful Strachey would have marred such a figure [the anti-metabole] had he been copying *True Declaration*' (p. 539).

Comparing Strachey's account with the official version of events in *True Declaration*, Reedy finds Strachey disagreeing with the Virginia Company account that the Indians killed the colonists' animals, which Strachey would hardly do if he were writing after publication of (and copying from) *True Declaration* since he wanted 'to ingratiate himself with the Company to advance his career' (p. 542). Rather, the company was distorting his account to stigmatize the Indians. Repeatedly, Strachey gives detail not in *True Declaration*, so he was not copying it, and as an eyewitness to the events did not need to. Stritmatter and Kositsky's claims of Strachey plagiarizing Smith's *Map of Virginia* are likewise exploded. Reedy reinforces Alden T. Vaughan's refutation (reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011]) of Stritmatter and Kositsky's claim that because Sir Thomas Gates is said by Strachey to be 'now bound for England' Gates cannot himself have carried the Strachey letter back to England, pointing out that *bound* does not mean he has already left but that he is prepared to.

Carol Chillington Rutter, in her essay ‘Unpinning Desdemona (Again) or “Who Would be Toll’d with Wenches in a Shew”?’ (*ShakB* 28:i[2010] 111–32), thinks that Denise Walen—in an article reviewed in *YWES* 88[2009]—is wrong and that the 1622 quarto of *Othello* does not show the play as cut for performances at the Blackfriars theatre, at least not in its scene of Desdemona undressing. Walen argued that the fifty Folio-only lines in *Othello* IV.iii, the unpinning of Desdemona, were in the original Globe performances but were cut for performance at the Blackfriars because the act interval after IV.iii made them unnecessary and that Q reflects this revised text. Rutter undertook practical experiments in unpinning an actor that she thinks show this to be false. Shakespeare wanted the undressing of Desdemona done quickly, since Othello demands it (‘Get you to, o’the instant’) and Desdemona lets Emilia know of the urgency. Using practitioners from the Globe replica theatre in London, Rutter tested Walen’s idea using original clothing. They found that neither Q nor F gives enough time for the unpinning of Desdemona if it is done as original clothing demanded: they must have used theatrical short-cuts and even then there is not enough time. Thus Rutter concludes that neither Q nor F is what Shakespeare wrote nor is performable by original practices.

Edmund G.C. King, in ‘Fragmenting Authorship in the Eighteenth-Century Shakespeare Edition’ (*Shakespeare* 6[2010] 1–19), finds that eighteenth-century editors were alert to what modern theatre historians tell us happened to a playscript in the theatre—it was fragmented and then reconstituted—and that their deprecation of this is reflected in their editions where they distinguish what was Shakespeare’s from what was the actors’. Johnson held that the texts of Shakespeare’s plays were fragmentary, but New Bibliographers overturned this to argue that they were essentially whole. King shows that eighteenth-century editors anticipated the work of Stern in understanding from dramatic practice that plays got split apart and reassembled in a different way in the theatre. Pope, Theobald, George Steevens, Capell, and Johnson all had close connections to the theatre, and were clear on this fragmentation being a bad thing. For them, the ‘whole’ falsely offered in the Folio had to be smashed apart to find the Shakespearian nuggets, and these had editorially to be cemented back together. Knowledge of their own period’s theatre practices encouraged eighteenth-century editors to suspect prologues, epilogues, and songs of not really belonging with the rest of the play, and to suspect other bits they did not like—such as the ghost visions in *Cymbeline*—of being interpolations. King calls this use of the theatre of their own time ‘a resolutely *presentist*’ (p. 13) mode of theatre history.

In a similar vein, J. Gavin Paul surveys how eighteenth-century editions tried to get onto the page some sense of the plays as (potentially) staged, using pictures and punctuation, most notably in Capell’s complex system of symbols marking changes of addressee, gesture, and even irony, in ‘Performance as “Punctuation”’: Editing Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century’ (*RES* 61[2010] 390–413). From a comparison of Shakespeare’s relatively incomplete stage directions with those given by twentieth-century over-specifiers such as G.B. Shaw (in his own plays) and Kenneth Branagh (in his published screenplay of his film of *Hamlet*), Philip Parry concludes that editors have in general been too prescriptive, and he gives some examples of how he would leave the players

more latitude, in 'Minding the Gap: Shakespeare and the Modern Editor' (*FMLS* 46:ii[2010] 166–88). Carl D. Atkins thinks he has solved a crux in *Measure for Measure* in 'Spiders' Strings and Ponderous Things: Solving a Crux in *Measure for Measure*' (*SP* 107[2010] 360–5). The crux is in the Duke's speech at the end of the third act, which in F reads 'How may likenesse made in crimes, | Making practise on the Times, | To draw with ydle Spiders strings | Most ponderous and substantiall things?'. Atkins surveys all the proposed emendations and their associated explanations and finds them wanting. His fix is to suppose that the compositor left out the *n* in *many* to set *may* and screwed up the punctuation, so it should read: 'How many likenesse made in crimes, | Making practise on the Times? | To draw with ydle Spiders strings | Most ponderous and substantiall things, | Craft against vice, I must applie'. That is, the second couplet was not complete on its own (as F's punctuation suggested it was) and needed to be completed by the next line in F. The word *likenesse* as a plural is acceptable in the period, and the solution eliminates the difficulty of the spiders' strings being Angelo's acts. Rather, the spiders' strings are the duke's machinations (mainly the bed-trick), being insubstantial things that will bring in the ponderous and substantial crimes of Angelo.

Meredith Skura traces the loose parallels between the anonymous *King Leir* and several of Shakespeare's plays in 'What Shakespeare Did with the Queen's Men's *King Leir* and When' (*ShS* 63[2010] 316–25). Like Forker (reviewed above), Skura wrongly thinks that the cumulative effect of insignificant things is significant: 'Not all the parallels proposed here between Shakespeare's and the Queen's Men's plays will satisfy a soul hot for certainties. But together the mass of plausible connections is impressive' (p. 325). Richard Hillman finds some parallels between *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and a French dramatic comedy published in 1594 in his essay '*A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *La Diane* of Nicolas de Montreux' (*RES* 61[2010] 34–54). The links are thematic—responses to reversals of affection and in particular Helena's disbelief that she is beloved—rather than verbal. Also using literary criticism rather than hard numbers, MacDonald P. Jackson argues that Shakespeare wrote at least a substantial part of the anonymous *Arden of Faversham* in 'Parallels and Poetry: Shakespeare, Kyd, and *Arden of Faversham*' (*MRDE* 23[2010] 17–33).

And so to the round-up from *Notes and Queries*. John Klause finds that the methodology of rhyme comparisons that Jackson used to attribute the first two acts of *Pericles* to George Wilkins is faulty, in his note 'Rhyme and the Authorship of *Pericles*' (*N&Q* 57[2010] 395–400). Klause takes issue with how Jackson's *Defining Shakespeare* (reviewed *YWES* 84[2005]) counted the links: if a rhyme occurs three times in Play A and five times in Play B, Jackson called that fifteen links, as he would if it occurred once in Play A and fifteen times in Play B. Because multiple uses of one rhyme have this effect in Jackson's methodology, just two rhymes—*ill/will* and *life/wife*—account for thirty of the fifty-eight rhyming links between *Pericles* Acts I and II and Wilkins's *Miseries of Enforced Marriage*. If we count each rhyme just once no matter how many times it is repeated, Wilkins's rhyming habits do not dominate in *Pericles* Acts I and II. Klause looks at other ways of counting, such as focusing on rhymes used more than once in both texts, and finds that *Pericles* Acts I and II are as

much like *The Rape of Lucrece* as they are *Miseries*. Klause counted the number of rhymes in *Pericles* Acts I and II that also occur in known Shakespeare work and the number of rhymes in *Pericles* Acts III, IV, and V that do, and found that the first two acts have more shared rhymes (counted once each) with known Shakespeare than the last three do. Perhaps, he reasons, rhymes do not tell us anything reliable at all.

Jackson's method did show some stark differences between *Pericles* Acts I and II and Acts III, IV, and V, but he did not undertake exhaustive searches for who might be Shakespeare's co-author, focusing instead solely on Wilkins. Klause repeats Jackson's methodology but bringing in Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon* for comparison, and Dekker comes out much like Wilkins and much like *Pericles* Acts I and II, while Acts III, IV, and V are markedly different. Until we know all the major dramatists' rhyming habits, all we can say is that the first two acts of *Pericles* are not by Shakespeare, not that they definitely are by Wilkins. The standard retort would be that Wilkins is the prime suspect because of his publication of the same story at the same time, but as we shall see, that is not quite so well established a fact as is usually thought. Klause thinks that when measuring near-rhymes (such as *him/sin*) Jackson's source David J. Lake missed a lot and that in fact by this measure the first two acts of *Pericles* look as Shakespearian as last three. Klause also finds fault with Jackson's claims from LION searching that a couple of rhymes—*consist/resist* and *impudence/offence*—are rare: Klause offers ten and nine examples respectively, although he has to go up to the year 1660 to produce the latter's list. Klause is not disputing the core conclusion that Wilkins wrote *Pericles* Acts I and II, just the use of rhyme in Jackson's argument that he did.

Joseph A. Dane wonders if perhaps Wilkins is not the author of the 1608 prose novella *The Painful Adventures of Pericles, Prince of Tyre* in 'Bibliographical Note on George Wilkins, [Author] of the *Pericles*' (*N&Q* 57[2010] 401–3). There survive just two exemplars of *Painful Adventures*, one in the British Library and the other in Zurich. Neither identifies Wilkins as the author on its title page, and the only thing linking him to the book is a dedication signed by him that appears only in the Zurich exemplar. The British Library exemplar has a regular gathering A with the main text starting on A4^r while the Zurich exemplar has an extra leaf-pair (bifolium) inserted (in fact, quired) so that the extra leaf 'a' (holding the two-page dedicatory letter) appears between A1 and A2 and its unsigned blank conjugate appears between A3 and A4. Since the main text begins on A4^r, this book cannot have been made by the common method of starting with sheet B and leaving the preliminaries that will appear on sheet A to be printed at the end of the print run. Rather the preliminaries were printed along with the beginning of the main text at the start of the print run. But was the extra bifolium added to make the Zurich exemplar or removed to make the BL exemplar? The Zurich exemplar does not seem to be a presentation copy (which might justify a one-off insertion) since it was within a decade bound into a *Sammelband* of texts of or about drama. The bifolium is made from the same paper as the final half-sheet K1-2 so it was quite likely printed with it, and its type is the same as the title page's subtitle.

Thus it seems that the dedicatory letter was an afterthought that occurred during the print run. Thus we do not know for sure that Wilkins wrote the pamphlet, Dane concludes. Dane does not mention explicitly the relevant fact that the nature of the bifolium's insertion—its being placed between A1 and A2 and between A3 and A4, resulting in pointlessly leaving a blank leaf between A3 and A4—indicates that it was present before binding took place; it was not added to an already bound exemplar. If he is correct to suspect that Wilkins did not write the book, this means that whoever had that dedicatory letter inserted was trying to deceive us, or was himself deceived. Usually we trust that books do not lie about their authorship unless we have evidence for lying, and it was still quite possible in 1608 to publish a play, or spin-off from a play, without putting the author's name on the title page.

Arthur Sherbo, in 'Shakespeare's Legal Language' (*N&Q* 57[2010] 112–18), goes through the Boswell–Malone *Complete Works* of 1821 finding moments when explanatory notes highlight legal ideas and terminology that he thinks not properly handled in Mary Sokol and B.J. Sokol's Athlone *Shakespeare Dictionary of Legal Language*. Richard M. Waugaman, in 'Psalm Echoes in Shakespeare's *1 Henry VI*, *Richard II*, and *Edward III*' (*N&Q* 57[2010] 359–64), repeats and extends the claim he made last year that Thomas Sternhold and John Hopkins's *The Whole Book of Psalms* was a source for Shakespeare. There are indeed paralleled words and phrases but Waugaman makes no attempt to show that they were not just part of a shared vocabulary amongst the period's writers. He also seems unaware that his finding allusions to the same source right across *1 Henry VI* undermines his claim that the allusions are a marker of Shakespeare's authorship, since there is plenty of independent evidence that this play is a collaborative work.

Implicitly contradicting the work of Elliott and Valenza reviewed above, Thomas Merriam, in his note 'An Injustice More Than Secular' (*N&Q* 57[2010] 364–6), offers reasons for supposing that Shakespeare had a hand in *Sir Thomas More* outside the parts usually given to him, to judge from unusual phrases occurring in Folio 2 *Henry VI* and *Sir Thomas More*. Building on an argument he made last year, Merriam shows that there are phrases in a bit of definitely Shakespearian writing, 2 *Henry VI* IV.vii.58–172, that occur across *Sir Thomas More*, leading to the conclusion that Shakespeare had contributed more than just the Hand D + Addition III material. *Sir Thomas More* has 'learned clerks' at viii.29, 'fly... to heaven' at xvii.113, cap flinging and repeated 'God save the king' at vii.151–75, 'a God's name go' at xii.27 and 'here pronounce free pardon... them all' at vii.151. Merriam subjects none of these to the necessary negative test to see how common they were in others' writing. A search on LION for 'learned clerks' in publications before 1650 shows three dozen, some before and some after Shakespeare's time. Likewise 'fly... heaven' is common, with more than two dozen occurrences. 'God's name go' is, however, unparalleled outside 2 *Henry VI* and *Sir Thomas More*, and so is 'hear pronounce free pardon'. (In my searches the 'variant spellings' and 'variant forms' options were switched on and rather than looking for the whole strings the various words were hunted wherever they appeared within a few words of one another.) In an abrupt switch of topic, the second half of Merriam's note tries to show that the '*Impropria* or Reproaches traditionally

sung in Latin at the Good Friday celebration of the Passion of Christ' (p. 365) are echoed across Shakespeare in moments from *Richard III*, *Othello*, *Pericles*, *All Is True*, and *2 Henry VI* but not *Sir Thomas More*.

Manabu Tsuruta has a possible new source for *The Merchant of Venice* in "The Benefit of Contentation": A Possible Source for *The Merchant of Venice* (*N&Q* 57[2010] 366–7). The year before he printed *The Merchant of Venice* for Thomas Heyes in 1600, James Roberts printed a sermon by Henry Smith called *The Benefit of Contentation* (that is, contentment) for Nicholas Ling. Tsuruta finds parallels between it and *The Merchant of Venice*: the idea of being satisfied with enough (which a usurious miser never is), the comparison of such a person to a ravenous wolf, the repetitions of the word *content* in the play, and the collocation of *cottage* and *palace* in Portia's speech about preachers following their own precepts (in I.ii), which two words also collocate in the preacher Smith's sermon. On the same play, B.J. Sokol, in 'Inverted Biblical and Religious References and Shylock's Word "Suffrance" in *The Merchant of Venice*' (*N&Q* 57[2010] 368–72, thinks that early audiences would have spotted that Shylock does not follow his own religion's teachings, so he is a bad Jew rather than simply bad because a Jew. Audience members acquainted with the Hebrew Bible (as many must have been) would spot that Shylock's argument about copying the Christians in taking revenge (in III.i) is in direct contradiction to the teachings of his religion, which calls for suffering wrongs patiently. They would also notice that his arguments about the treatment of slaves in the courtroom scene—why not free them? marry them to your daughters? feed them as well as you feed yourselves?—are in direct contradiction to the Old Testament injunctions to free slaves, to not disdain marrying them to your children, and to feed them as you feed yourself. Herbert W. Benario thinks that Shakespeare's *Henry V* was influenced by his reading of Tacitus, either in the Latin original or in the English translations of the 1590s, in his note 'Tacitus, Germanicus, and *Henry V*' (*N&Q* 57[2010] 372–3). In particular, King Harry is like Germanicus in walking among his men the night before a battle, and there is an attempted bribe to undermine morale in both; these are fairly loose connections, of course.

V.L. Forsyth, in 'Shakespeare's Italian Forest of Arden' (*N&Q* 57[2010] 373–6), asks the interesting question of why Shakespeare chose Arden/Ardennes as the location for most of *As You Like It*, eschewing the obvious answer that he found it in the play's main source, Thomas Lodge's *Rosalynde*. Instead Forsyth identifies Matteo Maria Boiardo's Italian romance epic *Orlando Innamorato*, which among the various works depicting the forest of Arden/Ardennes was the first to give it the 'romantic and mysterious overtones' it has in *As You Like It*. Only in Boiardo, Forsyth reasons, would Shakespeare find that this forest makes people irrationally and suddenly fall in love or change their entire personality. Sarah Dewar-Watson, in 'Othello, Virgil, and Montaigne' (*N&Q* 57[2010] 384–5), notices that Othello's speech to the Senate in I.iii uses the phrase 'antres vast' that occurs also in Virgil's *Aeneid* III, which refers to cannibals (as does Othello), and that Michel de Montaigne's essay 'Of the Cannibals' uses a bit of *The Aeneid* III as a headnote. Dewar-Watson sees what she calls the 'Montaigne–Virgil–cannibalism' link of *The Tempest* also occurring earlier in

Shakespeare's career. Perhaps Shakespeare read Montaigne in French, or there were English translations circulating.

Colin Burrow, in 'Spreading Lies in *Cymbeline* III.iv.32–9' (*N&Q* 57[2010] 403–4), points out that in *Cymbeline* Pisanio says that slander 'doth belie | All corners of the world' and it is not clear what *belie* means since its object here is the corners of the world rather than the person or thing being lied about. Burrow notices that Shakespeare liked to coin words prefixed with *be-* to indicate defilement: *besmirch* in *Hamlet*, *besmear* in several works, *bespice* in *The Winter's Tale*, and hence *belie* means to make filthy with lying, and that can apply to the world's corners. When in *The Winter's Tale* Camillo says to Florizel 'For instance sir, | That you may know you shall not want—one word' he means by *instance* not *example* but *proof*; at least, observes Giles Monsarrat in 'Shakespeare's Use of "For Instance"' (*N&Q* 57[2010] 404–5); that is how John Ford used it. Kenji Go, 'Biblical Echoes in the "Roar" of "Lions" in *The Tempest*, II.i.313–14' (*N&Q* 57[2010] 405–8), asks why in *The Tempest* Sebastian and Antonio say, as they are caught with their swords drawn over the just-wakened Alonso and Gonzalo, that they heard the roar of lions. The answer is that in the book of Proverbs and in the *Homily Against Disobedience* roaring lions are associated with royal displeasure, and hence there is irony in Sebastian and Antonio thinking of roaring lions to cover their failed regicide. Go does not mention it, but I suppose we might even see Freudian parapraxis in their guiltily blurted excuse. King James, in a passage in *Basilicon Doron* [1599, 1603] just after the one telling his son not to over-indulge in the liberal arts (as Prospero does), likens the king's wrath to the roaring of lions using a quotation from the book of Proverbs. Go finds the roaring lions image elsewhere in religious texts that Elizabethans and Jacobeans would have been familiar with, not least from oral recital at church, although it as often stood for the devil as for the king's wrath.

2. Shakespeare in the Theatre

In *The Winter's Tale: Shakespeare in Performance*, Judith Dunbar analyses eight key productions of the play, from Granville Barker's 1912 Savoy production to Declan Donnellan's Maly Drama Theatre version of 1997. Suffixed to this is an additional chapter by Carol Chillington Rutter, who considers a further eight productions staged between 1999 and 2006. The effect is a little unbalanced since discussion of the first eight productions occupies over 200 pages while that of the latter eight fills just thirty. Dunbar contends that the trend over the course of the twentieth century has been away from the Victorian pictorial style and a corresponding concentration on the play's political dimensions, not least in terms of a 'rethinking of the women's roles' (p. 2). While the shift from elaborate pictorialism to simplicity is in no way limited to stagings of this play, it has had the effect of emphasizing the explicit theatricality of *The Winter's Tale* specifically and the late plays more generally. This theatricality is characterized by 'rapid juxtapositions, mingled tones, evocations of wonder, and variations in aesthetic distance' (p. 13). Dunbar contends that the play's early performances must have aroused memories of

gender, she argues that children's versions of *The Tempest* depict Shakespeare as 'a model of (masculine) future authority but (feminine) future limitation' (p. 188). With her aim to make such constructions visible, she concludes: 'I look forward to a text which combines feminine autonomy *with* the cultural capital of Shakespeare' (p. 186). Hateley's argument is an important one, pointing to the continued need for politically motivated Shakespeare criticism and critical attention to the implications of Shakespeare's cultural capital.

Books Reviewed

- Albanese, Denise. *Extramural Shakespeare*. PalMac. [2010] pp. xiii + 181. £50 ISBN 9 7802 3010 5133.
- Armitage, David, Conal Condren, and Andrew Fitzmaurice, eds. *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought*. CUP. [2009] pp. 302. £59 ISBN 9 7805 2176 8085.
- Baker, David J. *On Demand: Writing for the Market in Early Modern England*. StanfordUP. [2010] pp. 224. £48.95 ISBN 9 7808 0473 8569.
- Batson, Beatrice, ed. *Word and Rite: The Bible and Ceremony in Selected Shakespearean Works*. CambridgeSP. [2010] pp. 199. £34.99 ISBN 9 7814 4382 2251.
- Berns, Ute, ed. *Solo Performances: Staging the Early Modern Self in England*. Rodopi. [2010] pp. 272. pb €54 ISBN 9 7890 4202 9521.
- Bevington, David. *Shakespeare and Biography*. OUP. [2010] pp. 179. £27 ISBN 9 7801 9958 6486.
- Brie, Steve, and William T. Rossiter, eds. *Literature and Ethics: From the Green Knight to the Dark Knight*. CambridgeSP. [2010] pp. 230. \$59.99 (£39.99) ISBN 9 7814 4382 2886.
- Brooks, Douglas A., and Lingui Yang, eds. *Shakespeare Yearbook: Shakespeare and Asia 17*. Mellen. [2010] pp. 556. \$139.95 ISBN 9 7807 7343 7265.
- Brown, Guy Story. *Shakespeare's Philosopher King: Reading the Tragedy of King Lear*. MercerUP. [2010] pp. 373. \$45 (£39.95) ISBN 9 7808 8146 1855.
- Buccola, Regina, ed. *A Midsummer Night's Dream: A Critical Guide*. Continuum. [2010] pp. xii + 212. £17.99 ISBN 9 7818 4706 1362.
- Chalk, Darryl, and Laurie Johnson, eds. 'Rapt in Secret Studies': *Emerging Shakespeares*. CambridgeSP. [2010] pp. 395. £44.99 ISBN 9 7814 4382 3289.
- Coursen, H.R. *Contemporary Shakespeare Production*. Lang. [2010] pp. xxi + 206. \$74.95 ISBN 9 7814 3310 9249.
- Davidson, Adele. *Shakespeare in Shorthand: The Textual Mystery of King Lear*. UDelP. [2009] pp. 324. £57.95 ISBN 9 7808 7413 0478.
- Del Sapio Garbero, Maria, Nancy Isenberg, and Maddalena Pennacchia, eds. *Questioning Bodies in Shakespeare's Rome*. V&R. [2010] pp. 388. €53.90 ISBN 9 7838 9971 7402.
- Diede, Martha Kalnin. *Shakespeare's Knowledgeable Body*. Lang. [2008] pp. 176. £42.97 ISBN 9 7814 3310 1335.

- Drakakis, John, ed. *The Merchant of Venice*. ArdenS. Methuen. [2010] pp. 400. £9.99 ISBN 9 7819 0343 6813.
- Dunbar, Judith. *The Winter's Tale: Shakespeare in Performance*. ManUP. [2010] pp. xxi + 298. £50.59 ISBN 9 7807 1902 7413.
- Dymkowski, Christine, and Christie Carson, eds. *Shakespeare in Stages*. CUP. [2010] pp. 324. £58 ISBN 9 7805 2188 4792.
- Egan, Gabriel. *The Struggle for Shakespeare's Text: Twentieth-Century Editorial Theory and Practice*. CUP. [2010] pp. 332. £58 ISBN 9 7805 2188 9179.
- Falocco, Joe. *Reimagining Shakespeare's Playhouse: Early Modern Staging Conventions in the Twentieth Century*. Brewer. [2010] pp. viii + 208. £50 ISBN 9 7818 4384 2415.
- Fitzpatrick, Joan, ed. *Renaissance Food from Rabelais to Shakespeare: Culinary Readings and Culinary Histories*. Ashgate. [2010] pp. ix + 171. £55 ISBN 9 7807 5466 4277.
- Gallagher, Lowell, and Shankar Raman, eds. *Knowing Shakespeare: Senses, Embodiment and Cognition*. PalMac. [2010] pp. ix + 270. £50 ISBN 9 7802 3027 5614.
- Garbero, Maria Del Sapio, Nancy Isenberg, and Maddalena Pennacchia, eds. *Questioning Bodies in Shakespeare's Rome*. V&R. [2010] pp. 388. €53.90 ISBN 9 7838 9971 7402.
- Hammond, Brean, ed. *Double Falsehood, or The Distressed Lovers*. ArdenS. Methuen. [2010] pp. 464. £16.99 ISBN 9 7819 0343 6776.
- Harris, Jonathan Gil. *Shakespeare and Literary Theory*. OUP. [2010] pp. viii + 224. £12.99 ISBN 9 7801 9957 3387.
- Hateley, Erica. *Shakespeare in Children's Literature: Gender and Cultural Capital*. Routledge. [2010] pp. 218. £23.50 ISBN 9 7804 1588 8882.
- Hirsch, Brett D., and Christopher Wortham, eds. *This Earthly Stage: World and Stage in Late Medieval and Early Modern England*. Brepols. [2010] pp. 180. £34.99 ISBN 9 7825 0353 2264.
- Hodgdon, Barbara, ed. *The Taming of the Shrew*. ArdenS. Methuen. [2010] pp. 400. £9.99 ISBN 9 7819 0343 6936.
- Holderness, Graham. *Shakespeare and Venice*. Ashgate. [2010] pp. 162. £50 ISBN 9 7807 5466 6066.
- Janes, Dominic, and Gary Waller, eds. *Walsingham in Literature and Culture from the Middle Ages to Modernity*. Ashgate. [2010] pp. xvi + 251. £55 ISBN 9 7807 5466 9241.
- Kelly, Charles Adams. *The Evidence Matrix for the First Quarto of Shakespeare's Hamlet: An Examination of the Details of Conflicting Theories*. Anvil. [2008] pp. 100. £28.68 ISBN 9 7809 6621 2648.
- Kelly, Charles Adams, Cara McBride, and Sarah Mandelbaum, eds. *The 'Hamlet' 3x2 Text Research Toolset*, 2nd edn. Anvil. [2009] pp. 235. £185.08 ISBN 9 7809 6621 2662.
- Kennedy, Dennis, and Yong Li Lan, eds. *Shakespeare in Asia: Contemporary Performance*. CUP. [2010] pp. 304. £58 ISBN 9 7805 2151 5528.
- Kermode, Lloyd Edward. *Aliens and Englishness in Elizabethan Drama*. CUP. [2009] pp. xii + 202. £56 ISBN 9 7805 2189 9536.

- King, John N., ed. *Tudor Books and Readers: Materiality and the Construction of Meaning*. CUP. [2010] pp. xvii + 270. £58 ISBN 9 7805 2151 4941.
- Kordecki, Lesley, and Karla Koskinen. *Re-Visioning Lear's Daughters: Testing Feminist Criticism and Theory*. PalMac. [2010] pp. 235. \$80 (£45) ISBN 9 7802 3010 4099.
- Kostihová, Marcela. *Shakespeare in Transition: Political Appropriations in the Postcommunist Czech Republic*. PalMac. [2010] pp. xi + 210. £50 ISBN 9 7802 3020 3242.
- Lamb, Mary Ellen, and Valerie Wayne, eds. *Staging Early Modern Romance: Prose Fiction, Dramatic Romance, and Shakespeare*. Routledge. [2010] pp. 262. £24.95 ISBN 9 7804 1588 8882.
- Leahy, William, ed. *Shakespeare and his Authors: Critical Perspectives on the Authorship Question*. Continuum. [2010] pp. ix + 192. £24.99 ISBN 9 7808 2642 6116.
- Levy-Navarro, Elena, ed. *Historicizing Fat in Anglo-American Culture*. OhioUP. [2010] pp. 254. £44.77 ISBN 9 7808 1421 1359.
- MacFaul, Tom. *Poetry and Paternity in Renaissance England: Sidney, Spenser, Shakespeare, Donne, and Jonson*. CUP. [2010] pp. ix + 275. £55 ISBN 9 7805 2119 1104.
- Majeske, Andrew J., and Emily Detmer-Goebel, eds. *Justice, Women and Power in English Renaissance Drama*. FDUP. [2010] pp. 200. £43.50 ISBN 9 7808 3864 1699.
- Maley, Willy, and Philip Schwyzer, eds. *Shakespeare and Wales: From the Marches to the Assembly*. Ashgate. [2010] pp. x + 248. £60 ISBN 9 7807 5466 2792.
- Maley, Willy, and Margaret Tudeau-Clayton, eds. *This England, That Shakespeare: New Angles on Englishness and the Bard*. Ashgate. [2010] pp. 272. £55 ISBN 9 7807 5466 6028.
- Menzer, Paul. *The Hamlets: Cues, Qs, and Remembered Texts*. UDeLP. [2008] pp. 264. £48.95 ISBN 9 7808 7413 0133.
- Nardizzi, Vin, Stephen Guy-Bray, and Will Stockton, eds. *Queer Renaissance Historiography: Backward Gaze*. Ashgate. [2009] pp. xvi + 247. £60 ISBN 9 7807 5467 6089.
- Nelson, Holly Faith, Lynn R. Szabo, and Jen Zimmerman, eds. *Through a Glass Darkly: Suffering, the Sacred, and the Sublime in Literature and Theory*. WLUP. [2010] pp. 480. \$85 (£70.99) ISBN 9 7815 5458 1849.
- Nemerov, Alexander. *Acting in the Night: 'Macbeth' and the Places of the Civil War*. UCalP. [2010] pp. 299. £27.95 ISBN 9 7805 2025 1861.
- Petersen, Lene B. *Shakespeare's Errant Texts: Textual Form and Linguistic Style in Shakespearean 'Bad' Quartos and Co-authored Plays*. CUP. [2010] pp. 332. £58 ISBN 9 7805 2176 5220.
- Pitcher, John, ed. *The Winter's Tale*. ArdenS. Methuen. [2010] pp. 464. £9.99 ISBN 9 7819 0343 6356.
- Pugliatti, Paola. *Shakespeare and the Just War Tradition*. Ashgate. [2010] pp. x + 249. £55 ISBN 9 7807 5465 9273.
- Shapiro, James. *Contested Will: Who Wrote Shakespeare?*. Faber. [2010] pp. x + 367. £8.99 ISBN 9 7805 7123 5773.

- Shell, Alison. *Shakespeare and Religion*. Methuen. [2010] pp. xi + 308. £55 ISBN 9 7819 0427 1703.
- Shiyab, Said M., Marilyn Gaddis Rose, Juliane House, and John Duval, eds. *Globalization and Aspects of Translation*. CambridgeSP. [2010] pp. 240. £37.99 ISBN 9 7814 4381 9657.
- Sousa, Geraldo U. de. *At Home in Shakespeare's Tragedies*. Ashgate. [2010] pp. xii + 204. £49.50 ISBN 9 7807 5466 8862.
- Stagman, Myron. *Shakespeare's Double-Dealing Comedies*. CambridgeSP. [2010] pp. 180. £34.99 ISBN 9 7814 4381 6366.
- Stewart, Stanley. *Shakespeare and Philosophy*. Routledge. [2010] pp. xvii + 225. £80 ISBN 9 7804 1599 8093.
- Stone, James W. *Crossing Gender in Shakespeare: Feminist Psychoanalysis and the Difference Within*. Routledge. [2010] pp. xvii + 185. £70 ISBN 9 7804 1587 3604.
- Streete, Adrian. *Protestantism and Drama in Early Modern England*. CUP. [2009] pp. x + 298. £62 ISBN 9 7805 2176 0171.
- Sun, Emily. *Succeeding King Lear: Literature, Exposure, and the Possibility of Politics*. FordUP. [2010] pp. 180. £44.50 ISBN 9 7808 2323 2802.
- Trivedi, Poonam, and Minami Ryuta, eds. *Re-playing Shakespeare in Asia*. Routledge. [2010] pp. xi + 343. £80 ISBN 9 7804 1599 2404.
- Vaught, Jennifer C., ed. *Rhetorics of Bodily Disease and Health in Medieval and Early Modern England*. Ashgate. [2010] pp. 260. £55 ISBN 9 7807 5466 9487.
- Weimann, Robert, and Douglas Bruster. *Shakespeare and the Power of Performance: Stage and Page in the Elizabethan Theatre*. CUP. [2010] pp. x + 266. £21.99 ISBN 9 7805 2118 2836.
- Welsh, Alexander. *What is Honor? A Question of Moral Imperatives*. YaleUP. [2008] pp. 228. £25 ISBN 9 7803 0012 5641.
- Zurcher, Andrew. *Shakespeare and Law*. Methuen. [2010] pp. xiv + 334. £55 ISBN 9 7819 0427 1727.