

narrative is the ambition of leading, mostly academic publishers to produce their own Shakespeare editions. After Methuen (Arden), it was Oxford University Press who in 1929 asked Ronald B. McKerrow to prepare an old-spelling edition; his *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare: A Study in Editorial Method* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939) became a particularly respected and authoritative statement, and its influence is felt in many later discussions.

From the first volume of the “Arden Shakespeare” edited by Edward Dowden in 1899, many editors of individual plays showed an awareness of new developments in textual studies, but it is interesting that “the first single-volume complete works edition executed entirely along New Bibliographical lines” (p. 259), the “Riverside Shakespeare”, ed. G. Blakemore Evans, appeared as late as 1974. When it comes to most of the important scholarly single-play series, like Arden, Pelican, New Penguin, Oxford, and New Cambridge, however, as Egan clearly explains, readers will find that each individual volume is as new, unconventional and up-to-date as its editor, whose methodology and textual convictions (or prejudices) the edition reflects.

In a useful appendix Egan gives a critical account of the major twentieth-century editions, with particular emphasis on their treatment of the text. His survey, though, stops short of the “RSC Shakespeare”, edited by Jonathan Bates and Eric Rasmussen (2007). The editors declare their special indebtedness to the work of Peter Blayney, Lukas Erne, John Jowett and Paul Werstine, for Egan exponents of “New Textualism” and “‘new’ New Bibliography”, whose contributions he critically, sometimes provocatively, but never unfairly, follows. The other two appendices contain basic information on early book production and a table of Shakespeare editions up to 1623.

Textual scholars and editors will find plenty of familiar information in this book, and many non-specialist readers will be grateful for competent guidance to editorial problems and controversies, with their noticeable consequences for the Shakespeare text we read. In the end, one feels that in the struggle for Shakespeare’s text, we have not got very much further than John Dover Wilson who, after some 40 years dedicated to the editing of Shakespeare, concluded “life is short, and the editing of Shakespeare an endless adventure”.⁴

Bonn

DIETER MEHL

James J. Marino: *Owning William Shakespeare: The King’s Men and Their Intellectual Property*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011. Pp. 204. Paperback \$ 49.95.

Marino’s history of the rights to perform and publish Shakespeare begins with the claim that the newly-formed Chamberlain’s men of 1594 began describing as Shakespeare’s some plays previously performed by other companies. By revision, Shakespeare turned the ur-*Hamlet*, *The Taming of a Shrew*, *King Lear*, *The Troublesome Reign of*

⁴ *King Lear*, ed. George Ian Duthie and John Dover Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), p. viii.

King John, *The True Tragedy of Richard 3* and *The Famous Victories of Henry 5* into his own works. The New Bibliographers understood early editions of Shakespeare not as early versions but mere garblings of scripts better represented by later good editions. Marino revives the old idea that the early printings represent these plays in the early stages of their evolution, but he neglects the evidence of garbling in the bad quartos. Folio *The Taming of the Shrew* (T4v) contains a good pun about facing (a tailor's term) and out-facing (braving someone's wrath) but in *The Taming of a Shrew* (printed 1594) the pun is clearly misremembered, like a joke badly told (E2v). In Q1 *Hamlet* (printed 1603), Laertes forgets his lines, responding to Claudius's "you shall have no let for your reuenge" (H3r) with the meaningless "My will, not all the world", which is the correct response to "Who shall stay you?", a question present in Q2 (1604–5) and the Folio but not Q1. Spotting the problem, the actor of Claudius replies "Nay but Leartes, marke the plot I haue layde" to bring his colleague back from disaster. There are similar garblings in other bad quartos. None proves the New Bibliographical theory of Memorial Reconstruction – that actors recalled their lines to make a fresh copy of the full script – but they establish that more than just revision separates the early bad editions from the later good ones.

Marino also treats as early versions of Shakespeare's plays the early editions of plays usually attributed to others. True, *The Famous Victories of Henry 5* has so much plot in common with Shakespeare's *1 Henry 4*, *2 Henry 4*, and *Henry 5* that it seems their prototype, and the close verbal parallels between *The Troublesome Reign of King John* and Shakespeare's *King John* are well known. But these cases are distinct from the Shakespearian bad quartos, and explaining everything by revision seems Procrustean. Marino's second chapter is about revision in *The Taming of the Shrew* and the mystery that the Folio mentions the character Soto from John Fletcher's *Women Pleas'd*, usually dated 1619–23, but also mentions the actor John Sinckler active in the 1590s. Marino posits continuous updating for topicality: Shakespeare's old play was made to allude to the company's newest offering. Perhaps, but the dating of *Women Pleas'd* is uncertain. The actor Joseph Taylor's name appears in the play's cast list in the 1679 Beaumont and Fletcher folio, and since he replaced Richard Burbage on the latter's death in 1619 the assumption that the list reflects first-performance casting dates the play no earlier than 1619. But the list might instead reflect casting for a revival of a play first performed somewhat earlier. Marino's third chapter considers revision in *Hamlet*. Characters go to considerable lengths to avoid saying the name of Claudius's chief advisor: "your father", "that great baby you see there", "this counsellor". Because his name is scarcely mentioned it could easily be changed (Corambis in Q1, Polonius in Q2) without calling in all the actors' parts for adjustment. Supporters of the Memorial Reconstruction theory rejected the explanation of difference by revision on the grounds that changing one actor's lines and not the others would be peculiar, but Marino points out that parts-based revision was convenient and had this effect. Granted, but revision cannot account for the bad quarto of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* closely matching the Folio when the Host is on stage and lapsing into paraphrase when he exits, while Memorial Reconstruction can.

Chapter Four (by far the best) is about the falsely dated quartos printed by William Jaggard for Thomas Pavier in 1619. The standard narrative is that Pavier's planned collected works of Shakespeare was suppressed by the King's men (perhaps with their Folio in mind), who got the lord Chamberlain, William Herbert the Earl of Pembroke,

to instruct the Stationers' Company in May 1619 that none of their plays could be published without their permission. Marino sees these quartos not as piracy but an assertion of publishers' rights in resistance to the ban. From the publishers' perspective, the rights to *The Famous Victories of Henry 5* covered Shakespeare's *Henry 5* too. Publishers ascribed plays to the company currently playing the Shakespearian version (the King's men) even when reprinting the earlier play that we ascribe to another company, so Bernard Alsop published *Famous Victories* as "Acted by the Kinges Maiesties Seruants" in 1617. Equally, a stationer who did not have rights to the old play might use Shakespeare's name to insist that his copy was not the old play, as when Nathaniel Butter published "Mr. William Shakespeare His . . . King Lear" in 1608 to distinguish it from *King Leir* published by John Wright in 1605. Once Butter had done this, owners of plays like *The Famous Victories of Henry 5* and *The Troublesome Reign of King John* would fear their rights being abrogated by someone else publishing the corresponding Shakespeare version with his name on it, so they beat them to it. This is an ingenious and persuasive new explanation for certain non-Shakespearian plays being attributed to Shakespeare.

Marino's final chapter takes the story up to the beginning of the seventeenth century, including the triumph of the publishers' notion of property because they survived the Interregnum intact and the playing companies did not. With no players' rights to limit what got attributed to Shakespeare, the second issue of the Third Folio (1664) added seven new plays; the stationers' view of property was now dominant. Marino's is a highly specialized and detailed book and there are few factual errors. He is wrong to claim that ". . . scripts were licensed by the Master of Revels for performance by a specific company, and by that company alone . . ." (p. 26). None of the six surviving performance licences (five manuscripts, one printed) specifies the company, although the Master might record it in his office book as a memorandum in case of trouble later. Marino rather misrepresents A. W. Pollard, attributing to him (pp. 14–16) ideas about textual definitiveness and recovery of the authorial text that he explicitly repudiated in *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare*. But the theatre history and book history here are generally well informed and Marino offers attractive new solutions to old mysteries.

Stratford-upon-Avon

GABRIEL EGAN

Alexander Shurbanov: *Shakespeare's Lyricized Drama*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2010. Pp. 311. Hardback £ 41.95.

Among contemporary books on Shakespearean topics the present study is unique in that it is neither about the cultural contexts nor the reception of Shakespeare's texts but about these texts themselves. Shurbanov presents his readers with the rare treat of fresh and original interpretations of whole plays and particular passages we may have believed we knew everything about.

Shurbanov bases his investigation on the assumption that while there are "three great kinds" of literature, namely "epos, drama and lyric" (p. 14) with a specific set of properties each, "the Renaissance was an age particularly prone to the interplay and hybridization of genres" (p. 13). In a long introductory chapter he provides a detailed