

VI

Shakespeare

GABRIEL EGAN, PETER J. SMITH, ELINOR PARSONS,
CHLOE WEI-JOU LIN, DANIEL CADMAN, ARUN CHETA,
GAVIN SCHWARTZ-LEEPER, JOHANN GREGORY AND
SHEILAGH ILONA O'BRIEN

This chapter has four sections: 1. Editions and Textual Studies; 2. Shakespeare in the Theatre; 3. Shakespeare on Screen; 4. Criticism. Section 1 is by Gabriel Egan; section 2 is by Peter J. Smith; section 3 is by Elinor Parsons; section 4(a) is by Chloe Wei-Jou Lin; section 4(b) is by Daniel Cadman; section 4(c) is by Arun Cheta; section 4(d) is by Gavin Schwartz-Leeper; section 4(e) is by Johann Gregory; section 4(f) is by Sheilagh Ilona O'Brien.

1. Editions and Textual Studies

Only one major critical edition of Shakespeare appeared this year: René Weis's *Romeo and Juliet*. This Arden³ edition was for many years promised as forthcoming from the labours of Lynette Hunter and Peter Lichtenfels, but their text of the play was instead released on a free CD-ROM accompanying their book *Negotiating Shakespeare's Language in Romeo and Juliet: Reading Strategies from Criticism, Editing and the Theatre* reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011]. The Arden general editors have given no explanation for the change of plan, but this reviewer found Hunter and Lichtenfels's text too poorly executed to pass muster as an Arden edition; Weis's replacement edition would appear to have been put together quite quickly.

The first quarter of Weis's 116-page introduction is concerned with 'Writing Love' and has fascinating reflections upon certain things that he has counted. Juliet speaks thirteen lines in Act V, 'one line for every year of her life', and the last one ends on 'die' (p. 3). Weis argues that this unlucky 13 and the idea of Juliet being nearly 14—the number of lines in a sonnet, about which the play cares so much—are intentional numerology on Shakespeare's part. Weis is equally incisive on the various family relations at work, pointing out that Rosaline is Juliet's cousin and that Tybalt is also Juliet's cousin and hence Rosaline and Tybalt may well be siblings, and that the Montague family

relationships are much more sketchily drawn (pp. 5–6). Weis considers the problem that Romeo and Juliet commit suicide, which elsewhere—though not in the Roman plays—Shakespeare depicts as a mortal sin, yet no one seems to judge them ill for it in this play (pp. 16–19). Weis is not quite up-to-date on scholarship about the dating of the various groups of Shakespeare’s sonnets, commenting that most of them were complete before he wrote *Romeo and Juliet* (pp. 21–2). This is quite possible, but recent articles by MacDonald P. Jackson, reviewed in *YWES* 80[2001] and 82[2003], proved that Sonnets 104–26 are Jacobean. More numerology emerges in Weis’s discovery that the word *Thursday*, the proposed day of Juliet’s marriage, occurs fourteen times in the play, once for each year at her next birthday (p. 25). It is odd that with everything timed out so perfectly in the play, Friar Laurence says that the potion he gives Juliet will last ‘two-and-forty hours’ since it in fact wears off after twenty-four hours, and Weis wonders if this is just a compositor’s error: *four-and-twenty > two-and-forty* (pp. 29–31).

In eleven pages Weis deals with ‘The Dates of First Performance and Publication’ (pp. 33–43). He works incrementally in pinning down dates so that certain assertions Weis makes are superseded by later ones. For example, the reference on the 1597 first quarto’s title page to *Romeo and Juliet* being played by Lord Hunsdon’s men puts ‘writing and first performance... between 22 July 1596 and 14 April 1597’ (p. 34) because that is when Shakespeare’s company’s patron had that title. In fact the title-page reference only really gives us a *terminus ad quem* for printing because although the edition would not use the Hunsdon title once George Carey became Lord Chamberlain, the play might have been written and performed well before 22 July 1596, when they were still the Lord Chamberlain’s men, and yet get attributed to Lord Hunsdon’s men on the edition’s title page when it came to be printed somewhat later. Weis goes on to acknowledge that March 1597 (not April 1597) is the latest date of composition and first performance of *Romeo and Juliet* on account of John Danter having his presses impounded in March 1597 (p. 35). Weis dates the Chamberlain’s men’s departure from The Theatre to 1597—in fact it was 1598—and notes John Marston’s allusion to *Romeo and Juliet* in collocation with ‘Curtain plaudities’, suggesting that it was played there, in his satire ‘The Scourge of Villainy’ in 1598 (pp. 35–6). Having acknowledged that the true *terminus ad quem* for composition and first performance was in fact March rather than April 1597 (as he claimed on p. 34), Weis then acknowledges that the *terminus a quo* is not ‘22 July 1596’ (as he claimed on p. 34) but 1594 when Will Kemp—named in a stage direction in the 1599 second quarto—joined the Chamberlain’s men (p. 36).

Weis speculates about the possible relevance of the dates of an earthquake in Kent and the death of Shakespeare’s son Hamnet in 1596 for dating *Romeo and Juliet* (pp. 36–9). He finds in Thomas Nashe’s pamphlet *Have With You to Saffron Walden* [1596] the source for some words and phrases in *Romeo and Juliet*, including *Prince of Cats*, *dish-clout*, *ropery*, *single-soled*, and *alligator*. In fact, of these, *Prince of Cats*, *ropery*, and *alligator* are indeed rare before 1600, but *dish-clout* and *single-soled* are not: the Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership database (EEBO-TCP) has amongst its 40,000 books several that use those words; the key question, though, is whether Nashe

copied Shakespeare or vice versa. Likewise, the phrase 'put up our pipes' in *Romeo and Juliet* appears also in Nashe's *Summer's Last Will and Testament* published in 1600. In this case, no other work has that phrase or even an approximation of it, but Shakespeare cannot have seen Nashe's book in print until three years after Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* appeared; again why cannot Nashe have copied Shakespeare? Weis thinks it significant that the word *coying* occurs in *Have With You to Saffron Walden* and in Q2 *Romeo and Juliet*'s 'those that haue coying to be strange' while Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* has 'they that haue more cunning to be strange', and he rejects Q2's reading of *coying* as self-contradictory, since to be *coying* means to be *strange*, 'even though 'coying' is supported... by its occurrence in *Have With You*' (pp. 40–1). Looked at correctly, *coying*'s appearance in *Hath With You to Saffron Walden* does not count for much since it was a relatively common word, with EEBO-TCP showing eleven occurrences in books published before 1600. Weis thinks the fact that the ballad of 'Romeo and Juliet' entered the Stationers' Register on 5 August 1596 might 'reflect the impact of Shakespeare's play' but considers it more likely, since the play relies on Nashe, that the ballad preceded the play (p. 43). In truth, that reliance has not been proven and in the case of *Summer's Last Will and Testament* seems impossible.

Although Weis has, by this point, already written substantially on the play's debt to Nashe, there follows a dedicated section on 'Sources' (pp. 43–52) containing the familiar stuff about William Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* and most especially Arthur Brooke's *Romeus and Juliet*. In an odd moment Weis refers to 'laws forbidding women to act on a public stage' (p. 50 n.1), although of course no such laws existed. Weis reckons that the reason Q2 has Romeo enter to open the Capulet tomb accompanied by 'Peter' (sig. L2^r) where logic requires that it should be Balthasar is that Brooke has his Peter accompany Romeus at this point. The play's stage history appears in a section called 'Performing Love' (pp. 52–94). Weis believes that 'Q1 is in all likelihood a touring text' (p. 56) although he has not established reasons for thinking so; he notes that it is 'abridged' and seems to take for granted that touring texts would be shorter than scripts performed in London but gives no reason for this. Weis refers to 'Juliet's soliloquy' (p. 81) without specifying which scene he means (she has more than one soliloquy) but presumably it is 'Farewell. God knows when we shall meet again... Romeo, Romeo, Romeo! Here's drink. I drink to thee.'

Of most interest to this review is the section 'The Texts: Q1 (1597) and Q2 (1599)' (pp. 94–15). Weis gives the standard information on the printing of Q1 being shared by John Danter and Edward Alde, using different type sizes. He simply asserts that 'Shakespeare's autograph lies behind Q2' and assigns its pages to two compositors (p. 96), citing an article by Paul L. Cantrell and George Walton Williams from 1957. The debate has moved on substantially since then and assumptions about compositorial consistency need to be defended in the light of D.F. McKenzie's revolutionary essays 'Printers of the Mind' [1969] and 'Stretching a Point' [1984]. A key question is why eighty-five lines in Q2 were set from Q1 despite Q2's copy being mainly an authoritative manuscript. Weis picks up a suggestion by A.W. Pollard in the *Times Literary Supplement* in 1920 to note that eighty-five lines is about how much writing

Shakespeare would have got onto a single manuscript leaf, so perhaps one leaf was missing from the copy for Q2 (p. 98). On pages 98–9 Weis delves into minutiae about the setting of Q2 without quite preparing the ground: a reader should first hear the evidence that part of Q2 (I.ii.51–I.iii.35 in Weis's edition) was set from Q1, including (but not confined to) Q2's sharing of Q1's odd habit of putting the Nurse's speeches in italics at that point, and then learn about why and how this happened. On page 99 Weis discusses 'The different speech prefixes (SPs) for Capulet's Wife in 1.3' without mentioning whether he means in Q1 or Q2; the point is merely that Q2's use of *Wife* as her speech prefix in the first part of I.iii (up to 1.iii.35) and of *Old La[dy]* thereafter is due to this section being set directly from Q1 which uses *Wife*. This part of the story is rather confusingly told.

Weis's discussion of the problems of Shakespeare's handwriting starts from the assumption that Q2 was set from his autograph, although of course the evidence for that is the presence of what look like misreadings of secretary hand, so there is a danger of circular reasoning here. Weis thinks that "'permissive" stage directions' (p. 101) of the kind '*Enter three or four . . .*' are characteristic of foul papers, as are false starts; in fact the former could make it into a promptbook although the latter could not. Most of Q2's Queen Mab speech is on page C2^r and is set as prose despite being clearly verse, and Weis wonders if that is because of 'problems experienced by the compositor when setting this passage on the inner forme' (p. 103). Weis does not say what kinds of problems he is thinking of, other than that they are 'probably traceable' to something in the copy rather than in the typesetting. Weis starts to discuss the possibility that there was an uncorrected state of the forme on which Q2's Queen Mab speech mostly resides, forme C(inner), and that in this state 'at least three key lines' were omitted (p. 103). At this point Weis offers no reason for supposing such a lost state once existed and simply refers his reader to G. Blakemore Evans's 1984 New Cambridge Shakespeare edition of the play. This possibility needs some elaboration.

Evan's discussion of the textual situation regarding the Queen Mab speech proceeds from two assumptions: (1) that Q2 was set seriatim order so that when C(inner) was being impressed C(outer) was in type at least as far as page C3^r, and (2) that if it was discovered during impression of C(inner) that some text had been omitted on C2^r (from within the Queen Mab speech) then inserting it on C2^r would entail work that was 'time-consuming and expensive to reset sheet C (inner and outer formes) beginning with C2^r', so instead the Queen Mab speech was reset on C2^r to confine the alteration to just that page. Yet Evans does not establish that Q2 really was set seriatim, and even if it was, the labour of inserting a couple of lines into one page and moving lines between the bottoms and tops of other pages to compensate for this would be, even for two formes, no greater (and probably somewhat less) than the labour of resetting a whole block of verse as prose, with its attendant problems of fresh justification and changing all the line-starting capitals to lower-case letters (the prose on C2^r does not have unwanted capitals where the verse lines used to begin). Most importantly, there is no extant uncorrected impression of forme C(inner) to motivate all this speculation about resetting.

Evans goes on to reconsider all this with the alternative assumption that sheet C was set not seriatim but by formes, and starting with C(outer). This would entail that when the compositor came to set C2^r and found he had misjudged his casting off—leaving insufficient room to set the Queen Mab speech as verse—he was stuck since the page-break C2^r/C2^v was immovable because C2^v was already in the press and being machined. Thus, rather than cutting the speech he set it as prose. This last explanation makes sense and has the advantage of not requiring there to be a lost uncorrected state of C(inner). (Actually, Evans's hypothesis supposing seriatim setting does not really require there to be a lost uncorrected state either and there is no reason to suppose one existed.) In explaining all this, Weis's paragraphs seem to be out of order. Only after his exploration of the possibility of a lost state of forme C(inner) does Weis pick out three lines in the Q2 Queen Mab speech that are apparently in the wrong place in Q2 and are absent entirely from the Q1 version. This suggests that these three lines were written into the margin of the exemplar of Q1 used as copy for Q2 and were noticed only after printing of C(inner) had begun so that the press was stopped and these lines were inserted (necessitating the resetting as prose), and accidentally inserted in slightly the wrong place. Had these three lines been identified by Weis before the discussion of the possible resetting of forme C(inner) the reader would better understand why that idea was being pursued.

Weis reckons that giving the repeated 'grey-eyed morn' speech to Romeo not the Friar is suggested by the quotation of it in Robert Allot's anthology *England's Parnassus* (published 1600) being based on Romeo's version in Q2. When trying to determine which of Q2's two lines 'This may flies do, when I from this must flie . . . Flies may do this, but I from this must flie' to retain, Weis argues that because Q1 has the latter line (and has it preceded by exactly the same line as it is preceded by in Q2) we should conclude that in performance the latter version was preferred. This point depends on accepting that Q1 has a special connection with performance, which Weis considers next. He reports Lukas Erne's Cambridge Early Quartos edition of *Romeo and Juliet* establishing that it was 'a legitimate version of the play in its own right, a text cut for touring purposes' (p. 105) although also containing memorial reconstruction. Weis considers the few occasions outside of the part where Q2 reprints Q1 where consultation of Q1 by Q2's compositor seems likely, and asks how some rather obvious errors persist in Q2 rather than being put right by consultation of Q1; his answer is that Q2's compositor was a conservative follower of his copy. Weis surveys the problems with the theory that Q1 represents the play cut for shorter performance, most especially that some highly 'prunable' (p. 106) material remains, such as the musicians' mini-scene and the Friar's long exegesis at the end, the latter of which is also extensively different in wording from the Q2 version. Also, there is apparently extensive rewriting separating Q1 and Q2 and it is not clear why Shakespeare would do that.

Weis considers Q1's stage directions being rather fuller and more literary than those in Q2, and the question of who wrote them. Only two of them Weis does not adopt for his edition: 'They draw, to them enters Tybalt, they fight, to them the Prince, old Mountague, and his wife, old Capulet and his wife, and

other Citizens and part them in the opening scene and *'Enter Romeo and Iuliet at the window'* just before Juliet's *'Wilt thou be gone?'* speech. Weis can see merit in Q1's expansive stage directions being witnesses of early performance but also in John Jowett's argument that they are just Henry Chettle's literary padding added in the printshop to sheets E–K (where almost all the long stage directions occur) because Alde was using a smaller typeface than Danter, who was printing sheets A–D. Weis does not choose between these incompatible theories and adopts the long stage directions because *'they have proved their worth in the theatre since and continue to intrigue and fascinate'* (p. 115).

In his *'Editorial Procedures'* (pp. 115–16) Weis explains that his edition is based on Q2 except where Q2 reprints Q1 for which his edition of course relies on Q1. A number of individual Q1 readings have also been adopted (listed in Appendix 1) but Weis does not indicate on what principle(s) he admitted them. Where Q1 and Q2 are verbally close—and by his count that is in 800 of the play's lines—Weis's collation records their differences, as it does when although their two versions of a scene differ too much to be collated they have particular lines that are very close to one another, albeit not necessarily even in the same part of the scene. Where Q1 has the same dramatic action as Q2 but in different words Weis uses the code *'var. Q1'* as distinct from *'not in Q1'* used where there are genuine gaps surrounded by material in common. The collations list Q2, Q3, Q4, and F readings (in that order) and then Q1, except of course for where this edition's copy text is Q1 (when the collation order is Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, F) or where Q1 and Q4 agree on readings that Weis prefers to the reading of Q2, Q3, or F (when the Q1 reading comes first). Crucially, though, Weis does not tell his reader how much emendation he thinks Q2 is in need of and hence how heavily he intervenes and just what has to be wrong in Q2 for him to depart from it. We can get a sense of those things from his particular editorial choices, to which we now turn.

At I.i.21 Weis sticks with Q2's *'I will be civil with the maids'* where Alexander Pope and many subsequent editors have preferred to emend to Q4's *'I will be cruel ...'* since Samson goes on to say that he will rape the Montague women; as Weis points out Samson is being sarcastic. At I.i.152 Weis retains Q2's reference to the flowering bud being bitten by a worm before it can spread its petals *'to the air | Or dedicate his beauty to the same'*, in which *the same* means also *the air*. Thus he rejects Pope's popular emendation of *'... dedicate his beauty to the sun'*, which has the attraction of sounding more poetical (especially since Romeo has been avoiding the sun) and being graphically plausible (since *sun* is easily misread as *same* in Shakespeare's handwriting). Weis prints *'Why then, O brawling love, O loving hate, | O anything of nothing first create'* (I.i.174–5) where Q2 has *'... first created'*. His reading of *create* comes from Q1, which he prefers because *created* is *'halting and clunky'* and has an extra syllable; he is aware of and cites Jill Levenson's defence of *created* in her Oxford Shakespeare edition. Romeo's Q2 reference to *'Mishapen Chaos of welseeing forms'* (I.i.177) Weis emends to *'... well-seeming forms'*, Q4's reading, although he commends Q1's *'... best seeming'* too. At I.i.209 Weis retains Q2's description of Rosaline being *uncharmed* by love rather than Q1's *unharmd* because it captures the sense of love as magic. Romeo in Q1 asks the Capulet servingman holding the list of feast-invitees

what they are invited to using the expression 'Whither to supper?' (I.ii.74) and Q2 has the same except that it spells *Whither* as *Whether*. The problem is that Romeo has not been told it is an invitation to supper. Editors have long reassigned the words *to supper* to the servingman as his answer to the question *Whither?*, but Weis follows the Folio's repunctuation that allows Romeo to guess what the invitation is: 'Whither? To supper?'

Romeo in Q2 says 'turne teares to fier' in a line that apparently is supposed to rhyme with 'be burnt for liers' and for that reason Pope, followed by Weis, emends *fier* > *fires* (I.ii.90). At I.iii.67 Juliet in Q2 calls the idea of her getting married 'an houre that I dreame not of' and the Nurse repeats 'An houre...' in response; Weis prefers Q1's 'an honour...' which makes considerably better sense. On the assumption that Q2 simply omits two of Benvolio's lines about how the masquers will present themselves at the Capulet party, which lines Q1 includes, Weis inserts them from Q1 and modernizes to 'Nor no without-book prologue, faintly spoke | After the prompter, for our entrance' (I.iv.7-8). Where Q2 gives the speech 'And to sink in it should you burden love, | Too great oppression for a tender thing' to 'Horatio', presumably one of the masquers in Romeo's group, Weis gives it to Mercutio without justifying this decision (I.iv.23). Weis follows Williams's brilliant single-letter emendation (*lights* > *light*) to turn Mercutio's nonsensical 'We waste our lights in vaine, lights lights by day' from Q2 into the modern 'We waste our lights, in vain light lights by day' (I.iv.45). Weis does not mention it but emendations that preserve Q2's placing of the comma to keep the phrase *We waste our lights in vain* make Mercutio say something fairly stupid, since 'wasting in vain' is a pleonasm. In Q2 Mercutio says 'Take our good meaning, for our judgement sits | Fiue times in that, ere once in our fine wits', and Weis emends the last two words to *five wits* on the assumption that in Q2 a letter *u* was accidentally inverted to make an *n* (I.iv.46-7). We should notice that Q2's reading is acceptable so Weis is setting the bar for emendation quite low.

At I.iv.53 Weis declines to include Benvolio's line 'Queene Mab whats she?' that Q1 puts before the Queen Mab speech and that Q2 lacks. The argument for including it was made in the Oxford Complete Works: it was omitted in Q2 for the same reason that the verse of the Queen Mab speech was set as prose, to save space after an error in casting off, and it would have been remarkably good fortune indeed if setting verse as prose perfectly fixed the problem with no further expedient having to be resorted to. Also, Q2's final line of the Queen Mab speech, 'This is she', completes Mercutio's answer to Benvolio's question. The lines 'Her chariot is... the fairies' coachmakers' are in Q2 but not Q1 and Weis reckons that they are in the wrong place in Q2, coming after the detail of what the tiny chariot is made of when really these three lines should introduce the description of the chariot (I.iv.59-61). However, Weis in his introduction gave a powerful argument against moving these three lines: the next line in Q2 is 'and in this state she gallops' which makes sense coming right after a description of travelling in state (= in style in a chariot) but which sounds distinctly odd coming directly after the reference to a worm 'Pricked from the lazy finger of a maid', which is what happens if we move the three lines upwards. In conclusion Weis writes that 'If the lines stand where Q2 has them, then everything before them becomes a crescendo towards the hazelnut

chariot' (p. 104) which is so convincing an argument it is hard to see why he was not swayed by it and instead intervened to alter Q2's arrangement.

Weis emends Q2's reference to a worm 'prickt from the lazie finger of a man' to '... of a maid' (I.iv.69) because he thinks it an allusion to the 'folklore belief that idle maids grow worms in their fingers'. But he gives no citation for this folklore and is decidedly unsure how Q2's reading came about if Shakespeare really did write *maid*. In fact, an EEBO-TCP search for *worms* within three words of *finger* throws up four hits in three books, two of which are indeterminate about gender—both in Hieronymus Brunschwig's 1528 edition of his *Virtuous Book of Distillation of the Waters of all Manner of Herbs* (STC 13436, sigs. P2^r, S2^r)—and the other two are explicitly masculine: Roger Ascham's *Toxophilus* STC 837 (published 1545) has 'a silie poore worme in his finger' (sig. D3^v) and Robert Rollock's *Certain Sermons* STC 21272 (published 1616) has 'A man will haue a worme in his finger' (sig. X8^r). None mentions idleness as the cause.

At I.iv.103 Weis resists the editorial tendency to prefer Q1's reference to the wind turning his *face* from the cold north to the warm south and instead follows Q2 to read 'Turning his side to the dew-dropping south', but gives no defence except to extol the reading he rejected: '[*face* instead of *side*] fits well with the pathetic fallacy of imagining the wind as a rebuffed agent'. Q2 has Benvolio say 'Call good *Mercutio*: | Nay Ile coniure too' which sounds like him answering himself, so Weis gives the second line to *Mercutio* and it makes much more sense as the start of his speech, which is a kind of conjuring (II.i.6). Uncontroversially, Weis rejects as *Mercutio*'s mockery of lovesick *Romeo*'s behaviour Q2's 'Crie but ay me, prouaunt, but loue and day' in favour of Q1's 'cry but ay me. Pronounce but Loue and Doue' (II.i.10). Equally uncontroversially, where Q2 has *Mercutio* call *Cupid Venus*'s 'son and her', Weis emends to Q1's 'son and heir' (II.i.12).

At II.i.13 Weis follows Q1 in having *Mercutio* call *Venus*'s blind son 'Young Abraham *Cupid*, he that shot so trim' where Q2 has '... shot so true' as it echoes a line from the ballad of King Cophetua that Shakespeare repeatedly alluded to. Q1 and Q2 call him '*Abraham: Cupid*' and the clearly wrong colon within a name being common to both shows Q2's dependence on Q1 for this line, which dependence other editors have used as justification for emending *Abraham* > *Adam* on the basis of this being an allusion to the archer Adam Bell of English legend. Weis argues that the point of 'Abraham *Cupid*' is a deliberate oxymoron: the biblical patriarch yoked to the pagan boy as opposites because love is simultaneously the oldest of human phenomena and the most childlike. At II.i.38 Weis makes the familiar emendation of Q2's joke that *Romeo* wishes *Rosaline* were 'An open, or' to 'An open-arse' on account of the context suggesting it, since *open-arse* was an old name for a medlar, and because *Mercutio* goes on to say that *Romeo* wishes himself a poperin (that is, pop-'er-in) pear, and on account of Q1 having at this point the euphemism 'An open *Et caetera*', and because *ars* in Q2's copy could have got misread as *or*. At II.ii.82 Weis marks as an emendation his departing from Q2's *pylat* for Q1/Q3/Q4/F's *pilot*, but the former is only a spelling variant of the latter; *OED* has no exact match but acknowledges the *y-for-i* and *at-for-ot* possibilities in spelling this word.

Where Q2 has the impossible '*Iu. Romeo. | Ro. My Neece*' Weis adopts the Cambridge New Shakespeare reading of '*...nyas*' (II.ii.167). For his '*And darkness, fleckled, like a drunkard reels*' (II.ii.190) Weis gets *fleckled* from Q1/F whereas Q2 has *fleckted*, which means bowed and hence is unsuitable in this context. At II.ii.192, Q2 has Romeo say that he will go to his 'ghostly Friars close cell', but Weis prefers Nicolaus Delius's emendation *friar's* > *sire's*, pointing out that 'a number of editors' have preferred it. This is not really a defence of departing from Q2, which seems fine. In Q2 Mercutio says of the manners (or perhaps the persons) of men like Tybalt 'The Pox of such antique lipping affecting phantacies' and Weis rejects the last word in favour of Q1's 'fantasticoes' on account of that word appearing also in Nashe's *Have With You to Saffron Walden* where he thinks Shakespeare encountered it (II.iv.29). Complaining of her aching bones, Weis has the Nurse say 'what a jaunt have I!', using Q1's *jaunt* where Q2 has *jaunce*, which is just an obsolete form of the same word (II.v.26). Weis accepts Williams's argument that where Q2 has '[ROMEO] Hold *Tybalt*, good *Mercutio* | *Away* Tybalt | *Mer[cutio]* I am hurt' the second line, '*Away* Tybalt', which is centred and marked off by white space above and below in Q2, is not a stage direction but a line of dialogue for Petruchio, who otherwise has nothing to say in the play although Shakespeare brought him on with Tybalt and others two pages earlier; the line simply got misunderstood as a stage direction in the printshop (III.i.90). Where Q2 has '*Ben[volio]* Here comes the furious *Tybalt* backe againe. | *Ro[meo]* He gan in triumph and *Mercutio* slaine' (III.i.123–45), Weis follows Q1 to give Romeo's line as '*Alive*, in triumph, and *Mercutio* slain' and offers a note surveying the most popular alternatives, as if he were not sure of his choice. Weis does not explain how *Alive* in Q2's copy got misread as 'He gan'. Where Q2 has Romeo refer to his 'fier end furie' Weis follows Q1 to print 'fire-eyed fury' since *eied* > *end* is an easy misreading (III.i.126).

Describing Romeo's intervention in the fatal sword fight, Weis has Benvolio say that his 'agile arm beats down their fatal points', getting that first word from Q1's *agill* because Q2 has the impossible *aged* (III.i.168). Weis has the Prince remark 'I have an interest in your hates' proceeding' where Q2 has '*... hearts proceeding*' which makes pretty good sense and, as Weis notes, 'is retained by a number of recent editions' (III.i.190); notice again that Weis sets a low bar for emendation. Weis makes no defence of his emendation of Q2 where Juliet reflects that lovers can see to do their 'amorous rights, | And by their owne bewties' to read 'amorous rites | By their own beauties', thereby deleting the *And* that Charles Jasper Sisson pointed out is emphatic (III.ii.9). At III.ii.76 a fairly obvious first thought is removed by Weis, following Lewis Theobald, in deleting the first word in Juliet's exclamation that Romeo is a 'Rauenous douefeatherd raue, woluishrauening lamb'. Another low-bar Q2 emendation: 'Here from *Verona* are thou banished' to 'Hence from ...' on Q1's authority (III.iii.15). Q2 has the Nurse say that Romeo's wild acts 'deuote | The vnreasonable furie of a beast' and Weis emends to Q1's 'denote ...'; Q2's *deuote* might of course just be the result of an inverted *n* (III.iii.109). For emending Q2's 'Thou puts vp thy fortune' to 'Thou pouts upon thy fortune' (III.iii.143) Weis credits Q4 but does not explain how Q2's reading came

about. Sisson pointed out that *pouts v̄p̄* in Q2's copy might easily have been misread as the common phrase *puts up*.

Where Q2 has Capulet praise Paris as 'youthful and nobly liand' Weis rejects Q1's reading of '...nobly trainde' and also rejects Q3/Q4/F's alternative of *allied* for the last word in order to accept the Arden2 emendation to *ligned* meaning *lined* in the sense of coming from a good family line (III.v.181). I should say that the modern spelling of *lined* ought then to be used. In Q2 Juliet says to Friar Laurence that she is 'past hope, past care, past help' (IV.i.45) and Weis emends *care* > *cure* so that this creates the pleonasm of wanting cure and help; why he thinks the pleonasm desirable is not stated. When Juliet ponders the alternatives that she would accept rather than marry Paris, Q2 has her say that she would willingly 'go into a new made graue, | And hide me with a dead man in his' (IV.i.85–6), and there seems to be a word missing at the end of the line. Q3 also lacks a word and Q1 has no exactly corresponding line, so the only early suggestions are Q4's *shroud* and F's *grauē*. Weis does not discuss F's reading but since he rejects Edmond Malone's suggestion of *tomb* on the grounds that it is just a synonym for *grave* (and hence not poetical enough to be Shakespeare) we can be sure he thinks *grave...grave* impossible too. Weis notices that elsewhere Juliet is quite fixated on Tybalt being in his shroud, and this sways him to accept Q4's reading. Sisson worried about the 'difficulties of hiding in an occupied shroud' but then remembered Trinculo in Caliban's gaberdine and admitted the possibility.

In Q2 Friar Laurence says that under the influence of his potion 'no breast shall testifie thou liuest' and Weis emends *breast* > *breath* (from Q1, although its phrasing differs slightly) despite Q2 making sense: the breast shows life by rising and falling (IV.i.98). Q2 has the Friar say that the potion will make the redness of Juliet's lips and cheeks fade to 'many ashes', which Weis finds unacceptable and instead he uses H.R. Hoppe's emendation to 'wanny ashes' (IV.i.100). When the Friar tells Juliet what will happen to her, Q2 has the obvious repetition that she shall 'Be borne to buriall in thy kindreds graue: | Thou shall be borne to that same auncient vault, | Where all the kindred of the *Capulets* lie', in which the first line is clearly a first stab at what became the second and third lines. Weis wisely just deletes the first line (IV.i.111–12). When Capulet (mildly) swears 'good father tis day' when there is no one around whom he might call *father*, editors generally emend to Q4's *faith*, and so does Weis (IV.iv.20). Imagining how she might panic in the Capulet tomb, Juliet in Q2 says 'if I walke, shall I not be distraught' (IV.iv.49), which makes no sense so Weis emends to 'if I wake' (from Q4). At IV.v.41 is another example of Weis setting the bar for emending Q2 fairly low. Paris, upon finding Juliet apparently dead, says 'Haue I thought loue to see this mornings face, | And doth it giue me such a sight as this?', which as Sisson pointed out makes perfect sense if one punctuates 'Have I thought, love, to see...'. Weis follows most editors in preferring *thought long to see* based on Q1. Q2 has Friar Laurence reprimand the wailing Capulets with 'confusion's care liues not, | In these confusions' and Weis adopts Theobald's emendation to 'Confusion's cure...' noting that Shakespeare's letters *a* and *u* are easily mistaken for one another (IV.v.65–6).

At IV.v.82, where Q2 has the Friar say that ‘some nature bids vs all lament’ despite the fact that the dead have gone to a better place, Weis (like most editors) emends to ‘fond nature . . .’ based on F2; again Q2 is defensible as it stands with *some nature* meaning an aspect of our natures. In Q2 Romeo asks Balthasar ‘How doth my Lady, is my Father well: | How doth my Lady *Iuliet?* that I aske againe’, which is perfectly grammatical and metrical if the second line is iambic hexameter with Juliet being disyllabic (V.i.15–16). Yet Weis goes for Pope’s deletion of *Lady* in the second line because this ‘renders the line metrical’. Q2 has a distraught Romeo say ‘I denie you starres’, which Pope and most editors since emend to ‘I defy you stars’ using Q1’s reading, and Weis does so too pointing out that the source uses *defy* for Romeo’s reaction at this point in the story (V.i.24). This is a matter of some consequence for the critical interpretation of the play: does Romeo accept the influence of the stars and oppose himself to it or does he now refuse to accept the reality of that influence? In other words, does he turn materialist as a consequence of despair? Having just expressed his faith in the irrational aspect of life (‘If I may trust the flattering truth of sleep . . .’) and having had that faith shattered by the news, there is plenty to commend the latter reading. On the other hand, his later ‘I will . . . shake the yoke of inauspicious stars’ (V.iii.110–11) suggests that he accepts the stars’ malign influence and fights it.

In Q2, Paris tells his page to listen through the ground for the sound of approaching footsteps by lying down ‘Vnder yond young Trees’ and Weis follows Pope’s emendation to ‘. . .yew trees’, noting that these trees were traditional in graveyards and were associated with sadness (V.iii.3). In defence of Q2, which makes sense, one might note that the speech is much concerned with the looseness of the earth, ‘vnfirme with digging vp of Graues’, which Shakespeare seems wrongly to have believed made sound travel more easily through it. Why send the page to lie underneath a tree unless the ground there were also supposed to be loose (and thus good for listening through) because it was newly planted, hence *young*? Q2 has Paris reply to Romeo’s plea to leave the churchyard and so avoid a fight with ‘I do defie thy commiration’ (V.iii.68), which last word Weis emends to *conjurat[i]on* based on Edward Capell’s alteration of Q1’s *coniurations* and the use of *conjurat[i]on* in *Richard II* and *Hamlet*. But *conjurat[i]on* does not mean merely *entreaty* as Weis claims but a specific entreaty to band together against a common enemy: the king and his kingdom against the usurper in *Richard II*, and the Danish king and English king against Hamlet in *Hamlet*. As Williams argues, and Weis quotes, *commination* has the right sense of religiose threatening and would easily be misread as *commiration*, especially by a compositor who was familiar with neither word.

There are more mixed first and second thoughts in Q2’s ‘I will beleeeue, | Shall I beleeeue that vnsubstantiall death is amorous’ (V.iii.102–3), where Weis rightly deletes the first stab, ‘I will beleeeue’. At V.iii.107 Weis emends Q2’s ‘this pallat of dym night’ to ‘this palace . . .’ using the Q3/Q4/F reading. This again shows how low Weis sets the bar for emendation since *pallet* means a mean bed or couch and, if the property used to represent Juliet’s bed earlier is reused to represent the tomb now, that idea fits the dismal scene better than *palace* does. For the famous Q2 repetition of ‘Depart againe . . . O true

Apothecarie! . . . Depart againe . . . O true Apothecary' Weis simply deletes the first passage as a false start (V.iii.108). Where Q2 has Capulet ask what is 'so shriek abroad' (V.iii.190) Weis emends to 'so shrieked abroad', which supposes an easy misreading of *shriekd* > *shrike*. As Weis notes, Q2's compositor seems to have supposed that Romeo's servant had the unlikely name of Slaughter: 'Here is a Frier, and Slaughter *Romeos* man' and he makes the emendation to '... and slaughtered Romeo's man', which is the Q4/F reading (V.iii.199). Like *shriekd* > *shrike* this appears to be a *d* > *e* confusion in which the copy's *slaughterd* was read as *slaughtere*, taken for a name, and was set without the final *e*.

Weis's edition has four appendices. The first lists the readings he takes from Q1 and Q4. The second offers the whole of the British Library's exemplar of Q1 in superb photofacsimile with, in the running headers, the Through Line Numbers from the Malone Society Reprints edition. (Cross-references to the act, scene, and line numbers of the present edition would have been even more helpful.) The third appendix lists in alphabetical order the main rhymes employed in the play and the fourth claims to be about 'Casting and Doubling' (pp. 412–26). This last is disappointing in that after reckoning that there are thirty-one speaking parts and discussing the doubling possibilities, Weis declines to specify just how many actors he thinks the play needs. His Casting Chart indicates only which scene each character appears in, which is just the first step in making a full doubling chart.

No monographs wholly on our topic appeared this year, but one that should have been reviewed last year (had the publisher been able to supply it) contained a couple of chapters relevant here: Edward Pechter's *Shakespeare Studies Today: Romanticism Lost*. Within a larger, and highly persuasive, argument about trends in criticism Pechter considers the Shakespearian application of the philosophy of materialism (pp. 53–84). Like Faustus in his opening scene in Christopher Marlowe's play, we pick up each theoretical approach to Shakespeare—historicism, postcolonialism, ecocriticism, and so on—in the hope that it will reveal the mysteries of the universe and we find it disappointing. This Pechter calls 'materialist discontent' (p. 56). Materialism itself is so widely and imprecisely used a term, differing little from the idea of worldliness, that Pechter thinks it might just serve as a banner to unite us all. Pechter has some fun pointing out the self-contradictions in Margreta De Grazia and Peter Stallybrass's influential essay 'The Materiality of Shakespeare's Text' and even more with Graham Holderness, Bryan Loughrey, and Andrew Murphy's response to it called 'What's the Matter' (pp. 61–5), and goes on to point out De Grazia and Stallybrass's contribution to the fashionable opinion that Shakespeare's achievement was a collective not an individual one.

The Romantics such as S.T. Coleridge idealized and essentialized Shakespeare because to do so was a blow against the aristocratic elite's claim upon him as their own, and according to Pechter modern attempts to make book history central to Shakespeare studies are likewise elitist: researchers with access to the originals are best placed to do the work. (He is right, although mass digitization of documents is helping to democratize the access.) De Grazia and Stallybrass claim that their materialism is

politically progressive, but Pechter can see no simple connection between one's politics and how one chooses to do literary criticism. The materialists want others to stop doing Shakespeare the way it is being done now and to start doing it another way, but the latter part of the exhortation is much less clearly defined than the former and as an argument it can easily just splutter to a halt with the exhortation to simply 'Stop!'

Pechter develops these claims in a chapter on 'New Theatricalism and the Repudiation of Literary Interest' (pp. 91–15). He considers the recent rise in the stock of the bad quartos, as evidenced in such works as Scott McMillin's *Othello* for the New Cambridge Early Quartos series, which focused especially on the actors rather than the author as the origin of its goodness. McMillin referred to the 160 lines of the Folio version that Q1 lacks, but understated their theatrical importance, containing as they do the Willow Song and Emilia's complaint about the gender double standard. The prevailing idea of one kind of New Theatricalism seems to be that shorter and dumber is better and more theatrical; according to Pechter that need not be the case. When the shorter-is-better claim is made for *Henry V*, the valorization of Q1 comes at the cost of losing all the irony and anxiety about kingship that is in the Folio version, and when it is made for *Hamlet* it actually destroys the play, since the whole point of *Hamlet* is dilatoriness, not getting on with it.

Pechter finds logical incoherence in the idea that we must look at each bad quarto 'in its own right' (p. 101) since, so the argument goes, they are in fact just as good as their related good quartos and Folio texts. As he points out, one can consider a bad quarto in isolation or compare it with something else, but one cannot do both activities at the same time. Indeed, according to Pechter it is the very redundancy, the cuttableness, of some of the good-quarto-only or Folio-only scenes—such as the fly scene in *Titus Andronicus*, the mock-trial in *King Lear*, the deposition scene in *Richard II*—that makes them good theatre: they are pauses of the action for the purpose of some reflection, as Alexander Leggatt pointed out (p. 106). Senior Shakespeareans now routinely valorize the collective effort of the theatrical team and denigrate or characterize as anachronistic the lauding of the author, and Pechter strongly opposes that. So does this reviewer, who found the rest of his book as intelligent, learned, and incisive as the parts reviewed here.

One aspect of the turn to book history that Pechter does not make enough of is the law of diminishing returns, and it is amply demonstrated in a collection of essays called *Shakespeare's Stationers: Studies in Cultural Bibliography* edited by Marta Straznicky. The biographical material it contains is first-rate scholarship in book history but it tells us little about Shakespeare or his texts; the title is thus somewhat gratuitous. Straznicky's introduction (pp. 1–6) states the collection's premise as the idea that the stationers who invested in Shakespeare 'had motives that were not exclusively financial' (p. 2). I would have thought that this was something to be established, not something to start with. Straznicky goes on to give what she suggests are reasons for thinking that publishers were motivated by loftier concerns than mere profit, but they are really just examples of how risky play publication could be for something big like the First Folio. In 'The Stationers' Shakespeare' (pp. 17–27) Alexandra Halasz claims without showing sufficient evidence that there grew a

divide between stationers who concentrated on printing and those who concentrated on owning 'copy' in the sense of the exclusive right to print certain works. She has some speculations on what would have happened if the Pavier collection of 1619 had gone ahead, but no significant evidence is used to support them.

In 'Thomas Creede, William Barley, and the Venture of Printing Plays' (pp. 28–46) Holger Schott Syme makes the point that 1594 was a big year for play publishing as well as live theatre, and asserts that Creede was a particularly active publisher of drama, to whose biography Syme adds considerable detail. Syme notices the significant activity of drapers within the publishing industry and describes the Stationers' Company's attempts to keep them out. He takes the trouble to critique what he calls the 'still-current' (p. 30) but in fact widely discredited theory that playing companies sold their scripts to publishers only if they were desperate for cash. Syme speculates that drapers got involved in publishing plays because they knew the players from transactions of supplying costumes; this is plausible but requires evidence if it is to be accepted. From a series of speculations of this kind, Syme concludes that 'plays were the sort of text that could complete a publisher's program or occupy underutilized presses but could not form the basis of a successful publishing business' (p. 44). Since Syme has to more or less make up the print-run sizes and the costs involved (because almost no hard evidence survives), this amounts to little more than a reflection that, being small, play quartos were not as lucrative per copy sold as big books.

The tenuousness of the volume's links to Shakespeare are apparent in the next two chapters. 'Wise Ventures: Shakespeare and Thomas Playfere at the Sign of the Angel' (pp. 47–62) by Adam G. Hooks is about the preacher Playfere who merely shared a publisher—Andrew Wise—with Shakespeare and was likewise described as mellifluous. That at least is a link to Shakespeare. In "'Vnder the Handes of...": Zachariah Pasfield and the Licensing of Playbooks' (pp. 63–94) William Proctor Williams considers this particular licenser for the press who in 1601 handled about a third to a half of all the books published in London. More obviously of interest to Shakespeareans is 'Nicholas Ling's Republican *Hamlet* (1603)' (pp. 95–11) by Kirk Melnikoff. From 1596, Ling can be shown to have chosen to publish republican-themed works, and Melnikoff gives some examples including one where Ling worked on the collecting of aphorisms, especially those about the role of the wise counsellor in relation to a monarch. At the moment when he published Q1 *Hamlet*, Ling had recently experienced a string of failures in play publishing. Melnikoff reckons that the role of Corambis as counsellor to Claudius is what attracted Ling to Shakespeare's play; it is Corambis's lines that are commonplace-marked in Q1.

Melnikoff sees republican sentiment in Corambis's lines warning Ophelia to beware Hamlet because powerful men turn out to be 'Great in their wordes, but little in their loue' (p. 106). Actually, no, Corambis does not say that of powerful men, he says it of 'louers' having warned Ophelia of male lust ('when the blood doth burne', 'To vnlocke Chastitie vnto Desire') and the danger of unwanted pregnancy ('you'l tender mee a foole'). Contrary to Melnikoff's claim, Corambis says nothing to Ophelia about powerful men hence nothing

here is republican in sentiment; the core claim of Melnikoff's chapter is based on a misrepresentation of the play's content. Melnikoff goes on to detail Corambis's relationship with Claudius, noting that he 'issues . . . commands to the King' (p. 108) including 'take this from this'. Since Corambis means 'my head from off my shoulders' this is hardly a command: it is a gesture of utter subservience. Melnikoff sees Corambis's 'aggressive counsel' being given in phrases such as 'be gone' said to the king (p. 108). He contrasts Corambis's forceful leading of his king with Horatio's subservient counselling of Hamlet and in some small differences between Q1's Corambis and Q2's Polonius he finds the former more republican in sentiment. It is all rather strained.

In 'Shakespeare the Stationer' (pp. 112–31) Douglas Bruster finds evidence that Shakespeare responded to the success in print of certain of his works and the failure of others. To counter Peter W.M. Blayney's suggestion that the glut of printed plays in 1594 was a marketing campaign to advertise the reopening of the theatres after a long plague closure, Bruster points out that the Shakespeare plays actually published in this glut were not, so far as we can tell, much performed thereafter. (I would have thought that we have such an incomplete record of performance for Shakespeare in the 1590s that the absence of evidence is here being misread as the evidence of absence.) Bruster prefers the idea that the players sold their playbooks to publishers because they needed the cash, and finds it bolstered by Alan B. Farmer and Zachary Lesser's recent overturning of Blayney's claim that plays were not lucrative for publishers. In the 1580s and 1590s what we call Arts and Literature made up an increasing proportion of books now listed in the Short Title Catalogue, peaking at 31 per cent in 1600 and then falling off, so the glut of Shakespeare editions in 1600 might reflect Shakespeare catching the high tide of this interest. Indeed the market may well have been saturated.

In the late 1590s Shakespeare began experimenting with prose dialogue for his aristocratic characters, and *1 Henry IV* and *2 Henry IV* are nearly half prose, mainly spoken by Falstaff. Bruster reckons that although theatre-goers liked Shakespeare's experiments in expanded prose writings in his plays, book-buyers did not: the reprint rates for the prose-heavy plays are lower than for his prose-light plays. Perhaps, but since Bruster's argument is that Shakespeare's percentage of prose dialogue shot up in the late 1590s the facts can just as easily be explained by those late 1590s plays remaining unprinted for some other reason: he fails to establish that their prose content was the cause. Also, in counting the non-reprinting of prose-heavy plays Bruster makes a sharp distinction between plays with less than 50 per cent prose and plays with more than 50 per cent, so that *1 Henry IV* at 45 per cent prose comes under the bar and *2 Henry IV* at 52 per cent passes over it. Setting the bar exactly there avoids the awkward problem for Bruster's argument that the relatively prose-heavy *1 Henry IV* was wildly successful in print, going through eight editions by 1632.

Bruster wonders if the setting of Shakespeare's prose as verse in Q1 *The Merry Wives of Windsor* was an attempt to make it visually more attractive to browsers—Thomas Creede who printed it had a track record of doing that—and likewise the prose set as verse in Q1 *Hamlet*. Shakespeare's response to the failure of his prose-heavy plays to get reprinted was to cut back

on the prose: his later plays revert to something like the proportion of prose in his early ones. Here Bruster finally addresses the anomalous prose-heavy *1 Henry IV* selling extraordinarily well, but only to claim that it misled Shakespeare into thinking prose would sell. But prose-heavy *1 Henry IV* did sell well and Bruster's thesis needs to accommodate that fact. Bruster ends with some speculation that Shakespeare himself kept his name off his title pages before 1598 because he thought it would imperil his application for a coat of arms, and hence that Francis Meres in *Palladis Tamia* 'outed' him (p. 131).

In 'Edward Blount, the Herberts, and the First Folio' (pp. 132–46) Sonia Massai notes that Blount liked to dedicate the books he published to powerful people and she traces several networks of patronage. She repeatedly refers to the 'endogenous' nature of print publication but does not explain exactly how that metaphor works. Endogeny's usual sense is of processes arising inside an organism, such as death from growing old, in contrast to exogeny, meaning processes arising outside an organism, such as death by being murdered. Prompted by the dedication to the Herberts in the Shakespeare First Folio, Massai digresses at length about the Sidney–Herbert–Montgomery patronage circle and the minutiae of the publishing of Philip Sidney's works. At this point, on page 142, it becomes clear that Massai has confused *endogeny* with *endogamy* (marrying or mating inside the group), since she makes the contrast with *exogamy* (marrying or mating outside the group) and moreover she gets the *endogamy/exogamy* distinction the wrong way around, thinking that there is 'an interdiction of excessive exogamy in the incest taboo' (p. 142). Of course, the incest taboo is an interdiction against excessive endogamy. John Aubrey repeated the rumour that the father of Mary Sidney's son Philip Herbert (the Folio dedicatee) was not Mary's husband but her brother Philip Sidney, and for Massai this makes sense of his being dedicatee of the Folio and the Folio preliminaries' likening of textual curation to parenting. Massai also traces a Sidney link in Blount being apprenticed to William Ponsonby, publisher of Sidney's works. Massai ends by arguing, implausibly, that by 'maimed and deformed' the Folio preliminaries meant that earlier editions of Shakespeare lacked the authorizing stamp of the Herberts (p. 146).

The last two chapters are the best in the book. In 'John Norton and the Politics of Shakespeare's History Plays in Caroline England' (pp. 147–76) Alan B. Farmer notices that Norton published all of Shakespeare's history play reprints in the Caroline period except those in the Second Folio, and in trying to figure out whether Carolinians found Shakespeare's history plays royalist or republican a consideration of Norton's output, especially his anti-Puritan pro-monarchical matter, is a useful pointer. Farmer helpfully explains in passing the rules for becoming a Master Printer, which Norton never did and hence he ought not to have operated his own printshop. Farmer details Norton's career, including his dispute-prone partnerships with Augustine Mathews and Nicholas Okes in the 1620s and 1630s, and the bottom line is that Norton was always only just managing to stay afloat as a businessman. Yet Norton was a prolific publisher of plays, and looking at who else published plays Farmer concludes that 'it seems as if playbooks were the preserve of smaller, minor printers' (p. 157).

In the 1620s Norton published godly sermons and treatises on the Catholic threat to England. At first this might seem to lend a republican slant to Norton's reprintings of Shakespeare's history plays, for in this period the godly were generally thought of as relatively suspicious of monarchy. But in 1627 Norton published an anti-Catholic sermon in which William Hampton argued that supporting the king's campaign against his parliament to gain money for military defence was the obligation of all right-thinking anti-Catholics, and Norton timed his publication to coincide with royalist agitation for non-parliamentary taxation for the military. In the 1630s Norton's output turned from being anti-Catholic to being anti-Puritan, on account of extreme Puritanism being another kind of threat to the monarchy. In other words, Norton favoured 'royal and Laudian ecclesiastical policies' (p. 168). In this climate, a play such as *1 Henry IV* was read as essentially anti-Puritan since Falstaff was really Oldcastle the Lollard; the King's men played 'Oldcastle' (presumably *1 Henry IV*) at court in 1631 and 1638. Farmer reckons that in the political situation of the 1630s Shakespeare's history plays were read as warnings about the greatest danger to England being internal rebellion, and hence they were of a piece with Norton's Laudian output.

The last chapter is 'Shakespeare's Flop: John Waterson and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*' (pp. 177–96) by Zachary Lesser. *The Two Noble Kinsmen* was first published by John Waterson in 1634 and did not get a reprint until 1679, and only then as part of the Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher canon with no mention of Shakespeare; by Shakespeare's standards that makes it a flop. Lesser focuses on the idea of a particular bookshop as a semi-stable entity with a lifespan longer than that of its owner at any one time, since the shop's name and stock need not change when it changes hands. Simon Waterson, John's father, established The Crown as a highly successful bookshop specializing in works originating from the universities that appealed to a wider London audience. John Waterson, however, was largely unsuccessful as inheritor of the business and dragged his family into debt. The problem was that John Waterson did not publish the successful, high-status titles that his father had left him the rights to but rather tried to branch out into publishing the professional drama. These plays John Waterson tried to make sound a bit elitist, stressing on the title pages that they were performed at 'private' (that is, indoor hall) playhouses. Aside from anything else this point has the useful effect of indicating that the public-theatre/private-theatre distinction was not simply invented by twentieth-century theatre historians to mislead us—and it is misleading since anyone with enough money could visit the supposedly private theatres—but emerged from the seventeenth-century publishers' efforts to construct an elite-minded readership for plays.

Lesser reads Waterson's publication of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* two decades after its first performance as part of the fashion for recovering lost classics of the preceding generation. This fits with *The Two Noble Kinsmen*'s own aggrandizing of the dead Geoffrey Chaucer to help construct a vernacular canon. Where Simon Waterson had favoured Oxbridge dons' quasi-Puritan writing, John Waterson's move towards the court in his pushing of London drama was—like that of John Norton described by Farmer above—a move from Puritanism to Laudianism. The customers of The Crown seem not to

have liked where the son was taking the father's business, hence his financial failure. Lesser ends by pointing out that we should not conflate two kinds of elite status that the early moderns kept distinct: intellectual eliteness embodied in the smart writing coming out of the universities and social eliteness embodied in whatever the court and the aristocrats happened to like.

In *YWES* 91[2012] this reviewer declined to examine Brean Hammond's Arden³ edition of *Double Falsehood* on the grounds that it was insufficiently relevant to the topic of Shakespeare's texts. This was a mistake, since the evidence for *Double Falsehood* being an adaptation of Shakespeare and Fletcher's *Cardenio* has become overwhelming. Nails are hammered into the coffin of Theobald-scepticism by the immense force of the first 200 pages of the twenty-six-chapter collection *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, edited by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor. In 'A History of *The History of Cardenio*' (pp. 11–61) Gary Taylor starts the assault on scepticism by observing that on 9 September 1653 the publisher Humphrey Moseley entered forty-two plays in the Stationers' Register, including 'The History of Cardenio, by M^r Fletcher. & Shakespeare'. The name Cardenio comes from Miguel de Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, and Taylor usefully surveys the reception in Protestant England of this Catholic novel. Cervantes' story of Cardenio would certainly have suited Fletcher's style, interests, and the kinds of characters he liked to write. In claiming that during the 1630–1660s 'Fletcher dominated play-printing' (p. 19), Taylor must be counting publication success rather differently from Lukas Erne, whose article reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011] put Shakespeare far ahead of everyone else in print popularity.

Taylor thinks that Moseley's not printing a play that he thought was by Shakespeare shows that Shakespeare 'had yet to become a magical cash cow' (p. 20). Moseley had the rights to *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and chose not to print it, so sticking Shakespeare's name on a Fletcher play was not something Moseley would have knowingly done as a fraud. A play having a title taking the form 'History of . . .' and then a person's name was pretty rare outside the works of Shakespeare, who used that formula repeatedly. On 20 May 1613 the King's men were paid for performing 'Cardenno' at court and on 9 July 1613 for performing 'Cardenna' there, and of course the minim error $ni > nn$ is easily made. If we look for someone writing for the King's men around 1612–13, Shakespeare is a prime candidate to collaborate with Fletcher, and once we consider the genre too the other active playwrights look much less likely.

The King's men's composer Robert Johnson wrote many extant songs for which we do not know the play, and one in particular has lyrics that suit the story of Cardenio especially well, combining as it does a young woman weeping into noisy waters near rocks, woods, and mountains, bewailing her betrayal in love by deceitful men, and her expectation of imminent death. Having searched systematically for its phrases, Taylor lists 'all collocations from the song that occur in only a single playwright' (p. 30). Here Taylor loses this reader as his list contains entries such as 'bells ring to] Shakespeare, 2 *Henry IV*; bell rings to] Jonson, *Every Man In*; Heywood, *Captives* (3 times)', which seems to point to more than one playwright. The canon with most links

to the song is Fletcher's. The song is in iambic pentameter, a form Shakespeare never used for songs, but Fletcher did. Edmund Gayton saw a lot of plays of this period—to judge by his recollections of them, including several that were not printed until much later—and he related the Cardenio story with details that are not in Cervantes but that are in this song with words by Fletcher and music by Robert Johnson, and Gayton likened Shakespeare to Quixote.

Double Falsehood was performed and printed in London in 1727 with Shakespeare as the author. Although based on the Cardenio matter in *Don Quixote* it must reflect at the earliest a post-Restoration adaptation of the King's men's play since it assumes Restoration staging and of course changes the title and the protagonist from Cardenio to Julio. Taylor finds some phrases in *Double Falsehood* that are characteristic of Theobald's writing, such as 'brutal violence' and 'at present' meaning 'now', that are nowhere to be found in early seventeenth-century writing. In *Don Quixote*, and presumably in the English play *The History of Cardenio*, the young women who are talked into having sex may reasonably expect to force the man concerned to marry them later, since that was not uncommon in the early seventeenth century, but by the time of *Double Falsehood* such women could at best expect to receive only financial compensation. Theobald would have had to rewrite that part of the story, turning a coerced consent into an outright rape, in order to make sense to eighteenth-century audiences.

Double Falsehood has, at just the point where Johnson's song would have appeared in *The History of Cardenio*, a different song that calls for 'Lute sounds within'. (Theobald of course might not have had in his manuscript the original songs since these may have been held on separate sheets of paper.) Johnson was a renowned lutenist and this song is followed by the rapt listening to offstage singing, which is exactly what happens in another Fletcher play. Could Theobald have concocted all this simply by knowing well Fletcher's style? No, because the scene in *Double Falsehood* also has verbal links to Fletcher's *Sir John van Olden Barnavel* that Theobald could not have known about and could not have imitated since it was unpublished. Thus Theobald must have had a manuscript containing some of the early seventeenth-century play. Pope's attack on Theobald's attribution to Shakespeare focused on the one line 'None but itself can be its parallel' in *Double Falsehood*, which he thought too absurd to be Shakespeare. Taylor, however, finds it typical of Shakespeare's collision of metaphor and singularity, and the speech in which it occurs has all the features of late Shakespearian verse; and of course Theobald could not have known that, since his sense of Shakespeare's chronology was highly faulty.

Brean Hammond's chapter 'After Arden' (pp. 62–78) is a series of reflections upon developments since publication of his Arden3 edition of the play and need not detain us. Aside from its merits as an argument about Shakespeare's play, 'Cardenio and the Eighteenth-Century Shakespeare Canon' by Edmund G.C. King has excellent material for an argument against the prevailing orthodoxy that copyright protects writers and their reputations. As King shows, copyright then as now exists to protect monopolizing publishers. King begins with the questions of why Theobald did not include *Double Falsehood*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and *Pericles* in his collected works

edition of Shakespeare, despite believing them his, and why he never published his promised dissertation on *Double Falsehood* being Shakespeare's. Suspicions that Theobald must have invented his alleged seventeenth-century manuscript else he would have shown it to the world or printed it in his *Works* are anachronistic, claims King, since literary manuscripts were not thought to be important and an editor of Shakespeare did not necessarily choose what went into his edition.

A key point for King is that before the 1710 Copyright Act publishers wanted to expand authors' canons, but after it they wanted to suppress new works because these threatened their monopolies in particular authors. In reaction to this, editors increasingly appointed themselves as examiners and discriminators of the canons they inherited rather than as expanders of them. Theobald was out of alignment with the new thinking. Of course, Pope went too far in his discriminations, rejecting *Love's Labour's Lost*, *The Winter's Tale*, *Titus Andronicus*, and *The Comedy of Errors* as having only a few lines of Shakespeare in them. He and Swift were strongly of the view that policing the boundaries of a canon (especially their own) was essential to an author's literary reputation. Pope and Theobald fell out over the size of the William Wycherley canon, with Pope trying to show that Theobald was careless about exactly who wrote what, and of course Theobald thought that all seven plays added to the second issue of the Third Folio had at least some Shakespeare in them.

Whatever the realities of the 1710 Copyright Act—and King points out that modern interpreters disagree on how its regulations were understood at the time—publishers in practice made editors stick to canons that had been established by their predecessors. Most importantly, extending one writer's canon was difficult for a publisher if doing so encroached on the canon to which another publisher had the rights. The addition of new manuscript-only material to a canon could be the basis for claiming newness—hence fresh copyright—in one's publication of the whole of that newly expanded canon. Although the owners of rights to lucrative canons might be tempted to extend their claims by this means they were even more forcefully frightened to set such a precedent lest someone else with an unpublished manuscript were to come along and take their monopoly away by the same principle. Theobald may also have decided not to publish *Double Falsehood* in his complete works edition of Shakespeare merely to avoid a fresh attack from Pope. Publishing the unedited manuscript was just not done at the time: a market for theatre-historical raw materials did not emerge for another 100 years. Indeed, knowing the provenance of the manuscript to be convoluted and tainted by its use in the theatre, Theobald might well have taken the view that publication of it would harm Shakespeare's reputation. Thus we should not read into Theobald's behaviour regarding this manuscript anything surreptitious or devious, as do some who deny *Double Falsehood* a place in the Shakespeare canon.

In 'Malone's *Double Falsehood*' (pp. 95–14) Ivan Lupic picks apart Hammond's slightly inaccurate account of the state of public knowledge in the time of Theobald regarding the 1613 performance records for *Cardenio* and its 1653 Stationers' Register entry. It was George Steevens who first linked the 1653 record to the 1613 records and Isaac Reed who first suggested that

Double Falsehood might be this otherwise lost *Cardenio*. A key question is whether Theobald could have known about the court performance records of 1613, and by tracing the peregrinations of the manuscript containing them Lupic shows that he might just have, although Theobald nowhere mentioned this evidence, not even to help to date the other plays that the court performance records mention. Lupic looks at Malone's marginalia to his own copy of the printed *Double Falsehood*, which show him to be convinced that Theobald was a fraud in at least as much as knowingly passing off someone else's play as Shakespeare's. Interestingly, it is the play's echoes of Shakespeare that raised Malone suspicions: Theobald, he decided, put them in to lend credit to his deception.

Tiffany Stern regards the plotting of a play to be a distinct textual activity, rather than just the thinking up of a plot to form its story, and in "Whether one did contrive, the other write, / Or one fram'd the plot, the other did indite": Fletcher and Theobald as Collaborative Writers' she explores what this would mean for *Double Falsehood*. Stern thinks that certain inconsistencies in Shakespeare's plays—"double time schemes, split plays with single stories, "ghost" characters in stage directions who never speak" (p. 118)—show that he did not execute extensive plotting before he began composing, so if he was going to collaborate it was probably with someone good at plotting, such as Fletcher. Stern details the accusations of plagiarism that were made against Theobald in respect of other work apart from *Double Falsehood*, and notes that he was especially accused of stealing plots. Stern also reports Theobald's expressed desire to imitate Shakespeare. (I would have thought that this desire needs to be understood in the light of the period's fashionable humility topos and Shakespeare's recent elevation to the status of a vernacular classic: imitation was the best a humble author might aspire to.) Much of Stern's argument uses the kind of logic familiar from anti-Stratfordian thinking, asking rhetorical questions in the form 'if he had such a manuscript, why did he not . . .?' More reasonably, Stern claims that the stylometric work to date on Theobald's habits is not good enough. True, it is not, and the next chapters address that.

In 'Looking for Shakespeare in *Double Falsehood*: Stylistic Evidence' (pp. 133–61) MacDonald P. Jackson starts with the problem that we have two layers of distancing to contend with: Theobald avowedly 'revised and adapted' (p. 134) the manuscripts he had, and the oldest of those manuscripts was probably from the Restoration theatre which itself would have interfered with the script. E.H.C. Oliphant assigned the parts of *Double Falsehood* as follows: Theobald revised every scene and wrote II.iii and II.iv on his own, Shakespeare lies behind I.i to III.ii and five speeches at IV.i.28–61 after Julio's entrance and maybe V.ii, and the rest is Theobald's writing or Fletcher's writing or Fletcher revised by Theobald. *Double Falsehood* uses the name Julio for Cardenio and in its metrical contexts Julio is almost always disyllabic in *Double Falsehood* whereas the name Cardenio is three or four syllables, hence 'no verse line containing the name Julio—and there are instances in every scene—can be an exact survival from *Cardenio*, with only the name altered' (p. 135). That is, every line with this name in must have been altered somewhat from *Cardenio* in order to make the new name fit. To a lesser

extent the same problem affects *Double Falsehood's* use of the name Leonora for Cervantes' Luscinda, since in *Double Falsehood* Leonora is quite often clearly spoken as four syllables.

At this point Jackson turns to Jonathan Hope's study of unregulated auxiliary *do*, which Shakespeare used much more often than his younger contemporaries. Shakespeare's rate of unregulated auxiliary *do* is 16–21 per cent, Fletcher's is 6–10 per cent, and Theobald's is 7 per cent, although on the evidence of his adaptations of Shakespeare Theobald only slightly lowered Shakespeare's rate when adapting him. Hope's figures for unregulated auxiliary *do* in each scene of *Double Falsehood* show that Oliphant's division of the play looks right on this evidence: broadly speaking the first half has Shakespearianly high levels of unregulated auxiliary *do*, far above Theobald's or Fletcher's levels. The picture is the same if we turn to double endings, that is lines with an extra unstressed syllable after the iambic pentameter, which Fletcher used more extensively than Shakespeare did, and especially monosyllabic double endings, which again Fletcher used more often. Theobald's own habits in this regard cannot explain the Fletcherianly high proportion of these features in the parts of the play Oliphant gave to Fletcher. Likewise if we look at where the break comes in lines shared between two speakers the Fletcher attributions by Oliphant again appear reasonable, although the Shakespeare-revised-by-Theobald sections of *Double Falsehood* have a very high frequency of break after the sixth syllable which appears to be a practice that Theobald applied to Shakespearian matter that he adapted.

Younger playwrights such as Fletcher preferred *has* and *does* to the older *hath* and *doth* and Shakespeare declined in his use of the older forms after 1600, so that by the end of his career Shakespeare was using the old and new forms about equally, while in his collaborations with Shakespeare Fletcher hardly ever used the older forms. Theobald almost never used the older forms. The distribution of these forms across *Double Falsehood* is essentially consistent with Oliphant's distribution of scenes to writers. Jackson describes some Literature Online (LION) searching for phrases in *Double Falsehood* and a footnote promises that the full data are available at <<http://liberalarts.iupui.edu/shakespeare/research/>> but in fact that url gives an http 404 error at the time of writing (December 2013). Switching to what appears to be a more recently organized site at the same host, <<http://www.iupui.edu/~oxford/>> still does not elicit the promised full dataset. The sixty-six lines at the start of *Double Falsehood* IV.ii are widely thought to be Fletcherian and the links (that is, shared phrases) found by Jackson to works in the Shakespeare canon, the Fletcher canon, the Fletcher-in-collaboration canon, and the Theobald canon show a large number of links to Fletcher even when we adjust for the different sizes of the canons. Moreover, when the same tests are done with passages from *Double Falsehood* that Oliphant attributed to Shakespeare-revised-by-Theobald and to Theobald alone the attributions of Oliphant are again corroborated.

This all makes complete forgery of *Double Falsehood* highly unlikely, most significantly because V.i—which Oliphant says is Fletcher revised by Theobald—has a preponderance of links to plays that Theobald could not have known were by Fletcher alone, since Cyrus Hoy did not figure out the

solo-Fletcher part of the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio until the twentieth century. If Theobald were faking *Double Falsehood* how could he know to use phrases from just those plays? A considerable problem, though, is that Theobald's familiarity with Shakespeare in his role as editor and adapter makes his own inventions hard to distinguish from Shakespeare. Here Jackson adopts qualitative rather than quantitative approaches to particular lines and phrases. Looking at the parallels between *Double Falsehood* and the 1612 Thomas Shelton translation of *Don Quixote*, the bits of *Double Falsehood* that Oliphant thought Shakespearian contain least such parallels and the Fletcher portions the most: it looks like Fletcher drew on Shelton more than Shakespeare did.

What if the *Cardenio* that Theobald possessed was by Fletcher and Beaumont, since Beaumont is the next most likely candidate co-author after Shakespeare? LION searching shows this to be most unlikely: the language of *Double Falsehood* is, on a binary comparison of Shakespeare versus Beaumont, much more like Shakespeare's. Also, Jackson searched for trigrams (that is, three words in succession) common to, first, the parts of *Double Falsehood* that Oliphant thought were Shakespeare-revised-by-Theobald and Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* but not found in *Coriolanus*, and then the same for trigrams in *Double Falsehood* and *Coriolanus* but not in Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. The former links totalled 34 in number and the latter 48 and Jackson seems to think this significant. (These numbers seem rather equal to me.) Jackson repeated the test for the parts of *Double Falsehood* that Oliphant thought were pure Fletcher: 54 trigrams shared with *Knight of the Burning Pestle* but not *Coriolanus* and 42 trigrams shared with *Coriolanus* but not *Knight of the Burning Pestle*. Again Jackson characterizes this as a sharp contrast but I cannot see the significance since the numbers seem all about the same: in the set 34, 48, 42, 54 the highest is little more than 50 per cent greater than the lowest. Jackson's conclusion is that Oliphant was probably right in that *Double Falsehood* was derived from a play called *Cardenio* by Shakespeare and Fletcher, but 'scarcely a line of Shakespeare's verse survives intact' (p. 161).

The next chapter, Richard Proudfoot's 'Can *Double Falsehood* be Merely a Forgery by Lewis Theobald?' (pp. 162–79), also uses stylometry but is considerably less persuasive than Jackson's. Proudfoot reports that all the dramatists working between 1590 and 1625 ended 85–95 per cent of their verse lines with monosyllabic words and the counts for disyllables and trisyllables are small enough and varied enough between these writers to be worth counting. Proudfoot counted all the line-ending trisyllables and above (which he calls polysyllables) in all the Shakespeare plays and all the Fletcher plays written from 1602 to 1614. Proudfoot uses the same logic as Jackson in pointing out that Theobald could not have known of Fletcher's hand in *All Is True/Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* so the presence of distinctly Fletcherian habits in line-ending polysyllables in *Double Falsehood* cannot be forgery. Proudfoot bases that claim for those Fletcherian habits on an exercise in which he took the 100 polysyllables in line-ending positions in *Double Falsehood* and counted how many of those polysyllables are found ending lines in Shakespeare plays, in Fletcher plays, and in Theobald's verse.

Without indicating how many he found, Proudfoot switches to the presentation of his tables and lists. In these, Proudfoot excludes proper nouns from his polysyllables and lumps together grammatical inflections for tense and number—*desire/desires/desired*, *gentleman/gentlemen*, *suspicion/suspitions*—but not those for part-of-speech such as *desirous* and *suspiciously*. Proudfoot counts and tabulates how many plays by Shakespeare, out of his 13 for the period 1602–4, how many plays by Fletcher (out of his 15 in that period), and many works by Theobald (in a rag-bag of his works) contain lines ending with each of a list of 33 words. Proudfoot explains that his first list of 33 words—out of the 100 polysyllables in line-ending positions in *Double Falsehood*—is simply those that are most widely shared by the writers in question, and that the subsequent lists are for the rarer cases. Unfortunately Proudfoot's reflections on his lists are inexpert and comprise little more than an assertion that there are rather a lot of matches.

Proudfoot begins his analysis by eliminating chance as an explanation: that nearly 80 per cent of the polysyllabic words in line-ending positions in *Double Falsehood* should also just happen to appear, as they do, in line-ending positions in the works of Shakespeare or Fletcher or both 'seems, to say the least, unlikely' (p. 171). This is an unsafe conclusion, since until one has gone looking for those words in line-ending positions in other dramatists' work there is no reason to suppose that this 80 per cent match is unlikely to arise by chance; the negative check has to be done. Proudfoot argues that if Theobald was a forger he emulated the style of Fletcher while explicitly disclaiming in the preliminaries to his edition of *Double Falsehood* that Fletcher wrote it. Indeed, Theobald seems to have believed, at least at first, that Fletcher did not write it; he may later have started to suspect that Fletcher was in fact a co-author but could not publicly admit that after trumpeting so loudly the opposite view. Proudfoot notes that when adapting early modern drama, Theobald tended to retain about half (40–60 per cent) of the line-ending polysyllables, and so he concludes that the 80 per cent of the line-ending polysyllables in *Double Falsehood* having a match in either Shakespeare or Fletcher seems high. It is hard to see why Proudfoot considers these percentages to be directly comparable.

Proudfoot then slices the data a different way, looking at by-scene and by-act totals for the line-ending polysyllables in *Double Falsehood* and their matching occurrences in the works of Shakespeare, Fletcher and Theobald, normalized for how many such line-ending polysyllables there are in each scene and act. In Shakespeare the matches are 84 per cent for Act I, 83 per cent for Act II, 63 per cent for Act III, 59 per cent for Act IV, and 57 per cent for Act V, which for Proudfoot shows 'Shakespeare's presence as strongest in the first three acts of *DF*' (p. 173). The numbers certainly are higher for the first three acts than for the last two, but overall these are tightly bunched figures: the outliers are scarcely more than one standard-deviation (12) from the mean of 69. In such a case one should not draw too much from the internal differences within the set. Suddenly, and in an offhand way (buried in a footnote), Proudfoot vaguely sketches the missing negative check: 'Other dramatists sampled [besides Massinger at >20%] have not matched the *DF* hundred words at rates of 20 or more: these include Beaumont, Chapman,

Day, Dekker, Field, and Middleton' (p. 175 n. 11). To make sense of this claim the reader needs to know which plays of these men he sampled, exactly how many matches there were, and whether '20 or more' means '20% or more', which was the metric for Massinger, and also just how much more than 20 per cent did the Massinger plays score. This is all most unsatisfactory in a supposedly quantitative study.

In 'Theobald's Pattern of Adaptation: *The Duchess of Malfi* and *Richard II*' (pp. 180–91) David Carnegie describes what Theobald did as a classic eighteenth-century adapter of drama: he imposed the unities and dramatic plausibility, simplified characters (especially to create passively suffering noble women), moved lines between characters, and altered scene endings to give characters sentimental reflections on their situations. The point for *Double Falsehood* is that we should suppose that *Cardenio* underwent the same process, so the original play probably had violation of the unities and more complex characters (especially women) speaking lines that are given to others in *Double Falsehood*.

The most impressive new work on the problems of the play comes in the essay 'Four Characters in Search of a Subplot: Quixote, Sancho, and *Cardenio*' (pp. 192–213) by Gary Taylor and John V. Nance. On the whole, dramatists of the Restoration and after considered subplots to be anti-Aristotelian in that they violate the unity of action and generally involve low-status characters. If *Cardenio* originally had a subplot involving Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, Theobald would have had an additional reason to cut it: there was a smutty musical of *Don Quixote* by Thomas D'Urfey that Theobald would have wanted to avoid associations with. Having a Quixote and Sancho subplot would make *Cardenio*'s character a parallel to Quixote's. That is why Moseley's Stationers' Register entry for *Cardenio* calls it 'The History of *Cardenio*', echoing *Don Quixote* in which Quixote's failure to understand what that word *history* means—he mistakes fictions for truths—is the central motif.

There are two dramatically pointless gentlemen in *Double Falsehood* IV.ii, and Taylor and Nance think them relics of the Curate and the Barber in *Don Quixote*. Likewise, Lopez and Fabian in *Double Falsehood* II.i observe and comment on Henriquez/Fernando in terms that make little dramatic sense at this point—likening him to a pedlar and a madman tormented by love—but which are perfectly explicable if their lines were originally written for Quixote and Sancho to observe mad Julio/*Cardenio* much later in the story. Moreover, the lines of Lopez and Fabian show that the former is in charge and is more intellectual than the concrete-noun-speaking latter—just as with Quixote and Sancho—and it is the former in each text (*Double Falsehood* and *Don Quixote*) who first spies the madman, first identifies him as a lover, and decides that they should follow him.

The speeches of Lopez and Fabian amount to just 82 words and Taylor and Nance used LION to look for their phrases in all the Fletcher collaborations and Shakespeare collaborations and, outside of LION, in Theobald's non-dramatic works, his verse, his letters, and his translations of Plato and Ovid. They list 'all cases where the language of Fabian and Lopez is paralleled in only one of the three canons' (p. 202). Lots of the Lopez and Fabian phrases turned up in more than one of the three canons—Fletcher's, Shakespeare's,

Theobald's—and they threw away all but the phrases that turned up in only one. Overwhelmingly the Lopez and Fabian speeches match with Shakespeare's language, rather less with Fletcher's, and hardly at all with Theobald's so Taylor and Nance conclude that these speeches are not Theobald's addition to the play. Moreover, the rare Shakespearian words and phrases in the Lopez and Fabian speeches are predominantly from Shakespeare's post-1600 plays and especially his late plays. Since Theobald could not know the chronology of Shakespeare's plays he could not have faked that result. The Lopez and Fabian speeches' links to the Fletcher canon are also to his 1610–14 plays. One reason why the Lopez and Fabian speeches have not been noticed before is that they are not a continuous block: they appear around the intervening speeches of Henriquez and Fernando, and those speeches do seem Theobaldian in their rare-word usage. Taylor and Nance end with some speculation on how effective *Cardenio's* scene of Quixote and Sancho overhearing mad Cardenio might have been (based on what happens in *Don Quixote*) and why and how Theobald, having decided to dispense with the subplot, cannibalized its contents.

The remainder of the book's chapters can be dealt with briefly. In 'Don Quixote and Shakespeare's Collaborative Turn to Romance' (pp. 217–38) Valerie Wayne notes that English plays began to allude to Cervantes' masterpiece a few years before Shelton's 1612 English translation appeared, and she reckons that Shakespeare's late plays' turn to Romance is attributable to Cervantes' influence. Wayne surveys the international popularity of Cervantes' novel, which could be read in England by those who knew Spanish almost as soon as it was published in Spain in 1605. Then she surveys the Cervantic metatheatricality and metatextuality in *Pericles*, *The Winter's Tale*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and other King's men's plays. Huw Griffiths's 'The Friend in *Cardenio*, *Double Falsehood*, and *Don Quixote*' (pp. 239–55) takes the kind of approach favoured by Jeffrey Masten in seeing a sexual connotation to Theobald's activity as a recoverer of Shakespeare and Fletcher's homosocial narrative. His main gist is that eighteenth-century adaptations sought to sideline the power of male–male relationships and assert domestic heterosexual norms and that Theobald may have stripped from *Cardenio* an opening movement laying out the Julio/Cardenio-and-Henriques/Fernando bond of close friendship, which is certainly there in the source, *Don Quixote*.

Lori Leigh's 'Transvestism, Transformation, and Text: Cross-Dressing and Gender Roles in *Double Falsehood* | *The History of Cardenio*' is 'an examination of both the nature and the efficacy of the heroine's (in this case Violante's) disguise in both Shakespeare/Fletcher/Taylor's work and in Theobald's' (p. 258) and hence is of little concern to this review. Leigh makes the useful point that Innogen is unlike Shakespeare's earlier women-disguised-as-men in that she is not empowered by her transformation but becomes even weaker, more of a victim than before; that is certainly true of Violante/Dorothea dressed as a shepherd boy in *Cardenio*. Matthew Wagner's 'In This Good Time: *Cardenio* and the Temporal Character of Shakespearean Drama' is another literary-critical essay, looking at Taylor's script of *The History of Cardenio*. Wagner's main point is that the treatment of time in

Double Falsehood (or at least Taylor's adaptation of it) is much like the treatment of time in plays by Shakespeare.

The last quarter of the book is a set of essays focused on performance, beginning with 'A Select Chronology of *Cardenio*' (pp. 283–5) by David Carnegie, giving the key dates for the events in the *Cardenio* > *Double Falsehood* transformation and a list of performances of the various reconstructions. In 'The Embassy, the City, the Court, the Text: *Cardenio* Performed in 1613' (pp. 286–308) Gary Taylor details the documents that fix the King's men's performance of *Cardenio* as one for the anti-Spanish Catholic ambassadors from Savoy on 8 June 1613 at the London home of the lord mayor, Sir John Swinnerton, and he explores Swinnerton's theatrical connections. Taylor then turns to the preceding performance before James I, between, so Taylor reckons from limited and ambiguous evidence, 5 January and 21 February 1613. There's no possibility that in early 1613 performances of *Cardenio* the villain of the piece (called Fernando/Ferdinando in Cervantes) had the name of Henriquez used in *Double Falsehood*, since this would sound like an insult to the recently deceased Prince Henry. So the play's original name got changed to Henriquez later and presumably that is when the name Cardenio was also changed to Julio. The names Henriquez and Julio cannot have been given by Theobald since he was trying to claim that the thing was Shakespearian and these are most unShakespearian names. Likewise for the minor character names: they are highly unShakespearian and unCervantic. The only logical explanation is that the change of names was meant to avoid association with D'Urfey's scandalous musical version of *Don Quixote* of 1694, which uses Cervantes' names of Cardenio and Fernando.

In '*Cardenio* without Shakespeare' (pp. 309–17) Roger Chartier looks at some other European theatricalizations of stories of *Don Quixote*. Ángel-Luis Pujante's 'Nostalgia for the Cervantes–Shakespeare Link: Charles David Ley's *Historia de Cardenio*' (pp. 318–28) is about a recent Spanish translation and adaptation of *Double Falsehood*. 'Cultural Mobility and Transitioning Authority: Greenblatt's *Cardenio Project*' (pp. 329–43) by Carla Della Gatta is about the adaptation by Stephen Greenblatt and Charles Mee, which is not based on the Cardenio story but a different story in Cervantes and was sent around the world for local theatre companies to further adapt. Bernard Richards's 'Reimagining *Cardenio*' (pp. 343–51) describes its author's own adaptation being performed by amateurs, as is 'Will the Real *Cardenio* Please Stand Up? Richards's *Cardenio* in Cambridge' (pp. 352–5) by Richard Proudfoot.

In 'Theobald Restor'd: *Double Falsehood* at the Union Theatre, Southwark' (pp. 356–69) Peter Kirwan details two productions at this small theatre, the first by the amateur troupe KDC and using the Arden3 text and the second by the professional MokitaGrit company. Greg Doran wrote 'Restoring *Double Falsehood* to the Perpendicular for the RSC' (pp. 360–7) during the planning for his 2011 production for the Royal Shakespeare Company and it describes how he filled the gaps in Theobald's version. Doran suspects that some of the changes Theobald made to the manuscript of *Cardenio* that he possessed were done at the insistence of the Drury Lane theatre managing triumvirate of Robert Wilks, Barton Booth, and Colley Cibber. 'Exploring *The History of*

Cardenio in Performance' (pp. 368–82) by David Carnegie and Lori Leigh is an account of a New Zealand amateur production of Taylor's script, by its directors, as is 'Taylor's *The History of Cardenio* in Wellington' (pp. 383–6) by David Lawrence. The collection ends with Terri Bourrus's account of the various incarnations and performances of Taylor's script (pp. 387–403).

The first 150 pages of *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare*, edited by Arthur F. Kinney, are on texts and hence relevant to this review. In the essay 'Authorship' (pp. 15–30) Hugh Craig introduces the topic, dismisses the so-called 'authorship question' (that is, did Shakespeare write Shakespeare?), sketches the changing historical notions of authorship, and concisely sums up the current state of the art without adding to it. Also mainly a survey of what we know is MacDonald P. Jackson's 'Collaboration' (pp. 31–52), but it additionally considers the differences in Shakespeare's and Fletcher's styles in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and shows that when Shakespeare wrote lines for the Mad Jailer's Daughter—a character mainly drawn in Fletcher's parts of the play—he adjusted his style to suit the character Fletcher had created. Despite this, character disjunctions are visible across the seams between the two collaborators' parts. The same is true of *All Is True* and *Cardenio* and hence the distinctive authorial styles were not erased, as Masten's influential theory says they should have been.

In 'Manuscript Circulation' (pp. 53–70) Arthur F. Marotti and Laura Estill start by surveying the copying out of Shakespeare's poems in manuscript collections and set to song. Sonnet 2 encouraging procreation was especially popular, although usually in the context of imploring a woman to yield to sex. Where these manuscript versions of the sonnets differ from the printed ones of 1609 it is hard to know if the cause is revision (authorial or otherwise) or corruption. Overall there was little manuscript copying of Shakespeare: his poetry 'did not have a strong presence in the manuscript literary culture of the time' (p. 62). Then Marotti and Estill turn to the nine complete plays in manuscript that we have from the seventeenth century, including the Dering and Douai manuscripts, which were all copied from print editions and hence are of almost no value in establishing what Shakespeare wrote.

Ann Thompson's essay 'Quarto and Folio' (pp. 71–84) could usefully have been longer: too many of its topics, such as the unediting movement, are only sketched. Thompson claims that the editors of the 1986 Oxford Complete Works 'championed the versions of the plays printed in the 1623 First Folio, mainly on the grounds that they are "the more theatrical versions" in every case' (pp. 73–4). This is misleading, since the Oxford editors did not in every case base their edition of a play on the version in the Folio. Where, for example, F is essentially a reprint of an earlier quarto they naturally preferred the quarto, as indicated in their Textual Companion's Summary of Control Texts, which shows nine plays where they preferred a quarto to a Folio version. It all hinges on what Thompson means by 'championed': the Oxford editors certainly did not think F the better text in every case. Apart from that, Thompson gives a reasonably accurate account of the various editions since 1986. Her section on 'What Are Folios and Quartos Anyway?' is just a description of the formats, plus the slightly misleading statement that 'The plays [in quarto] seem much more carelessly printed, by twenty different

publishers, and have no dedications, prefaces, epistles from the author, or other forms of material now known as “paratexts” (p. 77). In fact, some exemplars of *Troilus and Cressida* [1609] have a paratextual epistle from the publisher.

Thompson’s section ‘What Do Editors Do?’ is a general survey and a swipe at those who import too many readings from editions other than their copy-text. After all, ‘if the other text did not exist as an alternative, these editors would probably have let the readings of their respective copy-texts stand’ (p. 80). That is true, but those other text(s) does/do exist and not only is this potentially additional evidence in general for what Shakespeare wrote but also the alternative reading may change an editor’s estimation of the likelihood that a reading in the copy-text is correct by helping to show how it came into existence. For example, to take Thompson’s own case of *Hamlet*, there is a press variant in Q2 where Claudius promises a bonus prize for the final scene’s duel: ‘And in the cup an [Vnice | Onixe] shall he throwe’ (sig. N4^r). If we had only Q2 to go by, we would prefer ‘Onixe’ because it is a stone used to make jewellery and ‘Vnice’ seems like gibberish, but because F has ‘vnion’ at this point we can guess that ‘Vnice’ was the Q2 compositor’s first, bungled attempt to set this word and the alteration to ‘Onixe’ was someone’s attempt to turn that gibberish into sense. Thus looking at F changes one’s view of the likelihood of correctness within Q2’s readings and hence (*pace* Thompson) it is reasonable to allow evidence from outside one’s copy-text to affect one’s judgement of that copy-text.

In ‘Revision’ (pp. 85–99) Grace Ioppolo bizarrely starts out by taking Hamlet’s interventions in the work of the touring company who visit Elsinore as if these were straightforwardly evidence of how real companies worked. Ioppolo thinks John Heminges and Henry Condell’s claim to have received from Shakespeare virtually unblotted papers was ‘exaggerated, and false’ (p. 87). I cannot see how a claim could be both those things at once, since they are mutually exclusive. Ioppolo asserts that alterations to playscripts were ‘routinely’ (p. 87) called for by company managers, offering no evidence in support of this claim nor addressing the obvious objection that the Master of the Revels’ licence did not permit it. Ioppolo asserts that Henry Herbert ‘wrote notes to authors’ (rather than to company managers) about the changes he wanted, and again she fails to support this interesting claim with a reference, not even to the entirety of N.W. Bawcutt’s edition of Herbert’s office book, which presumably is her source.

Ioppolo eventually spots the contradiction that emerges from her position, admitting that ‘wholesale alteration or revision of the original text could have placed the acting company in jeopardy of defying the censor’s licence of the text as originally written’ (p. 89). All that she has to counter this problem is an observation that when they toured the regions the Master of the Revels would be unlikely to hear the details of what the companies had performed. Fine, but the evidence Ioppolo relies upon is almost all from Philip Henslowe’s diary of his London operations, not from touring. Apparently short of evidence, Ioppolo muddies the waters still further by treating as revision the reshaping of a work in progress, in this case Robert Daborne’s *Machiavell and the Devil*, as it is being written. Ioppolo regards as a sign in a printed play of ‘authorial

reworking' the appearance of "'ghost" characters who are listed in stage directions but never speak' (p. 91). That is true only if by 'reworking' we mean the author changing his mind in the very first act of composition, and it is hard to see what is 're-' about that. The same problem affects Ioppolo's characterization of signs of foul papers such as vague or incomplete stage directions as evidence of *reworking*: everyone else just calls these the signs of first composition and really this should be distinguished from revision *per se*.

Most extraordinarily, Ioppolo claims that the revision in Theseus's speech 'Lovers, and mad men . . . hath strong imagination' in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is *currente calamo* revision and she cites John Dover Wilson's New Shakespeare edition as the source of her view that Shakespeare made his revisions 'in the margin' (p. 93) to add extra lines. (She cites the wrong part of Wilson's edition, giving pages 138–41 when the relevant discussion is at pages 80–6.) Ioppolo defines *currente calamo* as 'changes while composing' (p. 92) but of course it means those made with the pen running on and hence specifically not those added 'in the margin'. Moreover, far from seeing these revisions as changes made while composing the play, Wilson thought that the interval between initial composition and revision was in this case probably several years.

Ioppolo then quotes the Folio version of this speech and describes as carefully corrected 'into proper blank verse lines' having been relined 'no doubt by Shakespeare' (p. 93) the resulting speech: 'The Poets eye in a fine frenzy rolling, doth glance | From heauen to earth, from earth to heauen. | And as imagination bodies forth the forms of things | Vnknowne: the Poets penne turns them to shapes.' This is not properly lined iambic verse at all. The proper lineation would be 'The Poets eye in a fine frenzy rolling, | doth glance From heauen to earth, from earth to heauen. | And as imagination bodies forth | the forms of things Vnknowne: the Poets penne | turns them to shapes . . .'. Ioppolo claims that Queen Elizabeth was 'rumoured to have taken great offence at' (p. 94) the deposition scene in *Richard II* but she gives no reference for this surprisingly specific claim. (That Elizabeth could see herself in Richard is one thing, but that she referred to a particular scene in Shakespeare would be new knowledge if Ioppolo could support it.) Ioppolo asserts that *Sir Thomas More* was 'repeatedly revised to suit the censor' (p. 94) and cites only a few out-of-date pieces of scholarship to support this view; there exists a more recent and equally well-supported argument that Tilney saw the manuscript just once.

Matteo A. Pangello's 'Dramatic Metre' (pp. 99–125) traces the emergence of blank verse as the dominant metre for English commercial theatre and Shakespeare's increasing use of variations upon the strict pattern to show characters' mental complexities. He suggests that metrically short lines and metrically long ones enabled a range of possible dramatic effects, but is not able to prove that any of them actually happened. The danger, which Pangello only glances at, is that we mistake for artistically designed metrical irregularity what is merely corruption in transmission. Pangello usefully points out and illustrates with apposite speeches the fact that end-stopped lines are not necessarily delivered slowly nor enjambed ones delivered quickly. Regarding the effect of 'Varying the Iambic Pulse' Pangello asserts that 'Now is the winter

of our discontent' begins with a trochee, but surely that is for the speaker to decide. In Richard Loncraine's film of *Richard III*, Ian McKellen seems to stress it 'Now is the WINTER of OUR DISconTENT', with little or no emphasis on 'Now'.

In his discussion of this topic, Pangello uses no symbols to mark where he thinks the stresses fall in particular lines, and this makes it hard to follow his claims about various kinds of feet being present. Pangello makes the useful point that the Duke in *Measure for Measure* speaks only verse to begin with, but once he has to start extemporising because events are outrunning his rigid plans—rigid like his verse-speaking—he switches to prose. His final section, on 'Trends', addresses the problems of counting aspects of Shakespeare's verse style and distinguishing those things, such as rates of rhyme, that are determined not only by chronology but also by genre. Some counts, such as rates of epic-caesura use and prose use, seem to peak mid-career and thereafter fall off, and Pangello speculates that as Shakespeare's verse got naturally looser towards the end of his career he no longer needed to employ epic-caesura and prose to create a naturalistic dialogue style.

The essay on the 'Book Trade' (pp. 126–42) by Adam G. Hooks starts by sketching the history of New Bibliography and objecting that its adherents understated the collaborative natures of drama and of printing. Hooks surely overstates things in the opposite direction when he asserts that 'the book trade was just as collaborative an environment as the theatre' (p. 131). In fact a single man could in principle put up the capital, buy the copy, typeset the work, impress it, bind it and sell it in his shop—and two or three men could do this easily—while commercial theatre required a team of at least ten people. Hooks claims more than we know when he asserts that the first extant edition of *Love's Labour's Lost* 'published in 1598, was the first printed play to bear Shakespeare's name on the title-page' (p. 134). It might have been, but reprints of *Richard II* and *Richard III* were also published that year with Shakespeare's name on their title pages, and we do not know whether *Love's Labour's Lost* preceded them.

In places Hooks's expression is so weak that it distorts his sense. He writes of the bad quartos that 'The irregularities of these texts were deemed inadequate and inferior to the "good" versions' (p. 138), where he presumably means that the texts themselves (not their irregularities) were deemed inferior. Hooks writes of the false ascriptions of *A Yorkshire Tragedy* and *Oldcastle* to Shakespeare: 'The attributions look "bad" when judged by modern principles of textual authenticity, but not when assessed by early modern standards' (p. 140). This is untrue: writers of the period complained when their works were misattributed or others' works were attributed to them; see for example Thomas Heywood and Shakespeare on William Jaggard's misattribution of their work in the 1612 edition of *The Passionate Pilgrim*. Hooks has the exceptionally misleading habit of using the construction 'it may have been . . . but' where he means 'while it is true that . . . yet', so that things we know for sure are by him made to seem uncertain. For example, he writes that 'Meres may have begun his praise of Shakespeare by admiring his "sweet" Ovidian poetry' (p. 135), 'The book trade may have established the commercial, and hence the conceptual, viability of plays in print' (p. 138),

and 'Pericles may have been excluded from the First Folio' (p. 140). In fact all those things are true and Hooks does not mean to suggest otherwise.

In 'Early Readers' (pp. 143–61) Sonia Massai is naturally enough much concerned with the habit of commonplacing and she offers a sketch of book-buying habits and how books were pitched by their paratexts. Massai here repeats the argument of her book *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor*, reviewed in *YWES* 88[2009], that the unauthorized corrections made to early editions were a kind of editing. Oddly, Massai characterizes as a replacement of one word by its 'synonym' the case of an annotator altering an exemplar of Q1 *King Lear* to turn Lear's 'I should bee false perswaded' into 'I should bee halfe persuaded' (p. 155); does Massai think that *false* and *half* are synonyms?

Turning to individual chapters in edited volumes that are otherwise irrelevant to our concerns, the most important this year was Hugh Craig and John Burrows's comprehensive demonstration that someone other than Shakespeare—probably Christopher Marlowe, Robert Greene, George Peele, or Thomas Kyd—wrote part of Folio *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI*, and most clearly its fourth act: 'A Collaboration About a Collaboration: The Authorship of *King Henry VI, Part Three*' (in Deegan and McCarty, eds., *Collaborative Research in the Digital Humanities*, pp. 27–65). The conclusion stands despite some initial confusion about Lady Anne in *Richard III*, calling her 'the widow of that funeral [at the start of *Richard III*], the object of that wooing' (p. 28). She is not the widow of that funeral since the dead body is not her husband's but her father-in-law's, King Henry VI. The confusion persists when they refer to *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI* III.ii, showing how 'Edward, lately possessed of the crown, importunes a reluctant Lady Anne Grey' (p. 28). No, that would be Lady Elizabeth Grey (later Queen Elizabeth to King Edward IV) and the Lady Anne of *Richard III* is Anne Neville, daughter to Warwick the Kingmaker.

The authors decided to test the case for four others apart from Shakespeare possibly having a hand in *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI*: Greene, Marlowe and Peele (because for a long time various commentators have suggested them), and Kyd (because Brian Vickers thinks he collaborated with the young Shakespeare). To undertake Burrows's Delta tests, they took fifty-four plays from Craig's digital collection, which fifty-four constitute all the single-author well-attributed plays from 1580 to 1599, and they focused on 150 function words in them. In the electronic texts the various forms of the function words were tagged for distinction, so *that* as a conjunction gets counted separately from *that* as a demonstrative and *that* as a relative, and so on. Within each specimen play the frequency of occurrence of each function word was compared to its mean frequency across the whole set of plays, giving a set of so-called z-scores, and the same was done for the target text, giving its z-scores.

The mean of the specimen play's z-scores' differences from the target play's z-scores is the so-called Delta score for that specimen play. With lots of specimens, as here, the Delta scores of all specimens' comparisons to the target text can be 'transformed into z-scores' (p. 33). Unfortunately the authors do not say how this is done, and explaining their procedures in words is not their strong suit. The important point is that this is a function-word counting

procedure using real words not strings, because in the electronic texts the part of speech is recorded for each function word. The lower the Delta scores of the specimen texts the more alike they are to the target text. When the specimen texts are not single plays but authorial canons, the lowest scores are 'almost always' (p. 33) for the set written by the person who wrote the target text.

Why only 'almost'? Of the eight plays in the total set of fifty-four that look most like *Twelfth Night*, two are Ben Jonson's *Every Man Out of His Humour* and *The Case Is Altered* and the other six are by Shakespeare. Nonetheless; the results are well beyond random association. Craig and Burrows assiduously note the failings of the tests, and observe that genre seems to matter: tragedy has more occurrences of *I* and *my* than comedy, while comedy has more *thou* and *you*, and the long speeches of tragedy call for more of the connectives. A major result of the testing is that both versions of *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI* (octavo and Folio) turn out to be rather like Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*, Peele's *Edward I*, Marlowe's *Edward II*, Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, and George Chapman's *The Blind Beggar of Alexandria* as much as like some Shakespeare plays. That is to say, Shakespeare's works do not dominate the lists of plays that O and F *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI* are like. Craig and Burrows then broke all the plays into acts and repeated the process. For *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI*, Acts I and especially IV came out as most non-Shakespearian, and again the non-Shakespearian writers whose plays *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI* was most like were Greene, Marlowe, Kyd, and Peele, with just a sliver of likeness to plays by Chapman and Munday too. As a check they repeated the test for *Titus Andronicus*, and it strongly showed Peele's works' likeness to *Titus Andronicus* Act I. The main result, then, was that Act IV of *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI* is the least Shakespearian bit of that play.

To explore the segmentation of the data, Craig and Burrows tried 'rolling segmentation', repeating their tests using 2,000-word chunks that move through the text at 200-word intervals so that the first chunk comprises words 1–2,000, the second words 201–2,200, the third 401–2,400 and so on. The results were too big to tabulate so Craig and Burrows provide a graph generated by the Microsoft spreadsheet software called Excel and an http link to an online copy of the full spreadsheet that anyone can download. Unlike so many such published links to further data, theirs worked at the time of reviewing, more than a year after the essay was published. In their graph, plays whose 108 rolling segments along the *x*-axis have scores near to zero on the *y*-axis are the plays most similar to Folio *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI*. Craig and Burrows highlight three horizontal lines in the graph: one is 16 plays by Shakespeare taken as a set and their scores averaged, another is 15 plays by Greene, Marlowe, Kyd, and Peele treated the same way, and the third is 23 plays by others treated the same way. The three lines wiggle across the page crossing over one another as their sets' averages become more or less like Folio *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI* as we move through the segments.

By contrast, when the experiment is repeated with *Twelfth Night* as the target text the three lines run in their own parallel furrows from left to right at fairly stable distances from the zero on the *y*-axis line. That said, the line for the 23-plays-by-others is the closest of the three to the zero on the *y*-axis line,

meaning least distant from *Twelfth Night*, but Craig and Burrows put that down to this set having 'much more comedy' (p. 41) than the others. Tabulating these results for *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI, Hamlet, Twelfth Night, and Titus Andronicus* and looking at the results, 'all the negatives and none of the positives attach to authorial groups with a genuine claim to the text in question', meaning that for *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI* the sets 16-Shakespeare-plays and 15-plays-by-Greene-Marlowe-Kyd-and-Peele have negative means (indicating 'like this play') and the set 23-plays-by-others has a positive mean (indicating 'unlike this play'). For *Hamlet* the 16-Shakespeare-plays set is the only set with negative means, as we would expect since it is not collaborative, and for *Twelfth Night* the result is the same for the same reason. For *Titus Andronicus*, Craig and Burrows changed the sets to 16-Shakespeare-plays, 5-Peele-plays, and 33-plays-by-others, and the results were that the first and second of those two sets had negative means (consistent with Shakespeare and Peele writing *Titus Andronicus*) and the third had a positive mean (indicating unlike *Titus Andronicus*). The standard deviations tell the same story: *Hamlet* and *Twelfth Night* are very much like the rest of Shakespeare.

Craig and Burrows then turned to an entirely different test, IotaPlus, which looks at words that one set of texts favours and that never appear in another set of texts. They do not go into detail about how the IotaPlus tests were conducted, moving straight to the tabulation of the results for the 108 segments of *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI*. The results for the 108 segments are divided into 4 quartiles of 27 segments, from the most Shakespearian (S1, or Shakespeare-1) to the least (NS1, or Not-Shakespeare-1) and each segment is assigned to one of these quartiles. Thus for whole runs of segments we get verdicts, and Craig and Burrows print a large table showing the detail for this new test and its being combined with the preceding Delta test. Craig has confirmed in private communication that there is a typo in the explanation of the highly complex procedure for combining the results of the two kinds of test: 'A combined score of 2, meaning that the segment ranks in the first quartile on both texts, is now marked S1' (p. 56) should read '... on both tests, is now marked S1'. Craig and Burrows claim that their finding a low p-value (<0.0001) for how often chance would produce the results that they have found means that 'The likelihood that the outcome is a chance-effect... is less than one in 10,000' (p. 56). I would dispute this conclusion on logical grounds: a calculation of how often chance alone will produce a particular outcome cannot, in the same breath, be used to argue that chance did not do it.

Next Craig and Burrows relate their 108 2,000-word rolling segments of Folio *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI* to the actual scenes of the play, and of course the overlap is complex. Think about how a scene slides into and out of the purview of a moving window: at any particular point near the beginning and end the window will cover some of the previous scene too, or the next one. An important interim conclusion is that the evidence gives reason to suppose that 'Act I Scene i and Act I Scene ii are non-Shakespearian' (p. 56). Likewise, 'Act III Scene iii to early Act V' look non-Shakespearian (p. 57). Craig and Burrows decided to split the play into the parts they were fairly sure about: the

strongly Shakespearian Pool A, 'seven scenes from Acts III and V', and the strongly non-Shakespearian Pool B, 'eight scenes from Acts I and IV', and the parts they were unsure about, 'a residue of 13 scenes for further investigation' (p. 57). The trick then was to add each unassigned scene in turn 'to both pools'—I think they mean first to one pool and then the other—and to observe whether that strengthened or diluted its character, making the Shakespearian parts more or less Shakespearian and the non-Shakespearian parts more or less non-Shakespearian. On this basis, Craig and Burrows classify 'Act II Scene ii as Shakespearian and four other scenes (II.iii, III.iii, IV.vii, and V.ii) as non-Shakespearian' (p. 57). That still leaves a quarter of the play—made of short scenes—with indeterminate authorship. Next Craig and Burrows apply the latter's Zeta test, as refined by the former, which finds the words that are favoured in one set of texts and disfavoured in another, and vice versa (that is, those disfavoured in the first set and favoured in the second). The essence of the method is described in my *YWES* 90[2011] review of the book *Shakespeare, Computers, and the Mystery of Authorship* by Hugh Craig and Arthur F. Kinney.

Dividing Folio *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI* into 16 scenes that the previous results inclined them to assign to Shakespeare and 12 scenes that the previous results inclined them to assign to non-Shakespeare (treated as seven 2,000-word blocks of Shakespeare and four 2,000-word blocks of non-Shakespeare), and doing the refined Zeta test using 16 early Shakespeare plays versus 38 non-Shakespeare plays to derive the set of discriminating words, the 11 blocks of Folio *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI* separated out into two distinct clusters in the scatter-plot, one cluster being all Shakespeare and the other all non-Shakespeare. Craig and Burrows tabulate their conclusions about the authorship of each scene of Folio *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI*, assigning it to either Shakespeare or the non-Shakespeare set of Greene, Marlowe, Kyd, and Peele taken together. The division is that Shakespeare wrote scenes I.iii–II.ii, II.iv–III.ii, IV.i, V.i and V.iii–V.vii, and that the rest of the scenes, I.i–I.ii, II.iii, III.iii, IV.ii–IV.viii, and V.ii, are non-Shakespearian. Rerunning the earlier test for homogeneity shows that the portion of the play they assign to Shakespeare has the homogeneity found with pure Shakespeare and is unlike the heterogeneity of *Titus Andronicus* or *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI* as a whole. What remains to be done is figuring out which of Greene, Marlowe, Kyd, and Peele were the co-author(s), and the trouble is that except for Marlowe there exists too little of their writing to test. Craig and Burrows end by examining some anomalies thrown up by their tests and come to the conclusion that these are most likely due to Shakespeare being particularly average in his rates of usage of common words.

The only two other chapters in edited volumes this year were relatively slight. Lukas Erne, 'Editorial Emendation and the Opening of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*' (in McDonald, Nace, and Williams, eds., *Shakespeare Up Close: Reading Early Modern Texts*, pp. 3–8, 334, 353–68), notes that the beginning of Q1 *A Midsummer Night's Dream* refers to the moon being like a silver bow 'Now bent in heauen' and since Nicholas Rowe everyone has changed that first word to 'New' but in fact Q1's reading make sense and has some aesthetic advantages (outlined by Erne) so he thinks we should keep it.

Lena Cowen Orlin, 'Gertrude's Gallery' (in McDonald et al., eds., pp. 291–9, 348–9), observes that in Q2 and Folio *Hamlet* the closet scene definitely takes place in something called a closet—that word keeps getting used—but Q1, on the other hand, does not use that word. Certain 'little' pictures of Claudius are said in Q2 and F to be selling well, but this is not said in Q1. Orlin reckons that Q2 and F imply that little pictures are used for the comparison of Old Hamlet and Claudius in the closet scene, but in Q1 big pictures are used and galleries were where big pictures hung. A gallery could also be called a lobby and because Hamlet says that Polonius will be smelt by those going up the stairs to the lobby, Orlin thinks that Gertrude's closet referred to in Q2 and F is either the gallery/lobby itself or 'a companion space' (p. 297) to one, a study/closet off of a gallery/lobby.

We begin the survey of journal articles with two by MacDonald P. Jackson that were overlooked in previous years. In the first, 'Francis Meres and the Cultural Contexts of Shakespeare's Rival Poet Sonnets' (*RES* 56[2005] 224–46), Jackson shows that the Rival Poet sonnets (Sonnets 78–86) can be dated quite confidently to around the turn of the century and that Francis Meres's *Palladis Tamia* [1598] was the source of the ideas and the phrasing in those sonnets and in Sonnet 55. The dating is achieved by counting the rare-word links to Shakespeare's plays written 1598–1600. Marlowe's 'The Passionate Shepherd to his Love' was first published in *The Passionate Pilgrim* in 1599 and misattributed to Shakespeare, and this would have given Shakespeare cause to reflect on his relationship to his former rival; this period is exactly when Shakespeare's allusions to Marlowe cluster. Was perhaps Marlowe the Rival Poet? George Chapman also has a claim based on biographical detail and some phrasings shared with Shakespeare, and he continued Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* in a 1598 edition. Marlowe-Chapman as a combined entity could be the Rival Poet.

Meres's *Palladis Tamia* names the chief poets of his day and puts then into various rankings; this 'must surely have helped provoke the Rival Poet series' (p. 234). Some of Meres's language and progression of ideas is found in the Rival Poet series and elsewhere in Shakespeare so Jackson proposes it as a source for *Sonnets*. The first link is that Meres mentions Ovid's exile immediately before mentioning Marlowe's being killed in a tavern brawl, and in *As You Like It* Touchstone mentions those things in that order: 'Ovid... was among the Goths' and 'more dead than a great reckoning in a little room'. Meres uses the word *countenance* in the sense of patronage, as does Sonnet 86. Meres refers to Shakespeare being emulated by the 'Muses [using his]... filed phrase' and 'phrase... Muses filed' occurs in Sonnet 85, and this collocation occurs nowhere else in LION. Meres calls Seneca and Plautus the best for tragedy and comedy respectively, and in *Hamlet* Polonius says 'Seneca cannot be too heavy, nor Plautus too light.'

The bits of Ovid and Horace that Shakespeare uses for Sonnet 55 are quoted together by Meres, and Shakespeare cannot have got them directly from Ovid and Horace since only in Meres are their quotations associated with Mars (as they are in Shakespeare's sonnet) and with the notion of overturning. Also, Shakespeare began for the first time to use in his writing after 1598 some unusual words that appear in Meres: *compeer* (Sonnet 86 and *King Lear*),

modern in the sense of ‘pertaining to now’ (Sonnet 83), *mellifluous* (*Twelfth Night*), *poetical* (*As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*), *disconsolate* (*King John*), *pickled-herring* (*Twelfth Night*), *extinct* as a verb (*Othello*), *portraiture* (*Hamlet*), *maker* (*Henry V* and *Coriolanus*), and *precepts* (*Hamlet* and several plays thereafter). Jackson acknowledges that he has not done the negative check and hence that all these words might have been merely ‘in the air’ at this time (p. 239). Jackson considers the possibilities for Jonson being the Rival Poet, coming to prominence as he did in the period 1598–1600, but he backs Katherine Duncan-Jones’s view that the Rival Poet sonnets are reacting to a general atmosphere of poetic rivalry at the end of the 1590s and that the Rival Poet is an amalgamation of several figures. In an appendix Jackson lists the verbal parallels by which he dates the various sections of *Sonnets*, and essentially this is the procedure he used in articles on dating reviewed in *YWES* 80[2001] and 82[2003].

In the second article, ‘Shakespeare’s Sonnet CXI and John Davies of Hereford’s *Microcosmos* (1603)’ (*MLR* 102[2007] 1–10), Jackson argues that Shakespeare read and responded to the reference to himself as a mere actor that John Davies of Hereford wrote in his poem *Microcosmos*. Jackson finds parallels between Sonnet 111 and a part of *Microcosmos* about Fortune making a high-minded person undertake the low profession of acting, which likens this to a stain, and uses the phrasing ‘That . . . better’. But who borrowed from whom? Sonnet 111 is one that Jackson has dated to after 1600, and nearby Sonnet 107’s apparent allusion to James I’s 1604 progress through London puts that one after *Microcosmos*, so presumably Sonnet 111 likewise postdates Davies’s book. Jackson eliminates the possibility that Davies somehow saw Shakespeare’s Sonnet 111 in manuscript and wrote a response to it in *Microcosmos*. Apart from anything else, Davies directly refers to Shakespeare’s being an actor while Shakespeare only alludes to it, and also Davies put in a marginal ‘W.S.’ marker that would have made it easy to find—and hence respond to—if Shakespeare were browsing the book. Davies would have had rather more work finding Shakespeare’s sonnet and responding to it by turning its allusion into direct reference. We know that Shakespeare read *Microcosmos* as its section on the three effects of drink is the source for the Porter’s speech on drink in *Macbeth*, and nowhere else in *LION* is drink associated with three effects. Jackson shows that later references to Shakespeare by Davies refer to him not as a close friend but as a public figure, so he was not one of the private friends amongst whom Shakespeare’s sonnets circulated in manuscript before print publication. An appendix shows the vocabulary links between Sonnet 111 and the Shakespeare plays written after 1600.

Another article that should have been noted previously is Tiffany Stern’s “‘The forgery of some modern author’? Theobald’s Shakespeare and Cardenio’s *Double Falsehood*” (*SQ* 62[2011] 555–93). Her argument is that Theobald’s *Double Falsehood* is probably wholly or partly a forgery by him and that even if there was a play called *Cardenio* co-written by Shakespeare and Fletcher (for which Stern finds little evidence) there is nothing to connect it to *Double Falsehood*. As Stern sees it, the key problems are the lack of a reason to suppose that Shakespeare wrote a play called *Cardenio*, or to link

Theobald's *Double Falsehood* to it, that the latter has no history outside of Theobald's use of it, and it is variously described in different places. In the royal treasury accounts for 1613 that list the King's men's plays at court it is called 'Cardenno', which, since the list also has 'The Hotspurr' and 'Benidicte and Betteries', might just be a lead character's name, not the title. A second entry in the same manuscript calls it 'Cardenna', which was also the name of a place. In 1653 Humphrey Moseley entered a group of plays in the Stationers' Register, including 'The History of Cardenio, by M^r Fletcher. & Shakespeare'. Stern claims that this list is alphabetized and that this one comes under 'F'. (Actually, it is only loosely alphabetized, starting with 'W^m. Samson' and putting Thomas Middleton before Philip Massinger.) The lack of an honorific 'Mr' for Shakespeare and the presence of a period before his name has sometimes been interpreted as evidence that he was added as an afterthought.

Worse still, the Stationers' Register list and a later one by Moseley in 1660 attribute to Shakespeare plays that we know are not his. Moseley appears to have been trying to save money on register entry by bundling pairs of plays together as individual plays with alternative titles. Perhaps *Cardenio* was by Fletcher alone. *The Two Noble Kinsmen* we know was a collaboration with Shakespeare, but Stern tries to cast doubt on *All Is True/Henry VIII*'s being one by suggesting that it is only because of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and Moseley's unreliable *Cardenio* evidence that we even suspect *All Is True/Henry VIII* to be a collaboration. Actually, no: the stylometric evidence for *All Is True/Henry VIII* being a Shakespeare-Fletcher collaboration is overwhelming. Stern provides the background on Theobald and his fight with Pope, reading the *Double Falsehood* claim as a part of Theobald's struggle to be recognized as a preserver of Shakespeare's legacy. Theobald never claimed that what he had was *Cardenio*. The manuscript that Theobald showed people was probably not Shakespeare's, as he repeatedly insisted in his *Shakespeare Restored* [1726] that no such manuscripts survive and in his correspondence with William Warburton when he was preparing *Double Falsehood* for the stage the following year he failed to mention having such a manuscript when discussing emendations based on speculations about Shakespeare's handwriting.

When he published *Double Falsehood*, Theobald's description of the manuscripts he had and what he thought were their provenances is ambiguous and vague. It is odd that no one else ever mentioned selling these manuscripts to Theobald. One of the manuscripts Theobald claimed to derive from John Downes, prompter for Thomas Betterton's Restoration company under William Davenant's management, and yet—in a period when theatres were desperate for pre-Commonwealth plays to perform—this supposedly Shakespearian survivor was not played in the Restoration. Perhaps, wonders Stern, Downes, Betterton, and Davenant, three lovers of Shakespeare, had the manuscript and knew it to be not by Shakespeare. Charles Gildon in 1719 claimed to have a manuscript of a Beaumont, Fletcher, and late Shakespeare play and possibly Theobald got hold of it, and possibly it once belonged to Betterton. The idea that in 1718 Jacob Tonson the Younger obtained a copy of Moseley's manuscript when he bought the rights to Moseley's plays, and sold it to Theobald, has to overcome the objection that Tonson would hardly have sat on such a manuscript while Pope was making his 1725 edition for Tonson

and then sell it to Pope's rival just when that edition was being criticized by said rival.

In any case, why did Theobald not include *Double Falsehood* in his edition of Shakespeare? He did quote it, just once, to defend a reading, but why only once? (As we have seen, this part of Stern's scepticism is dealt with by Edmund G.C. King's work on eighteenth-century copyright and its relation to canon-enlargement, reviewed above.) Also, asks Stern, why have we never heard of Theobald's Shakespearian manuscript since? He never mentioned selling it and it was not in his effects when he died. Theobald's manuscript of *Double Falsehood* is said in the 1770 edition of the play to have ended up in the Museum of the Covent Garden playhouse, but when that museum's collection was lost in a fire of 1808 no one mentioned the loss of a Shakespeare manuscript. Even before that fire, the great editors of the late eighteenth century did not go to the Museum of the Covent Garden playhouse to recover a lost Shakespearian manuscript. The prefatory material to the first edition of *Double Falsehood* says that the real proof of authorship is in the audience's reaction to the play, although Theobald had shown the play to (unnamed) great authorities. The preliminaries of the second edition are even more tentative about the Shakespeare link. Stern offers background material on Theobald's career, drawing special attention to his habit of plagiarism and of open imitation of Shakespeare. She thinks that he was also the anonymous creator of a translation of parts of *Don Quixote* that appeared as *Adventures on the Black Mountains* in 1729, the same parts as used in *Double Falsehood*.

Stern undertakes fresh stylometric work of her own, but rather than looking for signs of Shakespeare or Fletcher in *Double Falsehood* she goes looking for signs of Theobald in it. She finds the use of *heir* as a verb distinctive to *Double Falsehood* and other Theobald work and it is absent from Shakespeare. Theobald mixes *does/doth* and *has/hath* in his sole-authored work, so this mix appearing in *Double Falsehood* is not a sign of co-authorship. The internal rhymes of *Double Falsehood* can be paralleled from elsewhere in Theobald. Also, four words in *Double Falsehood* that Hammond thought markers of Shakespeare (*vassal*, *disprize*, *vermilion*, and *coil*) are present in the Theobald canon. (True, but five others are not.) Stern thinks that Hope's use of tests for auxiliary *do* is vitiated by his choosing one of Theobald's juvenilia, *The Persian Princess*, for comparison, and she refers to Jackson's and Proudfoot's stylometric essays in the then-unpublished *Quest for Cardenio* (reviewed above), pointing out that they largely ignore the evidence in Theobald's non-dramatic verse writing. Walter Graham's test of counting feminine endings (a supposed marker of Fletcher) simply missed Theobald's writing where he uses this feature extensively. Other matches between *Double Falsehood* and the Fletcher canon Stern dismisses as Theobald internalizing Fletcher's style, showing that the alleged markers of Fletcher can be exemplified from Theobald's work. Stern criticizes Stephan Kukowski's stylometric work on Fletcher's hand in *Double Falsehood*, pointing out that his habits can be found in Theobald too.

Stern discusses the changes to the names in *Double Falsehood* (when compared to its source, *Don Quixote*) and their effect of wrecking the metre; this of course only means that such lines presumably have had their metre

repaired, not that they were wholly rewritten. Finally, there are bits of *Double Falsehood* that are undoubtedly Theobald's because either he took credit for them, or they are distinctly eighteenth-century, or he kept changing them when quoting them, which he would not do if he was referring back to an authoritative manuscript. Stern considers the contemporary view that *Double Falsehood* was likely a forgery and wonders whether he forged the whole thing or whether it was 'a forgery on top of a real manuscript' (p. 590).

The present author's article on Q2 *Hamlet*, Gabriel Egan, 'The Editorial Problem of Press Variants: Q2 *Hamlet* as a Test Case' (*PBSA* 106[2012] 311–55), reconsiders all the edition's known press variants in the light of the latest thinking about the possible causes of variation and Joseph A. Dane's discovery that in general corrected and uncorrected sheets were not randomly mixed. Because the integrity of the heap was largely preserved during white-paper machining, reiteration, and gathering, an early state of one forme was usually backed by an early state of the forme on the other side of the sheet, and a late state was backed by a late state, and each exemplar is likely to comprise mainly sheets in the same state (early or late). Thus when deciding between readings in a press variant, it is reasonable to consider the character of the exemplar as a whole rather than treat each forme in isolation. In the same journal, Alan R. Dicks, 'John Dicks's Illustrated Editions of "Shakespeare for the Millions"' (*PBSA* 106[2012] 285–310), is a detailed and fascinating account of the economics of publishing Shakespeare in the age of the steam press and stereotyping, but because it sheds no light on the text of Shakespeare it is not within our purview.

The two most important articles of 2012 are concerned with extending the Shakespeare canon. In the first, 'Identifying Shakespeare's Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* (1602): A New(er) Approach' (*Shakespeare* 8[2012] 13–43), Brian Vickers shows that the Additions to Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* are by Shakespeare. The present reviewer must disclose that he was the editor who accepted this article for publication, on the basis of two approving referees' reports arising from double-blind peer review. The fourth edition of *The Spanish Tragedy*, the quarto of 1602, has 320 lines—clustered into five groups, the Additions—that were not in previous editions. Jonson was paid for additions to the play on 25 September 1601 and 22 June 1602, but the Additions are not in his style and in any case Marston's *Antonio and Mellida* (dated 1599) alludes to the Painter material in Addition 4, so it must have been in existence well before whatever Jonson was paid for. Vickers surveys the evidence that the Chamberlain's men played *The Spanish Tragedy*, including Richard Burbage in *The Second Return from Parnassus* seeming to coach a student in playing Hieronimo, the elegy on Burbage's death recalling his playing the part, and the Induction to Marston's *The Malcontent* seeming to say that the boys of St Paul's took a Jeronimo play from the King's men.

Vickers approvingly surveys Warren Stevenson's hunting of verbal parallels between Shakespeare's works and the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and unapprovingly surveys Hugh Craig's work counting word frequencies in its Additions. For Vickers, Craig's approach cannot achieve certainty and 'It is unable to identify any single utterance as author specific' (p. 24), as his own parallel-hunting methods does, and he objects that Craig treats a literary text

as a bag of words rather than a weaving of words. (This plausible distinction is specious: we do not know enough about how the mind creates language to say that one or other method more accurately corresponds to the process of literary invention, and the key thing is whether a method can be shown objectively to be a good discriminator of authorship; as we shall see, it turns out that Craig's method can and Vickers's cannot.) Vickers offers his trigram-hunting method as a third way that 'transcends the weaknesses of both approaches [Stevenson's and Craig's]' (p. 25) and is much more reliable than frequency counting when the sample text is small, as it is with the 2,600 words in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*. In the course of describing his method, Vickers makes an unsubstantiated assertion of some importance: 'the allocation of coauthorship in the Elizabethan and later periods was usually by scenes' (p. 27), and hence one can test individual scenes by his method. In fact we do not know for sure that co-writers divided their workload by scenes as there is very little evidence.

Vickers explains the mechanics of his method, which uses the software called Pl@giarism, for which he gives an Internet url that at the time of review (December 2013) pointed to an advertising website that randomly redirects visitors to various commercial sites with no scholarly content. (The journal *Shakespeare* has learnt its lesson and no longer publishes raw URLs: online projects must be identified by their names not their Internet addresses.) A Google search for the software under various possible permutations of its name leads to nothing, so in fact one cannot replicate Vickers's work, which is a significant demerit to the scholarship. Vickers criticizes Craig for using as a corpus of plays to search within the Chadwyck-Healey Verse Drama Database on CD-ROM—'better resources were available' (p. 28)—but in Craig's favour is the fact that other researchers have access to that database and can thereby verify or refute his claims.

Vickers's claims, on the other hand, are all based on a 'database [Marcus Dahl] has created, which contains over 400 plays and masques dating from the 1580s to the 1640s, and including the complete canons of Marlowe, Lyly, Peele, Kyd, Shakespeare, Dekker, Jonson, Chapman, Middleton, Beaumont, Fletcher, Massinger and Shirley, together with all the anonymously published plays' (p. 29). It was shown in this review in *YWES* 91[2012] that Dahl and Vickers's database does not in fact contain the entire Middleton canon: this reviewer listed many phrases that Vickers wrongly believes, from searching this database, to be absent from Middleton's writing. With a demonstrably unreliable corpus of electronic texts as its basis, Vickers's claim that 'the uniquely Shakespearian matches amount to 116 in the 320 lines of the Additions, a rate of one every 2.5 lines' (p. 29) needs to be tested. The crucial matter is whether the 'uniquely' part of that claim is true, since Vickers not finding something in Dahl's database, and so declaring that something to be uniquely Shakespearian, is only a reliable discovery if the database is complete and his method searches it properly.

Vickers makes the specific statistical claim that long n-grams are a more reliable indicator of authorship than short ones: 'The occurrence of longer consecutive sequences is an even stronger indicator, since a run of four words is statistically rarer, one of five is even rarer, and one of six is rarer still' (p. 29).

As we shall see, David Hoover has tested this claim and proved it to be false. In his Appendix 2, Vickers lists the matches he has found between the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and the Shakespeare canon, all 116 of them. These we can test by searching in EEBO-TCP and LION to see if any of the phrases were simply common in the period and hence are not decisive in ascribing authorship, and whether Vickers ought to have found them in Dahl's database because they do in fact also exist in the plays of dramatists other than Shakespeare.

Vickers's first match is '[take] note of it', the square bracket being necessary because in some of his matches all four words are present, and in others only the last three. Vickers finds this phrase only in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Measure for Measure*, *Twelfth Night*, *Hamlet*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, and *Cymbeline* but in fact the full four-word string is common in published writing. STC 6553 (published 1606) has 'taking note of it' (sig. A4^v), Nashe's *Have With You to Saffron Walden* STC 18369 (published 1596) has 'take note of it' (sig. L4^v), STC 18639 (published 1607) has 'take note of it' (sig. K7^r), and STC 18800 (published 1618) as 'take note of it' (sig. E1^v). Naturally, the three-word string 'note of it' is even more common since it includes all these and many more.

Vickers's second match is 'of it. | Besides' which he thinks present only in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *King John*, but there are also 432 hits in 385 EEBO-TCP books. Confining ourselves to just the period up to 1600, STC 3071 (published 1585) has 'of it besides' (sig. Aaa1^r), STC 3734 (published 1587) has 'of it, besides' (sig. Xxx8^r), STC 3802 (published 1580) has 'of it? Besides' (sig. Yy4^r), STC 4442 (published 1583) has 'of it? Besides' (sig. Ccc6^v), STC 4470 (published 1562) has 'of it, beside' (sig. ***1^v), STC 5008 (published 1563) has 'of it. Besides' (sig. Q4^v), STC 14842 (published 1535) has 'of it. ¶Besyde' (sig. B2^r), and there are 35 more matches in 33 books.

Vickers's third match is 'short lived', which he finds only in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Love's Labour's Lost* but there are 26 hits in 14 books before 1600 and if we extend the date to the end of EEBO-TCP's range (that is, up to 1699) there 376 hits in 273 records. In LION there are hits in Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* and Middleton's *The Revenger's Tragedy* (first performed 1605–6), the second of which Dahl's database really should contain if it is as complete as Vickers claims: 'over 400 plays and masques, 1587–1642' (p. 35). Vickers's fourth match is 'run to the', which he finds only in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Romeo and Juliet*. It is not at all clear why Vickers thinks this rare. LION has dramatic examples before 1600—the anonymous *Look About You* (first performed 1597–9), Thomas Ingelend's *The Disobedient Child* (first performed 1559–70), Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* (first performed 1589–90), Marston's *Antonio and Mellida* (first performed 1599–1600)—and dozens more if one expands one purview to the period generally. These additional examples include Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* that Vickers's method somehow failed to spot, and yet dozens more if one looks beyond just drama to poetry and literary prose. EEBO-TCP has 2,016 examples from 1,415 books published before 1700.

Vickers's fifth match is 'presently, | And bid', which he finds only in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI*, but EEBO-TCP shows that Aston Cokayne's play *Trappolin Supposed a Prince*, first performed in 1633 and printed as Wing C4894, has 'presently, and bid' (sig. Gg6^r). Vickers's sixth match is 'strange dream[s]', which he finds only in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Romeo and Juliet*, but unsurprisingly even if we confine ourselves to drama there are plenty of examples including the anonymous *Birth of Hercules* (first performed 1597–1610), Marston's *Antonio's Revenge* (first performed 1600–1), twice in Marston's *The Malcontent* (first performed 1602–4), Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* (first performed 1612–14), and several less well-known plays. EEBO-TCP finds 80 hits in 67 books before 1700.

Vickers's seventh example is 'do . . . hear me sir' where one word fills the gap, and he finds this only in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* ('Doe ye heare me, sir') and *King John* ('Do but heare me sir'). LION finds 'do you hear me, sir' in Middleton's *The Puritan* (first performed 1606), 'do you heare mee, Sir?' in William Percy's *The Cuck-Queanes and Cuckolds Errants* (no later than 1604 since it is a source for Marston's *The Dutch Courtesan*), 'do you heare me sir?' in Henry Porter's *The Two Angry Women of Abingdon* (first performed 1598–9), and 'Do'y heare me sir' in Edward Sharpham's *Cupid's Whirligig* (first performed 1607), all of which Vickers's method should have found.

Vickers's eighth match is 'Nay blush not', which he finds only in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Antony and Cleopatra* but LION finds it in Fletcher's *Love's Pilgrimage* (first performed 1616) and *The Little French Lawyer* (first performed 1619–23) and *The Island Princess* (first performed 1621), William Haughton's *Englishmen for My Money* (first performed 1598), Thomas Heywood's *The Four Prentices of London* (first performed 1594), Jonson's *The Devil is an Ass* (first performed 1616), Massinger's *The Great Duke of Florence* (three times; first performed 1627), and Francis Quarles's *The Virgin Widow* (first performed 1641), all of which should have been caught by Vickers's method.

Vickers's ninth match is 'Saint James [or Jamy]', which he finds only in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and *The Taming of the Shrew*, but LION finds 'Saint James' in the anonymous *King Darius* (first performed 1565), the anonymous *The Pedlar's Prophecy* (first performed 1561–3), the anonymous *Free Will* (first performed 1565–72), John Heywood's *The Four Ps* (first performed 1520–2), Jonson's *The Gypsies Metamorphosed* (first performed 1621), and George Ruggle's *Ignoramus* (first performed 1615). Vickers's tenth match is 'within this hour [,][] that', which he finds only in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and *The Winter's Tale*, but LION finds 'Within this hour, things that' in Fletcher's *Monsieur Thomas* (first performed 1610–16), and 'that within this hour' in Middleton's *The Witch* (first performed 1616). EEBO-TCP finds that STC 22719 (published 1593) has 'within this hour, that' (sig. Vv2^r) and there are several examples from the late seventeenth century.

Vickers's eleventh match is 'hanged up' when said of persons, and Vickers finds this only in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and *The Contention of York and Lancaster/2 Henry VI*, but LION finds it in the anonymous play *Nice Wanton* (first performed 1547–53), Lording Barry's *Ram-Alley*

(first performed 1608–10), Thomas Dekker's *1 Honest Whore* (first performed 1604), Fletcher's *The Spanish Curate* (first performed 1622), Massinger's *Believe As You List* (first performed 1631), William Stevenson's *Gammer Gurton's Needle* (first performed 1552–63), and Lewis Wager's *Life and Repentance of Mary Magdalene* (first performed 1550–66). Lastly for this survey, Vickers's twelfth match is 'me a taper' used in the imperative—such as 'give me a taper' or 'lend me a taper'—which he finds only in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Othello*, but LION finds it in *Antony and Cleopatra* too as 'Get me a taper'.

Thus we have to test the first 10 per cent of Vickers's list of claimed 'unique' parallels, meaning trigrams found in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and in Shakespeare but nowhere else, before we hit one for which that claim is actually true—imperative 'me a taper'—and even then our confidence in Vickers's method is diminished by the fact that he missed a Shakespearian example, 'Get me a taper' from *Antony and Cleopatra*. The unavoidable conclusion is that Vickers's method does not work and the likeliest reason for that is that the database of electronic texts he is searching is complete for Shakespeare but incomplete for other dramatists. We already know it is incomplete for Middleton. In any case, being a database of plays and nothing else, it is useless for doing the necessary negative check of excluding phrases that were simply common in the writing of the period. The really significant problem underlying all this is that Vickers's work depends upon a secret database—he has not published it—so no one else knows what is in it. None of this criticism is evidence against Vickers's central claim that the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* are by Shakespeare, which was already secured by the scholars whose methods he unwarrantedly denigrates.

Before turning to the second article on canon-enlargement it is worth noticing a long and highly detailed conference paper abstract posted online that tests the core methodology Vickers uses, which is long n-grams: "The rarer they are, the more there are, the less they matter": Online Abstract for a Paper Delivered on 19 July at the Conference "Digital Humanities" held at the University of Hamburg on 16–20 July 2012" <<http://www.dh2012.uni-hamburg.de/conference/programme/abstracts/the-rarer-they-are-the-more-there-are-the-less-they-matter/>> (accessed 9 February 2014). In it, David Hoover shows that Vickers is wrong and that long n-grams are poor markers of authorship. Hoover set about testing the hypothesis using a large body of works of known authorship from the nineteenth century: 83 works in all by 41 authors and totalling 2 million words, with 20 authors contributing more than one text. Using Burrows's Delta test, a method of counting frequently occurring words, Hoover found that 16 of the 20 multi-text authors had their entire canons correctly identified, three had all but one text of their canon correctly identified, and one author had his canon incorrectly identified as two discrete canons. Repeating the test but using bigrams (that is, n-grams where $n=2$) worsened the result: only 14 authors' canons were fully and correctly identified, and trigrams ($n=3$) were even worse. Then Hoover repeated it all for poetry and got the same result.

Then Hoover turned to really rare n-grams to replicate what Vickers does, but using Henry James's work. Hoover put together a reference set of

64 sections of third-person narration by 23 authors, and then created a three-text James corpus to provide the known-author set, an eight-text set of James texts to be tested as if they were of unknown authorship, and a six-text non-James set. Hoover found all the three- to six-word n-grams in the entire corpus (all these sets considered together), and because matches between two texts are required for Vickers's method he removed all the n-grams that occur in only one text. That left about 9,600 n-grams. Hoover took each of his eight James-as-if-unknown texts and counted the frequency of occurrence of its n-grams in the other seven James-as-if-unknown texts taken as a set, the James-known texts as a set, and the six non-James texts taken as a set, and then he did that for the six non-James texts and graphed the results.

The result was that the eight James-as-if-unknown texts share more n-grams with the known-James texts than the non-James texts do, but not by very much. Alarming, two of the non-James texts share more n-grams with the known-James texts than does one of the eight James-as-if-unknown texts, that one being the least Jamesian of that set. Thus, if we did not know that Nathaniel Hawthorne wrote *The House of Seven Gables* and we used Vickers's method to test whether Henry James wrote it, we would be impressed that 28 per cent of the n-grams in that book (making 291 n-grams in total) are also found in the James corpus and are not found in the reference set of works by 23 other authors. Vickers's attribution claims rest on fewer n-grams than that being shared between the works he wants to attribute and the Kyd corpus and nowhere else, so we must conclude that his method does not work. Repeating the tests for poetry, Hoover found poems that scored lower in their n-grams shared with the corpus of the person who wrote them than was scored by poetry by someone else. Lastly Hoover stitched together several people's poems to make a fake corpus and was able to find significant numbers of n-grams shared by particular poems and this fake corpus and nothing else, which by Vickers's logic would make these particular poems be by the same person as this fake corpus even though that person does not exist.

John Jowett, 'A Collaboration: Shakespeare and Hand C in *Sir Thomas More*' (*ShSurv* 65[2012] 255–68), extends the Shakespeare canon by arguing that he wrote More's soliloquy in Addition V of *Sir Thomas More*. Jowett takes as proven the assignment of the Hand D writing to Shakespeare and moves on to the question of how isolated from the other writers Shakespeare was in making his contribution to the play, and looking to see where outside of Hand D Shakespeare may have helped. In the theories of just how this complex manuscript, British Library Harley 7368, got put together, there is a problem in the Hand C stage direction at the bottom of folio 7b, which seems to be the opening stage direction for scene vi, Shakespeare's main contribution. The stage direction does not name More, only the rebels, and that is acceptable since More does not enter at the start of the scene. Shakespeare gives an entrance direction at vi.31 for the authority figures but it too does not mention More and More does not speak until vi.47, but at that point he speaks without having had an entrance direction.

Why not? Either because Shakespeare assumed that Hand C was dealing with getting More on to the stage, or he assumed that Hand C would do so later when stitching all the contributions together. Indeed, the entrance for the

authority figures at vi.31 leaves unnecessary space around itself as if Hand D were inviting Hand C to annotate it. Yet Hand C did not provide an entrance direction for More but did add an entrance for the sergeant-at-arms that was unnecessary since he was one of the people Hand C made a general entrance for at the start of the scene. Why would Hand C make such palpable mistakes? Because the piece of paper, folio 7, with its scene-opening stage direction at the bottom of the page was out of Hand C's hands: it was with Heywood so he could write on it his contribution.

Jowett decided to test the authorship of More's soliloquy in Addition V ('Why, this is cheerful news... richest at their boards') by looking for its phrases, chosen subjectively, in LION and EEBO-TCP. He wanted to examine in particular those phrases that appear in the works of just one of the list Shakespeare, Munday, Chettle, Dekker, and Heywood. Chettle and Dekker dropped out as having no phrases in common with this soliloquy. Shakespeare and Heywood were possible and Munday has one phrase very close: 'Thames, | Which, glad of such a burden, proudly swelled | And on her bosom bore him' from this soliloquy is very like 'Thames appeared proude of this gallant burden, swelling her breast to beare them' from Munday's water pageant for Prince Henry's investiture, published as *London's Love to Prince Henry* in 1610.

This could just be Munday remembering the revised *Sir Thomas More* when writing that pageant, as suggested by the lack of other links between the soliloquy and his work. Jowett lists a whole slew of phrases that are in the soliloquy and in Shakespeare: 'this is [adjective] news' is in *Coriolanus* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, '[plural noun] go and come' is in *Henry V*, 'burden...swelled...bosom' is like 'Swell, bosom, with thy freight' in *Othello*, 'proudly swelled' is like 'proud swelling' in *King John*, 'He's gone... Peace go with him' is like 'Art thou gone too? All comfort go with thee' in *The Contention of York and Lancaster*/2 *Henry VI*, 'merry heart lives' is like 'light heart lives' in *Love's Labour's Lost*, 'our diet' is in *Twelfth Night*, 'dainty for [noun]' is in *Love's Labour's Lost*, and 'dainty for the taste' is like 'Dainties to taste' in *Venus and Adonis* and 'daintiest that they taste' in *The Contention of York and Lancaster*/2 *Henry VI*.

All of these matches are rare or not found at all in other works. Jowett then went looking for phrases in the soliloquy that appear in the Heywood canon and rarely if at all elsewhere, and found about as many as he found rare connections to Shakespeare, so he concludes that the soliloquy we have is the result of 'initial drafting by Shakespeare and revision by Heywood' (p. 263). By considering just where in the soliloquy the Heywood links fall (which is in two clusters), Jowett reckons he can remove Heywood's revisions and so see the soliloquy as Shakespeare originally wrote it, and so he adds those thirteen lines to the canon of Shakespeare. The soliloquy's line 'Londoners fare richest at their boards' is scarcely in keeping with the sentiments of the food riot in the play, which makes sense: civic-minded Heywood wrote that line, and non-civic-minded Shakespeare wrote the food riot. Thus Shakespeare did more than contribute the riot-quelling scene to the play: he also wrote More's soliloquies in Addition III and Addition V that make the protagonist more articulate than he would otherwise be and give him an interiority. This

discovery puts Shakespeare close to the centre of activity in the play's revision, not on the periphery as we previously thought. It is still Hand C who is doing all the co-ordinating, however, and Jowett has a high opinion of his dramatic skills.

Certain attributions to Shakespeare continue to divide specialists, and *A Lover's Complaint* is perhaps the most contentious. Hugh Craig, in 'George Chapman, John Davies of Hereford, William Shakespeare, and *A Lover's Complaint*' (*SQ* 63[2012] 147–74), shows that it is not by Chapman or John Davies of Hereford (Brian Vickers's preferred candidate) and is probably by Shakespeare. The poem was printed at the back of *Sonnets* [1609] and is just over 2,500 words long. Ward E.Y. Elliott and Robert J. Valenza, Marina Tarlinskaja, and Vickers are all against *A Lover's Complaint* being by Shakespeare. Craig explores how far the language of the poem is like that of Shakespeare, Chapman, and John Davies of Hereford, attending in particular to words peculiar to one of these authors, words absent from the works of these authors, and a list of bigrams that appear often in an author's work and bigrams that are rare in an author's work. It emerges that *A Lover's Complaint* is nothing like the writing of Chapman or John Davies of Hereford and quite like Shakespeare's. There is not enough poetry in any of the candidate's canons for the testing to be done with poetry alone, so Craig had reluctantly to use drama, and he lists the reasons that this is sub-optimal.

For the test itself, Craig took out of the set of eight Chapman poems just one poem, *Euthymiae*, for testing and out of the 45 poems by others he took six out for testing. First he found all the words occurring in the remaining seven Chapman poems but not in the 39 poems by others and then he counted how often these words occur in segments of *Euthymiae* and in segments of the six non-Chapman test poems (expressed as percentages of words in the segment). Then he did the same with the words in 39 poems by others and not in Chapman. This gives two numbers for each segment of each tested poem—that is, each segment of *Euthymiae* and each of the six non-Chapman poems—with one number expressing how many peculiar-to-Chapman words it has and the other expressing how many not-in-Chapman words it has. From these two numbers for each segment a scatter-plot can be made, and it shows that non-Chapman poems' segments cluster in the top left and the Chapman poems' segments cluster in the bottom right, with clear daylight between them. When *A Lover's Complaint* is added, it falls clearly on the non-Chapman side of the graph.

Craig then put *Euthymiae* back into the Chapman pot and the six poems by others back into the non-Chapman pot and drew the next Chapman poem out of the eight and a fresh six out of the non-Chapman pot to rerun the above test; this he did until every one of the eight Chapman poems had been through the process. This validation step showed that the methodology is extremely robust, correctly identifying authors almost all the time. On these tests, *A Lover's Complaint* was always not by Chapman. Then comes a new test: instead of single words, Craig looked for bigrams; here instead of all-or-nothing searching—looking for things present in Chapman and entirely absent from non-Chapman—he had to work relativistically, looking for bigrams that are relatively frequent in Chapman and relatively infrequent in non-Chapman.

The strongest cases were *and their*, found in 77 per cent of Chapman segments and only 22 per cent of non-Chapman segments, and *about the*, found in 64 per cent of Chapman segments and only 15 per cent of non-Chapman segments. With 1,000 such pairings, Craig redid all the above analyses and plotted out the results. Again the test turns out to be reliable, and it puts *A Lover's Complaint* on the non-Chapman side seven out of eight times.

Craig repeated his tests by going back to single words, but instead of confining himself to just words in poems he now looked for words found in Chapman's plays and found in the Chapman poems and the non-Chapman poems, and for words found in non-Chapman plays that are found in the Chapman poems and the non-Chapman poems. The results are broadly as before, and *A Lover's Complaint* comes out as not by Chapman. Craig repeated all the tests using bigrams instead of words and again got good authorial separation and the result of *A Lover's Complaint* being not by Chapman. So, on to John Davies of Hereford, Vickers's candidate. Craig used seven of his poems for both kinds of test—favoured/disfavoured single words and bigrams—and in the validation stage he got 99 per cent accuracy on the first of these and *A Lover's Complaint* was always on the not-Davies side. The bigrams test achieved 97 per cent accuracy in validation using Davies's poetry and it too put *A Lover's Complaint* on the not-Davies side.

Then on to Shakespeare, whose poetic canon is too small to use, so instead Craig relied on his plays and a pile of plays by others to develop the favoured/disfavoured word lists. When made into a scatter-plot this test did not put the Shakespeare and non-Shakespeare poetry into two distinct clusters. Rather, the clusters overlap, although *A Lover's Complaint* is off to the far side of the Shakespeare cluster away from the non-Shakespeare. Craig lists some statistics in the counts that suggest but do not prove Shakespeare's authorship of *A Lover's Complaint*, and he mentions some tweaks that he tried, such as confining his study to pre-1600 plays on the grounds that the narrative poems and most of the Shakespeare sonnets had been written by then. Repeating the tests using not words but bigrams the scatter-plot shows a little more distinction in the clustering but still with considerable overlap and *A Lover's Complaint* appears in the borderland between Shakespeare and not-Shakespeare.

Thus *A Lover's Complaint* is not by Chapman or John Davies of Hereford and may be by Shakespeare. Craig goes on to critique preceding stylometric studies that found *A Lover's Complaint* not to be Shakespeare's, and in particular Elliott and Valenza's, and he points out that Tarlinskaja's counts of proclitics and enclitics are highly sensitive to chronology, which is uncertain with *A Lover's Complaint*. One key count used by Vickers is the frequency of use of the word *all*, which Davies strongly favoured and which occurs in *A Lover's Complaint* much more frequently than in Shakespeare. Craig's own counts show that Davies was in fact typical in his rate of usage of this word. Where Shakespeare chooses to use *all* a lot, in part of *Sonnets*, his rate actually exceeds that in *A Lover's Complaint*, although his career average is well below it.

In a year full of important works by Hugh Craig, there is yet one more to consider: 'Authors and Characters' (*ES* 93[2012] 292–309), in a special issue of

ES on stylometry and authorship attribution. In it he and John Burrows prove that the variation in their writing styles that dramatists employ to ventriloquize the speeches of their distinctive dramatic characters is not so great as the detectable variation in style between different dramatists. It has been argued that since dramatists vary their writing style to create characters' idiolect, authorship attribution by style is bound to fail. To test this, Craig took pairs of dramatists and broke their plays into character parts to see whether these cluster by dramatist when one counts the frequencies of 'a standard set of one hundred word-variables' (p. 293). Burrows and Craig confined themselves to characters who speak at least 2,000 words. Taking first the 53 Fletcherian characters who do that and the 96 Shakespearian characters who do that, they counted the occurrences of these 100 words in those 149 roles.

They used Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to graph the x , y plot (x being the First Principal Component and y the Second Principal Component) for each character's frequency of using those 100 words. That is to say, the data is in 100 dimensions, with each word-variable being a dimension. The PCA starts with the 100 columns (words) and 149 rows (characters), works out the correlations between the word columns, then finds new composite variables which characterize as much as possible of the correlations. Each word-variable has a loading on each of these composite variables (the Principal Components) and each character has a score on it, so one can plot either the word weightings or the character scores for any combination of Principal Components, in this case the first and second.

The resulting plot shows that all the Fletcher characters cluster in the north-east corner and the Shakespeare characters cluster in the south-west, with just one Fletcher character on the wrong side—the Shakespearian side—of the bisector of the clusters. Burrows and Craig then present the same graph, but instead of plotting the characters' scores they plot the words that gave these scores, and they make some literary-critical interpretations of who in the plays uses which kind of language. They repeat this analysis with Shakespeare's characters versus Middleton's, and again there's clear north-east/south-west separation on account of Middleton being high on Principal Component One and Principal Component Two, and Shakespeare being low on both. And then again for Fletcher versus Middleton, who again are highly distinguishable, and then again for Jonson versus Chapman, where results are much more mixed than previously: these two really do write like one another, although certain distinctions can be made.

Across all the dramatists whose work was tested, this method puts characters on the right side of the dividing line—that is, puts all those by one dramatist away from all those by the other dramatist—92.3 per cent of the time: only 1 in 13 characters falls on the wrong side of the line. Burrows and Craig briefly describe some variations on the method that they tried. The big picture is that authorship, much more strongly than character delineation, shapes frequency of word choice. The poststructuralist view that authorial distinctions are lost in the ventriloquism of drama is thus disproved.

In the *Times Literary Supplement*, Laurie Maguire and Emma Smith, in 'Many Hands: A New Shakespeare Collaboration?' (*TLS* 5690[2012] 13–15), explored the possibility that Middleton co-wrote *All's Well that Ends Well*.

A longer version of this article appeared for a while on the website of Oxford University's Centre for Early Modern Studies, and although that site still holds a pointer to the long version the article itself had, at the time of review in December 2013, disappeared, perhaps indicating that the claim had been retracted. Maguire and Smith point out that the play has many more couplets and more hypermetric verse than is usual for Shakespeare and there are confusions about people's names; these can be explained by co-authorship.

A key point for Maguire and Smith is the unusual speech prefix for something to be spoken by *All*, which they reckon occurs 'only twice in the Folio' (p. 13), both times in *All's Well That Ends Well*. I cannot understand why they think this, as I count 81 occurrences of the speech prefix *All* across the Folio: *Julius Caesar* (TLN 1564, 1578, 1609, 1676, 1691, 1698, 1705, 1768, 1772, 1777, 1784), *The Taming of the Shrew* (TLN 251), *All's Well That Ends Well* (TLN 960, 1979), *Henry V* (TLN 3360), *1 Henry VI* (TLN 1394), *The Contention of York and Lancaster*/*2 Henry VI* (TLN 427, 2389, 2424, 2473, 2493, 2746, 2762, 2795, 2809, 2830, 2874), *Richard Duke of York*/*3 Henry VI* (TLN 2586), *Richard III* (TLN 2463), *Troilus and Cressida* (TLN 2623), *Coriolanus* (TLN 6, 9, 12, 15, 29, 36, 50, 355, 359, 547, 549, 1070, 1435, 1528, 1564, 1659, 1881, 1891, 1896, 1901, 1910, 1913, 1948, 2004, 2015, 2356, 2391, 2407, 2427, 2432, 2915, 2923, 3647, 3725), *Timon of Athens* (TLN 525, 729, 733, 760, 764, 786), *Macbeth* (TLN 2512), *Hamlet* (TLN 2141, 2854, 3805), *Othello* (TLN 412), *Antony and Cleopatra* (TLN 1278, 2536, 3049, 3192, 3336, 3596).

As Maguire and Smith observe, Shakespeare prefers unregulated auxiliary *do*, whereas Middleton and *All's Well That Ends Well* prefer regulated, and the word *ruttish* occurs only in *All's Well That Ends Well* and in Middleton's *The Phoenix* and no other Elizabethan or Jacobean play. (Those hapax legomena claims seem to be true, but hapaxes are notoriously unreliable guides to authorship.) The anal fistula in the play is unusual, but Middleton has them in *The Widow* and *A Game at Chess* and the only other one in Elizabethan-Jacobean drama is in Marston's *The Fawn*. The very long dash at I.iii.149 is unlike Shakespeare but like Middleton. Maguire and Smith note the prevalence of some contractions and other orthographical habits and their clustering in particular parts of the play, but they do not mention that the compositor could have applied these. To Maguire and Smith's ears the play's stage directions too sound like Middleton in being 'novelistically explanatory' (p. 14), and the use of mock language to gull Parolles is like other scenes in Middleton. Beginning a play with a woman speaking, as *All's Well That Ends Well* does, is unShakespearean—indeed is unlike most other early modern dramatists—but it is a Middleton habit, and the overall moral tone of the play is rather more frankly realistic than we expect from Shakespeare but just what we expect from Middleton.

Three weeks after publishing Maguire and Smith's article, the *Times Literary Supplement* published a response by Brian Vickers and Marcus Dahl dismissing the attribution, "'What is Infirm"—*All's Well That Ends Well*: An Attribution Rejected' (*TLS* 5693[2012] 14–15). They agree that the play's spellings are not Shakespearean and that its speech prefixes are variable, but observe that this is true of other Shakespeare plays. Vickers and Dahl were

able to parallel *All's Well That Ends Well's* unusual stage directions with others from Shakespeare such as 'A Song the whilst Bassanio comments on the caskets to himself' from *The Merchant of Venice*. Yes, 19 per cent of the lines being rhyming couplets in *All's Well That Ends Well* is higher than Shakespeare's average of 5 per cent, but that average conceals a wide range around it, as *Twelfth Night* and *As You Like It* also have 19 per cent rhyming couplets. Vickers and Dahl quite rightly object that nothing in the play indicates that the king's fistula is an anal one, as Maguire and Smith make it. Maguire and Smith's observations about orthographic habits are irrelevant once we factor in the scribes' and compositors' mediation of the text. On the particular habits that Maguire and Smith count they are wrong that *All's Well That Ends Well* is unlike genuine Shakespeare. Vickers and Dahl dispute Maguire and Smith's counts of the speech prefix *All* in the Folio, as I do above. However, they count 13 such prefixes in *Julius Caesar* and I can only find 11 of them; I suspect Vickers and Dahl use a modern edition in which the prefix *Pleb[ians]* has twice been regularized to *All*. Likewise they claim 37 in *Coriolanus* but I find only 34; perhaps they include variations such as '*All Consp[irators]*', which I do not.

In 2011 *Shakespeare Quarterly* published a review essay by Brian Vickers on Shakespearian authorship studies that was not noticed here, since to review a review seems rather too introspective. However, a response to Vickers's review essay by John Burrows, 'A Second Opinion on "Shakespeare and Authorship Studies in the Twenty-First Century"' (*SQ* 63[2012] 355–92), is worth noticing for its demonstration that on key technical points Vickers does not understand the basic principles, and that contrary to his vehement assertions the counting of common words is a reliable technique for distinguishing authorship. Burrows takes the reader through Vickers's misrepresentations of the techniques used in Hugh Craig and Arthur F. Kinney's book *Shakespeare, Computers, and the Mystery of Authorship*. Some are simply cases of Vickers misunderstanding the book's quite clear prose, but in objecting that Craig and Kinney use only the First and Second Principal Components derived from their data and ignore the rest, Vickers betrays that he does not understand what Principal Components are. The First and Second Principal Components are, by definition, much more useful than the Third, Fourth, Fifth, and so on, since they represent vastly more of the correlations between the data they represent.

Vickers thinks that PCA analysis of word frequencies would be swamped by the huge difference in the absolute frequencies of the most frequent words and the least frequent words, but in fact only a naive user of PCA would make that error and Craig and Kinney explicitly explain their avoidance of it in their book. Burrows points out that Vickers is dangerously vague in his phrasing, referring to 'phrasal repetends, collocations, *N*-grams, call them what you will' (p. 380), but in fact collocations and *n*-grams are quite different things and neither is like phrasal repetends, which really are things that are supposed to go together in the writer's consciousness. That is to say, we can find all sorts of *n*-grams that are unique to a text but do not have a claim to be intentional. In fact most three-word strings are like that and Burrows gives examples from *Macbeth*.

Burrows explains what MacDonald P. Jackson has elsewhere called the 'one-horse-race problem' in Vickers's method of finding the trigrams in his *dubium*—say, the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*—and then hunting for those trigrams in the work of his preferred candidate (say Shakespeare), counting how many are in a large sample of other writers' work and if it is a lot less concluding that this proves that the candidate wrote the *dubium*. As Burrows points out, one needs to first ask how many such matches would we expect in any case and how big are the various writers' canons, since writers with large canons will match more such collocations for no other reason than that they have large canons. Moreover, Vickers includes in his sample of other writers' work some writers who could not be the author of the *dubium*—because they were safely dead before the *dubium* was written—so not finding the collocations in their work is irrelevant.

Burrows demonstrates his Delta test using the 500 words most frequently found in Craig's digital collection of 202 plays from 1576 to 1642, and then again using a smaller list of the top 300 words. The baseline against which each of 14 authorial sets of plays was tested was the rates of usage of those words in 12 late Shakespeare plays, and when we put into rank order the authorial sets' difference in rates of usage of those words—their differences from the 12 late Shakespeare plays, that is—it is the earlier Shakespeare that is most like the later Shakespeare. So 'the effect of authorship prevails' (p. 386). The same thing happens if we take early Shakespeare as the baseline and test late Shakespeare and his early peers against it: again authorship is the dominant determinant of likeness. The same thing emerges yet again when Burrows uses as his baseline 28 Shakespeare plays and graphs in a scatter-plot the likeness of other Shakespeare plays and non-Shakespeare plays to those 28—that is, likeness in rates of uses of the most frequently used words in all 202 plays—and the Shakespeare plays form a distinct cluster away from the non-Shakespearian.

Most importantly, the known collaborative plays *Titus Andronicus* and *Richard Duke of York*/*Henry VI* are, in all these tests, at the edge of the Shakespeare group and closest to the non-Shakespearian. Finally Burrows takes rolling 2,000-word segments from one play, starting with *Romeo and Juliet*, inching along by 200 words each time, and tests each segment's likeness (in frequent word usage) to other Shakespeare plays, divided into two sets (those pre-1600 and those post-1600) and a set of non-Shakespearian plays. *Romeo and Juliet* comes out very close to all the other Shakespeare plays and quite distinct from the non-Shakespearian. *Titus Andronicus*, however, is much more mixed, changing its affiliations across its scenes and acts and becoming Peele-like at just the places where, on other grounds, we think Peele was the writer. Then Burrows does the same for *Richard Duke of York*/*Henry VI*, drawing on his work with Hugh Craig reviewed above and repeating its conclusion, and then again with *Richard III* which is clearly Shakespearian until a blip at the end that Burrows puts down to the ghosts' stylized speeches to the dreaming Richard and Richmond.

One more work of computational stylistics applied to Shakespeare appeared this year: 'A Naive Bayes Classifier for Shakespeare's Second-Person Pronoun' (*L&LC* 27[2012] 17–23). In it, Kyle Mahowald used automated collocation

finding to see if in Shakespeare the words that occur around *you*, *ye*, *your*, *yours*, *yourself*, and *yourselves* are measurably different from those around *thou*, *thy*, *thee*, *thine*, *thyself*, and *thyselves*. He found that they are, so that if someone erased the pronoun in each case we could fairly reliably guess what they had erased—that is, whether it was the *y*- or *th*- version—solely guided by the context words. Mahowald prints a useful table of the words that collocate near each of the two types of pronoun, listed in order of their likeliness to appear near one rather than the other type of pronoun. Thus *shalt* is much more likely (229.5 times more likely in fact) to appear near a *th*- pronoun than a *y*- pronoun and *lordship* is much more likely (49.6 times more likely) to appear near a *y*- pronoun than a *th*- pronoun, and these two words are the most discriminating in that regard and hence they top Mahowald's table. The words *didst* (137.3 times more likely) and *voices* (18 times more likely) are the next most discriminating in that regard, down to *beauteous* (4.4 times more likely) and *senate* (3.6 times). (In all this, Mahowald is using the notion of likelihood metaphorically, since the numbers express how often he actually did find certain words collocating, not how often we might do so in some future experiment.)

What the table does not show is that, had he included pronouns that collocate near pronouns, the lead positions in the table would be taken by other pronouns of the same kind, so that the *th*- pronouns occur together, and so do *y*- pronouns. Mahowald's first column, for the words appearing near informal pronouns—which a person would use to talk down to another—has words likely to convey disrespect such as *fiend*, *damned*, and *villain*, while the second column, for words appearing near formal pronouns, has words likely to convey respect such as *lordship*, *ladyship*, *worship*, and *madam*. It is most gratifying to see the principles of formality that linguists have long derived from qualitative analysis being confirmed in a quantitative study.

Reviving a claim that recurs from time to time, Margrethe Jolly, in 'Hamlet and the French Connection: The Relationship of Q1 and Q2 Hamlet and the Evidence of Belleforest's *Histoires Tragiques*' (*Parergon* 29:i[2012] 83–105), reckons that the version of the play underlying Q1 *Hamlet* preceded rather than followed the version underlying Q2, since Q1 is much closer to the play's source, Francois de Belleforest's *Histoires Tragiques*. Jolly lists the plot features of the Amleth story in Belleforest that occur in Q1 and Q2, some of them moved from their place in the French version to occupy a different place in the English version of the story. If the Q2 version was written before the Q1 version we would expect it to have more borrowings from Belleforest than Q1 has, on account of Q1's version losing some of them. One example is the language combining *bed* and *incest*, present in Belleforest and Q2 but lacking the *bed* in Q1. Others are the word *occasions* for what is happening to Hamlet, the blaming of cowardice for thwarting great schemes, the idea of Hamlet as a *minister*, and his complaint about lacking *advancement*. All these are in Belleforest and Q2 but watered down or rephrased in Q1.

Against these Jolly has a stack of things common to Belleforest and Q1 and lacking in Q2. The first is that Belleforest's hero is repeatedly and consistently said to be young, as is Hamlet in Q1 but not in Q2. Another is the use of the word *entrap* in Belleforest and Q1 for the Ophelia–Hamlet relationship but not

Q2. (Mind you, Jolly admits that it is not used the same way in the same place in Belleforest and Q1.) Another is that Hamlet's grief for his dead father involves the word *tears* in Belleforest and Q1. Yet another is that the plan to entrap Amleth/Hamlet by setting a woman on him is hatched and put into practice all in one scene in Belleforest and Q1 but the planning and execution are spread over time in Q2. Another is that in Belleforest and Q1 Hamlet goes into the interview with his mother in her chamber full of suspicions ('first weele make all safe', Q1) but he is not suspicious in Q2. Jolly has quite a few more examples. In Belleforest and Q1 Amleth/Hamlet says that the black spots of his mother's and uncle's relationship need to be washed away, but in Q2 it is Gertrude who refers to those spots. Belleforest and Q1 call what Hamlet's mother has done *infamy*. In Belleforest and Q1 Hamlet openly tells his mother that her new husband killed her old one, while in Q2 it is only indirectly alluded to ('As kill a King'). In that interview in Belleforest and Q1 Hamlet speaks openly of taking revenge but in Q2's version he only alludes to it: 'Th' important acting of your dread command', he says to the Ghost.

In Belleforest and Q1 Amleth/Hamlet's mother agrees in their interview to conceal his plans for revenge, whereas in Q2 he asks her only to hide that he is feigning madness. At this point Jolly turns to George Ian Duthie's claim, an alternative to hers, that Q1 Gertrude's lines about concealing Hamlet's plans, 'I will conceale, consent, and doe my best', are a recollection of *The Spanish Tragedy's* 'I will consent, conceal; | And aught that may effect for thine avail'. Jolly reckons that in fact Kyd is the borrower because the ur-*Hamlet* had these lines and preceded *The Spanish Tragedy*. In Q1 Horatio tells Gertrude that Hamlet is 'safe arriv'de' back in Denmark after his sea voyage, but since she was not expecting him back this reference to safe arrival sounds odd. In Belleforest she was expecting him back and Jolly reckons that this bit of Q1 is a relic of Belleforest, just as was 'first weele make all safe' regarding Hamlet's suspicion of danger in the interview with his mother, which fact is not developed in Q1 since he does nothing to make the room safe. Overall, Q1 is about half the length of Q2 yet it has more debts to Belleforest, which is odd if Q1 is a cut-down version of Q2. How convincing one finds Jolly's conclusion depends upon the weight one gives to the counterbalancing effect of the Belleforest-Q2 agreements against Q1 (listed above), with which Jolly most fairly began her argument.

Juliet Dusinberre's Arden3 edition of *As You Like It*—reviewed in *YWES* 87[2008]—presented as its court epilogue a poem discovered by William Ringler and Steven May in 1972 and argued over ever since. Helen Hackett, in "'As the dial hand tells ore": The Case for Dekker, Not Shakespeare, as Author' (*RES* 63[2012] 34–57), is sure that it has nothing to do with Shakespeare, being written by Dekker for a court performance of his *The Shoemaker's Holiday* in 1599. Hackett reproduces the manuscript poem and offers a transcription, albeit with some errors: the penultimate line clearly has '& aeged' which Hackett renders as 'and aeged', and yet elsewhere she reproduces ampersands as ampersands, and there is also a mistranscription of 'account' as 'account' in the second line. The poem is dated 1598 and mentions Shrovetide, and since Shrovetide falls before 25 March Hackett reckons that we should read the date as modern 1599. (Well, only if we believe

that the writer delayed incrementing the year number until Lady Day, but not everyone did that, or did it consistently.) The Admiral's men and the Chamberlain's men played at court around Shrovetide 1599.

A good reason to pursue Jonson and Dekker as prime candidate authors is that they favoured the trochaic metre used in the poem. The theme of the epilogue—the hope of Elizabeth I's subjects growing old while she remains the same—is like those of the court epilogue to Dekker's *Old Fortunatus* performed at court by the Admiral's men around Christmas 1599. *The Shoemaker's Holiday* was also performed at court in that winter season and the holiday that its title refers to is Shrove Tuesday. Hackett claims (p. 39 n. 29) that she looked for the phrases 'dial hand' and 'dial's hand' in EEBO-TCP and LION and found that 'the only other occurrence' apart from in the Dial Hand poem is in Shakespeare's Sonnet 104. She missed a couple: Dekker's play *The Wonder of a Kingdom* (first performed 1619–31) has a character say of mariners that 'Their dialls-hand ere points to th stroke of death' (STC 6533, sig. F1^v), and curiously enough the speech in which this is said is repeated almost verbatim in John Day's play *The Parliament of Bees* (first performed c.1634–40), where the line about mariners becomes 'There dyals hand stil points to th'line of death' (Wing D466, sig. F4^v). Also, EEBO-TCP shows a few non-literary uses of the *dial[s] hands* from the first half of the seventeenth century.

Hackett reckons that Dusinger is wrong that the Richmond Palace sundial is relevant to the poem, since sundials do not have hands, and insists that because clocks and watches of this period lacked minute hands the dial hand was an image not of time racing on but of its slow, steady progress. Also, the lesson from dials and time in *As You Like It* is that we 'rot and rot', which is exactly the opposite of the epilogue's hope for Elizabeth. Also against Shakespeare's authorship is that almost nowhere else does he write about Elizabeth or lavishly praise her; Hackett works through the few allusions he makes to her and finds them lukewarm if not openly hostile to the queen. The case for Jonson is that he did suck up to monarchs and he did write about circles being symbols of orderliness and harmony. The case against him is that he was in jail around this time, once for killing Gabriel Spencer and once for debt. (I would not have thought that the actors would take against a suitable epilogue merely because its author was in jail.)

Dekker frequently wrote trochaic songs around the time of the Dial Hand poem, he was preoccupied with clock and watch dials, and used the word *circular* in relation to cycles of life and death, just as the poem does. His play *The Whore of Babylon* shares with the Dial Poem the image of 'lords' who are 'grave' and old 'sitting at your council boards'—that is a most precise verbal echo—and it likewise calls Elizabeth an empress. If Dial Hand is by Dekker, the play it most likely provided an epilogue to is *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, which is about Shrovetide and frequently mentions St Hugh of Lincoln, the patron saint of shoemakers, on whose feast day, 17 November, Elizabeth gained the crown in 1558. This play also has a court prologue in praise of the queen, and Dial Hand could be its missing court epilogue; it has scenes of monarch and people together (like the poem) and someone hoping (as the poem does) that the monarch will stay forever young. Hackett deals with an

obvious objection to the idea that the court performance on New Year's Day in 1600 of *The Shoemaker's Holiday*—mentioned on its title page—was the one that Dial Hand provided the epilogue for: the poem is dated 1598 in the manuscript in which it was found. To account for this Hackett has to suppose that the play had an earlier performance at court at Shrovetide 1599 with the poem as its epilogue; the Admiral's men were playing at court then.

In the course of an argument about Robert Greene's antagonism towards Shakespeare, Hanspeter Born, 'Why Greene Was Angry at Shakespeare' (*MRDE* 25[2012] 133–73), claims that Shakespeare rewrote the subplot of *A Knack to Know a Knave* that Greene had written for Strange's men, making it much funnier. Born considers the stylometric argument for Chettle's authorship of *Groatsworth of Wit* to have been demolished by Richard Westley in 2006 and accepts Greene's authorship of it, at least in the bits that are vociferously anti-Shakespeare, since Chettle had no motive to make up such a story. Greene in *Groatsworth of Wit* gives sincere admonitory advice to his fellow playwrights, warning Marlowe off atheism and all of them off trusting actors. But why pick on Shakespeare rather than, say, Edward Alleyn? By 1591, Strange's men—including Alleyn who continued to wear his Admiral's man livery—had topped the Queen's men as the country's leading troupe, and by far their biggest hit of 1592 was *1 Henry VI*, so Shakespeare was at this time one of them. Born reckons that Greene need not have heard *Richard Duke of York/3 Henry VI* on stage in order to make his allusion to it in 'Tygers hart wrapt in a Players hyde' but could have heard it in a tavern reading or at a rehearsal. Born's motivation here is to deny that Shakespeare was with Richard Burbage among Pembroke's men at The Theatre in 1592 when his *1 Henry VI* was a hit for Strange's men at the Rose: he wants Shakespeare to be one of Strange's men when Greene excoriated him.

Born reads in *Groatsworth of Wit's* fables an attack on Shakespeare as paymaster of Strange's men, refusing to lend money to the impecunious Greene. The 'onely Shake-scene' and 'absolute Iohannes fac totum' jibes are accusations of concealedness, and Born imagines that Shakespeare dominated Strange's men—writing, adapting, directing—and that it was his treatment of Greene's last play, which Born reckons was *A Knack to Know a Knave* (recorded by Henslowe as 'ne[w]' on 10 June 1592), that really annoyed Greene. Born looks closely at the text of the 1594 quarto of *A Knack to Know a Knave* and decides on the basis of his own ear and some verbal parallels in the description of night falling that this bit is early Shakespeare. A scene that is set up to be a wooing in terms of classical mythology unexpectedly turns out to be a farcical wooing in which a pretence of having a rheum in the eye covers a deceit, and Born points out that this connection between rheum and deceit (specifically via insincere tears) recurs in Shakespeare. Born thinks that Shakespeare also wrote the speech in which the wooer, Ethenwald, who was sent to woo a maid on his king's behalf, excuses his double-cross with hyperbolic language about the dawn, leading to a simple declaration that the woman is not worth a king's wooing, only that of an earl like himself. Born compares Ethenwald's soliloquy about the dangers of defying his king's embassy to woo a maid by taking the maid for himself with the soliloquy of

Lacy in exactly the same position in Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* and finds them quite unlike.

The most irritable of this year's articles is James M. Gibson's attempt, in 'Shakespeare and the Cobham Controversy: The Oldcastle/Falstaff and Brooke/Broome Revisions' (*MRDE* 25[2012] 94–132), to figure out just when the name of Oldcastle was changed to Falstaff in the *Henry IV* plays and when Brooke got renamed Broome in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. The two lords Cobham in question are William Brooke (tenth Lord Cobham) and Henry Brooke (eleventh Lord Cobham). On 23 July 1596 Henry Carey, the Lord Chamberlain, died, and William Brooke got the job on 8 August 1596. It is sometimes alleged that William Brooke was anti-theatrical but according to Gibson there is no evidence for this, and equally unsupported is the claim that he was especially pro-theatre. William Brooke died on 6 March 1597, and scholars have not been sure if he was the Cobham who objected to Oldcastle or whether it was his son Henry Brooke.

Gibson's narrative is that Edmund Tilney licensed *1 Henry IV* before July 1596 when Henry Carey was still Lord Chamberlain, it was played at court on 26 December 1596 with William Brooke as 'master of ceremonies' (that is, the Lord Chamberlain), that William Brooke was furious at the play's mockery of Oldcastle, and so early in 1597 he got Tilney to demand changes to *1 Henry IV* and to the in-progress *2 Henry IV*. Furthermore Tilney 'required... early publication of *1 Henry IV* to disseminate the changes' (p. 99), and when Tilney was licensing *The Merry Wives of Windsor* he required changes before its first performance on 23 April 1597. Gibson is unnecessarily rude about other scholars' handling of evidence, so it is surprising that he expects his reader to accept that *The Merry Wives of Windsor* was first performed in 1597, for which there is no hard evidence, and does not mention the evidence for its first performance being no earlier than 1600 presented by B.J. Sokol and reviewed in *YWES* 90[2009]. According to Gibson, after William Brooke died on 6 March 1597 the unpopularity of his son Henry Brooke and the popularity of Falstaff kept the scandal going. Gibson reckons that *1 Henry IV* cannot have been written after 8 August 1596 when William Brooke got the job of Lord Chamberlain, since Shakespeare would not intentionally write a play that would offend the Master of the Revels' boss.

The Chamberlain's men played at court on 26 December and 27 December 1596, and 1 January, 6 January, 6 February, and 8 February 1597, but William Brooke would have missed the last two of these as he was in mourning for his dead daughter from 24 January 1597. A letter from Edward Jones to William Brooke says that at a Sunday performance at court—which must have been 26 December 1596—William Brooke publicly rebuked Edward Jones for some mildly indecorous behaviour, and Gibson reckons it unlikely that the experienced courtier William Brooke would make such a fuss unless he were already worked up because the play they were watching was *1 Henry IV* mocking Oldcastle. In another letter a few years later Tilney referred to William Brooke being intemperate around this time, which presumably refers to the same offensive court performance that Tilney, as censor, had failed to prevent. Gibson objects to the chronology of the Oxford Complete Works that runs *1 Henry IV*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *2 Henry IV* on the grounds that

it is excessively driven by the need to space the plays out; he prefers a narrative in which Shakespeare had ‘written the two parts of *Henry IV* and *The Merry Wives* in a burst of creative activity before April 1597’ (p. 109).

Using rather old bibliographical scholarship based on the idea that foul papers were messy and promptbooks were tidy, Gibson tries to explain the textual condition of *1 Henry IV* and *2 Henry IV* in their quarto and Folio versions, concluding that the tidy *1 Henry IV* quarto and the tidy Folio *2 Henry IV* were both printed from transcripts of the foul papers that cleaned up those papers’ mess. Gibson approvingly quotes George Walton Williams’s explanation that tidy copies of *1 Henry IV* and *2 Henry IV* were made near the time of their first composition in order ‘to prove to Oldcastle’s angry posterity that their ancestor had been removed from both plays’ (p. 111). In fact we now know that multiple transcripts were routinely made of each play, so the existence of such transcripts does not require a special explanation. Gibson reckons that to undo the harm of *1 Henry IV*’s Oldcastle, Tilney made the playing company publish the revised version with Falstaff in it, and he made them add the ‘this is not the man’ disclaimer to the end of *2 Henry IV*.

William Brooke died on 6 March 1597 and on 17 April 1597 George Carey got his job as Lord Chamberlain, and he was made a Knight of the Garter on 23 April 1597. Gibson accepts the idea that *The Merry Wives of Windsor* was written in a rush for the last of these events. In the quarto of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* Ford takes the name of Brooke and in the Folio version he takes the name of Broome. Gibson cannot believe that Shakespeare accidentally used the name Brooke in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* or that the Master of the Revels would let him get away with it, so the *Brooke* > *Broome* change was, according to Gibson, Tilney’s response to another occasion when ‘Shakespeare simply overstepped the satirical mark’ (p. 114). But just when did Shakespeare change Brooke to Broome in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*? Gibson dismisses with pompous acerbity everyone else’s speculations on this point, including Gary Taylor’s that since the quarto of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is a memorial reconstruction the name Brooke must have been spoken in the first performances and hence the revision to Broome was made after 1602, perhaps at the instigation of Henry Brooke who was newly emboldened by his return to power arising from his marriage to the daughter of Charles Howard, the Lord Admiral, in May 1601. Gibson reckons that the name Brooke would not have got past the censor when *The Merry Wives of Windsor* was being prepared for its premiere on 23 April 1597 at the Knight of the Garter event, so the *Brooke* > *Broome* change must have happened during rehearsals for that premiere. When making the memorial reconstruction underlying Q, the actor playing the Host simply reverted to the original name. ‘Falstaff’ certainly did become the nickname for Henry Brooke—his enemies used it about him in letters—and Jonson had fun with *Cob-* and *-ham* in *Every Man In His Humour*.

Also on the topic of the relationship between the two versions of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is Elizabeth Zeman Kolkovich’s argument, in ‘Pageantry, Queens, and Housewives in the Two Texts of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*’ (*SQ* 63[2012] 328–54), that the 1602 quarto version was, as its title page brags, performed at Elizabeth’s court and the Folio version is a Jacobean revision

that is rather more critical of the queen and her court. Leah S. Marcus argued for Q1 being urban and F being courtly, but Kolkovich reckons that the courtly material in F is merely layered over what was already in Q1, the earlier state of the text. The shaming of Falstaff is, like a country-house progress-pageant entertainment, staged outdoors and like at least one such entertainment the ostensible goal is the punishment of sexual desire (in Falstaff); the covert goal is a successful marriage for Anne Page. Such entertainments often asserted the existence of good local government and stressed its compatibility with, rather than antagonism to, good central government. The pageant in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* features Elizabeth in the form of the Fairy Queen, but Q1 and F differ in their answers to just how the monarch's authority over towns such as Windsor works.

F's ending is not quite so joyful as Q1's and its reconciliation is somewhat measured. In F, Falstaff mocks Sir Hugh's 'Fritters of English' and neither of Anne's parents speaks to her, whereas her father explicitly forgives her in Q1. In F, Fenton is explicitly one of Prince Hal's dissolute companions, hence there is more of the court here than in Q1, and in F he talks of love in more blatantly economic terms than he does in Q1; Anne in F does not openly declare her love for Fenton. Indeed in F, Fenton is somewhat like Falstaff—a hanger-on of Hal's and merely after the money—and both are unreliable courtiers. There are F-only passages that characterize courtiers as lascivious. The quarto pageant has the fairies take care of local failings—slutish women, drunken officials—and gives the Fairy Queen a supervisory role over them all, even though Mistress Quickly taking this role is rather a low character and given to malapropism, albeit fewer in Q1 than in F. In F, the Fairy Queen is more harsh, more punishing, more obsessed specifically with female behaviour, so in essence she is more like Queen Elizabeth herself. And like Elizabeth, the F-version Fairy Queen polices Windsor Castle, not the town or country houses.

Giving this Fairy Queen role to Mistress Quickly rather daringly makes an analogy between properly running a house and properly running a country. F has Quickly engage in more unintentionally bawdy talk, such as the Latin lesson for William, suggesting that the Virgin Queen Elizabeth is not quite so clean as she makes out. Kolkovich laments that 'Q1 of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is less available to our students' (p. 352 n. 58) than other early quartos that are in print, but since Internet Shakespeare Editions has a reliable and readable digital transcription of it and the cheap Arden3 paperback edition has a superb photofacsimile of it at the back, she seems to be limiting her purview to just modernized editions. Kolkovich concludes with the idea that the Folio *The Merry Wives of Windsor* was a post-Elizabethan reflection on what she and her court were really like, hence it is less flattering than the quarto version performed at court.

When trying to figure out just how Folio and quarto versions of plays came about, theatre history necessarily impinges on textual criticism. Three theatre-historical essays are of relevance to this review. In the first, 'Did Shakespeare's Company Cut Long Plays Down to Two Hours Playing Time?' (*ShakB* 30[2012] 239–62), Steven Urkowitz argues that Shakespeare's plays were not usually heavily cut for early performance—they were reduced by no more than

10 per cent—since in fact two hours was not the regulation limit for their duration, and hence the short quartos cannot be explained as performance versions of the readerly long quartos and Folio plays. The orthodoxy is that the Shakespeare plays that are significantly longer than the period's average—all the histories and all the tragedies bar *Macbeth*—would have been cut for first performance to meet the two-hour norm, and that bad quartos reflect the shortened versions. In rejecting the two-hour norm, Urkowitz gives weight to an epigram by Sir John Davies in the 1590s in which a play-obsessed character called Fuscus spends 1–6 p.m. at the theatre, and far from being impatient with the length of the show as Alfred Hart claimed the evidence of Sir Humphrey Mildmay's diary entries from the 1630s (he 'loitered' at the playhouse) suggests a relaxed atmosphere.

Stephen Orgel used the cutting made in the Dering manuscript to combine *1 Henry IV* and *2 Henry IV* to argue for plays routinely being cut for performance, but in fact the compressed *Henry IV* play thus made by Dering still topped 3,100 lines. Likewise the cuts for performance marked in the quarto of *The Two Merry Milkmaids* leave it at around 3,000 lines, and there are of course paratextual references to plays being three hours long. Urkowitz reckons that cutting 10 per cent might have been normal since that is how much shorter F is than Q1 *King Lear*, and how much shorter the theatrical manuscript of Fletcher's *The Woman's Prize* is than the 1647 Folio version, and so he reckons that Erne greatly overstates routine cutting at 30 per cent. Henry Carey's letter of 1594 says that the players will start at 2 p.m. and finish at 4–5 p.m., which even including jigs would allow performances tending towards three hours. Although a City injunction of 1569 limited playing to 3–5 p.m., Urkowitz reads this as a negotiating position, not a strict rule that was applied. Nothing in *Records of Early English Drama* so far tells us that plays were limited in performance duration by civic authorities, and the records do tell us of academic plays seen by royalty that went on for three to eight hours.

Making exactly the opposite claim—that Shakespeare's plays were substantially cut for first performance—is Joe Falocco, in "'This is too long": A Historically Based Argument for Aggressively Editing Shakespeare in Performance' (*ShakB* 30[2012] 119–43). Certainly Restoration, eighteenth-, and nineteenth-century theatres cut *Hamlet* and *Othello* heavily, and only in the twentieth century did full-text performance become the norm. Falocco recites some of the well-known evidence for cutting for performance in the early modern period and he accepts Hart's counting of lines that suggested that 2,400 was the period's norm for plays. What about rates of speaking the lines? Falocco thinks that no more than seventeen lines a minute is plausible. And performance duration? The indoor theatres might have been able to run late with artificial light but then they were slowed down by intervals and pre-performance music, and in general Falocco thinks there was not enough time to run most Shakespeare plays without cutting.

In such debates much depends upon the weight one attaches to particular pieces of evidence and just how far one feels justified in attempting to marshal them all into a single, straightforward narrative. Holger Schott Syme published a work of uber-scepticism, 'Three's Company: Alternative Histories of London's Theatres in the 1590s' (*ShSurv* 65[2012] 269–89),

showing that we do not have all the pieces of evidence required to justify acceptance of the standard narrative of theatre history in the 1590s and Shakespeare's place in it, as written by Andrew Gurr. Strictly speaking he is quite correct, but his alternative narrative has at least as many problems as the one it would replace. Syme attempts to carve out a place for Pembroke's men as a successful London company of the 1590s, and in arguing that we do not know that the Chamberlain's men dominated the commercial theatre Syme takes too little account of the popularity of their plays in print, which does rather imply that dominance.

Syme thinks it likely that 'the first Henriad died with Pembroke's Men as a work of live theatre and was never staged by the Chamberlain's or King's Men' (p. 289). This is an easy claim to dismiss, since the epilogue to *Henry V* characterizes the *Henry VI* story as one 'Which oft our stage hath shown'. Even if added long after initial composition—these words first appear in the Folio—this still invalidates Syme's claim. Syme thinks that the only piece of evidence linking the *Henry VI* plays to the Chamberlain's/King's men is the Folio's inclusion of them, and that this is relevant only if we assume that everything in the Folio must have been performed by that one company. He calls our being misled on this 'the Folio effect' (p. 289), and he thinks it taints the dominant narratives of theatre history.

Richard Schoch, 'The Grimaldi Shakspere' (*ShakB* 30[2012] 1–19), reckons he knows who created the nineteenth-century *Grimaldi Shakespeare* parody and reads it as rather more serious than it has hitherto been deemed. This was a parody of the Perkins Folio—that is, John Payne Collier's fraudulently annotated exemplar of the Second Folio—but purporting to be based on a Second Folio annotated by Joey Grimaldi (1778–1837). Schoch tells the story of Collier's mid-nineteenth-century fraud and its uncovering, and the subsequent Grimaldi parody in which the comic actor, who never played Shakespeare, is claimed as the author of a series of scholarly corrections to the received text, which corrections are of course absurd. Schoch reckons that the author of the Grimaldi parody was Andrew Edmund Brae, who tried to prove that the Perkins Folio was a fake by showing that one its emendations uses *cheer* (taking the place of the obviously wrong *chair*) in the sense of a shout of approval, which sense was not available before the early nineteenth century.

Because its editor was on Collier's side, Brae could not get *Notes and Queries* to publish his work showing that the *chair* > *cheer* emendation proved Collier to be a fraud. Thereafter *chair* spelt as *cheer* appeared in one of the joke annotations in the Grimaldi parody, suggesting that Brae was the author of that parody and that he intended those who had suppressed his scholarship to recognize it. If so, the *Grimaldi Shakespeare* was not a harmless parody but a stinging attack. George Yeats, 'Shakespeare's Victorian Legacy: Text as Monument and Emendation as Desecration in the Mid-Twentieth Century' (*VLC* 40[2012] 469–86), also tells the story of Collier's forgery, as part of a larger history of Victorian ideas about the texts of Shakespeare being a kind of monument to the man and emendation of them a kind of putrefaction or desecration of his body. John Wolfson, in 'Bell's Edition of Shakespeare's Plays: A Bibliographic Nightmare' (*BC* 61[2012] 551–66), performs the signal service of working out the contents of the various Bell editions of Shakespeare,

which aimed to show what was being acted on the London stage, and he helpfully details the constituent parts of the various volumes that formed complexly overlapping series.

At the start of the last act of *Cymbeline*, Posthumus enters dressed as an Italian and carrying a bloody cloth, which he reflects upon as a sign that he is a wife-killer. Rodney Stenning Edgecombe, in 'Posthumus' Theodicy in *Cymbeline* V.i' (*ShN* 61[2011] 89), reads his lines 'But alack, | You [gods] snatch some hence for little faults; that's love, | To have them fall no more. You some permit | To second ill with ill, each elder worse, | And make them dread ill, to the doer's thrift' as an account of how divine grace operates, and one that swerves between pagan, Catholic and Puritan registers. To point up the irony of this combination of belief systems, Edgecombe reckons that the last word should be emended to *shrifi*. In the course of reading in *Sonnets* [1609] evidence of Shakespeare's adiphorism, Edgecombe, in 'Three Notes on Shakespeare' (*BJJ* 19[2012] 127–41), defends as intentional anadiplosis Sonnet 146's repetition of 'Poore soule the centre of my sinfull earth, | My sinfull earth these rebbell powres that thee array'. After all, in a similarly 'protracted, meditative way' (p. 135) Hamlet uses anadiplosis across a line-break in 'To die, to sleep. | To sleep, perchance to dream' and no one complains. In the same article, Edgecombe defends the Folio's reading of 'make rope's in such a scarre' in *All's Well That Ends Well*, with *ropes* invoking the idea of a twisted braiding of language used to trap someone and *scar* meaning *crag*, 'the resistant, unassailable surface of the intended victim's chastity' (p. 139).

And so to *Notes and Queries*. The most important contribution is the continuation of an ongoing dispute about the authorship of *Pericles* in which John Klause, in 'A Controversy Over Rhyme and Authorship in *Pericles*' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 538–44), attempts to show that MacDonald P. Jackson's stylometric method based on shared rhymes is flawed and does not prove George Wilkins's co-authorship. Klause writes that 'the ratio of all rhymed to verse lines in *Pericles* . . . [is] 31 per cent for Acts I–II (281/903), 25 per cent for Acts III–V (260/1032)' (p. 539), where presumably he means not *ratio* but *proportion*. Jackson excludes all but verse-dialogue lines in making his counts, and Klause thinks that excluding all the many rhymes by Gower in Acts III–V (222 of the 260 rhymed lines in this part of the play) is unreasonable. Underlying this is the fact that Gower has a lot more to say in Acts III–V than hitherto, so how one treats his lines is crucial to the overall counts.

Jackson tried to show that it is most unusual to find large changes in rates of rhyming within one play, so that the differences in those rates between *Pericles*' Acts I–II and Acts III–V are anomalous, but Klause reckons *The Merchant of Venice* and *Q1 King Lear* have exactly such internal differences. In *The Merchant of Venice*, Acts I–III have 132 rhymed lines while its Acts IV–V have only 18, and in *Q1 King Lear* Acts I–III have 139 rhymed lines while Acts IV–V have only 22, which compares with *Pericles* Acts I–II's 199 rhymed lines against its Acts III–V's 38. Even after we normalize for the size of acts, it remains the case that in Shakespeare the two halves of a play may differ by 5:1 in their use of rhymed verse lines. Thus rhymes may be highly unevenly distributed across a Shakespeare play and hence the unevenness of the distribution of rhymes in *Pericles* is not a sign of its having two authors.

Klaue points out that finding in *Pericles* Acts I–II many more rhymes shared with Wilkins's *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* than *Pericles* Acts III–V share with that play does not point towards *Pericles* Acts I–II and *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* having the same author, since in *Romeo and Juliet* Acts I–II show many more rhymes in common with *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* than *Romeo and Juliet* Acts III–V do, and yet we do not conclude from this that there are two hands in *Romeo and Juliet* or that one of them also wrote *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage*. Klaue tabulates what he asserts about rhymes in *Romeo and Juliet* that are shared with *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage*. It matters of course whether one counts rhymes as types, in which case subsequent repetitions of a particular rhyme are ignored, or as tokens, in which case they are not. Klaue repeats the objection he has made before to Jackson's method of multiplying rhyme links in which two *wife/life* occurrences in *Pericles* Act II and six *wife/life* occurrences in *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* count as twelve links between these plays. Klaue thinks that this procedure magnifies the internal disparity between the two halves of *Pericles* and masks the similar disparity in the two halves of *Romeo and Juliet*.

The problem is worst when a rhyme occurs just once in text A and a large number of times in text B: by multiplying these together to get what Jackson calls *links* we overstate the significance of a single rhyme in text A. Equally, consider the case when two texts have the same proportion of lines using a given rhyme. Thus *ill/will* constitutes 6 out of 296 rhyme tokens in *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* (= 2 per cent) and 3 out of 146 rhyme tokens in *Pericles* Acts I–II (= 2.1 per cent). In Jackson's method we multiply these occurrences to produce a product of 18 links, and dividing that product by the total number of rhymes produces wildly different results: 18/296 (= 6.1 per cent) for *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* and 18/146 (= 12.3 per cent) for *Pericles* Acts I–II. Klaue reckons that this overstates the importance of a small number of rhyme types, since the sharing of *ill/will* and *life/wife* accounts for more than half all the shared rhyming between *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* and *Pericles* Acts I–II that Jackson finds.

Klaue admits that other ways of counting rhymes are also problematic. If we simply calculate a proportion of rhyme tokens shared between two plays, then a play that has 200 rhyme tokens in all and has in common with *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* 10 rhyme tokens each used 4 times has 40/200 shared rhyme tokens, but so does a play that has also has 200 rhyme tokens in all but has 40 rhyme types shared with *Miseries* but with no repeats. Are these 40/200 results really the same? Perhaps sensing the weakness of his method, observes Klaue, Jackson more recently has focused on rhymes occurring more than once. Klaue thinks that in the present case the overall totals are so small as to be statistically insignificant and shows again that we can do the counting in subtly different ways to get wildly different results.

His main point is that there is no reason to trust Jackson's way of counting above any of the others, so Jackson's conclusion that rhyme points to Wilkins's authorship of *Pericles* Acts I–II is wrong. Jackson's method also requires certain judgements about just what constitutes a rhyme that other investigators may dispute. Jackson sees no rhyme in 'To bring you thus together 'tis no sin, | Sith that the justice of your title to him' on account of *him*

being an unstressed feminine ending. Klause thinks that *to him* should be elided to *t'him*, forming a regular stressed tenth syllable, otherwise 'the accent would fall awkwardly on the preposition [*to*]' (p. 543). I can see an argument for either view since if we read on in the play we find that the next clause makes sense of a stress on *to*: 'Sith that the justice of your title TO him | Doth flourish the deceit'.

Francis X. Connor, 'More Press Corrections in *Lucrece* (1594)' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 530–1), has found two previously undetected press variants in the 1594 first edition of *The Rape of Lucrece*. They appear close to one another in 'And [than | then] in key-cold Lvcrece bleeding streame | He fals, and bathes the pale feare in his face, | And counterfaits to die with her a space [. |,]' (sig. M3^v). In both cases the first reading is found in the three Folger exemplars, the Huntington exemplar and Bodleian Malone 34, while the second reading is in the Yale exemplar. The word *then* and the comma are the corrected readings, reckons Connor, since the word meaning modern *then* is spelt *then* in *The Rape of Lucrece* on every occurrence but once up to this point and the comma is more correct in this context than a period would be; also there is another known variant on this forme for which the Yale exemplar most likely represents the corrected state.

T.W. Craik, 'New Nuts or Hazel Nuts? *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, IV.I.37–38' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 533–4), notices that Titania says that she will send a fairy to find 'The squirrel's hoard, and fetch thee new nuts', which is one syllable short and does not make much sense since squirrels hoard old nuts not new ones. We need a disyllable taking the place of *new* and qualifying *nuts*, and elsewhere in Shakespeare such a disyllable is *hazel*, found in *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Romeo and Juliet* twice. It is hard to see how *hazel nuts* would get corrupted into *new nuts* but Craik reckons the compositor of the 1600 quarto might have been unable to read the manuscript so he made up something he thought plausible.

Thomas Merriam, in 'Conjunction of Collocations in *More* and *2H6*' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 60), responds to John Jowett's dismissal, in his Arden3 edition of *Sir Thomas More*, of Merriam's claims about six-word collocations—reviewed in *YWES* 90[2009]—by listing three more collocations shared by the Original Text of *Sir Thomas More* (which is in Anthony Munday's handwriting) and Folio *The Contention of York and Lancaster*/2 *Henry VI*: 'learned Clarke' versus 'learned clearkes', 'flye vp to heauen' versus 'flye to heaven' and 'a Gods name goe' versus 'a Gods name. Goe'. Actually, Merriam lists more than these, but the others were discussed in his 2009 article so they are not new. His point is that the Original Text of *Sir Thomas More* was written by Shakespeare and only copied out by Munday. Merriam does not indicate if the phrases he lists are not found anywhere else, nor does he accept that they are not quite identical matches. In fact LION shows 'learned clerk[s]' and 'fly [up] to heaven' to be common in the period. Merriam thinks that because only one of the matches is also in the 1594 quarto of *The Contention of York and Lancaster*/2 *Henry VI*, the author of the Original Text of *Sir Thomas More* cannot have got them from Shakespeare. I wonder why Merriam discounts the possibility that he heard them in performance.

Rhodri Lewis, 'Two Meanings in One Word: A Note on Shakespeare's *Richard III*, III.i.81–83' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 61–3), reckons that when Richard III gives as the false repetition of his aside 'So wise so young, they say, do never live long' the version 'I say, without characters fame lives long' and then refers to his moralizing 'two meanings in one word', the word *character* means both writing and the older sense of impressions upon the memory, which was conceived as being like a wax tablet. It takes both written and memorial record for fame to live long. The irony is that in killing the prince whom he is answering here, Richard forgets that posterity does indeed matter: the murder of the princes in the Tower is the act of infamy that brings Richard down.

As part of an ongoing disagreement with Richard Dutton, James P. Bednarz, in 'Dekker's Response to the Chorus of *Henry V* in 1599' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 63–8), offers evidence that the choruses to *Henry V* were present in the original composition of the play despite being absent from the 1600 quarto edition. The evidence is that two Dekker plays that can safely be assigned to composition in 1599 show his response to those choruses. The open-air theatre prologue, printed after the court prologue, in the 1600 edition of Dekker's *Old Fortunatus* clearly echoes the words of *Henry V*'s prologue: both choruses ask to be allowed to explain things, ask for pardon for the shortcomings of the theatre (and in particular its being too small for the action), and suggest that the power of the audience members' minds can make up the difference. Henslowe paid Dekker for this play in November and December 1599. Dekker's later choruses do the same again, and the key question is, who is copying whom? Bednarz cannot prove it but he sees Dekker as the copyist. Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, probably completed in July 1599—and undoubtedly performed at court on 1 January 1600—was influenced by *Henry V* in a set of thematic and characterological details that Bednarz sketches: Simon Eyre is Harry-like in his class-crossing affability and Pistol-like in his ostentatious language, and the play refers to beer from the Boar's Head and to tennis balls.

Thomas Merriam, 'Unhoused, Disappointed, Unaneled' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 70–6), traces the connotations of the words *unhoused*, *disappointed*, and *unaneled* from *Hamlet* through the centuries from their etymologies to their early modern significance in relation to religious controversy and into modern editions. The key point is that they were not taken seriously as sacramental language: almost everyone wanted to deny their power and at best they pointed to idolatrous nonsense. In his play *Hoffman*, Chettle borrowed these ideas and the idea of Ophelia's imperfect funeral to create the lament of Otho's mother over his imperfect preparation for the afterlife. So, did Shakespeare mean us to understand the ghost of Hamlet's father as literally being denied the important sacraments identified in *unhoused*, *disappointed*, and *unaneled*, or is he just nostalgic for the old Catholic ways? Merriam reckons that the repetition of the idea in Ophelia's maimed rites indicates that, unlike everyone else, Shakespeare took this deprivation seriously.

Why does Horatio say that only 'a piece of him' is present when he meets the sentinels in the opening scene of *Hamlet*? Jacob Sider Jost, 'Hamlet's Horatio as an Allusion to Horace's *Odes*' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 76–7), reckons that it is because that is what is said in Horace's Ode III.30: 'a large part of me will

elude the Goddess of Death'. This ode is the one that Shakespeare borrows from for Sonnet 55 ('Not marble nor the gilded monuments . . .') and the point of Horatio quoting Horace is that he is performing the very work of making an everlasting monument by writing and memorializing what the ode and the sonnet are about. Also, Horatio describes himself to the dying Hamlet as an 'antique Roman', as Horace was, and is given by Hamlet the job of memorializing him. What does Ulysses mean by the penultimate word in 'Peaceful commerce from dividable shores' in *Troilus and Cressida*? Editors and critics have not been able to come up with a satisfactory gloss because they have overlooked the role of *dividers* (compasses) in planning a sea-voyage, argues Pervez Rizvi in 'Dividable Shores in *Troilus and Cressida*' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 77–9): Ulysses means shores that voyagers have successfully navigated between.

In 'Like a dull actor . . . Hath virgined it e'er since' near the end of *Coriolanus* it seems that Coriolanus is kissed, but by whom and exactly when, asks Tom Clayton in 'Kissing Coriolanus' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 79–81)? His answer is that the phrasing makes the kiss initiator clearly Coriolanus's wife and the kiss mutual. The deepening of the marital bond here is important for criticism of Coriolanus's character, as he is not quite the mother's boy we sometimes think. MacDonald P. Jackson 'Verb Endings in the Quarto of *Shakespeare's Sonnets* (1609): Evidence for Dating' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 81–2), has new evidence that Sonnets 76–126 and *A Lover's Complaint* cannot have been written before 1600. It is the change in the third person singular conjugations of verbs from *-eth* endings, common in Shakespeare before 1600, to *-es* endings, common in Shakespeare after 1600. Tallying the counts of this choice for groups of the sonnets, numbers 76–126 show a marked preference for the more modern *-es* ending, as does *A Lover's Complaint*.

In a follow-up to his article earlier in the year, reviewed above, about the Original Text of *Sir Thomas More* being not composed by Munday but only copied out by him, Thomas Merriam, in 'Attention and Effort in the Transfer of an Orthographic Detail?' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 525–30), acknowledges the point he missed before: the Original Text might echo Folio *The Contention of York and Lancaster*/2 *Henry VI* because its author heard the play in performance, and the Folio's date of publication is irrelevant. But he still gets this point wrong by insisting that this performance was in '1592 at the latest' and hence 'more than seven years' (p. 562) before the Original Text of *Sir Thomas More* if it was written around 1600 as John Jowett believes. Of course, *The Contention of York and Lancaster*/2 *Henry VI* might easily have stayed in the repertory throughout the 1590s. Changing tack, Merriam returns to the argument he made in an article reviewed in *YWES* 87[2008]: the autograph manuscript of Munday's play *John a Kent and John a Cumber* has no words ending *-tt*, while the Original Text of *Sir Thomas More* has many, Hand D has a few, and so do the 1598 quarto of *Love's Labour's Lost* and the 1609 quarto of *Troilus and Cressida*. His point is that Munday's habits witnessed in his known autograph manuscript play do not match those in the Original Text of *Sir Thomas More*, and for Merriam that points to him working merely as a copyist.

In the midst of presenting this argument Merriam writes a sentence that makes no sense regarding probability and the application of Fisher's Exact

Test: 'If the ratios of terminal *tt* to terminal *t* in Hand D and *John a Kent* are compared (6 *-tt*: 135 *-t* versus 0 *-tt*: 1585 *-t*), the probability is less than 0.0001, less than one chance in ten thousand—as expected' (p. 527). The probability of what, exactly, is less than 0.0001? I presume he means that if someone is as likely to write a *-tt* as a *-t* ending then getting none of the former and 1,585 of the latter in *John a Kent* and *John a Cumber* is highly unlikely. That is quite true, but who is claiming that the likelihood is equal? Merriam needs to state his null hypothesis, as it is called, before he can use a Fisher's Exact Test in this way. Merriam notes that *-tt* endings are much rarer in print than in manuscript plays, and that *John a Kent* and *John a Cumber* is unusual in having none. Merriam graphs and tabulates various ways of stating this fact but he has no explanation for it. All he wants to suggest is that the Original Text of *Sir Thomas More* and *John a Kent* and *John a Cumber* being in the same hand, Munday's, does not prove that the same man composed them, since they are so unlike regarding *-tt* endings.

Horst Breuer, in 'The "Fox and Ape" Verse in Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Lost*' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 531–3), points out that the four animals in Armado's verse about 'the fox, the ape, and the humble-bee | [and] the goose' in *Love's Labour's Lost* were associated with deceit, lechery, procuring, and unchastity respectively, and that is what the verse is about: the first three cannot indulge their desires until the fourth joins them. George Mandel, 'Julius Caesar and *Caesar's Revenge*, Yet Again' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 534–6), notices things in common between the anonymous *Caesar's Revenge* and *Julius Caesar*. In both Titinius kills himself with Cassius's weapon after Cassius has used it for his suicide, there is the idea that a blade is raised or lowered in status by the social class of the man whose blood it sheds, Titinius kills himself saying that he does it to show the world how he loved Cassius, and there is a reference to the dying groans of men. Who copied whom depends on dating, and since *Caesar's Revenge* shows close familiarity with a bunch of literary texts written by the mid-1590s and nothing thereafter it is likely to be the earlier play and hence the donor.

One of the origins of the *King Lear* story is Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain*, in which Leir's father King Bladud tries to fly and is dashed to pieces. The Bladud story was much repeated and William Poole, 'Gloster and Bladud' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 536–8), reckons it is a source for the Dover Cliff scene of Edgar getting his father to believe he has safely been flown down from on high. Simon Reynolds, 'The Spider in the Cup: An Echo of Plutarch's *Moralia* in *The Winter's Tale*' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 544–5), finds a source for Leontes' speech about unknowingly drinking from a cup with a spider in it and not feeling nauseated until the spider is revealed. The same idea of not getting sick until the mind has the uncleanness pointed out to it occurs in Plutarch's 'On Moral Virtue' in his *Moralia*, available to Shakespeare in Philemon Holland's 1603 translation.

As well as the Strachey Letter, for *The Tempest* Shakespeare drew on Richard Rich's *News from Virginia* [1610] for Prospero's epilogue, according to Richard Abrams, 'Newes from Virginia (1610): A Source for Prospero's Epilogue?' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 545–7). Rich was the first person to call Bermuda the 'Bermoothawes' and the second person to use this *-ooth-* spelling was

Shakespeare in *The Tempest*. The key moment of influence is Rich's prefatory address which slips into verse for 'As I came hether to see my natue land, | to waft me backe lend me thy gentle hand', which as Charles Frey pointed out sounds like Prospero's epilogue. We can now check how rare this kind of phrasing is. Abrams went looking for stage orations that link hand-clapping to winds to sailing, and found none that precede *The Tempest*. Abrams fails to state his exact searches so it is not easy to check that he searched properly.

In the marvelling about the shipwreck in *The Tempest*, Austen Saunders, 'A New Source for *The Tempest*? Richard Cosin's *Conspiracie, for Pretended Reformation* (1592)' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 547–9), is helped to find a source by the play's characters agreeing that not one hair on anyone's head got hurt and that their clothes stayed dry. (This is not exactly correct, since King Alonso certainly thinks his son Ferdinand died in the storm.) Although the Bible has the hairs-on-head synecdoche in relation to a ship in a storm, it does not have the dry-clothes idea. But Richard Cosin's *Conspiracy for Pretended Reformation* [1592] does; or rather it has the hairs-on-head and dry-clothes bits, not the ship-in-a-storm bit, although it goes on to mention the sea and the idea of throwing one's books away.

Andrew Gurr points out, in 'Stephano's Leather Bottle' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 549–50), that Stephano in *The Tempest* calls his bottle a book, which indeed it would have looked like because it too was leather-bound. In the same play, Gurr, 'The Tempest's "Top"' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 550–2), wonders just where was 'on the top', the place taken by Prospero as he watches the banquet scene. Joan of Arc appears 'on the top' in *1 Henry VI*, and that could be the stage balcony. There is 'the top' mentioned several times in a stage direction for Jupiter's magnificent appearance in Jonson's masque *Hymenaei*, which Shakespeare certainly knew, and at that moment the masquers draw swords, just as the King's party does in the banquet scene of *The Tempest*. This does not tell us where 'the top' was, but might explain Shakespeare using the term: he was recalling, perhaps unconsciously, Jonson's masque.

Finally, Thomas Merriam, in 'Simplicity of Means' (*N&Q* 59[2012] 552–3), returns to his test of counting rates of the use of the word *hath*, which discriminates between works by Shakespeare, who uses it more than once per thousand tokens, and Fletcher, who uses it less than once per thousand. This test came up before in his article reviewed in *YWES* 82[2003]. Merriam applies his test to the two parts of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* as divided by Richard Proudfoot and indeed the supposedly Shakespeare part has more than one and the supposedly Fletcher part has less than one *hath* per thousand tokens, and likewise Ward E.Y. Elliott and Robert J. Valenza's division of *All is True/Henry VIII*.

2. Shakespeare in the Theatre

In *Shakespeare, Trauma and Contemporary Performance*, Catherine Silverstone is concerned 'to account for—but by no means rationalise—the ongoing and pernicious effects of various forms of violence as they have emerged in selected contemporary performances of Shakespeare's texts' (p. 2).

investigation of Fletcher's engagement with both Chaucer's plot and earlier plays by Shakespeare in 'The Anxiety of *Auctoritas*: Chaucer and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*' (*SQ* 63:iv[2012] 544–76). Teramura concludes that '*The Two Noble Kinsmen* represents a critical self-reflexive moment in the rise of dramatic literary canonicity' (p. 576). The importance not only of the author, but of the author's engagement with the canon of English literature is highlighted by the frequent allusions to Shakespeare's earlier works and his faithfulness to Chaucer's story in those parts of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* attributed to Fletcher (pp. 545–6, 576). Intertextuality and collaboration in the late plays, and the references that Shakespeare, and his collaborators and editors, make, not only to his own work but to other texts from antiquity to Cervantes, is providing a fertile area of new research.

Books Reviewed

- Aebischer, Pascale, and Kathryn Prince, eds. *Performing Early Modern Drama Today*. CUP. [2012] pp. xiii + 247. £60 ISBN 9 7805 2119 3351.
- Almásí, Zsolt, and Mike Pincombe, eds. *New Perspectives on Tudor Culture: Literature, Society, and Politics*. CambridgeSP. [2012] pp. 300. £44.99 ISBN 1 4438 3906 8.
- Benson, Sean. *Shakespeare, Othello and Domestic Tragedy*. Continuum. [2012] pp. x + 173. £60 ISBN 9 7814 4119 4701.
- Bevington, David. *Murder Most Foul: Hamlet through the Ages*. OUP. [2011] pp. xiv + 236. £25 ISBN 9 7801 9959 9103.
- Brayton, Dan. *Shakespeare's Ocean: An Ecocritical Exploration*. UPVirginia. [2012] pp. xv + 257. \$40 ISBN 9 7808 1393 2262.
- Brevik, Frank W. *The Tempest and New World-Utopian Politics*. Palgrave. [2012] pp. 192. \$128 ISBN 9 7811 3702 1793.
- Burnett, Mark Thornton, and Adrian Streete, eds. *Filming and Performing Renaissance History*. Palgrave. [2011] pp. xiii + 212. £50 ISBN 9 7802 3027 3436.
- Canning, Patricia. *Style in the Renaissance: Language and Ideology in Early Modern England*. Continuum. [2012] pp. ix + 209. £75 ISBN 9 7814 4118 5525.
- Cannon, Walter W., and Laury Magnus, eds. *Who Hears in Shakespeare? Auditory Worlds on Stage and Screen*. FDUP. [2012] pp. 313. \$85 ISBN 9 7816 1147 4749.
- Carnegie, David, and Gary Taylor, eds. *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*. OUP. [2012] pp. 448. £36 ISBN 9 7801 9964 1819.
- Christofides, R.M. *Shakespeare and the Apocalypse: Visions of Doom from Early Modern Tragedy to Popular Culture*. Continuum. [2012] pp. xvii + 216. £60 ISBN 9 7814 4117 9944.
- Coiro, Ann Baynes, and Thomas Fulton, eds. *Rethinking Historicism from Shakespeare to Milton*. CUP. [2012] pp. xiv + 306. £60 ISBN 9 7811 0702 7510.

- Deegan, Marilyn, and Willard McCarty, eds. *Collaborative Research in the Digital Humanities: A Volume in Honour of Harold Short, on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday and His Retirement, September 2010*. Ashgate. [2012] pp. 248. £65 ISBN 9 7814 0941 0683.
- Dillon, Janette. *Shakespeare and the Staging of English History*. OUP. [2012] pp. 160. £50 ISBN 0 1995 9316 3.
- Enterline, Lynn. *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion*. UPennP. [2011] pp. 208. \$45 ISBN 9 7808 1224 3789.
- Feerick, Jean E., and Vin Nardizzi. *The Indistinct Human in Renaissance Literature*. PalMac. [2012] pp. xii + 292. £55 ISBN 9 7802 3034 0473.
- Fitter, Chris. *Radical Shakespeare: Politics and Stagecraft in the Early Career*. Routledge. [2012] pp. 330. £28 ISBN 0 4157 1658 6.
- Fuller, David. *The Life in the Sonnets*. Continuum. [2011] pp. xiii + 118. £45 ISBN 9 7818 4706 4530.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Shakespeare's Freedom*. UChicP. [2010] pp. xiii + 144. £15.50 ISBN 9 7802 2630 6667.
- Hallett, Charles A., and Elaine S. Hallett. *The Artistic Links Between William Shakespeare and Sir Thomas More: Radically Different Richards*. PalMac. [2011] pp. 304. \$66.73 ISBN 0 2301 1367 1.
- Heal, Felicity, Ian W. Archer, and Paulina Kewes, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*. OUP. [2012] pp. 800. £95 ISBN 0 1995 6575 7.
- Herbrechter, Stefan, and Ivan Callus, eds. *Posthumanist Shakespeares*. PalMac [2012] pp. 280. £53 ISBN 9 7802 3036 0907.
- Hillman, Richard. *French Reflections in the Shakespearean Tragic: Three Case Studies*. ManUP. [2012] pp. 236. £65 ISBN 9 7807 1908 7172.
- Kelly, Philippa. *The King and I*. Continuum. [2011] pp. xviii + 109. £45 ISBN 9 7814 4117 8688.
- Kinney, Arthur F., ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare*. Oxford Handbooks of Literature. OUP. [2012] pp. 848. £100 ISBN 9 7801 9956 6105.
- Ko, Yu Jin, and Michael W. Shurgot, eds. *Shakespeare's Sense of Character: On the Page and from the Stage*. Ashgate. [2012] pp. xv + 264. £60 ISBN 9 7814 0944 0666.
- Landreth, David. *The Face of Mammon: The Matter of Money in English Renaissance Literature*. OUP. [2012] pp. 368. £32.99 ISBN 0 1997 7329 9.
- Lawrence, Sean. *Forgiving the Gift: The Philosophy of Generosity in Shakespeare and Marlowe*. Duquesne. [2012] pp. xxiv + 244. \$58 ISBN 9 7808 2070 4487.
- Lemonnier-Texier, Delphine, and Guillaume Winter, eds. *Lectures de 'Measure for Measure' de William Shakespeare*. Presses Universitaires de Rennes. [2012] pp. 320. €16 ISBN 9 7827 5352 0936.
- Lin, Erkia T. *Shakespeare and the Materiality of Performance*. Palgrave. [2012] pp. 256. \$128 ISBN 9 7811 3700 1061.
- Longstaffe, Stephen, ed. *1 Henry IV: A Critical Guide*. Continuum. [2011] pp. 240. \$32.95 ISBN 0 8264 4196 6.
- Lupton, Julia Reinhard. *Thinking with Shakespeare: Essays on Politics and Life*. UChicP. [2011] pp. xiv + 298. \$50 ISBN 9 7802 2649 6719.

- Lyne, Raphael. *Shakespeare, Rhetoric and Cognition*. CUP. [2011] pp. viii + 267. £60 ISBN 9 7811 0700 7475.
- Malcolm, Gabrielle, and Kelli Marshall, eds. *Shakespeare in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge Scholars. [2012] pp. 210. £39.99 ISBN 9 7814 4383 7873.
- Marshall, Gail, ed. *Shakespeare in the Nineteenth Century*. CUP. [2012] pp. xv + 464. £62 ISBN 9 7805 2151 8246.
- Martin, Christopher. *Constituting Old Age in Early Modern English Literature from Queen Elizabeth to King Lear*. UMassP. [2012] pp. 221. \$80 ISBN 9 7815 5849 9720.
- McDonald, Russ, Nicholas D. Nace, and Travis D. Williams, eds. *Shakespeare Up Close: Reading Early Modern Texts*. Arden Shakespeare. Bloomsbury. [2012] pp. xxxv + 377. £18.99 ISBN 9 7814 0815 8784.
- McKenzie, William, and Theodora Papadopoulou, eds. *Shakespeare and I*. Continuum. [2012] pp. xvi + 286. £65 ISBN 9 7814 4114 3716.
- McMahon, Chris. *Family and the State in Early Modern Revenge Drama: Economies of Vengeance*. Routledge. [2012] pp. 250. £85 ISBN 9 7804 1580 7753.
- Menon, Madhavi, ed. *Shakespeare: A Queer Companion to the Complete Works of Shakespeare*. DukeUP. [2011] pp. x + 494. £75 ISBN 9 7808 2234 8337.
- Moore, Tiffany Ann Conroy. *Kozintsev's Shakespeare Films: Russian Political Protest in 'Hamlet' and 'King Lear'*. McFarland. [2012] pp. 202. \$40 ISBN 9 7807 8647 1355.
- Orgel, Stephen. *Spectacular Performances: Essays on Theatre, Imagery, Books and Selves in Early Modern England*. ManUP. [2011] pp. xix + 283. £60 ISBN 9 7807 1908 1682.
- O'Rourke, James. *Rethorizing Shakespeare through Presentist Readings*. Routledge. [2012] pp. xii + 189. £85 ISBN 9 7804 1589 7037.
- Pechter, Edward. *Shakespeare Studies Today: Romanticism Lost*. PalMac. [2011] pp. 248. £55 ISBN 9 7802 3011 4197.
- Peterson, Kaara L., and Deanne Williams, eds. *The Afterlife of Ophelia: Reproducing Shakespeare*. PalMac. [2012] pp. 272. £58 ISBN 9 7802 3011 6900.
- Ray, Sid. *Mother Queens and Princely Sons: Rogue Madonnas in the Age of Shakespeare*. PalMac. [2012] pp. xiv + 195. £50 ISBN 9 7811 3700 3799.
- Ritchie, Fiona, and Peter Sabor, eds. *Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century*. CUP. [2012] pp. xiii + 454. £68 ISBN 9 7805 2189 8607.
- Silverstone, Catherine. *Shakespeare, Trauma and Contemporary Performance*. Routledge. [2011] pp. x + 175. £80 ISBN 9 7804 1595 6451.
- Sterrett, Joseph. *The Unheard Prayer: Religious Toleration in Shakespeare's Drama*. Brill. [2012] pp. xxxvi + 187. \$140 ISBN 9 7890 0423 0057.
- Straznicki, Marta, ed. *Shakespeare's Stationers: Studies in Cultural Bibliography*. Material Texts. UPennP. [2012] pp. 384. £45.61 ISBN 9 7808 1224 4540.
- Streete, Adrian, ed. *Early Modern Drama and the Bible: Contexts and Readings, 1570–1625*. PalMac. [2012] pp. xii + 267. £53 ISBN 9 7802 3030 1092.

- Tassi, Marguerite A. *Women and Revenge in Shakespeare: Gender, Genre, and Ethics*. SusquehannaUP. [2011] pp. 344. \$69.50 ISBN 9 7815 7591 1311.
- Taylor, Gary, and Trish Thomas Henley, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Thomas Middleton*. OUP. [2012] pp. 633. £95 ISBN 0 1995 5988 6.
- Vaughan, Alden T., and Virginia Mason Vaughan. *Shakespeare in America*. OUP. [2012] pp. xiii + 220. hb £40 ISBN 9 7801 9956 6372, pb £14.99 ISBN 9 7801 9956 6389.
- Vaughan, Virginia Mason. *The Tempest: Shakespeare in Performance*. ManUP. [2011] pp. xii + 238. £60 ISBN 9 7807 1907 3120.
- Vaught, Jennifer. *Carnival and Literature in Early Modern England*. Ashgate. [2012] pp. xi + 195. £55 ISBN 9 7814 0943 2081.
- Weis, René, ed. *Romeo and Juliet*. Arden Shakespeare. Bloomsbury. [2012] pp. 400. £8.99 ISBN 9 7819 0343 6912.
- Wiegandt, Kai. *Crowd and Rumour in Shakespeare*. Ashgate. [2012] pp. xii + 215. £55 ISBN 9 7814 0943 2197.
- Wiggins, Martin. *Drama and the Transfer of Power in Renaissance England*. OUP. [2012] pp. 176. £62 ISBN 0 1996 5059 0.