

# VI

## Shakespeare

GABRIEL EGAN, PETER J. SMITH, ELINOR PARSONS,  
CHRIS BUTLER, ANNALIESE CONNOLLY,  
RICHARD WOOD, STEVE LONGSTAFFE, JON ORTEN AND  
NAOMI McAREAVEY

This chapter has four sections: 1. Editions and Textual Matters; 2. Shakespeare in the Theatre; 3. Shakespeare on Screen; 4. Criticism. Section 1 is by Gabriel Egan; section 2 is by Peter J. Smith; section 3 is by Elinor Parsons; section 4(a) is by Chris Butler; section 4(b) is by Annaliese Connolly; section 4(c) is by Richard Wood; section 4(d) is by Steve Longstaffe; section 4(e) is by John Orten; section 4(f) is by Naomi McAreavey.

### 1. Editions and Textual Matters

Three major critical editions of Shakespeare appeared in 2008: Anthony B. Dawson and Gretchen E. Minton edited *Timon of Athens*, Keir Elam edited *Twelfth Night* for the third series of the Arden Shakespeare, and Roger Warren edited *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* for the Oxford Shakespeare. This year there were no monographs, no major collections of essays, and few journal articles on the subject of Shakespeare's texts. Since the three editions are of plays for which the 1623 Folio is the only authority—relieving editors of the task of deciding between the readings of competing early editions—there is not a great deal to be said about them and this section is somewhat shorter than usual.

The cover and the half-title page of Dawson and Minton's *Timon of Athens* make no mention of the shared authorship, but the title page prints 'and Thomas Middleton' under Shakespeare's name. Their 145-page introduction (average for an Arden these days) covers a number of thematic topics, and when making interpretative arguments Dawson and Minton's footnotes frequently discuss what particular productions chose to do for the moment under discussion. The editors acknowledge the collaborative nature of the play right away and connect it with the distinct possibility that the play was not staged when first written; until the last century productions were rare indeed.

Perhaps, they speculate, Shakespeare turned to Middleton because he wanted to write a gritty urban satire and knew it was not his forte (pp. 3–4). We know that sometimes collaborative labour was divided by scene or act units, but otherwise—and most famously with Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher—the collaborators worked closely with one another and cross-fertilized. Dawson and Minton think the latter happened with *Timon of Athens*, with Shakespeare forming the initial plan and writing two-thirds of the dialogue. Dawson and Minton summarize which writer did which bit, noting that while some parts can be ascribed with confidence to one or other writer, other parts seem to blend their labours (pp. 5–6).

There is no early performance history, and together with the unfinished nature of the script we have and the original intention to leave it out of the Folio this suggests that the play was abandoned; it survives only because it was slotted in to fill a gap that opened when it looked like *Troilus and Cressida* would have to be withdrawn from the collection (p. 10). Why leave it out of the Folio? Maybe, the editors suggest, because it was not acted and was only dimly remembered (p. 11). There is an obvious danger of circular logic here, since its not being in the Folio was one of the reasons for supposing it was not acted. Alternatively, it might have been omitted because it was co-written, and we know that the co-written plays *Pericles* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* were omitted; on the other hand, Dawson and Minton admit, co-written *All is True* was included in the collection. (Indeed, and co-written *Titus Andronicus*, *1 Henry VI*, *Macbeth*, and *Measure for Measure* were included too.) The usual evidence for dating a play is missing in this case: there is no Stationers' Register entry, no quarto, no records of or allusions to early performance. Dawson and Minton's best guess is that the play was composed in 1607. However, there is a likely allusion to the Gunpowder Plot of November 1605 in 'set whole realms on fire' (III.iii.34). If Shakespeare returned to Plutarch's *Lives* (used in 1599 for *Julius Caesar*) in order to write *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus* in 1607–8, he would have found there the story of *Timon of Athens* (pp. 15–16). Coriolanus is like Timon in detesting ingratitude and leaving his city, and like Alcibiades in attacking his city and then giving it a reprieve. An upper limit to the date is set by *Timon of Athens*'s avoidance of a five-act structure, which the King's men started using once they got the Blackfriars in 1608. There is something like an act-division structure to the first half of the play, but it ceases with the Timon-in-the-woods scene. Dawson and Minton explain that they retain the 'conventional act breaks (though we acknowledge their arbitrariness), partly for convenience of reference, and partly because the first half of the play really does reflect that kind of structure' (p. 17 n.1).

The sources are discussed concisely (pp. 18–27). One source is the anonymous comedy *Timon* based on one of Lucian's *Dialogues*, which itself also influenced *Timon of Athens*. The Lucian strain accounts for the character of misanthropic Timon being ridiculous, and Plutarch for him being tragic: *Timon of Athens* neatly combines this material. Only Lucian explains why Timon became a misanthrope and says that he found gold while in exile. Dawson and Minton outline the debt to the anonymous comedy *Timon*, and pose the awkward question of which came first. *Timon* seems to echo *King*

*Lear*, so perhaps it was a parody of Shakespeare written after *King Lear* and before *Timon of Athens*, hence *Timon of Athens* borrows bits from *Timon*. In genre *Timon of Athens* is mixed: sort of tragedy-cum-satire, but the audience is not given many reasons to like the tragic hero. Where it is satirical the play explores the perennial problem that satire is always caught up in the criticisms it makes. Dawson and Minton acknowledge that with certain exceptions (such as the Poet who is at once a scourge of flattery and a flatterer) the characterization is largely abstract, and the power of the play lies elsewhere (pp. 45–54). Timon's benevolence is actually 'an urge to undo reciprocity' (p. 52) because he hates his own dependence, and Dawson and Minton offer an excellent summary of the psychoanalytical ideas of Melanie Klein in which envy is central, and they persuasively link these to the idea of Fortune as a fickle mother, giving and then withholding her bounty (pp. 82–4).

Dawson and Minton's introduction is superb on matters of interpretation and language and there are few obvious errors. One is that they repeat, four times in all, the familiar assertion that Lear appears on a 'heath'; there is no heath mentioned in *King Lear* (pp. 87–8). In the same discussion they refer to the 'so-called "inner stage" at the Globe', a phrase and concept that has long been abandoned by theatre historians, not all of whom even accept that there was a permanent discovery space between the two stage doors whose existence is vouchsafed by a contemporary drawing of the Swan. Discussing the taking in wax of an impression of what is written on Timon's tomb, they ask why the soldier who does this cannot read the epitaph yet apparently reads something else that he finds around the tomb. Perhaps on Timon's tomb there are two epitaphs, one in English that he can read and one in Latin that he cannot; this is the explanation Dawson and Minton reluctantly settle for, but they explore the other possibilities, including the authorial manuscript containing first and second thoughts (pp. 102–9). When the wax impression is brought to Alcibiades in the next scene, it contains two epitaphs, so there are three in all. The two on wax contradict one another, the first telling the reader not to seek the name of the dead man. This first one also contradicts what the soldier read near Timon's tomb ('Timon is dead...') in the preceding scene, so Dawson and Minton cut it to leave the second epitaph from the wax, which they also prefer as more in keeping with the tone of the ending of the play. The editors go to great lengths to justify their editorial intervention of cutting one epitaph, apparently in fear of being judged too interventionist. As they point out, the manuscript from which the Folio text of the play was printed was probably authorial and in two hands. The evidence for this is that it was typeset by one man, compositor B, perhaps with a little help from compositor E, and the variations in certain spellings across the play fall into two groupings that follow the division into Shakespeare's and Middleton's writing.

The account of the play in performance (pp. 109–45) contains the familiar story of Restoration adaptation and the putting back of Shakespeare's material in the nineteenth century, and Dawson and Minton are particularly attentive to important twentieth-century productions on stage and on television. Their extensive account of the BBC television production neglects to mention that the Poet and Painter were played by the eminent British satirists John Fortune and John Bird, a casting decision suggesting that the

director—Bird and Fortune’s fellow satirist from the 1960s, Jonathan Miller—took much the same line as Dawson and Minton on the play’s essentially satirical purpose. In a surprising and most welcome innovation, the edition offers a ‘Note on the Text’ with the following explanation of its purpose: ‘Since the textual notes are rather cryptic and hard to make out for the non-specialist, it might be helpful to the reader to provide a few guidelines’ (p. 147). It would be commendable for Arden to adopt this note for all subsequent editions as even specialists might appreciate practical guidance on decoding the Arden’s typographical conventions.

There being only the Folio text as authority for this play, what follows here is consideration of the most noteworthy emendations adopted or invented by Dawson and Minton. In the opening stage direction, Dawson and Minton cut the Folio’s entrance for a ‘ghost’ Merchant who never speaks. They follow Samuel Johnson in printing ‘Our poesy is as a gum which oozes’ (I.i.22) for F’s absurd ‘Our Poesie is as a Gowne, which vses’ but defend F’s having the Poet say that his creative flow moves ‘In a wide sea of wax’ (I.i.48), rejecting the common emendations (‘of tax’, ‘of verse’) on the grounds that F either means a sea that is growing (on the wax) or else the Poet is referring to the wax tablet he writes his poems on. At I.i.89 Dawson and Minton use a common emendation (from Nicholas Rowe) in having the Poet say that Timon’s flatterers will let him ‘slip down’, rather than F’s bizarre ‘sit downe’. Using F3’s reading, Dawson and Minton have Timon say that he will not shake off Ventidius when he ‘most needs me’ (I.i.104) rather than F’s ‘must neede me’. Both make sense but F3 is, they say, ‘more idiomatic’ and in any case ‘must needs’ is ‘always followed by a verb’: the only other ‘must need’ in Shakespeare (2 *Henry IV* V.i.22–3) is also followed by a verb. (In fact that moment in 2 *Henry IV* is not an occurrence of ‘must need’ at all: it is ‘must needes be had’ in Q1 and F.) Dawson and Minton stick with Apemantus’s ‘That I had no angry wit to be a lord’ (I.i.238–9) which is F’s reading, rejecting all emendations. They admit that it is ‘obscure’ but they find none of the emendations plausible. As it stands, the line means either that if he were a lord he would hate himself, or better still that in order to be a lord he would have to give up his ‘angry wit’ which is what defines him, and that is why he would hate himself.

Dawson and Minton use William Warburton’s emendation to have Apemantus say that Timon’s meat would ‘choke me’ fore I should flatter thee’ (I.ii.38–9) where F has ‘choake me: for I should nere flatter thee’, which they admit makes reasonable sense: your meat would stick in my throat because I cannot flatter you. They also stay with F in printing ‘There taste, touch, all, pleased from thy table rise’ (I.ii.125) instead of emendations that try to make ‘all’ into ‘smell’: they point out that ‘all’ covers the missing senses. (Cupid has just mentioned the five senses, and editors generally want to fit as many as possible into this line in order to fulfil his promise; sight is covered by the next line’s offer to ‘feast thine eyes’ so hearing is the obvious omission.) Dawson and Minton dispute John Jowett’s claim—made in his Oxford Shakespeare edition reviewed in *YWES* 85[2006]—that the phrase ‘methinks I could’ (I.ii.225) appears nowhere in Shakespeare and is likely to be Middleton’s. They claim that there are four occurrences of ‘methinks I could’ and four of ‘methinks I should’ in Shakespeare, and they are quite right.

Jowett's counting, presumably automated by computer, seems to have been thrown off by the frequent use of a space between 'me[e]' and 'think[e]s' in the early printings. For dropping the line in F where the Senator repeats Caphis's 'I go sir' (II.i.33) by saying 'I go sir? | Take the Bonds along with you', Dawson and Minton offer the argument (shared with the *Oxford Complete Works*) that this is a serious scene and the Senator's line introduces incongruous humour. They turn F's 'With clamorous demands of debt, broken Bonds' into 'With clamorous demands of broken bonds' (II.ii.39) on the grounds that it not only fits the meaning better and avoids a clash with 'debts' in the next line, but it also fits the metre. (In fact F's reading would be metrically acceptable, albeit not so regular, with 'clamorous' spoken as a disyllable.)

Since the Fool says he serves a mistress not a master, Dawson and Minton emend F's apparently erroneous references to his master to make them refer to his mistress (II.ii.73, 101). At II.ii.99–102 they print 'When men come to borrow of your masters, they approach sadly and go away merry, but they enter my mistress's house merrily and go away sad' in place of F's '... go away sadly'. This is a suggestion made by the Arden general editor Richard Proudfoot and it balances the chiasmus by creating the sequence adverb (*sadly*), adjective (*merry*), adverb (*merrily*) and adjective (*sad*). Dawson and Minton use F2's reading where Flavius complains that whenever he showed Timon the domestic accounts Timon would say he 'found them in mine honesty' (II.i.135), meaning that Timon took his honesty as proof the accounts were in order. This they prefer to F, in which Flavius claims that Timon would say he 'sound them in mine honestie', which can just about be made meaningful ('sound' meaning 'take the measure of') but is the wrong tense (the past tense is needed). The editors adopt Alexander Pope's emendation to print 'This slave | Unto this hour has my lord's meat in him' (III.i.54–5) instead of F's '... vnto his Honor...' which makes a sort of awkward sense: he was honoured by being allowed eat at Timon's. For a notorious crux at III.ii.39, Dawson and Minton punctuate 'He cannot want fifty—five hundred talents' and explain that Lucius means that Timon is so wealthy he cannot be short of even as much as 500 talents, let alone the 50 talents the note asks for.

Dawson and Minton accept Lewis Theobald's emendation so that the stranger, observing Lucius's refusal of Timon's plea for money, says that such ingratitude is 'every | Flatterer's spirit' (III.ii.67) where F has the perfectly serviceable 'euery Flatterers sport'. By contrast, F has the very peculiar lines 'So fitly? Go, bid all my Friends againe, | *Lucius, Lucullus, and Sempronius Vllorxa*. All' (III.iv.5–6), and the problem is explaining where the meaningless '*Vllorxa*' comes from. Dawson and Minton reject all previous editors' attempts to explain it (such as F.G. Fleay's that it is a misreading of 'all luxors', meaning leeches) and they simply cut it, saying that we cannot tell what it is doing in F. They print 'He did behave his anger ere 'twas spent' (III.vi.22), using Rowe's emendation of F's 'behoove his anger', which seems to make no sense (he had need of his anger?); they point out that Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* has such a transitive use of the verb *to behave*. Dawson and Minton emend F's stage direction so that the 'divers Friends' of Timon who enter to be entertained include the ones we have seen being false friends (III.vii.0). F's speech prefixes for these characters do not name them

specifically (F uses numbers only) and Dawson and Minton think it better to keep this vagueness so they call them '1 LORD' and '2 LORD'. They reject Jowett's assigning of the speeches to numbered 'Senators' on the grounds that two of them seem ignorant of Alcibiades' banishment, and since the previous scene showed the Senators agreeing on this they would know about it if they really are supposed to be Senators.

Like Thomas Hanmer, Dawson and Minton have Timon's curse be 'The rest of your foes, O gods . . . make suitable for destruction' (III.vii.78–81) where F has 'The rest of your Fees, O Gods . . .'. Charles Jasper Sisson defended 'fees' as meaning 'properties', that is the people Timon wants destroyed, who are the properties of the gods. Against this Dawson and Minton object that it makes poor sense to ask the gods to destroy their own property. Also from Hanmer comes their 'This is Timon's last, | Who, stuck and spangled with your flatteries, | Washes it off' (III.vii.89–91) where F has 'This is *Timon's* last, | Who stucke and spangled you with Flatteries, | Washes it off', which as they say leaves 'Washes' without a subject and weirdly makes Timon accuse himself, rather than his false friends, of flattery. Hanmer is again followed in turning F's 'And yet Confusion liue' to 'And let confusion live' (IV.i.21), which Dawson and Minton admit is not really necessary. F has 'Raise me this Beggar, and deny't that Lord' (IV.iii.9), and the trouble is that to make sense of 'deny't', which has no antecedent, it needs to mean something opposite to 'raise'. Dawson and Minton go for J.C. Maxwell's emendation of 'deny't' to 'deject'. Where F has the puzzling line 'It is the Pastour Lards, the Brothers sides', Dawson and Minton accept the emendation first enacted by John Payne Collier to print 'It is the pasture lards the rother's sides' (IV.iii.12). They point out—but without saying why it is relevant—that there is a Rother Street in Stratford-upon-Avon; Collier himself joined the dots by noting that oxen are rothers and these were sold at Rother Market in Stratford, so Shakespeare would have known the word. For this edition Proudfoot came up with a fresh analogue to support the emendation's dropping of an initial letter B: 'Ravish'd' is misread as 'Bravishd' in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*.

Samuel Weller Singer was the first to emend F's 'the wappen'd Widdow wed againe' to 'the wappered . . .' (IV.iii.39), and again *The Two Noble Kinsmen* provides an analogue in Palamon calling himself young and 'unwappered'. Dawson and Minton follow Johnson in their emendation to 'spare not the babe . . . Think it a bastard whom the oracle | Hath doubtfully pronounced thy throat shall cut' (IV.iii.118–21), because it alludes to Oedipus, whereas F has the more generalized ' . . . the throat shall cut', which can be defended. Dawson and Minton accept the *Oxford Complete Works* emendation of F's curse on the prostitutes 'your paines six months | Be quite contrary' to 'your pain-sick months . . .' (IV.iii.143). Like Nicholas Rowe they have Apemantus accuse Timon with 'This is in thee a nature but affected' (IV.iii.201), meaning that he is putting on an act of misanthropy, in preference to F's ' . . . infected' which would not be an accusation but a condolence. In order to conform to the play's wider debate about Fortune, Dawson and Minton follow Rowe in having Apemantus attribute Timon's behaviour to a 'change of fortune' (IV.iii.203) rather than F's 'change of future' (that is, prospects), which makes perfect sense on its own. Another such relatively under-motivated change is

their following Hamner in having Apemantus refer to ‘mossed trees’ (IV.iii.222) in preference to F’s equally acceptable ‘moyst Trees’. Only occasionally do Dawson and Minton acknowledge how finely balanced such decisions are: they adopt Singer’s emendation of F’s ‘that poore ragge’ (that is, your father) to ‘that poor rogue’ (IV.iii.270) on the grounds that ‘Poore Rogue’ occurs three lines later, but admit that ‘stuff’ in the next line may have been suggested by ‘rag’.

Dawson and Minton print ‘APEMANTUS Here, I will mend thy feast. [*Offers food.*] | TIMON First mend my company, take away thyself’ (IV.iii.282) where F has ‘...mend thy company ...’, which perhaps makes better sense in a kind of misanthropically contrary way: improve your companionship by leaving me. The emendation is Rowe’s. On Pope’s precedent, Dawson and Minton delete ‘If not’ from F’s ‘Is not thy kindnesse subtle, couetous, | If not a Vsuring kindnesse, and as rich men deale Guifts’ (IV.iii.503–4), on the grounds that it came from eyeskip to ‘Is not’ in the previous line and harms the sense. However, one could make a case for ‘If not’ meaning ‘I’d even go so far as to say’, although as Sisson noted when admitting this as a possibility (*New Readings in Shakespeare*, pp. 177–8), the subtle covetousness is already indicated before ‘If not’, so calling it usury does not amplify the point but only rephrases it. F has the Senator say that the Senate ‘hath since withall | Of it owne fall’ (V.ii.32–3) and Dawson and Minton follow Rowe in emending ‘since’ to ‘sense’—needed for the meaning to be clear: we know we have done wrong, he is saying—but they also follow Pope in emending ‘it’ to ‘its’. This second change is unnecessary because, as Sisson remarked (*New Readings in Shakespeare*, p. 178), ‘it own’ is perfectly good early modern English.

With some misgivings, Dawson and Minton follow Rowe’s emendation of F’s ‘let foure words go by’ to ‘let sour words go by’ (V.ii.105), on the grounds that Timon means ‘let me say these last few bitter things and then die’. Dawson and Minton point out that the Soldier’s ‘The character I’ll take in wax’ (V.iv.106) might not be an impression but only copying onto a wax table. While usefully removing a troublesome detail that an impression would be back to front when later read, this raises another in having the Soldier copy something written in a language he cannot read; I suppose this would be plausible if the alphabet were familiar, so Latin perhaps but not Greek. Dawson and Minton print ‘These walls of ours | Were not erected by their hands from whom | You have received your griefs; nor are they such | That these great towers, trophies and schools should fall | For private faults in them’ (V.v.22–6), where F has ‘your greefe’ in place of ‘your griefs’. The problem is in understanding the referents of ‘they’ (the griefs?) and ‘them’ (also the griefs? or the people who caused the griefs?) As Dawson and Minton point out, not emending ‘greefe’ to ‘griefs’ as Theobald did would prevent ‘they’ referring to the griefs and hence it would have to refer to the causers of Alcibiades’ singular grief, meaning that these people who hurt him are not so important that he should destroy the city. But, as Dawson and Minton insist, Alcibiades has been saying that these people *are* so important in Athens that their city should fall, so the Senator would only be making a weak denial of his claim if F is thus left unemended, whereas with the emendation the Senator is

able to make the more powerful claim that the griefs are not so great as the consequence Alcibiades intends. Well worked out. At V.v.28–9 the Senator says of those who hurt Alcibiades '(Shame that they wanted, cunning in excess) | Hath broke their hearts', and Dawson and Minton follow a suggestion of Johnson's to emend 'cunning' to 'coming' and lose the brackets, which should have run all the way from 'Shame' to 'hearts'.

As can be seen from this survey of their interventions, Dawson and Minton are not particularly conservative and make no strenuous effort to retain Folio readings where previous editors have come up with plausible emendations that remove difficulty. They offer few new readings of their own. Their edition contains seven appendices. The first, entitled 'Sources', gives just what one would expect from Plutarch's *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans* (modernized from Thomas North's early modern English translation), plus relevant bits of the anonymous play *Timon*. The second appendix, 'Authorship', largely summarizes previous scholarship and simply declares bits of it to be unconvincing without saying why. Dawson and Minton are cautious about ascribing certain passages to one or other writer, which results in ascribing them 'Ambiguous'. The appendix on 'The Printed Text and its Anomalies' details Charlton Hinman's working out of how *Timon of Athens* came to replace *Troilus and Cressida* in the Folio and how *Troilus and Cressida* was then reintroduced. The fourth appendix simply details 'Changes to Lineation' and the fifth deals with 'Currency' in the play. Dawson and Minton outline the apparent fluctuations in the value of money, especially the talent, and survey the explanations that editors have come up with: self-correction by an author who realized he had undervalued the talent, confusion between two authors, contradiction in the sources, deliberate currency fluctuation to make the point that money is unstable, and the fact that dramatists were often simply inconsistent about talents. Dawson and Minton settle on three combined causes: multiple authorship, discrepancies in the sources, and indifference to the precise value of a talent. In the sixth appendix, a 'Doubling Chart', Dawson and Minton reckon that with at least thirty lines allowed for a quick change, the minimum cast is eleven men and four boys (plus some supernumeraries). The final appendix, 'Notable Performances of *Timon of Athens* in the Past Century', puts their notes into tabulated, potted descriptions.

The cover for Keir Elam's Arden edition calls his play *Twelfth Night*, but the half-title and title pages also give it its alternative title, *What You Will*. Elam's introduction is around the same length as Dawson and Minton's, 153 pages, but unusually it contains no section on the text and its editing: these matters are handled by appendix I. There is a common mistake early in Elam's introduction (p. 3 n. 1) when he discusses the difference between the Old Style and New Style (that is, Julian and Gregorian) calendars, which is a matter of asking 'What day is it today?', and elides it with the difference between incrementing the year number on 1 January (as we do now) and incrementing it on 25 March, Lady Day, as pious people used to do in deference to Christ's conception. It so happens that Pope Gregory's bill introducing his dating also moved the increment day from 25 March to 1 January and the bill that introduced New Style dating into England did the same. Nonetheless, the



matters are distinct, and contrary to Elam's assertion some Elizabethans incremented the year number on 1 January.

Elam reckons that John Manningham wrote in his diary that he saw 'Mid Twelfth night' because he started to write the title of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and that he thought Olivia was a widow because he was probably confused by her dressing in black (p. 4). James I saw *Twelfth Night* in 1623 (according to Henry Herbert) and Charles I wrote the name 'Malvolio' beside the title *Twelfth Night* in his copy of F2 (p. 5). The highly quotable Samuel Pepys disliked the productions of *Twelfth Night* he saw, but things picked up for the play on the stage in the mid-eighteenth century (pp. 6–7). In a long series of relatively short sections organized thematically, Elam covers questions that are frequently asked about the play. How come Viola does not present herself to Orsino as a eunuch and does not sing, as she said she would? How come Maria says that Feste will be one of the spectators at the gulling of Malvolio, but Fabian in the event takes his place? These are essentially loose ends in the plot (pp. 10–17). Elam gives readings of the play's peculiar title in relation to its content—misrule,wassailing, gifting, epiphany, characters named after saints—and explores the parallels (in experiences and names) between the characters. He makes an excellent point about Viola-as-Cesario imitating her brother because she is bereaved, and he is fascinating on narcissism in general (pp. 17–32). On clothing (pp. 38–50), Elam repeats the familiar (but unreferenced and problematic) claim that 'companies received clothing from their noble patrons' (p. 45), but he gets cross-gartering right and shows a picture. Many productions get it wrong and have the garters running the length of the calf rather than being confined to the knees.

Returning to one of the familiar problems, Viola's plan to present herself as a eunuch, Elam wonders if Cesario's name (from *caesus*, cut) means 'castrated'; he finds castratedness in Viola-as-Cesario's role and points to John Astington's observation that the aphorism beginning 'some are born great...' is based on Christ's discourse on eunuchs (pp. 57–68). The introduction is studded with startling contextual knowledge, such as the fact that Illyria (roughly modern Albania) was a place where rituals of same-sex unions of non-sexual love were long practised (p. 73). This knowledge is matched with sound interpretations, such as the idea that Antonio's advice to Sebastian to visit the southern suburbs—Southwark, where the dangerous pleasures are—and to lodge at the Elephant Inn, the name of a notorious brothel on Bankside, suggests that he is leading him into temptation (p. 75). It is odd, though, that in his discussion of the 'Performances Virtual and Actual' (pp. 87–96) Elam covers the means by which the 'dark house' scene was staged without mentioning Astington's seminal essay on it. Elam buys the idea that the play was performed in honour of the real Duke Orsini visiting Elizabeth's court at the time (or at least Shakespeare remembered the name when he came to write *Twelfth Night*), but not Anthony Arlidge's idea that Shakespeare had close connections with the Middle Temple and wrote the play for it, and hence that Manningham saw the first performance. There is not much in it, but Elam goes for first performance on the twelfth night preceding Manningham's viewing on 6 February 1602, so that would be 6 January 1602. The venue, he decides, was another private hall, not Middle Temple since there is no record

of a performance there on that day. The history of adaptations and rearrangements (pp. 96–106) shows not quite the extraordinary rewriting that befell other Shakespeare plays in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, but some considerable rearrangements, often driven by the staging requirements of the day. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries there were a number of musical adaptations. Productions in the past fifty years can conveniently be divided into the temporal—those that give it winter or spring settings—and the spatial ones that try to capture Illyria as a specific place (pp. 106–10).

A considerable part of Elam's introduction is taken up with a survey of particularly noteworthy performances in each of the play's major roles (pp. 122–45), followed (as with Dawson and Minton's edition of *Timon of Athens*) by a table giving the basic details of 120 productions. In the text of the play itself, a lot of the explanatory notes tell the reader the stage business choices for certain productions. A few explanatory notes are on different pages from the lines they gloss. This can easily happen when there is real difficulty fitting all the notes for one page onto that page, but here it seems to happen too often and looks like a typesetting error. Twice a collation note appears on the page preceding the one holding that line: for 'Toby' V.i.353 and 'against' V.i.356. The following is not an exhaustive list of emendations, just some notable ones. At I.i.5 Elam prints 'O, it came o'er my ear like the sweet south [that is, wind]', which is Pope's emendation of F's '... sweet sound'; Elam objects that F is tautologous. Elam has the Captain say of Olivia that 'she hath abjured the company | And sight of men' (I.ii.37–8) where F has 'sight | And company'. The switch is Hanmer's and Elam thinks it improves the metre in the second line, so that Viola's response, 'O that I served that lady', completes a regular line with feminine ending. The *Oxford Complete Works* editors argue for expanding 'prethee' into 'pray thee' (I.ii.49) on the grounds that Folio compositor B had a habit of shortening it, and in agreeing to this Elam notes that here it enables an internal rhyme with 'pay thee'. On page 171 something goes wrong in the collation section of the review copy: there are unwanted underscoring characters that look like a relic from a typescript that used underlining to represent italicization.

For a famous crux, Elam has Andrew Aguecheek say his leg looks good in a 'flame-coloured stock' (I.iii.130), which is Rowe's emendation of F's 'dam'd colour'd stocke'. Elam offers nothing to overcome the objection that it is hard to see how a compositor would set 'dam'd' where his copy had 'flame', yet he objects to the *Oxford Complete Works* emendation of 'divers-coloured' on precisely this ground. Collier's emendation to 'dun-coloured' is no good, says Elam, because the stockings need to be flamboyant. His alteration of F's entrance for Cesario and Malvolio 'at seuerall doores' to 'at separate doors' (II.ii.0) seems fussy: the quality of being apart is still one of the ordinary meanings of 'several'. Elam prints 'Alas, our frailty is the cause, not we, | For such as we are made of, such we be' (II.ii.31–2) for F's 'Alas, O frailtie is the cause, not wee, | For such as we are made, if such we bee', adopting F2 change of 'O' to 'our' and Joseph Rann's emendation (first proposed by Thomas Tyrwhitt) for 'if' to 'of'. Elam turns F's 'Some are become great, some atcheeues greatnesse, and some haue greatnesse thrust vponn em' into the

familiar ‘Some are born great, some achieve greatness and some have greatness thrust upon them’ (II.v.141–2), which is Rowe’s emendation of ‘become’ to ‘born’ based on the observation that the word ‘born’ is twice used later in the play when the contents of the letter are reiterated. As Proudfoot notes, ‘borne’ could easily be misread as ‘become’. Elam makes no comment on Patricia Parker’s essay of 2006 (reviewed in *YWES* 87[2008]), which pointed out that those later reiterations of the letter’s contents deviate in other ways too from this first reading: here Malvolio is told to smile, but at III.iv.71 he says that the letter told him to be sad.

At III.iii.14–15, F has ‘I can no other answer make, but thanks, | And thanks: and euer oft good turnes’, which second line is short one iambic foot. Elam adopts Theobald’s emendation to make the second line ‘And thanks, and ever thanks; and oft good turns’. This is a tricky problem, as the awkwardness of the short line could be intended to show that Sebastian is embarrassed at Antonio’s over-solicitousness. Elam alters F’s ‘for | t comes to passe’ to ‘for it comes to pass’ (III.iii.174), saying that ‘for’t comes to pass’ is another possibility, but he makes no mention of the ‘t’ starting a new line in F. Since it is always an error to start a new line with a space—unless you mean to indent the line, and this is the middle of a prose paragraph—it looks like a letter has come out of the forme of type. It would be odd to start a line with “t”, as would be needed for the reading ‘for’t’, so it is almost certain that a letter ‘i’ has come out; thus Elam’s ‘for it’ seems right. Strangely enough, however, his collation wrongly records that F’s reading is ‘For’t’ and his explanatory note says that F’s reading is ‘For t’, with a ‘wide space between “for” and “t”’, but does not mention the decisive matter of the line-break.

Elam’s first appendix is a substantial one concerned with ‘The Text and Editorial Procedures’ (pp. 355–79), and it begins with the simple facts. The 1623 Folio is basic for this play, and to print a manuscript a publisher needed ‘authority’ (sometimes called ‘allowance’) from the church or state as well as permission (‘licence’) from the Stationers’ Company. In the printshop of Isaac and William Jaggard, the Folio was printed concurrently with at least four other books, identified here, and compositor B set all of *Twelfth Night*. Elam reports that the play occupied twenty-one pages in the Folio, ‘signed Y2 to Z6’ (p. 361). This is not quite right, since the fourth, fifth, and sixth leaves of each regular gathering in the Folio are unsigned: he means that if they were signed those would be their signatures. Hinman’s reconstruction of the order of presswork in the Folio showed that, having finished most of *All’s Well That Ends Well*, the printers did not proceed to gatherings Y and Z (the end of *All’s Well That Ends Well* and all of *Twelfth Night*) but turned instead to the Histories section. Presumably, copy for *Twelfth Night* was not available since with no preceding edition there could not have been a copyright problem, as with the fuss over *Troilus and Cressida*. What was the Folio compositor’s copy? W.W. Greg thought *Twelfth Night* was printed from a promptbook, but admitted that there was little to go on to make such a determination. There are literary-scribal features to *Twelfth Night*, such as Latinate markers of intervals, but it is impossible to say what this manuscript was a transcript of.

As is fashionable these days, Elam calls the printer’s copy a ‘purely virtual object’ and says that we should be careful about ‘reifying it’ (p. 367). In truth

there is nothing virtual about the copy: it is merely a lost document. It is our conception of it, not the thing itself, that is 'virtual'. Reification is a particularly inappropriate term, because it implies that without someone doing the reifying the document would never have had physical existence, and that is not true. Elam concludes that the most we can say is that the copy was a transcript of either authorial papers or a theatrical document. In a useful subsection on punctuation, Elam is concerned with discourse markers: semantically empty words and phrases that add colour such as 'By my troth', 'Fie', and 'I warrant'. When these are used at the start of an assertion they receive too much weight if followed by a comma. Elam withholds the comma so that Andrew Aguecheek's 'By my troth I would not undertake her' (I.iii.56) is not a 'solemn pledge', as it would be if rendered as 'By my troth, I would not undertake her'. A second appendix on 'Casting' reports others' conclusions and offers a fresh calculation of its own with a doubling chart: eleven men and three boys (plus supernumeraries) are all that are needed. The last appendix covers music, reprinting musical transcriptions from the second Arden series edition.

Roger Warren's Oxford Shakespeare edition of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* is like this year's two Arden editions in a number of ways. Although the introduction is much shorter (sixty-two pages totalling around 20,000 words), it too is highly performance-centred: virtually every discussion of the problems of certain lines and scenes is fleshed out with a consideration of how practitioners have handled them. Particular praise is given Edward Hall's company, to which Warren is an adviser. The central staging problem, according to Warren, is how to reconcile the attempted rape of Sylvia and its aftermath with the regularly comic material, and he offers a brief survey of the history of attempts to do this (pp. 2–14). Regarding 'Origins' (pp. 14–18), the main sources are *Diana* by Portuguese writer Jorge de Montemayor, first published in Spanish in 1559 (translated into French in 1578 and English in 1598), and Boccaccio's *Decameron* 10.8, coming to Shakespeare not directly but via Thomas Elyot's retelling of it in *The Governor*. It is possible that Shakespeare was not the first to dramatically combine these stories: the title of a lost Queen's men's play suggests that it might just have been such a combination and hence an ur-*The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Other minor sources are uncertain and the links tenuous at best. There must be some connection with a scene in John Lyly's play *Midas*, and since *The Taming of the Shrew* also has parallels with that scene it seems more likely that Shakespeare in different places drew on Lyly than Lyly combined bits from different plays by Shakespeare (pp. 19–20).

In all likelihood *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* was Shakespeare's first play, so Warren explores what the dramatist might have been doing to acquire the ability to write it (pp. 21–7). Possibly Julia's reference to taking part in an amateur play at Pentecost (IV.iv.155–60) glances at Stratford Corporation's payment to 'Davy Jones [who later married into the Hathaways] and his company' for a 'pastime', which the young Shakespeare was involved in. We know that the Queen's men's Richard Tarlton performed with a dog, and they played in Stratford and Coventry in the late 1580s, so perhaps Shakespeare wrote it for them some time before Tarlton's death on 3 September 1588.

However, Lyly's *Midas* (to which *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* is indebted) is usually dated 1589 or 1590, and if that dating is accepted then the idea that Shakespeare wrote it in Stratford for the visiting Queen's men collapses. Warren turns to connections with Shakespeare's later work and finds that the Silvia-Proteus-Valentine love triangle is similar to the one in the sonnets; parallels with *Twelfth Night* are, of course, obvious (pp. 29–38).

The remainder of Warren's introduction is largely concerned with the staging of particular scenes and the nature of particular characters. The scene where Valentine's elopement is discovered by the Duke (III.i) is particularly clunky, he finds. Possibly, Julia deliberately gives to Silvia the wrong letter at IV.iv.119—the one she tore up earlier and has now stuck back together?—so perhaps she also deliberately hands over the wrong ring in the final scene. If so she wants her identity to be discovered (pp. 42–8). Lance's loyalty to his undeserving dog is paralleled in Julia's loyalty to the undeserving Proteus, and the scenes of Lance's berating Crab are brilliantly designed so that if the dog does not react to the accusations it is funny and if he does it is funny (pp. 48–53). Concerning the notorious problems of the final scene (pp. 53–9), Warren reckons that Valentine does not give Silvia to Proteus, but rather extends to Proteus the love he feels for Silvia; Warren explores how this has been handled in performance. Does Julia really faint, or just pretend to, at this point? Warren links this moment to Julia's other accidentally-on-purpose acts with the letter and ring.

It takes just four pages to deal with 'The Text' (pp. 59–62). The Folio, which is basic, was printed from a Ralph Crane transcript with massed entrance directions, which means he was making it for readers, not actors. This is awkwardly put by Warren, who writes that Crane was 'not transcribing a prompt-book' (p. 59), meaning not making one, although Warren could be misread as meaning not copying from one. Crane's copy may have been foul papers, which might explain his relatively heavy imposition of his own editorial habits: those massed entrances and what editors calls swibs, single words in brackets. Where there is a stop-press correction in F, such as 'heuilly' to 'griuously' (III.ii.14, TLN 1459), Warren reports that Charlton Hinman thought that copy was 'almost certainly' (p. 62) consulted, for this and other corrections on the same page. True, but it would be worth noting that Peter W.M. Blayney disagreed and thought it just as likely a printshop sophistication. Furthermore, in an insufficiently explained point of some importance, Warren asserts that the proof correction of 'heuilly' to '*griuously*' was made by consultation of 'Shakespeare's foul papers' (p. 62), which must mean he thinks the printer had access to two kinds of copy: Crane's transcript made from foul papers, and the foul papers themselves.

According to Warren, Crane probably made F's list of characters and imposed 'the division into acts and scenes' (p. 62). He must mean only the division into acts, since the scene breaks were doubtless an intrinsic part of the original writing. Crane may also have cut the play, since it is rather short, but Warren is not strongly convinced of this. For an explanation, in his 'Editorial Procedures' (pp. 63–5) Warren sends the reader back to the Oxford Shakespeare *Henry V* [1982], which seems a little dismissive. (Is not the reader of this edition entitled to at least a summary of those procedures?)

There is plenty of space in this short volume.) Warren confines himself to remarking that passages from non-Shakespearian works used in the introduction and commentary are modernized, that indications of lines spoken 'aside', or 'to' another character, are editorial, and that disputable emendations to stage directions are shown in broken brackets.

In the text of the play itself there are few emendations, mostly consisting of added stage directions. What follows is, as usual, not an exhaustive list: I have omitted the fairly indisputable corrections of obvious error. At I.i.43–4 F has 'The eating Canker dwels; so eating Loue | Inhabits in the finest wits of all', but Warren, following Stanley Wells, changes the second 'eating' to 'doting' on the grounds that F is weak and the misreading is graphically highly plausible. Warren adopts Pope's 'I leave myself, my friends, and all, for love' (I.i.65) in place of F's absurd 'I loue my selfe . . .'. Lance describes his mother as like 'a wood woman' (II.iii.26–7) where F has 'a would-woman', which is an adoption of Theobald's suggestion and a rejection of Wells's innovative emendation to 'moved', which assumes that minim error made 'm' look like 'w' and that an 'e' can easily look like an 'l'. The problem with Theobald's suggestion, of course, is its graphic implausibility, but Warren counters this by suggesting that 'would' was an acceptable spelling of 'wood'; the *OED* agrees, but its only example is this very moment from *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Warren has additional evidence: in Q1 *The Merry Wives of Windsor* 'wood' is a spelling of the verb 'would', but of course he needs the opposite evidence ('wood' spelt as 'would') to clinch the argument.

At II.iii.46–8 Warren prints 'PANTHINO Where should I lose my tongue? | LANCE In thy tale. | PANTHINO In my tail!', whereas F has Panthino simply repeat Lance's line back to him by saying 'In thy Taile'. Warren points out that the pun is on tale/tail: Lance says that Panthino will lose (and loosen) his tongue from too much talking (of his tale) but Panthino 'takes him to mean "rimming", anal penetration with the tongue'; the alteration of 'my' to 'thy' was Crane's censorship of this bawdy joke. Following Theobald, Warren has a servant come in and tell Silvia that her father wishes to speak to her (II.iv.113–15), whereas F has Thurio, who has been on stage a while, suddenly blurt out this servant-like news without giving him the means to acquire it. In one of his few original emendations, Warren makes Proteus say 'Why, Valentine, what braggartism's this?' (II.iv.162) where F has 'Why *Valentine*, what Bragardisme is this?' Crane had the peculiar habit of putting in an apostrophe to show elision and yet including the elided vowel, so Warren reckons Crane wrote Bragardisme's (meaning braggartism's) but the compositor omitted the apostrophe rather than the 'i'. In another adoption of Theobald, Warren has Proteus ask himself 'Is it mine eye, or Valentine's praise' (II.iv.196) that makes him, Proteus, suddenly love Silvia, where F has 'It is mine, or *Valentines* praise'. Sisson found a couple of similarly dropped eyes, including one in Sonnet 113. There is an error in the collation at II.iv.208: the word 'dazzlèd' in the dialogue is wrongly given the lemma 'dazzelèd', doubtless because Warren was thinking of its pronunciation.

At the beginning of II.v, F has Speed welcome Lance to 'Padua', but they are in Milan so Warren follows Pope in making that correction. Similarly at III.i.81 the Duke says that there is a lady 'in Verona here' but since they are in

Milan it just takes a switch of ‘in’ to ‘of’ to fix that. Warren follows Gary Taylor’s decision for the *Oxford Complete Works* in printing ‘she is not to be broken with fasting, in respect of her breath’ (III.i.316–17), where F has ‘shee is not to be fasting in respect of her breath’. The joke relies on a broke/break pun with the next line: ‘that fault may be mended with a breakfast’. Rowe printed ‘kissed’ where Taylor has ‘broken with’, although F’s reading could easily be accepted without emendation. For F’s ‘I often had beene often miserable’ (IV.i.34), Warren gives ‘I had often been miserable’, which is Collier’s emendation (dropping the second ‘often’ and reversing the order of ‘had’ and ‘often’). Where F has the Third Outlaw say that the lady he abducted was ‘heire and Neece, alide vnto the Duke’ (IV.i.47), Warren has him say she was ‘heir, and near allied unto the Duke’ which is Theobald’s emendation. Finally, at V.iv.67–8 F has ‘Who should be trusted, when ones right hand | Is periured to the bosome?’ but Warren follows Johnson in inserting the extra syllable to make it metrically regular as ‘Who should be trusted, when one’s own right hand’. There are two appendices to the edition. The first, ‘Music’, notes that there is just one song in the play, ‘Who is Silvia?’, the wooing sung by Proteus. Warren presents a setting prepared for this edition by Guy Wolfenden from a book of tunes published in 1601. The second appendix shows ‘Alterations to Lineation’.

There were no monographs this year. The closest to our topic was Patrick Cheney’s brilliant literary-critical work, *Shakespeare’s Literary Authorship*, on the ways in which bookishness functions in Shakespeare’s poems and plays, the study of which illuminates Shakespeare’s own ideas on authorship. However, it is not strictly relevant to a survey of work on Shakespeare’s texts and cannot be noticed here. The most important article this year was Zachary Lesser and Peter Stallybrass’s superb account of how commonplacing—the marking of sententiae in a text—was used in a tussle to establish the literary validity of drama, and how Shakespeare side-stepped this tussle and reinvented himself as a tragic-comic writer with no classical pretensions (‘The First Literary *Hamlet* and the Commonplacing of Professional Plays’, *SQ* 59[2008] 371–420). They start with the peculiar claim on the title page of Q1 *Hamlet* that it was performed at universities; this claim is unique in pre-Restoration printed drama. Moreover, the title page claims that the play was performed in the ‘Cittie of London’ (instead of the suburban amphitheatres), which also puts it outside the commercial theatre industry. Yet this edition is traditionally seen as unliterary, as a botched-up acting version in contrast to the authorially derived Q2. Indeed, Nicholas Ling, publisher of Q1, implicitly castigated his own product as imperfect when he published Q2 with a title-page boast of being better than Q1. Q2’s reference to its ‘true and perfect Coppie’ sounds like a boast of authoriality, and yet Q2 closely copies Q1’s title-page layout, even in its unusual hanging indent. Was he trying to pass off to undiscerning buyers the remainder of his Q1 stock as Q2 while hoping that discerning ones (who might already have Q1) would spot the improvements and be encouraged to have both? If so, the theatrical Q1 as was not quite so unlike the literary Q2 as we have thought.

The status of Q1 is all the more strange because it contains a rare, new literary feature: ‘sententiae or commonplaces that are pointed out to the

reader, either by commas or inverted commas at the beginning of each line or by a change in font (usually from roman to italic)' (p. 376), which arose first in prestigious and classical plays. The marks highlight Corambis's (= Polonius's) lines of advice to his son and daughter, and they make Q1 literary despite its memorial link to performance (which Lesser and Stallybrass accept). When first discovered in the nineteenth century, Q1 was taken to be Shakespeare's first stab at the drama. Although he gave a convoluted, and universally rejected, theory of the early *Hamlet* editions, John Dover Wilson realized that the commonplace markers were a writerly phenomenon, not one that could be attributed to a stenographer or actor or to the workings of anyone's memory; Albert Weiner spotted that too. But the success of the theory of memorial reconstruction caused these scholars to be ignored, even by editors who write about the same features appearing in Q2 *Hamlet*. If compositors would not introduce the commonplace markers, and actors would not, who did? Lesser and Stallybrass make a highly convincing case for their suspects.

Frances Mere's *Palladis Tamia* [1598] was the second part of *Politeuphuia: Wits Commonwealth*, published in 1597 by Ling—the publisher of Q1 and Q2 *Hamlet*—and was itself based on John Bodenham's compilation of classical authors. Bodenham and his circle also laboured to collate work by contemporary vernacular writers, resulting in *Bel-vedere or the Garden of the Muses* [1600], including 214 quotations from Shakespeare. Nearly half of these 214 were from *The Rape of Lucrece* [1594], the only Shakespeare book before Q1 *Hamlet* to have commonplace markers in it. Furthermore, Ling was also the co-publisher of Robert Allott's *England's Parnassus* [1600], another collection of contemporary vernacular writers. The appearance of commonplace markers in literature was sporadic before 1594, but then took off and Ling, James Roberts and John Busby were the key figures in this development. Roberts printed for Ling and/or Busby five commonplacéd books in 1594–8 whose excerpts ended up in *England's Parnassus* or *Bel-vedere*, so quite possibly these five were printed from the same manuscripts that Bodenham, Allott and Ling used to make their collections. In the preliminaries to *Bel-vedere* Bodenham writes in praise of the universities at Oxford and Cambridge, but of course in 1601 or 1602 students at St John's College Cambridge put on the play 2 *The Return from Parnassus* as the third part of a trilogy starting with *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus* and 1 *The Return from Parnassus*. The students gave an unflattering view of Shakespeare, and made an onstage mockery of *Bel-vedere* for its temerity in suggesting that vernacular authors should be commonplacéd. The student Ingenioso who leads the mockery is usually taken to represent Thomas Nashe, a Cambridge graduate whose experiences paralleled Ingenioso's in the plays and who likewise attacked modern writers, especially dramatists.

Yet around this time Gabriel Harvey, a Cambridge don, wrote that Hamlet had in it matter 'to please the wiser sort' (to judge from his annotation to his copy of Chaucer's works), and he paired it with *The Rape of Lucrece*, the only other Shakespeare work to have been printed with commonplace markers. 2 *The Return from Parnassus* presents Shakespeare as a poet, but at just this time one of his plays, *Hamlet*, was singled out by Harvey as being worth putting alongside the English greats and it was printed in Q1 with commonplace



markers; simultaneously Bodenham and Allott were putting not just Shakespeare's poems but his plays too into their commonplace books. In the first decade of the new century, plays suddenly started to predominate amongst the printed books containing commonplace markers. Jonson's *Every Man In His Humour* was printed with commonplace markers in 1601, but it had already appeared in Bodenham's *Bel-vedere*.

Thus Bodenham and Allott were commonplaceing a lot of drama, and indeed Lesser and Stallybrass reckon that it was their activity in putting extracts from plays in their commonplace books that led to the widespread publication of plays (many published by Ling) with commonplace markers in the first decade and a half of the new century. Before Bodenham and Allott's books were published no plays appeared with commonplace markers, after them came a flurry of plays printed with commonplace markers. There was in the compositor's typecase no sort for quotation marks: printers used inverted commas (or indeed non-inverted ones) to represent the variety of marginal marks indicating sententiae that they found in their manuscript and printed copy. However, shifts in printed font to note sententiae seem to indicate marks present in the body of a manuscript (not marginalia) or a change from italic to secretary hand (or vice versa). Marginalia and underlining could of course be added to a manuscript by anyone, but a change in handwriting (secretary/italic) is a feature of a writer, whether scribe or author.

Lesser and Stallybrass reckon that marginal commas are much less likely to be authorial (more likely to be added by a reader) than use of italics, but mid-line commas (inverted or not) that mark off more than one line's-worth of material are, they reckon, likely to be authorial. This is because they require more intervention than the marginal marks typically made by readers, and because we find Jonson doing them. All the material in *Every Man Out Of His Humour* that ended up in Allott's *England's Parnassus* is also marked up as commonplace using marginal commas in the 1600 quarto of Jonson's play. Perhaps Allott simply excerpted all the bits so marked in the quarto, or alternatively Allott's manuscript of the play (in which he marked the bits he wanted to excerpt) was used to print the play. Lesser and Stallybrass think the latter more likely because the play quarto also has commonplaces marked by change of font—presumably authorial ones—that Allott did not put into *England's Parnassus*, as we would expect him to do if he were simply copying from the quarto. There are also examples of highlighting words like 'proverb', 'saying', 'axiom' and so on in the dialogue of printed plays and these are typically associated with a font change too: presumably the author changed hand to highlight the commonplace.

The authors who most marked commonplaces in their own plays were Jonson and John Marston, and for other commonplace dramatists Lesser and Stallybrass reckon that Bodenham and Ling were the driving force. After all, if Shakespeare was responsible for the commonplaceing in *Hamlet*, why did he do so much more of it in Q1 than in Q2? It were better to suppose the differences arise from different readers' commonplaceing of the play. Looking at all the plays up to 1642 (something that Lesser's previous scholarly surveys make him expertly equipped to do), no obvious pattern emerges concerning which type of commonplaceing marker—change of font, marginal commas,

mid-line commas—is used, except that marginal commas are almost exclusively reserved for vernacular plays while font-changing is used for Latin and vernacular commonplacing. Lesser and Stallybrass decide that the marginal comma method arose as a compositorial indicator of the kind of commonplacing practice that Bodenham initiated and that quickly took off, and that was consciously trying to argue against the university view that English writing should not be commonplaced at all.

There is evidence in plays that have commonplace markers of a publisher's attempt to distance the work from the theatre. For example, instead of mentioning performance as Q1 does, Q2 *Hamlet* emphasizes its origin in the author's 'true and perfect Coppie', and the second issue of *Troilus and Cressida* in 1609 cancels the reference to performance and asserts that the play was never performed. Importantly, however, these distancing gestures are not the norm: 'Overall, about three-quarters of these playbooks [containing commonplace markers] advertise theatricality and performance on their title pages—by naming the playing company or the venue, or both' (p. 409). Thus, literariness emerges not in distinction from theatricality but in consort with it, and indeed professional plays are more often given commonplace markers than other vernacular writings are. (Although it is not mentioned here, this conclusion is consistent with earlier work by Lesser on the ways that drama was marketed.) Q1 *Hamlet* is squarely within this literary-theatrical (as opposed to literary-versus-theatrical) tradition: it is commonplaced and associated with the universities. 2 *Return from Parnassus* attacks Bodenham for trying to get vernacular poetry accepted as good enough to commonplace (and in that play Shakespeare appears only as a poet, not a dramatist) but Bodenham and his circle had already moved on and were trying, even more audaciously, to get professional stage plays accepted as literature. Q1 *Hamlet* was a manoeuvre in this struggle.

What kinds of writing were commonplaced in a printed play? Leaving aside *Sejanus's Fall*, which Jonson was commonplacing in order to deny it was topical (which is the opposite of commonplace) and hence escape censure for its political satire, it was writing concerned with love and women, the very things the university men agreed were not worth commonplacing. Whereas Lukas Erne sees the rising literariness of drama as an effort made by authors, Lesser and Stallybrass see it as an effect of the activities of readers like Bodenham and spreading from them to publishers. With the sole exception of one moment in *Troilus and Cressida*, Shakespeare does not seem to have marked the commonplaces in his plays. Moreover, where Erne sees increasing literariness in drama accompanying an interest in characters' interiority and psychology, Lesser and Stallybrass see the literariness witnessed in commonplacing as an interest in lines 'extracted from the dramatic situation and from the character who speaks them' (p. 416); that is to say, the lines of special interest are not individuals' thoughts but shared ones.

According to Lesser and Stallybrass's narrative, around 1607 Shakespeare decided to relearn his trade and apprenticed himself to George Wilkins and John Fletcher in order to get the hang of tragicomedy; this was instead of trying to establish himself as a writer (like Jonson) in the sententious style. It worked, and *Pericles* was the biggest hit of his career. By the time of Leonard

Digges's encomium to Shakespeare prefacing John Benson's 1640 edition of the sonnets, his not being commonplacéd was part of his greatness. The same distancing from the classics—in order to laud a new vernacular classic, Shakespeare—is apparent in John Suckling's portrait of himself reading *Hamlet* and in Nicholas Rowe's story that Suckling thought Jonson too indebted to the classical writers and Shakespeare wonderfully, imperiously, free of them. This should not distract us from seeing that, around 1600, Bodenham and Ling and others were aggressively asserting the place of vernacular dramatists alongside the classics.

The foremost journal in its field, *Studies in Bibliography*, has begun to catch up with itself after a hiatus. The volume published in 2008 is 'for 2005–6' and in it R. Carter Hailey throws light on the likely order of presswork in the Pavier Shakespeare quartos of 1619 ('The Shakespearian Pavier Quartos Revisited', *SB* 57[2008] 151–95). His primary evidence is the patterns of paper stock usage, which he derives from the reappearances of watermarks and characteristic chainline intervals, on the principles that a paper mould had distinctive intervals, was used constantly until it wore out in under a year, and that a printer bought a stock of paper for a job and used it up fairly quickly rather than mixing it with other stock over many years. Hailey set out to look at more exemplars of the Pavier quartos than W.W. Greg examined for his groundbreaking essays in *The Library* in 1908 (the ones that proved that the title-page dates were false), and he has found over fifty watermark pairs in them. This enables Hailey to speak more authoritatively about pairs (of which Greg was ignorant) and to track individual wireforms (that make the watermarks) as they get damaged from use.

Hailey begins by politely correcting an error in a standard textbook on the topic, Philip Gaskell's *New Introduction to Bibliography*, which claims that a book would usually be printed on just one stock of paper. Hailey's investigations show that this might happen, or else the book might be printed on a variety of paper stocks: there is no rule. David Vander Meulen came up with the technique of identifying stocks of paper even when there is no watermark: the intervals between chainlines form a kind of fingerprint. You have to measure the intervals at one place on the sheet each time—best to go for the centre of a sheet as it is the easiest spot to identify—because the lines wander a little in their intervals across the sheet. Hailey standardizes on always looking and representing watermarks from the felt side, that is the side you can see when looking down into the mould; the other side—the one into which the chainlines will impress—is known as the mould side. The details of how Hailey does his measuring are impressively complete, if a little daunting for all but the expert. I found only one error, and it is simply a slip of expression: 'If a mark is centered between chainlines . . .', Hailey writes, then his record has to identify the chainline intervals to the left and right of it (p. 160). He means that this, the specification of intervals on either side, is given if the chainline is centred on (not 'between') chainlines.

Hailey describes how his survey of the Pavier quartos refines Greg's identifications of watermarks and puts them into pairs: with his chainline interval measurement he can tell when marks that by eye Greg thought were made by one wireform in one mould were in fact made by different wireforms

in different moulds. Importantly, Allan Stevenson's continuation of Greg's work (published in *Studies in Bibliography* in 1951–2) was wrong in identifying the dates 1608 and 1617 written into a couple of watermarks in the Pavier quartos. Hailey has found these watermarks' twins, and unless they both were damaged in identical ways (an unlikely coincidence) the patterns can best be read not as numerals but as decorations in the watermark (p. 172). Regarding the order of presswork, the pattern of paper stock use implied by the watermarks show 'a complex production system that utilized cast-off copy and the concurrent printing of multiple plays to keep Jaggard's two presses busy' (p. 175). The evidence from paper is consistent with Blayney's inferences of the order of presswork from skeleton forme reuse, where one skeleton was used for both sides of each sheet but a different skeleton was used for alternate sheets. However, the paper evidence contradicts W.J. Neidig's determination, published in *Modern Philology* in 1910–11, of the order of printing of the title pages (and by inference the plays themselves), which was arrived at by tracking the changes around the bits the title pages have in common, which are the printer's device and 'Written by W. Shakespeare'. Hailey's trick is to show that the end of a particular book is printed on a mix of, say, two paper stocks, which two stocks appear together again only at the start of another book. The logical inference is that the second book was begun when the first was finished or was done concurrently with it; it is most unlikely that these two books were printed with a time interval between them, since that would require the printer to set aside the peculiar mix of two stocks that shows up in both. Hailey is also able, by the same procedure, to identify other books going through Jaggard's shop at the time: the anonymous *Troubles in Bohemia* [1619] and *The Second Part of the Booke of Christian Exercise* [1619], and just possibly John Selden's *The Historie of Tithes* that was begun by William Stansby but suppressed during production at the end of 1617.

Brian Vickers continues his reattribution of plays that Shakespeare had a hand in, and shows that Thomas Kyd was one of the authors of *Arden of Faversham* ('Thomas Kyd: Secret Sharer', *TLS* 5481(18 April)[2008] 13–15). (That Shakespeare had a hand in it was demonstrated by MacDonald P. Jackson in an article reviewed in *YWES* 87[2008].) On points of detail inessential to his claim Vickers is disturbingly misleading or mistaken. He writes that the Red Lion project of 1567 was a 'conversion' of a building into a playhouse, but, as has been known since Janet Loengard uncovered a lawsuit about it in the 1980s, the venue was a free-standing addition to the courtyard of a farm, without foundations. Vickers misleads on how scripts were delivered by freelance dramatists, claiming that 'Payment was on delivery' whereas in fact payment could be piecemeal, as sections were completed, as is clear from letters the dramatist Robert Daborne wrote to Philip Henslowe between March and December 1613, recorded as Articles 73 to 97 in Greg's edition of Henslowe's papers. He asserts that 'Having delivered their manuscript, most dramatists never saw a play again, and moved on to the next project', without addressing Grace Ioppolo's claim (reviewed in *YWES* 87[2008]) that dramatists worked closely with the actors on subsequent reshapings of a play; admittedly Ioppolo offered no clinching evidence to support her claim.

There are few works attributed to Kyd, yet his contemporaries said he was industrious, and claims that he wrote *Arden of Faversham* have emerged from time to time. Vickers has tested these claims using plagiarism-detection software that finds three-word collocations in order to compare the play to *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Soliman and Perseda* and the English translation of Robert Garnier's closet tragedy in French, *Cornelie*, these being three widely accepted Kyd attributions. Having found the collocations, the trick is then to eliminate the ones that occur in others' writing. Using a self-built machine-readable corpus of seventy-five plays from before 1596—there is no explanation why he does not use the Literature Online texts—Vickers was able to whittle the list of collocations down to thirty-two that appear only in *Arden of Faversham* and *The Spanish Tragedy*, thirty-six that appear only in *Arden of Faversham* and *Soliman and Perseda*, and eight that appear only in *Arden of Faversham* and the English translation of *Cornelie*. At this point in the argument, Vickers gives a URL to where he claims his raw data can be downloaded, but it resolves to simply the home page of the University of London's School of Advanced Study, and the data cannot be found from there. (In a subsequent issue of the journal the correct URL was given.) The evidential bottom line is that only Kyd and *Arden of Faversham* use 'And faine would have', 'Ile none of that', 'there is no credit in', 'thou wert wont to', 'on/ upon your left hand', 'then either thou or', 'have your company to', 'sit with us', 'give it over', 'heaven is my hope', and 'there he lyes'.

Two of these pieces of evidence are easily dismissed: 'thou wert wont to' appears in John Lyly's *Love's Metamorphosis* (performed by the boys of St Paul's in 1590) and 'sit with us' appears in Thomas Garter's play *Susanna* (published 1578), as *Literature Online* readily reveals. Vickers's rule of looking for matches only in plays before 1596 serves no obvious purpose: if we want to exclude sayings in common usage we need to check that around this time no one else was using these phrases. In fact, 'thou wert wont to' also appears in Anonymous's *The Wisdom of Doctor Dodypoll* (performed 1599) and Samuel Daniel's *The Queen's Arcadia* (performed 1605). If we widen the net a little to include variant forms and thereby admit 'thou wast wont to' we find it in Christopher Marlowe's 2 *Tamburlaine* (performed 1588), Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (performed 1595), Anonymous's *Timon* (performed 1602), John Marston's *The Malcontent* (performed 1604), Thomas Heywood's *The Rape of Lucrece* (performed 1607), Anonymous's *Tom a Lincoln* (performed around 1611), Thomas Middleton's *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside* (performed 1611) and *No Wit, No Help Like a Woman's* (performed 1613), John Fletcher's *Monsieur Thomas* (performed 1615), and John Webster's *A Cure for a Cuckold* (performed 1625). The phrase, then, was not in the least unusual. Vickers goes on to discuss looser verbal parallels between *Arden of Faversham* and the Kyd canon, and also claims *King Leir* for Kyd's authorship. He ends by arguing for Kyd's share in *1 Henry VI*, showing how many of its phrases are loosely mirrored in the Kyd canon and nowhere else before 1596. As before, the logic of limiting the search to plays before 1596 needs stronger justification than it gets in the essay. Jackson's work in the same field provides more secure scholarly procedures for the kinds of

argument Vickers wishes to make, and produces results that are harder to critique.

Jackson's own contribution to the field this year was substantial, and in two articles he disproves Brian Vickers's attribution of the poem *A Lover's Complaint* to John Davies of Hereford. The first uses unusual spellings that are characteristic of an author and, despite scribal and compositorial interference, make it into print ('The Authorship of *A Lover's Complaint*: A New Approach to the Problem', *PBSA* 102[2008] 285–313). Jackson's method was to search in plays in Literature Online from the period 1590 to 1614 that contain the unusual spellings in *A Lover's Complaint* as it appears in the 1609 quarto of the sonnets, and then repeat the process for Literature Online's poetry. One of the wrinkles is that Literature Online tags drama by date of composition and first performance, but poetry only by date of publication. Of the hits he found, Jackson recorded the rare spellings, defined as ones appearing in no more than five dramatists' plays, and he prints the complete list (identifying the plays and poems they occur in) from 'doble' to 'spungie'. The technical details of how he handled capitals, hyphenated words, inflections and conjugations, and apostrophes marking elision are well explained and reasonable. The plays having three or more rare-spelling links to *A Lover's Complaint* are *Hamlet*, *2 Henry IV*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *King Lear* and *Romeo and Juliet* (all by Shakespeare) and Middleton's *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*. Of the nineteen plays having two links to *A Lover's Complaint*, twelve are by Shakespeare, and of the sixty-one plays having one link, ten are by Shakespeare. Not only does Shakespeare dominate the top of the table of links, but the five Shakespeare plays with three or more links to *A Lover's Complaint* are all ones that on other grounds are thought to have been printed from authorial papers. The cross-check with the words' occurrences in poetry eliminates the danger that these are otherwise common spellings that happen to be rare in drama.

In all, Shakespeare's work comprises 8 per cent of the text searched by Jackson yet provides one in every three of the links to *A Lover's Complaint* he discovered. To counter Vickers's claim (made in works reviewed in *YWES* 84[2005] and *YWES* 88[2009]) that *A Lover's Complaint* was written by John Davies of Hereford, Jackson points out that his works' links to *A Lover's Complaint* are few. The rarest spellings of all, those occurring in *A Lover's Complaint* and only one other writer's work, are 'twaine', 'didde', 'sheelded', 'beseecht', and 'filliall', all Shakespeare's, and 'laundryng' (Jonson), 'sattu' (Giles Fletcher), 'addicions' (William Rowley), 'hewd' (George Chapman), 'subdewe' (William Warner) and 'brynish' (Nathaniel Baxter). It is obvious that no one is named twice except Shakespeare, who is responsible for five of the spellings. Broadening the net to look at the rarest spellings across the whole of Literature Online, Shakespeare still predominates: these are genuinely rare spellings in absolute terms, and they are common to *A Lover's Complaint* and Shakespeare. Jackson shows that a number of apparent errors in early editions of Shakespeare can be explained if we accept that the spellings uncovered in this study really are Shakespeare's idiosyncratic habits.

It occurs to Jackson that if Shakespeare were just an abnormally frequent user of peculiar spellings, then any searches for peculiar spellings in a work of unknown authorship, like *A Lover's Complaint*, would be likely to make links

with Shakespeare for that reason alone, no matter who wrote it. To discount this possible bias, Jackson repeated the whole exercise of this article but using as his suspect text a work known to be by John Davies of Hereford. It turned out to have most links with Davies's other works, not with Shakespeare; this extra step is described in an appendix to the present article made available online by the Bibliographical Society of America. A key advantage of spelling studies is that they are not likely to be skewed by poets' imitations of one another. Jackson ends with a couple of touchstones. Arguing against Davies's authorship of *A Lover's Complaint* is his liking for *sith* (= *since*), which Shakespeare does not show, and likewise Davies has a preference for using an apostrophe to indicate elision within a word, which Shakespeare does not. Shakespeare's and not Davies's preferences show up in *A Lover's Complaint*. Likewise with the preferences for abbreviating *it is* to *it's/its* or *'tis/tis* and spelling *ere* (meaning before) as *yer*. As Jackson points out, the evidence in his study covers too many printers (whose habits would average out) for them to be the cause of bias: these are authorial habits coming through in print.

Jackson's second article buttresses the first using not rare spellings but simply rare words ('*A Lover's Complaint*, *Cymbeline*, and the Shakespeare Canon: Interpreting Shared Vocabulary', *MLR* 103[2008] 621–38). As was already known, there are rare words—those used no more than five times by Shakespeare—that cluster in *Cymbeline* and *A Lover's Complaint*: *gyves* (as a noun), *physic* (as a verb), *amplify*, *blazon* (as a verb), *ruby*, *outwardly*, *tempter*, *aptness*, *commix*, *spongy*, *slackly*, *feat*, *rudeness*, *usury* and *pervert* (as a verb). Vickers reckons they are either common words in the language or Shakespeare copied them from John Davies of Hereford's *A Lover's Complaint* that was published, wrongly, under Shakespeare's name. These explanations Jackson finds improbable because in *Cymbeline* and *A Lover's Complaint* several of these words collocate with specific other words or occur in situations of similar action or feeling. Jackson has two more words to add to the above list: *seared* (as an adjective) and *outward* (as a noun). Searching for these seventeen words in Literature Online for 1598–1614 shows that four of them are almost never used outside Shakespeare: *physic*, *slackly*, *seared* and *outward*. However, Davies uses eleven of these seventeen words, so we need a test for whether it is more likely that Shakespeare got his from Davies (as writer of *A Lover's Complaint*) or simply wrote *A Lover's Complaint* himself. It is noticeable that fifteen of these seventeen words occur in other Shakespeare works besides *Cymbeline*, and predominantly in the later ones, and appear there more often than they do in the Davies canon. So it seems that Shakespeare in *Cymbeline* was not getting these words from reading Davies's work in the 1609 quarto of the sonnets; rather, he was simply repeating himself. The poetical use of the idea of something peeping through something else comes up frequently in Shakespeare and is in *A Lover's Complaint*, but is not in other writers' work nor in Davies's, other than as the commonplace idea of the sun peeping out. In Sonnet 69 and in *A Lover's Complaint* the rare noun *outward* is used of a man's appearance, which is uncommon. At this point in his article Jackson departs from the quantitative approach and starts showing how poetical conceits are shared between *A Lover's Complaint* and Shakespeare works. This approach is less persuasive than his quantitative method because it does not show that no

one else was using these conceits. When Jackson challenges Vickers on his reading of poetry, the contest is likewise inconclusive. But when he shows that the characteristic words of Davies that Vickers offers as evidence of his composition of *A Lover's Complaint* are truly commonplaces, the scales tip again in Jackson's favour.

In a third, slighter, article, Jackson gives his views on a clutch of well-known Shakespearian cruxes ('Three Disputed Shakespeare Readings: Associations and Contexts', *RES* 59[2008] 219–31). In Q2 *Romeo and Juliet* Romeo refers to the winged messenger of heaven travelling on 'lazie puffing Cloudes' in II.ii, but Jackson prefers Q1's 'lasie-pacing' (that is, lazy-pacing) clouds. The argument is essentially linguistic: the image is one of horse-riding, and Shakespeare repeatedly brings together words regarding pace (be)striding, horsemanship and supernatural beings riding in the air. Jackson thinks that Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* is 'perhaps' and Q1 *Hamlet* 'probably' based on memorial reconstruction. In *Hamlet*, the question is whether to accept a 'good kissing carrion' (as Q2/F have it), or Warburton's emendation to a 'god kissing carrion'. In favour of the latter is the idea that Hamlet is likening himself to a much-elevated thing (the sun) making a lowly thing conceive life, and so is deliberately activating Polonius's anxiety that the prince pursues Ophelia only for sex. The clincher in favour of Warburton is the frequency of other gods kissing lowly things in Shakespeare. For the 'dram of eale . . . of a doubt' problem, Jackson declares himself convinced that the *Oxford Complete Works* editors hit on the solution: it is 'The dram of evil . . . over-daub'.

Paul Werstine explains how the digital version of the *New Variorum Shakespeare (NVS)* will make readers' use of the edition, and especially of its collation information, much easier than hitherto, mainly because of Alan Galey's technical wizardry ('Past is Prologue: Electronic New Variorum Shakespeares', *Shakespeare* 4[2008] 208–20). Werstine refers to the series' electronic text of *The Winter's Tale* released on a CD-ROM accompanying the print version as 'protected' because it is in PDF format, but in fact anyone with a full version of the Acrobat software, or indeed of the many rival PDF-editing packages, can edit the document at will. The amazing visual representations of the collation data in the online *NVS* are possible because the project uses eXtensible Markup Language (XML) for encoding. The *NVS* has always been rigorous in its checking of volumes for accuracy, but Werstine reports that the discipline of tagging for XML has enforced even greater rigour. On the downside, however, editors find themselves going back and fixing errors after they thought they were done with an edition, simply because the electronic medium allows you to do this.

New Textualist objections to the regularizing of speech prefixes continue to resurface periodically, as when John Drakakis and Leah S. Marcus complained (in essays reviewed in *YWES* 88[2009]) that modern editors fail to follow the variations between the personal name 'Shylock' and the generic label 'Jew' and between the personal name 'Aaron' and the generic label 'Moor' in *The Merchant of Venice* and *Titus Andronicus* respectively. Lina Perkins Wilder likewise objects to the regularizing of Bottom's speech prefixes in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, since this Protean figure should be allowed break all constraints and be at once lover and tyrant, the company clown



inhabiting various roles, and Bottom the artisan ('Changeling Bottom: Speech Prefixes, Acting, and Character in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*', *Shakespeare* 4[2008] 45–64). To editorially reduce the multiplicity of 'Clowne', 'Pyramus', and 'Bottom' (as in the early editions) to just 'BOTTOM' is to efface the expression at a paratextual level of the phenomenon of changeability that the play is concerned with. This argument presupposes that someone's (the author's?) agency is expressed in the various names, but in fact there are good reasons to suspect that speech-prefix variation emerged in the printshop to solve problems of type shortage. Even if not, there is no reason to suppose that actors changed their performances for scenes where the speech prefixes change, so it is hard to see what is lost by regularizing the prefixes for the convenience of modern readers, who have enough work to do making sense of 400-year-old dramatic verse.

Last among the articles is John Felce's argument that Q1 *Hamlet* was written before Q2 or F ('Riddling Q1: Hamlet's Mill and the Trickster', *ShS* 61[2008] 269–80). Q1 is generally thought to derive from the play better represented in Q2 and F, but if so how come Q1 is closer than the others to the play's sources? Felce surveys the Hamlet story in Norse poetry and in the Danish oral tradition, which share the idea of sand as a kind of flour milled by the sea. (It never became clear to me why that idea matters; perhaps it emerges within the several untranslated foreign-language quotations offered here.) In the Norse tradition Hamlet is essentially a trickster, as he is in Q1; he is less so in Q2 and F. In Q1 the nunnery scene, Felce alleges, is more sexual than it is in Q2/F, more like the equivalent scene (a seductive ambush in the forest) in the sources. In Q1's nunnery scene, Hamlet says he never loved Ophelia, whereas in Q2/F he says he did and then says he did not, so Felce sees him as more obviously a deceiver in Q1. Because of where it appears in the action of Q1, the rejection of Ophelia is more important to the story, more a reason for her madness, than it is in Q2/F. Gertrude's knowledge of Hamlet's plan and her going along with it in Q1 also show it to be closer to the sources than Q2/F, in which versions we are allowed into Hamlet's mind. In the sources and in Q1 he keeps us out. Thus, according to Felce, the trickster of Q1 and the sources becomes the thinker of Q2/F.

Just two chapters in collections of essays were relevant to this survey. In the first, Leah S. Marcus offers a history of theories about the badness of Shakespeare's text, from the 1623 Folio through the intervening centuries to now, with lots of generalizations about how people felt about printing and about the theatre, but with no evidence offered to support the claims ('Who's Afraid of the Big 'Bad' Quarto?' in Dutcher and Prescott, eds., *Renaissance Historicisms: Essays in Honor of Arthur F. Kinney*, pp. 147–58). She focuses rather pointlessly on lectures given by Roger Chartier on French literature and then switches attention to a New Variorum Shakespeare editor who would not let his edition go online for fear that it would be corrupted. From there Marcus moves to Web 2.0 and the attacks of 9/11. The essay is a string of non sequiturs. Much more substantial is Anthony B. Dawson's reflection on editing, 'What Do Editors Do and Why Does It Matter?' (in Maguire, ed. *How To Do Things with Shakespeare: New Approaches, New Essays*, pp. 136–59). Dawson critiques Lukas Erne's *Shakespeare as Literary*

*Dramatist* as it applies to Folio *Hamlet*: if the underlying manuscript were, as Erne claims, an intermediate document in which were marked preliminary cuts for performance, but nowhere near all the cuts needed, what did John Heminges and Henry Condell think they were doing in using it for this prestigious book? They could easily have simply reprinted Q2 or Q3, which presented no rights problems. Good point. Dawson maintains that drama is not antithetical to literature: the scene in *Hamlet* where the Player recites the death of Priam neatly illustrates this by drawing on Virgil's *Aeneid* and alluding to bookish Marlowe, and it survives relatively unscathed across Q1, Q2 and F. We need not, Dawson counsels, be afraid of the concept of authorial intention. He ends by discussing the problems he faced editing *Timon of Athens* for the Arden edition reviewed above.

And so to the round-up from *Notes & Queries*. In Q1 *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Cupid aims an arrow 'At a faire Vestall, throned by west', but most editors prefer F's 'At a faire Vestall, throned by the West'. Richard F. Kennedy reckons that Q1 is better if we just emend it to 'At a fairy vestal, throned by west'; there are *faire/fairie* and *aire/airie* errors in F1 *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and 'by west' for 'by the west' was not unusual in early modern English ('*A Midsummer Night's Dream* II.I.157: A Proposed Emendation', *N&Q* 55[2008] 176). John Flood has an additional biblical source for Portia's claim that mercy 'droppeth as the gentle rain': it is Isaiah 45:8, which in the Geneva Bible is 'Ye heavens, send the dewe from aboue, & let ye cloudes drop downe righteousness' and in the Bishops Bible is 'Ye heauens from aboue drop downe, and let the cloudes rayne righteousness' ('"It droppeth as the gentle rain": Isaiah 45:8 and *The Merchant of Venice* IV.1.181', *N&Q* 55[2008] 176–7). Flood does not know which bible Shakespeare used (maybe both, he says) but judges Isaiah a particularly relevant book for this play and notices that the disadvantage of the Genevan reading in having dew instead of rain is counterbalanced by its pun on dew/Jew. In the first of two notes on Falstaff's speech about honour in *1 Henry IV* V.i, Christopher M. McDonough reads the 'scutcheon' to which he likens it as not merely the symbolic shield on which heraldic devices were drawn, but also the real weapon that in classical writings a coward throws away to save himself ('"A mere scutcheon": Falstaff as Rhipsaspis', *N&Q* 55[2008] 181–3).

Joaquim Anyó weighs the evidence for a number of possible sources for *Much Ado About Nothing*, and decides (as he did in a note reviewed in *YWES* 87[2008]), that *Tirante il Bianco*, first published in Valencia in 1490, is a neglected source ('More on the Sources of *Much Ado About Nothing*', *N&Q* 55[2008] 185–7). In Sonnet 46 the 1609 quarto reads 'To side this title is impannelled | A quest of thoughts', meaning that to decide whether the eye or the heart has a stronger claim of possession ('title') over the image of the love object a jury ('quest') has been established. The problem is the use of 'side' as a verb, and some editors go for 'cide' (= decide). What if, suggests Paul Hammond, the manuscript copy read 'finde' but 'f' was misread as 's' and 'n' omitted ('A Textual Crux in Shakespeare's Sonnet 46', *N&Q* 55[2008] 187–8)? The sense works well (find = determine) and graphically such a minim error is common in Shakespeare and can be paralleled from compositorial mistakes of 'n' minims elsewhere in the sonnets. For the purpose of goading Achilles

back into action, Ulysses in *Troilus and Cressida* imagines aloud a scene of Ajax with his foot on Hector's breast, accompanied by 'great Troy shrieking [shrieking]' (Q) or 'great Troy shrinking' (F). Both make sense, but because they are so similar MacDonald P. Jackson thinks that one must be wrong: Shakespeare would not revise one to make the other ('Great Troy Shrieking: *Troilus and Cressida*, III.iii.136', *N&Q* 55[2008] 188–91). (This is debatable: E.A.J. Honigmann's classic *The Stability of Shakespeare's Text* argued that such inconsequential tweaking is just the sort of thing he would do.) Jackson argues that elsewhere in this play and in Shakespeare, shrieking is what happens when disaster strikes, and it is often spelt 'shrike'. Also, Literature Online shows that John Ogle's poem 'Troy's Lamentation for the Death of Hector' (published 1594) uses various forms of 'shrike' much more often than other writings of the period. Ogle's account of the destruction of Troy has parallels with the destruction imagined in *Troilus and Cressida* and the destruction of Harfleur conjured up in *Henry V*. Thus 'great Troy shrieking' is the reading Jackson prefers.

In *Measure for Measure*, Elbow calls brothels 'common houses' and this is the *OED*'s only occurrence of the term. Is it an Elbowism? Kenji Go thinks not, as it appears as 'common base houses' in the *Second Book of Homilies* of 1563 ('On the Origin of the "Common Houses" as Brothels in *Measure for Measure*', *N&Q* 55[2008] 191–4). Unfortunately, what goes on in these 'common base houses' was said in the homily to be 'low occupying', which was probably innocuous in the 1560s (it meant simply a debased practice), but by the 1590s the work *occupy* was synonymous with *fuck* and the homily must have sounded terribly (unintentionally) vulgar by then; the offending passage was later reworded to avoid this. Perhaps, ponders Go, that is why 'common houses' appealed to Shakespeare and was put in the mouth of a constable who utters a stream of unintentionally vulgar words by mistake: it reminded everyone of an unintentional vulgarity in the homilies. David George has two sources for *Coriolanus*: the attack on Corioles is like the attack upon Orléans in *1 Henry VI*—similar actions, similar rhetoric—and a pamphlet on *The Great Frost* [1608] has phrases and ideas that come up in various places in *Coriolanus* ('Two New Sources for *Coriolanus*', *N&Q* 55[2008] 194–7). Actually, they are not unusual phrases or ideas, so accepting that they came from this pamphlet depends on accepting that so many everyday things accumulating in one place is unlikely; the odds for that are hard to calculate. George confuses the Arden Shakespeare and the New Cambridge Shakespeare, thinking that Michael Hattaway, editor of the latter's *1 Henry VI*, edited the former's (p. 195 n. 1).

According to Herbert W. Benario, the entry of Richard to London in shame, following Bolingbroke, in *Richard II* has parallels of phrasing and action with the death of emperor Vitellius in Tacitus's *Histories* ('Shakespearean Debt to Tacitus' *Histories*', *N&Q* 55[2008] 202–5). He thinks there may also be a parallel between the death of emperor Otho in Tacitus and the dignified death of the Thane of Cawdor in *Macbeth*, but he rejects a claimed parallel between Tacitus and *Richard III*. David McInnis is keen to dismiss the idea that *The Tempest* is an American play ('Old World Sources for Ariel in *The Tempest*', *N&Q* 55[2008] 208–13). There is a passage in George Wilkins, John Day and William Rowley's *The Travails of Three*

*English Brothers* in which bees are commented upon for their foraging abroad and taking home their booty. This McInnes thinks was in Shakespeare's mind when he wrote the song for Ariel 'Where the bee sucks', because Ariel will spend elsewhere the liberty he earns on the island and because the word 'industrious' is applied to the bees (and to Ariel at IV.iii.33) and the bees are 'merry' (as Ariel says he will be at V.i.93). McInnis finds a source for Ariel's ventriloquism in III.ii in Richard Eden's 1553 translation of Sebastian Münster's *Cosmographia*, which tells how spirits in the region of Tangut use ventriloquism and music to waylay and dissever groups of travellers, just as Ariel splits the shipwrecked men across the island. The same claim arises in Marco Polo's writing, although whether Münster got the idea from Polo or learnt of it independently is impossible to say. Somebody ought to advise journal publishers that printing the long URLs that scholars cut and paste into their essays is pointless. Here is one that is 129 characters long, much more than can be retyped accurately. Even those who access McInnis's essay as a PDF document will find that the hyperlink does not work because in typesetting certain characters have been changed: the ASCII hyphen in the URL has become an en-line dash. An indefatigable reader who corrects and retypes the URL will find it still does not work, unless she happens to be a member of the University of Melbourne: the quoted URL contains the string 'unimelb.edu.au' showing that it relies upon McInnis's prior authentication as a member of that institution.

In a note reviewed in *YWES* 86[2007], Thomas Merriam argued that the 31-line segment in the middle of *All is True* II.iii, in which the Lord Chamberlain enters and speaks to Anne Bullen, is Fletcher's interpolation in a scene otherwise by Shakespeare. Merriam now adds further evidence for the claim in the form of parallels between Fletcher's play *The Valentinian* and *All is True* ('A Fletcher Interpolation in *Henry VIII*, II.iii', *N&Q* 55[2008] 213–15). The alleged interpolation shares with Fletcher's play the phrase 'from this lady'. True, but the phrase also appears in Webster's *The Devil's Law Case* [1617] and Thomas Randolph's *The Jealous Lovers* [1632], and is in any case not unusual; it pops up in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*. There are thematic parallels between *All is True* and *The Valentinian* as well as some looser one-word verbal parallels. As so often with these cases, the cumulative weight of individually insignificant pieces of evidence has to be determined before assent is given to the proposition. The statistical analyses needed to make such determinations are highly complex and almost never feature in the arguments being made.

## 2. Shakespeare in the Theatre

Consider the following quotations: 'Once disguise playfully dissociates any unitary cast of character, the closure of representation in the characterization of given standards of worthiness itself is ruptured', and 'Shakespeare would explore the actor's grappling with cross-dressed disguise in several comedies'. While the latter quotation is comprehensible, it tells us nothing we don't already know. The former quotation, by contrast, if it is telling us something

original or important, masks that something beneath a style so opaque as to render it beyond assimilation. Now the fact that these two quotations come from the same page (p. 126) of *Shakespeare and the Power of Performance: Stage and Page in Elizabethan Theatre* only goes to show how much of a curate's egg the book is. Robert Weimann and Douglas Bruster have produced a volume that is by turns suggestive, exciting, bland and infuriatingly nonsensical.

Unfortunately for readers of the volume, it is the latter quality which is most extensively represented and conspicuous in a prose style that relishes formulations which demand to be read three or four times and, even then, without always making sense: 'a thick performative is jostling side by side with representations of personal and sometimes national plight' (p. 5) or 'a stage-centred approach is scarcely qualified for probing more deeply into the *énoncé/énonciation* relations in question, even when ultimately bifold authority wants to have a verbal correlative in the theatre itself' (p. 21). Elsewhere the pronouncements are so patent as to be virtually pointless: 'Shakespeare was immersed . . . within a dense network of theatricality' (p. 188); 'live actors [are] involved in a communication situation' (p. 190); the word 'hal' as printed cannot capture 'the performer's explosive breath, the airstream's vibrations in his vocal cords, or the membranes in his glottis' (p. 40).

The book comprises several theses but it never successfully sustains or clinches any of them. To begin with, and as its subtitle indicates, it is concerned to heal or at least, address 'a renewed or . . . growing rift between page and stage in Shakespeare studies' (p. 13). While the Oxford edition of *The Complete Works* sought to prioritize the plays' theatricality, more recent work by Lukas Erne and others has sought to stress the literariness of Shakespeare's composition—to suggest that the playwright had page as much as stage in mind when writing. For Weimann and Bruster the plays are not consumed in different places by different audiences/readerships but rather manifest and sustain a parity between stage and page. The plays' significance is in the ways 'in which the script and the show mutually engaged and intensified one another' (p. 25) and the authors are intent on exploring 'from how *in the theatre* the specific form and force of each medium defines, and is defined by the other' (p. 3, my emphasis). But notice the force of that 'in the theatre'—while the argument is made for a reciprocity that suggests a relationship among equals, stage is finally more equal than page.

Since the authors are primarily interested in the practicalities of performing rather than reading, this asymmetry should not shock us. In fact reading takes a back seat as they explore such theatrical phenomena as personation, character, clowning and cross-dressing. The argument is that basic personation gives way to a more complicated staging of character as 'a more comprehending image of subjectivity' (p. 160). This is said to occur 'at about the turn of the century' (p. 161) though there is no specific evidence offered for this timing. Indeed the authors cite Anthony Dawson on the ineluctable quality of the actor under the character, as it were, what Dawson refers to as 'a mingling of representational or mimetic acting and "presentational" acting whereby the actor . . . calls attention to his own skill and invites the audience to admire it' (quoted on p. 162) which rather gives the lie to the argument that we

graduate from latter to former, let alone ‘at about the turn of the century’. Rather, as Dawson insists, both styles are maintained on the early modern stage, a thesis which, in spite of their earlier claim, Weimann and Bruster are forced to acknowledge, conceding that ‘the person who is actually speaking is neither the actor nor the character but the actor-character’ (p. 176).

Given their greater interest in stage rather than page, it is unsurprising that the latter term doesn’t really get a look-in until page 180 (of a 223-page discussion). When it does appear, it means a bewildering number of things: early modern printing (i.e. the book trade), the relationship of prose and verse (i.e. prosody), printed and written matter within the plays—such as letters, tavern bills and other documents (i.e. hand properties). The authors attempt to account for the term’s multiplicity: “‘pages’” (their quotation marks) is ‘a term under which we could loosely gather all the materials in question here’—precisely the problem: the term is used so broadly, it ceases to be useful.

The volume ends not with a bang but with a whimper. One of the most textually intriguing and problematic of Shakespeare’s dramas which exists, as the Oxford editors and others have argued, as two distinct plays, *King Lear*, is here given short shrift. There is hardly any discussion of different texts but a series of weird suggestions: ‘the middle scenes of *King Lear* offer . . . a display of what we could anachronistically think of as the early modern playhouse’s green room’ (p. 200); ‘As long as something would stand for something else, the register of what is representative makes representation tick’ (p. 200). Both Weimann and Bruster are undisputed heavyweights of the Shakespeare world and one is loath to sound so waspish about their volume. The trouble is that in its eccentricity, its magpie-mindedness and its obfuscatory critical discourse, it clouds rather than illuminates the complex relationship between stage and page in early modern England.

In his elegant summation of the various essays that comprise *Shakespeare and the Cultures of Performance* (in Yachnin and Badir, eds., *Shakespeare and the Cultures of Performance*, pp. 169–88), forming the collection’s afterword, Edward Pechter points up the diversity of two of the terms used in its title: *performance* is no longer circumscribed by the theatre but is commonly used to refer to cultural, religious, social, even gender rituals and roles. *Culture*, similarly, ‘bounces around a sometimes bewilderingly wide and varied range of reference’ (p. 176). The terms’ polysemic nature accounts for the enormous variance of critical positions and stances taken by the nine contributors. David Bevington, in ‘Shakespeare and the Theatrical Performance of Rusticity’ for instance, adopts a straightforwardly biographical approach. He argues that the plays’ rural know-how suggests a rural playwright: ‘the sylvan and pastoral world of Shakespeare’s imagination [was that] from which he came and to which he would return again and again’ (p. 22). The essay is not unsentimental, including expressions such as ‘self-effacement’ or ‘good-natured laughter’ (p. 17). However at one point he is forced to concede that the biographical reading is ‘speculation’ and may even be ‘unproductive’ (p. 23). By contrast, both Gretchen E. Minton and Huston Diehl prioritize literary sources (classical and biblical respectively), the former suggesting that performances of *Troilus and Cressida* are complicated by ‘the enormous weight

of literary history' (p. 119) to do with sources about the Trojan wars which are no longer familiar to contemporary audiences, while Diehl demonstrates how *The Winter's Tale* appropriates and deploys 'an unsettling dimension of Pauline rhetoric: the rebuke' (p. 72) and, furthermore, 'By deliberately mingling preaching and playing in the character of Paulina, Shakespeare may be audaciously claiming Paul as a model for the playwright' (p. 74).

One play is the topic of two essays. In 'Payback Time: On the Economic Rhetoric of Revenge in *The Merchant of Venice*' Linda Woodbridge insists that early modern England 'witnessed an epidemic of personal and family indebtedness' (p. 29) and goes on to illustrate how the discourse of economic dependence is inseparable from that of revenge, arguing for an equivalence between 'monetary and retaliatory payment' (p. 29). In "'To give and to receive": Performing Exchanges in *The Merchant of Venice*' Sean Lawrence takes a broadly anthropological stance in his assertion that 'any apparent gesture of goodwill is . . . an effort to impose an obligation' (p. 44). From here he arrives at the not too unfamiliar conclusion: 'The play does not contrast amorous and financial economies, but conflates them into a single system of exchanges' (p. 45).

In 'To "gase so much at the fine stranger": Armado and the Politics of English' Lynne Magnusson reads the parodic Spaniard in terms of a contemporary linguistic xenophobia. Citing early modern tracts such as Thomas Wilson's *The Arte of Rhetorique* [1553], she argues for the existence of a cultural anxiety concerned with 'the damage from verbal invasion' (p. 62), though she concludes that Armado is not a 'despised alien' but rather 'an aspiring immigrant, eager to assimilate' (p. 68). In 'Shakespeare and Secular Performance' Anthony B. Dawson uses *Measure for Measure* as his test case in order to answer the question, 'in what ways does religion . . . enter into theatrical discourse?' (p. 83). It is in the cultivation and manipulation of audience pleasure that theatre resembles the rituals of worship—'religious language and feelings enter deeply into the performance on the public stage' (p. 89)—and he goes so far as to argue that the theatre was 'Brimful of religious thinking and sacramental allusion' (p. 97). Coppélia Kahn focuses on mid-nineteenth-century performance in her consideration of minstrelsy, in particular, Thomas Dartmouth Rice's *Otello, a Burlesque Opera*, performed in Philadelphia. Her treatment in 'Forbidden Mixtures: Shakespeare in Blackface Minstrelsy, 1844' is broadly sympathetic and she goes as far as to assert that 'Rice used blackface as a complex language of satire and critique, not to be confused with the demeaning caricature to which it was later reduced' (p. 122). The essay is especially cogent on ideas of the burlesque, and demonstrates that the knee-jerk reaction of modern criticism against minstrelsy may be founded on insufficient appreciation of its complexity and its combination of 'original and copy, authentic and spurious, elite and popular, tragic and comic' (p. 124). In '*The Tempest* and the Uses of Late Shakespeare in the Cultures of Performance: Prospero, Gielgud, Rylance', Gordon McMullan reflects imaginatively on the kinds of assumptions made about painters, composers, poets and other artists as they are evaluated in terms of their late work. He attributes the 'invention of lateness' (p. 150) to the Romantic period and notes that, perhaps not surprisingly, the confluence of 'the artist's life and the

progress of his...style' (p. 150) was a Romantic concern in particular. McMullan then goes on to show how 'the appropriation of Shakespearean lateness [has been deployed] as a vehicle for the self-conscious structuring of theatrical careers' (p. 147). By tracing the triangular relationship of Prospero, John Gielgud and Mark Rylance, McMullan demonstrates the mystical force of the role with the actors on the one hand and Shakespeare himself on the other. Yet in spite of the empathy between actor and playwright, McMullan notes wryly that Rylance is a vehement anti-Stratfordian (as was Gielgud before him). McMullan's pseudo-Greenblattian opening aside—flicking through a magazine on a train journey in Spain—this is a deft and persuasive essay. In their introduction (pp. 1–12), the editors propose that this diversity of approaches and topics is a strategy designed to confront the 'totalizing bent' (p. 3) of new historicism's understanding of culture. This is a wide-ranging and engaging collection but that such diversity is, in itself, sufficient to urge us to reappraise new historicism's homogenizing tendency is not convincing.

In 'Audience and Actor Response to a Staged Reading of Nahum Tate's *The History of King Lear* (directed by Joe Curdy) at the Shakespeare Institute, Stratford-upon-Avon, 27 January 2008' (*Shakespeare* 4[2008] 302–8), Curdy provides a vivid and fascinating account of his resurrection of Tate's all but extinct animal and details the responses of both cast and spectators. Having briefly summarized Romantic and post-Romantic critical positions and theatrical histories, he then poses the questions as to how a modern acting company and audience might respond and, perhaps more interestingly, whether the audience would be capable of viewing Tate's version free of the shadow cast by Shakespeare's play. (Curdy notes that the last professional stage version of Tate's *Lear* was in 1845.) Curdy's research method is refreshingly 'hands on', assembling a company comprising seasoned RSC actors (including Richard Corderly and Clifford Rose), academics and interested amateurs. By means of a series of interviews, he establishes that the performers were pleasantly surprised by the quality of Tate's writing and that they were willing to determine the 'performance potential of a text based on its theatricality' (p. 304) as opposed to the tyranny of language associated with Shakespeare. Curdy had also prepared a questionnaire which he circulated among the audience. Having prefixed his assimilation of these results with an informed analysis of the audience demographic—'roughly 75% were female...a statistic that corresponded to the high number of postgraduate students in attendance' (p. 305)—Curdy, with the aid of a couple of bar charts, demonstrates that 'overall the response was more optimistic than I [had] anticipated' (p. 305). The fraught question remains, however, whether the audience were responding positively to the play in its own terms or whether 'Tate's adaptation might merit interest from a modern audience simply as a notorious footnote in the performance history of Shakespeare's *Lear*' (p. 305). Although Curdy is unable to answer that question definitively, his raising it in the first place, as well as his empirical approach, are unusual and praiseworthy.

Sticking with the eighteenth century, Laura Engel describes not merely the performance but the cultural implications of Sarah Siddons's long association



with the role of Lady Macbeth. In 'The Personating of Queens: Lady Macbeth, Sarah Siddons and the Creation of Female Celebrity in the Late Eighteenth Century' (in Moschovakis, ed., *Macbeth: New Critical Essays*, pp. 240–57), she argues that Siddons invented a new 'category of identity... the modern female superstar' (p. 240). This seems, at first, to be a bold claim, but Engel constructs a rigorous and convincing argument. As the essay's title suggests, Siddons took on the mantle of several queens. Chief among these politically was Queen Charlotte, with whom an association was facilitated by the similarities between Siddons and Charlotte in the portraiture of Thomas Gainsborough (who painted both women): 'Just as Gainsborough created the idea of status, wealth, and noble bearing with his portrait of Siddons, Queen Charlotte appears magically beautiful in his representation of her' (p. 246). Engel argues that Siddons and Charlotte 'invoked similar images of royalty and maternity' (p. 242). The second queen Siddons inhabited, as it were, is Lady Macbeth, an account of which is still accessible through Siddons's own 'Remarks on the Character of Lady Macbeth' in which she empathizes with her heroine and considers her as being noble and compassionate in nature. Engel explains that the murder of her own child, hypothetically alluded to by Lady Macbeth, indicates not a violent streak but just the opposite, and she cites Siddons herself: 'The very use of such a tender allusion in the midst of her dreadful language, persuades one unequivocally that she has really felt the maternal yearnings of a mother towards her babe, and that she considered this action the most enormous that ever required the strength of human nerves for its perpetration' (quoted on p. 249). This would have been powerfully envisioned when, in April 1794, Siddons played the role while heavily pregnant. The final queen Engel describes is a product of the first two, Siddons's own 'status as a celebrity diva' (p. 242). Engel concludes effectively, 'For Siddons, "personated Queens"—real and imagined—made it feasible for her to embody an unprecedented form of female celebrity, and to transform one of the most ruthless stage heroines into an exemplar of femininity' (p. 254).

### 3. Shakespeare on Screen

Despite fewer book-length considerations of Shakespeare on screen this year, several journal issues focused upon performance and helped ensure that the research area continues to evolve. In 2008 two edited collections of essays were added to the University of Rouen's Shakespeare on Screen series, Anthony R. Guneratne focused upon Shakespearian films in his monograph *Shakespeare, Film Studies, and the Visual Cultures of Modernity*, and Frank Occhiogrosso's edited collection *Shakespearean Performance: New Studies* embraces screen versions within a performance-orientated study. *Gothic Shakespeares*, edited by John Drakakis and Dale Townshend, includes in its enquiry one essay analysing the connections between Shakespearian films and the horror film.

The *Shakespeare International Yearbook* granted space to 'European Shakespeares' in its special section, and the guest editors, Ton Hoenselaars and Clara Calvo, contributed an article examining the BBC's 2005

*Shakespeare-Told* series (*ShInt Y* 8[2008] 82–96). Special issues in three other journals focused more exclusively upon Shakespeare on screen. The customary ‘Shakespeare on Film’ issue of *Literature/Film Quarterly* (*LFQ* 36:ii[2008]) contains six articles and, this year, that number is exceeded with fourteen screen-related essays in *Shakespeare Survey*: ‘Shakespeare, Sound and Screen’ (*ShS* 61[2008]). The summer issue of *Shakespeare Bulletin* includes four articles centring upon ‘Shakespearean Screen Adaptations for the Teen Market’ (*Shak B* 26:ii[2008]).

Anthony R. Guneratne’s *Shakespeare, Film Studies, and the Visual Cultures of Modernity* seeks to ‘tell a different kind of film history’ (p. xiii) of film adaptations of Shakespeare’s plays. Guneratne’s emphasis is upon the cultural history of film adaptation, and he seeks to explore the intersections between film and other media. His study consists of five chapters, organized thematically, and a distinctive narrative style is established, with chapter titles and summaries in the style of an eighteenth-century novelist. These summaries signal the somewhat episodic nature of the text, which subtitles and section breaks maintain. Each individual chapter offers a focused case-study in response to the book’s opening thesis. Guneratne begins his introduction with a consideration of ‘Shakespeare’, the man and the work. He signals the number of firsts (within Shakespearian adaptation on film) which can be attributed to Méliès’s *Shakespeare Writing Julius Caesar* [1907] and then jumps decades to consider *Shakespeare in Love* [1998]. Both films establish that biographical genres ‘are reflective of contemporary concerns and preoccupations’ (p. 5). Guneratne moves on to consider the cult of Shakespeare in connection with geographical place, and he analyses three Russians adaptations: Yutkevich’s *Othello* [1956], and Kozintsev’s *Hamlet* [1964] and *King Lear* [1970]. These films are united by their use of Boris Pasternak’s translation and Guneratne explores linguistic translation as cultural translation.

The American film industry is then considered, and Hitchcock’s involvement in the British *Elstree Calling* [1930] prompts reflection upon Hollywood’s ability ‘to assimilate, and in doing so, transform varied sources of influence’ (p. 19). Chapter 2 explores in more detail this suggestion of cultural continuity in Anglo-American culture. In his consideration of the ‘film studies’ of the book’s title, Guneratne identifies ‘the three simultaneous registers of adaptation’ (p. 31): the movement from medium to medium; the movement from text to text; and that of culture to culture. He summarizes ‘Tendencies in Film Adaptations’ in tabular form and promotes a personal formula (A+ to E–) as a logical way of considering Shakespeare adaptations. The exploration of adaptations ranges widely to include *Theater of Blood* [1973], *Tempest* (Mazursky [1982]) and *Fanny and Alexander* [1982]. In his third chapter Guneratne focuses upon versions of *Hamlet* as a way of extending his consideration of film acting and stardom.

Guneratne’s interest in ‘visual cultures’ ensures that Shakespeare has generated ‘an artistic efflorescence that has continued to influence theatrical productions, photography and film’ (p. 49). These introductory ideas are secured with consideration of the cinematography in Olivier’s *Henry V* [1944] and *Richard III* [1955] alongside the contrasting style of Kurosawa’s

Shakespearian adaptations. Chapter 4 then concentrates on Orson Welles's visual language. Guneratne focuses upon 'the inequalities of modernity', and a geographical distinction is drawn between 'voluntary modernity' in Japan and 'imposed modernity' in Africa, Latin America and the Indian subcontinent (p. 62). The Merchant–Ivory *Shakespeare Wallah* [1965] and Vishal Bhardwaj's *Maqbool* [2004] are considered initially, and Guneratne uses the 'myth' invented in Salman Rushdie's 1995 novel *The Moor's Last Sigh* 'to sum up the legacies of Shakespeare, of film, and of the visual cultures that through, from, into, and out of languages, inform adaptations' (p. 73). The final chapter of Guneratne's study shifts between places, periods and texts in its consideration of the Shakespearian film work of Van Sant, Branagh, Godard, Pasolini, Greenaway and Luhmann.

Sarah Hatchuel and Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin edited two collections of essays to extend their Shakespeare on Screen series. In contrast with the series' previous publications (*A Midsummer Night's Dream* [2005] and *Richard III* [2005]), both collections of essays this year broaden their focus beyond one specific text. *Shakespeare on Screen: The Henriad* is genre-driven in its focus upon 'filming *history* plays' (p. 15), and there is some interrogation of cinema's avoidance of *Richard II* and enthusiasm for *Henry V*. Interest in the former play on television helps redress the balance and signals one way in which the collection of essays negotiates different screens. The volume is also interested in the way that filmed versions might be valued as useful, as 'tools to explore the texts' in contrast with scholarly assessment of stage productions (p. 17). The essays move between 'macro-analysis' and 'micro-analysis' and the editors make a virtue of these contrasting approaches. They encourage their readers to consider the way in which a connection between methodologies and technological advances might illuminate 'what Shakespeare's contrasting afterlives keep saying, not only about the dramatic texts but also about ourselves' (p. 18).

The essays which include some discussion of versions only commercially available in recent years are of greatest interest. Michael Hattaway's piece considers different kinds of non-cinematic versions in 'Politics and Mise-en-Scène in Television Versions of *King Richard II*' (pp. 59–74). Here the versions are categorized as made for television (Giles, 1978 and Woodman, 1981); televised theatrical performances which include an audience (Bogdanov and Carroll in 2003) and theatrical productions radically reworked for the screen (Deborah Warner's 1995 production). Hattaway's argument centres upon the importance of critics and producers recognizing these categories. Lois Potter focuses upon the 1954 version of *Richard II* in her 'The Royal Throne of Kings and the American Armchair: Deconstructing the Hallmark *Richard II*' (pp. 75–98). Potter situates the version in a theatrical context (on both sides of the Atlantic), considers the version alongside the 'real' coronation of Elizabeth II and looks closely at the tone of the reception to Maurice Evans's performance. Both Hattaway's and Potter's essays can be usefully set alongside Russell Jackson's article in *Shakespeare Survey* which considers: 'Maurice Evans's *Richard II* on Stage, Television and (Almost) Film' (*ShS* 61[2008] 36–56).

Hatchuel and Vienne-Guerrin's collection of essays is usefully concluded with José Ramón Díaz Fernández's '*The Henriad* on Screen: An Annotated

Filmo-Bibliography' (pp. 269–348). He develops a recent trend in 'Shakespeare on screen' publications by granting space to the reference materials and ordering them in a helpfully interpretative way. Six categories (film adaptations; television adaptations; filmed staged performances; derivatives and citations; educational films; documentary films) contain chronological lists of the screen versions with relevant books and articles positioned beneath their respective film. Selected entries are annotated to clarify the nature of the relationship, and the detail here ensures the usefulness of the scholarly resource. Fernández also contributed the detailed 'Teen Shakespeare Films: An Annotated Survey of Criticism' to *Shakespeare Bulletin* this year (*ShakB* 26:ii[2008] 89–133).

Sarah Hatchuel and Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin's other publication in the same series, *Shakespeare on Screen: Television Shakespeare*, is dedicated to Michèle Willems. Their text celebrates Willems's influential 1987 collection of essays, and responding to that seminal text prompts the question: 'Is there still such a thing as "Television Shakespeare"?' (p. 18). Some contributors respond to that question by moving beyond productions originally conceived to be broadcast on the small screen and therefore suggesting that television is now perhaps 'a hybrid object that seems to escape definition and apprehension' (p. 18).

One such example is Peter Holland's 'Afterword: What(ever) Next?' (pp. 271–7), which considers YouTube recordings of the 'RST Demolition' and suggests that the brief clip 'produces strange linkings of forms and of timescales' (p. 272). Holland's piece encourages reflection upon the relationship between the small screen, cinema and theatre. It is suggested that the YouTube community, whose roles can shift between producers (through uploading clips and comments) and receivers, 'requires a reformulation of what it means to watch or to share watching Shakespeare on screen as well as redefining what Shakespeare on screen might include' (p. 274).

Peter Hutchings directs attention towards a genre-inflected consideration of Shakespeare films in 'Shakespeare and the Horror Film' (in Drakakis and Townshend, eds., *Gothic Shakespeares: Accents on Shakespeare*. pp. 153–66). His assessment begins with the citation of *Hamlet* in Universal's 1931 *Dracula*, 'a founding text in horror cinema' (p. 153) and that film's use of *Hamlet* establishes an enquiry which negotiated cultural hierarchies in its consideration of *Macbeth* (Polanski [1971]), *Hamlet* (Branagh [1996]) and *Titus* (Taymor [1999]). The idea that 'Shakespeare's *Macbeth* concludes with a clear sense that a just rule has been restored' (p. 160) typifies Hutchings's at times uncomplicated perspective on the playtexts which constrains his analysis of the films. More interesting is his consideration of *Theatre of Blood* [1973] and *The Flesh and Blood Show* [1972]. The latter film explores less familiar Shakespeare on screen territory. The engagement with that film's theatricality and the suggested allusion to *A Double Life* (Cukor [1947]) deserve development.

Russell Jackson's essay is, in part, a consideration of Branagh's 2000 film in the context of critical responses. In 'Filming Shakespeare's Comedies: Reflections on *Love's Labour's Lost*' (in Occhiogrosso, ed., *Shakespearean Performance: New Studies* pp. 62–73), Jackson's personal tone reflects an

engagement with that which has shaped his own perspective upon the film. His defence of the film is cautious, and throughout the piece he considers the possible bias produced by his role as a collaborator in the film's production. His suggestion that 'From my own point of view... *Love's Labour's Lost* remains an enjoyable and testing experience' (p. 71) points to the self-conscious conflation of process and product in the assessment of the film.

Mark Thornton Burnett's essay provides a stark contrast to Russell Jackson's piece in its content and approach. 'Madagascan Will: Cinematic Shakespeares/Transnational Exchanges' (*ShS* 61[2008] 239–55) focuses upon two screen adaptations which document journeys to Madagascar: Alexander Abela's *Makibefo* (a version of *Macbeth* [2000]) and his *Souli* (inspired by *Othello* [2004]). Limited global exhibition and distribution mean that these versions have received little critical attention. Thornton Burnett raises questions about these processes as part of his engagement with concepts of transnationalism. An unexpected connection between Russell Jackson's article and Mark Thornton Burnett's piece can be found in the latter's suggestion that an emerging element within Shakespeare on screen scholarship lies in a consideration of 'the producers as well as the products, the creative forces as well as the final statements' (p. 255).

Ton Hoenselaars and Clara Calvo seek to emphasize the spatial and temporal locations in screen versions of Shakespeare's plays, and they suggest that the multiple labels used for screen versions can obscure that process of relocation. In 'Shakespeare Uprooted: The BBC and *ShakespeaRe-Told*' (*ShIntY* 8[2008] 82–96) decisions about time and space are defined as inextricably linked. The essay concludes by considering the series as a redefinition of contemporary Britain, and Hoenselaars and Calvo worry about the degree of Europhobia reflected in some of the series' specific choices.

The performance-orientated issue of *Shakespeare Survey*, 'Shakespeare, Sound and Screen', includes fourteen screen-related articles. Several of these pieces offer 'micro-analysis'. Anna K. Nardo discusses Branagh's adaptation of Shakespeare's text in *Love's Labour's Lost* [2000] (*ShS* 61[2008] 13–22), Peter Donaldson analyses the musicality of Michael Hoffman's 1999 *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (*ShS* 61[2008] 13–22), Alfredo Michale Modenessi considers the violence in Tim Supple's 2003 television film of *Twelfth Night* (*ShS* 61[2008] 91–103) and Lindsey Scott focuses upon Polanski's 1971 *Macbeth* (*ShS* 61[2008] 104–15). Two articles consider *Hamlet* versions. Simon J. Ryle uses the 'sense of rupture implicit in Jacques Lacan's theory of the gaze' (p. 116) to explore Olivier, Branagh and Almereyda's film adaptations of *Hamlet*. Catherine Grace Canino interrogates John Frankenheimer's suggestion that his film *The Manchurian Candidate* is 'a modern-day retelling of *Hamlet*' (p. 135). Canino places the film and the play alongside Foucault's and Meerloo's ideas about the 'coercive nature of power and the resultant reconstruction of self-agency' (p. 134). Her piece reads *Hamlet* with these theories in mind and 'through Frankenheimer's lens' (p. 146). The connections between the political context of Shakespeare's play, the protagonist's journey and the plot structure are set against the 1962 film in an, at times, thought-provoking way. Canino's piece is a useful illustration of

the way that an adaptation might be used as a tool for looking again at Shakespeare's text.

The boundaries of Shakespeare on screen are pushed by Thomas Cartelli's 'Channelling the Ghosts: the Wooster Group's Remediation of the 1964 Electronovision *Hamlet*' (*ShS* 61[2008] 147–60). Cartelli begins his essay with a consideration of the cultural context of Richard Burton's 1964 theatrical performance as Hamlet, which moved from Toronto to New York and was then filmed. An engagement with the technology used to make this 'Theatrofilm' means that Cartelli considers the recorded *Hamlet* to be 'both an anomalous and nostalgic throwback to the already superseded days of live television recording' (p. 148). The article then jumps forward to 2007 and considers the Wooster Group's 'sustained "emulation" of the 1964 "theatrofilm" of *Hamlet*' (p. 149). Cartelli is particularly interested in the effects of the Wooster Group's use of video footage 'as a visual prompt or model for their own efforts of imitation or emulation' (p. 150) and he notes that the film has been re-edited aurally and visually with the effect of displacing and colonizing the 1964 broadcast. In contrast, two other *Hamlet* films (Branagh [1995] and Almereyda [2000]) were briefly 'granted a freedom to speak directly to the audience seldom allowed the Burton production' (p. 151). Cartelli identifies the Wooster Group's *Hamlet* project as distinct in relation to their previous productions and he proposes that one problem lies in the way that Shakespeare's play has 'been largely emptied out of any point or purpose beyond studied and sustained replication' (p. 157). His article attests to the compelling presence of the screen images in the closing moments of the Wooster Group's piece, and questions are therefore asked about the result of the 2007 theatre production's 'increasingly fevered competition with the film itself' (p. 152).

Evelyn Tribble seeks to break with the critical tradition of analysing the 'extraordinarily dense rendering of the visual field' (p. 161) in her article 'Listening to *Prospero's Books*' (*ShS* 61[2008] 161–9). Michael Nyman's score for the film prompts Tribble to suggest that 'the acoustic dimension of *Prospero's Books* is one of the most complex areas of intersection between the play and the film' (p. 161). A comparable emphasis can be found in David L. Kranz's article on 'Tracking the Sounds of Franco Zeffirelli's *The Taming of the Shrew*' (*LFQ* 36:ii[2008] 94–112). While Nino Rota's score is given attention, Kranz does work hard to situate the scored music as one part of the 'sonic motifs, sound effects, volume, pitch, rhythm and mixing' (p. 94). Kranz's piece sensitively engages with the film's aural subtlety, and he makes a very strong case for the way that the soundtrack helps direct attention towards 'a mix of realism and artifice' (p. 95). The sustained attention to laughter as working variously, 'undercutting... appearances' and expressing 'positive emotion', is thoughtfully detailed, and existing critical ideas about the film and the play are challenged in a usefully precise way.

The customary special Shakespeare issue of *Literature/Film Quarterly* includes five other essays, all of which are grouped under the Barthesian heading 'Image/Music/Shakespeare'. Despite the bold decision of placing Shakespeare third in the title, the prioritization of 'image' supports Krantz's observation that visual enquiries dominate film scholarship. The articles which

look at visual imagery are less exciting than Krantz's aurally attentive piece. Monique L. Pittman's genre-inflected analysis of Shakespeare's uneasy position in Andy Fickman's version of *Twelfth Night* seems to continue the concerns emerging from last year's *LFQ* (35:ii[2007]). In 'Dressing the Girl/Playing the Boy: *Twelfth Night* Learns Soccer on the Set of *She's The Man*' (*LFQ* 36:ii[2008] 122–36) Pittman places the film securely in the context of teen movies. She persuasively justifies her disappointment that after the film's initial demonstration of 'the permeable boundaries between gender identities' it 'reverts to conservatism' (p. 123). In *Shakespeare Bulletin* both Elizabeth Klett and Laurie Osborne chose to situate *She's The Man* [2006] within the teen movie genre. Klett sets Fickman's film alongside *Lost and Delirious* [2001] and considers Viola's 'identity crisis' (p. 69) in 'Reviving Viola: Comic and Tragic Teen Film Adaptations of *Twelfth Night*' (*ShakB* 26:ii[2008] 69–87). Laurie Osborne's essay considers more closely the way that *She's The Man* was framed as a Shakespearian adaptation, in 'Twelfth Night's Cinematic Adolescents: One Play, One Plot, One Setting, and Three Teen Films' (*ShakB* 26:ii[2008] 9–36). Her piece explores 'intertextual and intercinematic connections created by the film itself and its marketing' (p. 10). Her argument then shifts to consider *Just One of the Guys* [1985], *Motocrossed* [2001] and *She's The Man* as 'intertexts' which demonstrate 'evolving gender politics' (p. 32).

Michael J. Friedman's introduction to the teen-focused *Shakespeare Bulletin* makes a strong case for dating the genre from the 1960s rather than as a mid-1990s, post-Luhrmann phenomenon: 'Introduction: "To think o' the' teen that I have turned you to": The Scholarly Consideration of Teen Shakespeare Films' (*ShakB* 26:ii[2008] 1–7). He contends that, rather than thinking in terms of a cinematic shift in recent years, it is more useful to connect scholarly analysis of films aimed at the teen market with 'a willingness on the part of Shakespeare critics to take teen Shakespeare adaptations seriously as an object of study' (p. 1). Friedman's definition of the study of Shakespeare's plays and their cinematic counterparts can, I think, extend beyond teen Shakespeare adaptations and define the relationship between Shakespeare and screen as offering, potentially, 'a mutually productive process' (p. 5).

#### 4. Criticism

##### (a) General

By focusing on the brief period Shakespeare spent as a lodger with French Huguenot exiles in *The Lodger: Shakespeare on Silver Street*, Charles Nicholl dispenses with the usual journey from cradle to grave, and goes into detail about matters often neglected in standard biographies. Part I relates the basic facts regarding Shakespeare's involvement with his former hosts the Mountjoys, their daughter Mary and their son-in-law Stephen Belott. The book's second section describes the physical environment around Silver Street, where Shakespeare lodged with the Mountjoys. As you would expect from Nicholl, the rendering of concrete detail—the churches, streets and shops—is superb. Admirably, Nicholl prefers not to pad out his reconstruction with

guesswork, stressing the value of *known* presence over ‘might have been present’. Part III tells us everything knowable about the Mountjoys, who made head-tires (delicate and fancy head-dresses), lingering on evidence relating Mrs Mountjoy’s visits to the quack doctor/astrologer Simon Forman (at times one is inclined to suspect Nicholl himself has a crush on this invisible French lady). The social and cultural relevance of head-tires is then examined at length. One thing emerges between the lines: the material details of head-tiring would be just the kind of ephemera Shakespeare would have gluttonously relished. Nicholl traces references to head-tires in Shakespeare’s works and explores Marie Mountjoy’s links to Queen Anne, noting that both Shakespeare and Marie were court servants. Analysing Shakespeare’s representations of ‘aliens’, Nicholl surmises that foreignness was exciting to the poet-playwright. Then comes an absorbing chapter on George Wilkins, whose brothel Mary Mountjoy went to live in after she married her father’s apprentice Stephen Belott in 1605. Nicholl relates these events to the composition of *Pericles* by Wilkins and Shakespeare. Included here is some very welcome discussion of other works by Wilkins from this period, including the play *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage*. Shakespeare seems to have felt in some way responsible for Mary’s married situation. Thus, the comparable plight of Marina in *Pericles* receives due attention. At one point, Nicholl suggests that Shakespeare teamed up with Wilkins because he was not able to write an effective city comedy by himself. This might be more plausible if the end result of their collaboration were something more like a city comedy than *Pericles*. By part VII of the book it is clear that the crucial element is the hand-fasting. What exactly was Shakespeare’s role in the troth-plight of Mary Mountjoy and Stephen Belott? It is said he ‘made [the couple] sure’. The witness Daniel Nicholas apparently deposed that Shakespeare did this by ‘giving each other’s hand to hand’ (p. 253), but this last phrase is deleted in the court record. Someone objected. Perhaps Shakespeare. In any case, as Nicholl suggests. Shakespeare played something like a directorial role in the ceremony. During a very pertinent discussion of *Measure for Measure*. Nicholl notes that Juliette and Claudio’s betrothal is not in Shakespeare’s source for the play. In sum, Nicholl’s thesis—that here for once we can really follow Shakespeare’s use of real-life experience in his work, *circa* 1603 and after—is amply sustained.

Like Nicholl’s book, Germaine Greer’s biographical study, *Shakespeare’s Wife*, has a novel focus, as indicated by the title. Unlike Nicholl, though, Greer *is* prepared (indeed, obliged) to pad out material evidence with speculation because, of course, even less is known about Anne Hathaway than about her husband. The vast majority of (male) Shakespearian biographers, says Greer, have tended to be disparaging about Anne because, let’s face it (they imply), wives of great men just do not understand their husbands. Thus, these scholars have supposed the Shakespeares’ marriage was unhappy. The problem with Greer’s attempt to counter this misogynist tide, of course, is that Shakespeare did spend the vast majority of his adult life away from his wife (and children) and blatantly snubbed Anne in his will. Greer chooses to play down these uncomfortable facts. Likewise, throughout the book, Greer insists that Shakespeare was never as prosperous as scholars customarily suggest. Again, the facts regarding his purchases of property simply do not uphold



Greer's argument. It is also odd that, having rightly attacked some stereotyping of Hathaway, Greer caricatures Anne's Catholic mother-in-law, suggesting that Mary Arden 'may have been something of a social climber' and was lazy in the house (p. 32). One begins to think there is something going on here. Declaring that 'the one resounding exception to the rule that wives of great men must all have been unworthy' is the case of 'wives of protestant reformers' (p. 9), Greer provides a list of housewife superstars (Anna Zwingli, Idelette Calvin and so on). The suspicion of special pleading is confirmed when Greer dismisses theories regarding Shakespeare's Catholicism as 'modish brouhaha' (p. 29). Apparently, Greer wishes to read Anne as a model Protestant housewife. It is a plausible supposition, but, on the other hand, for all we know, Anne was as slatternly as Greer's version of her mother-in-law. With some of the polemics out of the way, however, Greer's skills as a historical researcher come to the fore in chapters 5 and 6. Customs surrounding marriage are analysed with clarity and economy. There is, moreover, a healthy side to Greer's scepticism towards received wisdom. For example, she pays close attention to the marriage licence of 'Wm Shaxpere et Annam Whateley de Temple Grafton', challenging the usual view that this apparent oddity is the result of scribal error (p. 81). In line with her thesis, Greer speculates that Anne Hathaway was working in Temple Grafton, *perhaps* 'apprenticed to a skilled craftswoman or artisan' (p. 84). While this is by no means conclusive (after all, Anne Hathaway was never called Whateley and has no known connection with Temple Grafton), it at least demonstrates how complacently the Whateley document is dispensed with in conventional biographies. Another intriguing point made by Greer, consequent upon her notion of Hathaway as the industrious manager of a thriving cottage industry, is that Anne may have been the malt-hoarder rather than William ('Ungentle Hathaway?'). Unfortunately, however, the book ends with some examples of Greer at her most reckless. Discussing the poet-playwright's final years, Greer argues that Shakespeare *may* have died of syphilis. Therefore, she suggests, his son-in-law John Hall *probably* wrote the epitaph to prevent anyone digging up Shakespeare and finding evidence of his terminal disease. In addition, Anne's 'epitaph was probably written by John Hall, ventriloquising for Susanna' (p. 343). It is astonishing to find Greer denying authorship of a text to an early modern female and awarding it to her husband. Finally, Greer suggests that Anne Hathaway may have had a hand in preparing the First Folio. Once more, this is an interesting idea, but, again, there is no evidence to support it.

Though René Weis's biography *Shakespeare Revealed* has received less attention than Nicholl's and Greer's volumes, it does have its own claims to distinction. Its thesis is that Shakespeare was a real person, like any other author, and real people leave traces of their lives in their works. In addition, the book pays more attention than is customary in scholarly biographies to traditional anecdotes, evidently regarding these as valuable traces of actual events, relationships and personalities. This is not to say that Weis takes such tales at face value. Far from it, but he does not dismiss them as having no basis in historical reality. This offers a valuable corrective to new historicist reliance on material textual traces, for the latter approach inevitably gives greater air

time to an institutional version of history. Notwithstanding this openness to unorthodox material, Weis's book has been criticized for refusing to tackle the issue of whether Shakespeare spent his 'lost years' in Lancashire. This seems an unfair charge, for to explore this issue properly would commit Weis to devoting a large section of his book to a speculative area that has already been well served by previous biographers. However, Weis does not rubbish the Lancastrians. He acknowledges their existence (unlike Greer), allows the possibility of their case, notes the lack of hard evidence, and turns to matters about which he feels he has something new to add. For example, Weis re-examines the circumstances surrounding Shakespeare's marriage[s]. He points out that on 2 September 1582, just under three months before William Shakespeare married Anne Whateley, his father John Shakespeare voted at a Stratford council meeting for the first time since January 1577. As he was under virtual house arrest for debt at the time, John must have had a particular reason for doing this, Weis argues, noting also that Shakespeare senior did not vote again until September 1586. Weis posits that John was voting to snub one of the two losing candidates, George Whateley, head of the 'grand' Henley Street Whateleys, who had 'strong Catholic connections', including George's brothers who were both fugitive recusant priests (pp. 58–9). Weis does not go on to speculate what connection there may be between George and the otherwise non-existent Anne Whateley, but the matter certainly calls for further investigation. Elsewhere, though, Weis does allow himself to get a little carried away with speculation. For example, he seems quite certain that the 'dark lady' of the sonnets was Emilia Lanyer. I would be happy to be persuaded that Lanyer is in the mix, but it is a big leap from claiming Shakespeare was a human being who left traces in his work to making a case for one-to-one identifications of actual people with fictional characters.

*The Shakespeare International Yearbook* 8, special section, *European Shakespeares*, is edited by Ton Hoenselaars and Clara Calvo. As the subtitle indicates, the bulk of this volume is taken up with essays examining Shakespeare in European contexts. These include a study of Shakespearean reception in relation to mid-twentieth-century Portuguese academic politics by Rui Carvalho Homem in 'The Chore and the Passion: Shakespeare and Graduation in mid-Twentieth Century Portugal' (15–31), and an absorbing account by Tina Krontiris in 'Henry V and the Anglo-Greek Alliance of World War II' (32–50) of a 1941 Greek production of *Henry V*. Krontiris notes that '[w]hen Greece entered World War II in October 1940, all the theatre companies changed their repertoires, turning to satirical revues and war plays' (p. 38). These might involve an implied critique of what was seen as weak French resistance to the Nazis. The staging of *Henry V*, therefore, which had not been popular outside England prior to then, was 'an interventionist act' (p. 39). Krontiris concludes by examining the reasons why this production failed to do well at the box office. Alexander C.Y. Huang's contribution 'Asian Shakespeares in Europe: From the Unfamiliar to the Defamiliarised' (165–182), meanwhile, deals with Asian Shakespeares, exploring the benefits of defamiliarization. Asian acting conventions, for example, being less 'realistic', may, when applied to Shakespeare, lead Europeans to question

how appropriate 'realistic' conventions are to the performance of early modern drama. In 'The BBC and *Shakespeare Re-Told* (2005)' (82–96), the volume's editors Clara Calvo and Ton Hoenselaars provide close analysis of the BBC's *Shakespeare Re-Told* series of adaptations, pointing out how these versions relocate Shakespeare's comedies to Britain. Making Shakespeare accessible seems to entail insularity. In section III of the volume, dedicated to romance, Steve Mentz in 'Shipwreck and Ecology: Toward a Structural Theory of Shakespeare and Romance' (165–182), complains of the critical distortions created by career narratives. Nonetheless, he restricts the term 'romance' to the Shakespeare plays from *Pericles* and *Cymbeline* on. Mentz considers shipwreck as a major Renaissance trope. What makes his approach distinct, however, is the use of ecology as a key frame of reference for understanding what Shakespeare is up to in presenting fallible heroes. In the following essay, Tiffany J. Werth in 'Great Miracle or Lying Wonder? Janus-Faced Romance in *Pericles*' (183–203), reads *Pericles* as an example of Shakespeare exploiting 'the Janus-like aspects of early modern romance' (p. 183). That is, romance looks back nostalgically at a Catholic past but is also a big crowd-pleaser in the commercial present. Section IV contains two excellent review essays. The first, '(Re)Presenting Shakespeare's Co-Authors: Lessons from the *Oxford Shakespeare*' (219–237) by Tom Rooney, considers how the various recent collected editions of Shakespeare have dealt with the issue of collaboration. *Oxford 2* [2005] (Stanley Wells et al. eds) comes out the winner, but Rooney points out different ways in which the various editions excel. In the second review essay, Laurence Wright defends Harold Bloom's *The Invention of the Human* [1998] in "Inventing the Human: Brontosaurus Bloom and 'the Shakespeare in us'" (238–260). Wright emphasizes Bloom's Emersonian inheritance, viewing this as a counter-weight to Greenblattian determinism. Wright admits that Bloom can put people off, especially new young students, with his bardolatry. Accordingly, Bloom is perhaps best read as an antidote to unbridled cultural materialism.

*Shakespeare and Spenser: Attractive Opposites*, edited by J.B. Lethbridge, is a valuable collection of new essays offering a detailed consideration of the two Elizabethan authors in relation to each other. Lethbridge's 'Introduction: Spenser, Marlowe, Shakespeare: Methodological Investigations' is amply footnoted, functioning as a bibliographical guide to the topic. He stresses the collection's methodological rigour: Shakespeare and Spenser have been compared before, but this time it will be done *better*. Karen Nelson, in her essay 'Pastoral Forms and Religious Reform in Spenser and Shakespeare', argues that 'English authors of pastoral literature, along with their continental counterparts, were often engaged in "figuring forth" debates about reform and counter-reform with their shepherds and shepherdesses' (p. 143). She compares Spenser's use of Faerieland with Shakespeare's employment of Arden as exile states of wilderness, focusing also on the figure of the hermit. Catholic authors tended to associate hermits with the Church Fathers, while reformers surrounded the hermit-figure with wild men and cannibalistic savages. Nelson, moreover, sees Shakespeare as offering a *politique* version of the more aggressive (albeit coded) radicalism of Lodge's *Rosalind*. Anne Lake Prescott, 'The Equinoctial Boar: Venus and Adonis in Spenser's Garden,

Shakespeare's Epyllion, and *Richard III's* England', supplies an erudite assessment of the allegorical/mythographical renderings of the Venus and Adonis story, and equinoctial boar imagery, in *The Faerie Queene*, Shakespeare's epyllion and *Richard III*. In a similarly beast-tropic vein, Rachel E. Hile, 'Hamlet's Debt to Spenser's *Mother Hubberds Tale*: A Satire on Robert Cecil?', considers *Hamlet's* debt to Spenser's *Mother Hubberds Tale*, with regard to covert attacks upon the Cecils. Hile argues that 'Claudius' murder of Old Hamlet in order to woo his queen is reminiscent of Robert Cecil's role in the trial and execution of Essex and his concomitant increase in political power under Elizabeth' (p. 200). The heart of the collection, though, is Robert L. Reid's magisterial essay, 'Spenser and Shakespeare: Polarized Approaches to Psychology, Poetics and Patronage'. Reid stresses the 'peculiar Christian-Classical synthesis in each poet's work' (p. 82). He then compares Spenser's elaborate and overt use of pattern, structure and numerology with Shakespeare's concealed 'dramaturgical structure' (p. 83). Reid also considers Essex allusions in *Henry V* and *Julius Caesar*; the latter play offers 'a complex anatomy of Essex's militaristic quest for honour and power' (p. 94). Shakespeare, then, like Spenser, is attempting to fashion Essex, but the dramatist offers a 'socially inclusive... epic [i.e. the *Henriad*] to replace Spenser's refined intellectual allegory' (p. 95). Reid, however, does not restrict his focus to a consideration of Essex's fortunes. He develops his argument to present a finely nuanced comparative study of Spenser's and Shakespeare's concepts of self-love and the action of grace.

Phebe Jensen's *Religion and Revelry in Shakespeare's Festive World* updates Barber's work on festivity in the wake of revisionist history. Jensen argues for the 'importance of the continued association between traditional pastimes and Catholic "superstition" in early modern culture' (p. 5). However, Shakespeare, according to Jensen, aligns his work with festive energies on aesthetic rather than theological grounds. Jensen seeks to supplement recent scholarship in exploring devotional identity in a way that 'rejects the sharp devotional categorization' that, say, asking if Shakespeare was a Catholic assumes. But she also declares that Shakespeare 'clearly conformed to Protestantism' (p. 6). Some categories, it appears, are able to retain their form. The main body of the study, however, has less polemical positioning and much informative historicist analysis. After chapters examining attitudes to popular festivity in Reformation England and calendrical reform respectively, Jensen offers a reading of *As You Like It* in relation to the anti-clericalism of earlier Robin Hood texts. *As You Like It*, she avers, redirects Robin Hood-style anti-clerical satire, targeting mainstream Church of England clerics, thereby suggesting 'the unreliability of officially sanctioned marriage rituals' (p. 142). Jensen's conclusion to this chapter conflicts somewhat with statements in her introduction: 'When *As You Like It's* spectacles become sacramental, they reflect a belief in the salvific function of festivity' (p. 148). Presumably, Shakespeare is not pursuing merely aesthetic aims, therefore. After a chapter on Shakespeare's festive use of Falstaff and Falstaffian representations in *Twelfth Night*, the book concludes with an excellent chapter on *The Winter's Tale*. Jensen suggests that the play's statue scene implies one should not trust in Catholic spectacle. On the other hand, the scene is miraculous in terms of its

human effect. Again, it might be objected that such a humanist recuperation of the superstitious is not an exclusively aesthetic project. Jensen astutely notes, though, that Perdita herself 'reveals a profound . . . unease with festive play' (p. 218). With experience, Perdita learns that devotion must be ritualized to some extent. Consequently, she becomes more festive and playful, coming to resemble her father less and her mother more. Thus, as a hybrid figure blending secular pastoral with religious festivity, Perdita can be seen as an embodied appropriation, rather than nostalgic iteration, of 'the energies of ancient Catholic rituals' (p. 224).

The general (introductory) chapters of Bradin Cormack's *A Power To Do Justice: Jurisdiction, English Literature, and the Rise of Common Law, 1509–1625*, though not concerned directly with Shakespeare, might well be of great interest to scholars investigating the socio-cultural context of Shakespeare's works. In a densely theoretical, but hugely rewarding, prologue Cormack posits that jurisdiction, being improvised and, therefore, always provisional, is 'the sign under which literary and legal aesthetics are legible' (p. 5). Cormack demonstrates that jurisdiction is the performative phase of legality, and, therefore, as perfect implementation of the law is impossible, jurisdiction is the means by which a legal system can be challenged (deformed) from within. In other words, jurisdiction reveals law as flux, just as gender-as-performance, for example, reveals sexual identity as flux. The relevance of Cormack's insights into the importance of jurisdiction to Shakespeare's political contexts is readily apparent: the contest between canon law and common law may well turn out to be no less significant for the understanding of the nascent nation-state of England than the battle between religious confessions. For one thing, the importance of Ireland, as a liminal zone where the provisional nature of jurisdiction is most patent, here looms larger than ever before (chapter 3 deals with Ireland in relation to Spenserian texts). In chapter 4 Cormack examines the relationship between Shakespeare's second tetralogy and English law. As Cormack says, the French background of English law tended to undermine its function as a prop for the nascent nation-state. Accordingly, Cormack sees the insistence on the *non*-immemorial origins of common law as having pro-absolutist implications. That is, 'the Conquest was saved for English common law by becoming an iterative structure more than a discrete event'. Consequently, Shakespeare's history plays are 'deeply concerned with the trope of reiterative conquest' (p. 181). In his discussion of Thomas Starkey's *Dialogue between Reginald Pole and Thomas Lupset* [c.1530], though, Cormack's focus on legal implications perhaps prevents his readings from achieving a suppleness comparable to the theoretical sophistication of the book's opening chapters. As Cormack notes, Starkey's Pole proposes the adoption of Roman civil law in England in order to do away with common law and its Norman taint. Doing so would remove the potential for tyranny. Cormack, however, considers only the classical aspect of Starkey's emphasis on the need for an overarching *Roman* system of jurisdiction. Given the historical context of Starkey's dialogue, the argument for a papal role in determining sovereignty has at least to be acknowledged. Be that as it may, Cormack conducts some insightful close reading, especially in his discussion of the relationship between Shakespeare's kings and iconography in John

Rastell's 1529 chronicle history of England. In chapter 5 Cormack argues that Shakespeare questions the equation of jurisdiction with territory by exploiting ambiguities arising not only from the union under James I, but also from the attempted mapping of the sea. Pondering how an empire can maintain its jurisdiction across distance and borders, Cormack looks at the 1608 *Post-Nati* case, concerned with the problem of whether James's Scottish subjects, born after his accession, could inherit land in England. Cormack also examines how far allegiance and fidelity can be said to transcend distance and time. *Cymbeline* and *Pericles* are key texts here.

In the introduction to *Shakespeare in French Theory: King of Shadows*, Richard Wilson claims that "Shakespeare in French theory" emerged as a site of defiance of America's dream of the "end of history" in neo-liberal capitalism' (p. 5). Having established this, Wilson then pits Bourdieu's less rhapsodic version of Shakespeare against Foucault's romanticization of madness (for Foucault, Shakespeare's fools are a source of truth). Bourdieu locates Shakespeare in relation to power and commerce. Thus, 'Shakespeare pretended to serve the prince [or noble patrons] . . . not out of deference, but to protect his own creative freedom by playing off the playhouse against the palace' (p. 11). Wilson, however, complains that Bourdieu privileges the aesthetic over the political, and points out that Bourdieu lacked a perception of the religious dimension of Shakespeare's situation. The question then becomes, if Shakespeare is neither romantic truth-teller nor game-playing aesthete, what *was* he doing? Playing to (apparently) lose, suggests Wilson. Shakespeare seeks ways of surviving (by changing) until things change, as they inevitably must. Hence, he seems always to anticipate the positions of poststructuralism because he is never exactly anywhere. Thus, Wilson argues against claiming Shakespeare for any religion (which is odd because that is what critics tend to accuse Wilson of doing!). Shakespeare's optimism involves a resistance to religious finality, and is compatible with Derrida's spirituality of endless deferral. Wilson then offers a splendid (Derrida-influenced) account of Shakespeare's boundless hospitality to whatever 'guests' the future may bring. That is why all subsequent readings find such a warm welcome waiting in his plays. As in the mumming tradition (discussed in the Epilogue), the sincerely hospitable host becomes, in a sense, the captive of his guests, but, by the same token, the truly gracious guest becomes the adapted host of his host. In addition, the guest always brings a gift, an element of difference which rubs off on the host. (It is interesting to recall that Shakespeare was himself at times a lodger, a house-guest, for instance, of Huguenot exiles.) Wilson's first chapter includes a history of French response to Shakespeare, starting with the reaction of Henri IV's spy Jacques Petit to a performance of *Titus Andronicus* in Sir John Harington's house in 1596, and going on through neoclassical French dislike of Shakespeare, Shakespeare as revolutionary hero of the people, Lyotard's appropriation of Shakespeare for postmodernism, Deleuze's happy Hamlet and Derrida's glimpse of Shakespeare as a sentinel on the night watch at Elsinore, always ready for the Messiah (the future) whatever monstrous form it takes. Chapter 2 discusses Foucauldian Shakespeare: a Shakespeare on the border between changing epistemes. A lengthy discussion of *Measure for Measure* reads the play in relation to Foucault's theories of

surveillance as the control technique *par excellence* of the modern state. Wilson also includes the somewhat startling claim that modern idealizations of romantic love and companionate marriage derive their power from improvements in cereal farming. Once we can grow more, we can feed more people, so we can safely let subjects procreate. This provides a fascinating economic context for the loosening of the Catholic stranglehold on the sex lives of the faithful. One problem with this argument, as I see it, is that it equates reproduction with marriage. In chapter 5, Wilson registers the fact that Bataille was troubled by 'the gratuitousness of the sacrifice' (p. 174). Of course, it is precisely that gratuitousness which allows the sacrifice to escape from the economy of need. Wilson considers aspects of *Julius Caesar* in this regard, citing Richard Marienstras's comparison of Brutus to a priest. Duelling as a French import is investigated in the following chapter, bringing to light buried Essex allusions in *Twelfth Night*. Finally, in the Epilogue, Wilson distinguishes between carnival, as a defensive expression of insularity, and mumming, 'a more open, dialogic form of masquerade' (p. 247), suggesting that Shakespeare was more influenced by the mumming tradition, in which parties of disguised mummers invade houses. Accordingly, in his plays Shakespeare exaggerates the alterity of Moors, Jews, Egyptians and so on in order to test and extend his audience's hospitality.

Laurie Maguire's *Shakespeare's Names* is a (mostly) formalist study investigating the function of names in Shakespeare's works. The importance of names with regard to a broader theory of language is stressed by pointing out that Adam, before the Fall, effectively named the animals. True names, therefore, offer access to unfallen language. Accordingly, *Richard II* is concerned with a world that speaks a fallen language, where patience equals despair. A double standard of language, however, remains available. As the same play's Duchess of Gloucester says, that which in 'mean men' is 'patience' is 'pale cold cowardice in noble breasts' (p. 46). Chapter 2 looks at *Romeo and Juliet*. The lovers are damned because they live in a fallen world. 'What's in a name?' emerges as a crucial line: 'one of the two lovers must relinquish a surname if their love is to be feasible' (p. 51). But love is also about language—i.e. about learning to speak the language of the beloved. Achieving this selfless skill, one translates fallen into unfallen language. *Romeo and Juliet*, therefore, is about translation: Romeo into Juliet, Juliet into Romeo, comedy into tragedy, etc. Chapter 3 demonstrates the significance of characters' names in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, especially 'Helen' and 'Theseus'. Maguire brings out very well the disturbing undertones of this romantic comedy: 'a world ruled by Theseus is a frightening place for a character named Helen'. However, '[t]he story shall be changed', Helen announces (p. 82). She means the story of Apollo and Daphne, but Shakespeare means, argues Maguire, the story of Helen of Troy. In another section, Maguire argues for the influence of Euripides' strange *Helen* play on *All's Well That Ends Well*. Thus, she questions scholars' continuing scepticism as to Shakespeare's familiarity with Greek originals. Chapter 5 shows that the rampant doubling of Euripides' play is also recalled in *The Comedy of Errors*: Pauline/Plautine; Christian/Pagan; the Temple of Diana/the Abbey; and of course the play's two sets of twins, whose names cease to guarantee identity. Maguire discusses Paul's letter to the

Ephesians, in particular the advice given about marriage. She notes that marriage in the play is treated as a commercial transaction and a spiritual action. This is 'no more paradoxical' than the dramatic hybrid Shakespeare creates, implying thereby that the play effectually marries the sacred and the profane (p. 165).

Literary culture in Tudor–Stuart England was, in many respects, European culture, so studies which explore the relationship between Shakespeare and European literature, being thin on the ground, presumably because scholars focus on texts written in their native language, are always welcome. *Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries: Rewriting, Remaking, Refashioning* is one such artefact, being a collection of new essays, edited by Michele Marrapodi. In his introduction 'Appropriating Italy: Towards a New Approach to Renaissance Drama', Marrapodi stresses a desire to resist simplistic models of appropriation. Rather, 'the ideological appropriation of Italy may become a disruptive force which serves as a cover for political dissent' (p. 4). Thus, in the opening essay 'Pastoral Jazz from the Writ to the Liberty', Louise George Chubb celebrates the fact that continental pastoral works are now being taken more seriously as political allegory. With regard to pastoral drama, she argues that 'the very fact of dramatization offered the possibility of representing . . . intangible [concepts]'. Moreover, the development of the '3rd genre' of tragicomedy within pastoral drama 'authorized a venue for liberty of imagination', allowing jazz-like exploration of new doctrines and ideas (p. 16). This relative freedom was vital to Italian exponents of reformation within a Catholic context. Chubb considers the importance of these issues with regard to plays such as *As You Like It*. Robert Henke in 'Virtuosity and Mimesis in the *Commedia dell'arte* and *Hamlet*' also discusses Italian developments of hybrid genres, arguing that the ancient satyr play provided Italian classicists with useful hints in this regard. After tracing the development of the *buffone* tradition in early sixteenth-century Venice, Henke turns to the first organized professional performances of *commedia dell'arte* (from 1545). He stresses the importance of the actress Flamina's decision to convert the tragedy of Dido into a tragicomedy. In doing so, Flamina anticipates the generic morphologies of Shakespeare's Polonius. The Italian actresses, however, work in a mimetic tradition committed to self-contained illusion, distinct from the *buffone* style. Henke, then, finds a polyvocal Italian influence in the way Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, for example, oscillates between the poles of mimesis and buffoonery. In a seemingly related vein, Keir Elam in "'At the cubiculo': Shakespeare's Problems with Italian Language and Culture" finds that 'a great deal of the comic energy in Shakespeare's plays derives precisely from the grotesque failure to assimilate Italianate culture' (p. 105). To argue this case, Elam explores links between John Florio and Shakespeare, noting the use Shakespeare seems to have made of Florio's Italian dictionary *A World of Words* [1598] in writing *Twelfth Night*. Elsewhere, Adam Max Cohen in 'The Mirror of All Christian Courtiers: Castiglione's *Cortegiano* as a Source for *Henry V*' examines Castiglione's *Cortegiano* as a possible source for *Henry V*. The claim by one of Castiglione's speakers that a true courtier has the 'ability to appropriate traits of either gender when the circumstances require' is read as informing



Shakespeare's portrayal of Henry's rhetorical conquests (p. 41). Henry, moreover, applies the principle of *sprezzatura* even in battle at Agincourt. Thus, whatever his failings, Henry to some extent embodies a courtly ideal.

B.J. Sokol's *Shakespeare and Tolerance* reassesses the meaning of tolerance in the early modern period. Noting that post-Enlightenment definitions read 'tolerance' as implying a prior dislike of the tolerated person or belief, Sokol argues that Shakespeare 'dramatises circumstances in which tolerance is required *before* any dislike is established' (p. xii). After all, if tolerance only means 'forbearance from harming' then only the dominant can practise it (p. xiv). Shakespeare, however, says Sokol, regularly represents mutual tolerance between parties within a power relationship. The book's first chapter is concerned with humour. Sokol suggests that 'Shakespeare's representations of poor or failed jokes... need not be... inartistic' (future editors of Shakespeare plays take note!). Seemingly poor jokes may be included not to win easy laughter but 'to make salient points about individual or group relations'. Thus, humour in Shakespeare's works should always be assessed within the immediate fictional context. As Sokol says, 'a true joke must be capable not only of succeeding but also of failing' (p. 10). Thus, while tyrants command obedient laughter for their worst jokes, other characters may manage power-dynamics and affirm inter-subjectivity by making poor jokes *without* impunity. Turning to *The Merchant of Venice*, Sokol argues that Shylock initially did not intend to obtain his pound of flesh. The joke was on humourless Antonio. Thus, Shylock initially demonstrates his superiority through humour only to lose this superiority by succumbing to an urge for bloody revenge. Sokol's second chapter focuses on gender issues. *The Taming of the Shrew*, suggests Sokol, is mindful of the impossibility of any marriage being truly happy. However, the marriage of Katherine and Petruchio may turn out to be uniquely happy, the play implies, as a result of their having achieved mutual tolerance. Furthermore, Sokol stresses that the practice of toleration is not about finding some bland middle way. Tolerance is rather about becoming flexible, rather than retaining fixity in one's own character and beliefs albeit while professing one's tolerance of difference. In his chapter on religion, Sokol likewise argues that *Hamlet* and *All's Well That Ends Well* promote a 'tolerantly syncretic' viewpoint (p. 102). In the second of two chapters on race, Sokol discusses geohumoral theories, suggesting that Prospero's island is appropriately utopian in that it offers a temperate meeting place for different (geographically figured) humours. The final chapter considers Shakespeare's Antony (in *Antony and Cleopatra*) in relation to Aristotle's description of *megalopsychia*. The ups and downs of Antony's career and relationship with Cleopatra are linked to his ability to practise true tolerance.

*Shakespeare's Book: Essays in Reading, Writing and Reception*, edited by Richard Meek, Jane Rickard and Richard Wilson, pursues the idea that Shakespeare *did* care about the publication of his plays (as well as his poems). The introduction ponders Shakespeare's cryptic reference to the printer Richard Field in *Cymbeline*, concluding that Field (who sold his interest in *Venus and Adonis* after issuing one edition) did not value Shakespeare's dramatic work. Stanley Wells in 'A New Early Reader of Shakespeare'

discusses William Scott, secretary to Sir John Davies and a hitherto neglected early reader of Shakespeare. Scott gave evidence at the 1601 Essex inquiry, and in his remarks on Shakespeare, in his manuscript [*The Model*] of *Poesy* (to which Wells has had access), show particular interest in *Richard II*. Patrick Cheney in “‘An Index and Obscure Prologue’: Books and Theatre in Shakespeare’s Literary Authorship” argues that Shakespeare challenges the binary of page versus stage via his characteristic use of hendiadys. Duncan Salkeld’s account of *Henry V*’s publication history in “‘As Sharp as a Pen’: *Henry V* and its Texts” scans familiar terrain from a neglected viewpoint, asking whether the play’s Choruses were, in fact, designed to help a reader re-create the play’s theatrical performance in his or her imagination. Salkeld diagnoses his own reluctance to accept this hypothesis, for it conflicts with one’s received opinions regarding the dramatic (albeit metatheatrical) effect of the prologues. However, such thought-experiments demonstrate the advantage of emphasizing a print-conscious Shakespeare, in that doing so challenges settled viewpoints.

Tom Rutter’s *Work and Play on the Shakespearean Stage* is a thematic study, exploring the notion of work in relation to different aspects of Elizabethan and Jacobean culture. Chapter 1 demonstrates the relevance of late medieval and early modern religious upheavals to this topic, while the second chapter details how the display of superior acting skills served as a refutation of charges of idleness once actors had formed into companies under the protection of noblemen and justices. In this context, Rutter compares and contrasts the presentation of actors-as-characters in Shakespeare’s *Shrew* and *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* with the presentation of same in *The Taming of a Shrew* [c.1588–93]. In chapter 3, Rutter endorses Phyllis Rackin’s view that Shakespeare’s histories themselves engaged in the debate as to whether drama was capable of subversion, representing this debate as a contest between secular agency and divine providence. This insight, observes Rutter, acknowledges the fact that while players had noble backing they still needed civic approval and citizens’ money. Rutter then reads *2 Henry VI*, *Richard II* and *Henry V* for traces of tension arising from the players’ desire to please a plural audience. Chapter 4 includes discussion of Dekker’s use of the figure of St Hugh in *The Shoemakers’ Holiday* [1599]. This, notes Rutter, appears related to the invocation of St Crispian in Shakespeare’s *Henry V*. Deloney (Dekker’s principal source) mentions Crispin and Crispianian as preachers in Gaul who practised the art of shoemaking. Dekker replaces Crispin/Crispian with Hugh and gives more voice to the workers, whereas Henry suppresses Crispian’s shoemaker association. All of which supports Rutter’s argument that the Admiral’s men sought the city audience, whereas the Lord Chamberlain’s men remained cagier around 1599/1601. Chapter 5 continues the comparative study of different theatre companies’ interactions with their cultural environment, in relation to the theme of work, covering the period 1599–1610.

*Shakespeare as Children’s Literature: Edwardian Retellings in Words and Pictures*, by Velma Bourgeois Richmond, would be a useful purchase for any department running children’s literature courses. This is not to ghettoize the study, for it contains much material of interest to the general Shakespeare scholar as well. Chapter 1 provides a mini-history of children’s literature (as it

developed from chapbooks intended for the emerging literate poor) in order to provide a context for the achievement of the innovators in the field of Shakespeare adaptations for children: Charles and Mary Lamb. Subsequent chapters examine the Lambs' adaptations in detail before turning to Victorian and Edwardian developments. A pleasing feature of the book is the close attention paid to (and the many reproductions of) illustrations. This is hugely relevant to the history of the reception of Shakespeare, for illustrations reflect Edwardian reception no less than do textual adaptations. Focusing on pedagogical issues, the final chapters examine the use of Shakespeare in schools, analysing editors' intentions as stated in prefaces to adaptations for children and for schools, revealing much about educational attitudes and socio-cultural models in general.

In the opening contribution, "'A System of Oeconomical Prudence': Shakespearean Character and the Practice of Moral Inquiry", to *Shakespeare and the Eighteenth Century*, a collection of new essays edited by Peter Sabor and Paul Yachnin, Michael Bristol investigates Theobald's view that Shakespeare's most significant achievement was the creation of characters with fictional agency. Given this emphasis on character, figures such as Angelo in *Measure for Measure* raised critical issues for literary scholars of the eighteenth century, as Bristol shows. Jean Marsden's essay, 'Shakespeare and Sympathy' meanwhile, discusses how eighteenth-century readers expected great literature to communicate 'sympathy'. Marsden sees this expectation as distinct from the early modern focus on 'art's responsibility to "please and instruct"' (p. 29). According to Marsden, Adam Smith's first book, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* [1759], was a main instigator of the sympathy craze. Smith saw sympathy as 'the founding principle for all moral behaviour' (p. 31). As a result of this emphasis, tragedy was valued more than comedy. Moreover, eighteenth-century audiences were expected to show sympathy 'through highly visible tears' (p. 33). Nicholas Hudson discusses in "The 'Vexed Question': Shakespeare and the Nature of Middle-Class Appropriation" the question of middle-class appropriation of Shakespeare. In the eighteenth century, the middle classes 'increasingly made up the main audience at the theatres'. This class-conscious audience responded enthusiastically to Garrick's 'naturalness' because it was not linked to his character as king, but to his character's presumed individuality. Audiences and critics, moreover, projected their class anxiety onto the dramatist himself. Shakespeare's 'low birth and lack of education' enabled him to forgo the 'erroneous lenses of a classical . . . tradition'. He 'merely described what he saw before him' (p. 45). This approach, however, opened up a can of worms. For example, Maurice Morgan extended Johnson's empirical method to absurdity, insisting that, because we like him, Falstaff cannot really be a coward. Hudson concludes by observing, however, that Shakespeare was also valued for expressing contempt for the bourgeoisie. This suggests that the sentimentality associated with eighteenth-century empiricism tends to involve an element of self-loathing. A chapter by Fiona Ritchie, 'The Influence of the Female Audience on the Shakespeare Revival of 1736–1738: The Case of the Shakespeare Ladies Club', meanwhile, provides an account of the role of the Shakespeare Ladies Club in reviving interest in Shakespeare in 1736–8.

In the face of popular adaptations, the club campaigned for original versions to be performed and for the revival of neglected plays. Marcus Walsh's contribution, 'George Stevens and the 1778 Variorum: A Hermeneutics and a Social Economy of Annotation', compares the annotational styles of Steevens and Malone. For anyone interested in the history of the annotation of Shakespeare, this chapter is essential reading. It also contains amusing discussion of Steevens's use of fictional editorial personae to satirize his own endeavours. Paul Yachnin in 'Looking for *Richard II*' investigates how modern interpretations of Shakespeare's history plays have been influenced by the Enlightenment's emphasis on character-motivation as the guide to a play's meaning. In contrast, Yachnin argues, Shakespeare himself saw concepts such as Providence as having 'motives of its own' (p. 130). Thus, Yachnin concludes, Richard II's character is not necessarily the centre of gravity of the play bearing his name as title. Rather, that centre may be the cultivation in the audience of 'a sceptical spirit of historical enquiry that is inseparable from an enfolding awareness of themselves as a sacramental political community' (p. 134). Amanda Cockburn's chapter, 'Awful Pomp and Endless Diversity: The Sublime Sir John Falstaff' reveals that the main flaw with Adam Smith's view that moral behaviour is learned by observing and adopting established rules is that this model leads not to the purging of negative passions but only to their effective masking. This understanding helps to account for the ambivalent attitude to the masquerade in eighteenth-century England. Hence, the character of Sir John Falstaff, being a similar conflation of the immoral and the pleasurable, was a challenging problem for literary critics of the time. Gefen Bar-On Santor in "Looking for 'Newtonian' Laws in Shakespeare: The Mystifying Case of the Character of Hamlet" finds that Shakespeare was regarded in the eighteenth century as being great in so far as, like a humanities version of Newton, he comprehended the hidden workings of human nature. Consequently, Enlightenment critics set about trying to find the underlying principles of characters such as Hamlet. When these characters proved to be incoherent, the plays were suspected of being at fault, and in need of editorial fixing. Thus, while for readers today 'the association of *Hamlet* with ambiguity may seem like a commonplace', for editors such as Malone it was 'a revolutionary idea'. Ultimately, 'the Newtonian search for underlying principles produced the ironic effect of highlighting the limitations of the scientific worldview in relation to literary character' (p. 163). Finally, Jenny Davidson's essay 'Why Girls Look Like their Mothers: David Garrick Rewrites *The Winter's Tale*' compares early seventeenth- and eighteenth-century concepts of heredity, and discusses relevant aspects of *The Winter's Tale*.

In *Shakespeare, the Earl, and the Jesuit*, John Klause explores the links between Shakespeare, Henry Wriothesley and Robert Southwell. Copious evidence of Shakespeare's verbal debts to the Jesuit poet is provided in table form and examined in detail, revealing an ongoing virtual debate between the two authors regarding contentious issues for English Catholics. Klause's work evidently has connections with aspects of Richard Wilson's *Secret Shakespeare* [2004]. However, where Wilson found Southwell responding to Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*, Klause reverses the direction of intercourse, arguing that it is unlikely that Southwell read Shakespeare's epyllion in manuscript.

Consequently, where Wilson interprets Shakespeare's Venus as an analogue for Queen Elizabeth, Klause's Venus figures coercive Rome and its Jesuit emissary. On the one hand, Klause's version makes sense: Venus does resemble 'a Mother church who would possess a subject entirely' (p. 55). On the other hand, where Southwell notoriously exhorted English Catholics to embrace martyrdom, Shakespeare's Venus clearly does not seek martyrdom for her beloved Adonis. Possibly where both Wilson and Klaus lack suppleness in this regard is their seeming commitment to one-to-one identifications of literary characters with real people. An appreciation of the allegorical nature of early modern literature does not have to entail such an approach. Venus might be better read as presenting the possessive nature of any coercive religious institution. Notwithstanding his difference from Wilson with regard to *Venus and Adonis*, Klause by no means finds Shakespeare to be pro-Elizabeth. For example, discussing the 'fair vestal' speech in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, which is often taken to allude to Queen Elizabeth, Klause stresses its negative connotations. Thus, by tracing the abundant echoes of Southwell's writings in Shakespearean texts (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Rape of Lucrece*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *Titus Andronicus*, *Hamlet* and *All's Well That Ends Well*), Klause reveals a Shakespeare who is highly critical of both the Elizabethan regime and the Jesuit poet's 'stern moralizings' (p. 60). Nonetheless, given the evident extent of Shakespeare's borrowings from Southwell, says Klause in conclusion, it becomes more likely that the 'W.S.' to whom, it is supposed, the Jesuit poet dedicated a collection of poems in the early 1590s was the Stratford man (this dedication, it should be noted, appeared only in a 1616 Saint-Omer manuscript).

The late A.D. Nuttall provides a highly stimulating formalist account of Shakespeare's mental processes in *Shakespeare the Thinker*. Nuttall's Shakespeare is suspicious of language's (and, therefore, his own) capabilities to simulate and manage feeling. Accordingly, the monastery-like academy of *Love's Labour's Lost* is portrayed as an ultimately self-indulgent, self-deceiving institution. Nonetheless, Shakespeare is clearly not an anti-intellectual. Nuttall emphasizes throughout the book Shakespeare's profound knowledge of Latin classical works. However, Nuttall appears unconcerned as to where Shakespeare acquired such extreme familiarity with the classics. (It is sometimes claimed young Will could have easily learned all he knew from his local grammar school; if this is true we need look no further for a template for educational reform.) Working doggedly through the canon, Nuttall supplies countless insights and challenging, but always well-supported, readings. Extensive discussions of key speeches and scenes are rigorously self-interrogating. In particular, Nuttall shows how Shakespeare deployed complex rhetorical methods to interrogate Stoicism, nominalism, determinism and so forth. Over the course of the book, Nuttall demonstrates that Shakespeare was committed to a view of human identity as utterly dependent on social relations. In addition, Nuttall's Shakespeare often emphasizes the artificiality of his play-worlds, as if implying that a transcendent reality is the true one, but this does not make him a Platonist: 'the severe separation of the Form from the turbulent half-reality of the sensuously available world, is not there, in Shakespeare's mind. All remains this-worldly, fully human'

(p. 253). Though he skirts the issue of Shakespeare's faith, Nuttall by no means always plays safe in his readings. For example, he offers a full-blown (and extremely plausible) Gnostic interpretation of *Measure for Measure*. Nuttall admits, though, that he cannot say how Shakespeare accessed Gnosticism. He settles for assuming not a continuous textual tradition but 'the continuing *availability of the thought*' (p. 264). This is where a more historicized, intertextual approach might yield further dividends.

*Kenneth Burke on Shakespeare*, edited by Scott L. Newstok, usefully gathers the maverick intellectual's essays on the poet-playwright into one place. The book's insights come thick and fast, often from unexpected angles. For example, in a footnote to an article on 'Imagery', Burke surmises that 'corrective hypocrisy' would be the likely response of an author to an awareness of his or her habitual patterns of metaphorization. Thus, Shakespeare may have been aware of his habits, indeed 'deliberately coached himself to cultivate them'. This might represent a form of 'secular prayer'; i.e. by consciously employing certain metaphors, the poet can alter his or her subjective state—and, therefore, that of his or her spectator/reader (p. 50). Especially refreshing is Burke's view that Shakespeare was not so much a creator of characters who seem like individuals as a writer able to translate ideas into (and disperse them throughout) 'a scattering of personalities' (p. 8). Obviously such a view predisposes Burke to a theme-based approach. Accordingly, he insists that we pay attention to the opening lines (or scenes) of Shakespearian drama, as, in a sense, they contain the whole play. Intriguingly, like Nuttall (given that both scholars generally follow a formalist procedure), Burke finds himself obliged to posit a Shakespeare who remembered ideas, in the Platonic sense, rather than learned them. Burke, moreover, sees Shakespeare as translating the religious into the aesthetic, with the usual emphasis on the major tragedies that invariably accompanies this assertion. The aesthetic of course cannot give adequate meaning to a tragic universe. Thus, overwhelmed by a perception that words threatened to become mere 'words, words, words', Shakespeare botched *Hamlet* (p. 50). In his essay on *Othello*, however, Burke anticipates the return of historicism by asking the excellent question: why, at this time, does this play deal with the particular tension arising from a sense of one's wife as one's possession? Burke reads this tension against the transition from feudalism to capitalist nation-state, noting the probable relevance of enclosure acts. Hence, the significance of Desdemona being strangled—the fear of communal possession leading the jealous 'owner' to destroy the thing or person he seeks to profit from or claims to love. Similarly, Burke reads *Antony and Cleopatra* as demonstrating that 'love is in essence an empire'. Love becomes greater, the greater its territory. Shakespeare thus converts his spectators (who all 'own some shares in love') into budding empire-builders (p. 115). I could continue at length, but the wealth of insight embarrasses selection. Suffice to say, this collection would be a valuable addition to any library of Shakespeare criticism.

Ehsan Azari, in the introduction to *Lacan and the Destiny of Literature: Desire, Jouissance and the Sinthome in Shakespeare, Donne, Joyce and Ashbery*, observes that Lacan's theories, being often inadequately understood, are frequently misapplied in literary criticism. His book, therefore, is divided into

two sections, the first providing a comprehensive exposition of Lacanian theory, including its later formulations, the second offering examples of that theory being applied to works of literature. For those of us who struggle with some of the more complicated reaches of Lacan's thought, Azari's first section is obviously useful. Indeed, Azari admits that certain aspects of Lacanian theory remain obscure to him. However, Azari believes it is worthwhile getting to grips with Lacan, as his theories may, for instance, serve to deconstruct deconstructivism (i.e. manage to explain what deconstruction leaves as rubble in its wake). Azari maintains, moreover, that unlike Freudianism, the application of Lacan's theories does not commit the scholar to predetermined readings. I would object here that this precisely is one problem with Lacanian theory. It may not seek to impose the Freudian Oedipal model onto literary texts, but it does necessarily impose its presupposition that desire is always an expression of lack. I was hoping to see Azari tackle this problem, perhaps by acknowledging, say, the formidable attack made upon Freud and Lacan in Deleuze and Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus*, but for Azari, apparently, Lacan is right, desire equals lack, and that is that. Thus, literary texts may be read as illustrations of this theory. Nonetheless, Azari does address other challenges to Lacan, notably feminist charges made by Irigaray and Cixous. Scholars interested in these debates will find useful discussion in the book's second chapter. Chapter 5 discusses Shakespeare's 'theatre of desire', focusing on *Hamlet* as an articulation of male desire, and on *Coriolanus*, *Macbeth* and *The Merchant of Venice* as articulations of female desire. Azari applies Lacan's theories in an orthodox manner, incorporating the later ideas. This results in Azari arguing, for example, that, since we no longer desire an object once we attain it, when Ophelia is in reach of Prince Hamlet, 'he sends her to a convent to become a nun' (p. 12). Whatever the merits of this reading, it may be seen that Azari is applying psychoanalytical theory to the character of Prince Hamlet as though he were self-evidently an individual. Kenneth Burke's observation that Shakespeare's characters are not so much individuals as particles of ideas in action might offer an appropriate basis for proposing that it could be theoretically sounder to apply Lacanian psychoanalytical concepts to plays as a whole. Notwithstanding this, Azari's readings are multi-faceted and complex, so any reader with fewer qualms about the fundamental Lacanian model than myself is sure to find his book useful.

The *Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Popular Culture*, states editor Robert Shaughnessy, is not only concerned with contemporary manifestations but also features a broader historical assessment of the interactions between Shakespeare's texts and 'popular culture'. Consequently, several of the volume's essays offer chronological accounts of ways in which Shakespeare and his texts have been recycled and referenced in different media: in popular music, in digital formats, upon Stratford theatre playbills and posters. Often it is debatable how far these essays treat of popular culture rather than, say, middle-brow manifestations. For example, Peter Holland in 'Shakespeare Abbreviated' provides an excellent account of abbreviated versions of Shakespeare plays, reading them as 'deliberate intervention[s] in a history of cultural reception that negotiates concepts of high/low and popular/elite cultural formations' (p. 28). The 'popular' aspect of this formulation holds

good, however, only for pre-cinema eras. Be that as it may, the coverage of illegal performances of versions of Shakespeare plays, such as the Interregnum 'drolls', is especially welcome (pp. 33 ff.). Holland also describes Robert Elliston's 1809 staging of a balletic/quasi-operatic *Macbeth*. Only two theatre companies were allowed to perform spoken drama at the time, so the adaptation replaced spoken dialogue with mime and singing. Likewise, Pavel Kohout's 1977 abbreviated version of *Macbeth* 'was a response to legal restrictions, in Soviet-controlled Prague in 1977'. Unable to perform in theatres, Kohout's cast of five performed 'Living Room Theatre' (p. 40). Holland includes discussion of the Reduced Shakespeare Company's *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (Abridged)*. Needing to represent Ophelia economically, the cast invite sections of the audience to play the 'roles' of Ophelia's 'id', 'ego' etc—a hint perhaps of some fundamental link between audience participation and psychomachy (p. 42)? As mentioned, I am not sure how 'popular' this really is. This version of Shakespeare was debuted at the Edinburgh Festival and in the 'To be or not to be' speech, 'Hamlet' worries about having to 'make guacamole for twelve' (p. 43). In any case, Holland also mentions a wonderful-sounding 1987 production of *Hamlet* by the Cambridge Educational Theatre in which 'every actor played each "character" . . . denying narrative and creating non-linear theatre' (p. 42). In the following essay, 'Shakespearean Stars: Stagings of Desire', Barbara Hodgdon investigates how the concept of stardom has been configured at different cultural moments by describing contemporary responses to famous Shakespearian actors from Burbage onwards. She claims that 'the notion of stardom is alien to early modern thinking' but refutes herself somewhat by pointing out the 'social significance' of clowns such as Tarlton and Kempe (p. 48). Stephen Orgel in 'Shakespeare Illustrated' performs close readings of illustrations of Shakespeare texts, paying particular attention to Rowe's 1709 edition, in which each play had a frontispiece illustration. He stresses the oddity of the omission of illustrations from earlier English publications of dramatic texts, for their continental equivalents had been illustrated during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Laurie Osborne's essay 'Narration and Staging in *Hamlet* and its Afternovels' uses *Hamlet* as a vehicle for exploring how the concept of narrativity relates to popular assimilation(s) of Shakespeare. Osborne is interested in the 'competition between narration and action, between telling a story and staging it' (p. 117). Thus, she observes that 'Old Hamlet's story is a counter-narrative from the start, challenging the current report of his death' (pp. 117–18). Noting how Gertrude's seemingly eyewitness description of Ophelia's death raises the question of why the queen did not intervene, Osborne concludes that things narrated are always doubtful. Consequently, there is always room for further tellings, and licence for simplification or alteration to make things more comprehensible to people who were not present. In conclusion, Osborne argues that, by turning Shakespeare into new fiction, 'popular novelists rework Shakespeare's own creative process' (p. 128). Emma Smith's contribution, 'Shakespeare Serialized: *An Age of Kings*', ponders whether Shakespeare was in fact an author of serialized cliff-hangers. Smith analyses the 1960 BBC serial *An Age of Kings*, stressing the importance of structure for the reception of



Shakespeare's plays. The series-makers' decision to cut each featured play into two episodes created new emphases, implying in turn of course that the plays themselves had been conceived within modifying structures. In a presentist vein, Smith suggests that the articulations made available by such approaches (i.e. comparing modern serialized modes with Shakespearian drama) may serve 'to challenge the hegemony of historicism' (p. 147). Finally, investigating radio Shakespeare in 'Shakespeare Overheard: Performances, Adaptations, and Citations on Radio', Susanne Greenhalgh demonstrates how the maximum suggestiveness of the radio medium offers incitement to engage in the kind of imaginary activity that the Prologue in *Henry V* calls upon the audience to perform.

In *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor*, Sonia Massai pursues connections between the first committed publishers of English commercial drama (John and William Rastell) and the humanist project of Sir Thomas More. More required a high level of accuracy in the printing of his works, on a par with standards developed on the continent in preparing reliable editions of classical texts. However, unlike his opponent Tyndale, More allowed that his text might contain errors and, therefore, careful readers could function as agents of necessary correction—editors after the fact. As Massai shows, More's English printer of preference, William Rastell, applied the same high standards to the printing of commercial drama. This humanist combination of a commitment to accuracy and submission to correction by readers came, in due course, to inform the publication of Shakespeare's quartos (and the Folios). Thus, Massai contends, when scholars regard Nicholas Rowe as the first 'proper' editor of Shakespeare, dismissing earlier 'editions' as products of a process of decay, they do so because (like Rowe) they wish to retain potential access to an authorial text. Massai does not rule out authorial agency in the preparation of early modern quartos, but, given her findings concerning the Rastells et al., insists that readers' annotations were commonly incorporated by publishers within subsequent editions of a printed play, those publishers being keen to advertise their wares as 'perfected' editions. By comparing variant readings in extant multiple edition quartos, Massai demonstrates that neither composers nor *theatrical* annotators are likely to have been responsible for such variants. Thus, early modern editing appears to have been a collective process, carried out by publishers working in tandem with a community of careful readers. The use of the term 'perfected', moreover, turns out to be strategic. With reference to printing, 'to perfect' had two meanings in the period: 'to correct' and 'to complete'. Massai shows that publishers and authors took full advantage of the slippage between these significations. If their works contained mistakes (either formal errors or offensive matter) then these were the results of human fallibility. Therefore, sensitive correction (rather than punishment) was called for, with appropriate changes to be incorporated in subsequent editions. In her conclusion, Massai considers the implications of her findings for current editorial practice, pointing out flaws with both the copy-text and the facsimile approaches to producing editions of early modern plays.

Laura Shamas's *We Three: The Mythology of Shakespeare's Weird Sisters* opens with a concise, detailed account of the stage history of the 'Weird Sisters' from *Macbeth*, including the useful reminder that the only extant

contemporary description of their on-stage appearance comes from the diarist and astrologer Simon Forman, who refers to them as 'nymphs and fairies' (p. 2). This provides Shamas with a solid base for launching her investigation into what Shakespeare was up to in presenting these ambiguous figures to James I. Shamas pays close attention to probable sources for Shakespeare's depiction of the witches, including Holinshed's *Chronicles*, 'The Original Chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun' (c.1420) and Matthew Gwinn's *Tres Sibyllae* (performed 1605). Shamas also considers the mythological background of female triads at length and discusses the witch as a scapegoat-figure.

Nina Taunton's *Fictions of Old Age in Early Modern Literature and Culture* examines the contradiction between (classical-influenced) Renaissance prescriptive literature's praise of old age and customary fictional representations of the negative aspects of that condition. In addition, the book explores paradoxical attitudes to gender with regard to the pros and cons of old age. In the opening chapter, Taunton argues that, in *The Comedy of Errors*, Shakespeare transforms classical material in order to show that age is 'as much a state of mind as an inevitable condition defined by chronology' (p. 13). Chapter 2 investigates the notion that 'the old have a moral responsibility to prepare the young spiritually and temporally', noting that this issue 'becomes increasingly complex and ambivalent as it migrates... from prescriptive to imaginative writing' (pp. 35, 37). Thus, respect for age belongs to the ideal world, but inheritance issues generate uncertainty which finds expression in more 'realistic' scenarios. Accordingly, plays such as *The Merchant of Venice* and *King Lear*, by focusing on inter-generational relationships, manage to register debates derived from the world of realpolitik upon a dramatically engaging domestic scale. Taunton's discussion of *Lear* is particularly suggestive, as she interrogates the period's anxieties about inheritance and demonstrates the growing early modern conviction that testaments require written forms to secure their observation. *Lear*'s vain need for, and naive commitment to, old-fashioned spoken avowals of love and loyalty lead him to undermine the commonwealth, losing all claim to respect for his age, wisdom and (former) sovereignty in the process. By failing to realize the extent to which his identity was bound up with his role as king, he exposes his newly naked self to ingratitude and loss. Hence, 'old' *Lear* emerges as equivalent to 'the poor'. It becomes clear from the book's analysis that Shakespeare used terms such as young/old and rich/poor as dialectical categories. For example, in *All's Well*, as Taunton notes, the positive qualities of old age are projected onto Helena, so that she emerges as metaphorically 'old' and wise. However, Taunton focuses on the material implications of such poetic treatments by contrasting them with prescriptive texts. At times, this approach results in a feeling of mismatch between the imaginative and non-fictional categories. On the other hand, since it is obviously impossible to separate these categories, Taunton's rigorously materialist approach yields a rich sociocultural analysis of early modern attitudes to old age. Nonetheless, Taunton herself registers this categorical difference in her concluding observation that prescriptive manuals seem to be more obdurate in their positions whereas drama

(by Shakespeare, Middleton, Ford et al.) offers scope for the presentation of plural voices, occasioning a complex play of meaning.

In *Sacramental Poetics at the Dawn of Secularism: When God Left the World*, Regina Mary Schwartz argues that after Reformers rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation '[a]spects of the Eucharist began showing up in the poetry of the Reformation, albeit in completely unorthodox ways' (pp. 7–8). Both poetry and the sacrament of the Eucharist, notes Schwartz, are engaged in making present what is absent. Therefore, a sacramental notion of poetry entails that a reader/spectator is not just a passive recipient of a poem or play but is changed by his or her encounter with it. Furthermore, although Reformers insisted that the Mass only commemorates Christ's sacrifice, 'Shakespeare is clearly preoccupied with representing the *sacrifice* of the Eucharist'. Consequently, Schwartz sees *Othello* as a version of a priest sacrificing at the altar. Thus, the tragedy 'draws a troubling relation between murder and sacrifice' (p. 17). Schwartz devotes a chapter to *Othello*, noting, however, that Shakespeare's plays generally acknowledge a desire for redemption which the secular theatre cannot satisfy. In stating that '[t]he theatre cannot *do* anything to other humans', though, Schwartz seems to contradict her earlier assertion of the transformational power of a sacramental poetics. Nonetheless, Schwartz then makes the excellent point that it was the Reformers' very insistence upon the illusionism of the Catholic Mass which 'brought the Mass closer to the theatre'. If, therefore, the theatre successfully offered a cleansing and affecting ritual, without engaging in actual sacrifice, perhaps it became 'the first truly Reformed church' (p. 42). Moreover, as Schwartz deftly argues, if *Othello*'s killing of Desdemona is regarded as murder, it becomes emptied of significance—pointless slaughter. The audience, however, is encouraged to reinvest Desdemona's death with ritual meaning and regard it as an efficacious sacrifice. Hence the play insists upon Desdemona's purity, and gives prominence to her final forgiveness of *Othello*.

Rather than presume that early modern literature expresses any 'spirit of the age' in the use of archaeological themes, Philip Schwyzer, in *Archaeologies of English Renaissance Literature*, contends that archaeological concepts appear in specific alignments with political, religious and cultural crises; tracing these links allows us to interrogate the relationship between the past and the present. Thus, the book's third chapter considers how monastic ruins manifest in Elizabethan literary texts. For Schwyzer, such ruins figure doubleness. Elizabethan poetic descriptions of them are common but also stereotypical and imprecise. The resulting combination of declared emotional effect and optical disconnection results in ambiguity whenever monastic ruins feature in plays and poems. Schwyzer, moreover, finds an analogue to this doubleness in the figure of Aaron the Moor in *Titus Andronicus*: Aaron is a gleeful murderer but also a devoted parent. Therefore it is significant that Aaron is found cradling his son 'behind a crumbling monastic wall' (p. 101). Sonnet 73 ('Bare ruined choirs') also comes up for inspection in this context. Again there is doubleness in the treatment: the sonnet represents the monasteries' dissolution as analogous to a natural phenomenon (a tree's annual loss of leaves), but, while we know that spring will come again, how can the monasteries ever be restored? Schwyzer compares the sonnet to Maarten van Heemskerck's

painting *Self-Portrait, with the Colosseum Behind* [1553]. The middle ground of this work is said to show the artist's younger self, busily painting the monument, while the artist's bearded, mature self stands in the foreground and stares out at the viewer. 'The ruin stands between Heemskerck's two selves' (p. 104). By means of this comparison, Schwyzer effectively demonstrates the exploded representation of time in Shakespeare's sonnet. Chapter 4, meanwhile, reads the poem inscribed upon Shakespeare's burial monument ('Good friend, for Jesus' sake forbear . . .') as much less conventional than is usually claimed. Epitaphs written after the prohibition—during Edward VI's reign—of prayers for the dead 'rarely exhort the living to do anything for Jesus's sake' (pp. 117–18). On the other hand, the use of the verb 'forebear' actually reverses Catholic assumptions: the poem asks the reader *not* to do something. With this ambivalence in mind, Schwyzer goes on to discuss the significance of private family crypts in *Titus Andronicus* and *Romeo and Juliet*. He also seeks to contrast Shakespeare's apparent aversion to the promiscuous mingling of bodies after death with John Donne's declared appetite for it. This approach works well with regard to Shakespeare's tomb inscription, but Schwyzer then reads *Hamlet* in the light of this distinction, treating Prince Hamlet's views as equivalent to Shakespeare's own. Schwyzer thus argues for a Shakespeare who valued privacy, in this life and in the grave.

Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern's *Shakespeare in Parts* proposes looking at early modern actors' parts (portions of playscripts provided to individual actors containing all their character's dialogue) as a new way of approaching Shakespeare's plays, arguing that doing so will enable scholars to move away from the Romantic conception of the author as commanding genius. The book is divided into four sections, examining the history of the 'part'; the function of cues (lines which actors had to listen out for as signals for their next utterance); Shakespeare's use of premature and repeated cues; and directions for acting contained within dialogue. In section I, following analysis of the only extant English professional theatre part (Orlando from Green's *Orlando Furioso*), Palfrey and Stern explain that early modern playwrights designed parts for particular actors. Since there were no directors, the argument runs, casting was carried out within the writer's mind while he wrote. During a useful discussion of ways in which adult actors instructed boy performers, Palfrey and Stern stress how disastrous the closure of the theatres during the Interregnum appeared to the actors, removing as it did the practical need for the passing on of valuable acting skills. Explaining the function of cues, Palfrey and Stern claim that Shakespeare includes many repeated cues in his texts in order to generate surprises. The actor listening for his cue could be tricked into speaking at the wrong moment by treating the first appearance of a particular word or phrase as his cue to speak, when in fact, a subsequent repetition of that word or phrase was the proper cue. Examples of this technique 'invariably coincide with moments of decision for the character'. Thus, 'the score is subjected to . . . jazz-like peril' (p. 78). To the objection that such 'surprises' would only occur in rehearsal, Palfrey and Stern insist that whole-cast rehearsals were rare. In any case, the generation of surprise in early recitals provided the actor with hints for spontaneous-seeming performance.

Palfrey and Stern also claim that Shakespeare's use of cues in general was often meaningful and is a neglected area in interpretative studies.

Rebecca Steinberger's study, *Shakespeare and Twentieth-Century Irish Drama: Conceptualizing Identity and Staging Boundaries*, begins with a familiar proposition: Shakespeare gives a voice to the Other in his works (here it is the Irish Other). The book's opening chapter thus contrasts Shakespeare's ambivalent representation of the Irish in *Richard II* and *Henry V* to what Steinberger sees as Spenser's more univocal position in his *A View of the Present State of Ireland*. The chapter does, however, contain some factual errors: Steinberger wrongly states that *A View* was published (as opposed to probably written) in 1596, and refers to it as a 'state-supported' text (p. 5). However, chapter 2 reveals that the preceding section is best read as a necessary preliminary to the book's main focus: modern Irish drama's appropriation of Shakespeare, and the concomitant facilitation of Irish dramatists' escape from binary models. Steinberger discusses plays by Synge and O'Casey, making an interesting comparison between the Abbey Theatre and the Globe. In particular, Steinberger notes that Synge shared with Shakespeare the ability to juxtapose the comic and the tragic, a skill Steinberger maintains had been lost to the English-speaking stage for over two centuries. Furthermore, Steinberger compares the anti-clericalism she finds in *2 Henry IV* with O'Casey's anti-clerical discourse, observing that both dramatists wrote against a backdrop of exhortations to martyrdom uttered by charismatic figures. Thus, the Irish activist Padraic Pearse's demagoguery is discussed in relation to Henry V's 'band of brothers' speech. The book's third and final chapter focuses on the activities of the Field Day Theatre Company (formed in 1980) in Northern Ireland. The company's board of directors was selected to form a 50:50 balance of Protestants and Catholics. Nonetheless, its activities were not apolitical, but 'polypolitical' (p. 68). Field Day, notes Steinberger, set out to 'invent . . . an audience'. If nationalism 'invents nations where they don't exist', then it follows that the theatre can fashion its own audiences (p. 71). Field Day was also associated with polemical pamphlet production (three publications every six months). Here is much scope for presentist exploration. One wonders if Shakespeare's company operated in comparable ways.

Jane K. Brown begins her ambitious volume, *The Persistence of Allegory: Drama and Neoclassicism from Shakespeare to Wagner*, with a forthright statement: 'Between the cultural materialism of much recent scholarship in the English Renaissance and the rear guard of those who consider Shakespeare above all a dramatist of character . . . there is little space left for those who see a plurality of discourses operating in the plays' (p. 3). As might be expected, Brown's book seeks to occupy and expand that 'little space'. One of the strengths of Brown's approach is her perception that mimesis is not the opposite but rather the ground of allegory. For Brown, allegory is 'a mode of perception which renders the supernatural visible, by mimesis, a mode which imitates the natural' (p. 5). The discovery of perspective in the visual arts, argues Brown, meant that visual images became more 'realistic', without programmatically jettisoning their allegorical qualities, and, therefore, literary fictions had to keep up. Nonetheless, as a result of the secularization of

European culture, and the rise of empiricism, the allegorical basis of mimesis began to be devalued or ignored. Allegory (as the ground of mimesis) inevitably persisted, but without always being recognized. With regard to the development of English drama in particular, Brown insists on the importance of distinguishing between the mystery and morality traditions: mystery plays tended to relate centrally to the Passion, 'by typological reference if not directly' (p. 49), whereas morality plays, being more homiletic, are analogous to sermons. Brown also traces the development of pastoral drama from Poliziano to Shakespeare via Guarini and Tasso. This recovery of Shakespeare's allegorical heritage enables Brown to argue that modern scholarly perceptions of 'implausibility' in Shakespeare's works arise from 'the assumption that [a given] play's Gestalt is determined by its mimesis of human actions; if, however [the play is] understood as an experiment in blending dramaturgies, the problems become opportunities to examine the interaction of Aristotelian, Platonist and morality modes to create a more sophisticated allegorical dramaturgy' (p. 67). Brown then applies this insight, offering credible readings of *King John*, *Julius Caesar* and *Twelfth Night*. Brown's knowledge of classical texts stands her in good stead here. For instance, with regard to her discussion of *Twelfth Night* as a sophisticated variation upon the conventions of the morality play's representations of Vices and Virtues, Brown points out that disguise is not typical of Latin comedy, but has its origins as a dramatic device in the morality tradition, where it sustains a Vice's trickery. The transplantation of disguise to a neoclassical context in itself serves to foreground the device (such foregrounding is a common signal of allegorization). Moreover, 'Viola turns the disguise tradition inside out, since she is a rescuing Virtue not a Vice' (p. 99). From this it may be inferred that virtue must be disguised in some historical contexts (committed to a formalist approach, Brown does not explore the historical implications of her arguments in detail). Brown also provides a confessedly schematic run-through of the major tragedies, mapping a particular cardinal sin onto each. Subsequently, in a chapter on the illusionist stage, Brown makes the significant point that the development of a perspectivist stage during the seventeenth century had more to do with the installation of 'realism' as the governing dramatic mode than the sophistication of Shakespeare's powers of characterization. For, with a perspectival arrangement, 'stage actions "begin necessarily to take on the quality of empirical data"' (p. 17; quoting Stephen Orgel's *The Complete Masques of Ben Jonson*, p. 28). Moreover, the fact that the perspectival stage was first used for emphatically allegorical masques offers impressive support for Brown's case that allegory is the engine of mimetic development.

*Power and Imagination: Studies in Politics and Literature* by Leonidas Donskis has its peculiarities. It lacks an outline of structure (the general editor of the New Studies in Aesthetics series to which the book belongs feels obliged to provide a schematic outline in a foreword). In addition, the declared thesis—literature often says as much, if not more, about forms of power and authority than do works of political philosophy—is one which probably few readers would care to contest. At the same time, statements are made in the course of chapter 1 which lack adequate support, and so might themselves function better as thesis statements. For example, on pages

2–3 Donskis says: ‘If we consider love and friendship to be the primary forms and expressions of a modern society . . . then we will have to acknowledge that Shakespeare reveals the birth of the modern person.’ That seems a big ‘if’ and Donskis has not shown that ‘love and friendship’ were not well represented in earlier literature. This quotation also provides an example of Donskis’s apparently bullying tone (‘we will have to’). The reason I start with all this negativity, though, is to get it out of the way, for by the end of the book I was convinced of the profundity of Donskis’s arguments. Thus, I feel inclined to attribute the organizational and stylistic problems to cultural differences and limitations on Donskis’s management of tone in English (he is Lithuanian). It is only fair, though, to warn the prospective reader that Donskis’s book is not an easy one for the academic to use, accustomed as we are to be led by the hand through complex arguments. Donskis begins by pointing out that Machiavelli’s comedy *Mandragola* (written in 1518) does basically the same political work as *The Prince*. Therefore it is clear that early modern literary works have a serious political dimension. After an excellent chapter on Vico, Donskis compares and contrasts the representation of love and friendship in *Don Quixote* and *Romeo and Juliet*. In *Romeo and Juliet*, in Donskis’s view, ‘a fundamental conflict takes place between the premodern and modern mentalities’ (p. 51). Basically, the play represents the dawning of the modern age when people will choose their own loves and friends, thus rejecting tribal obligations which result in blood-feuds and maintain the traditional hierarchy. *Don Quixote*, likewise, takes place against a seismic shift in cultures—from the feudal to the modern. Thus it is all the more telling that, whereas Shakespeare seems able to imagine mutually satisfying friendships as existing only between social equals, Don Quixote and Sancho Panza develop a profound friendship by the end of Cervantes’ novel. Donskis also compares Don Quixote to Prince Hamlet, finding that both characters belong to ‘a transitional period in which the values and ideas of a previous age had stopped operating, but in which [reliable] new ones . . . had yet to appear’ (p. 46). The chapter then concludes with an apparent about-turn, endorsing Louis Dumont’s positive valorization of hierarchy. According to Dumont, hierarchy ‘is precisely what allows the creation of bonds between people, because any social whole is prior to a disconnected individual who is a typical modern invention’ (p. 67). Of course, it is not an about-turn at all. Rather, Donskis here completes the dialectical framework behind the statement from the book’s opening which I had (wrongly) read as coercive (rather than as contingent on the argument that was to follow).

In *Shakespeare Films in the Making: Vision, Production and Reception*, Russell Jackson focuses on the complexities of film-making processes, with regard to three distinct kinds of Shakespearian film. Chapter 1 provides an exhaustively researched account of the Warner Brothers studio’s attempt to acquire cultural prestige by making *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* [1935] with director Max Reinhardt. The second chapter sites Olivier’s *Henry V* [1944] firmly in its wartime milieu, examining Anglo-American behind-the-scenes politics. Jackson also supplies detailed analyses of other wartime films in order further to contextualize Olivier’s labours. In addition, Jackson demonstrates how Olivier’s use of elaborate framing devices exploited the metatheatricity

of Shakespeare's play. This approach enabled Olivier to 'side-step the debates of the 1930s about the compatibility of Shakespearean drama and the cinema' (p. 71). As a result of Olivier's manoeuvre, Jackson suggests, the viewer's imagination deals with the unrealities of film in a manner analogous to (but also quite different from) the way in which the Globe audiences' imaginations pieced out the bare stage. The final chapter investigates representations of Renaissance Italy in three film versions of *Romeo and Juliet*.

Shakespeare Now is a series of 'minigraphs', i.e. short works attempting to bridge the gap between general readers and specialized studies. Three volumes from the series are up for consideration. Eric S. Malin's *Godless Shakespeare* argues that Shakespeare explores and endorses an atheistic viewpoint in his works. Malin opens with the assertion that Shakespeare's 'faith or spiritual inclinations cannot be predicted or bound by the religious habits of thought endemic to much of his culture' (p. 3). The potential hazards of such a disregard for cultural context, however, are evidenced by a lack of subtlety in Malin's readings. Discussing the speech in *Romeo and Juliet* where Juliet asks 'gentle night' to cut Romeo into pieces and make stars of him to inspire worship, for example, Malin feels it is surprising that 'for a girl with a good religious education' her lines 'have nothing of Christianity about them'. This is well observed, but Malin then claims that Juliet thus 'takes surprisingly little account of divinity', her speech being 'innocently pagan' (p. 8). Yet a pagan speech *does* take account of divinity: it projects it upon or finds it immanent in nature. Another distracting feature of the book is Malin's habit of referring to 'believers' as 'unthinking' (p. 23). This attitude posits 'believer' and 'non-believer' as fixed categories in a way that ignores the function of doubt in early modern religious thought.

Philip Davis's *Shakespeare Thinking* represents a more positive expression of the series' aims. If we have lost the way of thinking common to Shakespeare's period, Davis argues, then there is 'a license for help wherever we can get it, in the alternative and less orthodox histories of human thinking' (p. 2). The first of the book's three sections is a historical survey of process-based ways of thinking, using Hazlitt, Carlyle, Montaigne, Goethe and Pico de Mirandola as reference points. In the middle chapter Davis offers readings of particular Shakespearian passages, suggesting that they show Shakespeare's unorthodox habits of thought in action, where any grammatical part of speech may be called upon to perform the function of a different one (such as prepositions taking the place of verbs). One weakness here is that the author never explains why he is using Shakespeare to illustrate his case, and not, say, Marlowe or anyone else. In chapter 3, Davis discusses Edwin A. Abbot's work, especially his *Shakespearean Grammar*, noting Abbot's argument that the loss of inflectional endings in the Middle Ages liberated and empowered Shakespeare. Abbot claimed that, though no longer represented, the converting power of inflection was retained in early modern English. This all fits with Davis's invigorating notion of a non-human 'it' as a conspicuous presence in Shakespeare's works: a '3rd thing'—the space between characters and words. By way of conclusion, Davis describes an ongoing project at the University of Liverpool. The brains of willing students are monitored as they are read items of language. Davis admits that there is little point reading



passages of Shakespeare to these subjects yet, but the observers are trying to analyse what happens in the brain when it is offered, for example, a noun being used as a verb. Commendably, Davis is out to champion the positive aspects of what other observers might consider to be anomalous thinking, with Shakespeare as his major ca[n]non. He even argues that, by revealing the extent of literature's capacity to act upon the brain, his team at Liverpool could help to put literary criticism back 'at the forefront of human critical thinking' (p. 91).

A third volume in this series, *Shakespeare's Double Helix*, by Henry S. Turner, presents two essays: one, focusing on hybrid forms in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, occupies the book's left-hand pages; the other essay, on the right-hand pages, argues that modern science is a new form of radical mimesis, and thus the rightful humanistic heir to early modern poetry. In the left-hand essay, Turner suggests that theatres replaced monasteries as machines for fabricating truths, prior to the construction of the first scientific laboratories. He also suggests that early modern anti-theatricalists feared that theatres were constructing 'a monstrous man-woman' (p. 10). These are juicy statements and invite further development. Turner's close reading of Shakespearian passages is sometimes less impressive, though. For example, he offers a stretched reading of Titania's speech on eco-breakdown, arguing that the described natural disasters lack a stated cause—this despite the fact that Titania identifies the cause of the bad weather as her ongoing debate with Oberon. Also, Turner sometimes gets carried away using scientific jargon; for instance, Helena is described as a cyborg because her heart is 'true as steel' (p. 96). A more focused use of a scientific concept occurs when Turner suggests that metaphors are akin to genetic modification (a topic Shakespeare, with his interest in the science of grafting, would probably have been intrigued by). Another quibble is that Turner equates Shakespeare's anti-poetic Theseus with church and state as a totality. A probable motive for this reductive attitude becomes apparent in the closing remarks of the left-hand essay, 'Theseus occupies the White House' (p. 108). There is a danger that modern arguments are being too casually mapped onto early modern culture here. The book's right-hand essay, however, makes a very strong case for modern science as a form of radical mimesis, continuing thereby the early modern humanist project. Turner argues this case eloquently, yet it remains doubtful whether the rank and file of scientists *really* view what they do in such a manner. The amusing example he gives of science creating by naming in fact works against his argument. Scientists, he reveals, have labelled two new fibroblast growth factor genes in *Drosophila*, the common fruit fly, 'Pyramus' and 'Thisbe' because they govern the development of cardiac tissue (p. 21). I take the point that poetry and science have here interacted, but surely the poetic language is being used descriptively. The genes were causing heart failure before they were named. More seriously, Turner fails to mention that in the modern corporate science world, new names get patented and make their authors a lot of money. To claim, therefore, that scientific acts of description are really acts of creation may easily be put to service in the corporate science world. Indeed, one wonders if Shakespeare is not being recruited as a potential PR man here. Turner's book also has a tendency to contradict itself in rather queasy

territory. For example, Turner stresses at one point that the human species should not 'retain a monopoly on . . . dignity' (p. 103). Just a few pages earlier, however, he had waxed lyrical regarding the modern genetic experiments being conducted on laboratory animals, such as the growing of human ears 'on the backs of mice for use in plastic surgery' (p. 99). Admittedly, Turner seems aware of this contradiction, seeing the need for the category 'human' as merely 'contingent' (p. 101). Despite my qualms in this area, I was fully convinced of the importance of the issues Turner raises. Thus, I would emphasize that this book certainly fulfils the stated aims of the series, engaging one's interest in perhaps unfamiliar spheres of specialist research. It should also be noted that the book concludes with a highly readable and wide-ranging bibliographical mini-essay.

In the following section, which discusses journal articles, I have generally omitted pieces offering readings of a single text. Rather, I summarize articles seeming to contain broader implications for the current understanding of Shakespeare's works.

In 'Finding *Cardenio*' (*ELH* 74[2007] 957–87), Howard Marchitello compares the cultural function of the lost Shakespeare and Fletcher play *Cardenio* to that of a funeral monument, i.e. a structure which fails to contain its nominal occupant. In short, the *Cardenio* concept is an occasionally manifesting ghost haunting the official canon, in that the play represented by that title continues to be lost only to be found again. Accordingly, Marchitello contends that Theobald's *Double Falsehood* (published 1728) was indeed based, as its editor/adaptor claimed, on Shakespeare-authored manuscripts of *Cardenio*. Pursuing links between textual and familial legitimacy, the article also finds in *Hamlet* expressions of the prince's anxiety with regard to his begetting. According to this reading, Hamlet is Claudius's bastard. Since *Double Falsehood* is often viewed as an illegitimate copy of the lost *Cardenio*, and yet (at the time of writing) is about to appear as an Arden edition, Marchitello's essay can be said to achieve its ambitious aim of demonstrating that the story of *Cardenio*-as-textual-ghost is intimately linked to the story of Shakespeare-as-author.

Also concerned with canon-formation is Stephen Orgel's 'The Desire and Pursuit of the Whole' (*SQ* 58[2007] 290–310). Orgel diagnoses the modern obsession with completeness with regard to Shakespeare's canon, in the case of both individual works and collected editions. Arguing against the excessive desire for integral artefacts, Orgel points out that the pains taken by Shakespeare's texts to declare their state of incompleteness are at least equal to those taken by modern editors to 'repair' perceived omissions. The article maintains that the drive for completion has manifested itself differently at different times. Thus, Magna Carta scenes were sometimes added to *King John* in the nineteenth century because, according to history, they really *should* be there. This is certainly a healthy reminder that modern editors are probably engaged in analogous distortions when they emend Shakespeare's text in line with what they suppose should be present. Orgel also recalls Garrick's wearing of a pneumatic wig as Prince Hamlet so that his hair could stand on end upon seeing the ghost. Orgel claims that this is a symptom of the desire to expand on the text to imply a fuller psychological life for the characters. Here the

argument threatens to become a little dogmatic, for surely all playscripts are recipes for 'fuller' performances, always with the proviso that each performance is not an attempt at completion but the enactment of one version in an endless series of possible interpretations. Pursuit of difference is not the same as pursuit of the whole. That said, Orgel's main argument is sound: completion is a self-defeating goal, the pursuit of which may obscure our view of the material texts as we have them.

In 'Canonizing Shakespeare: *The Passionate Pilgrim, England's Helicon* and the Question of Authenticity' (*ShS* 60[2007] 252–67), James P. Bednarz reprises arguments in defence of William Jaggard, the publisher of *The Passionate Pilgrim* [1599]. However, Bednarz differs from previous defenders of Jaggard, such as Joseph Loewenstein, who suggested that the name 'Shakespeare' functioned as a generic marker for high-quality poetry and that Jaggard was, therefore, only describing his product (*Pilgrim*) in good faith, in claiming (falsely) it was all written by Shakespeare. Bednarz points out that no other writer's name was used in this fashion in the period. Nevertheless, the article then recounts how Nicholas Ling (assumed to be the main editor of *England's Helicon*) reprinted four of the poems from Jaggard's 1599 collection but either reattributed them or left them anonymous. What emerges from Bednarz's analysis is that, whatever Shakespeare felt about all this, the editors involved were striving to publicize a Shakespeare of their own. For example, the poem from *Love's Labour's Lost* which Jaggard had entitled 'On a day' appears in Ling's collection as 'The passionate Shepherds Song'. Ling, moreover, appears to have replaced the word 'lover' in line 7 with 'Shepherd' to 'fit the design of his pastoral collection'. Since Jaggard ended up as one of the principal publishers of the First Folio, it is fair to assume that the contest among Shakespeare's contemporaries to eternize a particular version of the poet-playwright continued with the creation of that volume.

June Schlueter summarizes recent debates as to which Martin Droeshout out of the two likely candidates executed the Folio engraving of Shakespeare, in 'Martin Droeshout *Redivivus*: Reassessing the Folio Engraving of Shakespeare' (*ShS* 60[2007] 237–51). In 1991, Schlueter recalls, Mary Edmond put the case for the older candidate, who is known to have been a painter, while Christiaan Schuckman argued for the younger man. Admitting that she set out to argue on behalf of Edmond, Schlueter concludes by acknowledging that the evidence now suggests the younger Droeshout was indeed the engraver. Schuckman found ten further Droeshout engravings in Madrid, all signed, with four of them labelled as executed in Madrid. There may be an interesting lead here for Shakespeare scholars, with reference to continuing debates as to the mix of confessional allegiances among the people responsible for the publication of the First Folio: the younger Droeshout's earliest (extant) commission in Spain was the coat of arms of a major player in the Spanish Counter-Reformation, Gaspar de Guzmán. Other Spanish Droeshout engravings portray Catholic saints and Counter-Reformation iconography.

Alan D. Lewis, in 'Shakespearean Seductions, or, What's with Harold Bloom as Falstaff?' (*TSL* 49:ii[2007] 125–54) is bothered by Bloom's

agonistic Shakespeare. Bloom, Lewis observes, has argued that alone among authors Shakespeare is untroubled by the anxiety of influence. The Stratford man may have seen Marlowe as a threat but dealt with that by creating Falstaff (who, implausibly, Bloom sees as a version of Marlowe) and then killing him off. One problem with Bloom's approach is that it appears to be 'underwritten by a distinctly Freudian notion of an anxious, melancholic masculinity beset with lack', according to which the mother (or the female) is denied a role in artistic creation (p. 128). Thus, Lewis concludes that Bloom wants a Shakespeare who is 'a self-sending god—free of emasculating literary influence' (p. 138). For his part, Lewis prefers Oscar Wilde's notion of Shakespeare's art as seduction not agon. In fairness to his target, however, Lewis acknowledges that, in *The Anxiety of Influence*, Bloom allows that Shakespeare clearly had extra-poetic influences.

Brian Vickers's article 'Coauthors and Closed Minds' (*ShakS* 36[2008] 101–13) opens with much polemical positioning before settling down to make its point that, while the single-author paradigm is appropriate for classical authors (despite Foucault's claim it is a bourgeois invention) and, not coincidentally, for classicist writers such as Spenser, Milton and Fielding, it does not work for drama written in London between 1579 and 1642. Vickers, here as elsewhere, makes excellent cases for *1 Henry VI*, *Titus Andronicus* and *Pericles* having been extensively co-written. However, one wonders if the majority of scholars really question these findings. Furthermore, there is a big gap between arguing the case for the three plays mentioned, and declaring that all of Shakespeare's plays are typical of Vickers's totalizing model. As said, though, where Vickers argues for specific plays, he makes a very persuasive case. For his thorough analysis of *1 Henry VI* in this regard, see 'Incomplete Shakespeare: Or, Denying Coauthorship in *1 Henry VI*' (*SQ* 58[2007] 311–52).

In 'A Partial Theory of Original Practice' (*ShS* 61[2008] 302–17) Jeremy Lopez discusses issues arising from the growth of the original practices movement over the past twenty years or so. Unusually, he draws upon related websites' promotional material as the best available documents of original practice in action, justifying this by pointing out that critics friendly to original practice tend to be divorced from the activity itself. After noting the (understandable) optimism of the promotional material, he goes on to observe that original practice, on closer scrutiny, turns out not to be about finding out (and repeating) how it was done back then. What is being offered, he infers from the promotional material, is the promise of infinite scholarship, for new historicist scepticism about the possibility of recovering the past is to be imported into theatrical production. More generally, Lopez is concerned that the material reality of theatre itself is being neglected by new historicism, hidden beneath the latter's stylistic elegance: body-text is being turned into literature. Thus, the message of the cited promotional material dismays him in that it suggests the original practices movement is not primarily committed to emphasizing theatre's material reality.

In 'Terms of "Indearment": Lyric and General Economy in Shakespeare and Donne' (*ELH* 75[2008] 241–62), Barbara Connell resists the usual tendency to conflate the term 'economy' with 'restrictive economy', using

Bataille's work on 'general economy', which accommodates the notion of 'unproductive or sacrificial expenditure', as found in gift-giving cultures (p. 241). Bataille saw the break between feudalism and the bourgeois period as related to the decline of the archaic gift economy. However, where Bataille used modernist poetic works as signifiers of general economy, Connell here discusses early modern amatory lyrics: Shakespeare's Sonnet 31 ('Thy bosom is indeared with all hearts') and Donne's Elegy 10 ('Image of her whom I love more than she'). According to Connell, both Shakespeare and Donne use and transform Petrarchan cultural capital; both authors play with discourse in a way that may be read (following Adorno) as resisting the restrictive economy of sonnet conventions. Donne, however, seems more concerned than Shakespeare to resolve conflict and contain uncertainty. Donne's poetry, therefore, is markedly committed to restrictive economy, being obsessed with gauging losses and gains. By contrast, Shakespeare seems more prodigal in his expenditure. Connell includes discussion of *King Lear* in this regard, citing Richard Halpern's argument that the tragedy is concerned with the historical transition from 'Do you love me?' to 'How much?' The play, moreover, throws feudalism over the precipice (squandering it, in effect), in order to reassemble it in a tragic guise.

In 'From Revels to Revelation: Shakespeare and the Mask' (*ShS* 60[2007] 58–71) Janette Dillon protests critical neglect of the Tudor mask. (For the less spectacular Tudor version of this cultural phenomenon, Dillon rejects the 'masque' spelling as a misguided attempt to dignify what has tended to be perceived as a childish entertainment.) Dillon also points out the overlooked importance of Hall as a historical source (albeit often via Holinshed) for our knowledge of early Tudor masking. Scholarly attitudes to the mask of course impinge on Shakespeare studies, given the dramatist's evident commitment to the mask as an enabling device. Dillon discusses relevant aspects of Elizabethan Shakespeare plays: *Richard III*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Titus Andronicus*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Much Ado About Nothing* and *As You Like It*. She then turns to Jacobean works: *Timon of Athens*, *The Winter's Tale* and *Henry VIII*. This division allows for nuanced comparisons to be made between the cultural milieus of the two regimes. With regard to *As You Like It*, Dillon points out, however, that 'the very fact that *As You Like It*... already contains the germ of the later, spectacular form indicates that there can be no absolute separation between "mask" and [Stuart] "masque"' (p. 66).

In 'Protesting Too Much in Shakespeare and Elsewhere, and the Invention/Construction of the Mind' (*ELR* 37:iii[2007] 337–59), Richard Levin looks at characters from Shakespeare's plays (and the works of other dramatists) who seem to protest too much, thus indicating their hypocrisy. Such representations may be read as satirical attacks upon puritanical two-facedness. However, Levin interrogates this at first glance straightforward verdict. Is puritanical Malvolio (one of the over-protesters) actually insincere? Does he not just protest too much for other characters' and, presumably, the audience's taste? Likewise, though Angelo in *Measure for Measure* seems to fit the bill of hypocritical Puritan, Levin notes that he is shown to be surprised by his alteration. Similarly, Romeo and Orsino are portrayed as immature

Petrarchans, but are not depicted as insincere. It turns out that the overwhelming majority of the over-protesters are in earnest. Why, then, do we tend to suspect their honesty? Levin suggests that over-protesting seems insincere because it is usually done for an audience, or by characters seeking to convince themselves while denying natural impulses. The latter aspect indicates a certain amount of divided self-consciousness. Hence, Levin considers whether this representation in Shakespeare's plays of people discovering that they have been fooling themselves does not indicate that, just like us, early modern people had a sense of continuous selfhood. Yet Greenblatt claims, says Levin, that this was unthinkable in the sixteenth century, while Dollimore says it came with the Enlightenment. However, Levin observes, these scholars provide no real evidence. Nonetheless, the *content* of one's over-protesting does derive from the cultural environment. The essay has not finished yet. In order to test Freud's theory of the unconscious, Levin next ponders whether early modern gynophobia might not be equivalent to modern homophobia. That is, where, according to Freudianism, homophobes reveal unconscious anxieties about their own homoerotic impulses, over-protesting early modern gynophobes may likewise really be anxious about their desire for women. Levin declares, however, that he can find no evidence in early modern texts that this is the case (he invites scholars to provide him with possible examples). Given this, Levin concludes that the Freudian unconscious does not really exist, but is rather a 'story we tell ourselves'.

In 'Rereading Shakespeare: The Example of Richard Braithwait' (*ShS* 60[2007] 268–83) Richard Abrams pays close attention to the First Folio preface by Heminge and Condell. The latter authors' reference to 'Friends, whom . . . can bee [readers]' guides if necessary' implies, argues Abrams, that 'Shakespeare's first editors imagined a community of readers helping each other to understand' the Bard's works, something akin, that is, to a Bible-reading group (p. 268). Evidence of Stuart-era Shakespeare reading groups is thin on the ground, so Abrams turns to the writings of the poet Richard Braithwait for inferential support. After a detailed description of his use of Literature Online (LION) to police his allusion-hunting, Abrams embarks on a compelling analysis of Shakespearian allusions in Braithwait's works. For example, Braithwait sets out to 'redeem' Pyramus and Thisbe in 'Loves Labyrinth' [1615], his declared subject being 'The disastrous fals of two star-crost | Louers' (p. 272). Also of interest is the fact that, when Braithwait's first wife died, the poet evidently found the funeral rites inadequate, for he resolved to dedicate annual poems of commemoration to his deceased spouse. In these poems, Braithwait alludes to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the question of sincere mourning being of obvious relevance. As Abrams observes, it is significant that Braithwait chose to allude to a secular work in such a context. In addition, Abrams quotes Braithwait on the value of post-reading discussion with good friends (such activity can soothe a 'distemperd' mind). Where the Folio editors quite fit with regard to Braithwait's activities as Shakespeare-reader, however, is left largely to our surmise (if they knew 'Loves Labyrinth', comments Abrams, 'they may well have read the poem as a gloss on *Romeo and Juliet*', p. 277).

*(b) Problem Plays*

The majority of scholarship produced on the problem plays this year is to be found in a series of edited collections on a range of subjects, including Renaissance justice, Shakespearian performance studies and European politics, and it is *Measure for Measure* and *All's Well* which continue to dominate the critical discussion. In the first of these collections *Justice, Women, and Power in English Renaissance Drama*, Andrew Majeske and Emily Detmer-Goebel provide a useful introductory essay which surveys the development of the interdisciplinary approach to law and literature over the past twenty years (pp. 11–26), while the collection itself contains essays on plays by Shakespeare and his contemporaries including *Arden of Feversham* and the tragedies of John Webster. The first of two essays on *Measure for Measure*, ‘Shakespeare’s Bed-Tricks: Finding Justice in Lies?’ (in Majeske and Detmer-Goebel, eds., pp. 118–39), Detmer-Goebel argues that while the bed-tricks appear to offer solutions to the difficulties facing characters such as Helena, Mariana and Isabella, the plays ultimately tap into cultural anxieties about women and their perceived propensity for lying about sex. By contrast David Evett offers a less sceptical reading of the marriages depicted at the end of *Measure* in ‘“What is yours is mine”’: Sexual and Social Complementarity in the Trial Scenes of *Measure for Measure*’ (pp. 140–52) as he considers the ways in which marriage and the domestic household offered a model for the running and organization of the state. *Measure*, Evett argues, is unusual amongst Shakespeare’s plays as it lacks the usual domestic households or relationships and so must build them from scratch. The marriages at the end of the play therefore serve to provide the building blocks to establish Viennese society and the couples themselves provide a model of complementarity, with male and female characters bringing qualities to their union which make it a complete unit.

Familial relationships in the final scene of *Measure* are also the focus for Corinne S. Abate’s essay, ‘Missing the Moment in *Measure for Measure*’ (in Occhiogrosso, ed., pp. 19–39), which seeks to challenge the critical emphasis placed upon the Duke’s proposal to Isabella and his role as stage manager in V.i by redirecting our attention to Isabella’s relationship with her brother Claudio and their reunion at the close of the play. *Shakespeare and European Politics* contains two essays on *Measure for Measure* and, like *Justice, Women, and Power in English Renaissance Drama*, also provides a stimulating introductory chapter which considers ‘European Shakespeare’ as a research area in its own right. The first essay, by Roderick J. Lyall, ‘“Here in Vienna”’: The Setting of *Measure for Measure* and the Political Semiology of Shakespeare’s Europe’ (in Delabastita, de Vos and Franssen, eds., *Shakespeare and European Politics*, pp. 74–89) responds to work by Gary Taylor and John Jowett in the early 1990s, who argued that Shakespeare originally set his play in the Italian city of Ferrara and that Thomas Middleton substituted Vienna for Ferrara in 1621 when he revised the play. Lyall challenges the view that the play’s initial setting was Ferrara rather than Vienna and goes on to consider the political and religious significance of the Austrian city in the late 1590s and early 1600s. In an essay from the second

section of the collection, which examines twentieth-century performances of Shakespeare's plays in a European context, Veronika Schandl's essay, 'Measuring the "Most Cheerful Barrack": Shakespeare's Measure for Measure in Hungary under the Kádár Regime (1964–85)' (pp. 158–68), offers an important overview of landmark productions of the play, particularly in the wake of the failed revolution in 1956. Schandl traces the ways in which different directors sought to utilize the play's darker, more troubling aspects as the means of reflecting contemporary political anxieties in Hungary. The final essay from an edited collection is the jointly authored essay by Gale H. Carrithers Jr and James D. Hardy Jr, 'Rex Absconditus: Justice Presence and Legitimacy in *Measure for Measure*' (in Shami, ed., *Renaissance Tropologies: The Cultural Imagination of Early Modern England*, pp. 23–41). This collection was inspired by the monograph *Age of Iron: English Renaissance Tropologies of Love and Power* by Carrithers and Hardy, in which they identify and discuss Renaissance literature in the light of the following tropes: 'Journey', 'Theatre', 'Moment' and 'Ambassadorship'. The essay on *Measure* draws on the tropes of 'Moment' and 'Theatre' and examines the Duke's exercise of power in the context of royal coronation and public displays of royal power. The essay suggests that ultimately the Duke's role in the play is a benign one and that the marriages arranged in the final scene of the play offer a just and optimistic conclusion.

Another performance criticism essay on *Measure* comes from Pascale Aebischer, 'Silence, Rape and Politics in *Measure for Measure*: Closer Readings in Performance History' (*ShakB* 26:iv[2008] 1–23), who considers the handling of the silences in the play, particularly the silence of Isabella in recent productions, using the archival material of the RSC at the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust. Aebischer looks at six productions between 1970 and 1998 and, like Veronika Schandl's essay on the production of the play in twentieth-century Hungary, suggests ways in which each production encodes contemporary cultural and political concerns in Britain during this period. The 1987 production directed by Nicholas Hytner clearly engages with the sexual politics of that decade 'at the height of Thatcherism, the conclusion of the play pointed even less ambiguously towards recognition of the link between state repression and the challenge to sexual integrity. Isabella's right to her body and her chastity, within a society coming to terms with the implications of AIDS for the sexual revolution, was never in doubt' (p. 9). The plague of 1603–4 provides the context for Catherine I. Cox's essay, "'Lord have mercy upon us": The King, the Pestilence, and Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*' (*Exemplaria* 20[2008] 430–57). The essay explores the association between disease and civic excess and degeneracy beginning with Shakespeare's source, Boccaccio's *Decameron*, before moving on to Shakespeare's other plays, such as the histories, *Romeo and Juliet* and *Measure for Measure*. In 'Measure for Measure and the (Anti-)Theatricality of Gascoigne's *The Glasse of Government*', Richard Hillman develops the work of Charles T. Prouty, who argued that Gascoigne's morality play, based on the story of the Prodigal Son, had been an influence on Shakespeare's play. Hillman goes on to consider the triangulated relationship between Gascoigne's play, George Whetstone's



*Promos and Cassandra* and Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* (*Comp D* 42[2008] 391–408).

As publications in 2008 on *All's Well That Ends Well* were scarce, this year's survey will consider an edited collection overlooked in last year's entry, published by Routledge in the New Critical Essays series. The play, as Gary Waller points out in his detailed yet incisive introduction, is one of the least popular of Shakespeare's plays, is rarely performed and tends to prompt strong reactions from readers. Waller provides a clear overview of the play's critical and performance history in a chapter which is usefully divided by subheadings including: 'Genre: *All's Well* as a Problem Play', 'Old and New Historicisms', 'Fistulas, Receipts and the Learned Woman' and 'Shakespeare's Critique of Masculinity'. In the first essay of the collection, which begins by focusing on the sources of the play, Steven Mentz considers the value of 'source study' in his essay 'Revising the Sources: Novella, Romance, and the Meanings of Fiction in *All's Well, That Ends Well*' (pp. 57–70), and argues that the two narrative forms which influence the play, the Italian novella and the romance, help to account for the characterization of Helena as witty Doctor She and the passive Patient Grissel. Mentz concludes that 'The double source underwrites *All's Well's* fundamental division: the play is both comedy of wit and romance of suffering' (p. 58). Regina Buccola also considers Boccaccio's *Decameron* the source for *All's Well* in "'As sweet as sharp": Helena and the Fairy Bride Tradition' (pp. 71–84), as she reflects on observations made by Robert S. Miola on the parallels between *All's Well* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Both plays, according to Miola, blend elements of romance, comedy and folk tale and examine themes of transformation. Buccola builds on Miola's observations and locates her discussion of the play in the context of the fairy lore and the folk tales available to a contemporary audience which involved the intervention of the Fairy Queen in human relationships. Paul Gleed takes issue with the reputation of *All's Well* in the light of the more traditional ideas about festive comedy developed in the 1960s in 'Tying the (K)not: The Marriage of Tragedy and Comedy in *All's Well That Ends Well*' (pp. 85–97). Gleed resituates the play in the context of the festivals of ancient Greece, the Pharmakos and the Eiresione, to argue that the play captures the essence of Greek comedy through its blending of pleasure and suffering, life and death (p. 87).

In a fascinating essay 'All's Well That Ends Well and the Art of Retrograde Motion' (in Waller, ed., pp. 98–110), Deanne Williams begins with a close reading of the exchanges between Helena and Parolles in Act I, scene i, when Helena suggests that Parolles was born under the sign of Mars when it was in retrograde. The planet in this aspect was associated with introspection, depression, irrationality and retrospectivity. Williams uses this discussion of planetary motion to argue that it provides insights into the character of Parolles as well as the relationship between Helena and Bertram. Kent R. Lehnhof provides another context for Helena's role as Doctor She as she examines the role of women in the medicine shows of Italian and English mountebanks in 'Performing Woman: Female Theatricality in *All's Well That Ends Well*' (pp. 111–24). Lehnhof illustrates the parallels between the routines of the mountebank and the staged comedy in the public theatre, making the

point that the Italian word for medicines was also the same word used for street actor, thus blurring the distinction between the two professions. The focus of Ellen Belton's essay, "'To make the 'not' eternal": Female Eloquence and Patriarchal Authority in *All's Well That Ends Well* (pp. 125–39), is Helena's verbal dexterity and she argues that Helena's eloquence establishes her authority in the play as it surpasses that of the male characters.

Helen Wilcox offers another generic label for *All's Well* in her essay 'Shakespeare's Miracle Play? Religion in *All's Well That Ends Well* (pp. 140–54), where she argues that her choice of label is used 'not to imply a reliance upon medieval dramatic traditions, but rather to assert that devotion, faith and redemption are among its chief concerns' (p. 140). Michele Osherow continues the religious theme by locating the play in the context of Old Testament stories found in the book of Proverbs concerning biblical heroines known as women of valour, in 'She Is in the Right: Biblical Maternity and *All's Well That Ends Well* (pp. 155–68). Osherow establishes parallels between Helena's story and those of these biblical women, and insists that 'the complexities surrounding Helena establish her as part of a biblical tradition of women who, in the name of motherhood, risk modesty and honesty to achieve their goals' (p. 155).

David Bergeron shifts the focus to the absent fathers in the play and argues that *All's Well* is full of dead, ageing and inadequate fathers in "'The credit of your father": Absent Fathers in *All's Well That Ends Well* (pp. 169–82). Here Bergeron considers Shakespeare's handling of this theme in other comparable plays such as *Hamlet* to argue that both Helena and Bertram are coming to terms with the loss of their fathers. The erotic potential of the rings which circulate in the play is the subject of Nicholas Ray's essay, "'Twas mine, 'twas Helen's": Rings of Desire in *All's Well That Ends Well* (pp. 183–92), while Catherine Field, in "'Sweet practicer, thy physic I will try": Helena and her "Good Receipt" in *All's Well That Ends Well* (pp. 194–208), continues the focus upon the medical, but situates her discussion of the play in the context of medical cures and the female housewife as medical practitioner to consider Helena's part in the curing the king. The play's interest in medicine and the body reflects a wider concern with 'the empiric in a world increasingly less magical and less religious and where bodies of kings and upstarts are subject to the cold eye and hand of "how to" science recorded in the form of the receipt' (p. 201).

Terry Reilly's contribution turns attention from the medical to the legal profession as he considers the legal status of wards and their guardians and argues that, like *Cymbeline*, *All's Well* is concerned with the relationship between the two. The precise context is the debate surrounding the abolition of the Court of Wards and Liveries in 1604, and Reilly provides fascinating case studies of those members of the nobility who were wards themselves, including the earl of Southampton and Robert Devereux, the second earl of Essex. The influence of new historicism on Shakespeare criticism is examined in Craig Dionne's essay, 'Parolles and Shakespeare's Knee-Crooking Knaves' (pp. 221–33), as he examines the theme of self-fashioning in *All's Well* and how 'Shakespeare uses the courtly rogue as a vehicle to parody the radically ersatz, or depthless depthless quality of the genuinely scripted self' (p. 224).

Finally, Bob White discusses Elijah Moshinsky's production of *All's Well* for the BBC. One of the valuable features of this collection is the inclusion of stills from recent productions of the play by Purchase Repertory, Ark Theatre Company and Washington University to illustrate a number of the essays. Unfortunately this final piece lacked any additional visual material, which would have been helpful to its discussion of the director's interest in 'pictorial art' (p. 236).

(c) *Poetry*

Of the publications on Shakespeare's poems that appeared this year by far the majority were on the sonnets. In an article entitled 'Will Will's Will Be Fulfilled? Shakespeare's Sonnet 135' (*Expl* 66:ii[2008] 66–8), Erica L. Zilleruelo asks if the speaker of the poem 'has the same success with [spoken] language' as the writer does with the written word (p. 68). Zilleruelo explores 'the poet's eloquence' in the 'intertwining of four possible interpretations of "will"', but also notes the speaker's inability to achieve *his* goal, to 'have' the poem's addressee, the infamous Dark Lady of Shakespeare's sequence. This 'juxtaposition' of poetic success and sexual failure 'creates an interesting quandary for readers, who must reconcile the ironic discrepancy Shakespeare creates' (pp. 67–8).

Similarly admiring of the poet's skill, Regula Hohl Trillini's article, 'The Gaze of the Listener: Shakespeare's Sonnet 128 and Early Modern Discourses of Music and Gender' (*M&L* 89:i[2008] 1–17), corrects the previous critical perception of cruxes and mixed metaphors as 'authorial oversights' (p. 17) in Shakespeare's Sonnet 128. In a particularly enlightening essay, Trillini examines the early modern ambivalence towards musical performers and performances, noting the acknowledgement by writers in the period of 'music's dual potential as a force for good and evil' and the 'gendered aspects' of this discourse, which has significant consequences for reading Sonnet 128 (pp. 2–3). Where earlier critics may have dismissed the poem's invocation of musical performance as (besides an extended erotic metaphor) a jokey allusion to the Dark Lady's ability as a performer, Trillini, employing a sound knowledge of the virginals, finds a series of 'fascinating transgressions' that go beyond the clumsy metaphorical language of lesser poets towards a literal sense of the 'hands-on' that has Shakespeare displaying a more intimate acquaintance with the instrument than he has been credited with previously (p. 10). Indeed, Trillini's reading finds the virginals an apt device for a poet who wishes to represent 'the role of confusion inherent in the situation of a female performer before a male listener. He is being seduced by her, but is also tempted to seduce her himself, while the woman is both dangerous and victimized, simultaneously man-eater and sweetmeat' (p. 12). This essay includes a reading of that other famous 'musical' sonnet, Sonnet 8, in which the consequences of Trillini's work for reading the 'Young Man' sonnets are made apparent: in Sonnet 8, unlike the 'conflicted and thrilling eroticism' of Sonnet 128, an 'almost cloying harmony is established' as another male listener takes the place of the female performer (p. 13).

Turning from musical to legal matters, Paul Hammond, in a note on Sonnet 46, 'A Textual Crux in Shakespeare's Sonnet 46' (*N&Q* 55[2008] 187–8), makes a strong case for emending 'fide' to 'finde' in line 9. As part of the poem's legal conceit, a jury, a 'quest of thoughts' (l. 10), is asked to settle a dispute between the speaker's eye and heart over the ownership of the lover's image: they, the jury, are, it appears, in the only authority for the poem, asked 'to side this title'. Previously, 'fide' has either been read straightforwardly as 'side' (meaning 'to assign to one of two sides') or interpreted less persuasively as 'cide', meaning 'decide'. Hammond, noting that Sonnet 46 is the only example of the former meaning cited in the *OED* and that the composers of *Shakespeare's Sonnets* [1609] were wont to omit the letter 'n', judges 'finde' to be a more fitting choice for the legal context of the poem.

Barbara Everett's article in the *London Review of Books*, 'Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Sonnet' (*LRB* 30:ix[2008] 12–15), is much broader in scope, reading the sonnet sequence as a whole against the Elizabethan courtly fashion for sonnet-writing. Everett welcomes the uncertainty surrounding Shakespeare's authorship of *A Lover's Complaint* for the consequent doubt that this casts on what she terms the 'Elizabethanising' of the sonnets. This 'scholarly falling back on convention', which includes the case for the inseparability of the *Complaint* from the sonnets on the grounds of Elizabethan custom, prevents the full play of all the mysteries the poems contain; for Everett, a central theme of the sonnets 'is the defeat of the mere social moment and its transmutation into an eternal landscape' (p. 13). Compared to other Elizabethan sonneteers, such as Sidney, whose sonnets can be 'sterile' (p. 15), Shakespeare looks 'to move through and beyond the whole utilitarianism of the Tudor ethos, the concept of goodness as use, as profit, which unites the Elizabethan farmyard to the guild and the court: to find an innate metaphysic in human love itself' (p. 14).

Joshua Cohen's short article for the *Shakespeare Newsletter*, 'Ovid Inverted: Shakespeare's Sonnet 20 and the Metamorphoses of a Metamorphosis' (*ShN* 58:iii[2008] 93, 97) is interested in the conceit of Sonnet 20, which is characterized as a 'story in a line of female-to-male sex change scenarios stretching back to Ovid's tale of Iphis and Ianthe' (p. 93). For Cohen, Shakespeare and Ovid are alert to the mysteries of desire and identity: 'what we desire does not necessarily correspond with who we think we are'. In this provocative essay, Cohen extrapolates from the speaker's imagined transformation of a female love-object into a male in Sonnet 20 to the sonnet sequence as a whole, such that 'the speaker/poet pursues...two desires: one, a sublimated, idealized, but sexually charged passion for the young man; and the other, a tempestuous physical relationship with a sensual and promiscuous woman' (p. 97).

Another article that addresses the whole sequence of sonnets is Georgia Brown's 'Time and the Nature of Sequence in Shakespeare's *Sonnets*: "In sequent toil all forwards do contend"' (in Maguire, ed., *How To Do Things with Shakespeare*, pp. 236–54). Inspired by a visit to the Landesmuseum in Zurich, where, among other artefacts, Renaissance clocks are exhibited, Brown's essay displays the ways in which 'the *Sonnets* do show Shakespeare thinking about the mechanisms of time' and goes some way to answering

'the question of why sonnet sequences...[became] such a resonant and popular form in the 1590s' (p. 237). For Brown, Shakespeare's poet/lover experiences time in a peculiarly postlapsarian way: he is hurried and subject to the pressure of inexorable change, unlike his prelapsarian counterparts, represented by Milton's Adam and Eve, who may 'Sleep on' (*Paradise Lost*, IV.773). His motto is, inevitably, *carpe diem* (pp. 237–8). Alighting on individual sonnets as she goes, Brown includes several insightful close readings. Sonnet 60 (the source of the essay's title) is notable for its allusions to both natural and 'artificial, or mechanical, ways of telling time', suggesting the 'parallels projected by geometry onto charts of the earth and the sky' via the deepening lines on a human face. In the same sonnet, the word 'nativity' (l. 5) 'invokes the zodiac' and the whole Ptolemaic system of astronomy (pp. 239–40). The sonnet sequence's (both Shakespeare's and those of others) preoccupation with time is conceived as a reaction to 'the real intrusion of time into people's private lives' (p. 247); the sixteenth century saw a rise in indoor timepieces as technology advanced and mechanical clocks grew smaller. Moreover, Brown notes a tension between the idea of a poetic sequence, which implies the linearity of narrative so often sought by critics, and the 'oscillation, and backwards and forwards motion', of actual sonnet sequences. Happily, this tension is resolved in the shape of those Renaissance clocks in which time, that conventionally 'continuous and unidirectional phenomenon', is marked by an oscillating regulator (p. 248).

Not unlike the clockwork sonnets in Georgia Brown's reading, Michael C. Clody's study of the 'Young Man' sonnets, 'Shakespeare's "Alien Pen": Self-Substantial Poetics in the Young Man Sonnets' (*Criticism* 50:iii[2008] 471–500), relies on the 'perpetual movement' of poetic mimesis. Drawing on the work of Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe (*Typography: Mimesis, Philosophy, Politics*, ed. Christopher Fynsk [1989]), William West ('Nothing as Given: Economies of the Gift in Derrida and Shakespeare', *CL* 48:i[1996] 1–18) and Susan Stewart ('Lyric Possession', *CritI* 22:i[1995] 34–63), Clody develops an elegant way of 'reading for general mimesis' in which one must 'listen to the way that language brings forth rather than the ideas it artistically represents' (p. 475). Clody characterizes his own method, quoting Stewart, as a consideration of 'the "many springs of a poem's generation" in the active mode in which language brings forth—its "perpetual movement of presentation"' (p. 476). This theoretical approach inherits something from each of the mimetic theories of Aristotle, Sidney (*The Defence of Poesy*) and Shakespeare's Polixenes ('that art | Which you say adds to Nature, is an art | That Nature makes': *Winter's Tale*, IV.iv.90–2). In beginning to read the Young Man sonnets, Clody focuses on the speaker's pleas to the addressee to encourage procreation, in which Shakespeare employs the language of economic growth. In the absence of real offspring, as Clody argues, the poems' metaphorical 'economy' is founded on a void, leading the critic to find 'the value of the poems' economy...in their perpetual fluctuations', 'as a model of [their] movement rather than a fund for its metaphors' (pp. 477–8). This is exemplified by lines such as, 'I must each day say o'er the very same' (l. 6), from Sonnet 108, in which the repetition of the addressee's 'fair name' (l. 8) 'incarnates the thin substance of love, ever fresh, and

each...*insistence*...extends that substance into the future' (p. 478). Ultimately, the poems' absent core cannot realize a consummation; the young man declines 'from occasion to muse', and the poet becomes 'present-absent to himself during the act of conception'. It is this state of oscillation (so to speak) between presence and absence that defines literary subjectivity in this reading of poesis (pp. 486–7); it is a reading that, in Clody's concluding words, 'gestures towards an immanent force of linguistic alterity that drives, but cannot be captured by, representation' (p. 495).

Páraic Finnerty's essay, 'Queer Appropriations: Shakespeare's Sonnets and Dickinson's Love Poems' (*BandL* 3:ii[2008] no pagination), discusses the afterlife of the sonnets, particularly their use by Emily Dickinson in her own poems as an 'authoritative and... controversial resource for her construction of love'. Finnerty offers 'an antidote to the intrusive and spurious biographical readings' of both poets' lyrics. Here, Dickinson and Shakespeare are shown to be poets similarly capable of treating 'the gender of the speaker or addressee... as an interchangeable alternative', thereby 'unsettling... the naturalness of the male or female position within the lover's discourse', but neither is seen, to paraphrase Robert Browning, to 'unlock his or her heart'. Using many of Shakespeare's tropes, Dickinson turns their metaphorical force to her own ends. In one of several readings that delineate the precise parallels and divergences between the two poets' poems, Finnerty compares the love triangle and 'the imagery of light and darkness' in Shakespeare's sonnets with Dickinson's 'That Malay—took the Pearl', in which a 'Pearl' is lost to a 'Swarthy fellow'. In both scenarios, the speakers feel their losses deeply because of a sense of their own unworthiness and lose out to rivals—Shakespeare's 'woman coloured ill' (Sonnet 144) and Dickinson's Malay—whose 'darkness' is repeatedly invoked. Moreover, in terms of sexuality, as Finnerty notes, Dickinson appears to be using Shakespeare's homoerotic discourse for the expression of lesbian love.

A notable book-length work on Shakespeare's sonnets is Robert Matz's *The World of Shakespeare's Sonnets: An Introduction*. It is divided into four sections, containing eight, seven, nine and seven short chapters (some shorter than three pages) respectively; a 'Coda' entitled 'Universal Shakespeare?' concludes the study. As Matz asserts in his preface, although this book, like other recent publications (Paul Edmondson and Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare's Sonnets* [2004] and Dymphna Callaghan, *Shakespeare's Sonnets* [2007]), is an introduction, 'it offers a more particular argument'. In wishing to place the emphasis on 'the relationship between the sonnets and Renaissance culture' rather than the 'many riches that formal literary analysis' can reveal (which is not to say that there is a lack of strong literary analysis here), Matz certainly brings a freshness to this kind of publication (p. 3). Matz's particular method is perhaps most readily evident in the titles of some of the thirty-one chapters: 'Love, or Literary Credential?', 'But Did They Have Sex?', and 'Gynerasty'. The first two of these three examples illustrate one aspect of Matz's style: he asks (and answers) many questions in a direct and lucid manner. The third, while also indicating the same directness, is typical of the author's determination not to separate the sonnets from the social milieu of their time. In this case, he considers 'how Shakespeare portrays his black mistress

through the lens of negative Renaissance stereotypes about women'. Such expositions invariably raise even more questions ('Does the magnificent fairness of Shakespeare's young man depend on locating anything that's black somewhere else—in the mistress?', for example), which Matz hardly ever fails to broach himself (p. 113). The later chapters of the book, included within the section headed 'So Long Lives This', which covers the afterlife of the sonnets, have some of the most enlightening content. The graphs and pie charts showing the varying degrees of anthologization of individual sonnets and groups of sonnets in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries are effectively utilized to tell a story of the ebbing and flowing of the significance of Matz's avowedly historicist approach to reading the sonnets (pp. 199–202). Perhaps, with the publication of this introduction, predominantly targeted at the sonnets' new readership, it could be said that 'history [has] come back' (p. 202).

Kathryn Schwarz's article, "'Will in overplus": Recasting Misogyny in Shakespeare's Sonnets' (*ELH* 75[2008] 737–66), like Matz, engages with the 'conventions of a hegemonic misogyny' on which Shakespeare draws. Nevertheless, Schwarz, interested as much in literary subjectivity (see the discussion on Clody above) as in 'misogynist clichés', highlights the operation of the 'will' ('the agent that mediates between reason and passion') in the final twenty-eight sonnets, including that pivotal meditation on 'Will' that is Sonnet 136 (p. 739). Yet, unlike other critics, Schwarz sees a 'circulation of will across lines of gender' that 'demystifies' the 'totalizing claims' of misogyny (p. 738); the last twenty-eight sonnets are shown to 'dismantle the assumptions that define women and will as instrumental, and construct instead a system of intersubjective exchange' (p. 741). Schwarz builds on this insight, enlisting the work of Paul de Man to describe the process by which both the speaker and the addressee 'construct an autobiography not of a privileged . . . solipsism but of heterosocial relations' (p. 743); in de Man's words, 'they determine each other by mutual reflexive substitution' ('Autobiography as De-Facement', in *The Rhetoric of Romanticism* [1984]). This leads quite naturally to further observations on the notions of beauty and truth that are invoked in the sonnets. As the earlier conclusions suggest, these 'effects' are seen to be produced by 'heterosocial' forces as opposed to any 'discretely possessed' will: 'Beauty is not something that God does to women for men, or that men do to women for God or for men, or that women do to women for women or for men or for God; or rather it is never only one of these things' (p. 754). Nevertheless, Schwarz is ultimately justified in claiming that the last twenty-eight sonnets clearly show 'the participation of feminine subjects in the strategies that define them' (p. 759).

Manfred Pfister's essay, "'Bottom, thou art translated": Recent Radical Translations of Shakespearean Sonnets in Germany' (in Dente and Soncini, eds., *Crossing Time and Space: Shakespeare Translations in Present-day Europe*, pp. 21–36), acknowledges the 'literary ritual' that translating Shakespeare's sonnets into German has become in Germany, as well as noting the 'gamut of critical questions' that this raises for the discipline of Translation Studies, but is most interested in the complexities of 'the triangulation between source text, previous translation and new translation'

(p. 22). But not just any new translation qualifies for attention here. It has to fall into Pfister's most extreme category (of seven categories in total): *Radikalübersetzung*, a term originating with Ulrike Draesner ('Twin Spin: Acht Shakespeare-Sonette', *ShJE* 136[2000] 160–70) and translated as 'radical translation' (p. 26). Indeed, Pfister chooses Draesner's translation of Sonnet 3 for analysis, along with Franz Josef Czernin's two versions of Sonnet 62. In these latter poems, Czernin complicates Pfister's triangulation even further by adding an even more radical translation—a translation to the second power... *Übertragung der Übersetzung*—to his first (p. 31).

Both publications on *A Lover's Complaint* are by MacDonald P. Jackson, and continue the scholarly debate about the poem's authorship. Responding in both instances to Brian Vickers's attribution of the poem to John Davies of Hereford (*Shakespeare, A Lover's Complaint, and John Davies of Hereford* [2007]) and the decision of Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen to exclude it from the Royal Shakespeare Company's *Complete Works* (*The RSC Shakespeare: William Shakespeare. Complete Works* [2007]), Jackson contends that they are wrong. The most extensive evidence is presented in Jackson's essay, 'The Authorship of *A Lover's Complaint*: A New Approach to the Problem' (*PBSA* 102:iii[2008] 285–313). Using the Chadwyck-Healey electronic database Literature Online (LION), Jackson aims to counter the 'superficially impressive' evidence of earlier studies, in which 'the search for similarities has been uncontrolled'. Jackson prefers 'to search a predetermined range of texts, by a variety of authors, for a carefully defined category of features that they share with the disputed work'. This more obviously scientific approach has been made possible, Jackson notes, by the 'advent of searchable electronic databases' (p. 287). Initially, Jackson searches the drama of 1590–1614 for instances of rare spellings of words in *A Lover's Complaint* and finds that five out of six plays that have 'three or more rare spelling links to *LC*' were written by Shakespeare; twelve out of nineteen of those with two links were Shakespeare's; and 'a further ten Shakespeare plays, plus Hand D of *Sir Thomas More*, and fifty-one non-Shakespearean plays register one link' (pp. 294–5). As Jackson states, 'It is hard to see why, if Shakespeare did not write *LC*, three of his plays should each share more rare spellings with it than does any play by another playwright, and why plays by Shakespeare should so dominate the list of those with two or more spelling links to the poem' (p. 296). Shakespeare also 'dominates... [Jackson's] list of rare spelling links to poetry and drama texts no less clearly than the... list of links to drama alone', even though his 'canon covers only about eight per cent of the amount of text searched' (p. 300). Jackson goes on to reduce his list to 'those [spellings] employed by a single writer and those employed by no more than two writers', and then even further still, and Shakespeare's dominance becomes more and more evident (pp. 302–3). After five sections of Jackson's essay in which he makes the positive case for Shakespeare's authorship of *A Lover's Complaint*, he reserves a sixth for challenging John Davies of Hereford's authorship. Here, with reference to Davies's preference for '*sith* as an alternative to *since*', for 'apostrophes to indicate metrical elision in various words', for *yer* instead of 'ere', and for *it's* in place of 'it is', Jackson makes an equally persuasive case (pp. 308–11). Precluding 'a gigantic conspiracy among printing-house



workers', Jackson appears to have established strong links between *A Lover's Complaint* and Shakespeare (p. 312). In the other article on the same authorship question, 'A Lover's Complaint, Cymbeline, and the Shakespeare Canon: Interpreting Shared Vocabulary' (*MLR* 103:iii[2008] 621–38), Jackson again uses Literature Online to contest Brian Vickers's account (in his case for Davies's authorship, *Shakespeare, A Lover's Complaint, and John Davies of Hereford* [2007]) of why *A Lover's Complaint* and *Cymbeline* have a lot of 'rare-in-Shakespeare words' in common (p. 637). Jackson finds, contrary to Vickers's assertion, that several of the words were 'in general usage in London between 1603 and 1609' (Vickers, p. 213), that they were 'used by no non-Shakespearean writer during those years', but were used by Shakespeare in works of this period other than *Cymbeline* (pp. 637–8).

Lois Potter's article, 'Involuntary and Voluntary Poetic Collaboration: *The Passionate Pilgrim* and *Love's Martyr*' (in Drábek, Kolinská and Nicholls, eds., *Shakespeare and his Collaborators over the Centuries*, pp. 5–19), is part of a collection arising from papers given at a conference (with the same title) at the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University in Brno, Czech Republic in February 2006. Potter makes an interesting connection between Shakespeare and the 'rich variety of collaborative and combative verse' found in the early modern period, including the 'commendatory' verses published (at Prince Henry's behest) with Thomas Coryate's travel book, *Coryate's Crudities Hastily Gobbled Up* [1611], which were humorously and satirically composed by Coryate's associates at the 'elite Mermaid Club' (p. 9). *The Passionate Pilgrim* is suggested as a possible contribution to the fashion for such collaborative collections; in answer to the question of 'how so many sonnets on the Venus and Adonis theme came to be written', Potter suggests that writers might have competed or collaborated on them as part of 'a tribute to Shakespeare's early erotic poems and plays' (p. 12). Indeed, it is also postulated that, in contributing some examples of his own work, Shakespeare might have been 'using this opportunity [in 1599] to test the waters before deciding whether to publish the mainly misogynistic and bawdy poems that constitute 126–152 of the 1609 edition [of *Shakespeare's Sonnets*]' (pp. 12–13). In the case of *Love's Martyr* [1601], and the 'The Phoenix and the Turtle' contained therein, Potter argues for Shakespeare's poem being part of another significant collaborative project, in which Shakespeare and his fellow dramatists (Marston, Chapman and Jonson), as well as the anonymous 'Ignoto' and *Vatum Chorus*, would have been more than willing to add their poems to Robert Chester's volume in honour of Sir John Salusbury. What has often been considered a tenuous relationship between authors and patron might, in fact, have been quite significant, not least because of the prior existence of a 'cooperative poetic circle' of Welsh bards, who had benefited from the restoration of the Salusbury family fortunes (after the damage incurred as a result of the Babington plot) and the munificent literary patronage that followed. Potter's essay chimes with the suggestion made by Colin Burrow (*William Shakespeare: The Complete Sonnets and Poems* [2002], p. 89) that, after the execution of the earl of Essex, new patrons were being sought by poets such as these.

Judith H. Anderson includes a chapter in her book, *Reading the Allegorical Intertext: Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton*, on the intertextual

relationship between Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* and Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*. Entitled 'Venus and Adonis: Spenser, Shakespeare, and the Forms of Desire' (pp. 201–13), it characterizes Shakespeare's poem as 'a seriocomic meditation on the landscape of desire, or wanting—on passion and grief—and on the kinds of figures desire generates in the third book of Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*'. This is achieved by Shakespeare's 'folding into characters' of several allegorical figures taken from Spenser's epic (p. 201). Adopting a method in opposition to a posited 'critical tradition [that] has too often assumed rivalry or anxiety as the only possible relation between poets and precursors', Anderson sees Shakespeare performing 'at once an act of reading and of (in)habitation' (p. 204). If Shakespeare is 'inhabiting' anywhere in Anderson's reading, it is Spenser's Garden of Adonis from Book III. In response to Ellen April Harwood's article, 'Venus and Adonis: Shakespeare's Critique of Spenser' (*JRUL* 39[1977] 44–60), Anderson expands what she sees as Harwood's 'too selective' reading to take into account the fullest 'implication of [Spenser's] Garden' and recognize the way Spenser 'often uses a kind of refraction to relate largely disparate figures to a single type, such as Venus' (p. 206). More specifically, Shakespeare is shown to deploy the topos of a 'landscape of erotic desire' found in the Garden of Adonis, but whereas Spenser retains an atmosphere of myth—'Right in the midst of that Paradise | There stood a stately Mount . . .' (III.vi.43)—Shakespeare's landscape is more suggestive and comic: 'Within this limit is relief enough, | Sweet bottom grass and high delightful plain | Round rising hillocks, brakes obscure and rough' (ll. 235–7) (Anderson, p. 208). Ranging more widely, and in keeping with her recognition of Spenser's relating of 'disparate figures to a single type', Anderson notes the 'figure of a female bending over a recumbent male'—Acrasia, Cymoent, Belphoebe, Venus, Argante and Britomart—that recurs from the end of Book II to almost the close of Book III of *The Faerie Queene* and is central to the representation of Venus in Shakespeare's narrative poem (p. 209). The Giantess Argante is a significant 'Venerean figure' for Anderson; her 'taste for boys', her incestuous character and her 'manhandling' all have parallels in the nature of the Shakespearian goddess (pp. 210–11). In the end, the huge variety of Spenser's allegorical figures that Shakespeare would have had to 'fold' into his characters leads Anderson to suggest that it 'actually exceeds and challenges such a concentration, defying containment' (p. 212).

W.P. Weaver's article, "'O teach me how to make mine own excuse": Forensic Performance in *Lucrece*' (*SQ* 59[2008] 421–49), is the final publication to be considered here. It takes as its subject Lucrece's speeches following her rape, and offers a corrective to the critical consensus on the poem that likens these speeches to the early modern genre of female complaint. Weaver's thesis is that 'the primary formal models of Lucrece's speeches are to be found in the rhetorical exercises and textbooks of Elizabethan grammar schools' (p. 422). Crucially, Weaver reveals the dark irony of a schoolboy's lessons in rhetoric being used to speak eloquently of the inadequacy of words when a woman must narrate her own violation. In a compelling conclusion to a persuasive essay, the representation of the 'hyperarticulate Lucrece' is compared to the 'silent Lavinia' of *Titus Andronicus* in order to suggest that 'Lavinia's dismemberment is Shakespeare's first image of the insufficiency of

words alone to narrate such a crime' and that 'Lucrece's rhetorical exercise and judicial speech are his proofs' (p. 448–9). Shakespeare is shown drawing on an education in 'late antique and early modern rhetoric' (p. 423), as well as his own canon.

(d) *Histories*

Robert A Logan's *Shakespeare's Marlowe* ranges widely across the canon in its consideration of the latter's influence on the former; its discussions of the histories focus on *Richard III*, *Richard II* and *Henry V*. Beyond the level of verbal or strong character echoes, 'Marlowe' here functions rather as 'republicanism' sometimes does in Andrew Hadfield's 2005 book: in both, analogues are treated as, effectively, sources, though there may be any number of other analogous elements outside the remit of the book which remain unexplored. So Logan asks, of Henry's response to the tennis balls insult, whether Shakespeare is trying to make him sound authoritative in the epic manner of a Tamburlaine. It is an interesting question, but to answer it the book would have to address how we might tell simple authoritative language from language which might be 'authoritative in [an] epic [but non-Marlovian] manner' from language 'authoritative in the epic manner of a Tamburlaine'. Logan's discussion of Marlowe's dramaturgy above the verbal level focuses on the ways in which he seems to have invented 'prototypes'—or, in the case of Edward II, what we might call a 'proto-prototype' which didn't particularly catch on—to which Shakespeare responded. A later chapter on the 'deep' influence of *Tamburlaine* on *Henry V* suggests that Shakespeare acknowledges through his protagonist the prototypical nature of Tamburlaine, finally coming round to the heroic history paradigm Marlowe's two-parter established. Logan interestingly explores the ways that Shakespeare's Henry negotiates with the Tamburlaine type, rather in the manner that earlier criticism suggested Falstaff negotiated with the *miles gloriosus*. However, most of what Shakespeare learned from Marlowe, it appears, is uncontroversial aesthetic techniques such as unsettling the audience's desire to experience a fixed, idealized image of the protagonists in order to create and sustain dramatic tension. The book's focus is resolutely aesthetic—neither writer's use of or attitudes towards the chronicles, for example, get much attention, and nor do historical or theatrical contexts.

David N Beauregard's *Catholic Theology in Shakespeare's Plays* focuses on the relationship between papal authority and the English monarch in the two non-tetralogical histories, arguing that the Catholic Church's authority is comparatively sympathetic when held next to the absolutisms of the two titular monarchs in *King John* and *Henry VIII*. John's legitimacy is in question by the time he produces his anti-papal speech at III.i, and his words consequently are arrogant—an arrogance which is transferred by association to Henry VIII through the use of phrases such as 'supreme head'. The flipside of establishing the absolutist tendencies of the monarch is a defence of the papacy. Here Beauregard's defence of the papal legate in *King John* deals in some very fine distinctions indeed—for example, he mitigates Pandolph's threat that an

assassin of John would be canonized on the grounds, first, that assassination was never an official papal policy, second, that saints are venerated rather than worshipped (so he is off-message politically and doctrinally) and third, that this is in the context of a heated exchange of views. Pandulph, in a formulation that might raise the odd eyebrow, he sees as a conciliatory and finally benevolent figure who brings about peace. Similarly, Beauregard suggests that, though Katherine, Wolsey and Campeius in *Henry VIII* provide some suggestion of Shakespeare's theological positioning (and he admits that the latter two are 'corrupt'), papal authority is never unequivocally attacked—in fact coming off rather well. Henry, on the other hand, is neglectful, hypocritical and manipulative. For this reader, the limitation of Beauregard's approach is his neglect of politics and nationalism; his generous interpretation of Pandulph's character proposes a writer (and theatre company, and audience) extraordinarily remote from the usual understanding of the immediate post-Armada context into which the play came.

Patricia Cahill's *Unto the Breach: Martial Formations, Historical Trauma, and the Early Modern Stage* considers the way the history play—broadly conceived to include *Tamburlaine* and *The Triumph of Chivalry*—shapes and is shaped by the 'new military rationalities' of the *fin de siècle*, theorizing both labouring bodies and trauma. 'Trained bands' were a late Elizabethan innovation requiring selection from the more established 'musters' (hence, Cahill notes, 'pass muster'), and as such foreshadow the kind of taxonomies satirized in Dickens's *Hard Times* more than two centuries later. The Gloucestershire scene in *2 Henry IV*—properly a representation of an impressment 'muster' rather than a voluntarist 'recruitment'—focuses critical attention on such Foucauldian scrutiny, and for Cahill is fatal to the chivalric ideals represented most obviously via Hotspur. Such impressments were also important factors in a national 'proletarianization', as once economically independent workers took up places within a strict command hierarchy. But where other stagings of impressments 'imagine this as 'a kind of primal moment when a man is torn from his home and transformed into someone else's goods, the Gloucestershire one re-enacts that rupture five times as five men fend off Falstaff's inquiries' (pp. 84–5). Cahill's attention here is not on the corruption of the process, but its relationship to incipient knowledges of enumeration, discipline and normativity. Cahill sums it up as one of 'riotous particularity' (p. 92), which at the same time disrupts the scene's satirical impulses. The play's answer to this is not what Dover Wilson identified as the 'chivalry, of the old anarchic kind' of Hotspur, but the calculative and indeed bureaucratic rationality of Hal, influentially anatomized by Greenblatt's 'Invisible Bullets'. This continues to operate in Eastcheap throughout the second play, as through the first; however, the play does end with the lean and Lenten king subjected to the appraising gaze of the lean Shallow.

A short epilogue on *Richard III* returns to the issue of trauma. Even before the ghosts appear near the end of the play, the 'integrity of space' convention of the amphitheatre stage has been 'shattered' by having two 'places' represented at once (in contrast, the 'French' and 'English' tents are never on stage at the same 'time' in *Henry V*). This is all the more disorienting because it is accompanied by the forms of the new military science, with both

leaders plotting their battle formations, both writing, and Richard's need for precision about the time. The ghosts themselves are assimilable to the repetition compulsions of trauma, and doing so leads Cahill to oppose 'redemptive' readings of the scene by claiming that they 'evoke the eeriness of history itself' (p. 217); her reading of trauma seems to depend on eternal repetition, committing her to the position that 'movement forward—literal succession—[is] an impossibility'. This point demonstrates the incompatibility of Cahill's reading with a reading like Greenblatt's in *Hamlet in Purgatory*. However, it does not in itself demonstrate its superiority.

Hugh Grady's superb work on the *Henriad* has found its reader. David Schalwyk considers the two *Henry IV* plays' representations of 'service' in *Shakespeare, Love and Service*. 'Service' is defined as 'a commingling of affect and structure, devotion and self-interest, abandon and control' (p. 172), and Schalwyk takes it as a master-concept for understanding affective bonds between nobility and royalty, and its wider distribution among other social milieux—the 'ungoverned' services of tavern or brothel, and the 'more settled reciprocities of rural Gloucestershire' (p. 165). The chapter opens with a keynote reading of the tormenting of Francis and of Shallow and Davy in Act V of 2 *Henry IV*. Of the former, Schalwyk perceptively remarks that 'the cruelty of the joke lies in the way in which Hal tortures the young man with the suggested promise of release' while being constantly reminded of his immediate 'servile obligations' from the other room, and the indifference with which the 'wayward royal apprentice' then abandons him (p. 166). In a sense, Falstaff is a 'loyal servant . . . calling in . . . debts' (p. 168), and Schalwyk reads him here as 'characteristically Janus-like' (p. 169), aware of the self-interest in service relationships while blind to what this will mean for himself. In another sense, of course, Falstaff's structural position in regard to the prince is occluded, certainly in comparison with his affective bonds. Theatrically, too, the millennia-old 'master-servant' double act is given a new twist, with the master undermining the servant (so that, in Weimann's terminology, he takes the *platea* to the servant's *locus*).

But 'master' and 'servant' are not simply roles to be adopted or shucked off. Schalwyk argues, against Grady, that Hal is 'contaminated' by the self-imposed but structurally servile positions he occupies—his 'inventory' of Poins's shirts and silk stockings is rather closer to the laundry than the panopticon, as it were. Schalwyk argues also that Grady's perception of the play as anticipating a modern 'shifting nature of subjectivity' (p. 180) is effectively a reading of the tavern scenes between Hal and Falstaff. Elsewhere, 'the parameters of variation in subjectivity are relatively constrained'—Hal certainly moves between roles, but 'each of these roles restricts the possibilities of fully inhabiting the others or another' so that 'the heir-apparent finds that he can never recover the affective tenderness of the loving son' (p. 192). It is only in the tavern that forms of identity can be 'tried without consequence'. Schalwyk points, too, to the downside of 'modern' freedom in comparison to the obligations on the early modern master, noting the 'utterly unreciprocal' (p. 187) nature of Falstaff's relationships with Quickly, Feeble and Shallow, and the 'profound sense of loss' when the new king leaves Falstaff as merely his pensioner.

Schalwyk remarks, in passing, that the plays ‘offer a sustained *realistic* representation, sometimes parodic, of service as it might have touched the drawer or ostler’ (p. 165). Ostlers, carriers, tapsters and others are the focus of Alan Stewart’s *Shakespeare’s Letters* (and the virtually identical article ‘Shakespeare and the Carriers’, *SQ* 58[2008] 431–64). Focusing on the Gadshill robbery, he proposes that it shows how ‘an unholy alliance between career criminals and their high-ranking protectors preyed on a crucial infrastructure of early modern England...the network of carriers and carriers’ inns on which so much communication depended’ (p. 117). Carriers typically travelled between specific provincial locations and specific London inns, carrying letters and goods, and accompanying people, in both directions, and as such provided a crucial link between recent London immigrants and their origins. The Tarlton part in *The Famous Victories* is a carrier, fittingly in the light of Tarlton’s ‘rustic in the city’ persona. Though he is robbed at Gadshill this is not staged, and the audience does not see Dericke until he reaches Deptford. In contrast, Shakespeare gives us a detailed representation of the inn at Rochester, as well as the nearby Gadshill, and anatomizes both ‘corrupt’ and ‘good, exploited’ inn servants, the former in league with the robbery. In common law, losses at an inn were the liability of the innkeeper (hence the Hostess’s indignation when Falstaff asks her ‘have you enquired yet who picked my pocket?’ at III.iii). Similarly, if a carrier was robbed he was responsible for compensating the owner, which explains the carrier’s virtually non-speaking presence with the sheriff when he investigates the robbery in Eastcheap at II.iv. The play emphasizes, in other words, that robbery affects not only the rich but vulnerable (indeed, ‘victimized’) figures like the carrier. In doing so it ‘refuses an easy separation between evil lowly villains and the reckless, dashing elite characters’ (p. 149). Falstaff’s progress towards battle parodies that of a carrier, mapped against inns and staging points, and amongst his ‘food for powder’ are both ostlers and tapsters. Hal’s implication in the robbery, and continuing indulgence of Falstaff, must be read in this light, for his victims ultimately are the carriers—the figure who for provincial immigrants into London is nothing less than ‘the face of home’ (p. 154).

An altogether different view of the carriers informs Harry Berger Jr’s ‘A Horse Named Cut: *1 Henry IV*, 2.1’ (in Dutcher and Prescott, eds., pp. 193–205). Berger claims that this scene is less about “‘objective” circumstances’ and more about ‘the speakers’ condition as they represent it to themselves’ (p. 195). Berger does mean speakers rather than characters, ‘more the objects than the subjects of their discourse’ (p. 196), and thus ‘sitting ducks for social parody’ (p. 195). What speaks through them is ‘their delight in the victims’ discourse’ (p. 196): ‘victimization has its pleasures, chief of which is the delight in mastering the expressive conventions of the discourse that represents it’ (p. 199). However, what follows this rather reductive reading of the scene is an extremely subtle close reading of verbal ducking and diving between Gadshill and the Chamberlain, whose ‘victim’ status is far more complex than Berger initially implied, showing in the tension between ‘rhetorical bluster and syntactical uncontrol’ (p. 203).

Colin Burrow’s ‘Reading Tudor Writing Politically: The Case of *2 Henry IV*’ (*YES* 38:i-ii[2008] 234–50) provides yet another example of the rewards

that focusing on a seemingly marginal element can bring. He sees the Gloucestershire scenes of that play speaking 'in a mode attuned with incredible precision to sensing awkward and potentially settling interactions between different projects and affinities within the Tudor commonwealth' (p. 250). Burrow then provides an appropriately precise reading, showing how the elusiveness of the scenes' effects is a function of these interactions. Shallow in a sense 'speaks' from a position of overlap between different spheres and roles, 'interlaced fragments of his affinity, his juridical being, his household' (p. 242), and Burrow persuasively argues that this kind of position was a function of the many networks, structures and positions within which many people situated themselves. But this is no Whitmanesque hymn to multiplicity; Shallow is 'repeatedly *not quite* performing responsibilities that were explicitly those of JPs in this period' (p. 245).

Phebe Jensen considers the ways in which Falstaff might be said to 'haunt' the cakes and ale of *Twelfth Night* in *Religion and Revelry in Shakespeare's Festive World*. The Illyrian play itself is a response to the Admiral's men's 'splitting' in *Sir John Oldcastle* of the complexly Puritan-and-festive Falstaff of *1 Henry IV* into two characters, a 'good' proto-Protestant Sir John (Oldcastle) and a festive Catholic priest, Sir John of Wrotham, and his paramour Doll. The latter Sir John is twice referred to as 'Master Parson', a standard term of derision for Catholic priests—and what both Sir Toby and Feste call Sir Topas in Act IV of *Twelfth Night*. Jensen sees the encounter between the secular Lord of Misrule, the Lenten jester and the 'kind of Puritan' as both a theatrical in-joke and a clear clue to the further distribution of the Falstaff-function of *1 Henry IV* (as it were) amongst several characters. Malvolio's Puritanism is not 'hypocritical attachment to holiday excess' (p. 169) (which Jensen sees as a Falstaffian characteristic), but opposition to festive revelry. Festivity itself is detached from its Admiral's men, anti-Falstaff association with corrupt Catholicism. The effect is to revisit the festive tradition, defending the theatre as its current institutional base. A rather different take on Falstaff and festivity comes in Robert Shaughnessy's closely historicized reading of post-war British performances of the Henry plays, "'I do, I will": Hal, Falstaff and the Performative' (in Henderson, ed., *Alternative Shakespeares 3*, pp. 14–33). Shaughnessy traces the ways in which Hal's line 'I do, I will', in a theatre under the influence of Beckett and Pinter, came to be performed as enacting an irreversible transition between play and 'confessional frankness'. Shaughnessy contrasts the kind of self-present subjectivity this reading presents us with to Michael Gambon's Protean performance as Falstaff, as 'just possibly... the embodiment of a kind of oppositional politics' (p. 32). Alexander Welsh provides a short but incisive analysis of Falstaff's 'honour' speech in *1 Henry IV* in *What is Honor? A Question of Moral Imperatives*. Honour 'thrusts the body into the path of danger' (p. 53), testing the body on behalf of the self, yet is also 'word' (bodily courage alone is not honour); it cannot be certain until death, when 'the possibility of any further actions is at an end and the pledge has been surrendered for good' (p. 53). E.P. Lock's 'Thouing the King in Shakespeare's History Plays' (*EIC* 58[2008] 120–42) explores the transgressiveness of Falstaff addressing king Henry as 'thou' in his appeal to him at the end of *2 Henry IV*. The essay surveys the various

categories of breaking the general grammatical rule that 'you' is used to an equal or superior; it does not consider the play in depth, but finds that the majority of such rule breaches are not, in context, direct challenges to royal legitimacy.

Elena Levy-Navarro investigates fatness and leanness in the *Henry IV* plays in *The Culture of Obesity in Early and Late Modernity*, taking aim at 'essentialist' readings of such categories. Falstaff is the 'before', and Hal the 'after', in an image familiar to contemporary diet culture; he is also the 'before' of psychoanalytic readings, a stage to be passed through or past to be mastered, and 'the excesses of old civilization' (p. 75). But she points out that Falstaff's fatness is to an extent constructed by Hal in the service of his own project of predatory 'virtuous self-restraint' (p. 68), and in that sense takes its place on one side of the binary oppositions many critics see operating between Falstaff and Hal. While Levy-Navarro attends very closely to the linguistic constructions of fatness and leanness, showing convincingly that neither is conclusively privileged by the plays, some of her readings seem rather literal. Hal's language 'characterizes' rather than, for example, plays with Falstaff. I'm not sure how well the fat/thin binary as here constructed could cope with, for example, the martial and heroic body of single combat that is the focus at the end of the first play (Falstaff's body is un-modern and 'feudal' but there is no mention of Hotspur's to speak of), or indeed the thinness of Shallow, who is here programmatically lined up, with the thin beadles leading Doll and the Hostess away, on the side of the new *civilitéé*.

Lauren M. Blinde seeks to uncover the place of rumour in Shakespeare's idea of history in 'Rumored History in Shakespeare's *2 Henry IV* (*ELR* 38:i[2008] 34–54). The essay's leaps of logic are at times disconcerting. I can see that 'By presenting Rumor as our historian, Shakespeare encourages the audience members to include a fundamental sense of unreliability in their thinking about history', but I can't see how that entails the very next sentence's claim that 'Rumor is history's foundation, and thus for Shakespeare history is, in many ways, rumor' (p. 35). I found Blinde's argument, when it diverged from the critics whose work she competently surveys, extremely difficult to understand, and when I did understand it I found it tendentious and over-fond of sweeping assertions ('Rumor's creative potential allows the dramatist to transcend both class and historicity', p. 37). An example from early in the essay, seeking to introduce one of the ideas to follow, will allow the reader a taste of the effort (and, for some no doubt, the rewards) involved in engaging with it: 'By embodying the conflict between narrative and display, Rumor transcends the split between aural and visual epistemologies in order for Shakespeare to argue that history is fundamentally imaginative. Although narrative and display seem to compete with, rather than reinforce, each other, Shakespeare's Rumor undoes the conflict by replacing narrative and display with anatomy to present a theory of history that transcends notions of true and false' (p. 35). Enough transcendence, already.

Ian McAdam's 'Masculine Agency and Moral Stance in *King John*' (*PQ* 86:i-ii[2007]) 431–64) proposes that the play offers a distinctly less religiously engaged sensibility than recent accounts find. He suggests that the play's central concern is 'individual moral and rational agency' (p. 68), and that both



Catholic and Protestant forms of Christianity are subjected to scrutiny from this point of view. This 'self-possession' (the right kind of 'strong possession') is most clearly located, and therefore gendered, in the Bastard. John's nobles and the Citizen at Angiers are judged by his standards and found wanting. Here McAdam equates manliness with assertive and consistent political commitment, and naturally enough finds John a 'precarious...manly role model' (p. 88). Paul Quinn, on the other hand, argues that John is a 'full-blown Protestant martyr' in "'Thou shalt turn to ashes": Shakespeare's *King John* as Protestant Martyrology (*Moreana* 45:clxxv[2008] 189–207). Shakespeare's play is the culmination of decades of Protestant revisionism, beginning with Simon Fish in the 1520s, and his distinctive contribution is to reconceive John's death, turning away from Foxe's account of it to draw instead on the deaths of Foxe's Marian martyrs. Where *The Troublesome Reigne* presented 'reconfigured Protestant history masquerading as political allegory' Shakespeare writes 'Foxe inspired martyrology' (p. 199). John's protracted exit from the world via poison is accompanied by an unusual number of references to burning, so much so that he 'appears to burn to death' (p. 201). John's fate in the second half of the play even mirrors the Foxean sequencing of accusation, confirmation, condemnation and sentence, beginning with Pandulph in III.i.

Paul Hammer returns to the question of Essex and *Richard II* last broached by Blair Worden in 'Shakespeare's *Richard II* and the Essex rising' (*SQ* 59[2008] 1–35). Hammer is an expert on Essex (and is writing a monograph on 1601). Here he offers a revisionist account of Essex's final years as a way of freshly contextualizing the issues. There is no space to delineate the detailed and fascinating narrative Hammer provides in his discrediting of the interpretation of this experienced military leader's last throw of the dice as a 'pathetically incompetent coup' (p. 18). He concludes that Essex, beset by plots, and with his enemies at court having gained the upper hand, plotted to force his way into Elizabeth's presence to justify himself, but was instead panicked into throwing himself on the mercy of the London authorities who, however, had already been primed to rebuff him. Hammer then takes aim at Worden's suggestion that the Globe play performed on the eve of Essex's action was not *Richard II*. He plausibly suggests that Essex was 'present at the playing of' not a lost play based on Hayward's history of *Henry IV* but at the playing of the *character*, perhaps in plays we still have. Hayward's book was seeking to capitalize on Essex's public association with plays featuring Bolingbroke, not the inspiration for a new play about him. Finally, Hammer investigates the ways in which the play was 'a coterie performance on a public stage' (p. 26), with a range of privately available significances for Essex's followers, some of whom were descendants of the aristocrats portrayed in the play. The play, Hammer suggests, would have built on Essex's associations with Bolingbroke, but also functioned as a cautionary example of how things could go wrong if the faction had its way and confronted Elizabeth. A bare summary doesn't do justice to the patient, scholarly and comprehensive case Hammer assembles. This essay is, quite simply, essential reading for anybody interested in historicizing Shakespeare.

*(e) Tragedies*

Shakespeare's tragedies received a great deal of attention in 2008. The critical output in the subject is impressive, and much new insight is provided by experts within the field. The studies represent various critical schools and approaches, and the resulting totality is rather intriguing. Questions regarding Shakespeare's ideas as revealed in his works are addressed, relations between text and performance are explored, and issues concerned with interpretation and authorship are discussed. Other studies throw new light on attitudes to race in *Titus Andronicus* and *Othello*. Some few plays have been revised or updated. Several studies of scholarly high standard have described the tragedies as part of Shakespeare's work as a whole, and their contribution to our understanding of the tragedies specifically should not be overlooked. Finally, there are numerous illuminating articles that focus on more limited topics. Collectively the scholars in Shakespeare studies have provided considerable new insight into the tragedies. The following survey will first deal with more general studies, then turn to specific tragedies.

*Shakespeare's Book: Essays in Reading, Writing and Reception*, edited by Richard Meek, Jane Rickard and Richard Wilson, is a collection of essays on various aspects of Shakespeare study, with a focus on the question whether his plays work as well on the page as on the stage. Of immediate interest to a review of Shakespeare's tragedies is Richard Meek's article on "'Penn'd speech': Seeing and Not Seeing in *King Lear*' (pp. 79–102). Meek refers to the description of dramatic utterances as 'penn'd speech' (from *Love's Labour's Lost* V.ii.146–8), indicating the paradoxical nature of the spoken words in dramatic texts, the fact that they are penned as well as spoken. Meek pursues this by asking how readers and audiences conceive of dramatic works. He subsequently explores 'the textuality of Shakespearean drama via a reading of *King Lear*, a play that—like *Love's Labour's Lost*—contains an unusually large number of epistles and other stage documents' (p. 79). Meek argues that *King Lear* is concerned with relations between seeing, hearing and reading, experiences which are relevant to our appreciation of the play. Meek's approach to *King Lear* involves questions related to text and performance, for example whether his plays work equally well on the page as on the stage. As Meek notes, there are many examples of 'seeing' in *King Lear* and much emphasis on literal as well as metaphorical blindness. The analysis comments on several instances of this, particularly in IV.vi. In Meek's opinion, we should not try to decide whether Shakespeare is pro- or anti-theatrical in a simple sense, but 'we should think more about the ways in which his works themselves explore the relationship between text and performance, and even dismantle the distinction between the two' (p. 97).

Some related questions are dealt with in Robert Weimann and Douglas Bruster's book, *Shakespeare and the Power of Performance: Stage and Page in the Elizabethan Theatre*, which sets out to redefine the relationship between language and performance on the early modern stage, with special reference to Shakespeare's achievement. According to the authors, Shakespeare foregrounds the power of performance through his use of clowns and fools, Vice descendants, gendered disguise, and 'secretly open' types of role-playing.

In Shakespeare's plays there is, therefore, a drive towards a dynamic relationship between show and language. Stage–page relations are addressed with reference to a great many Shakespeare plays, including most of the tragedies. In addition to specific chapters on *Richard III* and *King John*, a special chapter is devoted to *King Lear*, which is seen as containing a dynamic inventory of modes of playing in the early modern theatre. 'These modes range from Lear's madness, Edgar's excessive role-playing, Kent's threadbare disguise, and the "all-licensed Fool" to the lower, more earthy "new pranks" (Goneril's phrases [*King Lear* I.iv.201, 238]) that recur so frequently in the tragedy' (p. 199). The play is saturated with performance tricks and practices. To the authors, *King Lear* communicates the freedom to reveal the solemnization as well as the loss of royal power, and the division, oppression, and corruption caused by criminal acts of self-interest. The discussion contains many illuminating observations on 'the play's most radical "practicers," Edmund and Edgar' (p. 203). As the authors note, most criticism of *King Lear* puts emphasis on the act and consequences of dividing the kingdom, while 'the underlying politics and poetics of authority in representation have received considerably less notice' (p. 216). The authors commendably point out linkage among different dimensions in *King Lear* and thus increase our appreciation of the interplay between text and stage.

*The Norton Shakespeare* has appeared in a second edition, still with Stephen Greenblatt as general editor. The work continues to be based on the Oxford edition. The new edition has drawn on reactions from the thousands of readers that have made use of the book, and recent scholarship has been taken into account. As a result, there are some minor changes to the general introduction, as well as to the introductions to individual plays, textual notes have been made to reflect new findings, and new notes and glosses have been included. The general bibliography and the selected bibliographies have been extended and updated. The genealogies have been revised, and new annotated film lists follow the introductions to the plays. The filmographies reveal that all Shakespeare's tragedies have been filmed. This new edition of the *Norton Shakespeare* is published in three different formats. Of these there are four genre paperbacks, including one on the tragedies. The publisher's online resource, Norton Literature Online, has been extended, giving access to a great number of useful general resources.

While the second edition at first glance appears little changed from the first edition (after all only six pages have been added), some alterations should be noted. The excerpt from Henry Jackson's comments on *Othello* [1610] has been removed. The same applies to Nicholas Richardson's comments on *Romeo and Juliet* [1620].

To the students of Shakespearian tragedy, the new edition of the *Norton Shakespeare*, like the old, continues to provide illuminating introductions to each of the tragedies, from *Titus Andronicus* to *Coriolanus*. *Titus Andronicus* 'differs strikingly from most Renaissance tragedies' (p. 400), *Romeo and Juliet* has become one of the greatest love stories 'by means of the incandescent brilliance of its language' (p. 989), *Julius Caesar* 'dramatizes incidents that seem ... of world-historical significance' (p. 1549), while the introduction to *Hamlet* at once declares that *Hamlet* is an enigma (p. 1683). And for the last

tragedy, Katharine Eisaman Maus tries to answer the question, “What goes wrong in *Coriolanus*?” To the editors, *Othello* today ‘speaks to readers and audiences alike with unusual power, largely because it explores race and racism in unsettled fashion’ (p. 2109). *Timon of Athens* is seen as having ‘strong affinities to *The Merchant of Venice* in its concern with the connections between affectional and monetary bonds, and between material and intangible goods’ (p. 2263). Just as in the first edition, *King Lear* is presented with Q1 and F on facing pages for ease of comparison. In addition, a conflated version is offered, prepared by Barbara K. Lewalski. The *Norton Shakespeare* has for a number of years proved a useful resource for students and teachers alike. The collaboration with the readers reflected in the new edition, and the updating that has taken place, seem to have led to an even better Shakespeare resource.

*Shakespeare in Theory and Practice*, by Catherine Belsey, is a collection of essays written over a long period. The original articles appeared in a variety of publications but are now put together in a slightly revised form. Two interesting essays deal specifically with a Shakespeare tragedy; chapter 9 is devoted to *Hamlet* (‘In the case of Hamlet’s Conscience’) and chapter 10 to *Othello* (‘Iago the Essayist’). Looking back on her *Hamlet* essay, Belsey notes that, ‘Contrary to the widespread account of a prince required to kill Claudius but impeded by his own psychological inadequacy, my view is that Hamlet confronts an ethical question: what *ought* he to do?’ (p. 13). She observes a dissatisfaction with the binary oppositions central to the criticism when the essay originally appeared in 1974. To Belsey, Hamlet’s obligations were ‘less resolved, more equivocal, than commentators were ready to acknowledge’ (p. 13). Belsey’s essay on Hamlet’s conscience includes interesting comments on the Protestant science of casuistry, with specific reference to William Perkins’s influential work. As regards *Hamlet*, the ambiguities remain, and the question ‘What ought Hamlet to have done?’ (p. 156) is supplemented with ‘What else could he have done?’

Belsey’s other essay with relevance for the tragedies, ‘Iago the Essayist’, is an approach to *Othello* from a formal perspective, seeing the tragedy as a clash of genres, where heroic poetry encounters a sceptical type of prose, reminiscent of Montaigne. In Belsey’s view Iago becomes so destructive because he betrays the genre he mimics. Iago’s style masks his intense passion, ‘prosaic skepticism confronts passionate poetry and prevails, taking possession of the hero to his own destruction’ (p. 167).

Four tragedies are discussed in David Schalkwyk’s *Shakespeare, Love and Service*. *Timon of Athens* is considered in a chapter (‘More Than a Steward’) that also encompasses the sonnets and *Twelfth Night*. *Antony and Cleopatra* is commented upon in the chapter on ‘Office and Devotion’ with *1 and 2 Henry IV*, which includes another look at the sonnets. Finally, *King Lear* and *Othello* are treated in the chapter ‘I Am Your Own Forever’. The book reveals the interaction of two concepts, love and service, and was written on the assumption that all relationships can be seen as love relationships. Schalkwyk considers service ‘the world we have lost’ (p. 3) and love ‘the word we have lost’ (p. 5). He sets the unpolished *Timon of Athens* beside *Twelfth Night*, using the sonnets as a bridge, and unravelling a darker view of love, duty and sacrifice. For the treatment of *Antony and Cleopatra*, the author places the

Henriad alongside it to illuminate the similarities between relationships of friends in service, including Henry and Falstaff, on the one hand, and Antony and Enobarbus, on the other. As Schalkwyk makes perfectly clear, questions relating to love, friendship and service pervade all levels of the play. He remarks that '*Antony and Cleopatra* is an exception to my earlier claim that love has disappeared from the critical vocabulary of Shakespeare critics in the past two decades' (p. 197). In the course of the play, Antony and Cleopatra extend the concept of *eros*, making infusing it 'with the subjectivities of soldiership, mastery, service, beggary, play, friendship, and transcendence' (p. 198). The chapter on *King Lear* and *Othello* sees the two as being united by their empowerment of the qualities, as well as uncertainties, of service. In different ways, both plays are preoccupied with showing love and service. Schalkwyk describes service in *King Lear* as a dynamic concept which changes shape from one type of relationship to another, at one time approaching love, later an instrument of hatred. The play may therefore be read partly as emphasizing structural forms of power, and partly as a type of agency that transforms ideological instrumentality into an irrational devotional quality of love. Schalkwyk finds that *King Lear* and *Othello*, for all their differences, 'have much in common, not least their shared social framework of service and love, warped and self-negating' (p. 245). What follows is an interesting discussion of *Othello*, including comments on the master–servant dialectic involving Othello and Iago and a discussion of Emilia's counter-service. Schalkwyk's book represents scholarly work of a high standard, and greatly illuminates its subject.

David Crystal's '*Think on my words*': *Exploring Shakespeare's Language* contains references to most of Shakespeare's work, including the tragedies, but the book explores the playwright's overall use of language, rather than the language of particular plays. The book is highly relevant as an excellent exploration of Shakespeare's language, and Crystal's question 'What does it do?' implies a semantic as well as a pragmatic approach.

Jonathan Bate's book, *Soul of the Age: The Life, Mind and World of William Shakespeare*, is an extensive treatment of Shakespeare's world. For our purposes its references to the tragedies are highly relevant, and all examples of the genre receive some comment. For example, *Hamlet* is discussed with dilemmas and duality in mind; *Othello* is approached with observations on the bawdy court and occasional comments on the charismatic villain. There are also references to Othello as soldier and Othello as Christian. The author's discussion of *King Lear* particularly comments on allusions to philosophers and on the Fool. Bate's discussions of aspects of the tragedies are illuminating, and he reveals an excellent grasp of Shakespeare's world.

David Bevington has explored the ideas prevalent in Shakespeare's work in his book *Shakespeare's Ideas: More things in Heaven and Earth*. While the book reflects Shakespeare's political and moral philosophy as revealed in the plays as well as the poems, the student of Shakespeare's tragedies will find that all the tragedies are referred to repeatedly. *Julius Caesar*, *Hamlet*, *King Lear* and *Othello* receive more attention than the others within the genre. Thus Bevington sees *Julius Caesar* as 'the story of great philosophical ideas in conflict' (p. 160), and he aptly discusses Brutus's divided state of mind.

His discussion of *King Lear* is equally interesting, containing a focus on deliberate evil and finding ‘the existential challenge in *King Lear*... especially acute’ (p. 171). *Hamlet* is referred to repeatedly in the book, incorporating comments on the theological distinctions needed to understand what the Ghost is telling his son. Bevington also discusses interestingly the—in Calvinist terms edifying—contrast between Hamlet’s dead father and Claudius. The discussion of *Othello* includes illuminating commentary on Iago as a consummate deceiver. In Bevington’s view, there is in both *King Lear* and *Othello* a clash of ideologies that ‘centres to a considerable extent on the existential challenges posed by Iago and Edmund to conventional ideas of moral order’ (p. 162). Although mirroring what plays as well as poems suggest about a great many topics, Bevington’s book on Shakespeare’s moral and intellectual commitment is rewarding reading for the general reader as well as the expert. It is especially commendable that Bevington presents a finely balanced account, avoiding extreme interpretation.

In an article devoted to a somewhat related topic entitled ‘Who Do the People Love?’ (*ShS* 61[2008] 289–301), Richard Levin discusses Shakespeare’s opinions on politics. According to Levin, Shakespeare’s views on art, justice, love, marriage, friendship, sex and religion are implied in his works. Shakespearian critics have had no problems in showing, by supporting evidence from the plays, what were Shakespeare’s views on subjects such as justice, nature, war and honour. In Levin’s experience, it is more difficult for critics to point out Shakespeare’s attitude to politics. Levin notes that in Shakespeare there are only three extended treatments of ‘the people’ as a separate political agency: the Roman plebeians in the first three acts of *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus*, as well as Jack Cade’s rebels in Act IV of *2 Henry VI*. In all three plays they appear as a mindless, fickle and murderous ‘rabble’. Levin thus clearly demonstrates that while critics have wanted Shakespeare to favour democracy, there is every reason to believe that he did not.

A special issue of *Shakespeare* (4:ii[2008]) is devoted to ‘Shakespeare and Islam’, and in the ‘Introduction’ (pp. 102–111), Mark Hutchings, guest editor, states that the publication is not concerned with approaching doctrinal questions but with questions of adaptation and appropriation, staging and interpretation. The issue thus contributes to central fields within contemporary Shakespeare studies, including the tragedies. The term ‘Islam’ is used to cover the Ottoman empire as well as the Persian, and the early modern as well as more recent periods are considered.

*The Review of English Studies* (RES 59[2008] 219–31) contains an article by MacDonald P. Jackson on ‘Three Disputed Shakespeare Readings: Associations and Contexts’. The author acknowledges the careful work involved in the preparation of a critical edition of a Shakespeare play: selecting from variants in the earliest printed texts or later conjectural emendations. The article is focused on two passages in *Romeo and Juliet* (II.ii.26–32 in *The Riverside Hamlet*) and two in *Hamlet* (I.iv.36–8 and II.ii.174–86), arguing that in practically all recent editions the editors have made the wrong choices. These views are based on examinations of context and of associations, not least concerning imagery, with similar situations in other Shakespeare plays.

John W. Velz, who passed away in 2008, has an engaging article on ‘Eschatology in the Bradleian Tragedies: Some Aesthetic Implications’ (*ShN* 58:ii[2008] 41, 62, 64, 74). The illuminating discussion on the eschatological motif deals with the four plays that A.C. Bradley said defined the genre, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Macbeth* and *King Lear*. Velz notes that in the ‘Bradleian tragedies’ the judge and his judgement are absent, while in plays with comedic resolutions judgements seemingly based on Doomsday pageants and moralities abound. In another article John W. Velz presents ‘Notes on Shakespeare’s Sources for Four Plays’ (*ShN* 57:iii[2007/8] 87–8, 96). The author examines a few passages from *Julius Caesar*, *Othello*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Cymbeline* in relation to passages in North’s Plutarch, in order to demonstrate that ‘even the least prominent of source questions can throw light on the creative process’ (p. 87). To illustrate his point, Velz uses an example from *Julius Caesar* IV.iii. Shakespeare is establishing a conflict between private grief and military necessity. Plutarch employs three different numbers to indicate military strength in the various Lives of Brutus, Marcus Antonius and Cicero. In Velz’s view, Shakespeare, when writing *Othello* five years later, borrowed from *Julius Caesar* IV.iii the uncertainty about numbers that Plutarch had prompted.

In *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* (*ShJE* 144[2008] 47–65) Jerzy Limon writes about ‘The Fifth Wall: Words of Silence in Shakespeare’s Soliloquies and Asides’. Limon advocates that acoustic silence on the stage does not necessarily mean silence in fictional space. Making use of a great many examples from Shakespeare’s plays, including *King Lear* (I.i.60) and *Titus Andronicus* (Acts II and V), the author shows that ‘in theatre verbal signs do not necessarily have to be the signs of verbal utterances in the fictitious realm, and *vice versa*’ (p. 48). In the theatre there are, according to Limon, at least two semiotic orders in constant play. Each of these is distinguished by a hierarchy of functions, in Charles Peirce’s terminology named for example iconic, indexical and symbolic. Limon’s subsequent comments on *King Lear* I.i.60 concern the question whether the single sentence is a short soliloquy or an aside.

Addressing the question of authorship, David Scott Kastan, in ‘“To think these trifles some-thing”: Shakespearean Playbooks and the Claims of Authorship’ (*ShakS* 36[2008] 37–48), comments informatively on several of the tragedies. Kastan assumes that ‘all agree that nineteen of Shakespeare’s plays were individually published before the Folio appeared in 1623. By 1603, fifteen of these were already in print’ (p. 41). Six of them, including *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*, first appeared as ‘bad quartos’, and, as Kastan notes, these seem to have been printed without Shakespeare’s initiative or knowledge. In order to replace deficient printings, *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet* were soon followed by new versions. As Kastan cautiously puts it, the other six plays, including *Titus Andronicus*, ‘appeared in editions that might plausibly be thought to reflect the desire or at least a willingness of Shakespeare to see them in print in the form they were published’ (p. 42).

Turning to treatments of individual plays, we start with *Titus Andronicus*, noticing that in *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* Gustav Ungerer has an informative article on ‘The Presence of Africans in Elizabethan England and the Performance of *Titus Andronicus* at Burley-on-the-Hill,

1585/96' (*MRDE* 21[2008] 19–56). Ungerer's discussion is an illuminating contribution to our knowledge of Africans in Elizabethan England. As Ungerer points out, Shakespeare in 1594 confronted the Elizabethans with Aaron, a literate African and a dramatic figure trained in the classics. The dramatist thereby presented a marked departure from the notion of black inferiority. However calculated such a move may have been, this was not, in Ungerer's view, surprising to the educated classes, to courtiers and noblemen whose views had been shaped by the Portuguese and Spanish experience. In addition, the author refers to the descendants of English merchants who had slaveholdings in Andalusia from 1480 to 1572. Ungerer unravels the history of the black presence in Elizabethan England, then turns to the performance of *Titus Andronicus* on 1 January 1596. Ungerer's survey of the presence of Africans in Elizabethan England includes fascinating comments on the English female slaveholders and English merchant slaveholders. The Guinea Charter of 1588–98 is specifically discussed, as are the Mediterranean traders and the Portuguese New Christians as slaveholders in England. The performance of *Titus Andronicus* is seen as breaking 'new ground in its attempt to cast doubt on the conventional perception of the African other as an inferior being' (p. 39). Ungerer observes that the racial discourse of the time was an immediate concern, as the founding of the Guinea Company in 1588 caused a great influx of black Africans, reaching a peak around 1593/4, when Shakespeare was writing *Titus Andronicus*.

In *New Literary History* Tzachi Zamir has an article on *Titus Andronicus* entitled 'Wooden Subjects' (*NLH* 39:ii[2008] 277–300). Zamir presents a literary criticism of the play discussing the great many examples of atrocities inflicted on characters. The topics treated include tree imagery, pain and its aesthetic experience, and grief. Zamir concludes that *Titus Andronicus* is a tragedy about the genre of tragedy.

Moving on to *Romeo and Juliet*, we find an article on the European Herbal Medicines Directive, seemingly outside our area, in which Philip A. Routledge asks the titillating question, 'Could It Have Saved the Lives of Romeo and Juliet?' (*Drug Safety* 31:v[2008] 416–18). As Routledge points out, herbal medicines have a long history of therapeutic use. They may, however, occasionally cause dose-related or idiosyncratic toxicity. *Romeo and Juliet* contains many references to herbal medicines. In Routledge's view, Shakespeare recognized that therapeutic benefit and toxicity could come from the same herbal source. Thus, in *Romeo and Juliet* II.iii Friar Laurence states that 'Within the infant rind of this weak flower, Poison hath residence, and medicine power'. Romeo himself knew about the effects of herbal medicines, informing Benvolio that plantain leaf would help his 'broken shin' (I.ii). Routledge argues that what puts Juliet into a deep sleep was almost certainly a type of herbal medicine (distilled liquor). Also, what Romeo uses to take his own life thinking that Juliet is dead is a poison which might be of herbal origin. Routledge advocates that what seems to cause the chain of events ending with the death of the two lovers is poor communication. As he concludes, the fate of the lovers is sealed when Juliet, in Act III scene v, decides 'I'll to the friar to know his remedy, if all else fails I can but die'.



A discussion of the name Rosalind, as used by Spenser in *The Shepheardes Calender* and Shakespeare in *Romeo and Juliet*, appears in *TLS* (12:xii[2008] 13–14). As the author Andrew Hadfield points out, the character Rosalind never appears although she is referred to in both texts. The article contains scholarly speculations concerning who the character might be or what she represents.

'The Taming of Romeo in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*' is the subject of a short article in *Explicator* (*Expl* 66:iv[2008] 206–8) by Wisam Mansour. The author argues that Juliet is a stronger person than is customarily assumed. To prove that point Mansour focuses on the balcony scene in II.ii, which 'illuminates Juliet's depth of personality and accentuates her struggle for selfhood' (p. 206). Juliet wants to control her destiny by manipulating and taming Romeo. In support of this view, the author points to Shakespeare's use of falconry and falconer imagery.

Among the tragedies, *Hamlet* continues to receive more critical attention than any other Shakespeare play. Harold Bloom's edition of *Hamlet* has appeared in the Bloom's Shakespeare through the Ages series. The book is a study guide to the play: it does not contain the text but presents a selection of excellent criticism of *Hamlet* through the centuries. The introductory chapters contain a biography of the playwright, a summary of the play, key passages in *Hamlet*, and a list of characters. The main portion of the book contains criticism of the play by writers as different as Ben Jonson and Samuel Pepys from the seventeenth century, Voltaire, Fielding, Sterne and Goethe from the eighteenth century, and Schlegel, Lamb, Hazlitt, Coleridge, Edgar Allan Poe, Hugo, Nietzsche, Swinburne, Arnold, Twain and Wilde from the nineteenth century. Of critical views meant to represent the twentieth century, we find Chesterton, de la Mare, Bradley, Eliot, Joyce, Wilson Knight, Empson and Bloom himself. It is a pity that most of the authors are represented by very short excerpts. Those that are given most attention, or space, from the seventeenth century are Francois de Belleforest from 1608, with his *The Hystorie of Hamblet*, and John Dryden, for remarks in his preface to *Troilus and Cressida*. From the eighteenth century Samuel Johnson receives a comparatively large amount of attention. Of nineteenth-century criticism Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy* is one of several excerpts that make an impression. It is to be expected, as well as commended, that A.C. Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy* has been included. Other interesting comments are found in Joyce's *Ulysses*. G. Wilson Knight is represented by 'The Embassy of Death: An Essay on Hamlet', from *The Wheel of Fire*. One of the most extensive examples of criticism is William Empson's 'Hamlet When New', from the *Sewanee Review*. Similarly, Harold C. Goddard's comments from *The Meaning of Shakespeare*, Stephen Booth's 'On the Value of *Hamlet*', and Margaret Ferguson's '*Hamlet*: Letters and Spirits' are allowed some development. Graham Bradshaw's contribution, 'Hamlet and the Art of Grafting', from *Shakespeare's Scepticism*, is intriguing for his rejection of much new historicist and cultural materialist Shakespeare criticism. From the present century only one source of criticism has been deemed worthy of representation: James Shapiro's two half-page comments on *Hamlet* in *A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare*. As an overview of *Hamlet* criticism

Bloom's book is insightful and serves a useful purpose. But for in-depth studies, including more exemplifications from the twenty-first century, other publications might be better suited.

Michael Davies has written a book on *Hamlet: Character Studies* in the series Continuum Character Studies. This is a small volume containing interesting views on the character Hamlet, primarily, but also comments on the other characters. It is a student-friendly book which makes accessible a fairly sophisticated type of literary analysis. Initially, Davies gives an overview of *Hamlet* and discusses dramatic character as perceived in Shakespeare's time as well as in more recent criticism. A separate chapter deals with Shakespeare's way of introducing us to Hamlet's character and considers complexities concerning Hamlet's first appearance. Hamlet is described as 'a compendium of selves: an early modern man of no fixed identity' (p. 50). In a chapter on *Hamlet's* other characters, Davies notes that these other characters do not detract from the impression that the tragedy 'has been constructed through or around the consciousness of its hero, as if its action is somehow taking place within and without Hamlet's own mind' (p. 75), as he is the subject of others' conversations and speculations. Particular attention is paid to the rivalry between the polarized characters of Prince and King, while the other characters, Polonius, Laertes, Gertrude and Ophelia, are seen as reflecting the nature of Claudius's court, family, and affairs of state. The conclusion moves from characters to the key themes and issues, ending on the unsettling realization that '*Hamlet* appears to be full of doubles with whom Shakespeare twins his Prince in complex dramatic and rhetorical ways' (p. 115).

The question of *Hamlet* as a literary and professional version of the First Quarto is considered in *Shakespeare Quarterly*. In the article 'The First Literary *Hamlet* and the Commonplacings of Professional Plays' (*SQ* 59[2008] 371–420), Zachary Lesser and Peter Stallybrass address the use of commonplace markers, commas or inverted commas at the beginning of each line. The discussion includes the use of commonplaces by those responsible for the publication of both Q1 and Q2 of *Hamlet*, publisher John Bodenham and stationer Nicholas Ling. The authors' interesting conclusion is as follows: 'Reading Q1 *Hamlet* with the commonplace markers in mind suggests, in what may now seem a paradox, that if we want to historicize this playbook in its own moment, we need to see it not simply as a theatrical abridgment but rather as a *literary text for reading*' (pp. 379–80).

Another article on *Hamlet* focuses on the character Horatio. In 'Specters of Horatio' (*ELH* 75[2008] 1023–50), Christopher Warley finds that Horatio embodies rationality as well as objectivity and justness. The character of Gertrude is approached in Richard Levin's article, 'Gertrude's Elusive Libido and Shakespeare's Unreliable Narrators' (*SEL* 48[2008] 305–26). The article discusses the nature and role of the characters involved in the play, with special emphasis on Gertrude's sexuality and her relationship with her husband. In *Critique*, Shuli Barzilai compares *Hamlet* and one of Margaret Atwood's novels in the article '"Tell my story": Remembrance and Revenge in Atwood's *Oryx and Crake* and Shakespeare's *Hamlet*' (*Critique* 50:i[2008] 87–110). The author notes that several of Atwood's novels share multiple elements with revenge tragedy. An intertextual reading comparing Atwood's novel with

*Hamlet* demonstrates that both texts contain a revenge plot involving a murdered father, a mother marrying the murderer, and an only son dedicated to vengeance. Insight into a psychoanalytical interpretation of *Hamlet* is provided in the article 'On the Ghostly Father: Lacan on *Hamlet*', by Stefan Polatinsky and Derek Hook (*Psychoanalytic Review* 95:iii[2008] 359–85). A Lacanian psychoanalytical reading of the play suggests that *Hamlet* is a tragedy of desire.

In a lengthy essay using as a point of departure Walter Benjamin's 1928 *Ursprung des deutschen Trauerspiele* (translated as *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*), Hugh Grady discusses 'Hamlet as Mourning-Play: A Benjaminesque Interpretation' (*ShakS* 36[2008] 135–65). Grady presents Benjamin's theory of allegory and discusses aspects of the play with allegory in mind, among them the role of the Ghost, Hamlet's vision of the emptiness of the world, Ophelia's madness, and the graveyard scene. In Grady's view, the play goes beyond the limitations of the *Trauerspiel* in its complex hero, while it follows the typical *Trauerspiel* in its conclusion. The ending of *Hamlet* is characterized by the ambiguity of catastrophe, involving a balance between continuing emptiness and redemption, even triumph.

Versions of the printed text of *Hamlet* are focused on in Ian Felce's article on 'Riddling Q1: *Hamlet*'s Mill and the Trickster' (*ShS* 61[2008] 269–80). The author notes the questionable shape of the First Quarto of *Hamlet* when it was rediscovered in Henry Bunbury's closet 200 years after the publication of the First Folio. Felce points out that Q1 was printed in 1603 and Q2 appeared in 1604–5, while it took twenty years before the First Folio version was published in 1623. With the exception of some telling differences, Q2 and F are close, sharing some celebrated verse, characters behaving similarly and a similar chronology of scenes. Q1, the 'bad' quarto, stands out, however. It is considerably shorter than the other two, characters are different with regard to name and action, the chronology of scenes is dissimilar, and the verse is frequently patchy. On the basis of this, Felce argues that it is doubtful that Shakespeare could have been responsible for Q1 as it stands. The Q1 *Hamlet* text may therefore be viewed as a skilful theatrical abridgement. He refers to Thomas Clayton's opinion that Q1 is a memorial reconstruction by a player. Textual comparison between the texts of Q1, Q2 and F may indicate that Q1 most closely approaches the *Hamlet* tradition and was written before Shakespeare's re-creation of the play.

In the article 'Eclipse of Action: *Hamlet* and the Political Economy of Playing' (*SQ* 59[2008] 450–82), Richard Halpern addresses a few old problems in *Hamlet* and presents a new approach to character, action and temporality. Halpern contends that '*Hamlet* reworks the Aristotelian discrimination between *poiesis* and *praxis*, making and doing, in a way that not only produces a major philosophical statement on the nature of human action but also fundamentally recasts the relation between the tragic and the political' (p. 450). He argues that this creates a major philosophical affirmation of the nature of human action and reshapes the relationship between the political and the tragic. To Halpern, Adam Smith's work on political economy is a threat to Aristotle's understanding of action. The ethical and political dimensions of this crisis are remade by Hannah Arendt in the twentieth century.

Stimulating work on *Othello* is represented by, for example, Nicholas Potter's book *Othello: Character Studies*, which has appeared as one of the Continuum Character Studies, a series aiming 'to promote sophisticated literary analysis through the concept of character' (p. ix). After an introduction to the play, Potter deals with the character Othello in three consecutive chapters, followed by three chapters on Iago and one on Desdemona. There is also a chapter on the minor characters, including the Duke, Brabantio, Roderigo, Emilia, Montano and Ludovico, then a short conclusion and further reading. Commenting on the close of the play, Potter instructively notes that so far the postcolonial position has not been sufficiently explored, and in his view, 'It is perhaps this perspective that offers the most poignant view of the play' (p. 118). In one version *Othello* is the tale of an idealistic member of a subaltern race in the service of a colonial power intent on exploiting his people. While Potter finds that new historicism and psychological accounts have problems accommodating a tragic perspective, feminism can unravel the tragedies of Desdemona and Emilia and may develop Othello's tragedy as being of a constructed masculinity. Potter categorically states that tragedies are about endings. Significantly, Cassio has the last word of the play, 'it was he who was the cause, in great part, of Iago's anger; it was he who, next to Desdemona and before Roderigo, was most wronged' (p. 121). Potter's study is that of a well-read author who opens our eyes to new aspects of the characters of the play.

*Speaking of the Moor: From Alcazar to Othello* is another fascinating study of *Othello*. In her book, Emily C. Bartels tries to show that speaking of the 'Moor of Venice' is not as straightforward as one would think. Othello represents many and culturally divergent images, and this is apparent in the diversity of narratives of Africa. The multiplicity of images makes it hard to draw the line between them. Although Othello bids the audience to 'speak of me as I am; nothing extenuate, | Nor aught set down in malice' (V.ii.341–2), it is difficult to speak clearly of his ethnicity. Bartels focuses on and emphasizes the place of Africa in the early modern English imagination, and through her study she reveals the openness with which the Moor was treated in the period: as she points out, the Moor became a central character on the stage. This applies to *Othello* as it does to *Titus Andronicus*. Bartels makes clear that there is no single attitude to blackness. 'In *Titus*, as in *Othello*, interpretations of the Moor happen *inside*, not *outside*, the cultural moment' (p. 99). The variables with regard to geography and history, religion, and skin colour contribute to making the Moor truly intriguing. Tellingly, the chapter devoted to the character Othello is called 'The "stranger of here and everywhere"' (p. 155). More than anything, *Othello* the play, at its core a domestic tragedy, is the staging of a cross-cultural exchange, in which 'we cannot really tell where Venice's story stops and the Moor's story begins' (p. 190). The book places Moor plays alongside texts containing Moorish figures. Besides interesting chapters on *Othello* and *Titus Andronicus*, Bartels's study includes comments on Hakluyt's *Navigations*, John Pory's translation of *The History and Description of Africa*, and Queen Elizabeth's letters suggesting the deportation of 'blackamoors'. *Speaking of the Moor* increases our understanding of the

diversity of attitudes to people of African descent in early modern England and contributes to our appreciation of the divergent images of the Moor.

Othello is also addressed by Lena Cowen Orlin in her article on 'The Domestication of *Othello*' (*ShJE* 144[2008] 132–47). Orlin focuses her discussion on III.iii.213, 'to see her father's eyes up, close as oak'. She argues that this should be read in the context of the materialistic culture of Elizabethan England. In Orlin's view, Othello's material imagination is reconfigured under the malign influence of Iago. Othello in turn internalizes paranoid and superstitious beliefs that are detrimental to him. There is a striking change in Othello from the role of being leading general to that of being domesticated. Orlin concludes: 'By falling subject to suspicion of a blocked peephole, by phrasing his belief in his own betrayal as the constituting of a corner, Othello confirms his domestication' (p. 146).

An extensive essay by Shawn Smith in *Papers on Language and Literature* discusses 'Love, Pity, and Deception in *Othello*' (*PLL* 44:i[2008] 3–51). The point of departure for the article is Henry Jackson's reaction to the performance of *Othello* at Oxford in 1610, where he was moved by the image of Desdemona's dead body on the stage, an image Smith describes as non-verbal but not unrhethorical. This raises questions about the dramatic economy of *Othello*. Smith notes that 'much of the play's dialogue draws on the vocabulary and rhetorical forms of forensic debate' (p. 4). Legal contexts, including the 'court of love', are important for an understanding of the treatment of pity as a token of Desdemona's love for Othello, a love questioned as a feigned response when Iago later makes Othello raise doubts about her fidelity. Smith's article discusses *Othello*'s dual mode of verbal and visual expression as reflected in two currents of *Othello* criticism, one concerned with the importance of speech and narrative in the play, and the other with a focus on the visual power of its final scene. The article contains a thorough discussion of pity, love and deception, ending on an ominous note that Iago, although 'censured', will remain 'outside the world of justice and mercy that he has helped to impose upon Othello and through which he has succeeded in achieving his goal—revenge upon Othello' (p. 48).

A.R. Braunmuller has edited an updated edition of *Macbeth*. This edition, which replaces that of 1997, appears in the New Cambridge Shakespeare series and is, according to the publisher, 'the most extensively annotated edition of *Macbeth* currently available, offering a thorough reconsideration of one of Shakespeare's most popular plays' (p. i). The updated, lengthy introduction of 110 pages considers the contexts of the composition of the play. More particularly, the introduction deals with the character Macbeth in legend and the play *Macbeth* in history, *Macbeth* in the mind, and *Macbeth* in performance. Possible new sources are mentioned, including Thomas Middleton's writing. There are also comments on filmed versions of the play. The part on recent criticism and scholarship lists a few of the many contributions to our understanding of *Macbeth* from the two most recent decades. There is also a section on *Macbeth* since 1700. The page-by-page commentary on the text is unusually full. The comments make frequent references to the *OED* and other lexical sources and draw attention to the play's verbal inventiveness. Following the dramatic text, there is a section on

textual analysis, which deals with different aspects of the Folio, including comments on Thomas Middleton's contribution to the Folio. Here it is stated that Folio *Macbeth* 'may print passages not written by Shakespeare but (most probably) by Thomas Middleton; Act I, Scene ii, has been especially controversial' (p. 271). This updated edition of *Macbeth* reveals thorough research, it is conscientiously annotated, and it appears a superb tool for researchers and students involved in Shakespeare scholarship.

'Shakespearean Debt to Tacitus' Histories' is the topic of an article by Herbert W. Benario (*N&Q* 55[2008] 202–5). In addition to drawing on *Richard II*, Benario also comments on *Macbeth*, suggesting several parallels of dramatic narrative between Tacitus and Shakespeare.

Sofie Kluge has written 'An Apology for Antony: Morality and Pathos in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* (*OrbisLit* 63:iv[2008] 304–34). Kluge initially observes that critical opinion about *Antony and Cleopatra* has varied a great deal. The study starts off with a discussion of the play as being a mixture of pathetic and moral tragedy. The author sets out 'to demonstrate how the play's peculiar combination of morality and pathos results in a dialectical critique of both moral and pathetic concepts of the tragic (p. 305). According to Kluge, Shakespeare created in *Antony and Cleopatra* an 'apology' for Antony, exploring the beauty of perdition and greatness in a person having become an image of corruption. In the author's view, the play fundamentally relies on the Christian moral concept of tragedy, and this interferes with the apologetic direction contained in the play. A consequence of this is that 'the character of Antony appears in an ambiguous chiaroscuro whose somber moral tones have their origin in Roman and medieval historiography while the lighter, more comprehensive ones stem from the poet's Renaissance heritage, Petrarchan philography, Humanist anthropology, and Neoplatonic transcendental philosophy' (p. 305). The ambiguity inherent in Shakespeare's characterization of Antony's role as tragic hero will, in Kluge's opinion, by implication lead to questioning the view of Shakespeare as a modern dramatist and of Renaissance drama as breaking away from the medieval heritage.

'Two New Sources for *Coriolanus*' is the title of an article by David George (*N&Q* 55[2008] 194–7). George sees battle-scene influences on *Coriolanus* issuing from the staging of *I Henry VI*, with regard to both rhetoric and action. The author also finds textual similarities between the anonymously written pamphlet 'The Great Frost' and *Coriolanus*, concluding that Shakespeare was influenced by the pamphlet.

In a thought-provoking article on 'Shakespeare as Coauthor' (*ShakS* 36[2008] 49–59), Jeffrey Knapp looks into Shakespeare's return to co-authorship at the end of his career. Knapp notes that, according to current histories of authorship in Renaissance drama, 'collective playwriting was both the practical and the theoretical norm in English theaters until around 1600, when the idea of single dramatic authorship first began to surface' (p. 49). To Knapp it makes sense to suggest that Shakespeare might have had a co-author in plays such as *Henry VI* and *Coriolanus*. He looks for reasons why Shakespeare would have returned to collaborative writing towards the end of his career, and after he had become famous as a single author. Knapp looks for other genres of collective writing in the book market at the time, and states

that, interestingly, Shakespeare returned to collective playwriting at a time when there was a substantial change in his dramaturgy from tragedy to romance. Three or four years before *Pericles*, Shakespeare wrote his great tragedies *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus* and *Timon of Athens*. These tragedies, and especially the last two, with protagonists who overvalue their singleness, ‘offered little hope that a new generation might continue or complete the work of the generation before it’ (p. 52). With *Pericles*, as an example of one of his late co-authored plays, Shakespeare envisioned ‘a future of “new joy” beyond the single life of his protagonist, which in turn created a future for himself beyond the single genre of tragedy’ (p. 52).

As should be amply revealed in this review of scholarship on Shakespeare’s tragedies published in 2008, critics continue to be strongly attracted to the genre. The multiplicity of approaches to Shakespearian tragedy is stimulating and truly impressive. This remarkable interest in Shakespeare’s tragedies and the resulting wealth of competent scholarship testify, in the final analysis, to the greatness of Shakespeare’s artistry.

(f) *Late Plays*

Gordon McMullan’s *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing: Authorship in the Proximity of Death* [2007] was discussed in detail in last year’s review. His contribution to this year’s *Shakespeare and the Cultures of Performance*, edited by Paul Yachnin and Patricia Badir, also merits attention, if only to show that the concept of ‘late’ writing continues to be debated. ‘*The Tempest* and the Uses of Late Shakespeare in the Cultures of Performance: Prospero, Gielgud, Rylance’ (a version of the concluding chapter of his monograph) explores ‘the appropriation of Shakespearean lateness as a vehicle for the self-conscious structuring of theatrical careers’ (p. 147). Focusing on John Gielgud’s and Mark Rylance’s involvement with *The Tempest* at various stages of their careers, McMullan argues that both actors use the idea of late Shakespeare—and specifically *The Tempest* as Shakespeare’s last play, and the assumption that Prospero is Shakespeare’s alter ego—to validate their theatrical careers. In this lively and engaging essay, McMullan draws attention to the ‘utility’ (p. 153) of the idea of lateness in Shakespeare, and exposes our investment in the idea of lateness as ‘a final flowering’ (p. 150). While it is for this that the essay is most valuable, it also makes a significant contribution to our understanding of Shakespearian theatrical careers.

In contrast to McMullan’s revisionary work on lateness, the concluding chapter of Patrick Cheney’s monograph, *Shakespeare’s Literary Authorship*, presupposes a ‘late or mythic phase’ (p. 234) of Shakespeare’s literary career. Picking up on an idea raised in the epilogue of his 2004 book, *Shakespeare, National Poet-Playwright*, Cheney reads in Shakespeare’s work the assertion of a ‘counter-laureate authorship’, which he brings to a close with an examination of *Cymbeline*:

*Cymbeline* helps conclude a study of Shakespeare’s literary authorship—his historic role as national poet-playwright—because it is the only late

romance formally set in Britain. It therefore affords a unique opportunity to wed the political topic of nationalism to the literary topic of romance, especially since late in his career Shakespeare rescripted this emergent stage genre by fusing a discourse of theatre to a discourse of poetry (p. 234).

In an appealing analysis of Imogen's conversation with Pisano about her plan for reuniting with Posthumous at Milford Haven, Cheney sums up his approach to *Cymbeline*: 'The conversation turns out to be about "Britain"', but it also combines an ancient trope for lyric poetry, the discourse of print culture, and theatre, and so forms a memorable miniature of Shakespeare's literary authorship near its close' (p. 238). Cheney identifies *Cymbeline* as a play about Shakespearian authorship, and specifically a play about the author's writing of Britain: 'As a late national romance about Shakespeare's counter-laureate career, *Cymbeline* functions as a testament to his historic authorship' (p. 242). In what he calls his 'intertextual intratextuality' (p. 246), Cheney demonstrates that in *Cymbeline* Shakespeare alludes to the work of other ancient and contemporary poets specifically concerned with the writing of nation through self-conscious references to his own previous work. Cheney thus suggests that Shakespeare presents himself as 'self-conscious counter to the Western art of laureate self-presentation' (p. 263) as he reviews his literary authorship towards the end of his career. Following McMullan's challenge to the idea of lateness, the notion of 'late Shakespeare' must be accepted with caution. Still, in 'Venting Rhyme for a Mockery: *Cymbeline* and National Romance', Cheney's concept of 'counter-laureate authorship' offers a fresh reading of *Cymbeline* and Shakespeare's literary canon as a whole. Within this, a particular highlight is his persuasive reading of the bedroom scene, which for the first time interprets the Ovidian allusions through Imogen and not Iachimo, and thus focuses 'on the author's literary representation of female consciousness and identity' (p. 246).

Also highlighting *Cymbeline*'s preoccupation with nation but taking a very different approach, Andrew Escobedo's 'From Britannia to England: Cymbeline and the Beginning of Nations' (*SQ* 59[2008] 60–87) considers the idea of England, Britain, and the question of national origins in the play. Observing that *Cymbeline* 'registers a transition from conceiving the nation as a community of deep-rooted *nati* to conceiving it as a community of rather recent origin' (p. 62), he argues that it 'dramatizes the tension between a sense of a British nation, awkwardly heterogeneous but linked to antiquity, and an English nation, potentially pure but severed from tradition' (p. 63). Reading *Cymbeline* as a response to the question 'What is a nation?', Escobedo argues that the play offers two answers: '(1) the (British) nation is a community that tries to make the best of the heterogeneity of deep roots, or (2) the (English) nation is a community that eschews roots for the sake of purity in the present' (p. 65). In this carefully researched and persuasively argued essay, Escobedo demonstrates the complexity of *Cymbeline*'s representation of nation and makes a significant contribution to the continuing debate about national consciousness in the early modern period, and the question of 'Britain' in particular.



In a second essay on *Cymbeline* in *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Bonnie Lander challenges the conflation of Imogen with the idea of nation that has characterized much criticism of the play. 'Interpreting the Person: Tradition, Conflict, and *Cymbeline's* Imogen' (*SQ* 59[2008] 156–84) focuses on the 'person' of Imogen, and argues that the play explores two different models of personhood—the culturally determined and the self-determined—through its representation of Imogen, and imagines her as 'a philosophical adventurer who interrogates these opposed conceptions of character in order to achieve a satisfying definition of personhood in which both conceptions exist in dynamic interrelationship' (p. 158). Taking this approach, Lander produces an interesting new reading of the ending of the play and the circumstances in which Imogen can proclaim 'I am nothing', and she concludes: 'The contradictory position [Imogen] embodies confirms the necessity of dismantling the immensely powerful structures governing identity formation, even if such structures can never ultimately be discarded. The defining nature of identity must not be allowed a tyrannical hold, yet such definitions can and must never be wholly overthrown; selfhood itself relies on them' (p. 181). The essay makes its argument through a detailed discussion of the play's performance history and, more importantly, its reception, and for this it is particularly useful.

In the first of two pieces on service in the late plays, David Schalkwyk's *Shakespeare, Love and Service* looks at the ways in which the personal, affective relations of love are informed by the social, structural interactions of service. His concluding chapter, '"Something more than man": *The Winter's Tale*', identifies Camillo, Antigonus, Paulina, Hermione and Autolycus among the servants who populate *The Winter's Tale* (and offers insightful overviews of their particular representations of service), but focuses on Paulina, who, as the play's 'chief agent of resistance, healing, and restoration' (p. 263), he understands as the epitome of service in the Shakespearian canon. Maintaining that *The Winter's Tale* represents the crisis of service in the face of tyranny more than any other Shakespearian play, he identifies 'disobedience, critical opposition, and judicious counsel' (p. 263) as the essential qualities of service. And while he challenges the assumption that service is inherently conservative, Schalkwyk argues that 'Shakespeare's concern with the affective ethics of *continued* service even in the face of tragic obduracy, represents a dimension that cannot be encompassed by the mere politics of resistance' (p. 263). In this richly nuanced analysis of representations of service in *The Winter's Tale*, the subtle reading of Camillo's relationship with his two masters, Leontes and Polixenes, is a particular strength. Also noteworthy is its penetrating reading of the statue scene in which, Schalkwyk concludes, 'What we witness through the inversion of master and servant in Act Five [i.e. Leontes' transferral of power to Paulina] are the transformations of desire into love and of power into service' (p. 296).

The theme of service is also taken up in Melissa E. Sanchez's 'Seduction and Service in *The Tempest*' (*SP* 105:i[2008] 50–82), which situates the play in the context of Jacobean debates on the duties and responsibilities of kingship, and specifically the continuing struggles between king and parliament that the Great Contract of 1610 failed to resolve. She argues that *The Tempest* reflects

upon these debates, and reminds its audience that ‘indulgence and assault, seduction and force, are not opposites but simply different expressions of the claim to erotic, and hence political, agency’ (p. 81). Focusing on Miranda, the article is most interesting for its questioning of her subjugation, and its exploration of her relationship with both other subjects (Caliban, Ariel) and other women (Sycorax, Claribel). Sanchez also provides an intriguing analysis of Prospero’s epilogue, which, she argues, aligns the audience with Prospero’s other subjects.

In her informative article on Caliban and Miranda’s education, ‘Single Parenting, Homeschooling: Prospero, Caliban, Miranda’ (*SEL* 48[2008] 373–93), Hiewon Shin questions the interpretation of Prospero as a patriarchal imperialist and offers a more sympathetic analysis of his relationship with Caliban and Miranda as both father and educator. She argues that Caliban received good schooling from Prospero until his attempted rape of Miranda, after which he was denied a masculine education, made to engage in domestic chores, and trained only for feminine service. This view is broadly compatible with colonial readings of the play, of course, but this is not Shin’s primary focus. She then argues that the education of Miranda is untypical for the period, and persuasively suggests that her training allows her to challenge traditional gender roles. Anchoring her analysis of *The Tempest* with a detailed discussion of the education and training of children in the early modern period, Shin’s essay draws upon writers such as Thomas Elyot, Thomas Salter, Henry Smith, and Juan Luis Vives. While it sometimes implies that ideas about children’s education were straightforward and accurately reflected children’s educational experiences, the essay’s argument that Prospero offered a progressive education to Miranda is convincing, and its alternative reading of Caliban’s education and training is interesting (if potentially controversial).

Katherine Steele Brokaw turns her attention to Ariel in her captivating essay on Ariel’s performance history. ‘Ariel’s Liberty’ (*ShakB* 26:i[2008] 23–42) has at its heart Julian Bleach’s celebrated performance for the RSC, but situates Bleach’s Ariel in the context of other performances of *The Tempest*. In doing so, Brokaw delightfully shows how the best Shakespearian adaptations always shed new light on the play. Making her case through detailed textual analysis, she argues that Shakespeare deliberately left the role of Ariel open to the actor’s interpretation. Emphasizing the richly metatheatrical nature of *The Tempest*, Brokaw argues that ‘this textually ambiguous, wide-open, liberated role pushes hard on questions of who creates meaning in theatre, inviting an actor’s body to exceed the disciplines of the text’ (p. 39). Reflecting on the fertile ambiguity of the play’s construction of Ariel, this article brings Ariel and *The Tempest* vividly to life through its detailed discussion of the history of Ariel in performance.

Ariel is also the focus in the first of two essays on sources for *The Tempest* published in 2008. David McInnis, in ‘Old World Sources for Ariel in *The Tempest*’ (*N&Q* 55[2008] 208–13), posits Wilkins, Day and Rowley’s *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* [1607] and Richard Eden’s *A treatyse of the newe India with other newe founde landes and islandes* [1553], a translation of portions of Sebastian Munster’s Latin text, *Cosmographia*, as possible Old World sources for the play. In doing so, he challenges the assumption that the

play is about America, and instead argues that *The Tempest* is ‘a generic travel play, concerned simply with the unknown and the psychology of exploration’ (p. 210). Reading Ariel in the context of stories of malignant spirits coming from Old World travel, McInnis’s essay makes a significant contribution to the continuing debate about *The Tempest*’s colonial contexts, and offers a fresh perspective on the play. Alden T. Vaughan, on the other hand, returns to more familiar New World sources for *The Tempest*, contending, in ‘William Strachey’s “True Reportory” and Shakespeare: A Close Look at the Evidence’ (*SQ* 59[2008] 245–73), that critics such as Roger Stritmatter and Lynne Kositsky have been incorrect in rejecting Strachey’s letters as a source for Shakespeare’s play. Vaughan sets out his evidence carefully—the letter reaching London in September 1610; at least two copies circulating widely; as well as the thematic and verbal parallels with the play—and makes a good case for the legitimacy of the ‘True Reportory’ as a source for *The Tempest*; I wonder if this marks an end to this particular debate.

Michael Neill certainly assumes the influence of the ‘True Reportory’ when he draws attention to the acoustic effects in the representation of the Bermuda shipwreck in his discussion of the uses of sound in Shakespeare’s play. Reminding us that *The Tempest* ‘is equipped with an elaborate soundtrack, in which episodes of violent, discordant, and chaotic noise are set against the harmonious songs and instrumental music performed by Ariel and his consort of spirits’ (p. 36), ‘“Noises, / Sounds, and sweet airs”’: The Burden of Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*’ (*SQ* 59[2008] 36–59) focuses on the play’s representation of concord and discord, exploring how the play’s meaning is expressed through aural effects. Focusing on its elaborate play on the word ‘burden’ in its musical and other senses, Neill shows how *The Tempest* challenges the binary of ordered speech and disordered noise and links this to Prospero’s exercise of power on the island. This complex and beautifully written essay offers a meticulous reading of the play’s orchestration of sound and shows again the value of attending to aural effects in Shakespeare’s plays.

While Neill observes that *The Tempest* is ‘steeped... in the language and motifs of scripture’ (p. 58), Huston Diehl’s essay, ‘“Does not the stone rebuke me?”: The Pauline Rebuke and Paulina’s Lawful Magic in *The Winter’s Tale*’ (in Yachnin and Badir, eds., pp. 69–82), focuses in detail on theological allusions in *The Winter’s Tale* to explore Paulina’s connection with her namesake, the apostle Paul, and in doing so argues that she is situated at the centre of Reformation debates about ‘the nature of representation, the power of words, the status of images, and the legitimacy of the theatre’ (p. 71). In particular, Diehl reads the statue scene as a ‘visual rebuke’ that completes the work of Paulina’s earlier verbal rebukes, and thus shows how Paulina’s theatrical spectacle does Leontes good. Showing how Shakespeare ‘appropriates Paul for his own theatrical purposes’ (p. 75), the chapter offers a persuasive analysis of the statue scene. It promotes a more nuanced understanding of Protestantism and theatre, arguing that through the play Shakespeare develops ‘a Protestant aesthetic of the theatre in direct response to attacks by Protestant clergy’ (p. 76).

David N. Beauregard, in contrast, relocates Shakespeare to a Catholic context in his monograph, *Catholic Theology in Shakespeare’s Plays*. Based on

the contention that Shakespeare was Catholic, the book attempts to uncover evidence of Catholic theology in the plays. ‘Nature and Grace in *The Winter’s Tale*’ argues that the action of the play ‘is structured along the lines of the three “parts” of the Roman Catholic sacrament of penance, following the movements of contrition, confession, and satisfaction’ (p. 109). Taking a similar approach, ‘“Let your indulgence set me free”’: Prospero’s Farewell in *The Tempest*’ argues that Prospero’s epilogue ‘contains a peculiar series of references to sin, grace, and pardon that are the expressions of a sensibility rooted in Roman Catholic doctrine’ (p. 145). Beaugregard’s evidence of ‘non-explicit’ (p. 146) Catholic theology in the two plays is more or less convincing, even if he has a tendency to homogenize diverse reformist theologies and practices in order to assert Catholic particularity. And while the implications of his arguments could be teased out further—reading such references as ‘essentially mimetic’ (p. 109) is a little unsatisfying—Beaugregard’s work does help to uncover the plays’ theological underpinning.

The next three essays on *The Winter’s Tale* explore issues of gender and sexuality in the play. In ‘Framing Wifely Advice in Thomas Heywood’s *A Curtaine Lecture* and Shakespeare’s *The Winter’s Tale*’ (SEL 48[2008] 131–46), Kathleen Kalpin revisits the issue of Leontes’ jealousy and links it, as many others have done, to Hermione’s persuasive speech. In a detailed reading of Act I, scene ii, Kalpin argues that Leontes reads Hermione’s conversation with Polixenes as a curtain lecture (persuasive speech between a wife and her husband that takes place in bed), and immediately reaches the conclusion that his wife has been unfaithful with his friend. By making the same conceptual leap that she accuses Leontes of making (from private speech to curtain lecture), Kalpin perhaps overstates her case. Nevertheless, treating the curtain lecture as a distinct genre (her discussion moving from Pepys to Erasmus to Heywood), Kalpin suggests that its representation of persuasive female speech is ambivalent, ‘complicating any simple causal relationship between women’s speech and their sexual actions’ (p. 132). With broad implications for the play’s debate about female speech and sexuality, this is the essay’s significant achievement.

In ‘Siring the Grandchild in *The Winter’s Tale* and *The Fawn*’ (SEL 48[2008] 349–71), Robert W. Reeder moves from the relationship between husbands and wives to explore the intergenerational tensions between fathers and sons (Polixenes and Florizel, primarily, but also Leontes and Mamillius), which, he suggests, come to a head ‘when the *next* generation is in view’ (p. 351). ‘Prospective grandchildren’, argues Reeder, ‘serve as a site of conflict between father and son: are they going to reflect the father’s will or the grandfather’s?’ (p. 350), and he offers a nuanced reading of the father’s sexual jealousy implicit in Polixenes’ relationship with Florizel and Perdita, and Leontes’ relationship with Mamillius, Hermione and Perdita. Reading *The Winter’s Tale* as prodigal son drama, Reeder argues that Leontes and Florizel’s embrace at the end of the play offers the hopeful possibility that conflict between father and son can be resolved because ‘the scene stages the fact that the same person can—and, in time, will—stand in the place of son and father’ (p. 350). This is a rich and carefully argued essay that sheds important light on the struggles between men that are dramatized in the play.

Shifting from sons to daughters in *The Winter's Tale*, Diane Purkiss's provocative essay, 'Fractious: Teenage Girls' Tales in and out of Shakespeare' (in Lamb and Bamford, eds., *Oral Traditions and Gender in Early Modern Literary Texts*, pp. 57–72), reads *The Winter's Tale* primarily as 'the romance of the discovery of the daughter' (p. 57), and focuses on Perdita, the daughter whose story, she claims, is subordinated to that of her parents in both the play itself and its critical reception. Uncovering traces of folk tales told by adolescent girls in the play's representation of parent–child relationships, she shows how Perdita's story chimes with stories told by real teenage girls in the early modern period. Reading the play through detailed analysis of depositions given by adolescent girls in witch trials, Purkiss maintains that these young women had 'a storyteller's stake in the tale of the lost girl because it was a story they told about themselves, a story that could be a tale of rebellion and subversion of all that being a teenage girl meant' (p. 57). Specifically, she reads girls' fairy tales as fantasies by which they both express and relieve their anxieties around their relationships with mothers/mistresses. However, she points out that in *The Winter's Tale* it is Leontes who 'becomes a nightmare version of the teenage girls' nightmares about their mothers' (p. 68), which, she claims, oddly legitimates his passions. Purkiss's essay is less about *The Winter's Tale* than the marginalized voices of teenage girls that are fleetingly glimpsed in the play, but this is the key strength of the essay, which ably demonstrates how the play is steeped in an oral tradition, and she helps us to return to the voices that speak through the play.

Two student-orientated guides to Shakespeare's most-studied late plays were published in 2008, both of which focus on the plays in performance. The first, Ros King's *The Winter's Tale: A Guide to the Text and the Play in Performance*, is the latest addition to Palgrave Macmillan's Shakespeare Handbooks series. As with other titles in the series, at the core of the book is a detailed scene-by-scene commentary, which gently guides students through the play as it raises thought-provoking issues and questions, especially around performance. A student-friendly overview of critical assessments of the play showcases its richness and helps students formulate their own responses to the play. A particular highlight is the book's sections on key productions of the play on stage and screen, which illuminate the play through its performance history and open up for the student new interpretative possibilities. Also useful, in its discussion of the play's sources and cultural context, is its comparison with Robert Greene's *Pandosto*, which is helpfully illustrated with generous excerpts from the text.

The second student guide is Lisa Hopkins's *Shakespeare's The Tempest: The Relationship between Text and Film*, which like the other books in Methuen's Screen Adaptations series, provides in-depth analysis of how *The Tempest* has been adapted for the screen—specifically, in Fred Wilcox's *Forbidden Planet* [1956], Derek Jarman's *The Tempest* [1979], and Peter Greenaway's *Prospero's Books* [1991]—and shows how the alternative readings demonstrated in each of the films represent new interpretations of the original text. The opening part of the book, 'Literary Contexts', provides an overview of responses to the play by literary critics. Focusing on William Strachey's pamphlet as source for the play, and then raising issues of colonization and exploration, and their

connection with gender and sexuality, Hopkins prioritizes postcolonial readings of the play; however, she also introduces other interpretations, such as psychoanalytical and genre-based readings. She then finishes the first part by showcasing the many ways in which the play has been adapted in a variety of media, and very usefully raises key issues inherent in the process of adapting the play (considering a variety of topics from setting, time-frame and genre to back story and music). The main part of the book, 'From Text to Screen', introduces the three substantial case studies via a detailed history of the play on screen, which is then followed by a conclusion that compares their different takes on the play through the readings they emphasize or subordinate. Hopkins's comparison of film adaptations of the play with the perspectives of literary critics is particularly useful. On the question of Caliban's blackness, for example, she writes: 'Although literary criticism may not have all the answers, this is one area in which it has at least attempted to bring an informed political awareness to the play' (p. 144). Finally, a discussion of critical responses to each of the films, supplemented with generous quotation, brings the book to a conclusion. Accessibly written and bursting with ideas for studying *The Tempest* through film, this is an excellent resource for film and literature students and their teachers. Its crowning achievement is in showing students how screen adaptations of the play represent interpretations rather than offering transparent access to the play, and it helps bring the play to life through a consideration of filmic performance.

Another exciting volume aimed primarily at students is Laurie Maguire's *How To Do Things with Shakespeare: New Approaches, New Essays*. In this creative and innovative collection, Shakespearian scholars were asked to preface specially commissioned essays with a short description of what prompted them to embark on their particular research project, with the aim of helping students to develop their own critical approaches to Shakespeare. Three essays are included on the late plays: Tanya Pollard examines *Cymbeline* in the context of Greek romance; Chris R. Kyle explores *Henry VIII's* specific use of history; and Paul Yachnin reads *The Winter's Tale* in terms of Renaissance ideas about animals: 'it is sheep all the way down' (p. 216). An engaging collection of essays in their own right, this volume introduces students to contemporary approaches to Shakespeare in a stimulating and accessible way. Its particular strength lies in its self-consciousness about the process of literary research, which will be both inspiration and invaluable resource to students as they begin to formulate and develop their own research projects.

### Books Reviewed

Anderson, Judith H. *Reading the Allegorical Intertext: Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton*. FordUP. [2008] pp. 436. £49.50 ISBN 9 7808 2322 8478.

- Azari, Ehsan. *Lacan and the Destiny of Literature: Desire, Jouissance and the Sinthome in Shakespeare, Donne, Joyce and Ashbery*. Continuum. [2008] pp. 205. £60 ISBN 1 8470 6379 3.
- Bartels, Emily C. *Speaking of the Moor: From Alcazar to Othello*. UPennP. [2008] pp. vii + 252. \$55 ISBN 9 7808 1224 0764.
- Bate, Jonathan. *Soul of the Age: The Life, Mind and World of William Shakespeare*. Viking. [2008] pp. xii + 500. £25 ISBN 9 7806 7091 4821.
- Beauregard, David N. *Catholic Theology in Shakespeare's Plays*. UDeLP. [2008] pp. 226. \$49.50 ISBN 9 7808 7413 0027.
- Belsey, Catherine. *Shakespeare in Theory and Practice*. EdinUP. [2008] pp. 224. £60 ISBN 9 7807 4863 3012.
- Bevington, David. *Shakespeare's Ideas: More Things in Heaven and Earth*. Blackwell. [2008] pp. 248. £45 ISBN 9 7814 0516 7956.
- Bloom, Harold, and Brett Foster, eds. *Hamlet*. ChelseaH. [2008] pp. 464. \$50 ISBN 9 7807 9109 5928.
- Braunmuller, A.R., ed. *Macbeth*, 2nd edn. The New Cambridge Shakespeare. CUP. [2008] pp. xxi + 297. hb £40 ISBN 9 7808 6240 0, pb £8.99 ISBN 9 7805 2168 0981.
- Brown, Jane K. *The Persistence of Allegory: Drama and Neoclassicism from Shakespeare to Wagner*. UPennP. [2007] pp. 304. £39. ISBN 0 8122 3966 0.
- Cahill, Patricia. *Unto the Breach: Martial Formations, Historical Trauma, and the Early Modern Stage*. OUP. [2008] pp. x + 227. £50 ISBN 9 7801 9921 2057.
- Cheney, Patrick. *Shakespeare's Literary Authorship*. CUP. [2008] pp. xxv + 296. £57 ISBN 9 7805 2188 1661.
- Cormack, Bradin. *A Power To Do Justice: Jurisdiction, English Literature, and the Rise of Common Law, 1509–1625*. UChicP. [2008] pp. 406. £24 ISBN 0 2261 1624 2.
- Crystal, David. *'Think on my words': Exploring Shakespeare's Language*. CUP. [2008] pp. 272. hb £40 ISBN 9 7805 2187 6940, pb £ 12.99 ISBN 9 7805 2170 0351.
- Davies, Michael. *Hamlet*. Character Studies. Continuum. [2008] pp. viii + 141. hb £50 ISBN 9 7808 2649 5914, pb £11.99 ISBN 9 7808 2649 5921.
- Davis, Philip. *Shakespeare Thinking*. Continuum. [2007] pp. 105. £14.99 ISBN 0 8264 8695 0.
- Dawson, Anthony B., and Gretchen E. Minton, eds. *Timon of Athens. William Shakespeare and Thomas Middleton*. Arden3. [2008] pp. 480. hb £60 ISBN 9 7819 0343 6967, pb £17 ISBN 9 7819 0343 6974.
- Delabastita, Dirk, Jozef de Vos, and Paul Franssen, eds. *Shakespeare and European Politics*. AUP. [2008] pp. 385. £70.50 ISBN 9 7808 7413 0041.
- Dente, Carla, and Sara Soncini, eds. *Crossing Time and Space: Shakespeare Translations in Present-Day Europe*. PLUS/Pisa University Press. [2008] pp. 128. €14 ISBN 9 7888 8492 5404.
- Donskis, Leonidas. *Power and Imagination: Studies in Politics and Literature*. Lang. [2008] pp. 170. £32.90 ISBN 1 4331 0125 0.
- Drábek, Pavel, Klára Kolinská, and Matthew Nicholls, eds. *Shakespeare and His Collaborators Over the Centuries*. CambridgeSP. [2008] pp. xii + 242. £76. ISBN 9 7818 4718 9783.

- Drakakis, John, and Dale Townshend, eds. *Gothic Shakespeares: Accents on Shakespeare*. Routledge. [2008] pp. 243. pb £19.99 ISBN 0 4154 2066 0.
- Dutcher, James M, and Anne Lake Prescott, eds. *Renaissance Historicisms: Essays in Honor of Arthur F. Kinney*. UDelP. [2008] £57.50 ISBN 9 7808 7413 0010.
- Elam, Keir, ed. *Twelfth Night*. Arden. Methuen. [2008] pp. 428. £8.99 ISBN 9 7819 0343 6998.
- Greenblatt, Stephen, et al., eds. *The Norton Shakespeare*, based on the Oxford edn.; 2nd edn. Norton. [2008] pp. xviii + 3,419. \$60.99 ISBN 9 7803 9392 9911.
- Greer, Germaine. *Shakespeare's Wife*. Bloomsbury. [2007] pp. 406. £8.99 ISBN 0 7475 9300 3.
- Guneratne, Anthony R. *Shakespeare, Film Studies, and the Visual Cultures of Modernity*. Palgrave. [2008] pp. 346. £45 ISBN 9 7814 0396 7886.
- Hatchuel, Sarah, and Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin, eds. *Shakespeare on Screen: The Henriad*. URouen. [2008] pp. 358. pb €21 ISBN 2 8777 5454 5.
- Hatchuel, Sarah, and Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin, eds. *Shakespeare on Screen: Television Shakespeare. Essays in Honour of Michèle Willems*. URouen. [2008] pp. 315. pb €21 ISBN 9 7828 7775 4507.
- Henderson, Diana E, ed. *Alternative Shakespeares 3*. Routledge. [2008] pp. x + 310. £62 ISBN 0 4154 2332 5.
- Hopkins, Lisa. *Shakespeare's The Tempest: The Relationship between Text and Film*. Methuen. [2008] pp. 224. £12.99 ISBN 9 7807 1367 9106.
- Jackson, Russell. *Shakespeare Films in the Making: Vision, Production and Reception*. CUP. [2007] pp. 280. £53 ISBN 0 5218 1547 5.
- Jensen, Phebe. *Religion and Revelry in Shakespeare's Festive World*. CUP. [2008] pp. xii + 267. £50 ISBN 9 7805 2150 6397.
- King, Ros. *The Winter's Tale: A Guide to the Text and the Play in Performance*. Shakespeare Handbooks. Palgrave. [2008] pp. 168. £42.50 ISBN 9 7802 3000 8519.
- Klause, John. *Shakespeare, the Earl, and the Jesuit*. FDUP. [2008] pp. 339. £59.95 ISBN 9 7808 3864 1378.
- Lamb, Mary Ellen, and Karen Bamford, eds. *Oral Traditions and Gender in Early Modern Literary Texts*. Ashgate. [2008] pp. 276. £55 ISBN 9 7807 5465 5381.
- Lethbridge, J.B., ed. *Shakespeare and Spenser: Attractive Opposites*. ManUP. [2008] pp. 320. £50 ISBN 9 7807 1907 9627.
- Levy-Navarro, Elena. *The Culture of Obesity in Early and Late Modernity: Body Image in Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton and Skelton*. Palgrave. [2008] pp. xii + 238. £40 ISBN 9 7802 3060 1239.
- Logan, Robert A. *Shakespeare's Marlowe*. Ashgate. [2007] pp. vii + 251. £55 ISBN 9 7807 5465 7637.
- Maguire, Laurie. *How To Do Things with Shakespeare: New Approaches, New Essays*. Blackwell. [2007] pp. 320. £60 ISBN 9 7814 0513 5269.
- Maguire, Laurie. *Shakespeare's Names*. OUP. [2007] pp. 256. £28 ISBN 9 7801 9921 9971.



- Majeske, Andrew, and Emily Detmer-Goebel, eds. *Justice Women, and Power in English Renaissance Drama*. AUP. [2008] pp. 193. £40.50 ISBN 9 7808 3864 1699.
- Malin, Eric S. *Godless Shakespeare*. Shakespeare Now. Continuum. [2007] pp. 132. £14.99 ISBN 9 7808 2649 0421.
- Marrapodi, Michele, ed. *Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries: Rewriting, Remaking, Refashioning*. Ashgate. [2007] pp. 300. £55 ISBN 9 7807 5465 5046.
- Massai, Sonia. *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor*. CUP. [2007] pp. 254. £53 ISBN 9 7805 2187 8050.
- Matz, Robert. *The World of Shakespeare's Sonnets: An Introduction*. McFarland. [2008] pp. 240. £29.95 ISBN 9 7807 8643 2196.
- Meeke, Richard, Jane Rickard, and Richard Wilson, eds. *Shakespeare's Book: Essays in Reading, Writing and Reception*. ManUP. [2008] pp. vii + 273. £55 ISBN 9 7807 1907 9054.
- Moschovakis, Nick, ed. *Macbeth: New Critical Essays*. Routledge. [2008] pp. xi + 363. £65 ISBN 9 7804 1597 4042.
- Newstok, Scott L, ed. *Kenneth Burke on Shakespeare*. Parlor Press. [2006] pp. 368. £35 ISBN 9 7816 0235 0038.
- Nicholl, Charles. *The Lodger: Shakespeare on Silver Street*. Lane. [2007] pp. 378. £20 ISBN 9 7807 1399 8900.
- Nuttall, A.D. *Shakespeare the Thinker*. YaleUP. [2007] pp. 428. £10.99 ISBN 0 3001 3629 6.
- Occhiogrosso, Frank, ed. *Shakespearean Performance: New Studies*. FDUP. [2008] pp. 211. \$47.50 ISBN 9 7808 3864 1286.
- Palfrey, Simon, and Tiffany Stern. *Shakespeare in Parts*. OUP. [2007] pp. 416. \$45. ISBN 0 1992 7205 0.
- Potter, Nicholas. *Othello: Character Studies*. Continuum. [2008] pp. 152. hb £50 ISBN 9 7808 2649 4320, pb £11.99 ISBN 9 7808 2649 4337.
- Richmond, Velma Bourgeois. *Shakespeare as Children's Literature: Edwardian Retellings in Words and Pictures*. McFarland. [2008] pp. 363. £29.92 ISBN 0 7864 3781 8.
- Rutter, Tom. *Work and Play on the Shakespearean Stage*. CUP. [2008] pp. x + 205. £50 ISBN 9 7805 2188 4860.
- Sabor, Peter, and Paul Yachnin, eds. *Shakespeare and the Eighteenth Century*. Ashgate. [2008] pp. 189. £55 ISBN 0 7546 6295 2.
- Schalkwyk, David. *Shakespeare, Love and Service*. CUP. [2008] pp. 336. £52 ISBN 9 7805 2188 6390.
- Schwartz, Regina Mary. *Sacramental Poetics at the Dawn of Secularism: When God Left the World*. Stanford. [2008] pp. 187. £49.50 ISBN 9 7808 0475 6679.
- Schwyzer, Philip. *Archaeologies of English Renaissance Literature*. OUP. [2007] pp. 256. £59 ISBN 9 7801 9920 6605.
- Shamas, Laura. *We Three: The Mythology of Shakespeare's Weird Sisters*. Lang. [2007] pp. 140. £34.90 ISBN 0 8204 7933 0.
- Shami, Jeanne, ed. *Renaissance Tropologies: The Cultural Imagination of Early Modern England*. Duquesne. [2008] pp. 382. £49.99 ISBN 9 7808 2070 4098.

- Shaughnessy, Robert, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Popular Culture*. CUP. [2007] pp. 291. £48 ISBN 9 7805 2184 4291.
- Sokol, B.J. *Shakespeare and Tolerance*. CUP. [2008] pp. 260. £50 ISBN 9 7805 2187 9125.
- Steinberger, Rebecca. *Shakespeare and Twentieth-Century Irish Drama: Conceptualizing Identity and Staging Boundaries*. Ashgate. [2008] pp. 132. £50 ISBN 9 7807 5463 7806.
- Stewart, Alan. *Shakespeare's Letters*. OUP. [2008] pp. xvi + 405. £26 ISBN 9 7801 9954 9276.
- Taunton, Nina. *Fictions of Old Age in Early Modern Literature and Culture*. Routledge. [2007] pp. 210. £95 ISBN 0 4153 2473 1.
- Turner, Henry S. *Shakespeare's Double Helix*. Continuum. [2007] pp. 129. £13.99 ISBN 0 8264 9120 6.
- Waller, Gary ed. *All's Well That Ends Well*. New Critical Essays. Routledge. [2007] pp. xix + 258. £70 ISBN 9 7804 1597 3250.
- Warren, Roger ed. *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. OUP. [2008] pp. 208. £7.99 ISBN 9 7801 9283 1422.
- Weimann, Robert, and Douglas Bruster, *Shakespeare and the Power of Performance: Stage and Page in the Elizabethan Theatre*. CUP. [2008] pp. x + 266. £52 ISBN 9 7805 2189 5323.
- Weis, René. *Shakespeare Revealed: A Biography*. Murray. [2008] pp. 444. £10.99 ISBN 0 7195 6574 8.
- Welsh, Alexander. *What is Honor? A Question of Moral Imperatives*. YaleUP. [2008] pp. xxiv + 228. £25 ISBN 9 7803 0012 5641.
- Wilson, Richard. *Shakespeare in French Theory: King of Shadows*. Routledge. [2007] pp. 336. \$37.95. ISBN 0 4154 2165 9.
- Yachnin, Paul Edward, and Patricia Badir, eds. *Shakespeare and the Cultures of Performance*. Studies in Performance and Early Modern Drama. Ashgate. [2008] pp. 224. £55 ISBN 9 7807 5465 5855.