

VII

Shakespeare

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

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

1. Editions and Textual Studies

One major critical edition of Shakespeare appeared this year: Peter Holland's *Coriolanus* for the Arden Shakespeare Third Series. Holland starts with 'A Note on the Text' (pp. xxiii–xxvii) that explains the process of modernization and how the collation notes work, and does so very well. Next Holland prints another note apologizing for but not explaining—beyond 'pressures of space'—his 44,000-word introduction to the play having 'no single substantial section devoted to the play itself and its major concerns, no chronologically ordered narrative of *Coriolanus*' performance history, no extensive surveying of the history and current state of critical analysis...[and not] a single footnote' (p. xxxviii). After a preamble, the introduction itself (pp. 1–141) begins *in medias res* with *Coriolanus* in the 1930s, giving an account of William Poel's production in 1931 and one by Comédie-Française in 1933–4 and other reinterpretations by T.S. Eliot and Delmore Schwartz. Next comes a brief sketch of what may have inspired Shakespeare to write the play and then a substantial section on Shakespeare's 'Reading' for the play (pp. 25–49). Here are considered the sources, starting with Livy's *The Romane Historie* in Philemon Holland's 1600 translation and also in the Latin original. Holland finds that "'Rome" [is] a word repeated more frequently in this play than in

any other of his works' (p. 34) but does not state how he determined this. The digital edition of the Oxford *Complete Works* published in 1989 has 105 occurrences of 'Rome' in its *Titus Andronicus* and only 91 in its *Coriolanus* and in the Cambridge-Macmillan *Complete Works* of 1863–6 (via Chadwyck-Healey's database Editions and Adaptations of Shakespeare) it is 110 for *Titus Andronicus* and 102 for *Coriolanus*. Holland shows that North did quite a lot of ideological twisting of his French source, making the story more anti-ecclesiastical and anti-democracy as he translated (p. 40).

Holland's section on 'Dating: Writing and Performance' (pp. 49–77) notes that in *Epicoene* Ben Jonson has Truewit say 'you haue lurch'd your friends of the better halfe of the garland, by concealing this part of the plot!' which sounds like Menenius's 'He lunched all swords of the garland' in *Coriolanus*. If Jonson is the borrower here then this dates *Coriolanus* no later than the composition of *Epicoene* in 1609 or 1610. A parallel phrase regarding hanging caps on the horns of the moon when throwing them up in Robert Armin's *The Italian Tailor and his Boy*—entered in the Stationers' Register on 6 February 1609—is as equally uncertain a guide to the earliest date for *Coriolanus*, not least because the preface where this appears could be a late addition to the text. Holland considers the possibility that the image of flung-up caps hanging on the moon's horns 'was proverbial' before Shakespeare or Armin used it and that they were merely employing 'a familiar turn of phrase' (p. 52). My searches of the currently transcribed holdings of the Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership database (EEBO-TCP), which to date (December 2014) comprise just over one-third of EEBO's 130,000 books, do not support this idea. In EEBO-TCP books published by 1605 there are no parallel occurrences found by full-text searches for 'cap near.10 moon'—meaning *cap* within 10 words, in either direction, of *moon*—nor 'hang near.10 moon' with variant spellings and variant forms of detection switched on.

Holland reports that the use of the word *gulf* in the Fable of the Belly in *Coriolanus* echoes the use of that word in William Camden's *Remains of a Greater Work Concerning Britain* of 1605, and he tracks one more minor phrasal parallel that might date the play, but places almost no weight on it. Regarding the famous lines 'no surer, no, | Than is the coal of fire upon the ice' (I.i.170–1) in *Coriolanus*, Holland objects that contrary to the sense of them no one ever suggested that during the Great Frost the use of coals on the Thames was dangerous, so he rejects the entire allusion. Holland is also sceptical of the alleged allusion whereby 'he'll turn your current in a ditch | And make your channel his' (III.i.99–100) refers to Hugh Middleton's plans for bringing piped water to London, and remarks that in any case the likely gap between first composition of *Coriolanus* and its first performance makes dating difficult. By contrast, dating the play from popular unrest regarding food supply—in particular riots against the enclosure of common land in 1607—is more certain, although Holland sees the unrest as an influence on the writing rather than a guide to just when the first performances occurred.

The food riots of the time were compared by commentators to a series of previous English uprisings, including Watt Tyler and Jack Straw's (1381), Jack Cade's (1450), and Robert Kett's (1549). Holland sees the 1595 food riots in London as more significant than the 1607 Midlands Revolt. In how it handles

ingratitude and its effects upon in the individual and their close family, Holland regards *Coriolanus* as a development upon 'lessons learnt in the writing of *Timon [of Athens]*' (p. 72), so *Coriolanus* is the later of the two. Holland concludes that *Coriolanus* was probably finished by the end of 1608. He cannot tell if it was written with first performance at the Globe or the Blackfriars theatre in mind and the evidence from plague closure and the king's recompense of the company for lost income is, says Holland, 'murky' (p. 76). One odd slip is a remark that *A Midsummer Night's Dream's* act intervals in the Folio do not mean that for its first performances at 'the Globe' (p. 76) the play had such intervals; Holland's own Oxford Shakespeare edition of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* dates the play's first performances no later than 1596, three years before the Globe was built. Holland makes the useful point that the cornets mentioned for entrances in the Folio text of *Coriolanus* look like annotations upon existing stage directions for flourishes—as in '*A flourish. Cornets*'—rather than being part of the original stage directions, so these cornets do not necessarily indicate that the first performances were indoors (p. 76).

In a section on 'Voting and Citizens' (pp. 77–98) Holland records that this play uses the word 'voices' more than any other Shakespeare play. The procedure of voice-giving, which is not quite free voting, that is depicted in *Coriolanus* is much like the procedure in early modern England at city and national elections. Holland is insightful on Shakespeare's depiction of crowds and the practice of democracy: before they have Tribunes the Roman people are rather 'thoughtful' (p. 82) about politics, but the Tribunes become their mouthpieces and effectively silence them. The Tribunes are at least petty-bourgeois, since Brutus laments 'Would half my wealth | Would buy this for a lie' (IV.vi.162–3). Holland points out that the plebeian citizens of the play need not be equivalent to the lowest class of Londoners at the time of the play's first performances: they might well be equivalent to the middling sort who could rise in the trades and guilds and serve in the London Corporation (pp. 85–8). He agrees with critics who think that reassigning the citizens' speech prefixes in the first scene tends to make them a mob with a ringleader rather than a group of individuals able to think for themselves.

The section '*Coriolanus* and Early Modern Politics' (pp. 98–107) concerns the application of stories from ancient Rome to early modern England, which was a popular pastime in the early 1600s. A number of writers were accused of topical allusions that they excused as misapplication of their works, especially regarding the executed Earl of Essex. 'Shaping the Play' (pp. 107–19) is about the rhythm of the scenes and acts, which are never quite synchronized because the play is dealing with material about 'three cities, divided perhaps into two parts, shaped in five acts' (p. 111) and there is, as it were, no common denominator. Holland has some interesting thoughts on the word *remain* in the play and on how the Tribunes tend to remain on stage at the ends of their scenes, a visible emblem of their not really having a place in the Roman political structure. '*Coriolanus* Rethought: Brecht, Osborne, Grass' (pp. 120–33) looks at the production planned by Bertolt Brecht and executed in rather diminished form by his successors, then briefly at Gunter Grass's *The Plebians Rehearse the Uprising* as a response to it, and then at John Osborne's

never-produced adaptation called *A Place Calling Itself Rome*. Lastly 'Filming *Coriolanus* (2011)' (pp. 133–41) looks at Ralph Fiennes's recent film of the play.

And so to Holland's text itself and the choices he makes about emending the only substantive early edition, the text of the 1623 Folio, hereafter F. Scene I.i has a well-known problem in its speech prefixes for the Citizens being merely *1. Cit[izen]*, *2. Cit[izen]* and *All*. The speeches for *1 Citizen* make him voluble in the opening moments but he says almost nothing after Menenius enters, at which point *2 Citizen* does almost all the talking for the crowd. Editors often give *2 Citizen's* side of the conversation with Menenius to *1 Citizen* in the name of character consistency, on the grounds that it is implausible for the scene-opening hothead to suddenly fall silent. Michael Warren argued that this common reassignment has the undesirable effect of making the Roman crowd seem homogenous and led by one agitator, while F's dispersal of lines makes the crowd polyvocal and more intelligent because comprising a consort of voices in agreement. Holland follows F's (and Warren's) assignment of speeches. Holland does not think the speech prefix *All* means that everyone speaks in chorus: 'It may indicate that the line is to be shared between two or more individuals or groups of Citizens' (I.i.2n.).

At I.i.87, Holland adopts Lewis Theobald's widely accepted 'I will venture | To stale't [the Belly Fable] a little more' where F has *scale* for *stale*. Where F has Menenius say that the Belly 'tauntingly replied' (I.i.105), Holland adopts Nahum Tate's 'tauntingly replied'. For F's claim that Hector's wounded forehead spat blood 'At Grecian sword. *Contenning*, tell *Valeria*' (I.iii.45), Holland goes for F.A. Leo's 'At Grecian sword contemning. Tell *Valeria*', pointing out that Shakespeare's large lower-case *C* probably made the compositor think that someone called *Contenning* was being sent to deliver a message to *Valeria*. Naturally enough, where *Valeria* refers to Penelope's spinning filling '*Athica*' with moths, Holland emends to follow F3's '*Ithica*' (I.iii.86). In F, Martius ends his rousing speech to drive his men on to attack the gates of Corioles with 'wee'l beate them to their Wiues, | As they vs to our Trenches followes' (I.iv.43), and the problem is that last word. The key to fixing it is to realize that *follow's* is a way of saying *follow us*. All that remains is to decide whether Martius means 'As they... follow us' or whether the sentence ends with 'trenches'—so his men will beat the Corioli to their wives as they have just been beaten to their trenches—and 'Follow us!' is a new sentence of final exhortation in which Martius uses the aristocratic plural. The former requires Martius awkwardly to say 'they us... follow us' so Holland plumps for 'As they us to our trenches. Follow's!'

After Martius is locked inside the gates of Corioles, Lartius laments in F 'Thou are left *Martius*' (I.iv.58) and Holland resists the common emendation *left* > *lost* on the grounds that F makes sense. C.J. Sisson, on the other hand, pointed out that *left* suggests desertion whereas Lartius's whole speech is about loss. When Lartius as part of his eulogy to Martius makes the meaningless remark 'Thou was't a Souldier | Euen to *Calues* wish' (I.iv.61) Holland follows Theobald's emendation to '... Cato's wish'. Where F calls the soldiers of Antium '*Antients*' and '*Antiat's*' (I.vi.53, 59) Holland naturally follows Alexander Pope in emending the former to match the latter, although

noting that *Antients* could be defended as a spelling of *ancients* meaning *ensigns*, as in Ancient/Ensign Pistol in the English history plays. At I.vi.76–8 a notorious crux in F comes after the stage direction ‘*They all shout and waue their swords, take him vp in their | Armes, and cast vp their Caps*’, which is Martius’s soldiers’ response to his rousing of them. What follows has no speech prefix and looks like a continuation of the speech that Martius was making before this stage direction: ‘Oh me alone, make you a sword of me: | If these shewes be not outward, which of you | But is foure *Volces*?’ In a long note, Holland considers just what the soldiers ‘*all shout*’, which might be, dispersedly, ‘Oh me alone’ and ‘make you a sword of me’. Having discounted that as too extreme an emendation—violating ‘F’s clear ascription to Martius’—Holland explores at length just what Martius might mean by these words and settles on the punctuation of ‘O, me alone! Make you a sword of me?’ while insisting that ‘there is no way an editor’s choice for the line can show the full range of meanings that the varying punctuations make possible, almost all of which seem to me to be perfectly practicable choices in performance and analysis’.

Where F has Martius say, rather nonsensically, ‘please you to March, | And foure shall quickly draw out my Command, | Which men are best inclin’d’ (I.vi.83–5), Holland follows Edward Capell’s suggestion that the second line should begin ‘And I shall...’, the mistake perhaps arising because the manuscript copy had a capital *I* that looked rather like the figure 4 used a few lines earlier in ‘which of you | But is foure *Volces*?’ At I.ix.44–5, F has Martius say ‘When Steele growes soft, as the Parasites Silke, | Let him be made an Ouerture for th’ Warres’, which has been much discussed and emended. As Sisson pointed out, the key is understanding *him* as the court-parasite. Holland uses *ovator* for *Ouverture* and in a long note explains that it means one who rejoices and that this is really a matter of variant spelling. F has the Herald announce the addition to Martius’s name thus: ‘With Fame, a Name to *Martius Caius*: | These in honor followes *Martius Caius Coriolanus*’ (II.i.160). Holland follows Capell in moving *These* to the end of the first line to complete its metre and then removing *Martius Caius* (‘probably the result of dittography’) from the second, as George Steevens did, to make it regular. At II.i.175, F has *Com[inius]* say the line ‘And liue you yet? Oh my sweet Lady, pardon’ after Menenius first speaks to Coriolanus (‘Now the gods crown thee’) in II.i. This is possible, but Holland follows Theobald’s reassignment of the line to Coriolanus, on the assumption that the speech prefix in the underlying manuscript was misread.

When Menenius says, amid all the welcoming of Coriolanus and his fellow soldiers as the conquering heroes, ‘Yon are three, that Rome should dote on’ (II.i.181) as F has it, some editors emend to F2’s ‘You are three...’. But as Holland points out the line can be ‘a general comment about the three, addressed to anyone within earshot’ so the emendation is unnecessary. Speaking of the welcome that Rome’s women give to Coriolanus, Brutus in F says ‘our veyl’d Dames | Commit the Warre of White and Damaske | In their nicely gawded Cheekes, to th’wanton spoyle | Of Phoebus burning Kisses’ (II.i.109–12). Holland notes that *nicely gawded* (meaning made up with cosmetics) is possible, but since the wider point is protection from sunlight he

prefers William Nanson Lettsom's emendation *gawded* > *guarded*. Referring to Coriolanus's vowed intention not to perform the acts of humility needed to gain a consulship and how this will destroy his political ambitions, Brutus says in F 'So it must fall out | To him, or our Authorities, for an end' (II.i.238). Editors have emended heavily but Holland only alters *Authorities*, > *authority's* in which *s* is an elision of *is* and 'for an end' means 'bound to end'. Holland sticks with F for Sicinius referring to a time when Coriolanus's insolence 'Shall teach the people' (II.i.249), meaning 'teach them what he is really like', but acknowledges the attraction of Thomas Hanmer's emendation to 'Shall touch the people' meaning set off their anger at him.

Having criticized Coriolanus's contempt for the people of Rome, which seems to be the reason Coriolanus rises and makes to leave the Capitol, Brutus says 'Sir, I hope my words dis-bench'd you not?' (II.ii.69). Holland claims that this *disbenched* is 'EBO's only example in this sense' of making a person leave their seat, but in fact it also appears in a satirical poem by Alexander Radcliffe published anonymously in broadsheet in 1681 (Wing L740A) and under his name in 1682 (Wing R129, sig. H8^r). Holland is nonetheless right that this could be Shakespeare's coinage. In F, Coriolanus asserts to the citizens to whom he is supposed to be humbling himself that his own desert has brought him before them (II.iii.66). When one of them asks if he really means this, F has him reply 'I, but mine owne desire' which Holland, following Tate, emends to 'Ay, but not mine own desire' since otherwise his reply is meaningless. Lamenting the need to beg the Roman citizens for his consulship, Coriolanus in F asks himself 'Why in this Wooluish tongue should I stand heere' (II.iii.113), and the problem is what to do with *Wooluish tongue*. The second word can be defended but Holland prefers the explanation of it as a compositor's misreading of *toga* spelt *toge* or *tōge*. Why a toga might be said to be wolfish is more difficult, but after considering in a long note the possibility that it should be *woollen* or *foolish* or *womanish* (this last preferred by the Oxford *Complete Works* of 1986), Holland decides to stick with F and prints 'wolfish toge'.

Speaking to some of the citizens of Rome about how to convince the rest to revoke their approval of Coriolanus as consul, Brutus starts giving an account of Coriolanus's ancestry and says in F 'Of the same House Publius and Quintus were, | That our best Water, brought by Conduits hither, | And Nobly nam'd, so twice being Censor' (II.iii.238-41). There seems to be a line missing between '... Conduits hither' and 'And Nobly nam'd...' and presumably it was about the person given a name that reflected his twice being the Roman censor. Plutarch tells us that the man so named was Censorious, but the problem is how to invent the missing line, if that is what an editor chooses to do. Holland goes for Nicolaus Delius's adaptation of Plutarch's 'Censorinus also came of that familie, that was so surnamed, bicause the people had chosen him Censor twice' into the iambic pentameter line 'And Censorinus that was so surnamed'. As Holland notes, if something like this was in the manuscript then there were two successive lines beginning with *And* ('And Censorinus...' and 'And Nobly...') and hence eyeskip could explain why one was missed by the compositor. In the midst of a discussion of why the Roman citizens have turned against Coriolanus and the claim that the Tribunes have manipulated

them, F has *Com[inius]* say 'You are like to doe such businesse' (III.i.49). Because this occurs within a sequence of eight speeches in which Coriolanus and Brutus take turns exchanging verbal blows, editors have often followed Theobald's reassignment of the line to Coriolanus. But as Holland notes, Coriolanus's speech prefixes are consistently long here—*Corio*—so there is no reason to assume error at this point and he retains the line within Cominius's part.

Towards the end of his bitter exchange with the Tribunes, F has Coriolanus begin an address to the Senators with 'O God! but most vnwise Patricians' (III.i.92) and Holland points out that the 1606 prohibition on the use of God's name on stage makes this an unlikely choice of words by Shakespeare. He follows Theobald's emendation to give 'O good but most unwise patricians'. In the heat of the attempt to arrest Coriolanus, Menenius says 'Goe, get you to our House: be gone, away' (III.i.231), and as Holland notes there is no reason to suppose that they share a house so he emends to Nicholas Rowe's '... get you to your house...'. There appears to be a whole run of incorrect speech prefixes in F at III.i.232–41. After a Senator repeats the advice that Coriolanus get away, the Folio has *Com[inius]* offer the conflicting advice 'Stand fast, we haue as many friends as enemies'. Following William Warburton, Holland reassigns the speech to Coriolanus on the grounds that 'he is always eager for a fight' and Cominius is rather more placatory and will in any case shortly say that it is 'odds beyond arithmetic' to stay. Likewise, in this section Holland gives to Cominius rather than Coriolanus 'Come, sir, along with us' and then gives to Coriolanus the belligerent lines 'I would they were barbarians, as they are, | Though in Rome littered; not Romans, as they are not, | Though calved i'th' porch o'th' Capitol' that F most implausibly gives to *Mene[nius]* who of course nowhere else speaks like this. Holland wonders if this run of incorrect speech prefixes perhaps reflects damage to the printer's copy that the printer tried to made good by conjecture.

At III.i.326, Holland sticks with F to have Sicinius say 'To eject him [Coriolanus] hence | Were but one danger, and to keep him here | Our certain death' where editors since Theobald have emended *one danger > our danger* to make two phrases representing two possibilities begin the same way: 'our danger... our death'. As Holland remarks, 'F makes perfectly good sense'. In response to his mother's chiding 'I would have had you put your power well on | Before you had worn it out' (III.ii.18–19), F has Coriolanus dismissively respond 'Let go' (meaning 'have done'). This strikes Holland as 'a little too peremptory from son to this mother' so he accepts John Dover Wilson's emendation to 'Let't go'. I cannot see how this softens the tone. In response, Volumnia says 'Lesser had bin | The things of your dispositions, if...' Coriolanus had been more circumspect in his dealings with the Romans citizens (III.ii.21–2). The problem is *things*, which sounds much too weak and vague, and Holland surveys several of the proposed emendations before settling rather uncomfortably—it being 'at least a decent explanation orthographically'—for R.B. Parker's *tryings*. Discussing the need for Coriolanus to make a show of submission to the citizens of Rome, Menenius in F says 'he should thus stoope to'th' heart' (III.ii.33). Holland

emends the last word to *herd*, Theobald's invention, since it makes better sense and being spelt *heard* could easily have been misread as *heart*.

Making a show of conformity to civil order before the Senators, Patricians, and Tribunes, Coriolanus in F implores the gods to 'plant loue amongs | Through our large Temples with y^e shewes of peace' (III.iii.35-6). This wording can be defended, as he explains, but Holland nonetheless prefers Theobald's emendation of *Through* > *Throng* so that this is two wishes with two active verbs (*plant* and *Throng*). Menenius, trying to placate the Tribunes and citizens, says of Coriolanus's uncompromising phraseology 'do not take | His rougher Actions for malicious sounds' (III.iii.53-4) and Holland adopts Theobald's emendation *actions* > *accents* because, as Sisson showed, it was an easy misreading given early modern orthography: *accēts* misread as *accōns*. Holland adopts Capell's emendation to have Coriolanus, about to enter Aufidius's house, say 'My birthplace hate I' rather than F's 'My Birth-place haue I' (IV.iv.23). In F, Aufidius imagines pouring war into the bowels of Rome and 'Like a bold Flood o're-beate' (IV.v.133). Holland rejects Rowe's emendation of the last word *beat* > *bear* in favour of R. Grant White's *beat* > *bear't* because Shakespeare uses *overbear* transitively like this elsewhere. In F, Aufidius says 'One fire driues out one fire; one Naile, one Naile; | Rights by rights fouler, strengths by strengths do faile' (IV.vii.54-5) and the second line is hard to explain. Holland follows Alexander Dyce to make the second line become 'Rights by rights falter' and lists the main alternatives he rejects. The rejections include Sisson's defence of simply adding an apostrophe to *rights* to indicate elision and make it mean *right is* and letting *fouler* stand so that 'Right's by rights fouler' means that one right is made appear foul by the presence of other rights. In fact, if we think that Sisson's account of the meaning is within the bounds of plausibility then strictly speaking no emendation is needed: both occurrences of *rights* may be plural and the sense might be that some rights (howsoever foul) are made to fail by the juxtaposition of other rights even fouler than they.

Reporting how he fared in his embassy to Coriolanus, Cominius reports in F 'What he would do | He sent in writing after me: what he would not, | Bound with an Oath to yeeld to his conditions' (V.i.67-9). The problem is in determining who is to yield and to what, if indeed *yield* is the right word. Coriolanus obviously is not about to yield so the only other (implied) subject would be Rome, but as Holland notes there is no plausible way to describe Rome as unyielding at this point: no one has resisted the advance of Coriolanus and his army. Holland explores the attempts to stick with *yield* and the various emendations that have been offered, and goes for *yield* > *hold* (so Coriolanus is the subject of the verb), which was first used in Wilson's New Shakespeare edition of the play. Wilson attributed this emendation to a conjecture of 'Solly', presumably meaning Thomas Solly the Victorian philosopher. In a long note Holland considers Swynfen Jervis's reordering of 'What he would do | He sent in writing after me: what he would not' into 'What he would do, | What he would not, he sent in writing after me' and rejects this as suggesting rather too much flexibility on Coriolanus's part: at this moment the point is his utter inflexibility.

Meeting Coriolanus and Aufidius, who enter after a Watchman has prevented him from going forward to the Volscian camp, Menenius in F says to the Watchman 'guesse but my entertainment with him: if thou stand'st not i'th state of hanging' (V.ii.63-4). Editors have often emended here—Edmond Malone chose *but* > *but by*—but Holland defends F as Menenius smugly telling the Watchman 'just have a guess what's going to happen'. Finally, after his kiss with Virgilia, F has Coriolanus comment upon it—'Now by the iealous Queene of Heauen [=Juno], that kisse | I carried from thee deare...'—and then rebuke himself for paying no attention to Volumnia: 'You Gods, I pray, | And the most noble Mother of the world | Leauē vn saluted' (V.iii.48-50). As Holland remarks, F's *pray* might be right (he has just sworn by Juno) but the self-rebuke is more clearly made if one follows, as Holland does, Theobald's emendation *pray* > *prate*.

In all, we can say that Holland has no strongly marked tendency to emend the Folio text of *Coriolanus* and is willing to at least entertain F's readings even when they are quite hard to make sense of. In almost every case where he decides to emend he confines himself to choosing between existing conjectures rather than offering new ones of his own. After a section of 'Longer Notes' (pp. 412-39) that would not fit on the same pages as the parts of the play they elucidate (responded to above), comes Holland's 'Textual Analysis' (pp. 440-63). He starts with the story of *Troilus and Cressida* being reinstated during the Folio's production and then gives Charlton Hinman's analysis of the setting of *Coriolanus* by compositors A and B, including an account of the casting off and the small stretching and crowding adjustments that had to be made in various places to fit the page breaks already agreed upon. Holland describes compositor A's habit of moving the word *and* from the end of a line to the start of the next line (pp. 444-5) and his general inability to solve problems of space without wrecking metre. Holland approves of Paul Werstine's work showing that even towards the end of his career when his verse style became looser and more subject to experimentation, Shakespeare generally wrote in iambic pentameter and any departures from it that we find in early editions are more likely to be compositorial than authorial. This leads to some examples where it really is hard to figure out if F's lineation is acceptable and for which Holland defends his policy of being 'resolutely inconsistent' (p. 449).

Next comes a study, much shaped by Lee Bliss's work, of the manuscript copy for F. Holland points out that the habits in the writing of Hand D of *Sir Thomas More* such as starting verse lines with lower-case letters, making one written line share more than one verse line, and squeezing material into the margins, would all cause the compositor the kinds of problem we see evidence for in F. Likewise Shakespeare's habitual use of a *c* that looked like a *C* could explain some unwanted full stops (sentence breaks) in F. Holland takes some examples of apparent manuscript misreadings in F and tries to make sense of them as being caused by the peculiarities of writing in Hand D, such as over-shortened speech prefixes that can lead to speeches being wrongly assigned. Holland rightly insists that where stage directions are imprecise—as in the entrance of 'three or four' persons—'a production has to decide how many actors are to go onstage, whether in rehearsal or at a performance' (p. 453), but he does not insist that the precise number was written down anywhere.

Holland then explores some features of F that suggest a scribal hand intervening between Shakespeare's manuscript and F: *ha's* for *has*, *a'th* for *o'th*, *it's* for *tis*, and a set of punctuation marks to indicate elision that are not found in the elided words in the writing of Hand D (pp. 454–8). Where there are full speech prefixes in compositor A's setting, this is much more likely to be scribal rather than compositorial expansion. Holland is pretty sure that the two speech prefixes for *Omnes* in F are scribal, since this prefix rarely appears in the Folio outside *Coriolanus*, just six occurrences in all. There are lots of *All* speech prefixes in Folio *Coriolanus* that Holland reckons show that the compositors systematically altered the scribe's *Omnes* to *All* but missed a couple (pp. 456–7). Likewise the stage direction '*Exeunt . . . Cumalij's*' is a Latin form much more likely to be a scribe's than Shakespeare's or a compositor's (pp. 457–8). Holland reckons that we just cannot tell who is responsible for the act division in Folio *Coriolanus*.

So, the big question is: was this scribal transcript, which retained some of Shakespeare's own habits while also imposing some of the scribe's, used in the theatre? Holland acknowledges the recent collapse of the New Bibliographical consensus that everything had to be tidy in a promptbook (pp. 458–9). (Werstine's book on this topic is reviewed below.) Holland finds nothing in F that would preclude its underlying manuscript being used to run a performance (pp. 459–60). What signs are there that it *was* used in performance? There are fairly full sound cues, which in some cases look like annotation-for-clarification, such as '*Flourish. Cornets*' and in others look like mistakings of Shakespeare's intention (pp. 460–2). The recurrent repetition in entry stage directions so that the *two Tribunes* are called *Sicinius and Brutus* strikes Holland as a prompter's annotation-for-clarification. He sees a particularly interesting piece of evidence for two hands in the underlying manuscript in that 'The action of 1.4 has both that "*Martius follows them to gates, and is shut in*" (43.1) and, three lines later, "*Enter the Gati*" . . . The error of *Gati* for *gates* suggests that the compositor (or scribe) assumed this referred to a group of characters (especially given the familiar form of "*Enter*" followed by a noun)' (p. 462). Holland's conclusion, then, is that the copy for F was a scribal transcript of an authorial manuscript and that either this authorial manuscript itself or the transcript of it was annotated for theatrical use (pp. 462–3).

The first of two appendices is '*Coriolanus* in Performance: A Skeletal History' (pp. 464–8), which tabulates every known production and adaptation on stage or screen since 1660. In the second, on '*Casting Coriolanus*' (pp. 469–77), Holland sees no scope for what he calls the conceptual (that is, thematic) doubling of roles. Holland thinks that the play can be performed by twelve men and four boys, which as he points out is fewer than T.J. King and David Bradley thought. Holland identifies and discusses each scene that presents problems for doubling and he offers a doubling chart in which he assigns each actor to one or more roles. (Some editions offer only a less useful casting chart showing which characters are in each scene.) Holland uses a splendidly simple typographical convention to distinguish characters who are present throughout the whole of a particular scene from those who enter after the beginning and those who exit before the end.

The only other Shakespeare edition of relevance to this year's review is the *Collaborative Plays* volume from the Royal Shakespeare Company and Palgrave Macmillan. The obvious question to ask about this volume of plays by 'William Shakespeare and Others' is its relationship to the *Complete Works* of Shakespeare from the same publishing team and general editors (Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen) published in 2007 and reviewed in *YWES* 88[2009]. The title of the new volume presents a problem since the earlier one contained *1 Henry VI*, *Titus Andronicus*, *Timon of Athens*, *Macbeth*, *Measure for Measure*, *All Is True* | *Henry VIII*, *Pericles*, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, which are widely agreed to be co-authored plays. This earlier *Complete Works* acknowledged the presence of George Peele's writing in *Titus Andronicus*, of probably Thomas Nashe's in *1 Henry VI*, of John Fletcher's in *All is True* | *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, of Thomas Middleton's in *Timon of Athens* and *Macbeth* (but not *Measure for Measure*), and of George Wilkins's in *Pericles*. Its table of contents, however, gave co-authorship credits only for *Pericles* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, presumably because these plays were not published in the Shakespeare First Folio, on which that *Complete Works* was based. With so much collaborative writing in the *Complete Works*, what is left to put into this *Collaborative Plays* volume?

Surprisingly, the answer is mainly plays that almost nobody thinks Shakespeare wrote—*Lochrine*, *Thomas Lord Cromwell*, *The London Prodigal*, and *A Yorkshire Tragedy*—together with plays that many people think Shakespeare contributed to—*Sir Thomas More*, *Edward III*, *Arden of Faversham*, *The Spanish Tragedy*, and *Double Falsehood*—and one about which there is general uncertainty: *Mucedorus*. This collection of ten plays, then, is not what its title page claims, a set of collaborative plays by 'William Shakespeare and Others'. Several of the plays in the *Complete Works* of 2007 really are collaborative plays by Shakespeare and others (and so belong here), and several of the ones presented here under that rubric almost certainly are not. What, then, is the rationale for this set of ten plays? The answer given in Jonathan Bate's general introduction is that the organizing principle is not what Shakespeare actually wrote but what people used to think he wrote, 'the plays ascribed to him in print in his lifetime' (p. 10), plus the ones he co-wrote. Necessarily such a principle of selection produces a gallimaufry, and Bate strains somewhat to assert the coherence of the collection. 'Three of the four' (of *Lochrine*, *Thomas Lord Cromwell*, *The London Prodigal*, and *A Yorkshire Tragedy*) 'came from the repertoire of the acting company in which [Shakespeare] was a shareholder. He might have commissioned them. He might have polished up the raw scripts... He might have acted in them' (p. 11). Indeed he might, but we have no evidence that he did.

Much the best thing in *Collaborative Plays* is a long essay on 'Authorship and Attribution' by Will Sharpe (pp. 641–745). Sharpe begins with the taxonomic distinction given above: *Sir Thomas More*, *Edward III*, *Arden of Faversham*, *The Spanish Tragedy*, and *Double Falsehood* fall within the range of 'almost certain to very likely' to be in part by Shakespeare, *Mucedorus* is 'worth considering' for that designation, and *Lochrine*, *Thomas Lord Cromwell*, *The London Prodigal*, and *A Yorkshire Tragedy* are 'highly unlikely to almost impossible' attributions (p. 642). Sharpe works through the history of the

attribution to Shakespeare of each of these plays in turn, summarizing the arguments and the evidence as they emerged across the four centuries since the plays' first appearance. The result is a wise and comprehensive review essay, but it adds nothing new to the case for any of the attributions so it need detain us no further.

Two important monographs on our topic appeared this year. Lukas Erne's *Shakespeare and the Book Trade* is a companion to his *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* that appeared a decade ago and has been reissued in a second edition worth brief consideration. This second edition has a new preface (pp. 1–25) that responds to arguments against Erne's position that have appeared in the decade since its first publication. Erne's core claim is that, far from being indifferent to the publication of his plays, Shakespeare wanted to cultivate a print readership and sometimes wrote rather more dramatic dialogue than could be staged in the theatres precisely in order to please his readers. In the preface to the second edition Erne addresses at length the only serious critique of his argument published so far, which was David Scott Kastan's essay '“To think these trifles some-thing”: Shakespearean Playbooks and the Claims of Authorship' (reviewed in *YWES* 92[2013]). Kastan claimed that Erne had understated the importance of evidence that players saw publication as contrary to their interests, as witnessed in the large number of early editions of Shakespeare being bad quartos and in so-called 'staying orders' in the Stationers' Register that seem to show publication being blocked by the actors. Erne responds that Kastan lumped Shakespeare's pre-Chamberlain's men's plays in with his Chamberlain's men's plays, which he should not. Thus Kastan's tally was inflated by things Erne thinks irrelevant and when referring to the players' sanguinity about publication he was referring only to the Chamberlain's men's attitudes.

The publication of bad quartos does not contradict his argument, Erne responds, since it simply shows that several times the playing company was beaten to the publication of its plays by other parties. We do not know for sure that a 'staying order' in the Stationers' Register means that the playing company opposed publication—there could be other obstacles, like the lack of ecclesiastical authority for publication—and even if the company was trying to prevent publication of a particular text that it had not authorized this does not mean that it opposed publication in principle. In the case of the 'staying order' of 4 August 1600 regarding *As You Like It*, *2 Henry IV*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, and *Every Man in His Humour*, three of those four plays were in any case published in editions apparently 'set up from authorial manuscripts' (p. 7), which suggests to Erne that the players were actively involved in the publication. On this last point Erne is vulnerable to the criticism that our ability to determine the nature of the underlying manuscript copy of a printed play—as assumed in the phrase 'set up from authorial papers'—has been greatly overstated. This Paul Werstine shows in a new book reviewed below. Also, it could be objected that, as James Hirrel argued in an article on 'staying orders' reviewed in *YWES* 91[2012], such orders reflect not a stable power relationship between those who would publish plays and those who wanted to prevent publication, but rather a series of skirmishes that the players sometimes lost and sometimes won. Aside from Kastan, Erne also responds

to Richard Rowland's review of the first edition of *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*, which argued that in claiming that over-long plays were cut for performance Erne had understated the evidence from the manuscript of Thomas Heywood's play *The Captives*, which is marked with the author's and bookkeeper's cuts but nonetheless remains long. Erne points out that Rowland himself mistook how many lines are in *The Captives* because he counted manuscript lines not relined modernized lines, which is the only way to make a fair comparison with relined and modernized Shakespeare play scripts.

In *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* Erne argued that Shakespeare wanted to be a bestselling author. In his new book *Shakespeare and the Book Trade* Erne proves with overwhelming empirical data that Shakespeare achieved this ambition. The introduction (pp. 1–24) gives the important overview that Shakespeare got published early in his career and there were sixty-five editions of his works in his lifetime, averaging one every four or five months from 1593 to 1616. That is, he was in his own time an important literary figure rather than becoming one after his death. How did we overlook this until now? Erne reckons that we have been taken in by the dip in his print popularity in the late seventeenth century. Erne, perhaps somewhat defensively, justifies his avoidance of the case-study model of book history in favour of counting things across broad spans of time and of using different spans of time in different parts of his argument. (When Erne first published his counts for Shakespeare publications, this reviewer (in *YWES* 83[2004]) objected that it was hard to follow his reasoning because he kept jumping from one chronological list to another; Kastan's critique of Erne also implies that he rather too freely constructs different chronological lists to suit different claims.)

Among the key facts according to Erne is this one: of the thirty-nine known Shakespeare plays—the thirty-six in the 1623 Folio, plus *Edward III* [1596], *Pericles* [1609], and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* [1634]—nineteen appeared in print in this lifetime, one appeared between his death and the publication of the Folio (*Othello* in 1622), eighteen more appeared in the Folio, and one (*The Two Noble Kinsmen*) appeared soon after. The top-selling editions were *I Henry IV* (six editions by 1616, nine by 1660), *Richard III* (five by 1616, eight by 1660), and *Richard II* (five by 1616, six by 1660); his history plays were by far his most popular genre. *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* outsold the plays, but *Sonnets* did not. The force of these numbers is overwhelming, although at various points one might want to name or count things slightly differently from Erne. Like the editors of the 1986 Oxford *Complete Works*, Erne calls the fragment of the first edition of *I Henry IV* Q1 rather than Q0, and likewise the entirely lost first edition of *Love's Labour's Lost* he calls Q1 and the 1598 edition (the first extant one) he calls Q2. Most commentators want to have something remaining of an edition before giving it a positive number, although this may reflect an unconscious association of the number zero with loss. Erne treats the 1619 book *The Whole Contention* as if it were a single publication on account of having 'one title for both texts' (p. 16) rather than as the third editions of *The Contention of York and Lancaster* and *Richard Duke of York*. This is perhaps not entirely consistent an approach, since titles should not carry so much weight with us.

Erne makes his case for omitting uncertain collaborations and other marginal texts from his list, from which it becomes clear that of the 106 pre-Restoration Shakespeare editions, seventy-six were plays and thirty poems. Just up to 1616 the counts are forty-five play editions and twenty poem editions, so however you look at it the idea that in print he was mainly known as a poet is untrue. Of the decades 1593–1602, 1603–12, 1613–22, and 1623–32 it was the first that saw the most Shakespeare editions, with a tailing off thereafter. That is, Shakespeare was a print superstar right from the start rather than being gradually discovered by the book trade after his death, as is often claimed.

Erne's first chapter, 'Quantifying Shakespeare's Presence in Print' (pp. 25–55), is a longer version of his article 'The Popularity of Shakespeare in Print' (reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011]), but automated comparison of the two versions shows extensive rewriting, so it will here be considered as a fresh piece. Erne cites the evidence that the 1,500-exemplars limit on print runs was routinely exceeded. The variations in print runs ought not to skew the statistics drawn from rates of reprints since they ought to even out rather than affecting one dramatist more than another. Erne reckons that around 260 books were published in the year 1600, of which 30 per cent were what we would call literature. These include the first editions of *Henry V*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, *2 Henry IV*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and the second editions of *Titus Andronicus*, *The Contention of York and Lancaster*, and *Richard Duke of York*, and the fourth and fifth editions of *The Rape of Lucrece*. That makes ten editions of Shakespeare, and his writing was also excerpted or anthologized in *England's Parnassus* and *Belvedere* and *England's Helicon*. In all, a remarkable 5 per cent (13 out of 260) of the year's books had some Shakespeare in them. The real literary bestseller of the whole period, however, was *Venus and Adonis*, outselling everything but the two *Euphues* books by John Lyly.

Erne compares Shakespeare's published output with that of the highly prolific Robert Greene and finds that in the sixty-eight years from his first publication (that is, 1583–1650) Greene's forty titles went through 116 editions, while in the sixty-eight years from his first publication (that is, 1593–1660) Shakespeare's twenty-nine titles went through 105 editions. That equals 2.9 editions per title for Greene and 3.6 editions per title for Shakespeare. Dicing the data other ways, including looking at shorter periods after first publication, gives the same result: Shakespeare was more successful in print. Peter Blayney has convinced everyone that plays were not especially popular in print, which Erne reckons has had the side-effect of concealing just how wildly popular Shakespeare was in print. Of course, the ways of counting books are contestable—is the Shakespeare First Folio thirty-six editions or just one?—and so are the ways of counting plays. For example, should we exclude masques and civic pageants as something quite different from the commercial theatre? Erne starts by counting each collaborative play as one hit for each of its authors and counting 'the number of times a publisher invested in a playwright' (p. 37), so that the First Folio counts as one time, and including only plays performed for paying audiences. On this basis, up to 1642 the seventy-four playbook editions of Shakespeare put him 50 per cent ahead

of his nearest rival, Thomas Heywood, at forty-nine editions, and then comes John Fletcher at thirty-four editions. This last claim is tabulated twice: once up to the year 1642 and once again up to the year 1660 and giving the same rank order.

What about lost editions, and the problem that after 1700 the cultural importance of Shakespeare made people look after early books by him, thus distorting the figures? Alan Farmer and Zachary Lesser, in an article reviewed in *YWES* 86[2007], compared Stationers' Register entries to extant playbooks and calculated that there were few lost editions: no more than one lost playbook edition per year including first editions and reprints. Thus lost editions would not much upset Erne's calculations. What about collaborations getting double-counted, once for each author? As someone who collaborated less often than his rivals, Shakespeare was in fact even further ahead of his collaborating (and hence double-counted) rivals than Erne's counts would suggest. There is no solution to the problem that we do not actually know all the collaborations, of course, so Erne just presents in an appendix the attributions he finds most convincing. If we switch to counting collections once per play they contain, Shakespeare soars even further ahead of the others on account of the Folios. The picture is the same if we look only up to 1616, the year of Shakespeare's death. Indeed, by 1600 Shakespeare was already the bestselling dramatist of the age, and if we count only title-page ascriptions to the author (since until the late 1590s it was common to leave the author's name off the title page) the pattern still remains the same: Shakespeare emerges in 1600 as the front runner and by 1616 is miles ahead of everyone else.

What about if we measure Shakespeare's editions as a proportion of all play editions? Same result: he had 17 per cent (45 out of 263 editions) of the whole market across 1594–1616, broken down into 27 per cent of the market in 1594–1602 (28 out of 102 editions) and 10 per cent of the market in 1603–16 (17 out of 161 editions). What about the objection that he wrote more plays than anyone else, so he is bound to dominate the printed play market? This premise is something of a fallacy since James Shirley, Fletcher, and Heywood wrote about the same number of plays. In any case with the very high turnover of plays going through the playhouses—say fifteen new plays a year for each company and two or more companies working at any one time, of which plays only two were Shakespeare's—his proportion of all playwriting was low. On this subject Erne does not do all the mathematics but actually it is $2 \div 30$ plays per year being Shakespeare's if we assume two companies, which equals about 7 per cent of the writing, or well below his 17 per cent dominance of the print market across 1594–1616, or 27 per cent dominance across 1594–1602. Of course, Shakespeare's share of the activity would be even lower if there were usually more than two companies operating but higher if fifteen new plays a year—a figure derived from Henslowe's Diary, our only source for repertory size—is unusually high.

The best guide to popularity in print is reprint rate, since a reprint shows that the preceding edition had sold out or was about to and the publisher had reason to suppose fresh copies would sell. Blayney showed that around one-fifth of plays got a reprint within nine years of first publication, and Erne points out that nearly three-fifths of Shakespeare's plays achieved this honour.

If we look at all plays first published in 1583–1622 then the proportion that got a reprint inside twenty-five years is about 50 per cent, but for Shakespeare's it is 85 per cent. Erne slices the data one more way but the result is the same: Shakespeare was a publishing phenomenon.

Erne goes on to compare specific reprint rates for Shakespeare with those for John Lyly, George Peele, Robert Greene, Thomas Heywood, George Chapman, Thomas Dekker, John Marston, Thomas Middleton, William Rowley, Ben Jonson, Philip Massinger, Richard Brome, John Ford, and James Shirley. For all these dramatists, most of their plays failed to reach a second edition inside twenty-five years. Only Christopher Marlowe, John Webster, Francis Beaumont, and John Fletcher get above the half-reprinted-inside-twenty-five-years bar. Counting reprints-per-play, the order is Beaumont (at an average of two reprints per play), then Shakespeare (1.6), then Fletcher (1.45) then Marlowe (1.4), although of course these averages are somewhat misleading for writers such as Marlowe with a very small canon—the eight editions of *Doctor Faustus* bump up his average—so Erne experiments with dropping the most popular play by each dramatist and then with looking at only those dramatists whose canon is ten or more plays. Then Erne goes for reprints-inside-ten-years, and yet again Shakespeare is way out in front.

G.E. Bentley concluded that up to 1690 Jonson was much more popular than Shakespeare, based on counting allusions to and quotations from their plays, but Erne thinks that this way of counting shows Jonson to be 'the writers' writer' and that own his method of counting editions shows that Shakespeare was 'the readers' writer' (p. 54). Shakespeare's popularity dipped in the second half of the seventeenth century, so that his eighteenth-century popularity was in fact a revival of the popularity he had enjoyed in the first half of the seventeenth century. When judging the overall popularity of playbooks, you have to think about whose playbooks you are concerned with, since the difference in popularity between the most popular and the least is huge.

Erne's second chapter is on 'Shakespeare, Publication and Authorial Misattribution' (pp. 56–89) and argues that his popularity was the reason that others' works were ascribed to him. *The Passionate Pilgrim* published late in 1598 or in 1599 has twenty poems and Shakespeare's name on the title page, but only five of them—poems 1, 2, 3, 5, and 16—are his. Rather a lot of printed plays either misascribe their content to Shakespeare or use his initials wrongly to imply that he wrote them. Between 1595 and 1622 there appeared ten editions of seven plays that do this, and not one for any other dramatist. Indeed, in the period 1584 to 1633 not one wrong attribution of a professional play has been identified by modern scholarship except those that misidentify Shakespeare. An order by Henry VIII in 1546 had required that every printed book carry its author's name, printer's name, and year of printing, but that requirement did not get put into the Stationers' Company royal charter in 1557, and publishers were free to publish anonymously. There were no penalties for misattribution, so once dramatists' names became common on printed plays the publishers might as well try it.

Erne lists the misattributions of all plays in the later period of 1634–60. There are twelve cases, and Erne suggests that in most the motive seems to

have been exploitation of the selling power of the name that is misused, since the person identified usually had a recent significant real publication, especially an edition of collected works. The identification of Beaumont and Fletcher had by this time become a powerful selling point and their names dominate the list. Erne is careful to distinguish those cases where he thinks the misattribution was an honest mistake. Not one of the twelve cases involves Shakespeare, so how come all the early misattributions are to Shakespeare and none of the late ones are? Erne puts off answering this question for twenty pages and returns to the Shakespeare cases. *Lochrine* (published 1595) is described on its title page as a 'Lamentable Tragedie ... Newly set fourth, ouerseene and corrected, by W.S.' and perhaps that word 'lamentable' is part of the attempted association with Shakespeare, whose *Titus Andronicus* (Q1, 1594) and *Romeo and Juliet* (Q2, 1599) used that word on their title pages. Erne here relies on Tiffany Stern's idea that title pages and playbills used the same wording so that although the *Romeo and Juliet* title page uses the word 'lamentable' four years after *Lochrine* was published, the *Romeo and Juliet* playbills of 1595 might have done so around the time that the printed edition of *Lochrine* sought to exploit the association. They might, but Stern's article claiming that title pages for printed plays drew on the wording of their respective plays' playbills, reviewed in *YWES* 87[2008], was hampered by the complete lack of evidence: not a single pre-Commonwealth playbill survives.

The use of the Chamberlain's men's name and the initials 'W.S.' on the title page of *Thomas Lord Cromwell* in 1602 must have been meant to suggest Shakespeare. So was its phrase 'Chronicle History', which had appeared before only on the title page of the 1600 quarto of *Henry V*. No genuine Shakespeare work was ever ascribed to 'W.S.' or 'W. Sh.' in the period. The title-page ascription of *The Puritan* [1607] is generally accepted to have been an attempt to deceive, although not a terribly sophisticated one since the title page also identifies the playing company as the Children of Paul's, for whom Shakespeare never wrote. Could the use of the initials W.S. be an innocent mistake, there being another dramatist with these initials? No. Erne considers each candidate in turn and rejects him: 'no other W.S. wrote a professional play between 1590 and 1616 that was deemed worthy of publication in print' (p. 73), so the misattribution was deliberate. The title-page attributions of *The London Prodigal* and *A Yorkshire Tragedy* to Shakespeare give his full name and that of the King's men, and if the latter were true it would be hard for a playgoer to know that the former was false.

A Yorkshire Tragedy was entered into the Stationers' Register by Thomas Pavier as being by Shakespeare, so perhaps the manuscript sold to Pavier made the false claim. Pavier, of course, was involved in mass misattribution in the Pavier Quartos printed by William Jaggard in 1619, including a reprint of *A Yorkshire Tragedy* still ascribed to Shakespeare and a reprint of *1 Sir John Oldcastle* newly ascribed to Shakespeare. That Shakespeare's *1 Henry IV* continued to also be called *Oldcastle* even after Shakespeare changed the character's name would have given Pavier some excuse of confusion in misattributing the rival company's play of that title to Shakespeare. Discussing the Pavier Quartos, Erne mentions (p. 79n60) but does not respond to James Marino's ingenious argument about them, and *Oldcastle* in particular, in his

book *Owning William Shakespeare* (reviewed in *YWES* 92[2013]), presumably because it appeared too late. The last Shakespeare misattribution before the First Folio was the third quarto [1622] of *1, 2 Troublesome Reign*: it used 'W. Shakespeare' whereas the second quarto [1611] used 'W. Sh.' and the first quarto [1591] was anonymous. The relationship between this play and Shakespeare's *King John* muddies the waters here. That the first and second quartos mention the Queen's men and the third does not was perhaps due to a dishonest desire to suppress this information that pointed away from Shakespeare's authorship. Seven Shakespeare misattributions occurred in 1604–13 when there was a noticeable lull in the publication of genuine Shakespeare—just *King Lear* [1608], *Troilus and Cressida* [1609], and *Pericles* [1609]—that created a vacuum the false books filled. Unlike the real thing, the misattributed plays did not enjoy high reprint rates.

Authors, we know, objected to misattribution vociferously—Erne gives the examples—and we know that Shakespeare particularly minded it from the evidence of Heywood's *Apology for Actors* [1612]. The third edition of *The Passionate Pilgrim* published by William Jaggard in 1612 added more poems to what it reprinted from its earlier editions and took them from Heywood's *Troia Britannica* published by Jaggard in 1609. In *Apology for Actors* Heywood made his famous statement that he was innocent of Jaggard's putting his poems into a collection that had Shakespeare's name on it, and he mentions that Shakespeare was offended by it too. That Jaggard was made aware of Shakespeare's displeasure is suggested by the cancel title page for the 1612 edition of *The Passionate Pilgrim* in which Shakespeare's name is removed. When Nicholas Ling included four of the poems that *The Passionate Pilgrim* attributes to Shakespeare in his *England's Helicon* he did not copy over the misattribution to Shakespeare despite clearly getting their texts from *Passionate Pilgrim* rather than elsewhere. Clearly Ling realized that they were misattributed and put this right. The first edition of *The Passionate Pilgrim* in 1598 was obviously intended to cash in on Shakespeare's newfound popularity in print, since its title alluded to the meeting of Romeo and Juliet and it has a group of non-Shakespearean Venus and Adonis poems, the subject Shakespeare had made wildly popular. Finally in this chapter comes Erne's tentatively suggested reason for the flood of early misattributions to Shakespeare: holding back his own material after 1603 for 'a more prestigious' publication, Shakespeare may 'have preferred to see his name on title pages of playbooks he had not authored rather than on those he had but were not yet meant for print' (p. 89).

Erne's third chapter, 'The Bibliographic and Paratextual Makeup of Shakespeare's Quarto Playbooks' (pp. 90–129), compares Shakespeare's early quartos with those of other dramatists, looking at how they were made, including their paratexts and other furniture. The upshot is that Shakespeare's were conventional—non-elite, demotic, and reflecting 'unpossessioned authorship' (p. 4)—whereas Jonson's, Marston's, and Chapman's quartos tried to create a high-culture model of authorship for drama. Since stationers' catalogues of books did not start to appear in England until the 1650s, the title pages gave publishers the only promotional opportunities that existed. Erne spells out the rising percentage of printed plays naming their

authors on their title pages across the periods: up 1593 (15 per cent), 1594–8 (42 per cent), 1599–1603 (42 per cent), 1604–8 (60 per cent), 1609–13 (70 per cent), 1614–18 (58 per cent), and 1619–23 (70 per cent). Shakespeare led this trend, going from almost never to almost always being named on his title pages in his lifetime, and his percentages rose earlier than the average shown above. Generally plays that were first published anonymously stayed anonymous when reprinted, but unusually Shakespeare's did not, and over time his name was printed in larger and larger type. The processes were reciprocal: Shakespeare benefited from but also contributed to the rising status of printed drama. Shakespeare is named more often than any other dramatist as a person whose text has been corrected/augmented/enlarged within the book. Erne lists the quartos where this happens but does not separate the cases where it is unclear whether 'By William Shakespeare' governs the whole book—in which case someone else might have done the correcting/augmenting/enlarging—or governs specifically the claim about correcting/augmenting/enlarging it. Putting 'By William Shakespeare' on a separate printed line makes it less obviously tied to the preceding correcting/augmenting/enlarging claim. Asserting that the text had been corrected/augmented/enlarged had the effect of raising its status by characterizing it as important enough to deserve such editorial attention. Noticeably, though, printed Shakespeare plays lack the other usual markers of literary status, the 'Latin title page mottoes, dedications, prefatory epistles, commendatory poems, dramatis personae, arguments, sententiae markers, continuous printing, and act and scene division' (p. 99).

Venus and Adonis has a Latin motto on its title page, but no subsequent Shakespeare printing has. Jonson almost always used Latin mottoes, but other playwrights generally did not. None of Shakespeare's pre-Folio plays is dedicated to anyone, but then again plays usually were not, at least not until the Jacobean period, and by then most of Shakespeare's quartos had already appeared. Likewise epistles and addresses to the readers: these were almost unheard of in printed plays until the Jacobean period. The publishers' epistles on *Troilus and Cressida* [1609] and *Othello* [1622] are most unusual in referring to the greatness of the author of the work. Commendatory verses were very rare in printed plays, used mostly by Jonson, and in not having them Shakespeare was perfectly normal. Likewise the printing of an 'Argument' (that is, plot summary) before a play and dramatis personae lists: this feature started out rare and got a little less rare over time.

Erne turns to 'continuous printing', meaning the embedding of speech prefixes within verse lines to preserve the integrity of the verse at the expense of the integrity of the actor's speech. It was a classical technique, so of course Jonson started to use it and a few dramatists followed. Of Shakespeare editions, only Q1 *King Lear* has it, and only then to save paper. Next Erne turns to the printing of act and scene breaks, and concludes that Shakespeare did not write them and by and large his printers did not impose them, and when they did—for example in parts of the First Folio—it was not done consistently. The pattern is much the same regarding the marking of sententiae: Shakespeare's are typical of play printings of the period in having none or few, and where they are present they are not authorial.

Jonson demanded that special English (rather than imported) paper be used for printing *Sejanus's Fall* in 1605, but Shakespeare's plays were printed on ordinary stuff. Extra blank leaves to protect play quartos show that this format was not considered quite so disposable as has sometimes been suggested, but these were not peculiar to Shakespeare. Nor was his plays appearing almost exclusively in quarto format, which came to be the norm for single-play editions. Regarding typefaces too, Shakespeare's play editions were just normal. Blackletter was used for plays before the 1590s, but in that decade roman became the dominant typeface for plays. Thereafter blackletter was reserved for official documents, and low-class writing and roman type was used for elevated matter, including what we now call literature. Plays were just such elevated matter.

So how come, if Shakespeare was an extraordinary success, his books generally do not have the things listed above—'Latin title page mottoes, dedications, prefatory epistles, commendatory poems, dramatis personae, arguments, sententiae markers, continuous printing, and act and scene division' (p. 99)—that were markers of literary status? The answer is that printed plays generally lacked these things except in the cases of Jonson and, to a lesser extent, Marston and Chapman. Indeed, that printed plays did not have these markers that were found in other works of literature gave to the pleasure of reading plays an experience of immediacy that was akin to the immediacy of going to the theatre: the reader was taken suddenly into the midst of things. Paratexts prepare the reader for what is coming and thus betray a lack of faith in the reader.

Erne reckons that Shakespeare did not quite give up poetry when the theatres reopened in 1594: he combined drama and poetry. And he did not give up the solitariness of the poet for the teamwork of collaborative playwriting, since he mainly wrote his plays unaided. Unlike Jonson, who saw the printed page as high culture and the theatre as low culture, Shakespeare saw the former as a way of presenting the latter. The lone exception is the second issue of *Troilus and Cressida* in 1609 that weirdly decries public performance. The lack of dedications, addresses to the reader, and so on in printed Shakespeare has been misread as an indication of his indifference to print. Rather, unlike Jonson and his followers, Shakespeare did not try to insert himself as author into the works. The books stood for themselves and were wildly popular.

Erne's fourth chapter is 'Shakespeare's Publishers' (pp. 130–85), and for each of them he reports what else he published, whether he focused on particular genres, and, where it can be determined, whether he had any personal contact with Shakespeare and whether he saw the value of using Shakespeare's name to sell books. No early publisher of Shakespeare handled both poems and plays: it was strictly one or the other. Thus it was not the First Folio that initiated the segregation of the canon in this way, for it started much earlier with the quarto publishers. John Harrison acquired the rights to *Venus and Adonis* from Richard Field in 1594 and the same year he entered *The Rape of Lucrece* in the Stationers' Register. Harrison first published *Venus and Adonis* in quarto format, matching the way Field had published it in 1593, but when he reprinted both poems he switched to 'the more prestigious octavo

format' (p. 148) and Erne wonders if that was because Harrison also had two Ovid octavos on sale and knew that people were starting to talk of Shakespeare as the English Ovid. Erne considers the reprinting history of *Venus and Adonis*, including a carefully made forgery of the Leake edition of 1602 made by Robert Raworth in 1608 that was detected and severely punished by the Stationers' Company. That Raworth risked it is a further sign of this poem's extraordinary and well-known commercial success.

Like Harrison, William Jaggard also seems to have wanted to exploit Shakespeare's reputation as the English Ovid: when he published the third edition of *The Passionate Pilgrim* in 1612—the one that Shakespeare took offence at—he mentioned on the title page that he had added material from Ovid: 'two Loue-Epistles, the first from Paris to Hellen, and Hellen's answer backe againe to Paris'. Without any more such illuminating insights, Erne next covers the publications of Thomas Thorpe, Edward Blount, James Roberts, Andrew Wise, Thomas Millington, Cuthbert Burby, Matthew Law, John Busby, Arthur Johnson, Nathaniel Butter, Thomas Pavier, John Smethwick, Henry Gosson, John Trundle, William Aspley, Edward White, Thomas Walkley, Thomas Hayes, Richard Bonian, Henry Walley, and Thomas Fisher. The most interesting thing about this list is its length: a significant subset of the fairly small community of London publishers invested in Shakespeare's name. Nicholas Ling is particularly important for Erne's story because of his publishing of commonplace books, which genre elevated the status of Shakespeare and helped 'turn Shakespeare into a literary dramatist in print' (p. 172). Erne's main point, which is amply made, is that it was not the First Folio that made Shakespeare literary: that had already happened with the preceding quartos.

It should be clear, then, that Erne's book will fundamentally change the way we tell the early part of the story of Shakespeare in print. His last chapter, 'The Reception of Printed Shakespeare' (pp. 186–232), continues the rewriting. Fredson Bowers influentially claimed that printed plays were little regarded and easily discarded and this view has become orthodoxy, but Erne shows that Shakespeare's at least were highly regarded. The average number of surviving exemplars of a Shakespeare edition published up to 1616 is 8.2, which is quite high. Erne tabulates the figures. He notices that for editions that got reprinted soon after their publication the number of extant copies is much lower than for plays that did not, but he admits that just what to make of these data in respect of popularity is hard to know. We are hampered by not knowing the print-run sizes, and these would in any case be based on publishers' guesses about future sales, not on real sales figures. So there are just too many variables. In essence the problem is whether to interpret the scarcity of extant copies to mean that a play was so popular that copies were read to destruction, or contrarily to suppose that it was so unpopular that few copies were made.

Erne records that there are 370 surviving copies of editions of Shakespeare's plays published in his lifetime, which is considerably more than for material that really was considered ephemera. He looks at the known owners of Shakespeare quartos to dispel the idea that Thomas Bodley's dismissive attitude was the period's norm. His cases include Sir William Drummond of Hawthornden, whose printed plays collection, including several Shakespeares,

was accepted as a donation and catalogued by the University of Edinburgh in 1626–7. Sir John Harrington also collected printed plays and owned almost a complete set of the pre-1610 Shakespeare editions, and an unknown Cambridge physician and Scipio Le Squyer had some too. So did Henry Oxinden, Humphrey Dyson, George Buc, Sir Edward Dering, and Frances Egerton (the Countess of Bridgewater), the last like Harrington having almost a complete set of what was available of Shakespeare in print at the time (1602) and that was apparently bound as one volume. Thus she and not Pavier should take the honour of being the first to try to put together a collected Shakespeare. (Erne must know that he is stretching a point here, since a reader putting together her own single volume of collected plays is quite different from a publisher trying to sell an entire print run of plays collected in this way.)

Erne engages briefly with the newly popular academic game of looking at what got bound with what, as if that tells us something about attitudes towards the books concerned. As Erne mentions, the binding of books was expensive so a large part of the incentive was merely practical—books of the same size would go together—rather than interpretative or thematic. Erne quickly moves on to early collectors of Shakespeare editions, including Edward Conway in Ireland, Robert Burton (of *Anatomy of Melancholy* fame, which quotes and alludes to Shakespeare lines), Sir Thomas Mostyn, Henry Percy, Algernon Percy, and Frances Wolfreton. Libraries might not have appreciated Shakespeare editions, but early collectors certainly did. We have less knowledge of early readers of Shakespeare, but Stanley Wells has expanded this area with his account of the responses of William Scott. As well as their critical comments, early readers' emendations of faulty readings and their adding of necessary stage directions are a useful check on our sense of textual correctness.

Erne offers three substantial appendices. The first tabulates 'Publication of Playbooks by Shakespeare and his Contemporaries to 1660' (pp. 233–52) and, to make comparisons such as reprint rates meaningful, only dramatists with at least five plays published in at least twelve editions are included. The Second Folio counts as a reprint of the First Folio, but Erne does not count the First Folio even where an actual quarto seems to have been used as printer's copy. This seems odd, but in defence he is using the same criteria as Farmer and Lesser, which enables meaningful comparisons between their work. More surprisingly still, Q2 *Hamlet* is counted by Erne as a reprint of Q1. Unsurprisingly the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647 gives him a lot of trouble, as regarding authorship it is not what it purports to be. Erne's second appendix lists 'Playbooks of Professional Plays, including Reprints, 1583–1622' (pp. 253–6), working year by year and giving the editions' index numbers from W.W. Greg's *Bibliography of the English Printed Drama (BEPD)* and useful running totals. Lastly, there is an appendix of 'Shakespeare's Publishers, 1593–1622' (pp. 257–62) that runs alphabetically on last name, summarizing what each publisher did in the areas of publication, Stationers' Register entries, and the transferring of rights.

The only other monograph relevant to this review this year was Paul Werstine's *Early Modern Playhouse Manuscripts and the Editing of*

Shakespeare. A key purpose of the book is to 'demonstrate that New Bibliography's most enduring editorial categories [foul papers and prompt-book] are invalid' (p. 4). For Werstine, the key evidence is 'nineteen MSS and three annotated quartos'. Because some of the manuscripts that appear to have annotations enabling them to be used in the theatre have only a few such annotations, Werstine reckons that 'it seems probable that some MSS or printed texts without any annotation whatsoever may well have served the same purpose in the playhouse that these did' (p. 4). The first problem with this logic is that the cache of surviving manuscript playbooks—just nineteen in all, by Werstine's count—represents between 1 and 2 per cent of the number that once existed, assuming that around 1,000–2,000 plays were written for the commercial theatres of London between 1576 and 1624. (Around 500 printed plays survive.) When at least 98 per cent of the evidence for a phenomenon is missing, historians must ask whether the remaining 2 per cent is likely to be representative of the whole, and parallels from other fields should make us cautious. For example, were we to construct an impression of Elizabethan clothing from the materials that survive, we would imagine that everyone from monarch to peasant was wearing silk lace, since it survives in abundance while woollens and linens are rare. In truth, of course, the high value and easy reusability of silk lace makes it much more likely to survive than other textiles. The second problem is that Werstine's logic threatens to turn any non-theatrical manuscript into a theatrical one since the absence of theatrical annotations would qualify it as one of those theatre documents that managed without theatrical annotations.

The first two chapters of Werstine's book are essentially expansions of his article 'The Continuing Importance of the New Bibliographical Method', reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011]. In the first, 'The Discovery of "Foul Papers"' (pp. 12–59), Werstine tells the story he has told several times before of W.W. Greg finding that Edward Knight copied out Fletcher's *Bonduca* from the 'fowle papers of the Authors' and Greg's comparing this manuscript with the 1647 Beaumont and Fletcher folio edition (hereafter F). Greg's mistake was to assume that the differences between the manuscript and the printed edition are due to Knight accurately representing the deficiencies of the authorial foul papers when in fact it was Knight's transcript that introduced those deficiencies. According to Werstine, the entire New Bibliographical misconception of foul papers arises from Greg's misreading of the evidence about *Bonduca*. Werstine details the argument of Greg's unpublished paper of 1927 on *Bonduca* (discovered by Grace Ioppolo in 1990), in which Greg somewhat anticipated E.A.J. Honigmann in arguing that when copying out his own untidy foul papers of the play to give the King's men a fair copy, Fletcher revised it. Thus F differs from the Knight transcript not only because Knight had trouble reading the foul papers but also because of this subsequent authorial revision.

By the time he came to make his Malone Society Reprint of *Bonduca* in 1951 Greg had changed his mind and no longer saw authorial revision at work in the differences between Knight's transcript and F. At most there was non-authorial revision, but Greg did not follow through the consequences of that insight. If there are non-authorial revisions separating the foul papers and the

promptbook-derived F then someone other than Fletcher must have read those foul papers and added to them, yet by Greg's own definition those foul papers should have been illegible to anyone but Fletcher alone. In an endnote (p. 53n15) Werstine deals with the possibility that there was an intervening authorial fair copy on to which the non-authorial revisions were added, pointing out that the only reason to posit this document would be to make Greg's theory work.

Werstine gives Greg no credit for modifying his view: 'It is most odd that Greg should have developed his conception of "foul papers" in the direction of their frequent transcription by scribes; in doing so he seems to have forgotten that in his initial 1927 reconstruction of the *Bonduca* "foul papers" their defining characteristic was their inaccessibility to scribal transcription' (p. 28). I would say that Greg came to realize that foul papers need not be so foul as to be uncopyable by anyone other than the author. Werstine lists the modern Shakespeare editions that warmly embraced Greg's idea that an early printing was based on foul papers, but then admits that their editors did not understand that term as Greg did: 'Without Greg's unpublished essay, none of these editors was constrained in employing the words "foul papers" by the complicated history of the *Bonduca* texts that subtended Greg's conception' (p. 29). Well, precisely. These editors were not using Greg's faulty logic in relation to *Bonduca* because his essay containing it was unpublished; instead they were just agreeing that certain things in the early printings looked like they derived from a pre-rehearsal script. Werstine traces Greg's failed attempts to find tangible examples of foul papers in extant manuscripts, including Heywood's holograph *The Captives* and the fragmentary manuscript of Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris* and parts of the Additions to *Sir Thomas More*. These are poor examples of the kind of foul papers Greg imagined Knight copying to make his transcript of *Bonduca*, as they are fairly legible and seldom confusing. Rather than attacking Greg directly, Werstine uses John Dover Wilson as a proxy and attacks his attempts to find evidence for foul papers copy in the errors in early editions of Shakespeare. As Werstine rightly points out, Wilson failed to recognize poor printing—as happened in William White's shop, to judge by his reprinting where we have the originals to compare with his work—as an alternative explanation that accounts for errors in printed books.

In Q2 *Romeo and Juliet* the lines 'Her chariot is an empty hazelnut | Made by the joiner squirrel or old grub, | Time out o' mind the fairies' coachmakers' come after the detailed description of Queen Mab's coach rather than before it. Werstine agrees that moving them to the beginning of that description makes logical sense but objects that Mercutio need not make sense: 'why should Mercutio be made to develop with reference to logic a speech about a dream he pretends to have had?' (p. 39). I would answer that the audience needs to follow what he says even though it is about a dream, and that this kind of writing is of a different order from the intentionally incoherent babble of crazy Leontes. Surprisingly, Werstine takes at face value John Russell Brown's claim that shared spelling habits prove that the same two composers who set Q2 *Hamlet* in 1604 also set Q1 *The Merchant of Venice* in 1600. It suits Werstine to accept this because these men's work on Q1 *The Merchant of Venice* was exemplary and thus 'dealt a crippling blow' (p. 42) to

Wilson's argument that Q2 *Hamlet* contains lots of compositorial omissions. But Werstine must know that Brown's finding of two compositors in Q2 *Hamlet* is much more securely based and better corroborated by other studies than his claim that the same two men were four years earlier employed on Q1 *The Merchant of Venice*. Werstine points out that the things omitted by Q2 *Hamlet*—if we judge F to be reliable in including them—are simple words and phrases that would not give a compositor much trouble, especially as in most cases there are neighbouring lines with the same words and phrases that the compositor obviously could read, whereas the lacunae in the *Bonduca* transcript really are unusual phrases, to judge by what F has at those places, that would give a compositor trouble. Again, *Bonduca* is a poor model for the claim that foul papers underlay an early edition of Shakespeare and it lacks the repetitions that we find in Q1 *Love's Labour's Lost*, Q2 *Romeo and Juliet*, and Q2 *Hamlet*, and that are generally attributed to these editions being printed from authorial foul papers.

Werstine ends the chapter by summarizing what is wrong with Greg's idea of foul papers as reconstructed from the differences between Knight's transcript of *Bonduca* and the 1647 folio text of it. The problem is that Werstine assumes rather than demonstrates that Greg got his conception of foul papers almost entirely from his work on *Bonduca*. Indeed, this is an inherently implausible hypothesis since Greg's work on *Bonduca* was unpublished. Although a leader of New Bibliography, Greg was not simply followed unthinkingly by his peers. In reality, and contrary to Werstine's claim, Greg's conception of foul papers was also derived from his study of the early printed editions of Shakespeare and hence these early editions not being like the *Bonduca* case is not evidence against Greg's conception of foul papers, which was more capacious and more flexible than Werstine, confining himself to the case of *Bonduca*, allows.

Werstine's second chapter, 'Redefining "Foul Papers"' (pp. 60–106), is also almost entirely about *Bonduca*; Werstine places a tremendous lot of weight upon what Greg thought of that play but did not publish. Greg came to suspect that someone other than Fletcher revised *Bonduca* between the foul papers seen by Knight and F, and Werstine reckons that the additions to IV.iii—that is, what F has over and above the Knight transcript—are so incompetent that they cannot be Fletcher's work or that of anyone else he collaborated with. The problems include the bungling of the soliloquy convention and inconsistency in characterization generated by the revision. Greg assumed that the scenes missing from the foul papers and present in F were part of the original play, but Werstine thinks that unlikely since even without them the play is perfectly coherent—what are the odds that losing a couple of sheets would do no damage?—and also because the F-only scenes are rather like the additions to IV.iii in introducing inconsistency and redundancy. Indeed, F really rather ruins Act V in drawing it out with slack writing and the repetition of events and the content of speeches. Why were these additions to Act V written? Because Fletcher originally wrote much too short an Act V, 'the shortest last act he ever wrote for a play' (p. 71). The existence of these non-authorial revisions proves to Werstine's satisfaction that the authorial foul papers (copied by Knight) were clear enough for someone

other than Fletcher to read—and hence Knight could read them well enough—although as we have seen this requires Werstine to rule out the existence of a lost authorial fair copy.

So why did Knight make such a terrible transcript of the legible authorial foul papers? Werstine turns to Knight's work in his transcript of Nathan Field, Philip Massinger, and John Fletcher's *The Honest Man's Fortune*, which is so like the version of the play in the 1647 Beaumont and Fletcher folio that Greg decided that Knight's transcript and the 1647 folio used the same lost manuscript as their copy. Thus we can compare Knight's transcript to the 1647 folio to get a sense of what Knight tends to do. At this point Werstine's argument becomes considerably more persuasive and in parts quite brilliant. Greg noticed that Knight's work in *Bonduca* is beautifully tidy and assumed that this care extended to the accuracy of the words, not realizing that beauty of presentation is the enemy of accuracy because Knight was reluctant to correct his mistakes. Knight was demonstrably prone to making errors, such as leaving out a letter even in a proper noun he had copied dozens of times before, so this error cannot be put down to the illegibility of his copy. Werstine traces a set of other errors and sophistications that Knight was prone to. He details Knight's sin of eyeskip affecting his transcript of *Bonduca* and shows that when he spotted what he had done Knight would try to squeeze in later the line he had omitted, if it could make a kind of sense, or else he would just drop it altogether if he could not find a spot for it. This was the key habit that Greg mistook for confusion arising from illegibility in the foul papers.

Werstine speculates about other errors in the *Bonduca* manuscript that are easily accounted for by Knight's now known habitual slips. The speech-prefix and speech-rule errors in Knight's *Bonduca* can also be explained as his habitual errors, on the evidence of his scribal work elsewhere. Knight tended to put in all the rules as he was writing the speeches, and then go back and put in the speech prefixes. Thus if he made an error with the rules he would be compounding it with the speech prefixes. Where Knight left a gap in his transcription of *Bonduca* and came back to fill it in later, Greg thought he saw a careful scribe skipping over what he could not read. Werstine points out that in the second word of 'armed troopes' at the end of a line in this transcription, the word 'troopes' was clearly written in later by Knight (so he must initially have left a gap), and the F reading of 'armed Carts' would have been so unfamiliar to Knight that when he found it in the foul papers he invoked his habit of changing unfamiliar phrases to familiar ones. That is, Knight left gaps when he wanted the freedom to change Fletcher's words without marring the document, not where he was—so Greg thought—being scrupulous.

Thus Greg had Knight's attitude the wrong way around. Even where the omitted word or phrase was not unusual, we should not assume that the copy was illegible, only that Knight was being demonstrably cavalier in giving himself space to interfere in the text. This was common in scribes: Ralph Crane was like that too. The habit extends to the stage directions. Greg assumed that the faults and unnecessary expansions in the directions in Knight's transcription of *Bonduca* were due to the foul papers having tentative, incomplete stage directions. Werstine shows that they are typical of Knight's scribal work. Werstine's conclusion for this chapter is that Knight's transcription of

Fletcher's foul papers of *Bonduca* differs from the folio version not because Knight accurately copied untidy foul papers but because he inaccurately copied relatively tidy foul papers that went on to form the basis of F.

For his third chapter, 'Playhouse MSS: What Bookkeepers Did Not Do' (pp. 107–47), Werstine moves from the particularities of individual cases to the wider generalizations drawn from them. What Greg knew as a student of theatre manuscripts was in conflict with what he wanted as a textual scholar, and Werstine believes that he let the needs of the latter distort his account of the manuscripts. Having already deluded himself that foul papers were untidy, Greg now forced some of the manuscripts he knew into the anachronistic category of promptbooks. In 1931 Greg acknowledged that what he called promptbooks need not be terribly complete or consistent in stage directions, although we can see him starting to assume that promptbooks were more typically made from scribal transcripts than authorial papers. Then Greg got misdirected by R.B. McKerrow's celebrated essays 'The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts' [1931–2] and 'A Suggestion Regarding Shakespeare's Manuscripts' [1935]. At this point Werstine brings in a new class of evidence not normally considered relevant to this topic except by Tiffany Stern, which is Restoration promptbooks. These show that needless authorial variations were not tidied up.

Looking at Ralph Crane's transcript of *Sir John van Olden Barnavelt*, Werstine notes that it shows no attempt to clarify with distinct speech prefixes the groups of people—burghers from Utrecht, burghers from The Hague—who must be distinct. He points out that we do not get hopelessly confused reading the manuscript, although there are ambiguities about who says what that different editors have resolved in different ways. Werstine's point is that Crane did not try to impose singularity and nor did the bookkeeper annotating this manuscript. Indeed, Werstine could rather more forcefully have pointed out that Greg called this Crane transcript of *Barnavelt* a promptbook—he quotes Greg doing that—so that its ambiguities contradict Greg's characterization of promptbooks as regular. There is something of an attempt to save Greg from himself here, as Werstine turns to his dependence on McKerrow for his ideas about regularity in stage directions. Yet at the same time Werstine seems wilfully to misread Greg. For example, introducing a discussion of 'ghosts' Greg wrote that 'At the beginning of a scene an author will sometimes write down a list of the characters he is likely to require'. Werstine comments that Greg wrongly imagines 'an entrance SD containing a list of characters appearing only "at the beginning of a scene"' (p. 123) when in fact entrance directions can also appear part-way through a scene. Of course Greg knew that: he was characterizing a certain kind of massed entrance that one sometimes finds, not saying that mid-scene entrances do not also occur. Werstine seems again wilfully to misread Greg as claiming that whether someone speaks is the sole criterion for deciding if they are a 'ghost', as if Greg were unaware that a non-speaker might nonetheless be essential to a scene if they have some business to perform or are addressed at an important moment. Werstine points the reader to his appendix showing 'ghosts' and mutes who, contrary to Greg's expectation, were not removed by bookkeepers annotating

manuscripts; indeed 'ghosts' and unnecessarily doubled entrances are more common in theatrically annotated manuscripts than in others.

Much the same is true of stage directions that fail to name the persons needed: many examples of this survive in theatrically annotated manuscripts. Regarding indefinite stage directions, Werstine credits Greg for reverting in 1955 to his earlier position that these need not be cleaned up in promptbooks, and points out that Greg did not acknowledge that his acceptance of this point undermined his very distinction between untidy foul papers and clean promptbooks. Again, Werstine points to his appendices that list all the indefinite stage directions surviving in theatrically annotated manuscripts. Regarding petitory stage directions of the kind 'do X or Y', or 'do Z if possible', which Greg regarded as particularly authorial, Werstine admits that the only surviving examples are indeed in manuscripts in their author's hands but points out that the backstage plot for *2 Seven Deadly Sins*—and there could not be a more theatrical document—has one: 'Enter Sarda wth as many Jewels robes and Gold as he ca <n> cary'. I do not agree that this is petitory. How much he could carry might be determined in rehearsal or even on the first performance as he is loaded up with properties; this is not admitting multiple possibilities but just declining to state in advance how much an actor can carry.

Werstine acknowledges that there was some attempt by theatricalizing scribes to disambiguate the script they were annotating, but he continues to list the detailed evidence that for the most part they preferred instead to leave ambiguity standing. What emerges most strongly here is that there are many examples that do support Greg's claims about regularization through annotation—notably in *The Captives* and *John a Kent and John a Cumber* on page 128 and *A Looking Glass for London and England* on page 129—yet nonetheless ambiguities remain. Werstine lays great stress on perfect regularity not being achieved, but from the same evidence I would say that it was clearly their goal. There are contradictions regarding the nature of authorial versus theatrical manuscripts not only between early Greg and late Greg but also within Greg's classic book *The Shakespeare First Folio* of 1955. Werstine shows that Greg's determination that Q1 *A Midsummer Night's Dream* [1600] was printed from authorial papers, on the basis of what Greg had determined would be found in the way of variation and imprecision in foul papers, is flatly contradicted by the real evidence of surviving manuscripts.

In the course of this argument, Werstine rejects Wilson's contention that mislined verse in Q1 *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is the result of the printer trying to cram in lines that were marginal additions to the authorial papers that were his copy (p. 144n24). Werstine remarks that the quire with the mislined verse, G, also has pages with fewer lines than in the rest of the book, and that the number of lines so saved in the quire, six, is exactly the number that would have been used if the mislined verse set as prose had been properly set as verse. Because of this correspondence—six lines being saved by mislining verse as prose and the quire being six lines short overall—Werstine suggests that the best explanation is not to suppose that the copy was hard to cast off correctly but to simply assume just one reason for both phenomena. That is, the gathering is six lines short because the compositor mistakenly set the verse

as prose and so had set six lines fewer than he should when he came to the end of the copy allocated to quire G. Indeed, many of the features from which Greg concluded that the copy for Q1 *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was authorial papers are found in Folio *Julius Caesar* and yet Greg believed that this was set from theatrical copy.

The same problem of inconsistent thinking bedevils Greg's determination of theatrical copy for certain Folio texts, and also his rejection of the possibility of 'the use of printed copies in the playhouses' (p. 136) in which the quartos used as copy for F picked up their theatricalizing annotations during such theatrical use rather than by cursory annotation from consultation of theatrical manuscripts while being made ready to serve as copy for F. In support of the idea of quartos being used as promptbooks, Werstine cites 'the documented use of the *Fleire*, *Looking glasse* . . . and *Milke-Maids* quartos' in this way (p. 136). Greg tried to accommodate aspects of Shakespeare's biography to his work on underlying texts, for example in supposing that the authorial papers for the earliest Shakespeare plays were unlikely to still exist three decades later so that the Folio copy for these plays had to be theatrical, and that towards the end of his career Shakespeare was not much in London so he wrote expansive stage directions to make up for his absence in person. Werstine is right that Greg knew that authors not bookkeepers might be the source for calls for offstage sounds and music, but nonetheless used these calls to diagnose theatrical copy underlying printed books. Just how much blame should attach to Greg for this is uncertain, since in the creation of heuristic tools generalizations necessarily swamp the detail. Werstine admits that Greg was explicit that his methods for detecting underlying copy were highly uncertain, and Werstine puts much of the blame on subsequent editors who nonetheless confidently built upon them.

Werstine's fourth chapter, 'Playhouse MSS: What Bookkeepers Did' (pp. 148–99), offers more of the same, using examples from real manuscripts to show that what Greg claimed about differences between foul papers and promptbooks was frequently wrong. Regarding persons' names, theatrical manuscripts can be just as inconsistent as authorial manuscripts, and indeed bookkeepers and censors introduce variations in names used in stage directions and speech prefixes. An example of what looks like name variation introduced by a bookkeeper appears in a printed edition, Q2 *Romeo and Juliet*, that is commonly argued because of name variation to have been printed from authorial papers: 'Enter Madame and Nurse. | Nur. Madam. | Iu. Nurse' (H3^r). As Werstine comments, 'clearly another hand has intervened to supplement the SD with *Madame*, a word obviously taken from the dialogue' (p. 155). That is, someone added 'Madame' because the dialogue seemed to need it, but 'Madam' is simply what the Nurse calls Juliet. Werstine considers ambiguities created when scribes copied stage directions from mid-line or the right side to the left side of speech columns, noting that they often omitted essential parts of what they were copying. If they did this merely for visibility then the completeness of the original mid-line or right-side direction made up for it, but as Werstine observes the new left-side stage direction might be the one that gets into a printed text and there its incompleteness could, by Greg's rules, be mistaken for a sign of the author. The same is true when stage directions at the

top of a page were copied to the bottom of the preceding page in order that they would not come as a surprise when the leaf was turned by whoever was using the document.

Greg thought indefinite stage directions (as in '*Enter four or five*') to be a sign of the author, but Werstine has examples of bookkeepers' annotations introducing them. But there are not many examples and in only one case, from *The Honest Man's Fortune*, is there an 'X or Y' number alternative: all the rest are just imprecise nouns such as 'Attendants' and 'Fellows'. Next Werstine turns to loose ends, false starts, and confusions. He likens to the double death of Romeo in Q2 the contradiction caused by Anselmus in Middleton's *The Lady's Tragedy* returning to consciousness after the stage direction '*Ansel: dies*' and then having a second '*dyes*' direction a couple of dozen lines later. I would say that the crucial difference here is that Romeo repeats his dying speeches so clearly that these must be two authorial attempts at the death scene, not merely a single stage direction that is rethought. Werstine deals with Honigmann's claim that duplicated dialogue in Shakespeare comes from undeleted first attempts appearing alongside second attempts. This Werstine likens to the repetition in the final execution scene in *Sir Thomas More* in Munday's fair copy. Werstine admits that this would not have produced the duplication seen in Q2 *Romeo and Juliet* since in *Sir Thomas More* the deletion of the first version is clearly marked, but he insists that since this is Munday's fair copy the conclusion that repetition points to authorial papers is wrong. This is a misrepresentation of Honigmann, who was not claiming that duplication cannot appear in theatrical papers, only that uncertainty between two versions of something is more typical of authorial than theatrical papers.

A similar argument governs Werstine's account of the repetition in *Sir Thomas More* regarding the discovery that one of More's servants cheated the players out of part of their reward. Werstine thinks that in this case the deletion might not have been understood by a printer: 'Hand B's manner of deleting the first version by bracketing it and then drawing through the dialogue a line joining the arms of the brackets may or may not have clearly indicated deletion to someone outside the playhouses, especially since Hand B also uses within the deleted passage a second method of deletion, this one unmistakable, by stroking out a line (35) and some part lines (23, 29, 33)' (p. 188). It is hard to see why Werstine thinks that something that is deleted by two methods, one of them 'unmistakable', might not have been understood as deleted by someone outside the theatre. Werstine has another four examples of repetition in a theatrical manuscript of *The Soddered Citizen*, but again the deletions of one version are really clear so this is not comparable with Q2 *Romeo and Juliet*. A fifth example is something Werstine claims is repetition in a song, but it is only the insertion of an additional pair of lines by marginal annotation (p. 190). In this case, there would be two versions of the song only if one reads the same writing twice, once ignoring the inserted couplet and once including it at the place it is meant to be inserted. In this crucial section of his book Werstine can adduce no theatrical manuscript parallels that would explain the duplications in printed Shakespeare plays that New Bibliographers attribute to authorial paper repetition and undeleted first thoughts.

Lastly in this chapter Werstine turns to the interpretation of the appearance of actors' names in printed plays. McKerrow reckoned that an actor's name as well as the character's name indicated promptbook origins, while the actor's name appearing alone indicated authorial paper origins. Greg eventually adopted this idea, but thought that in promptbooks only minor characters' names would be so glossed. Werstine attempts to show that in fact theatrical manuscripts do use actors' names instead of, rather than merely as well as, their characters' names and that they do so even for the most important characters in the play. When the evidence comes, however, it is not a flood: Werstine has one example each from *John of Bordeaux*, *The Lady's Tragedy*, *The Two Noble Ladies*, and *Edmond Ironside* and then a slew from the (atypical) *Believe as You List*, of which several are anticipatory reading notes, not regular stage directions or speech prefixes. Despite this paucity of evidence, Werstine concludes that we simply cannot tell whether foul papers or promptbook copy underlies any particular early printed edition of a play. He is right that these determinations cannot be made with certainty, but the uncertainty is not as complete as he suggests.

In his fifth chapter, 'Behind the Stage / In the Tiring House' (pp. 200–20), Werstine tries to infer playhouse practices from his analyses of the theatrical manuscripts. He reckons that playhouse practices may have changed in the 1630s and that before then all a prompter did was feed lines to dried actors. A change in the 1630s seems to be that, to judge from the fullness of the anticipatory warnings about entrances and properties in *The Lady Mother* and *The Wasp* (both for the King's Revels company), the plot was done away with and the book was used for everything. Werstine makes the same mistake as Stern in thinking that Henry Herbert's instruction 'Purge ther parts, as I have the booke' indicates that the actors' cue-scripts might be 'already transcribed before the censor returned the licensed MS' (p. 203). Herbert was referring to the parts of *The Tamer Tamed*, which necessarily were already in existence since he was not licensing a new play but putting a stop to a revival of it two decades after those parts were made for the first performance. This tells us nothing about whether parts were normally made before a play was licensed, and common sense tells us that they were not as purging them after licensing (to reflect the censor's demanded changes) would be tedious. Werstine leaves open the possibility that the actors' parts might be made 'from another copy of the play while the Master of the Revels was busy with the copy he was censoring' (p. 204), and like Stern he misreads Robert Daborne's letter about having 'altered one . . . scenan in the third act which [the actors] have . . . in parts' as showing that 'with this play the actors' parts were already being transcribed before the bookkeeper had a complete text of the play'. If this interpretation of the word 'parts' were right, then the actors' parts were being transcribed before the author had finished the play and before the company had agreed to buy it. Since a pitch of this play to the company upon completion is planned, the Werstine–Stern interpretation of this letter cannot be correct. Sometimes 'in parts' just means partially.

Werstine thinks that the prompter's book did not need to be accurate in its speech prefixes since in prompting he just needed the dialogue, which he would call out to the stage in general if someone dried. For the same reason, faulty

stage directions would not hinder the prompter. Since it was the actors' job to get themselves ready by consulting the plot, the prompter did not care if the stage directions had errors in the names so long as everybody entered at the right time in relation to the onstage dialogue. Werstine notices that in theatrical documents missing entrance directions tend to cluster in five kinds of unusual entrance: from below the stage, or to the 'above', or from a hiding place, or for characters who recently exited and are about to re-enter to the same scene, or who are speaking 'within'. Actors in the first three categories would not pass the place where the prompter was positioned by one of the stage doors, so it was not his job to help them, and those in the last two categories would be taking their cues from the action on the stage not from the prompter. Missing exits in theatrical documents are unimportant as it was the actor's job to get himself off the stage.

Amongst the King's Revels company's plays in the 1630s there is a sudden concern with completeness of anticipatory, warning stage directions in *The Lady Mother* and *The Wasp*. Werstine looks first at the much more sporadic signalling of such things in other manuscripts and wonders why *Thomas of Woodstock* has the 'warning direction' for 'Shreves Ready' but not for lots of others' entrances. (Werstine silently abandons William B. Long's untenable claim that this is not a readying note to be consulted in performance but rather a pre-performance reminder to acquire whatever it takes to present shrieves.) Returning to the King's Revels company in the 1630s, the evidence of *The Lady Mother* and *The Wasp* gives the impression that it was the prompter's responsibility to get every actor ready to go on. Oddly enough, although the bookkeeper—the same man for both manuscripts—is scrupulous in giving himself these warnings in this initial round of annotation, after the scripts got revised and cut the warnings were not scrupulously changed to meet the new requirements of the plays. Werstine speculates that the revised versions of the plays are the ones nearest to final performance and so were uppermost in the bookkeeper's mind and hence least in need of written *aides-mémoire*.

Werstine stresses how unlike all the other manuscripts *The Lady Mother* and *The Wasp* are, for example in being sent back to their authors for fresh work after initial marking up for performance, in order to argue that they are untypical of theatrical manuscripts in general. Here we see subjectivity entering the problem, since with so few surviving playbook manuscripts another theatre historian might equally well argue that these two are typical and the rest are anomalous. Werstine treats *The Welsh Ambassador* as a unique case all of its own, sitting between the other eighteen, which eschew readying and anticipatory notes, and *The Lady Mother* and *The Wasp*, which have them in abundance. One significant difference is that in *The Welsh Ambassador* some of the notes are omitted where they would cause complex overlapping around quick-succession entrances, and Werstine guesses that the scribe simply had not discovered a way to represent this kind of complexity.

The conclusion to Werstine's book is titled 'Empirical Editing of Shakespeare' (pp. 221–33). According to Werstine, the Oxford *Complete Works* editors' hypothesis of good quartos being printed from foul papers and independently authoritative Folio texts of the same plays being printed from promptbooks falls because his study has shown that the distinction between

foul papers and promptbooks is illusory. Andrew Gurr's maximal/minimal text hypothesis also falls because *Believe as You List* and *The Launching of the Mary* show that the cutting down for performance was enacted on the licensed authorial playbook, not a copy of it, and because in the case of *Bonduca* at least it was the authorial version that was too short—especially because of a short final act—and the thing had to be extended to make the theatrical version. Werstine dismisses Erne's idea that short Shakespeare quartos reflect performance of essentially the same plays as the longer quarto and Folio versions, pointing out that the Q/F differences of *Romeo and Juliet*, *Henry V*, and *Hamlet* are far greater than the differences created by the marking up of extant manuscripts for theatrical performance.

Gary Taylor and John Jowett thought that scene divisions were not added in the theatricalizing of manuscripts, although the author's scene divisions would be tolerated, and hence where these appear they are the consequence not of theatrical annotation but literary annotation, as for a patron's private transcript. They overlooked the fact that Crane's transcript of *Sir John van Olden Barnavelt*—a transcript by a theatrical scribe—has scene divisions. So, according to Werstine, we cannot diagnose literary over theatrical transcript as the copy for a printed edition on the basis of that printed edition having its scene breaks emphasized. Similarly Robert K. Turner Junior deduced from the presence of 'Finis Actus' markers in Folio *Twelfth Night* that it must have been printed from something other than a promptbook since prompters did not add such things, and Wells for the Oxford *Complete Works* accepted this. But Werstine points out that *The Welsh Ambassador* and *The Parliament of Love*, both clearly theatrical manuscripts, have this feature.

Werstine supports Blayney's suggestion that it was the companies who sold their plays to the publisher, 'to advertise the company's wares' (p. 226). Although he is reluctant to generalize from one case, the fact that the theatrical scribe Knight thought that the acting version of *Bonduca* was the one he should be trying to represent suggests to Werstine that where possible publishers were given the theatrical not the authorial version of a play. What of the claim that the company would not let the licensed playbook out of its possession? Werstine responds that the King's men could not find their licensed playbooks of *The Winter's Tale* and *The Honest Man's Fortune* when they needed them. The possibility of a licensed theatrical manuscript being sent to the publisher is shown, according to Werstine, by *The Walks of Islington and Hoxton* being published 'in 1641 . . . with its license reproduced in the printed text' (p. 227). In fact this play was published in 1657, not 1641 (that was when it was licensed for the stage), and of course by the middle of the Interregnum a theatrical licence held no value as there was no commercial theatre industry.

Werstine tries to rehabilitate A.W. Pollard's idea of 'continuous copy' in which a single manuscript served first as the authorial papers and then was marked up to make the document used in the theatre, rather than first being copied out afresh. He rightly observes that Greg tended not to think through to its consequences the fact that about half the surviving theatrical manuscripts are based on authorial papers. True, but by the same token Werstine is guilty of not thinking through the consequences of the other half of

them not being based on authorial papers. Werstine concludes that unless one has incontrovertible evidence about what type of copy underlay a particular printing—as we have, for example, in the distinguishing marks of Ralph Crane's copying—we should simply admit that we cannot tell what kind of copy the printer had. On this principle, even Q2 *Romeo and Juliet* and Q2 *Hamlet* might have been printed from theatrical copy. As we have seen, variable speech prefixes do not prove otherwise, and nor does an actor's name appearing where we expect a character's name. As a final example, Werstine offers that in Q2 *Hamlet* the marginal stage direction '*Drum, trumpets and shot. | Florish, a peece goes off*' is a duplication, a feature unique to theatrical manuscripts.

The material printed after the conclusion of Werstine's book repays close investigation because it is meant to substantiate his claim to base his conclusion on the first full survey of all of the relevant documents. Thus 'The Manuscripts' (pp. 234–357) is a chronological listing that rethinks such things as how many hands are in each document rather than, for example, relying on the judgements of editors in the Malone Society Reprints series. Werstine details what it takes for a manuscript to be considered one that was intended to be used during a performance for the purpose of prompting. It is not merely the presence of act divisions, or references to properties and sound effects, or cuts/additions, or censoring marks, since all kinds of manuscripts have those, but rather those things appearing in an annotating hand other than the main hand. Certain kinds of notes are clearly for use during performance, such as anticipatory/warning notes, repetition of stage directions, addition of actors' names, and censoring or licensing notes. A manuscript need not have all these features to be theatrical, and certainly it is not the performance licence that makes a manuscript into the one used for prompting. Werstine warns that the annotating need not be complete: playbooks used in performance vary in how much of it they have. (Here he is trying to avoid the objection that some of the manuscripts he includes—and *Barnavel* in particular as we shall see—may not in fact have been annotated for the purpose of being used during performance but may have been annotated for some other purpose.) Werstine prints a handy table showing which of the theatrical documents have which of the various features used to categorize a document as one used during performance, including such things as 'Full repetition of existing SDD' and 'Warnings'.

The majority of this section is taken up with Werstine going through each of his manuscripts, describing them in some detail. He shares Richard Proudfoot's uncertainty that Munday composed the play *John a Kent and John a Cumber*: just because the manuscript is in his hand does not mean he composed it. This bears on the case of *Sir Thomas More* too, since the idea being rejected is that a dramatist such as Munday would not work solely as the scribe of other men's work. As Werstine asks, why not if he was good at it? The present reviewer is taken to task in an endnote: 'Egan . . . suggests that inconsistencies in the theatrical annotation of *Kent* may indicate it was not used to guide performance, a suggestion that assumes bookkeepers were consistent in their treatment of playhouse MSS they intended to hold during performance. Such an assumption is not borne out by the evidence in extant

MSS annotated for the stage' (p. 344n17). In fact Egan argued only that if it was used to guide performance (as Long claimed) then its theatricalizing annotations are remarkably inconsistent—changing the timing of some entrance directions where the entering character is spoken of as visible before their entrance, but not others that have exactly the same problem—and that other possible reasons for its creation and those annotations should be considered.

Next, Werstine deals with the problem that in Act V in the *Barnavelt* manuscript the Prince of Orange enters, has a conversation about the fates of the prisoners including Barnavelt, and agrees to admit the French ambassadors and orders chairs to be brought in for them to sit on, but is not given something for himself to sit on. As Trevor Howard-Hill observed, theatrical and diplomatic decorum would not allow for the Prince to stand while the ambassadors sit, so there must be something still to be done to this manuscript to make it ready to perform the play. Werstine examines the entrance direction for the ambassadors, which started out as '*Enter Boisisse Morier*' (each being the name of one man, as shown by the ensuing speech prefixes) but which the bookkeeper altered to '*Enter 2 Embas. Boisisse Morier*' which could be understood as three men even though only two are needed. Howard-Hill rightly calls this the adding of confusion, but Werstine has an alternative explanation that he thinks removes the confusion. Werstine notices that after the first speech prefix for *Boisisse* the bookkeeper added '*m' Rob.*', presumably the name of the actor, and decides that what happened is that first the bookkeeper added '*2 Embas.*' to the entrance direction merely for emphasis but then he decided the two ambassadors' roles could be taken by one actor speaking the lines for both, so he struck out *Boisisse's* name in the entrance direction and added the actor's name after his first speech to show that this one man takes both roles.

The chief problem with this proposal is that it renders the dialogue of the play absurd. Vandermitten advises admitting 'the *French Embassadors*' (2573), Bredero says to let 'them in' so 'their Propositions' may be answered by 'their *Frendes*' (2575–7). One of the ambassadors says to Barnavelt's wife and daughter 'We will plead for him: and prevaile we doubt not . . . leave vs to o^{ur} endeau^{rs}'. The Prince of Orange orders 'bring *Chaires* there for their *Lordships*' (2584). Vandermitten calls for silence so all can hear 'them' (2585) and the first ambassador to speak begins 'We are *commaunded* . . .' (2588). After hearing the ambassadors' plea for clemency the Prince of Orange calls them 'yo^r good *Lordships*' (2649) and *Morier* confirms that 'we shall make known' *Orange's* reply, and *Orange* sends them off with 'roome there for their *Lordships*' (2655–7). The dialogue could not make more plain that there are two ambassadors, yet Werstine thinks—merely on the basis of *Boisisse's* name being deleted from the original entrance (although the same hand confirmed '*2 Embas.*') and his speech being glossed with an actor's name—that only one ambassador enters.

While each of the plural pronouns in the lines quoted above could be switched to a singular pronoun without hurting the metre, the Prince of Orange's command 'bring *Chaires* there for their *Lordships*' (2584), which is supported by the marginal stage direction calling for '*2. Chaires*', would have

to be entirely rewritten. And it is these chairs that cause the trouble. In an endnote (p. 350n80) Werstine accuses Howard-Hill and the present reviewer of 'making much' of this stage direction for two chairs and suggests that it might simply be a superfluous direction now that there is only one ambassador. Or if it is not superfluous then one of the two chairs is for the single ambassador and the other chair is for the Prince of Orange, eliminating the problem. Howard-Hill and I are not just making much of the stage direction, we are making much of the dialogue that is consistent with the stage direction: the Prince really does ask for chairs and says that they are for the ambassadors, plural.

In order to do away with the problem Werstine is forced to suppose a casting cut (from two ambassadors to one ambassador) for which he has no evidence and that renders a considerable number of lines in the scene impossible to say. And yet he concludes this untenable hypothesis with 'There is nothing remarkable about the bookkeeper's intervention on the occasion of the now single ambassador's entrance' (p. 288). This problem in *Barnavel* matters so much, and Werstine is so keen to explain it away, because as Howard-Hill observed, the non-playability of this theatrical manuscript—the Prince cannot stand while the ambassadors sit—proves that it was made for some theatrical purpose other than running the play in performance, such as the making of parts. This establishes that we cannot safely conclude from cases of incompleteness that manuscripts used to run performances could themselves be incomplete: the manuscripts in question might have existed for other theatrical purposes besides running the play.

Three appendices end the book. In the first, 'Characteristics of Gregian "Foul Papers" in Playhouse Texts' (pp. 358–91), Werstine lists such things appearing in the theatrical manuscripts as variations in the form or spelling of persons' names, ambiguities in persons' names, faulty speech prefixes and stage directions, followed by a tabulation of which manuscripts have which of the faults. In the second appendix, 'Knight's Placement of Stage Directions in *Beleue*' (pp. 392–7), Werstine looks at some cases where Sisson thought that Edward Knight's annotation of Massinger's manuscript of *Believe as You List* was meant to move mid-scene entrance directions up a bit so that the actor had time to walk across the stage. Werstine finds that only one example really does this: the rest are just rewritings for emphasis that Knight put where he could given the limited space in the left margin and his need not to overwrite long speech prefixes there. Werstine laments that what Sisson claimed of *Believe as You List* has been taken as a general principle about bookkeepers timing entrances precisely. We should not treat the appearance of early mid-scene entrance directions in printed plays as evidence that they were printed from theatrical copy. (True, but we can still say that such things look like the results of theatrical annotation—that is, an author would not misplace his entrance directions in this way—even if there was no general attempt by bookkeepers to move entrances earlier to time them better.)

The third appendix concerns 'Physical Evidence of Dramatist–Bookkeeper Collaboration' (pp. 398–400). With *The Lady Mother* it is clear that the manuscript went back and forth between a theatrically annotating scribe and the dramatist, the two working closely together, and likewise *The Wasp* went back to its dramatist after theatrical annotation. For Werstine these are almost

unique cases, and both concern the King's Revels company in the 1630s. Other manuscripts to have gone back to their dramatists during readying for performance are *Believe as You List* and *The Launching of the Mary*, in both cases because the censor wanted rewrites. All other cases Werstine finds unproven. The whole point of this appendix seems to be to give a reason for its long endnote (p. 400n3) rejecting Grace Ioppolo's claim, made in *Dramatists and their Manuscripts in the Age of Shakespeare: Jonson, Middleton and Heywood* (reviewed in *YWES* 87[2008]), that manuscripts routinely shuttled back and forth between the dramatist and the playing company.

The most important of several book-form collections of essays this year was *The Creation and Re-creation of Cardenio: Performing Shakespeare, Transforming Cervantes*, edited by Gary Taylor and Terri Bourus. In a foreword (pp. xiii–xviii) Robert Chartier identifies the important end that this collection achieves: showing that Lewis Theobald was telling the truth about the dramatic manuscript he possessed. Chartier is full of approval for all the claims except for Taylor's idea that Don Quixote and Sancho Panza themselves featured in the subplot of Shakespeare and Fletcher's play and were cut by Theobald. Not all the essays are equally relevant to this review and the ones that are only literary-critical will be omitted. In 'Reading Cervantes, or Shelton, or Phillips? The Source(s) of *Cardenio* and *Double Falsehood*' (pp. 15–29), Taylor and Steven Wagschal show that *Double Falsehood* is indebted to Thomas Shelton's 1612 translation of *Cardenio*, which strongly suggests that Theobald did not forge it as he would not use that source. The title of the play *The History of Cardenio* attributed to Shakespeare and Fletcher in 1656 must come from the 1612 translation of *Don Quixote* by Shelton since it appears there and not in the Spanish original of 1605. Theobald seems not to have read Shelton's translation, and nobody in Theobald's time seems to have known that Shelton's translation was available in 1612: they thought the 1620 edition of Shelton the earliest. Thus Theobald, if he was making a Shakespeare forgery, was most unlikely to have based it on a source that, as far as he and his contemporaries knew, was not available until after Shakespeare died. Theobald did have a copy of the 1687 translation of *Don Quixote* by John Phillipps.

To test if *Double Falsehood* depends upon Miguel de Cervantes's Spanish original or Shelton's 1612 translation or Phillipps's 1687 translation, Taylor and Wagschal examined all the parallels between the play and Shelton that previous commentators have found and compared them with the readings in Cervantes's Spanish original and Phillipps's translation. Some of these turn out to be common to all the texts, but nine verbal parallels link *Double Falsehood* and Shelton against Cervantes and against Phillipps. In particular, there is the appearance of the rare name Roderick in Shelton and as a character in *Double Falsehood*. There was no reason for Theobald to invent this name if he was forging, since its rareness—no play before 1612 uses it—makes it a most unlikely name to pick in order falsely to lend a Jacobean flavour. Indeed, Roderick is the name of an elder brother in Shelton's version of part of *Don Quixote* outside of the Cardenio story, and he serves a function there of enabling a happy-ending marriage that the elder brother Roderick in *Double Falsehood* also serves and that the elder brother in the Cardenio story

does not. Thus Taylor and Wagschal see this as Shakespeare and Fletcher drawing upon a non-Cardenio part of Shelton to build up the elder brother in their play.

However, there are also four verbal links between *Double Falsehood* and Phillipps or Cervantes and against Shelton, but these are not dialogue links—as the *Double Falsehood* to Shelton links are—but rather paratextual elements including the dramatis personae list of *Double Falsehood*. These look to Taylor and Wagschal like Theobald's interference. For one of these moments when Theobald seems to have intervened, the brandishing of a dagger in *Double Falsehood* III.ii, Taylor and Wagschal reckon that Cervantes's original has—and presumably Shakespeare and Fletcher's play had—at this moment the male protagonist using a dagger dishonourably. They reckon that Robert Wilks, who played the part, would not allow his character to be shown in such an unflattering light.

In 'The 1612 *Don Quixote* and the Windet-Stansby Printing House' (pp. 31–46), David L. Gants attempts to figure out what else was being printed in the Windet-Stansby printshop at the time that it printed *Don Quixote* in 1612. He uses evidence from Stationers' Register entries and dated prefatory material in the books themselves and also external information, as when a book prints a masque and we know from other sources just when that masque was performed. The task of figuring out the workflow is really a matter of fitting together pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. The order of work within the edition of *Don Quixote* can be recovered from skeleton forme reuse and wear in the type and the brass rules used to make the boxes on the page, and in particular a distinctively damaged rule that turns up in another book going through the printshop at the same time. The pieces of evidence complexly buttress one another and point to the edition of *Don Quixote* being finished in 'middle to late spring 1612' (p. 43), and hence before the death of Prince Henry on 6 November 1612. The publication of the English translation of *Don Quixote* in the spring of 1612 falls just before a gap—November 1611 to June 1613—when we know of no Shakespeare play being premiered. Thus, the period from summer to autumn in 1612 would have been a good time for him to write a play based on it.

Gerald Baker's essay '*Quixote* on the English Stage: A New Glimpse of *The History of Cardenio*?' (pp. 47–59) concerns a letter written on 29 October 1630 by the diplomat Sir Thomas Roe to Elizabeth Stuart, the Winter Queen. In it Roe referred to there being no plays due to a plague closure and hence no 'love of Pirames & Thisbe' and none of the 'various fortunes of Don Quixotte' on the stage. Baker reckons Roe was referring to Shakespeare and Fletcher's *Cardenio* because of this allusion to *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in the same sentence. Edmund Gayton in 1654 also mentioned Pyramus and Thisbe in his *Pleasant Notes Upon Don Quixote*, so the link between *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Don Quixote* seems to be recurrent. Baker can find no other play, extant or lost, that might be the object of Roe's allusion. Given what we know of Roe's life, his best opportunity to see such a play was at court; we know *Cardenio* was performed at court much earlier and perhaps it was again in 1629–30.

'Shakespeare, Theobald, and the Prose Problem in *Double Falsehood*' (pp. 109–23), by John V. Nance, looks specifically at the prose of I.ii.179–224 of *Double Falsehood* (36 lines totalling 334 words) and finds that it is by Shakespeare. In his sole-authored works of 1608–18, Fletcher wrote little prose (under 1 per cent of his lines), while Shakespeare's sole-authored works of 1607–13 comprise 20 per cent prose. Thus if we suspect Fletcher's hand in *Double Falsehood* then its substantial prose alone suggests he had a co-author, and his only two collaborators that we know of who wrote substantial amounts of dramatic prose are Shakespeare and Beaumont, since Massinger did not. At this point Nance gives a statistic that is apt to mislead all but the most careful reader. Having reported that on his own Fletcher wrote under 1 per cent of his dramatic lines in prose, Nance reports that, of the prose in Fletcher's collaborations with other men, 30 per cent of the lines are by Fletcher. This 30 per cent is not directly comparable to the 1 per cent mentioned earlier in the paragraph, as this 30 per cent is his share of the prose that is there and not the proportion of what is there that is prose. Investigators do well not to juxtapose in this way numbers derived from different types of calculation, as they give ammunition to objectors to these methods who either misread them or, if they spot what has been done, complain (rightly enough) that the author is jumping from statistic to statistic without sufficient signposting.

In his co-authored work with prose-favouring authors like Shakespeare, Fletcher wrote more prose than he wrote in his sole-authored work. Nance turns at this point to what Theobald was apt to do with the prose in the plays he adapted. Working on Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*, Theobald took out virtually all the prose, and presumably his doing the same explains the small, and seemingly abbreviated, parts of Fabian and Lopez in *Double Falsehood* II.i. Nance thinks that Theobald may have retained rather more of Shakespeare's prose than he did of Fletcher's. Theobald had trouble making up his own dramatic prose, to judge from his other works: it is reserved for comic sub-plot scenes that are easily detachable from the wider play. *Double Falsehood*, by contrast, has good prose lines embedded within scenes that are mainly in verse, which Shakespeare was certainly capable of creating. There are 181 lines of prose in Theobald's play *Orestes*, which he said he wrote in imitation of Shakespeare, but it has just one verbal parallel with Shakespeare and lots with other Theobald works. Thus it would appear that when Theobald tried to imitate Shakespeare he did not write a lot of Shakespeareisms.

Considered thematically, Nance finds the prose of *Double Falsehood* I.ii.179–224 to be Shakespearian, especially in the prose/verse/prose transitions that portray struggles for power between interlocutors. Systematically searching in the canons of Theobald, Fletcher, and Shakespeare for the phrases in I.ii.179–224, the links to Shakespeare's canon so dominate that we are justified in declaring this part of *Double Falsehood* to be Shakespeare's work. The links are predominantly to late Shakespeare plays, as they should be if he is the author. Nance lists all the parallels between *Double Falsehood* I.ii.179–224 and the canons of all plausible candidates except Theobald, Fletcher, and Shakespeare—so it is not just a three-horse race—and finds far

fewer links to any other author than he found links to Shakespeare. If we confine ourselves to writers for the King's men around 1612–13 who collaborated with Fletcher, then it has to be Shakespeare.

Regarding the essay 'Sleight of Mind: Cognitive Illusions and Shakespearian Desire' (pp. 124–69) by Gary Taylor, I must for transparency declare that I read a pre-publication draft of it and provided comments that appear to have in a minor way affected the revision for publication. The key finding of Taylor's essay is that Stern's essay claiming that Theobald forged *Double Falsehood* (reviewed in *YWES* 93[2014]) is mistaken. In some cases Stern is simply wrong on a fact, as with her assertion that in their authorship tests Jackson and Proudfoot did not look for other writers beyond Shakespeare, Fletcher, and Theobald. Stern noted some features of Theobald's writing in *Double Falsehood*, such as *ere* meaning *before* being spelt *e're*, but these are not features of authorship but of copying out, and they appear also in Theobald's edition of Shakespeare. She also misrepresented what Brean Hammond wrote about the four words that are markers of Shakespeare, which words she found in Theobald's work. Hammond used them as discriminators of Fletcher from Shakespeare—because Fletcher avoided them—not as discriminators of Shakespeare from everybody else. Taylor concedes that Theobald's use of these four words should exclude them from being employed in the way Hammond employed them, since their appearance in *Double Falsehood* might indeed be just due to Theobald. But the other five words used by Hammond confirm the pattern revealed by other evidence: the first half of *Double Falsehood* is Shakespearian, the second half Fletcherian.

Stern's suggestion that the play called 'Cardenna' might simply be about the place Cardena in Spain is, Taylor objects, poor theatre history: no known play is named after a place so obscure. Stern misrepresented Richard Farmer by suggesting that he thought that perhaps Theobald had a manuscript marked as the work of 'W. Sh.' and assumed it was Shakespeare's when in fact it was William Shirley's. As a theatre historian should know, Taylor points out, there was no early modern dramatist named William Shirley. Likewise her suggestion that perhaps the play called 'Cardenna' or 'Cardenno' was *A Very Woman* which has a character 'Cardenes'. As Stern ought to know, that play is based on source published in 1617, too late for the 1613 play to be based on it. Stern's claim that Theobald put on the play to enhance his reputation and so earn the right to edit Shakespeare was nonsensical: Theobald's credentials were textual, not performative, and the performance might well have flopped. Stern dismissed Theobald's claim that he got his manuscript from the team of John Downes, Thomas Betterton, and William Davenant working in the mid-1660s on the grounds that this team never performed it (which is most odd), but as Taylor points out we know about the performances of only a fraction—Robert Hume reckons 7 per cent—of the Restoration plays that got performed. That Theobald said that it had not ever been performed is irrelevant, since we know he was wrong about performance of it in Shakespeare's time.

Stern claimed that Theobald was a great imitator of Shakespeare, so Taylor takes the opening lines of a poem that Theobald wrote explicitly in imitation

of Shakespeare and does a Jackson-style hunt for its phrases and collocations in LION, distinguishing between the matches counted type-wise and token-wise. The poem comes out having more links to Theobald than to Shakespeare. The same is true, although with rather more Shakespeare links, for Theobald's play *Orestes*, which he considered to be like Shakespeare's work. Then Taylor does the same with the first seven lines of *Double Falsehood* and it has far more links to Shakespeare's works. Taylor reckons that because a Fisher's Exact Test of the contingency table of links between the opening lines of *Double Falsehood*, Theobald's *The Cave of Poverty* and *Orestes*, and Shakespeare's works, produces a p -value of 0.00007829, this means that there is 'less than one chance in seventy-eight thousand that the opening of *DF* belongs to the same population as the opening of *Cave of Poverty* and *Orestes*' (p. 137). I disagree. This p -value means that one time in 12,773 (that is, $1 \div 0.00007829$) chance alone would produce the skewed contingency table of links between the various works even without common authorship. P -values tell us how often chance alone will produce the result observed but cannot tell us whether on a particular occasion chance did produce the result observed.

Taylor shows that Stern falls victim to the 'conjunction fallacy' in her sentence 'were Theobald to have forged a play from scratch, it would probably have come from *Don Quixote*, resembled Shakespeare and Fletcher in style, and contained fragments of Shelton's translation'. As Taylor points out, multiplying the conjoined terms and taking into account the Theobaldian base rates for each action produces a low probability not a high one. Stern's claim that Theobald also imitated Fletcher is even weaker than her claim that he imitated Shakespeare, and has the added problem that *Double Falsehood* contains links to *Sir John van Olden Barnavelt*, which was not available to Theobald as it was lost until the mid-nineteenth century. In any case Theobald's sense of how Fletcher wrote would be derived from the 1679 Beaumont and Fletcher folio, which in fact has little Fletcher in it. So how come Theobald managed, if Stern is right, to imitate what we now know to be Fletcher's style? And why would Theobald imitate Fletcher's style in a play he was trying to pass off as Shakespeare's? One might suppose that he knew of the Stationers' Register entry that gave the play to both of them, but Theobald never referred to knowledge of this.

Taylor takes two passages from V.ii of *Double Falsehood* and shows that to judge from links to works of known authorship one is a Theobald interpolation and the other real Fletcher. Here too Taylor misuses the notion of a p -value, commenting that 'although this speech [*Double Falsehood* V.ii.251–7] cannot belong to either the Shakespeare or the Fletcher canon, there are three chances in four that it belongs to the same population as the passages we have analyzed from Theobald's two Shakespeare imitations' (p. 144). Since a p -value tells you how often chance alone will do something you have found, Taylor finding in this case that p equals 0.7477 means not that there is 3-in-4 chance of the texts having the same author but rather that even if they do not have the same author the results obtained—that is the numbers of links between works as shown in his contingency table—are not at all unlikely. For Taylor's purposes, only small p -values have any significance.

Next Taylor turns to the well-known phenomena of 'affective bias' and the 'halo effect': Stern dislikes Theobald and casts Shakespeare as a victim. Most people find *Double Falsehood* uninteresting drama, so rather than blame Shakespeare they prefer to blame Theobald. Taylor makes a useful analogy: if *Timon of Athens* had not made it into the Folio (as it nearly did not), how would we approach Thomas Shadwell's *The History of Timon of Athens, the Man-Hater* of 1678? We might reasonably respond that parts of it do not sound like Shakespeare, but we would be wrong to say that the whole thing is a forgery. Taylor responds to Stern's use of negative evidence—questions such as 'where are the manuscripts now?'—and after pointing out that this is the wrong way to argue he offers some possible answers of his own, for example that Theobald's plans were upset by the success of John Gay's *The Beggar's Opera* and Pope's *The Dunciad*.

Taylor ends with the 'narrative fallacy'—our preference for stories over statistics—and looks at a genuinely Shakespearian speech (I.ii.109–16). Again the interpretation of *p*-values slips Taylor up, for he asserts that 'the probability that I.ii.109–16 has the same origin as I.i.1–7 is 100%' (p. 157). This cannot be a valid interpretation unless there is a *p*-value of zero, meaning that chance can never produce the result observed. That cannot be correct since Fisher's Exact test is incapable of producing a zero result even for the most skewed contingency table. One other small slip is that on page 158 the heading of a table repeatedly refers to lines 'I.i.109–16' where 'I.ii.109–16' is meant.

A book-form collection of essays not available last year called *On Authorship* may now be noticed as several of its contents are relevant here. In their introduction (pp. 11–46) its editors Rosy Colombo and Daniela Guardamagna give an account of the book's genesis via a rather an old-fashioned, New Textualist, emphasis upon European literary theory and its concern with fragmentation and instability. An odd note is sounded by assertions such as 'Obviously, a research into stage directions could receive little support from electronic tools' (p. 17). In fact databases such as Editions and Adaptations of Shakespeare and Literature Online enable one to separate out play stage directions for searching and have been used to considerable effect for this purpose. The introduction contains the occasional incomprehensible sentence such as 'A worthy intent of setting lands in order and making sense of the plurality of stylistic and linguistic approaches has fostered in Vickers the ambition to establish a canon of directions and methods in authorship attribution studies, to the exclusion of computational stylistics: apparently Doctor Johnson's syndrome is not a monopoly of Harold Bloom' (p. 18). The second half of the introduction is an accurate and comprehensive history of the Shakespeare apocrypha from the work of Tucker Brooke to the present day, with just the odd slip such as giving the date of George Carey's appointment as Lord Chamberlain as March 1597 (p. 37n70) when it was in fact April 1597. It ends with a helpful table summarizing the history of attribution and the current consensus for each play.

The standard of the essays is generally high, although Paolo Pugliati's 'The Burden of Proof from New Biographism to New Disintegration' (pp. 133–48) is a notably incoherent survey of Shakespeare's biography and the authorship

question. It contains a lot of spelling errors, for instance William Leahy is 'Lehay' (p. 137 and p. 137n9), Jeffrey Masten is 'Geoffrey Masten' (p. 139n14) and then becomes 'Stephen Masten' (p. 143) and Tiffany Stern is 'Sterne' (p. 148). The contrast could not be sharper with the next essay, MacDonald P. Jackson's 'Reviewing Authorship Studies of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries, and the Case of *Arden of Faversham*' (pp. 149–67), which responds to Vickers's article 'Shakespeare and Authorship Studies in the Twenty-First Century'. Jackson points out the parts of Hugh Craig and Arthur Kinney's book *Shakespeare, Computers, and the Mystery of Authorship* (reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011]) that Vickers seems to have ignored because it shows them to be using a fantastically accurate authorship attribution test that is right in more than 98 per cent of cases. Vickers also ignored the chapters in Craig and Kinney's book that confirmed views that he already held, failing to acknowledge that this should be treated as validation of their methods. Repeatedly, Vickers focused on a single wrong or ambiguous result achieved by Craig and Kinney when validating their tests using works of known authorship and he neglected to mention the hundreds of right results that dominate their findings.

Jackson finds Vickers claiming things about Craig and Kinney that are simply not true, such as Kinney's alleged failure to tell the true story of critics' views on Kyd's supposed authorship of *Arden of Faversham*. As Jackson shows, Kinney listed exactly the views and their holders that Vickers claims he omitted, and it is Vickers who ignores the many powerful critical voices dismissing Kyd's authorship of the play. Jackson goes on to critique Vickers's own attribution method of finding shared parallels between a suspect text and a candidate author's canon, which Vickers fails to repeat for multiple candidate authors and so his work suffers from the one-horse-race problem. Then Jackson shows some original LION searching he has undertaken to find all the plays from 1580 to 1600 that have phrases in common with the telling-the-dream sequence, scene vi, in *Arden of Faversham* but which phrases occur no more than five times overall in the plays of that period. Jackson lists all the phrases he finds and then tabulates by play those appearing twice or more in a play. Of the twelve plays, seven are wholly by Shakespeare and two are partly by him. Moreover, Jackson finds a lot of parallels between Arden's dream of hunting and *Venus and Adonis*.

Roger Holdsworth's contribution to the book is 'Stage Directions and Authorship: Shakespeare, Middleton, Heywood' (pp. 185–200). He begins with the observation that Nashe had a fondness for stage directions that begin 'Here . . .' in *Summer's Last Will and Testament* and that this phrasing occurs too in the first act of *1 Henry VI*, which on other evidence is by Nashe. Chapman favoured stage directions with the word *solus* in them. These are not, however, infallible tests, reports Holdsworth. The stage-direction phrasing 'with [person] in [his/her] hand' is rare overall but it occurs in Q1 *King Lear* and Act V of Folio *1 Henry VI*, yet the latter is widely thought not to be by Shakespeare. Middleton liked mid-scene directions of the form 'Exit . . . Enter again', and ones in which a character enters 'expressing' some emotion, and ones using the phrase 'an apparel'. Most famously Middleton favours 'Enter [A] meeting [B]', although as Holdsworth notes in this form it is

unclear whether B is already on stage. The presence of this phrasing in the quarto of Middleton's *Hengist, King of Kent* (probably based on authorial papers) while the manuscript versions (probably from prompt copy) alter it to remove the ambiguity suggests to Holdsworth that players found the phrasing unhelpful. The phrasing pops up six times in Shakespeare, four of them in places—twice in *Timon of Athens*, twice in *Macbeth*—where we already suspected Middleton's hand in any case.

Holdsworth thinks that Taylor might even be underestimating how much Middleton there is in *Macbeth*, since Taylor gives to Shakespeare 'Let this pernicious houre, | Stand aye accursed in the Kalender' but it is very close to 'Curst be that day for ever . . . let it stand | Within the Wizardes booke (the kalendar)' from *I Honest Whore* by Middleton and Dekker that was written before *Macbeth*. Holdsworth did a non-LION manual search for stage directions of the form 'Enter [A] meeting [B]' and 'Enter [A], [B] meeting [him/her/them]' in the period 1580 to 1642. (He avoided LION because its choice of copy-text is not always the right one.) The upshot is that, apart from Middleton, only William Sampson and Heywood use this phrasing more than once and no one uses it as much as Middleton. This phrase really is a reliable marker of authorship.

In 'King Lear: The Division of the Critics' (pp. 229–53) Maria Valentini gives a lengthy history of the scholarship about the Q/F *King Lear* relationship. She focuses on the revision theory and responses to it, making just the occasional comment of her own supporting one or other position, mainly just to say that it is convincing. She ends up agreeing with Richard Knowles that quite probably neither Q nor F represents what got performed in Shakespeare's lifetime, which was probably cut down a lot from the maximal scripts he produced. She turns to the chapter on *King Lear* in Craig and Kinney's book, which found a coherent Shakespearian pattern to the Q/F differences. Unfortunately, she then approvingly cites Vickers's critique of the book. It is a shame that the editors of this collection did not let her see Jackson's demolition of Vickers's critique, reviewed above, since it makes her acceptance of Vickers's writing seem naive.

Occasionally someone comes up with a new way to implement computational stylistic tests for authorship that makes it much easier to construct a set of experiments using an existing principle. Giuliano Pascucci's 'Double Falsehood / Cardenio: A Case of Authorship Attribution with Computer-Based Tools' (pp. 351–72) is just such an invention. He shows that *Double Falsehood* is a Shakespeare and Fletcher collaboration by using file compression software as an indirect means of counting recurring patterns in writing. Compression software works by finding recurrent strings of characters in a text and tokenizing them. For example, the word *the* is so common in English that instead of storing it as three characters using, typically, twenty-four binary digits we could instead assign it a unique code, or token, of its own using fewer digits. Pascucci's trick is to take an existing tokenizing algorithm—specifically the long-established LZ77 algorithm—that he has used to compile a set of tokens that are optimal for compressing text A (by one author) and then apply that tokenizing set to compress text B (by a different author) and observe how much shorter the algorithm manages to make text B.

The efficiency of the algorithm (that is, its success at shortening text B) is a measure of similarity of the two texts, since the more alike they are (the more words and phrases they have in common), the more often the tokens representing recurrent words and phrases in A will serve to stand in for recurrent words and phrases in B as well.

The LZ77 algorithm works by continuously generating a dictionary of tokens as it examines a certain portion of a text, a 'window', that it moves from the beginning to the end of the text. The point of this 'moving window' is that the dictionary of tokens can be continuously updated with the most frequently occurring words and phrases and there is no need to consider the whole of the file all at once. (This desire to compress data without examining the entire file containing it arises from the needs of telecommunications systems: LZ77 works 'on the fly' with continuous streams of data, such as video and audio feeds.) In Pascucci's method, the comparison is made by taking a long stretch of text A and then appending a short bit of text B on the end. This is done so that the moving window of the compression algorithm generates a substantial dictionary of tokens representing the recurrent character strings it finds in text A and then, at the join, the algorithm is confronted with text B and must try to compress it using the existing dictionary of tokens optimized for text A. How well it achieves this compression depends on how alike are text A and B. Keeping A long and B short gives the algorithm minimal opportunity to readjust its dictionary of tokens to suit text B.

Although I have been explaining the process using the idea of recurrent words and phrases it is important to realize that what is being compressed is pure textual data that includes spaces. The compression algorithm might find that the string 's t' occurs a lot in text A because it has many occurrences of 'thinks that' and 'ones to' and that the same string 's t' occurs a lot in text B because it has many occurrences of 'is to' and 'has to'. To the compression algorithm these are the same thing, being merely repetitions of 's t' that it can replace with a token. The genius of Pascucci's method is that to find out which text of the set A, B, C, D (all of equal length) is most like text X you simply have to see which compresses best out of X+A (that is a concatenation of the two of them), X+B, X+C, and X+D. That is the theory. The practice was to take each of the thirteen scenes from *Double Falsehood* and attach it to the end of a work by each of the people who might have written it.

For reasons that are not clear, Pascucci did not let LZ77 loose on the whole of each of the candidates' texts but rather broke the candidates' texts into '23 kb' segments (p. 367). In fact, he cannot really mean 'kb' (thousands of bits) but must mean 'KB' (thousands of bytes, each being 8 bits), since he reports that *Hamlet* was broken into six such fragments and by my calculation *Hamlet* is about 150–250KB in ASCII encoding. Pascucci claims that his texts were in Unicode encoding that stores each character as one byte, but in fact he must mean Unicode as represented in UTF-8 encoding which, for simple English writing, is the same as ASCII encoding, since all other encodings of the Unicode character set need more than one byte for each character. Importantly, he relied on Project Gutenberg for his plays' electronic texts, which means that they were in original spelling and his results depend

somewhat on the agents of their transmission—scribes and composers—and that they were linguistically 100 years older than the bits of *Double Falsehood* he was testing. Somewhat mitigating this is Pascucci's decision to pre-process his input files by deleting stage directions and speech prefixes and he also 'removed the divisions in acts and scenes, line numbers, punctuation, new paragraphs' (p. 368). This is good because it means that LZ77 will not have tried to tokenize punctuation and line-breaks.

Pascucci tabulates his findings regarding *Double Falsehood* scene by scene, and they broadly confirm the division of the play that E.H.C. Oliphant long ago came up with. Pascucci gives the raw entropy figure for his analysis of *Double Falsehood* I.iii, and although it is closest to *Cymbeline* it is also close to Massinger's *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, and he wonders whether Massinger had a hand in the scene. He refers to trying a 'BCL version' (p. 370), but he gives no hint what he means by that or even what it might be a 'version' of. Although Pascucci does not try to factor Theobald's revision or creation of material in *Double Falsehood* into his method, he speculates about some of his results arising from such revision or creation. An obvious validation step that Pascucci does not report having tried would be to repeat this experiment using parts of known Shakespeare writing treated as though they were thought to be by someone else. That is, it would be useful to know the normal range of variation within the Shakespeare canon.

One further book-form collection of essays has matter of relevance to this review: *The Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship*, edited by Neil Freistat and Julia Flanders, containing Hans Walter Gabler's 'Late Twentieth-Century Shakespeares' (pp. 79–96). Gabler reckons that because it derived its methods from manuscript studies in which the extant witnesses are much younger than the lost archetype—hence their differences cannot be accounted for by authorial revision since the author was long dead—the New Bibliography of Greg was blind to the fact that authorial revision might explain the differences between early editions of Shakespeare. This seems not quite right, since even long after the author's death a pair of manuscripts might vary due to authorial revision if they descended independently from a pair of ancestral manuscripts separated by authorial revision. Also, Gabler seems to me to understate the New Bibliographers' awareness of authorial revision: McKerrow certainly referred to it in his *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare* in 1939.

Gabler takes *King Lear* as a two-text test case, tracing how the acceptance of authorial revision has brought Shakespeare textual scholarship back in line with the rest of the world and enabled much genetic criticism to throw light on how Shakespeare worked. He sees the 1986 Oxford *Complete Works* as an edition built upon the intellectual work done in splitting *King Lear*, but in fact inspection of Stanley Wells's publications in the late 1970s and early 1980s indicates that many of the principles that Gabler admires were established before Wells came to accept the argument for splitting *King Lear*. Gabler somewhat overstates the readerly nature of the Folio, neglecting to mention that it devotes a whole page to listing 'The Names of the Principall Actors in all these Playes'. He describes the absence of explanatory notes from the Oxford *Complete Works* as if it were an important aesthetic consideration,

when in fact it was imposed by publisher's fiat near the end of the edition's creation and after the editors had written all the notes they intended to put on their text pages.

Regarding the change of the name Falstaff to Oldcastle, Gabler objects that for *1 Henry IV* the Oxford *Complete Works*' control text has Falstaff and that the obligation to undo censorship is not necessarily sufficient to justify emending this reading. The obvious retort is that this control text is but a witness to the thing the edition was intending to recover, which was the text of the first performance. This intention is witnessed in giving the plays their original stage names such as *The Contention of York and Lancaster* and *All Is True* that later got changed to *2 Henry VI* and *Henry VIII*, and doing this even though the control texts use those later names. Since Sir John must have been called Oldcastle in the first performances of *1 Henry IV*—else his descendants the Cobhams would not have known to complain about it—the Oxford *Complete Works* editors had to use this name in their edition of the play. Two other chapters in the collection are recommended. Paul Eggert's 'Apparatus, Text, Interface: How to Read a Printed Critical Edition' (pp. 97–118) uses early editions of *Hamlet* to illustrate the problems of making critical editions, but it adds nothing to our knowledge of the text of the Shakespeare play. The contribution of Randall McLeod (as Random Cloud) is 'Fearful Asymmetry' (pp. 135–87), a quite extraordinarily technical and difficult essay about the detection of something going wrong with the printing of the 1732 edition of John Milton's *Paradise Lost* from the evidence of anomalies in the sewing together of the gatherings and detection of the felt and mould sides of each sheet.

After summarizing the recent scholarship on the differences between the three early editions of *Hamlet*, Matthew Vadnais concludes that objections to their playability are unfounded, in "'Speake(ing) the Speech(es)": Reassessing the Playability of the Earliest Printings of *Hamlet*' (in Moncrief, McPherson, Enloe, and Cohen, eds., *Shakespeare Expressed: Page, Stage, and Classroom in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, pp. 81–92). Two commonly overstated problems, he finds, are that a short cue (one or two words) that an actor is waiting for might be spoken in the middle of a speech as well as at the end of it, and that multiple speeches are cued by the same cue-words. As Vadnais points out, when there are only two characters on stage this problem is illusory: each man knows that he has to start speaking when the other man stops, no matter what the cues are. Two-way conversations of this kind make up a large proportion of all dialogue. Where there are more than two characters speaking in a scene, it is nonetheless common for one character to be what Vadnais calls 'the stem' (p. 88) who speaks alternate speeches because the others are all taking it in turns to speak to him. The stem knows that whenever someone else finishes, it is his turn again. Vadnais gives fascinating numbers for how many conversations in Shakespeare take this structure, but disappointingly he neglects to describe how he worked them out. Reducing still further the problem of cue confusion are the many scenes of what Vadnais calls 'collaborative action' (p. 90), such as dancing and swordfighting, that (*pace* Stern and Palfrey) must have required collective rehearsal.

An entire special issue of the unpaginated online journal *Early Modern Literary Studies* this year was devoted to 'Shakespearean Configurations' and two of the contributions are relevant to this review. In 'Configuring the Book' (*EMLS* 21[2013] 9 paras.), Andrew Murphy notes that although *Venus and Adonis* was first printed in two quarto editions, 1593 and 1594, all subsequent editions up to 1700 were in formats that preserved the pagination but made the book smaller and hence cheaper to produce and perhaps cheaper to buy. This did not happen with the plays, however: only *3 Henry VI* appeared in octavo. Instead, plays went up in size for the Folio, which largely killed off the market for Shakespeare play quartos. Murphy remarks that by 1623 'there were no new titles to be brought to publication' (para. 5), but I would have thought that *The Two Noble Kinsmen* was just such a thing. The important point is that the cost of reading Shakespeare plays went up because the Folio was thirty to forty times more expensive than a quarto. As Murphy admits, the Folio gave readers thirty-six quartos' worth at once, but the bar for admission to Shakespearian reading (at least in this form) nonetheless rose from *6d.* to *15s.* Murphy speculates on what might have happened if the cheap octavo experiment of *3 Henry VI* had succeeded and in place of the expensive Folio the seventeenth century had seen a flourishing of cheap octavo play editions.

In 'Punctuation as Configuration; or, How Many Sentences Are There in Sonnet 1?' (*EMLS* 21[2013] 19 paras.) William H. Sherman discusses at length a fine-art reprint of *Sonnets* created in 2009 and based on the design of a 1909 reprint, focusing in particular on attitudes towards the 1609 original's punctuation. Sherman agrees with Helen Vendler that the serial colons used in 1609 allow Sonnet 1 to have both a 4+4+4+2 structure and traces of an underlying Petrarchan 8+6 stanza structure (para. 7). Sherman places Greg's distinction of substantives and accidentals at the heart of modern editorial zeal for repunctuating, and claims that Greg described accidentals 'as surface features that shape and inflect but do not usually create or contain the verbal meaning found in the so-called substantives—that is, the words themselves' (para. 14). What is missing here is an acknowledgement that Greg meant the word 'accidental' in its Aristotelian philosophical sense and not the everyday sense. Sherman quotes *OED* (citing Greg) defining accidentals as 'any feature that is non-essential to the author's meaning', but those are the *OED*'s words not Greg's. Quoting Greg himself expressing this idea is helpful because he has been widely and mistakenly assumed to hold a naive idea about language—that punctuation is not essential to meaning—that is utterly implausible for a man of his literary sophistication. Sherman acknowledges the scholarship that finds punctuation in early Shakespeare editions to be scribal and/or compositorial, but he still thinks that some of the punctuation might be Shakespeare's and even if it is not it is punctuation typical of his time and hence is worth preserving. When Sherman writes that 'colons mark a pause that is longer than a colon but shorter than a full-stop' (para. 17) he presumably means '...longer than a comma...'. He ends inconclusively by saying that we lose potential meanings when we repunctuate, which is true but not news.

And so to the individual journal articles. The most important of these is Pervez Rizvi's argument, in 'The Bibliographical Relationship between the

Texts of *Troilus and Cressida* (*Library* 14[2013] 271–312), that positing a lost Q0 is the best way to explain the anomalies of Q1 and Folio *Troilus and Cressida*. In 1928 Peter Alexander and in 1950 Philip Williams made the claim that Folio *Troilus and Cressida* (hereafter F) was printed from an exemplar of Q1 that was marked up from an authoritative manuscript. If that is the case, the problem is explaining where the fifty-nine F-only errors come from. Rizvi reports Gary Taylor's changing explanation of the textual situation of *Troilus and Cressida*, ending with a stemma in which foul papers underlie Q1 and also are copied out fairly by Shakespeare—which process produced small changes from the foul papers—to make the promptbook. According to Taylor this promptbook was then copied by a scribe who misread it in parts and thus made a neat, authoritative but in parts quite wrong transcript that was used to annotate an exemplar of Q1 and so turn good readings bad in that exemplar, which exemplar was copy for F.

This would explain the F-only errors, but Rizvi thinks the hypothesis inherently implausible. If the manuscript used to annotate Q1 (to make F's copy) was so clear that its erroneous readings were written onto Q1 in place of Q1's good readings, why bother using Q1 at all: why not just print F from this clear manuscript? Moreover, Taylor's hypothesis is disproved by the errors that Q1 and F have in common, which could in his theory come about only if the collator who let his manuscript's bad readings overrule the good ones in Q1 also let a set of bad readings in Q1 stand (and hence get into F) even though his manuscript showed the correct readings at these points. Rizvi lists some occasions when, by Taylor's hypothesis, this must have happened, with the overlooking of Q1 errors happening right next to the copying into Q1 of errors from the manuscript.

Barbara Mowat and Paul Werstine offered the alternative explanation that the F-only errors arose in the Jaggards' printshop when F was being printed. Rizvi refutes this by showing that Folio *Troilus and Cressida* would have to have twice the printshop error rate of the next most erroneously printed play in the Folio, which is *Titus Andronicus* set by apprentice compositor E. William Searle (in an article reviewed in *YWES* 82[2003]) blamed the F-only errors on compositor H, but in fact the errors are by no means confined to his stint and in any case his error rate on other work is unexceptional. Anthony B. Dawson argued that F was set in parts from Q1, which explains the Q1/F errors in common, and in parts from a manuscript; this would explain the F-only errors as misreadings of that manuscript and the Q1-only errors as things the manuscript got right. Rizvi disproves this by showing that the Q1/F errors in common and the F-only errors occur close to one another so frequently that the printers would have had to be frantically switching between Q1 and manuscript as their copy for F, sometimes 'after setting only a few lines from one copy' (p. 284).

Rizvi considers William Godshalk's theory that F was set from a scribal transcript of an exemplar of Q1, which exemplar was first used as the company's promptbook and had Shakespearian alterations written onto it. The trouble with this theory is that it requires Shakespeare to have failed to correct the manifest errors in the exemplar of Q1. Next Rizvi considers Godshalk's alternative theory that a scribe made the copy for F by producing

a fair manuscript that conflated an exemplar of Q1 with a playhouse manuscript. This, though, makes it hard to explain the F-only errors, since for these the scribe must have failed in each case to recover the correct reading from Q1, and also makes it hard to explain the Q1/F errors in common, since for those the scribe must have failed in each case to recover the correct reading from the manuscript.

Then comes Rizvi's own theory of the Q1/F relationship: they are both descended from a common lost ancestor edition, Q0, printed shortly after the Stationers' Register entry in 1603. Badly printed from a manuscript, Q0 introduced most of the errors we see in Q1 and F. The F-only errors are errors in Q0 that Q1 fixed. When Q1 was printed from Q0 the exemplar of Q0 was first marked up by reference to an authoritative manuscript to correct the errors that could not be corrected by guesswork alone. The first three pages of F were printed from Q1 (we already knew that) and then printing of the play was stopped, as we know, and when it resumed F's copy was switched to Q0. The fifty-four Q1-only errors are things that F got right because its copy of Q0 was first collated with an authoritative manuscript. The fifty Q1/F errors in common are things that were wrong in Q0 that neither Q1 nor F managed to fix. One of the complexities of Rizvi's theory is that the two manuscripts used at two different times to annotate an exemplar of Q0—once to make copy for Q1 and once to make copy for F—cannot have been the same manuscript, since 'there are too many differences between Q[1] and F to support such a belief' (p. 287).

This Q0 theory helps explain why the restarted printing of F used a different copy from the copy used for the three pages of the abortive first attempt. As well as discovering in the Stationers' Register that he owned the right to print the play that he thought he had to abandon printing—a right he had acquired, unbeknownst to him, when he bought James Roberts's business in 1606—William Jaggard found that Roberts had kept a copy of Q0 in the very premises that Jaggard had taken over and was now using. Switching to printing F from Q0 (Roberts's edition) would make Jaggard's position even stronger than if he continued using Q1 (published by Richard Bonian and Henry Walley in 1609), since his right to reprint Q0 was incontrovertible.

Suppose that there was an Inns of Court performance of *Troilus and Cressida*. Presumably this would be reflected in the Q1 version of the play, which in one state refers to its contents not being played before the public. F has Pandarus rejected twice, once at the end of V.iii (which rejection Q1 lacks) and once again at the end of the play (which rejection Q1 has). Rizvi reckons that F prints both the public stage rejection (at the end of V.iii) and the Inns of Court rejection (at the end of the play). Since bringing Pandarus on in the battle scene that ends the play merely to have him rejected by Troilus is not good dramaturgy, Rizvi concludes that this was a rewrite made solely for the Inns of Court audience—as part of the rewrite that created the epilogue spoken by Pandarus after his rejection—and hence it came after the public theatre performance that contained better dramaturgy. The epilogue would suit an audience of lawyers at the Inns of Court especially ('my will shall here be made' says Pandarus) so Rizvi thinks it was written for that occasion, even

although it appears in Q1 and F, and that the F-only prologue was written for the public performance.

If Q0 was printed from a manuscript containing the public theatre version of the play then it would have the prologue in it, and Q1's lack of this prologue can be explained only by the manuscript used to annotate an exemplar of Q0 to make copy for Q1 not having the prologue—that is, this manuscript represented the Inns of Court version of the play—and hence the manuscript used to annotate another exemplar of Q0 to make copy for F, which manuscript must (we have already agreed) reflect a different version of the play, must have been one reflecting the public play version. But, Rizvi reasons, that line of deduction cannot be correct since F contains the epilogue that was written for the Inns of Court audience. 'From this argument by *reductio ad absurdum* we deduce that Q0 must have been the private [Inns of Court] version of the play' (p. 294). This is not the most convincing part of Rizvi's article since it requires that the prologue was only in the public version and the epilogue only in the Inns of Court version, and that has not been established but only conjectured.

Rizvi goes on to try to explain the variant states of the 1609 Q1 title page. He supposes that the lost Q0 mentioned public performance even though it was based on the Inns of Court version because quarto title pages conventionally would do that. While Bonian and Walley were using Q0 to print Q1, Walley's friend and Inns of Court man John Marston perhaps lent them a presentation manuscript containing the Inns of Court version to annotate Q0 from and, realizing from this manuscript the exclusivity of their play, they changed the title page, dropping the claim to public performance that Q1 inherited from its Q0 copy and adding the epistle about exclusivity. Rizvi dates Bonian and Walley's acquisition of this manuscript by the appearance of an F-only error in a line that appears correctly on page B2^f of Q1. By this point in the printing they possessed the manuscript else Q1 would also have this error, and hence they got the manuscript after the initial setting of sheet A, with its title-page reference to public performance, and before the setting of sheet B. The manuscript used to annotate an exemplar of Q0 to make F copy must be different from the one used for the same purpose to make Q1 (which manuscript represented the Inns of Court version of the play) and hence the manuscript that helped in making copy for F was of the public version of the play. This explains the double rejection of Pandarus, the first time picked up from the manuscript and the second time picked up from Q0, and other small repetitions can be explained the same way.

In an appendix, Rizvi shows that Philip Williams's claim that, due to shared incidentals, F must have been printed from Q1 is overstated. Quite often it is perfectly plausible that the feature is in common because the compositors in each case made the same choice, as with the typographical styling of proper nouns. But Rizvi accepts that the five times Q1 prints *Troy* in italics, having used roman type for its dozens of other occurrences of the word, are followed in F, which also uses roman type almost exclusively for this word, and that this is a real bibliographical link. Williams's claims about speech-prefix forms being in common are just wrong, Rizvi shows—he overlooked or suppressed a lot of the evidence—and so are his claims about shared spelling of words

ending in *-ie*. Overall, Rizvi reckons that Williams is right about the bibliographical connection between Q1 and F, but there is less evidence for it than Williams claimed. At this point it would be useful if Rizvi reminded his readers that in his view the real explanation of the link is not that F was printed from Q1 but that F and Q1 were both printed from Q0, from which they got their common incidentals.

In a second appendix, Rizvi lists all the errors in Q and F on which his study is based, acknowledging that in such cases not all investigators will agree on just which readings are errors. In a third appendix, Rizvi lists for eight Folio plays printed from lightly annotated quartos the occurrences of an error in F where the quarto is correct, establishing a baseline expectancy for this phenomenon. In a fourth appendix, Rizvi acknowledges that his hypothesized annotation of an exemplar of Q0 to make copy for Q1 is unheard of for any known Shakespeare quarto and he considers the alternative, suggested by one of the journal's peer reviewers, that stop-press correction in Q0 and editorial rather than authoritative annotation of it could explain all the evidence. As Rizvi points out, the Q-only and F-only errors are often so close together that individual formes of Q0 must have had errors of both kinds on them, so we cannot simply say that Q1 was printed from an exemplar of Q0 in which the F-only errors had been corrected and the Q1-only errors had not and that F was printed from an exemplar of Q0 in which the Q1-only errors had been corrected and the F-only errors had not.

But what if in the stop-press correction of Q0 the F-only errors were fixed and the Q1-only and Q1/F-shared errors were not? Then an exemplar of Q0 in the corrected state was used to print Q1 and hence Q1 has Q1-only errors and Q1/F-shared errors but not the F-only errors. Then an exemplar of Q0 in the uncorrected state was got ready to be F copy by being annotated using a manuscript, and in this annotation the Q1-only errors were fixed but the F-only and Q1/F-shared errors were not. This would explain everything and do away with the preparation of copy for Q1 involving annotation of Q0 by reference to an authoritative manuscript, which, as the reviewer pointed out, we have no precedents for among the Shakespeare quartos. This hypothesis would require that stop-press correction of Q0 fixed the fifty-nine F-only errors, which is rather a lot of corrections, since Q2 *Hamlet* by the same printer, James Roberts, at around the same time has only twenty-six stop-press corrections. What about editorial correction when Bonian and Walley were making Q1? Even Sonia Massai, who argues for much more editorial correction than other investigators believe in, does not have many examples of the kind of correction seen in Q1—that is, things it gets right that F gets wrong—being achieved without use of an authoritative manuscript. Perhaps, suggests, Rizvi, press correction plus editorial correction plus annotation from an authoritative manuscript are needed to account for the situation.

Hugh Craig, 'The Date of *Sir Thomas More*' (*ShS* 66[2013] 38–54), shows that, as MacDonald P. Jackson recently argued, the original text of *Sir Thomas More* was written in the early 1600s and not in the early 1590s as used to be commonly believed. There is little internal or external evidence to pinpoint the date(s) of composition of the *Sir Thomas More* manuscript. Craig surveys what there is and the various attempts to marshal it all, leading to the

(until recently) accepted dating of 1593–4 for the original version of the play and more recently Jackson's narrowing of the limits to 1596–1602 and then Jowett's agreement that it was written around 1600. So, we have an old general agreement on 1593–4 and a new agreement on a date around 1600. To help choose between these options, Craig took thirty plays from the early 1590s and twenty-eight plays from the early 1600s and looked for changes in style; he found that *Sir Thomas More* is like the later group. Counting the frequencies of 219 function words in each set, Craig found that for twenty-eight of them the difference between the mean frequencies was deemed significant by Student's *t*-test. To validate this conclusion, he repeated the process but with the fifty-eight plays randomly divided into two groups: this time no significant differences emerged. A particularly clear example is that in the early plays *thee* and *thou* are used about as often as *you*, but in the late plays *you* is used twice as often as *thee* and *thou*. Likewise *doth* is much more frequent than *does* in the early plays but they appear roughly equally often in the late ones.

The rate of use of the word *very* is about three times higher in the late plays than in the early ones, and the word *most* is also much more frequent in the late plays. The articles *a* and *an* are much more frequently used in the late plays, and Craig suggests that this reflects plays getting 'more detached, more urbane, more reflective dialogue' (p. 44). The same is true of the modal auxiliaries *would* and *could*, and Craig reckons that this coincides with an increasing sense of broadening horizons and new possibilities, especially for the self. Craig uses Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to reduce the twenty-eight variables—that is, the counts of the frequencies of twenty-eight function words—to just two variables, the first Principal Component and the Second Principal Component. For each of the fifty-eight plays he plotted these two variables on the *x* and *y* axes of a graph and the result is clear clustering, especially along the *x*-axis, the first Principal Component.

This chronological clustering trumps genre: early histories go with early non-histories, late histories with late non-histories. *Sir Thomas More* sits squarely in the late plays' cluster. Craig worries that the function words he is counting were themselves derived from the set of fifty-eight plays, and to test if this matters he took one play out of the group, found the words using the same set of rules, and then tested how it scored on the word-set to which it did not contribute. In fact he did this ten times, and in each case the removed play, treated as if it were of unknown chronology, fell into the cluster in which it truly belonged. Next Craig created a new test in which he excluded the 219 function words already used and looked simply for words that occur in at least half of a set of 216 plays. (Craig neglects to mention how he selected those 216 plays.) From this word-set he looked for the forty-five words that have the greatest differences in their frequency of use in the early plays compared to their frequency of use in the late plays. Using these words Craig counted their frequencies in his fifty-eight plays—thirty early ones and twenty-eight late ones—and then used PCA to reduce these forty-five variables for each play to just two so he could plot these two variables on an *x/y* graph. As before, the two sets of plays cluster visibly on the graph, and *Sir Thomas More* is squarely among the late plays. As before, the validation—by removing each of ten plays *in turn*, repeating the experiment without this play, and then seeing where the

test would place this play—worked perfectly: each of the ten plays is correctly assigned to the group it was extracted from.

In *YWES* 91[2012] we reviewed Adele Davidson's book arguing that stenographic transmission of the underlying script can explain many of the anomalies found in Q1 *King Lear*. Davidson adduced no smoking-gun evidence for which only stenographic transmission can provide the explanation, so the hypothesis stands unproven. In an article that is rather more dependent upon Davidson's pioneering scholarship than it acknowledges, 'Sermons, Plays and Note-Takers: *Hamlet* Q1 as a "Noted" Text' (*ShS* 66[2013] 1–23), Tiffany Stern achieves the same kind of stalemate for Q1 *Hamlet*. We know that sermons were taken down by short-handing auditors, as Davidson and Stern point out, so why not plays? Stern rehearses the well-known limitations of the memorial reconstruction theory being used to account for Q1 *Hamlet*, most pertinently the existence of garbling even within the parts of the actors who are supposed to have made the reconstruction. On the assumption that Q2/F are essentially correct, Stern points out an occasion where in Q1 the actor playing Marcellus 'misremembers his own cues' (p. 2). In fact, she is right only if one agrees with her that the order of the lines in Q1 is wrong rather than just, on these occasions, being different from Q2/F but nonetheless valid. That is, on its own Q1 makes sense at the points Stern draws attention to. Stern reports that Paul Menzer, in a book reviewed in *YWES* 91[2012], showed that 'because of its poor cues' Q1 is 'unstageable' (p. 3). This cannot literally be true since with minimal correction Q1 *Hamlet* has several times been staged, and indeed unless we allow some correction virtually all early editions of Shakespeare are unstageable.

Stern sets herself the task of answering the question of 'whether some people, using any form of [short-]handwriting they liked, on any number of occasions, could have penned *Hamlet* Q1' (p. 4). Of course, put like that we can confidently predict that the answer will be yes, since there is bound to be something in Q1 that could be explained by use of short-hand. Like Davidson, Stern gives a survey of note-taking at sermons and parliamentary speeches, and remarks that John Willis's *Stenography* could be bought with or without hand-inked illustrations of the symbols needed for his system, which unusual expedient saved the publisher the cost of having custom-made pieces of type cast for them. Stern then turns to note-takers in theatres and the few references to them in plays, although these seem to refer to the catching of particular phrases, not the whole of the play.

Because William Basse in *A Help to Discourse* [1623] quotes a passage from *Hamlet* but in a way that 'differs verbally from all three printed *Hamlet* editions' (p. 9), thus ruling out transcription, Stern reckons that somebody must have taken notes on it during performance. Since the passage is merely five lines long, I would say that someone might just be quoting from memory of either performance or reading, and no note-taking is needed for this. The clincher for Stern is that Basse's book prints 'So sacred and so hallow'd is that tune' where the play has '...is that time'. This she reckons must be a misreading of a note taken in the theatre rather than a mishearing or misremembering of performance, and it is unlikely to be a compositorial error because it is retained in reprintings. Actually, compositors' errors often are

retained in reprintings so that fact tells us nothing. Still she may be right, although in this case the misreading of a written record of a recollection of the passage from performance is just as likely as note-taking happening in the theatre, which is what Stern cites this as proof of.

When Stern looks for signs of note-taking in Q1 *Hamlet* she is alert not merely for signs of a particular kind of short-hand, but any kind of 'swift writing' (p. 11) in general. One such general technique was the use of a symbol for a noun like *air* that is then modified with a small addition to make related words like *breath* and *mist*; words of such 'like sense' got called synonyms (p. 11). Stern spots a few such synonyms in Q1 *Hamlet*. Another technique was to record only the beginnings of words and leave the remainder to memory, and Stern reckons that this would account for Cornelia/Cornelius, Voltemand/Voltemar, and Plautus/Plato. Another technique was to omit the end of a line that rhymed with the one above, since the rhyme would prompt recollection of the correct ending. Stern finds examples of this too, but again swift writing is just one possible explanation: she has no clinching example that can be explained only in this way. Note-taking would account for aural errors, and Stern lists some of those from Q1 *Hamlet*. Memorial error can as easily be ascribed to note-taking, via the failure of memory upon expansion, as it can the full-blown memorial reconstruction theory. Note-taking would account for stranded words in the middle of speeches in Q1 that are the same as the word in Q2 but in a different sense. Stern gives the examples of *course* meaning *body* in Q2 but *direction* in Q1, *grave* meaning *serious* in Q2 but *sepulchre* in Q1, *borne* meaning *frontier* in Q2 but *carried* in Q1 (pp. 13–14). These she claims look like note-taking because the word but not the sense has been preserved, and actors remember senses. Do they, though? This is not self-evident to me.

John Willis's guide to stenography suggested radical curtailing of poetic expansiveness, and Stern finds such curtailing in Q1 when compared to the equivalent moment in Q2. Stern also thinks that a couple of stage directions embedded in dialogue, mislineations, and reordering of parts in Q1 can be explained by note-taking and are not likely to be invented by memorial reconstruction. For the reordering argument, Stern points out that material that is of the same kind in Q1 and Q2 (scenes of persons with books) is dispersed across Q2—once with Hamlet and his book in the 'fishmonger' scene and once again with Ophelia's book in the 'To be or not to be' scene—and is brought together in Q1. Printed editions of note-taken sermons admit to using creative patching to cover missing material, and Stern reckons that such patching is present in Q1 *Hamlet* when bits of *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Twelfth Night*, and *Othello* float in. The extended Q1 repetition of 'nunnery go' and the scene of Horatio confiding in the Queen who abandons her husband for her son simplify the language and the action respectively. Also signs of note-taking are the gaps where Q1 lines seem to rely on preceding lines that it lacks and that Q2 possesses, including Horatio walking in after the exit of the players and saying 'Heere my Lord' although no one has called him, and Hamlet saying to Claudius 'Come drinke, here lies thy vnion here' although no one has mentioned putting a pearl in the cup (p. 16).

Why would the quality of Q1 be so variable? Because note-takers could not keep up with fast or indistinct speakers, only slow and distinct ones. Perhaps if

several note-takers pooled their notes then the variability in their skills would show through too. The lines marked as *sententiae* by being preceded with inverted commas in Q1—‘Be thou familiar, but by no meanes vulgare . . . For the apparrell oft proclaimes the man’—Stern reckons might have acquired those marks because the lines were first put into someone’s commonplace book and then they provided ‘a section supplied by a different noter’ (p. 19) from the rest of the scene they are in. This is hard to credit since whoever was putting it all together would presumably want to hide such provenance, not flaunt it like this. Apparently unconvinced by her own suggestion, Stern then wonders if the inverted commas mark that the lines were spoken on one occasion that the play was recorded by a note-taker but were omitted in a different performance also noted. Stern speculates on why anyone would turn notes taken during performance into a book. The possible incentives must include financial reward for the manuscript seller, a desire to preserve the ephemeral, and the hope of a publisher to gain the monopoly on the title and so profit by forcing the owners to release a good text that he would publish, as indeed happened with Q1 and Q2 *Hamlet*, Nicholas Ling being the publisher of both. If Q1 is a record of performance, then even its aural mistakings are themselves useful pointers to what actually got said on the stage in the version of the play that it records. That is, something that could be misheard for the word in Q1 is what was said.

Cyrus Mulready, ‘Making History in Q *Henry V*’ (*ELR* 43[2013] 478–513), thinks that, contrary to Lukas Erne’s claim, it is the 1600 quarto (hereafter Q1) and not the Folio *Henry V* (hereafter F) that is the more readerly version, made by cutting down the play to produce a simplified chronicle history, which was an established and popular book genre. Mulready surveys the theories of Q1’s relation to F, noting that they are not entirely coherent and do not always fit well with the evidence on which they are based. He proposes to argue not from the internal evidence but the external: condensed historical accounts were popular in the book market. Mulready thinks that Q1 represents an attempt to ‘tap into’ that market by repurposing a play. At this point, Mulready cites Thomas Berger, noting that even after F came out the rights to Q1 were transferred from one stationer to another, which ‘suggests this version retained some of its market value despite the arrival of F’ (p. 482n10). I should say an even clearer sign that Shakespeare quartos, and hence the rights to them, retained their market value after the publication of the Folio is that quarto reprints continued to appear: *Richard III* [1629, 1634], *The Merry Wives of Windsor* [1630], *Othello* [1630], *Love’s Labour’s Lost* [1631], *The Taming of the Shrew* [1631], *1 Henry IV*, [1632, 1639], *Richard II* [1634], *Romeo and Juliet* [1637], *The Merchant of Venice* [1637], and *Hamlet* [1637].

The 1600 quarto of *Henry V* calls itself a ‘CRONICLE’ on its title page, and this is the peg on which Mulready hangs his comparison to other books purporting to tell chronicle histories, and in particular short, cheap books, such as John Stow’s abbreviated *Annals*, that were emerging to compete with the well-established large-format chronicles of Edward Hall and Raphael Holinshed. Another such abbreviated history was William Warner’s rhyming-verse *England’s Albion* of 1586, which in its 1602 edition made an explicit

virtue of adding an epitome that cut out the detail so that the big historical pictures could emerge. In general, short histories sold better than the long ones, and Mulready provides a table of playbook editions that called themselves chronicles or true histories on their title pages, from *Edward 1* [1593] to *Perkin Warbeck* [1634]. Mulready suggests that the Dauphin (present in F) being replaced, as historical accuracy requires, by Bourbon at the battle of Agincourt in Q1 might show 'added attention to historical accuracy' (p. 490) resulting in correction to the script that ended up in F. The Folio text of *Henry V* actually has Fluellen be a reader of historical chronicles and the Chorus refers to those in the audience who have read them, and calls the play an 'abridgement' (V.0.45) of the story. Q1's lack of the complicating choruses is of a piece with the non-dramatic abridged histories' simplification of their stories.

Mulready reckons that the manuscript copy for Q1 was shortened in the printshop and that stage directions were added to clarify the story, including the first entrance for Pistol and Hostess Quickly noting that she is 'his wife', which F achieves by dialogue. Later in the scene, Q1 has the characters' names spoken in dialogue where F does not, and Mulready thinks Q1's arrangement 'theatrically unnecessary' and that 'the detail helps to make the scene more intelligible in reading' (p. 497). I would say precisely the opposite: since speech prefixes are not spoken, it is the theatregoer not the reader (who already has the benefit of seeing the speech prefixes) who gains from names being spoken in dialogue. Mulready attempts the long-discredited practice of determining the provenance of stage directions from their tense or mood so for the difference between F's '*Draw*' (meaning their swords) and Q1's '*they draw*' Mulready suggests that 'This shift in verbal mood perhaps indicates a direction for actors [in F], rather than a narrative sign of an action to be imagined [in Q]' (p. 497). Mulready goes on to find other stage direction amplifications in the quarto line of descent that he reckons aid reading, including Q3 having an explicit stage direction for the action implied by the dialogue of Fluellen making Pistol eat a leek. He is at least right that this is most likely printshop sophistication, since Q3 is otherwise a reprint of Q1 and the added material only requires someone to read the dialogue and figure out the action.

Mulready reckons that for the Harfleur attack Q1 is less theatrically showy than F, and whereas Gurr thinks this is because Q1 wants to remove any sense that Henry fails—the scaling ladders do not get him into Harfleur, talking does—Mulready argues instead that the point is to get back to what chronicles tell us, which is not the elaborated story F has. Likewise the Dauphin (in F) to Bourbon (in Q1) substitution takes the play closer to the historical sources, as does Q1's leaving out F's character of Bedford, who historically did not go to France, and Q1's placing of Warwick in France, which happened and F omits. Mulready thinks that there are no good theatrical reasons to make these improvements in the play's historical accuracy, but readers would appreciate it. Q1 also has theatrically impossible stage directions that would not bother a reader but point away from theatrical provenance for this script. Mulready traces the publications of Thomas Pavier after he got the rights to *Henry V* and printed its Q2 in 1602, and the pattern is that patriotic stuff about

Englishmen's doings at home and abroad were his favoured topic, especially in the form of histories or pseudo-histories derived from romance.

The weakest of this year's articles is a polemic by Cordelia Zukerman, 'Equivocations: Reading the Shakespeare/Middleton *Macbeth*' (*ShS* 66[2013] 24–37), against Gary Taylor's edition of *Macbeth* in the Oxford Collected Middleton, which she criticizes for being a mediated work rather than providing perfect access to Middleton's original. It is hard to understand why she thinks this is worth pointing out or imagines that Taylor is unaware of it, since his edition repeatedly asserts the point she offers as her own deduction. In a footnote Zukerman records that 'Brian Vickers, in his scathing review of the Middleton *Macbeth*, systematically rebuts the scholarship that points to Middleton as the adapter of the play' (p. 25n3). Zukerman is unaware that Vickers's rebuttal has itself been demolished, not least by this reviewer's demonstration in *YWES* 91[2012] that a great many phrases that Vickers believes to be absent from Middleton's writing are in fact there. Zukerman repeatedly cites Vickers's flawed scholarship on this topic.

Zukerman thinks that those of us who refer to scribes and composers adding error to a text are thereby 'idealizing the lone genius who produces, unaided, a "perfect" text' (p. 27). For Zukerman the idea of an individual author, or even an individual human being, was a construction of the Enlightenment, and she cites Margreta de Grazia, Tiffany Stern, and Jeffrey Masten on the collaborative nature of all writing. Such unhistorical overstatement is easily blown away by authorship attribution studies: if there was no such thing as the individual author how come we can so accurately and so often distinguish one person's writing from another's? Zukerman even doubts that 'authors had particular spelling or punctuation preferences' (p. 28). Again, if so how come we can time and again detect with impressive accuracy certain authors by their spelling preferences? Zukerman cites in support of her view a series of studies from the 1990s that pre-date the achievements of computational stylistics in our field and that have since been discredited.

In deciding to use modern spelling for his edition of *Macbeth*, on the grounds that we cannot recover the original spelling, Zukerman notes that 'Taylor assumes that early modern authors had individual spelling preferences' (p. 29). He does and they demonstrably did. On Taylor's decision to use no punctuation in his *Macbeth* Zukerman cites the extensive scholarship of Malcolm Parkes for no greater purpose than to assert that 'Punctuation . . . contributes to determining the meaning of a text' (p. 30). Zukerman starts by quoting Taylor on Shakespeare pointing lightly and then, after a lengthy tour of the topic which repeatedly sounds like it is meant to complicate what Taylor claims, she comes to the same conclusion. She puts into Taylor's mouth words that no one familiar with his work would consider remotely plausible, for example that 'Taylor claims to present the reader with a text that is as editorially neutral as possible'. On the contrary, he refers explicitly and repeatedly to his mediation. Zukerman gets herself really confused once she brings in Stanley Fish and reader response theory, which she thinks she needs in order to argue that 'there is . . . no objective, neutral, physical text, but only moments of interaction between a text and a reader'

(p. 33). She ends up complaining that ‘Taylor, in requiring his readers—no matter who they are—to insert punctuation themselves, moves the mediating force from the editor to the reader’ (p. 36), which is what she started out asserting is the condition of text in the first place.

Adam H. Kitzes, ‘The Hazards of Expurgation: Adapting *Measure for Measure* to the Bowdler Family Shakespeare’ (*JEMCS* 13:ii[2013] 43–68), offers an account of Thomas Bowdler’s Shakespeare editions that shows them to be rather more intelligently thought through than is usually assumed to be the case. The *Family Shakespeare* evolved through several editions, starting with Henrietta Bowdler’s 1807 edition of just twenty plays, which project her brother Thomas took over and expanded. Kitzes looks in particular at his changing treatment of the problematically sexual play *Measure for Measure*. In the first *Family Shakespeare* to include all the plays, the 1818 edition, *Measure for Measure* was represented by John Philip Kemble’s script for performance at the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, which was quite different from the Folio text. In the 1820 second edition Bowdler included his own amended text of *Measure for Measure* based on the Folio. Kitzes surveys how Bowdler himself described the problems of making the plays suitable for family reading aloud without destroying them, which he admitted was sometimes impossible. *Measure for Measure* was the toughest case, and when in the 1820 edition he used the Folio supplemented by bits of Kemble’s script he made it acceptable mainly by cutting. Kitzes finds the cuts inconsistent and in places quite whimsical.

Bowdler was working under two incompatible notions of purity: removing the sexual content but also—and this is why he rejected Kemble’s adapted script—getting back to what Shakespeare wrote before theatre-people mangled it. Kitzes considers how Bowdler defended his edition against a hostile review of it in *The British Critic*. Bowdler came to see what he was doing as a kind of editing of Shakespeare that improved it, implying that the vulgar bits were unconnected to the text proper and perhaps not even by Shakespeare. Eventually, in the 1825 edition, he managed to do without any of Kemble’s script for *Measure for Measure*. After Bowdler’s death his expurgated Shakespeare really started to sell, but where he had been quite explicit that he was adapting the plays to make them suitable for family reading aloud—not representing the plays themselves as adults should read them—these posthumous Bowdlers passed themselves off as the thing itself.

Megan Heffernan, ‘Turning Sonnets Into Poems: Textual Affect and John Benson’s Metaphysical Shakespeare’ (*SQ* 64[2013] 71–98), offers a reading of the choices that went into the design of John Benson’s 1640 edition of Shakespeare’s sonnets that casts this edition as itself a kind of reading of the 1609 first quarto. Benson’s reprint of the 1609 *Sonnets* used to be treated as a piracy and the reordering of the poems it performed as an attempt to conceal the theft, but Heffernan sees much artistry in what Benson did. He did not randomly shuffle the sonnets but rather he kept adjacent ones together, showing sensitivity to how they build upon one another. Heffernan ends with a thoughtful consideration of how the design of editions of John Donne’s poetry in the 1630s affected Benson’s design choices for his edition of Shakespeare’s poems. Anthony James West, ‘Proving the Identity of the Stolen Durham

University First Folio' (*Library* 14[2013] 428–40), offers a fascinating account of the detective work that went into proving that the exemplar of the Folio offered to the Folger Shakespeare Library in 2008 was the Durham University exemplar stolen in 1998. But since this adds nothing to our knowledge of the text it cannot be described further here.

Finally, then, to the round-up from *Notes and Queries*. The most widely discussed short article this year was Douglas Bruster's claim, in 'Shakespearean Spellings and Handwriting in the Additional Passages Printed in the 1602 *Spanish Tragedy*' (*N&Q* 60[2013] 420–4), to have found fresh evidence that Shakespeare wrote the Additions to Thomas Kyd's play. Bruster compares the unusual spellings of certain words in *Sir Thomas More* Hand D with those in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*. However, this comparison is what MacDonald P. Jackson has shown to be an unlosable one-horse race, since those spellings might be used by other men too and any set of unusual spellings is bound to match someone's habits; what is needed is a search for how many other people were using those spellings. Bruster reports without demur that Eric Rasmussen thinks that Hand D's *scilens* might be a unique spelling in the period, but it is not: EEBO-TCP has several books, including a presumably well-printed Bible, using it. Bruster finds in the Additions the same word spelt different ways in the same line, just as we find in Shakespeare. True, but lots of people did this, not just Shakespeare.

Bruster finds in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* some errors that he suspects are orthographic misreadings, but acknowledges that some (not all) might result from 'carelessly sorted type' (p. 422). In fact they all could come about in this way, since mistakes in distribution could put any letter into any sort box. Bruster thinks that the spelling *crevie* for what was clearly meant to be *crevice* is particularly revealing since Shakespeare often left off a terminal *e* after *c* and hence if Shakespeare wrote *crevie* the compositor might easily have misread the final *c* for an *e* and so set the *crevie* we find in the Additions. This is inherently unlikely since the spelling *crevie* or *creuie* for *crevice* is rare in EEBO-TCP, occurring just three times (once each in STC 25685, 3070, and 14600.5). Thus Bruster's explanation requires that a compositor set what he almost certainly would have regarded as either nonsense or, if he figured out the meaning from the context, a spelling of the word *crevice* that he had not seen before or else he regarded this as a word unknown to him and he set what he saw in the copy. These are not impossible scenarios, but they are considerably less likely than a rogue *e* finding its way into the *c* sort-box in the compositor's typecase.

There is a crux in the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* that reads: 'What is there yet in a sonne? | To make a father dote, raue, or runne mad. | Being borne, it poutes, cryes, and breeds teeth. | What is there yet in a sonne? He must be fed, | Be thaught to goe, and speake I, or yet. | Why might not a man loue a Calfe as well?' The problem is 'I, or yet' and Bruster reckons the simplest explanation is that 'I, or' was in fact in the manuscript copy the speech prefix '*Ier[onimo]*', placed there as an anchor-marker because Shakespeare added—in the margin or on a separate slip—the lines about sons being no better than cattle, which lines now occupy the next seven lines,

after first composing the segment without them. Perhaps, but there is nothing to corroborate this suggestion.

MacDonald P. Jackson, 'All Is True or Henry VIII: Authors and Ideologies' (*N&Q* 60[2013] 441–4), shows that the reassignment of the authorial stints of *All Is True* / *Henry VIII* proposed in Thomas Merriam's book *The Identity of Shakespeare* in 'Henry VIII' (reviewed in *YWES* 86[2007]) is wrong. The orthodoxy is that Shakespeare wrote I.i, I.ii, II.iii, II.iv, III.ii.1–203 (from the beginning to the King's exit), and V.i, and that Fletcher wrote I.iii, I.iv, II.i, II.ii, III.i, III.ii.204–459 (from the King's exit to the end), IV.i, IV.ii, V.ii, V.iii, and V.iv. Merriam would take from Shakespeare and give to Fletcher II.iii.50–80 and V.i.86–157 and take from Fletcher and give to Shakespeare II.ii.1–17, II.ii.116–42, III.i.1–23, III.ii.228–35, III.ii.255–325, IV.i.37–80, and IV.ii.31–99. Jackson looks at how this reattribution appears in the light of the evidence that Vickers has collated about the shares. Fletcher we know used more feminine endings, especially monosyllabic and verb-plus-pronoun ones, than Shakespeare did, and also used more end-stopped lines. Fletcher also used many more occurrences of *ye* and *em* than Shakespeare, and Shakespeare preferred *ay* to *yes* while Fletcher strongly preferred *yes*. Shakespeare preferred *hath* to *has* and Fletcher did not. Shakespeare liked unregulated *do* and Fletcher did not.

Jackson tabulates first how often the distinctive metrical features—feminine endings, feminine endings that are monosyllabic, feminine endings that are verb-plus-pronoun, and unstopped verse lines—appear in the passages that Merriam would reassign between Shakespeare and Fletcher, giving for reference the accepted norms of each man for each verse feature. It is clear in each case that Merriam's reassignments run counter to the numerical norms for each man. Jackson reports (without tabulation) that the same is true, albeit not quite so clearly, for the counts of *ye*, *em*, *ay*, *yes*, *hath*, *has*, and unregulated *do*. Jackson has another test too: the number of words between punctuation marks, which he calls 'phrase length'. Using the Arden2 edition, Jackson long ago established that Fletcher used more phrases of lengths 2–6 and 12 words than Shakespeare did, and Shakespeare used more phrases of all other lengths than Fletcher did. Taken as a whole, the material that Merriam proposes to reassign from Fletcher to Shakespeare tests like Fletcher on phrase length and the material that Merriam proposes to reassign from Shakespeare to Fletcher tests like Shakespeare on phrase length. Moreover, taken as individual units (parts of scenes) to be reassigned, the same result occurs. Whatever merits there are in altering the boundaries so that each co-author of *All is True* / *Henry VIII* becomes more consistent in his depiction of the religious rights and wrongs of the play, a stylistic analysis is strongly against it.

In a second article, 'Reasoning About Rhyme: George Wilkins and *Pericles*' (*N&Q* 60[2013] 434–8), Jackson responds to John Klause's article (reviewed in *YWES* 93[2014]) disputing his claim that the habits of rhyming in *Pericles* Acts I and II show that they have a different author from Acts III, IV, and V and that the first two are by George Wilkins. Jackson defends the exclusion of Gower's speeches from his counts since the relevant evidence is rhyme in ordinary dialogue, not in choric narration that Shakespeare rarely used. Jackson thinks that Klause used verbal sleight of hand to argue that

The Merchant of Venice and *King Lear* are as internally disparate in the distribution of rhymes as *Pericles* is: the numbers are not the same. (I would have thought that Klause's point nonetheless stands since even though *The Merchant of Venice* and *King Lear* are not quite as internally disparate as *Pericles* they are still highly internally disparate, so *Pericles'* internal disparity need not be attributed to co-authorship.)

Klause pointed out that Acts I and II of *Romeo and Juliet* have many more shared rhymes with Wilkins's *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* than *Romeo and Juliet* Acts III, IV, and V have, and at about the same level of disproportion found between *Pericles* Acts I and II and *Pericles* Acts III, IV, and V. Jackson reckons that this is not significant since the division of *Pericles* was performed before he went looking for the rhymes, whereas the division of *Romeo and Juliet* was done after the rhymes were sought and for the purpose of comparison. That is, it is the corroboration of an existing hypothesis that makes the *Pericles* case compelling. Similarly, other pieces of evidence that Klause brings in to parallel the differences between the two halves of *Pericles* do not require a dual-authorship hypothesis, but once such an hypothesis is in existence they are strong evidence in support of it. Jackson admits that in his book *Defining Shakespeare* (reviewed in *YWES* 84[2005]) he did treat certain of Wilkins's rhyming habits as being virtually an authorial trademark and he now accepts that other writers, and in particular Samuel Rowley, also used them.

Another investigator responding to Jackson's work is Quentin Skinner, in 'A Spurious Dating for *All's Well That Ends Well*' (*N&Q* 60[2013] 429–34), who thinks that *All's Well That Ends Well* was written in early 1605. In an article reviewed in *YWES* 82[2003] Jackson argued that the mention of a Captain Spurio in *All's Well That Ends Well* must have been written after Middleton's *Revenger's Tragedy*, which features a character called Spurio, and hence *All's Well That Ends Well* is no earlier than mid-1606. Skinner reckons that in fact Shakespeare could have made up the name Spurio. Or he might have got it from another novella in his source, William Painter's *The Palace of Pleasure*, where the character Spurius's name is the first word in one story. Or he might have got it from one of his sources for *The Merchant of Venice*, which uses it. Admittedly, these are uses of the name Spurius not Spurio, but in the translation from Latin to Italian the alteration of *-eus/-ius* endings to *-eo/-io* endings is common (as in *Romeus* > *Romeo*). Setting Jackson aside, then, what is the right date for composition of *All's Well That Ends Well*? Skinner reckons late 1604 to early 1605. Previous metrical tests show *All's Well That Ends Well* to be like *Othello* and *Measure for Measure*, which would also drag it towards the beginning of the decade 1600–9 rather than the end. Also, claims Skinner, *All's Well that Ends Well* is like *Othello* and *Measure for Measure* in dramatizing what 'classical rhetoricians recognized [as the] two main "constitutions" of a judicial cause' (p. 433), which Skinner explains. So, unless Shakespeare got interested in these matters when writing *Othello* and *Measure for Measure* and then dropped his interest for a few years only to revive it in *All's Well That Ends Well* these facts put these three plays close together and Skinner's best guess is early 1605. Perhaps, but Shakespeare gaining an

interest, dropping it, and then returning to it for a later play does not seem especially implausible.

Dennis McCarthy, 'Shakespeare and *Arden of Faversham*' (*N&Q* 60[2013] 391–7), joins the growing ranks of those who think that Shakespeare wrote all or part of *Arden of Faversham*. Using the open-source document-comparison software Wcopyfind, McCarthy uncovered a set of five- and six-word strings in common between *Arden of Faversham* and plays by Shakespeare and then went looking for them in EEBO-TCP and found that they are indeed rare. As McCarthy explains this is essentially the methodology used by Vickers, and McCarthy is clearly unaware that it suffers from the one-horse-race error, as Jackson has pointed out. That is, there are bound to be some long phrases that are only in one person's canon and in *Arden of Faversham*, and the proper test is to see if using another person's canon and *Arden of Faversham* you find different results. In McCarthy's article, it is not until he lists the strings in question that the reader discovers that they are not all continuous runs of five or six words but include the close proximities of shorter runs that added together make five or six words in common. Among McCarthy's list of shared strings are two between *Arden of Faversham* and *2 Henry VI* and *3 Henry VI*, which of course are increasingly emerging as collaborative plays by Shakespeare although the divisions are not agreed upon. Quite a few of the claimed strings-in-common appear in other works in EEBO-TCP as many as five times, so their rarity is not even especially high. Interestingly, though, the linking phrases come from all five acts of *Arden of Faversham* not just the central section that is most securely attributed to Shakespeare.

According to Mark Hutchings, 'Scene Division in *Titus Andronicus*' (*N&Q* 60[2013] 402–4), there is a scene break in *Titus Andronicus* caused by a clearing of the stage that editors have overlooked. Hutchings reports that the Folio text of *Titus Andronicus* 'signals an end to the first act following the stage direction "*Exeunt, sound trumpets, manet Moore*"' (p. 402) but that is untrue since this stage direction is not present in F. Rather, F has an '*Exeunt*' then an act division ('*Actus Secunda*') and then '*Flourish. Enter Aaron alone*', which makes perfect sense. What Hutchings appears to mean is that F chooses to put an act interval at a point where Q1 has '*Exeunt, sound trumpets, manet Moore*'. Hutchings claims that F's putting an act interval at this point 'makes no sense, since the stage has not been cleared' (p. 402) but of course in F it has been cleared: Aaron left with the others at the end of Act I and comes back on alone at the start of Act II.

Hutchings's account of the action of the play is faulty, as when he claims that 'Aaron plants a bag of money in the hole into which Bassianus's body will be placed' (p. 403). This cannot be right since the fake letter that Tamora gives Saturninus reads 'Look for thy reward | Among the nettles at the elder tree | Which overshades the mouth of that same pit | Where we decreed to bury Bassianus' (II.iii.271–4) and this agrees with Aaron's earlier words that he is burying the gold under a tree and with his finding of it immediately after Saturninus reads the letter aloud. If the gold were in the hole with Bassianus then Aaron would not be able to so easily and quickly recover it. More confusion follows as Hutchings writes of 'the exit first of Tamora's brothers

with Lavinia and then, six lines later, by the exit of Tamora herself: at which point the stage is cleared' (p. 403). Tamora has no brothers in the play so he must mean her sons. Hutchings objects that with Tamora's sons taking Lavinia off to rape her and Tamora exiting shortly after, the stage is now clear and hence a fresh scene should be marked. He admits that the dead Bassianus is still on stage in whatever represents the pit—hence the stage has not been cleared—but dismisses this explanation, which is the true reason that editors do not start a new scene at this point. Hutchings gives no reason for his rejection of this explanation, saying that 'such an explanation, inferred here rather than set out by any modern editor, seems dubious' (p. 404). I should say that it is not set out by any modern editor because it is thought quite obvious that the presence of the murdered Bassianus means that the stage has not been cleared.

Thomas Merriam, 'Unremarked Evidence against Anderegg's Conjecture' (*N&Q* 60[2013] 407–10), believes that Anthony Munday could not have possessed a copy of Nicholas Harpsfield's life of Thomas More from which to write the original version of the play *Sir Thomas More*. It was Michael A. Anderegg who came up with the idea that Munday may have got hold of Harpsfield's manuscript-only life of More via his Catholic-hunting work for Richard Topcliffe, and Jowett draws on this idea in his edition of *Sir Thomas More*. Merriam objects that there is no hard evidence that Munday possessed a copy of Harpsfield's text and that it would have been highly risky for him to have done so. The reason is that Topcliffe, who lived until 1604, wrote of his detestation of Harpsfield's writings. True, but as Merriam earlier acknowledges Topcliffe was 'decommissioned as torturer-without-portfolio' (p. 408) in 1595, so why he should be a threat to Munday is not clear unless Merriam thinks that the play was written before 1595. (We saw above Hugh Craig's corroboration of other evidence that it was written after 1595.) Merriam reports that Topcliffe recorded that he had the queen's permission to retain his copy of Harpsfield, so Munday, lacking such permission, would have been taking a huge risk. Actually, what Merriam quotes is not the queen's permission but rather that, and this is Topcliffe writing about Harpsfield's text, 'the Queen's majesty hath seen & hath read of [it], & her highness did command me to keep [it]'. A commandment to keep something is not the same as 'permission', the word that Merriam uses.

Brian Vickers, 'Lear's Fool and the Meaning of "Snatching"' (*N&Q* 60[2013] 427–9), asks why the Fool in Q1 *King Lear* says that ladies 'will not let me have all the fool to myself—they'll be snatching'. Gary Taylor, followed by R.A. Foakes and Stanley Wells, thought this was the word *fool* in the sense of a custard, which greedy ladies are always snatching. Vickers finds that implausible, remarking very sensibly that the Fool and some ladies 'would hardly be seated at the same table' (p. 427). The solution lies in recognizing that snatching meant having quick sex, for which Vickers cites some contemporary plays, so the Fool is referring to women playing sexually with his bauble or penis. (I cannot see in any of Vickers's examples the word *snatch* clearly having this meaning, since the primary meaning of *to take* makes perfect sense of the quotation in each case.)

The idea of death as rest recurs in *Hamlet*: ‘rest, rest perturbed spirit’ (I.v.183), ‘rest her soul, she’s dead’ (V.i.131–2), and ‘flights of angels sing thee to thy rest’ (V.ii.312). Roger Stritmatter, reckons that this idea needs a source and finds it in Revelation 14:13 about how the dead ‘rest from their labours’: ‘Revelations 14.13 and *Hamlet* I.v.91–108: “Write, Blessed Are the Dead!”’ (*N&Q* 60[2013] 415–18). The verse instructs the reader to ‘Write, Blessed are the dead’ and Stritmatter notes that Hamlet actually does write in his tables about his dead father. (True, but not that he is blessed—far from it.) Stritmatter finds a bit in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* that he reckons is also indebted to Revelation 14:13, and notices that just as Revelation 14:13 refers to the works of the dead following them (whatever that means), Hamlet is worried about his posthumous reputation.

Ceri Sullivan, “‘A horse, a horse, my kingdom for a horse!’” (*N&Q* 60[2013] 400–1), asks where Shakespeare got his collocation of a horse, a kingdom, fortune, and massive personal strength at the end of *Richard III*. Sullivan reckons it was Psalm 33 verses 16–17 in the Geneva Bible: ‘The king is not saved by the multitude of an hoste, neither is the mightie man delivered by great strength. A horse is a vaine helpe, and shall not deliver any by his great strength.’ Anthony Munday’s *The English Roman Life* was a pamphlet based on his undercover work at the Roman College, and Andrew Kau, ‘The Jew of Rome? Munday’s *English Romayne Life* as a Historical Source for a Sympathetic Shylock’ (*N&Q* 60[2013] 411–15), thinks that its accounts of Jews in Rome, not true knowledge of Jews in Venice, underlie *The Merchant of Venice*. Kau lists some loose parallels between the abuse of Jews in Munday’s book and the abuse of Jews in the play, including such things as pricking Jewish skin, forced conversion with loss of goods, and the segregation of Jews in ghettos. In the same play, Graziano’s closing pun about keeping safe Nerissa’s ring has a bunch of known archetypes, but one that Andrew S. Keener, “‘Deuine Ariosto His Ring’ and Gratiano’s Bawdy Pun’ (*N&Q* 60[2013] 410–11), reckons we have missed is the fifth satire in Lodovico Ariosto’s *Satires*. It is further connected to *The Merchant of Venice* by John Florio alluding to it in the context of doctor’s opinions and merchants as cut-throats.

In Sonnet 125 Shakespeare’s narrator begins ‘Were ’t aught to me I bore the canopy . . .’, and John M. Rollett, in ‘Shakespeare’s Sonnet 125: Who Bore the Canopy?’ (*N&Q* 60[2013] 438–41), asks the perfectly reasonable question of just what it meant to bear a canopy. It turns out to be the carrying by important dignitaries of an embroidered piece of fabric over the head of the monarch, which is not something Shakespeare might ever do. So, in the poem he or his narrator imagines being allowed this honour while at the same time saying that it would not impress him. When in *Twelfth Night* Sir Toby says of Olivia ‘My lady’s a Cathayan’ this is not, according to Zhiyan Zhang, “‘My lady’s a Cataian’: Cataian in *Twelfth Night*’ (*N&Q* 60[2013] 418–20), meant as a reproach, as most editors seem to think when they gloss this line. Zhang quotes quite a few early sources referring to the Chinese in approving terms and explains that the misunderstanding is all George Steevens’s fault since he was the first to gloss the line this way.

2. Shakespeare in the Theatre

As the title of Bart van Es's *Shakespeare in Company* suggests, the playwright needs to be studied as a constituent of and a contributor to a number of collaborative creative relationships. Moreover, the economic connotations of 'company' alert us to the fact that Shakespeare's output was formed in part by financial arrangements, not least his acquiring a stake in the company and then the theatre for which he was writing. As van Es states unarguably, 'There is inevitably a connection between the literary features of a work and the material conditions of its creation' (p. 37).

Shakespeare in Company is a meticulous account of the institutional and economic forces that shaped the plays themselves and an acute analysis of the ways in which this shaping occurred. For instance, in 1594 Shakespeare became a sharer in the Chamberlain's men and, as such, an 'attached' playwright. Unlike Kyd, Chapman, Jonson, Ford, Webster, or Beaumont, Shakespeare wrote for a single company, an arrangement, claims van Es, that he 'initiated' (p. 80). This facilitated the composition of roles with particular actors in mind and 'a new concern with the process of casting individual performers [which in turn] enabled the creation of psychological depth' (p. 98). In 1599 Shakespeare bought part-ownership 'of the most impressive performance venue in London' (p. 149) and the Globe became the company's permanent residence. This financial security cemented Shakespeare's association with Burbage, for whom he wrote the roles of Hamlet, Othello, Lear, and Macbeth among others: 'The great tragedian was now Shakespeare's primary partner and by the middle of the decade the dramatist would entirely abandon the writing of comedies' (p. 247).

Van Es argues that the late plays written with Fletcher, 'evince a gradual loosening of [Shakespeare's] acting-company connections' (p. 301) and this is manifest in the yielding of characterization to 'a more choreographic interest in visual impact and rhetorical effect' (p. 291). This is a sensitive, erudite, and intriguing study which demonstrates the inseparability of the rarefied perfections of Shakespeare's art and the day-to-day business of the entertainment industry. Van Es's book is also discussed, from a different perspective, in section 4(d).

'This is not a scholastic work', is the opening sentence of Peter Brook's *The Quality of Mercy: Reflections on Shakespeare*. 'The theatre lives and breathes in the present, not in libraries or archives' (p. 10). Fair enough, though one wonders why Brook (who has just given his complete archive to the Victoria and Albert Museum) should be writing a book about why Shakespeare does not belong in books. But I am being churlish about one of the greatest directors of modern times. This book is actually more interesting for the snippets of Brook's life and times rather than any pronouncements on Shakespeare. In fact, when it comes to the latter, Brook is rather blasé, not to say wrong. When he asserts 'There is no document to show rewriting' (p. 9), he is promulgating the tired old notion about Shakespeare's writing as a spontaneous overflow. What about the two versions of *King Lear* or the writing by negotiation and revision that constitutes the dog's breakfast of *Sir Thomas More*? On the other hand, details of conversations with Olivier are

Deborah Uman and Sara Morrison's essay collection *Staging the Blazon in Early Modern English Theatre* contains two essays of note on the comedies. Grant Williams's essay, 'Double Exposure: Gazing at Male Fantasy in Shakespearean Comedy' (pp. 13–24), attempts to discredit the easy assumption that blazons assert the significance of male identity's contribution to patriarchal culture, instead suggesting that blazons 'disrupt ideological interpellation' (p. 14). Williams's New Historicist essay attempts to set up a nationalist early modern context, and address *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *As You Like It*, and *Love's Labour's Lost* in the space of a few pages, which prevents his argument from running as deep as it might, threatening to render the nationalist angle of the argument more tangential than it might be in a longer study. Shakespearean comedies, Williams maintains, frequently stage Petrarchan verse, and in doing so 'open up a differential space that challenges male thinking on femininity' (p. 14). Williams argues that the blazon's function served as an assertion of 'English patriarchal nationalism' (p. 15), or as a mental 'state-of-the-nation', and is reshaped in Shakespeare's comedies to stage 'the exposure of male interiority' (p. 21). This opens up the male gaze as the object of scrutiny, instead of the anatomized female body, subsequently 'dissolving the bonds of homosocial communities' (p. 24).

Elizabeth Williamson's contribution to the same collection, 'Dismembering Rhetoric and Lively Action in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*' (pp. 37–49), is more singularly focused on *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and argues that performance is a lively counter to a literary rhetoric, rejecting 'the blazon's tendency towards pure ornamentation' (p. 40), which, at the close of her essay, she ties her argument to the assertion that the play is responding to anti-theatrical attacks on the cross-dressed boy actor (p. 49). Williamson's argument rests on the Lacanian assumption that the genre bears witness to narcissistic self-aggrandization, and that, in *Two Gentlemen*, the mastery of courtly love cannot measure up to 'the beauty of a living, breathing woman' (p. 41). Williamson too employs New Historicism, using, in particular, anti-theatrical tracts as a means to articulate the agency of the female's resistance to ideology—that is to say, the cross-dressed body 'functions here as the vehicle for clarifying the distinction between subject and object' (p. 43). The boy actor's convincing portrayal of Julia 'indicates a clear move away from the segmenting language of the blazon to a discourse informed by contemporary theories of acting that stressed the vital, bodily connection of one human being and another' (p. 45). The issue, of course, is the play's ending, and Williamson contributes several pages to assessing the end that stages the silence of Julia's voice and contrasts the lively body of the actor 'to the dead images that populate Proteus's erotic imagination' (p. 46). Williamson argues that the fourth act teaches the audience 'to pay attention to the multilayered performance' (p. 49), which stands as an alternative to the blazon that 'flattens and objectifies the subject' (p. 49); the audience is encouraged to overlook the inconsistencies in a text in favour of a critical appreciation of the performance that gives life to the otherwise staid objectification of the female.

Books Reviewed

- Aebischer, Pascale. *Screening Early Modern Drama: Beyond Shakespeare*. ExeterUP. [2013] pp. 286. £59.99 ISBN 9 7811 0702 4939.
- Anderson, Judith H., and Jennifer C. Vaught, eds. *Shakespeare and Donne: Generic Hybrids and the Cultural Imaginary*. FordUP. [2013] pp. viii + 291. £37.06 ISBN 9 7808 2325 1254.
- Bartels, Emily C., and Emma Smith, eds. *Christopher Marlowe in Context*. CUP. [2013] pp. xxviii + 382. \$110 ISBN 9 7811 0701 6255.
- Bate, Jonathan, Eric Rasmussen, Jan Sewell, and Will Sharpe, eds. *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays*. The RSC Shakespeare. Palgrave. [2013] pp. 752. £22.50 ISBN 9 7811 3727 1440.
- Bennett, Susan, and Christie Carson. *Shakespeare Beyond English: A Global Experiment*. CUP. [2013] pp. xxvi + 317. £17.99 ISBN 9 7811 0767 4691.
- Berger, Harry, Jr. *A Fury in the Words: Love and Embarrassment in Shakespeare's Venice*. FordUP. [2013] pp. x + 229. £61.11 ISBN 9 7808 2324 1941.
- Bickley, Pamela, and Jenny Stevens. *Essential Shakespeare: The Arden Guide to Text and Interpretation*. Bloomsbury. [2013] pp. x + 343. £45 ISBN 9 7814 0815 8739.
- Boitani, Piero. *The Gospel According to Shakespeare*. UNDP. [2013] pp. xiii + 156. £21.95 ISBN 9 7802 6802 2358.
- Brook, Peter. *The Quality of Mercy: Reflections on Shakespeare*. Hern. [2013] pp. viii + 116. £12.99 ISBN 9 7818 4842 2612.
- Brown, Eric C., and Estelle Rivier, eds. *Shakespeare in Performance*. CambridgeSP. [2013] pp. xx + 244. ISBN 9 7814 4384 7827.
- Buccola, Regina, and Peter Kanelos, eds. *Chicago Shakespeare Theatre: Suiting the Action to the Word*. NIUP. [2013] pp. viii + 284. £21 ISBN 9 7808 7580 4675.
- Calbi, Maurizio. *Spectral Shakespeares: Media Adaptations in the Twenty-First Century*. Palgrave. [2013] pp. 252. £55 ISBN 9 7802 3033 8753.
- Chapman, Alison A. *Patrons and Patron Saints in Early Modern English Literature*. Routledge. [2013] pp. xii + 242. \$140 ISBN 9 7804 1565 6849.
- Charry, Brinda. *The Tempest: Language & Writing*. Bloomsbury. [2013] pp. xii + 195. £21 ISBN 1 4081 5289 4.
- Cohen, Adam Max. *Wonder in Shakespeare*. PalMac. [2012] pp. x + 226. £63 ISBN 9 7802 3010 5416.
- Coiro, Ann Baynes, and Thomas Fulton, eds. *Rethinking Historicism from Shakespeare to Milton*. CUP. [2012] pp. xiii + 306. £59.99 ISBN 9 7811 0702 7510.
- Colombo, Rosy, and Daniela Guardamanga, eds. *On Authorship*. Memoria di Shakespeare, 8. Bulzoni Editore. [2012] pp. 473. €32.30 ISBN 9 7888 7870 6583.
- Connolly, Annaliese, ed. *Richard III: A Critical Reader*. Bloomsbury. [2013] pp. xii + 254. £60 ISBN 9 7814 4116 8252.

- Connolly, Annaliese, and Lisa Hopkins, eds. *Essex: The Cultural Impact of an Elizabethan Courtier*. ManUP. [2013] pp. xii + 324. £65 ISBN 9 7807 1908 4942.
- Connolly, Annaliese, and Lisa Hopkins, eds. *Goddesses and Queens: The Iconography of Elizabeth I*. ManUP. [2013] pp. 208. pb £12.99 ISBN 9 7807 1909 0110.
- Cormack, Bradin, Martha C. Nussbaum, and Richard Strier, eds. *Shakespeare and the Law: A Conversation Among Disciplines and Professions*. UChicP. [2013] pp. 344. £24.50 ISBN 9 7802 2692 4939.
- Craik, Katharine A., and Tanya Pollard, eds. *Shakespearean Sensations: Experiencing Literature in Early Modern England*. CUP. [2013] pp. x + 244. £49.57 ISBN 9 7811 0702 8005.
- Critchley, Simon, and Jamieson Webster. *The Hamlet Doctrine: Knowing Too Much, Doing Nothing*. Verso. [2013] pp. xi + 269. £14.99 ISBN 9 7817 8168 2562.
- Crystal, Ben, ed. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Springboard Shakespeare. Bloomsbury. [2012] pp. viii + 110. £6.99 ISBN 9 7814 0816 4631.
- Cummings, Brian. *Mortal Thoughts: Religion, Secularity and Identity in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture*. OUP. [2013] pp. xv + 367. £50 ISBN 9 7801 9967 7719.
- Cummings, Brian, and Freya Sierhuis, eds. *Passions and Subjectivity in Early Modern Culture*. Ashgate. [2013] pp. 328. £70 ISBN 9 7814 7241 3642.
- Daniel, Drew. *The Melancholy Assemblage: Affect and Epistemology in the English Renaissance*. FordUP. [2013] pp. xiii + 309. £34.13 ISBN 9 7808 2325 1278.
- Daugherty, Leo. *The Assassination of Shakespeare's Patron: Investigating the Death of the Fifth Earl of Derby*. Cambria. [2011] pp. 376. \$199.99 ISBN 9 7816 0497 8469.
- Dickson, Vernon Guy. *Emulation on the Shakespearean Stage*. Ashgate. [2013] pp. 216. £60 ISBN 9 7814 0946 9285.
- DiPietro, Cary, and Hugh Grady, eds. *Shakespeare and the Urgency of Now: Criticism and Theory in the 21st Century*. PalMac. [2013] pp. xxii + 212. £55 ISBN 9 7811 3701 7307.
- Dobski, Bernard J., and Dustin Gish, eds. *Shakespeare and the Body Politic*. Lexington. [2013] pp. xiv + 272. £44.95 ISBN 9 7807 3917 0953.
- Drakakis, John, and Dale Townshend, eds. *Macbeth: A Critical Reader*. Bloomsbury. [2013] pp. xv + 333. £55 ISBN 9 7805 6764 0796.
- Dupuis, Margaret, and Tiffany Grace. *Approaches to Teaching The Taming of the Shrew*. MLA. [2013] pp. xii + 248. £26.26 ISBN 9 7816 0329 1187.
- Edmondson, Paul, Erin Sullivan, and Paul Prescott, eds. *A Year of Shakespeare: Re-living the World Shakespeare Festival*. Bloomsbury. [2013] pp. 291. £43.79 ISBN 9 7814 0818 8149.
- Edmondson, Paul, and Stanley Wells, eds. *Shakespeare Beyond Doubt: Evidence, Argument, Controversy*. CUP. [2013] pp. 298. £19.99 ISBN 9 7811 0760 3288.
- Ellis, David. *The Truth About William Shakespeare: Fact, Fiction and Modern Biography*. EdinUP. [2013] pp. 208. pb £19.99 ISBN 9 7807 4864 6678.

- Erne, Lukas. *Shakespeare and the Book Trade*. CUP. [2013] pp. 316. £25.79 ISBN 9 7805 2176 5664.
- Erne, Lukas. *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*, 2nd edn. CUP. [2013] pp. 323. pb £19.99 ISBN 9 7811 0768 5062.
- Feather, Jennifer, and Catherine E. Thomas, eds. *Violent Masculinities: Male Aggression in Early Modern Texts and Culture*. Palgrave. [2013] pp. xi + 273. £60. ISBN 9 7811 3734 4748.
- Fitter, Chris. *Radical Shakespeare: Politics and Stagecraft in the Early Career*. Routledge. [2012] pp. vi + 330. £95 ISBN 9 7804 1589 7938.
- Floyd-Wilson, Mary. *Occult Knowledge, Science, and Gender on the Shakespearean Stage*. CUP. [2013] pp. xi + 236. £55 ISBN 9 7811 0703 6321.
- Forker, Charles R., ed. *The Troublesome Reign of John, King of England*. MUP. [2011] pp. 224. £55 ISBN 9 7807 1907 8989.
- Freistat, Neil, and Julia Flanders. *The Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship*. CUP. [2013] pp. 325. £19.99 ISBN 9 7805 2160 3294.
- Hamlin, Hannibal. *The Bible in Shakespeare*. OUP. [2013] pp. xvii + 378. £55 ISBN 9 7801 9967 7610.
- Herbrechter, Stefan, and Ivan Callus, eds. *Posthumanist Shakespeares*. PalMac. [2012] pp. xv + 261. £56 ISBN 9 7802 3036 0907.
- Holland, Peter, ed. *Coriolanus*. The Arden Shakespeare. Bloomsbury. [2013] pp. 536. £8.99 ISBN 9 7819 0427 1284.
- Kahan, Jeffrey. *Shakespiritualism: Shakespeare and the Occult, 1850–1950*. Palgrave. [2013] pp. 270. £61 ISBN 9 7811 3728 2200.
- Kelen, Sarah A., ed. *Renaissance Retrospections: Tudor Views of the Middle Ages*. MIP. [2013] pp. x + 234. £25.38 ISBN 9 7815 8044 1735.
- Kewes, Paulina, Ian W. Archer, and Felicity Heal, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*. OUP. [2012] pp. 800. £100 ISBN 9 7801 9956 5757.
- Ko, Yu Jin, and Michael W. Shurgot, eds. *Shakespeare's Sense of Character: On the Page and From the Stage*. Ashgate. [2013] pp. xvi + 264. £65. ISBN 9 7814 0944 0666.
- Kositsky, Lynne, and Roger A. Stritmatter. *On the Date, Sources and Design of Shakespeare's The Tempest*. McFarland. [2013] pp. x + 261. \$45 ISBN 9 7807 8647 1041.
- Lafont, Agnes, ed. *Shakespeare's Erotic Mythology and Ovidian Renaissance Culture*. Ashgate. [2013] pp. xiii + 202. £57.97 ISBN 9 7814 0945 1310.
- Lees-Jeffries, Hester. *Shakespeare and Memory*. OUP. [2013] pp. xiv + 228. £50 ISBN 9 7801 9967 4268.
- Lopez, Jeremy, ed. *Richard II: New Critical Essays*. Routledge. [2012] pp. 290. £140 ISBN 9 7822 3882 8469.
- Loughnane, Rory, and Edel Semple, eds. *Staged Transgression in Shakespeare's England*. Palgrave. [2013] pp. xii + 298. £55.25 ISBN 9 7811 3734 9347.
- Maley, Willy, and Rory Loughnane, eds. *Celtic Shakespeare: The Bard and the Borderers*. Ashgate. [2013] pp. xli + 324. £62.13 ISBN 9 7814 0942 2594.
- Maus, Katharine Eisaman. *Being and Having in Shakespeare*. OUP. [2013] pp. v + 141. £26.99 ISBN 9 7801 9969 8004.

- McCoy, Richard C. *Faith in Shakespeare*. OUP. [2013] pp. xvii + 194. £32.99 ISBN 9 7801 9994 5764.
- McEachern, Claire, ed. *Shakespearean Tragedy*, 2nd edn. CUP. [2013] pp. xiii + 302. £55 ISBN 9 7811 0701 9775.
- Moncrief, Kathryn M, Kathryn R McPherson, Sarah Enloe, and Ralph Alan Cohen, eds. *Shakespeare Expressed: Page, Stage, and Classroom in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. FDUP. [2013] pp. 314. £51.45 ISBN 9 7816 1147 5609.
- Morse, Ruth, Helen Cooper, and Peter Holland, eds. *Medieval Shakespeare: Pasts and Presents*. CUP. [2013] pp. xiv + 263. £60 ISBN 9 7811 0701 6279.
- Mudan Finn, Kavita. *The Last Plantagenet Consorts: Gender, Genre, and Historiography, 1440–1627*. Palgrave. [2012] pp. xii + 267. £61 ISBN 9 7802 3039 2984.
- Mulready, Cyrus. *Romance on the Early Modern Stage: English Expansion Before and After Shakespeare*. PalMac. [2013] pp. x + 251. £55 ISBN 9 7811 3732 2708.
- Munro, Lucy. *Archaic Style in English Literature, 1590–1674*. CUP. [2013] pp. xii + 308. £65 ISBN 1 1070 4279 8.
- Novy, Marianne. *Shakespeare and Outsiders*. OUP. [2013] pp. ix + 203. £53 ISBN 9 7801 9964 2366.
- Pascucci, Margherita. *Philosophical Readings of Shakespeare: 'Thou Art the Thing Itself'*. PalMac. [2013] pp. vii + 275. £58 ISBN 9 7811 3733 5357.
- Pask, Kevin. *The Fairy Way of Writing: Shakespeare to Tolkien*. JHUP. [2013] pp. 178. £45 ISBN 9 7814 2140 9825.
- Post, Jonathan, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare's Poetry*. OUP. [2013] pp. 784. £100 ISBN 9 7801 9960 7747.
- Power, Andrew J., and Rory Loughnane, eds. *Late Shakespeare: 1608–1613*. 2nd edn. CUP. [2013] pp. 358. £59.99 ISBN 9 7811 0701 6194.
- Ray, Sid. *Mother Queens and Princely Sons: Rogue Madonnas in the Age of Shakespeare*. PalMac. [2012] pp. xiii + 195. £56 ISBN 9 7811 3700 3799.
- Ryle, Simon. *Shakespeare, Cinema and Desire: Adaptation and Other Futures of Shakespeare's Language*. Palgrave. [2013] pp. 272. £50 ISBN 9 7811 3733 2059.
- Shalkwyk, David. *Hamlet's Dreams: The Robben Island Shakespeare*. Bloomsbury. [2013] pp. xvi + 191. pb £15.99 ISBN 9 7814 4112 9284.
- Shannon, Laurie. *The Accommodated Animal: Cosmopolity in Shakespearean Locales*. UChicP. [2013] pp. xvi + 290. \$78 ISBN 9 7802 2692 4168.
- Smith, Emma. *Macbeth: Language and Writing*. Student Guides. Bloomsbury. [2013] pp. xviii + 174. £30 ISBN 9 7814 7251 8286.
- Staznicky, Marta, ed. *Shakespeare's Stationers: Studies in Cultural Bibliography*. UPennP. [2013] pp. viii + 374. £48.13 ISBN 9 7808 1224 4540.
- Swift, Daniel. *Shakespeare's Common Prayers: The Book of Common Prayer and the Elizabethan Age*. OUP. [2013] pp. 289. £18.99 ISBN 9 7801 9983 8561.
- Taylor, Gary, and Terri Bourus, eds. *The Creation and Re-creation of Cardenio: Performing Shakespeare, Transforming Cervantes*. Palgrave. [2013] pp. 352. £19.16 ISBN 9 7811 3734 4205.

- Theile, Verena, and Andrew D. McCarthy, eds. *Staging the Superstitions of Early Modern Europe*. Ashgate. [2013] pp. 308. £65 ISBN 9 7814 0944 0086.
- Thornton Burnett, Mark. *Shakespeare and World Cinema*. CUP. [2013] pp. 290. £64.99 ISBN 9 7811 0700 3316.
- Uman, Deborah, and Sara Morrison, eds. *Staging the Blazon in Early Modern English Theatre*. Ashgate. [2013] pp. ix + 220. £63 ISBN 9 7814 0944 9003.
- van Es, Bart. *Shakespeare in Company*. OUP. [2013] pp. xii + 357. £26.99 ISBN 9 7801 9956 9311.
- Waldron, Jennifer. *Reformations of the Body: Idolatry, Sacrifice, and Early Modern Theatre*. PalMac. [2013] pp. xvi + 296. £61 ISBN 9 7811 3703 0047.
- Werstine, Paul. *Early Modern Playhouse Manuscripts and the Editing of Shakespeare*. CUP. [2013] pp. 446. £19.75 ISBN 9 7811 0751 5468.
- Wilson, Richard. *Free Will: Art and Power on Shakespeare's Stage*. ManUP. [2013] pp. iii + 466. £80 ISBN 9 7807 1909 1780.
- Wilson, Richard, Richard Dutton, and Alison Findlay, eds. *Region, Religion and Patronage: Lancastrian Shakespeare*. MUP. [2013] pp. 272. £15.99 ISBN 9 7807 1906 3695.
- Woods, Gillian. *Shakespeare's Unreformed Fictions*. OUP. [2013] pp. 256. £63 ISBN 9 7801 9967 1267.
- Woods, Gillian. *Shakespeare: Romeo and Juliet: A Reader's Guide to Essential Criticism*. PalMac. [2013] pp. xii + 182. £45 ISBN 9 7811 3703 0047.