

VI

Shakespeare

GABRIEL EGAN, ELINOR PARSONS, DANIEL CADMAN,
RICHARD WOOD, STEVE LONGSTAFFE AND
KATE WILKINSON

This chapter has three sections: 1. Editions and Textual Matters; 2. Shakespeare on Screen; 3. Criticism. Section 1 is by Gabriel Egan; section 2 is by Elinor Parsons; section 3 (a) is by Daniel Cadman; section 3 (b) is by Richard Wood; section 3 (c) is by Steve Longstaffe; section 3 (d) is by Kate Wilkinson.

1. Editions and Textual Matters

Unless the general editor Stanley Wells decides to include plays in which Shakespeare had only a minor role—such as *Edward III*, *Arden of Faversham*, *Sir Thomas More*, and *The Spanish Tragedy*—the Oxford Shakespeare series begun in 1982 with Gary Taylor's *Henry V* has come to completion with Anthony B. Dawson and Paul Yachnin's *Richard II*. The only other major critical edition this year was John Jowett's *Sir Thomas More* for the Arden Shakespeare Third Series. Dawson and Yachnin start their 118-page introduction to the play by acknowledging that they do not know if Shakespeare planned the whole second tetralogy when he sat down to write *Richard II*, 'but it seems likely that he entertained the idea of putting together a sequence' (p. 2). Dawson and Yachnin are sure that the earl of Essex did not mean to depose Queen Elizabeth but only to recover her favour, remove her advisers who were against him, and set up James VI as her successor. Essex might not have known that his followers had commissioned a performance of *Richard II* and they would not have known that there was an uprising planned for the next day (p. 5). (Actually, Dawson and Yachnin are a bit contradictory on this point, for in the next sentence they write that some of those who commissioned the performance would have known what was being planned). Two of those who commissioned the performance were descendants of the play's Northumberland, and of course Bolingbroke was Essex's ancestor. Dawson and Yachnin read Elizabeth's reference to 'this tragedy' being played

forty times in open streets and houses as only a *de casibus* generalization: the fall of great men happens thus often and in such places (p. 8).

A key question with this play is whether it was censored in performance or print. Dawson and Yachnin think that the full text (including the deposition scene) was written in 1595 and was always performed, and that only in print was the deposition scene omitted (pp. 9–11). The deposition scene, with its wordplay, just sounds like mid-1590s Shakespeare and not like his work ten years later. Of the ten extant exemplars of Q4 [1608], the first to print the deposition scene, three have no title page, six name the company as the Chamberlain's men (which they had not been for five years) and one has a variant title page naming them as the King's men and drawing attention to the inclusion of the deposition scene. If the deposition scene was omitted in the early performances—if Q1 [1597] represents the play as performed—then there ought, in Dawson and Yachnin's view, to be better stitching around the missing scene. Also, as Gurr points out, is hardly likely that the players held on to a scene that they were barred from performing in 1595 in the hope of later being permitted to play it, and then were allowed to perform it in 1607–8 in time for its appearance in Q4 of 1608. Cyndia Clegg argued that the deposition scene was censored in the 1590s not so much because of the deposition itself but because of its repeated insistence that the commons—that is, parliament—has to be satisfied and hence has priority over the monarchy.

The chronicler Raphael Holinshed's account of Bolingbroke's and Richard's entries to London after the usurpation focuses on divisions within society—aristocrats versus Londoners, and London's mayor and alderman versus London's rabble—that Shakespeare flattens out: everyone turns against Richard except the clergy. In particular, Shakespeare airbrushes the citizens out of the story and makes everyone a subject. This Dawson and Yachnin see as part of 'a movement within state-sponsored writing in the 1590s, a dominant reframing of the people as subjects of the crown rather than as citizens with traditional rights and responsibilities under civic as well as royal authority' (p. 26). Yet the play is radical, because although it articulates the dominant ideology it puts that ideology up for discussion amongst ordinary people, not least because it is a play for public performance (p. 29). The gardeners' scene is like a little inset play with its own audience and actors (the gardeners) who are articulate and well informed, and put on an allegory about proper kingship in which 'bushy, green excrescences' get lopped off (p. 31). The recurring disappointments of non-violence—the cancelled joust, the anticipated attack on Flint Castle that is not needed—are meant to make the audience 'wish for the assault that results in Richard's murder' and thus be 'a party to the regicide' (p. 37). Thus the play's first audiences are the inheritors of a kingdom secured for them by Richard's Christ-like sacrifice. Dawson and Yachnin at first suggest that there was no history play genre before Shakespeare invented it (pp. 40–3) but later they acknowledge the few surviving predecessors. Dawson and Yachnin think that *Richard II* is influenced by Shakespeare seeing *Thomas of Woodstock* in performance, but in fact the latter came later, as MacDonald P. Jackson showed in an article reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011].

In their section on 'Language' (pp. 57–66), Dawson and Yachnin rely on the *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*) to attribute the first use of *monarchize* to Thomas Nashe in 1592 (p. 62 n. 1). In fact William Warner used it in chapter 15 of *Albion's England* (STC 25079) in 1586. It ought to be on every general editor's checklist to ask 'First datings of words: *Literature Online* and *Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership* consulted?' Only occasionally do Dawson and Yachnin make a banal remark, such as the observation that language 'is the fundamental constituent of this and every Shakespeare play' (p. 66). Their section on 'Character' (pp. 66–78) is most unusual for a modern edition: it goes through the principals and describes and illustrates their personalities. Regarding 'The Play on the Stage' (pp. 78–109), Dawson and Yachnin observe that five pre-Folio quartos, each mentioning recent performance, show the popularity of *Richard II*. After an initial (relatively) well-documented stage history—at a private house in 1595, on a ship in 1607, revived at the Globe in 1631—the play appears only occasionally in the subsequent stage history before the twentieth century, despite there being much fuller records. Nahum Tate's Restoration adaptation was banned even after he revised it to relocate the story to Sicily. Lewis Theobald's wildly adapted version of 1719, including a doomed love interest between Aumerle and Northumberland's daughter, was highly popular. John Rich's production at Covent Garden in 1738 was largely faithful to Shakespeare's text and played up the topical relevance of the political aspects. Here two successive footnotes give virtually the same information about Rich's promptbook 'consisting of leaves taken from the Second Folio (1632) but with many handwritten changes and additions drawn from Pope' (p. 82 n. 2) and 'consists of leaves of the Second Folio (1632) with manuscript deletions, emendations, and additions deriving from Pope's edition' (p. 83 n. 1). Presumably one of these two notes was meant to be cut.

Edmund Kean revived the play in adapted form in 1815 so that Bolingbroke nearly gives the kingdom back to Richard, and Richard's queen finds him dead in prison. Charles Kean (Edmund's son) revived the play in 1857 with all the pictorial extravagance and historical accuracy we associate with Victorian theatre. Frank Benson's production of 1899 was perhaps better off for being witnessed 'after a fire had destroyed most of the scenery and costumes' (p. 86) so that attention focused instead on the central performance; it certainly did in twentieth-century productions. The big idea of John Barton's 1973 Royal Shakespeare Company production in which Ian Richardson and Richard Pascoe alternated in the roles of Richard and Bolingbroke was that 'kings, like actors, are "twin-natured", their personhood and their role intricately entwined' (p. 90), and it emphasized that Richard goes from being a two-bodied man to a one-bodied man while Bolingbroke makes the opposite journey.

Dawson and Yachnin begin their section on 'Textual Analysis' (pp. 109–18) with a disclaimer that they have done no original textual work and are not even going to explain the problems in full since that might 'bog down our presentation of what we regard as the key issues' (p. 109 n. 1); they simply point the reader to existing textual scholarship and, for 'the fullest discussion', the *Textual Companion* to the *Oxford Complete Works* of 1986. The pre-Folio

quartos are Q1 [1597], Q2 [1598], Q3 [1598], Q4 [1608], and Q5 [1615], forming in essence a single line of reprints derived from Q1, which was set from autograph copy or a transcript thereof. Q4 was the first to print the deposition scene, but its text of that is 'marked by omissions and mislineations' (p. 110). F is complex, being mainly a reprint of Q3, but it has 'some fleeting connection with Q5 near the end and it restores a significant number of readings from Q1 that had suffered from errors and corruption in the move to Q2 and Q3' (p. 110). The exemplar of Q3 used as F copy must first have been supplemented by something else (perhaps in the form of annotations) since F contains the deposition scene that is not in Q3, and it is not Q4's and Q5's version of the deposition scene. That something else seems to have been a promptbook made from a transcript of Shakespeare's papers, but the term 'promptbook' here must be understood in the light of William B. Long's insistence that early modern documents used to run plays were not as regularized and tidy as those used in later centuries. Q1 is closest to Shakespeare's hand so it is basic to a modern edition, but an editor must decide how much weight to give those Folio differences from Q1 that might on the one hand reflect Shakespeare's second thoughts recorded in the promptbook that supplemented Q3 as F's copy or else might simply be corruptions introduced by other agents in the transmission. In making this judgement, Dawson and Yachnin have admitted more F readings than the Arden 3 and New Cambridge Shakespeare editions of the play, but not so many as the Oxford *Complete Works*.

Just what is it about F that points to a theatrical source for its variants? The traditional answer is that F's stage directions are fuller, less readerly, and more theatrically minded than the quartos', and Dawson and Yachnin go along with this, although it requires them to implicitly disagree with Long about the nature of early modern theatrical manuscripts. Thus where Q1 has an imprecise stage direction '*Enter king and Queene, &c.*' F's expansion of this 'is the kind of thing that it would be necessary to specify in the theatre' while Q1's '*&c.*' is a mark of the author in the heat of composition (p. 111). F also adds sound effects that are missing from or minimalist in Q1 and its stage directions fix what is plainly wrong in Q1, although it also misses some opportunities to do so. For this reason, Dawson and Yachnin tend to favour F's stage directions or a mix of F's and Q1's. But for F's early exit of Gaunt ten lines before the end of 1.1 (in order to enter at the start of 1.2), Dawson and Yachnin go for Q1's reading of no early exit because they think Shakespeare wanted to break the so-called Law of Re-entry at this point and only a bookkeeper would so fussily add such an unmotivated exit for Gaunt just as his son's fate is being decided upon (p. 112). However, as C.J. Sisson long ago pointed out, Gaunt does have a possible motivation for leaving in that his son has just publicly refused to obey him, and the last thing Gaunt says is that he should not have to ask twice to be obeyed. F also cuts, for theatrical reasons, some of Q1's wordiness and since Dawson and Yachnin use Q1 as their control text they feel they have to retain these cut lines. This seems illogical: if one follows F's variant stage directions because they reflect what got performed one should also follow its theatrical cutting of lines because these

cuts also reflect what got performed. Naturally, Dawson and Yachnin follow Q1 in oaths that F, reflecting the swearing ban of 1606, softens.

Puzzlingly, F has some differences from Q1 that are indifferent substitutions, and yet also restores some Q1 readings that Q2–Q3 corrupt. How come? Because the promptbook used to supplement an exemplar of Q3 used as F's copy contained a few authorized revisions. In a footnote (p. 114 n. 1) Dawson and Yachnin explain that Q1 probably was not set directly from authorial papers but rather a transcript of them because (i) Q1 is relatively clean (and that is hard to achieve when setting from Shakespeare's papers) and (ii) it has only eight occurrences of the exclamation spelt *O* against twenty-eight of it spelt *Oh* and Shakespeare preferred the former. There yet remains the problem that F sometimes departs from Q3 to set something worse or nonsense that would look similar in secretary handwriting, such as *plated* > *placed*. Why would the annotator making F's copy cross out a good Q3 reading and write in a bad or nonsense one? Dawson and Yachnin suspect that in fact the manuscript readings got into F not by being written onto an exemplar of Q3 but by the Folio compositors sometimes looking at the manuscript itself and misreading it. They are sceptical of Gary Taylor and John Jowett's argument that the manuscript promptbook was itself imperfect and had been patched at the end from an exemplar of Q5, causing F's agreement with Q5 against Q3 in the final part of the play.

So, how many of F's differences from Q1 should an editor incorporate? Dawson and Yachnin do not assume that because a reading was in the manuscript promptbook they should adopt it: 'since an Elizabethan playbook is the product of multiple agents—scribes, bookkeepers, actors, author—it is difficult to be sure that a particular variant originates with Shakespeare, rather than someone else' (p. 115). Thus they take the old New Bibliographical line that for authority one must be able to trace a reading back to Shakespeare and not just to the theatre company or to what got performed. Dawson and Yachnin provide a convenient list of the most important of their adoptions of F's variants from Q1 (pp. 115–16). What to do about the inconsistency of the naming of the two kings in Q1 and F? Dawson and Yachnin list all the variations and announce that they will just use RICHARD and BOLINGBROKE except in the play's opening stage direction where they give Richard his title. Where F uses contractions that appear to regularize metre Dawson and Yachnin have followed them, on the assumption that F represents here what got spoken in performance. This too seems to contradict their earlier-mentioned practice of retaining lines from Q1 that F omits—since they did not there adopt what got spoken—and it does not indicate how they think pronunciation cues got into the promptbook; presumably they think someone copying it out knew how to represent metrical regularity by using elision.

Dawson and Yachnin end their introduction with a statement of their 'Editorial Procedures' (pp. 119–28), summarizing that Q1 is basic except for the deposition scene, where F is basic. Dawson and Yachnin collate Q1/F variants but do not routinely collate Q2, Q3, Q4, and Q5 readings unless an F variant or an adopted reading first appeared in one of those. For the deposition scene, Dawson and Yachnin collate all Q4/F variants. Dawson and

Yachnin helpfully take the trouble to explain how collation notes work using illustrations. Sometimes they collate readings that they do not adopt but which many other people have adopted. Unlike other Oxford Shakespeare editions, Dawson and Yachnin put all of their alterations to, or inventions of, stage directions into square brackets and collate them like any other emendation, and of course stage direction variation between Q1 and F is collated.

And so to the text itself, and a survey of some of its most interesting choices. At 1.4.23 Dawson and Yachnin print '[RICHARD] Ourself and Bushy, Bagot here and Green' which is Q6's reading. Q1 has just 'Our selfe and Bushie' (making a short line) and F has 'Our selfe, and *Bushy*: heere *Bagot* and *Greene*'. There is no discussion of the variant. At 1.4.52–3 they print '*Enter Bushy* | [RICHARD] Bushy, what news?' which is F's reading rather than Q1's '*Enter Bushie with newes*'. Dawson and Yachnin think this an example of F being the more theatricalized text (p. 111). They do not discuss the possibility that the variant arises from mistaken expansion of *w*^t, which can stand for *with* and for *what*, so that something like 'Enter Bushie *w*^t newes' in manuscript could have given rise to both readings. At 2.1.18 Q1 reads 'As praises of whose taste the wise are found' and common emendations include making the last word *fond*, so that the meaning is ironic: even the wise are fond of praise, and Richard is not wise. F at this point is multitudinously corrupted by degeneration through the quartos: 'As praises of his state: then there are sound'. Dawson and Yachnin go for the Oxford *Complete Works* emendation of the last word to *feared*, which could easily be misread as *found*, especially as the next line ends in *sound*. Dawson and Yachnin follow Samuel W. Singer's 1856 edition in printing 'For young hot colts, being reined, do rage the more' (2.1.70) where Q1 has '... being ragde...' and F has '... being rag'd...'.¹

Describing the very beginnings of Bolingbroke's rebellion, at 2.1.280 Northumberland lists the approaching forces. Q1 reads 'That Harry duke of Herford, Rainold L. Cobham | That late broke from the Duke of Exeter' and F has substantively the same. The trouble is, historically it was not Cobham who broke from Exeter but Thomas, son of Richard the earl of Arundel, as Holinshed reports. It looks like a whole line has dropped out from between these two, and editors since Edmond Malone have supplied one from Holinshed. Dawson and Yachnin go for the Riverside edition's reading, 'Thomas, son and heir to the Earl of Arundel'. At 3.2.40, Q1 has Richard say that thieves 'range abroad vnseene | In murthers and in outrage bouldy here' during the night, just as they do during his absence from his country. F has '... bloody here', but Dawson and Yachnin follow Henry N. Hudson's emendation to '... boldly here' so that *boldly* modifies *range abroad* not *outrage*. In one of his several accesses of self-rebuke when facing Bolingbroke's rebellion, Richard says 'Awake thou coward Maiesty thou sleepest' (3.2.84) while F has 'Awake thou sluggard Maiestie, thou sleepest'. Dawson and Yachnin follow F here, arguing (i) that the difference must be a revision, and (ii) that the point about waking someone sits better with *sluggard* than with *coward*.

Justifying the rebels' side, Northumberland says that Bolingbroke has promised that he returns from banishment only to secure his inheritance and nothing more, expressed in Q1 as 'This swears he, as he is princesse iust'

(3.3.118). F has ‘This swears he, as he is a Prince, is iust’, which makes better sense but could just be an independent printshop attempt to restore sense. Sisson argued that the manuscript probably used an abbreviation for *and* so that the line ended *prince & just* and since this abbreviation (somewhat like a modern italic *e*) could also stand for terminal *-es* the compositor of Q1 read it as *princes iust* which he regularized to Q1 ‘princesse iust’. Accepting this argument, Dawson and Yachnin print ‘This swears he, as he is a prince and just’. At 5.6.8 appears Northumberland’s list of captured counter-revolutionaries, and Dawson and Yachnin follow F to print ‘The heads of Salisbury, Spencer, Blunt and Kent’ where Q1 has ‘The heades of Oxford, Salisbury, Blunt and Kent’ which is unhistorical: Oxford had no part in the conspiracy and F’s reading looks like an authoritative revision. There are no appendices to Dawson and Yachnin’s edition; all that follows the main text is an index. At 309 pages it is almost exactly half the length of Charles Forker’s rival Arden 3 edition reviewed in *YWES* 83[2004]; the editions are about equal in words per page at around 450.

The title page of John Jowett’s Arden 3 edition of *Sir Thomas More* gives a taste of the textual complexity he faced: ‘SIR THOMAS MORE | Original Text by | Anthony Munday and Henry Chettle | Censored by | Edmund Tilney | Revisions co-ordinated by Hand C | Revised by | Henry Chettle, Thomas Dekker, | Thomas Heywood and William Shakespeare | Edited by | JOHN JOWETT’. Notice the careful attempt to distinguish various labours, including the present editor’s. Jowett’s introduction to the play runs to 129 pages but is supplemented by eight appendices totalling 162 pages, or nearly one-third of the entire book. These appendices amount to an additional small monograph on the textual situation, comprising 50,000 words. The key starting points for all this are the survival of the play only in manuscript form, including a few pages in Shakespeare’s handwriting, its potentially problematic theme—the life and martyrdom of the Catholic More—and the manuscript’s clear signs of censorship and revision, including the insertion of several leaves holding what are called the Additions.

Jowett dates original composition of a lost draft of the play by Munday (and maybe Chettle) to ‘in or around 1600’ (p. 5), which draft Munday then copied out entirely to make the present manuscript’s Original Text. This the censor Tilney saw, and on it he marked his famous cuts, including the whole of the London citizens’ insurrection against foreigners that the play depicts (p. 5). Then, ‘Most likely, the revisions all came after Tilney’s censorship of the Original Text’ (p. 6). In the Malone Society reprint of the play in 1911, W.W. Greg used single letters to designate the various hands (that is, handwritings distinct to one person) that he found in the manuscript, and most of them have now been identified: Hand A = Chettle, Hand B = Heywood, Hand C = a playhouse annotator/scribe, Hand D = Shakespeare, Hand E = Dekker. How come the revisions do not cut the insurrection entirely, as Tilney insisted? If revised after 1603, the new peace with Spain would have eased anti-Catholic tensions so that a play about the Catholic martyr More would be less incendiary, and as a King’s man Shakespeare was known to be safe with insurrection scenes. The surviving manuscript is, nonetheless, mutilated and

intermediate between the finished play Munday originally wrote and ‘any theatrical future the play may have had’ (p. 7).

One of the play’s many perplexities is its being written by the apparently anti-Catholic Munday, of whom Jowett offers a brief life (pp. 9–15). Munday worked with the Catholic hunter Richard Topcliffe and had access to the manuscript life of More written by Nicholas Harpsfield and owned by More’s grandson (found upon his arrest) that formed the basis of the play. The upshot of Jowett’s biography is that Munday was a self-contradictory figure and that perhaps the play was his atonement for helping to torture Catholics. Francis Meres, in *Palladis Tamia* [1598], praised Munday as ‘our best plotter’, presumably meaning writer of pitches to theatre companies. Next comes a brief life of Chettle (pp. 15–18), who may have co-authored the Original Text and definitely authored Addition I. Chettle probably also wrote the revised scene 5 as copied out by Hand C. In this account of his life, Jowett claims that Chettle was ‘editor and perhaps part-author’ (p. 16) of *Greene’s Groatsworth of Wit*, although in the past Jowett has more positively claimed that Chettle was the author of it.

Jowett gives a brief account of Shakespeare’s contribution to the play, which is by far the most extensive of the Additions (pp. 18–22). The scene of a hungry insurrection being pacified by patricians that Shakespeare wrote for *Sir Thomas More* he reused in *Coriolanus*. Shakespeare appears also to have written the soliloquy that forms Addition III, transcribed by Hand C, and Jowett thinks that he also wrote some of the soliloquy at the start of the next scene (9.6–18), in which case he was more intimately and extensively involved in the revision process than has previously been thought. There follows a brief life of Dekker (pp. 22–3), who wrote the new bits of scene 8 transcribed by Hand C and also the bit in his own handwriting. He seems to have added sympathy for the character Falconer, who gets an enforced haircut. The university-educated dramatist Heywood being Hand B is not entirely certain, but Jowett accepts it and summarizes his oeuvre (pp. 23–6). Heywood annotated the Original Text with new speeches and wrote three sections of the Additions; his main contribution was bulking out the comic stuff for Clown Betts to soften the insurrection scenes, making them seem less dangerous. Continuing the biographical approach, Jowett notes that Tilney’s own father was an usher in Henry VIII’s court and his mother was one of Catherine Howard’s chamberwomen. Tilney’s comments on More’s ‘good service’ show that he favoured there being a play about More and his aim was to enable it, not suppress it. Hand C is an unidentified scribe and theatre annotator and he wrote the plots of *2 Seven Deadly Sins* and *2 Fortune’s Tennis*. We can tell that he was copying not composing the material in his handwriting, as he makes errors an author would not make, and he was overall supervisor of the revisions.

Putting the play in the context of other drama of its time (pp. 29–47), Jowett notes that there was a late 1590s fashion for king-adviser plays, started by Shakespeare’s Falstaff. Jowett relies on Berger, Bradford, and Sondergard’s index of play characters to assert that in drama written between ‘the formation of the professional theatres’ (presumably 1576) and 1625 there are characters called Doll only in *2 Henry IV*, *1 Oldcastle*, *Sir Thomas More*, *Northward Ho!*,

The Alchemist, and *Epicene* (p. 30). But in fact there is a Dorothy who is repeatedly called Doll (in dialogue, stage directions, and speech prefixes) in John Fletcher's *Monsieur Thomas* that the Database of Early English Playbooks dates 1610–c.1616. There is also a Doll in Francis Merbury's *The Marriage between Wit and Wisdom*, which as Jowett discusses is the source for the title of the play-within-the-play in *Sir Thomas More* (p. 64). The date of Merbury's play is uncertain, but it survives only in a manuscript dated 1579. Jowett details how *Sir Thomas More* uses, and strategically departs from, Holinshed's account of the insurrection and More's rise to power. Tilney altered the words used for the misbehaving foreigners in the Original Text from *stranger* and *Frenchman* to *Lombard*, and in his long note Tilney called the rebellion a mutiny against the Lombards. This deflected attention away from Dutch and French Protestant immigrants, and the revisers took the hint, playing up the specifically Lombardian angle.

Regarding the sources (pp. 47–70), Jowett details the play's dependence on Holinshed and on Harpsfield's manuscript *Life and Death of Sir Thomas More*, and other more minor borrowings. Harpsfield's account is in part based on William Roper's memoir, the latter being the source for More's kidney stones (p. 57). The minor sources include a story about Thomas Cromwell (More's Protestant successor at court) in John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, which the play transplants onto More in the Falconer hair-cutting scene. Merbury's *The Marriage between Wit and Wisdom* supplied only the title of the play-within-the-play: the content comes from R. Wever's *Lusty Juventus* (published c.1550). *Sir Thomas More* conflates the father (politician) and son (poet) Surreys to make a figure who combines what More cannot, the competing roles of a man of letters and a man of state. The word *Lambard* literally means long-beard, and that somewhat explains the scene about Falconer's long hair and the missing beard problem in the inset play, and the term has hermit-like associations. More famously wore a hair shirt, and the play is insistently concerned with beards as markers of maturity and wisdom.

At this point Jowett turns to *Sir Thomas More* as 'A Play for the Theatre' (pp. 96–121) and begins by noting that it is sometimes assumed that the play was abandoned and never performed in the early modern period. However, it is clear that those involved in the revisions (especially Hand C) were working hard to make something performable, and we cannot assume that they failed. Scott McMillin showed that the Original Text has fifty-nine speaking parts, which is a very high number but can be handled by fourteen men and five boys using doubling, and Jowett reckons that the same number can handle the revised text too. Hand C's annotation '*Mess / T Goodal*' alongside a late addition of a messenger's speech announcing the arrival of the Lord Mayor's party at the start of scene 9 presumably specifies the actor, Thomas Goodale, to be used because the man usually playing messengers in other scenes was unavailable at this point. If so, this tells us that when Hand C wrote this annotation the casting had been worked out.

Dating of the Original Text to around 1600—which is argued at length elsewhere in this edition—rules out Strange's men as the players since they had disbanded by then, and rules out the Admiral's men since Philip Henslowe's Diary, full for this period, makes no mention of it. It is too big a play for a

boys' company. Derby's men, who emerged to challenge the Chamberlain's/Admiral's men duopoly in the late 1590s, are a possibility as the commissioners of the Original Text. Derby's men disbanded after 1602 and that would give an opportunity for the play to migrate to the Chamberlain's/King's men and get its revisions. We now suspect from David Kathman's work that Goodale and Hand C (who wrote the plot of *2 Seven Deadly Sins*) were Chamberlain's men, but Jowett points out that Hand C also wrote the plot of *Fortune's Tennis*, an Admiral's men's play. Kathman would seem to have Hand C switching from the Admiral's men (for whom he wrote out *John a Kent and John a Cumber*) to the Chamberlain's men (for *2 Seven Deadly Sins*) and then back to the Admiral's men (for *Fortune's Tennis*). This is not impossible: actors, we know, did move between companies, so why not scribes? Jowett thinks that the Worcester's/Queen's men company is an alternative possible company for the commissioning of the revisions, since Heywood was a sharer in it, and he, Chettle, and Dekker wrote for this company. Also, its patron Queen Anne (Anne of Denmark) had Catholic sympathies. No productions are known before the twentieth century, and Jowett lists all those between 1900 and the completion of his edition in 2011 (pp. 108–10).

Continuing a welcome new trend in scholarly editions, Jowett offers a helpful section explaining his work called 'The Edition: A Reader's Guide' (pp. 121–9). There are gaps in the manuscript that can with reasonable confidence be filled in conjecturally (as recorded in the Commentary) and gaps that cannot; both are noted by <...>, but where individual letters are indecipherable the brackets are not used and instead the word is treated as an emendation. The play is represented essentially as the revisers intended it. But what to do about things that Tilney wanted cut that the revisers left uncut? Jowett leaves them uncut. Where the revised state offers alternatives, both states are present in this edition. Where this edition's copy text switches from Original Text to an Addition, this is marked by a horizontal rule labelled on each side with the respective source. Where there is text in the Original Text that overlaps with a revision, it has been replaced and reproduced in an appendix. In the play text, the interventions of writers other than the main one at that point are recorded by underlining to show what was cancelled and superscripted sigla to show what was added, but the main writer's changes of mind are not. Thus to show that Hand C altered Shakespeare's speech prefix Jowett prints 'ALL CITIZENS ^CLINCOLN^C We'll be ruled by you', in which what Shakespeare originally wrote (just the word 'all' in the manuscript) is underlined to show that Hand C deleted it and what Hand C added is marked by superscripted sigla. Also the added material in another hand is styled in a sans serif typeface (not represented in this review) since we can sometimes tell that something is added but not who added it; in such cases there are no sigla, just the typeface change.

Where a dramatist deleted his own material and supplied an alternative in its place, the deleted matter is not preserved in the body of this edition (since the authorial intention to remove and replace it is clear), but where he deleted material and did not offer a replacement the deleted matter is present in the body of the edition and marked as deleted, on the grounds that this deletion is unlikely to be the consequence of immediate second thoughts but rather

belongs to a later stage of revision. Where omission is marked, it is done by underlining if just a few words are involved, or by marginal vertical lining if more, both with sigla at each end of the line if we know who did the deleting. At this point in the explanation Jowett writes that 'In longer deleted passages, identifiable hands other than the main author or scribe of the passage in question are marked with superscript and subscript letters as follows' (p. 125), but in the example that follows I see no superscript letters showing identifiable other hands, only subscript letters showing whose hand did the deleting. Comparing the example with the same text in the body of the edition (3.1–8) it appears that one of Tilney's annotations, represented by '^T*Mend this*^T', has been accidentally omitted from the example. Another small slip is that Jowett writes that 'Superscript and subscript letters are explained on p. 486' but in fact page 486 is part of an appendix reprinting the source material.

To illustrate his method in practice, Jowett takes a complex case from Hand D where Shakespeare revised himself *currente calamo* and then Hand C, reading over what Shakespeare had written, could not quite make sense of the heavily corrected passage so he slashed through it and added a joining phrase to produce what he thought made sense. The result is what Jowett represents as 'Make them your feet. ·_CTo kneel to be forgiven | Is safer wars than ever you can make | Whose discipline is riot. | In, in, to your obedience! Why, even your hurly | Cannot proceed but by obedience.·_C | '^CTell me but this:'^C What rebel captain,' (6.125–30). This decodes as Hand C deleting 'To kneel to be . . . by your obedience' and inserting the phrase 'Tell me but this' to replace it. But in fact Hand C did not delete the first five words, 'To kneel to be forgiven', but rather started his deletion at 'Is safer wars', apparently thinking that Shakespeare meant 'Make them your feet to kneel to be forgiven. Is safer wars . . .' rather than (as Jowett thinks Shakespeare meant) 'Make them your feet. To kneel to be forgiven is safer wars . . .'. Thus Hand C got himself thoroughly confused about how to parse the sentence he thought began 'Is safer wars . . .' and gave up on it, deleting the lot and making a bridge with 'Tell me but this:'. Yet Jowett marks 'To kneel to be forgiven' as part of Hand C's deletion. Why? The answer is that 'in order to preserve the continuity of the text as Shakespeare left it, Hand C's implicit alteration of the sentence structure is not followed' (p. 129). In other words, Jowett admits that it is impossible in one text to fully and precisely represent just what was going on in such a complex case—'A single text cannot, finally, be both post-revision and pre-revision' (p. 129)—but an editor 'can go a long way' in that direction, and he has tried.

The text of *Sir Thomas More* occupies pages 131–326. Where there are gaps in the manuscript, Jowett sometimes leaves them as gaps (recording previous editors' guesses in the notes) and sometimes uses one of the guesses or his own and records in the notes the alternatives previously guessed at. In the List of Roles, Jowett shows an interestingly fresh approach to the ordering of names, giving first 'DOLL Williamson' then 'WILLIAMSON *her husband, a carpenter*' whereas traditionally husbands have come before wives even where, as here, hers is the larger and more complex role. At 1.110–12, where the manuscript has an extensive gap through damage, Jowett patches it by taking from Holinshed Lincoln's account of how London's preachers felt

about speaking out against the wrongs committed by the foreigners. Scene 4 exists in two forms: the Original Text version and a revised version in which Heywood copied out the original lines and added extra ones for the Clown Betts. The former version, marked for deletion (probably by Tilney), is relegated to Appendix I by Jowett, and the latter is used in the main text. Scene 5 is one of the Additions and is written in Hand C but may have been composed by Chettle; it has no equivalent in the surviving Original Text, but there may once have been one.

In scene 6, the first 165 lines are Shakespeare's added dramatization of More quelling a riot with rhetoric, and quite appropriately Jowett here expends his greatest effort in figuring out the order of writing and rewriting. To judge from Jowett's description, line 6.31 in the manuscript reads

now prenty
Lin how say yo^u prentisses simple downe wth him

with 'prentisses simple downe wth him' written first, then 'how say yo^u' tacked on the front and 'now prenty' interlined above. (It is not clear how Jowett knows that 'how say yo^u' was written after what follows it.) The problem is figuring out what 'prenty' means. Jowett decides that it is an abbreviation for *prentices* so he expands the line to read: 'LINCOLN How say you now, prentices? Prentices "simple"? Down with him!'

Later in scene 6, the manuscript has two successive lines for rebels—one saying that they will not listen to Lord Surrey, the next saying they want to hear Lord Shrewsbury—each of which is preceded by the speech prefix 'all' (6.44–5). Hand C deleted the second speech prefix as redundant, but Jowett reckons what Shakespeare meant was for 'SOME CITIZENS' to say the first line and 'OTHER CITIZENS' to say the second, which is how he presents the pair. This makes sense of a rebel multitude expressing multiple, incompatible opinions—which they tend to do in Shakespeare—as when a few lines later some call for More and some for Surrey to speak. However, this means that Jowett thinks he knows Shakespeare's intention better than Hand C did, even though Hand C worked in the theatre alongside Shakespeare. This is editorial confidence indeed, but it is justified by Jowett's treatment of the moments later in the scene where Hand C clearly misunderstands what Shakespeare is up to. After More has started his persuasive speech showing the error of rebellion, one of the rebels says 'Before God, that's as true as gospel' (6.100). But who says it? Shakespeare gave the line to 'Bettes' which Jowett thinks meant George Betts, but Hand C deleted that prefix and gave it to Lincoln. Jowett leans towards Hand C's choice, pointing out that Lincoln is elsewhere in the scene amenable to More's person and his mode of reasoning, while George Betts wanted to hear Surrey and Shrewsbury speak. 'Either reading is playable', notes Jowett, and the style of his presentation of the speech prefixes ('GEORGE BETTS^C LINCOLN^C') keeps both options before the reader. This is an interestingly tricky case for application of the usual editorial criterion of authorial intention, since Shakespeare's intentions clearly included letting Hand C finish his work for him, hence the incomplete and/or imprecise speech prefixes elsewhere in the scene. At 6.145 there is a typographical glitch

in Jowett's collation ('_145 that] why yo^u that') since an underscore (a relic of underlining from the previous note?) ought not to precede the line number.

The lines at 7.16–29 are marked as deleted in the manuscript by a vertical rule in the right margin, which rule Jowett reproduces in his edition and labels at either end with a superscripted T, the siglum for Tilney. But the collation note reads '16–29] *Marked for omission, probably MS (Ch)*', which seems to indicate that Chettle drew the deletion rule. Perhaps Jowett means that Chettle drew the rule but Tilney was the force behind it because he demanded omission of the insurrection, and the lines deleted are about civic unrest. Or does Jowett simply mean that the lines are doubly deleted? At 8.3–5 Jowett prints '... the provision of the power above, | Fitted and shaped just to that strength of nature | Which we are born with. Good God, good God', in which *with* is an editorial addition—the manuscript reads 'borne good'—made on the assumption that it is needed and that Munday omitted it. One might argue that it is unnecessary, since the *strength of nature* could be an abstract quality that we are born *as* rather than born *with*. Where an Addition is a copying out by Hand C of a scene for which we also have Munday's Original Text, we can correct Hand C's copying errors by reference to the Original Text. Thus the line at 8.140 in Addition IV (in Hand C) reads (in modernized form) 'Hath borne the same of your Lord Chancellor' but the Original Text this replaced reads (again in modernized form) 'Hath borne the fame of your Lord Chancellor'. Jowett decides that Hand C simply misread *fame* as *same* when copying it out. Thus although Addition IV is the main authority here—because it is a revised form of the scene—the Original Text equivalent is a check upon its readings.

When at 9.66 More says that the play he has chosen for the entertainment of the London aldermen has a 'liberal argument', Jowett feels the need to explain that *liberal* 'did not have its present political usage'. Glossing can involve difficult decisions about the ordinary reader's vocabulary, but I would not have thought that the political sense of *liberal* is so dominant that other senses need to be pointed out, since we still use the word to mean generous or copious (a liberal serving) and undoctinaire (liberal Judaism, liberal Christianity). Perhaps Jowett is thinking of his book's reception in America, where *liberal* is more narrowly understood. That Jowett retains the core New Bibliographical assumption (*pace* William B. Long and his adherents) that authorial stage directions can be distinguished from theatricalized ones is clear from his characterization of the stage direction '*Enters . . . so many Aldermen as may . . .*' (9.91.1–2) as 'typical of an author's SD, in that it leaves the determination of exact numbers to be resolved later by the theatre company'. More reassures his wife that the Lord Cardinal's men will do their best and that 'They that would better comes not at our feast' (9.127), as Jowett prints it. The manuscript's '*. . . their feast*' seems wrong since it is the Mores' feast, not the actors. The reading *our* is Jowett's own invention, based on the logical necessity and on the likelihood that Munday misread from his own papers (when making this fair copy, the Original Text) and picked up '*. . . their feast*' from its rhyme with the previous line '*. . . their best*'. Jowett considers and rejects Jonathan Hope's and Richard Proudfoot's alternative emendations of '*. . . their feats*' and '*. . . this feast*'.

At 9.359–60 there is another typographical error in the collation notes: ‘359 than] then o^r owne lorde, 360 first -] first MS (followed by an erased word . . .’. The underlining, which represents manuscript deletion, should end with the comma after ‘lorde’ rather than continuing into the line number and lemma for the next note. Usually, where the manuscript is unreadable Jowett just marks a gap and in his notes he gives the various inventions editors have offered to fill the gap, but at 13.19 he is confident enough print one of his own in ‘MORE True, son, here’s <no strife,>’ and gives a defence of it. Finally, and crucially, at 16.188 Munday’s manuscript has More say that female modesty is such an attractive garment ‘as it is neuer out of fashis: sits as faire’. Everyone agrees that *fashis* is a mistake for *fashion* (spelt *fashið*), and Greg read this as vital evidence that Munday’s writing here—Greg did not know it was Munday’s and called it Hand S—was merely scribal copying of another’s work, on the grounds that authors do not make such mistakes in copying their own words. Jowett disagrees: ‘the required reading is so obvious that an unconscious slip of the pen is plausible: perhaps anticipating the end of the next word, “sits”, or a refraction of a residual anxiety about the metre of “it is”’.

In Appendix I (pp. 327–43) Jowett presents in modernized form the passages in the Original Text that were replaced in revision, with explanatory and collation notes detailing conjectured and disputed readings where the manuscript is damaged or seems simply in error. The much longer Appendix II (pp. 344–94) is ‘Textual Analysis’ and it begins with a description and history of the play manuscript. Aside from the two-leaf wrapper, there are twenty folio leaves, thirteen of them the Original Text and seven the Additions, which are ‘inserted in three separate places’ (p. 344). Except for Addition I, the Additions are inserted into the Original Text as close as possible to the spots where they are needed. At the point where the two largest Additions, II and IV, are inserted, leaves have been removed from the Original Text because the Additions replace them; but of course there are overlaps before and after the new material. However, Addition I (folio 6) is well out of place being between folio 5 and folios 7–9, but Peter W.M. Blayney worked out from the presence of a wormhole in folio 6 that it used to be in the right place—between folios 18 and 19—because the hole on folio 6 matches the location of those on folios 22, 21, 20, and 19 (in order of vermicular consumption). Jowett does not give the full story of this fascinating piece of detective work.

Table 1 (pp. 348–50) represents the layout of the manuscript pictorially. This is a diagram of what is on each page of the manuscript, giving folio numbers, which Hand did the writing, and the scene and line references from Jowett’s edition. The diagram is hampered by having to represent on the surface of this edition’s pages both sides of the manuscript’s pages. To fully visualize the manuscript it would have been helpful if Jowett could have given up twenty leaves of his edition to a representation that used one leaf in his book for one leaf in the manuscript. Jowett here describes the two slips that were pasted onto folios 11b and 14a but without using the special designations that he uses for them in Table 2 below, which are ‘folio 11*b’ and ‘folio 13*a’. These numbers derive from Greg’s (confusing) designations for these slips as

11* and 13*, but since Jowett's *a* and *b* helpfully record which sides of the leaves the slips were pasted onto he ought to have called them 11*b and 14*a.

Jowett characterizes the Original Text as a 'fluently written fair copy', but once the revisions were made it was so untidy—with pointers to and from the Additions—that 'a fresh transcript would probably have been needed before the play could have progressed any further' (p. 353). Such a fresh transcript may well have been made: we cannot assume that because the surviving manuscript is messy the play never got performed. Jowett gives a neat summary of the relationship between Tilney's censorship and the revisions, observing that 'The revisers proceeded with disregard for Tilney's demands, or knew nothing of them, or were involved before Tilney saw the MS' (p. 358). It is tempting to speculate that Tilney did not see the manuscript until after the revisions were made, but this cannot be since the manuscript was too messy by then to be given to the Master of the Revels. Decisively for this idea, there are copious censoring marks by Tilney in the Original Text and none in the revisions, which would be an extraordinary coincidence if he saw both.

Jowett surveys the various attempts to reconcile Tilney's censorship with the revisers' actions, including multiple rounds of partial censorship of early versions of the manuscript and the idea that the revisions were made while Tilney was looking at the manuscript. Jowett points out the obvious problems with these: even if the revisers were responding to only a partially censored manuscript they were clearly ignoring Tilney's demands, and it was not allowed for a playing company to alter a play after licensing. A better explanation, offered by Scott McMillin and Gary Taylor, is that the revisions followed some time after the censorship, when changed conditions (including a new monarch) might make the players hope that the previous objections no longer applied. Also, we should not assume that the revisers saw Tilney's note on the first page: they may well have been working piecemeal without an overview of the whole thing. Indeed there was no need to look at the first page at all if, as Jowett thinks likely, the company decided that scene 1 was beyond cure and would have to go.

Hand C was the co-ordinator of all the revisions, which seem to have been carried out in isolation of one dramatist from another. The paper on which the Additions were written is of better quality than the paper holding the Original Text, with narrower chainlines and different watermarks (all pots). The Additions have between them four different versions of the pot watermark, and although it is not impossible for a batch of paper from the same manufacturer to have such variety—the makers could construct a series of moulds of roughly the same design—it is more likely that they came from a single mixed stock imported from one locality. It follows, then, that the various revisers were all supplied with their paper by one source, presumably the theatre company or Hand C. Jowett tries to work out if any of the half-sheet leaves given to the revisers were conjugate—that is, if two leaves were once joined as one sheet that was then cut in half—and although the evidence is inconclusive it seems likely that they were and indeed some of the dramatists might even have been given the uncut sheet to cut themselves. It seems that collaborative play composition was divided up by sheets, that is leaf pairs, and the handing out of sheets to the revisers of *Sir Thomas More* seems to

corroborate that. (Actually, the only other evidence that Jowett adduces for this division by sheets is a single comment from Dekker.)

We cannot, as Paul Werstine does, treat the Original Text as foul papers and the revisions as more polished theatrical writing, since the revisions themselves are 'authorial first drafts' (p. 366) and thus once they were annotated by Hand C they became intermediate documents, part-way between authorial drafts and theatrical manuscript. Indeed, the Original Text is in many ways more tidy and complete than the revised play, and if Tilney had not objected it could easily have become the licensed playbook. Here Jowett argues against the logic and evidence by which Werstine used *Sir Thomas More* to attack the New Bibliographical categorical distinction between foul papers and promptbooks, but a reader who did not know the debate on this fine point that has raged over the past twenty-five years probably would not appreciate what Jowett is up to. Jowett's reconstruction of 'The Sequence of Revision' forms Table 2 (pp. 368–9).

As well as being an author of the revisions, Chettle was possibly also a co-author of the Original Text. Where scene 8 is restructured to combine the Randall–Erasmus scene and the Falconer scene—which were separate in the Original Text, as the fragments of them that remain show—the Erasmus material is only lightly altered but the Falconer material is fundamentally rewritten. Thus it seems that 'some passages were written on fresh leaves of paper while others took the form of annotations to the lost section of the Original Text' (p. 372). Hand C seems to have composed the lines that join the Original Text and the revisions, to judge from how inelegant they are. Scene 5, the Guildhall scene, appears to have been written before scene 4 (the first riot scene) and scene 6 (the riot quelled by More), else Heywood crammed scene 4 onto one side of a piece of paper, writing up its margin in the end, while unaccountably leaving its other side blank in order to hold scene 5, which had not been written yet. A lot of ink has been wasted wondering what the Clown was meant to say after the stage direction 'Manett Clowne' at the end of scene 4, but as Jowett notes, Eric Rasmussen solved this long ago: the stage direction is meant to appear before the scene's last two lines, not after them, and it indicates that those two lines are the Clown's parting soliloquy. In general, the revisers' determination to stick to page breaks by cramming material into the margins helps Jowett figure out the order of writing and shows that the work was divided up by units of paper.

Scene 6 lines 1–165 are Shakespeare and they replace a scene in the Original Text that we do not have. The piece of paper holding Hand C's new opening stage direction for this scene (and holding scene 5 too) was probably with Heywood, helping him to write scene 4, at the time Shakespeare was writing scene 6. Thus Shakespeare did not know the new staging that Hand C had devised involving the Clown, which is why Shakespeare's riot-quelling scene has no part for the Clown and Hand C and Heywood had to alter it—the former reattributing speeches, the latter adding a line—to create one. Oddly, Shakespeare gives More no entrance direction in the scene, yet he cannot have assumed that More was on stage already since thirty lines into the scene More and others rescue the sergeant-at-arms Downes; this would not look brave if More had been standing around the whole time just watching. Also, Hand C's

stage direction for the start of scene 6, written at the bottom of the piece of paper Heywood was holding, has an entry for Downes at the start of the scene, yet Hand C also supplied a second entry for Downes twenty-one lines into the scene just before he speaks. Why did Hand C not fix these two errors—no entry for More and two entries for Downes—since he was so careful to fix speech prefixes in this scene? Because with that other sheet containing scene 6's opening direction away with Heywood, Hand C did not notice the problem at the time when he was fixing the speech prefixes in what Shakespeare had just written. This is all rather brilliantly worked out by Jowett and entirely compelling.

For the other Additions too, Jowett figures out the order of writing from the minutiae of the manuscript. What emerges is evidence—corroborating what has been seen before—that Hand C used the wording of stage directions to link together various pieces of rewriting in various places. He would end one stretch with a stage direction that indicated what was to follow so that he could more easily stitch the parts back together later, as in 'Enter To the players wth a reward' so that when he received the mini-scene of the players' reward he would know where to put it. An important conclusion made by Jowett is that we need to distinguish the tidiness of the manuscript from the tidiness of the script it contains: 'while new passages of text can have the literary or theatrical effect of joining up, their physical presence has the opposite effect on the MS: it becomes more disjointed and fragmented as the play becomes more unified' (pp. 392–3). Jowett ends Appendix II with a neat overview of the revision process. Unlike the other revisers, Shakespeare 'did not write on pre-existing script' and so 'seems a little removed from the process' (p. 394). In Appendix III (pp. 395–414), Jowett lists all the cross-referencing marks and crosses ('+' marks) in the manuscript, describes how the manuscript has deteriorated since Alexander Dyce transcribed it in 1844 and gives a list of the readings for which we have only Dyce's authority. Jowett also gives a transcription of Shakespeare's riot-quelling scene, listing its doubtful and 'irregular accidental' readings.

Appendix IV (pp. 415–60) is another long one, dealing with 'Authorship and Dates'. Munday is the obvious candidate for composing the Original Text, since it is in his hand. But did he collaborate with anyone? Thomas Merriam has argued that Shakespeare was in fact the main author of the Original Text and that Munday was trying to entrap him in religio-political trouble. Jowett reports that M.W.A. Smith has critiqued Merriam's various stylometric tests, but overstates the scope of this critique: the most recent article by Smith in Jowett's bibliography was published in 1994, while of Merriam's thirteen articles in Jowett's bibliography nine were published after 1994 and so cannot have been addressed in those Smith articles. Certainly the Original Text has a high rate of feminine endings, one of the key stylometric markers, but that is better evidence for dating (placing the play later than the early 1590s) than for authorship. The recent attempts to characterize Shakespeare as a closet Catholic are found by Jowett to be groundless, since Robert Bearman has shown that we have no reason to believe he was the Lancastrian Shakeshafte or that his father completed a secret Catholic testament. Jowett summarizes all the stylometry that has found against Shakespeare's authorship of the whole

play, and adds some subjective reasons of his own regarding dramatic style and structure. Munday, unlike Shakespeare, wrote a lot about London's civic life and is much the better candidate for originating the play.

Jowett reckons that the Original Text was composed around 1600, noting that the evolving handwriting of Munday puts it after *John a Kent and John a Cumber* that is now dated 1595 or 1596 and before *Heaven of the Mind* dated 1602. Also, it is a city comedy in certain places and that is a late 1590s genre, at which time there was a theatrical and publishing boom in English history plays, especially ones that did not focus, as early histories had, on the monarch. The Original Text seems influenced by *Julius Caesar* in a number of ways: having a 'found' will that leaves money to ordinary people; starting the action with a 'public disturbance' (p. 428) by politicized citizens; and a threat (not in *Sir Thomas More's* sources) to burn down enemies' houses. There is perhaps also an influence from *2 Henry IV* in the betrayal of rebels who voluntarily disarm before their captors. The Original Text has Sir John Munday (also the author's last name) attacked by a mob rather like Cinna the poet in *Julius Caesar*, who is attacked by a mob who confuse him with Cinna the conspirator (p. 429 n. 1). A topical allusion to French peace in *Sir Thomas More* would have made more sense in 1600 than before, and MacDonald P. Jackson's latest stylometric evidence (noticed elsewhere in this review) also points to 1600 or after. To judge from gaps in Henslowe's payments to them, Munday and Chettle were available to work for a company other than the Admiral's men around this time. For dating the revisions, Jowett accepts McMillin's assignment to 1603–4, which is confirmed by a group of stylometric tests including those on Shakespeare's well-documented style. The revisions contain a reference to the scouring of Moorditch, an open sewer, which took place in 1603. Jowett reckons that the ascription of Hand B to Heywood is more solid than has previously been thought, and at this point there appears another small internal cross-referencing error: on page 435 a pointer reads 'discussed below, p. 434' but it should be to page 437.

Jowett devotes considerable space (pp. 437–53) to the key ascription of Hand D to Shakespeare, summarizing the overwhelming case for it and alluding briefly to, but not addressing by his name, the argument presented by Gerald E. Downs (reviewed in *YWES* 88[2009]) for thinking that the Hand D material is a transcript not foul papers. (Here too is a faulty internal cross-reference: '(see below, pp. 439–40)' on page 440, should direct the reader to pages 442–3.) Jowett makes the common error of failing to distinguish between Early English Books Online (EEBO), which is a database of pictures of book pages, and the Text Creation Partnership (TCP), which is a database of manually keyboarded transcriptions of the words on those pages and which can be purchased as an add-on feature of EEBO. Where EEBO can be searched only in its metadata (authors, titles, publishers, and so on), with the TCP add-on (to make EEBO-TCP), the user can search within the texts of the books, at least for the subset of EEBO for which the transcriptions have been completed. Referring to the scope of EEBO-TCP (which he just calls EEBO), Jowett reports that it had only 11,500 texts at the time of writing, which corresponds to TCP's holdings around 2006–7. At the time of writing,

December 2012, it contains 44,000 books, and past searches that previously failed to find hits in EEBO-TCP now routinely find them.

By doing full-text searches, Jowett comes up with a bunch of spellings and phrases that are in Hand D and elsewhere in Shakespeare but rare in or entirely absent from anyone else's work. For example, there is 'Peace, ho' (multiple times in *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus*), 'Even by the rule' (*Julius Caesar*), and 'Would feed on one another' (*Coriolanus*), and in each case the dramatic context where the phrase is used is the same too. Also, 'those same hands | That' (with the line-break falling exactly there) is shared between Hand D and *King John* and nothing else. Jowett has a 410-word footnote detailing more of the most compelling collocations between Shakespeare and Hand D and no one else (p. 446 n. 1). What about the six rare words in Hand D that are not found in known Shakespeare works, namely *troy* (as a unit of weight), *parsnip*, *shrievalty*, *transportation*, *appropriate*, and *inhumanity*? One might think that their presence in Hand D tells against its being his work. In fact, as Jowett shows, in other 164-lines samples from known Shakespeare plays written around this time (1604), one finds about the same number of words that are unexampled anywhere else in Shakespeare: seven in the first 164 lines of *Troilus and Cressida*, eight in the first 164 lines of Shakespeare's part of *Measure for Measure*. Thus finding six words in Hand D that are not found anywhere in Shakespeare is perfectly consistent with Shakespeare being the author of Hand D's writing.

Addition III is a twenty-one-line soliloquy that includes the Shakespearian-sounding 'it is in heaven that I am thus and thus', the last three words being a phrase Shakespeare repeatedly used and the whole of it being very close to Iago's 'tis in ourselves that we are thus, or thus'. Jowett has a few more such phrases in Addition III that can be paralleled from known Shakespeare. Addition V might also be Shakespeare's too, once we subtract a few lines that are probably Heywood's, because they echo closely Heywood's lines drafted elsewhere in the manuscript. A number of scholars have recently suggested that the case for ascribing Hand D to Shakespeare is weak, but without giving the evidence, and for Jowett this is symptomatic of the recent desire to deny the authority of authorship in general. As Jowett points out, Hand D being Shakespeare actually brings Shakespeare down from his pedestal: here he is found mixing his labour with dramatists who have hitherto been considered mere hacks for Henslowe. In Appendix V (pp. 460–9), Jowett surveys the various editions of the play, mildly critiquing their editorial choices and acknowledging the limitations imposed on them by forces beyond the editor's control, as when Greg is constrained by the unusual page layout of the Malone Society Reprint series. Jowett shows that after E.K. Chambers's anti-disintegrationist British Academy lecture of 1924, Hand D was treated as highly anomalous Shakespeare and was largely ignored, with Jenkins-Sisson [1954] the only mainstream modernized edition of the whole play.

Appendix VI (pp. 470–2) deals with one spelling choice, *sheriff* versus *shrieve*. There are twelve distinct spellings of this word in the manuscript, and ordinarily an editor would modernize to *sheriff*. But sometimes *shrieve* has to be retained for the sake of metre, and the problem is particularly vexed because the various writers' practices regarding the word's spelling and

pronunciation differ. Jowett establishes that Munday used *sheriff* in prose and monosyllabic *shrieve* in verse, whereas Shakespeare seems to reserve *shrieve* as a citizens' form of the word, which appears in highly rhythmic prose. Thus it is impossible to find a single modernizing practice that respects the incompatible authorial intentions of the various collaborators on this play. Jowett plumps, with avowed discomfort, for using *sheriff* throughout except where *shrieve* is unequivocally a monosyllable in verse. Appendix VII (pp. 473–86) gives modernized reprints of the source material from Holinshed's chronicles, Nicholas Harpsfield's manuscript life of More, Thomas Stapleton's *Tres Thomae*, R. Wever's *Lusty Juventus*, and Munday's *A Banquet of Dainty Conceits*. The last appendix (pp. 487–8) is a doubling chart in which Jowett shows that the revised version of the play could be performed by fourteen men and five boys. The latter figure is high, but is unavoidable because scene 9 features More's two daughters, the Lady Mayoress, More's wife, and the player of Lady Vanity.

Two important reference works in our field appeared this year: Eric Rasmussen and Anthony James West's *The Shakespeare First Folios: A Descriptive Catalogue* and Standish Henning's New Variorum *The Comedy of Errors*. The former is based on physical inspection of every known surviving exemplar of the Folio and describes 'all leaves in all extant volumes (recording their condition, losses and replacements, annotations, and watermarks), as well as providing descriptions of each copy's binding and lively narratives about previous owners' (p. viii). This is valuable information for those interested solely in the book as physical object, but on its own it does not help to establish Shakespeare's text, the main concern of this review. Appendix I lists the stop-press correction variants in the 232 surviving exemplars of the Folio, which would at first appear to be an extraordinary achievement, outstripping Charlton Hinman's collation of fifty-five exemplars that took fourteen years to complete. In fact, Rasmussen and West did not fully collate all 232 exemplars: they collated 'several exemplars completely', revealing new variants not previously known, and then with their expanded list of known variants they checked the readings in each exemplar (personal correspondence to the reviewer). While this gives us more knowledge about stop-press correction of the Folio than before, the method could not find variants that exist at previously unsuspected moments in the text and only in one or more of the exemplars not fully checked. Likewise Henning's invaluable edition provides a record of the emendations of all major and most of the minor editions of his play since it was first published in the Folio in 1623, and gives a useful stage history, but as its base text is merely a reprint of the Folio it is not strictly relevant here and will not be discussed further.

One monograph of relevance to this review appeared this year: James R. Marino's *Owning William Shakespeare: The King's Men and Their Intellectual Property*. Marino begins by observing that the editing of Shakespeare started with Nicholas Rowe's edition of 1709, which he sees as the Tonson publishing house's response to parliament deciding to limit copyright. By perpetually reprinting with new editors, the Tonsons kept control of Shakespeare. Putting it this way muddies the distinction between rights to the words of Shakespeare and rights to the editorial labour. Marino thinks that an editor has to change

the text in order to establish her rights—if she fails to make changes she cannot publish—but that is not the case: if her labour leads to the same conclusions as a previous editor's did she may publish the same conclusion (say, a particular emendation). In any case, her labour in writing the notes and other material is protected. If Marino were right there could be no competing print facsimiles, but of course there are.

Since Lewis Theobald's victory over Alexander Pope, editors have sought not to rewrite Shakespeare to their own liking but to preserve and transmit what he wrote. Marino thinks this means that now 'Editors, therefore, renounce their own prerogative over the text' (p. 6). This overstates the case in the opposite direction, since in deciding what Shakespeare wrote and how to preserve it for modern readers, editors insert themselves into the work. The argument that follows about a tension between being faithful to Shakespeare and being original as an editor arises from Marino's false premises about the nature of editorial labour, and he ends by adding a third false premise, that the editorial goal is 'The establishment of an incontrovertibly "correct" text' (p. 7). Happily for the future of editing this is not possible.

Marino thinks that eighteenth-century editors such as Pope were misled by the practices of their day to read the words 'as acted by' on a title page as a sign of alteration—as it was in Pope's time—when in fact on early title pages this was a badge of authenticity. Whereas eighteenth-century performances were always adaptations, Marino reckons that whatever 'pre-Civil war players did' (p. 11) *was* the play itself even as it changed. It is not clear at this point why Marino gives that right to a company in 1641 but not a company in 1661, simply because the company of 1641 maintains the name it had when Shakespeare left it thirty years earlier; the reasoning becomes clear only at the end of his book. Marino's introduction simply asserts these continuities and discontinuities as if they were unproblematic, but in fact the whole point of his book is to substantiate these surprising claims. The reader might usefully have been told that in advance.

In essence, Marino treats the playing companies' ownership of their plays as something akin to John Milton's or Michel Montaigne's ownership of their prose materials, so that subsequent editions showing alterations were equally authorized and the new just replaced the old. Looked at from the company's point of view, the adding of material to *Doctor Faustus* or *The Spanish Tragedy* in Henslowe's Diary is much like the revision that altered *Hamlet* and *King Lear*, to judge by their early editions. Marino feels the need to attack the New Bibliography because it was author-centred, claiming that the aim of its advocates, including R.B. McKerrow, was 'the reconstruction of the copy text underlying the printed play, and ultimately of the author's original holograph, by studying the material traces left upon the playbook during its production' (p. 14). In fact McKerrow expressed doubt that the nature of the underlying copy could even be determined let alone its substance reconstructed, hence his advocacy of best-text editing instead of trying to recover the authorial manuscript. Even the neutral term 'authorial foul papers' is, according to Marino, one of the 'New Bibliographical concepts' (p. 16). Yet we need a term for the first writing down of the script and 'foul papers' is a particularly

appropriate term as it was used by writers in the early seventeenth century; there is nothing anachronistic or conceptual about it.

In chapter 1 (pp. 19–47), Marino starts with some minor discrepancies in how theatre historians have treated mutually incompatible early records of Shakespeare's theatrical career, as when his company appears to perform in two places at once on 28 December 1594. Marino's reinterpretation is to speculate that the plays we think of as Shakespeare's and his company's might have belonged to someone else. We should not assume that just because one company's plays turn up in another's repertory, the vector of transmission was an actor bringing it with him as he moved between companies: it could just be an outright purchase. Marino catches Andrew Gurr in a small slip about Heminges' affiliation before joining the Chamberlain's men and attributes inordinate significance to it as a symptom of traditional theatre history's 'profound investment in preserving the Chamberlain's Men's claims to their initial repertory' (p. 29). Marino thinks that the Chamberlain's men made a habit of attributing to Shakespeare every play they got from other companies, specifically *Hamlet*, *The Taming of a/the Shrew*, *King Lear*, *King John*, *Richard III*, *Henry V*, *The Contention of York and Lancaster*/*2 Henry VI* and *Richard Duke of York*/*3 Henry VI*. But this claim holds only if one considers each of *ur-Hamlet*/*Hamlet*, *The/A Shrew*, *King Leir*/*King Lear*, *Troublesome Reign*/*King John*, *True Tragedy*/*Richard III*, and *Famous Victories*/*Henry V* to be one play, and most people do not. The obfuscation here is that Marino is treating all plays with the same or similar titles or similar plots as one play.

Because no non-Shakespearian play that the Chamberlain's men would have inherited from the companies from which its founder members came has survived in records of its repertory—only the Shakespearian ones—Marino suggests that it is not that Shakespeare was the only one to bring plays with him but that later on the Chamberlain's men labelled all the ones they received as Shakespearian. Because one company could mount a play on the same subject as a rival company's offering, 'revising one's plays was a commercial necessity' (p. 33). This does not follow: if the first company had the better play—as is clearly the case with *1, 2 Henry IV* versus *Sir John Oldcastle*—then there was no need to change it; revision accompanied revival, not first-run competition. Marino describes the attributions to companies on a number of early quartos, but tends to treat each edition as if it faithfully represented the play as performed. Thus the reprintings of the good 1594 quarto of *Titus Andronicus* cause him to write that it was 'exceptional for its textual stability' (p. 39). In fact we do not know this: the play as published was stable because of monogenetic descent in the order Q1 > Q2 > Q3 > F. We have no idea if there were bad texts that happened not to make it into print. Marino rightly objects that the performance of *Titus Andronicus* at Rutland for Sir John Harington on 1 January 1596 was probably not by the Chamberlain's men, since they were in London on 28 December 1595 and 6 January 1596.

According to Marino, the New Bibliographical notion of memorial reconstruction is (literally) preposterous because in truth the first printings represent early versions of the plays that over time became the versions represented in late printings. Why would a playing company revise them? To make them their own, hence the *Owning* of his book's title. The problem with

Marino rejecting entirely the alternative memorial reconstruction explanation is that there exists clear evidence that in at least some cases the early printing garbles the words that appear in the later one. In the 1594 quarto of *The Contention of York and Lancaster*/*2 Henry VI* there is the garbled genealogy of the duke of York and in the 1594 quarto of *A Shrew* a broken jest about facing and outfacing, and in both cases it is easy to see how the text behind the Folio version was corrupted to make the earlier edition, and difficult to see how a corrupted chronology or joke could have been fixed up in revision to make what we find in the Folio. Likewise, in the 1603 quarto of *Hamlet* the actor playing Laertes seems to forget what he is talking about, responding to Claudius's 'content your selfe, be rulde by me, | And you shall haue no let for your reuenge' with the meaningless 'My will, not all the world', which is in fact the correct response to 'Who shall stay you?', a question present in Q2 [1604–5] and F but not in Q1. Spotting the error, the actor of Claudius comes back with 'Nay but Leartes, marke the plot I haue layde', which restores the exchange to sense. (This last example sounds like a recording of an error in performance, as Downs argued in an article reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011].) In the 1597 quarto of *Romeo and Juliet*, Capulet says to Paris on the night of the feast that he would have gone to bed an hour ago were it not for Capulet's company, which is absurd. In Q2 this line is in the right place, happening the next night after Tybalt's death and as the whole Capulet family is in mourning.

Marino ignores all this evidence in order to ask his readers to consider what follows from allowing the proposition that 'the texts published first might have been written first' (p. 43). Given this premise, Shakespeare emerges all the more the hero of the 1590s for turning the weak dramatic material in the bad quartos into the good quarto and Folio plays we know. But Marino is slippery about just which plays became which. It is one thing to say that the quarto *Contention of York and Lancaster* became Folio *2 Henry VI*, but quite another to claim, as Marino does here, that Shakespeare's *King Lear* is a rewriting of the anonymous *King Leir*. I would instead say that it is another play on the same topic. Most importantly, no one has ever claimed that *King Leir* is a bad quarto garbling of the script underlying *King Lear*, but there is plenty of evidence that quarto *Contention of York and Lancaster* is a garbling of the script underlying Folio *2 Henry VI*. One obvious objection to the idea that the early quartos are early versions of the plays that were later revised to make the Folio versions is that the early quartos are more distant from the sources, as would happen by textual corruption. Marino pre-empts this objection by making the counter-intuitive assertion that Shakespeare really did revise the old plays to make them closer to their sources (pp. 46–7).

Again treating different plays as versions of one play, Marino writes as if the anonymous *True Tragedy of Richard III* was the original for Shakespeare's *Richard III*. He sees the whole first tetralogy as an act of unifying into a singularity disparate works that belonged to multiple companies, requiring those who see the plays as all originally Shakespeare's to ask themselves 'why he would undertake a four-part sequence that would be spread among three different sets of players' (p. 45). Marino reworks the same point on the next page as 'If Shakespeare wrote all four of these plays [the first tetralogy], or early drafts of them, before he joined the Chamberlain's Men, then he wrote

them for more than one set of actors and without any reasonable expectation of ever seeing them acted together' (p. 46). I cannot see why Marino assumes that Shakespeare had to leave each play with the players that first performed it; might he not have built an expanding portfolio of related plays that he brought with him through the various companies he worked with? Because Folio *Richard III* makes more references to the other plays in the cycle than does quarto *Richard III*, Marino concludes that the Folio reflects the subsequent labour of binding together the complete cycle. This argument ignores the likely provenance of the copy for the Folio and quarto. The Folio appears to reflect authorial papers before rehearsal (when Shakespeare perhaps wanted to link this play to the ones he had already written), while the quarto shows rehearsal alterations, such as the streamlining of casting by cutting Clarence's unnecessary daughter and being more efficient in doubling. The quarto could, then, reflect a first-run (or later revival) attempt to detach the play from its cycle, as would be sensible if it were playing well on its own as a tragedy.

The bulk of Marino's second chapter 'Sixty Years of *Shrews*' (pp. 48–74) is a reprint of his article on this topic reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011], with two substantial inserted passages. He begins, though, with an important misrepresentation of the Stationers' Company's rules on registration, thinking that because the rights to one were good for protecting the other, '*The Taming of a Shrew* and *The Taming of the Shrew* were evidently thought of as a single play' (p. 48). No: the company was interested not in whether they were one play or two but in whether the publication of one manuscript might harm a stationer's investment in publication of the other. In the first substantial insertion to the argument (pp. 68–70), Marino claims that the revision of *A Shrew* into *The Shrew* is like the revision of *King Leir* into *King Lear*, taking away the character motives made plain in the earlier text. The names and relationships in *The Tamer Tamed* do not quite fit those in *The Taming of the Shrew*, but perhaps the names and relationships were always in flux and hence *A Shrew* is part of the same family. The second insertion (pp. 72–3) argues that the revision of *The Taming of the Shrew* shown by its mention of Soto from John Fletcher's *Women Pleas'd* is just part of the ongoing and endless updating of plays to produce a coherent repertory; the players wanted Shakespeare's old play to allude to something new in the repertory in the late 1610s (pp. 72–3).

Chapter 3 (pp. 75–106) makes for *Hamlet* essentially the same argument Marino made regarding *The Taming of the Shrew*, that we cannot treat the ur-*Hamlets* as distinct from the *Hamlet* we know. We do not have to assume that the revision of a play took place all at once: the play could evolve over years (pp. 78–9). That is fair enough up to a point, but a brake upon this process would be the requirements of censorship, since the Master of the Revels' licence covered one text, not a moving target. Neither Corambis's nor Polonius's name is spoken on the stage very much, and in fact *Hamlet* seems to go to considerable lengths to avoid saying his name: 'your father', 'that great baby you see there', 'this counsellor'. Marino reckons that avoiding saying the name allowed the name to be changed by making small alterations in one actor's part. Marino explains that altering just a few players' parts was a convenient way to revise and/or expand a play, especially by bulking the

middles of speeches and keeping the cues unchanged. He takes Tiffany Stern's line that the play was thought of as a collection of parts and that when expanding a play the practicalities of working with parts shaped the entire process. This is what Marino thinks happened with the renaming of Corambis/Polonius and indeed the entire revision of Q1/Q2/F *Hamlet*. One of the props of the memorial reconstruction theory was that it best explained why some characters' speeches in bad quartos are virtually identical to their speeches in the good texts while other characters' speeches vary greatly, since intentional revision of only the words of certain characters seems an odd kind of intervention. Marino rightly points out that this is true if one imagines the revision being performed on a single copy of the entire script, but it makes perfect sense if the revision was carried out part-wise (p. 93). Character names that no one speaks or only one person speaks are easiest to change in parts; indeed one character may even get the name wrong without anyone noticing since no second speaker would use a contradicting name. Names that lots of people speak would take a lot of work to revise in multiple parts. Again, true: but who does Marino think was keeping track of which parts mention which names, and how did they do it? This new parts-based revision hypothesis seems to demand practices no less cumbersome than those of whole-script revision.

Marino finds in *Hamlet* a cluster of allusions to Edward Alleyn and the Admiral's men (pp. 97–105). There is an Osric in *A Knack to Know a Knav* performed by Alleyn and Strange's men in the early 1590s, and *Osric* is also the title of a lost play performed at the Rose in the late 1590s, according to Henslowe's records. 'Jephthah' is an exclamation used by Hamlet after Polonius gives his list of genres and it is also the title of an Admiral's men's play of the early 1600s, again according to Henslowe's records. Hamlet alludes to Alleyn (via Roscius), and the Admiral's men's *Damon and Pythias*, and gets Rose, Fortune, Turks (a staple of the Admiral's men's repertory) and players into a single line: 'my fortunes turn Turk with me, with two Provençal roses on my razed shoes, get me a fellowship in a cry of players, sir?'. All these allusions to the Admiral's men come in a short space of Hamlet's part to which they 'could have been added very easily' (p. 100). Marino points out that Henslowe's *Jephthah* and *Osric* plays were written in 1602, so the only way *Hamlet* could allude to them is if it were no earlier than 1602, or at least revised in 1602 and after. Marino mentions that *Hamlet* may be influenced by the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*, apparently without noticing the argument, made by Hugh Craig two years before Marino's book was published (and reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011]), that Shakespeare actually wrote those additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*.

By far the best chapter in Marino's book is the fourth (pp. 107–42) on 'William Shakespeare's *Sir John Oldcastle* and the Globe's William Shakespeare'; it is, however, not strictly new since a version of it appeared in the journal *Renaissance Drama* in 1999. This reviewer failed to notice it at the time so it is given detailed attention here. Marino starts by asking why Thomas Pavier's quarto of *Sir John Oldcastle* attributes it to Shakespeare while also attributing it to the Admiral's men. His answer is that the publishers' sense of proprietorial ownership and the actors' were not the same. (At this point a confusing slip enters Marino's text when he refers to the 1619

Pavier quarto of *The Whole Contention between the Two Famous Houses of Lancaster and York* as ‘*The Whole Part of the Contention Between Lancaster and York*’ (p. 111); what would a whole part be?) Marino attacks Greg’s idea that Pavier was the central falsifying force in the Pavier quartos, pointing out that if the project really was piracy other stationers would have spotted it right away. After all, the Pavier quartos bear Jaggard’s well-known ornament on their title pages and Pavier was visibly active in asserting stationers’ rights. Indeed, according to Marino, that is the point: Jaggard printed the Pavier quartos to assert stationers’ rights over those of authors or players.

Specifically, where players used an author’s name to assert that he had taken over an old play and made it his own by revision, the stationers’ view was that the author’s name united the disparate texts on one topic. The false dates on the Pavier quartos were used to circumvent the Stationers’ Company edict of May 1619 preventing publication of the King’s men’s plays, which edict arose from the players getting William Herbert, who was the earl of Pembroke and the Lord Chamberlain, to take their side in protecting their intellectual property. The Stationers’ Company had its own ideas about intellectual property, and the Pavier quartos were part of a reaction to the players trying to impose their ideas on the company. This was all part of a larger struggle between the court and the Stationers’ Company about monopoly rights. Thus Pavier was not trying to hide from his fellow stationers his violation of the May 1619 edict: he expected them to support his circumvention of the instruction. This whole argument requires that the edict preceded the publication of the Pavier quartos, but of course it may (as the traditional narrative has it) have followed the publication and be a reaction to the Pavier quartos’ appearance. Nonetheless, Marino’s is an attractive explanation of the otherwise murky events.

But why include *Oldcastle* as a Shakespeare play in the Pavier collection? We know that the Chamberlain’s men played something that was identified as *Oldcastle* in 1600, 1631, and 1638, but was it *1 Henry IV* or had they stolen the Admiral’s men’s hagiographical play? Either way, the use of this title suggests that these plays were liable to be confused for one another just as the characters Falstaff and Oldcastle live a double life in one another; Marino calls this ‘entanglement’ (p. 124). From the publishers’ point of view, the rights to *Famous Victories* were rights to *Henry V* too, and indeed publishers tended to ascribe plays to the current company playing the Shakespearian version even when they were reprinting an earlier publication that we ascribe to another company. Thus Bernard Alsop published *Famous Victories* as ‘*Acted by the Kinges Maiesties Seruants*’ in 1617, *The Troublesome Reign of King John* was attributed to Shakespeare in an edition of 1622, and *A Shrew* was ascribed to the King’s men in an edition of 1631. When copy for the Shakespeare Folio was registered, rights to *The Troublesome Reign of King John* and *A Shrew* were taken to cover Shakespeare’s *King John* and *The Taming of the Shrew*, and *1 Henry VI* had to be registered as the ‘third part’ of *Henry VI* so as not to tread on the rights to *The First Part of the Contention*. Whereas the players’ interests demanded that they make new and improved versions of their old plays, from the stationers’ point of view the improvements just made matters worse since they rendered unsold copies of the old play harder to sell.

Equally, however, a stationer who did not have the rights to the old play might use Shakespeare's name to insist that his copy was not the old play, as when Nathaniel Butter published *'Mr. William Shakespeare His True Chronicle History of the Life and Death of King Lear'* in 1608 to distinguish it from *King Lear* published by John Wright in 1605. (Actually, this is one example where Marino's source for a lot of his ideas about intellectual property, Blayney, disagrees: he thinks that Butter must have come to terms with Wright.) Once Butter had done this, owners of plays such as *Famous Victories* and *Troublesome Reign* would fear that their rights would be abrogated by another publisher sticking the name Shakespeare on a publication of *Henry V* or *King John*, so they had to anticipate this attribution and themselves publish *Famous Victories* and *Troublesome Reign* with Shakespeare's name on. This is a subtle and persuasive argument for why plays got misattributed to Shakespeare.

Thus early modern publishers' notions of intellectual property were not philosophical but practical and commercial and subject to change: 'some individuals, like Butter, might embrace the actors' model for intellectual property (differentiating *Lear* from *Leir*) rather than the Stationers', if it happened to give him a commercial advantage' (p. 132). Marino ends by surveying the commendatory poems in the 1623 Folio, arguing that these cast Shakespeare as primarily a dramatist (avoiding his prior reputation as a poet) and as the best of the dead dramatists, not necessarily better than any living one. The King's men did not want their current output to be implicitly criticized by the book, so Shakespeare was assigned to a bygone age as an entertainer of Elizabeth and a writer for the Globe not the Blackfriars. It is the Folio versions of Shakespeare's plays that mention the Globe: 'Hercules and his load' in *Hamlet*, the 'wooden O' in *Henry V*, and a form of *Totus mundus agit histrionem* expressed as 'All the world's a stage' in *As You Like It*. Thus it is the Folio that makes us want to reconstruct the Globe, to put back the very limitations against which the Chorus of *Henry V* 'purports to chafe' (p. 142).

Marino's last chapter (pp. 143–59) takes his narrative up to the statute of Queen Anne of 1710 that overturned the Stationers' Company's notion of intellectual property. The King's men's grip on Shakespeare was lost in 1642 with the closure of the theatres, and all performance rights to pre-Commonwealth drama lapsed with the dissolution of the companies that held those rights. Marino thinks that we have no evidence that the pre-Commonwealth playbook manuscripts were passed down to the Restoration actors and that they must have relied on printed plays. On this point, Marino overlooks the odd bit of relevant evidence. For example, William Davenant's Restoration revival of Thomas Middleton's adaptation of *Macbeth*—as represented in the 1623 Folio—includes the full versions of the songs that Middleton had imported into *Macbeth* from his *The Witch*, even though the Folio lacks them. Unless Davenant knew *The Witch*, which seems unlikely since it was unpublished, he probably had a pre-Commonwealth manuscript of the adapted *Macbeth* that included the songs in full.

According to Marino, because Restoration revivals of pre-Commonwealth plays were based on printed texts they were not parts-based and hence there was no pressure to preserve cues, since fresh parts had to be made anyway.

Yet the publishers' rights to pre-Commonwealth plays continued uninterrupted—they had the Stationers' Company records to enforce them—and from 1660 they did not have to deal with the players' quite different notions of intellectual property. Indeed, the emerging Red Bull company leader Michael Mohun actually asked Humphrey Mosely for exclusive rights to perform the plays he published. With no players' rights to control what got called Shakespeare's work, the second issue of the Third Folio [1664] added seven new plays; the stationers' view was now dominant.

Once Thomas Killigrew, leader of the King's men, and William D'Avenant, leader of the Duke of York's men, got their royal patents, they set about reasserting exclusive performance rights, with Killigrew getting the rights to almost all pre-Commonwealth plays by royal patent. The restored monarchy treated performance rights as its own gift to bestow at will. D'Avenant was required by his patent to improve the old plays given to him, which is why he made his adaptations. The two royal patents, Killigrew's and D'Avenant's, were inheritable and alienable. In 1682 the two companies merged to form the United Company, which of course then had an absolute monopoly on playing in London. This monopoly ended in 1695 when Thomas Betterton led a breakaway group of star actors from the United Company and they formed their own company, and got a new royal patent from William III. Although the leader of the United Company, Christopher Rich, could have pressed his rights to all old plays, and thereby shut out the new rebel group of stars, he chose not to. Both companies had access to everything. Thereafter, all the old plays were considered usable by anyone so long as the theatre was licensed, and it was not until the 1843 Theatres Act that the limitation of performance to specific patent theatres was lifted.

This year, two book-form collections of essays with contributions of relevance to this review were published. The first is *Stylistics and Shakespeare's Language: Transdisciplinary Approaches*, edited by Mireille Ravassat and Jonathan Culpeper. Chapter 1, "'Strange Deliveries': Contextualizing Shakespeare's First Citations in the *OED*" (pp. 8–33) by Giles Goodland, is about how much *OED* distorted the historical linguistic record by attributing coinages to Shakespeare that in fact can now be antedated. The section of *OED* from *P* to *Ra-* was published in 1903–4 and was redone for *OED Online* in March 2005 to June 2008, using EEBO-TCP amongst other sources. Goodland counts how many words in this section were given to Shakespeare in 1903–4 and how many of those have now been antedated to someone else in *OED Online*, and it is about half and half. Goodland goes through the cases. He is able to extract the remaining first uses where no one (not even Shakespeare) picked up the new word and used it again, and treats these not as coinages—since they did not catch on—but as nonce-words. Throughout this essay its methodology is poorly explained.

Chapter 2, 'Shakespeare's Vocabulary: Did it Dwarf All Others?' (pp. 34–57), by Ward E.Y. Elliott and Robert J. Valenza, is better, but also fails to fully explain its methodology. They show that Shakespeare only appears to have had a bigger vocabulary than everyone else, and the causes of the illusion are that his surviving canon is so large, he wrote on many topics, and his writing was much more available to the *OED* editors than anyone else's.

Marvin Spevack's concordance (based on the Riverside text) counts 884,647 tokens (total words) in Shakespeare and 29,066 types (distinct words excluding repetitions), but of course editors disagree on the modernizing and commonizing of the early texts. (Elliott and Valenza might have mentioned that editors also disagree more fundamentally on the words of the works too.) Up to 10 per cent of the canon was written by Shakespeare's collaborators. Most importantly, Spevack's approach counts variant forms and inflections as separate types (boosting his types total) because he did not reduce every type to its lemma (its dictionary headword). In the pre-computer age, hand-counters such as the pioneering Alfred Hart did reduce every type to its lemma. Distortion of the total in the opposite direction arises in Spevack's method (and Elliott and Valenza's) where one type corresponds to two dictionary headwords, as in *row* the verb and *row* the noun. All these counts based on written texts tell us how many words the writer used, not how many he knew, but as we shall see that unknown may be derived from the known.

Elliott and Valenza report that after counting the types-to-tokens ratios for Milton, Shakespeare, and Fletcher they come out in that order of descent: Milton used 6,500 different words in a block of 40,000 words, Shakespeare 5,470:40,000 and Fletcher 4,444:40,000. Elliott and Valenza compiled a 600,000-word corpus made of fifteen 40,000-word blocks, four of the blocks by Shakespeare and the other eleven by seven other authors. In these 600,000 tokens there were 28,747 types and of those 12,265 were found in only one of the fifteen blocks and so were 'new' to the corpus. Shakespeare's four blocks comprised 27 per cent of the corpus and he contributed 31 per cent of these new words, which is about what we would expect, whereas Milton contributed much more than his share and again Fletcher the least. To introduce their next test, Elliott and Valenza show a graph that they call 'normalized word type frequency profiles' (p. 44), one for Shakespeare and one for the Bible, but they neglect to label their *x* and *y* axes so the whole thing is incomprehensible. What follows from this graph is a methodology that is not explained well enough for this reviewer to fully grasp it, but which seems to be based on the idea that one can infer a writer's latent vocabulary (the words she knows but does not use) from the ratio of types to tokens and from the fact—demonstrated by Bradley Efron and Ronald Thisted using another methodology I do not understand—that Shakespeare knew about twice as many words as he used.

It appears that the method is to see how many types one needs to 'get through' 20,000 of the writer's tokens and then compare that to the 77 types it takes to get through 20,000 of Shakespeare's tokens. (I assume that 'get through' means one takes a list of all the types starting with the most commonly used, the second most commonly used, and so on down the table, and one moves down the list until the total occurrences of all those types reaches 20,000 tokens.) So, if one gets through the top 77 commonest types to reach 20,000 tokens then the writer is like Shakespeare and probably knew 66,000 types in all (31,000 used, 35,000 latent). If it takes 127 types to reach 20,000 tokens, as it does for Milton, then this writer probably knew a lot more words and it comes out at 140,000 types, whereas with Fletcher one gets through only 63 types to reach 20,000 tokens, so he knew only 49,000 types.

It is quite possible that I am here completely misrepresenting Elliott and Valenza's methodology, and if so I do not think it is entirely my fault. Their essay is almost entirely comprised of discursive prose—no formulas, just one (unlabelled) graph—yet it does not convey clearly what they did.

The conclusion is that once we remove the distortions caused by corpus size, it turns out that Shakespeare's vocabulary did not dwarf those of his contemporaries. Indeed Milton's vocabulary and perhaps Edmund Spenser's dwarfed Shakespeare's. Moreover, modern educated people have vocabularies about the same size as Shakespeare's and some (including one of the authors of this paper) have vocabularies much larger than his. What about the claim that Shakespeare coined words more often than anyone else? This is harder to test, but is probably a myth too. Elliott and Valenza cite chapter 1 in this collection and other studies showing that the counts of Shakespeare's neologisms are over-inflated by methodological bias, including his greater availability to the *OED* compilers and our willingness to accept his new amalgamations. Rather wittily, Elliott and Valenza point out that if Shakespeare's new amalgamations that did not catch on—such as *adoptious* and *insultment*—had been used by the American president George W. Bush they would have been discounted as ignorant gaffes not brilliant inventions.

Chapter 3, 'A New Kind of Dictionary for Shakespeare's Plays: An Immodest Proposal' (pp. 58–83), by Jonathan Culpeper, is an interesting critique of what Shakespeare dictionaries currently do regarding such knotty problems as whether *ah!* qualifies as a word, whether *and* should be included and whether the reader needs to know the gender break-down of a particular word's usage. Oddly, Culpeper thinks that Phoebe in *As You Like It* is a prostitute when in fact she is a shepherdess (p. 58). Chapter 4, "'If I break time": Shakespearean Line Endings on the Page and the Stage' (pp. 84–97), by Peter Kanelos, is a somewhat reductive consideration of whether verse line endings were marked in pronunciation even in enjambed lines. Kanelos misquotes the opening lines of Folio *1 Henry VI* as 'Hvng be y heuens... King Henry the Fist' instead of the correct 'Hvng be y^e heuens... King Henry the Fift' (p. 87). On the same page he writes that 'Caesuras in these early works are rare', which indicates that he is using the word *caesura* to mean a rather stronger break than most people understand by this term. Whereas Kanelos finds no caesura in 'Cease to perswade, my louing Protheus' (p. 87), I would say that the comma marks one. Confusingly Kanelos distinguishes 'Tudor poetry' from that produced by 'Elizabethan poets' (p. 88), although of course Elizabeth was the last of the Tudors. Kanelos speculates about what Shakespeare might have meant his actors to do regarding the importance of the line-ending in verse, and decides that pausing at the end of each verse line even if the sense runs on makes the character appear to be thinking about what to say next rather than just blurting it out.

Chapter 5, 'Subject-Verb Inversion and Iambic Rhythm in Shakespeare's Dramatic Verse' (pp. 98–118), by Richard Ingham and Michael Ingham, concerns a single poetic-linguistic choice. Normally in English the subject pronouns are not stressed, so being able to flip the order (*seek I* instead of *I seek*) can be helpful to a poet in conforming to iambic pentameter. But in some cases Shakespeare's early works seem to invert subject and verb precisely in

order to put subject pronouns into one of the stressed positions (syllables 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10). Broadening the purview, however, the main outcome from studying a group of history plays and tragedies is that Shakespeare did indeed tend to put pronouns in unstressed positions, but in the early plays and on those occasions when subject pronouns are in the stressed position Shakespeare often used the unusual verb–subject order to put them there. This is a definite choice. That is, rather than flipping subject–verb order to conform to the usual assumption that subject pronouns are not stressed, and so within the rules of iambic pentameter to ensure that they are not stressed, Shakespeare flipped the order to make them stressed. The Inghams ends with a survey of how some of the BBC Shakespeare actors handled the problem. They conclude that ‘the option of inverting a subject pronoun around the verb in Shakespeare’s dramatic verse had nothing to do with respecting iambic pentameter. Rather it was a freestanding stylistic variant used by the poet in order to achieve a high style effect, possibly even a monumental quality. The later plays show a decline in the frequency with which this variant is deployed’ (pp. 114–15). Moreover, an actor in an early play who wants to avoid stressing a pronoun that sense tells her should not be stressed has to break the iambic pentameter. In the later plays we do not find this mismatch, so ‘disruption of iambic rhythm is not a distinctive hallmark of the late plays, but rather of the earlier ones’ (p. 115).

The basis of Peter Groves’s ‘Shakespeare’s “Short” Pentameters and the Rhythms of Dramatic Verse’ (pp. 119–38), which forms chapter 6, is a distinction between beats, stress, and accent that this reviewer is unable to hear (p. 120). Perhaps the scheme makes sense when given at book length—Groves reports that he compresses and summarizes it here—but to this reader it comes across as a series of questionable assertions of rules governing speech that Groves seems to find self-evident or needing only one or two examples. Groves’s system for recording the various features of speech is complicated and cryptic, typically using pointed brackets, superscripting, virgules, carets, curly brackets, underlining, and boldface type. A typical example is ‘< Luc’us > my Gowne|: ^ fare|well good| Messa|{la}’. Finding certain gaps in what is spoken, Groves argues that they are meant to be filled with an actor’s gesture such as a shrug, a kiss, a sigh, a start, and so on. In chapter 7, ‘Wholes and Holes in the Study of Shakespeare’s Wordplay’ (pp. 139–64), Dirk Delabastita tries to span the old-fashioned criticism about puns (*wholes*) while also, a la poststructuralism, acknowledging the *holes*. Since adherents of the latter think the former is based on a self-delusion regarding artistic coherence and unity, the project to bridge them seems motivated solely by the title’s homophonic pun. Delabastita wonders if the *Hamlet sullied/solid/sallied* variant arises from a kind of punning (p. 147), but this is not possible: only the last two are in the early editions, since *sullied* is merely John Dover Wilson’s proposed editorial emendation. Delabastita thinks that compared with the readers of the quartos, the readers of the 1623 Folio apprehended the texts ‘at a further remove from the theatrical environment which had initially engendered them’ (p. 160). For quite a few plays this is not true, since the Folio text is more theatricalized than the preceding quartos, on account (for

example) of being printed from, or improved by reference to, post-rehearsal theatrical documents.

Mireille Ravassat's "'A Thing Inseparate / Divides More Wider than the Sky and Earth": Of Oxymoron in Shakespeare's Sonnets' (pp. 165–91) is a reading of the sonnets focused on the device of the oxymoron and is of no relevance to this review. Chapter 9, 'Stylistic Analysis of the Rhetoric of Suicide in *Hamlet*' (pp. 192–214), by Thomas Anderson and Scott Crossley, argues that the three characters who contemplate suicide—Hamlet, Ophelia, Horatio—show Shakespeare exploring a secular alternative to the dominant Christian prohibition against it. Anderson and Crossley use Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) to analyse the speeches of Hamlet and Ophelia against a control group of speeches by non-suicidal Horatio and Laertes. They look for the markers of suicide, and in particular whether Hamlet uses the markers of modern secular attitudes towards suicide, such as 'personal pronouns, lack of communicative and social features', while Ophelia uses markers of old-fashioned religious attitudes towards suicide such as 'plural pronouns, words related to death, sex, religion' (p. 198). These markers were derived by earlier use of LIWC on writings by those who had committed suicide. The answer is yes: Hamlet and Ophelia sound like suicides when they get suicidal and they sound different from one another about it, in that she is more concerned with the traditional religious prohibitions than he is. Also, Ophelia and Hamlet start out using the personal pronoun *I* about equally often, but once they get suicidal she uses more words that indicate her concern for her place in a social and familial setting, while Hamlet remains solipsistic throughout. Oddly, when describing the words that LIWC counts, Anderson and Crossley remark on Hamlet's 'use of words associated with the family such as "mom", "brother", and "cousin"' (p. 209). In fact there are no occurrences of *mum* or *mom* in this play.

The last two essays are concerned with cognitive linguistics. In chapter 10, 'Shakespeare's Sexual Language and Metaphor: A Cognitive-Stylistic Approach' (pp. 215–45), José L. Oncins-Martínez uses Cognitive Metaphor Theory (CMT), developed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, to read the sexual imagery. When explaining how CMT models metaphorical thought, Oncins-Martínez writes that it is the process whereby 'we understand one domain of experience in terms of another, conventionally represented in the form A is B (e.g. LIFE IS A JOURNEY), where A is the target and B the source domain, roughly equivalent, respectively, to Richards' (1936) "vehicle" and "tenor"' (p. 219). He should have listed the last two nouns in the reverse order since LIFE is the tenor and JOURNEY is the vehicle. Chapter 11, 'Cognitive Interplay: How Blending Theory and Cognitive Science Reread Shakespeare' (pp. 246–68), by Amy Cook, is more of the same from the previous chapter. Cook seems to think that Laura Bohannon's classic essay of 1954, 'Shakespeare in the Bush', was first published 1995. This would explain why Cook is rather disturbed by some of Bohannon's language, since anthropologists no longer speak or write as Bohannon did. The second half of the essay veers off into a discussion of phantom limbs and mirror neurons, with only a tenuous connection to the first half.

Three essays relevant to this review appeared as chapters in books that are otherwise outside its scope. William Flesch thinks that modern editing overlooks Shakespeare's notion of textual fidelity, which was adherence not to the word but to the idea ('The Bounds of the Incidental: Shakespeare's View of Accuracy', in Stephen Burt and Nick Halpern, eds., *Something Understood: Essays and Poetry for Helen Vendler*, pp. 83–104). Thus where two early editions differ, an editor should combine them to preserve the idea, which was probably invariant in the underlying manuscripts. On the basis of Claude Shannon's theory of communication—and especially the idea that any amount of noise can be overcome by redundancy in the encoding of the signal—Flesch objects to Gary Taylor's editing of Q1 *King Lear* as if F did not exist. In particular, Taylor prefers his own emendations over F's corrections of Q's error. Flesch's underlying assumption here is mistaken, as we have no reason to suppose that Q1 and F are different encodings of the same signal—the same prior text—and much reason to suppose that the signal changed between the encoding as Q1 and the encoding as F, by (most likely, authorial) revision. This makes Shannon's ideas inapplicable. To be fair, Flesch somewhat acknowledges this by writing that 'To argue as I do... is to argue for a robustness of signal or meaning or accuracy' (p. 87). However, *robustness* itself is a problematic term when applied, as here, to a *signal* as well as its *meaning* and *accuracy*, since the last two are really about our understanding of a signal. Flesch assumes that all Q1/F differences are noise, from which it follows that an editor must use them both to recover the signal. That does indeed follow from the premise—and was how most editors treated the texts of *King Lear* until the 1980s—but the premise is faulty.

To defend his assumption that nothing but corruption separates the quartos and the Folio, Flesch argues that until recently quotation was seen as the attempt to report someone's meaning, not their exact words, and that alterations of pronouns and tense were acceptable. He uses examples from Shakespeare where characters quote one another inaccurately to argue that this is done to sacrifice 'verbal accuracy to other—more Shakespearean—effects' (p. 95). His examples include: the Nurse in *Romeo and Juliet* telling the story of what her husband said when the toddler Juliet fell over; Juliet repeating the Nurse's words relating important news so that '[NURSE] Tybalt is gone, and Romeo banished' becomes '[JULIET] Tybalt is dead, and Romeo banished'; the changing terms of the contract that Antonio enters into for Bassanio; and the letter that gulls Malvolio. Rather than quoting from the early printings, Flesch quotes from the Riverside edition without realizing that there the wording of Malvolio's letter has been tidied up, as Patricia Parker pointed out in an essay reviewed in *YWES* 87[2008]. Other examples of imperfect internal quotation are Richard II making a prophecy about Northumberland that Henry IV recalls and slightly rewords in *2 Henry IV*, and Macbeth recalling the apparition's comforting words about 'none... of woman born' with rewordings. Flesch's point about Shakespeare's ideas regarding verbatim repetition is well made, but it has no relevance to his mistaken assumption that all quarto/Folio variation arises from errors of transmission.

In the second of our three chapters-in-books, Patricia Parker objects to a number of emendations and modernizations of spelling and punctuation in editions of *Twelfth Night*, arguing for the retention of Folio readings that are suggestive of certain thematic connections ('*Twelfth Night*: Editing Puzzles and Eunuchs of All Kinds', in James Schiffer, ed., *Twelfth Night: New Critical Essays*, pp. 45–64). Modernizing 'Viol-de-gamboys' to 'Viol-de-Gambo' loses the connection to *boys*, and modernizing 'mistris *Mals* picture' to 'Mistress Mall's picture' loses the phonetic connection to *Malvolio*. (The second of those would be true if *Mall* has to rhyme with *ball*, but it does not: Londoners have no trouble rhyming The Mall and Pall Mall with *pal*.) Parker objects to correcting drunken Toby's 'come home in a Carranto' to '...coranto' as it loses the connection to *car* as a means of transport, and thinks it pointless trying to figure out what Toby's 'passy measures panyn' means when as drunken talk it might simply conflate *paynim* (pagan) and *pavan* (a dance). Emending Toby's 'with what wing the stallion checkes at it' (said of Malvolio as he reads Maria's letter) to 'with what wing the staniel checks at it' (*staniel* being a kind of bird) is wrong, argues Parker, because stallions can have wings too (witness Pegasus) and it suits Malvolio better to be likened to a stallion. Emending Andrew Aguecheek's reference to the tendency for his hair not to 'coole my nature' to 'curl by nature' is wrong because cooling invokes ideas about gender's relation to bodily heat. The emendation of Viola-as-Cesario's 'Alas, O frailtie is the cause, not wee, | For such as we are made, if such we bee' to 'Alas, our frailty is the cause, not we...' should be resisted on the grounds that 'our frailty' links these lines to the preceding 'women's waxen hearts' where 'O frailtie' does not, and the frailty is not specifically women's.

Parker makes the same case for punctuation being editorially emended, arguing that in the scene where Andrew Aguecheek appears to mistake Maria's name as Maria Accost, the confusion is created by modern editors. F has 'Tob. Accost Sir *Andrew*, accost. | *And*. What's that? | *To*. My Neeces Chamber-maid. | *Ma*. Good Mistris accost, I desire better acquaintance | *Ma*. My name is Mary sir. | *And*. Good mistris Mary, accost'. Parker argues that the first line here is addressed to Maria as an instruction to accost (approach) Andrew Aguecheek, and that 'Good Mistris accost' and 'Good mistris Mary, accost' are likewise Andrew's encouragements to approach, not mistakings of her name. This is a novel interpretation of the action and dialogue, but it is less comic than the standard reading. The clincher for Parker is the comma in Andrew's 'Good mistris Mary, accost', which Parker thinks makes the standard reading impossible and is present in all four Folios. True, but since the Folios form a single line of reprinting that is not surprising. Modern editions that tell Orsino which twin to speak to in the final scene spoil the fun to be had in modern productions when, still confused, he addresses the wrong twin. Parker also thinks that decisions about which lines are sung are contentious, and proposes that instead of adding a direction so that the play begins with music that Orsino silences, a modern edition should just have a note explaining that the Folio does not make explicit this opening music. Editors who think that Viola abandons her plan to present herself as a eunuch to Orsino because the play has been revised are being over-literal, according to Parker. After all, the word *eunuch* could just mean a kind of flute that had no

voice of its own but could be, as it were, spoken through; this suits Viola and the play generally much better.

In the last of our chapters-in-books, Lukas Erne surveys how nineteenth-century editors of Shakespeare responded to evil characters in their introductions and explanatory notes and by bowdlerizing cuts ('Mediating Evil: The Editorial and Critical Reception of Shakespeare's Villains', in Kirsten Stirling and Martine Hennard Dutheil de la Rochère, eds., *After Satan: Essays in Honour of Neil Forsyth*, pp. 68–84). The recurrent response was that editors diminished the awkward bits of Shakespeare where the reader or playgoer is made uncomfortably complicit in evil, as when finding Iago or Richard III likeable. The editors wanted the plays to teach simple moral lessons. By cutting Iago's plausible lies of a sexual nature, the bowdlerizers pushed more of the blame for Desdemona's death onto Othello. Erne gives a useful account of the Neoplatonist Plotinus's argument, taken up by early Christians, that evil is not a positive thing. Rather than being an essence, evil is just the absence or diminution of the quality of goodness; this idea helps Christians overcome the objection that God himself is responsible for evil because he created it along with everything else.

The four most important articles to be surveyed this year were all by MacDonald P. Jackson, and three of them should have been noticed in previous years. In the oldest, Jackson argues that Shakespeare wrote *A Lover's Complaint* and did so in 1604–5: '*A Lover's Complaint Revisited*' (*ShakS* 24[2004] 267–94). *A Lover's Complaint* appears at the end of the 1609 first edition of Shakespeare's sonnets, and one reason for suspicion about its authorship was the lack of any precedent for tacking a complaint on the end of a sonnet sequence. As Jackson points out, it was only recently noticed that Samuel Daniel's sonnet sequence *Delia* [1592] ends with *The Complaint of Rosamund*, so a precedent does exist. Elliott and Valenza's work on the poem suggests that Shakespeare did not write it, but Jackson thinks that their methods are unreliable where the known base of the author's poetry—in this case just two narrative poems and the sonnets—is small. Jackson critiques their tests as applied to *A Lover's Complaint*, noting that although it falls outside the Shakespeare range for the count of *no/no+not* usage so do all the works by other authors that they tested, and within one author's canon there is considerable variation on this test. Also, simply turning raw counts into rates as they do has a misleading effect where the total counts are small. It is better to use techniques such as Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and to measure such things as standard deviation to see how significant it is that a text fails a particular test. Importantly, Elliott and Valenza did not randomly divide the accepted Shakespeare canon into two halves and use one half to generate the Shakespeare ranges on each test and the other to check that these ranges really do distinguish Shakespeare's texts from those of others. Rather, they used the whole canon to generate the ranges, and doing so is known to produce ranges that exclude some genuine work.

Jackson gives a subjective argument for the rhetoric and diction of *A Lover's Complaint* being like Shakespeare's, and then repeats his Literature Online (LION) searching methodology, described in previous papers. He looks for phrases and collocations in *A Lover's Complaint*, or rather in sample parts of

it, that LION shows to be used ‘five or fewer times’ in plays from 1590 to 1610. (Strictly speaking he means one to five times, since of course zero is excluded.) Also, it should be mentioned that the initial selection of phrases and collocations seems to have been done by human judgement. Jackson did not have the computer find them but rather decided for himself which words were likely to be relatively rare and hence worth looking for in LION; it is possible that unconscious, pro-Shakespearian bias entered at this point. Jackson lists the seventy-five phrases/collocations he found—some of them occurring in *A Lover’s Complaint* and multiple plays—and finds that known Shakespeare works predominate even after he normalizes the results, dividing by the number of each man’s plays from that period, to adjust for the fact that Shakespeare’s canon is much bigger than everyone else’s. In particular, *A Lover’s Complaint* has most links to *Othello*, *All’s Well That Ends Well*, *King Lear*, and *Timon of Athens* (all written 1603–7), but amongst the links to non-Shakespearian plays there is also a predominance of plays from roughly these years. So it seems that certain phrases were ‘in the air’ (p. 290) at certain times, and that *A Lover’s Complaint* was written in 1603–7 and most likely 1604–6, the middle of this range.

Jackson uses the same methodology to argue that Shakespeare wrote scene 8, the quarrel scene, in *Arden of Faversham*, and that he might have written quite a bit more of the play, in ‘Shakespeare and the Quarrel Scene in *Arden of Faversham*’ (*SQ* 57[2006] 249–93). Most readers agree that the quarrel scene is the best part of the play and that it anticipates *Macbeth* in a number of ways. The Stationers’ Register entry was on 3 April 1592, and a quarto followed that year. The play was—or would have been had the attempt not been botched—attributed to Shakespeare by William Archer in 1656. Allusions to John Lyly’s *Endymion* [1588] and a rumour about Robert Dudley that was unlikely to be repeated on stage before his death in 1588 make late 1588 the earliest date of composition. As before, Jackson went looking in LION for phrases and collocations that are in the quarrel scene in *Arden of Faversham* and that also occur between one and five times in other plays from 1580 to 1600. There was, necessarily, a subjective element: ‘Parallels in imagery and ideas were recorded only if passages had at least one prominent word in common. Apart from compounds, single words linking the quarrel scene to five or fewer places within the corpus were disregarded, unless supported by striking similarities of context’ (p. 257). Also, the words in common had to have the same sense: *loathsome weeds* in one place was not a hit with *loathsome weeds* in another if the first meant plants and the second meant clothing.

In the event, twenty-eight plays were found to have four or more links with the quarrel scene in *Arden of Faversham* and eighteen of them are in the Shakespeare canon. The ones with the most links are his early plays *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Contention of York and Lancaster*/2 *Henry VI*, *Richard Duke of York*/3 *Henry VI*, and *The Taming of the Shrew*. Adjusting for the difference in length of play—making it more significant if a short play has a link to *Arden of Faversham* than if a long one has—the outcome is broadly the same: links to Shakespeare predominate. Many of the Shakespeare links are to his plays written after 1592, so they cannot be explained by someone who was making a memorial reconstruction of *Arden of Faversham* filling it

out with recollections of performance. The methodology was retested by applying it to two speeches from *Doctor Faustus*, the apostrophe to Helen and the final soliloquy. Which plays from 1580 to 1600 do those speeches have links with? Overwhelmingly, Christopher Marlowe's. Jackson ends with some subjective connections between Shakespeare and the quarrel scene from *Arden of Faversham* in terms of significant imagery. He remarks that in all of LION only *Arden of Faversham* scene 8 and *The Rape of Lucrece* have both *copesmate* and *sland'rous/slanderous*, and likewise only they have all three of the words *copesmate*, *rifled*, and *cannon*. True, but why confine oneself to literary writing? EEBO-TCP currently shows seven other pre-1600 books in which *copesmate* and *sland'rous/slanderous* both appear and two, other than *Arden of Faversham* and *The Rape of Lucrece*, in which all three of the words *copesmate*, *rifled*, and *cannon* appear. So the question is whether it is valid to compare the suspect play only with other literary texts rather than other published writing of all types.

The third of Jackson's articles was another that argued for Shakespeare's authorship of *A Lover's Complaint*, this time by showing the flaws in Brian Vickers's stylometric argument that it is not, in 'Neologisms and Non-Shakespearean Words in *A Lover's Complaint*' (*Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 245:160[2008] 288–302). In *Shakespeare*, '*A Lover's Complaint*', and *John Davies of Hereford*, Vickers used as evidence against Shakespeare's authorship of the poem the fact that it contains words not used elsewhere by Shakespeare or used in senses Shakespeare did not use elsewhere. We now know at what rate to expect Shakespeare to introduce new words to his vocabulary when writing a new work, and Vickers derived his rate of Shakespeare's Latinate neologisms from the work of Jürgen Schäfer and Bryan Garner. This seems to show that there is one neologism every thirty lines or so in *A Lover's Complaint* but only one in 232 lines in *The Rape of Lucrece*, one in 398 lines in *Venus and Adonis*, one in 431 lines in the sonnets, and one in 187 lines in the plays. On this evidence, *A Lover's Complaint* does not look like Shakespeare.

Vickers's numbers, however, are wrong due to miscounting and because he normalized the counts (by giving them as one per so many lines) on the basis of the number of tokens in a text when in fact he should have been normalizing by number of types, since long works have proportionally fewer types to tokens than short texts. To see why this is the case, consider the line 'O for a muse of fire, that would ascend', which has nine tokens and nine types, making one type per token. If we extend the sample to include the next line, making 'O for a muse of fire, that would ascend | The brightest heaven of invention' there are 14 tokens but only 13 types (because *of* appears twice), making 0.93 types per token. 'O for a muse of fire, that would ascend | The brightest heaven of invention | A kingdom for a stage, princes to act' has 22 tokens but only 18 types (because *of* and *for* appear twice and *a* appears three times), making 0.82 types per token. The decline continues the more lines there are, and neologisms will by definition be new types.

Measuring rates of Latinate neologisms per total types (rather than per total tokens as Vickers does) makes *A Lover's Complaint* come near the top end of the Shakespeare range, but within in. Jackson demonstrates this with Garner's

figures and then with Schäfer's. Jackson also notes that *OED* probably credits *Love's Labour's Lost*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *A Lover's Complaint* with more neologisms than they deserve because it assigns them dates of composition that are five to ten years too early, making them seem to precede works that they in fact followed. What about the claim that *A Lover's Complaint* has many words that appear nowhere in the accepted Shakespeare canon? Jackson tabulates this—again as rates per total types not per total tokens—and *A Lover's Complaint* comes out a little higher than *Venus and Adonis*, *The Rape of Lucrece*, and *The Phoenix and the Turtle*, but not by much, and compared to the plays it is perfectly within Shakespeare's range.

Elliott and Valenza's test for peculiar words is one that Valenza himself has expressed reservations about as it seems to declare all his poems outside Shakespeare's range, which range the test largely derives from the plays. Elliott and Valenza's method is to plot the full range of Shakespeare's habit on a particular test and then to define a somewhat shorter range, centred on the middle of the full run, as the zone within which a text of unknown authorship has to fall in order to be declared Shakespearian. That is, they remove the outliers. But of course *A Lover's Complaint* might sit among the Shakespearian outliers, and indeed Jackson shows that on Elliott and Valenza's test it does so alongside certain parts of *Hamlet*, *The Tempest*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *The Winter's Tale*, *Venus and Adonis*, *I Henry IV*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *Othello*. Also, Elliott and Valenza's automated system includes a host of proper nouns—names of people, races, and so on—that should properly be eliminated. Vickers claimed that the Latinate neologisms in *A Lover's Complaint* are more characteristic of Davies than Shakespeare, but Jackson shows that a lot of them use the prefixes *em-*, *im-*, and *in-* and the suffixes *-ure*, *-ive*, *-ant*, *-ent*, *-less*, and *-ion*, which is just what Shakespeare does.

The last of Jackson's articles (aside from a long note in *Notes and Queries*, discussed below) is the one referred to in Jowett's edition of *Sir Thomas More*, as mentioned above, and it shows that the play was written after 1595 and perhaps even after 1600: 'Deciphering a Date and Determining a Date: Anthony Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber* and the Original Version of *Sir Thomas More*' (*EMLS* 15:iii[2011] n.p.). The playbook manuscript of *John a Kent and John a Cumber* is in Munday's own hand but the date at the end of the manuscript is not. E. Maunde Thompson and Greg read the date as 1596 and I.A. Shapiro read it as 1590. The Original Text of *Sir Thomas More* is in Munday's hand, and Thompson and Greg decided that his handwriting changed and that *Sir Thomas More* came after *John a Kent and John a Cumber* and before Munday's autograph *The Heaven of the Mind*, dated by him 22 December 1602. *John a Kent* has a great many feminine endings, so if it really was completed by 1590 then Munday was a major pioneer of this important poetical development. Looking closely at the date in *John a Kent*, Shapiro argued that as a 6 the final figure would be anomalous, but Jackson has found several similar-looking manuscript sixes and points out that here the final figure was clearly written clockwise, which noughts almost never are or were.

Dated to 1596, *John a Kent and John a Cumber* has the typical number of feminine endings for its period. This dating would make *Sir Thomas More*

later too, since it is orthographically between *John a Kent* and *The Heaven of the Mind*. The feminine-ending rate in the Additions to *Sir Thomas More* is about the same as the feminine-ending rate of the Original Text, suggesting that the Additions are not very much later. Ants Oras showed that over the 1590s and early 1600s, the pauses in lines—marked by punctuation or a change of speaker—moved to later in the line, from most commonly after the fourth syllable to most commonly after the sixth, and on this test *Sir Thomas More* is later than the early 1590s. David J. Lake showed that around 1599–1600 all dramatists started using contractions such as 'em for *them* and o'th for *of the* a lot more than hitherto, and carried on doing so until the civil war; on this evidence too *Sir Thomas More* is later than the early 1590s. Likewise the use of *has* and *does* instead of *hath* and *doth*, which Lake noted was also a change occurring rapidly around 1600. With the exception of *Sir Thomas More*—which is anomalously modern in having several uses of *has* and *does* if it really was written in the early 1590s—the words *has* and *does* are very rare in plays before 1600, this too points to a date after 1595. Lastly there are in *Sir Thomas More* some oaths that were fashionable in the early seventeenth century, such as *Gods me*. *Sir Thomas More* avoids all mention of Cardinal Thomas Wolsey, which might be because it was written after the Admiral's men had exhausted audiences' interest in this man with their two lost plays *The Life of Cardinal Wolsey* and *The Rising of Cardinal Wolsey* (both 1601).

Before turning to the other articles published in 2011, a couple that were missed from previous years will be noticed. In the first, David Scott Kastan argues that Lukas Erne is wrong about Shakespeare being a literary author, in "‘To think these trifles something’": Shakespearean Playbooks and the Claims of Authorship' (*ShakS* 36[2008] 37–48). Erne's *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (reviewed in *YWES* 84[2005]) has just two chapters of core evidence: one on the Elizabethan-period publishing of Shakespeare and one on the Jacobean. The latter is mainly a story of not publishing, which Erne tried to explain in relation to the publishing that went before, so that everything rests on his argument about Shakespeare's publications in 1595–1603, which Kastan undertakes to re-examine. Erne's claim that by the end of 1602 all of Shakespeare's plays that could be printed had been printed is more or less true, but the claim that it was generally two years from composition to Stationers' Register entry depends on some unusual dating of the plays. Erne has to explain away or ignore some fairly clear evidence that players considered publication to be against their interests, such as Thomas Heywood's statement to this effect in *The English Traveller* [1633], the Whitefriars sharers' articles of agreement forbidding it, the epistle to *Troilus and Cressida* referring to it, Richard Brome's 1635 contract with the Salisbury Court theatre banning it without the players' consent, and the Lord Chamberlain's letter of 1619 to the Stationers' Company stopping publication of the King's men's plays without their permission.

Perhaps the playing company and/or Shakespeare wanted to control publication rather than being simply in favour of it. Nineteen of Shakespeare's plays were printed before the 1623 Folio, and fifteen of these were in print by 1603. But of those fifteen, nearly half were bad quartos: *The Contention of York and Lancaster*/2 *Henry VI*, *Richard Duke of York*/3 *Henry VI*, *Romeo and*

Juliet, Henry V, Hamlet, The Merry Wives of Windsor, and—to judge from the recent evidence of a lost first edition and the 1598 quarto’s reference to being ‘Newly corrected’—*Love’s Labour’s Lost*. Moreover for three of these—*Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet*, and *Love’s Labour’s Lost*—the bad quarto was followed by a good one, as if to force it out of the marketplace. The first quarto of *Titus Andronicus* cannot have been authorized by Shakespeare or the Chamberlain’s men since it has neither name on it. The evidence of ‘staying’ orders also indicates that publication was sometimes thought by the actors to be against their interests. When we take those ‘stayed’ publications—*The Merchant of Venice, As You Like It, 2 Henry IV*, and *Much Ado About Nothing*—away from the eight good quartos before 1603, there are just four publications that support Erne’s claim that there was a coherent strategy of publication by the Chamberlain’s men. Sure, Shakespeare wrote plays too long to be performed uncut, but so did others, and everyone involved knew that cutting was routine.

The last of the catch-up articles is Osvaldo A. Rosso, Hugh Craig, and Pablo Moscato’s highly technical application of information theory to the study of Shakespeare’s vocabulary in ‘Shakespeare and Other English Renaissance Authors as Characterized By Information Theory Complexity Quantifiers’ (*Physica A* 388[2009] 916–26). The paper calculates two statistics for the word-occurrence frequencies in a group of 136 plays and forty-nine poems from the period 1580 to 1640 (including Shakespeare): the Shannon Entropy and the Statistical Complexity. These statistics are comments upon the probability distributions of the results obtained from measuring how more or less often than the average rate of usage is the particular rate of usage of each word in each text. These comments bear upon the mathematical notions of entropy and randomness, which together with the means by which these statistics were calculated are technically (and especially mathematically) complex to a degree well beyond the scope of this review and the comprehension of this reviewer. Indeed, it is distinctly possible that the foregoing summary substantially misrepresents the article’s method. Thus the article cannot be properly reviewed here and there is no point noticing it further, other than to mention that the main conclusion is that ‘Shakespeare’s plays generally use vocabulary items at a rate which is very close to the norm for the drama of his time’ (p. 925).

This year Craig published a more humanities-friendly version of the same argument that Shakespeare’s exceptionality did not reside in his using lots of words that other people were not using—rather, his vocabulary is remarkably unexceptional—in ‘Shakespeare’s Vocabulary: Myth and Reality’ (*SQ* 62[2011] 53–74). The key claim here is that ‘Shakespeare introduces “fresh” words—that is, words he has not used before—at about the same rate as his contemporaries’ (p. 58). Craig’s method counts word forms—so *light* counts once whether used as noun or adjective, while *run* and *ran* count as two—and he starts with original-spelling electronic texts for which the variant spellings are consolidated using the software described in his article co-authored with R. Whipp reviewed in *YWES* 91[2012]. Craig compared twenty-eight sole-authored plays by Shakespeare and around 100 plays by others. In these, Shakespeare used 20,000 different words (the highest number) while Ben Jonson (next highest) used 18,000 and George Peele 6,000 (the lowest).

However, Shakespeare's is the largest surviving canon, followed by Middleton (thirty-one plays, eighteen sole-authored), and dividing the number of different words by the size of the canon shows that other writers would have equalled or surpassed his count of different words if they had written as much as he did.

As was demonstrated above in connection with Jackson's critique of Vickers's failure to grasp this point, as canons increase in size the number of different words (expressed as a proportion of the total number of words) goes down with each new addition. Thus, an x/y plot line of 'total words' versus 'different words' quite quickly heads towards the horizontal, since adding a new play adds lots of words to the canon but does not add many new words. This makes comparisons of Shakespeare with others difficult. Craig tried to standardize comparisons by taking the first 10,000 words of each play for Shakespeare and a set of plays written in 1580–1619 by twenty-four other dramatists, giving 121 such 10,000-word blocks in all. In each block, Craig counted the number of distinct words (types), and Shakespeare comes out at about average for the group of dramatists, at 1,663 types in 10,000 tokens. Next Craig measured how many new words come into the dramatist's total word-usage with each new play he writes. Shakespeare, Middleton, and Jonson start out by introducing 2,200–2,500 distinct words in their first plays, then a further 1,300–1,600 fresh words in their second plays, and 1,000–2,000 in their third plays. There is a small spike because Middleton and Jonson introduced more new words in their third plays than they did in their second, but the overall trend is down. This pattern of decline is broadly the same whether we count whole plays or rates of new types per 1,000 tokens, and compared to other dramatists Shakespeare is typical, not exceptional. So, the large vocabulary of his canon is due simply to him having the largest canon.

Eliot Slater wondered if Shakespeare's greatness was his use of ordinary words in extraordinary ways, so Craig set out to discover if Shakespeare uses more of the common words and fewer of the rare words than other dramatists do. Using his 121 blocks of 10,000 words, Craig derived two numbers for each and made a graph in which the x axis counts how many tokens in this block are instances of the 500 commonest types and the y axis the number of 'singletons', meaning words used just once. (It is not clear from Craig's explanation whether by 'commonest' types he means commonest in this particular block or commonest across all 121 blocks, nor whether the 'singletons' are used just once in this block or just once in all 121 blocks; I suspect in both cases he means across all 121 blocks.) Again, Shakespeare comes out as typical of the dramatists, not exceptional. This measure seems related to genre: plays with multiple exotic locations and people tend to use fewer common words and more 'singletons' than plays that stay in one domestic setting.

Craig did a similar calculation with his 121 blocks of 10,000 words by looking for rates of usage of the commonest 100 words in them, from *the* (average usage 301 per 10,000 words) to *art* (average usage 11 per 10,000 words). For each block, representing a sample from one play, he measured the difference between its frequency of use of each word and the average frequency (across all blocks) for that word, and then to normalize for all words he

divided that by the average frequency for that word. So, if the block from *Much Ado About Nothing* uses *the* 350 times and *art* 5 times the score would be 49/301 (= 0.1628) for *the* and -6/11 (-0.546) for *art*. For each block this produced 100 deviations from the norm, one for each word, and Craig averaged them to get the play's overall deviation from the norm. (He does not explain whether he made all the negatives positive, but calling them *deviations* rather than *differences* implies that +0.1 and -0.1 both count simply as a deviation of 0.1—so, an average of 0.1—rather than averaging out to zero.) The result is that, of all the playwrights tested, Shakespeare is the one who least deviates from the mean. The results are the same if the averages are recalculated using not all 121 blocks but only the blocks by all the dramatists other than the one who wrote the block currently being tested. (At least, that is what I think Craig means by 'recalculate the word averages without each of the authors' works in turn and use that as the basis for our measure of difference from the mean', p. 67.) The results are also the same when using only the top 50 rather than 100 commonest words. The pattern of Shakespeare's exceptional averageness breaks down only when Craig focuses on just one genre, comedy, and only when he calculates the averages not across all the blocks but only the blocks not by Shakespeare.

Richard Dutton reckons that *The Merry Wives of Windsor* was written in 1599–1600 and revised for its known court performance in 1604, with Q1 [1602] reflecting the first version and the Folio the revised version, in 'A Jacobean *Merry Wives*?' (*BJJ* 18[2011] 1–26). This is much the same argument of revision-for-revival separating a bad quarto and its Folio counterpart that Dutton made for *Henry V* in an article reviewed in *YWES* 86[2007]. Dutton aims to show that we should not patch the scant Folio stage directions from Q1 just because the latter has fuller stage directions, since authorial revision may separate the performances from which Q1 derives and the manuscript behind F, which is usually supposed to be printed from a Ralph Crane transcript of authorial papers. Dutton gives the date that George Carey was made Lord Chamberlain as 14 April 1597, but in fact it was 17 April 1597. On 23 April 1597 Carey was also made a Knight of the Garter, and it has been assumed that *The Merry Wives of Windsor* was written to celebrate this elevation. The trouble is, the play has significant Garter material only in F, so something like F would have to have been in existence in 1597 and there is no record of any performance in connection with the Garter ceremonies. Moreover, *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is not in Francis Meres's 1598 list of Shakespeare plays. Dutton seems unaware that B.J. Sokol has shown (in an article reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011]) that *The Merry Wives of Windsor* alludes to Elizabeth Aston's marriage in 1600 so it must have been written after that event.

To understand Dutton's complex argument, one needs to bear in mind that William Brooke, tenth Lord Cobham, was made Lord Chamberlain in July 1596 on the death of Shakespeare's patron Lord Hunsdon, whose son George Carey also wanted the job and had to wait until William Brooke died in April 1597 to get it. When William Brooke died his son Henry Brooke hoped to get the Lord Chamberlain job, but instead his rival George Carey got it. In 1599 Henry Brooke, eleventh Lord Cobham, was elected to the Order of the Garter,

and Dutton reckons that this (1599–1600) would have been a good time for Shakespeare to revive his teasing of the Cobham family by naming the foolish character in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* Brooke, having left them alone in his previous play, *Henry V*. But in fact the name is Brooke in Q1 but Broome in F, and Dutton thinks this is evidence that Q1's underlying manuscript is prior to F's underlying manuscript rather than following it. Henry Brooke, eleventh Lord Cobham, was implicated in the Main Plot of 1603 and stripped of his Garter on 14 February 1604, and Dutton thinks that after this *The Merry Wives of Windsor* was revised to make the Folio version for a court performance on 4 November 1604. Henry Brooke had become associated with Oldcastle/Falstaff by his resistance to the name Oldcastle, and now the association would be strengthened by Henry Brooke being stripped of his Garter just as is Fastolf in *1 Henry VI*, the character from whom Shakespeare took the new name for Oldcastle.

From Roslyn L. Knutson's analysis, it is clear that the one occasion that could make an acting company pay for substantial revisions was taking a play to court, so that it was revised over and above what was shown to the public, even if only by adding a special prologue and/or epilogue. Q1 *Merry Wives of Windsor*'s title page shows that it was played at court by the time of its publication in 1602. Dutton thinks that Q1 is a poor transmission, not of the play underlying F but 'of something else, now lost' (p. 16). The King's men played a lot at court around Christmas 1604, and with James having just made several new appointments to the Order of the Garter the Folio version of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* would be especially welcome. There are Folio-only moments in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* that would particularly suit a court performance, such as the reference to revelling around the oak until 1 a.m. (which was the time that court performances usually ended) and the change of the name Brooke to Broome so that it becomes a fig-leaf that draws attention to what it conceals, the allusion to Cobham. In Q1 it seems that Anne Page plays one of the fairies and Mistress Quickly the queen of the fairies, but Anne Page is queen of the fairies in F. Dutton agrees with critics who find the Q1 ending consonant with the rest of the play, while the more formal and dignified masque in F seems like something tacked on for a specific court occasion. That is, the revision apparent in F is incomplete.

Adele Davidson has responded to Richard Knowles's critique (reviewed in *YWES* 91[2012]) of her claim that stenographic reproduction was an important vector in the creation of the first quarto of *King Lear* in "'Common Variants" and "Unusual Features": Shorthand and the Copy for the First Quarto of *Lear*' (*PBSA* 105[2011] 325–51). Part of Knowles's rejection of the stenographic argument was based on showing that what Davidson characterized as unusual words in Q1 *King Lear* generated by stenography are in fact normal-spelling variants in the period. Davidson responds by pointing to particular ones that definitely are not, as revealed for example by EEBO-TCP for the years 1473–1630 having no occurrences of *thourt* (as a spelling of *thwart*) other than Q1 *King Lear*. Davidson lists fifty-seven such spellings that are rare outside Q1 *King Lear* (at least, not found in EEBO-TCP), from *arint*, *autums*, and *bagger* (for *beggar*) to *trild*, *vtund*, and *wanst*. All Davidson's EEBO-TCP searches hereafter are for the years

1473–1630, and so are all of mine. Since TCP is considerably larger than it used to be, several searches that for Davidson produced no hits now produce them, and the conclusions she draws from not finding hits must be treated sceptically.

Thus Davidson makes claims for press-variant readings in Q1 *King Lear* that are now problematic. She claims that Q1's *fichew* is 'unique in EEBO-TCP' (p. 334) but I find two occurrences outside Q1: STC 20919 (year 1481) 'the fychew, the fyret, the mowse, and the squyrel' (sig. k6^r) and STC 15146 (year 1582) 'euery Fichew, Polcat, Wesell, Stote, Faire, Badge, or Wilde cat' (sig. C3^v). Likewise Davidson claims that Q1's *Coknay* (for *Cockney*, east London) is unique (p. 335), but I find it in STC 13291 (year 1546) 'A good coknay coke [= cook]' (sig. L2^v). Davidson claims that Q1 *King Lear*'s *bedlom* (for *bedlam*) is unique in TCP, but in fact there is STC 3070 (year 1604) 'to play the Bedlom in this sort' (sig. Ccc2^v). Because Davidson does not state the size of the TCP collection at the point at which she did her searching, nor when she was searching, it is impossible to tell if she failed to find certain words because she was searching incorrectly or because they really were absent from TCP at the time. As with all such research, conclusions drawn from not finding something are less reliable than those drawn from finding something.

The well-known shortening of the measure in parts of Q1, because the compositor indented the stick, cannot explain the shortening of words such as *beniz* (for *benizon*) as these occur where the measure is not shortened as well as where it is. At this point Davidson simply reiterates her general position on stenography, offering no new evidence but pointing the reader to details in her monograph *Shakespeare in Shorthand* (reviewed in YWES 91[2012], and not considered by Knowles). Mostly she rebuts Knowles's objections to stenography and it is hard to evaluate the claims as they rest upon the weighting one gives to various indeterminate matters such as how well known, and how prone to error, the shorthand systems were.

Alan F. Hickman, in 'In a Minor Key: Visual Effects in Shake-Speare's Sonnets' (*SEDERI* 21[2011] 147–61), finds considerable significance in the physical layout of *Sonnets* [1609], but to this reviewer it is all in the eye of the beholder. Hickman gives a description of the layout of the book and thinks the spelling of Shakespeare's name is especially interesting as it has 'a hyphen between *s* and *p*' (p. 148). That is not where the hyphen falls: it is *Shake-speare* not *Shakes-peare*. Hickman sees significance in the word *clock* appearing only in Sonnets 12 and 57 since $5 + 7 = 12$. Also, Sonnet 12 refers to 'Time's scythe' and Sonnet 77 is also about the effects of time, and it (Sonnet 77) has its head chopped off by its first two lines appearing on E4^v and the remaining twelve appearing over the page on F1^r. The scythe recurs in Sonnet 100 if we think of that number in roman numerals (C, like a scythe) and if we accept with Hickman that the line 'If any, be a *Satire* to decay' looks chopped off because short. The scythe recurs again in the two blank lines in brackets at the end of Sonnet 126.

Hickman finds significance even in numbers that do not quite add up: Sonnet 104 is concerned with a time span of three years, or 156 weeks, 'which is just two more than the number of poems in the sequence' (p. 151). Sonnet 60 is broken by a page-break, which Hickman thinks helps it to make its meaning

by highlighting the first words of the first two lines after the break. In the line ‘Thou blinde foole loue, what doost thou to mine eyes’, at the start of Sonnet 137, Hickman sees two pairs of eyes (in *foole* and *doost*). The layout of the title page looks to Hickman like ‘the approximate outline of a Renaissance stage’ (p. 153), with its headpiece being a hanging at the back and the two horizontal rules being the front edge of the platform. The layout of type on the dedication page (‘TO.THE...T.T.’) looks to Hickman like a keyhole, as befits the sonnets’ private contents, and the same idea is picked up in the headpiece above Sonnet 1, in which Hickman sees a drape over a bed.

In the context of Shakespeare’s lost play *Cardenio*, Richard Meek and Jane Ricard show that presenting authorship as a singular thing is not a modern bias: early modern texts did it, even collaborative ones: “‘This Orphan Play’: *Cardenio* and the Construction of the Author’ (*Shakespeare* 7[2011] 269–83). Miguel de Cervantes, in the preliminaries to *Don Quixote*, jokes about authorship and the practice of making up references to one’s classical sources to give one’s work gravity, and in the middle of this he repeatedly presents himself as merely the compiler or editor of others’ stories about his central character. In telling the story of *Cardenio*, *Don Quixote* has several overlapping narrators yet the story remains incomplete. Paradoxically, such devices actually intensify the power of Cervantes as the ultimate author. The same effect is generated by Cervantes’ inclusion within the narrative of *Don Quixote* of a copy of one of his own earlier books and a discussion by others of his non-completion of stories. When collaborating with others or revising their work, Fletcher tended not to represent authorship as anything other than singular. The prologue to *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, for example, refers to Geoffrey Chaucer as its singular father and the play as an adaptation by a single ‘writer’.

By a tortuous and speculative chain of connections, L.A. Collinson, in ‘A New Etymology for Hamlet? The Names Amlethus, Amlodi and Admlithi’ (*RES* 62[2011] 675–94), establishes that Saxo Grammaticus’s Irish sources for his *Gesta Danorum* (a source for *Hamlet*) might already have linked the Hamlet figure with players, with a clown whose skull gets dug up, and with a sea-eddy—as Shakespeare’s Hamlet is likened in ‘mad as the sea’, ‘sea of troubles’, ‘gulf’, and ‘cess/cease of majesty’—even though Grammaticus himself leaves these elements out of his work. Ward E.Y. Elliott gives an account of what he and Robert J. Valenza are up to in their stylometric study of Shakespeare, in ‘Notes from the Claremont Shakespeare Clinic’ (*ShN* 49[2011] 105, 108–12). The news is all about interim results and the details of technical methods, at the level of which kinds of computers and software they are using. There are no firm research outcomes revealed, but it is useful to know that they currently do not attribute to Shakespeare the play *Thomas of Woodstock* (as Michael Egan does), nor the additions to the play *Mucedorus* (as MacDonald P. Jackson does), that they are unsure about his authorship of the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* (maintained to be Shakespeare’s by Hugh Craig and Brian Vickers, independently), and do not give Shakespeare a hand in *Arden of Faversham* (as maintained by Jackson).

And so to the round-up from *Notes & Queries*. The most substantial is MacDonald P. Jackson’s response to John Klause’s criticism (reviewed in

YWES 91[2012]) of Jackson's use of rhyme to identify George Wilkins as Shakespeare's co-author on *Pericles*, in 'Rhymes and Authors: Shakespeare, Wilkins, and *Pericles*' (*N&Q* 58[2011] 260–6). The nub of this is that Jackson thinks Klause misunderstood why certain rhymes count and others do not, and they disagree on how best to count multiple links between works. Klause claimed to find a rhyme on *sin/him* in *Measure for Measure* that Jackson (and his source Helge Kökeritz) overlooked: 'To bring you thus together 'tis no sin, | Sith that the justice of your title to him' (IV.i.71–2). But as Jackson points out, that is not a rhyme since *sin* is stressed and *him* is an unstressed feminine ending. Klause offered another allegedly missed rhyme on *sin/him* in 'Only, in this disguise I think 't no sin | To cozen him that would unjustly win' (IV.ii.76–7), arguing that *him* is an internal rhyme. As Jackson points out, this is not a rhyme at all: the rhyme here is *sin/win*.

Klause's objection to how Jackson counted the rhymes that connect *Pericles* Acts I and II with other plays and Wilkins's *The Miseries of an Enforced Marriage* is really an argument about types versus tokens. Should one rhyme that is found in two plays by different authors get counted once no matter how many times it occurs (the types model) or should each occurrence of that rhyme linking the two plays count each time it happens (the tokens model)? Jackson argues that Klause's types approach distorts the evidence since two plays using the same rhyme five times each really is stronger evidence (and should count as twenty-five links between them) than the two plays using the same rhyme once (counting as just one link between them). Klause's approach also fails to normalize the counts to factor in just how much rhyme there is in a play: 'Surely a predilection signalled by the dual use of a rhyme in a play that contains 100 rhymes altogether is stronger than the same dual use in a play that contains 300 rhymes altogether' (p. 264). Wilkins tends to reuse the same rhymes in a work (counting here rhyme-types not rhyme-tokens), so that the percentages of rhymes that get reused are 8.5 per cent for *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage*, 9.2 per cent for *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*, 8.6 per cent for *Pericles* Acts I and II, but only 1.6 per cent for *Pericles* Acts III–V. Again the two halves of the play are clearly distinguished.

Klause wrongly thought that finding more of the *Pericles* Acts I and II rhyme-types elsewhere in the canon of Shakespeare than there are *Pericles* Acts III–V rhyme-types shared with the canon of Shakespeare was an argument against co-authorship or against the use of rhymes to determine authorship. As Jackson points out, this is mistaken. The Shakespeare canon is so big that finding somewhere in it a match for most of the rhymes Wilkins used is not surprising. Klause claimed that other poets apart from Wilkins might have the rhyming habits that appear in *Pericles* Acts I and II, but Jackson reports that although he (Jackson) has since found some aspects of Wilkins's rhyming style in the work of Samuel Rowley, overall David Lake's work on the plausible alternative candidates (apart from Wilkins) for *Pericles* Acts I and II showed that none was remotely likely. For several cases where Klause saw certain nasal assonant near-rhymes that Lake and Jackson overlooked, Jackson disputes that they really are rhymes. Just what counts as a near-rhyme is, of course, subjective.

Thomas Merriam made two relevant contributions this year. In the first, he argues that Munday's spelling in *Sir Thomas More* is like his spelling in *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, in 'Moore the Merier' (*N&Q* 58[2011] 241–2). In a note reviewed in *YWES* 87[2008], Merriam showed that in *Sir Thomas More* Munday uses dozens of *-tt* endings and always spells *been* as *bin*, whereas in *John a Kent* he never uses *-tt* endings and always spells *been* as *beene*. Merriam has another example now: for the words *merry/merrie*, *merriment*, and *merrily*, *Sir Thomas More* almost always uses one medial *-r-* where *John a Kent* almost always uses two. This is beyond the bounds of coincidence, and Merriam reckons that it shows that Munday was not composing—during which his habits would dominate—but was copying out someone else's words. Merriam assumes that the plays were written 'about the same time' (p. 241), but I suppose that if they were separated by some years then Munday's spelling habits might have changed in the meantime.

In his second contribution, 'King John and Henry V as Anomalies' (*N&Q* 58[2011] 242–7), Merriam gives reasons for believing that *Henry V* has some Marlowe in it and that *King John* was co-authored. Merriam's method is to list the forty most common words in the Folio in descending order of frequency, from the most common *the* (1) through *and* (2), *I* (3), *to* (4) down to *we* (39) and *thee* (40). The same table can be generated for other texts, such as the quartos of Shakespeare plays and plays by other people. Where the tables are largely the same—as measured by a variety of statistical methods that Merriam does not explain—the work is by Shakespeare and where not, not. Merriam gives the table for the top forty words in the Folio, in *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Hamlet* and in Marlowe's *1* and *2 Tamburlaine*, showing that the last two of these differ quite obviously from Shakespeare. When the Principal Component Analysis is plotted, Shakespeare's works cluster apart from the works of others, even when Merriam takes into account the year of composition. The thirty-six plays in F are more than twenty years apart overall, and they still cluster. When Merriam breaks the plays into chunks according to verse/prose distinctions—the thirty-six Folio plays thus breaking into seventy-two chunks—the PCA still shows Shakespeare clustering with Shakespeare. However, the verse segments are now visually separated from the prose ones—so this is also a test for whether something is verse or prose—but both are well away from the non-Shakespearian matter. Or rather, this is true for all but the verse parts of *Henry V*, which cluster with Marlowe's plays, as do the parts of *King John* that Merriam 'previously designated' as not Shakespeare in an article reviewed in *YWES* 88[2009].

Boris Borukhov, in 'R. Chester's *Love's Martyr* and the Hyphenated Shakespeare' (*N&Q* 58[2011] 258–60), reckons that the printed signature 'William Shake-speare' after *The Phoenix and the Turtle* in Robert Chester's *Love's Martyr* [1601] was probably printed from autograph, and hence Shakespeare really did write his name with a hyphen in it. The forms of the other printed signatures in the book, Jonson's and Chester's, match how they appear in autograph manuscripts. Also, Chester has included a number of superfluous signatures in the book, so it looks like the printer was mechanically reproducing what he was given, namely each poem as signed by its author. Thus, the printer probably did not interfere with the

Shakespeare signature at the end of his poem either. Borukhov seems unaware that the signature is in an italic typeface in which the forward-projecting kern of *k* would clash with the backward-projecting kern of the long *s* if they were placed next to each other (or even separated by just an *e*, as appears here) so that the compositor had to put a hyphen between them to make the pieces of type sit together.

Two contributions make much more plausible points about Shakespeare's sense of his own name. B.J. Sokol, in 'Shakespeare's Weak Signature in Sonnet 76' (*N&Q* 58[2011] 236–7), notices that in Sonnet 76 the narrator refers to his poetry almost revealing his identity because he has not kept up with the latest poetic fashions, and then he writes of his words 'Showing their birth and where they did proceed'. Given their frequency in the canon, finding a word beginning with *Sh-* in the same line as one beginning *pr-* is pretty unlikely, and occurring together in the context of poetry about revealing one's identity they probably constitute a glance at Shakespeare's name. In the similar vein, Andrew Gurr argues, in 'In-Jokes about Spear-shakers' (*N&Q* 58[2011] 237–41), that when Worcester in *1 Henry IV* refers to the perilous act of crossing a raging torrent 'On the unsteadfast footing of a spear', the last word is surprising since a spear is most unsuitable for this purpose. Jokes about shakers of spears were commonplace—Jonson makes one with 'shake a lance' in his commendatory verse in the Folio—and Gurr reckons that Worcester's line is a light allusion to the dramatist's name that perhaps only his fellow actors were meant to hear.

Lea Puljcan Juric traces the historical record of 'Bargulus, the strong Illyrian pirate' who is mentioned in *The Contention of York and Lancaster/2 Henry VI* and who was in fact a land-based robber not a sea-pirate, in 'Shakespeare's "Bargulus, the Strong Illyrian Pirate"' (*N&Q* 58[2011] 233–6). Juric decides that Shakespeare might have known about him from Robert Whittington's 1534 edition of Cicero where that land-to-sea mistake is made. Vladimir Brljak finds the origins of *Hamlet* in the biblical story of Lamech in 'Hamlet and Lameth' (*N&Q* 58[2011] 247–54). Lamech kills his fratricidal great-great-grandfather Cain just as Hamlet kills his fratricidal uncle Claudius, who is twice likened to Cain in the play (I.ii.105, III.iii.36–8). Cain was killed by Lamech accidentally shooting him with an arrow in the forest, just as Hamlet accidentally stabs Polonius (thinking him Claudius) behind the arras. Religious discussions and explications of Lamech's story focused on the question of intent and culpability and on the possibility that taking private revenge necessarily creates widespread and uncontrollable catastrophe, as happens in *Hamlet*. Also, Lamech was sometimes spelt Lameth, which is an anagram of Hamlet. Travis D. Williams, in 'The Bourn Identity: Hamlet and the French of Montaigne's Essais' (*N&Q* 58[2011] 254–8), reckons that Shakespeare got the word *boorn* (meaning *border*) from Montaigne's essay on old age in the original French. The evidence is essentially 'the thematic relevance of Montaigne's passage to Hamlet's soliloquy' (p. 257). Since Shakespeare also got from Montaigne the word *consummation*, but via John Florio's English translation of 1603, he appears to have been using both versions, either of which he may have seen in manuscript prior to its printing.

In the Folio *The Winter's Tale* a disguised Polixenes pleads with his son Florizel to let his father know of the intended marriage and says 'reason my

sonne | should choose himselfe a wife', but T.W. Craik, in 'A New Emendation in *The Winter's Tale*' (*N&Q* 58[2011] 267), thinks we should emend this to 'reason any son . . .' because Polixenes does not want to reveal his identity and (as Craik shows with examples) misreading *any* as *my* was a common mistake. In the same play, Andrew J. Power, "'Not weighing well the end": Shakespeare's Use of *The Mirror for Magistrates* in *The Winter's Tale*, l.ii.258' (*N&Q* 58[2011] 266–7), thinks that Camillo's phrase 'weighing well the end' comes from George Ferrer's *The Mirror for Magistrates* [1559], where it appears in exactly this form. In fact there is 'well weighed thententes & endes of' in STC 12857 (sig. f7^r) printed in 1547 and 'not yet well weighed the end of' in STC 22213 (sig. Ll14^r) printed in 1614, so the collocation of *weigh*, *well*, and *end* was not exclusive to Ferrers and Shakespeare; Power simply failed to perform the necessary negative check. Thomas Rand, in "'Exit, pursued by a bear" and the Day of the Lord' (*N&Q* 58[2011] 268–70), notices that in the biblical book of Amos at 5:19 the Day of Judgement is imagined 'As if a man did flee from a lion, and a bear met him', which is true of Antigonus if the lion is Leontes. Indeed, but are we to suppose that Shakespeare gave Leontes that name just to activate this connection, or that the Bible gave him the idea and hence that the whole play was built around the bear scene? Either seems unlikely.

2. Shakespeare on Screen

The year's publications are similarly sparse in number to those of 2010. I have granted the greatest space here to a select number of 2011's most thought-provoking journal articles. Last year's piece concluded that 'place matters', and Anthony Davies begins his essay by identifying that a key problem for a film of *Othello* 'lies in the location of the tragic action' (p. 11), in "'An extravagant and wheeling stranger of here and everywhere": Characterizing *Othello* on Film—Exploring Seven Film Adaptations' (*ShSA* 23[2011] 11–19). The versions are divided into cinematic adaptations—Buchowetzki [1922]; Yutkevich [1955]; Welles [1952]; Parker [1995]—and filmed stage productions—Burge/Dexter [1965]; Suzman [1988]; Nunn [1989]. The number of versions means the analysis becomes rather fragmented, but the breadth of detailed engagement allows rewardingly specific connections between, for example, the proportional differences between the length of time spent in Venice.

Ramona Wray focuses upon a prison-based adaptation, *Mickey B* (Magill [2006]), in 'The Morals of *Macbeth* and Peace as Process: Adapting Shakespeare in Northern Ireland's Maximum Security Prison' (*SQ* 62[2011] 340–63). Her argument seeks to develop existing scholarship on Shakespeare in prisons by suggesting that *Mickey B* invites analysis of 'the significance of specificity in prison Shakespeares' (p. 344). Wray's precise attention to language, physicality, and structure prompts thoughtfully specific consideration of the appropriation: 'The film invites us to think anew about Shakespeare, his local utility, and the reparative cultural work his plays are still enlisted to perform' (p. 346). Wray celebrates the way in which *Mickey B*,

asserting that ‘So long as we look to *Timon* to unlock the mystery of *Timon*, we will fail to connect the play’s specific socio-economic context with its general textual contrariness’ (p. 376). Instead Bailey argues that in order ‘To understand why the dramatic exploration of debt produces generic disruption’ she must investigate ‘how the play functions as a formal engagement with the problem of the penal debt bond, and the stakes of staging the complex process of remuneration in a theatre financed by debt’ (p. 376). To underline that early modern theatre was built on debt, Bailey illustrates Henslowe as an influence for Shylock before going on to address the ‘penal logic of forfeiture’ (p. 378) and the ‘divide between revenge and justice’ (p. 380) for the creditor and the debtor, and to suggest that ‘a more apt comparison [for Henslowe] might be to *Timon*’ (p. 381). In so doing, Bailey argues that ‘the business of playing offers a window onto the punitive force of bonds’ and that ‘Only by first understanding the players’ objections to bonds on grounds that they served as instruments of retaliation can we appreciate the strategies *Timon* employs to neutralize the exploitative elements of bonding’ (p. 387). In the second half of the article Bailey conducts a close analysis of the text and of the shifting ‘locus of revenge’ (p. 395) in the play to illustrate the links between the play and its place in its historical (theatrical) moment. Bailey concludes that ‘*Timon* is less invested in anatomizing character failing than in exposing the ways in which an economy of accumulated obligation challenged character consistency’ (p. 399) and that *Timon* should be read as a revenge tragedy and that so doing ‘illuminates [the play’s] awareness of both the terrifying and productive potential of debt’ (pp. 399–400).

Books Reviewed

- Anderson, Judith, and Joan Pong Linton, eds. *Go Figure: Energies, Forms, and Institutions in the Early Modern World*. FordUP. [2011] pp. 215. £40 ISBN 9 7808 2323 3496.
- Bell, Robert. *Shakespeare’s Great Stage of Fools*. PalMac. [2011] pp. xii + 186. £52 ISBN 9 7802 3011 5118.
- Burt, Stephen, and Nick Halpern, eds. *Something Understood: Essays and Poetry for Helen Vendler*. University of Virginia Press. [2009] pp. 352. £20.50. ISBN 9 7808 1392 7855.
- Cefalu, Paul, and Bryan Reynolds, eds. *The Return of Theory in Early Modern English Studies: Tarrying with the Subjunctive*. Palgrave Macmillan. [2011] pp. 344. £55. ISBN 9 7802 3023 5496.
- Cook, Patrick J. *Cinematic Hamlet: The Films of Olivier, Zeffirelli, Branagh, and Almereyda*. Ohio University Press. [2011] pp. 272. hb \$55.00. ISBN 9 7808 2141 9441.
- Burt, Stephen, and Nick Halpern, eds. *Something Understood: Essays and Poetry for Helen Vendler*. University of Virginia. [2009] pp. 352. £59.50 ISBN 9 7808 1392 7848.
- Dawson, Anthony B., and Paul Yachnin, eds. *Richard II*. Clarendon. [2011] pp. 309. £6.39 ISBN 9 7801 9960 2285.

- Dobski, and Gish, eds. *Souls with Longing: Representations of Honor and Love in Shakespeare*. Lexington Books. [2011] pp. x + 332. £21.95 ISBN 9 7807 3916 5423.
- Fahey, Maria Franziska. *Metaphor and Shakespearean Drama: Unchaste Signification*. PalMac. [2011] pp. xviii + 216. £50 ISBN 9 7802 3025 1878.
- Fuller, David. *The Life in the Sonnets*. Continuum. [2011] pp. 134. £13.49 ISBN 9 7818 4706 4547.
- Gray, Ronald. *Shakespeare on Love: The Sonnets and Plays in Relation to Plato's Symposium, Alchemy, Christianity and Renaissance Neo-Platonism*. Cambridge Scholars. [2011] pp. 130. £34.99 ISBN 9 7814 4382 7119.
- Guneratne, Anthony R., ed. *Shakespeare and Genre: From Early Modern Inheritances to Postmodern Legacies*. PalMac. [2011] pp. xvii + 314. £45 ISBN 9 7802 3010 8981.
- Healy, Margaret. *Shakespeare, Alchemy and the Creative Imagination: The Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint*. CUP. [2011] pp. 270. £58 ISBN 9 7811 0700 4047.
- Henning, Standish, ed. *The Comedy of Errors*. New Variorum. MLA. [2011] pp. 647. £85.98 ISBN 9 7808 7352 2960.
- Hiscock, Andrew, and Lisa Hopkins, eds. *King Lear: A Critical Guide*. Continuum. [2011] pp. 256. £17.99 ISBN 9 7814 4115 8963.
- Höfele, Andreas. *Stage, Stake & Scaffold: Humans & Animals in Shakespeare's Theatre*. OUP. [2011] pp. xiii + 315. £30 ISBN 9 7801 9956 7645.
- Jackson, Ken, and Arthur Marotti, eds. *Shakespeare and Religion: Early Modern and Postmodern Perspectives*. UNDP. [2011] pp. 304. pb £32.95 ISBN 9 7802 6803 2708.
- Jowett, John, ed. *Sir Thomas More*. Arden Shakespeare. Methuen. [2011] pp. 542. £5.99 ISBN 9 7819 0427 1482.
- Lochman, Daniel, Maritere Lopez, and Lorna Hutson, eds. *Discourses and Representations of Friendship in Early Modern Europe, 1500–1700*. Ashgate. [2011] pp. 292. £60 ISBN 9 7807 5466 9036.
- Marino, James R. *Owning William Shakespeare: The King's Men and Their Intellectual Property*. UPennP. [2011] pp. 204. £32.50 ISBN 9 7808 1224 2966.
- Martin, Randall, and Scheil Katherine, eds. *Shakespeare/Adaptation/Modern Drama: Essays in Honour of Jill L. Levenson*. UTorP. [2011] pp. xii + 329. £45.99 ISBN 9 7814 4264 1747.
- Mirsky, Mark Jay. *The Drama in Shakespeare's Sonnets: 'A Satire to Decay'*. Fairleigh Dickinson University Press. [2011] pp. 273. \$75 ISBN 9 7816 1147 0260.
- Oakley-Brown, Liz, ed. *Shakespeare and the Translation of Identity in Early Modern England*. Continuum. [2011] pp. 208. £60 ISBN 9 7808 2644 1690.
- Ochiogrosso, Frank, ed. *Shakespeare Closely Read: A Collection of Essays*. Fairleigh Dickinson University Press. [2011] pp. 126. hb \$60.00 ISBN 9 7816 1147 0147.
- Rasmussen, Eric, and Anthony James West, eds. *The Shakespeare First Folios: A Descriptive Catalogue*. PalMac. [2011] pp. 965. £225 ISBN 9 7802 3051 7653.

- Ravassat, Mireille, and Jonathan Culpeper, eds. *Stylistics and Shakespeare's Language: Transdisciplinary Approaches*. Advances in Stylistics. ContinuumL. [2011] pp. 284. £18.99 ISBN 9 7814 4117 1726.
- Sarat, Austin, Catherine O. Frank, and Matthew Anderson, eds. *Teaching Law and Literature*. Modern Language Association of America. [2011] pp. viii + 510. £19.95 ISBN 9 7816 0329 0937.
- Schiffer, James, ed. *Twelfth Night: New Critical Essays*. Routledge. [2011] pp. 304. £85 ISBN 9 7804 1597 3359.
- Stirling, Kirsten, and Martine Hennard Dutheil de la Rochère, eds. *After Satan: Essays in Honour of Neil Forsyth*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. [2011] pp. 210. £39.99 ISBN 9 7814 4382 3388.
- Strier, Richard. *The Unrepentant Renaissance: From Petrarch to Shakespeare to Milton*. UChicP. [2011] pp. xii + 305. £29 ISBN 9 7802 2677 7511.
- Stockton, Will. *Playing Dirty: Sexuality and Waste in Early Modern Comedy*. University of Minnesota Press. [2011] pp. xxvi + 192. £17 ISBN 9 7808 1666 6072.
- Tosi, Laura, and Shaul Bassi, eds. *Visions of Venice in Shakespeare*. Ashgate. [2011] pp. 278. £60 ISBN 9 7814 0940 5474.
- Wilder, Lena Perkins. *Shakespeare's Memory Theatre: Recollection, Properties, and Character*. CUP. [2010] pp. vii + 221. £58 ISBN 9 7805 2176 4551.
- Womersley, David. *Divinity and State*. OUP. [2010] pp. xviii + 409. £69 ISBN 9 7801 9925 5641.