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

1. Editions and Textual Studies

No major critical editions of Shakespeare appeared this year. The only relevant monograph was MacDonald P. Jackson’s *Determining the Shakespeare Canon: Arden of Faversham and A Lover’s Complaint*, which is an extremely well put together combination of revised versions of previously published articles, joined together with discursive connective tissue and supplemented by fresh writing. The topic is of the highest interest to Shakespearians at all levels, and Jackson’s handling of it manages to convey the technical complexity—to satisfy the specialist who is entirely ‘up’ on the subject—without losing the newcomer to this field. The introduction (pp. 1–6) surveys the history of belief in the Shakespearian authorship of *A Lover’s Complaint* and at least part of *Arden of Faversham*, pointing out that if the former is not by Shakespeare then that changes our whole view of *Sonnets* [1609] in which it appeared. For *Arden of Faversham*, Jackson’s key claim is that the middle portion—Act 3 in editions that divide it that way—centred upon the Quarrel Scene (scene 8) is by Shakespeare.

Jackson’s chapter 1, ‘Shakespeare and the Quarrel Scene in *Arden of Faversham*’ (pp. 9–39), is substantially the same as his *Shakespeare Quarterly*
article of the same title reviewed in *YWES* 92[2013], revised lightly to make an excellent introduction to his consideration of the play, beginning with the literary-historical context before moving to his computational method. Jackson’s attribution method, now widely known, admired, and emulated, is to search in Literature Online (LION) for phrases and collocations found in the text he is trying to attribute, looking for those that are comparatively rare. In the present case he confined his searches to plays first performed between 1580 and 1600 and threw away all hits that occurred more than five times across LION. What matters is how many such rare links—that is, phrases-in-common—are found between the text to be attributed and each potential author’s canon as represented in LION. For the Quarrel Scene in *Arden of Faversham*, twenty-eight plays in LION contain four or more such links, and of those eighteen are by Shakespeare. Even allowing for Shakespeare’s canon being larger than anyone else’s, that is a compelling predominance of links to Shakespeare, with nearly two-thirds of all the links pointing to this one dramatist.

Chapter 2, ‘Reviewing Authorship Studies of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries, and the Case of *Arden of Faversham*’ (pp. 40–59), responds to Brian Vickers’s *Shakespeare Quarterly* review of Hugh Craig and Arthur F. Kinney’s 2009 book *Shakespeare, Computers, and the Mystery of Authorship* (the book was reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011]), which review was also the subject of a brilliant critique by John Burrows in *Shakespeare Quarterly* in 2012 (reviewed in *YWES* 93[2014]). Like Burrows, Jackson here patiently explains where and how Vickers is unjust in his characterizations of the scholarship in Craig and Kinney’s book. Then Jackson performs his usual LION search technique, counting how many phrases and collocations are shared between the suspect text and all plays in a certain period, and tabulating those that occur not more than five times; for this the suspect text is Arden’s account of his nightmare in scene 6. The vast majority of the links are with Shakespeare plays. Also, Jackson finds a tight cluster of verbal links between the nightmare story and *Venus and Adonis* lines 554–648. In his chapter 3, ‘Gentlemen, *Arden of Faversham*, and Shakespeare’s Early Collaborations’ (pp. 66–84), Jackson notes that Shakespeare’s prologue to *Henry V* and his epilogue to *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* characterize their audiences as gentle and ask their pardon for his play’s shortcomings, and that no other play in the period 1575–1600 besides *Arden of Faversham* does that, according to LION. Jackson goes on to reuse the evidence in Craig and Kinney’s book to comment upon his own findings about *Arden of Faversham*, and in particular the links between the part of it that Jackson thinks is by Shakespeare and the parts of several collaboratively written Shakespeare plays that Craig and Kinney think are Shakespeare’s; the results are highly convincing. Likewise, Jackson returns to his previous work on compound adjectives in the play (a construction that Shakespeare favoured) and finds that if we separate out scenes 4–9 (that is, Act 3) from the rest of *Arden of Faversham* it has many more of them than the rest of the play (once we normalize for length of sample), and Jackson finds spots of Shakespeare elsewhere in the play too. In sum, as Jackson puts it, ‘the old evidence, when revisited, confirms the new’ (p. 78). There is a useful additional check in Jackson showing that a number of words and phrases that
Shakespeare almost never uses appear in *Arden of Faversham* but only either side of, not within, the central section that Jackson claims is Shakespeare’s. Jackson’s chapter 4, ‘Parallels and Poetry: Shakespeare, Kyd, and *Arden of Faversham*’ (pp. 85–103), is substantially the same as Jackson’s 2010 literary-critical article of the same title in *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*.

Next comes a wholly newly written chapter on ‘Counter-Arguments and Conclusions’ to Jackson’s claim about *Arden of Faversham* (pp. 104–26). Martin Wiggins reckons that *Arden of Faversham* must be an amateur play because no professional company would demand that a boy actor have so many lines as the heroine does: 588 lines compared to, say, Juliet’s 541 in Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*, which is normally considered quite extraordinarily difficult a role for a boy. But as Jackson points out, in the central part of *Arden of Faversham* that is Shakespeare’s work, Mistress Arden gets relatively few lines, perhaps because Shakespeare at least could see that overloading the boy would be unwise (p. 105). Wiggins also reckons that the stage directions of *Arden of Faversham* are unprofessional-sounding in using the phrase ‘Here enters . . .’ and often beginning, like a narrative account, with the word ‘Then . . .’. Such stage directions take up the perspective not of the performers but of the audience. Jackson counters that these stage directions might not be authorial but the work of ‘a reporter or scribe preparing the script for publication’ (p. 105). In any case, Jackson remarks, Thomas Kyd’s *Soliman and Perseda*—which, like *Arden of Faversham*, was printed by Edward Allde for Edward White—has similar audience-perspective stage directions using the word ‘Then . . .’. Thus Jackson convincingly demolishes Wiggins’s claim that the unusual stage directions in *Arden of Faversham* reveal an amateur writer by showing that they can be paralleled with those from the professional drama.

Jackson likewise dismisses the claim that the writer had to know the geographical area around Faversham in Kent, pointing out that the misspellings of several place names tell against it. Regarding the possibility that we are chasing a mirage in author-hunting because the author might be an unknown writer, Jackson lays out the reasons why that is unlikely. In particular, ‘The extant plays of 1576–1642 constitute a very large sample (about 700) of all those that were written, and a large sample can, within a slight margin of error, provide trustworthy information about the full population’ (p. 117). This means that where we have a play of unknown authorship and find that in various objective tests it matches the works of a known playwright the reason for this is more likely to be that it was written by that known playwright rather than that it was written by someone else we know nothing about.

Chapter 6, ‘*A Lover’s Complaint*: Phrases and Collocations’ (pp. 129–40), is partly based on Jackson’s 2004 *Shakespeare Studies* article ‘*A Lover’s Complaint* Revisited’ reviewed in *YWES 92*[2013]. The first test applied is Jackson’s standard one of finding phrases and collocations occurring no more than five times in *A Lover’s Complaint* and in LION plays from the period 1590–1610. The result is that links to Shakespeare predominate, even once Jackson normalizes for just how much more Shakespeare writing there is (which, all else being equal, makes a match to Shakespeare more likely). Of the
links to Shakespeare plays, the links to plays written 1603–6 predominate, and the links to non-Shakespearian plays also peak around then, so certain phrases seem to have been simply fashionable and widely used.

Jackson then turns to Vickers’s ascription of *A Lover’s Complaint* to John Davies of Hereford, and starting with John Jowett’s demonstration that *A Lover’s Complaint* stanza 1 has lots of phrases that Shakespeare used and Davies did not, Jackson extends this approach to consider stanzas 2 to 7, finding the same result. Also, even where the words used to express it differ, particular poetic conceits are shared by *A Lover’s Complaint* and Shakespeare. In the new field of computational stylistics there are methodological alternatives within certain practices and we do not yet enjoy a consensus about exactly how to count various phenomena. For example, how much weight should be given to the fact that a single phrase or collocation in the work to be attributed appears multiple times in a work within a known author’s canon? Should we count it once for all, or count it once each time it occurs in that known author’s canon? When the results of various methods are borderline cases, such questions matter greatly, but as Jackson here demonstrates beyond any doubt, the case of *A Lover’s Complaint* is not borderline: ‘Whatever mode of reckoning we adopt, the affiliations of *A Lover’s Complaint’s* idiolect are with Shakespeare, rather than with Davies’ (p. 140).

The next three chapters are essentially the same as previously published essays. Chapter 7, ‘Spellings in *A Lover’s Complaint* as Evidence of Authorship’ (pp. 141–68), reprints Jackson’s 2008 essay ‘The Authorship of *A Lover’s Complaint*: A New Approach to the Problem’, published in the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* and reviewed with strong approval in *YWES* 89[2010]. Chapter 8, ‘Neologisms and “Non-Shakespearian” Words in *A Lover’s Complaint*’ (pp. 169–83), is substantially the same as Jackson’s 2008 essay of the same title for *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, reviewed with strong approval in *YWES* 89[2010]. And chapter 9, ‘*A Lover’s Complaint*, Cymbeline, and the Shakespeare Canon: Interpreting Shared Vocabulary’ (pp. 184–206), is substantially the same as Jackson’s 2008 essay of the same title for *Modern Language Review*, reviewed with strong approval in *YWES* 89[2010].

Concluding the second half of the book is the newly written chapter 10, ‘*A Lover’s Complaint*: Counter-Arguments and Conclusions’ (pp. 207–18). Marina Tarlinskaja has argued that the verse style of *A Lover’s Complaint* is much unlike Shakespeare’s verse style, but as Jackson points out, ‘we have no way of knowing what metrical characteristics we should expect to find in rhyme-royal stanzas of a narrative poem by Shakespeare that was written in the first decade of the seventeenth century’ (p. 207), because aside from this one (if he wrote it) he wrote no others. The only Shakespearian verse writing that uses the same stanzaic form as *A Lover’s Complaint* is *The Rape of Lucrece* written more than a decade earlier—and Shakespeare’s verse habits of the kind measured by Tarlinskaja demonstrably changed over time—so that we just do not have the right kind of samples to compare with. Next Jackson shows that the conclusion of Ward E.Y. Elliot and Robert J. Valenza that *A Lover’s Complaint* is not by Shakespeare was based on flawed tests and misinterpreted results, as he illustrates in a separate article described elsewhere in this review.
Lastly Jackson deals with the flaws in Vickers’s arguments based on rhyme, which are vitiated by multiple false assertions and misconceptions about chance. For example, Vickers finds it highly significant that *A Lover’s Complaint* and John Davies of Hereford’s *Humour’s Heaven on Earth* share the triple rhyme *wind/find/mind*, but as Jackson shows this was a common triple rhyme, occurring twenty times in poems from 1593 to 1617 (p. 214).

As has been remarked several times in this review over recent years, Vickers repeatedly finds that widely used (indeed, commonplace) features of writing are shared between a work he wishes to attribute and the canon of the writer he wishes to attribute it to, and declares this sharing to be beyond coincidence and hence proof of common authorship. It is important to look widely at the field of candidates. Jackson shares this reviewer’s concerns and writes of Vickers that ‘his methodology is essentially that of those nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholars who, fixing on a candidate for the authorship of a disputed work, amassed data to buttress their views, whereas what are required for convincing demonstration are, as made clear in Chapter 1 on the Quarrel Scene in *Arden of Faversham*, modes of operation that treat rival candidates impartially and uniformly and allow pointers to any one of them to predominate’ (p. 215). The book ends with appendices (pp. 219–51) that provide all the data upon which the arguments depend, including extensive lists of phrase-matches from Literature Online.

One book-form collection of essays contains material that is relevant to this review: *Women Making Shakespeare: Text, Reception, Performance*, edited by Gordon McMullan, Lena Cowen Orlin, and Virginia Mason Vaughan as a Festschrift for Ann Thompson. The collection contains many fine essays, but only the few that are relevant to the topic of Shakespeare’s texts are noticed here. All the contributors were required to keep to under 3,000 words (including all apparatuses) so the essays do not have the space to go into much detail. In ‘Remaking the Texts: Women Editors of Shakespeare, Past and Present’ (pp. 57–67), Valerie Wayne notes that the history of women editing Shakespeare starts with Henrietta Bowdler. I would have thought this a rather ignominious beginning since she censored him, but Wayne seems reluctant to condemn her for that. Wayne offers no new evidence in her whistle-stop tour of women editing Shakespeare, just a survey of what is already known, ending in virtually a list of who is active today in editing Shakespeare, and then an actual list of the gender balances of various series and teamwork editions. Surprisingly, Wayne omits Sonia Massai, an editor, textual critic, and historian of the book, even though she contributes to this collection.

In ‘“To be acknowledged, madam, is o’erpaid”: Woman’s Role in the Production of Scholarly Editions of Shakespeare’ (pp. 69–77), Neil Taylor ponders why women do not edit Shakespeare as much as they teach and write about him. He does not mention the plausible but unfashionable possibility that on average male brains and female brains are attracted to somewhat different activities, so that while there is a considerable overlap—a lot of women do like the work of editing, and like it somewhat more than most men do—there is nonetheless an average difference in the size of the two populations of suitably interested persons. Indeed, given what we know about the evolved differences between male and female brains, the hypothesis...
of no average difference regarding a task that calls for quite specific cognitive abilities would on the face of it be more implausible than one that posited some difference. The prospect that this possibility raises is that even when all the biases and obstacles are removed there may still not be a 50/50 gender split amongst editors. Perhaps more people believe this than are prepared to say it out loud, for fear of being misunderstood as blaming women for their relative absence from the discipline when of course for most of its history the reason for their absence has been blatantly sexist bias and obstacle-raising.

H.R. Woudhuysen’s ‘Some Women Editors of Shakespeare: A Preliminary Sketch’ (pp. 79–88) is about the biographies of various women editors, not about their work, and ‘Bernice Kliman’s Enfolded Hamlet’ (pp. 89–98) by John Lavagnino has some interesting reflections on how user interfaces for digital editions have changed over the past twenty years, but offers nothing substantial on the texts of Shakespeare. In ‘Women Making Shakespeare—and Middleton and Jonson’ (pp. 99–108), Suzanne Gossett poses the question that the previous essays have avoided regarding inherent (or is it learnt?) gender bias: ‘are women editors attracted to the comedies’ and so choose to edit them, because of their ‘very content’ rather than because men are keeping the tragedies and histories to themselves? Gossett does not have an answer (p. 101), but is convinced that men and women have different tastes: ‘Conventionally women are assumed to be more interested in fabric and clothes than men are; I have found it so’ (p. 102).

Gossett ends with a couple of emendations that she thinks of interest to the feminist editing of Shakespeare. The first is Diana’s remark to Bertram: ‘I see that men make rope’s in such a scarre | That we’ll forsake ourselves’ (All’s Well That Ends Well 4.1.i.39–40). Gossett finds Gary Taylor’s emendation to ‘I see that men make toys e’en such a surance . . .’ to be incomprehensible, although she then quotes Taylor’s careful unpacking of each term and its polysemy. Gossett prefers P.A. Daniels’s ‘I see that men may rope’s [¼ rope us] in such a snare’ and she gives some defence of it against Taylor’s objection that it does not lead (as his emendation does) to Diana’s sudden demand of a ring from Bertram, arguing that Diana considers herself one of the women (¼ ‘us’) who has been so ensnared, so she negotiates for terms.

Next Gossett turns to the problem of some apparently faulty speech prefixes in Merry Wives of Windsor 4.1, which Helen Ostovich fixes in the new Norton Shakespeare third edition of the play using a ‘specifically feminist justification’ (p. 107). Gossett seems to think this goes too far, since ‘Even a feminist editor must respect the actual words of a text’ (p. 108). Here Gossett comes perilously close to suggesting that the premise of all these essays on feminist editing may be faulty and that so long as editors are not being sexist—and whether that ideal has yet been achieved is an open question—editing has no need of feminist theory. The remainder of the contributions to this collection are about the reception of Shakespeare and hence are of no concern to this review, although they are highly interesting.

This year the theme of the book-form periodical Shakespeare Survey was ‘Shakespeare’s Collaborative Work’. In ‘Why Did Shakespeare Collaborate?’ (ShS 67[2014] 1–17), Gary Taylor observes that we now know that more than one-third of the plays by Shakespeare were collaborative. Shakespeare did not
write the beginnings of the plays he collaborated on: he came in at the complicating phase because he was better at characterization (and especially characters experiencing some emerging conflict) than at plot or exposition. In the early 1600s Shakespeare could not alone satisfy the demand for plays about and set in London and he was in general better at comedy (on which he never collaborated) than at history and tragedy (on which he did). Collaboration certainly can produce inconsistency in plays, but it is not at all clear that early audiences and readers minded this: they seem to have valued variety at least as much as unity. And of course, Shakespeare’s non-collaborative plays are full of inconsistencies too. Shakespeare collaborated because, in some genres, it made for better plays than he could manage on his own.

The second essay is by the present reviewer and is titled ‘What Is Not Collaborative about Early Modern Drama in Performance and Print?’ (ShS 67[2014] 18–28). It argues that recent commentators, especially Tiffany Stern, have overstated the routine alteration and revision of play scripts—the Master of the Revels’s licensing fee gave the players a strong disincentive—and have likewise overstated how far printing was an inherently collaborative process. In fact, Egan argues, what got licensed represented pretty well what got performed and what got printed represented pretty well what the printer was given to print. Much in the same vein, Will Sharpe’s ‘Framing Shakespeare’s Collaborative Authorship’ (ShS 67[2014] 29–43) diagnoses general overstatement of the collaborative nature of dramatic creativity and reasserts the importance of authorship, lone and collaborative. Sharpe sees Shakespeare collaborating to a lesser extent than Taylor does, counting not total plays but lines—initially excluding cases that Taylor considers proven—and finding that more than 90 per cent of Shakespeare’s writing went into his sole-authored plays and less than 10 per cent into his collaborative ones. By this method of tallying, Shakespeare could have contributed small parts to many more plays and still put much more (in terms of word counts) into his sole-authored plays than his collaborations. Clearly, we need to be careful how we express ourselves regarding the amount of collaborative writing that Shakespeare undertook.

In ‘Collaboration and Proprietary Authorship: Shakespeare et al.’ (ShS 67[2014] 44–59), Trevor Cook takes the opposite line from Egan to argue the poststructuralist position that ‘Shakespeare was probably accustomed to definitions of authorship, textual property and the individual very different from our own’ because the ‘radically collaborative nature of staging a play requires each participant to relinquish his (or her) individual interests’ (p. 35). Cook supports Jeffrey Masten’s claim that co-authorship was ‘a dispersal of authority, rather than a simple doubling of it’ (p. 46) and traces the various attempts by authors to assert ownership of, or at least get credit for, their bits of various collaborative works. Cook acknowledges that ‘writers at the turn of the seventeenth century could and sometimes did observe proprietary authorship in the context of collaborative working arrangements’ (p. 58), but he thinks that inevitably the practice of co-authorship blurs the boundaries of the individual writing stints. Cook repeatedly cites Masten and mocks the folly of scholars who ‘are motivated to identify who wrote what in a
collaboration so effective that it is difficult, if not impossible, to tell’ (p. 59).

The next essay, Barry Langston’s ‘Topical Shakespeare’ (ShS 67[2014] 60–8),
contains readings of topicality in 1 Henry VI but nothing relevant to this
review.

Amongst the highlights of the collection is William W. Weber’s essay, ‘Shakespeare After All? The Authorship of Titus Andronicus 4.1 Reconsidered’ (ShS 67[2014] 69–84). Ever since scholars have accepted the case for co-authorship of Titus Andronicus, Peele has been given scenes 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, and 4.1, and Weber shows that the last of these has not been subject to stringent enough testing. Weber applies MacDonald P. Jackson’s technique of looking for near-unique phrase matches in LION, which as remarked above is rapidly becoming the most widely used and trusted method of authorship attribution. At first sight, though, 4.1 has rather too few feminine endings to be typical Shakespeare, with just three in its 128 blank-verse lines, but the right number to be Peele’s. But Shakespeare’s habitual deviation from his normal rate of feminine endings is easily broad enough to accommodate one scene having so few, and counting by acts is more reliable a way of using feminine-ending rates to attribute authorship.

Weber shows that Titus Andronicus 4.1 has tended to be lumped in with the rest of the Peele contribution to the play even in studies that could have tested it independently, and since it does not disrupt those studies’ general conclusions of Peele’s hand in the play scene 4.1 has remained in the putative Peele stratum. Only the feminine ending test puts it there. Another test that might suggest that 4.1 is Peele’s rate of use of vocatives, but again, like the rate of feminine endings, this metric can swing wildly within anybody’s scenes, depending on dramatic content. In particular, 4.1 uses a child actor and it might well be astute of a dramatist to use a lot of vocatives in such a scene so that the child has least trouble remembering who is who. Weber uses the handy checklist of all Shakespeare’s child characters given in Kate Chedgzoy, Suzanne Greenhalgh, and Robert Shaughnessy’s collection Shakespeare and Childhood [2007] to see if Shakespeare used vocatives more often in scenes involving children, and indeed he does: twice as often as in those scenes without children.

Then comes Weber’s application of the Jackson-inspired tests of 4.1. Every phrase and collocation of the scene—he does not say how distant, for collocations—was entered into LION and looked for in Peele’s and Shakespeare’s canons; this makes for a two-horse race, which in this case is desirable since no other plausible candidate exists. The phrases and collocation unique to one canon were recorded as one hit for each unique phrase with the number of occurrences within each canon not recorded. For this test, the Shakespeare canon was restricted to The Comedy of Errors, Love’s Labour’s Lost, Richard II, Richard III, Romeo and Juliet, The Taming of the Shrew, The Two Gentlemen of Verona, and Venus and Adonis to make it as much like Peele’s canon in size and genre-balance as possible; this test is demonstrably valid for even quite short samples, as 4.1 is. The result is that 25 per cent of scene 4.1’s unique matches to either Peele or restricted-canon Shakespeare are to Peele and 75 per cent are to Shakespeare. Quite a few of the matches to Shakespeare are epizeuxis, which is supposed to be a Peele trait. Moreover,
looking at individual words there is in 4 just one, *playeth*, that appears in Peele’s canon but not in Shakespeare’s canon, and more than a dozen that appear in Shakespeare’s canon and not in Peele’s. Turning to subjective criteria, Weber shows that in 4.1 we see Shakespearian sophistication in its use of literary and mythical allusions, something Peele was not at all sophisticated about. The conclusion is the Shakespeare, not Peele, wrote *Titus Andronicus* 4.1.

On the same play, Dennis McCarthy and June Schlueter argue, in ‘A Shakespeare/North Collaboration: *Titus Andronicus* and *Titus and Vespasian*’ (*ShS* 67[2014] 85–101), that the former is an adaptation of the latter, now lost, which the authors here attribute to Thomas North. The authors search within the database of the Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership (EEBO-TCP) but they mistakenly think that they are searching within the whole of EEBO, so that they unwisely comment of their findings that ‘In a database of 128,000 texts, this cannot be coincidence’ (p. 92). Depending on which version of the product one has, EEBO-TCP contains no more than about 53,000 texts. More importantly, McCarthy and Schlueter commit what Jackson has identified as the one-horse error in that they use the text-comparison software called Wcopyfind to determine phrases common to *Titus Andronicus* and North’s *The Dial of Princes* and only then go looking for these phrases in EEBO-TCP. As Jackson has pointed out, any two substantial texts will have phrases in common that are unique to those two so such a shared link proves nothing.

In ‘The Two Authors of *Edward III*’ (*ShS* 67[2014] 102–18), Brian Vickers starts with a brief history of authorship-attribution studies about this play—with an in-passing disparagement of the counting of function word frequencies—and confirms the unavoidable conclusion that Shakespeare wrote scenes I.ii, II.i, and II.ii. But who wrote the rest? Those familiar with Vickers’s recent work will not be surprised to hear that he thinks it was Thomas Kyd. The argument begins with the dramatic convention of ‘the narration of an off-stage event, usually a catastrophe, conveyed by a Nuntius’ (p. 105) that came from Senecan tragedy. *Edward III* and *The Spanish Tragedy* have this feature and, more unusually, both do it for both sides of a conflict (pp. 108–9).

To explore further the connection, Vickers uses software to find the trigrams—that is, three words in succession—that are common between the non-Shakespearian parts of *Edward III* and *The Spanish Tragedy* and Kyd’s translation *Cornelia*, and then eliminates the ones that are found elsewhere in the drama generally, defined as ‘plays written for the public theatres before 1596’ (p. 111). This way of working is the classic one-horse-race error identified by Jackson, and it is remarkable that Jackson’s proof that this method is fatally flawed—first given in a 2008 article in *Research Opportunities in Medieval and Renaissance Drama* (reviewed in *YWES* 90[2011])—has not deterred Vickers and others (such as McCarthy and Schlueter, above) from using it.

Vickers ends with some examples of words and plot details in common between Kyd’s work and *Edward III*. As in his previous studies, Vickers uses a database of plays compiled by Marcus Dahl, and its manifest incompleteness
is indicated by his mistaken assertions of what is absent from the drama. For example, Vickers claims that ‘The word “flints” is rare in the pre-1596 play canon’ being found only in *Cornelia, Edward III, and The Spanish Tragedy* (p. 115). In fact this word appears in the 1599 quarto of Thomas Heywood’s 2 Edward IV (sig. U3v) that was first performed (according to the Database of Early English Playbooks, DEEP) in 1592–9, in the 1600 quarto of The Merchant of Venice (sig. G3v) that was first performed in 1596–8 (according to DEEP), and in the 1594 quarto of The Contention of York and Lancaster (sig. D2v) that was first performed in 1590–1 (according to DEEP). Anybody with access to LION would find these occurrences of *flints* so the only possible conclusion is that Vickers is still searching a woefully incomplete database and making false claims based on what he fails to find there.

The core of Vickers’s claim about the authorship of *Edward III* is the words and phrases that he thinks are not to be found outside of the three plays being tested, but with a demonstrably inadequate database of all the other drama, those claims of non-presence cannot be trusted. In his appendix of allegedly unique matches between *Edward III* and *The Spanish Tragedy* Vickers lists ‘joynd in one’ (p. 116) as such a case, but he overlooks the 1597 quarto of Romeo and Juliet (first performed 1594–6), which has ‘joynd ye both in one’ (sig. E4v). Likewise, Vickers claims that certain single words are found only in *Cornelia* and *Edward III* and nowhere else in pre-1596 drama (pp. 117–18), but for some of his examples this is an astonishing claim. Can Vickers really believe that *engendered* is rare? It is not, for it appears in Christopher Marlowe’s Massacre at Paris (first performed in 1593) and in Thomas Nashe’s Summer’s Last Will and Testament (first performed 1592) and The Merchant of Venice (first performed in 1596–8) and in other less well-known plays. Or take *coronet*, which again Vickers claims can be found only in *Cornelia* and *Edward III* and no other pre-1596 play. But in fact it appears in John Lyly’s Midas (first performed in 1589) and in A Midsummer Night’s Dream (first performed in 1595–6) and in Robert Greene’s Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay (first performed in 1586–90).

Vickers’s errors are legion. Take negligence, which again Vickers claims can be found only in *Cornelia* and *Edward III* and no other pre-1596 play but which—as anyone familiar with drama of the period would surely predict—pops up in many plays, famous and obscure: Famous Victories of Henry V (first performed in 1583–8), Anonymous and Shakespeare’s Arden of Faversham (first performed in 1588–92), A Midsummer Night’s Dream (first performed in 1595–6), Anthony Munday’s John a Kent and John a Cumber (first performed in 1590–4), and Anonymous’s King Lear (first performed in 1590–4), as well as other plays. There is no point testing every one of Vickers’s claims since, besides the methodological flaw (the one-horse-race problem identified by Jackson), his claims are vitiated by the glaring absences from the private database he is using. These absences are obvious to anyone checking his work via LION and they make his claims about verbal rareness manifestly wrong.

Vickers’s essay is followed by Francis X. Connor’s ‘Shakespeare, Poetic Collaboration and The Passionate Pilgrim’ (ShS 67[2014] 119–29). The Passionate Pilgrim was published in 1599 by William Jaggard and purported
to be by ‘W. Shakespeare’, but it has only five of his poems in it—three from *Love's Labour's Lost* and two from *Sonnets*—and the rest of the poems are by other people. Connor treats *The Passionate Pilgrim* as a kind of collaboration—in the ‘socialized production’ sense—although we do not know if Shakespeare had anything to do with it, and Heywood’s account of Shakespeare’s response to the 1612 edition that put Heywood’s work under Shakespeare’s name tells us that he was not involved in that edition. Connor reckons that *The Passionate Pilgrim* has its own artistic coherence and he explores first its tangential links to Shakespeare and then its publishing history—what else the Jaggard publishing house was doing and the new market for Shakespeare’s books—and how it figures in sammelbands and books of excerpts. Connor wonders why some poems in *The Passionate Pilgrim* are introduced with pilcrows or Aldine leaves, which may be marks showing that the slips of paper holding the poems in *Love's Labour's Lost* were separate from the script of the play and that these marks were the linking devices between the loose sheets and the script.

James P. Bednarz’s ‘Contextualizing “The Phoenix and Turtle”: Shakespeare, Edward Blount and the Poetical Essays Group of *Love’s Martyr*’ (*ShS* 67[2014] 130–48) treats *The Phoenix and the Turtle* as Shakespeare’s intentional collaboration in the 1601 book project *Love’s Martyr*. This book contains Robert Chester’s epic poem *Love’s Martyr* followed by twelve ‘Poetical Essays’ by ‘Ignoto’, John Marston, George Chapman, Ben Jonson, and *The Phoenix and the Turtle* by Shakespeare. The essay is largely concerned with the ways that the book trade could produce such an innovative collaborative volume and the claim that this is a collaborative work is based on a rereading of the poetical relationship between Shakespeare’s poem and Chester’s poem to which it responds; so the essay is not of direct relevance to this review.

In ‘Shakespeare’s Singularity and *Sir Thomas More*’ (*ShS* 67[2014] 149–63), James Purkiss reckons that the consensus from W.W. Greg to Gary Taylor is that Shakespeare was not closely involved in the collaborative writing of this play, and Purkiss sets out to show that in fact he was. Purkiss explores what has been discovered about the shares and actions of the various hands in *Sir Thomas More*, emphasizing just how much of this knowledge is speculative. He asserts without justification that a lot of relatively unreliable tests all pointing towards the same conclusion do not themselves add up to a reliable pointer towards that conclusion. In fact they do, and an entire branch of mathematics, much used in medical diagnoses and risk management depends on this principle. Purkiss quotes Michael Hays claiming that ‘non palaeographic arguments may reach the same conclusion as palaeographic ones, but they cannot strengthen palaeographic arguments themselves’ (p. 153). But this also is untrue. If the non-palaeographic arguments point strongly to the conclusion that writer X thought up the words in document Y and if document Y has some marked (but non-conclusive) handwriting similarities to document Z that is definitely in the hand of writer X (say, his will), then this non-palaeographic evidence really does strengthen the palaeographic case since the alternative hypotheses become less likely. That is, the field of candidates for whom the palaeographic facts must fit the evidence is thus, by the
non-palaeographic evidence, narrowed to those who not only had similar handwriting but were also in a position to copy out the author’s words.

Purkiss explores the non-essential point that scholars have disagreed about just how involved Shakespeare was in the writing of *Sir Thomas More*, making a lot of the relatively small differences of opinion about this. Those who think that Shakespeare was disconnected from the writing of the rest of the play complain that the rebels get more cartoonish as they get more rebellious—at the start of the play they are quite dignified and justifiably indignant—and Purkiss explains that this is just what happens to individuated characters when the needs of the drama require it. Hand D seems to pick up from earlier in the play the notion of simplicity in the rebels’ action, and that is what Purkiss reckons shows Hand D’s close connection with the rest of the play. That is, the representation of the rebels was already turning clownish before Hand D got started and Hand D made it more so. Purkiss revives Gerald Downs’s claim (reviewed in *YWES* 88[2009]) that Hand D contains eyeskip errors and so it must be a transcript rather than original composition, in which case, says Purkiss, it might contain a mix of Shakespeare’s and others’ writing. Indeed, it might, but no one has brought forth anything significant to show that it is and this seems like a desperate attempt by those who would deny Shakespeare’s authorship of the crowd-quelling scene to suggest that it might not be wholly his. Purkiss ends by finding a couple of phrases in Hand D that can be found in others’ writing, but this kind of non-systematic parallel hunting tells us nothing, as he must know since he reports Jackson’s voluminous writing on the strict protocols that need to be followed if such parallels are not to mislead us.

Brean Hammond’s contribution to the collection is called ‘*Double Falsehood*: The Forgery Hypothesis, the “Charles Dickson” Enigma and a “Stern” Rejoinder’ (*ShS* 67[2014] 164–78). Like Gary Taylor in ‘Sleight of Mind: Cognitive Illusions and Shakespearian Desire’ (reviewed in *YWES* 94[2015]), Hammond seeks to show that Tiffany Stern’s essay ‘“The Forgery of Some Modern Author”? Theobald’s Shakespeare and Cardenio’s *Double Falsehood*’ (reviewed in *YWES* 93[2014]) is quite wrong to suggest that in *Double Falsehood* Theobald passed off his own forgery as Shakespeare’s play. Hammond also responds to Stern’s other essay on this topic, called ‘“Whether one did contrive, the other write, | Or one fram’d the plot, the other did indite”: Fletcher and Theobald as Collaborative Writers’ (reviewed in *YWES* 93[2014]). Hammond finds a series of factual errors in Stern’s account of Theobald’s literary activities: she just does not seem to understand that he was not speaking for himself in his regular publication *The Censor* and in general she tries to assassinate his character by implication, for example by observing that he was known for his pantomimes without indicating what a serious genre this was.

Hammond shows that the hypothesized transmission history for *Cardenio* proposed in his Arden3 edition is paralleled in the certain transmission history of the Philip Massinger and Nathan Field play *The Fatal Dowry* that survived in manuscript in the hands of Restoration theatre practitioners and thence reached mid-eighteenth-century performance. There’s nothing miraculous or suspicious about this kind of transmission. Thus an eighteenth-century
reference to another such manuscript by Francis Beaumont, John Fletcher, and Shakespeare turning up is treated seriously by Hammond and wrongly dismissed as vague by Stern. Hammond notes that Stern ignores the recently discovered allusions to *Cardenio* in pre-Commonwealth performance, and has nothing to say in response to the recent stylometric work that points to Shakespeare’s hand in *Double Falsehood*.

The next eleven essays in this volume of *Shakespeare Survey*, fascinating as they are, are unconnected to the topic of this review. Then comes B.J. Sokol’s ‘John Berryman’s Emendation of *King Lear* 4.1.10 and Shakespeare’s Scientific Knowledge’ (*ShS* 67[2014] 335–44). Some exemplars of Q1 *King Lear* have at 4.1.9–10 the line ‘Who’s here, my father poorlie, leed’ (Q1u) and others ‘. . . my father parti, eyd’ (Q1c) while Q2 and F have ‘. . . My Father poorly led?’ There is no obvious dramatic reason connected to the wider Q/F differences that would explain Q1 and F differing on this reading. There is an attraction to the *poorly led* reading in that Gloucester enters with an old man (who in Q1’s stage direction is explicitly leading him) and hence Edgar notices this detail at first before noticing the reason for it. Sokol thinks that the poet John Berryman’s emendation to ‘My father pearly-ey’d’ is correct. Sokol traces the early modern association of pearls with cataracts, referencing his own previous work on Alonso’s pearl-eyed blindness in *The Tempest*. For Berryman’s reading to be correct, we have to say that Q1u is nearly correct in *poorlie* except that oo should be ea and that Q1c is entirely correct in *eyd*. How could this happen? Sokol cites personal correspondence from the present reviewer on a similar mix of good and bad readings occurring in a press variant before and after stop-press correction. In such cases the first setting may get some of the letters right while being, at the level of the word, incorrect and unintelligible. Proof correctors care more for overall intelligibility than the percentage of letters correctly set and may alter an entire reading to achieve it, thereby lowering the percentage of letters that are correct. The remainder of this volume of *Shakespeare Survey* is not relevant to this review.

And so to this year’s articles. The most significant for our purposes are two by Gary Taylor on the subject of Middleton’s adaptation of Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*. The first contains a fresh exploitation of Jackson’s attribution method described above: Gary Taylor, ‘Empirical Middleton: *Macbeth*, Adaptation, and Microauthorship’ (*SQ* 65[2014] 239–72). The present reviewer must disclose that he read a pre-publication version of this essay and is acknowledged amongst others for making comments that the author found helpful in revision of it. Once Middleton’s *The Witch* was printed in 1778 it became clear that it had influenced *Macbeth* in at least scenes 3.5 and 4.1, but with recent computational approaches both supporting and, in the work of Brian Vickers, denying Middleton’s adaptation of *Macbeth*, non-specialists must be tempted to shrug their shoulders and conclude that the matter is undecidable. Naturally, adaptation is harder to spot than collaborative writing because usually an adapter contributes fewer words to the final result than a co-author would. We have ample reason to suspect that ‘What? is this so? . . . Musicke. | The Witches Dance, and vanish’ in *Macbeth* (4.1.140–8) is a Middleton interpolation, but it is only sixty-three words in all. This sample seems too small for most methods to test unless we also use bigrams
Taylor’s method is to go searching for these strings in electronic databases of Shakespeare and Middleton that Oxford University Press now sells as Oxford Scholarly Editions Online. First, a validation stage: does the proposed test find Shakespeare to be the author of a work known to be by Shakespeare? Taylor takes a passage of sixty-three words from *King Lear* that, like the passage from *Macbeth*, is in rhymed tetrameters: 1.3.57–67. The test is whether this passage contains more \( n \)-grams and collocations from the Shakespeare canon than the Middleton canon, after we discard those that appear in both canons. (It would be interesting to hear of the result for those \( n \)-grams and collocations from the passage being tested that are found in Shakespeare’s and in Middleton’s canons: are they found more often in Shakespeare’s?) Taylor finds thirteen such parallels with the Shakespeare canon and only two with the Middleton canon counting type-wise, so that if one \( n \)-gram or collocation matches to two different bits of the Shakespeare canon then it counts only once, and 17:2 counting token-wise, so that one bit of the *King Lear* passage matching two bits of the Shakespeare canon counts twice. Counting either way—13:2 or 17:2 in Shakespeare’s favour and against Middleton—the method seems to have correctly identified Shakespeare as much more likely than Middleton to have written the passage from *King Lear*.

Taylor repeats the test with sixty-three words of rhymed tetrameters from undisputed Middleton writing: *A Mad World, My Masters* 4.1.43–51, and again looking only for \( n \)-grams and collocations that find a match in either the Shakespeare or the Middleton canon but not both. Surprisingly, this comes out at 12:8 in favour of Shakespeare if we count token-wise. Explaining this, Taylor’s remarks seem to imply that he has been searching LION as well as OSEO although in his description of the method on page 246 he had mentioned only OSEO; as he rightly observes, Shakespeare is better represented in LION than Middleton is. Also offered as explanations for the failed attribution of *A Mad World, My Masters* are that Shakespeare influenced Middleton (and not vice versa) and that Shakespeare has the bigger canon (about twice the size) and so he has more, as it were, ‘opportunity’ to match any given \( n \)-gram or collocation. Other ways to accommodate this surprising failure are to say that this test tells us not to expect much Middleton-like writing in work truly by Shakespeare but to expect Shakespeare-like writing in work truly by Middleton, and that it tells us to count type-wise. (Personally, I would not expect one failed attribution attempt to tell us something so fundamental about the method, variations upon which should emerge only after a lot of randomized tests.)

Counting type-wise instead of token-wise, the present failure to detect Middleton’s hand is turned into a marginal success: 6:7 in favour of Middleton. Taylor reckons that the results of this test show that ‘collocations are more significant than consecutive word strings’ (p. 252) because in this test none of the collocations find matches in Shakespeare and two find matches in Middleton. (Again, I would counsel that it is too soon to draw any such conclusions about the method from just two validations of it.) Taylor observes...
that in this test one play, *Hengist, King of Kent*, provides several of the Middleton matches, so we could test ‘concentrations in a single work’ (p. 253), and that we could also constrain the test by date, so looking for Elizabethan versus Jacobean plays. He notes that if he had applied these constrains to his first validation test on *King Lear*—counting by types, looking only at plays written in the same monarchical reign, looking for concentrations in a single work, and only at collocations—then it would still have pointed to Shakespeare as the author in that case.

Taylor decides to introduce another criterion: overall rarity of the *n*-gram or collocation, as judged by its appearances outside the Shakespeare or Middleton canons in LION. This refinement of dropping those *n*-grams and collocations that also appear in other writers’ canons—that is, other than those of Shakespeare and Middleton—makes the test work the way Taylor wants it to: the *King Lear* passage is conclusively Shakespearian, the *Mad World* passage is conclusively Middletonian. Using this newly refined test, Taylor tests the passage from *Macbeth* we started with. He finds: more Middleton than Shakespeare types (8:9) but not tokens (13:11), that Middleton has more Jacobean types (3:9) and tokens (5:11), that Middleton has more unique parallels (1:4 on types, 1:6 on tokens), that Middleton has more unique Jacobean parallels (0:4 on types, 0:6 on tokens), and more concentrations in a single work: 2-types-1-unique for Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* versus 2-types-2-unique for *The Witch*.

Taylor uses the statistical procedure called Fisher’s Exact Test to try to see how likely it is that chance alone would produce the results he has found for the Shakespeare and Middleton parallels to the passage from *Macbeth*. This part of the essay I find least convincing, since his null hypothesis is ‘that the Folio *Macbeth* passage was written by Shakespeare’ and I am not clear how he thinks Fisher’s Exact Test could be used to test that hypothesis. Something is clearly wrong with how Taylor uses Fisher’s Exact Test in that he comes to the conclusion that it shows that ‘there is a 100 percent probability that the *Mad World* sample and the *Macbeth* sample have the same author’ and yet he also asserts that ‘This 100 percent probability does not mean there is absolute certainty that they were written by the same author’ (p. 256). In fact, as a matter of language, the first claim does entail the second—they are the same claim—and importantly Fisher’s Exact Test is not mathematically capable of telling us anything with 100 per cent probability so this application of it must be faulty.

What if someone other than Shakespeare or Middleton wrote the passage? Taylor repeats his searches of *n*-grams and collocations from the *Macbeth* passage in all the Jacobean drama in LION, and finds that the matches come preponderantly from Middleton works: 2:5 by types, 2:9 by tokens. (In fact these are hits he got before, so this is really applying the ‘must be Jacobean’ constraint and loosening the authorship constraint to be ‘by anyone’.) But is it not unfair to look at only Jacobean drama, since Shakespeare had done most of his work by 1603? To meet this hypothetical objection, Taylor relaxes the date constraint to ‘1576–1642’ (for first performance) and finds that Middleton still predominates. The unavoidable conclusion is that the passage is by Middleton.
After glancing at his own paper on Middleton authoring the five lines between ‘Enter Hecate and the other three witches’ and ‘Music and a song’ (4.1.38.1–43.1)’ (reviewed below), Taylor turns to Macbeth 3.5, where Hecate first appears, which is often claimed to be entirely Middleton’s work. It comprises 259 words, almost entirely rhymed tetrameters. For his Shakespeare parallel passage Taylor chooses Pericles scene 10 (= 3.0), one of Gower’s choruses, from which he picks 259 words. By the same tests as above, Shakespeare predominates in matches to the Pericles passage no matter which way you slice it, and Middleton dominates matches to Macbeth 3.5. Again, to these entirely convincing results Taylor applies Fisher’s Exact Test in ways that are not clearly valid statistically.

To the second edition of Robert S. Miola’s Norton Critical Edition of Macbeth, Taylor contributes a new essay on the play’s authorship, the key point of which is that Brian Vickers’s objections to Taylor’s claim that Middleton adapted Macbeth are all mistaken: ‘Macbeth and Middleton’ (in Miola, ed., Macbeth, 2nd edn., pp. 296–305). Taylor responds primarily to Vickers’s 2010 Times Literary Supplement essay called ‘Disintegrated: Did Thomas Middleton Really Adapt Macbeth?’ and the associated files made public on the London Forum for Authorship Studies website (reviewed in YWES 91[2012]). Grace Ioppolo wrongly claimed that because the songs in Macbeth are merely cued with a few opening words followed by ‘&c’ they were probably not added by an author, since an author would write out the whole song. In fact, as Tiffany Stern showed, such a pointer to the full text of a song held on another piece of paper would be perfectly normal, and authors used them.

In order to argue that Shakespeare might have added the two songs from The Witch to Macbeth, Vickers had to use an old dating of The Witch that assumes that it was written in 1609–16, but in fact the modern dating of the play is late 1615 or 1616. For Vickers to be right, Shakespeare would have had to adapt Macbeth in the very last months of his life, which is odd. Taylor reports that Vickers’s account of R.V. Holdsworth’s work on stage directions that use the present participle meeting simply misrepresents Holdsworth’s work, and that Holdsworth himself has now declared that it does. Taylor objects (as did this reviewer at the time) that Vickers’s use of the evidence of the entrance direction ‘Enter Bast[ard] and Curan meeting’ from King Lear is a red herring because it clearly calls for both men to enter. What is at stake in this discussion is the ambiguity generated by entrances of the form ‘Enter A meeting B’, not specifying whether B is already on stage, and this is a kind of ambiguity that is common in Middleton and not found in Shakespeare. This ambiguity is found twice in the bits of Macbeth that Taylor attributes to Middleton. Shakespeare never used the word seam but Middleton used it many times (and Macbeth uses it once) to create images of bodies being ripped apart, especially from neck to navel. Jonathan Hope’s work on the rates of regulated do is not conclusive, but it too points in the direction of Middleton’s authorship of Macbeth 3.5 and 4.1.

Vickers tries to show that Hecate’s rhymed lines are like those of other supernatural characters in Shakespeare, but, as Taylor points out, none of those Shakespearian characters speak in rhymed iambic tetrameters as Hecate.
does and as lots of Middleton characters, especially supernatural ones, do. Marina Tarlinskaja’s analysis of the prosody that Vickers draws upon has now been withdrawn by her because she realizes that she was not grasping exactly which lines Taylor was claiming as Middleton’s; once she knew that she decided that there was too little evidence for her approach to work upon. Regarding Vickers’s argument based on failing to find certain trigrams from Macbeth in the Middleton canon, Taylor reports this reviewer’s demonstration (in *YWES* 91[2012]) that they are there and that Vickers simply missed them. Once we search in ‘comprehensive, public databases’ such as LION, we can find in Middleton many and in Shakespeare few parallels for another excerpt from Macbeth, the seven lines from ‘Enter Hecat, and the other three Witches’ to ‘Musicke and a Song. Blacke Spirits, &c’ (4.1.39–43) that Taylor claims are Middleton’s. Taylor here lists them all.

Three articles by Hugh Craig in collaboration with others address the methods by which authorship attribution is currently being carried out. The first, ‘An Information Theoretic Clustering Approach for Unveiling Authorship Affinities in Shakespearean Era Plays and Poems’ (*PLoS ONE* 9:x[2014] n.p.), shows that, contrary to the assertions of poststructuralism and postmodernism, authorship trumps all other considerations (such as genre and topic) when weighing the likenesses of plays from Shakespeare’s time by means of their rates of usage of all words. The authors took 256 plays from Shakespeare’s time and used the Intelligent Archive software (described in *YWES* 91[2012]) to regularize their variant spellings and disambiguate (from context and frequency) strings that point to different words, such as the multiple verbs and nouns all represented by the three-character string *r-o-w*. For the resulting 66,907 unique words in these 256 plays they then counted how many times each word appears in each play, producing a data matrix of 66,907 × 256 cells. What followed was the application of an algorithm to see if the rates of usage of these words varied in a way that can be called ‘clustering’: that a particular set of plays are all alike in their rates of usage (high or low) of particular sets of words. Then they looked to see if the clusters that the algorithm comes up with—and that it was not, as it were, ‘informed’ of before—align with some known criterion such as author, or genre or date or topic.

The algorithm used was ‘Minimum Spanning Tree k-Nearest Neighbour’ (MST-kNN), and it was applied after using as the ‘distance’ between two works the Jensen–Shannon Divergence (JSD) between the frequencies of the words in these two works. Full appreciation of the mathematical formulas in which MST-kNN and JSD are explained is beyond the limit of this reviewer’s comprehension. The resulting clusters were clearly dominated by authorship (not genre, not topic) as the most powerful determinant of ‘closeness’. As an authorship attribution test this is quite powerful: the authorship of the near neighbours of a work in a cluster is a reliable guide to the authorship of that particular work. The authors talk the reader through the various branches and rings of works in their large cluster-chart, acknowledging the few cases where similarity of genre and topic seem to have shaped the connections. The big conclusion, though, confirms other recent work in this field: authorship is not a post-Romantic principle of categorization and is not subordinate to genre
and topic, but really is an objective, detectable facet of the surviving works of this period. Impressively, the authors include their entire raw datasets for others to work on.

In the second of Craig’s articles, ‘Language Chunking, Data Sparseness, and the Value of a Long Marker List: Explorations with Word N-grams and Authorial Attribution’ (L&LC 29[2014] 147–63), it is shown that Brian Vickers is wrong to believe that trigrams are inherently better markers of authorship than single words are. The intuition on which this fallacy is based is that n-grams where \( n > 1 \) must be better for authorship attribution than those where \( n = 1 \) (individual words) because they reflect how the mind uses language. The problem with long strings of words is that there are many different unique instances of them even in quite long texts, with each unique instance being as rare as rare can be. As well as strict n-grams (certain words in a certain order), this study uses ‘skip n-grams’ in which ‘we find the first instance of one of the listed words, then move to the next of them, ignoring any intervening unlisted words. The second 2-gram begins with the second of these words and adds the third, and so on’. (It is not clear from this description whether or how the number of ‘intervening unlisted words’ that are skipped might matter here.)

The first corpus tested is 174 English Renaissance sole-authored, well-attributed professional plays in which the old spelling of function words has been modernized and their elisions expanded. The second corpus is 254 articles from Victorian periodicals. In each case the corpus is divided into segments, and finding (even multiple times) or not finding something is counted as a presence or absence for that whole segment. The authors went looking for n-grams common or rare or absent in one authorial set compared to others. The key question is what difference it makes when \( n \) goes from 1 to 5. The authors applied John Burrows’s Zeta test that calls one set of text segments (say, an author’s) the base and another set (say, of other writers’) the counter and for each n-gram gives a number calculated as follows: 
\[
\text{Zeta score} = \frac{\text{number-of-base-segments-containing-this-n-gram}}{\text{number-of-base-segments}} + \frac{\text{number-of-counter-segments-lacking-this-n-gram}}{\text{number-of-counter-segments}}.
\]
Thus the Zeta score has a theoretical maximum of 2 for n-grams that occur at least once in every base segment and never occur in any counter segment. By repeating this for \( n \) going from 1 to 5 they were able to see which length of n-gram is most distinctive of authorship.

The authors also performed a version of Burrows’s Iota test by counting all n-grams that appear twice or more in the base set but never in the counter set. Doing this for one author among the Victorian periodical writers and taking the top 500 scoring n-grams and plotting how high their Zeta scores are produces a gently sloping downward trend. The top, most authorially distinctive, n-gram scores between 1.3 and 1.5 (out of a theoretical maximum 2) and that is true whether the n-gram is single words, 2-grams, or 3-grams, but for 4-grams and 5-grams the high score is only around 1.1. Just as interestingly, for the remaining 499 n-grams in the 500 top-scoring n-grams the rate at which the scores drop off as we go down the list is different for different values of \( n \): 1-grams’ scores drop off more slowly than 2-grams’ scores, 2-grams’ scores drop off more slowly than 3-grams’ scores, which drop off more slowly than 4-grams’ scores, which drop off more slowly than
5-grams’ scores. Thus, on average, the lower that \( n \) is, the more discriminating of authorship is the \( n \)-gram, so 1-grams (individual words) are best.

Next the authors tried to replicate what Vickers’s method does: to isolate long \( n \)-grams that occur repeatedly in one author and then see if they can reliably attribute one text by that author to that author after they have taken it out of the set and treated it as if it were of unknown authorship. It turns out that 3-grams provided the largest number of markers appearing in more than one work, but 2-grams provided a greater number of markers if we are looking for markers that appear in more than 2, 3, 4, or 5 works. In general then, for this kind of investigation, 2-grams are better than 3-grams. Turning to ‘skip \( n \)-grams’, the authors clarify what this means and it turns out that distance does not count. (Presumably, though, all \( n \) of the words have to occur within the same text segment for the skip \( n \)-gram to count.)

Because for their skip \( n \)-gram test the authors used a pool of predetermined function words, there was no guarantee that the top 500 Zeta-scoring \( n \)-grams would be more used by the author in question than in the context set of other authors’ writing, and in the event for 1-grams only the top 100 were so used: the other 400 got scores less than 1 (out of a maximum of 2). But for 2-grams to 5-grams the graphs stay above 1 as they peter out, and 2-grams turn out to be best. Just which length of \( n \)-gram works best for distinguishing authorship depends on just where you set the threshold for rarity, so that for the author in question, Anne Mozley, ‘The 4-grams set yields the largest number of markers appearing in more than one Mozley article, the 3-grams set yields the largest number appearing in more than two, and the 2-grams set provides the single strongest marker: over over does not appear in the articles by others, but appears in four Mozley articles’ (pp. 155–6). Thus, contrary to Vickers’s assumption, we cannot just say ‘look how many works of author \( X \) this \( n \)-gram appears in without appearing in anybody else’s work—this must be beyond coincidence’, since in fact the significance of that discovery varies with the length of the \( n \)-grams.

When repeating these experiments for other authors and consolidating the results, the outcome is the same: 1-grams are best overall if one is allowing the texts themselves to choose the words (that is, the ones with the highest Zeta score), but if one is using function-word-skip-\( n \)-grams then 2-grams are best, and indeed in overall discriminating power the function-word-skip-2-grams are best. With all-word-strict-\( n \)-grams, 3-grams are best, and with function-word-strict-\( n \)-grams, 4-grams are best. Again, there is no simple rule of thumb for what length of \( n \)-gram will be best for authorship attribution. This work was all done with nineteenth-century periodicals, and turning to early modern drama the results are that with all-words-strict-\( n \)-grams 1-grams are best and with function-word-skip-\( n \)-grams 2-grams are best, and of these two the former are the best for authorship distinction. The authors’ conclusion is that ‘no one style of \( n \)-gram outshines the others in providing authorial markers and that attributionists would be wise to keep an open mind about the usefulness of each’ (p. 159). Importantly, function-word-skip-2-grams that do better than 1-grams overall might be getting some of their advantage not because of the particular combination of words but merely because they embody multiple individual function words that are themselves highly
discriminatory of authorship. In general, on these results (and contrary to Vickers’s assertion) ‘rare markers are less useful for attribution than regularly occurring ones’ (p. 161).

The third of Craig’s three articles, ‘Language Individuation and Marker Words: Shakespeare and His Maxwell’s Demon’ (PLoS ONE 8:vi[2013] n.p.), should have been noticed last year but appeared in a publication not normally seen by Shakespearians. The point is essentially the same as that of the article just reviewed—that authorship is detectable in the rates of usage of high-frequency words—but it is pursued here in strict mathematical form. The authors took 168 plays from Shakespeare’s time and for each they counted (using the Intelligent Archive) the occurrences of the 55,055 unique words they contain between them. Then the investigators counted using a new metric they have invented, called CM_1, for the rates of usage of these words by John Fletcher, Ben Jonson, Thomas Middleton, and William Shakespeare compared to the other writers. The word choices (for and against each word) are like Maxwell’s Demon in the famous gas-physics thought-experiment of the same name, who admits certain highly energetic molecules through his partition by opening it, and shuts it to keep out slower, molecules.

From the 55,055 unique words found, the ones that are most distinctive of the authorship of Fletcher, Jonson, Middleton, and Shakespeare (that is, four sets of most-distinctive-words) were found using some mathematics of frequency distribution that this reviewer does not fully comprehend. The real advance of this paper appears to be in the mathematical detail of how one processes the frequencies of occurrence of the words to find the words that are most distinctive. Specifically, the authors’ newly invented CM_1 score for a word’s distinctiveness within the dataset is a refinement of Welch’s t-test, itself a refinement of Student’s t-test, to suit a particularly common situation in authorship attribution testing. That situation is where one is comparing a set of plays by a single author with a set of plays known to be by different authors, as in ‘Shakespeare versus the Marlowe-Jonson-Middleton set’. The article’s authors were able to show that their new CM_1 score beats the usual t-test by feeding its results for these 168 plays into the WEKA machine-learning software package, the algorithms of which are not disclosed in this article (although the software is open source), and using 50 of its methods to produce models of authorship based on these data. That is, WEKA was asked to develop tests for authorship based on the frequencies of occurrence of the most distinctive words (as scored by CM_1), which tests were then ranked for how reliably they did in fact detect authorship, and the most effective tests were isolated. The efficiency of these tests (based on CM_1 scoring) was then compared using the same tests based on t-test scoring to show that CM_1 is better.

Douglas Bruster and Genevieve Smith, ‘A New Chronology for Shakespeare’s Plays’ (DSH [2014] n.p.), offer a new chronology of Shakespeare’s plays based on a new analysis of existing verse-style data, and it is largely but not entirely in agreement with the widely accepted chronology. This study uses Ants Oras’s pause counts to put the plays in a new order, and other data are brought in to anchor the chronology, such as particular plays’ known dates of first performance and the known dates of theatre closure due
to plague. (The last of these will, of course, require some assumptions about how Shakespeare reacted to the theatres being closed: did he cease writing plays or carry on regardless?) Oras counted pauses in each syllabic position from ‘after 1’ to ‘after 9’ and tabulated the result, using three strengths of pause: A (the weakest) marked by any punctuation, B marked by any punctuation stronger than the weakest punctuation, which is a comma, and C marked by a change of speaker. The use of iambics makes the pauses tend to come after evenly numbered syllables. Early in his career Shakespeare favoured pauses after position 4, but he gradually shifted to favouring position 6, or at least the second half of the line, over his lifetime.

The Oxford Complete Works of 1986–7 used Oras’s lists to help produce its chronology, but in many cases it insisted on an order that does not quite follow Oras’s trends. As Bruster and Smith admit, this sometimes is inevitable since Oras’s data put 2 Henry IV before 1 Henry IV and The Tempest before Pericles. (A key point here is that this happens if one assumes that the trend that Oras was tracing drifted consistently in one direction, with no reversals where a new play displays less of the phenomenon than its predecessor; this assumption is not obviously sound.) In an article reviewed in YWES 83[2004], MacDonald P. Jackson in 2002 more or less confirmed the Oxford chronology by a new statistical examination of Oras’s data, but some anomalies stood out. According to Jackson, The Merchant of Venice, The Merry Wives of Windsor, and All’s Well That Ends Well are later than the Oxford Complete Works’ editors reckoned, and 2 Henry IV, Troilus and Cressida, and Othello are earlier.

Oras treated each play as equally important for his work, but of course short plays give less evidence than long ones and should be discounted, and so should plays with a lot of prose (because they have less verse). Bruster and Smith describe the statistical technique of Correspondence Analysis (CA) that they use, and it is like the more familiar Principal Component Analysis (PCA) but suited to categorical rather than continuous data. They acknowledge that plays may have no single date of authorship because they are revised over time, and they decide to exclude from their study Oras’s C-pauses because they think that shared verse lines are a different phenomenon altogether. Bruster and Smith are able to also add new data from knowledge of Shakespeare’s collaborations that was unavailable to Oras.

Having done the PCA and CA analysis that plots the plays on just two axes (each axis representing a bundle of favoured pause positions), Bruster and Smith explain their ‘bootstrap’ procedure: they resample by randomly choosing various subsets of datapoints to run the PCA and CA again, which ‘affords us some measure of uncertainty for our CA scores’ (p. 5). Adding uncertainty sounds undesirable, but what they mean is that the resampling enables them to estimate how much uncertainty attaches to their original results, so they can add what are called ‘confidence bars’ to the data points. Unfortunately they do not explain why resampling enables this. Presumably if the randomly chosen samples give much the same results as the full dataset then the results are more reliable than if the randomly chosen samples give highly different results. But that is just my guess; it may be wrong, and the principle ought to have been explained by the authors. The ‘95 per cent confidence intervals’ from this resampling ‘produce a polygon for
each play and trace a gradual arc up and to the right’ (p. 5). The authors give no detail on how a confidence interval produces a polygon nor what the arc represents nor why it projects upwards and to the right, but presumably each confidence interval is a one-dimensional value for either CA1 or CA2 so that when CA1 and CA2 are plotted as $x/y$ co-ordinates on a graph the result is a polygon. (I would have guessed that it would be an ellipse, so perhaps this explanation too is wrong.) This does not help us understand the arc unless this simply refers to the drift of the polygons over time as the favoured pause position drifts.

A variant of CA called Constrained Correspondence Analysis (CCA) allows the fixing of certain points when trying to find the seriation (= correct ordering), which is just what we need with the Shakespeare plays. The seriation itself comes entirely from the assumption, not yet made clear by Bruster and Smith, of a continuous one-directional drift in CCA scores with no reversing; this is not necessarily an unreasonable assumption but it does need to be foregrounded. The fixed points used to ground the seriation are *3 Henry VI* being written in late 1591, *Henry V* being written in mid-1599, *Pericles* being written in early 1607, and *The Tempest* being written after 1611. The authors provide a helpful diagram showing how an assumption of one-way and steady drift in CCA score gives a straight line running upwards and to the right on a plot in which the $y$-axis is CCA score and the $x$-axis is time. Because we have known CCA scores for certain plays and known dates for those plays, we can fix the $x$-axis’s time-scale and hence allow other plays’ dates to be derived from their CCA scores on the $y$-axis.

This picture enables the generation of an entire chronology, with 95 per cent confidence intervals, although Bruster and Smith also added in further fixed points based on their acceptance of Leeds Barroll’s claim that Shakespeare stopped writing plays when the theatres were closed. Moreover, they were able to add in Marina Tarlinskaja’s prosodic data, but these are continuous (as percentages) not classes (like Oras’s data) so they ran PCA not CA on it. (Just how they combined the results of their analysis of Tarlinskaja’s data with the results of their analysis of Oras’s data is not made clear.) Bruster and Smith provide a complete listing of their entire Shakespeare chronology and for each play they give a brief discussion of the evidence and how their results compare with those of earlier studies. The especially noteworthy conclusions are that: *Titus Andronicus*, not *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, is Shakespeare’s first play; that *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* comes as late as 1594; and that *As You Like It* is dated 1597, *Troilus and Cressida* 1598, *Measure for Measure* 1602, *Antony and Cleopatra* 1610, *Coriolanus* 1611, and *The Winter’s Tale* and *Cymbeline* 1613. (The last two are especially surprising since Simon Forman records seeing the first—and probably the second depending on how we read his account—in 1611.) At the close the authors give the important caveat that their work assumes ‘that Shakespeare’s verse line developed in one direction, and regularly, without significant deviation’ (p. 16). It is notable and comforting that for many of the plays this new analysis more or less confirms the existing chronology derived by quite different means.

Matt Steggle edited Shakespeare’s *Measure for Measure* for the third edition of the Norton Shakespeare, and in a spin-off article, ‘The Cruces of *Measure
for Measure and EEBO-TCP’ (RES 65[2014] 438–55), he shows how judicious use of EEBO-TCP can help us make sense of the play’s cruces and emend them where necessary. Steggle gives a technically astute introduction to EEBO-TCP and its strengths and weaknesses, applauding Jonathan Hope and Michael Witmore’s term ‘prosthetic reading’ for what we are doing when we use such a resource. The term is particularly salient when we assert that certain phrasings are absent from any book, since even the most diligent manual reader could not be sure of that for thousands of books, although such a reader might be able to confidently assert the presence of certain phrasings. Steggle rightly complains that research in textual criticism that uses EEBO-TCP frequently fails to give enough detail on just how the claimed results were obtained, and he is scrupulous in this regard.

The first crux considered by Steggle is Escalus’s ‘Some run from brakes of Ice’ (Measure for Measure 2.1.39). A widely adopted emendation is Nicholas Rowe’s ‘... brakes of vice’, and although vice fits well in the context it is unclear what a brake of it would be. W.W. Skeat objected that a brake cannot be a thicket since nobody ever ran away being chased by one of those. EEBO-TCP shows no examples of brakes of ice or breaks of ice, but ‘brakes of OR breaks of’ has seventy-eight hits, ‘a small enough number to check one by one’ (p. 444). Steggle found that in devotional literature the notions such as brakes of sensuality and brakes of vanitie show that ‘the words “brakes of” can indeed, in writing of this period, be followed by an abstract noun introducing a metaphorical register’ (p. 444) and that the recurrent idea is to avoid them. So, he supports Rowe’s ‘brakes of vice’ emendation.

The second crux is Angelo’s ‘Let’s write good Angell on the Deuills horne | ’Tis not the Deuills Crest’ (Measure for Measure 2.4.16–17). Samuel Johnson read this as conditional: if we write that on the devil’s horn, then his horn is no longer understood to be his crest (= insignia). Bawcutt read it as imperative: Angelo has discovered that he is no angel, so appearances are deceptive and we might as well write ‘good angel’ on the devil’s horn since we cannot trust that his appearance reveals his true nature. Alwin Thaler understood the idea to be that all sorts of people are now like the devil so his crest no longer exclusively denotes him. A number of critics have taken the antecedent of ’Tis to be not the horns but the inscription ‘Good Angel’, and others have argued that we cannot make sense of this crux and emendation is needed, with various, not terribly widely accepted, proposals.

Steggle points out that a crest does not have to be worn by the person it denotes but could be carried by, for example, servants on their livery. One could wear the devil’s livery or crest, and indeed in Measure for Measure Isabella goes on to say exactly that about Angelo in 3.1, that he is wearing ‘the cunning Liuerie of hell’. Steggle finds in Richard Braithwaite’s work an occurrence of devil’s crest meaning his livery (sometimes literalized in fancy clothes) that we humans wear when we sin. This enables Steggle to gloss Angelo’s lines as saying that ‘When the devil looks like the devil, with horns and so on, you can see him for what he is. His threat is neutralized, then, and you might as well call him harmless. The real danger is the grave-seeming person with hidden evil intent. They are the ones wearing the true livery of the
devil’ (p. 448). This seems rather a lot of meaning to be compressed into the thirteen words of the crux.

The third crux is Angelo’s ‘Admit no other way to saue his life | (As I subscribe not that, nor any other, | But in the losse of question) that you . . .’ (Measure for Measure 2.4.88–90). The really tricky bit is ‘in the losse of question’, which has been glossed a number of unconvincing ways, including ‘for the sake of argument’ and ‘provided that nothing can be said in his defence’. Others have tried emending the words and/or punctuation, for example by moving the closing bracket to after ‘other’ and reading ‘But in the loss of question’ as ‘when his case is lost’. But Steggle has found in EEBO-TCP that losing the question was a common idiom: in disputes it meant losing the thread and going off-topic, and that suits the context admirably.

The fourth crux is Isabella’s characterization of Angelo as one whose grave appearance and pronouncements ‘Nips youth i’ th’ head, and follies doth emmew | As falcon doth the fowl’ (Measure for Measure 3.1.89–90). The difficulty here is the meaning of ‘emmew’. Thomas Keightley’s emendation to enew, ‘the hawking term for a falcon driving a fowl into the water (en eau)’ (p. 451), has been widely accepted. But Steggle finds that, despite the apparent French etymology, this hawking term was often spelled emew and the sense of enclosing (mewing up) seems also active. The fifth crux is Angelo’s claim that his ‘Authority beares of a credent bulke | That . . .’ no one will dare dispute his honesty (Measure for Measure 2.4.25), where credent seems to mean believable and believing although no one else used it that way, and various emendations have been proposed. EEBO-TCP shows Steggle that this reading is indeed most unusual: a bulk can be the direct object of bear but not of bear of, nor of bear off (the currently favoured emendation). Steggle proposes the emendation bears so far credent bulk and EEBO-TCP gives plenty of parallel phrasings: belief and disbelief are often conveyed in metaphors of physical distance.

Lukas Erne and Tamsin Badcoe, in ‘Shakespeare and the Popularity of Poetry Books in Print, 1583–1622’ (RES 65[2014] 33–57), show that poetry books consistently enjoyed about twice or thrice the market share of all books that was enjoyed by plays, but reprints were rarer, that Shakespeare’s Venus and Adonis was the most popular poetry book of its age, that his The Rape of Lucrece and The Passionate Pilgrim did very well, and that his Sonnets was merely typical in not getting a reprint since 80 per cent of such books did not. Erne and Badcoe focus on the popularity of all poetry books published in 1583–1622; as they point out this is companion work to that done by Alan Farmer and Zachary Lesser on the popularity of play books (reviewed in YWES 86[2007]). Of necessity they start with some definitions of terms. What makes a book, which may have mixed content, a poetry book? Their answer is that it has to be ‘chiefly’ verse. What is a book? Answer: not a broadside. What counts as a second edition if the contents change? Answer: they rely on the Short Title Catalogue to make this call. How should we count republication in collections of mixed authorship and miscellanies? Answer: they do it on a case-by-case basis depending on how much of the collection comprises material from the first edition.
Erne and Badcoe’s first table shows raw counts for poetry books published each year in 1583–1622, and the average is 17.5 first editions and eight reprints a year. The numbers rise quickly at the beginning of this period before plateauing, and the key transitional year seems to be 1594, which of course is when both Shakespeare’s narrative poems were newly out and when playbooks flooded the market too. Political events such as the death of Queen Elizabeth in 1603 and of Prince Henry in 1613 seem to have caused spikes in commemorative poetry books. What about the market share enjoyed by poetry books? We have from Peter W.M. Blayney’s work the figures for the total book market size, and it was growing rapidly. Since poetry book sales were largely static after the 1594 jump this means that poetry books had a decreasing share of the market. On average across the period poetry books had about 10 per cent of the market share for all books.

Erne and Badcoe discover that there were always twice or three times as many poetry books on the market as play books, and as demand for one rose or fell so did demand for the other. Of course, numbers of first editions indicate what publishers think will sell, but numbers of reprints indicate what actually did sell. There being more poetry books published thanplay books, the reprint rate for poetry books was much lower (about half) than that for play books. Perhaps, speculate Erne and Badcoe, the continually renewed publicity for successful plays in the form of theatre revivals kept driving up demand for play reprints. Shakespeare bucks the trend for poetry books generally: he had few published and they were often reprinted. Because there were so many poetry books published, Shakespeare never dominated this market as he did the play-books market if we count first editions. But if we count reprints instead he out-performed the average by a long way. Within that profile, Venus and Adonis and The Rape of Lucrece were extremely popular (compared to the market average) and even The Passionate Pilgrim was well above average. The failure of Sonnets to get republished was just normal for this market: as noted, 80 per cent of poetry books were not reprinted. Venus and Adonis in particular popularized the heroic sestet verse form as well as the epyllion content concerned with ‘youthful eroticism, luxury, and transgression’ (p. 49). In 1608 Robert Raworth tried and failed to publish a pirated edition of Venus and Adonis (he was caught), which was worth the risk because this was ‘the best-selling poetry book of its time, going through more editions than any of the other 701 poetry books first published between 1583 and 1622’ (p. 53).

As well as producing his own studies showing that A Lover’s Complaint is by Shakespeare, MacDonald P. Jackson, in ‘A Lover’s Complaint and the Claremont Shakespeare Clinic’ (EMLS 16:iii[2013] n.p.), is able to show that others’ studies that reach the opposite conclusion are flawed. This essay is a critique of the methods by which Ward E.Y. Elliot and Robert J. Valenza of the Claremont Shakespeare Clinic have dismissed A Lover’s Complaint as non-Shakespearian in an article in Shakespeare Quarterly in 1997 and in a collection of essays called Words That Count edited as a Festschrift for Jackson in 2004 and reviewed in YWES 85[2006]. Their method was to devise a series of counts of various features in the works and then set upper and lower limits for these counts so that as many as possible known-Shakespeare works...
fall within the boundaries and as many as possible known-non-Shakespeare works fall outside them. Their failure was that they did not hold aside—in the sense of not using them in the determining of their boundaries—some blocks of known-Shakespeare poetry in order to test the validity of their boundaries. The fact that the known-Shakespeare poetry almost all falls within their boundaries is misleading, since that is what those boundaries were set to achieve.

Jackson repeats the Elliott and Valenza method using just *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* to set the boundaries and shows that the resulting limits would declare the *Sonnets* to be un-Shakespearian by a greater margin than it declares *A Lover's Complaint* to be un-Shakespearian. (Or rather, he uses their own published data to recalculate the boundaries without actually running their tests again.). Elliott and Valenza’s method uses what they call ‘handfitting’ to determine the upper and lower boundaries: they moved them around manually to include the Shakespearian and exclude the non-Shakespearian. Jackson shows that it is better to use a consistent mathematical procedure to set the boundaries, based on averages and allowing two standard deviations from the average in either direction above and below the average to be the boundaries. Applying this rule with Elliott and Valenza’s own results, Jackson is able to show that the tests get better at excluding the non-Shakespearian and that *A Lover’s Complaint* now looks Shakespearian.

Jackson has a specific objection to one of Elliott and Valenza’s tests, which counts the rates of use of *no* and *not* and divides the occurrences of the former by the occurrences of both. This test is demonstrably incapable of separating Shakespearian from non-Shakespearian poetry, for which the averages on this test are almost identical. Because we are here dealing with comparative rates, a text with lots of *nos* and *nots* can have the same rate as one with hardly any *nos* and *nots*, thereby obscuring the vast difference in absolute terms that makes their figures differently significant. Elliott and Valenza are effectively counting just a small subset of all the function words in a text, and instead the proper way to proceed is to count ‘all those [function words] that occur in Shakespeare’s works above a certain level of frequency and compare blocks by principal component analysis’. Jackson has further objections to the counting of averages for features such as *with* being the penultimate word in a sentence where the data’s standard deviation is very high; that is, some blocks score highly on this test, some score zero, and the average is not really typical of any one block. Other critiques are that tests derived from plays are demonstrably (Jackson shows it) not reliable for poems and vice versa, and that some of the features they measure, such as rates of feminine endings in verse, were clearly drifting over time. With all these faults, Elliott and Valenza’s tests’ finding that *A Lover’s Complaint* is not by Shakespeare should not be taken as substantial evidence in the matter.

John Jowett, ‘Disintegration, 1924’ (*Shakespeare* 10[2014] 171–87), traces just why E.K. Chambers chose the word *disintegrators* for those whose approaches to Shakespeare scholarship he vigorously rejected. The rhetorical power of the word *disintegration*, which as Jowett shows still gets used pejoratively about those investigating Shakespeare’s co-authorship of plays, comes from Chambers’s 1924 talk ‘The Disintegration of Shakespeare’, which
‘encapsulated cultural anxieties flowing from theoretical science and reinforced by inter-war fears among the English elite of weakening social cohesion’ (p. 172). Disintegration was, of course, a modernist concern, with Albert Einstein breaking up the Newtonian certainties and postwar social cohesion breaking down. Ernest Rutherford had recently split the atom—named from a-tome, meaning indivisible—and he used the word disintegration in the titles of several of his works. For Chambers the word especially connoted the social disintegration warned of in the 1860s in Matthew Arnold’s Culture and Anarchy, and for him English literature and especially Shakespeare were bulwarks against that. Chambers’s disintegrators were of two kinds: (1) the author-attribution specialists giving Shakespeare’s works (or parts thereof) to other authors, and (2) A.W. Pollard and John Dover Wilson for their particular form of New Bibliography.

As Jowett notes, Chambers was accepting of Dover Wilson’s ideas when they matched his own. Jowett traces the biographies of the two men and their connected labours in developing the British schools system and their both being adherents of Matthew Arnold’s ideas about the positive social benefits of education in general and English literature in particular. The early Wilson thought that Shakespeare’s plays were much worked and reworked, coming originally from other authors, and that the print editions give only the illusion of ‘stability and integrity’ (p. 180). Chambers strenuously denied the idea of endless revision of plays and that this took place in endlessly revised manuscripts, the ‘continuous copy’ theory. The manuscript of Sir Thomas More created this impression of endless, untidy revision, and the key question is how typical one takes this manuscript to be. Jowett sketches the harmful effect on authorship-attribution scholarship that Chambers’s essay had for decades after its publication. We live now in a age that does not value literary integrity and coherence, and yet authorship attribution scholarship is not fashionable, for lingering postmodernism rejects its very model of authorship as something assignable to a person. Jowett argues that we can think of co-authorship ‘as an articulated conversation or contestation between authors’ (p. 182) so that it is both social and individualistic: ‘the development of Shakespeare’s drama can be re-animated as a narrative of intersections with other dramatists and other dramatic styles’ (p. 183).

Thomas Merriam, ‘Was Munday the Author of Sir Thomas More?’ (Moreana 151[2014] 245–56), argues that the Original Text of Sir Thomas More looks, on certain tests, rather Shakespearian, so perhaps Shakespeare worked with Anthony Munday on that as well as the later additions. He starts by summarizing his own 1987 article that counted ‘Five stylometric word habits’ in Munday’s John a Kent and John a Cumber and Munday’s contributions to the two parts (Death and Downfall) of Robert Earl of Huntingdon, and Julius Caesar, Titus Andronicus, Edward III, and the Original Text of Sir Thomas More. This article claimed that Shakespeare was more likely than Munday to be the author of the Original Text of Sir Thomas More. Unfortunately, the habits in question are not described in enough detail. For example, does the habit ‘be followed by a’ mean followed immediately after or at some distance? If the former, then why not simply say he counted the occurrences of the bigram be a and if the latter we need to know the maximum
permitted distance. Likewise for the habit ‘be not followed by a’ are we saying that some other word (other than a) had to follow be or would it count if be were at the end of a sentence, or line, or speech, which are all other ways for be to be not followed by a? The same kind of uncertainty that could easily have been cleared up applies to all the other habits counted.

Merriam repeats these same tests now with all thirty-six plays in the Folio and plots the resulting data's two principal components for each play—presumably reducing each play's five data points to two—as a scatter-graph. The Shakespeare plays all cluster together with the Original Text of Sir Thomas More and John a Kent and John a Cumber, and the Robert Earl of Huntingdon plays cluster together away from this group. But, as Merriam admits, Edward III also clusters with the Shakespeare plays despite having only quite a small bit of Shakespeare in it, so Merriam has not proved that this test is good at distinguishing authorship in general. What his test needs is systematic validation by being given randomized samples of plays where the authorship is known and seeing how convincingly it distinguishes plays taken out of that sample and tested as if they were of unknown authorship; this would give an overall reliable rate we could judge. Being right more than 90 per cent of the time would be good.

Rodney Stenning Edgecombe offers some emendations and reinterpretations of particular cruces in Shakespeare in ‘Five Notes on Shakespeare’ (BJJ 21[2014] 289–302). Where the Folio text of 1 Henry VI has ‘I: Beauties Princely Maiesty is such, | Confounds the tongue, and makes the senses rough’ Edgecombe thinks rough needs emendation because senses cannot be made so. He suggests rush as it nearly rhymes, and other pairs of lines in this scene rhyme, and elsewhere in Shakespeare the senses, similarly confounded, take flight. In 2 Henry IV the Lord Chief Justice says that Falstaff lives in ‘great infamy’ and Falstaff replies ‘He that buckles himself in my belt cannot live in less’ (1.2.138–40). The joke, according to Edgecombe, is not about Falstaff deliberately pretending that he thinks infamy is a cloth he might wear, but that he takes it to be a word meaning hunger (as in famished). In Falstaff’s claim that ‘The young Prince hath misled me. I am the fellow with the great belly, and he my dog’ (2 Henry IV 1.2.146–7) it is not clear why he calls Hal his dog. Edgecombe reckons that the point is the topsy-turvydom of the dog leading its master, which is what the man-in-the-moon’s dog does to him—in one tradition, that dog is really the devil—and Falstaff says elsewhere that he and his crew are minions of the moon (1 Henry IV 1.2.26).

The Folio text of All is True/Henry VIII has the Duke of Buckingham complain of Wolsey that ‘his owne Letter | The Honourable Boord of Councell, out | Must fetch him in, he Papers’, which many editors leave unemended. Edgecombe thinks that it makes more sense if the comma in the second line is moved to the end of the line and he changed to the, giving ‘. . . The honourable board of council out, | Must fetch him in the papers’, which he glosses as meaning that Wolsey puts the king’s council out of the picture (circumvents them) and writes letters demanding money from various gentlemen who ‘are de facto inscribed in his list or file (“must fetch him in the papers”’) (p. 295). I cannot see how ‘must fetch him in the papers’ means that. When Buckingham says ‘my life is spand already: | I am the shadow of
poore Buckingham, | Whose Figure euen this instant Clowd puts on, | By 
Darkning my cleere Sunne’ the precise meaning is not immediately clear. 
Edgecombe suggests that adding a d to figure solves the problem because then 
even clearly means evening. Edgecombe does not make explicit what he thinks 
the adjective figured does in modifying evening, but it seems to have the same 
meaning as prefigured.

Comparing herself to Sylvia, Julia in The Two Gentlemen of Verona says 
‘What should it be that he respects in her, | But I can make respective in my 
selife?’ Most editors gloss respective as make worthy of respect, but Edgecombe 
thinks that Julia uses the word in the sense of in respect of (= regarding) herself 
and with a pun on respicere (Latin for providence) so he puts a comma after 
make. The gloss he gives to the resulting construction seems to me too complex 
for the occasion it serves. Sonnet 119 has the lines ‘How haue mine eies out of 
their Spheares bene fitted | In the distraction of this madding feuer?’ Edgecombe objects to the usual gloss of fitted as meaning convulsively 
dislodged (from fit = seizure) and reads this as an example of Shakespeare 
thinking of one person seeing with another’s eyes, so that eyes that are fitted 
are eyes ‘taken out of their spheres and fitted into others” (p. 300). In a 
separate note, ‘The “Present Quality of War” Crux in 2 Henry IV 1.3’ (ShN 
63[2014] 96), Edgecombe attends to Folio 2 Henry IV having Lord Bardolph 
say ‘Yes, if this present quality of warre, | Indeed the instant action: a cause on 
foot, | Liues so in hope’. Edgecombe proposes turning this into sense by 
emending indeed > indued (in the sense of clothed). That is, if ‘Hotspurian 
impulsiveness’ were clothed with the quality of war—namely foresight, which 
Bardolph is about to detail presently—then, yes, a military cause is hopeful. 
This is indeed better than the currently accepted emendations of punctuation only.

An article by Terri Bourus and Gary Taylor, ‘Measure for Measure(s): 
Performance-Testing the Adaptation Hypothesis’ (Shakespeare 10[2014] 363– 
401), reports that Bourus directed her university theatre company in two 
versions of Measure for Measure: one based on the Folio text and one on the 
pre-Middleton-adaptation version as constructed by John Jowett’s ‘genetic 
text’ for the Oxford Collected Middleton. The practitioners found the aesthetic 
effects of the two productions quite different even though the textual variants 
are not extensive; a few strategically placed changes can make a lot of 
difference. An interesting and previously overlooked point is that the revival of 
the play must have opened at the Blackfriars theatre because as John Jowett 
showed (in work reviewed in YWES 88[2009]) the adaptation occurred 
between 6 October 1621, when one of the sources for it became available, and 
late March 1622 when Crane’s transcript was handed to the Folio printers; 
that being winter-time the King’s men would be using their indoor theatre. The 
Globe performances of the original version of the play in 1604 probably ended 
with a jig, which was usual, but these were banned, and the 1621 performances 
probably omitted the jig. The remainder of the article has many interesting and 
important comments on the performance consequences of the textual 
differences between the two versions of the play, but they fall outside the 
scope of this review.
Pervez Rizvi, in ‘Stemmata for Shakespeare’s Texts: A Suggested New Form’ (PBSA 108[2014] 96–106), proposes a new way of writing editions’ stemmata in a tabular form with horizontal rows for individual textual objects (manuscripts, editions), with time running left to right, with boxes in each row denoting the transformations of the object in that row, and with lines between the boxes denoting acts of copying or consultation. One possible objection to this admirable scheme is that it has places for physical objects but not for texts that get stored in actors’ heads when they read their parts and that later get expressed in performances. The stemma for Henry V in the Textual Companion to the Oxford Complete Works of Shakespeare has a place for ‘performances’ and Rizvi objects that ‘since a performance is neither a material object nor a change in a material object’ (p. 98) it should not be in the stemma. Thus in his stemma for this play there is ‘no arrow between the promptbook and the memorially reconstructed text. This shows that the material object called the promptbook was neither copied nor consulted in creating the material object called the memorially reconstructed text’ (p. 100). One can see the logic of Rizvi’s argument, but if we follow it we lose the link between the authorial papers and the performances they gave rise to. In his stemma the actors seem able to create a memorial reconstruction of something, the script of the play, without there being any connection (any line) between this reconstruction and the thing it reconstructs. How did they do this? If Rizvi could address this objection—perhaps by indicating why it is illusory for the kind of work that stemmata should do or else by making a place for the actors’ parts as physical objects—then his plan for a new layout would clearly improve on the existing design.

And so to the round-up from Notes and Queries. Karen Britland, ‘Psalm 140 and Diana’s Crux in All’s Well That Ends Well’ (N&Q 61[2014] 241–4), returns to the familiar crux that Suzanne Gossett looked at above. In the Folio All’s Well That Ends Well, Diana says to Bertram (who is trying to seduce her): ‘I see that men make rope’s in such a scarre, | That wee’l forsake our selues. Giue me that Ring.’ What is meant by ‘rope’s in such a scarre’? Britland approves of P.A. Daniel’s emendation of scarre > snare that Gary Taylor found impossible because one does not get roped in a snare. The curious rope’s Britland considers a simple plural with an obsolete apostrophe. (I would have thought that it is far from obsolete and its currency has given it the slang name of a greengrocer’s apostrophe.) What about the problem that the image of snaring does not suit well the idea of forsaking oneself? Britland explains this by pointing to Psalm 139 (or 140 according to varying religious opinion) that refers to the ropes and snares by which the innocent are led by the sinful to forsake themselves. (In fact that is not quite what the psalm seems to say, so there is some forcing of the argument to make the allusion seem to fit.)

Thomas Merriam, ‘A Phrasal Collocation’ (N&Q 61[2014] 231–3), ponders in a general and noncommittal way how texts come to use the same strings of words. Charles Forker’s edition of The Troublesome Reign of King John listed a lot of trigrams (and longer) in common between that play and the plays of George Peele, and Merriam wonders how n-grams with a large n (such as 7) can come to be in common between two works. He has a particular example in mind: ‘the queen and her two sons; And’ which appears in Shakespeare’s Titus
Andronicus and Robert Southwell’s *The Epistle of Comfort* (printed perhaps in 1587). Merriam seems to make no more of this than the conclusion that it shows ‘the influence of a Jesuit on Shakespeare’, which does not seem especially helpful.

Jane Kingsley-Smith, ‘A Method Unto Mortification: A New Source for *Love’s Labour’s Lost*’ (*N&Q* 61[2014] 233–6), reckons that *Love’s Labour’s Lost* was partly inspired by a Protestant theological work about renouncing the vanities of this world. In the play Dumaine says of himself ‘Dumaine is mortified’, in the sense of having suppressed his appetites. Kingsley-Smith reckons that Shakespeare got the word and the idea from Thomas Rogers’s book *A Method of Mortification* (published in 1586), a Protestant theological work based on a Catholic original. The original Catholic author, Diego de Estella, was born in Navarre and, having disapproved of court life there, was forced into a monastery. This biography sounds somewhat like that of the play’s Don Armado—Shakespeare’s first and most memorable Spanish character—who comes to Navarre’s court and considers himself one of those who has signed up for its ascetic life. As Kingsley-Smith shows, the concerns of Rogers’s book—just how does one abjure worldly vanities?—are like those of the play, and she traces a number of parallels. Both allude to Ecclesiastes 13:1 on being defiled by touching pitch, both refer to breath being a vapour that is destroyed by sunlight, both refer to stumbling in the darkness of moral ignorance, and both have Judas Maccabeus hurt by idle words.

Chunxiao Wei, ‘“Saint Peter’s Church” in *Romeo and Juliet*’ (*N&Q* 61[2014] 236–8), responds to the claim by Richard Paul Roe in *The Shakespeare Guide to Italy* [2011] to have identified the particular St Peter’s Church used by the Capulets in *Romeo and Juliet*. Rather pointlessly, Wei sets out to debunk all this as geographically and historically implausible. It could just as easily be dismissed on literary-historical grounds: we have no reason to think that Shakespeare was using local knowledge since his sources account for everything. Henry Buchanan, ‘The Merchant of Venice, III.ii.99: A Proposed Emendation’ (*N&Q* 61[2014] 238–40) has a new solution for the crux in Bassanio’s speech about a ‘beauteous scarf | Veiling an Indian beauty’ (*Merchant of Venice* III.ii.98–9), which has puzzled editors by its notion of beauty hiding beauty. Buchanan reckons that *scarf* is a nautical term for the sails of a ship, which veil its valuable interior or *booty*. (I cannot see that a ship’s sails, which go on top, veil its insides.) Buchanan reckons that the line should be emended to refer to the ‘beauteous scarf | Veiling an Indian booty’, which of course suits the wider maritime-commerce theme of the play.

Leo Daugherty, ‘A Previously Unreported Source for Shakespeare’s Sonnet 56’ (*N&Q* 61[2014] 240–1), reports a new source for one of Shakespeare’s poems. Sonnet 56 begins ‘Sweet love, renew thy force. Be it not said | Thy edge should blunter be than appetite, | Which but today by feeding is allayed, | Tomorrow sharpened in his former might’. Daugherty hears in this an echo of George Whetstone’s sonnet (in *The Rock of Regard* [1576]), ‘First love renue thy force, my ioyes for to consume . . .’, for which the context of rekindling lost love with verse is the same. David George, ‘Hamlet and the Southwark Ghost’ (*N&Q* 61[2014] 244–6), also has a new source. A ghost story published in 1674 seems to have echoes of Hamlet’s father’s ghost returning from the dead to
talk to him, including the shared detail of an orchard: in *Hamlet* that is where the murder takes place, and in the ghost story the murdered man is buried—and maybe was murdered—in his orchard. Furthermore, in the ghost story, the murderer initially gets away with it, his wife is none the wiser, the ghost walks about in a cellar, and the murdered man has buried wealth, which last detail matches what Horatio speculates is the cause of the ghost’s return in *Hamlet*. Also, in the story the ghost says that he must not speak of his experiences after death. When published, the story included accounts of the ghost appearing in Southwark in the 1500s. George points out that the known sources for *Hamlet* lack these details and wonders if Shakespeare heard of this story in Southwark prior to writing the play.

Ingrid Benecke, ‘The Shorter Stage Version of Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* as Seen through Simon Forman’s Eyes’ (*N&Q* 61[2014] 246–53), reckons that *Macbeth* as we know it from the Folio was cut before being performed at the Globe in 1611 and seen by Simon Forman, with the omissions being reflected in what Forman omits. Benecke begins with the surprising assertion, for which no reason is given, that Forman’s eyewitness account of *Macbeth* at the Globe in 1611 was not influenced by his knowledge of Raphael Holinshed’s prose chronicles. (It is commonly thought that Forman’s reference to the Weird Sisters as ‘féries or Nimphes’ might be such a recollection of Holinshed.) The next sentence is even more confusing as it claims that the play was ‘written before 1610/11, most likely between the year 1603 and sometime after spring 1606’. That last clause covers all time from 1606 to the present day, so presumably Benecke means ‘in 1606, after its spring’. The next sentence begins ‘It therefore . . .’ but it is unclear what the antecedent is; the previous sentence began with its own backwards pointer (‘That supports . . .’), and the one before that simply asserted that Forman’s account is ‘closely related’ to the Folio text instead of Holinshed’s account, which seems to be stating the obvious: Forman primarily recalled the play he saw, not its source. I have no idea what the author is trying to tell us by all this.

Then begins Benecke’s account of how Forman’s notes differ from the play we have in the Folio, and it wrongly ascribes agency: Forman ‘cuts the number of characters down to Duncan, Macbeth and his Lady, Banquo, “Dunks 2 sonns”, and the Macduffs’ (p. 247). Surely, no, he simply does not recall or think it worth his trouble to mention the others; this is not cutting in any recognized sense of that term. Because in Forman’s notes the main characters are ‘flat’ and ‘far less complex’ than in the Folio, Benecke wonders if the psychological subtlety we know from the Folio was not present in what got performed at the Globe in 1611. The simpler explanation would be that it takes many words from a great artist to convey psychological complexity, and brief notes from a physician-spectator cannot be expected to do it.

Benecke rehearses the familiar observation that it is surprising that Forman did not mention the play’s explorations of the physical manifestations of mental illness, since that would have been bound to interest him. In places Benecke uses language to describe Shakespeare’s play that critics and theatre practitioners might well consider to be highly loaded, for example calling the Weird Sisters ‘malevolent hags’. Benecke has a most peculiar notion of the hypothesis that the play was revised between the time Forman saw it and
the printing of the Folio—that is, the Middleton adaptation theory—in that she wonders whether ‘Hecate and her subservient spirits (III.v, IV.i) were excised’ (p. 248) for the show Forman saw, whereas of course the adaptation hypothesis, of which she seems only dimly aware, is that they were added by Middleton after Forman saw the play. Benecke offers many observations and speculations about the play as staged in 1611 based on what Forman does not write, and appears not to appreciate that this is all much too speculative because we do not know why someone might have not recorded something. Some of the writing is particularly awkwardly phrased: ‘Macduff meeting Macbeth’s enemy in England can be taken to be a traitor to the Scottish throne’ (p. 248) and ‘He thus centres treasonable evil on Macbeth’ (p. 249).

In the second half of the article, Benecke gives a second complete summary of how the play looks in Forman’s account. According to Benecke, the Forman account represents a coherent cutting of the play and since that cutting is unlikely to have been done by Forman she concludes that what was performed at the Globe was a cut version of the Folio text.

Thomas Merriam, ‘A Reply to “All Is True or Henry VIII: Authors and Ideologies”’ (N&Q 61[2014] 253–6), reckons that his redistribution of the shares of Shakespeare and Fletcher in All is True/Henry VIII is confirmed by a fresh look at some old data. This is a response to MacDonald P. Jackson’s article in Notes and Queries the previous year (reviewed in YWES 94[2015]) in which Jackson showed that the moving of the boundaries of the authorial stints proposed by Merriam would give to Fletcher passages that have Shakespearian (and un-Fletcherian) rates of various verse features and likewise give to Shakespeare passages that have Fletcherian (and un-Shakespearian) rates of various verse features. Merriam responds that ‘Metrical and linguistic criteria, of the kind which Jackson carefully summarizes, are not by themselves capable of delimiting texts by author’ (p. 253).

Merriam offers a cumulative sum (cusum) graph, reprinted from ‘page 424 of Notes and Queries cclxviii (December 2003)’ (p. 254), which is a cryptic reference: he means it is from his article ‘Though This Be Supplementarity, Yet There Is Method In It’ (reviewed in YWES 84[2005]). But in fact it is not quite a reprint: the picture on page 424 of that article looks quite different from the one reproduced here in overall shape of the graph and the horizontal axis’s labelling. This last point is the clue to why the graphs look different: in the original, the $x$-axis ran from 0 to 3500 (representing sequential lines in the play) and in the present one it runs from 400 to 700. Thus the present graph is about a one-tenth part of the original that has been stretched horizontally by a factor of ten while the $y$-axis (which has no scale in the original or the reproduction) remains unstretched.

A cusum graph like this shows, line by line in the play, the total of all occurrences of a set of words and verbal features: counts of all, are, conscience, did, 'em, feminine endings, find, from, hath, in, is, it, little, words ending in -ly, must, now, sure, they, 'tis, too, and where/there. To understand how the graph is made and hence how to read it, one must turn not to Merriam’s 2003 article but to the article to which that one refers its reader, in Literary and Linguistic Computing from 2000. The method is that for each word or feature the total
number of occurrences in the play is counted and divided by the number of lines, which gives us the expected number per line if this word or feature were uniformly distributed across the play. A typical figure might be, say, 0.25 for *and*, meaning that we expect one *and* every four lines. For each line of the play is plotted how many times that feature has occurred up to that point (hence cumulative sum), minus the number we would expect to be the sum for that feature up to this point if the feature were uniformly distributed across the play.

Thus if the first *and* occurs in line 3 and there is another in line 4 but none in lines 5 or 6 then the cusum figures for lines 1 to 6 would be –0.25, –0.50, 0.25, 1.0, 0.75, and 0.50. Plotted with line numbers running horizontally and cusum figures running vertically, this means that negative slopes (running north-west to south-east) represent parts of the play where the feature is consistently occurring less often than expected (say because author A wrote those lines), as with our first, second, fifth, and sixth lines having deficits of *and* (none, where 0.25 is expected), and that positive slopes (running south-west to north-east) represent parts of the play where the feature is consistently occurring more often than expected (say because author B wrote those lines), as with our third and fourth lines running a surplus of *and* (one each, where 0.25 each is expected).

Merriam talks the reader through his cusum graph, referring to where the ‘breaks’ occur, but it is not clear to this reader just what he means by these breaks because there are micro-trends of positive and negative slopes occurring within larger trends that are generally positive or generally negative. In other words, just what counts as an overall positive or negative slope is a function of how closely one looks at the data. But for the present application this is not a serious problem because the passages to be redistributed between Shakespeare and Fletcher occur at known line numbers so Merriam is able to isolate in a separate picture exactly which parts of the graph refer to those passages. As he rightly claims, for the seven passages that he has reallocated from Fletcher to Shakespeare the slopes are clearly positive (indicating Shakespearian authorship). But as he admits, for the two passages that he has reallocated from Shakespeare to Fletcher the slopes are not so clear: ‘mostly negative slopes [= Fletcherian] except for their tails’ (p. 256).

N.M. Ingebretson, ‘A Hound in Shakespeare’s Addition to *Sir Thomas More*’ (*N&Q* 61[2014] 256–7), spots a crux where one is not usually thought to exist. In the Hand D part of *Sir Thomas More* (by Shakespeare), More refers to the rebels’ desire to ‘lead the majesty of law in lyam | To slip him like a hound’ (6.137–8). The problem is that a *lyam* is a line used to hold a scenting-dog called a lyam-hound (also called a lymer) while greyhounds were held not on a *lyam* but on a *slip*. So, this combination of *lyam* and *slip* is a crux. Even if we think *slip* just means *let loose* the problem does not go away, for lyam-hounds were not let loose to chase the quarry but were kept restrained and walked with their handlers behind the pack to pick up the scent again if the pack lost it. Ingebretson offers no solution to this crux, but simply points it out.

For the same play, Regis Augustus Bars Closel, ‘The Marginal Latin Tag in the Manuscript of *Sir Thomas More*’ (*N&Q* 61[2014] 257–60), has a solution to
an old puzzle. In the middle of the rewritten scene of Erasmus meeting More in *Sir Thomas More* there is a strange marginal Latin line ‘*Et tu Erasmus an diabolus*’ (8.191). (It means ‘And you are either Erasmus or the devil’, which translation CloseL neglects to give.) The line comes from anecdotes about More that circulated at the time of the play, and his great-grandson Cresacre More referred to it in his biography of More published around 1631 and possibly in manuscript circulation before then. The line in question is More’s response to Erasmus’s line, told in the anecdote but not in *Sir Thomas More*, of ‘*Aut tu es Morus aut nullum*’. (This means ‘Either you are More or nobody’, and again CloseL does not help the reader here.) CloseL’s suggestion is that both Latin lines were meant to appear in the play as an exchange (‘Either you are More . . . And you are either Erasmus . . .’) in the midst of their conversation when they recognize one another. CloseL is not sure if this exchange was part of the original writing or added during the revisions.

Also on *Sir Thomas More*, Thomas Merriam, ‘Determining a Date’ (N&Q 61[2014] 260–5), reckons that the Original Text was written before the mid-1590s, to judge from its rare-word usage. Different readers of the manuscript of Anthony Munday’s *John a Kent and John a Cumber* see different figures in the date written on it, which is not in Munday’s hand. Some see 1590, some 1595, and some 1596; most recently, MacDonald P. Jackson, in an article reviewed in YWES 92[2013], saw 1596. Fresh examination of the manuscript shows that part of Munday’s signature overwrites or is overwritten by part of the date, throwing further doubt on the date because it is not certain which was written on top of which. Since the date of *Sir Thomas More* depends in part on the date of *John a Kent*, this uncertainty spreads to the former play. Jackson has advanced an argument for a late date for *Sir Thomas More* based on various verse features, such as lots of feminine endings, which did not become so common until after 1600. Merriam objects that a couple of late plays (from 1598–1605) also have low rates of feminine endings. Even if true, a couple of such outlier cases would not dispose the overall trend, which is well established.

Merriam turns to Eliot Slater’s method of dating plays using their frequencies of rare words, to which he applies the cusum graphing method to show the occurrences in various plays of the rare words collected by Slater. When graphed so that the *x*-axis is the date and the *y*-axis is number of occurrences of Slater-rare-words that are common to the play to be dated and various plays for which the date (and hence the *y*-axis point) is known, the typical cusum pattern is observed. That is, the occurrences in a given play of Slater-rare-words common to various other plays form a rising slope and a falling slope with the peak between the two occurring at the point occupied by the play in the known chronology that has most Slater-rare-words in common with the play to be dated. For *John a Kent* this play is *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* of 1595–6, but for the Original Text of *Sir Thomas More* it is *The Comedy of Errors* of 1594, which is rather earlier than Jowett dates the play in his recent edition of it. As a check, Merriam applies the same test to *Sir John Oldcastle* and his method dates it just as we would expect from the external evidence, which is its dependence on *1 Henry IV* and its completion in October 1599 according to Henslowe’s Diary.
Adrian Blamires, ‘Ben Jonson’s Additions to The Spanish Tragedy as the Subject of Ridicule’ (N&Q 61[2014] 265–8), finds evidence of Ben Jonson’s dramatic writing not always being appreciated. Edward Alleyn retired from the stage between 1597 and 1600, and during that period the Admiral’s men did not play The Spanish Tragedy, which they had often performed before. Alleyn returned to the stage in 1601, and the play was revived with Jonson paid to write additions to it, although these seem not to be the additions that survive in the quarto of 1602. The addition of the Painter’s Part at least must have existed by 1599 because it is parodied in John Marston’s Antonio and Mellida of that year. Richard Burbage must have played Hieronimo because 2 Return from Parnassus mimics him doing it and his famous funeral elegy recalls his performance in the role. Thus the Chamberlain’s men must have played The Spanish Tragedy during Alleyn’s retirement from the stage.

When Alleyn revived the role at the Fortune, he probably felt he had something to prove, and perhaps Jonson’s revisions are connected to that. The boys’ company play The First Part of Hieronimo (published in 1605) is a prequel to The Spanish Tragedy and it seems to contain an allusion to Jonson’s additions for the revival of The Spanish Tragedy when Hieronimo says of the news that Lorenzo is honest ‘Go, tell it abroad now; | But see you put no new additions to it’. Blamires reads this as ‘evidence that Jonson fulfilled his task, but that his additions did not find favour, at least amongst the Blackfriars cognoscenti’ (p. 268). This seems a lot of weight to put on a small allusion, but then Blamires cheerfully admits that indeed it is.

2. Shakespeare in the Theatre

Shakespeare’s canonical prominence has tended to augment the profile of the Chamberlain’s/King’s men at the cost of other acting companies. Moreover, Shakespeare’s attachment as writer-in-residence to this single troupe serves to occlude the extent to which, as Lawrence Manley and Sally-Beth MacLean assert, the circumstances surrounding such companies were in flux in the early 1590s. Lord Strange’s Men and Their Plays demonstrates that, in many ways, Shakespeare is the exception rather than the rule, and the stability associated with his middle and later career wholly atypical. As Manley and MacLean insist in this assiduously researched book, ‘1589–93 was marked by exceptional fluidity and volatility (as well as artistic ferment) in the theatrical profession’.

At the heart of their project is the repertory and writers associated with Strange’s men, including Robert Greene, Thomas Kyd, Thomas Lodge, Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Nashe, and George Peele. In addition, Manley and MacLean argue for the inclusion of plays by Henry Chettle, Anthony Munday, and Shakespeare. Fortunately the Diary of Philip Henslowe is able to assist them here though not without ambiguities and omissions. The arguments in favour of the inclusion of Sir Thomas More and 1 Henry VI, for instance, rely on hypotheses. They date the former play nearly a decade earlier than its latest editor, John Jowett, whose proposal of 1600 postdates the dissolution of the company by seven years, and they assume that Shakespeare authored rather than revised the latter.
Not only were the playwrights hawking their wares about various companies (and in this Shakespeare, in the early days, may have been no exception), but the performers too were willing to forgo fidelity to any one company if the money was right. Edward Alleyn, the star of the Admiral’s men, was touring with Strange’s men in the early 1590s, and troupes of actors would occasionally fragment and reorganize under new patrons. The central artists of Strange’s men eventually became Chamberlain’s men. This is a thorough and important book for those interested in the pioneering years of the commercial theatre and the emergence of Shakespeare’s subsequent company.

For Andrew James Hartley, Julius Caesar is ‘so often dismissed as dull, a classroom exercise whose historical roots anchor it to multiple dusty pasts’ (p. 241). His vibrant and intelligent book on the play’s stage history demonstrates how wide of the mark is such a lazy assumption. In Julius Caesar: Shakespeare in Performance Hartley notes the play’s ‘curious ability to be both historical meditation and urgent contemporary reflection at the same instant’ (p. 6). Such an example is Orson Welles’s 1937 adaptation, Caesar: Death of a Dictator, staged at the Mercury theatre in New York. Hartley’s enthusiasm for this production is clear: he calls it ‘the most important single production in the play’s performance history’ (p. 36). Welles (remarkably only 22 years old) read the play as an indictment of the contemporary failure to confront fascism. Hartley not only comments astutely on the production but uncovers the controversies surrounding it, such as Welles’s own lacklustre performance: he was more interested in directing, using a stand-in Brutus during rehearsal and stepping into the production at the last minute. The preview was ‘a fiasco’ (p. 47) with an appalling sound system and an audience who left without applauding. Eventually Welles conceded to Norman Lloyd, who played Cinna the poet, and the scene (having been omitted) was restored. It became ‘the emblem of the production’ (p. 43). Next, Hartley turns his attention to Joseph Mankiewicz’s 1953 film version starring James Mason as Brutus, John Gielgud as Cassius, and Marlon Brando as Mark Antony. The latter’s centrality ‘announced that Shakespeare could be as much American as he was British’ (p. 62). Hartley is fascinating and penetrating on the contextual paranoia surrounding the McCarthy witch-hunts and the way in which Cecil B. DeMille attempted to undermine Mankiewicz in ‘a lengthy oration [with] deliberate and obvious parallels to Mark Antony’s funeral oration’ (p. 71)—illustration, if we needed it, of the play’s powerful political discourse. For Hartley, the whole episode, including the film itself, is ‘a meditation on the dangers of the new American nationalism’ (p. 73).

Closer to home, there are discerning analyses of the play’s metamorphoses in the middle of the last century. Lindsay Anderson’s 1964 Royal Court version was inflected by the topicality of ‘kitchen sink’ (p. 88) drama. John Barton’s 1968 RSC production confronted the importance of character rather than the heroic scale of the plot, while Trevor Nunn’s 1972 RSC production fell victim to an elaborate staging involving complex machinery and technical wizardry which proved intrusive. The BBC version (direct by Herbert Wise in 1979) receives a good kicking—‘Caesar at its nadir’ (p. 131)—as does Peter Hall’s 1995 RST production: an ‘unmitigated disaster’ (p. 156).
The most interesting chapter (to me anyway) was the examination of the ways in which Ron Daniels (RST, 1983), Terry Hands (RST, 1987), and Stephen Pimlott (RST, 1991) responded to the imperious regime of Margaret Thatcher. Pimlott’s Caesar, Robert Stephens, for instance, ‘glowed with the Iron Lady’s certainty, her influence and the dread she inspired in those who had finally mustered the courage to bring her down’ (p. 147). Hartley has a thorough sense of the fall-out from the battles pitched between Thatcherite monetarism and cultural investment (and the comprehensive attack on the latter). The hysteria surrounding Howard Brenton’s *The Romans in Britain*, directed in 1980 by Michael Bogdanov, intensified questions about the role of the theatre in the undermining of Victorian values, and Hartley concludes glumly that the quietism that characterized Daniels’s and Hands’s productions was directly the result of the RSC’s decision ‘to mute the *Romans in Britain* challenge in return for ongoing subsidy’ (p. 151). There follow discussions of some of the play’s productions in Europe, India, and South Africa as well as the American South (Hartley himself was involved with the 2001 and 2009 productions by the Georgia Shakespeare Festival). This is a terrific book with a real insider’s knowledge of the play’s Protean potential to reinvent itself according to local (Louisiana in the 1930s) and world (9/11) events. It is a model of performance history—a sagacious combination of archive material, historical context, and extrapolation of particular staging decisions.

In ‘“Let them use their talents”: *Twelfth Night* and the Professional Comedian’ (in Findlay and Oakley-Brown, eds., *Twelfth Night: A Critical Reader*, pp. 144–65), Andrew McConnell Stott considers the increasing degree of professionalization surrounding performing and specifically the playing of the jester. Stott notes that Feste is constantly eliciting money from Olivia, Orsino, Viola, and Sebastian: ‘Performers are vendors and they need to be paid, the play seems to be saying’ (p. 149). This trend takes place against an increasing sense of theatrical entertainment itself as a kind of service industry. One consequence of the development of ‘urban labour was the space it created for more clearly defined leisure time, and, as such, the more specialized and commodified leisure market that grew to fill it’ (p. 151). Stott details the importance and influence of the livery companies on the emerging theatrical industry. Hemmings, Tarlton, and Armin, for instance, had all completed apprenticeships with one of the livery companies, a position that allowed them ‘to bind apprentices to them who studied nothing but playing’ (p. 152). In the case of *Twelfth Night* Viola’s capacity to ‘sing | And speak to [Orsino] in many sorts of music’ (I.ii.53–4) puts her in direct professional competition with Feste. But Stott also underlines a fundamental distinction between the two performers—whereas Viola’s ‘ultimate fate [is] to reconcile appearance and reality, Feste’s role is geared towards bringing the contingency of identity more dramatically into relief’ (p. 161). Indeed, ‘questions of identity are at the root of all the performing services Feste offers’ (p. 163). This essay is a useful corrective to the notion that Feste is representative of a festive or carnival spirit; Stott ably demonstrates the ways in which his fooling is part of the new emerging occupation of player.

Three essays, in their different ways, dwell on materiality. The first is Holly Duggan’s lively and entertaining essay, ‘“As Dirty as Smithfield and as
Stinking Every Whit”: The Smell of the Hope Theatre’ (in Karim-Cooper and Stern, eds., *Shakespeare’s Theatres and The Effects of Performance*, pp. 195–213), in which she argues that ‘olfaction is an important aspect and effect of performance’ (p. 213). Although her discussion is focused primarily on Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair* and its residence at the Hope theatre (‘known for its unique and horrible stench’ (p. 197) in part due to its doubling as a bear pit), her insistence on ‘the importance of understanding the material conditions of London’s theatrical entertainments’ (p. 213) holds good for the city’s other theatres too. The public theatre, she writes, ‘is a space where one can experience, first hand, all the sights, sounds and smells that collectively define London’ (p. 208). These might include ‘the scent of livestock, pork, leather, tobacco, stale gingerbread, ale, farts, belches, sweat and urine’ (p. 204)—hmmm, quite an outing then!

The same volume contains an innovative and ingenious essay by Nathalie Rivere de Carles called ‘Performing Materiality: Curtains on the Early Modern Stage’ (pp. 51–69). Though theoretically intricate in places, the essay brilliantly discusses the variety of roles curtains can perform in the early modern playhouse by ‘unveiling the dramatic and aesthetic role of textile props that have traditionally been seen as nothing other than ornamental fixtures’ (p. 55). Colour might indicate the genre of the play—black for tragedy, for instance—but curtains can also be used to reveal characters in the discovery space (Dr Faustus): they can hide characters; conceal or reveal beds and so on. In fact, as de Carles demonstrates, ‘stage-hangings possess a significant mobility, they facilitate dynamic movement in other stage properties and actors’ (p. 54). The essay is alert to the semiotics of hangings in a sophisticated way. In the case of Faustus, for example, the ‘combination of the curtain’s initial stasis and its secondary mobility acts as a dynamic pattern for Faustus’ performing body’ (p. 57). The proximity of curtain and actor is even more pronounced in the case of the hiding Polonius. As de Carles puts it, ‘The materiality of the stage-hanging is, in this instance, endowed with a double physicality: it is a reminder of the recently visible performing body of Polonius, and it is a surrogate for his skin: Hamlet will pierce both curtain and man with his dagger’ (p. 66). She goes on to note the intriguing textual difference between Q2’s and F’s ‘I’ll silence me even here’ and Q1’s ‘I’ll shroud myself here’. The latter formulation thus foretells his own demise or, as she puts it, ‘Q1 has a greater impact as the arras is truly identified as deadly.’ Curtains, she concludes, are not merely passive hangings or ornamental objects, ‘they are instruments turning the playwright’s language into performance’ (p. 69).

Duggan’s and de Carles’s insistence on materiality is shared by Tiffany Stern. In ‘‘Fill Thy Purse with Money”: Financing Performance in Shakespearean England’ (*ShJE* 150[2014] 65–78) she begins by noting the usual penury so conspicuously characteristic of Elizabethan actors and writers before explaining that Shakespeare’s affluence stemmed from his status as a sharer (‘an investor in his company’, p. 66) and a housekeeper (‘an investor in the theatres used by his company’). Stern then goes on to examine some of the varied income streams which circulated around the theatre. The selling of ale, nuts, fruit (fresh and dried), tobacco, and prostitutes is well documented, but
Stern also considers the possibility that Shakespeare’s company may ‘have been involved in one of theatre’s other major trades: bookselling’ (p. 72). She cites various references within contemporary plays of characters discussing the habit of reading within the playhouse, and she notes that Middleton’s 1611 edition of The Roaring Girl contains an epistle which trusts the book will ‘be allowed . . . Gallery room at the play-house’ (p. 73), but I am not sure how convinced I am that a greatly illiterate audience would have been interested in books. To be fair, Stern herself acknowledges that ‘This is, of course, speculation’ (p. 73). Her further suggestion that the concern in later plays with ‘people seemingly unable to see their way through a haze’ (p. 74) is due to the build up of tobacco smoke in the indoor theatre is, it seems to me, even more speculative. After all, the ‘amazed’ lovers of A Midsummer Night’s Dream are just as lost in the outdoor playhouse. But, in line with Duggan’s essay above, Stern is convincing on the olfactory potency of the theatre—here in financial terms: ‘Money’s look, sound and smell was part of the atmosphere of the playhouse, and everyone who worked for the theatre wanted it’ (p. 69).

Tina Krontiris studies the political indifference of postwar Greece to the Nazi destruction of Greek Jews. Her ‘The Merchant of Venice at the National Theatre of Greece [1945] and the Silencing of the Holocaust’ (ShS 67[2014] 279–98) is a profoundly important if melancholy essay about the circumstances surrounding the production which ‘stands symbolically at the beginning of a long series of silences about the Holocaust in Greek history’ (p. 298). She demonstrates that the production, directed by Pelos Katselis, was utterly uninterested in the historical events which immediately preceded it: ‘the National Theatre’s first postwar production of The Merchant of Venice expatiated on the play’s harmonious theme, downplayed the Jewish-Christian conflict and so it silenced the racial issue’ (p. 294). Krontiris explains this peculiarity in terms of a number of postwar circumstances: Greece’s desire to treat the Nazi occupation as a crime against Greeks in general (thus not against Jews in particular), the politically fragmented state of postwar Greece, and the government’s indifference to Jews returning from the Nazi camps together with their dispossession: ‘Reconciliation, mercy, harmony, love— these were the themes stressed in the 1945 performance’ (p. 291). This is an important though uncomfortable essay to read: ‘Through its choice of an apolitical, escapist interpretation of Merchant, the National Theatre’s first postwar production participated in the silencing of the Holocaust and the subsequent suppression of the history of Jews in Greece’ (p. 280).

In ‘Big-Shouldered Shakespeare: Three Shrews at the Chicago Shakespeare Theater’ (ShS 67[2014] 244–64), L. Monique Pittman examines one orthodox and two rather more radical productions of Shakespeare’s play. Pittman’s attack on CST’s artistic director, Barbara Gaines, is puritanical and over-earnest: ‘in [Gaines’s] understanding of Shakespeare the Humanist, she mystifies the very forces of authority that perpetuate social disequilibrium and injustice’ (p. 247). There is also some heavy-handed theoretical posturing: ‘The heterogeneous afterlife of the theatre defies monolithic absolutes while the institutional materiality of performance spaces themselves typically represents an elite network of authority that underprops the homogenizing ideology of the dominant class’ (p. 245). But once she gets on to discussion of the
productions themselves, the essay sheds this colourlessness. David H. Bell’s 2003 production is condemned for having ‘channeled a wistful nostalgia and softened the gender troubles of the play’ (p. 248). Apparently, its insipid aesthetic did little to help: ‘a deeply romantic stage design implied the inevitability of an amorous plot outcome’. Josie Rourke’s production of 2010 used an adaptation by Neil LaBute which, frankly, sounds dire. Petruchio’s acceptance of Kate’s final submission, ‘Now there’s a wench’, prompted this response: ‘With a grandness of movement, her hands reached up to punctuate a definitive “Fuck this. We are done here”’ (p. 254). Pittman maintains, apparently seriously, that ‘the LaBute-Rourke production questioned, albeit briefly, the founding and self-constituting assumptions of the Chicago Shakespeare Theater’ (p. 256). Sounds to me more like a case of biting the hand that feeds you! Finally the Chicago Shakespeare in the Parks festival production of 2012, directed by Rachel Rockwell, is assessed. Pittman is rightly sensitive to the implications of taking a ‘colour-blind’ (p. 261) production to ‘Chicago’s segregated neighbourhoods’ and, of the casting of a white Petruchio (Matt Mueller) and a black Katharina (Ericka Ratcliff), she writes, ‘this piece of casting did not appear “blind” unless “blind” is taken to mean casting without an eye to unintended consequences, namely the visual implications of a Caucasian man imposing his will on an African-American woman’ (p. 267). This is a powerful and well-made point but elsewhere the tone of the article is occasionally peevish.

Much more sensitive is ‘The Wrathful Dragon versus the Foolish, Fond Old Man: Duality of Performance and Post-Feminist Affect in the 2013 Oregon Shakespeare Festival’s King Lear’ (CahiersE 86[2014] 63–73). The essay is a collaboration between Gretchen E. Minton and Kevin A. Quarmby, and its partnership is appropriate given that the two of them are reviewing Bill Rauch’s production which cast two actors in the key role: ‘Like the production it evaluates, this study bears the hallmark of duality. Neither writer saw the other’s version. Neither communicated their views before committing them to type. Two actors, two writers, one Shakespeare play’ (p. 64). While this casting decision was perfectly comprehensible in sparing a single actor the physical demands of playing the role throughout an eight-month season, it also allowed Rauch to explore the play in an ‘expanded’ (p. 64) way. Minton saw Jack Willis in the role while Quarmby attended a performance by Michael Winters. While Willis played the king as ‘the ultimate bullying mob boss’ (p. 65), Winters ‘appeared more childlike at [the] moment of regal abdication’. Accordingly, ‘the Winters Lear was bound to elicit more pity, both from onstage characters and audience’ (p. 66). At the closure of I.v, going into the first interval, ‘two respective audiences were left with two very distinct Lear images: one, a broken old man shuffling into senility; the other, an aggressively destructive individual, less a danger to himself than to those with whom he shared the stage’ (p. 68). Minton and Quarmby dwell on what they identify as one of the production’s most shocking sequences—the killing of the Fool, through which the Willis Lear enacted ‘his imaginary hatred of his daughters’ (p. 70). For the Winters Lear, however, the moment was all the more shocking since the audience has watched him ‘nonchalantly stroke and pat his Fool on the head, as if acknowledging a favourite pet’. They go on, ‘The accidental
killing of the Fool, not at all surprising with the Willis Lear, was much more unexpected and emotively charged in the hands of Winters.’ Finally, the authors show how such an extreme contrast shifted the characterization of Cordelia (played by Sofia Jean Gomez). Winters’s Lear, thoroughly destroyed by the storm, had ‘declined so completely and realistically that, by the time he was reconciled with his daughter, Cordelia’s initial reticence threatened to register as hard-heartedness rather than justifiable self-preservation’ (p. 72). Willis’s maintenance of a strength and viciousness, by contrast, meant that ‘Gomez’s equally strong Cordelia could more easily, and with relatively little effort, shine again as the forgiving, loving child of an unworthy parent.’ This is an eloquent and insightful essay which integrates wonderfully the two voices of its collaborators and underlines the plurality of performances, even within a single production.

Two very different essays on the reappearance of character as a critical notion appeared this year. In the first, Nick Hutchison, ‘a literary scholar’ (p. 202), and Donald Jellerson, ‘a working performance professional’, consider the issues surrounding the critical situation and the realization onstage of character. Their ‘“I do care for something”: Twelfth Night’s Feste and the Performance of Character’ (ShakB 32[2014] 185–206) is first and foremost an attempt to bridge the impasse between theatrical and academic notions of character. For the latter group, they opine, ‘asking what characters “want” may seem passé or even wrong-headed’ (p. 185) while thespians assume that there is an inherent ‘character “in” the text that persists as an artifact of language’ (p. 188). They rightly note that Shakespeare wrote characters as much as stories ‘complete with interior lives, pasts, and possible futures’ (pp. 191–2). Unfortunately their resolution is hardly earth-shattering: noting (correctly) that Elizabethan theatre lacked the rehearsal periods of the modern theatre and that the rapidly revolving repertory demanded a new play every day, they conclude: ‘Shakespeare must write character not to be “discovered” in a lengthy rehearsal period but to be read and heard in the script itself, both by the actor and the imaginatively active audience’ (p. 193). But such implicit stage directions which suggest a character’s outlook, mood, or preferences are hardly a new discovery. The remainder of the essay is concerned with Feste’s paternalistic care for Olivia, a feature of his character which explains his hostility to Cesario (‘in my conscience, sir, I do not care for you’, III.i.27) and his contempt for Malvolio. Of course this is entirely feasible as an interpretation, as is the historical evidence that Shakespeare’s implicit stage directions addressed the alacrity of new productions but, taken together, they never really add up to constituting the desired rapprochement between gown and greasepaint.

The second essay to deal with character is Edward Pechter’s ‘Character Criticism, the Cognitive Turn, and the Problem of Shakespeare Studies’ (ShakS 42[2014] 196–228). Pechter proposes that such interest in character emerges almost as soon as the playwright’s earliest commentators: ‘Drawn consistently to the facility and intensity with which Shakespeare engages us with different modes of being in the world, the earliest Shakespearians centered their emergent enterprise on the striking effects of dramatic characterization’ (p. 199). Pechter then marches us along the well-trodden
paths of Romantic commentators—Coleridge, Keats, Shelley, Hazlitt—and notes the reaction of L.C. Knights not only against Bradley but (less well known and even more intemperate) Ellen Terry who, in Knights’s words, ‘does not represent critical Authority’ (p. 207). Pechter then proposes that the contemporary return to character is not simply a reaction against the dehumanizing thrust of literary theory, but is actually due to the rise of cognitive psychology and evolutionary theories of the mind. Pechter explains, while ‘bear attacks are rare these days, the kinds of challenges facing modern humans remain similar to those faced by our earliest ancestors. Whether they entail cooperation . . . or competition . . . they all require attempts to figure out what is in the mind of someone who is trying to figure out what is in ours. Mind reading skills continue to be essential to our success’ (p. 211). But Pechter is not satisfied with this explanation and further insists that the category of the literary itself destabilizes it: ‘the mixed feelings [cognitivists] struggle with are continuous with the ones that emerged along with the idea of the literary in romantic character criticism’ (p. 214). Pechter concludes that such ‘mixed feelings’ are not, however, necessarily demonstrative of failure: ‘Contrary desires do not have to paralyze the will. Even if we cannot move them to a resolution, we can move around within them in critically interesting ways’ (p. 222). This is a challenging but exhilarating essay.

Lois Potter claims that Shakespeare ‘was too much a man of the theater to be a literary dramatist’ (p. 469). In ‘Shakespeare and Other Men of the Theater’ (SQ 65[2014] 455–69) she challenges a number of myths (biographical and theatrical) about the playwright and emphasizes throughout the degree to which he was ‘not the sort of writer who felt finished with a play once he had delivered it to his colleagues’ (pp. 468–9). In this, he is unlike the purist Ben Jonson, who ‘deleted someone else’s contribution to Sejanus and omitted the collaborative Eastward Ho! from the 1616 folio’ (p. 457). Potter argues that the paucity of Shakespeare’s known collaborations might be due simply to his being unacknowledged rather than the romantically fashionable idea that he was a solo genius. She cites the revivals of The Spanish Tragedy [1602] and Mucedorus [1610] as productions which might contain what she calls ‘invisible contributions’ (p. 456). This idea will of course have serious implications for the received wisdom of Shakespeare’s canonical centrality: ‘there may be some danger in supposing that everything in his work is part of an organic whole, or that this organic whole is his creation rather than ours’ (p. 458). Potter goes on to advance two intriguing speculations—the first that Shakespeare was not a bad actor—indeed, she writes, ‘I believe that Shakespeare was among [the] very good actors’ (p. 462). Again, the evidence is not that he was a poor actor, just that there is none that suggests he was a good one. Burbage is always in the limelight, but as Potter slyly points out, ‘Burbage must have been wonderful, but one reason why he always looked like the best actor was that he always had the best parts’ (p. 463). The other fascinating possibility Potter comes up with explains Shakespeare’s apparent retirement. She postulates that because he is listed second in the players of Sejanus he probably played Tiberius, a character who does not figure in the final scene. Therefore Shakespeare ‘would have been the logical person to address the audience and ask for its verdict on the play’ (p. 465). The fact that the production was
greeted with hisses and boos may have contributed to Shakespeare’s decision to retire from performing. Of course a lot of this is conjecture, but Potter’s detailed historical knowledge and her sound common sense make much in this essay pleasurably convincing.

In a provocative and meticulous study of recent Cressidas, Jami Rogers laments a shift from second-wave to post-feminism. In ‘Cressida in Twenty-First Century Performance’ (Shakespeare 10[2014] 56–71), Rogers considers the performances of Juliet Stevenson and Amanda Root, who took the role for Howard Davies (RSC, 1985), and Sam Mendes (RSC, 1990). In the case of both these productions the Cressidas were more sinned against than sinning—particularly in IV.vi, staged as something approaching a gang rape by the Greek generals. Rogers demonstrates how modest attire, reticence, embarrassment at Pandarus’ salacious suggestions and a genuine adoration for Troilus (respectively Anton Lesser and Ralph Fiennes) militated against the portrayal of Cressida as a wanton. In this, both productions ‘appeared to be bucking tradition’ (p. 61). Rogers goes on to suggest that in spite of the significance of these performances (and productions) ‘a less sympathetic view of the character evidently continues to persist elsewhere’ (p. 62). Examples include Peter Stein’s Edinburgh Festival and RSC production of 2006 in which Annabel Scholey took the role, and Trevor Nunn’s National Theatre production of 1999 in which Cressida was played by Sophie Okonedo. These last two Cressidas were sexualized through costume (or in Scholey’s case, shedding of costume) and by their lack of interest in Troilus in emotional terms. The argument is generally convincing, though there are a couple of slips along the way. When Rogers talks of the ‘feminine ideal’ as being ‘proscribed by the male gaze’ (p. 63), I assume she means the opposite—prescribed—and her description of The Sun’s page 3 pictures as a ‘steady diet of titillation’ (p. 63) is also a (subliminally?) comically counter-productive one. But Rogers has a good eye for detail and, while I did not always agree with her readings of particular production decisions, she neatly extrapolates these to construct significant arguments about the contemporary socio-political position of women—a thoughtful and intelligent article.

Boika Sokolova’s ‘The Reflective Part of Man: Javor Gardev’s Bulgarian Shakespeares’ (CahiersE 85[2014] 73–83) is a lively account of the work of ‘an emblematic name in Bulgarian theatre’ (p. 73). Sokolova’s analyses of four of Gardev’s productions demonstrate her assertion that ‘the sound and the fury, the anger and desperation of the Bulgarian post-communist Zeitgeist have found a powerful intellectual expression through a radical performance aesthetic’ (p. 73). She examines Gardev’s Bastard, based on King John (Varna, Bulgaria, 2001); The Tempest (Adama, Turkey, 2004); King Lear (Sofia, Bulgaria, 2006), and Hamlet (Sofia, 2012). All of these shows, in their various ways, are characterized by a ‘post-Brechtian style [which] challenges illusionist “magic”, de-familiarises comfortable pre-conceptions about the plays and characters [and] eschews totalising answers’ (p. 74). Most radical perhaps was the decision to direct The Tempest as a revenge play with the aristocrats ‘blown up by Trinculo who was wired up as a suicide bomber, with Caliban operating the remote control. After the explosion, in an emblematic act of self-annihilation, Prospero climbed into a body bag and pulled the zip.
closed’ (p. 76). Here Sokolova identifies a pressing and contemporary political concern: ‘in the context of Turkish political reality and Kurdish struggle for independence [the sequence] had powerful political implications in 2004’ (p. 78). Other productions are similarly punctuated with symbolic violence. *King Lear* featured a ‘profoundly disturbing emblem of the triumph of amorality’ (p. 70) by having the body of the hanged Fool ‘suspended upstage in his red cloak, like a huge bloody exclamation mark over the action’. Sokolova concludes grimly, ‘No easy trips on green fields of memory these [productions], but uncomfortable as they are, they “speak what we feel not what we ought to say”’. While Gardev’s aesthetic is clearly a glum reaction to the ‘squandered hopes’ (p. 75) of post-communist Bulgaria, Sokolova’s capacity to capture and explore the productions’ aesthetics is both vital and stimulating.

### 3. Shakespeare on Screen

In 2014 a wide-ranging group of monographs, essay collections, and journal articles focused upon television, film, and Internet-based materials. The distinct approaches of the year’s three monographs seem largely to be reflective of the series within which each appears: Oxford University Press’s *Oxford Shakespeare Topics*, Arden Shakespeare’s *Screen Adaptations*, and Palgrave’s *BFI Film Classics*. In the first-mentioned series nearly thirty books have now been published, and Russell Jackson’s *Shakespeare and English-Speaking Cinema* is the first screen-focused text. I suggested last year that the spirit of criticism had become one of celebration, and Jackson offers a positive conclusion to his introduction: ‘the transgressive, playful dimension of films that profit from Shakespeare . . . is to be valued and celebrated’ (p. 15).

His title signals the priority given to textual aspects of the films, and his preference for the term ‘cinema’ signals the complex contexts within which films exist with an emphasis on an awareness of production, distribution, and audience. Jackson also reminds us that ‘the word “film” is an anachronism when applied to work originated and shown by digital means’ (p. 6). The six-chapter study has at its heart a consideration of comedy, followed by tragedy. The initial chapters consider ‘People’ and ‘Places’ and the penultimate one examines ‘Politics in the Shakespeare Films’. The final chapter looks ‘Beyond Shakespeare’ to consider films which seem, perhaps superficially, to stretch clear-cut identification with Shakespeare’s work. Jackson begins his introduction by considering approaches at the core of adaptation studies. His contention that ‘the terms “original” and “fidelity” . . . remain current in the thinking of those who work on screen (or stage) versions’ (p. 2) paves the way for his preference for ‘original’ to designate ‘the play this film starts from’ (p. 15). The economy of the term is perhaps necessary in a text with such a huge scope. Support in terms of how commercial pressures function and a premium upon the popular reception of films provides context for Jackson’s decision but here, and later in the book, the brevity of engagement with critical debates of this kind might frustrate the reader.
In contrast, the other two monographs focus upon a single play each. Robert N. Watson, in *BFI Film Classics: Throne of Blood*, contextualizes his in-depth study of Kurosawa’s film with reference to Shakespearian scholars (including Buchanan, Donaldson, and Hindle), as well as considering its initial reception and the views of film scholars. Particular attention is granted to consideration of the kind of tragedy that is presented, and that approach seems consistent with Watson’s broader scholarly interest in both ambition and death in relation to Renaissance texts. One fascinating dimension of the book is the enhanced feature via ClipNotes, a commercially available iPad application devised by one of his UCLA colleagues. The app offers a digest of the book’s commentary on the film and enables the film to be watched with the commentary visible. It is not perhaps necessary for a reader familiar with the film who owns the book, but it is useful to reflect on the potential implications for future scholarly approaches. The app allows a critic to sidestep the cost implications of pictorial illustrations in printed texts and, with the use of typed rather than audio commentary, there is less distraction from a film’s aural features. Watson’s examination of Kurosawa’s film is driven by the emphatic idea that ‘Throne of Blood is a profoundly ambivalent exploration of human morality that is at once intensely localised and transhistorical—and is deeply self-conscious about its medium’ (p. 15). The BFI Film Classics series accommodates an enviable wealth of illustration, and that pictorial specificity is matched with a rewarding level of detail in an engagement with precise moments in Shakespeare’s play. With over 150 volumes of slim texts, the series (which has been running for twenty years) explicitly promotes an author’s personal response to the film. Watson expresses in a footnote the hope that his account will show that the reported idea that Kurosawa did not consult the playtext during rehearsals ‘cannot have been true’ (p. 90).

Samuel Crowl’s *Shakespeare’s ‘Hamlet’: The Relationship between Text and Film* is the fourth Shakespearian title in the seven-volume Screen Adaptations series. The series is aimed at students, and so the opening chapter works hard to give a brief introduction to the various ways in which the play has been interpreted. However, the decision to offer, within a four-chapter study, a chapter dedicated to Olivier followed by one focusing on Branagh means that Crowl is able to offer in-depth discussion of both their films. He draws on a range of archival materials from the British Library and the Branagh archives in Belfast. His analysis is also enhanced with materials gleaned from the British Film Institute’s recent acquisition of the papers of Helga Cranston, the editor of Olivier’s film. Crowl contextualizes the achievements of Olivier and Branagh with some consideration of the treatments by Kozintsev (1964), Richardson (1969), Zeffirelli (1990), Almereyda (2000), Campbell Scott (2001), and Sherwood Hu’s *Prince of the Himalayas* (2006).

Under her married name, Helga Cranston’s work also features in *Women Making Shakespeare*, edited by Gordon McMullen, Lena Cowen Orlin and Virginia Mason Vaughan. McMullen collates a number of interviews he conducted with her for his article reflecting on her role as film editor for Olivier’s *Hamlet* and Richard III: ‘Editing Olivier’s *Hamlet*: An Interview with Helga Keller’ (pp. 243–51). The piece usefully unsettles auteur-led approaches in film criticism. In other respects, the essay collection falls outside the remit of
this review. Whilst over a third of the volume’s essays examine women’s performance, it is only in the aforementioned interview where film is a focus. Film production remains, largely, a male preserve.

Particular attention has been paid this year to the relationship between theatre and film. In *Shakespeare Bulletin* Susanne Greenhalgh introduces a special performance reviews section examining ‘Live Cinema Relays of Shakespearean Performance’. Greenhalgh’s introduction (*ShakB* 32:ii[2014] 255–61) offers a valuable survey of the role British Shakespearian productions are playing in the ‘live’ screenings. Education screenings, encores, and the Globe productions that are filmed on two consecutive evenings give currency to the term ‘live’. Greenhalgh draws attention to other labels which further confuse the nomenclature. She suggests that the difficulty agreeing on a term is reflective of the medium’s status as a ‘hybrid form’ and that these reviewers are ‘registering and interrogating the significance of this new mode of experiencing Shakespearean performance’ (p. 258). Her introductory essay includes some fascinating figures which make explicit the scale of the audiences (around 60,000 for the Donmar Warehouse *King Lear* in 2010) and of the box-office revenue (reportedly well over a million dollars for the RSC’s *Richard II* in 2013). Six reviews examine a sample of the output from two key companies: the National Theatre (NT Live) with two productions directed for the screen by Tim van Someren: the Donmar’s *Coriolanus* (Rourke, 2014) and the Manchester International Festival’s *Macbeth* (Ashford and Branagh, 2014). A further three tragedies were directed for the screen by Robin Lough: *Hamlet* (Hytner, 2010), the Donmar’s *King Lear* (Grandage, 2011), and *Othello* (Hytner, 2013). Lough was also the screen director of the Royal Shakespeare Company’s first live-to-cinema broadcast: *Richard II* (Doran, 2013). The company has appointed John Wyver as its media consultant. Wyver declares his affiliation in his review of the NT Live *Hamlet* (*ShakB* 32:ii[2014] 261–3). He pays particular attention to the tension between theatrical, televisual, and cinematic languages.

John Wyver shows similar concerns in his essay, ‘“All the trimmings?”: The Transfer of Theatre to Television in Adaptations of Shakespeare Stagings’ (*Adaptation* 7:ii[2014] 104–20). His wide-ranging article leads the journal’s special issue, drawing on materials presented at the ‘From Theatre to Screen—and Back Again!’ conference, held at De Montfort University in Leicester in February 2014. Three of the five articles consider Shakespearian topics. Wyver traces a tradition of live broadcasts, and the subtle changes concomitant with the movement from theatre to television are clearly identified. By noting trends, such as the way live broadcasts in cinemas rather than on television have been dominant in recent years, the article conducts an in-depth analysis of the nuances of cinematic, theatrical, and television styles. He challenges what has become a customarily (and disappointingly) negative critical response.

The desire to offer a corrective to dominant attitudes towards a particular type of screen work is evident in Jacob Boguszak’s article, ‘The Poetics of Shakespearean Animation’ (*ShakB* 32:ii[2014] 159–83). He notes the importance of the engagement because of the increasing use of computer-generated imagery, citing, for example, the CGI sequences in Julie Taymor’s *Tempest*
The approach is logical and he identifies ‘five defining aspects of performance in animation: metamorphosis, stillness, space, character, and voice’ (p. 161). Boguzak takes the Soyuzmultfilm/S4C The Animated Tales two-season series (1992 and 1994) as case studies, and he collates a wealth of persuasive examples from the twelve 25-minute-long adaptations. His discussion of space and voice leads to clear commendation of the series—and indeed of the technique of animation more broadly. In relation to the latter, Boguzak notes the particular meaning that silence acquires ‘throwing the (inauthentic, acquired) art of speech into sharp relief’ (p. 174) while a heightened awareness of space ‘restor[es] the original volatility of meaning on the empty stage’ (p. 180).

The annual Shakespeare-focused issue of Literature/Film Quarterly is introduced by Elsie Walker, who connects the recent discovery of Richard III’s body in Leicester with Kevin Spacey’s ‘dry wit, rhetorical acumen, indomitable will for power, and capacity for absolute ruthlessness’ as Frank Underwood in House of Cards (Netflix, 2013–). Walker suggests that both offer reminders of Shakespeare’s representation of the king: ‘The Body of Richard and the Afterlife of Shakespeare’ (LFQ 42:ii[2014] 410–13). The five articles include consideration of the various Romeo and Juliet references in one episode of the American television show Cold Case (CBS, 2003–10), an exploration of the relationship between characterization on television and in the film version of Strange Brew (Moranis and Thomas, 1983) alongside analysis of a more mainstream cluster of films: 10 Things I Hate About You (Junger, 1999), Anonymous (Emmerich, 2011), Coriolanus (Fiennes, 2011), Hamlet (Almereyda, 2000), Shakespeare in Love (Madden, 1998), and The Taming of the Shrew (Zeffirelli, 1967). Shrew adaptations are analysed by Christopher Bertucci in his article on ‘Rethinking Binaries by Recovering Bianca in 10 Things I Hate About You and Zeffirelli’s The Taming of the Shrew’ (LFQ 42:ii[2014] 414–22). He offers a useful corrective towards the way scholarship ‘fixates’ (p. 414) on the play’s central couple and, in particular, on the delivery of Katherine’s final speech. The argument persuasively rejects a tendency to label screen productions as ‘either repressive or progressive’ (p. 414) and offers a more nuanced view of the two commercially successful adaptations. Bertucci prompts reassessment of the relationship between Katherine and Bianca, and a detailed analysis of the specific decisions made in each screen version is set alongside the dominant critical views on the films, ensuring that his concluding idea has a secure basis: ‘While the sisters never formally organize their resistance against dominant ideologies, they do have moments of dissent and they recognize, to some degree, that they share in many of the same struggles’ (p. 423).

Shakespeare Wallah (Ivory, 1965), The Last Lear (Ghosh, 2007), and Twelfth Night (Supple, 2003) also feature as case-study texts showing the engagement with the intercultural context of global Shakespeare. The introduction signals a determination to widen the terms of engagement with this scholarly area and the tone is set with probing assessment of the Royal Shakespeare Company’s casting and directorial decisions in Julius Caesar (Doran, 2012) and Much Ado About Nothing (Khan, 2012). Dionne and Kapadia employ the term ‘crosshatched’ to drive an approach which acknowledges the particularities of different cultural arts forms and their contexts. It provides the ‘key to understanding the multivalent textual and political perspectives working in Bollywood appropriations of Shakespeare’ (p. 3).

Shakespeare-on-screen scholarship in 2014 seems more disparate than in previous years. There are perhaps strong possibilities for global attention (in relation to the recent experiments in content and form) to the work that is being analysed and to the critical materials themselves. Literature/Film Quarterly has recently announced its decision to become an open-access journal. If the shift to greater availability of critical work becomes more widespread, it will be interesting to see whether there is any discernible shift in the style and content of film scholarship.

4. Criticism

(a) General

Shakespeare and the Italian Renaissance: Appropriation, Transformation, Opposition is the latest in a series of important volumes on this subject edited by Michele Marrapodi. The relationship stated in the title is approached in different ways in the eighteen essays divided into three parts that make up this volume. Part I is on ‘ Appropriations of Poetry and Prose’. In ‘Sprezzatura and Embarrassment in The Merchant of Venice’, the first of three ‘Castiglione’ chapters (though the author of Il cortegiano also figures at the start of Lawrence Rhu’s chapter later in the book), Harry Berger Jr. defines the admittedly anachronistic term ‘embarrassment’ as the opposite of sprezzatura, and then analyses the role of Portia as ‘Principal Embarrasser’ (p. 23) in The Merchant of Venice (‘a comedy of embarrassment’), with a couple of added references to Othello (‘a tragedy of embarrassment’, p. 22). Berger tends to overstate ‘Portia’s war against Antonio’ (p. 23), and the Castiglione connection in this chapter is rather tenuous, so much so that the fact that Portia’s alias, ‘Balthasar’, happens to be Castiglione’s first name passes without comment. On the other hand, in ‘A Niggle of Doubt: Courtliness and Chastity in Shakespeare and Castiglione’ John Roe begins by mentioning echoes of The Courtier that have been found in Shakespeare’s comedies, and later supplements this information by pointing out how, in the passage that has been linked to Much Ado, Hoby’s translation had created a non-existent female interlocutor. The chapter focuses on ‘the activity of the “stage misogynist” whose intention is to slander a woman’ (p. 40 n. 3)—a kind of ‘courtly’ situation that finds an antecedent in Castiglione’s dialogues—and
gives us a fine reading of how this affects the characters of Desdemona in *Othello* and Hermione in *The Winter's Tale*. In chapter 3, ‘Dramatic Appropriations of Italian Courtliness’, Thomas Kullmann explores ‘Shakespeare’s interest in Italian courtliness’ (p. 58), as evidenced first of all by his early plays. Kullmann finds the reason for this interest in the joint attractions of exoticism and of ‘the theatrical character of courtliness’, including the dramatization of practical jokes (here, in remembering Cardinal Bibbiena’s role as recounter of practical jokes in *The Courtier*, Kullmann might also have mentioned his authorship of *La Calandria*, a play with an important ‘beffa’ component along the lines of Boccaccio). Kullmann’s discussion of *Much Ado About Nothing* and *Twelfth Night* (the latter included presumably by virtue of the automatic equation of an aristocratic setting with an Italian locale) is forced to acknowledge the markedly ‘uncourtly’ character of the jokes in question, but there is an interesting paragraph on Maria’s motivation. In an important essay, ‘Disowning the Bond: Coriolanus’s Forgetful Humanism’, Maria Del Sapio Garbero discusses the theme of violated hospitality in *Coriolanus*, drawing on Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and Seneca’s *De Beneficiis*. Melissa Walter’s chapter is on ‘Matteo Bandello’s Social Authorship and Paulina as Patroness in *The Winter’s Tale*’. Walter sees her title character as performing an ‘Italian-coded act of female patronage and artistic creation’ (p. 95) in helping to effect Hermione’s return, a role that she links back to the representation of women as patrons and active participants in Bandello’s *Novelle* and their dedicatory letters. As Walter reminds us, plot-wise Bandello’s novella 1.22 has been linked directly to both *Much Ado* and *The Winter’s Tale*; however, one is tempted to add, an even more obvious antecedent for such feminine roles can of course be found in Boccaccio’s *Decameron* and its framing device. The final essay in Part I, Karen Zyck Galbraith’s ‘Tracing a Villain: Typological Intertextuality in the Works of Painter, Webster, Cinthio, and Shakespeare’, considers *Othello* and *The Duchess of Malfi* in relation to each other and to their respective source novellas in order to show how in these texts ‘performativity’ is used to reveal ‘the “villain” characters’ own “muddled” interiority’ (p. 109).

Part II deals with ‘Transformations of Topoi and Theatregrams’, and opens with Keir Elam’s chapter on ‘“Wanton Pictures”: The Baffling of Christopher Sly and the Visual-Verbal Intercourse of Early Modern Erotic Arts’. Quoting several passages in early modern English works, including Ben Jonson’s plays, Elam’s informative article traces the tradition of linking Elephantis’ famed (and no longer extant) sexual drawings with the *Modi* (Erotic Positions), a composite work consisting in Marco Antonio Raimondi’s woodcuts from drawings by Giulio Romano (also mentioned in Walter’s chapter) to which Pietro Aretino added his lascivious sonnets. Elam’s intent is to show that the mention of ‘wanton pictures’ in the Induction to *The Taming of the Shrew* links Shakespeare’s play directly with the original Italian version of its source, Ariosto’s *Suppositi*, whose Prologue contains an allusion to this tradition of erotic drawings, while Gascoigne’s translation mentions the adjective ‘wanton’ but no pictures. Elam also suggests that Suetonius’ description of Emperor Tiberius may be a source for Shakespeare’s Induction too, as it was for the mention of the pictures in *The Alchemist*. Another source adduced here
(anticipating Marrapodi’s own chapter later in the collection) is Aretino’s play *Il marescalco*. However, Elam concludes, the much softer, mythological character of the pictures alluded to in the Induction to *Shrew* aligns them perhaps more closely to another celebrated work by Giulio Romano, the Palazzo Te frescoes in Mantua. In ‘Shylock’s Venice and the Grammar of the Modern City’ Sergio Costola and Michael Saenger analyse the codes that mark Bassanio as native and Shylock as foreign, drawing a parallel with some awkward prepositional usage in John Florio’s grammatical works as well as with Florio’s own ‘foreignness’ in London. In the next chapter, Eric Nicholson discusses ‘Helen, the Italianate Theatrical Wayfarer of *All’s Well That Ends Well*’ in terms not so much of derivation from Italian sources as of ‘resources in common’ (a model he borrows from Richard Andrews) and of ‘importable “theatregrams”’ (in the wake of Louise George Clubb: p. 165), showing how shared elements with *commedia dell’arte* scenarios modify and augment the Boccaccian storyline. Bruce W. Young’s chapter, ‘“These Times of Woe”: The Contraction and Dislocation of Time in Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*,’ is a thorough discussion of the foreshortening of time in Shakespeare’s play compared to previous versions of this story, including how Shakespeare increases the level of anxiety by lowering Juliet’s age to 14. These changes shift the focus away from specific Italian cultural features, like duelling and feuding, and make this a tragedy of the misjudgement arising from the compression and misuse of time. Camilla Caporicci’s chapter, ‘“Dark is Light”—From Italy to England: Challenging Tradition through Colours’, discusses the rejection of the traditional dark/light opposition in Giordano Bruno, Caravaggio, and Shakespeare. In relation to the playwright, Caporicci draws on the Song of Songs to postulate a new relationship of ‘kinship’ or derivation of black from white, offering brief but relevant discussions of Shakespeare’s black characters and especially of his ‘Dark Ladies’ (in *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, and the sonnets). Part II concludes with Iuliana Tanase’s ‘The Italian *Commedia* and the Fashioning of the Shakespearean Fool’, which strives to link moral categories from Aristotelian theory and Italian comedy to fool-characters in Shakespeare’s plays (including Hamlet in his feigned madness).

Part III is devoted to ‘Oppositions of Ideologies and Cultures’, and opens with Marrapodi’s chapter on ‘The Aretinean Intertext and the Heterodoxy of *The Taming of the Shrew*’, which, complementing Keir Elam’s contribution discussed above, focuses on how Aretino’s *Il marescalco* can help ‘explain the dramatic function of the Induction and its relationship to the rest of [Shakespeare’s] play’ (p. 236). Lawrence F. Rhu’s ‘Shakespeare Italianate: Sceptical Crises in Three Kinds of Play’ reflects on the ‘crises of doubt and jealousy’ (p. 260) in *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Othello* and *The Winter’s Tale*. Rhu’s study focuses on each play in turn and does not take into account any ‘external’ linking factors, like the fact that the two comedies share the same Italian locale (Messina being actually in ‘Sicilia’). In her stimulating chapter, ‘The Jew and the Justice of Venice’, Hanna Scolnicov begins by pointing out how the courtroom scene in *The Merchant of Venice* offers a version of the medieval representation of ‘the triumphant *Ecclesia* and the blindfolded *Synagoga*’ (p. 275), and then goes on to discuss two other, interlinked, visual
allusions in this same scene: Shylock with his knife and scales (a reference, Scolnicov argues, specifically to the representation of Venice as Justice that can be seen all over the city) and Portia/Balthasar dressed up as the law doctor of the *commedia dell’arte*. Thus, Scolnicov concludes, in this scene Shakespeare is both ‘imitating and deconstructing the revered notion of the Justice of Venice’ (p. 289). Rocco Coronato’s chapter, ‘*Hamlet*, Ortensio Lando, or “To Be or Not To Be” Paradoxically Explained’, brings up some striking parallels between Lando’s *Paradossi* (partially translated by Anthony Munday in his 1593 *Defence of Contraries*) and Hamlet’s counterfeit folly and ‘contrarian paradoxes’ (p. 296) and, most interestingly of all, ‘the emergence of *dulcedo* in the face of adversity and the Stoical anticipation and acceptance of death’ (p. 298). Coronato is well aware that the similarities could be part of the general circulation of ideas in the Renaissance, but the comparison with Lando (for instance, on whether it is better to die than to live long and painfully) does indeed seem illuminating. It could also be extended outside *Hamlet*, since Lando’s postulation that a fool enjoys more peace of mind than a king (p. 298) could be set beside 2 Henry IV III.i. Duncan Salkeld’s ‘Much Ado about Italians in Renaissance London’ says a few interesting things about the relationship of *Much Ado About Nothing* with its sources in its first few pages, while the rest of the chapter, with its detailed account of Italian immigrants’ dealings with prostitutes in Elizabethan London, taken from the Bridewell Court Minute Book, seems rather less relevant, even though it does include a foreigner by the name of ‘Benedick’. Similarly, Anthony R. Guneratne’s chapter, ‘Shakespeare, Italian Music-Drama, and Contemporary Performance: Space, Time, and the Acoustic Worlds of *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Tempest*’, gives a virtuoso discussion of two Shakespeare-based performances at New York’s Lincoln Center in 2012, the pastiche opera *The Enchanted Island* and Prokofiev’s *Romeo and Juliet* ballet—or at least it does so eventually. Like its title, it goes through quite a lot of things before it gets there: things to do with the two plays in question, music in Shakespeare’s plays, theatre history, and the Italian Renaissance in general, though I would query some of its incidental statements. In fact, this whole book could have done with slightly more careful editing, at several levels. However, it is definitely a useful volume, where, to a greater or lesser extent, every essay offers some valuable information or insight.

David Scott Kastan’s *A Will to Believe: Shakespeare and Religion* is born out of the 2008 Oxford Wells Shakespeare Lectures, a fact that Kastan elegantly acknowledges by having a quotation from Stanley Wells as epigraph for each of his five chapters. The text has been allowed to maintain a conversational tone, but the book also includes a wealth of relevant notes and bibliographical references. The title, *A Will to Believe*, is drawn from William James and alludes to the notion ‘that religion is not a matter of instinct or intuition’ (p. 2) but a mixture of personal emotions and social and historical pressures. Throughout the study Kastan steers a middle course: on the one hand he acknowledges, and indeed documents, the centrality of the religious question in Shakespeare’s time and how it is reflected in Shakespeare’s works; on the other he resists the idea that we should or could infer anything about Shakespeare’s own religious position from the available biographical evidence...
or from a reading of his works. The biographical evidence is discussed in chapter 2, after an introductory first chapter that surveys the state of the question. Chapter 3 deals with the representation of Catholics and Catholicism in the plays, focusing on *Romeo and Juliet*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, and, especially, on *King John* and *Measure for Measure*. Discussion of the two latter plays includes how they were censored at an English college in Valladolid in the mid-1640s— *Measure for Measure* apparently proved too much for the censor, who razored it out altogether. Kastan’s position is that ‘Shakespeare, although his own faith seems indeterminable, unquestionably reveals an awareness of and perhaps even a sympathy for much of what resisted the reform’ (p. 49). What the representation of Catholic elements in these plays undoubtedly tells us is that it was not as controversial as one might expect solely on the basis of contemporary works of religious polemics. In fact, in everyday life people had to adapt to the religious divide, and these plays prove ‘that at least at certain moments Catholicism could be represented, especially at a distance, as something more or less neutral’ (p. 55). Chapter 4 attempts to inject into this book a ‘cosmopolitism’ and ‘universalism’ that in fact it is forced to deny in Shakespeare’s own vision, by looking at the representation of Jews and Moors (or of a Jew and a Moor) in *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello*. Although it may prove a problem in our own reception of the plays, the fact that Shakespeare effectively fails to accommodate Jews and Moors in a universalist vision is simply due to the fact that this is not what the plays are about. Faithful to his premise that he will not look for religious allegory in Shakespeare’s plays, Kastan records but does not develop Sir Israel Gollancz’s intuition according to which, given that since 1290 there had been no openly practising Jews in England, in the *Merchant of Venice* ‘Jewishness . . . can be no more than a metaphor’ (p. 89). Finally, in his reading of *Hamlet* in chapter 5, as in the book overall, Kastan moves between accepting and delimiting the importance of the religious issue. Before the appearance of the ghost, Hamlet’s problem is his personal grief: theological doubts only come to the fore when he actually sets eyes on the ghost. The ending is again shaped by practical forces, as events precipitate through people’s actions, not as a direct consequence of the ghost’s injunction. However, the play does throw into relief crucial religious issues: not only the real nature and provenance of ghosts, but the propriety of mourning, and the nature of dying itself. And, as Kastan concludes his elegant and thoughtful study, ‘in the space of those uncertainties the play transforms theology into tragedy’ (p. 143).

It is worth mentioning, at least briefly, Maurice Charney’s *Shakespeare’s Style*, even though it is not meant primarily for an academic audience, but rather for the informed reader and spectator—probably more the latter, since it dedicates one short chapter to each of the thirty-four plays ascribed undoubtedly to Shakespeare whereas it does not deal with the poems. It could still, of course, be of interest to academics and especially teachers. Individual chapters would serve well as starting points to stimulate student discussion, as could the book’s overall theme: the centrality of ‘unresolved dramatic conflict’ (p. 177) to Shakespeare’s art.

In *Shakespeare’s Nature: From Cultivation to Culture* Charlotte Scott effects a thorough reconnaissance of the subject of husbandry and cultivation in early
modern England, drawing on a wealth of resources, such as contemporary best-selling manuals by Thomas Tusser and Gervase Markham. This book charts ‘the extent to which attitudes to husbandry could reveal a discourse of social relations’, and how those attitudes changed as ‘ideas of improvement restructured the relationship between the individual and the commonwealth’ (p. 221). In terms of readings of Shakespeare’s works, the five main chapters deal with the connection between ‘the language of husbandry’ and ‘social approbation’ (p. 28) in the sonnets, the politics of peace in Henry V (as represented in Burgundy’s speech on France as ‘this best garden of the world’), the ‘emerging distinction between nature and culture’ (p. 121) in Macbeth, ‘the relative values of essential and modified nature’ (p. 151) in The Winter’s Tale, and ‘illusory’ landscapes (Prospero’s masque and Gonzalo’s commonwealth) in The Tempest. Timon of Athens makes an appearance in the Conclusion, where Scott also briefly addresses the controversial question of Shakespeare’s unwillingness to intervene in the matter of the Welcombe enclosures (which did not take place anyway).

With Katie Knowles’s Shakespeare’s Boys: A Cultural History we enter into that category of ‘hybrid’ books that move partly ‘inside’ and partly ‘outside’ Shakespeare, since the second part of her study uses aspects of the performance history of Shakespeare’s plays in order to examine changes in the representation of boyhood from the long eighteenth century to our own day. Thus, the insights offered in this part of the book relate more to the social history of those periods than to the plays themselves and include, for instance, how ‘the Victorian idea of boyhood had become so idealised and specific that . . . the ideal Shakespearean boy was often, for the Victorians, a girl’ (p. 9). Part I, on the other hand, offers readings on the plays themselves. It is divided into three chapters, according to the three categories of young boys identified by Knowles as featuring in Shakespeare’s plays. Chapter 1 deals with ‘noble heirs’, who struggle and generally fail to be seen as individual children rather than the representatives of a dynastic line, and meet a brutal end as a consequence (in the history plays, Macbeth, and The Winter’s Tale). Chapter 2 examines the predicament of children who are ‘required to stand in for absent male relatives in a context of violence and revenge’ (p. 6) in the Roman plays Titus Andronicus and Coriolanus. Knowles links this to a discussion of ‘the complex and often contradictory ways in which boys achieved manhood in early modern England’ (p. 65). Her subject is particularly suited to a discussion of Coriolanus given, on the one hand, the characterization of the hero by Bate and Rasmussen as ‘Peter Pan in full body armour’ (cited and rather qualified by Knowles on p. 83) and, on the other, the play’s topical link with contemporary portrayals of Henry, Prince of Wales. Chapter 3 refers to the contemporary debate on the merits of an old-style education through apprenticeship or service versus the merits of formal schooling, and links it especially to a discussion of Moth in Love’s Labour’s Lost and Falstaff’s Boy in 2 Henry IV and Henry V.

Knowles’s book and Deanne Williams’s study of Shakespeare and the Performance of Girlhood belong to the same Palgrave series, and are thus implicitly packaged, though not explicitly presented, as companion pieces to each other. Indeed Knowles opens the way to Williams’s book by stating that
‘an examination of “Shakespeare’s girls” deserves its own book-length study’ (p. 4), but only after potentially undermining such a project in the process of justifying the choice of limiting the subject of her own study to male children: with one exception, ‘the girls who appear in Shakespeare’s plays are often babies’ or ‘tend to be young women, of marriageable age . . . the plays’ depiction of them as marriageable suggests that they are entering the adult phase of life’ (p. 3). Williams does not sufficiently address this issue, i.e. she does not really define what constitutes a ‘girl’ as opposed to a ‘woman’ in Shakespeare’s plays, unless it is through the recurring argument that girls are defined by the performance of girlhood. There is an interesting initial discussion of the origins and connotations of terms such as ‘girl’ and ‘wench’. In Shakespeare the term ‘girl’ is applied to self-willed young women (in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *Romeo and Juliet*—see chapter 1), but there is also ‘the sense that girlhood is bound up with tears’ (p. 67), for instance in *The Taming of the Shrew*. Chapter 2, on ‘Isabelle de France’, ‘recovers’ the historical child-bride figure, in opposition to the fact that the Queen in *Richard II* is seen by most readers as an adult. Chapter 3 zooms in on the lute-playing ‘Ofelia’ in Q1 *Hamlet*. Chapter 4 begins by discussing the girlhood of Elizabeth I both as a historical figure and as portrayed in Thomas Heywood’s *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*, and then moves on to the ‘lost girls’ in *Pericles*, *The Tempest*, and *The Winter’s Tale*. (The exception mentioned by Knowles, Clarence’s daughter in *Richard III*, does not feature in this study.) Parts II and III are likely to constitute the more original and valuable section of the book, as they move outside Shakespeare’s plays to examine, respectively, the shift in Jacobean and Caroline masques, including Milton’s *Comus*, where girls were allowed to perform, and seventeenth-century ‘writing girls’ Lady Rachel Fane and the Cavendish sisters.

Ostensibly an ‘outside’ book, *Shakespeare and Politics*, edited by Bruce E. Altschuler and Michael A. Genovese, in fact has much to offer in terms of insights into the plays themselves. Its stated purpose is that of using Shakespeare’s plays to throw light on contemporary politics, especially those of America (which it does without pulling its punches; see for instance the parallel between *Richard III* and Richard Nixon on p. 14). The editors are both political scientists, and so are most of the contributors. However, the fast-paced discussions of the plays are illuminating in themselves, and do take into account their multidimensionality. I would love to use this book in a course on Shakespeare—perhaps after doing a bit of editing, as I would not want my students to write about ‘Volumina’ (pp. 8–9) in their *Coriolanus* essay (that said, there are not really many typos in this unassuming but well-crafted book). This is one of several plays discussed by Michael A. Genovese and Thomas E. Cronin in chapter 1, ‘On Shakespeare’s Commanders and Kings’. It is worth quoting a passage from this chapter to show why young people who are about to take up their place in the world are likely to appreciate both this book’s contents and its style: ‘Leaders make choices, good and bad. Where their choices are designed for self-promotion, they often fail; when their choices are made rashly, they often fail; when they decide based on poor or faulty information, they usually fail; where they are too self-absorbed, they usually fail. It is in the choosing that Shakespeare’s politics and his morality
play out. Fate may play a role, but human intervention—choice—matters most’ (p. 3). In chapter 2 Bruce E. Altschuler discusses ‘Macbeth and Political Corruption’, demonstrating the play’s relevance to a reflection on this evil in our day by looking at a number of modern productions and remakes, from Orson Welles’s 1948 Macbeth through Barbara Garson’s MacBird! [1966] to Rupert Goold’s 2007–10 production with Patrick Stewart in the title role. In chapter 3, ‘A Dionysian Hamlet’, Sarah A. Shea takes Nietzsche’s definition of Hamlet as a ‘Dionysian man’ as the starting point for her analysis of this character’s journey towards the achievement of ‘the necessary intellectual discipline and spiritual fortitude’ (p. 48). Shea sees Hamlet as ‘Shakespeare’s political philosopher par excellence’ (pp. 49–50) and points to his eventual acquisition of self-knowledge and coming to terms with his ‘unruly drives’ (p. 61) as an example to be followed by anyone wanting to take any role in politics, from election candidate to simple voter. Paul A. Cantor’s ‘Antony and Cleopatra: Empire, Globalization, and the Clash of Civilizations’ draws a parallel between present-day globalization and Shakespeare’s reflection on Roman history and politics, while, on the other hand, in discussing another Roman play Philip Abbott, in ‘Decisions, Decisions, Decisions: Tyrannicide in Julius Caesar’, focuses on the assassination of the Roman dictator as a universal example of a crisis situation, in which one decision engenders many others. In his brief chapter on ‘Why Iago Is Evil: Othello and the American Desire to Understand Corruption’, Coyle Neal asserts that ‘Americans have a desire to understand why that pervades the culture’ (p. 99). Neal gives as examples of this the sermon with which John Winthrop sought to justify God-sanctioned inequality in 1630 (‘among the first words spoken publicly in colonial America’, p. 100) and the way in which the most striking thematic deviation from its Shakespearian original in Tim Blake Nelson’s 2001 film O is its repeated emphasis on jealousy (in the sense of rivalry) as the single, insisted motivation for the actions of Hugo, its Iago-equivalent. Marlene K. Sokolon’s chapter, on ‘Richard III, Tyranny, and the Modern Financial Elite’, shows how ‘Shakespeare’s play . . . questions whether democratic peace abolishes the possibility of a Richard in our world’ (p. 106) and then depicts a worrying scenario in which the ‘financial elite’ provides the modern-day environment where such an unscrupulous character might ‘plot with fewer legal and constitutional constraints’ (p. 107). The remaining chapters (simply listed here because of space constraints) deal with equally and even more substantial issues, such as ‘Cymbeline and the Origins of Modern Liberty’ (David Ramsey), ‘Shakespeare’s Henry V and Responsibility for War’ (John M. Parrish), ‘Troilus and Cressida: The Value of Reputations and the Corruption of Society’ (Lilly J. Goren), ‘Deception and Persuasion in Measure for Measure’ (Carol McNamara), and ‘Absurdity and Amateur Hour in the American Political Forest: A Midsummer Night’s Dream and the Nightmare of Polarization’ (Kevan M. Yenerall). From the point of view of what this book tells us about Shakespeare’s works in themselves, besides the intrinsic interest of the readings proposed here, there is the fact that by showing how loud and clear Shakespeare puts his political message across this collection supports the view of those who see the plays as actively engaged in the historical and
political context of their time, and as addressing important messages to the ruling elite of Elizabethan and Jacobean England.

Kate McLuskie and Kate Rumbold’s *Cultural Value in Twenty-First-Century England: The Case of Shakespeare* describes the difficulties intrinsic in the task of defining ‘cultural value’, even in such a seemingly obvious case as Shakespeare. In this respect, it identifies a ‘shift . . . from a view of culture as a special arena of social and intellectual activity to one that dealt with the commonplace, day-to-day leisure activities of the whole population’ (pp. 242–3), and how ‘the locus of intrinsic value’ migrated ‘from the product to the audience’ (p. 245). (One wonders, however, whether it might not be possible to apply a method similar to that developed by Franco Moretti and his team to ‘measure’ the canon of the nineteenth-century novel, i.e. a diagram where one axis indicates popular engagement—in Shakespeare’s case, for instance, number of spectators, amateur productions, etc.—and the other measures the number of academic studies and editions.) The back cover blurb for this book claims that ‘it uniquely uses social policy, anthropology and economics, as well as close readings of Shakespeare’s plays’. Though the social study aspect is preponderant, this volume too, therefore, adopts a ‘hybrid’ approach, as it discusses ‘value’ both as currently applied to Shakespeare and as represented within a number of Shakespearian plays (on pp. 56–75), particularly *Troilus and Cressida* and *The Merchant of Venice*. There are also references to performance history (for instance, on pp. 130–40), in line with the fact that ‘the cultural value of [Shakespeare’s] works increasingly depends upon the added value of performance’ (p. 247). On the other hand, the final three chapters, mostly the responsibility of Kate Rumbold, are entirely devoted to today’s cultural industry and Shakespeare’s position within it, as they deal with ‘Government and the Values of Culture’, ‘Value in Shakespeare Institutions’, and ‘Branding Shakespeare’.

Moving on to the ‘Reference’ section, Marion Gibson and Jo Ann Esra’s *Shakespeare’s Demonology* is one of the 2014 additions to what is now the Arden Shakespeare Dictionaries series, an excellent publishing enterprise that has brought us Stuart Gillespie’s dictionary of sources, *Shakespeare’s Books*, and other useful scholarly tools. The volume is laudably more comprehensive than just a guide to *Macbeth* and Poor Tom’s utterances in *King Lear*, though perhaps we would not expect Viola’s metaphorical involvement with ‘charms’ and ‘poor monsters’ in *Twelfth Night* to earn her six mentions in a dictionary on this subject, as can be gathered from the index that usefully supplements the alphabetical arrangement by keywords (in addition, searchable e-book versions are available for this as for other volumes in the series). The brief introduction draws attention to how ‘porous’ the boundaries of this subject can in fact be (p. 3), and summarizes the demonology-related sources to which Shakespeare may have had access and the role the subject plays in Shakespeare’s works. An especially valuable feature is the seventeen-page up-to-date bibliography.

It may be worth reminding readers that with volume 4, 1598–1602, Martin Wiggins and Catherine Richardson’s *British Drama 1533–1642: A Catalogue* (cf. *YWES* 93[2014] and 94[2015]) has started to reach Shakespeare’s major plays. This volume covers *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Henry V*, *Julius Caesar*,
As You Like It, Hamlet, Sir Thomas More, Twelfth Night, and Troilus and Cressida, as well as providing an entry for Love's Labour's Won and including references to Shakespeare in relation to a variety of other plays from this period. The dating of Shakespeare’s (and other early modern) plays was always going to be a contentious issue, but most readers will nonetheless be grateful even for a generic point of reference: in this catalogue the dating is not presented dogmatically, and in the absence of precise evidence we are given both ‘Limits’ and a ‘Best Guess’. The arrangement by best-guess date is in fact invaluable in that it allows us to see at a glance what other less well-known plays were being produced round about the time of the major works of early modern English drama. Entries are meticulous, recording every morsel of available factual evidence on the plays’ early textual and performance history, and therefore may offer some neglected fact or source even to experts on a particular play.

In fact, we need to support such large-scale, long-term, labour-intensive projects. Because of its prominence, academic publishing on Shakespeare is liable to showcase any fall in standards. Without wanting to generalize, the temptation to point the finger at a quantity-over-quality, publish-or-perish, quick turnaround regime is strong when one repeatedly comes across certain problems in books issued by major academic publishers: one book gave the title of an early Shakespearian comedy as Two Gentleman of Verona—not once or twice, but throughout, including the index; in another, the bibliography showed signs of shockingly poor editing; another’s introduction, in summarizing the first chapter, repeated sentences verbatim from it; and in several cases authors had clearly been under pressure to make hyperbolic statements as to the uniqueness of their topic that are then contradicted by the review of previous scholarship in their first pages. We are certainly not the first to call for greater investment of both time and resources to return to academic publishing: so as to enable the sort of care and attention that comes through, for instance, in a book for the general public such as Shakespeare for Grown-Ups, by Penguin Random House editors Elizabeth Foley and Beth Coates.

(b) Problem Plays
This year has seen a variety of approaches to all three of Shakespeare’s problem plays, covering a range of issues relating to the plays’ historical contexts, their sources, and their afterlives on stage. One of the most fruitful topics for discussion on Measure for Measure was related to the issues provoked by the Duke’s strategies of surveillance in the play. This conceit is at the centre of William M. Hamlin’s essay, ‘Conscience and the God-Surrogate in Montaigne and Measure for Measure’ (in Gray and Cox, eds., Shakespeare and Renaissance Ethics, pp. 237–60), one of two of this year’s essays to consider the problem plays in relation to the influence of Michel de Montaigne. Here, Hamlin places Measure for Measure in dialogue with Montaignean scepticism, particularly in relation to the role of conscience; both authors, according to Hamlin, ‘think about conscience when conscience fails to function in the ways that their shared cultural inheritance tells them it
should’ (p. 237). Hamlin argues that Shakespeare consistently responds to the Montaignean view of conscience as a ‘scrupulously accurate inward recognition of personal guilt or rectitude’ and ‘a cognitive state of such extraordinary potency that it consistently finds means to channel itself into outward manifestation’ (p. 238). Following on from this view of conscience, Hamlin highlights several occurrences of tropes in Shakespeare’s plays that he identifies as ‘god-surrogates’, which are defined as ‘forms of mimetic representation’ that ‘function to prompt or prod conscience’ when it fails ‘to carry through with its alleged potential to expose the truth of inward states’ (p. 243). One of the most notable instances of this is Hamlet’s deployment of the play-within-the-play to expose Claudius’s guilt. The Duke’s scheme of disguise and surveillance in *Measure for Measure* is seen as a larger-scale replication of the same exercise in order to have Angelo examine his conscience; unlike Claudius, however, Angelo ‘has an opportunity to redeem himself by behaving with moral probity’ rather than simply revealing his guilty conscience (p. 247). The Duke’s treatment of Angelo is based upon the deployment of a variety of ‘god-surrogates’, including the bed-trick and the need for him to judge Claudio’s transgression (both of which are unsuccessful in forcing Angelo to examine his conscience), before capitalizing on a third ‘god-surrogate’ in the form of Isabella’s intervention in the final scene. In spite of being ‘pained by his hypocrisy’, Angelo does not allow his conscience to spur him into confessing his vices; in this way, he demonstrates that conscience is at work within him, ‘though it scarcely functions at anything like the optimistic level imagined by the Duke... or by Montaigne in his more positive moments’ (p. 255).

Tai-Won Kim’s article, ‘Pastoral Power and Theatricality: Early Modern Governmentality in Shakespeare’s *Measure for Measure*’ (*MES* 22:ii[2014] 29–51), begins by emphasizing the play’s status as a rare example of one of Shakespeare’s comedies that ‘enable us to meditate on and discuss the idea of government in early modern England’ (p. 29). This focus upon ‘the art of government, in both early modern senses of statecraft and governing one’s self’ helps to reveal how ‘the art of government becomes the nodal point of early modern subjectivity’ (p. 30). The article considers the Duke’s delegation of political authority to Angelo and sees both the Duke’s reputation for self-examination and the hypocrisies of Angelo’s administration as products of the ‘close relationship’ Shakespeare establishes ‘between political government and the government of one’s self’ (p. 36). Other focal points in this reading include the Duke’s harnessing of theatricality, both in his disguise as the Friar which allows him simultaneously to ‘establish his moral superiority and invisible power’ while ‘keeping a safe distance from the corruption and degradation in Vienna’ (p. 38), and in the decidedly theatrical reinstatement of his power at the play’s conclusion. The Duke’s histrionic reassertion of his power allows him to provide an exemplar of ‘respect, admiration, and awe’, which serves to address ‘an urgent need to find ways to make individuals internalize normative values and ethics’ (p. 45). In this reading, then, the Duke’s scheme depends not just upon his reassertion of political authority, but also upon inspiring the ability of successful and virtuous self-government in his subjects.
The Duke’s governmental strategies are also considered in Benjamin J. Whalen’s article, ‘Private Conscience, Public Reform, and Disguised Rule in The Malcontent and Measure for Measure’ (BJJ 21:i[2014] 73–91). This article considers Measure for Measure in the context of the ‘disguised duke’ genre that enjoyed a brief vogue at the beginning of James’s reign and of which John Marston’s The Malcontent is another notable example. According to Whalen, the plays’ similarities go beyond the shared trope of the disguised ruler into more specific themes, including the ‘effect of a state’s intrusion into the realm of private conscience through the government’s adoption of religious authority’ and concerns with ‘the extensive negative effects of sin upon the community, and the need for repentance to include a sinner’s private reconciliation with God and the correction of his relationship with his community’ (p. 75). In this sense, both plays show the respective rulers’ disguises as means of bringing about broad societal changes through intervention on a personal, microcosmic level. Such endeavours require the rulers to pay particular attention to the spiritual welfare of their subjects; Whalen argues that such concerns on the part of the respective dukes go beyond any ‘practical plans or political gains’ and are instead rooted in ‘an altruistic concern for the spiritual good’ of their more recalcitrant subjects (p. 79). This is manifested most specifically in Vincentio’s choice of disguise in Measure for Measure, with his ‘symbolic assumption of the friar’s robes’ representing ‘his essential connection to the spiritual life of the community’ (p. 82). This, for Whalen, represents the crucial distinction between the two plays; whilst Marston’s Altofronto ‘encourages penance in the guise of a malcontent critic’, Vincentio’s choice of clerical role is a means of ‘connecting his physical habit and disguise to the theological language of repentance that he so often invokes’ (p. 83). This reading therefore aims to look beyond what are often regarded as cynical governmental strategies adopted by the disguised rulers and to argue for an additional motivation for the disguises based upon pastoral responsibilities to ensure the spiritual health of their commonwealths.

The theological implications of the play were explored in various contributions to scholarly work on Measure for Measure. Musa Gurnis’s article, ‘“Most ignorant of what he’s most assured”: The Hermeneutics of Predestination in Measure for Measure’ (ShakS 42[2014] 141–69), opens by stating that the play ‘demonstrates a sustained preoccupation with the central experiential challenge of predestination’ and that it ‘investigates predestinarian theology and its attendant forms of cultural judgement as an epistemological problem’ (p. 141). For Gurnis, such investigations are dependent upon the responses of a theologically diverse audience; the play engages in a ‘manipulation of audience and expectation’ which ‘establishes and then challenges the presumption of a correlation between one’s inward predestined condition and external, social status’ (pp. 147–8), resulting in a play in which ‘souls cannot be slotted into worldly categories’ (p. 148). The bulk of the article performs an analysis of Angelo, as a means of representing the play’s insistence upon the ‘opacity of souls’ (p. 158). At his first appearance, Angelo is associated with election in the language employed towards him, before the play gradually unfolds the troubling elements of his character. Through the representation of Angelo, the play initially encourages sympathy and identification with his
emotional turmoil before revealing his sinful nature in his attempts at sexually exploiting Isabella. In this way, ‘Angelo’s cultural identity as a godly man is shown to be an unreliable indicator of the predestined condition of his soul’ and, ‘instead of revealing his “true state,” Angelo’s self-diagnosis as one of the damned is itself undermined by the play’s comic resolution’ (p. 159). By encouraging such mixed responses in the audience, the play therefore engages them in a process that underlines the disjunction between an individual’s outward appearance and the condition of their soul, thus highlighting the unreliability of spiritual examination.

The theological issues posed by Measure for Measure are also considered in two essays from Stages of Engagement: Drama and Religion in Post-Reformation England, edited by James D. Mardock and Kathryn R. McPherson. The first of these is Kathryn R. McPherson’s chapter, ‘Performing Catechism in Measure for Measure’ (pp. 155–70), which explores the implications of catechism as a ‘pedagogical strategy’ (p. 155), particularly in Isabella’s first encounter with Angelo. McPherson argues that ‘Measure for Measure offers a fascinating opportunity to explore . . . early modern echoes in the public theaters of the era’, as well as to explore the play’s emphases upon ‘the complexities of reformed faith, gender, and power’ and the ways in which it offers a ‘critique of how those forces interact’ (p. 158). Shakespeare’s provision of an opportunity for Isabella to perform catechetical practices, particularly in her interrogation of Angelo, resists the very social roles toward which her education had impelled her’ (p. 161). Whilst Isabella may engage in catechetical practices, she, and indeed the audience, are left with numerous unanswered questions, and Angelo’s failure to learn such premises as ‘mercy, moderation, or even honest self-examination’ means that Isabella’s encounter with him does not ultimately achieve the desired ends of catechism (p. 168). McPherson concludes that this scene reflects the broader development of the play, leaving as it does numerous ‘unanswered questions’ at its conclusion, which potentially highlight the ‘failure of catechetical methods . . . to teach citizens to think through the implications of their faith and judgement’ (p. 169).

The same collection also contains Terri Bourus’s essay, ‘Counterfeiting Faith: Middleton’s Theatrical Reformation of Measure for Measure’ (pp. 195–216). Here, Bourus considers the implications of Thomas Middleton’s adaptation of Measure for Measure from the early 1620s and emphasizes the need to consider this play as the work of ‘two playwrights with markedly different religious profiles’ (p. 202). It is also important to consider the fact that the play effectively has two composition dates and that ‘the religious climate had significantly changed’ by the time Middleton came to revise it, not least because of the impact of the Gunpowder Plot of 1605. The Middletonian revisions respond to this new climate by changing the setting to Vienna, thereby addressing the ‘violent religious boundaries’ provoked by the Thirty Years War (p. 207). Bourus also makes a number of connections between the Middletonian revisions and his other dramatic works in order to emphasize his
preoccupation throughout his career with the representation of Protestantism on stage.

Terri Bourus also collaborated this year with Gary Taylor on *Measure for Measure(s): Performance-Testing the Adaptation Hypothesis* (Shakespeare 10:iv[2014] 363–401) which, like Bourus’s other essay this year, considers the implications of the ‘genetic text’ (p. 363) of *Measure for Measure* produced by John Jowett for the Oxford complete works of Middleton, which aimed both to identify the Middletonian revisions and to reconstruct the original Shakespearian text. This article is an account of the authors’ work with the Hoosier Bard company to mount productions of the two distinct texts as a means of experimenting to explore the effects of the adaptation hypothesis. Amongst the issues considered in this article are the effects of Middleton’s version being destined to be performed at Blackfriars, the omission of the earlier version’s concluding jig, the reappearance of Julietta in the final scene of the revised version, the introduction of various characters (an effect of many of Middleton’s revisions clustering around the beginning of scenes and the first appearances of characters), the representation of the female characters, and the changes in public attitudes towards James I that had taken place between the composition of the two versions. Amongst the principal conclusions offered by the article are that the reconstructed earlier version of the play does constitute a coherent, self-contained, and performable dramatic text, as does the revised version, and that the revisions have a significant bearing upon the production as a whole, as ‘changes at one point in a character’s arc can change the vector of that actor’s interpretations’ and, because of the interactions and collaborations with the other actors, they ‘can have a domino effect on surrounding characters’ (p. 394).

The recent performance history of *Measure for Measure* is also considered in Huw Griffiths’s article, ‘Hotel Rooms and Bodily Fluids in Two Recent Productions of Measure for Measure, or, Why Barnardine Is Still Important’ (ShakB 32:iv[2014] 559–83). Griffiths focuses upon the use of the character of Barnardine in two productions of the play; in spite of his ‘relatively marginal position in the narrative’, this character is used to tie together a number of the play’s key themes in these productions, particularly the position of the individual in relation to the law. The earlier production, staged at the Belvoir theatre, Sydney, in 2010 and directed by Benedict Andrews, contained an extra-textual scene, performed without any dialogue, which takes place in a luxury hotel room and features a naked Barnardine wrecking the room and smearing blood and excrement over the walls. Another production, from the director Thomas Ostermeier, performed the following year at the Schaubühne theatre in Berlin, had Barnardine represented by a pig’s carcass which was suspended above the stage and used as a prop in various scenes. The play’s head-trick is instigated by having the Provost saw off the pig’s head with a chainsaw. Griffiths explores the ways in which these contemporary productions reflected the play’s ‘oft-noted concerns with justice and surveillance and with forms of personation and substitution’ (p. 559), as well as such related issues as torture, physical abjection, and the relationship between the body and the law. Griffiths thus highlights significant continuities between the concerns
of these performances and the play’s interrogation of the bearings of such issues in the seventeenth century.

Alongside Hamlin’s essay, Montaigne also figures in this year’s scholarship on *All’s Well That Ends Well*. Arthur Kirsch’s article, ‘The Bitter and the Sweet of Tragicomedy: Shakespeare’s *All’s Well That Ends Well* and Montaigne’ (*YR* 102:ii [2014] 63–84), considers Shakespeare’s turn towards the tragicomic genre in the ‘problem’ comedies of the early 1600s, and particularly the genre’s potential for ‘exploring the actual texture of human experience’, thereby associating itself directly with the methods employed for self-examination in Montaigne’s *Essays* (p. 66). Montaigne’s influence upon Shakespeare’s turn towards tragicomedy, Kirsch argues, can be discerned particularly through the shared emphases on sexuality, with Shakespeare ‘drawing upon Montaigne’s sense of his embodied being, and most especially his sexual being’ (p. 68). Kirsch outlines a number of parallels between *All’s Well* and Montaigne’s essay ‘Upon Some Verses of Virgil’, including their shared sense of the disjunction between noble birth and virtue, and highlights *All’s Well* as ‘a reflection of Montaigne’s tragicomic way of thinking about sexuality’, particularly the decline of youthful sexual prowess (p. 69). Kirsch also explores how the two texts meditate upon the often vexed relationship between love and sexuality, and concludes by considering how *All’s Well* anticipates the engagement with Montaigne in Shakespeare’s late romances.

Also considering the European influences upon *All’s Well That Ends Well* is Eric Nicholson’s essay, ‘Helen, the Italianate Theatrical Wayfarer in *All’s Well That Ends Well***’ (in Marrapodi, ed., pp. 163–79), which proposes a series of Italianate influences upon the play which go beyond what is often acknowledged to be its principal source, the tale of Giletta di Narbona from the third day of Giovanni Boccaccio’s *Decameron* cycle. Nicholson bases his analysis upon a model of ‘resources in common’ which follows the premise that ‘professional theatre practitioners of early modern Europe developed a working method of assimilating and transforming, each in their own way, a common pool of gags, poetic tropes, character types, plot-lines, and narrative devices’ (p. 165), meaning that Shakespeare’s engagement with his sources was in fact part of a more complex method of cultural appropriation than ‘the kind of one-way “influence” or even competitive imitation postulated by traditional literary histories’ (p. 165). According to Nicholson, the adaptation would have involved, in part, a collaborative endeavour between Shakespeare and his players which would have entailed ‘trying out, mixing and matching, cutting and pasting, as it were, a heterogeneous variety of theatrically oriented devices, some of them Italianate and made available by travelling actors’ and audiences’ reports’ (p. 165). Such premises provide a framework for analysing a number of tropes drawn from Italianate theatrical tradition, including Helena’s association with the figure of the *prima donna innamorata*, and Paroles’ similarities to the Capitano figure. Nicholson therefore argues that *All’s Well*’s response to Italianate culture is in fact the product of an engagement with a variety of theatrical tropes, practices, and conventions, rather than a response to an individual narrative template. Such engagement also lends the play a sense of self-conscious theatricality, conveyed especially through the representation of Helena.
The year’s scholarship on *All’s Well* also includes a short note by Karen Britland. In ‘Psalm 140 and Diana’s Crux in *All’s Well That Ends Well*’ (*N&Q* 61[2014] 241–4), Britland examines one of the most puzzling cruces in the Shakespearian canon. Diana’s lines in response to Bertram’s wooing in IV.ii (‘I see that make rope’s in such a scarre’) have been the subject of considerable editorial debate and, relatively recently, provoked a radical emendation by Gary Taylor for the Oxford edition of the play. Britland contests Taylor’s emendation of the line to ‘I see that men may rope’s in such a sureance’ by instead arguing for a lighter emendation to ‘I see that men may rope’s in such a snare’. This emendation is based largely upon verbal parallels with the fifth verse of Psalm 140 in various translations as well as the two texts’ common emphases upon ‘the ways in which the evil speakers lay traps for the unwary’ (p. 213).

Two of the three essays on *Troilus and Cressida* from this year both focus, coincidentally, on the effect of musical cues in the play. Russell West-Pavlov’s article, ‘Trumpets and Strumpets: Time, Space, Emulation and Violence in Shakespeare’s *Troilus and Cressida*’ (*Anglia* 131:i[2014] 1–22), examines the effects and resonances of a number of trumpet calls that take place throughout the play. West-Pavlov highlights the numerous bearings that this ‘theatrical sign’ has upon the ‘semiotic structure of the drama’, particularly in terms of the representation of the scenario (in the midst of war), the place (a military camp), and the time (‘the threshold to combat’) (p. 2). Trumpet calls also relate closely to the principal themes of the play and the representation of a ‘masculine ethos of warlike bravour which depends upon ongoing conflict to reinforce its warlike identity’ (p. 3). Such concerns are complemented by the trumpet call’s contribution to a ‘self-reflexive turn which, by addressing the problem of imitation’, relates its self-conscious theatricality to questions of masculine emulation (p. 3). The various trumpet calls, signalling, by turns, prompts to demonstrations of masculine prowess, the exchange of women, and the performative and emulative properties of chivalry, therefore combine to participate in the play’s inscription of ‘the Trojan War narrative and its Shakespearean deconstruction within a new economy of entertainment as entrepreneurial exchange’ (p. 16). Such commodification highlights the theatre’s own situation within an emergent consumer culture; as a result, the kinds of ‘spiralling processes of violence’ dramatized by the play were experienced ‘as a brake upon the development of an increasingly hegemonic economic system of wealth- rather than rank-based competition’ (p. 19).

The relationship between temporality and musical devices also figures in Erin Minear’s essay, ‘Music for Helen: The Fitful Changes of *Troilus and Cressida*’ (in Dunn and Larson, eds., *Gender and Song in Early Modern England*, pp. 153–68), which argues that it is a work in which ‘the treatment of music, by playing on the tension between philosophical harmony and sonic experience, provides a new—even inverted—perspective that confers value on change and the ephemeral’ (p. 154), with music also serving to undermine the association between sound and motion. The chapter begins by examining III.i, a scene dominated by musical metaphors and culminating in a song by Pandarus. This follows Paris’ mocking of Pandarus’ ‘emptily repetitive language’ with a further implication that the song to follow will be identical to the ‘fits’ for which he is criticized—‘empty hiccups of sound’ (p. 155)—and,
indeed, with its ‘relentless repetition of the word “love”’, the resultant song ‘enacts the progress of sexual desire and finally devolves into meaningless, if suggestive, syllables’ (p. 156). The prominence of this song during the only scene to feature Helen, the subject of the conflict, is one example of the ways in which the play ‘insistently breaks down the cherished distinction between the virtuous “harmony” of war and the effeminate music of love. Both kinds of music are marked by an exaggerated emphasis on materiality and meaningless’ (pp. 157–8). Pandarus’ song is also reflective of how ‘the play’s narrative struggles to unfold in time, but cannot since all the plot developments are not only inevitable, but already present, “couched” in the current instant’ (p. 162), meaning that the characters in the play are unable to escape from the historical figures they are destined to become; this results in a situation in which ‘the future is superimposed over the present’ (pp. 161–2). Pandarus’ song also comes to reflect ‘this static reality, functioning emblematically as the kind of song such a man would sing’ (p. 163). Such points are brought to bear by Minear upon the play’s representation of Cressida and the inevitability that she will forever be characterized by her sexuality and ability to ‘sing any man at first sight’.

The recent performance history of Troilus and Cressida is also covered in this year’s scholarship by Aneta Mancewicz’s article, ‘Looking Back at the Audience: The RSC & the Wooster Group’s Troilus and Cressida (2012)’ (MultSh 11:xxvi[2014] 65–79), which examines the critically unsuccessful collaborative production of the play by the British and American companies. The two groups worked largely independently with distinct staging and conceptual choices (the RSC took on the roles of the Greek characters, while the New York-based Wooster Group presented the Trojans). For Mancewicz, the controversial reception of this venture ‘exposed differences in the staging of Shakespeare between the UK and the US, as well as between classical and avant-garde theatre’; in this way, the production offers us an ‘insight into the nature of Shakespearean staging and spectating in Anglophone culture’ (p. 66). Mancewicz draws on the experience of seeing the production in performance, alongside a selection of reviews and critical responses to it, in order to outline how such responses brought to the fore a number of preoccupations with Shakespearian performance in Britain, including ‘the perception of the text as an autonomous universe governed by realistic rules, psychological principles, and immediate political concerns’; as a result, the production was particularly notable for how it provided a reflection of its audience and the ways in which it ‘powerfully exposed their assumptions and preferences’ (p. 76).

(c) Poetry

In 2013 a major publication with focus on Shakespeare’s poetry was produced. The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare’s Poetry, edited by Jonathan F.S. Post, contains thirty-eight essays each focusing on different aspects of Shakespeare’s poetry. Despite the title, the majority of the book contains essays which are not specifically about Shakespeare’s poems as such, but engage with a number
of his dramatic works. The book is divided into seven parts, grouping between three and ten essays in each. Part I, ‘Style and Language’, contains five essays. The first of these, ‘Shakespeare’s Styles’ by Gordon Teskey, focuses on the changing of Shakespeare’s writing style over the course of his life, with Teskey noting, ‘Over the course of his approximately twenty-year career, Shakespeare’s style quite naturally changed, so that we may speak of him writing in a succession of styles’ (p. 3). Teskey examines the Shakespeare canon as a whole, engaging with a number of the plays, but spends significant time on Hamlet and the ‘To be, or not to be’ soliloquy. There is a similar focus on later passages both in this play and also a number of others to bolster his position. Chapter 2 is ‘Shakespeare’s Style in the 1590’s’ by Goran Stanivukovic, in which the author argues that the final decade of the sixteenth century saw greater importance being placed on language than on stories and characters. Stanivukovic frames his argument in three subsections and engages with critics from both Renaissance and modern times. Chapter 3, ‘Shakespeare’s Late Style’ by A.R. Braunmuller, continues the focus begun by Stanivukovic but looks in more depth at Shakespeare’s later activity. Braunmuller engages with a number of plays, with particular focus on the comparatively early Macbeth and ending his essay with an examination of The Winter’s Tale. As with Stanivukovic’s essay there is also reference to older critics; Braunmuller makes specific reference to John Dryden and discusses Shakespeare’s work in the terms framed by this author. Chapter 4 is ‘Shakespeare and the Arts of Cognition’ by Sophie Read, and begins with a brief discussion of Hamlet and Macbeth. Read compares the two, noting ‘If Hamlet drags in the most fascinating of ways until its high-speed ending, Macbeth traces the reverse trajectory of temporal extremes’, noting that the difference in tempo in the two plays can be ascribed to the mental state of the eponymous characters. Read moves on to engage with the sonnets, and again notes the differing cadence throughout the sequence and discusses what may be gleaned from this. Margaret Ferguson’s ‘Fatal Cleopatras and Golden Apples’, which forms chapter 5 and closes Part I, is primarily engaged with Shakespeare’s use of wordplay and puns. Ferguson looks at a number of the plays and unsurprisingly spends some time focusing on Sonnet 135, with its frequent repetition of the word ‘will’. Ferguson discusses other interpretations of this and other sonnets as well as presenting her own theories.

Part II, ‘Inheritance and Invention’, contains eight chapters and is headed by Colin Burrow’s essay ‘Classical Influences’. This piece discusses the classical styles that can be read within Shakespeare’s work and begins by examining Shakespeare’s knowledge of the classics. Burrow notes that Shakespeare would have been aware of such authors as Ovid and Virgil and points out that Venus and Adonis is based on part of Ovid’s Metamorphoses. Burrow continues by engaging with other Shakespeare works, including The Rape of Lucrece, before focusing on the sonnets. Here he notes that ‘Shakespeare’s debts to classical poetry are elusive and diffusive’ (p. 110), and then examines some examples of this debt. Ovid’s Metamorphoses is also discussed in chapter 7, Anthony Mortimer’s essay ‘Shakespeare and Italian Poetry’, which focuses heavily on Italian poetry of the sixteenth century and how this influenced Shakespeare. Mortimer looks at poets such as Agostini,
dell’Anguillara, and Dolce, who all completed Italian translations of Ovid’s work, and then examines Shakespeare’s continuation of this work with *Venus and Adonis*. Of course any discussion of Italian Renaissance poetry would be incomplete without reference to Petrarch, and Mortimer looks at this author as well as, to a lesser extent, Dante, to add weight to his argument. Mortimer ends his piece by examining in some depth Petrarch’s *Canzoniere* and examining the influences found within Shakespeare’s sonnets. In chapter 8 Anne Lake Prescott discusses Shakespeare and the French author Joachim Du Bellay in her piece ‘Du Bellay and Shakespeare’s Sonnets’. Prescott argues that Shakespeare would have read Du Bellay, and that his sonnets were influenced by this author. She also makes the point that Shakespeare was equally influenced by Spenser’s *Ruines of Rome* and notes that ‘Ruinish’—a term she and the Hieatt brothers have coined to describe ‘a lexical force-field made of walls, *tempus edax*, bloody foundations, civil broils, “ruinate”, “injurious”, “of yore”, prideful self-containment, giants, maps, “wear”, “outworn”, “map”, and more’ (p. 135)—not only appears frequently in the works of Shakespeare and Spenser but also in numerous other works. Continuing to make reference to ‘Ruinish’, Prescott moves on to examine Du Bellay’s *Antiquitez*, before considering anti-Petrarchism and concluding her essay with a brief discussion of *Titus Andronicus*. Chapter 9, Linda Gregerson’s ‘Open Voicing: Wyatt and Shakespeare’, discusses Thomas Wyatt’s translation of Petrarch’s *Rime sparse* and the influence this had on Shakespeare. Gregerson begins by noting that Wyatt’s translation is much less rhetorical than those that preceded it; she writes that this version is ‘Grounded, demotic, shot through with grievance and insinuation’ (p. 153), giving a much different impression than the previous versions. Gregerson continues by using her analysis of Wyatt to discuss Shakespeare’s works; she engages with a number of the sonnets, as well as the plays, with specific focus on ‘a comedy (*Twelfth Night*), a history play (*1 Henry IV*), and a tragedy (*Othello*)’ (p. 163). Chapter 10 is ‘Grammar Rules’ in the Sonnets: Sidney and Shakespeare’ by Alysia Kolentsis, in which the author discusses the development of the English language with specific focus on the works of Sidney and Shakespeare. Kolentsis looks in depth at *Astrophel and Stella* and compares Sidney’s grammatical usage with that of Shakespeare in a number of sonnets. Chapter 11, Catherine Nicholson’s ‘Commonplace Shakespeare: Value, Vulgarity and the Poetics of Increase in *Shake-Speares Sonnets* and *Troilus and Cressida*’, begins by comparing these two George Eld-produced 1609 editions of Shakespeare’s works, noting the varied reception of the works both at the time and by modern scholars. Nicholson continues to discuss the idea of value within both editions as well as touching upon other themes that the works share. Chapter 12, Marion Wells’s ‘Philomela’s Marks: Ekphrasis and Gender in Shakespeare’s Poems and Plays’, traces the impact of Ovid’s version of the classical tale on Shakespeare, focusing on four of his works, including *Lucrece*. Wells discusses the motif of rape that exists within her four chosen texts and draws interesting parallels between the more violent tales of *Lucrece* and *Titus Andronicus* and the ‘softer’ comedy *The Winter’s Tale*. This section is concluded by John Kerrigan’s ‘Shakespeare, Elegy and Epitaph’, which discusses epitaphs written by Shakespeare, including the poet’s own. To
further his argument Kerrigan engages with a number of the sonnets as well as the less well-known *Phoenix and the Turtle*. The essay also contains a discussion of epitaphs written for Shakespeare by other authors, including John Milton.

Part III, ‘Songs, Lyrics and Ballads’, contains only two chapters: ‘Song in Shakespeare: Rhetoric, Identity and Agency’ by Gavin Alexander and ‘Shakespeare’s Popular Songs and the Great Temptations of Lesser Lyric’ by Steve Newman. Both of these essays focus on poetical language within Shakespeare’s plays rather than any of the poems themselves; Alexander writes about how we are to respond to the lyric poems within such works as *As You Like It* and *Othello*, while Newman continues this theme with this focus on the songs that appear in some of Shakespeare’s more well-known plays including *Hamlet* and *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*.

Chapter 16, Abigail Rokison’s ‘Shakespeare’s Dramatic Verse Line’, begins Part IV, ‘Speaking on Stage’. Like the preceding two chapters, this focuses more on poetical styles within Shakespeare’s prose than on his poetry *per se*. Rokison discusses Shakespeare’s use of various techniques, including his employment of blank verse, in an attempt to ‘consider the potential dramatic function of these various forms’ (p. 285). This approach is echoed in chapter 17, ‘Shakespeare’s Word Music’, with Paul Edmondson beginning his essay with a series of passages from a number of plays describing the sound of Shakespeare’s poetry as ‘music’. The essay continues with an analysis of Viola’s speech from *Twelfth Night* before moving the focus to Lady Macbeth’s dialogue with the Doctor and Gentlewoman from Act V, scene i of *Macbeth*. Bruce R. Smith’s essay, ‘Finding Your Footing in Shakespeare’s Verse’, also addresses poetical styles within Shakespeare’s dramatic work. Smith gives the reader advice on how best to understand and appreciate the rhyme and metre of Shakespeare’s words, giving examples from many of his plays before briefly engaging with the sonnets to conclude the chapter. Chapter 19, ‘From Bad to Verse: Poetry and Spectacle on the Modern Shakespearean Stage’ by Jeremy Lopez, asks, ‘Is it possible to hear blank pentameter verse during a theatrical performance?’ (p. 340). Lopez engages with a number of critics and theatrical personae to find an answer. The final chapter of Part IV is ‘‘Make My Image but an Alehouse Sign’: The Poetry of Women in Shakespeare’s Dramatic Verse’ by Alison Findlay, amongst others, to show how the use of language offers different meanings based on the speaker’s gender.

Part V, ‘Reading Shakespeare’s Poems’, is the first section that focuses exclusively on Shakespeare’s poetry. The ten essays here feature criticism on most of Shakespeare’s poetic works, ranging from chapters on the sonnets to an essay on *The Phoenix and the Turtle*. The first of these, ‘‘To Show and So to Publish”: Reading, Writing, and Performing in the Narrative Poems’ by Charlotte Scott, examines both *The Rape of Lucrece* and *Venus and Adonis* and how these pieces work effectively as dramatic forms. In chapter 22, Subha Mukherji also looks at *Venus and Adonis* in ‘Outgrowing Adonis, Outgrowing Ovid: The Disorienting Nature of *Venus and Adonis*’; the author uses this
poem, and to a lesser extent Lucrece, to interrogate Shakespeare’s relationship with Ovid. Joshua Scodel’s ‘Shame, Love, Fear, and Pride in The Rape of Lucrece’ focuses on the manner in which these emotions are portrayed in the poem. Scodel not only comments on the way Lucrece’s emotions are represented, but also discusses the same elements with regard to Tarquin and Brutus, before concluding his piece with an examination of shame within the Golden Age. The next five chapters primarily engage with the sonnets. Chapter 24, ‘The Sonnets in the Classroom: Student, Teacher, Editor-Annotator(s), and Cruxes’ by David Sofield, looks at the difficulties encountered when teaching the sonnets and offers some analysis of a number of them. This is followed by L.E. Semler’s essay, ‘“Fortify Yourself in Your Decay”: Sounding Rhyme and Rhyming Effects in Shakespeare’s Sonnets’, which examines the rhyming patterns found within the sequence and what effect the use of different forms has. Chapter 26 is David Schalwyk’s ‘The Conceptual Investigation of Shakespeare’s Sonnets’, wherein the author looks at the voices present in these works and the manner in which they are represented throughout the sequence. Chapter 27, Russ McDonald’s ‘“Pretty Rooms”: Shakespeare’s Sonnets, Elizabethan Architecture and Early Modern Visual Design’, examines a different element of these works, with the author proposing ‘a new context for examining the Sonnets’ (p. 486), that of visual design in the sixteenth century. McDonald examines the poems and suggests that Shakespeare’s use of style and pattern can be linked with similar patterns found in architecture of the era. In chapter 28, ‘The Poetics of Feminine Subjectivity in Shakespeare’s Sonnets and A Lover’s Complaint’, Melissa E. Sanchez addresses what she feels is a neglected aspect of these two works, conceding that ‘the dark lady is indeed promiscuous’, but then asking: ‘and so what if she is?’ (p. 507). Sanchez illustrates her point by discussing the female perspective in A Lover’s Complaint before also analysing a small number of the sonnets. Chapter 29 also engages with A Lover’s Complaint, with Katherine A. Craik’s ‘Poetry and Compassion in Shakespeare’s A Lover Complaint’. Craik examines this poem in depth, discussing examples of compassion within the work, while also engaging with a number of critics of both the Renaissance and the modern era to express her views. The final chapter of this part, John Kerrigan’s ‘Reading The Phoenix and Turtle’, focuses on one of Shakespeare’s less frequently examined poems. Kerrigan provides the reader with an examination of the text, discussing a number of themes and interpretations of the work.

Part VI, ‘Later Reflections’, contains five essays which are concerned with Shakespeare’s reception in post-Renaissance times. The first of these is ‘Shakespearean Poetry and the Romantics’ by Michael O’Neill, which examines the manner in which the Romantic poets responded to Shakespeare. O’Neill discusses the reaction of poets such as Wordsworth and Byron, and how Shakespeare’s poetry affected these poets in different ways. In chapter 32, Herbert F. Tucker continues to bring Shakespeare more up to date in his essay ‘Shakespearean Being: The Victorian Bard’. Like O’Neill in the previous chapter, Tucker looks at the reception of Shakespeare in this era. Peter Robinson, in chapter 33, ‘Shakespeare’s Loose Ends and the Contemporary Poet’, carries out a similar exercise with relation to modern
poets, including Ted Hughes, John Ashbery, and Elizabeth Bishop, noting that a number of these poets created poems in direct response to Shakespeare’s works. Unlike the previous two essays, the major point of focus for Robinson’s piece is the plays rather than the poetry with which O’Neill and Tucker primarily engage. James Longenbach, in ‘The Sound of Shakespeare Thinking’, takes a slightly different approach. Beginning with a discussion of key scenes in *The Tempest* and *3 Henry VI*, Longenbach notes how ‘Thinking in Shakespeare is what turns us, changes us, makes us move.’ The author proceeds to discuss some of the Romantic poets before concluding his chapter with a brief discussion of Shakespeare in relation to Woolf’s *Mrs Dalloway*.

Judith Hall’s ‘Melted in American Air’ concludes Part VI and discusses the reception of Shakespeare in the United States. Hall examines the reaction of a number of American figures and does not limit herself to those involved solely in the written media, discussing the likes of Cole Porter alongside more traditional subjects such as Walt Whitman.

The final part of the book, Part VII, ‘Translating Shakespeare’, contains three essays all concerned with the issues faced when translating the poetry of Shakespeare into a different language. The first of these, ‘Yves Bonnefoy and Shakespeare as a French Poet’ by Efrain Kristal, examines the manner in which Bonnefoy, a celebrated poet in his own right, translated a number of Shakespeare’s works, including *Venus and Adonis*, *Lucrece*, and the complete sonnets. Kristal also briefly discusses alternative translations before concluding his piece with an examination of Bonnefoy’s translations of a number of the plays. Chapter 37, ‘Glocal Shakespeare: Shakespeare’s Poems in Germany’ by Christa Jansohn, discusses how Shakespeare’s poetry is as well received by the German audience as his plays. Jansohn examines a number of theatrical productions of the narrative poems before discussing why there has not been a well-received translation of the sonnets. The book concludes with Belén Bistué’s ‘Negotiating the Universal: Translations of Shakespeare’s Poetry In (Between) Spain and Spanish America’. In this essay Bistué discusses the unique challenges faced by those who wish to translate Shakespeare’s poetry into Spanish considering the historical enmity between the British and Spanish empires.

Changing focus to articles published on this subject, it is notable that there has been a relative dearth of material written over the last year. Of the nine articles discussed here three were published in the latter half of 2013 with only six new articles written in 2014. The majority of these articles focus on the sonnets. Mike Ingham discusses the challenges faced in adapting the sonnets into musical form in his essay ‘The True Concord of Well-Tuned Sounds’*: Musical Adaptions of Shakespeare’s Sonnets* (*Shakespeare* 9:ii[2013] 220–40), citing examples from artists like Rufus Wainwright and Ladysmith Black Mambazo. Suzanne M. Tartamella compares the ‘Dark Lady Sonnets’ (Sonnets 127–52) with elements of Shakespeare’s dramatic work in her article ‘Reinventing the Poet and Dark Lady: Theatricality and Artistic Control in Shakespeare’s *Taming of the Shrew*’ (*ELR* 43:iii[2013] 446–77), arguing that there is value in discussing the play in relation to these specific sonnets. In contrast, Fenghua Ma engages with the first 126 sonnets in her paper ‘The Tragic Vision in the Fair Youth Group in Shakespeare’s Sonnets’ (*TPLS*...
4:v[2014] 941–8), looking at the ‘Fair Youth’ in relation to such concepts as friendship and betrayal. In the essay ‘Anatomies of Imagination in Shakespeare’s Sonnets’ (SEL 54:i[2014] 105–24), Suparna Roychoudhury discusses the relationship between love, poetry, and the body before engaging with the sonnets and giving examples of where this occurs in Shakespeare’s work.

Jonathan P.A. Sell’s essay, ‘Terminal Aposiopesis and Sublime Communication: Shakespeare’s Sonnet 126 and Keats’s To Autumn’ (in Sell, Borch, and Lindgren, eds., Ethics of Literary Communication: Genuineness, Directness, Indirectness, pp. 167–88), discusses the use of this technique in literature through the years, while also specifically engaging with Shakespeare’s and Keats’s works. Also focusing on only one of Shakespeare’s sonnets is Leo Daugherty, who has written a brief note discussing ‘A Previously Unreported Source for Shakespeare’s Sonnet 56’ (N&Q 61[2014] 240–1).

Two articles focus on Venus and Adonis. The first of these, Ernest P Rufleth’s ‘Courting Disaster: Hunting and Wooing in Shakespeare’s Venus and Adonis’ (Poetica 81[2014] 33–58), discusses these two concepts as they appear within the poem, noting the disparity in the amount Shakespeare wrote about each subject. As seems to be de rigueur, Rufleth also compares Shakespeare’s version of the poem with its source material, Ovid’s Metamorphoses, noting the differences between the two and offering theories as to why these differences occur. Sofie Kluge, in her essay ‘Adonis at the Crossroads: Two (Three) Early Modern Versions of the Venus and Adonis Myth’ (MLN 129:v[2014] 1149–69), discusses Shakespeare’s version of the myth in relation to Pedro Soto De Roja’s Fragmentos de Adonis with specific focus on the interpretation of Adonis in both works.

Lukas Erne and Tamsin Badcoe have chosen not to focus on any one element of Shakespeare’s poetry, but instead look at the reception of his works at the time of their initial publication in their article ‘Shakespeare and the Popularity of Poetry Books in Print, 1583–1622’ (RES 65[2014] 33–57). Erne and Badcoe do not focus solely on Shakespeare, but also note the popularity or otherwise of other writers and their works.

(d) Histories

This year provided a number of interesting items dealing with or touching on Shakespeare’s history plays, ranging from the politics of food to the physical landscape and the metaphysical self. Marisa R. Cull’s Shakespeare’s Princes of Wales: English Identity and the Welsh Connection examines the ‘Welshness’ of Shakespeare’s princes of Wales, arguing for a paradoxical Wales that, for contemporary audiences, was both familiar and alien; an ally and a rebel; the foundation of the commonweal’s mythic past and a perpetual reminder of the altogether more ancient claims to rulership of the island’s original inhabitants. In Cull’s introduction, she points to Fluellen as a neat encapsulation of the paradoxical view of the Welsh: he is at once both a comic rustic and a shrewd, ‘barbed’ (p. 3) observer of the English. Taking Pocock’s articulation of early
modern British political identity as a starting point, Cull’s study provides a nuanced and insightful reading of Shakespeare’s history plays to reveal this fundamental paradox; crucially, Cull also situates Shakespeare’s works within the wider developmental context of the humanist history play, discussing a broad range of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century historical and dramatic works to illuminate the centrality of ‘Welshness’.

Perhaps the most fraught aspect of this paradox is the repeated English ‘staging’ of Wales at moments of crisis in the succession (most pertinently for Shakespeare’s audience, in the establishment of the Stuart dynasty). Cull shows how the English co-opting of Welsh identity was brought out to the public in precisely these moments of communal uncertainty in order to manage and promote particular readings of the Anglo-Welsh past. This paradox is eminently visible, perhaps most so in the Henriad. The ‘fetishized’ (p. 53) Prince Hal is constructed emphatically and repeatedly as the Prince of Wales, in continual tension with his role as English heir: in 1 and 2 Henry IV, he is focused largely on asserting his independence from his father (both as his literal father and as the paterfamilias of the kingdom: a timely distinction in Jacobean England).

The first chapter provides a contextual assessment of the political uses of the literal principality and title, demonstrating a changing attitude towards the uses of the title, Wales, and Welsh identity throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Cull focuses on demonstrating how successive English monarchs used the Welsh principality and its attendant title to ‘stage’ claims about bloodlines, borders, and rights. The subsequent chapters focus on the symbolic value of Wales and its princes, and it is here that we find the most valuable contributions from Cull as she provides comprehensive analyses of well-chosen illustrative texts ranging from well-known to less well-known writers from across the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Though the title of the book makes a Shakespearian focus clear, Cull does an admirable job of integrating texts by a range of authors alongside Shakespeare’s histories.

One of the most successful sections of this book is chapter 2, which considers the symbolic roles of the principality and its title amid anxieties about the tensions and connections between Welsh and English identity (both cultural and royal). Despite the popular identification of Prince Hal as Shakespeare’s most visible Prince of Wales, Cull puts great emphasis on reminding us that Hal is not Shakespeare’s only Prince of Wales; indeed, he is not even the only Prince of Wales in the Henriad. Chapter 2 therefore focuses largely on the ‘shadowed princes’ (p. 12) in 1 and 2 Henry IV: Owen Glendower and Edmund Mortimer. Cull identifies a Jacobean anxiety about the uncertain importance of a direct, bloodline-based claim to the throne (in relation to other justifications), and points to both a sense of the ‘unfulfilled potential’ (p. 55) of Wales, and a contemporary concern with how to harness that potential for English gain. Cull discusses the apparent lack of ‘capable princes’ in Shakespeare’s histories in this context, and more specifically, in relation to the issues raised by the Tudors’ Welsh connections and the transition of the crown to the Stuarts.
Chapter 3 focuses specifically on the preoccupation of the 1590s English stage with dramatized attempts to absorb a specifically Welsh history of martial and monarchical authority. Cull uses George Peele’s *Edward I* and Shakespeare’s *Henry V* to examine the implications of these two texts’ negotiations over the English co-opting of (historically Welsh) ‘British’ mythic history, from Brutus to Arthur and beyond. The ‘Brutus’ founding myth that the Tudor monarchs promoted so energetically exemplifies the manner in which early modern English monarchs recognized the authority of the ancient Britons, and its use demonstrates the negotiations (cultural, political, and religious) required to harness that authority for a post-1066 ruling class.

Chapter 4 marks a shift from examinations of how the English Crown appropriated Welsh identity as a corollary to English power in moments of crisis to a consideration of the staging of the Jacobean ‘British’ union effort. Read through the investiture of Henry Frederick as Prince of Wales in 1610— which united the traditional titles of the Scottish and English heirs apparent for the first time—Cull shows how Shakespeare’s *Cymbeline* (written for the King’s men) and R.A.’s *The Valiant Welshman* (written for the Prince of Wales’ men) stage the role(s) of the Prince of Wales in line with their patrons’ conflicted relationship.

The final chapter looks at the aftermath of the death of James Frederick and the run up to the English Civil War, concluding that there was a significant decline in the ‘use value and the symbolic value of the princedom of Wales’ (p. 14). Among other texts (including Ben Jonson’s *For the Honour of Wales, King and Queene’s Entertainment at Richmond*, and Thomas Nabbe’s birthday masque for the future Charles II), Cull uses Milton’s *A Maske at Ludlow Castle* to show how the decades preceding the Civil War mark a lack of attention and use of the symbolic value of Wales: both the principality and the title itself. This, Cull argues, led in no small part to the literal neglect of the unifying power of the Welsh ‘other’, and contributed to the rise of divisions within the English polity.

*Shakespeare’s Princes of Wales* concludes with an unusual brief epilogue that leaps to the 1969 investiture of the current Prince of Wales, Charles Windsor. This is not a criticism; too often the early modern past is made to feel more like a foreign country than it perhaps is. This epilogue showcasing the politically sensitive and utilitarian investiture of Charles provides a point of contact between our worlds that, if not a mirror image, reminds us that there are useful analogies to be found between our sense of spectacle and that of the early modern world.

There has been a great deal of attention paid to Shakespeare’s boy actors over the past thirty years, but as Katie Knowles’s impressive first monograph *Shakespeare’s Boys: A Cultural History* shows, we have not yet understood Shakespeare’s children as well as one might have assumed. Knowles’s study seeks to participate in the relatively recent development of interdisciplinary ‘childhood studies’ to understand the cultural contexts of Shakespeare’s boy characters from the early modern period through to the present day. This monograph incorporates aspects of performance, gender, and cultural studies, but retains a tight focus on performances in British contexts. It is not a criticism of this volume to suggest that more work is required—clearly—on
non-British contexts, but rather is a compliment: Knowles has made clear how much is yet to be done on this rich and important topic.

As this book covers a very long chronological range, it is divided into two parts. Part I covers the early modern period to the Restoration, with Part II discussing the eighteenth century to the present day. Chapter 1 focuses on the aristocracy in the first tetralogy, King John, Macbeth, and The Winter’s Tale, considering how youthful heirs are subject to the often impossible (indeed, often fatal) pressures of maintaining a dual sense of self as individual leader and as dynastic representative-in-waiting; of being both a vulnerable child and the moral (and legal) superior of often proud lords. This chapter will therefore have a particular pull for readers interested primarily in Shakespeare’s history plays. Knowles presents these readings through a sociolinguistic lens, arguing that the transitional early modern usage of ‘imp’ parallels similar changes in contemporary attitudes towards the individuality of aristocratic children.

Chapter 2 examines two of the Roman plays—Titus Andronicus and Coriolanus—through the ‘hyper-masculinity’ of these early modern depictions of martial Rome. Knowles shows how the ‘little men’ who are required to stand in for their fathers demonstrate a complex attitude towards the transition to adulthood in this intensely masculine environment. While chapter 2 depicts boys imitating men, one of the most interesting aspects of chapter 3 looks at men imitating boys. The chapter looks at aspects of education in early modern England, contrasting the ‘new style’ grammar schools—and their focus on the cultivation of values and skills—with the older forms of apprenticeship (including the page system). While readers primarily interested in the history plays will enjoy Knowles’s examination of Falstaff’s Boy in 2 Henry IV and Henry V, it is Knowles’s analysis of the lords of Navarre in Love’s Labour’s Lost and the links between their scholasticism and cultivated boyhood that demonstrate the value of this approach most neatly.

Chapter 4 marks the beginning of Part II, and surveys the Restoration and eighteenth-century adaptations of Shakespeare’s works with a particular focus on the increased use of pathos in reworked versions of the histories and tragedies. Knowles argues that the increased sentimentality of the boy characters marks a process of simplification and ‘coherence’, which would lead to the reactionary rise of ‘Bardolatry’ in the later eighteenth century. Chapter 5 follows this sentimental trend into the Victorian era, considering a continuing process of idealization for children that created a context where violence against children was anathematized. Not only did this require the significant alteration of particular plays or characters (or the complete removal of particular plays from production), but it also created a vogue for female actors to play boy roles (including young girl actors as well as women), as it was felt that boy actors could not communicate the vulnerability of the child characters.

The final chapter brings the study up to the modern day, considering a range of filmic productions alongside those on stage. Knowles characterizes these productions as developing a tension between the ‘innocent’ and the ‘culpable’ child. Knowles also examines the breaking down of barriers between the ‘child’ and ‘adult’ characters, demonstrating a fluidity between ‘immature’ adults and
‘uncomfortably adult’ children in line with developing modern conceptions of the psychological role of childhood events and pressures in shaping the adult.

Knowles’s chronological sweep inevitably means that a very tight thematic focus must be maintained to avoid an endless series of digressions, and as such, it would not be fair to critique this book for not providing extensive coverage of each concept or period it touches. Knowles makes clear that there is a wealth of scholarship on early modern children that she is not attempting to ignore or replicate; despite this, a closer relationship between contemporary works and Knowles’s impressive close readings would have provided a fruitful context that otherwise is left to the reader. Nevertheless, this is a very useful and well-written book that merits close attention and is sure to refresh critical interest in Shakespeare’s children.

This has been a good year for scholarship on Shakespeare’s children: along with Knowles’s monograph on boys we have also been given Deanne Williams’s Shakespeare and the Performance of Girlhood. In a wide-ranging but well-organized study, Williams provides convincing and searching analyses read through a feminist lens; this book is about the self-conscious performance of girlhood not as an abstract point of interest for abstruse scholarship on the past, but as a conscious and continuous process that unites us with that not-always-distant past. The introduction makes this abundantly clear by connecting Williams’s own past with formal and informal performances of girlhood from the past four centuries, moving through aspects of gender history, performance studies, cultural studies, critical theory, and film studies.

Divided into three sections, this book provides an overview of performances of girlhood that will be of interest to scholars of gender, theatre, performance, history, and literature. Part I looks at the characters described as or called ‘girl’ in Shakespeare’s plays. This section shows how Shakespeare appropriated contemporary discourses of girlhood and adapted them onstage: in some ways a virtue of necessity, when we consider the male world of the Elizabethan playhouse; in others, an(other) opportunity for the playwright to call attention to aspects of cultural understanding. The first chapter, ‘Peevish and Perverse’, begins by considering the relationships between girlhood and morality, first through Joan La Pucelle in 1 Henry VI and subsequently through The Two Gentlemen of Verona, The Taming of the Shrew, and Romeo and Juliet. The second chapter will be of particular interest for readers of this section, as it examines Queen Isabelle in Richard II, encompassing Isabelle’s status as conflated first and second wife, as girl/woman, and as Anglo-French Elizabethan symbol. The third chapter takes an equally nuanced look at Ophelia and representations of girlhood and madness in Hamlet.

Part II moves forward in time to examine the more complex attitudes to the performance of girlhood found in Stuart masques. These attitudes are more ‘complex’ because of the increasing opportunities for girls and women to perform on Stuart stages, which allowed for an additional reflective layer to historical roles previously played by boys; this in turn helped fuel a rise in the number of parts written for female actors themselves.

Part III completes this trajectory by examining female writers and performers themselves, and considering how previous material and contemporary contexts were adapted by (or responded to) by these writers and actors.
Though the content covered in this section falls outside the remit of this review, it is well worth reading; it draws the material of the previous two sections together into a fascinating set of case studies that merit close attention. This volume is a necessity for anyone interested not just in Shakespeare’s girls, but also in a wide range of themes and topics touching on childhood, gender, power, and performance. If its breadth was the only thing this book contributed, it would still be worth reading; beyond that, its excellent style and interesting methodology make it clear that it is a very important addition to early modern studies.

Michael Saenger’s new monograph *Shakespeare and the French Borders of English* brings together linguistic, political, and performative boundaries to examine Anglo-French relationships and their importance in Shakespeare. Building on recent work on the interplay between language, literature, law, and performance, Saenger provides us with a study of the physical and intangible borders—and thus the identity—of Shakespeare’s England. This book thus engages with aspects of political history, historical linguistics, translation studies, and performance studies, in addition to material that will be of interest to literary critics and historians of a broader stripe. It should be emphasized that this is not a book about French influence on early modern English Shakespeare, nor a book about English depictions of France, but rather a study of how ‘Shakespeare uses the idea of France to explore language and identity’ (p. 6). In this, Saenger fits within a group of recent scholarship on the historical sociolinguistics of political and cultural identity (though this study is not an exclusively linguistic one by any means), and makes a valuable contribution to this group.

The first two chapters of the book deal largely with theory and methodology. Chapter 1 provides a theoretical background and framing for the subsequent chapters, arguing that postcolonial discourses have, in some ways, impeded Anglo-French studies; Saenger instead reads his texts through feminist and queer theoretical lenses. Chapter 2 provides a solid grounding in the historical sociolinguistic aspects of the study through case studies incorporating German and classical Greek linguistic concepts of ‘foreignness’ and the self. Saenger utilizes these case studies to demonstrate similar issues in a range of Anglo-French texts. There is much to recommend these two chapters, not least that they (Chapter 2 in particular) place the most emphasis on contextualizing Shakespeare’s representations.

The second section focuses on genre studies, considering selected texts from Shakespeare’s histories, comedies, and tragedies in turn. Chapters 3 and 4 will be of the greatest interest to readers looking for criticism on Shakespeare’s histories; they discuss representations—or, as Saenger neatly describes it, ‘a version of the memory of France’—of Anglo-French history in *Richard II* and *Henry V* (though there are a number of references to other Shakespearian plays as well) (p. 105). These are not surprising choices, dealing as they do with the loss and reconquest of France for an age concerned quite seriously with both insular and continental geopolitical borders and identities in general, along with the relatively recent memory of the Henrician French incursions. While they are not surprising (either in terms of playtext choice or critical insights), these two chapters provide clear and convincing connections to a
range of contemporary texts, ranging from the well-known *Mirror for Magistrates* to less well-known texts such as Thomas Cooper’s 1549 *Chronicle of the World*. These two chapters are highly useful in this respect. It is a shame that this book must have been in the final stages of production at the same time as *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed’s Chronicles*: chapter 3, ‘Anterior Design: Presenting the Past in *Richard II*’, in particular presents a number of excellent opportunities to engage with that rich resource. That is, of course, no fault of the author’s and does not imply a criticism of the book; however, future studies might benefit from reading these texts together. This study is highly recommended for readers interested in aspects of cultural exchange, memory, and language.

Our next item is Charlotte Scott’s *Shakespeare’s Nature: From Cultivation to Culture*. This study looks at agrarian Shakespeare: the links between the natural world and its representation in Shakespeare’s plays and in Shakespeare’s wider cultural contexts. Scott argues that the values of late Tudor and early Stuart England were shaped by the ‘terms and practices of husbandry’, in that the cultivation of the self was a form of ‘self-mastery’ that lay at the heart of early modern moral discourse (p. 2). These practices are consistently expressed through agrarian metaphors and display a fundamental concern with the establishment of order and consistency. Scott provides an extended introduction to provide a nuanced look at early modern agrarian cultural influence and importance, which helps this book connect to a developing body of scholarship on the cultural importance of early modern landscapes. While its conclusions often confirm what many scholars will already have felt, it is a valuable addition to this fruitful field of study.

This book encompasses a range of Shakespeare’s works, and readers of this section may choose to limit their attention to chapter 3, ‘*Henry V*: Humanity and Husbandry’ (though the entire book is well worth reading). This chapter focuses primarily on the Duke of Burgundy’s lengthy speech in V.ii (found in the First Folio edition of the play, but not the 1600 quarto) as exemplifying the agrarian tropic associations between virtue, peace, and husbandry. Scott focuses in particular on the associations between the plough, the practice of ploughing, and morality (specifically, Christian morality). Through the war with France, England is left ‘wild’ and unmanaged: indeed, both countries are devastated, and the destruction of the physical farmland reflects the misdirection of resources and management into war instead of peace. Burgundy’s speech seeks to remind both monarchs that ‘peace is commensurate with good management’ (p. 94).

The relationship between England and France is a complex one, and Scott argues that Burgundy’s positioning as mediator is central to the play’s conceptual development of France as a ‘new England’, a ‘space of alterity’ (p. 100) that allows for observation of the empirical results of war. The landscape itself is a form of social discourse, and the social, cultural, and environmental pressures that shape that discourse help to mark France as a kind of ethical nexus, a way for Henry V and Shakespeare’s early modern audiences to think through the management of the commonweal.

As mentioned above, this study’s utility lies in its drawing together of primary texts (dramatic, poetic, legal, and otherwise) with modern scholarship
on language, literature, and landscapes. The extensive footnotes provide a very rich network of critical connections for the reader to explore, though the discursive aspects of the footnotes can be a bit distracting. There are occasional lapses in critical assessment—the frequent mention of ‘Christian’ morality would have benefited from analysis more sensitive to the confessional complexities of the period—but that does not detract too seriously from what is a book that is sure to help further encourage the bringing together of literary, historical, and landscape studies.

Moving from the physical to the philosophical, 2014 has also seen the publication of an excellent essay collection, *Shakespeare and Continental Philosophy*. Edited by Jennifer Ann Bates and Richard Wilson, this collection represents an attempt to revisit aspects of poststructuralist thinking in Shakespeare studies by placing at the centre of this field the ‘rift’ between the aesthetic anglophone critical and philosophical approaches to Shakespeare and the positivist-flavoured European readings of England’s national symbol. These essays invite us to solve this puzzle through the pairing of particular philosophers (e.g. Nietzsche, Lacan, Aristotle) with selected plays, reading the plays through philosophical lenses that renew the emphasis on the imaginative power of the texts rather than on the historicist ‘spaces, places, people, and things’ that have become dominant in Shakespeare studies.

Most relevant to this section in *Shakespeare and Continental Philosophy* is James A. Knapp’s chapter, ‘Richard II’s Silent, Tortured Soul’ (pp. 94–120). Starting with Richard’s musings on the mirror and interiority in IV.i, Knapp examines the tensions between Richard’s material world and the internal self through the lens of Nietzsche’s understanding, in *The Birth of Tragedy*, of the productive tensions between ‘Apollonian and Dionysian forces’. Using aspects of Cartesian phenomenology and Jean-Luc Marion’s ‘givenness’, Knapp characterizes *Richard II* as a tragedy through Richard’s inability to ‘know’ his metaphysical, interior self; it is thus not Richard’s political failures that characterize the play and king, but his philosophical failures. This is a useful and provocative volume, but one feature will be applauded unanimously by all readers: it has appeared simultaneously in hardback and wallet-friendly paperback versions.

The final book to be highlighted here is David Scott Kastan’s *A Will to Believe: Shakespeare and Religion*. Kastan’s previous works are important enough that any of his publications will draw considerable attention; this review would be incomplete without at least a brief mention of the aspects of his latest book that are relevant to the histories. The book itself does an excellent job of tackling some of the perennial questions faced by Shakespeare scholars: What did Shakespeare believe? How did his beliefs affect his plays? To what extent do his plays reveal aspects of early modern belief? These are perennial questions because they are impossible to answer with any certainty (beyond the certain knowledge that scholarly attempts to answer them almost invariably reveal more about the critic than Shakespeare). Kastan mitigates this by telling us that ‘Shakespeare declines to tell us what to believe, or what he believed. But . . . he shows us that human beings do believe and in their various and variant beliefs, they discover and create complex relations to their pasts and their futures’ (p. 7). Kastan describes Shakespeare’s plays operating
in a religious world that was largely unconcerned with dogma, even in an age of intense confessional conflict. In this, Kastan follows historians like Eamon Duffy by arguing that the plays deal with the broad strokes of Christianity, which was what most people were concerned with. The plays do not engage with complicated aspects of theology; instead, Kastan identifies psychological factors as provoking most of the plays’ crises. Kastan’s closest engagement with doctrinal issues of interest to historicist readers comes in chapter 3, ‘All Roads Leads to Rome’, and most of his mentions of the history plays come in this section.

There have been a number of noteworthy articles published in 2014, foremost of which is the 2014 volume of *Shakespeare Studies*, which is concerned with food studies and Shakespeare. Of the essays within, three merit particular attention in this section, dealing as they do with a selection of history plays. The first of these is Rebecca Laroche and Jennifer Munroe, ‘On a Bank of Rue; or, Material Ecofeminist Inquiry and the Garden of Richard II’ (*ShakS* 42[2014] 42–50). Laroche and Munroe argue that the garden scene in Richard II benefits from a materialist reading—rather than a metaphorical one—to reveal the gendered aspects of the garden, scene, and characters. Laroche and Munroe argue that the Gardener is not linking the garden to England through metaphors about monarchical rule, but is suggesting practical methodologies for the maintenance of the kingdom. This essay urges scholars to think about how we incorporate the material turn into considerations of early modern food studies, and responds to several of the issues regarding the materiality of literary landscapes raised in Scott’s *Shakespeare’s Nature*.

The second of our essays in this volume considers the politics of hunger in 2 Henry VI and the English market for sack (as read through Falstaff in 1 and 2 Henry IV). In ‘Revolting Diets: Jack Cade’s “Sallet” and the Politics of Hunger in 2 Henry VI’ (*ShakS* 42[2014] 51–62) Hillary Eklund provides a view of food politics in Shakespeare from the bottom up. Eklund’s reading of this play demonstrates the interplay between hunger, poverty, criminality, and sedition, and challenges traditional associations between these forces. This essay reads food inequalities as informing political positions: the excesses of the nobility fuel ‘internecine’ battling—and further waste—while the hunger of the ‘lower’ people forces searches for new modes of resource distribution.

The last of our three essays in this volume looks at sack. In ‘“More Natural to the Nation”: Situating Shakespeare in the “Querelle de Canary”’ (*ShakS* 42[2014] 106–21), Barbara Sebek reads the role(s) of sack in early modern England through Falstaff in 1 and 2 Henry IV. Tracing the production and exchange networks that brought the extremely popular sweet wine to England and making use of the seventeenth-century epistolary travel accounts of James Howell, Sebek examines the literature of alcohol manufacture, purchase, and consumption. These networks and debates are framed through larger concerns about consumption, identity, and the body politic.

There are a number of other essays in this collection that deal with issues relevant to the study of the histories, even if they do not necessarily mention the histories themselves. Among these is Diane Purkiss’s ‘The Masque of Food: Staging and Banqueting in Shakespeare’s England’ (*ShakS* 42[2014]
This wide-ranging article brings *Timon of Athens* and *Titus Andronicus* together with a range of early modern texts including the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* [1499], Robert May’s *The Accomplisht Cook* [1660], Thomas Dawson’s *The Good Huswifes Jewell* [1596], Dekker’s *The Shoemakers Holiday* [1600] and *If It Be Not Good, the Diuel Is in It* [1612], *A Warning for Fair Women* [1599], William Davenant’s *The Cruell Brother* [1630], Thomas Goffe’s *Orestes* [1633], Heywood and Brome’s *The Witches of Lancashire* [1634], *The Wisdome of Doctor Dodypoll* [1600], George Chapman’s *The Tragedy of Alphonsus Emperour of Germany* [1654], Ben Jonson’s *A Masque of the Metamorphos’d Gypsies* [c.1621], the 1597 *Daemonologie* of James I, and others. This is an exceptionally rich reading of the staging of banqueting and performative consumption, and would benefit readers examining aspects of political performance in Shakespeare and other early modern texts.

In ‘What More Remains?’: Messianic Performance in *Richard II* (SQ 65:i[2014] 22–48), Dominic Sherman discusses *Richard II* as a performative and political laboratory, wherein objects, people, and concepts are tested and discarded. Drawing on a range of theoretical propositions and proponents, Sherman argues that criticism of *Richard II* has settled into a binary state, using as an example David Scott Kastan’s statement that Richard’s theatricality is empowered through its superficiality: ‘The “lye” of the theater demystifies the idealization of the social order that the ideology of degree demanded’ (quoted p. 24). Sherman counteracts this characterization of the ‘lye’ as impotent by arguing that a binary structure oversimplifies the nature of performative political power. For Sherman, *Richard II* paradoxically ‘defines the theatre as a specifically executed set of actions that depend on materiality to disconnect signification and to make themselves impotent, incapable, and ultimately immaterial by design’ (p. 26; emphasis in original). Richard’s subsequent deposition marks the failure of this theatricality: however, this is an active failure, a failure that cannot be achieved without the paradoxical power of its own performativity. Sherman calls this ‘messianic performance’: actions that require failed actions in a self-defeating paradox. Sherman reads this as a Pauline trope for the ‘material texture of the stage’, with a messianic Richard revealing the artifice and superficiality of performance as ‘an alternative to ideological structures of meaning-making’ (p. 26) in line with Paul’s dissection of the self in 1 Corinthians. Paul describes himself as neither a Jew nor *not* a Jew, but rather a third thing in between: this too is Richard’s place as king/not-king. This important article thus cuts against Richard as Žižek’s ‘zero at the center of the crown’, and sees Richard as both zero *and* crown (and something beyond either), and merits close attention not just from those concerned with Shakespeare’s kings, but for all early modern scholars who consider early modern representations of the past and their uses.

Moving from ‘nothing’ to the absence of memory, Jonathan Baldo’s wide-ranging ‘Shakespeare’s Art of Distraction’ (*Shakespeare* 10:i[2014] 138–57) covers a significant swathe of Shakespeare’s plays to demonstrate succinctly how Shakespeare uses distraction and forgetfulness as a key aspect of his stagecraft. As with so many aspects of his works, Shakespeare’s use of distraction interrogates the nature of that which is distracted in a self-knowing
way: the plays are themselves entertainments, and consciously seek to manipulate the attention and the sense of self of those in the audience. Baldo touches on many plays outside the remit of this section, but one particularly trenchant example falls in *Henry V*: Baldo characterizes the play as a complex game of distraction whereby the characters seek to distract each other, and Henry seeks to distract the audience most of all. Henry is pushed to war by the Church prelates who hope he will forget his efforts to appropriate Church wealth; for his part, Henry endeavours that we will all forget that he executes Bardolph for stealing from the Church—the Church that Henry himself was so assiduously working to appropriate, only forestalled by payments and the war with France. Shakespeare too is grappling with distraction: Baldo argues that the second tetralogy shows a fragmented land, so distracted as to ‘forget’ itself; Shakespeare’s Britain too is distracted, unable to reconcile official ecumenical positions with a similarly fragmented population. Baldo’s movement through the canon is deft and convincing, and elucidates with clear examples the interplay between memory and distraction in Shakespeare.

A final essay that readers of this section may find interesting is Lucy Munro’s ‘“Nemp your sexes!”: Anachronistic Aesthetics in *Hengist, King of Kent* and the Jacobean “Anglo-Saxon” Play’ (*MP* 111:iv[2014] 734–61). Though it does not cover Shakespeare’s history plays, it provides a useful reminder about the historiographical pressures that helped shape Shakespeare’s sense of English history. While this article’s consideration of the early modern senses of the Saxon/British ‘other’ is most relevant to plays like *Coriolanus* and *King Lear*, it also is applicable to the issues raised by Marisa Cull in her treatment of *Henry V*. Munro’s consideration of the ‘performative’ past also has clear importance for spectacle-rich plays like *Henry VIII*, and is well worth the attention of readers interested in a range of early modern history plays.

(e) Tragedies

One of the most important monographs in this section is Simon Palfrey’s *Poor Tom: Living ‘King Lear’*. This book explores the role of Edgar, who has more lines than anyone except the king but who is relatively ignored by critics. It argues that by attending to Edgar, and especially his role as poor Tom, we can understand how ‘He irrupts in the middle of the Edgar-role, somehow its totem, in some obscure way almost the role’s cause, at once patchwork of the already lived and previously spoken, and an image of pure potentiality’ (p. 9). It is Palfrey’s attentiveness to *King Lear*, and especially Tom, which is so compelling. The book is made up of twenty-eight short chapters, each with twelve ‘scenes’ with twelve ‘interludes’, a prelude, introduction, conclusion, and a brief afterword. With the exception of the prelude and the afterword, the book does not tend to offer the personal memoir seen in some other experimental literary criticism on Shakespeare recently.

However, there is something experimental about the monograph; as Palfrey explains in the afterword, ‘This book has a twin sister, called *Shakespeare’s*
"Possible Worlds", published by Cambridge University Press, bigger and better-mannered than "Poor Tom" (p. 257). The 'scenes' tend to work through the play, paying particular attention to the role of Edgar/Tom. The 'interludes' offer slightly more reflective responses to issues raised in the 'scenes': for example, Edgar's duel with his brother discussed in scene 11 is followed by an interlude entitled 'Jacob and Esau', which Palfrey argues offers a 'tantalizing precursor of the story of Lear's brothers' (p. 225). In some senses Palfrey's work here offers a collage of methodological frameworks, showing a range of different kinds of attention to the text and philosophical, spiritual, and theatrical possibilities; concerns about the animal and vegetable, cue-scripts, and spectres, are synthesized with thinkers such as Simone Weil, Emmanuel Levinas, and Maurice Blanchot. This range is disorienting at times, but ultimately it rewards patient reading. The final sections on the echoes of Tom in the closing moments of the play are particularly thought-provoking: 'King Lear is a play that in a profound sense happens at the deposition, in the lapsed space between one covenant and the next: between death and life, extinction and recovery, participation and eradication. And as ever, the ultimate figure for this tantalized condition is Tom' (p. 249). As well as championing the one-play Shakespeare monograph, the book offers an understanding and feeling reading of King Lear that, at heart, challenges the status quo of much Shakespeare criticism.

Another, more explicitly, critical-creative book is Tales from Shakespeare: Creative Collisions by Graham Holderness. Holderness sets out his manifesto thus: "'Creative criticism' mingles criticism and creativity together in a promiscuously hybrid discourse. Its arguments operate, as do the creative works it studies, as much by metaphor as by logical argument. And it penetrates into areas where criticism normally dares not go, deep into the subjectivity of the critic and reader. It proposes, in short, a new and fundamentally reorientated relationship between criticism and creativity" (p. xiv). Following an introduction concerning the question of 'appropriation' in relation to Hamlet and the idea of 'collision' taken from particle physics, Holderness's book consists of four parts. Each part is split into two sections: the first is more recognizably 'critical', while the second is 'creative', although, of course, Holderness is working to show how porous this boundary can be. Two parts are particularly relevant to this section. The first part considers the story of a performance of Hamlet (and Richard II), which is said to have been performed on board the Red Dragon off the coast of what is now Sierra Leone in 1607. This chapter is not out to prove the account's authenticity, but considers it as a cultural collision that can tell us something about our view of Shakespeare; the next section is followed by a 'creative-critical' (p. 35) commentary on the narrative, although this is focused on Richard II. The other relevant part is Part III, on Coriolanus, which investigates the collision between the play and Ralph Fiennes's film version. He suggests provocatively that 'in order to deepen our sense of what Shakespeare's Coriolanus has to offer us, we need to take the hero out of the play altogether'; that is, we need to try 'searching contemporary culture not just for signs of Shakespeare's Coriolanus, but also for examples of the Coriolanus figure, reproduced as a kind of contemporary folk-hero and cultural mythos' (p. 90): Holderness
offers Kathryn Bigelow’s *The Hurt Locker* and Sam Mendes’s James Bond film, *Skyfall*. The second section of this part offers a creative response to *Coriolanus* in the form of a spy-thriller narrative, which will be of interest to those working in adaptation studies and creative writing to start with. However, the book clearly has a larger axe to grind; that is, thinking through the ‘continual reciprocal traffic of exchange and transformation’ (p. 225) between ‘Shakespeare’ and ‘not Shakespeare’, as well as investigating our narration of Shakespeare and the Shakespearian tales that we carry on.

Nicole E. Miller’s *Violence and Grace: Exceptional Life between Shakespeare and Modernity* represents an important study in the seemingly ever-expanding field of studies in political theology, and one of the most important when it comes to early modern English studies. The first half of the book, entitled ‘States of Affliction’, focuses particularly on early modern drama in relation to the modern thinkers Hannah Arendt, Ernst Kantorowicz, and Carl Schmitt. As Miller explains, her ‘primary goal is not only to demonstrate the ways the playwrights explore the febrile political tensions of the period, but also to show how their works illuminate modern political phenomena originating in medieval and Renaissance political theology (p.3). The second half of the book, ‘States of Grace’, includes two chapters relevant to this section. Chapter 3, ‘Sacred Life and Sacrificial Economy: Coriolanus in No-Man’s-Land’, explores how in *Coriolanus* ‘Shakespeare captures the state of exception coupled to the transition from monarchy (*Regnum Romanum*) to fledgling Republic (*Res Publica Romanum*), a moment of crisis never really subsumed in the reordering of civic affiliation at the play’s close’ (p. 102). Typical of the theoretical dexterity shown in this book, the chapter touches on ‘the peculiar tensions inhabited by the modern citizen-soldier, thinking of these tensions in terms of the economy of the gift, its exploitations, impossibilities, and doublings’ (p. 103), before reading the play in relation to Agamben’s concept of ‘bare life’ and Walter Benjamin on violence. Thinking through the economy of the gift in the play, Miller ends by suggesting that ‘What Coriolanus represents, finally, remains a suspended grace, a token withheld, a sign never fully either inscribed or understood, even as we are called upon to “assist” in his remembrance’ (p. 132). Chapter 4, ‘The Aesthetic of Messianic Time: Gravity and Grace in *King Lear*’, responds particularly to the writing of Simone Weil. As Miller explains, ‘For Weil, “affliction” (*malheur*) provides the most insistent sense of materiality, the reminder of our fleshly presence in the world; yet, paradoxically, affliction also bears within itself the capacity to draw us toward grace. Like Paul’s “now”, Weil’s *malheur* incorporates both a sense of fate, or doom—of that which is to come—and also folds itself around the *heur*, the punctual sense of a specific time, a now’ (pp. 135–6). Miller’s chapter, which, like the rest of her monograph, is hard to do justice to here, explores how *King Lear* confronts the aesthetics of suffering. The monograph ends with a short epilogue which reflects on the stakes of reading and political life by way of the last words of the protagonist of *Timon of Athens*.

Janet Clare’s *Shakespeare’s Stage Traffic: Imitation, Borrowing and Competition in Renaissance Theatre* is an important reassessment of the way we consider Shakespeare’s plays in relation to those of his contemporaries, and the relationship between stage and page. Clare explains that she uses the term
“theatre traffic” as a simultaneously competitive and interactive process, illustrated through attention to the plays that variously interlock’ (p. 2).

Chapter 6, entitled ‘Hamlet and the Humour of Children’, reads Hamlet alongside such plays as The Spanish Tragedy, Antonio and Mellida, Antonio’s Revenge, The Malcontent, and The First Part of Jeronimo, but her reading is especially alert to the different published versions of Hamlet. ‘Poised at a crucial moment of theatrical and literary production, the textual history of Hamlet offers’, she argues, ‘a striking instance of the way plays were shaped or re-shaped to take cognizance of each other’ (pp. 166–7). ‘More than any other play by Shakespeare, although perhaps not more than any other play of its time, Hamlet is explicitly embroiled in theatrical fashion, and this intrudes into the script’ (p. 192). She ends by suggesting that ‘the publication of Q2 [Hamlet] could have been something of a riposte to the generic inventiveness of Antonio’s Revenge: a literary makeover of a popular play in response to the former’s de-construction of the genre’ (p. 194). The point of this chapter, however, is not to prove the priority of one version of a play over another, but to explore how Hamlet was not created in isolation but as part of a conversation, in print and on the stage, about theatre and revenge tragedy.

Forensic Shakespeare by Quentin Skinner is a major study of Shakespeare’s use of judicial rhetoric as a method of argument in a number of his plays, especially the tragedies. In his introduction Skinner explains that ‘By focusing on the theory of judicial rhetoric we can hope in the first place to help explain why certain of Shakespeare’s scenes have a particular shape, and why a number of individual speeches conform to a recurrent pattern and arrangement’ (p. 2). The chapters of the book do not focus on individual plays, but draw on a range of scenes from ‘several in which the dramaturgy is extensively drawn from classical and Renaissance treatises on judicial rhetoric’ (p. 1). Hamlet features as a key text: Skinner is particularly interested in the way in which characters in the plays are called upon to act as judges, ‘hearing, assessing, and delivering a verdict on the truth of what they are told’ (p. 73). Skinner also focuses on the role of rhetoric in the speeches by Brutus and Antony following the death of Caesar in Julius Caesar, and Alcibiades’ defence of Timon in Act III of Timon of Athens. In Othello, Iago ‘illustrates the age-old anxiety voiced by Plato in the Gorgias about the morality of the rhetorical arts’ (p. 251). Iago is an adept rhetorician who ‘shows himself acutely aware of the rhetorical rules for ensuring that a fabricated confirmatio can be made to sound like the truth’ (p. 252). In response to a confirmatio may come the defence, or refutatio; this Skinner explores in the closing scene of Romeo and Juliet, where the actions of Friar Lawrence and Balthasar are questioned, stating that ‘the enquiry that Shakespeare goes on to dramatize has no parallel in Arthur Brooke’s Romus and Juliet, but it closely follows the analysis in the Ad Herennium’ (p. 271), the classical book on rhetoric. The Rhetorica ad Herennium is in fact an important text in Skinner’s argument, which goes some way to showing how we have often overlooked rhetorical manuals such as this one in our assessment of Shakespeare’s books and learning and his construction of certain scenes, especially in the tragedies.

Bridget Escolme’s Emotional Excess on the Shakespearean Stage: Passion’s Slaves does play out its argument through an analysis of modern theatre and
film productions; however, it also has relevant chapters to this section. The first chapter ‘“A brain that leads my use of anger”: Choler and the Politics of Spatial Production’, reads Coriolanus in relation to anger and writers such as Plutarch, Seneca, and Montaigne on this emotion, as well as touching on Žižek’s reading of the Ralph Fiennes’s film of Coriolanus. Escolme pays particular attention to the way in which the emotion of anger seems to put characters in motion in different historical and performance settings. Hamlet is briefly considered in the chapter ‘“Stop your sobbing”: Grief, Melancholy and Moderation’, but the other main chapter relevant to this section is ‘“Give me excess of it”: Love, Virtue and Excessive Pleasure in All’s Well That Ends Well and Antony and Cleopatra’. Escolme suggests that in early modern drama love is ‘un-self-ish because it undoes the self’ (p. xxxvii). She argues that ‘Antony and Cleopatra places love in precisely the contradictory position in which it, and the passions more generally, appear in early modern philosophical treatises: though they cause violence, sickness and distress, life would be bland and humans “brutish” without them’ (p. 142). The synthesis of historical and performance studies makes this study particularly valuable.

Shakespeare’s Staged Spaces and Playgoers’ Perceptions by Darlene Farabee includes two central chapters on the tragedies. As Farabee explains in the introduction, each ‘of the following chapters focuses on an individual play to explore how stage mechanics and stage-illusion interact to produce effects for playgoers and readers’ (p. 12). In ‘Narrative and Spatial Movement in Hamlet: “To find his way”’, Farabee explores how the characters’ special interactions establish positions for playgoers. She shows how playgoers remain with ‘a non-moving Hamlet’ (p. 92) as narrative events hurry forward. The chapter, ‘Place, Perception, and Disorientation in Macbeth: “A walking shadow”’, investigates how ‘the relentless forward movement of the narrative sweeps playgoers along with Macbeth himself’ (p. 98). Darlene Farabee’s work will be of interest to those working on stage space and the affective potential of scenic apparatus on playgoers, but another key benefit is to offer a model for close reading which is sensitive to the plays and the early modern stage spaces they were performed in.

Violence, Trauma, and Virtus in Shakespeare’s Roman Poems and Plays: Transforming Ovid, by Lisa S. Starks-Estes, traces the predominant myth of Ovid’s Philomela in Shakespeare’s works, particularly those based on Roman history or myth and legend. She argues that Shakespeare ‘turns to Ovid for the means to articulate the unspeakable, to examine the erotics of aggression, and to investigate the tragic effects of violence—of trauma’ (p. 2). As might be expected, there are a number of chapters on the tragedies. ‘Shakespeare’s Perverse Astraea, Martyr’d Philomel and Lamenting Hecuba: Ovid, Sadomasochism, and Trauma in Titus Andronicus’, which deals with a sadomasochistic Tamora and the Philomela-like Lavinia, argues that Shakespeare responds to Marlowe’s Dido and Aeneas by creating ‘an Ovidian revenge play’ (p. 97). ‘Dido and Aeneas “Metamorphis’d”: Ovid, Marlowe, and the Masochistic Scenario in Antony and Cleopatra’ continues this Marlovian interest exploring how Shakespeare ‘out-Ovids’ (p. 112) Marlowe and Ovid by creating, in Antony and Cleopatra, an anti-epic heroism. These chapters are in Part I, ‘Love’s Wound: Violence, Trauma, and Ovidian
Transformation in Shakespeare’s Roman Poems and Plays. Part II deals with ‘Transforming Bodies: Trauma, Virtus, and the Limits of Neo-Stoicism in Shakespeare’s Roman Poems and Plays’. Two essays in this section deal with the body and an Ovidian poetics of transformation: ‘Bleeding Martyrs: The Body of the Tyrant/Saint, the Limits of ‘Constancy’, and the Extremity of the Passions in Julius Caesar’; and ‘‘One whole wound”: Virtus, Vulnerability, and the Emblazoned in Coriolanus’. Shakespeare emerges here as ‘an anti-Augustan, Ovidian poet-playwright’ (p. 144). The book is concerned with sources and politics in the early modern period; however, its other psychoanalytical approaches mean that it also has much to offer on the way in which violence and trauma are represented.

Hospitality and Treachery in Western Literature, by James A.W. Heffernan, is a wide-ranging monograph, as the title suggests, but it contains a useful chapter on Shakespeare. Following chapters on classical and biblical hospitality, as well as one on Beowulf and Gawain, chapter 4, ‘Staging Hospitality: Shakespeare’, has sections on Timon of Athens, King Lear, Macbeth, and also The Winter’s Tale. His essay explores a historical shift in emphasis, when ‘the word hospitality came to mean not sustenance for the poor but entertainment, often lavish entertainment of the rich and influential’ (p. 119); thus, this ‘turns hospitality into showmanship’ (p. 119). Perhaps predictably, ‘Timon is virtually devoured by his guests’ (p. 121), while King Lear ‘exemplifies the violation of Christian hospitality’ (p. 122) and Macbeth the ‘subversion of hospitality’ (p. 129). And yet putting the plays in the larger context of hospitality in literature helps to identify how Shakespeare’s plays ‘test the very meaning of hospitality in his own time’ (p. 148).

Christopher Warley’s Reading Class through Shakespeare, Donne and Milton includes a chapter entitled ‘Just Horatio’; this chapter revises the article published as ‘Specters of Horatio’ (ELH 75[2008] 1023–5). For Warley, ‘the social position of Horatio remains tantalizingly unclarified’ and thus ‘The specter of Horatio presiding over Hamlet becomes the name and the means for class criticism generally’ (p. 70). He suggests, following Harold Bloom, that ‘reading or viewing Hamlet requires identifying, one way or another, with Horatio (p. 48). Warley’s approach is thus particularly concerned with the act of interpretation and hesitation. The monograph includes this chapter in the context of a reading of Shakespeare, Donne, and Milton with a close reading which is lightly inflected by thinkers such as Adorno, Bourdieu, and Derrida.

Another book attuned to modern thinkers is All for Nothing: Hamlet’s Negativity by Andrew Cutrofello, which is published in the Short Circuits series edited by Slavoj Žižek. He examines how, ‘For the past four hundred years, Hamlet has been lurking... in the space of philosophical positions’ (p. 14): ‘What the figure of the Sophist represented for Plato, Hamlet has represented for modern philosophers’ (back cover). The five chapters are centred on five forms of Hamlet’s negativity: ‘his melancholy, negative faith, nihilism, tarrying, and non-existence’ (p. 13); his ‘non-existence’ can refer to his death or his status as a fictional character. According to Cutrofello, these forms roughly correspond to the five stages of the play, although not quite the five acts. All for Nothing is an extraordinarily learned work which deals with a large range of thinkers from Descartes and Deleuze to Schopenhauer and
Schmitt, as well as taking in nearly all of Shakespeare’s plays at one point or other. This is a book as much about these, mostly Continental, thinkers as it is about Shakespeare, but it deserves to be read by those working on *Hamlet*, and on Shakespeare in relation to philosophy.

Leon Harold Craig’s *Philosophy and the Puzzles of Hamlet: A Study of Shakespeare’s Method* will be regarded by many working in English studies as something of a curiosity. Working in the traditions of analytic philosophy, it argues that, with *Hamlet*, ‘the most oft-cited problems and criticisms are actually solvable puzzles’ (back cover). Craig comments of recent *Hamlet* criticism that, ‘if I suspect that a particular piece of criticism would be practically unintelligible to Shakespeare, it’s of little use to me’ (p. 14); Craig argues that this is because he is trying to ‘understand Shakespeare’s plays as he most likely understood them himself’ (p. 14). However, Craig’s enterprise tends to see *Hamlet* as literature to be read, and furthermore as a ‘consummate work of reason’ (p. 189; emphasis in original). There is good evidence to suggest that early modern people did imagine Shakespearian drama as being literature, but Craig hardly touches on the similarities and differences between theatre audiences and readers. Thus, the book’s argument tends to put puzzle-reading philosophers on the one hand, and ‘non-philosophical readers’ (p. 4) and theatre-goers on the other: ‘the pursuit of an answer to a recognizable puzzle will lead a thoughtful student of the play to notice other curious features which are easily overlooked in a performance, or in initial and superficial readings’ (p. 6). Nevertheless, those perplexed by the questions of *Hamlet*, such as the protagonist’s madness, or ‘the relationship between acting and actual life’ (p. 85), will find in this book a whole range of insights on these questions.

*Shakespeare’s ‘Whores’: Erotics, Politics and Poetics*, by Kay Stanton, includes a chapter on ‘The Heroic Tragedy of Cleopatra: The “Prostitute Queen”’. An earlier version of this chapter appeared as an essay in 2002 in *The Female Tragic Hero in English Renaissance Drama*, edited by Naomi Conn Lieble, but was not reviewed then. She argues that ‘Cleopatra’s deserved status as tragic hero can be recovered by focusing less on what is demonstrably repressive and misogynistic Aristotelian tradition and more on the roots and psychic functions of tragedy’ (p. 71). The chapter features in Stanton’s monograph among a series of chapters examining female sexuality in the context of the word ‘whore’ in Shakespeare.

Alex Schulman’s *Rethinking Shakespeare’s Political Philosophy: From Lear to Leviathan* is the first monograph in the Edinburgh Critical Studies in Shakespeare and Philosophy series edited by Kevin Curran. The book is split into two parts: ‘Shakespearean Antiquity’ and ‘Shakespearean Modernity’. Relevant chapters include ‘Pagan Christs: Politics in the Roman Plays’, in the first part, and ‘King Lear and the State of Nature’, in the second. In the first of these, Schulman pays attention to the concept of civic virtue, arguing that ‘Coriolanus, Julius Caesar and Antony and Cleopatra’ depict differing conceptions of the person, refracted through shifting regimes: not only political regimes, the classical-monarchy-aristocracy-democracy model that set the terms for Aristotle’s heirs, but philosophical and psychological regimes, regimes of individual and collective self-understanding in transition between
Paganism and Christianity’ (p. 56). Rather than moving through the plays in the chronology of authorship, he moves through Roman history, ‘covering the decline of the republic and coming of empire, and of Christianity in Julius Caesar and Antony and Cleopatra’ (p. 57). Schulman reads King Lear in relation to modern social contract theory; in The Secular Contract: The Politics of Enlightenment [2011], Schulman argued that social contract theory was intertwined with secularization, ‘dethroning the timeless Theos of scriptural revelation to enable free collective reconstruction politics’ (p. 24). The second half of his book on Shakespeare explores how ‘The social contract represents a second birth into political maturity, modern liberal democracy’s supersession (or ersatz) of the older rites of rebirth anchoring tribal ritual and religious conversion. This trope unites Hobbes’ Leviathan, Spinoza’s Tractus, Locke’s Second Treatise on Civil Government, Rousseau’s Du contrat social, and Kant’s political essays’ (p. 24). Schulman suggests ‘King Lear as a dramatic prototype for a construction (story? fable?) subsequently influential in early modern political theory: the state of nature prompting a social contract’ (p. 123). Those already familiar with the history of political philosophy will find this book most useful as it ventures speedily from Plato and Aristotle right across, via Shakespeare, to Hobbes and Kant.

Kurt A. Schreyer’s Shakespeare’s Medieval Craft: Remnants of the Mysteries on the London Stage explores the synergies of medieval theatrical traditions and Shakespearian drama. The monograph includes an opening chapter, ‘Toward a Renaissance Culture of Medieval Artifacts’, and one on the Chester Banns, before chapters on individual Shakespeare plays next to medieval ones; these explore how Shakespeare’s plays recollect mystery plays, even as they reinscribe medieval elements with new significance. ‘Then Is Doomsday Near’: Hamlet, the Last Judgement, and the Place of Purgatory’ focus on the space under the stage: Hamlet seeks not only to murder his father’s killer but, like the stage devils of the Last Judgement, to send his soul off to Hell’ (p. 129). The final chapter is entitled ‘Here’s a Knocking Indeed!’: Macbeth and the Harrowing of Hell’. Schreyer argues that Hell also had ‘an “aural scene” that Shakespeare’s audience would readily have recognized from its experience of provincial mystery drama’ (p. 151). So, an audience at the Globe might hear knocking but they could also remember the ‘aura of Hell from the mysteries’ (p. 152). The extent to which early modern audiences did remember medieval drama at such times is difficult to ascertain, but Schreyer’s study will be of use to those working on early modern material culture in the theatre and examining the medieval remains in Shakespearian drama.

Shakespeare in London is a volume co-authored by Hannah Crawforth, Sarah Dustagheer, and Jennifer Young that features several chapters on the tragedies. Each chapter pairs one Shakespearian text with a place, street, or institution in London, working chronologically from Titus Andronicus in 1594 to Henry VIII in 1613, and, as if that was not clever enough, the chapters move geographically from west to east London. In addition, each chapter has a topic, such as violence, politics, or class; so the first chapter is entitled ‘Violence in Shakespeare’s London: Titus Andronicus (1594) and Tyburn’. Other relevant chapters include ‘Class in Shakespeare’s London: Romeo and Juliet (1595–6) and the Strand’, ‘Religion in Shakespeare’s London (1600–1)
and St Paul’s’, ‘Medicine in Shakespeare’s London: King Lear (1605–6) and Bedlam’, and ‘Economics in Shakespeare’s London: Timon of Athens (1607) and the King’s Bench Prison, Southwark’. This is a dexterous undertaking which pays off in terms of introducing students to a cultural materialist and historically savvy approach to the plays which does not lose sight of Shakespeare’s language: as the authors explain in the acknowledgements, this book originates in a course on ‘Shakespeare’s London’ at King’s College, London. The book will be particularly helpful for students of Shakespeare, but scholars interested in the representation of London will also want to consult it.

Arden Shakespeare published a number of student-focused guides to Shakespeare in 2014. Laurie Maguire’s Othello: Language and Writing, in the Arden Student Skills: Language and Writing series, follows in the footsteps of Emma Smith’s Macbeth: Language and Writing, reviewed last year. The Othello volume contains chapters on ‘Language and Narrative’, ‘Language and Genre’, ‘Language and Boundaries’, and, as usual, ‘Writing Tips and Topics’. The section on ‘Language and Genre’ contains more on performance history and Shakespeare’s contemporaries than the Macbeth volume, but it maintains the series’ focus on Shakespeare’s language. This series is clearly one of the most useful of its kind.

Moving to edited collections, this year also saw the publication of two volumes concerned with the tragedies in the Arden Shakespeare State of Play series. This series acts as a helpful parallel to the Arden Student Skills series but offers a range of essays by different contributors on the play in question; not all of these essays are aimed simply at students, but offer new research as well. Macbeth: The State of Play, edited by Ann Thompson, is split into four parts. Part I, ‘The Text and its Status’, contains a piece by Anthony B. Dawson on ‘Notes and Queries Concerning the Text of Macbeth’ and one by Brett Gamboa on ‘Dwelling “in doubtful joy”: Macbeth and the Aesthetics of Disappointment’, which works from the impression that ‘No other play by Shakespeare has so extensive a history of disappointing audiences’ (p. 31) and goes on to think through how the play might be structured to create this effect. Part II deals with ‘History and Topicality’ and contains three essays: Dermot Cavanagh’s on ‘Politic Bodies in Macbeth’, Debapriya Sarkar on ‘“To crown my thoughts with acts”: Prophecy and Prescription in Macbeth’ and one by Kevin A. Quarmby on ‘Lady Macbeth, First Ladies and the Arab Spring: The Performance of Power on the Twenty-First-Century Stage’; the first two essays deal with early modern history, while the third considers modern performance and the media’s construction of Hillary Clinton as a Lady Macbeth figure. Part III contains ‘Critical Approaches and Close Reading’: Darlene Farabee on ‘“A walking shadow”: Place, Perception and Disorientation in Macbeth’ discusses how ‘Macbeth’s moral and psychological deterioration manifests itself through his inability accurately to perceive his location and direction’ (p. 138), and contrasts this with Banquo; the other essays include Geraldo U. de Sousa on ‘Cookery and Witchcraft in Macbeth’, and Jonathan Hope and Michael Witmore on ‘The Language of Macbeth’. The final part is entitled ‘Adaptation and Afterlife’: Sandra Clark examines evidence concerning the text used in Macbeth productions in ‘The Shapes of Macbeth: The Staged Text’; Philippa Sheppard writes on ‘Raising the Violence
while Lowering the Stakes: Geoffrey Wright’s Screen Adaptation of *Macbeth*, a film on drug gangs set in present-day Melbourne; and the final essay is by Ramona Wray on ‘The Butcher and the Text: Adaptation, Theatrically and the “Shakespea(Re)-Told” *Macbeth*, which considers the 2005 adaptation of *Macbeth* in the BBC’s Shakespeare(Re)-Told season.

*Othello: The State of Play*, edited by Lena Cowen Orlin, is not divided into parts. It includes ten essays on various topics: Laurie Maguire on ‘*Othello*, Theatre Boundaries, and Audience Cognition’; Lois Potter on ‘“All’s One”: Cinthio, *Othello* and A *Yorkshire Tragedy’; Robert Hornback on ‘“Speak[ing] Parrot” and Ovidian Echoes in *Othello*: Recontextualizing Black Speech in the Global Renaissance’; Ian Smith on ‘Othello’s Black Handkerchief’ (this appeared as a journal article, reviewed last year); Ambereen Dadabhoy on ‘Two Faced: The Problem of Othello’s Visage’, which explores ‘Shakespeare’s ambivalent construction of Othello through a re-turn to the geographic, cultural, and imperial hegemonies of the eastern Mediterranean’ (pp. 122–3); Lynn Enterline on ‘Eloquent Barbarians: *Othello* and the Critical Potential of Passionate Character’, where she argues that ‘*Othello* both uses and interrogates the grammar school’s language, curriculum, and disciplinary methods for achieving eloquence by giving classically inflected methods for achieving eloquence to precisely those characters its rhetorical training was designed to exclude: women and “barbarians”’ (p. 154); James Siemon on ‘Making Ambition Virtue? *Othello*, Small Wars, and Martial Profession’, which explores ‘Shakespeare’s first post-war tragedy’ (p. 178); David Schalkwyk on ‘Othello’s Consummation’, which reads the play in relation to Lucretian accounts of love and desire; Robert N. Watson on the linking of neologisms and synonyms in ‘Othello’s Double Diction’; and, finally, Colleen Ruth Rosenfeld on ‘Shakespeare’s Nobody’, which considers the issue of who or what is knocking in Act IV, scene iii, and its repercussions for our understanding of the play. Like the *Macbeth* volume, this book will be useful for undergraduates, but it will also be valuable to scholars writing on the play.

*Shakespeare and Renaissance Ethics*, edited by Patrick Gray and John D. Cox, is a particularly powerful volume. The editors’ contextualizing introduction suggests that ‘the pendulum of critical moment, having swung too far in the direction of abstract theorizing, may now be at risk of swinging too far in the opposite direction, that of materialist detail . . . One purpose of an anthology such as the present one is to help the field recover some sort of equilibrium’ (p. 11). The essays in this volume, then, unashamedly address such issues as ‘ideas’, ‘thinking’, and ‘human moral choice’ (p. 13), but with an awareness of past critical disputes. Part I is entitled ‘Shakespeare and Classical Ethics’. It starts with Gordon Braden’s essay on ‘Fame, Eternity and Shakespeare’s Romans’, which reads suicide in *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra* in relation to classical and Christian views on the subject, and early modern representations of suicide: ‘When Shakespeare does dramatize an unmistakably Roman suicide, he displays a scrupulousness that his fellow dramatists do not always show. The scruple has to do with what the imminent suicide imagines will happen next’ (p. 42). So, in *Julius Caesar*, Brutus does not anticipate a heavenly afterlife, as he appears to in North’s translation of Plutarch’s *Lives*. Similarly, Braden argues that Antony and Cleopatra are not
Part II of the book, ‘Shakespeare and Christian Ethics’, includes a chapter on ‘Shakespeare’s Prayers’, which deals in part with Claudius’s prayer in *Hamlet* and ‘the distinction between “contrition” and “attrition”’ (p. 129) in Christian theology. ‘The Morality of Milk: Shakespeare and the Ethics of Nursing’, by Beatrice Groves, is also in this second part of the book. She writes that an ‘aphorism of the early modern period stated that milk could transmit morals and that a child might be infected by the weak principles of the woman who nursed him: “he sucked evil from the dug”’ (p. 139). Her essay includes subsections on *Romeo and Juliet* and *Coriolanus* that explore some of the times that Shakespeare alludes to this aphorism; however, she finds that Shakespeare’s wet-nurses do not follow this convention: Groves argues that nursing is ‘an apt symbol for Christian ethics . . . Shakespeare’s nuancing of these fears and prejudices can be read as an ethical position celebrating the nonblood ties that bind communities together and a redemption of the female, lower-class “other”’ (p. 154). Also in this part, Russel M. Hiller writes on ‘Hamlet the Rough-Hewer: Moral Agency and the Consolation of Reformation Thought’. He argues that ‘Hamlet’s antic disposition throughout the tragedy’s long middle is his active response to the problematic world of Elsinore, his method of “rough-hewing” his way until he is morally satisfied to face his destiny as revenger’ (p. 168). Hamlet, in this view, is not stuck in an ‘ultra-Calvinist, predestined prison’ (p. 161): he is a ‘moral dynamo’ (p. 177).

The final part of the book is entitled ‘Shakespeare and the Ethical Thinking of Montaigne’: the essays in this section compare and contrast the two ‘thinkers’ because, ‘Like Shakespeare, Montaigne engaged closely with a wide range of both classical and Christian reflections on ethics’ (p. 21). Patrick Gray’s ‘“HIDE THY SELFE”: Montaigne, Hamlet, and Epicurean Ethics’ suggests that Montaigne followed the ‘Epicurean principle “lathe biosas” (live unnoticed)’ (p. 213) and that *Hamlet*, and particularly Hamlet’s behaviour, can be seen as a critique of this principle, and perhaps implicitly of Montaigne himself. The other relevant essay in this section is ‘Madness, Proverbial Wisdom, and Philosophy in *King Lear*’ by Peter Mack. Mack works from the fact that informal moral philosophy was part of the grammar-school curriculum, and was read and collected in the form of aphorisms in particular. He argues that both Shakespeare and Montaigne ‘used narratives to reflect on the truth and applicability of moral sententiae’: ‘where the proverbs and axioms summarise established moral teaching on different sides of a question, Lear’s wild perceptions and the bleak narrative of the play offer the audience new ways of thinking about these issues’ (p. 284). This essay’s focus on humans and animals via Montaigne could also make it productive to be read alongside Laurie Shannon’s *The Accommodated Animal*, reviewed last year, which this essay does not mention. Overall, this volume may strike some as being very old-school, but the baby should not be thrown out with the bathwater: there is a great deal of high-calibre thinking at work here.
The Return of Theory in Early Modern English Studies, volume 2, edited by Paul Cefalu, Gary Kuchar, and Bryan Reynolds, follows on from a volume in 2010 edited by Reynolds and Cefalu. In Part I, on ‘Posthumanism’, Joseph Campana’s essay on ‘The Bee and the Sovereign (II): Segments, Swarms, and the Shakespearean Multitude’ will be of particular interest to researchers in animal studies and political theology, as it responds to work in these fields in a reading of Coriolanus. As well as drawing out the political ramifications of the language of bees in relation to sovereignty and the multitude, the essay argues that ‘The value of a new wave of work on early modern creatures is that this first wave of work that primarily treats a restricted range of creatures and that primarily revolves around the problem of human exceptionalism might be expanded not merely for the sake of greater inclusivity but so as to encourage greater complexity in how we frame life in its many forms in the Renaissance’ (p. 63).

Part III, on ‘Historical Phenomenology’, includes two relevant essays. In ‘Shakespearean Softscapes: Hospitality, Phenomenology, Design’, Julia Reinhard Lupton continues her work exploring the affinities between design theory and Shakespearean drama, ending by analysing the ‘hostile softscape’ of Birnam Wood in Macbeth: ‘What the softscape paradigm allows us to apprehend is the extent to which environments of entertainment, including their battlefield inversions, are composed indifferently of both living and fashioned stuff (foliage, flags, banners, drums, trumpets, blood, breath), fluid entities whose phenomenal effects (sound, color, motion, smell and their mutual melding) course among natural and media ecologies, eroding their distinctions by creating alternative rivulets of meaning and agency and becoming figures for the shifts and feints of consciousness itself’ (pp. 156–7).

Also in Part III is ‘Describing the Sense of Confession in Hamlet’ by Matthew J. Smith; he proposes that early modern drama can be read as a form of phenomenological description. Focusing on Claudius’s confession scene, he argues that ‘the scene’s sense of confessionality is less a direct and simple effect of Claudius’s speech than it is a diffusion of the penitent’s interior struggle into its perceptual environment’ (p. 167). Shakespearean drama, Smith suggests, ‘enacts phenomenological description by presenting actions like confession—actions typically understood as only secondarily perceptible—in their distinct inaccessibilities’ (p. 180). Those working on Shakespeare cannot be expected to include reference to every relevant article in their work, but this essay could be read fruitfully alongside Joseph Sterrett’s ‘Confessing Claudius: Sovereignty, Fraternity and Isolation at the Heart of Hamlet’ (TPr 23:5[2009] 739–61).

Gothic Renaissance: A Reassessment, edited by Elisabeth Bronfen and Beate Neumeier, follows from a conference in Cologne on the English Renaissance and the Gothic. The first part, entitled ‘Shakespearean Hauntings’, includes two chapters on Hamlet. In ‘Yorick’s Skull’, John Drakakis starts by considering the skull used in the David Tennant Hamlet at the RSC. He asks: ‘how might the strange case of André Tchaikowsky’s skull, and his wish that it should be used in modern performance of Hamlet, help to illuminate a “Gothic” strain in Shakespeare’s Hamlet that we might even wish to extend to Renaissance writing generally?’ (p. 26). In an answer that takes in Freud,
Bataille, Derrida, and a number of other early modern playwrights and eighteenth- and nineteenth-century writers, Drakakis suggests that it ‘is the question whether we can consider Shakespeare and his contemporaries as “Gothic” writers in their culturally specific engagement with “history” that intertextual events such as the re-animation of André Tchaikowsky’s skull as the dead jester Yorick, bring into focus for us’ (p. 29).

The essay by Drakakis is followed by Catherine Belsey’s ‘Beyond Reason: Hamlet and Early Modern Stage Ghosts’. This essay considers the evidence for the idea that Hamlet had a hand in the development of the Gothic genre. Belsey reads the ghost in Hamlet in the context of classical drama and popular storytelling, suggesting that ‘Shakespeare’s uncanny apparition represents a new departure in early modern drama’ and that ‘the fascination of what exceeds mortal understanding was eagerly taken up by some of the dramatist’s own contemporaries’ (p. 32). Belsey suggests that the fascination with undecidability in Hamlet can be seen translated in the later Gothic novel, ‘as it continued to permit in fiction the return of an undecidability Enlightenment science longed to dispel’ (p. 50). Her contribution is both theoretically informed and historically aware, and shares Janet Clare’s attention to intertexuality in her monograph, reviewed above. Part IV, entitled ‘Persistence of the Gothic’, includes an essay on ‘Shakespeare, Ossian and the Problem of “Scottish Gothic” ’, which discusses how ‘Macbeth frequently served as the lens through which “Gothic” Scotland was perceived and represented’ in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (p. 239); it can be fruitfully read alongside Macbeth: A Critical Reader, edited by John Drakakis and Dale Townshend, reviewed last year.

Edited by Jennifer Ann Bates and Richard Wilson, with an introduction by the latter, Shakespeare and Continental Philosophy is touted as ‘the first collection to explore the interface between continental thinking and Shakespeare’s plays’ (back cover). A number of essays touch on Shakespeare’s tragedies, but four are especially relevant. Jennifer Ann Bates’s essay, ‘Hamlet and Kierkegaard on Outwitting Recollection’, reads Hamlet next to Kierkegaard’s pseudonymously authored Concluding Unscientific Postscript to Philosophical Fragments. She reads these ‘two Danish melancholics’ as people who both see themselves ‘as having to set right the joint of time’ (p. 40). She argues that the ‘central image in Hamlet and Postscript is . . . that of a grave out of which and into which things rise and fall back. The task for Hamlet and [Kierkegaard’s pseudonymous author] Climacus is to make the plot into a moment of genuine embodiment that becomes, has actual, forward movement’ (p. 41). Author of Hegel and Shakespeare on Moral Imagination [2010], Bates focuses on the oaths of Hamlet and the graveyard scene depicted in Postscript to reflect on theatre, existentialism, and ‘the ghostly call to remember’ (p. 46).

‘Is Othello Jealous? Coleridge and Russell contra Wittgenstein and Cavell’, by Andrew Cutrofello, explores the relationship between jealousy and scepticism. Following Coleridge, Cutrofello suggests that Othello is not prone to suspicion and jealousy, as Leontes is in The Winter’s Tale; rather, Othello is a sceptic. It is Iago who transforms ‘Othello’s scepticism into something like jealousy by allegedly warning him against it’ (p. 127). Besides
taking in thinkers who have read *Othello* and considering Descartes’s own scepticism, the essay is a philosophical reflection on the nature of jealousy: ‘something like scepticism underlies Othello’s jealousy, while something like jealousy underlies Descartes’ scepticism’ (p. 123). As the final footnote explains, a different version of some of this material appears in *All for Nothing*, reviewed above.

Edward S. Casey’s ‘Hamlet on the Edge’ works from the premise that borders are often more fixed and determined, whereas a boundary is ‘a comparatively porous edge’ (p. 136). As Casey concedes, ‘the distinction between “border” and “boundary” is mostly [his], but the argument that death is a land whose edge is boundary-like is Hamlet’s’ (pp. 136–7). Casey reads Shakespeare alongside Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty in a consideration of the boundary states in *Hamlet*, especially sleeping, dreaming, Hamlet’s madness, and ‘the intermediacy [sic] of mirrors’ (p. 139); his essay is a good example of thinking *with* Shakespeare, because Casey goes on to consider the repercussions of the play and these boundary states for the understanding of our own existence: ‘we are “beings of the between” who live from one intermediacy to another, all the while remaining in the *metaxu* of our life as a whole’ (p. 144).

‘“No” as Affirmation: A Continental-Philosophical Reading of *Coriolanus*’, by Bernard Freydberg, works from Mary Beard’s suggestion that ‘the study of the classics is the study of what happens in the gap between antiquity and us’ (quoted p. 236). Freydberg focuses on the character of Coriolanus’s wife, Virgilia. He argues that in Act I, scene iii, when Volumnia insists that her daughter-in-law should spend time with her, and Virgilia responds ‘No, good madam, I will not out of doors’ (I.iii.72), her ‘“No” is affirmative in every essential sense’ (p. 242). Her ‘No’ affirms her independence and her fearlessness in the face of ridicule, but Freydberg also suggests that her ‘No’ is the ‘only means of self-assertion available to her’ (p. 243). He goes on to draw parallels between the natures of Virgilia and Coriolanus, and ends by affirming that in their difference ‘the perhaps untimely theme of *Coriolanus* emerges: the awesome power of human marital love’. Freydberg’s argument is not always entirely convincing, but his attention to Virgilia is valuable.

Turning to journal articles, Arthur F. Kinney’s ‘Recognizing Shakespearian Tragedy’ (*ShS* 67[2014] 221–34) responds to the writing influenced by cognitive science, such as that of Daniel Gardner in *The Science of Fear* [2009], to suggest that Shakespeare’s own tragedies are frequently structured via fear: ‘Galen taught Shakespeare that the primal passion of fear alone lay at the heart of tragedy for the characters in the play’ (p. 224). After briefly considering the shaping of fear in Shakespeare’s comedies and histories, Kinney goes on to explore the role of fear in *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, and *King Lear*. A footnote explains that this article is a companion piece to ‘Recognizing Leontes’ (*ShS* 63[2010] 326–37). His article also offers a useful insight into early modern writing on the passions, such as those by Thomas Wright and Robert Burton, with a view to understanding how Shakespeare’s first audiences might have interpreted the characters’ supposed emotional states.

Other particularly relevant essays in *Shakespeare Survey* that may be of interest include: ‘*Othello* Across Borders: On an Interlocal and Intermedial
Exercise’ (ShS 67[2014] 327–34) by Rui Carvalho Homem, on ‘Bandanna’ (1999), an opera by Daron Aric Hagen with a libretto by the Irish poet Paul Muldoon, [which] dislocates the plot of Othello to the fraught setting of a town on the border of the US and Mexico in the internationally momentous year of 1968; B.J. Sokol’s ‘John Berryman’s Emendation of King Lear 4.1.10 and Shakespeare’s Scientific Knowledge’ (ShS 67[2014] 335–44); and ‘Spectacle, Representation and Lineage in Macbeth 4.1’ (ShS 67[2014] 345–71) by William C. Carroll.

In ‘Classical Quotation in Titus Andronicus’ (ELH 81:iii[2014] 787–810) Pramit Chaudhuri explores the four Latin quotations in the play, suggesting that ‘their notorious garbling reflects the thematic concerns of the play as a whole’ (p. 787). Chaudhuri follows Brian Vickers’s attribution, which would assign the two Senecan quotations to George Peele, and argues that ‘Peele’s advanced training in Latin suggests that the wording of the two Senecan quotations was not an error of language or memory, but rather a deliberate adaptation’ (p. 788). Chaudhuri shows how the theme of mutilation in the play ‘extends to the very atomic level of Latin citations’ (p. 802).

Lori Schroeder’s ‘The Only Witness a Tongueless Child: Hearing and Reading the Silent Babes of Titus Andronicus and The Winter’s Tale’ (MRDE 27[2014] 221–47) begins by analysing a story of child murder reported in various early modern broadside accounts; a child witness loses her tongue at the murder scene. Schroeder argues that the accounts point towards ‘a keen desire for closure that is both aesthetically and socio-politically reassuring’ (p. 222). Paying particular attention to Lavinia and the silent Lucius and infant at the end of the play, she suggests that, in ‘an attempt to close down anxiety, [Titus Andronicus] in many ways only opens up its own nervousness, essentially doubling and compounding it’ (p. 237).

J.K. Barret’s ‘Chained Allusion, Patterned Futures, and the Dangers of Interpretation in Titus Andronicus’ (ELR 44:iii[2014] 454–85) examines how Titus Andronicus ‘constructs its present tense on literary historical terms: not only is the play overwhelmingly devoted to classical allusion and imitation, but its characters also constantly and overtly refer to these texts’ (p. 453). Shakespeare’s characters act out scenes from Ovid’s Metamorphoses without an awareness of the consequences. Barret’s work is focused on temporality and interpretation; characters live out and interpret events via textual models, which foreclose the future.

John McGee had two articles published on Romeo and Juliet this year. ‘Piloted by Desire: The Nautical theme in Romeo and Juliet’ (ES 95:iv[2014] 392–409) picks out the conceit of Cupid as a suicidal ships’ pilot, a god who pilots Romeo. McGee examines the nautical theme in relation to the source, Arthur Brooke’s Romeus and Juliet: in Brooke ‘the maritime imagery powerfully conveys the lovers’ subjugation to forces beyond their control’ (pp. 397–8); in Shakespeare they ‘convey wilful self-endangerment’ (p. 398). This essay clearly complements Laurence Publicover’s essay on ‘Shakespeare at Sea’, reviewed below. ‘A Set of Wit Well-Played in Romeo and Juliet Act 2, Scene 3?’ (Shakespeare 10:i[2014] 1–22), by John McGee, examines the contest of wit between Romeo and Mercutio, arguing that, far from there being...
friendly banter between them, an unchanging Romeo is thoroughly outwitted by a satirical Mercutio.

In ‘Tragic Proportions: The Art of Tyranny and the Politics of the Soul in Hamlet’ (ELR 44:i[2014] 78–107) Katherine Bootle Attie suggests that, ‘Like Plato in The Republic, Shakespeare in Hamlet aestheticizes tyranny as a misperception of size, scale, and proportion’ (p. 80). Key figures in her argument include Hamlet, Claudius, Laertes, Pyrrhus, and Fortinbras, but the article also focuses on the concept of audience. The idea of a tyrannically clapping audience in the play, she argues, comes from Plato’s Republic, where ‘Socrates reasons that tyranny can happen to anybody because it is as much a moral state as a political one’ (p. 79). Both tyranny and tragedy display an ‘art of disproportion’ (p. 84).

András Kiséry’s ‘“I Lack Advancement”: Public Rhetoric, Private Prudence, and the Political Agent in Hamlet, 1561–1609’ (ELH 81:i[2014] 29–60) explores the politics of Hamlet in relation to earlier stories of Hamlet, or Amlethus. He argues that, rather than representing the conflict between Claudius and Hamlet as one of public politics or the commonwealth, as it is in source texts, Shakespeare’s Hamlet ‘carefully and consciously confines itself to an exploration of political actions from the perspective of prudence and of personal loyalties’ (p. 31). Kiséry’s thesis is that this shift marks a change in the history of Hamlet and of English drama. Like Attie’s piece, this one pays special attention to the representation of tyranny, but Kiséry also goes on to address the representation of the political network of agents bound to a patron in relation to early modern political culture.

Seth Lerer, in ‘Hamlet’s Poem to Ophelia and the Theatre of the Letter’ (ELH 81:iii[2014] 841–63), argues that ‘Among the most dramatically and typographically enigmatic of the play’s scenes is the one of Hamlet’s love letter to Ophelia’ (p. 842). He explores the different representations and printings of the scene in Q1, Q2, the First Folio, and later editions such as Rowe’s, arguing that they display ‘not garbled versions of a Shakespeare original, but rather various performance practices in flux’ (p. 843); these include different ways of performing interiority. He goes on to suggest that, as Act II progresses, ‘the play builds a pervasive sense of the already-quotedness of life’ (p. 857).

Robert I. Lubin’s ‘“Apparel oft proclaims the man”: Visualizing Hamlet on the Early Modern Stage’ (ShakB 32:iv[2014] 629–47) will be of interest to those working on early modern costuming or visual culture. Lubin argues that we can learn much about the way costume signifies in Hamlet by paying attention to references to clothing in the play’s language. Key figures include Hamlet, the Ghost, Horatio, Claudius, and Fortinbras: the military apparel of Fortinbras makes him the most appropriate leader, following the representation of the armoured Ghost, whereas Hamlet’s funeral weeds associate him with the black-gowned scholar Horatio.

In ‘Relation and Responsibility: A Levinasian Reading of King Lear’ (MP 111:iii[2014] 485–509) Kent R. Lehnho provides a philosophical reading of King Lear via the thinking of Emmanuel Levinas, who once commented that ‘It sometimes seems to me that the whole of philosophy is only a meditation of Shakespeare’ (p. 486). Lehnho employs Levinas’s concern with intersubjectivity to consider how the play ‘explores what it means to be in relation to the
other and to be responsible for the other’ (p. 488), as well as thinking through the repercussions for how we respond to King Lear as audience members and literary critics. This article could profitably be read alongside Howard Caygill, ‘Levinas and Shakespeare’ (in Bates and Wilson, eds., Shakespeare and Continental Philosophy, reviewed above).

A miniature version of Simon Palfrey’s monograph on Poor Tom is available through his article ‘Attending to Tom’ (SQ 65:i[2014] 1–21), which is adapted from the book, reviewed above.

John Baxter’s ‘Tying the Knot in Othello’ (EIC 64[2014] 266–92) begins by investigating what happens ‘outside the “acted action” of the play’ (p. 267), with special focus on the marriage of Desdemona and Othello and some attention to that of Emilia and Iago. Baxter goes on to suggest that the ‘handkerchief clinches the “tying” of Othello’s plot, but because it brings Emilia into the action, it also inauguates the “untying”’ (p. 278); this is because, according to Baxter, Emilia discovers a new understanding of marriage and intervenes at the play’s conclusion. Baxter examines the different attitudes to marriage voiced in the play, as well as historical sources such as writing on marriage in the Book of Common Prayer, to argue that the ‘tying of the knot in the play is completed as a kind of double knot, winding from the completion or fulfilment of the marriage knot between Othello and Desdemona back through the marriage ceremony to a snarl of attitudes and behaviours hostile to marriage’ (p. 288).

Responding to Keith Thomas’s monograph, Religion and the Decline of Magic [1971], in ‘Distracting Othello: Tragedy and the Rise of Magic’ (PMLA 129:iv[2014] 649–71) Donald Hedrick explores a magic associated with sleights of hand and deception; he designates the supernatural kind as ‘magic1’ and the stage magic as ‘magic2’. Although attention to the first kind of magic may have declined during the early modern period, Hedrick argues that the second kind ‘informs the distinctive tragedy of Shakespeare’s Othello’ (p. 649). Hedrick examines this stage magic in the context of Theodor Adorno’s work on distraction.

Antony and Cleopatra features heavily in Laurence Publicover’s ‘Shakespeare at Sea’ (EIC 64[2014] 138–57). In an essay which historicizes the early modern sea, as well as paying close attention to Shakespeare’s language, Publicover argues that ‘Across a number of plays, but mostly consistently in Antony and Cleopatra, sea imagery allows Shakespeare to explore characters’ desire to unanchor themselves from the worlds that have formed them’ (p. 140). Publicover suggests that this sea has a different resonance from Romantic and post-Romantic ones; ‘Antony’s dissolution is an act of negation rather than a creative process’ (p. 153). Publicover shows how the sea works in Shakespeare not just as a metaphor for chaos and disorder, but also as a ‘rich and complex symbol for a form of selfhood that is at the same time a rejection of selfhood’ (p. 153).

One of the few articles on Coriolanus this year is Anny Crunelle-Vanrigh’s ‘“Seeking (the) mean(s)”: Aristotle’s Ethics and Shakespeare’s Coriolanus’ (CahiersE 86:ii[2014], 23–44). Crunelle-Vanrigh reads the play in relation to Aristotle’s understanding of virtue in the Nicomachean Ethics, as well as Machiavelli’s virtù in The Prince; she argues that the play is influenced by
Aristotle’s *Ethics* in ways that go beyond the simple identification of Martius as a magnanimous man but inform the play’s ‘dialectic of excess and defect’ (p. 24). The article focuses especially on how Coriolanus’s quarrel with Aufidius ‘harbours a battle of doctrines that nearly turns their single combat into a political allegory, the friction of *virtus* and virtú’ (p. 37).

The *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* this year focused on ‘Money and Power’ and included an article by Katherine A. Gillen on ‘“What he speaks is all in debt”: Credit, Representation and Theatrical Critique in *Timon of Athens*’ (*ShJE* 150[2014] 94–109). The article explores the play’s critique of the patronage system in relation to its ‘broader interrogation of the ways in which proto-capitalist credit practices destabilize understandings of value and representation, artistic as well as monetary’ (p. 94). It is the play’s reflections on credit practices which make it resonate with twentieth-century audiences. Noting the lack of receptive audiences in the play itself, Gillen speculates that Shakespeare and Middleton may have used theatre in this play ‘to shock a public that is imagined as self-interested and apathetic’ (p. 108).

(f) Late Plays

*The Tempest*, as always, remains the most popular critical focus amongst Shakespeare’s late plays, followed closely by *The Winter’s Tale*. *Cymbeline* likewise produced work of note, but neither *Two Noble Kinsman* nor *Pericles*, *Prince of Tyre* did. Transformation and classical texts are two themes that seem to stand out in this year’s works.

Themes of colonialism, race, and the body continue to dominate discussion of *The Tempest*. John Kunat’s article, ‘“Play Me False”: Rape, Race, and Conquest in *The Tempest*’ (*SQ* 65:iii[2014] 307–27), begins by pointing to the inherent contradiction of the golden-age scene as foregrounding the contrast between nature and civilization (pp. 307–8). For Kunat ‘*The Tempest* is not so much an historical allegory as an imaginary reconstruction of the mode through which sovereign authority may have been instituted’ (p. 324).

The contrast between the natural and the civilized in the play is represented primarily—for Kunat—through the character Caliban. For Kunat, Caliban is presented on the one hand by his ‘civilized’ master as a diabolic beast, humanity at its most natural and base. On the other hand Kunat argues that it can be read ‘that Caliban’s socialization was circumscribed by a particular view of human nature, one associated in the play with the corrupt world of Italian politics’ (p. 308).

Kunat ably argues that the rape in the play should not be reduced to simple dichotomies, but that the full ‘discursive complexity of sexual violation’ in early modern England must first be brought to bear on the act itself. Kunat also warns against readings of the rape as solely a ‘colonialist fantasy’ to justify Caliban’s enslavement, although he acknowledges that from the modern perspective this reading is immediately apparent (pp. 309–10).

Instead Kunat ties the possession or ‘conquest’ of Miranda to the framing of the play: Alonso’s daughter ‘Claribel’s marriage to the King of Tunis’ (p. 311). Kunat pursues ‘the parallel between Ferdinand and Caliban in their drive to
possess Miranda, with the King of Tunis positioned as the anomalous figure who undermines what otherwise appears as an absolute distinction between them and the different worlds they represent’. Kunat suggests the family on the island, in which both African and European coexist, is written large in the political family at the end of the play: ‘the presumptive family that Prospero attempted to create on the island is transposed to the political realm, in which Africa and Europe are now bound to one another through marriage, collapsing the sexual and social contracts into one another in a way that belies their mutual origin in forms of consensual domination’ (p. 327).

Kunat’s well-argued and thoughtful paper takes a traditional reading of race, politics, and colonialism in The Tempest and transforms it. Kunat does this by pointing to the thematic and discursive links between Miranda’s potential conquistadors, and to the return to the framing of the play at its end by Gonzalo, who reminds the audience that ‘In one voyage | Did Claribel her husband find at Tunis’ just as ‘Ferdinand, her brother, found a wife’ (5.1.208–10)’ (p. 326). This reading moves the play firmly away from colonization as it relates to the New World, and views it within its stated Mediterranean context, although I would quibble with the emphasis on Caliban as an African rather than as the ‘Black man’ or ‘black boy’ who often represented a demonic figure in early modern Europe. Yet there are many well-made points in Kunat’s work, not least in his emphasis on the interaction between the framing of the play and its main themes.

Race and the Mediterranean context in The Tempest are also central to Irina Kantarbaeva-Bill’s discussion of Anglo-Ottoman anxieties in the play: ‘Anglo-Ottoman Anxieties in the Tempest: From Displacement to Exclusion’ (Caliban 52[2014] n.p.). Rather than focusing on the nature/civilization, African/European, and male/female dialectics of Kunat, Kantarbaeva-Bill urges us to move away from the traditional interpretation of the play as a ‘metaphor of colonization, either of the New World or of Ireland’, and notes that ‘The Tempest’s pervasive setting on an island in the Mediterranean serves to illuminate how each English reference to the Ottomans depends upon Shakespeare’s choice of displacement’. In this reading Tunis is interpreted within its historical context as a part of the Ottoman empire, and as the heir to ancient Carthage. The framing of the play through Claribel’s marriage is likewise foregrounded, though in this case as a site of European contention with Ottoman power. Likewise Sycorax and Caliban’s island are the site of conflict between Ottoman and European territory, with the island as Ottoman soil captured and held by Prospero.

This reading does not disregard the colonial context that so many have read into the play, but resituates it within the actual Mediterranean, and within the real geopolitical circumstances of the period. Like Kunat, Kantarbaeva-Bill is emphasizing both the actual context of the play and how Shakespeare’s framing establishes that context.

Prospero uses, and how this influences our understanding of both the nature of his magic and his character. Lellock engages with a variety of early modern texts on alchemy and magic, and draws connections between their conceptions and Shakespeare’s representation of Prospero. The form of magic, and the ends for which it is used, was a major source of contention in early modern Europe, and this contention and the uncertainty it creates around Prospero serve as a narrative in which transformation plays a central role. Of course this transformation is neither simple nor easy: suffering serves as a trial to temper both characters and narrative, transforming them as alchemy and conjury were purported to be able to magically transform the ordinary into the extraordinary. For Lellock the play itself as a whole ‘seems to posit that theatre itself is a philosopher’s stone that can lead to transformation’ (p. 137).

Shannon Kelley’s study of the symbolic role of coral in *The Tempest*, ‘The King’s Coral Body: A Natural History of Coral and the Post-Tragic Ecology of *The Tempest*’ (*JEMCS* 14:i[2014] 115–42), also deals with the extraordinary and transformation, but in relation to ecological history. Kelley examines how the study of how natural history had conceived of coral influenced Shakespeare’s use of it as a metaphor for resurrection. The understanding of coral itself was as a wondrous substance, of unknown taxonomy: coral was neither plant nor animal but a synthesis of both to Linnaeus and Aristotle. It was a shrub to Pliny, even a ‘vegetal mineral’ in Theophrastus. Coral was considered a remedy for illness by Pliny, was used in funerary rituals, and ‘occupies a liminal space between death and resurrection’ (p. 123). Alonso is symbolically reimagined by Shakespeare (via Ariel) as ‘poetic vision’ of a ‘non-decomposed coral and pearl corpse’ (p. 130). For Kelley the transformation or ‘changes in its physiological structure create a provocative metaphor for the body politic’ (p. 134).

R. Allen Shoaf’s discussion of *The Tempest* in chapter 5 (pp. 69–84) of his *Lucretius and Shakespeare on the Nature of Things* suggests that it was Shakespeare’s familiarity with Lucretius and Epicurus that led to *The Tempest*’s title. This is therefore—for Shoaf—an examination of the opposing desires in the tempestuous mind of the protagonist and a desire for *ataraxia*, a state of calm. For Shoaf, *The Tempest* is the mature work of a poet exploring the boundaries of his own power, and the power of mankind more generally in the face of natural power. In this reading of the play Prospero is the authorial avatar who is interacting with a reading of Lucretius on the power of man and nature. The possibility of transformation, of change, is bound up in Prospero’s tempestuous desires and the need to be able to control them and the future through his predictions. These ideas themselves are not wholly new, but the connection to a philosophical framework leads to some intriguing conclusions about Prospero’s temperament and its relationship to the play at large: ‘As long as Prospero seeks vengeance, as long as he incants in anger, as long as he craves total control, he is in the tempest and (far more destructive) the tempest is in him’ (pp. 80–1).

Studies of *Cymbeline* this year venture away from nationalist themes. Benjamin V. Beier’s study of persuasive language in *Cymbeline*, ‘The Art of Persuasion and Shakespeare’s Two Iagos’ (*SIP* 111:i[2014] 34–64), compares Imogen’s ability to overcome Iachimo with the linguistic dominance of Iago in
Othello. Beier argues that Shakespeare rarely wrote characters that were as able as the sharp-sighted Imogen to perceive and combat the villain's sophistry. Or, as Beier argues, ‘In Cymbeline, Imogen suggests that apt and ethical rhetoric is at least equal to, if not more powerful than sophistical speech’ (p. 62). Imogen’s instrument for persuasion, her ‘art’, is not only her use of language, but at a key moment of the play her voice itself. Beier argues that in Cymbeline Shakespeare shows that the natural, intuitive knowledge of Imogen and other characters allows the story to be turned aside from the tragedy of Othello.

Questions of personal liberty, law, and the socio-legal structures of early modern England as reflected in Shakespeare’s plays are discussed in Camilla R. Barker’s ‘Shackles in Shakespeare: On the Falsity of Personal Liberty in Renaissance England’ (LLR 35:i[2014] 25–42). The question of how developments in law and their underlying principles impacted representation of society in early modern literature is a field certainly worthy of more discussion—as the recent discussion of oral contracts and law in Christopher Marlowe’s Faustus by Laura Levine in Magical Transformations on the Early Modern English Stage deftly showed. However, Barker’s grip on the historical context of Shakespeare’s plays lets down the framework within which she is working. For example, in discussing the crisis the loss of Cymbeline’s children creates, she references Henry VIII’s succession laws, not the late Elizabethan succession crisis. However, Barker’s discussion of Prospero’s power and the lack of personal liberty amongst the ‘subjects’ of the island in The Tempest shows the potential of the thematic discussion of freedom in early modern drama from a socio-legal perspective.

Cymbeline is also briefly discussed in Lisa S. Starks-Estes’s Violence, Trauma, and Virtus in Shakespeare’s Roman Poems and Plays. In the coda to her book, Starks-Estes discusses Shakespeare’s engagement with Ovid in the trauma and masochism of A Midsummer Night’s Dream and Cymbeline. She argues that Cymbeline was composed at a time when attitudes toward the Roman poet had begun to shift and the play therefore ‘voiced Shakespeare’s defence of and rededication to Ovid’ (p. 162). The coda points to Shakespeare’s use of the nightingale ‘to establish himself as an Ovidian poet-playwright’, and to signal ‘his multi-layered borrowings from Ovid’, in particular, from the tragic story of Philomela (p. 162). For example, when Imogen finds Cloten’s headless body (although a case of mistaken identity), Shakespeare’s heroine imitates Ovid’s Hecuba (as his Venus had earlier done) by smearing her face with her dead loved-one’s blood. For Starks-Estes this moment of Ovidian tragedy ‘becomes a vivid representation of traumatic grief’ which builds upon her melancholy, becoming a state of near-insanity (p. 178). Starks-Estes’ discussion of tragedy and trauma, on the one hand, and Roman virtus, on the other, is embodied by Imogen’s two brothers, who, in and through their relationship with her as the boy Fidele, display their own virtus and experience Ovidian tragedy.

Discussions of religious themes come to the fore in this year’s works on The Winter’s Tale. Jill Delsigne’s examination of the play, ‘Hermetic Miracles in The Winter’s Tale’ (in Hopkins and Ostovich, eds., pp. 91–108), contrasts Shakespeare’s positive depiction of Paulina’s transformation of Hermione
from statue to woman with the negative depiction of magic-wielding friars in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. Unlike Friar Bacon in the earlier play, Hermione denies she is using evil spirits to achieve her ends, and instead humbly describes herself as merely a conduit for God’s miracle. Delsigne argues that the transformation of the statue in *The Winter’s Tale* is a positive use of the Roman Catholic hermetic tradition of animating statues of saints and martyrs. She draws upon Lodovico Lazzarelli’s ‘synthesis of Catholicism with hermeticism’ to ‘provide a model’ for Paulina’s animation of Hermione (p. 108). For Delsigne the repentance of Leontes leads to Paulina’s act of reconciliation, her restoration of Leontes’ lost family. But Friar Bacon’s repentance comes only at the end of the play, when his own attempt at animating a brass head has failed. Unlike Paulina’s quasi-sacramental act of reconciliation following Leontes’ extended penitence, Friar Bacon’s act of magic uses ‘ghastly fiends’ and ‘devils’ in schemes which usually had unforeseen and tragic consequences.

Robert Appelbaum examines the same moment in *The Winter’s Tale* in ‘“Lawful as Eating”: Art, Life, and Magic in The Winter’s Tale’ (*ShakS* 42[2014] 32–41), but focuses on the analogy of Leontes between the lawfulness of eating and the restoration of Hermione through the art of magic. Appelbaum examines the inherent problems in the words used by Leontes in his injunction, the relationship between poor diet and Leontes’ behaviour in the play to this point, the power of kingship to make magic ‘as lawful as eating’, and the problem of whether any actual magic occurs at this point in the play, and if it did, whether it was ‘white’ or ‘black’ magic. Appelbaum concludes that in making his statement ‘If this be magic, let it be an art lawful as eating’ Leontes is condoning the act, whatever its origins, and that in his association ‘Leontes wishfully demystifies the magic he apprehends’ (p. 39). But this act also re-mystifies eating for Appelbaum, who argues in his conclusion that ‘Eating, as he alludes to it, embodies the right to life, a right that it behoves a king and a nation to protect. And he implies that this activity and the right to life that warrants it should be as wonderful—though perhaps also as contentious—as the magic that has awakened his faith’ (p. 40). Appelbaum ably engages with texts on magic, food, and early modern drama as well as his source in this brief but engaging piece of scholarship.

The final article to focus on the moment of the statue’s transformation is by Hannah Chapelle Wojciehowski: ‘Statues that Move: Vitality Effects in *The Winter’s Tale*’ (*L&T* 28[2014] 299–315). In her examination of Hermione’s return, Wojciehowski draws upon ‘insights from the fields of psychology and cognitive neuroscience to aesthetic experience’ (p. 300). She suggests that shared understandings of embodied cognition are also influenced by how the world around us conceives of them. She ties together modern understandings of cognition with early modern conceptions of sight and hearing, and argues that ‘post-Reformation loss’ of art and affect in religious contexts caused the ‘theatrical recuperation’ of visual modes of inducing affect (p. 311). The role of viewing in the effect of vitality seen in the transformation of Hermione from statue to woman is therefore part of a ‘Watershed moment’, the Protestant Reformation, which was ‘a collective rethinking of beliefs and practices on a monumental scale’ (p. 312). This monumental shift therefore allows ‘today’s
cognitive cultural historians... the occasion to theorise how the neural imaginations of individuals and groups may have been gradually rewired in response to massive ideological and technological changes’ (p. 312). Without Appelbaum’s political emphasis, Wojciehowski also points to Leontes’ statement on magic as ‘an art as lawful as eating’, but for Wojciehowski this is ‘the experience of vitality’ through which we feel and reaffirm our attachments to each other and to life itself’ (p. 312).

Julia Reinhard Lupton’s article, ‘Judging Forgiveness: Hannah Arendt, W.H. Auden, and The Winter’s Tale’ (NLH 45:iv[2014] 641–63), likewise focuses on Hermione’s return in Act V, but unlike Delsigne and Appelbaum, she focuses on Hermione herself rather than on either Paulina or Leontes. Reinhard Lupton engages with the opposing views of W.H. Auden and Hannah Arendt on forgiveness as an act or forgiving as ‘an action that always involves the speech and comportment of a plurality of persons’ (p. 641). These form the basis for Reinhard Lupton’s questioning of the extent to which Hermione forgives her husband Leontes for his role in the deaths and losses incurred during the play on her return to him. As Lupton argues, Hermione is aware of Leontes’ responsibility for the events of the play and this needs to ‘be considered in any tallying of the play’s final settlements’ (p. 642). By engaging with different understandings of forgiveness, Lupton aims at—and succeeds in—deepening our understanding of the actions of Hermione once she is restored to her family (p. 657). Lupton points out the two opposing views of forgiveness presented by these two authors suggest both common and divergent heritages, suggesting that how we interpret Hermione’s actions at the end of the play might rely on how we ourselves view forgiveness and reconciliation based on the social constructs within which we act (p. 642).

The role of social mores, or theological upbringing, in influencing conceptions of sin, repentance, and forgiveness in The Winter’s Tale is also the central theme of Paul D. Stegner’s work on the gendered construction of penitence in the play: ‘Masculine and Feminine Penitence in The Winter’s Tale’ (Renascence 66:iii[2014] 189–202). Stegner immediately sets the tone of his article by stating that ‘Shakespeare’s theological vision in the play is rooted in a modified form of traditional penitential practices’ (p. 189). In Leontes’ exchange with Camillo in Act I, Stegner sees evidence of Shakespeare’s understanding of Catholic doctrine on sacramental confession. This establishes a tripartite, formulaic, and defined mode for penitence and forgiveness. Stegner contrasts this ‘masculine’ forgiveness, with Paulina’s later counselling of Leontes. Following the death of Mamilius, and the apparent loss of both Hermione and Perdita, Paulina claims that the scope of his crimes demands a perpetual penitence, which Leontes’ extreme guilt induces him to comply with. These two opposing priest-like figures, Camillo and Paulina, are then discussed within a framework that shows how medieval and early modern writers conceptualized penitence and forgiveness as gendered behaviours. Paulina uses the language of feminine deference, Stegner shows, to manipulate Leontes into his penitence, sustain it, and bring it to an end. However Paulina herself, in ending Leontes’ sorrow, Stegner argues, is brought back under male control through matrimony. Stegner suggests that in ordering the marriage of his two opposing priest-figures Leontes not only revokes Paulina’s permission...
to speak—‘O peace, Paulina’—but ‘reasserts masculine governmental authority’ (p. 199).

_The Winter’s Tale_ and _The Tempest_ are only briefly discussed in Susan Wiseman’s work on metamorphosis in _Writing Metamorphoses in the English Renaissance_. But it is her discussion of _The Winter’s Tale_ and contemporary tales of children found in the wild that I wish to highlight here. The loss and return of Leontes’ family are often discussed within the terms of redemptive religion, but Wiseman’s focus is on how these ideas reflected popular literature about children left or lost in the wild. It is in the context of losing a child to the wild that Wiseman discusses the thematic meaning of the bear that ensures Perdita’s anonymity by killing Antigonus. For Wiseman, ‘the interplay of stories of “lost” and “found”’ in the play gives the audience ‘a bravura, interrogative reworking of ready-made, pre-known stories about these events’ (p. 185). Wiseman is here referring to tales of children lost after wild natural violence, such as attacks by wild animals, or weather events such as the storm in which these events occur: ‘the bear’s arrival before the audience links the stories of lost and found children’ in Jacobean England to Shakespeare’s tale (p. 186). But the wild in this story is less wild than at first glance. Wiseman points to the bear garden of London’s South Bank, and the semi-tameness of the pastoral landscape Perdita actually finds herself in. For Wiseman, ‘Perdita’s story, then, is of a child saved from the wild lodged in a play deeply immersed in, and interrogating the social basis of, stories of wild children’ (p. 190). The interaction between ballads and broadsides about wild children, and the framing of Perdita’s loss are only an aside in Wiseman’s work, but nonetheless rich and thought-provoking. And Wiseman’s discussion of bears, bear-baiting, and their relevance for tales of metamorphosis, such as Perdita’s, is as intriguing and informative as the rest of her work, brief though it may be.

As always, _The Tempest_ has been the most studied of the late plays. It seems to be a continuing site of scholarship, along with _The Winter’s Tale_, while works like _Pericles, Prince of Tyre_ and _Two Noble Kinsman_ are not represented at all. However, there is an overwhelming, if unintended, theme to the works this year. They are either investigating transformation or are taking the existing scholarship and using a close examination of detail, transforming how we might have thought about concepts, for example colonialism and imperialism in _The Tempest_, and bringing greater depth to those plays as a result. Emphasizing the framing of a play such as _The Tempest_ shows Shakespeare’s intended Mediterranean context, and opens up new areas of study, for example the Ottoman connections of the King of Tunis and how these might impact on our interpretation of the island’s inhabitants.

Most of the work this year has focused on the minutiae of the plays in question, challenging our preconceptions by returning to details of character, context, and language. There was little this year, in comparison to previous years, to challenge the genre of the late plays. Instead some of the richest work was to be found in brief examinations of Shakespeare’s use of wider ideas, such as Kelley’s ecological history of coral, or Wiseman’s examination of Perdita’s loss.
Comedies

Michael Collins’s collection of essays honouring Stephen Booth, Reading What’s There: Essays on Shakespeare in Honor of Stephen Booth, is, unsurprisingly, a selection of new critical readings of the texts themselves which, amid some of the other methodologies on offer this year, feels underdeveloped and somewhat dated. Michael Goldman’s essay, ‘On the Final Songs in Love’s Labour’s Lost’ (pp. 41–9), offers an analysis of how the closing songs of Love’s Labour’s Lost meaningfully conclude a process of ‘playing through to reality’ (p. 45), where ‘theatrical and festive activities become ways of touching the universe of death and adult limitation and becoming adequate to it’ (p. 45). The figurative and syntactical simplicity of the songs, Goldman contends, returns us to an ‘almost abstractly conventional festivity’ (p. 46), offering a closure to the news of death, and culmination of the twelve-month test, opening the reader to the new values advanced by the end of this play. Goldman’s lightly bardolatrous essay invokes (but does not fully utilize) pastoralism as a means of arguing for the songs as a conscious ‘advance in style’ (p. 46) for Shakespeare. Goldman’s essay, for the ‘serious mind’ (p. 48) ponders a slightly out-of-date concern as to whether the closing songs are ‘a final poignant aporia of the poet or the intrusion of an actor tidying up’, insisting on the absolute binary between play and reality that characterizes the literary rejection of the theatrical.

Margaret Maurer’s contribution to the volume, ‘Leonato and Beatrice in Act 5, Scene 5, Line 97 of Much Ado About Nothing’ (pp. 89–98), is a consideration of the last scene of Much Ado that attempts to strip away the editorial intervention that sees Beatrice passed from Leonato to Benedick for a kiss, as editors of the line ‘peace, I will stop your mouth’ (V.iv.97) often construct it. Instead of acknowledging these bonds between men, Maurer looks to the silent presence of Innogen, mother of Hero, in the first quarto, as evidence of a demonstration of ‘a silent woman as the pretext of a man taunting another man with the possibility of cuckoldry’, in retaliation for the Act I, scene i, insulting of Leonato by Benedick, which Maurer imagines could have been in the presence of the unspeaking Innogen. The homosocial connotations of the situation are passed over in favour of a short précis of ‘a pervasive series of unobtrusive imprecisions in the play’ (p. 94) centred on familial connections that raise questions of Beatrice’s fatherless condition, in this maddeningly brief and speculative essay.

Craig Dionne and Parmita Kapadia’s collection, Bollywood Shakespeares, is an important contribution to the field of globalized Shakespeares, recognizing the tradition of Indian Shakespeare and specifically locating that tradition in the vibrant Bollywood industry. The book covers a wide range of adaptations, but for our purposes, Richard Allen’s study, ‘Comedies of Errors: Shakespeare, Indian Cinema, and the Poetics of Mistaken Identity’ (pp. 165—92), is of interest. Allen suggests that the motif of mistaken twins in The Comedy of Errors is a popular trope in Bollywood cinema, and proposes studying the history of this trope in the cinema, to underscore ‘the relationship between knowledge and sight precisely by confounding that relationship’ (p. 166). Allen draws two lines of Shakespearian influence on the
Indian cinema—the first through the Bengali literary and cultural tradition that is inherently colonial, and the second of Parsi theatre, which had an ‘irreverent, appropriative relationship’ (p. 167) to Shakespeare. Citing the first Indian translation of the play, in 1869, into Bhrantibilas (the play of errors), Allen argues that the Bengali tradition offers an ‘Indianization’ of the characters that allows for relative fidelity to the plot, and that subsequently produced the first cinematic rendition of the play in Bengali, Bhranti Bilash [1963], which was followed by Angoor [1982], and more recently, Do Dooni Char [2010]. These films, Allen contends, contrast strikingly with the British adaptive history of the play, choosing to play up sensuality over romance, proposing that ‘familial closeness breeds a relationship of playful intimacy that could quickly slide into something else’ (p. 174).

Allen goes on to tentatively suggest ‘an indirect influence through the profound impact that Shakespeare’s plots had on the Parsi theatre of Bombay’ (p. 181) that was a determining factor in the shape of popular Hindi cinema. Parsi’s bold and aggressive rewrites allowed melodrama to penetrate the trope of fraternal twins and mistaken identity, a hybridity which renders The Comedy of Errors appealing to celebrity actors looking to display range. Allen traces the narrative through several examples, including Afsana [1951], Chinatown [1962], Haseena Maan Jayegi [1968], Kishen Kanhaiya [1990], and Bade Miyan [1998], which, somewhat intriguingly, conflates Shakespeare’s play with Michael Bay’s 1995 Hollywood blockbuster, Bad Boys. Allen closes his fascinating précis of The Comedy of Errors’ Bollywood history with the suggestion that if this play ‘had not existed, it would have to have been invented by Bollywood’ (p. 189).

Next up is Patrick Gray and John D. Cox’s collection, Shakespeare and Renaissance Ethics. Indira Ghose’s essay, ‘Shakespeare and the Ethics of Laughter’ (pp. 56–75), examines the various ethics of laughter, throughout the comedies, arguing that Shakespeare exhibits a discomfort with purely derisory laughter, instead, seeing out alternative sources of the comic. Thankfully, she chooses to take on Twelfth Night, the exception to her rule that ‘scapegoat figures in his comedies are rarely humiliated in a devastating manner’ (p. 66), to illustrate this point. Ghose makes the contestable claim that the increased popularity in classical ideas of decorum ‘led to the emergence of a divide between elite and popular culture in the early modern period’ (p. 67), and turns to Malvolio as the example of a joke that goes too far, outlining how the prank opens with an ostensible satire on a social climber, and ends with ‘a sense of unease’ (p. 70) at Malvolio’s degradation.

Jane Kingsley-Smith’s essay, ‘Aristotelian Shame and Christian Mortification in Love’s Labour’s Lost’ (pp. 76–97), attempts to re-evaluate the impact of Aristotle’s Rhetoric on early modern literary accounts of shame, turning her attention to Love’s Labour’s Lost as a ‘labour of mortification and repentance’ (p. 95), that ultimately achieves very little. Kingsley-Smith creates a comparative structure that pits the more sensitive Shakespeare against the shamelessness of Montaigne, by suggesting that, for Shakespeare, the self-mortification of shame ‘produces a defensive reaction that hides the self from the self’ (p. 83). To that end, she situates the men of Navarre’s vows within a discourse of mortification that they make no attempt to redress, instead
reinventing themselves as lovers, as Armado does in the face of his lust for Jaquenetta. Kingsley-Smith asserts the importance of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, which ‘judges the moral efficacy of shame from a perspective of something like disappointment’ (p. 89), and which characterizes the play.

Ruben Espinosa and David Ruiter’s collection, *Shakespeare and Immigration*, is an important, book, not only because of its timely content, but for its inclusion of convincing, modern scholarship that intersects past and present in a rigorous, academic manner. Eric Griffin’s essay, ‘Shakespeare, Marlowe, and the Stranger Crisis of 1590’ (pp. 13–36), which opens the volume, examines the role of theatre during the ‘stranger crisis’ of the late sixteenth century, examining, among other texts, *The Comedy of Errors*’s place as a site of the ambivalent domestic attitude towards Elizabeth’s open immigration policy. Griffin’s brief consideration outlines an Ephesus that is analogous to early modern England through its ambivalence towards the precarious balance of traditional and contemporary religious and nationalist identity. This is manifest in the Latinate literary references of *The Comedy of Errors* routinely being ‘subordinated to an earlier Greek heritage that is constructed, both in national and spiritual terms, as more pure than its universal successor’ (p. 16). However, the play’s attitude to the status of England as a refuge for immigrants is more ambivalent; its elevation of English financial and social concerns manifest in a reticence towards strangers jars with more nationalist discourses found in pamphlets such as *A Fig for the Spaniard or Spanish Spirits*. The essay goes on to stand *The Comedy of Errors* alongside *Sir Thomas More* and, as would be expected, *The Jew of Malta* and *Titus Andronicus*, arguing that these plays, by reflecting the widespread ambivalence regarding large-scale immigration, operated as a locus for public dissatisfaction with London’s sudden influx of foreign and domestic immigrants.

In his essay ‘My Hopes Abroad: The Global/Local Nexus in *The Merchant of Venice*’ (pp. 37–58), Geraldo U. deSousa argues that the play’s portrayal of sites of cross-cultural and transnational encounters articulates an anxiety about Venice’s participation in a global marketplace. The globalization that Antonio embodies, deSousa argues, destabilizes the notion of home and creates a character who demonstrates a ‘demarcation between exterior and interior space’ (p. 43), who cannot articulate, or even interrogate, the source of his unhappiness. Antonio’s self-alienation stands in contrast to Portia, who represents a robust defence of Venetian ideals, particularly in the courtroom, where she underscores the ‘boundaries between Venetian and the alien’ (p. 44). Through her late father’s will, Portia has been thrust into a global marketplace, creating a paradox between the secure home that the intentionality of the will envisions and the ‘casino for foreigners’ (p. 45) Belmont has become. Yet the marriage to a Venetian man allows a clear establishment of ownership over her house that frees Portia to be able to leave her home and save her husband. DeSousa makes an effective contrast of Belmont to Shylock’s home, in the argument that Shylock’s abode delineates the plight of many transnational migrants and the ways in which the security of the house may contrast with a profound sense of cultural alienation. The juxtaposition, unfortunately, omits an examination of Jessica’s migration from one ‘home’ to
the other, in favour of a comparison with Barabas’s home in *The Jew of Malta*,
ending with the idea of Shylock as a refugee in his own house.

Kathryn Vomero Santos’s contribution is an essay entitled ‘Hosting Language: Immigration and Translation in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*’ (pp. 59–72), and uses the discrepancies between Evans’s Welsh and Caius’s French accents to explore the ways in which the play demonstrates an English that ‘serves as a host that is as hospitable as it is hostile to its strange guests’ (p. 60). In particular, she argues, Shakespeare’s dialogic drama stages the hospitality of the English language that simultaneously absorbs difference and demonstrates a resistance to complete assimilation for the foreign-born immigrant. Relying on the metaphor of translation that characterizes Falstaff’s wooing of Mistresses Page and Quickly, Santos argues that the ‘out-of-into’ translation from the source language to a target language is analogous to a process of crossing borders, and can often leave the immigrant in a liminal space.

Santos takes her conceit further, arguing for the English language as an arena of linguistic play, even as it ‘acknowledges that the host language is vulnerable to violation’ (p. 67) by the natives who also fail to master appropriate English grammar and vocabulary. At this point, the Host becomes central, both as an organizing principle of the play’s dramaturgy, caught between the two foreigners, and as an emblem of the linguistic metaphor, as he ‘emphatically declares his possession of the English language at the expense of Evans and Caius and becomes a figure for English as a host language that both makes room and denies entry at the proverbial inn’ (p. 67), and in spite of the Host’s own fears of being cozened due to verbal slippage, the play affirms a difference that maintains the boundaries that incomplete language demarcates.

Elizabeth Acosta Valdez’s excellent essay, ‘Open Doors, Secure Borders: The Paradoxical Immigration Policy of Belmont in *The Merchant of Venice*’ (pp. 177–98), is a presentist study that frames the play in the context of the current American Diversity Visa Immigration programme (also known as the green card lottery), in particular, emphasizing the institutional advantage given to those with a clear proficiency in English, noting that, for both would-be American citizens and suitors to Portia’s hand, ‘winners are not chosen based on random luck, but rather through calculated measures, in which the criterion is similitude’ (p. 184). Bassanio, who carries all of the traits of the undesirable immigrant, is able to overcome the flawed lottery thanks to the vulnerability of the casket test to manipulation, highlighting the failure of the system. Yet, Acosta Valdez argues, we should not view Portia’s interest in Bassanio as any less self-interested than his in her. Portia’s manipulation of the casket lottery secures her a husband ‘who can be manipulated in a way that allows Portia to have that agency and ownership she desires’ (p. 189) and he is selected for precisely the qualities that her late father sought to exclude. This exclusion of more worthy candidates brings Acosta Valdez’s reading back to the present, under the guise of contemporary audience response; the audience can use the casket scene of *The Merchant of Venice* to meditate on the resistance to, and manipulation of, the system against valid candidates for permanent residency who are seen as less ideologically desirable: foreigners who are ‘too foreign’ (p. 192). Acosta Valdez’s powerful essay ends on the
acknowledgement that both systems ‘seem to promote discrimination and racial prejudice (p. 194).

Frances E. Dolan’s student-centric guide *Twelfth Night: Language and Writing* is an informally written, pop-culture-referencing introduction to the play that opens with the suggestion that the reader ‘use the play as a starting point—as evidence in itself’—rather than turning first to the work of historians and critics to explain it’ (pp. 5–6). Dolan pushes students to ask questions of their own, historicizing the play by discussions of boy actors, Elizabeth I, and Puritanism. The book also offers a wealth of strategies for thinking and writing about the play, asking the reader questions to prompt further thought, and suggesting sources such as the Open Source Shakespeare concordance as a place to seek out language patterns. As the book works through formal elements, such as patterns of imagery, the role of the blazon, tropes, and verse forms, it regularly pauses to offer writing strategies, including checklists and rhetorical devices to ensure that an essay engages the reader. Dolan’s book is dense in content, but accessible to its intended audience, and thorough to a point that exceeds Shakespeare analysis. It is full of good writing advice, and carefully works through a concise reading of the play.

Alison Findlay and Liz Oakley-Brown’s *Twelfth Night: A Critical Reader*, Arden’s second critical companion to *Twelfth Night*, offers an introductory overview of critical approaches to the play, beginning with a critical and performance history, moving through ‘new directions’ for the text, and closing with a short essay on pedagogical resources for those using the play in a classroom setting. Unlike the Norton critical editions that offer a wide variety of topics in abridged form, Arden’s critical reader includes an overview of the play’s reception, and four lengthy ‘new directions’ essays that constitute the bulk of the book. Kier Elam’s essay, ‘“Ready to distrust mine eyes”: Optics and Graphics in *Twelfth Night*’ (pp. 99–122), historicizes the play’s optical illusions, contextualizing its ‘veritable catalogue of visual images’ (p. 107) through a discussion of other early modern art. Randall Martin’s contribution, ‘Shipwreck and the Hermeneutics of Transience in *Twelfth Night*’ (pp. 123–43), frames the shipwreck as part of a greater exploration of how ‘eschatological and diachronic time and knowledge, and their related hermeneutic tendencies . . . illuminate respective shipwreck and holiday epistemologies’ (p. 126) in the play, creating a positive portrayal of ‘open subjective potential’ (p. 126). Andrew McConnell Scott’s ‘“Let them use their talents”: *Twelfth Night* and the Professional Comedian’ (pp. 144–65) uses both textual study and theatre history to suggest reading Feste as a paid fool, one whose relationship to festivity ‘belongs more to his ability to evoke sentimental longing for it rather than being its inherent, fully embodied representative’ (p. 147). Finally, Tiffany Stern’s essay, ‘Inverted Commas around the “Fun”: Music in *Twelfth Night*’ (pp. 166–88), examines the music of *Twelfth Night*, arguing for music as not only a part of characterization but ‘a site of comedy’ (p. 180) that enacts a progression that is parallel to the central narrative. The essays that comprise the book seem to be original and diverse pieces of scholarship, which left me puzzled as to the anticipated readership: they seem too long and too niche for an undergraduate audience, and a little ambitious to work as a teaching aid.
Turning to Robert Henke and Eric Nicholson’s collection, *Transnational Mobilities in Early Modern Theatre*, Henke’s essay, ‘The Taming of the Shrew, Italian Intertex, and Cultural Mobility’ (pp. 23–36), is a source study that affirms the values of Shakespeare’s Italian connections by identifying the transnational and transcultural roots of *The Taming of the Shrew* as a site of exploration, as opposed to nationalist anxiety. In particular, Henke traces the explicit allusions to *commedia dell’arte* to suggest that the implicit homage present in Shakespeare’s play illustrates an easy cultural mobility between England and Italy. The dramaturgical mobility that Henke argues is demonstrative of a transnational aesthetic circulation is also reflected in the play itself, as it meditates on ‘the questions of mobility, border-crossing and identity formation’ (p. 32). Frustratingly, Henke only begins to deeply connect with *The Taming of the Shrew* at the very end of his essay, pointing out Gremio’s dependence on foreign commodities that would immobilize Bianca and categorizing Gremio’s acquisitiveness as ‘rapine, rather than true cultural mobility’ (p. 36); and he declines to offer an substantive alternative from the play.

Susanne Wofford, in the most pithy essay of the collection, ‘Hymen and the Gods on Stage in Shakespeare’s *As You Like It* and Italian Pastoral’ (pp. 69–92), aligns Rosalind with the ‘mago’ (or in this case, ‘maga’) figure of the Italian pastoral tradition, and suggests that the play goes further in its use of its transnational counterpart by the representation of the god Hymen on stage. Using the notion of ‘theatregram’ that has been adopted as a key methodology in the book in which the essay appears, Wofford aligns Hymen with the ‘dichotomous experience of eros’ (p. 76), that characterizes late sixteenth-century Italian pastoral, sorting carefully through both art history and pastoral literature to explore the implications of Hymen’s double gender, of the male god representing female physiognomy. This intertheatricality, Wofford argues, is further enhanced by the presence of the Italian madrigal in English culture. Wofford uses this extensive contextualization in the book in which the essay appears, Wofford aligns Hymen with the ‘dichotomous experience of eros’ (p. 76), that characterizes late sixteenth-century Italian pastoral, sorting carefully through both art history and pastoral literature to explore the implications of Hymen’s double gender, of the male god representing female physiognomy. This intertheatricality, Wofford argues, is further enhanced by the presence of the Italian madrigal in English culture. Wofford uses this extensive contextualization to suggest that, in *As You Like It*, Hymen becomes a symbolic figure of power and authority, albeit theatrical, and not religious, achieved through the potency of its metaphorical value. In the Italian pastoral, Hymen and Cupid become theatregrams that allow for generic closure of a text. Hymen, Wofford contends, must be embodied as a Roman god to become a performative authority for the marriages that Rosalind arranges, and to create a space to validate the results of her transgressions. Furthermore, Hymen arranges a conditional closure of the play, which allows for the marriages even as it leaves open-ended the gendered roles of husband and wife in Rosalind and Orlando’s union. Wofford evokes the notion of theatrical faith, which elides religious commitment through its recognition of its own theatricality, rightly insisting on a valuation of the aesthetic over the spiritual.

Schalwyk’s essay, ‘Shakespeare’s Untranslatability’ (pp. 229–44), is a robust defence of transposing Shakespeare’s plays into new cultural artefacts through the act of translation, and uses Uys Krige’s *Twaalfde Nag*, an Afrikaans translation of *Twelfth Night*, as his central example of the values of transcribing the play linguistically. Schalwyk makes a brief and well-worn defence of the adaptive processes before embarking on his main topic: why
Twaalfde Nag might, in fact, be a better play than Twelfth Night. Schalwyk uses his own experience of directing a bilingual (English and Afrikaans) production of the play. He argues that translation allowed for the Afrikaans dialect to be used to flesh out, and make relevant (and funny), the largely flat dialogue between Feste and Sir Andrew in II.iii which is, he rightly argues, ‘within, not beyond, the ethics of translation’ (p. 237), through a loyalty, not only to the spirit of the text, but to Shakespeare’s own theatrical practice. While Schalwyk acknowledges the limitations of translation in particular instances, he defends the poetical reconfiguration on the grounds that it places the audience in the same position as its early modern counterpart, receiving the words ‘with surprise, delight, and wonder at their powerful newness’ (p. 240).

Melissa Walter’s essay, ‘“Are You a Comedian?”: The Trunk in Twelfth Night and the Intertheatrical Construction of Character’ (pp. 53–66), uses the trope of the trunk to argue for a relationship between the novella and dramatic form that is ‘interactive and reciprocal’ (p. 53). White suggests Barnabie Riche’s tale ‘Of Apollonius and Silla’ as a possible source for Twelfth Night, before focusing on the extensively used trope of a trunk as conveyor of bodies (both dead and alive). Walter’s argument, however, hangs on the presence of a trunk indicated in Trevor Nunn’s 1995 film instead of Shakespeare’s text, and she tackles this absence of the trunk in the play itself by explaining that its presence is indicated by Viola’s ability to change clothing. If, Walter argues, Viola’s clothes come out of a trunk at the beginning of the drama, and the trunk is staged, ‘the image of the trunk as a limited material thing, which contains varied narrative and symbolic possibilities, like the human body itself, is also staged’ (p. 64).

As with many books on adaptation, Alexa Huang and Elizabeth Rivlin’s collection Shakespeare and the Ethics of Appropriation is less concerned with textual exegesis than methodology. Courtney Lehmann’s challenging and occasionally difficult essay, ‘Double Jeopardy: Shakespeare and Prison Theatre’ (pp. 89–106), argues for an ethical interrogation of pedagogical performance projects in prisons, and uses her own experience of a production of Measure for Measure, performed at Kentucky’s Luther Luckett penitentiary, to examine the complex issues of oppressive heteronormativity, silence, and retributive justice that such close interaction with Shakespeare’s text might elicit. Lehmann’s claim that Shakespeare ‘can be appropriated as a powerful source of resistance to the warehousing of social identity in prison’ (p. 101) is particularly illustrated in the exploration of the clowns, Pompey and Lucio, whose masks allow the actors, a cop-killer and paedophile respectively, the opportunity to ‘perform alternative relationships to centralized power’ (p. 101), offering these men a moral strength to see through the facades of authority, rendering Shakespeare ‘a broker of transparency’ (p. 101). Lehmann’s suggestion that Shakespeare performance is potentially ‘a spur to their self-transformation’ (p. 102) is ideologically contentious, but nonetheless this essay is an important evaluation of the impact that Shakespeare study and performance can have outside academe.

Jessica Dell’s New Historicist contribution, ‘“A witch, a quean, an old cozening quean!”: Image Magic and Shakespeare’s The Merry Wives of Windsor’ (in Hopkins and Ostovich, eds., pp. 185–202), uses local history of
witchcraft to suggest that the play exposes and exorcises ‘largely misogynistic views of woman and magic through laughter’ (p. 186). Dell structures her argument around Ford’s ongoing conflation of witchcraft and sexual immorality, which, at the close of the play, allows the people of Windsor to abandon their false and destructive superstitions in favour of celebrating the true magic of female virtue’ (p. 193). By localizing her discussion of witchcraft to Windsor, Dell is able to posit a successful female confrontation with ignorance and bigotry, connecting history to the communitas in the play. Mother Pratt, the absent witch, becomes crucial to this argument, embodying both Ford’s anxieties about the homosocial bonds of women and his wife’s experience of the same. It is Mother Pratt’s absence from the play, Dell argues, that empties the threat of such a figure by allowing Falstaff to impersonate her, and renders Ford’s attempted witch hunt comically impotent. Moreover, Dell trades on the traditional notion of the witch as socially impotent to suggest that the childless local curiosity, Mistress Ford, embraces the negative associations of the figure of the witch to ‘gain access to the supposed magical arsenal attributed to her witch-counterpart ’ (p. 196) and harness the power of superstition for her own benefit, enacting transformations and tricks on the watered-down Ford substitute, Falstaff. Once empowered, Dell argues, the two wives use their moral authority to create a queen, and use the hunting imagery throughout not only to legitimize Falstaff as prey, but to exceed their association with a queen, Elizabeth, by invoking a goddess, Diana, who punishes the men on behalf of the women of Windsor.

In Laurie Johnson, John Sutton, and Evelyn Tribble’s collection Embodied Cognition and Shakespeare’s Theatre: The Early Modern Body-Mind, James Knapp’s essay, ‘Mental Bodies in Much Ado About Nothing’ (pp. 86–103), uses Claudio’s rejection of Hero as a starting point to consider the ‘relationship between Hero’s outward appearance and her immaterial character’ (p. 87). Knapp focuses on a pre-Cartesian moment of uncertainty as to the mind/body divide as a means of understanding the play’s preoccupation with ‘nothing’, found in its thematic emphasis on the gap between the material and immaterial. Knapp uses Ambroise Paré’s theory of the three mental faculties—imagination, reasoning, and memory—as key to navigating the space between the mind and body to suggest that the scenes of both recognition and misrecognition that characterize Much Ado About Nothing are constructed through a process of comparing memory and imagination. The human capacity for cognition, Knapp argues, relies on a dependable relationship between material and mental bodies, and confusion arises ‘when the characters are invited to compare mental bodies derived from the imagination’s ability to create false images in the mind without any immediate external stimulus’ (p. 96). That is to say, the fictions offered to a character reconstruct the memory of a mental body by endowing it with the characteristics imagined. This draws Knapp to the altar scene, in which Claudio’s imaginings allow him to misread Hero’s blush as a mark of her shame, a notion further complicated by the fact that an audience would likely only recognize the blush through its narrated description. Ultimately, Knapp argues, Much Ado About Nothing fails to resolve the ‘more troubling
implications of the mysterious interplay between the material body, corporeal spirit (thought), and immaterial soul’ (p. 100).

Peter Kishore Saval’s book *Reading Shakespeare through Philosophy* is an attempt to imagine Shakespearian drama as philosophical praxis, and is in large part, extraordinary, although the structural imbalance between the chapters is occasionally frustrating. Too brief is his eloquent and convincing chapter, ‘A Philosophy of History in *Love’s Labour’s Lost*’, which attempts to view the play as a ‘cerebral puzzle’ (p. 50), as a means of countering the ‘anemic character of the play itself’ (p. 50). Saval suggests a preposterous reading that envisions the play as an ‘ass-backwards’ (p. 50) riddle of history, envisioning a historicized reading that takes the delayed marriage of Henry of Navarre to Queen Margot as the beginning of a chain of events that leads to the St Bartholomew’s Day Massacre. To do so, he reimagines the play as a comic history, in that ‘it fulfils historical time by putting it off, and presents a history of what was never written and what did not take place’ (p. 51). Comedy, therefore, Saval argues, becomes redemptive up to its foregone conclusion, ‘because it delivers redemption from the dead time of history’ (p. 55). This anamorphosis of history manifests itself in a play that is continually confounding generic expectation, blending light and dark, humour and melancholy.

Potentially a book in itself, the chapter ‘Primordial Debt, Communism, and *The Merchant of Venice*’ makes up the bulk of this slim volume. The essay is an attempt to frame *The Merchant of Venice* as part of ‘a vision of human life that stretches from the individual to the cosmos’ (p. 59), challenging ‘our liberal ideas about the connection between subjective autonomy and human freedom’ (p. 59). The chapter drives slowly towards *The Merchant of Venice* because of the need to unpack disparate philosophies, which is one of the failings of this otherwise excellent book. Saval frames his discussion of the play with a lengthy exposition of anthropologist David Graeber’s *Debt*, which argues that money arose as a result of debt, that fulfilled ‘a general sense of social obligation that exists in every human society’ (p. 60), identifying ‘primordial debt’ as the myth of obligation that is impressed upon humans operating within a society, government, or faith. After making the appropriate nod towards Mauss’s study of the gift, Graeber proposes that the myth of primordial debt constitutes a ‘form of baseline communism’ (p. 61) that creates a system of social obligations without accounting for them, as a means of encouraging social bonds. Communism, here, means not a political practice but a basic human sociability that resists the notion of indebtedness—something that the criminalization of debt pollutes.

Saval uses his carefully unpacked theory as a means of suggesting that the development of coinage is something that ‘uproots individuals from their complex relationships and therefore promotes the very individual isolation with which its ideology colludes’ (pp. 71–2). He begins with the etymology of *basanos* and how its connection with the torture of slaves ‘reveals how the confusion of human and commercial values intersects with the whole of the military-coinage-slavery complex of the ancient world’ (p. 88). When he finally reaches *The Merchant of Venice*, Saval connects ‘the material form of money to an entire argument about the very character of human relationships’ (p. 92),
as well as to the Eucharist, as a means of foreshadowing a Nietzschean tragedy in Portia’s narrative. He suggests that the crux at the heart of *The Merchant of Venice* is the characters’ inability to distinguish between that which should be kept and that which can be contracted. Unfortunately, Saval’s enthusiasm for his methodology leaves little time for Shylock, intriguingly suggesting at the end of the lengthy essay that the court’s decision ‘is not a rejection of that logic of usury and debt, but an act in support of it’, overriding ‘his claim that there are certain human desires . . . that cannot be monetized’ (p. 102).

In his chapter ‘The Being of the Future in *Twelfth Night*’, Saval revisits an idea he alludes throughout the book, that ‘we require new metaphysical ideas to make sense of this idea of time’ (p. 125). He does so by looking to Aristotle’s *De Interpretatione*, to suggest that the challenge of verbalizing the indeterminate character of the future is linked to ‘the affections of the soul in time, whose limits are the limits of anxiety about what can be spoken and what’s to come’ (p. 128), and suggests that *Twelfth Night* ‘starts to look as though it promises to reveal a solution’ (p. 128) to the discursive tension between a character and fate. *Twelfth Night*, he contends, continuously presents a sense of betrayal that represents itself as excessive, hallucinatory to the point of madness, ‘that must grasp itself in the relinquishment of its own proper territory’ (p. 137). ‘The porosity of this discourse’ (p. 137) manifests itself in a multivalent voice that affirms and silences, finding equivocal character in multiple spaces, such as the Captain’s silence or Olivia’s letters. Consistent throughout his book is the insistence on the value of genre. Saval closes by noting that, similarly to his position on *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, in *Twelfth Night*, ‘comedy presents the openness to a principle of unity neither as the one, nor the all, but singularity as an unaccountable difference’ (p. 142).

The New Kitteridge Shakespeare *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, edited by Matthew Kozusko, situates the text in a performance context, offering the student and casual reader discussion topics, a brief essay on reading Shakespeare as performance, and a filmography. As part of its dedication to the series’ founder, George Kitteridge, the text follows Kitteridge’s 1903 edition, with annotations by Kozusko. Most interestingly, the closing essay establishes parameters for reading the play visually, offering help with the recognition of performance choices, discouraging the reader from leaning on Shakespeare’s intentions as a dramatist, and offering a pithy defence of reading against the authority of the playwright, which should empower the reader to move past performance and into critical thinking.

In Michele Marrapodi’s collection *Shakespeare and the Italian Renaissance: Appropriation, Transformation, Opposition*, Sergio Costola and Michael Saenger’s essay, ‘Shylock’s Venice and the Grammar of the Modern City’ (pp. 147–62), attempts to link Shylock and John Florio, through idiomatic language, to suggest an Italian intertextuality that marks Shylock out as Other, both in London and Venice. Costola and Saenger historicize the London–Venice relationship to suggest that the Shakespearian audience would have expected a ‘complex balance of Englishness and foreignness’ (p. 148) in their representation. Costola and Saenger make a similar argument to Valdez Acosta, although they more speculatively assign Bassanio’s success at the casket test to his Protestant ideology, which guides the choice; this also allows
them to view Shylock as a double alien, which is revealed not only in his faith, but also in his language. The essay takes pains to note that what the play offers is ‘not an implicit contrast between any religion and any other, but rather a linguistically marked contrast in the way in which such distinctions are made socially’ (p. 161).

John Florio’s connections to Shakespeare have been well documented, but Costola and Saenger draw attention to the way in which Florio ‘wrestled with his relationship to an English society that was at turns expansively multilingual and spasmodically xenophobic’ (p. 154), ultimately marketing his Italianate identity as something both awkward and flamboyant. In particular, Costola and Saenger home in on a problem with prepositions that marks Shylock as a Florio-esque outsider to Venice, allowing Portia the opportunity to distinguish between the merchant and the Jew once he begins to talk.

Hanna Scolinicov’s essay, ‘The Jew and the Justice of Venice’ (pp. 275–90), argues that although ‘ideological confrontation between the messages of the Old and of the New Testaments, between the defeated Synagoga and the triumphant Ecclesia’ (p. 276) dominates the play, the relocation of this debate to a ‘civil and Venetian framework’ (p. 276) destabilizes the certainty of the outcome. Scolinicov builds her argument on an attempt to visually reconstruct the courtroom scene, using Shylock’s probable stage props of knife and scales as a ‘bitter parody’ (p. 280) of the figure of Justice, and by extension of Venetian justice. Scolinicov uses this mockery to build a case for Shakespeare’s familiarity with Venice’s intense identification with the figure of Justice, manifest in art across the city. Scolinicov focuses on these tenuous authorial connections over a deeper interrogation of the claim that ‘Shylock cuts a grotesque figure, a parody of Justice’, in opposition to Portia, whose virginity enshrines her as the ‘true representative of Justice’ (p. 286), even as her cross-dressing marks her as part of the more ‘farcical’ (p. 287), tension-relieving tradition of commedia dell’ arte.

Duncan Salkeld’s essay, ‘Much Ado About Italians in Renaissance London’ (pp. 305–16), argues for a conflation of Italy and contemporary London as a source of anxiety, because of the way the tropes of genre are awkwardly juxtaposed against a seedier reality that looks to the city beyond the playhouse walls. As is consistent with Marrapodi’s collection, Salkeld spends some time outlining the analogous Italian text—in this case, Ariosto’s Orlando Furioso, whose fifth canto not only adheres to Much Ado’s Hero subplot, but, Salkeld contends, mirrored a practice of hiding away women in early modern London. Salkeld seeks to draw a parallel between Much Ado About Nothing and a late 1570s prostitution ring, through the evidence that many of the men prosecuted for keeping prostitutes were Italian and a more generalized reputation of Italians in London for sexual deception and licentiousness. Likewise, Salkeld attempts to build a case for potential sources, or at least cultural overlap, on the 1601/2 case of the propositioning (or abduction—the distinction is deliberately left vague in the essay) of Mary Copeland, by the French ‘Master Benedick’. Like many of the essays in this collection, the lack of distinct methodology allows for little more than raising an interesting coincidence that is rarely fully tethered to a reading of the text.
Marrapodi’s book shares many topics and methodologies with Henke and Nicholson’s *Transnational Mobilities*, including the concept of theatregrams. In “‘Wanton Pictures’: The Baffling of Christopher Sly and the Visual-Verbal Intercourse of Early Modern Erotic Arts’ (pp. 123–46), Kier Elam argues for the trans-cultural value of the erotic art promised to Christopher Sly at the beginning of the play, tracing the Italian connection from the Prologue’s admonition to the audience not to expect a ‘wanton Suppose’, which, Elam argues, looks to Ariosto’s *I Suppositi*’s own references to erotic art, as well as Aretino and Raimondi’s infamous illustrated sonnets, which, Elam argues, enjoyed a presence on the early modern English stage. In particular, Jonson’s extensive referencing of the illustrations of the Aretino validates not only the assumption that the texts were known by dramatists and audiences alike, but that at the heart of ‘this early modern English tradition of citations are not the sonnets but the “pictures”, as they are almost invariably called, often attributed directly, as we have seen, to Aretino’ (p. 133).

Elam moves back towards *The Taming of the Shrew* through Aretino’s own play, *Il Marescalco*, which through the homosocial trope of a man marrying a boy in disguise, offers its audience a ‘double Aretinian pedigree’ through allusions to the sonnets and dramatic similarities to his plays. Unfortunately, Elam does not fully unpack the implications for *The Taming of the Shrew*’s gender politics when he points out the passive ventriloquism of the women in Aretino’s sonnets, which he acknowledges as misogynistic, instead maintaining a textual focus on the ekphrasis of trans-cultural references throughout the induction.

In David McInnis and Matthew Steggle’s collection *Lost Plays in Shakespeare’s England*, Christi Spain-Savage’s chapter, ‘Reimagining Gillian: The Merry Wives of Windsor and the Lost “Friar Fox and Gillian of Brentford”’ (pp. 229–52), argues that the archetype of the Witch of Brentford, based on history, and most notably presented in the lost Admiral’s men’s play *Friar Fox and Gillian of Brentford*, validates the recent critical trend that sees *The Merry Wives of Windsor* as revised between the 1602 quarto and 1623 First Folio. Spain-Savage notes that the revisions between the quarto and Folio versions of the play refine Falstaff’s comedy in the scene from a broad physical endeavour to a more topical resonance of Mother Prat, which looked towards the recent representation of Gillian of Brentford by the Admiral’s men. Spain-Savage traces the literary evolution of Gillian from a tavern hostess and bawd into a cunning woman, suggesting that the shift, from a bawd to the witch that Falstaff alludes to, occurs in the lost play *Friar Fox and Gillian of Brentford*. Spain-Savage offers the conjecture that Gillian’s association with a comically mystical religious figure might have marked her out with the potential for necromancy that informed Shakespeare’s appropriation, which shifts from ‘Gillian of Brentford’ in 1602, to ‘the witch of Brentford’ in 1623. Moreover, Spain-Savage suggests that the desexualization of the woman of Brentford speaks more to the public identification of Gillian as a cunning woman than as a bawd, further supporting Spain-Savage’s case for the influential presence of *Friar Fox and Gillian of Brentford* in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. 
Lindsay Ann Reid’s brief treatment of The Taming of the Shrew as part of her larger study of Ovid’s place in the culture of the Tudor book, Ovidian Bibliofictions and the Tudor Book: Metamorphosing Classical Heroines in Late Medieval and Renaissance England, treats the play as an exemplum that saw women in literature ‘collected, glossed, and represented in a series of new and ever-changing textual permutations’ (p. 40). Reid argues that The Taming of the Shrew is deeply ‘invested in exploring the persuasive power of the Tudor rhetor and in dramatizing the labile nature of exempla in the querelle des femmes’ (p. 58), particularly through Bianca’s schooling. The ironic invocation of Ovid in Bianca’s courtship pedagogy creates an intertextual identity for women, employing both literary and rhetorical strategies as a means of shaping or contextualizing character. In particular, Reid argues, the concept of the good and bad sister is constructed so as to allow the most skilled orator ‘to render shrewish women and worthy women virtually interchangeable’ (p. 60). Petruchio’s rhetorical ability is consecrated in the final act, where he is able to dominate other men in the game of exemplary wives, staging the ‘persuasive ability of the rhetor to argue in utramque partem’ (p. 63).

Kurt Schreyer’s book Shakespeare’s Medieval Craft: Remnants of the Mysteries on the London Stage is an insightful analysis of the heritage of medieval mystery plays on Shakespeare’s stage. In the chapter ‘Balaam to Bottom: A Sixteenth-Century Translation’, Schreyer proposes to elide the Ovidian allusions, and instead read Bottom’s ass’s head in the context of ‘the drama, liturgy festival, and polemic of the sixteenth century’ (p. 74). He foregrounds the materiality of the craftsmen, and builds an argument for a parallel between the popular Chester Cycle play Moses and the Law: Balaack and Balaam, in which the unwitting Balaam falls into an argument with his ass, which has stopped on the road to prostrate itself in the presence of an angel. Schreyer trades on the well-established artisanal nature of medieval drama to suggest the quality of the ass’s costume that might indicate the play’s popularity, which extended into the seventeenth century and, more significantly, to suggest that Shakespeare was ‘keenly aware of the centrality of craft to mystery playing, and the Pyramus and Thisbe scenes in Dream comically exploit it’ (p. 78).

Schreyer uses the Chester Cycle to launch a brief history of the ass-headed man, moving through Scot’s Discoverie of Witchcraft in 1584, into Protestant anti-papal tracts, including John Barthlet’s The Pedegrews of Heretiques [1566] and Pierre Boaistuau’s 1569 Certaine Secrete Wonders of Nature, suggesting a metamorphosis (pun intended) of the image between generations of viewers of the Chester Cycle. This multifaceted figure of the popish ass, Schreyer contends, could simultaneously represent Rome’s spiritual greed, beastly appetites, and vicarious sexuality, and a theatrical nostalgia to the people who witnessed the image in the late sixteenth century. Schreyer then uses the textual references of the materiality of the head, combined with properties accounts, to speculate that an impoverished craft guild might have sold the head to London players. More engagingly, he builds on this speculation to propose a transformation of the object of the ass’s head from feminized devotional parody to a more secular sexualized object. This conflation, he contends, looks backward rather than forwards, and ‘brings the religious history of the ass into
closer proximity by retaining previous cultural affinities’ (p. 95), before satirizing the archaic dramatic forms that the presence of the ass’s head would invoke, through Pyramus and Thisbe.

Mary Villeponteaux’s book *The Queen’s Mercy: Gender and Judgment in Representations of Elizabeth I* is a historicist exercise to identify Elizabeth as an influence on a variety of early modern texts. In her chapter, “‘A Goodly Musicke In Her Regiment’: Elusive Justice in *The Merchant of Venice*”, Villeponteaux argues that Portia represents an Elizabeth figure who is historicized as Protestant by the burden she bears, not only to show mercy, but to impose a rigorous punishment on the religious others who would threaten her realm. Villeponteaux cleaves a little too much to the Portia/Elizabeth analogy, eschewing a more layered argument of representation in favour of historical analogies, arguing that Portia ‘most fully embodies the conflicting fantasies of Elizabeth as a judge who can act both as a tender, merciful queen and rigorous scourge of religious enemies’ (p. 112). That said, there is value in the shift away from a Marian figure of Elizabeth in the analysis of Portia’s implementation of punishment. Portia’s calculated distance from the final judgement of Shylock, Villeponteaux claims, elides the charge of severity in much the same way that Elizabeth disavowed responsibility for Mary Stuart’s execution, and the end of the chapter’s inclusion of *Endymion* begins a more effective dialogue about the ways in which Elizabeth’s (and thereby Portia’s) rule continues to be subject to the pressures of a largely male court.

“‘Pardon Is Still the Nurse of Second Woe’: *Measure for Measure* and the Transition from Elizabeth to James’, registers the play as a product of a liminal time in between two rulers, asserting that the text is subsequently an anticipation of ‘a more absolutist ideology’ (p. 134) that would be inherently less merciful than its predecessor’s. Villeponteaux aligns Elizabeth with the Duke Vincentio, whose leniency has seen the kingdom fall into disarray, yet resists the execution of strict justice for fear of tarnishing his image. In *Measure for Measure*, Villeponteaux contends, ‘mercy is repeatedly aligned with sexuality, the fruits of pardon with the fruits of intercourse’ (p. 141). In the wake of such contamination, Isabel’s plea for clemency is undermined by the sordid reality of what such mercy could unleash—a concern realized when the appeal to Angelo’s empathy awakens his desire for Isabel. Villeponteaux brings this argument back to James I by arguing that the quality of mercy is dictated by the privacy of the decision-making process, where the unruly passions of the individual may run free. By contrast, she argues, the final scene, in which mercy is meted out in the public sphere, removes the danger of unbounded, subjective mercy—something that she argues James I stage-managed throughout his monarchy.

Unsurprisingly, Susan Wiseman’s exploration of metamorphosis as a literary device, *Writing Metamorphosis in the English Renaissance 1550–1700*, begins with a discussion of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, offering the play up as ‘a test case in the transformations undergone by classical metamorphosis’ (p. 15). Metamorphosis, for Wiseman, is thematized, both through the intertextual character that defines the play’s construction, and through theatrical discourse, for example in the doubling of mechanicals with fairies. Her thesis leads into a brief précis of the various source materials that
Shakespeare stitches together in the play, and the various transformations within the narrative. Wiseman suggests that the transformation accrues valuable layers onto the original baseline, and leaves a residue that propels forward, which, she argues, pits ‘the constant and true against the changed and wandering’ (p. 25), both textually and thematically. The chapter juggles the discussion of source material and the shape of the content, to suggest ‘a dense saturation of metaphoric material which is in varying degrees likely to be present to auditors’ (p. 27). Wiseman’s book covers an enormous breadth of material, and passes through our subject texts briefly. The book’s later discussion of transformed nature in The Tempest proposes the play as a cabinet of curiosities that appeals to the curiosity of seventeenth-century audience members. More pithy than the Midsummer Night’s Dream exegesis, Wiseman’s discussion of The Tempest proposes that metamorphosis is addressed under the topic of generation, posing ‘the conundrum of the monster alongside the magical resolution of the problem of inheritance in the main plot’ (p. 116), through Caliban’s desire to people the isle with his own progeny. The ‘generation and uses of monsters’ (p. 116) is filtered through an analysis of Trinculo, who envisions an adoption, and use, for the monstrous progeny of the island. The constant shifting of genre in the play reinforces the navigation of the borders between human, natural, supernatural, and monstrous, and these movements are classified as metamorphic ‘in either Aristotelian or Baconian formations’ (p. 124).

Amid a sea of productions, Magdalena Adamczyk’s ‘Interactional Aspects of Language Based Humour in Shakespeare’s Comedies: The Dynamics of Punning by Ladies in Waiting’ (Atlantis 36:i[2014] 11–30) is the lone article on The Two Gentlemen of Verona in 2014. Building a comparative study that also includes Twelfth Night and Much Ado About Nothing, Adamczyk suggests that among ladies in waiting punning becomes an attempt to assert dominance over interlocutors. Adamczyk’s article is data-driven, creating a word-to-pun ratio to establish a gender division that sees servant women out-punning their male counterparts. She notes a ‘socially asymmetric all-female participant framework’ for puns that empower the serving women, most commonly over their mistresses’ pretentious expectations, observing that, for example, Lucetta’s punning delays the handover of Julia’s letter. Punning, therefore, allows women to interact and redress aspects of social imbalance.

Ryan Farrar, in his essay, ‘As You Like It: The Thin Line Between Legitimate Utopia and Compensatory Vacation’ (UtopST 25:ii[2014] 359–83), contends that As You Like It recognizes the inconsistency of personal utopias, and as a result creates, in the Forest of Arden, ‘a space in which social fantasy uncharacteristic of Elizabethan society can blossom’ (p. 366). The conflict between the courtly visions and enactment of utopian values and Jaques’ more complicated and realistic response is enacted to complicate the Duke’s creation of a pastoral Arcadia. Farrar uses canonical scholars, including Harold Bloom, to make broad assertions about the Romantic nature of the Forest of Arden, suggesting that the subjective moods create a conflicting pack of attitudes that ‘may disrupt and taint the forest’s natural order’ (p. 370). Most interestingly, Farrar suggests that the duality present in the play, in particular Orlando’s dystopian experience, permits an ambivalent appeal to two entirely
different audiences (p. 372), creating a play the ending to which is both ‘tidy and subversive’ (p. 380).

Leah Marcus’s far-reaching discussion of implicit colonialism as a characteristic of As You Like It’s reception history, ‘Anti-Conquest and As You Like It’ (ShakS 42[2014] 170–95), doesn’t entirely fulfil its promise to examine ‘the paratextual means by which editors have intensified a fascinating process of provincialization in editing the play’ (p. 171), instead, offering a deep, if occasionally digressive, reading of gendered animal imagery in the play, suggesting that the animal–human interactions within the play are analogous to colonialism. Marcus’s labyrinthine argument begins with the suggestion that Shakespeare’s excision of the French elements of Rosalynde creates a more thoroughly English narrative, which establishes a bias in the play’s central characters against the foreign. This isolates Jaques through his continual association with ‘strange rituals that have come over the years to carry strong colonial resonances’ (p. 173), and requires his removal from the play, in order to remove ‘the threat of nebulous difference that might otherwise taint Rosalind, Orlando, and the rest of the “inland bred”’ (p. 174). From there, Marcus goes on to suggest Jaques’ sympathetic, yet nonetheless colonial, association with the deer of the forest, which she convincingly argues by tracing the Latin roots of Jaques’ exclamation ‘ducadame!’ (II.v.54), translating it as ‘Lead, O deer!’ (p. 186). The threat of human and animal melding that occurs when Orlando imagines himself a doe to Adam’s fawn, and the general gender instability, contribute to a threat of contamination to the sacred provincialism in the Forest of Arden that is contained by Jaques’ isolation at the end of the play.

All of this is well and good, but Marcus rests her editorial argument on the claim that Rosalind is sufficiently preferred to warrant insulation from the contaminative threat of the outsider. Marcus rest this on the argument that ‘editors have chivalrously protected Rosalind against references that point to her underlying male identity’, such as instances of ‘hee’ in the Folio text and the assumption that the Folio’s final ‘Exit of the play is an ‘Exeunt’, taking all of the characters offstage for Rosalind’s epilogue, thus denying them the opportunity to engage with the gender confusion that Rosalind’s declaration of female identity would elicit, and preventing entirely any challenge to the well-ordered ending (pp. 189–90). Unfortunately, Marcus does not convincingly connect this to the editorial agency she claims drives the essay, leaving unsubstantiated the claim that the 1986 Oxford Shakespeare ‘encountered considerable resistance’ (p. 172) to its suggestion that the forest at the heart of the text was the French Ardennes; and, moreover, Marcus follows this with nineteenth- and early twentieth-century stage history to reinforce the argument. This is a pity, because otherwise the essay overall is well crafted and its complex trajectory carefully worked out.

Matthieu A. Chapman’s essay, ‘The Appearance of Blacks on the Early Modern Stage: Love’s Labour’s Lost’s African Connections to Court’ (EarT 17:ii[2014] 77–94), is an attempt to redress the ‘continual erasure of actual blacks from English theatrical history in favour of white men in blackface’ (p. 80). Chapman’s important essay also attempts to undo the perceived academic binary that suggests a prevailing fascination with black bodies that
permits only revulsion and fascination, challenging the assumptions of critics such as Dympna Callaghan and Ayanna Thompson. Chapman does so by arguing for the presence of ‘actual blacks on commercial and court stages’, going as far as to suggest the possibility ‘that Shakespeare wrote the blackamoor musicians into Love’s Labour’s Lost to make use of actual blackamoor musicians available at court’ (p. 80) as a demonstration of cultural and economic power. Chapman uses the scant evidence available to suggest that the exploitation of the performative skills of black Africans was commodified by the nobility at court to ‘enhance their own social status’ (p. 81). From there, it is a reasonable assumption that the commercial stages followed suit, and Chapman suggests that there was an exploitation at play through ‘staging the exoticism of othered races for commercial purposes’ (p. 81), using a selection of texts, including Marlowe’s Tamburlaine, Lodge’s Wounds of Civil War, George Peele’s Battle of Alcazar, and Beaumont and Fletcher’s Island Princess, as well as Shakespeare’s own The Merchant of Venice and Titus Andronicus, as evidence. Moreover, Chapman synthesizes the textual examples with the practical argument that it was simply more affordable and easier to hire a black actor rather than pay for cosmetics that would eliminate the ability for an actor to play both a black and a white character in the same production.

Chapman concludes his argument by speculating that Shakespeare wrote the blackamoor musicians into his play ‘to garner favour by allowing the Elizabethan court an opportunity to place actual black Africans on the stage as a display of status and power’ (p. 88). Although Chapman freely acknowledges the likelihood that his is an argument ‘of possibility rather than probability’ (p. 89), the 1605 performance of Love’s Labour’s Lost at Whitehall, which occurred the day before Jonson presented The Masque of Blackness, speaks to a fetishization that encourages the assumption that the court interest in black Africans created social sanctions that allowed a space for black performers.

As its title suggests, Tara and Philip Collington’s article, ‘“The Time When . . . The Place Where”: Chronotopes and Chronologies in Love’s Labour’s Lost’ (SP 11:iv[2014] 786–820), examines the way in which Bakhtin’s chronotope can be used to illustrate three concurrent temporo-spatial frames in the play that ‘affect[] thematic coherence’ (p. 789) throughout the text. The article argues for three frameworks. The chronotope of the retreat is signified by the three-year withdrawal from sexual contact, in which ‘physical space is rigidly demarcated (inside vs. outside), and distances are precisely measured into zones’ (p. 796). The invasion of the men’s isolated space brings the chronotope of the embassy into play, the public nature of which collapses a clear distinction between time and space, and, more importantly, brings the chronotope into direct collision with that of the retreat, which is invoked in the play by the vaguely militaristic presence of the French tents and humorous siege mentality. These two chronotopes interact in such a way that blurs the consistency of the timeline in the play, which is the chronotope of the comic idyll, which ‘preserves space as an idealized natural setting for courtship but accelerates temporality to a fever pitch’ (p. 809) to satisfy the Aristotelian unity of time, and complement the notion of love’s frenzy. This final chronotope is deeply invested in the pastoral, existing in a
space that accelerates temporal change, both by the association with the changing seasons and the insistence that, to the lovers, ‘every second counts’ (p. 811)—an idea that is later complicated by the intrusion of real life as the play concludes. Collington and Collington’s article suggests that the play’s ostensibly unsatisfactory ending can occur because of the braiding together of these three distinct chronotopes, which continue to operate on their individual spatio-temporal prerogatives, ultimately resulting in ‘an audacious medley’ (p. 820) of experimental forms.

Maurice Hunt’s brief essay, ‘Thomas Nashe, The Vnfortvn ate Traveller, and Love’s Labour’s Lost’ (SEL 54:ii[2014] 297–314), is an argument for Nashe’s The Vnfortvnte Traveller as influential on the diction, imagery, and satirical nature of Shakespeare’s Love’s Labour’s Lost. In particular, Hunt notes that the ‘repetition of parallel clauses and phrases within an elaborate sentence; the similar structure of colorful, often hyperbolic rhetoric; the huddling of utterance in a nonstop statement; the preference for cumulative sentences bursting with imaginative metaphors’ (p. 297) links Moth’s Act III speech to Nashe’s prose style. Linguistic similarities abound, including the likening of the King of Navarre’s love sonnet to Surrey’s poems in Nashe, as well as dramaturgical common ground, including Love’s Labour’s Lost’s staging of the Nine Worthies, a vision that is presented to Charles V in Nashe’s prose picaresque. Hunt acknowledges that his case is not new, seeking to add to Douglas Bruster’s recent critical analysis of Nashe’s influence. Hunt suggests that, in this case, the value of association lies in the character of Moth, who, by association, Hunt suggests, makes Nashe’s Juvenalian excess ‘more attractive’ (p. 310), repaying a compliment to Nashe in response to the defence of plays that exists in Pierce Penilesse.

In ‘Antonio’s (Happy) Ending: Queer Closure in All-Male Twelfth Night’ (CompD 48:iii[2014] 221–40) Chad Allen Thomas argues that the recent history of post-millennial all-male productions of As You Like It creates ‘a cross-gendered Shakespearean aesthetic that is sexy, provocative, queer, and often emphasizes homoerotic attraction’ (p. 223). Thomas argues for a ‘more explicit, textual homoeroticism’ (p. 224) that modern productions, in conversation with one another, can yield, moving away from an examination of how such eroticism was manifest in early modern stagings. As Thomas acknowledges, such productions spring from an ideological choice to queer Shakespeare, eschewing the recent trend for ‘original practice’ productions. Thomas uses cross-gender casting to challenge the argument of Northrop Frye’s 1957 model of comedy, which suggests that end-of-play coupling satisfies audience expectations. The suggestion that ‘cross-gender casting can reveal a stage production’s attitude towards sexual and gender identity in ways that we can otherwise only intuit’ (p. 229), because of corporeal embodiment, does not seem to permeate deeper than the assumption that performance denotes gender, and as a result, offers more of a survey of increased acceptance by recent audiences than a more carefully theorized assessment of the value of eroticized male bodies on the modern stage. Thomas’s affirmative case for the ways in which ‘Queer Shakespeare offers lesbian and gay audience members the opportunity to feel as if they belong’ (p. 237) would also have benefited from being contextualized by a broader queer history of Shakespeare on stage.
Ellen M. Caldwell’s essay, ‘Opportunistic Portia as Fortuna in The Merchant of Venice’ (SEL 54:ii[2014] 349–73), presents Portia as the emblem of the Renaissance figure of the fickle Fortuna, who creates ‘rewards and punishments as determined by her desire’ (p. 349). As a result, Caldwell states, the play becomes a study not of justice and mercy, but ‘of how opportunistic entrepreneurs operate in marriage and the market place’ (p. 350). After a cursory nod towards Shakespeare’s correct and incorrect use of emblems scattered across his plays, Caldwell jumps into a close reading of the emblematic imagery in the first scene of Act IV, to make a case for reading the scene iconographically. Moving from Shylock’s scale-wielding parody of justice to Justice’s own representation as a legal scholar in the 1758–60 Iconologia, Caldwell goes on to more carefully parse the play to suggest that ‘Portia dons the blindfold of male disguise that allows her to use the law’s impartiality to exercise her obvious partiality in this legal dispute’ (p. 352). To define Portia as Fortuna not only undermines any semblance of justice in the play, but also speaks to an early modern conflation of Fortuna and Occasio that allows for Caldwell’s description of Portia as an entrepreneur, pragmatically taking advantage of ‘unlooked for and undeserved’ (p. 364) changes in circumstances that she can manipulate to her advantage.

David Goldstein’s essay, ‘Jews, Scots, and Pigs in The Merchant of Venice’ (SEL 54:ii[2014] 315–48), is a historicist reading that situates the obsession with similitude in The Merchant of Venice as part of a greater topical anxiety between England and Scotland that emerged during the 1590s. In particular, Goldstein’s lengthy meditation on kashrut, a practice, he notes, that is omitted from The Jew of Malta and The Three Ladies of London, argues that the practice was positively viewed as analogous to the Christian sacrifice of generosity in early modern culture. Goldstein makes this argument to reinforce the extant critical connection between Jews and Puritans in early modern culture, before noting that there was another prominent group which was associated with ‘religious radicalism, usury, miserliness, greed, cruelty, hypocrisy, falsehood, jealousy, Old Testament literalness, outright Judaizing, persecution by the Spanish inquisition, and all round otherness’ (p. 320)—the Scots. The post-Scottish Reformation transferral of Puritan stereotypes onto the Scots, Goldstein argues, centralizes gluttony, and by introducing Shylock with his rejection of pork, Shakespeare plays on the popular contemporary myth of the Scottish aversion to pork, further tracking swine-Scottish punning to James I’s family name, which is derived from ‘sty ward’ or pig-keeper (p. 324), to convincingly suggest that the expectations of a stage Scot are ‘paradoxically embodied in the person of a Venetian Jew’ (p. 326).

To argue for the Scottish contextual reading rejects traditional notions of The Merchant of Venice as engaging with the Lopez controversy, or the larger issue of Puritan radicalism, and by doing so, suggests a complex engagement with the notion of the union of two crowns, which is manifest in the Bassanio–Portia and Jessica–Lorenzo pairings, in which ‘the principle of parity struggles, mostly unsuccessfully, within a hierarchy of dominance’ (p. 329). To do so requires analogizing Bassanio as the Scot and Portia as an avatar of Elizabeth, which is manifest in Portia’s attempt to sever Bassanio from his divided duty between her and the implicitly French Antonio. Likewise, the anxiety
surrounding Jessica’s conversion and assimilation suggests an uneasy alliance between the two nations.

Harriet Phillips’s essay, ‘Late Falstaff, the Merry World, and The Merry Wives of Windsor’ (Shakespeare 10:ii[2014] 111–37), attempts to redress the critical disappointment in Falstaff’s representation in the play by suggesting that nostalgia for his past comedic glory drives the nature of comedy in the play. The Merry Wives of Windsor ‘explores the pressures of accommodating the past in early modern England’ (p. 113) through the carnivalesque Sir John, exposing the impossibility of nostalgia’s continued existence in the present. Philips unpacks the outdated nature of the merry world topos to Elizabethan culture, suggesting that traditional merriment becomes increasingly suspect during the Puritan Reformation. The emphasis on Falstaff’s age, his downward spiral, from the Henriad into the Merry Wives of Windsor, and the contemporary nature of Shakespeare’s Windsor all contribute to the portrayal of a man out of date. Philips chooses not to discuss Anne Page and the generational disparity in the play, instead arguing for an evolution of the wives’ humour that ultimately leaves Falstaff ‘an old comic adrift in a new form’ (p. 126).

Jason Gleckman’s convincing essay ‘‘I know a bank. . . .’’: A Midsummer Night’s Dream, Fairies, and the Erotic History of England (Shakespeare 10:i[2014] 23–45), uses literary history, specifically Spenser’s The Faerie Queene, as a means of interrogating the evolving value of marital eroticism in Protestant England through ‘those erotic beings native to the English countryside: the fairies’ (p. 23). Gleckman argues for seeing the transition between Egeus’ ancient privilege to dispose of Hermia as he wishes and Theseus’ slightly more modern amelioration as analogous to the early modern transferral of nuns’ authority—derived from the Virgin Mary—to the virginal queen, Elizabeth I. It is ‘in such ways, [that] the opening of A Midsummer Night’s Dream offers a concise imaginary history of the erotic’ (p. 25). Linking Lysander’s English gifts of ‘knacks, trifles, nosegays, sweetmeats’ (I.i.34) with the environment that houses the fairies, Gleckman creates a space for the uninhibited erotic, and argues that by looking to Spenser we might see how the intensity of these erotic, sexual desires might be channelled towards the Protestant faith.

Unsurprisingly, Gleckman moves to Book III, and Britomart, to make his case, arguing that she becomes Shakespeare’s ‘template for womanhood, the embodiment of an erotic virtù that produces, among other things, a female insistence on marrying the man of her choice’ (p. 30). Gleckman uses ecocriticism to elucidate the eroticized female autonomy that links Spenser’s women and Shakespeare’s, using Spenser’s own acknowledgement of the sensual forest and garden to create a reflection in A Midsummer Night’s Dream, one that absorbs Spenser’s own belief in concupiscence, which allows God to work through the flesh as deeply as through the spirit, turning ‘the heart of stone into one of flesh’ (p. 35). If Bottom, as Gleckman argues, is ‘capable of receiving the intense gift’ (p. 36) of fairy-generated sexual power, there is hope for us all.

Peter Herman’s essay, ‘Equity and the Problem of Theseus in A Midsummer Night’s Dream; or, The Ancient Constitution in Ancient Athens’ (JEMCS
14:4–31), argues a simple yet significant premise: that Theseus, by using his equity to overrule Egeus’ demands for Hermia’s death, pushes up against tyranny, achieving ‘the right result, but for the wrong reasons’ (p. 4). This presents a potentially darker vision of Theseus that is more in accord with the ‘threatening atmosphere that hangs over’ (p. 23) Pyramus and Thisbe and the resolutions of the play as a whole. Athens, Herman argues, was a ‘nation of laws, not people’ (p. 7), created by Theseus, and aspirationally recognized by an early modern England and monarch who ‘embraced their subservience to the law’ (p. 8). Herman delves deeply into sixteenth-century judicial debates that circulated around the extent of monarchical equity, not surprisingly finding his wealth of material produced in the 1520s, in response to Thomas Wolsey’s declaration that the king ‘ought of his royal dignity and prerogative to mitigate the rigor of the law where conscience hath the most force’ (quoted in Herman, p. 12). Theseus’ own impatience for his wedding, Herman suggests, is an acquiescence in the rule of law, and his first-act amelioration of Egeus’ demands is as far as he might reasonably go without circumventing the law, even in the face of what an early modern audience would have recognized as a ‘monstrous’ (p. 17) patriarchal privilege. This matters, Herman contends, because as well as undermining the Ancient Constitution, it also violates the English coronation oath, and looks forward to Theseus’ own overthrow and expulsion from Athens.

Gitanjali Shahani’s essay, ‘The Spiced Indian Air in Early Modern England’ (ShakS 42[2014] 122–37), is a splendid New Historicist treatment of A Midsummer Night’s Dream that argues that there is a manifestation of the ambivalence about ‘cultural corporeal boundaries’ (p. 123) that the spice trade provoked in Titania’s preoccupation with her Indian boy. Shahani examines both anti-spice pamphlets and recipe books to suggest a concern with the contamination of the natural body that specifically implicated women, by the domestic source of such contamination. That the dangers of ‘heterogeneous mixing’ (p. 127) of spices in the kitchen were offset by female medical and culinary expertise emerges in A Midsummer Night’s Dream, where ‘we see early articulations of a justificatory logic that would inform later narratives of colonial plunder’ (p. 129), drawn together by Robin Goodfellow’s participation in an ‘indigenous domestic economy’ (p. 130).

Shahani argues that the pre-colonial vision of a ‘part mythical, part mercantile’ (p. 131) India, which Titania’s obsession with the changeling boy indicates, is a manifestation of the ‘growing female fascination with Indian novelties’ (p. 131) that was causing consternation in the domestic English household. As a result of this credible, well-argued historical assessment, Shahani’s reading of Oberon’s attempt to curtail the ‘female obsession with foreign merchandise’ (p. 133) is persuasive. This is further compounded by the article’s efficient examination of Bottom as a mulatto, which calls attention to Titania’s troublesome obsession with the ‘implicit monstrosity of the Indian boy’ (p. 134).

Paul Innes’s article, ‘Sensory Confusion and the Generation Gap in Much Ado About Nothing’ (CS 26:iii[2014] 1–20), offers a careful and well-argued close reading of how the play ‘plays with spectatorship, hearing and audience perspectives’ (p. 4). In particular, Innes argues, acknowledging our current
placement in a very visual culture will allow us to look back more carefully at
the Renaissance stage, which thrived on verbal representation, the uncertainty
of which is key to Much Ado About Nothing. To abandon a search for
character psychology, Innes argues, not only affords a closer understanding of
Renaissance dramaturgy, but will reveal a difference between generations that
underpins the play. The dramatic narrative schema that divides character
groups by generational differences is founded on the Renaissance notion of
utility—that is to say that age, like gender, ‘is another “nothing” that is rope
for dramatic exploration’ (p. 13). In Much Ado About Nothing, Innes contends,
age and experience are able to circumvent the ongoing miscommunications
that characterize the play, and that, ultimately, ‘Leonato functions as the
leader of a group of characters that will re-assert patriarchal control over the
women and the younger men of the play’ (p. 15). Leonato’s reconstitution of
patriarchy at the end of the play, embodied when he stops Beatrice’s mouth by
giving her to Benedick, renders Much Ado About Nothing more akin to the late
plays, such as The Tempest or, more obviously, The Winter’s Tale, which
engage with generational anxieties.

Jonathan Burton’s essay, ‘Christopher Sly’s Arabian Night: Shakespeare’s
The Taming of the Shrew as World Literature’ (JEMCS 14:iii[2014] 3–30), on
The Taming of the Shrew seeks to consider the influence of non-Western
narrative traditions on Shakespeare’s imagination, arguing that The Taming of
the Shrew’s lord-for-a-day Christopher Sly narrative finds commonality in The
Arabian Nights, which also draws on the dream-conceit. Burton’s analysis is
tilted towards the pedagogical goal of ‘crossing cultural and disciplinary
borders in a moment when East and West continue to be seen in terms of their
allegedly irreconcilable traditions and values’ (p. 7).

Kerry Gilbert-Cooke’s effective essay, ‘Addressing the Adressee:
Shakespeare and Early Modern Epistolary Theory’ (JEMS 3[2014] 243–63),
makes the argument that epistolary theory manifests itself in Shakespeare
through the concern of appropriate superscription. Gilbert-Cook specifically
examines comedies in this context, because of the ‘vertical communication’ (p.
245) that is exclusive to the comedies, as characters reach out to their social
superiors. The article uses the historiography of epistolary writing to argue for
an under-theorization of the formal elements of the letter, in particular, the
role of the addressee. In Shakespeare, Gilbert-Cooke contends, attention is
drawn to the formal elements of the letter to reinforce the contents of the text,
conveying especially eroticism, allowing for reading to reciprocate ‘the desire
that writing conveyed’ (p. 255). For example, Malvolio’s act of reading
Maria’s letter crystallizes his fantasy of social advancement, that, following the
perusal of the letter, manifests itself in lust for Olivia. The social deference
indicated by the formal elements of Maria’s letter makes explicit the social
opportunity at the heart of the letter, which is what Malvolio seizes upon. At
the other end of the spectrum, the lack of care and attention to the details of
Falstaff’s letters to Mistresses Page and Ford, identical in all but name,
communicate the disrespect that spurs their revenge—more so than the
impetus behind their composition.

Nick Hutchinson and Donald Jellerson’s analysis, in ‘“I do care for
something”: Twelfth Night’s Feste and the Performance of Character’ (ShakB
Proposing a ‘strategic essentialism’ (p. 188) that is born out of historical stage practice, literary analysis, and actor preparation, Hutchinson and Jellerson use the type of character exploration that is typical of the modern rehearsal room as a means of discovering the mysterious ‘something’ that Feste claims to care for in III.i of *Twelfth Night*, referring several times to the rehearsal processes of unnamed actors. The collaborative work between the performance practitioner and literary scholar yields an admirable close reading, although I suspect the main value of such an article is pedagogical, as it indeed does rely on a textual essentialism that can only work in a more traditional production context; that is, assuming that no directorial concept reconfigures the balance of characters, their relationship to one another, and the setting. Even if the stability of such a practice feels somewhat overstated, this well-researched and diligent essay makes a salient case for academic investment in the ‘emotional life’ (p. 191) of characters.

In a careful close reading, ‘What they Will: Comic Grammar in *Twelfth Night*’ (*Shakespeare* 10:ii[2014] 158–70), Rikita Tyson argues that the use of modal auxiliary verbs, particularly ‘will’, suggests that the play ultimately rests ‘hope’ on the active use of ‘will’. Tyson resists the urge to unpack all instances of ‘I will’ in *Twelfth Night*, carefully choosing instances that illustrate the verb’s association with wish and desire. This modal utterance, which she links with ‘can’, ‘may’, ‘must’, and ‘might’, ‘bring a being into being, demonstrating the thinking, evaluating, and judging that characters are always doing by means of these declarations’ (p. 160), locating activity in *Twelfth Night* in small verbal choices made by various characters. Viola’s language, for example, posits her will that her brother will survive the shipwreck, creating hope ‘through an act of will and wordplay’ (p. 163). Hope, in turn, creates the will to seek out the opportunity that leads Viola to Orsino. Tyson carefully traces out the interplay of assertion of, and submission to, the wills of the self and others, to outline how these utterances create a space for action. Ultimately, she argues that Viola’s ‘actions show us the paradox of will suggested by the fluidity of modal meanings: obligation and volition, inference and demand, can be revealed by, compressed into, and even enacted by these pinpricks of words in the smallest of sentences’ (p. 167); this sort of paradox shapes the comic energies of the play, and gives direction to the desires of the characters.
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