VII

Shakespeare

BRETT GREATLEY-HIRSCH, PETER J. SMITH,
ELISABETTA TARANTINO, DOMENICO LOVASCIO,
SHIRLEY BELL, CHRISTIAN GRIFFITHS,
KATE WILKINSON, SHEILAGH ILONA O'BRIEN, AND
LOUISE POWELL

This chapter has three sections: 1. Editions and Textual Studies; 2. Shakespeare in the Theatre; 3. Criticism. Section 1 is by Brett Greatley-Hirsch; section 2 is by Peter J. Smith; section 3(a) is by Elisabetta Tarantino; section 3(b) is by Domenico Lovascio; section 3(c) is by Shirley Bell; section 3(d) is by Christian Griffiths; section 3(e) is by Kate Wilkinson; section 3(f) is by Sheilagh Ilona O'Brien; section 3(g) is by Louise Powell.

1. Editions and Textual Studies

Readers will, I hope, forgive the relative brevity and narrow scope of this section as a necessary consequence of accepting the *YWES* brief three-quarters into the year. To avoid piecemeal, superficial treatment of the full range of this year's offerings in Shakespearean textual studies, I limit my focus to a more manageable section of scholarship: studies in authorship attribution and the apocrypha. My discussion thus excludes a great deal of interesting and important work across a field whose vibrancy and rapid evolution is reflected by the range of topics brought together in Margaret Jane Kidnie and Sonia Massai's *Shakespeare and Textual Studies* (CUP). My capacity as interim caretaker of this section similarly does not allow me to give the third edition of *The Norton Shakespeare* (Norton) and three impressive monographs — Laura Estill's *Dramatic Extracts in Seventeenth-Century English Manuscripts* (UDelP), Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume's *The Publication of Plays in London 1660–1800* (BL), and Zachary Lesser's *Hamlet after Q1* (UPennP) — the due consideration and thorough assessment they deserve. No doubt my successor will wish to address these and other studies here neglected in a suitably enlarged section next year.

The Year's Work in English Studies (2017) © The Author 2017. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the English Association. All rights reserved. For Permissions, please email: journal-s.permissions@oup.com
doi:10.1093/ywes/max008

Aside from the *Norton* collected works, four single-text critical editions of Shakespeare's plays appeared in 2015. The second edition of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* for the Arden Shakespeare Third Series ('Arden3') gave Lois Potter an opportunity to revise the text and correct a number of errors and inconsistencies, mostly minor, identified by reviewers of the 1997 first edition (see especially John Jowett's review in *ShS* 51[1998] 309–10). More substantive textual changes are outlined in a new 'Additions and Reconsiderations' section appended to the introduction, in which Potter also surveys the effect of critical interest in 'collaboration', both authorial and theatrical, on scholarship on the play's language, Chaucerian source, patterns of casting and doubling, and editorial and publishing history, including its translation into Spanish (pp. 147–64). 'The topics discussed remain much the same', Potter observes, 'but they are now more likely to be interpreted as sites of contention between Shakespeare and Fletcher' (p. 150). Potter also briefly extends the original performance history to cover major stage productions in Britain and North America between 1997 and 2014, as well as the 2004 *Complete Arkangel Shakespeare* audio-recording (pp. 164–69).

Since critics of the 1998 first edition of the Arden3 *Troilus and Cressida* were universal in their praise for David Bevington's treatment of the text, it is unsurprising that the second edition is largely a reprint. The text, introduction, and appendices remain substantively unchanged, with the exception of an appended 'Additions and Reconsiderations' section extending the earlier edition's coverage of *Troilus and Cressida* in performance to include stage productions from Australia, Britain, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States from 1998 to 2014, and updating discussion of the play's critical reception. The 'Selective bibliography' has also been revised to cover the period 1998–2014 (pp. 503–6).

The 'Additions and Reconsiderations' appendage has become something of a convention for revised Arden3 editions. Although they may make it easier for owners of previous editions to identify *some* of the new content, I cannot help thinking the material might be more usefully integrated into relevant sections of the existing introductions. There is nothing in the table of contents in these editions to demarcate the various subsections of the 'Additions and Reconsiderations', rendering this approach particularly unhelpful for students and other first-time readers who may rightly expect a section of the introduction dedicated to, say, the play's performance history to provide all the pertinent information about that topic. After wading through an already substantial introduction, is it not equally frustrating for a reader to find interpretations and conclusions revised — and potentially rejected? That said, some editors are more careful (generous?) than others to construct a dialogue between material old and new. For example, Bevington modifies his earlier conclusion in the introductory section on Shakespeare's sources in light of new scholarship and provides a footnote to indicate extended discussion of this topic in the 'Additions and Reconsiderations'. By contrast, Potter refers readers of her 'Additions and Reconsiderations' section backward, but neglects to direct readers of the introduction forward. Potter's elaborate reconsideration of the play's 'unusual casting pattern' and doubling (pp. 159–63), for example, is couched in terms of 'Developing a view that I suggested

earlier (pp. 73–5)', but there is nothing in those early pages to indicate this later addition.

In the preface to the first edition of *Troilus and Cressida*, which also remains largely unchanged (save to reflect the passing of the series in the interim from Routledge to Bloomsbury), Bevington argues against having to produce a single-text edition of the play (in line with the series' general policy at the time) and laments the 'burdensomely numerous' textual notes such an edition requires (pp. xvi–xviii). The publication of editions of Q1, Q2, and F1 *Hamlet* in 2006 suggests that the Arden Shakespeare Third Series was no longer averse to version-based editing, at least in certain conditions. If those conditions include the 'prestige' and market share of the play in question, then reserving version-based editions for the texts of *Hamlet* is perhaps defensible on commercial grounds alone. However, in light of Bevington's persuasive arguments for a two-text edition of *Troilus and Cressida* and his obvious enthusiasm for its undertaking, merely publishing a revised single-text edition represents a lost opportunity for the Arden3. It is too early to tell whether the Arden4 will take this leap.

The late Thomas L. Berger remarked that Kenneth Muir's frequently reprinted 1984 revised Arden2 edition of *Macbeth* 'remains the edition to be first consulted by serious students of *Macbeth*' (in Ann Thompson et al, *Which Shakespeare? A User's Guide to Editions* [1991], p. 104). If Peter Kirwan's sober assessment of Sandra Clark and Pamela Mason's Arden3 edition is any indication, the situation is unlikely to change: 'This *Macbeth* breaks no new ground in text, interpretation or presentation, concentrating instead on marshalling existing scholarship' (*ShS* 69[2016] 484). There is a frustrating tendency in this edition's introduction to refer readers elsewhere. For example, the introduction opens with an outline of its contents, announcing that 'Textual matters are dealt with in Appendix 1' (p. 1). The decision to relegate 'textual matters' to an appendix devalues textual scholarship as secondary to criticism, but is not in itself uncommon in Arden editions. However, in some cases the extent of the 'textual matters' and detail of analysis justifies its relocation, at least in part, elsewhere in the edition. This is certainly not the case here. Appendix 1 is split into two brief sections: Mason's discussion of the text 'from the perspective of the editor' (as opposed to?) and Clark's evaluation of recent debates about revision and authorship (pp. 301–21, 321–36). The purpose of Mason's section, a revision of a paper previously published in an essay collection on *Macbeth*, is to demonstrate the 'primary concern of the editors of this edition to re-examine, consistently challenge and rethink the editorial tradition and practice surrounding the editing of *Macbeth* in an attempt to look at the text afresh, with new eyes, to reassess its particular qualities and characteristics' (p. 302). This may have read as a more radical departure, were it not for the stated 'editorial policy' taking 'a respect for the Folio text' as its 'lynchpin', with a concomitant 'allegiance to what [the Folio text] offers in the absence of coherent and compelling reasons to make emendations' (p. 301). Previous editors are taken to task for 'tidying up' the Folio's lineation and punctuation, features that Mason argues in 'some cases' are 'a means by which Shakespeare communicates the pressures, tensions, and complexities which the characters are experiencing' (p. 305). For Mason,

'editorial practice' in this regard 'seems to have gained nothing and lost a great deal' (p. 308). This is not a persuasive argument, and a conservative editorial approach such as this risks obscuring the meaning of the text for a modern readership for the sake of orthographical fidelity. Mason admits as much: 'To standardize the punctuation in order to help a modern reader is both a sensible and uncontested policy' (p. 308). Sensible and uncontested, perhaps, but not consistently applied. Two examples will suffice. The description of how Duncan's 'virtues/Will plead like angels, trumpet-tongued, against/The deep damnation of his taking off' (1.7.18–20) introduces a comma after *trumpet-tongued* not present in the Folio text. The editors unconvincingly argue that the word 'may modify either *virtues* or *angels*', but the imagery and pattern of language that immediately follows indicate that the word should be read as modifying *angels* alone. Although they acknowledge 'the completion of Macbeth's thought is interrupted by the entrance of his wife' at 1.7.28, the editors retain the Folio's period and reject the conventional addition of a dash to typographically indicate this interruption. On the topic of Lady Macbeth's entrances, Mason makes much of the speech prefixes for her and Macduff's wife (pp. 311–12), arguing that the names 'Lady Macbeth' and 'Lady Macduff' are products of the editorial tradition and do 'not exist in Shakespeare's play' (p. 311). This is certainly true — the Folio gives 'Lady' and 'Wife' as speech prefixes for these respective characters, though stage directions also use 'Macbeth's wife', 'Macbeth's Lady' and 'Macduff's wife'. Mason zealously imposes LADY in speech prefixes and stage directions, even when this interferes unnecessarily with the Folio text. For example, the Folio's '*Enter Macbeth's wife alone with a letter*' is perfectly sensible; Mason's editorial insertion of '[LADY]' after '*Macbeth's wife*' is wholly unnecessary (1.5.0 s.d.). There are other instances where the treatment of the text is at odds with the reading given in the annotation. Noting that the word is 'often emended', Clark and Mason retain the Folio's *time* in the Porter's speech, 'Come in time' (2.3.5), on the basis that the 'phrase can simply mean that the farmer's entry is timely'. If, as the note continues, 'The farmer, equivocator and tailor turn out to be parallel figures', then surely emending *time* to *time-saver*, *time-pleaser*, or simply *farmer* is justified so the line conforms to the verbal pattern established by 'come in, equivocator' (2.3.11) and 'Come in, tailor' (2.3.14).

Clark adopts an equally conservative approach for her portion of Appendix 1, 'The Folio Text and its Integrity', attending to the play's authorship and provenance. Again, readers anticipating a fuller discussion are directed elsewhere: 'there is no intention here to discuss these [issues] in any detail' (p. 321). Instead, Clark briefly summarizes scholarly arguments about the degree of textual revision in the Folio text and the play's relationship to Middleton's *The Witch*, concluding 'The Folio text of *Macbeth* is probably not the original version that Shakespeare wrote in 1606; but the extent to which it differs may well be very slight, and confined to 3.5 and two passages in 4.1' (p. 336). On the songs, Clark observes that 'it is impossible not to feel their incongruity' (329), but the decision not to print them denies readers the opportunity to make this assessment themselves. Slavish adherence to the Folio text might explain the decision not to interpolate the songs into the text, but failure to provide them in an appendix effectively cripples the edition. Yet again, readers

are directed elsewhere for material — for example, the stage direction '*Sing within*. "Come away, come away, *etc*."' (3.5.35) is glossed thus: 'The opening words of this song, sung offstage, are from a song given in full in Middleton's *The Witch*, and constitute one of the main pieces of evidence adduced for Middleton's authorship of the scene. Brooke, 162–5, includes the whole of the song in his text'.

If the wholesale exclusion of the songs renders the text of the edition incomplete, notable omissions in the introduction have a similar effect. While the section on '*Macbeth* and time' (pp. 62–82) attends admirably to this 'all-pervasive theme' (p. 82), Clark's discussion of language in the play (pp. 38–62) may have profitably engaged with recent stylistic analysis, such as Jonathan Hope and Michael Witmore's work on the topic for *Macbeth: The State of Play* (Bloomsbury [2014], pp. 183–208) — a collection to which Clark contributed an essay on *Macbeth* in performance. Given the wealth of available material, Clark's discussion of *Macbeth*'s stage history in the edition is remarkably brief and narrowly focused on 'a selection of themes and topics that have proved significant in productions in England over a long period' (p. 97). 'England' is something of a misnomer, since the vast majority of productions surveyed are from London and Stratford-upon-Avon. Film and television adaptations are given uncomfortably short shrift, meriting only a handful of references. The result is an entirely English — or, more specifically, London and Stratford — *Macbeth*, a picture that denies readers insight into the richness and variety of responses the play has inspired across different cultures, theatrical traditions, languages, and political contexts. Also absent is any consideration of the various experiments adapting the play to other media — the *Voyager Macbeth* (1994), for example, was one of the earliest forays into producing multimedia digital editions of Shakespeare, incorporating an audio-recording of a complete RSC production, film clips, critical essays, a concordance, and a delightful 'karaoke' function (in which Macbeth's or Lady Macbeth's audio is muted), all linked to a hypertext version of the New Cambridge text. In keeping with the rest of the edition, readers expecting a more comprehensive treatment are directed elsewhere.

Given the theoretically endless possibilities afforded by the medium, digital editions are often perceived as somewhat 'incomplete' if they fail to offer more than their counterparts in print. Even when they do, however, reviewers of digital editions are quick to tally the functions and features that are absent. For example, Stephen Wittek's 2015 review of Joost Daalder's edition of *1 The Honest Whore* for Digital Renaissance Editions (*This Rough Magic* [2015] 7 paras) praises Daalder's meticulously edited text, the extensive critical apparatus, and the 'striking and original features' offered by the platform before lamenting the inability to download the text for offline reading, create bookmarks, or adjust the text appearance (beyond the in-built function of the Web browser). 'Ultimately', Wittek concludes, 'one may safely assume that functionality will only improve as this very exciting, very ambitious project moves forward'. More telling is Francis X. Connor's review essay, '*The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson Online* and the Utility of the Digital Edition' (*PBSA* 109[2015] 247–63), whose title signals Connor's focus on that digital edition's 'utility' and not 'the editorial work itself' (p. 254).

Connor's review is more explicitly concerned with what the digital edition 'does not do' and, like Wittek, his critiques are couched in terms of features *in potentia*, written 'with the full knowledge that any criticism will hopefully read as outdated at some point in the future' (p. 254). Both of these reviews exemplify a tendency, if not an imperative, towards maximalism in both the evaluation and creation of digital editions. These thoughts are drawn from a paper Aaron T. Pratt and I delivered at the 2016 MLA conference, titled 'Infinite Riches in a Little ROM'.

But the 'digital' in 'digital edition' need not come with the maximalism that so often attaches to it, and quantity of content or features is not, in itself, a useful measure of a digital edition's quality. Although digital editions 'allow for more space and are able to do things beyond the scope of print', as Eoin Price suggests, 'there are times when brevity might be best' (*YWES* 95[2016] 526). Jessica Slights' 2015 digital edition of *Othello* for Internet Shakespeare Editions (ISE), internetshakespeare.uvic.ca, assembles an impressive collection of critical, editorial, and supplementary material, without overwhelming the reader/user (hereafter simply 'reader'). In keeping with other ISE editions, Slights' *Othello* includes a modern-spelling text with full critical apparatus, semi-diplomatic transcriptions of the Q1 and F1 texts, and photo-facsimiles of Q1, F1, F2, F3, F4, Rowe, and Theobald. The supplementary materials, lightly edited and in modern spelling, provide further context and are well suited to classroom discussion. These include relevant extracts from Peele's *The Battle of Alcazar* and the anonymous *Selimus*, the play's source from Cinthio and an analogous tale from Fenton's translation of Bandello, passages from contemporary manuals on household governance and treatises on the passions, selections on Venice from Coryate's *Crudities*, and Elizabeth I's letters on the deportation of blackamoors. Unlike the Arden editions mentioned above, Slights' edition is both 'born digital' (i.e., it has no prior existence in print) and 'open access' (i.e., freely available to anyone with access to the Internet). Slights' general introduction offers a sensitive and engaging reading of the play, arguing '*Othello*'s emotional power derives in part from its disconcerting insistence on both the participation and the impotence of its audience' ('Introduction', para. 2). Analysis of this strategy provides a framework for Slights to address tried and tested aspects of the play: characterization, questions of gender and power, early modern geopolitics and the Mediterranean setting, religion, race and ethnicity, and the themes of deception, abuse of language, and failure of the senses to distinguish appearance from reality (paras. 3–25).

Although described as 'sketches in broad strokes', Slights' discussion of *Othello*'s critical reception is admirably thorough, beginning with Thomas Rymer's late seventeenth-century denouncement of the play's depiction of 'a man of color as a tragic hero' and its 'violations of a natural hierarchy that positions people of color firmly below white Europeans, and non-Christians below Christians' ('A Survey of Criticism', paras. 2–3). The canonical eighteenth- and nineteenth-century critics (Johnson, Schlegel, Coleridge) are considered, and usefully juxtaposed with others less familiar. In so doing, Slights recovers the important — and frequently unacknowledged — contributions of women:

> In addition to prompting a reassessment of Iago, the nineteenth-century view of Shakespeare's characters as expressions of fundamental truths about human nature stimulated a growing interest in Desdemona. This attentiveness to the play's tragic heroine intersected with a notable increase in the number of women's voices contributing to public conversations in the realm of literary criticism, as female actors began lecturing and publishing on the roles they performed on stage, and as women slowly began to be admitted to the ranks of professional scholars of Shakespeare. (para. 7)

Chief amongst these early pioneers is Anna Jameson, 'notable as the author of the first substantial and systematic discussion of Shakespeare's female characters' in 1832, and Slights' is the only modern edition of *Othello* I am aware of that not only mentions Jameson's study of Desdemona, but also recognizes its critical significance (paras. 7–8). In the remainder of the 'Survey of Criticism', Slights summarizes other influential literary-critical approaches to *Othello*, including character criticism, formalism, genre criticism, psychoanalysis, feminism and gender studies, New Historicism, postcolonial criticism, and critical race studies. Noting a 'consensus . . . building around the notion of *Othello* as a text of the early modern Mediterranean', Slights concludes her survey by gesturing towards recent attempts to provide 'alternative historical contexts for the play', including 'new work on connections between early modern London's black community and the city's playhouses' and 'on links between sixteenth-century dyeing practices and the properties of Desdemona's handkerchief' (para. 21).

As one might expect, just over half of Slights' performance history traces various theatrical traditions of playing Othello, from white actors in blackface to black actors performing the role, as well as more recent experiments in cross-racial and 'photo negative' casting. Aside from an apartheid-era South African *Othello* mentioned in passing, all of the stage productions surveyed are professional and either British or American ('A History of Performance', paras. 1–14). The second half of Slights' performance history offers a detailed analysis of English-language film and television adaptations of *Othello*, from Orson Welles' 1952 Hollywood film to a 'self-consciously post–9/11' 2008 Canadian television production presenting 'Othello as a North African Muslim whose ethnic identity determines his relationships in ways that exceed his control' (paras. 15–21). Many cultures have made Othello their countryman, and the play has enjoyed a long tradition of non-Anglophone performance on both stage and screen. Slights' otherwise commendable performance history is marred by an exclusive focus on English-language productions.

In the 'Textual Introduction', Slights describes her editorial approach as broadly 'pragmatic'. The F1 text is used as copy, and Slights treats Folio-only passages 'as deliberate additions to an earlier, less complete text from which Q1 was derived' (para. 3). However, the Folio is not slavishly adhered to, and Slights frequently adopts readings from Q1 and Q2 'primarily in order either to correct likely errors in F1 or to regularize the meter of verse lines' (para. 3). Her collation, which can be displayed in note form and/or in-line using colour

to distinguish between textual variants, is extensive but not without notable absences such as Theobald's conjectured reading (adopted by Hanmer without proper credit) of *make* for *mock* in 'It is the green-eyed monster, which doth mock/The meat it feeds on' (3.3; TLN 1781–82). Slights also admits some 'consistent intrusions from Q1' are 'not detailed in the notes', namely 'the many oaths and asseverations that do not appear in F1 but which seem likely to have enlivened the play early in its theatrical life' (para. 3). Her treatment of the text is sound, and Slights provides ample commentary. Many of these notes demonstrate an awareness of performance possibilities: for example, the opening stage direction, 'Enter Roderigo and Iago' (TLN 2), follows F1, but the note draws attention to how this is reversed in Q1–2 and 'playing the entrances in this order could operate as an early sign of the dominance that Iago has over Roderigo throughout the play'. The edition also makes use of the ISE's rendering of 'uncertain' stage directions in grayed out text. For example, Slights adopts F1's placement of Cassio's entrance at TLN 233, a line after Q1–2's placement, and signals this uncertainty visually with the greyed out text accompanied by a detailed commentary note on the effect of these options on performance. Slights' adoption of Q2 readings is often not simply 'pragmatic', but sensible. For example, editors typically retain Q1's and F1's 'This present wars against the Ottomites' (TLN 582), such as Michael Neill does for the Oxford, follow Malone in emending *This* to *These*, as Norman Sanders does for the New Cambridge, or retain *This* but give *war* as correcting a 'common error' in the printing of both Q1 and F1, as E.A.J. Honigmann does for the Arden3. Slights adopts the Q2 reading, 'This present war against the Ottomites', producing the same text as Honigmann without the need for elaborate arguments about transmission errors. Even so, the edition incorporates some questionable readings. For example, Slights retains F1's '*tongued* consuls' (TLN 27), which editors frequently emend to *toged* or *toga'd* to preserve the contrast between soldier-in-arms and toga-wearing consul. As support, Slights cites Neill's remark that *tongued* enables a 'chain of association' with 'spinster' (TLN 26) and 'prattle' (TLN 28) — but, as Slights notes, Neill opts for *toga'd* in his edition, and the emendation fits both meaning and metre. There are also instances where emendations of punctuation affecting the meaning of the text are not adequately noted. Slights introduces a period in Iago's speech ending 'For daws to peck at. I am not what I am' (TLN 71), for example, noting only the Q1 variant *doves* for *daws*. The F1 text gives 'peck at;' and both Q1 and Q2 give 'peck at,' — Slights' period severs the rhetorical sequence and breaks the conditional sense of the lines: 'For *when* my outward action [. . .] [*then*] I am not what I am' (TLN 67–71). These issues notwithstanding, Slights' *Othello* is an impressive addition to the Internet Shakespeare Editions, and one that shows that digital editions can more than hold their own against any commercial print counterpart.

One monograph on the apocrypha appeared this year. In fact, Peter Kirwan's *Shakespeare and the Idea of Apocrypha: Negotiating the Boundaries of the Dramatic Canon* is the first monograph-length study of the apocryphal plays as critical, theatrical, and editorial phenomena and not merely as a series of authorship attribution problems to be solved. This is an ambitious and

provocative book, combining different critical-theoretical approaches to understand the canonical status of Shakespeare's plays as subject to exigencies of print and performance, shifting critical-theoretical priorities, and changing cultural tastes. In so doing, Kirwan marshals a breadth of material not typically brought together, which ultimately succeeds in demonstrating that the Shakespeare apocrypha merits sustained intellectual engagement. In 'Canonising the Apocrypha' (pp. 15–71), Kirwan showcases his aptitude for book history, skillfully tracing the fortunes of the apocryphal plays in print from early appearances in quarto to their collected incorporation into the 1663 Third Folio. From there, the '43-play canon' of the Third and Fourth Folios became 'a casualty of a burgeoning culture of Bardolatry' in the eighteenth century, which, following Theobald's ignominious defeat at the hands of Pope, 'treated aesthetic quality as a form of objective proof and prioritised authorial reputation over textual origins' (p. 34). Along the way, Kirwan draws attention to the importance of editions typically glossed over by other publishing histories, such as Robert Walker's *Dramatick works of William Shakespear* (1734–35). As the first to desegregate the disputed plays from the canonical and 'place equal authority on all forty-three plays', Walker's edition is a pertinent example of the arbitrary construction of the apocrypha (p. 26). According to Kirwan, two strands of scholarship on the apocrypha emerged in the eighteenth century: one implicating the 'increased degradation of the disputed plays' in 'the process of canonising Shakespeare as the British national poet', the other seeking to 'rehouse the [apocryphal] plays in more suitable formats, reflecting a new set of assumptions concerning authenticity' (p. 48). Key moments in the second strand include George Steevens' 1778 revision of Samuel Johnson's edition and Edmond Malone's 1780 *Supplement* in the eighteenth century, followed in the nineteenth century by Charles Knight's inclusion of a 'doubtful plays' volume in his *Pictorial Edition* (1838–41), William Hazlitt's revision of Malone's *Supplement* in 1852, and Henry Tyrrell's *Doubtful Plays of Shakspere* (c.1853). For Kirwan, C. F. Tucker Brooke's 1908 *Shakespeare Apocrypha* represents both a culmination of these previous efforts and a radical departure from them. By replacing 'supplement' and 'doubtful' with 'apocrypha', Brooke's anthology delivered 'a decisive blow in the death of nineteenth-century disintegration', introducing 'a category between "Shakespeare" and "not-Shakespeare"' that created 'a freestanding, defined canonical space' for the plays (p. 69).

In the second chapter, 'The Apocrypha in Rep' (72–114), Kirwan identifies common themes and dramatic strategies across Shakespeare's plays, canonical and apocryphal, as performed contemporaneously in the repertory of the Chamberlain's–King's Men. The repertory studies approach is invoked to privilege the shared content and thematic concerns of the plays over any need to establish Shakespeare's precise involvement with them — 'writer, reviser, adaptor, actor, selector, advisor, commissioner, mentor; the possibilities are multiple and ultimately unprovable' (p. 75). These dramatic commonalities suggest that 'distinctions between "Shakespeare" and "not-Shakespeare"' on the early modern stage 'were blurred enough not to preclude the attachment (prior or subsequent to print) of Shakespeare's name' (p. 75). Acknowledging that any reconstruction can only ever be partial (because only a fraction of the

plays is extant), Kirwan proceeds to read plays in the Chamberlain's–King's Men repertory in juxtaposition with one another, regardless of authorship. These illuminating readings reveal a repertoire of plays bound together by common dramatic strategies, shared themes and subject matter, dominant motifs, and generic innovations, including prodigal husbands and patient wives (pp. 75–89), absent rulers and sympathetic commoners (pp. 89–98), 'romance and nostalgia' (pp. 98–106), and 'ensemble comedy' (pp. 106–111). Kirwan's lively and sensitive readings make a convincing case for renewed critical and theatrical interest in non-canonical plays.

In the remaining chapters, Kirwan turns to more contentious matters of authorship attribution and editorial theory. The treatment of these topics is less nuanced than those discussed earlier in the book. Chapter Three, 'Defining "Shakespeare"' (pp. 115–63), is a pessimistic assessment of Shakespearean authorship attribution study. Kirwan makes some sensible observations about the need for attribution studies 'to be brought into positive conversation with literary, theatrical and theoretical approaches' (p. 118), and the concomitant requirement that literary scholars 'develop the necessary skill sets to be able to properly critique it' (p. 163), but even these well-meaning assertions reflect an unsophisticated understanding of a complex field. For example, Kirwan either misrepresents or misunderstands the distinction between categories of 'external' and 'internal' evidence when discussing the title-page attribution of *Locrine* and other early playbooks. 'The notion of "external" evidence', he writes, 'implies an independent, separate or impartial witness, an outside corroboration of authorial origin' (p. 129). While relevant to considerations of its validity, notions of independence, distance, and impartiality are irrelevant to the classification of evidence as either internal or external. In *Attributing Authorship: An Introduction* (CUP [2002]), an important work curiously omitted from Kirwan's discussion, Harold Love distinguishes between these as follows: 'Broadly, internal evidence is that from the work itself and external evidence that from the social world within which the work is created, promulgated and read; but there will always be overlap' (p. 51). Thus, a claim in a diary to the authorship of a work published anonymously constitutes external evidence, whether penned by the author or another agent, because it is *external to the text of the work itself*. As with other so-called 'para-texts', title-page attributions are also typically classified as external evidence — even if, as Kirwan argues, 'they are brought into being at the same moment as the printed text' and are 'part of a simultaneous reconstitution of "author" and "work"' (p. 129). Other generalizing statements reflect a casualness toward authorship attribution study and its various methodologies. Again on *Locrine*, Kirwan argues that 'authorship tests are less accurate in ascertaining local revision' (p. 132), but fails to specify the tests to which he refers. Since he is not a practitioner, part of the problem undoubtedly stems from Kirwan's reliance on biased sources and on certain critics he mistakenly treats as representative of mainstream authorship attribution study, when in fact they operate at its fringes. The work of the Ward E. Y. Elliott and Robert J. Valenza, frequently cited throughout the chapter, is a case in point. Serious technical questions about their methods remain unanswered (see e.g. Thomas Merriam, 'Untangling the Derivatives:

Points for Clarification in the Findings of the Claremont Shakespeare Clinic' *L&LC* 24[2009] 403–16), and the pair have adopted an uncritical approach to text selection and processing, admitting to constructing their corpus 'with whatever text we could get, not troubling over which version we had, or what vagaries might be presented by the original-spelling text' (Ward E. Y. Elliott and Robert J. Valenza, 'And Then There Were None: Winnowing the Shakespeare Claimants' *CHum* 30[1996] 208). Equally troubling is Kirwan's characterization of Brian Vickers' 'Shakespeare and Authorship Studies in the Twenty-First Century' (*SQ* 62[2011] 106–42) as 'a magisterial survey of recent debates and the issues of practitioners prioritising their own methodologies and studies dating quickly' (p. 116). This is high praise for a review essay so ruthlessly antagonistic and biased in its treatment that it provoked a sobering thirty-eight page corrective (see John Burrows, 'A Second Opinion on ''Shakespeare and Authorship Studies in the Twenty-First Century''' *SQ* 63[2012] 355–92).

In the final chapter, 'Apocryphising the Canon' (pp. 164–206), Kirwan turns his attention to the practical and 'implicit ''end'' of authorship studies', namely, 'the constitution and presentation of the Canon' (p. 163). The chapter comprises three case studies, each exemplifying a particular paradigm of canon formation: 'bibliographical authorship (The Complete Books Attributed to William Shakespeare)', exemplified by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen's 2007 RSC *Complete Works* edition; 'individual authorship (The Complete Works to Which William Shakespeare Contributed Some Part)', as 'provocatively disturbed' by the inclusion of Shakespearean material in the 2007 Oxford Middleton; and 'the performative canon (The Complete Modern Shakespeare Repertoire)', represented by the RSC's Complete Works Festival of 2006–7 (p. 169). The first case study is marred by a confusion of terminology and the unhelpful introduction of neologisms. For example, Kirwan claims that the 'only single volume *Complete Works* that is theoretically constructed on principles of material bibliography' is the 2007 RSC edition (p. 170). He continues:

> This edition, following the ethos of edition-based editing, prioritises the 1623 folio as a material book: it begins with a physical moment of textual *incarnation* rather than a hypothesised moment of textual *origin*. While the core objective of edition-based editing, the retention of the distinctive features of an early authoritative manifestation of the text, is not new in itself, the edition's innovation here is in applying it to an early anthology. (p. 170)

Since the emphasis here is on the Folio as a material object, Kirwan probably intends *descriptive bibliography* where he writes 'material bibliography', since *physical bibliography* (another term for *analytical bibliography*, but 'physical' is a closer match with 'material') would render the claim absurd. 'Edition-based editing' is a similarly problematic construction, by which Kirwan presumably means 'version-based editing'. Issues of nomenclature aside, the RSC *Complete Works* certainly privileges readings from the F1 texts (except in cases where these do not exist), but not its material construction and

'distinctive features'. It does not, for example, preserve the Folio's setting of text in two columns or even retain F1's use of serif typefaces. The logical consequence of an editorial policy that 'prioritises the 1623 folio as a material book' is not the RSC *Complete Works*, but a facsimile edition. Later, Kirwan proposes a line-up of plays that a 'notional Complete Works of Shakespeare based on rigid bibliographical principles' would include (p. 173), but does not specify what these bibliographical principles might be. At times, the use of unorthodox terms renders completely obscure the sense: 'While the edition-based model remains constant, multivolume series are more flexible to the kind of dynamic canonizing and book-based editing that the paradigm requires' (p. 174). By 'edition-based model', does Kirwan mean *version-based editions* or *collected-works editions*? 'Multivolume series' presumably refers to *single-text editions*, but I am unsure what is meant by 'book-based editing'. To conclude this case study, Kirwan suggests the 'advent of hypertext editions' and 'online databases such as Early English Books Online, Eighteenth Century Collections Online and Literature Online' promises 'to democratise the availability of texts and allow "canons" to be constructed by readers' (p. 181). However, Kirwan offers no examples of 'hypertext editions' here or elsewhere in the book, and it is unclear how the 'online databases' he cites can possibly 'democratise the availability of texts' when access to them is limited by commercial, institution-based subscription. By contrast, Kirwan's other case studies are free of terminological issues and offer astute observations of their subjects. 'The key to interpreting the Oxford Middleton's inclusion of *Macbeth* and other plays', Kirwan suggests, 'is partially concealed by the author-centred marketing and the attempts to elevate Middleton's cultural status'. For Kirwan, the 'true achievement of this Middleton canon is, in fact, the decentring of Middleton within his own volume, to a point where even the text of an auditor's response to a Middleton pageant can be included'. Thus, in one of my favourite pithy statements in the study, 'Middleton becomes a motif or meme in his own book, acting as a link rather than a tyrannical bordering presence' (pp. 184–85). Kirwan's discussion of the 2006–7 RSC Complete Works Festival is similarly insightful, demonstrating the importance of performance in authorizing attribution: 'Whenever an early modern play is newly attributed, it is paramount to consolidate the attributions in performance; for a play to be saved, the word must be made flesh' (p. 189). However, as Kirwan cogently argues, the enterprise is fraught with complications:

> At one level, the very ephemerality of stage performance means that no one performance can ever be a 'complete' rendition of a work. Cuts, errors, interpolations, adaptation and interpretation all turn the theatrical experience into a performative engagement with the text, defying and rejecting the possibility of completion. The problems [...] of reaching a complete textual Shakespeare are even more apparent on stage, where a choice has to be made between textual variants: there is no performative equivalent of the 'Textual Variants' appendix. (pp. 191–2)

After a brief Epilogue (pp. 207–14), Kirwan provides a useful Appendix (pp. 215–29) tabling the first attribution and current scholarly consensus about the

authorial status for all the apocryphal plays. Aside from its fresh readings and wealth of materials, which persuasively establish these oft-neglected plays as worthy objects of study, the chief value of *Shakespeare and the Idea of Apocrypha* lies in its call for a scholarship that engages with multiple critical-theoretical methodologies — including those outside one's usual comfort zone.

In '"I tell you what mine authors says": A Brief History of Stylometrics' (*ELH* 82[2015] 815–44), Jeffrey Kahan's intention is to make the field of stylometry appear ridiculous. To make his case, Kahan employs the same strategies for which he critiques stylometrists: cherry-picking case studies, distorting evidence, misrepresenting scholarship, and dubious logic. After a series of vignettes featuring 'some of the key historical moments in the mating of statistical methodologies and Shakespeare' (p. 816), Kahan hopes his potted history of the field may 'serve as its epitaph' (p. 837), concluding 'scientific inquiry (or, more accurately, pseudo-scientific inquiry) concerning such questions [of Shakespearean authorship] just doesn't add up' (p. 838). Consider the following short, self-contained vignette: '1980, UNIVERSITY OF MUENSTER. Marvin Spevack publishes the last of his nine-volume Shakespeare concordance. He lists 19,083 unique words. More recent counts have radically revised that number to 28,829 unique words. Spevack was off by nearly 50%. It seems, therefore, safe to say that for much of the history of stylometrics, scholars could not even count words properly. Without a proper count, statistics are virtually impossible' (p. 829). Kahan fails to realise that the disparity between the figures he cites reflects an application of different criteria for countable features that appear in (potentially different) Shakespearean texts. Kahan's use of the word 'unique' here is ambiguous, because these are not counts of words *unique* to Shakespeare's vocabulary. Rather, they are counts of word 'types', a term used to distinguish a word as an abstract entity from the concrete, particular instances of that word (or 'tokens'). For example, the line 'A horse! A horse! My kingdom for a horse!' from *Richard III* contains five word types (*a*, *horse*, *my*, *kingdom*, *for*) or nine tokens (with three instances of the types *a* and *horse*). Beyond the distinction between 'type' and 'token', the criteria for what defines a countable word may also differ. For example, scholars may wish to produce separate counts for homograph forms, count words as lemmas, expand or retain contractions, separate or retain compound words, and differ in their approach to orthography and spelling. As the source of the words to be counted, the choice of text(s) is another determining factor. Spevack uses the text of the *Riverside Shakespeare*, an edition that notably 'preserves' a selection of early modern word-forms and, following the dominant editorial practice at the time, conflates texts that survive in different versions. The 'more recent counts' to which Kahan refers are those automatically generated by the Open Source Shakespeare, opensourceshakespeare.org, an online edition based on the so-called 'Moby Shakespeare', derived from William George Clark and William Aldis Wright's 1864 *Globe Shakespeare*. The Open Source Shakespeare's concordance function treats compound words and contractions as distinct types and also counts words appearing in stage directions. (The inclusion of stage directions is problematic, since many are editorial insertions and the authorial statuses of those present in the early texts on which the edition is based are themselves uncertain. It also

produces amusing results, such as counts for the Roman numerals designating various monarchs as they enter and exit.) In sum, what Kahan identifies are tallies of 'words' counted according to different criteria as they appear in radically different editions of Shakespeare's works. They are not a case of an inability to reach 'a proper count'. The only misleading arithmetic here is Kahan's calculation of Spevack's total as 'off by nearly 50%'. As a percentage, 19,083 out of 28,829 (Kahan's 'radically revised' target total) is just over 66%, meaning it was short by just under 34%. As Kahan's 'nearly 50%' ironically demonstrates, defective counting does not make it 'virtually impossible' to generate statistics; what matters is whether the statistics are accurate, relevant, and meaningful. Kahan's central argument rests on an assumption that 'a mathematical or scientific approach to reading literature' is to reject 'the humanist tradition' (p. 818), but this ignores the history of the concordance — a history going back at least to the Middle Ages — and the interest in counting features of language in texts it reflects. Kahan also misrepresents his subjects. For example, an unrelated statement about the limitations of raw statistics by Hugh Craig and Arthur F. Kinney is re-applied to dismiss Caroline Spurgeon's 'goal as nothing but a dream' and somehow support the notion that 'looking for a non-Shakespearean voice in a Shakespeare collaboration becomes virtually impossible' (p. 826). Kahan can also be casual in his handling of quotation. For example, on MacDonald P. Jackson's *Studies in Attribution: Middleton and Shakespeare*, Kahan writes 'He [Jackson] approaches his work with a self-described "deployment of forensic skill"' (p. 827). Kahan's term 'self-described' here suggests that Jackson is arrogating 'forensic skill' to himself, when Jackson does nothing of the sort, as is clear from the context of Jackson's original sentence: 'For demonstration in matters of attribution, as opposed to the formulating of hypotheses, the making of assertions, or the deployment of forensic skill in an attempt to persuade, quantification is necessary . . .' (p. 5). Kahan's carelessness extends not only to the names of plays, such as when he admonishes Jackson's later work for not comparing *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* with '*The* [sic] *Yorkshire Tragedy*' (p. 828), but also to the ambiguous neologism of what he terms the 'block approach' in authorship attribution (p. 833 and *passim*), which unhelpfully conflates text segmentation with the tests themselves. Kahan's caution that 'The reader should now be sufficiently wary of such pronouncements' (p. 835) could serve as a disclaimer for his own article.

I turn now to consider articles from 2015 offering more serious treatment of Shakespearean stylometry and authorship attribution. A special issue of *Studia Metrica et Poetica* on the scholarship of Ants Oras prompted two articles relevant to this section. In 'Ants Oras and the Analysis of Early Modern English Dramatic Verse' (*SMP* 2:ii[2015] 48–57), MacDonald P. Jackson traces the contribution of Oras' *Pause Patterns in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama: An Experiment in Prosody* (UFlorP [1960]) and its legacy in providing a method for research on authorship and chronology. Jackson concludes that the 'meticulous analysis of versification, based on the accumulation of quantitative data', as pioneered by Oras, 'remains a key to the understanding of individual playwrights' styles' (p. 55). In 'Shakespeare's Pauses, Authorship, and Early Chronology' (*SMP* 2:ii[2015] 25–47), Douglas

Bruster offers a series of case studies demonstrating how Oras' pause-pattern analysis can 'better place works of early modern drama in chronological order' (p. 30) and 'enrich our conversations about attribution even when they do not resolve specific questions' (p. 33). In 'Vocabulary Links between Shakespeare's Plays as a Guide to Chronology: A Reworking of Eliot Slater's Tables' (*Shakespeare* 11[2015] 446–58), Jackson reexamines the analysis of rare words published in Eliot Slater's *The Problem of 'The Reign of King Edward III': A Statistical Approach* (CUP [1988]) and corrects errors in calculation. The recalculated figures broadly support the chronology proposed by the Oxford Shakespeare *Complete Works* (OUP [1986]). The findings are promising, but Jackson notes the need to 'redo Slater's work on plays now [but not then] considered collaborative' (p. 453) to improve accuracy. By extending earlier methodologies and reworking the data produced by previous scholars to generate new findings, all three of these articles also poignantly repudiate Kahan's reductive narrative about stylometry's 'lack of progress' (p. 837).

In broad terms, Jackson's authorship attribution method is to search Literature Online (LION) for word sequences and collocations found in the text to be attributed, looking for those that are comparatively rare. Where a phrase or collocation is found in numbers of texts above a certain threshold, it is excluded. What remain are rare phrases- and collocations-in-common between the suspect text and the works of potential authorial candidates as represented in LION, which are tallied. According to the method, the greater the number of such rare 'links', the more likely a candidate's authorship of the text becomes. In 'Imitation or Collaboration? Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare Canon' (*ShS* 68[2015] 32–47), Gary Taylor and John V. Nance adapt Jackson's method to distinguish 'actual Shakespeare from Shakespeare imitating someone else' (p. 36), namely Christopher Marlowe, in short passages from *Titus Andronicus* and *1 Henry VI*. To validate the method, Taylor and Nance submit corresponding passages from Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris* and *The Jew of Malta* to the same procedure. The article presents a useful conceptual model, contrasting identity, which is *cellular* and *systemic*, with imitation, which is *selective*, 'because we cannot (and early moderns certainly could not) identify and replicate all the fine-grained cellular detail of the huge complex changing system of any individual linguistic entity', as well as *semiotic*, 'because it depends on pattern recognition: the writer must first recognize a pattern in another person's lexical or gestural language and then replicate that pattern' such that readers 'also recognize those selected features as the sign of a particular identity' (pp. 33–4). The results are promising, but the application of Jackson's method as reported warrants closer scrutiny. While they are careful to ensure that the sample sizes are the same (i.e., 173 words), I am not convinced that Taylor and Nance adequately address the problem of class size asymmetry — in other words, the disparity in total words between the canons representing each of the candidate authors. In theory, at least, an author with a larger corpus has more opportunities to use the words and phrases that happen to be found in the suspect text. Although Taylor and Nance cite links identified between a passage of *Titus Andronicus* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* to suggest 'genre cannot explain the strong connection' (p. 37), there is inadequate discussion of the potential effect of

genre, which represents another aspect of class asymmetry: not all genres are equally represented (or represented at all) in the works of the candidate authors. In theory, at least, we might expect certain phrases and collocations to be found more often in works of a particular genre. We might also expect to find a degree of self-repetition across the text of a play, which makes Taylor and Nance's failure to exclude the play from which the passage under investigation is excerpted from the corpus of potential matches a highly questionable decision. Should it surprise us that two matches for words and collocations in a 173-word segment of *The Jew of Malta* (II.iii.176–99) are found elsewhere in the play, and should this count towards the likelihood of Marlowe's authorship? Taylor and Nance do not list the plays (and later, poems) included in their searches of texts in the LION, Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership (EEBO-TCP), and Oxford Scholarly Editions Online (OSEO) databases, which frustrates any attempt to scrutinize their corpus as a whole. We can, however, critique what is reported. For example, a more conservative bibliographer might object to Taylor and Nance treating *Selimus* as Robert Greene's (pp. 35, 37), since the attribution (first proposed by Alexander Dyce) has received little sustained scholarly attention and falls short of constituting a consensus. Finally, Taylor and Nance use Fisher's Exact Probability Test to claim various 'chances' and probabilities of their results being random (p. 46-47). However, this is a misapplication of the test, which does not calculate probabilities, but frequencies — that is, how *often* a set of results will occur by chance alone, given prior conditions. Taylor has previously been taken to task for misusing the test in this way (see *YWES* 94[2015] 345; *YWES* 95[2016] 404), and this time is no different.

In 'Did Shakespeare Write Double Falsehood? Identifying Individuals by Creating Psychological Signatures with Text Analysis' (*Psychological Science* 26[2015] 570–82), Ryan L. Boyd and James W. Pennebaker use 'language-derived psychological signatures' for Shakespeare, Fletcher, and Theobald to compare with *Double Falsehood*. Their results 'offer consistent evidence against the notion that *Double Falsehood* is Theobald's whole-cloth forgery', finding 'a strong presence of Shakespeare's signature in the early parts' of the play and Fletcher's contributions 'greatest in the final two acts' (p. 579). Like Elliott and Valenza, Boyd and Pennebaker are not literary scholars or textual critics which, aside from notable differences in terminology that one might expect when reading psychological research, might also explain the mercenary attitude to text selection. 'Texts from each author were acquired from various sources' (p. 572), which, with the exception of Theobald, are not identified — even in the 'Text Sample Acquisition' section of the 'Supplemental Material' available to download from the journal's publisher. Electronic transcriptions of Theobald's plays were created by crowdsourcing the task using Amazon's *Mechanical Turk* online platform. With the exception of *Double Falsehood* itself, Boyd and Pennebaker sought to include only 'plays that are generally believed to have been written in solo', and while each text was 'manually stripped of extraneous information that did not directly reflect the author's language', stage directions 'were left intact' (p. 572). It is unclear on what basis this consensus on authorial status was reached, because the corpus of 55 plays listed in Table A1 (p. 580) includes a number of collaborative plays (e.g. the

Henry VI plays, *Macbeth*, and *Measure for Measure*) and translations (e.g. *Electra* and *Orestes*). It is also unclear whether Theobald's operatic pantomimes, which form the greatest portion of his corpus, are suitable for comparison. Along with genre, there is a class size asymmetry, with Shakespeare represented by 33 plays, Fletcher by 9, and Theobald by 12. Failure to provide total word-counts or list the sources of the texts frustrates any attempt to calculate the disparity between authors with more precision. Beyond the careless construction of the corpus and casual text preparation, Boyd and Pennebaker's study employs methods that are not designed to account for historical language use. The 'content-word measures' they describe work by grouping words into 40 predetermined (modern) categories, including 'positive and negative emotions, family members, sensory perceptions, religion, and death', whereas the 'meaning-extraction method' generated '13 broad themes' of words — 'Emotionality', 'Royalty', 'War/Battle', 'Tragedy', 'Nature', 'Social', 'Femininity', 'Youth', 'Greatness', 'Romance', 'Slumber', 'Nobility', and 'Family' (p. 573 and 'Supplemental Material'). The potential for error in classifying early modern words according to modern psychological categories and present-day usage and meaning should be readily apparent to the reader. For example, Boyd and Pennebaker categorize *sweet* as a 'Femininity' word, *happy* as 'Youth' word, *honest* as a 'Nobility' word, and, most curiously, *swear*, *vow*, and *oath* as 'Romance' words ('Supplemental Material'). While such errors do not necessarily invalidate Boyd and Pennebaker's findings, they do make it difficult to take their study seriously.

Finally, in a brief article, '*A Lover's Complaint* and Early English Books Online' (*N&Q* 62[2015] 586–9), MacDonald P. Jackson responds to criticism that his study published in *Determining the Shakespeare Canon* (CUP [2014]) failed to consider evidence from the EEBO-TCP corpus and searched only the LION database for matches with rare spellings found in *A Lover's Complaint* and its candidate authors. After repeating his searches using the EEBO-TCP corpus, Jackson finds added support for his earlier results, concluding 'the rare spellings shared by *A Lover's Complaint* and Shakespeare's plays originated in Shakespeare's own autograph manuscript and survived whatever stages of textual transmission led to their appearance in print' (p. 589).

2. Shakespeare in the Theatre

Michael Dobson's 'Shakespeare and the Idea of National Theatres' (*ShS* 67[2015] 234–46) is characteristically urbane and humorous. It is also unashamedly autobiographical, as Dobson name-checks his school tutor, 'the best teacher of English and drama ever, Wendy Williams' (p. 235), notes how his grandfather played the Ghost in *Hamlet* (p. 245), and mischievously relishes the chance to infuriate Dominic Dromgoole, former artistic director of the Globe: 'The last time I described Shakespeare's Globe as the folksiest theatre in London I received an abusive email from its artistic director, so I am going to do so again just in the hopes of annoying him' (p. 242). The essay charts the emergence and superimposition of three characteristics of national theatres: the historical involvement of royalty, the tradition of the actor-

manager (Garrick to Olivier – and Branagh?) and 'what I am going to call the notion of a folk theatre [according to which] drama should be an expression of traditional immemorial indigenous popular culture' (p. 241). The essay ranges across France, Germany, and eastern Europe but ends, fittingly, in Dobson's office in the Shakespeare Institute with its offcut of 'royal carpet, with a pattern depicting all the kings from the history plays' (p. 245) which featured in the newly opened Shakespeare Memorial Theatre. Never mind presentist, this essay is autobiographicist!

'Actors' Conversations at the Rose Theatres' (*CahiersE* 88[2015] 155–68) is also animated by a distinctly personal perspective. Near the opening of his account of the first decade of the Kingston Rose, Frank Whately admits that 'this article offers some personal reflections, based on my experience as a founding director of the Kingston Theatre Trust' (p. 156). This is an insider's account which explores the relationship between the architecture of the space and playing styles. It also implicitly decries the pseudo 'Ye Olde Englande' sentimentality of historical reconstructions: 'there was no intention of building a chocolate box souvenir replica in Kingston' (p. 164). (No names are mentioned but it's a good job Dromgoole probably doesn't subscribe to *CahiersE*.) The theatre is less an archaeological reconstruction than a laboratory, a place to examine and reflect upon 'particular practitioners' discoveries' (p. 156). This shift, Whately concludes, is a current trend: theatres such as the Kingston Rose and the Sam Wanamaker 'reflect the design of the first public theatres in England [and] have begun to reveal acting styles which are very different from those which have predominated in actor training for the past century and in most stage practice since the Restoration' (p. 166). Whately underlines the similarities in terms of size between Philip Henslowe's 1587 Rose and its Kingston namesake: 'the external diameter of the 1587 Rose was 72 feet and that of the Kingston Rose is 73 feet 7 inches; the inner "yard" of the 1587 Rose was 49 feet and of its Kingston offspring 49 feet 6 inches' (p. 163). Of course, we should add that the Kingston Rose accommodates probably less than half the audience of Henslowe's crowded auditorium but, nevertheless, the similarity of dimensions allows practitioners a feel of what the original may have been like. Whately suggests that actors such as Barrie Rutter have spoken of the space's aptness for intimacy as well as its capacity 'to take epic readily' (p. 166). Whately finds in this empiricism an endorsement of the academic work of Bruce Smith and Robert Weimann: 'the Rose works most effectively when the acting is "presentational" ' (p. 157). The space lends itself, perhaps as did the original Rose, to 'an extrovert physical and vocal quality' (p. 159).

Robert Shaughnessy reports on a collaborative research project between the University of Kent's School of Psychology and the Globe. 'Connecting the Globe: Actors, Audience and Entrainment' (*ShS* 67[2015] 294–305) discusses the various dynamics of the Globe audience, especially those standing in the yard, and the manner in which theatre critics and acting companies relate (in quite distinct ways) to them. The phenomenon of 'entrainment' is the process of synchronizing 'initially independent rhythmic systems' (p. 295) which, in the case of the groundlings, leads to a homogenizing of their responses to the live action played out in front of them. Shaughnessy draws on show reports from

stage management, theatre reviews, and actors' interviews which variously document audience reaction to and interaction with the Globe's Playing Shakespeare 2013 production of *Romeo and Juliet*. Shaughnessy argues that 'Shakespeare's Globe is a highly emotionally contagious space: the audience is visibly and audibly on display to itself, thus maximizing the opportunities for behavioural mirroring' (p. 304). This mass observation (as it were) is treated distinctly in critics' and actors' accounts. Indeed, Shaughnessy regards the critics' contempt for the groundlings, on the one hand, and the actors' sometimes gushing admiration for them, on the other, as 'fairly polarized thinking' (p. 299). But just as the groundlings keep the actors on their toes, so they (as a large, homogenized force) can also be threatening: 'loss of control is a persistent worry, and there is constant concern that Globe performance can all too easily get out of hand, and that the audience can take charge' (p. 303). Shaughnessy cites how the show reports of the matinee on 18 March 2013 noted many missed cues and late entrances. The screams of the largely female teenage audience obscured several cues. Shaughnessy likens this crowd to the cacophonous reactions of teenyboppers at a rock concert. To Bieber or not to Bieber? What an awful question.

'Entrainment' also rears its head in another essay on the Globe audience. Penelope Woods, in 'Skilful Spectatorship? Doing (or Being) Audience at Shakespeare's Globe Theatre' (*ShakS* 43[2015] 99–113), notes that audience participation in 'clapping and bobbing and the likelihood of that audience joining in vocally when invited' (p. 107) is greater in productions preceded by 'a larger number of musical pieces performed before the play opens'. The audience, she suggests, uniquely at the Globe, 'is essential for the realization of performance', and she claims audience presence is a vital part of 'a ''system'' of performance' (p. 100). As she puts it, 'A porous and contingent site of interaction between performer, building, weather, play, and audience is produced that alters and subverts norms of audience behavior and assumptions around their passivity and quiescence' (p. 101). Woods is acute on the self-consciousness of those standing in the yard berated by Flavius at the opening of *Julius Caesar*: 'Hence! Home, you idle creatures, get you home: / Is this a holiday?' (she uses the 1999 production directed by Mark Rylance). The groundlings are both the plebeians whom the character berates and the audience at whom the actor is railing: 'Flavius's metatheatrical joke capitalizes on a latent shared suspicion that watching plays is unproductive, passive, voyeuristic' (p. 99). However, her conclusion is less convincing: she argues that the audience's 'capacity to switch between states of self-consciousness, absorption, laughter, nervousness [and] dread' (p. 111) demonstrates 'an emotional skilfulness in this audience'. It seems to me that the play's capacity to take an audience with it in spite of forcing it to encounter all these varied emotional states is evidence, rather, of the playwright's skills, not those of the audience.

In 'The International Language of Physical Theatre at the 2012 Globe to Globe Festival' (*ShJE* 151[2015] 101–15), Stephen Purcell also stresses the importance of the audience's contribution to the completion of the theatrical event: 'theatre is not a one-way act of signification, but a conversation' (p. 114). He examines some half a dozen productions from the 2012 Globe

Festival which were particularly concerned with physical gesturing as a way of overcoming the fact that they were played in a variety of languages: 'Clowning ... might be described not so much as a *language* but as a particular communicative strategy: self-aware, dialogic and playful' (p. 113). Purcell challenges the notion that gesture transcends culture, though, at the same time, he acknowledges that it may communicate to a wider audience than a particular spoken language: 'It is in translating Shakespeare's text into physical metaphor, I would argue, that such [theatrical] work achieves its broadest intercultural reach' (p. 110). Intriguingly, he suggests that through physicalizing these plays they were transformed 'in a double sense: transformed to the cultures of the companies themselves, but also *re*-transformed for the occasion of the Globe to Globe Festival in particular' (p. 113). This is an original and engaging essay, and Purcell has a good eye for performance details.

We move from the Globe to the RSC and Peter Kirwan's 'The Roared-at Boys? Repertory Casting and Gender Politics in the RSC's 2014 Swan Season' (*Shakespeare* 11[2015] 247–61). Kirwan examines the gap between the stated intention of the RSC's Roaring Girls season and its effects. The season, he opines, was marketed 'on the strength and specificity of its interest in women' (p. 248). Moreover it was to be 'a statement of intent in respect to women's roles both on and offstage at the RSC in this new era' (p. 252)—the new era being the reign of Greg Doran as artistic director. However, Kirwan goes on to demonstrate how the programming served to marginalize feminist concerns and reinforce the secondary status of the female-directed productions. Most obviously, while these peripheral plays were taking place in the Swan, the main house next door was mounting productions of the patriarchal *Henry IV* plays as well as *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*—a play not renowned for its feminist credentials. Nor was this sexism ameliorated by the choice of plays at the Swan. Of *The Roaring Girl* (directed by Jo Davies) Kirwan asserts that 'However the play is read, the *term* "roaring girl" remains the preferred phrase of the judgemental, misogynistic order for framing and situating Moll within a society that cannot fully accept her' (p. 249). The production was set somewhere between a Victorian slum and a contemporary music gig—it featured some (just terrible) rapping and rock songs. For Kirwan, this blending of different periods further undermined any feminist reading: 'The time-travelling feminism of this production risked rendering the resonance of the roaring girl so diffuse as to be meaningless' (p. 258). The other plays in the season are also challenged in feminist terms. Of *The White Devil*, for instance, Kirwan makes the point that 'The transgressive changeability or duplicitousness implied in the play's title ... already encodes a means of containing the disruptive or inexplicable woman', while the later addition of *The Witch of Edmonton* to the season (directed by Doran himself) 'did nothing, of course, to detract from the negative connotations of "roaring" ' (p. 250). Given Kirwan's acute and intelligent critique of the season's sexual politics, his conclusion is surprisingly conciliatory: the season 'reopened important conversations about female agency and the company's own positioning of women' (p. 260).

Christopher Baker, in ' "Let me the curtains draw": *Othello* in Performance' (in Evans, ed., *Othello: A Critical Reader*, pp. 51–81), provides a thorough

stage history concluding with the unsurprising pronouncement that it will continue to be 'as impossible to disengage productions of *Othello* from an awareness of contemporary racial friction as it has been for audiences to separate *The Merchant of Venice* from a post-Holocaust context' (p. 81). Baker, from the outset, emphasizes the play's meta-dramatic quality: 'it is not only the audience that is both involved in the play and yet outside it as observers of the performance, but likewise the hero himself who often seems conscious of his own identity within the story and of himself as the object of others' gaze' (p. 52). Perhaps this is the reason for the star quality of the play's title role, with performers including Betterton, Garrick, Cibber, Kean, Salvini, Aldridge (who 'at 17 appeared as Othello at the Royalty Theatre in London', p. 63), Robeson, Olivier, and Hopkins. Several of these stand out for Baker, who notes some general trends in terms of the performance history of this play. During the Romantic period, for instance, 'the stage conception of Othello was shifting, the pendulum swinging more towards a freer expression of his uninhibited side, an alteration also emerging in literary criticism' (p. 59). In illustrating this point, Evans cites Hazlitt, who 'was less concerned with Othello's social persona than with his tragic psyche'. The stage equivalent of this shift of focus was the performance of Edmund Kean, who prompted Keats to remark how he was 'direful and slaughterous to the deepest degree' (p. 60). But it was the black actor, Robeson, who brought to the play 'an intentional awareness of the racial predicament of his own society' (p. 64). In the wake of this there is, according to modern sensibilities, anyway, something clumsy or miscalculated about both Olivier and Hopkins blacking up to take the role. Evans notes of the latter that 'This was the last (and may perhaps be the final) time a major actor played Othello in blackface on film' (p. 70). Perceptively, given *Othello*'s domestic setting, Baker notes how from its first performances it was not only a Globe but a Blackfriars play, which suggests 'an enclosed space for audiences eager for more nuanced styles' (p. 54). Throughout this essay there is much that is familiar, but Baker's fluency and inclusiveness make this an obvious port of call for those recapitulating the play's theatrical history.

Othello is also the focus of Clare McManus's ' "Sing it like Poor Barbary": *Othello* and Early Modern Women's Performance' (*ShakB* 33[2015] 99–120), in which she suggests that the combination of singing and speaking during the willow song of IV.iii 'can illuminate the interaction between English and continental theater, staging an embedded moment of opposition between English boy actor and continental actress' (p. 99). This is a suggestive idea, and McManus is thorough on 'the continental context of the circulating trope of the lamenting abandoned woman' (p. 115), but her argument that the willow song requires 'a high-wire act of exceptional confidence' (p. 108) or (repetitively) a 'high-wire act of talent, skillfully and charismatically executed' (p. 110) is over-egging the pudding. Yes, the boy actor is required to mix singing and speaking at the same time as changing costume, but is the co-ordination of these activities really so very difficult? While McManus is right to point out the competitive edge of the English theatre's rejection of the song's 'Italianate contexts in favour of the English ballad' (p. 113), that is not enough to convince me that the willow song constitutes a significant challenge

to the mixed-sex theatre of the Continent from single-sex English theatre practice.

Another study of a single play, this time *The Tempest*. In his evocative and deftly balanced 'Airy Spirits: Winds, Bodies, and Ecological Force in Early Modern England' (*ShIntY* 15[2015] 21–38), Steve Mentz insists that wind is the driving force not only of Shakespeare's play but of the early modern world, writing of 'the wind–human exchanges that drove early globalization' (p. 22). He goes on, 'Shakespeare's stormy play presents a diverse accumulation of ideas about air and wind' (p. 34). Mentz neatly balances the abstract spirituality of the play against its maritime substance, juxtaposing Prospero's and the Boatswain's opposed conceptions of the weather: 'The anti-materialist wizard wants only Providence, while the physical mariner feels only disorderly wind. These two symbolic understandings of the human relation with the environment, Prospero's magic and the Boatswain's craft, define the play's attitudes toward air as immaterial force and material presence' (p. 25). It is the presence of this force in the theatre that animates the play: the task of the playwright and audience is 'to find within the insubstantial element traces of meaning' (p. 34). In this way, theatre-going itself becomes an ecological activity or at least one concerned with decoding the varieties of human attitudes to the non-human world—a bold and provocative idea.

Still concerned with the natural world, at least as a point of departure, Adam Rzepka unpacks the variety of ways in which the spectator's imagination is tested and utilized in the early modern theatre. His ' "How easy is a bush supposed a bear?": Differentiating Imaginative Production in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*' (*SQ* 66[2015] 308–28) is a consideration of 'the collaboration between playwright, performer, and audience' and underlines 'the diversity of imaginative production' (p. 310) that this triangulated relationship produces. Rzepka notes the 'markedly experimental' way in which the play grafts 'imaginative landscapes onto the physical space of the theater' (p. 318). Techniques include evocative linguistic description and the suggestive use of classical names to summon up ideas of pastoral vistas, for instance. Elsewhere the suggestion of 'the microsphere' in the naming of Mustardseed, Peaseblossom, Moth, and Cobweb announces 'the theater's capacity to work comfortably within the apparent paradoxes of representation it is uniquely capable of posing' (p. 324). Throughout, Rzepka is adamant that this process is sophisticatedly self-conscious and that the play is explicit about the vulnerabilities of semblance. The audience is, he concludes, 'confronted with the heterogeneity of the modes of imagination that theater can demand of us' (p. 327).

Andrew Bozio cites some of the same theoretical sources as Rzepka (such as Evelyn Tribble and John Sutton's work on cognitive ecology), and his essay is also concerned with the conceptualization of space. 'Embodied Thought and the Perception of Place in *King Lear*' (*SEL* 55[2015] 263–84) examines the 'relationship between embodied thought and the environment' (p. 264). Bozio cites Gloucester's blinded pronouncement that he sees the world 'feelingly' as demonstrating that epistemology relies upon corporeality; therefore, he goes on, *King Lear* 'suggests that the embodied mind and its immediate environment are mutually constitutive of one another' (p. 265). In theatrical terms the

importance of this suggestion is that theatre demands (and is reliant upon) the 'spatialization of thought' (p. 265) both within the terms of the narrative but also in order to make sense of *King Lear* itself in the theatre. Typically, for a play perched on the edge of its own theatrical cliff-top, while it 'foregrounds the role of experience in defining location, it invokes this intimacy between place and personhood precisely in order to stage its dissolution' (p. 279).

Paul Prescott's 'Shakespeare and the Dream of Olympism' (in Prescott and Sullivan, eds., *Shakespeare on the Global Stage: Performance and Festivity in the Olympic Year*, pp. 1–37) considers the ubiquity of the playwright in the year of the London Olympic Games [2012]. The so-called Cultural Olympiad featured the World Shakespeare Festival, an umbrella term which included visiting non-English productions in Stratford and London (the Globe's own 'Globe to Globe' festival), the 'Shakespeare Unlocked' season on the BBC, projects in schools, artistic exhibitions, *The Hollow Crown*, and so on *ad nauseam*. Prescott ponders Robert Dover's Cotswold Olympicks which, during the year of the London Olympics celebrated its 400th anniversary. Played just outside Chipping Campden—a mere 12 miles from Stratford-upon-Avon—the games may have been attended by Shakespeare himself but, in any case, they offer a 'reassuringly rural' (p. 6) nostalgia and 'an easy congruence between Shakespeareanism and Olympism' (p. 7). Perhaps most conspicuously and bewilderingly 'Shakespeare was threaded throughout the [2012] Olympic opening ceremony (estimated global TV audience: 900 million)' (p. 4), the function of which was 'to transmit and transfer images of Britain and Britishness that might easily be read and approvingly consumed by the national and global audience' (p. 22). There 'was little or no question as to why', Prescott asserts, 'the global study of Shakespeare might be a good thing or not' (p. 11). But the overwhelming optimism of the Shakespearean Olympic dream is punctured when Prescott considers some of the less ennobling manifestations of the Bard circulating at the same time, such as the footage of a Royal Marine sergeant murdering an Afghan insurgent in September 2011 with the words, 'There you are, shuffle off this mortal coil, you cunt.' The incident, filmed on a head-cam worn by another in the patrol, 'offered a painful reminder that the nightmare of history was very far from over' (p. 21). (Coincidentally, at the very time of writing, the *Guardian* [7 December 2016] reported that the soldier concerned, Alexander Blackman, is likely to have his conviction set aside on the grounds that he was suffering mental stress.) Prescott is also sceptical towards a sequence in the opening ceremony which dramatized the meeting and romantic involvement of a young couple via the Internet. Sir Tim Berners-Lee was revealed as 'a benign Prospero' (p. 24) whose World Wide Web drew them together. Prescott notes that the girl was mixed-race and the boy black, and insists that this apparently happy pairing should be read against the 'see-sawing [British] government attitudes to multiculturalism and immigration, and the London riots of summer 2011' which followed the police shooting of Mark Duggan (who was mixed-race). Prescott sombrely observes, 'At the time of the riots, pre-Olympic preparations were well underway for a new, semi-militarized infrastructure of defence systems and anti-terrorist surveillance' (p. 26). This is an eloquent and

thoughtful essay which considers Brand Shakespeare as both a successful and problematic manifestation of Brand UK.

Brand Shakespeare features at the end of Robert Ormsby's meticulous study of *Coriolanus* on stage. *Coriolanus: Shakespeare in Performance* concludes that 'the playwright's brand—based on star power, a cut script, ''respectfully'' interventionist direction and spectacle ... has prevailed in the theatre, on screen and in journalistic response to *Coriolanus* productions for most of the postwar era' (p. 243). The first of the book's eleven chapters deals with its stage history from first performance—'there is not much we know about the tragedy in early modern England' (p. 1)—through to its early twentieth-century productions, but things really get going when Ormsby discusses Olivier's 1959 performance, directed by Peter Hall (Olivier had played the role for the first time in 1938). This is the production which featured Olivier's death-doomed leap head first, to be caught by the ankles. Unsurprisingly, perhaps, the 'critics' response, collectively revealed a journalistic community largely in tune with the star system' (p. 43)—this, in spite of the RSC's avowed intention to assemble an ensemble company. (Though Ormsby cites Tynan's eloquent analysis, he misses perhaps the best sentence in theatre reviewing of the period. Laurence Kitchin vividly described Olivier's protagonist cursing the plebeians: 'There was a bizarre impression of one man lynching a crowd.') Between 1951 and 1971 several productions of the play were clearly influenced by Brecht, though Ormsby notes that the British reception of Brecht 'frequently coded Brechtian theatre as an ideologically hostile and distinctly foreign threat to Shakespeare' (p. 48). For instance, of the 1965 London residence of the Berliner Ensemble, Ormsby suggests that the company diluted Brecht and displayed 'an apolitical theatrical aesthetic, providing only an imprecise socialist gloss on their work' (p. 62). Günter Grass's adaptation, *The Plebeians Rehearse the Uprising* (RSC, 1970) ultimately did little politically. The diminution of Brecht's influence was a hallmark of the RSC's 1972–3 production with Nicol Williamson (directed by Trevor Nunn with Buzz Goodbody) as well as the 1977 RSC production starring Alan Howard (directed by Terry Hands). By 1984 and the BBC Shakespeare version, starring Howard and directed by Elijah Moshinsky, the plebs, servants, and crowds had been largely removed so that the focus had become psychological rather than political. Not till Peter Hall's 1985 production for the National, starring Ian McKellen, which took place against the protracted and violent miners' strike, was the play's staging 'explicitly engaged with its political context' (p. 140). Hall had been outspoken against cuts in public funding for the arts under Thatcher, though Ormsby notes awkwardly that labour problems at the National Theatre itself had 'provoked Hall to vote Tory in 1979' (p. 141).

There follow accounts of three overseas productions—Gábor Székeley's 1985 Budapest production (starring György Cserhalmi), Steven Berkoff's 1988 New York production (with Christopher Walken), and Robert Lepage's adaptation, *Coriolan* (starring Jules Philip, international tour, 1992–4). While Székeley's production was characterized by a lack of a particular political target, its topicality of design hinted at 'a melancholic recognition that the futility of participating in a degraded public sphere has a profoundly corrosive effect on anyone who attempts to do so' (p. 158). The American production

'coincided with an anxiety about specifically national identity (American or British) disrupting an idealized Shakespeare' (p. 189). Lepage's adaptation (translated by Michel Garneau) 'demonstrates how globalization can spur the reinvention of the local' (p. 192). In all these productions the politics seem generalized or, indeed, vague. But even this is better than the deep conservatism of Dominic Dromgoole's Globe version of 2006, starring Jonathan Cake. Ormsby cites Peter Holland, who was infuriated, describing this as 'the most reactionary production of the play I [Holland] had ever seen' and finding the 'racial politics' of *Coriolanus*'s publicity photograph, in which Cake kicks Mo Sesay's black Aufidius in the face, 'positively embarrassing' (p. 219). The production's humour targeted the theatre's groundlings, who equated to the play's lower classes, so that political grievances from below seemed merely humorous. Holland again: 'the patricians, RP-speaking, rational and ... clearly benign, could not but be the sympathetic centre of the politics of this divided society, for all the world like an old-fashioned Tory party, the core of a benevolent establishment' (p. 219).

Ormsby's final chapter is an account of Ralph Fiennes's feature film released in 2011 (screenplay by John Logan). Perhaps this film's most successful and conspicuous features are the involvement of the viewer in the battle sequences and the ways in which the film reworks the Hollywood figure of the action hero. Throughout this book Ormsby's analysis is eagle-eyed, though there are some tricks missed. Fiennes's 2000 stage performance of the role (directed by Jonathan Kent) could have figured more, especially since it took place in a film studio (Gainsborough) and formed an interesting contrast in scale. While the politically quietest thrust of Ormsby's book downplays the play's politics, some mention of more explicitly politicized productions would have offered valuable counter-examples—David Thacker's French Revolution RSC production (with Toby Stephens, 1994); Michael Bogdanov's ESC Brechtian epic (starring Michael Pennington, 1990), or Tim Supple's superb production, almost overrun by plebeians, staged at Chichester Festival in 1992 and starring Kenneth Branagh. And what, if any, might be the effects on a production of this macho play of a female director—Jane Howell directed Corin Redgrave in the role at the Young Vic in 1989? (Every one of Ormsby's directors is male.) Still, this is a valuable book for those boning up on the play's various manifestations (though it must be added that the quality of the black and white pictures is pretty poor).

3. Criticism

(a) General

Oxford University Press has replaced its Very Short Introduction to *Shakespeare* by Germaine Greer with one to *William Shakespeare* by Stanley Wells: the new volume actually takes on the serial number (60) of the previous one. The move makes sense both as a better fit with the series remit and in updating the content (Greer's essay was originally published in 1986). This is evident in the new version's attention to Shakespeare's

collaborative work and the inclusion in the ‘Further Reading’ of ‘books that can be recommended to anyone tempted to question who wrote Shakespeare’ (p. 120). The volume is especially aimed at readers who may not have encountered Shakespeare since their schooldays (pp. xiii–xv, 111). In fact, these readers may find some surprising information compared to what they would have learnt at school: that the dedication to Mr W.H. is not by Shakespeare but by the sonnets’ printer (p. 44) and that the collection may not have been about one young friend but several (p. 45), or the idea that late in his career Shakespeare may have been ‘encouraged’ by his company ‘to work with a colleague who was more attuned to popular taste’ (p. 107). Character names (‘A mischievous puck ... Robin Goodfellow’, p. 73; *Cymbeline*’s Giacomo), the chronological table on pages 116–17, and mentions of several textual issues all, obviously, refer to work done for the Oxford Shakespeare. The book is divided into eight chapters: ‘Shakespeare and Stratford-upon-Avon’, ‘Theatre in Shakespeare’s Time’, ‘Shakespeare in London’, ‘Plays of the 1590s’, ‘Shakespeare and Comic Form’, ‘Return to Tragedy’, ‘Classical Plays’, and ‘Tragicomedy’, plus an ‘Epilogue’ on Shakespeare’s afterlife. Up-to-the-minute scholarship is tempered by a real feel for the details of Shakespeare’s life and times, as when the section on ‘Shakespeare’s Reading’ in chapter 1 is enlivened by the remark that Holinshed had resided not far from Stratford in later life and that Shakespeare may therefore have met him as a boy (p. 16). Chapters 4–8 discuss each work’s plots and themes, always with an awareness of their performance dimension and often including cross-references to the earlier background chapters as well as concentrated insights, such as the mention of Viola and Sebastian’s ‘antiphon of reunion’ in *Twelfth Night* V.i (p. 80). In his substantial analysis, Wells finds room to express his opinion on the desirability of modern editions (p. 48), the relevance of biographical data (p. 88), and the unattainability of ‘total authenticity’ in the staging of the plays (p. 111). His final message to the addressees of this not so very short introduction is: ‘Whether directly or indirectly, no one can remain untouched by Shakespeare. He is in the water supply; he is here to stay’ (p. 115).

Unsurprisingly, some of the information and views in Wells’s Very Short Introduction are also found in Paul Edmondson and Stanley Wells’s edited collection *The Shakespeare Circle*. In her ‘Afterword’ to this book (pp. 335–9), Margaret Drabble hails its ‘indirect and circular approach’ to Shakespearean biography as ‘a great success’ (p. 339). The volume’s combination of new archival research (mostly, though not only, in the Stratford chapters) and state-of-the-question reporting on various Shakespeare-related figures does indeed prove illuminating and, thanks to a detailed index and chapter-by-chapter bibliography, the book can serve as a useful reference tool. It contains a wealth of intriguing information, starting from the cover, which portrays a signet ring that may have belonged to Shakespeare (p. viii). Each of the book’s three sections comes with an additional short introduction by the editors. On the crucial issue of religious background, the information gathered in Part I, ‘Family’, does seem to justify the editors’ conclusion that the church of the time ‘was catholic and reformed and could accommodate a wide-range of spiritual and religious beliefs among those who were happy outwardly to

conform. Overall Shakespeare and his family, like most other people of their time, seem to have done just that' (p. 9). Another important issue in this section concerns the family's financial circumstances. Michael Wood (chapter 1, 'His Mother Mary Shakespeare', pp. 13–25) follows the traditional view that Shakespeare's father withdrew from public life after an economic downturn, while in chapter 2, 'His Father John Shakespeare' (pp. 26–39), David Fallow argues that John Shakespeare's involvement with the wool industry brought him prosperity in the end. Fallow further suggests that the reason why Shakespeare moved to London in the first instance was to do with his father's business (p. 32). Given the paucity of information on Shakespeare's three brothers, all of whom died unmarried before the dramatist and none of whom reached the age of 50, chapter 3, 'His Siblings' (pp. 40–8), by Catherine Richardson, deals with 'sibling experiences that must have seemed normal to Shakespeare' (p. 42), before focusing on the youngest brother, Edmund, sixteen years William's junior and a fellow-actor. In chapter 4, 'His Sister's Family: The Harts' (pp. 49–56), Cathy Shrank focuses on Joan, who was five years younger than her famous brother and the only one of his siblings to survive him: in fact, Joan buried her husband and her last surviving sibling within a week of each other. Chapter 5, by Katherine Scheil, summarizes the available information on 'His Wife Anne Shakespeare and the Hathaways' (pp. 57–70), using new archaeological evidence to illustrate the lifestyle at New Place. On the vexed question of the 'second-best bed', Scheil points out that the phrase could have been added by others. (As an alternative explanation, on pp. 156–7 Stanley Wells mentions Thomas Combe's will, which bequeathed all bedsteads to his wife, except the best bedstead, which went to his son.) In chapter 6, 'His Daughter Susanna Hall' (pp. 71–85), Lachlan Mackinnon discusses the Shakespeare family's funeral monuments, suggesting that Susanna wrote all their epitaphs. She is characterized as having 'Roman Catholic sympathies' despite being married to the Puritan John Hall (p. 77). On page 81 Mackinnon mentions a visit by Queen Henrietta Maria to New Place in 1643, and how Susanna later sent the queen a book that heavily criticized Catherine de' Medici, not least as the driving force behind the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre. Some of the information provided here is wrong, namely the presumed printer's name, the person to whom the book was given in the first instance (since an inscription in the book itself declares that it was gifted by Susanna to Richard Grace), and even the fact that Henrietta Maria was Catherine de' Medici's granddaughter (p. 82; the title of the book on p. 84 is also slightly misspelled). On the other hand, Susanna's possession of this book ties in with the fact that, as Greg Wells points out in chapter 7 ('His Son-in-Law John Hall', pp. 86–100), her being fined for absence from Easter Communion in 1606 could just as well be evidence of Puritan as of Catholic leanings (p. 92). Wells's essay includes a discussion of how medical figures evolved in Shakespeare's plays, though not necessarily by consequence of his daughter marrying a physician in 1607. On Shakespeare's son there is notoriously little to say and, perhaps influenced by the example of Joyce's speculations in *Ulysses* on the link between Hamnet's death and *Hamlet* (pp. 106–7), Graham Holderness flirts elegantly with creative non-fiction (chapter 8, 'His Son Hamnet Shakespeare', pp. 101–9). While not wishing to

adjudicate on this supposed connection, Holderness does report an intriguing mistake in Shakespeare's will, where the neighbour after whom Hamnet Shakespeare was named is called 'Hamlett' (pp. 101, 106). Germaine Greer's essay on 'His Daughter Judith and the Quineys' (chapter 9, pp. 110–21) provides details that effectively bring the fantasy world of Shakespeare's comedies closer to his family's life in Stratford: for instance, how, in line with his Puritanism, the elder Quiney's first act as a bailiff was to forbid workmen's attendance at alehouses except at Christmas (while his family's mercer business then branched out into that of vintners). Along these lines, one wonders whether Greer's account of Judith's marriage to the caddish or naive Thomas is not more or less consciously shaped on that of Helena and Bertram in *All's Well That Ends Well*. An example of how divergent views are given equal space within this book is the fact that, according to Greer, Shakespeare was forced to make Susanna his sole heir by the conditions of her marriage settlement, while in chapter 10, 'His Granddaughter Lady Elizabeth Barnard' (pp. 122–34), René Weis reiterates that the playwright's will was changed in order to safeguard the estate from 'feckless' Thomas Quiney (p. 128). According to Weis, Elizabeth's birth and her father's medical profession may be reflected in *Pericles*. Prior to her death in 1670, she was her grandfather's last surviving direct descendant, which justifies the 'impulse to search for genuine Shakespeare materials from New Place among the descendants of the Barnards', her second husband's family (p. 131). A mention of a prolonged stay at Shakespeare's home, New Place, by 'His "cousin" Thomas Greene' gives Tara Hamling the opportunity to include a detailed description of the house in chapter 11 (pp. 135–43). Part II, on 'Friends and Neighbours', opens with chapter 12 by Stanley Wells on 'A Close Family Connection: The Combes' (pp. 149–60), a Protestant landowning family and owners of the largest house in Stratford (New Place being the second largest). Chapter 13, by Carol Chillington Rutter, is on 'Schoolfriend, Publisher and Printer Richard Field' (pp. 161–73), who also moved to London and managed the printing house that issued *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* after being apprenticed to printer Thomas Vautrollier, while chapter 14, by David Kathman, is on 'Living with the Mountjoys' (pp. 174–85)—thus these two chapters focus on Shakespeare's Huguenot connections. David Riggs discusses 'Ben Jonson' (chapter 15, pp. 186–98), including aspects of literary influence, for example on *Twelfth Night*, while Andrew Hadfield shows how references by 'Richard Barnfield, John Weever, William Basse and other encomiasts' do prove that a specific person named William Shakespeare was indeed the author of certain plays and poems (chapter 16, pp. 199–212). In Susan Brock's essay on 'Last Things: Shakespeare's Neighbours and Beneficiaries' (chapter 17, pp. 213–29), we learn that twenty-one out of twenty-five people mentioned in Shakespeare's will belonged to the Stratford rather than the London milieu and that, with the notable exceptions of his godson and the latter's father, his legatees were 'almost all ... mavericks in some way' (p. 226). These are all information-rich chapters, where details and opinions often overlap with or supplement those given elsewhere in the book: see for instance Stanley Wells's opinion that there must be 'at least a small fire' behind the 'puffs of smoke' that point to Southampton providing Shakespeare with financial help towards

a big purchase (p. 151). Several chapters link the factual information they provide with aspects of Shakespeare's works (e.g. on pp. 176–7, mentions of head-tires in the plays and Marie Mountjoy's profession as tirewoman). It should be pointed out that the notion that Field's master, Vautrollier, had been in trouble for printing heretical books by Giordano Bruno (p. 165) is at odds with what is generally believed by Bruno scholars. On the other hand, it is interesting to see that Shakespeare is now finally being credited with a 'first-rate classical education' (p. 186; see also p. 164), though this goes rather against the drift of Hadfield's chapter (who, however, is mostly referring to authors who were writing at the turn of the century, who seem only to have known Shakespeare's poems, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Richard III*). In Part III, 'Colleagues and Patrons', Andy Kesson's essay on 'His Fellow Dramatists and Early Collaborators' (chapter 18, pp. 235–47) in fact focuses on *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* and how it may not be by Greene, adding a general discussion of the issue of 'authorship'. John H. Astington gives a thorough account of 'His Theatre Friends: The Burbages' from the biographical and financial point of view (chapter 19, pp. 248–60), while Bart van Es explores the difference between the 'pan-European and domestic appeal' of Kemp and Armin respectively (p. 263) and its 'transformative effect' on Shakespeare's writing (p. 262); however, van Es believes that 'the old "row with Kemp" narrative' should be discounted (p. 269), and points out those aspects that did not make Robert Armin a pleasant character (chapter 20, 'His Fellow Actors Will Kemp, Robert Armin and Other Members of the Lord Chamberlain's Men and the King's Men', pp. 261–74; in fact, not much is said about the 'other members'). Alan H. Nelson rounds up 'His Literary Patrons' (chapter 21, pp. 275–88), that is, the patrons of Shakespeare's acting companies and the dedicatees of his works, focusing in particular on the earl of Southampton and his personal relationship with the dramatist. Nelson does not believe that the dedication to the sonnets is by Shakespeare (p. 284) and does not comment on the view, recorded in Kesson's chapter, that Mr W.H. is to be identified with 'publishing associate William Holme' (p. 232); however, he does point out that it is unlikely that an earl would be addressed by that title. Duncan Salkeld's essay (chapter 22, pp. 289–96) is especially credited by Margaret Drabble with providing the reader with a new 'sense of illumination' in relation to Shakespeare's work (p. 338) through its expert account of 'His Collaborator George Wilkins', a tavern and brothel keeper who played an important part in the writing of *Pericles*. In chapter 23, 'His Collaborator Thomas Middleton' (pp. 297–304), Emma Smith reports on current efforts to identify the younger dramatist's involvement in Shakespeare's plays thanks to an increased awareness of the collaborative nature of much early modern theatre and of Middleton's linguistic markers. Besides *Timon of Athens*, attention has focused on *Macbeth*, *Measure for Measure*, and, most recently, *All's Well that Ends Well*. Lucy Munro considers how the career of 'His Collaborator John Fletcher' (chapter 24, pp. 305–14) intersected with Shakespeare's: first in echoing his plays, then in collaborating with him on at least three works that are so unlike the 'romances' that they challenge the whole category of the 'late play', and finally taking Shakespeare's place as the King's men's dramatist. Munro's incidental reminder of the mixed recusant Catholic and Protestant

family connections of the Beaumont and Fletcher firm again illustrates an important by-product of this book, which is to remind us that the reality of human connections at the time caused most people, including Shakespeare, to live a chequered existence in terms of religious allegiances. In the book's final chapter (chapter 25, pp. 315–28), drawing on recent research by David Kathman, Paul Edmondson documents the financial acumen and civic engagement of 'His Editors John Heminges and Henry Condell', which made them 'full-time London equivalents of Shakespeare' (though they left behind more children and less money), showing how 'All of them helped to represent the rising and respectable face of the professional theatre' (p. 326). The 'Closing Remarks' by the two editors weave factual information from the book into a brief, elegant narrative and suggest possible avenues of further investigation. The book is complemented by a website (theshakespearecircle.com), where it is possible to listen to dramatized narratives by some of the figures discussed in this work, read by familiar names in Shakespeare studies and important Shakespearean actors.

By general consensus, one of the most successful as well as original approaches to a combined biographical and critical study of Shakespeare is that adopted by James Shapiro in his *1599* (*YWES* 86[2007] 381) and in his 2012 BBC documentary on Shakespeare and the early years of the reign of James I (see, for instance, Grace Tiffany's essay, reviewed below). The 'sequel' to *1599* follows much the same format, but with even more emphasis on the plays that characterize the chosen year: *1606* is subtitled *William Shakespeare and the Year of Lear*, while the American (Simon & Schuster) edition changes the order to *The Year of Lear: Shakespeare in 1606*. This is also, as announced in the 'Prologue' (p. 10), the year of *Macbeth* and *Antony and Cleopatra* (Shapiro explains in a three-page note at the end of the book how he navigated the perilous waters of Shakespeare chronology). The book juxtaposes the year's events, cultural artefacts of a directly occasional nature, and Shakespeare's plays in order to show the underlying connections. This was the year of James's unsuccessful struggle to impose the union of his kingdoms—and the year in which Shakespeare's plays start talking less in 'English' and more in 'British' terms. The country is still reeling under the effect of the Gunpowder Plot, and its law-enforcement powers feel even more dangerously under attack by its moral equivalent and ally: the dreaded 'equivocation'—a word and concept that takes centre-stage in *Macbeth*, but that Shakespeare had already memorably used in the Gravedigger's scene in *Hamlet*. Another buzz-word of the year is 'allegiance', as this year sees Catholics forced to declare their loyalty to the king. For their part, players are forced to expunge all 'profanity' from their plays, leading to many a 'Jove' cropping up in unlikely places. Shapiro's book repays his readers with several insights like those on the wider significance to *King Lear* of the brutal world depicted in Harsnett's *Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures*; or how details from 'The King's Book' on the Gunpowder Plot reappear in *Macbeth*, or those from the king of Denmark's state visit—something in which Shakespeare's company would have been involved as Grooms of the Chamber—find their way into *Antony and Cleopatra*; or *Macbeth* borrowing

from the other two plays' sources, i.e. Harsnett (see pp. 217–18) and Plutarch's *Life of Antony* (see p. 267).

Several of the essays in *Shakespeare the Man: New Decipherings* [2014], edited by R.W. Desai, purport to follow in Shapiro's footsteps. Desai's introduction (pp. ix–xxix) provides a whistle-stop tour of biographical lore on Shakespeare from Ben Jonson down to the most recent biographical studies, while arguably the most important and certainly the most substantial chapter in the book takes the place of a Conclusion. Grace Tiffany's essay (chapter 1, 'Shakespeare's Playwrights', pp. 1–16) also opens with a discussion of recent efforts to find 'Shakespeare the Man' in his works. Her own attempt in this chapter focuses on three historical events that she believes influenced Shakespeare's depiction of 'the plays' player-playwrights', identified as Jacques in *As You Like It*, *2 Henry IV*'s Pistol, Jupiter in *Cymbeline*, Vincentio in *Measure for Measure*, Paulina in *The Winter's Tale*, and *The Tempest*'s Prospero, these events being the 'War of the Poets' (1599–1601), the 1606 Act to 'Restrain Abuses of Players', or anti-profanity laws, and the 1572 Articles, that declared aspects of the Catholic religion to be fantasies and thus made them, and the figures of Catholic priests and friars, available for representation in works of fiction. In chapter 2, 'The History of the Shakespeares and the Shakespeares in the Histories' (pp. 17–52), Joseph Candido reads the second tetralogy in the light of Shakespeare's material and financial dealings with his father at the time of the play's composition. In chapter 3 (pp. 53–66), R.S. White conducts a 'thought experiment' (p. 54) on the subject of '1592–1594: Shakespeare's "Other" Lost Years', and in particular on how Shakespeare may have spent part of those years writing sonnets (and 'A Lover's Complaint') with a view to inserting them into a prose romance along the lines of Sidney's *Arcadia*. This allows the poems to be viewed as potentially spoken by different characters. Next, Mythili Kaul builds on and expands findings by other critics, from J.M. Brown in the nineteenth century to more recent work by Stephen Greenblatt, to show that if, in the character of Falstaff, 'Greene was caricatured in part through the lens of Harvey, Harvey, in turn, is caricatured through the lens of Nashe' (chapter 4, 'Greene, Harvey, Nashe, and the "Making" of Falstaff', pp. 67–84: 77). She also reports other links that have been adduced between her quarrelsome trio and characters from *Love's Labour's Lost*. After a methodological preamble, Subhajit Sen Gupta's essay (chapter 5, ' "Look in the calendar": *Julius Caesar* and Shakespeare's Cultural-Political Moment', pp. 85–99) covers ground that will be familiar to readers of Shapiro's *1599*, as it discusses *Julius Caesar* against the background of the building of the Globe theatre, the abolition of Catholic holidays and images, Essex's Irish campaign, the 'Protestant naturalization of unnatural phenomena' (p. 94), and the calendar reform. Chapter 6 (' "But I have that within which passeth show": Shakespeare's Ambivalence toward His Profession', pp. 101–20) is a version of an essay by R.W. Desai originally published in *The Shakespeare Newsletter* in 2006/7 (on which see *YWES* 88[2009] 463–4, though perhaps Desai's argument should be credited with a little more complexity). In chapter 7, ' "Those lips that love's own hand did make": Anne Hathaway and Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*' (pp. 121–34), Shormishtha Panja argues that in his poem Shakespeare recalls

his early sexual desire for an older woman who would have been the pursuer in the relationship. Panja's adducing of *Faerie Queene* III.i as an additional source may not be quite as original as indicated, but she does remind us of some interesting connections, including a reference to two different Venuses in Plato's *Symposium*. In the next chapter, drawing on Shapiro, René Weis, and Charles Nicholl among others, Lisa Hopkins discusses the churches that had an actual or possible bearing on Shakespeare's life and works, with particular regard to *Hamlet* (chapter 8, 'Shakespeare's Churches', pp. 135–46). In chapter 9, 'Shakespeare and the Rhythms of Devotion' (pp. 147–55), Stuart Sillars finds parallels between 'the sounds and rhythms of liturgical prose' (p. 149) and passages in *Henry V* and *Hamlet*. (On a related topic, see David Bagchi's chapter in the Meek and Sullivan collection reviewed below.) John O'Meara (chapter 10, 'Outbraving Luther: Shakespeare's Final Evolution through the Tragedies into the Last Plays', pp. 157–81) identifies in *Hamlet* the moment when the dramatist 'plunges into a Luther-like confrontation with the very worst of human nature' (p. 162), which here refers mostly to lust, and in fact O'Meara's discussion at this point literally merges into *Othello*. O'Meara then goes on to analyse 'the transition from *King Lear* to the last plays' and the accompanying 'shift in focus away from the experience of his tragic characters to the transfigured mind of Shakespeare himself' (as we read on p. 157, in a summary prefixed to the chapter). John W. Mahon's 'Shakespeare among the Jesuits' (chapter 11, pp. 183–97) surveys the links that have been adduced between Shakespeare and the Society of Jesus in terms of actual references in and possible influences on his works, and any evidence of a personal connection. In Mahon's view, Shakespeare, unwilling to be martyred for any religious faith, 'was probably a Church Papist' (p. 184). Mahon's position contrasts—but perhaps more nominally than in substance?—with the final chapter in this collection, 'Was Shakespeare a "Church Papist" or a Prayer Book Anglican?' (chapter 12, pp. 199–264), in which Charles R. Forker decides that 'the second of the two is the more likely', i.e. that Shakespeare 'was a practicing Anglican with a strong residual sympathy for the old faith'. In the rest of the chapter Forker summarizes the evidence for both sides of the argument and then examines 'themes and details' in Shakespeare's works that support what he points out 'can only be' his 'inference' (p. 203). This essay is more substantial in every respect than an average book chapter. Alongside David Scott Kastan's *A Will to Believe: Shakespeare and Religion*, reviewed in *YWES* 95[2016], it provides a precious tool to help the reader evaluate the evidence and different critical positions on what Brian Cummings in a British Academy lecture called 'the last great mystery of Shakespeare studies' (quoted here on p. 199).

Julia Reinhard Lupton's elegant essay, 'Birth Places: Shakespeare's Beliefs / Believing in Shakespeare' (*SQ* 65[2014] 399–420), also deals with Shakespeare and religion, but from two different angles. As helpfully summarized by the author (p. 400), the article is divided into three sections: a discussion of current scholarship on this topic; an analysis of 'abounding secularism' in *Cymbeline*; and a reading of Henry James's short story *The Birthplace*, which illustrates the religious connotations that can attach to the cult of Shakespeare himself. In relation to Shakespeare's play, Reinhard Lupton points out the 'multiple

religious possibilities' (p. 401) derived from the fact that Christ's birth occurred at the time of King Cymbeline, but the play never alludes to that event. She focuses her analysis on Act III, scene ii, where Innogen leaves the court with Pisanio and her husband's murderous jealousy is revealed to her, a scene that ends in the 'suspension of sacrifice' and the unfolding of 'classical *virtù*' (p. 409) but also literally with a benediction (p. 411).

David Scott Kastan's volume, though published at the same time as Desai's collection, was based on the first series of the biennial Oxford Wells Lectures, from 2008. There's no escaping Sir Stanley in this year's review: as we move away from biographical or religious concerns, we turn to the book derived from the 2012 series of Wells Lectures: Lorna Hutson's *Circumstantial Shakespeare*. Hutson discusses circumstances—'the "five W's (and one H)" of journalism' (p. 76)—not in the post-Enlightenment understanding of proof, but in the classical rhetorical sense in which Shakespeare would still have understood them, of 'the finding out of figures and arguments in order to speak and write movingly and convincingly' (p. 77). By recovering the old meaning of this term from classical forensic rhetoric, Hutson intends to refute two assumptions: that there is no 'common ground between continental neoclassical theory and English dramatic practice', specifically Shakespeare's (p. 4), and that 'Shakespeare's plots are uniformly pants' (p. 37, quoting a *Guardian* reader) and that it pays to concentrate on character instead, a view that has resurfaced in a very different form from Johnsonian criticism in recent discussions of Shakespeare's works as collaborative and performance-centred enterprises. Hutson's contention is that questions of whether or not English drama followed the classical unities 'pale into insignificance' next to a shared concern with a 'rhetorical and dialectical invention' (pp. 19–20) that used 'circumstances' to arouse 'emotion through mental image-making' (p. 79). On the first level, the application of 'circumstances' in early modern plays is the dramaturgical equivalent of a novelist's 'show, not tell', where indications of time, place, and motive are naturally woven into the dialogue, as opposed to those plays castigated by Sidney, where a character 'must ever begin with telling where he is, or else the tale will not be conceived' (p. 23). Secondly, Hutson shows how in Shakespeare 'times, places and the events that occur in them seem more natural and vividly real' than in the plays of his contemporaries because 'these times and places are already implicitly shaped' (p. 54) by characters' discussions and assumptions about them. Besides Sidney, several ancient, early modern, and contemporary critics are taken into account, with special reference to Quintilian (though quotations from Castelvetro confirm the need for a reliable full English translation of his treatise on Aristotle's *Poetics*—as well as for turning the spellchecker off when quoting in other languages). Chapter 1 focuses on *Romeo and Juliet* as a '*locus classicus*' for illustrating Shakespeare's use of 'circumstances' (p. 55), and chapter 2 is on 'the connection between the forensic conception of Opportunity in *Lucrece* and the way time and place are imagined in *Lear*' (p. 75). Chapter 3 is mostly on *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*: what looks like an editorial blunder on Lance's 'my master's ship' joke (p. 120) within a discussion of ships, sheep, and travel by water between Milan and Verona, is in fact the Folio's reading—supporting, perhaps, Stanley Wells's defence of

modern editions in his Very Short Introduction. Finally, chapter 4, on *Macbeth*, adds a political dimension to the discussion, and adduces a Ciceronian source that throws important light on the ambiguous mention of the additional sleepers in Duncan's chamber in Act II, scene ii.

Several books in this section bear out Hutson's evaluation that there is currently a resurgence of character-centred criticism, though this does not seem to be limited to textual and performance concerns.

One study that positively advocates a character-based approach is Neema Parvini's *Shakespeare and Cognition: Thinking Fast and Slow through Character*. This is a slim volume from the Palgrave Pivot series, where each chapter comes with its own abstract and DOI number. As the subtitle indicates, it takes as its starting point research done by Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky in the field of experimental psychology and behavioural economics and published in Kahneman's 2011 bestseller, *Thinking Fast and Slow*. Chapter 1 describes the current state of play in character analysis; chapter 2 introduces the key concepts to be utilized in the wake of Kahneman's book, i.e. dual-process theory, heuristics, and cognitive biases (including the practice of 'priming'); chapter 3 applies these concepts to two notorious instances of persuasion in Shakespeare, namely the wooing of Lady Anne in *Richard III* and Benedick accepting Beatrice's indictment of Claudio in *Much Ado About Nothing*; while chapters 4 and 5 offer two case studies, of Iago's persuasion of Othello and Hamlet's indecision respectively. As a matter of fact, one wonders whether we do need the new terminology and formal psychological perspective: the technical terms described in chapter 2 could be (and sometimes are) substituted by more intuitive concepts such as the contrast between reason and instinct or intuition, jumping to conclusions, or psychological and verbal manipulation. However, this is a work of undoubted brilliance, which makes several illuminating points, such as the idea that Iago at first resolves to attack Othello on the point of race, and only resorts to sexual jealousy once he has seen Plan A fail, or the analysis of personal pronouns in Hamlet's soliloquies to trace the shift from rational process to instinctive reaction. But it is worth remembering, with Hutson, that ultimately literary characters are the result of textual strategies and devices. One could object, for instance, that the baffling quality of the instances of persuasion analysed by Parvini is due to Shakespeare's foreshortening, to great dramatic effect, of a normally longer process of erosion of reason on the part of affect. In any case, for readers interested in pursuing this kind of methodology, Parvini concludes by indicating several possible avenues for further research.

Even the most theory-shy reader should not be put off by Julián Jiménez Heffernan's extensive references to Nietzsche, Derrida, and a variety of contemporary thinkers in his study of extraordinary characters, *Shakespeare's Extremes: Wild Man, Monster, Beast*. It is true that the fifty-page introduction does not so much summarize and introduce the book's argument as allow the author to give his opinion on a wide range of matters and critical theories related to the animal/human divide, but this is done in an ebullient and often entertaining style. Most importantly, there are many illuminating insights to be gathered from the intertextual parallels adduced in this book. The first chapter is a discussion of 'impasse' in Marlowe's drama that draws on the *pars*

destruens of Alain Badiou's thought and his interest in 'subjective forms that cannot be either individual or communitarian' (p. 59; Heffernan quotes Badiou, *Logics of Worlds* [2009], p. 9). The three Shakespearean chapters that follow focus on Edgar as Poor Tom in *King Lear*, Caliban in *The Tempest*, and Julius Caesar. The obvious absentee from this line-up of extreme human beings is Richard III, who, however, features repeatedly in the book, especially in an extended comparison of the eponymous play with *The Tempest* on pages 144–9. The overarching thesis, that the main characteristic of Shakespeare's 'monsters' is how they retain a general humanity, gives way to effervescent readings of each character and their respective plays (tellingly, there is no concluding chapter). Chapter 2 convincingly demonstrates the important role played by the extended episode of Cardenio in Cervantes' *Don Quixote* in shaping several aspects of *King Lear*, in particular its transfer of location to the heath and Edgar's assumption of the Poor Tom disguise. Chapter 3 includes a discussion of Henry James's 'impressive misreading' (p. 115) of *The Tempest* in his novel *The Awkward Age*. Chapter 4 makes a case for keeping Ovid, Lucan, and Montaigne (and also, why not, Nietzsche) in mind as part of the intertextual/thematic scenario in *Julius Caesar*, and demonstrates the usefulness of this through an avowedly character-centred discussion (p. 158) that elegantly interweaves the theme of 'misunderstanding' and the trope of the lion as they occur in the play. The book's very liveliness is probably to blame for two easily corrected faults: its rather *too* ebullient appraisal of other critics' arguments, and some unaccountable textual disasters (for instance, in the quotations on pp. 176 and 183).

Robert Ellrodt's *Montaigne and Shakespeare: The Emergence of Modern Self-Consciousness* was originally published in French in 2011 under the title *Montaigne et Shakespeare: L'Émergence de la conscience moderne*. As the author explains (p. vii), the English version could not maintain the ambiguity between the two meanings of the French *conscience*, (self-)consciousness and moral conscience; thus the latter concept appears more clearly delimited and confined to chapter 6. Also, an 'annexe' in the French version entitled 'Et Shakespeare créa la jeune fille' has been left out because it focused only on the playwright (p. vii). The author's reflection on the issue of *la conscience moderne* began back in 1952 (see also his 1975 *Shakespeare Survey* article, reviewed in *YWES* 56[1977] 147). Notwithstanding up-to-date critical references this book is very much 'old school': not many critics today would dare produce a one-chapter overview of 'The Progress of Subjectivity from Antiquity to Montaigne' (chapter 2) in order to claim that the 'New Forms of Self-Consciousness in Montaigne', based on 'Calling the Self into Question' and the 'Persistence and Coherence of the Self' (as indicated in the titles of chapter 1 and its subsections) are not found anywhere before or around Shakespeare except perhaps in John Donne. After surveying manifestations of subjectivity in the literature of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance in England, chapter 3 analyses the sonnets. Ellrodt points out that Shakespeare used the word 'self' 'more often than his contemporaries and apparently created many compounds' with it (p. 72). He does not believe that the sonnets were influenced by Montaigne, but does find in them an understanding of the self as personal identity that is not recorded in the *OED* prior to Hume and

Berkeley (p. 72). This chapter then traces the relationship between the medieval monologue and the soliloquies in the dramatic works, before addressing the question of specific parallels between the *Essays* and Shakespeare. According to Ellrodt, these begin and are particularly strong in *Hamlet*, may then 'be found in plays performed between 1601 and 1606, particularly in *Troilus and Cressida*, *Measure for Measure* and *King Lear*' (p. 92)—and then subside, to resurface only in *The Tempest* (a play that Ellrodt does not specifically discuss in this book). Chapter 4 explores the 'Complexity and Coherence of the Shakespearean Characters' by taking into consideration Hamlet, Macbeth and Lady Macbeth, and King Lear, and argues for the presence of 'a self endowed with some permanent features' (p. 94) against modern theories to the contrary. Chapter 5 reviews the apprehension of time in Montaigne and Shakespeare, comparing it with that of their predecessors and contemporaries, but also focusing especially on the sonnets, where, Ellrodt points out, the word 'when' occurs with relatively high frequency in the 'young man' poems, while the word 'fate' occurs only once in the entire collection, in line with Shakespeare's non-deterministic view. Finally, chapter 6 finds a fundamental adherence to 'humanistic and modern' values beneath both writers' occasionally sceptical and relativistic stance (p. 144), a balanced view which is summed up in Ellrodt's 'Epilogue' by the word 'wisdom'.

Montaigne also features briefly in Jamie E. Graham's wide-ranging 'Consciousness, Self-Spectatorship, and Will to Power: Shakespeare's Stoic Conscience' (*ELR* 44[2014] 241–74). The first half of the article focuses on questions of morality and the self in Cicero and Machiavelli as a means to analyse the synthesis operated by Nietzsche between these two authors' positions. Graham turns specifically to Shakespeare in the second half of his article, after he has described aspects of the epistemology of morals in post-Reformation England with reference to Richard Hooker and William Perkins, and after he has briefly discussed Montaigne as an author in whose works 'A moral psychology emerges negatively, the result of allowing reality to push back against others' maxims'. Graham argues, with reference to Henry V, Shakespeare's 'most Machiavellian' hero (p. 257), that the playwright achieves a similar effect through his scepticism and dramatic irony. In his conclusion, Graham turns to *Hamlet* where, in his view, 'the shortcomings of Cicero's moral safeguards assert themselves, as Hamlet is unfree to choose a role suited to his talents and no amount of conscience or consciousness can supply him with an epistemology of morals' (p. 274).

The notion of character briefly surfaces also in David Hawkes's *Shakespeare and Economic Theory*, which is part of a new series, Arden Shakespeare and Theory, together with the volumes by Carolyn Brown and Gabriel Egan reviewed below. Hawkes examines the transition from a subjective, character-based view of economics as the science of utility (or the management of a household in the best possible way, which includes taking human relationships into account) to modern economics (what the ancients called chrematistics), i.e. the science of exchange. This transition was just beginning to take place in Shakespeare's time, and Hawkes finds in the dramatist an ultimately conservative attitude, but also 'enough sympathy' towards would-be upwardly

mobile characters such as Jack Cade, Iago, and Edmund 'that we are forced to take their complaints and aspirations seriously' (p. 10). This becomes yet another aspect of Shakespeare's relevance today, since we are now returning to a notion of economics as influenced by subjective elements. The book is divided into two parts. Part I, a general introduction to 'Economics in History and Criticism', in fact never quite loses Shakespeare from sight. For instance, it includes a discussion of Marx's repeated engagement with Timon's speech on money (pp. 38–40) and of how, 'Having been praised by Marx and Engels, the Bard was ripe for appropriation by the forces of international Socialism' (p. 46). Part II focuses on Shakespeare's works mostly by means of an examination of economics-related keywords, such as 'commons' and 'commodity', 'price' and 'dear' (chapter 6), or 'worth' and 'value' (chapter 7); the concepts of wage labour, servitude, and slavery (chapter 8); 'the "restricted" economic significance of the word "use"' (p. 152) and the term 'advantage' (chapter 9); the terms 'property', 'counterfeit', and 'coining', and Francis Bacon's 'Idols of the Market-Place' as a way of deploring 'the autonomous power of liturgical, economic and verbal signs simultaneously' (p. 171, in chapter 10). The latter are an aspect of the common problem of 'taking signs for things' which, though the quotation dates back to Augustine (p. 157), was specifically felt to be arising in Shakespeare's time. In relation to the terms 'commodity' and 'usury' Hawkes also addresses parallels with attitudes towards sex. Plays that recur frequently in the discussion include the histories, *Coriolanus*, *Measure for Measure*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Pericles*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and, of course, *Timon of Athens*, while the 'Conclusion' applies the key concepts explored in the book to a discussion of *The Tempest*.

'Money and Power' is also the theme of the 2014 *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, which includes papers from the spring 2013 conference of the Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft (*ShJE* 150[2014]). The first three articles address the issue to which most of Hawkes's volume is devoted: the way in which Shakespeare's works reflect the rise of a new form of economy. These include essays by Christina von Braun (in German, with English summary appended), who links the shift from money to credit to a growing belief in symbolism on the one hand and 'the monetary value of "human flesh" on the other', and refers to *The Merchant of Venice* and *Measure for Measure* as revealing an 'almost sacral authentication of money, originating from sacrifice' (*ShJE* 150[2014] 11–29: 29); Jean E. Howard on 'Shakespeare and the Consequences of Early Capitalism' (*ShJE* 150[2014] 30–45), showing through examples from the histories, *King Lear*, and *Pericles* how the author both mourns the past and anticipates the future; and Isabel Karremann (in German, with English summary), who discusses *The Comedy of Errors* and the character of Falstaff to argue against the New Historicist 'anxiety-and-alienation paradigm' (*ShJE* 150[2014] 46–64: 64). These are followed by discussions of the materiality of the theatrical experience, with Tiffany Stern's article on the additional merchandise available and the overall costs of attending the theatre in Shakespeare's time, '"Fill thy purse with money": Financing Performance in Shakespearean England' (*ShJE* 150[2014] 65–78; reviewed in *YWES* 95[2016]), and essays on the transition from patronage to the commercial theatre by John Blakely, on *Love's Labour's Lost* and *Twelfth Night* ('Feste, *Twelfth Night's*

"Material Fool"') (*ShJE* 150[2014] 79–93), and Katherine A. Gillen, '"What he speaks is all in debt": Credit, Representation and Theatrical Critique in *Timon of Athens*' (*ShJE* 150[2014] 94–109; reviewed in YWES 95[2016]). Finally, there are three articles on representations of Shakespeare in the last hundred years: Christopher Balme on 'the beginnings of the global theatre trade', including a discussion of British troupes in India and Southeast Asia at the start of the twentieth century, '"His means are in supposition": Shakespeare and the Beginnings of the Global Theatre Trade' (*ShJE* 150[2014] 110–27); Nicole Anae on Daniel E. Bandmann's Shylock in late nineteenth-century Australia, '"The majestic Hebrew ideal": Herr Daniel E. Bandmann's Shylock on the Australian Stage, 1880 - 1883' (*ShJE* 150[2014] 128–45); and a fascinating paper by Mark Thornton Burnett, 'Capital, Commodities, Cinema: Shakespeare and the Eastern European "Gypsy" Aesthetic' (*ShJE* 150[2014] 146–60), on the new genre of '"gypsy" Shakespearean cinema' (p. 146), represented by *Romani Kris*, a Hungarian adaptation of *King Lear* [1997], directed by Bence Gyöngyössy, and *Hamlet* [2007], by Serbian director Aleksandar Rajkovic, where Shakespeare's plays are used to describe the situation of the Roma people in eastern Europe after the fall of the socialist regimes.

Within the 'economy' in the old sense of household management, the preparation and handling of food would of course have held a place of primary importance. The 2014 issue of *Shakespeare Studies* is devoted to this subject. Two articles of general import within this volume (not reviewed in the previous issue of *YWES*) were written by authors of full-length studies on the topic. Ken Albala (author of *Food in Early Modern Europe* [2003]) contributes an essay on 'Shakespeare's Culinary Metaphors: A Practical Approach' (*ShakS* 42[2014] 63–74), which provides relevant early modern recipes in order to highlight, for instance, how the technical term for the crust of pies was 'coffin', which has obvious connotations with the funeral-cum-wedding pies in *Hamlet*, as well as explaining the literal sense of the term as used in a notorious scene in *Titus Andronicus* V.ii (one wonders whether this might not even be a source image for the scene itself, alongside its obvious classical antecedents). Also interesting is the way that references to culinary 'brine' (mostly in the comedies and in *Romeo and Juliet*) generally point to forms of mourning that are a little 'off'—too prolonged or exaggerated. Joan Fitzpatrick is the author of *Food in Shakespeare* [2007]. Here she writes on 'Diet and Identity in Early Modern Dietaries and Shakespeare: The Inflections of Nationality, Gender, Social Rank, and Age' (*ShakS* 42[2014] 75–90), showing how the dietaries by Thomas Elyot, Andrew Boorde, and William Bullein linked issues of food intake, health, and humoral balance. Fitzpatrick explains that through these works 'it is possible to trace patterns of consumption in Shakespeare's plays and what they might indicate about early modern attitudes to foreigners and Catholics, women, the poor, the old, and the social elite' (p. 76). Her article touches especially upon the *Henry IV* plays and *Merry Wives* (including a discussion of the name Bardolph), *King Lear*, and *Macbeth*.

An entirely different form of materiality is addressed in the 2015 issue of *Shakespeare Studies* with Mario DiGangi's survey of 'Shakespeare's "Bawdy"' (*ShakS* 43[2015] 131–53). DiGangi stresses the negative rather

than pleasurable connotations of the word in the majority of cases in Shakespeare, and focuses on ‘an eroticism that violates corporeal boundaries and pushes beyond subjective desires’ (p. 132). His analysis of Shakespearean examples, concentrated in the first eight pages of the essay, focuses on ‘the sexual disgust experienced by Diomedes [in *Troilus and Cressida*], Hamlet, Othello, and Leontes’ (p. 133) and concludes with a discussion of Mercutio’s joke about ‘the bawdy hand of the dial’ in *Romeo and Juliet* II.iii.

Three volumes focus on emotions in Shakespeare and his age: one authored book, Steven Mullaney’s *The Reformation of Emotions in the Age of Shakespeare*, and two edited collections, by Richard Meek and Erin Sullivan, *The Renaissance of Emotion: Understanding Affect in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, and by R.S. White, Mark Houlahan, and Katrina O’Loughlin, *Shakespeare and Emotions: Inheritances, Enactments, Legacies*. This confirms that the ‘emotional turn’ is truly underway—a development on which Meek and Sullivan provide useful bibliographical references (see p. 18 n. 3), as well as generally bringing us up to date on the state of the question in emotion studies in their introduction. Their volume is divided into three parts. The four chapters in the first part explore non-fictional works that have a bearing on the perception of the emotions in early modern England. In an important chapter (chapter 1, ‘The Passions of Thomas Wright: Renaissance Emotion across Body and Soul’, pp. 25–44), Erin Sullivan discusses what has now become a ‘classic’ on the topic of emotions in early modern England, Thomas Wright’s *The Passions of the Mind in General* [1601], addressing its relationship to the Jesuit’s works of religious polemics, and also the work’s interest in more ‘disembodied’ emotions, ‘the emotionality of the rational soul’ (p. 40). Chapter 2, ‘ “The Scripture moveth us in sundry places”: Framing Biblical Emotions in the *Book of Common Prayer* and the *Homilies*’ (pp. 45–64), by David Bagchi, examines the ‘emotional discourse’ in the texts of the officially imposed Protestant religion (p. 49; on this topic see also Stuart Sillars’s essay and section III of Charles Forker’s chapter, both in the Desai collection reviewed above). In chapter 3, ‘ “This was a way to thrive”: Christian and Jewish Eudaimonism in *The Merchant of Venice*’ (pp. 65–85), Sara Coodin reads *The Merchant of Venice* in the light of Christian and Jewish eudaimonism, or ideas on ‘how to flourish’ or do well in life. Coodin focuses on the parable of Jacob and Laban’s cattle told by Shylock in Act I, scene iii, to justify his financial activities. Although she has earlier dismissed ‘spirit-and-letter’ readings of Shylock’s attitude, it is not clear that this very episode could not be read along those lines: was the ‘spirit’ of Laban’s contract with Jacob not that the latter would get a certain number of beasts, presumably ‘statistically’ estimated on the basis of previous years? And by applying his ingenuity to the alteration of that statistical average, was Jacob not effectively cheating his uncle of a number of cattle? However, it probably remains true that Shakespeare is bringing up the issue rather than offering a solution in one sense or the other. Part I concludes with chapter 4, by Mary Ann Lund, on ‘Robert Burton, Perfect Happiness and the *Visio Dei*’ (pp. 86–105). Part II is on ‘Shakespeare and the Language of Emotion’, and opens with an essay by Nigel Wood on ‘Spleen in Shakespeare’s Comedies’ (chapter 5, pp. 109–29). Wood discusses the tragicomic potential of the word ‘spleen’, and how

Shakespeare 'favoured it as comprising a remarkably broad spectrum of meaning' and being especially related to 'the ungovernable qualities of emotional excess' (p. 113). This is followed by Richard Meek's chapter 6, ' "Rue e'en for ruth": *Richard II* and the Imitation of Sympathy' (pp. 130–52). Meek describes the use of the term *sympathise* and its 'precursor' *rue* in the depiction of Queen Isabel's feelings towards her dispossessed husband in Samuel Daniel's *Civil Wars*, and links it to Shakespeare's exploration of the term *rue* and similar emotion terms in *Richard II*. Meek shows how, in borrowing from Daniel in Act V, scene i, Shakespeare 'makes the emphasis upon the emotional impact of narration far more explicit' (p. 143), using the verb *sympathise* in a way that 'represents a key moment in the history of the term' (p. 144). The final section of the chapter explores the parallel question of a monarch's pity for his subjects as applied to Richard in Act I and to Bolingbroke in Act V of the play. In chapter 7, 'What's Happiness in *Hamlet*?' (pp. 153–74), Richard Chamberlain takes the unusual step of attempting to discuss *Hamlet* from the point of view of its critics' happiness or otherwise, engaging in particular (from the chapter's very title) with John Dover Wilson's 1935 study, *What Happens in Hamlet*, and its stipulation that we should ask ourselves 'in what mood are the principal characters' when a scene begins (3rd edn. [1951], p. 174). The first chapter in Part III, which is on 'The Politics and Performance of Emotion', is Andy Kesson's ' "They that tread in a maze": Movement and Emotion in John Lyly' (chapter 8, pp. 177–99). We return to Shakespeare with chapter 9, '(S)wept from Power: Two Versions of Tyrannicide in *Richard III*' (pp. 200–20), by Ann Kaegi, who, like Mullaney (see below), takes as her starting point the way in which the Reformation transformed 'the relationship between the living and the dead' (p. 200). Kaegi's chapter focuses on the lamentations of the women in *Richard III*, on how they contravene laws and regulations of Shakespeare's time, and how they ultimately constitute an alternative, effective form of tyrannicide. In chapter 10, 'The Affective Scripts of Early Modern Execution and Murder' (pp. 221–40), Frederika Bain draws upon 'broadside and pamphlet execution narratives from the late sixteenth to the mid-seventeenth century, including accounts of the regicide of Charles I, and upon Thomas Preston's ... *Cambyses, King of Persia* and Shakespeare's *Richard III*' (p. 222), and discusses in turn the principal figures in execution scenes: the King, the Executioner, the Condemned, and the Spectators. The final chapter, chapter 11, 'Discrepant Emotional Awareness in Shakespeare' (pp. 241–63), is by R.S. White and Ciara Rawnsley. It shows how Shakespeare played off 'different emotional registers and patterns, allowing them to change, and finally merging them in harmony' (p. 242). The chapter focuses on Act IV, scene ii, of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and the 'transformation of suffering into joy' in *Cymbeline* (p. 251), 'examples chosen because they are driven by emotions rather than simply untangling narrative complications' (p. 244). Peter Holbrook's 'Afterword' (pp. 264–72) concludes this volume by highlighting Shakespeare's singularity in making 'the emotional life of human beings the essence of art' (p. 264), further showing how this is inextricably linked to the issue of freedom and free will. Holbrook thus puts forward a parallel claim to

that made by Robert Ellrodt for the playwright's interest in individual self-consciousness.

Steven Mullaney's volume echoes episodes and critical references that are developed (often more fully) in Meek and Sullivan's collection, sometimes showing an uncanny complementarity: while Sullivan admittedly does not address Thomas Wright's 'interest in rhetoric and persuasion' (p. 40), this is the main focus in Mullaney's discussion of *The Passions of the Mind*. Mullaney offers new terminology for familiar concepts: for instance, 'affective technologies', which could be (and are) glossed as 'forms of cultural performance' (p. 150). In chapter 1, Mullaney discusses instances of 'affective irony', the emotional equivalent of dramatic irony, in Thomas Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* and Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* (drawing also on modern productions of the play and focusing on audience reaction to Marcus' drawn-out rhetorical speech on the mutilated Lavinia) and in *The Merchant of Venice* (does the latter become a revenge play when seen from a Jew's point of view? It does not, because its 'genre cues' work against this interpretation; p. 90). Chapter 2, after adducing some fascinating examples from anthropology and neurology, examines how the first history tetralogy responds to the trauma of the Reformation and its attempt to erase memory by severing the affective links of the population with previous generations. A basic tenet in this work is that the early modern English theatre is for us now a privileged tool for the recovery of emotions from a different era: Shakespearean examples given are Antonio's sadness in *The Merchant of Venice* (pp. 35–6), and the visit by the Groom of the Stables to Richard II (pp. 38–9). This parallels its importance for the creation of a new public sphere in its time. This aspect is discussed especially in the third and final chapter, 'What's Hamlet to Habermas?', which in fact says much less on *Hamlet* than at several other points in the book.

It is interesting how discussions of emotions in Shakespeare tend to focus on the histories in the first instance, and then the comedies (including the problem plays). Of the twenty-three chapters in the volume on *Shakespeare and Emotions* co-edited by R.S. White, Mark Houlahan, and Katrina O'Loughlin only two deal with the tragedies. Chapter 1, 'Reclaiming Heartlands: Shakespeare and the History of Emotions in Literature' (pp. 1–14), functions as an introduction. In it Bob White describes the 'affective turn' (p. 1) that has occurred not only in the study of literature and drama but also in a variety of other fields, and sets the present 'pluralistic' collection (p. 2) against a long-term background, from Plato to current 'New Emotionalism' (p. 9), characterized by the polarity between the rational condemnation and the 'poetic' exaltation of emotions. Part I, 'Emotional Inheritances', shows how Shakespeare's representation of emotions is indebted more to his literary sources than to humoral theories. In chapter 2, ' "Of comfort and dispaire": Plato's Philosophy of Love and Shakespeare's Sonnets' (pp. 17–28), Danijela Kambaskovic argues that a link with Plato's philosophy of love brings the young man and dark lady sections of the sonnets 'to an equivalent philosophical footing' (p. 18). In chapter 3, '*Locus amoenus* or *locus violens*? Shakespearean Emotions Expressed through an Ovidian Model' (pp. 29–38), Bríd Phillips shows how *Titus Andronicus* reshapes and even 'undercut[s]'

(p. 29) the conventions of the *locus amoenus* that had already been used by Ovid to signal impending moments of 'emotional excess' (p. 30). Chapters 4 and 5, by Ciara Rawnsley and Andrew Lynch, are discussed below, with the late plays and the problem plays respectively. The section on sources in this collection concludes with two essays that glance at the intersection of sexual and political issues in the history plays: chapter 6, 'French Feeling: Language, Sex and Identity in *Henry V*' (pp. 59–68), by Stephanie Downes; and Mary-Rose McLaren's 'Power, Vulnerability and Sexuality: Representations of Margaret of Anjou in a London Chronicle and Shakespeare's *3 Henry VI*' (chapter 7, pp. 69–79), which draws on a mid-fifteenth-century commonplace book contained in fair copy in British Library MS Egerton 1995.

Part II, 'Shakespearean Enactments', focuses on readings of the plays themselves, literally so in Peter Groves's peroration in favour of keeping to the metre when speaking Shakespeare's lines because this will normally yield superior emotional sense than when the lines are accented according to a more banal conversational emphasis (see chapter 8, ' "My heart dances": Performing Emotion through Shakespeare's Rhythms', pp. 83–94). In the next chapter, ' "The teares of ten thousand spectators": Shakespeare's Experiments with Emotion from Talbot to Richard II' (chapter 9, pp. 95–104), Ruth Lunney describes the audience's emotional response to the character of Talbot in *1 Henry VI* and the eponymous figures in *Richard III* and *Richard II* by comparison with the 'response called for across a body of roughly contemporary texts' (p. 96), consisting mostly of history plays by other authors and works by Christopher Marlowe. Chapter 10, by Martin Dawes, is on 'Emotional Education and Leadership in the *Henriad*' (pp. 108–15), while Anthony Guy Patricia, in chapter 11, ' "Say how I loved you": Queering the Emotion of Male Same-Sex Love in *The Merchant of Venice*' (pp. 116–23), brings together 'queer theory and emotionality studies' in his analysis of the Antonio and Bassanio relationship, taking issue with Joseph Pequigney's distinction between their relationship and that of Antonio and Sebastian in *Twelfth Night*, and adding an original reading in unselfish terms of Antonio's famous melancholy in the first scene of *The Merchant of Venice*. Chapters 12 and 13, by Alison V. Scott and Ronald Bedford respectively, are both on *Troilus and Cressida*, and are discussed in the problem play section below. In chapter 14, 'Displacement: Maps and Emotions in *Othello*' (pp. 146–54), Christopher Wortham links cartography (definitely relevant to his other example, the medieval play *The Castle of Perseverance*) with the account of Othello's adventures in Act I, scene ii. However, it is unclear why Wortham here refers to Waldseemüller for elements that are normally traced back to the medieval Mandeville narrative. In the next essay, 'Lear in the Storm: Shakespeare's Emotional Exploration of Sovereign Mortality' (chapter 15, pp. 155–63), Jennifer Hamilton insists on Lear's experience of shame and sees his fury in the storm 'as a tragic culmination of the emotional experience of embodying the paradox of sovereignty itself, the King's Two Bodies' (p. 162). Heather Kerr's ' "Sociable" Tears in *The Tempest*' (chapter 16, pp. 164–72) finds that Prospero's emotional interaction with Gonzalo in Act V, scene i, manifests a kind of sympathy normally only found from the eighteenth century onwards.

Part III, ‘Emotional Legacies and Re-enactments’, consists of papers on the reception of Shakespeare: Philippa Kelly on her experience as a dramaturge (and as a bereaved sister) in chapter 17, ‘Only Connect: Dramaturgy and a Living Shakespeare,’ (pp. 175–85); Susan Broomhall on the 2012 British Museum exhibition *Shakespeare: Staging the World* (chapter 18, ‘Cabbages and Kings: Curating the Objects and Emotions of English Encounter with the World through Shakespeare’, pp. 186–97); Andrew Lawrence-King on a seventeenth-century musical setting of ‘To be or not to be’ believed to provide clues on the early modalities for delivering the speech (chapter 19, ‘’Tis Master’s Voice: A Seventeenth-Century Shakespeare Recording?’, pp. 198–217); Simon Haines on forms of recognition in Shakespeare and nineteenth-century philosophy, with examples from *Othello*, *King Lear*, and *Antony and Cleopatra* (chapter 20, ‘Recognition in Shakespeare and Hegel’, pp. 218–30); Rosemary Gaby on *The Hollow Crown* (chapter 21, reviewed in the histories section below); and Elizabeth Schafer on an Australian production of the Falstaff-centred comedy (chapter 22, ‘Whose Nostalgia? Geoffrey Rush and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Brisbane 1987’, pp. 240–50). Chapter 23 (pp. 251–5) contains an ‘Afterword’ in which Mark Houlahan summarizes the answers given in this volume to the problem of how we can know about emotions in the early modern world, arranging them under three headings: ‘Archive’, or written testimonies (including both primary and secondary literature) and material objects; ‘Enactment’, i.e. performances and accounts of performances; and ‘Embodiment’, a category for which Houlahan, in my view, fails to give a satisfactory exposition, beyond mentioning how a number of chapters in the book ‘evoke Descartes as a key early modern philosopher of the body’ (p. 254).

The theme for the 2014 volume of *Shakespeare Survey* was ‘Shakespeare’s Collaborative Work’. Two articles of more general import that were not mentioned in the last issue of *YWES* (95[2016] 396–402) have some bearing on the topic of emotions. With explicit reference to a ‘much-maligned’ 1967 essay by John Barth, and adducing examples from the sonnets, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Hamlet* (including a comparison with Book VI of Milton’s *Paradise Lost*), and *The Tempest*, Stephan Laqué, ‘Shakespeare’s Literature of Exhaustion’ (*ShS* 67[2014] 235–41), suggests that the richness of Shakespeare’s plays may in fact stem ‘from a kind of tiring surfeit and from a powerful sense of exhaustion’ (p. 235); while in ‘Why Ganymede Faints and the Duke of York Weeps: Passion Plays in Shakespeare’ (*ShS* 67[2014] 265–78) Sujata Iyengar discusses the significance of the red-marked (in most instances bloodstained) cloth in *3 Henry VI*, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, *As You Like It*, *Othello*, and *Cymbeline*.

The 2015 issue of *Shakespeare Survey* is entitled ‘Origins and Originality’ and includes three articles of a general character, alongside work-specific essays, or essays that deal with special topics such as translation. The volume opens with a contribution by Margreta De Grazia on ‘Shakespeare’s Anecdotal Character’ (*ShS* 68[2015] 1–14), which includes a close reading of Rowe’s 1709 biographical essay on Shakespeare and a discussion of the famous issue of ‘blotting’ lines (or not), raised by Ben Jonson and traced by Rowe back to its original in Horace. By reference to this and other eighteenth-

century pronouncements, De Grazia concludes that the discrepancy between the 'wayward' anecdotal figure and the 'upright' Shakespeare of the biographies is due to the fact that, at this point in time, the anecdotes conveyed an image of the perceived unruliness of the writing rather than of the man himself. In 'What Is a Source? or, How Shakespeare Read His Marlowe' (*ShS* 68[2015] 15–31), Laurie Maguire and Emma Smith raise important methodological questions on the very concept of (Shakespearean) sources, and on the different planes on which one can discuss Shakespeare's relationship with his rival. They argue, partly on the basis of parallels first adduced by J.B. Steane, that the presence of Marlowe's *Dido* is felt not only in the First Player's speech in *Hamlet* but also and especially in *The Tempest*. The article perhaps exaggerates the distance between Marlowe's 'washed up' Aeneas (p. 23) and Virgil's 'triumphant' hero (p. 22), but it does make several points that will need to be incorporated in future discussions of *The Tempest*. It then draws on hauntology and trauma studies to investigate a different (unconscious) model of textual recollection, and concludes with a series of parallels between *Dido* and other plays in the Shakespeare canon. Farah Karim-Cooper's 'Shakespearian Gesture: Narrative and Iconography' (*ShS* 68[2015] 118–30) suggests that 'the context of a gesture is paramount to an interpretation of its meaning in a text' (p. 121), and illustrates this with reference to two gestures in Shakespeare: an involuntary, individual one in *The Rape of Lucrece* lines 386–7, where the heroine is asleep with her cheek resting on her hand, and the gestures with which, as Karim-Cooper states, Hamlet deliberately conveys his 'madness' to Ophelia, knowing that she will report it (as she does in Act II, scene i). In the latter case, Karim-Cooper adduces examples where 'taking by the wrist' signals a rape, thus highlighting the dangerous and dark connotations that the iconographical context lends to this passage in *Hamlet*.

The theme of the 2015 issue of *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* is 'Shakespearean Festivities', in line with the joint celebration in 2014 of the 450th anniversary of Shakespeare's birth and the 150th anniversary of the Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft. Most of the articles are on aspects of the reception of Shakespeare, including, rather prophetically, one by Heinrich Detering on 'Bob Dylan's Shakespeare' (*ShJE* 151[2015] 149–66; in German with English summary). The exception is 'Ominous Feasts: Celebration in Shakespeare's Drama', by Ina Habermann (*ShJE* 151[2015] 116–30), which discusses the plays themselves. Citing examples from across the canon, but focusing especially on *Antony and Cleopatra*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Habermann illustrates the 'technique of syncopation' (p. 121), whereby general celebrations are marred by some ominous occurrence. On the other hand, real moments of happiness happen offstage as nostalgia for happy times past or anticipation of future celebrations, thus creating potential 'asynchrony' (p. 130) between the collective and the individual.

A similar concern is at the basis of *Shakespeare and Democracy: The Self-Renewing Politics of a Global Playwright*, in which Gabriel Chanan sifts through over half the plays in the canon asking a simple and direct question—What is Shakespeare's attitude towards democracy?—meaning not so much a system of political representation as a just and egalitarian society and culture.

Chanan's main conclusions could be summarized as follows: that Shakespeare's dialectical method, his way of showing both sides of an argument, in itself 'aligns naturally with democracy' (p. 197); that there are nevertheless 'social blind-spots in the plays' (back cover), particularly in the treatment of Shylock and Caliban; and that reading the plays in the order of composition highlights a development in Shakespeare's attitude, moments when his 'trajectory' towards democracy 'goes into reverse' (p. 189). This happens at those points in time when he is closest to the power structures of his day, that is, when he is writing the second historical tetralogy and the court is beginning to take note of this successful dramatist, and in late plays such as *Henry VIII* and *The Tempest* (in fact, one thing that I would definitely edit out of this very readable book, which does offer a number of arresting insights, is the close of chapter 5, where Chanan fantasizes that it was Shakespeare himself who, in a fit of disgust, set fire to the Globe during a performance of his final history play). On the other hand, *The Winter's Tale* is presented in the conclusion as 'an important stepping stone towards democracy' (p. 208) thanks to the character of Paulina, who, like the servant who dies trying to prevent the blinding of Gloucester in *King Lear* ('Shakespeare's greatest hero', p. 183), exemplifies the lower classes' prerogative to mitigate the dangerous arbitrariness of power.

Celebrating Shakespeare, edited by Clara Calvo and Coppélia Kahn, CUP, 2015 was not received in time for review, and will be covered with material from 2016.

(b) Problem Plays

Measure for Measure attracted by far the largest share of scholarly attention among Shakespeare's problem plays in 2015, and a strikingly diversified range of critical takes. Adrian Streete, in 'Lucretius, Calvin, and Natural Law in *Measure for Measure*' (in Loewenstein and Witmore, eds., *Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion*, pp. 131–54), is the first scholar ever to shed light on the extent to which the play's engagement with Lucretian philosophy seeks to criticize 'the dominant Protestantism of early modern England' by dramatizing 'a Calvinistic world becoming Lucretian' (p. 133). The contrast is exemplified by the play's attitudes towards sexuality, in particular in relation to Angelo's handling of his own, and others', sexual drive. Despite the strictly Protestant, puritanical bent of Angelo's rule—under which sexual pleasure 'is to be rigorously policed' (p. 141)—Act II, scene iv, makes him 'emerge as a Lucretian sensualist in thrall to his sexual desires', thereby exposing 'the keen tension between a Christian and a materialist understanding of sex' (p. 147). Although both Protestant and Lucretian philosophy conceive of humans as at the mercy of irresistible urges, 'the former sees this as tragic, the latter as inherently comic, a fact that may in part account for the bittersweet generic makeup of this play' (p. 146). Ultimately, *Measure for Measure* seems cautiously to suggest that 'a Lucretian universe where sexual pleasure and mutuality are valued is largely preferable to one that tries to control or deny

human sexuality' (p. 150), even though the play blatantly 'doesn't end with a Calvinistic world turned *completely* Lucretian' (p. 154).

The negation of sexuality, in the form of virginity, takes centre stage in Andrew Lynch's essay '"... another comfort": Virginity and Emotion in *Measure for Measure*' (in White et al., eds., pp. 49–58). For Lynch, the character of the 'traditional virgin martyr' offers a useful framework within which Isabella's 'emotional attachments', 'her defiance of unjust power and outspoken pursuit of truth' can be seen as exhibiting a higher degree of coherence and appropriateness to her situation than if one thinks of her as 'an intensely religious young woman of the very early seventeenth century' (p. 50). In particular, the importance Isabella places on virginity should be understood in relation to 'an independent and personal passion for the divine' (p. 53) typical of characters in the hagiographical tradition. Yet the play is not a virgin martyr's legend, where the protagonist 'is always perceived to be on the martyr's narrative path to God' and is therefore allowed considerable 'freedom of action and expression'. Hence, though initially setting up Isabella 'like a heroine in the virgin martyr genre', the play ends up 'disappoint[ing] her with bitter ironies' by 'subordinat[ing] the heaven-bound values of the virgin saint's life to those of a secular comedy concerned with earthly justice and the control of sexual passion through marriage' (p. 56).

Two essays deal with the question of genre, though from different perspectives. Genevieve Lheureux, 'Authority and Displacement: *Measure for Measure* or the Empty Chair Policy' (in Labaune-Demeule, ed., *Authority and Displacement in the English-Speaking World*, vol. 1: *Exploring Europe/from Europe*, pp. 11–23), argues that the intervention of providence that is necessary for *Measure for Measure* to end happily, 'placed as it is at the end of a series of rather unlikely developments' (p. 19), should be seen as an attempt on Shakespeare's part to expose the artificiality of the conventions and mechanical formulas that regulate comedy, as exemplified in the use the Duke makes 'of all available stage ploys to turn a potential tragedy into a comedy' (p. 18), such as 'the series of forced marriages that conclude Act V, or ... the indiscriminate mercy that [he] bestows on his subjects' (p. 12), with no distinctions made 'between lighter offences ... and heavier crimes' (p. 21). Moreover, said questioning of 'the very workings of comedy' cannot but lead the audience 'to question ... the relationship between justice and lawfulness' (p. 12) in a world where, rather than 'an expected prize', marriage 'has been turned into a paradoxical form of retribution' (p. 21), and any 'consolation of an ordered, meaningful world in which retribution and reward operate to guarantee that justice eventually prevails' (p. 22) is ultimately denied.

The unhappiness of the married characters at the end of the play, according to Igor Shaitanov in 'A Struggle of Genres, or a Dialogue: A Post-Bakhtinian View of Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*' (*Style* 49[2015] 477–93), betrays 'the uncertainty in what generic terms and in what system of values' the play should be understood (p. 487). In Shaitanov's view, *Measure for Measure* should be read as having 'a morality play as its background and a tragicomedy as the final step in its development'. The fact that 'Angelo is prevented from committing ... the crimes ... of murder and seduction—and is thus saved from punishment' ought to be construed on a deeper level as a return 'to his own

long-neglected humanity' (p. 488), in an implicit Shakespearean nod to *Everyman*. Despite the morality-like background, the play is nonetheless 'morally ambiguous, in part because of its shifting system of values', as evidenced by the final scene when only Angelo is pardoned (p. 491)—even though he and Lucio can be said to be 'extremes that meet' (p. 490) in their distortion of 'the topographic plane of myth', as 'Holiness in Angelo and carnival in Lucio are overdone' (p. 491).

François Laroque, 'Magic, Manipulation and Misrule in *Doctor Faustus* and *Measure for Measure*' (in Chiari, ed., *The Circulation of Knowledge in Early Modern English Literature*, pp. 123–32), argues that in the play 'transmission and transgression are presented ... as activities that are simultaneously contrasted and paralleled' (p. 130). The Duke's plan to delegate 'his authority ... in order to ... suppress sexual anarchy in Vienna while he himself safely hides' can be read as 'a cunning ploy to put Angelo's virtue to the test'. However, the Duke's incessant use of stratagems and devious tricks makes him appear corrupt as well, and ultimately shows that 'far from being extirpated, vice perpetuates itself in new forms' (p. 131), with transgression taking place 'through a form of interregnum which plays the role of a safety valve as in the traditional interval of festive misrule' (p. 132).

Sharing Laroque's focus on the Duke's manoeuvring, L. Joseph Hebert Jr., ' "When vice makes mercy": Classical, Christian, and Modern Humanism in Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*' (in Radasanu, Balot, and Burns, eds., *In Search of Humanity: Essays in Honor of Clifford Orwin*, pp. 209–24), reads the play as 'a response to Machiavelli's radical critique' of 'classical and Christian humanism' (p. 209), as is made evident by the Duke's course of action. Whereas his overall conduct is 'redolent of Machiavellian *virtù*', his hesitation to have Barnardine executed (which significantly jeopardizes his elaborate plan) in fact reveals that, though 'tempted to follow the new modes and orders of *The Prince*, he is not ... willing to embrace core theoretical and practical features' (p. 219) of Machiavellianism. The play seems ultimately to suggest that society should be built on 'love and virtue rather than on the Machiavellian foundation of fear and desire' and that, in keeping with the classical humanist tradition, 'it is virtue, and not vice, that "makes" the mercy necessary to govern imperfect human beings' (p. 221).

Painstakingly scrutinizing language, structure, grammar, metrics, vocabulary, and imagery, as well as analysing a passage from *The Rape of Lucrece* informed by the same logic and sharing the same tone, John McGee, in 'The Lost Couplet Conjecture in Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*' (*ES* 96[2015] 264–76), challenges J.W. Lever's influential conjecture that the Duke's monologue about the punishment of crime concluding Act III is missing a couplet. The speech contrasts 'two types of men and their respective capacities as law-implementing sovereigns': first, the Duke describes the ideal judge; then, he 'turns to his polar opposite—a judge who is at least as evil as the people he condemns' (p. 270). Here, argues McGee, when Vincentio mentions a 'likeness made in crimes / Making practice on the times', he has in mind a criminal-like judge who imposes his own version of justice on society; and when he imagines this same magistrate trying to 'draw with idle spiders' strings / The most ponderous and substantial things', he is actually portraying this

judge's attempt to cleanse society from crime as inherently futile, because 'when a lawless man tries to implement the law, there can be no true justice' (p. 273). In a wider perspective, the Duke's speech clearly 'articulates ideas that appear to have been widely prevalent at the time of the play's composition' (p. 274), by 'addressing the far-reaching legal ramifications inextricably bound up in the person of the sovereign' (p. 276).

The issue of justice is also at the core of the discussion of the play by Paul S. Fiddes in 'Law and Divine Mercy in Shakespeare's Religious Imagination: *Measure for Measure* and *The Merchant of Venice*' (in Bugliani Knox and Lonsdale, eds., *Poetry and the Religious Imagination: The Power of the Word*, pp. 109–28), who sees *Measure for Measure* as wondering how 'divine mercy and justice [can] be applied in an imperfect world', thus confronting 'issues that concerned jurists and theologians in Shakespeare's time' without, however, 'offer[ing] a theory or a doctrine' but simply opening an imaginative space in which the complex tensions between 'human and divine justice . . . can be explored' (p. 119) and 'in which we can work at a human approximation to transcendent justice and mercy' (p. 125). What Shakespeare seems to imply is that the best way to live within these tensions is by exercising the virtue of moderation, which in *Measure for Measure* seems to combine 'the classical virtues of Aristotle's "reasonableness" . . . and Seneca's clemency . . . together with the Reformer's ideal of Christian "equity"' (p. 118).

The Extended Mind hypothesis, i.e. the notion that 'human cognitive processes can be constituted by coalitions of biological and non-biological resources, rather than being confined to neural circuitry' (p. 1), underlies Miranda Anderson's discussion of *Measure for Measure* in *The Renaissance Extended Mind*, a discussion primarily focused on the significance of mirror motifs in the play. As Anderson points out, with the spread of 'new and improved mirrors' in the early modern era, mirror motifs started to be employed more and more often in literature for 'the representation of cognition and subjectivity', especially in relation to 'concerns about first-person versus third-person access to our own or to others' subjective cognitive experiences' (p. 179). This is exemplified in *Measure for Measure* by the contrast between Angelo's image of 'himself as Law personified' and his realization, prompted by Isabella, that he in fact plays 'a less exalted part in the more complex embodied and distributed cognitive system that comprises our flawed human world' (p. 189). In this sense, mirror motifs are shown as exposing 'a two-way relationship between the creation of the original by the image and the image by the original', as the 'mirror of the law is shown by Angelo's hypocrisy as operating humbly through the upholder of it, as a form of extended subjectivity' (p. 185).

Applying George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's cognitive metaphor theory to the numerous, polysemic uses of 'slip' and its cognate words in the play, Paul Yachnin and Patrick Neilson, 'Slips of Wilderness: Verbal and Gestural Language in *Measure for Measure*' (in Yachnin, ed., *Shakespeare's World of Words*, pp. 187–209), conclude that Shakespeare's use of metaphors in *Measure for Measure* 'exemplifies Lakoff and Johnson's argument for the metaphoricity of language itself and for the essentially metaphorical character of our descriptions of the world' (p. 191). All the major characters in *Measure*

for Measure variously 'slip', that is, 'deviate from', either 'law, ideology, power or society' (p. 200) under the influence of some internal or external force, and 'the degree to which the characters slip under pressure demonstrates that none of them is of metal sufficiently pure to take an impression straightforwardly' (pp. 199–200). Yet 'all deviate in ways that reveal their individual qualities, leading them along an irregular course toward something like a revelation of self', in an adaptation of 'the "fortunate fall" of Adam and Eve' (p. 200).

Convinced that Thomas Middleton's modifications to the characterization and story arc of *Measure for Measure* in *More Dissemblers Besides Women* 'perhaps account for revisions that he made to Shakespeare's play' in the early 1620s. Regina Buccola, in ' "Some woman is the father": Shakespeare, Middleton, and the Criss-Crossed Composition of *Measure for Measure* and *More Dissemblers Besides Women*' (*MRDE* 28[2015] 86–109), compares the plays in order to highlight the differences between the two playwrights' 'conception[s] of female characters [who have a more prominent role in Middleton] and figures of secular and religious authority' (p. 88). Buccola's comparative discussion illustrates that, even though 'marriage, chastity, or whoredom' are presented 'as the only viable options for their female characters' by both dramatists, this choice is performed by Middleton's women 'with the guidance of a maternal Duchess, whereas Shakespeare depicts women as guided to their respective destinies by a paternal friar/Duke' (p. 92).

The evidence for Middleton's early 1620s revision of *Measure for Measure* is regarded by Richard Wilson, in ' "As mice by lions": Political Theology and *Measure for Measure*' (*Shakespeare* 11[2015] 157–77), as both crucial for examining the problematical nature of the play and 'fatal to the myth of Shakespeare as a mystic royalist' (p. 169). On the one hand, Shakespeare's portrayal of such a hapless and disrespected ruler as Vincentio could 'only be ventured during the headless interregnum at the outset of the new reign, when James delayed his entry into his southern capital for a year after he deserted his northern one' (p. 161), so that the fictional Vienna must have strongly reminded its audience of the real Edinburgh, to the point of prompting a rewriting of the play. On the other hand, however, when Middleton tackled the play in the 1620s he turned comedy into tragicomedy and transformed 'a drama of demonic substitution ... into an allegory of divine sovereignty, idealizing the monarch as a *deus ex machina*'. Hence, 'the real problems of *Measure for Measure* reflect the contradiction of Jacobean ideas about election and divine right, and the regression of Tudor parliamentarianism into Stuart personal rule' (p. 168), with Middleton responsible for the insertion in Shakespeare's play of 'the authoritarian ideal that runs throughout his canon, of the great dictator' (p. 174).

The topicality of *Measure for Measure* is also taken up by Jane Rickard in *Writing the Monarch in Jacobean England: Jonson, Donne, Shakespeare and the Works of King James*, where she discusses the play's engagement with *Basilikon Doron*, especially in relation to 'the conjunction in James's work of the biblical phrase that gives the play its title with the issue of slander, one of the play's central thematic concerns'. In particular, by 'draw[ing] upon the phrase's wider biblical context', the play seems 'to interrogate the kind of

position James maintains' (p. 225) regarding 'how a ruler's public image is produced and may be contested' (p. 222) rather than straightforwardly making the new king the object of eulogy or satire. In so doing, 'the play highlights the ironies of associating the logic of measure for measure with the issue of slander': since James in *Basilikon Doron* advocates 'the right to speak freely while imposing limits on the speech of their subjects', and states that 'rulers are uniquely vulnerable to slander', no punishment exists 'for a subject that is exactly equivalent to the crime of slandering a ruler' (p. 226); therefore the play ultimately seems to suggest that 'the preoccupation of rulers with "slanderous" comment, epitomized in *Basilikon Doron*, may in effect produce what it seeks to prevent' (p. 227), namely criticism of the ruler.

In the context of a wider-ranging study of *Shakespeare's Folktale Sources*, Charlotte Artese sees the play as embodying 'the difficulty of adapting folktales, specifically by adding other folk narrative motifs to them' (p. 143), namely, in this specific case, those of the 'resistant sister', the 'disguised ruler', the 'bed trick', and the 'compassionate executioner', all added by Shakespeare—and, at the level of the plot, by the Duke—to the underlying 'Measure for Measure' folk-tale narrative. The situation is complicated further by the fact that the folk tale upon which Shakespeare's play draws had already been adapted by other writers, whose earlier versions of the story are 'preserved like fossils' and 'retained as counternarratives within the play' (p. 144). In the concluding scene, the Duke, 'as playwright-cum-folktale adapter' (p. 158), iterates all those versions one by one in order to reject them as lies, so as to present himself 'as the sole possessor of the one and only version of Isabella and Angelo's story' (p. 159). Yet, apart from the amusement Shakespeare might have wished the audience would feel 'at the lengths he [was] going [to] to torture the old story into a comedy' through recourse to considerably far-fetched solutions—for example, 'The double absurdity of a condemned criminal refusing to be executed and a pirate doppelgänger punctually dying' (p. 157)—'the audience is apt to have deep reservations about the marriage and the marriage plot' (p. 163) that leads Isabella to marry the Duke, so that the play turns out to be 'a failure in terms of creating a satisfying comic ending' as well as adapting the tale 'into a reassuringly romantic comedy' (p. 148).

Artese's monograph also examines another problem play, *All's Well That Ends Well*, and her contribution therefore deals with one of the three broad themes around which critical approaches to the play revolved in 2015: sources, economics, and desire. The story of Giletta as recounted by Boccaccio, Shakespeare's most immediate source, is in fact a version of the folk tale, 'The Man Who Deserted His Wife'. Shakespeare, argues Artese, makes very few departures from Boccaccio, but when he does, it is to insert 'details from the folktale not found in the *Decameron*' (p. 131)—for example the episode of the cure of the king—apparently in order to bring his plot increasingly 'into line with the "Deserted Wife" tradition' as the play progresses. This movement towards folk-tale lore produces 'a tension between the way a theater audience usually knows the motives and plans of characters, through dialogue and especially soliloquy, and the way an audience already familiar with the plot of a play knows a character's plans and motives, through prior acquaintance with

the tale' (p. 121). This tension is evidenced by the fact that, 'while the audience gains privileged access to Helen's interiority through her speeches and dialogue in the first half of the play ... they lose contact with her in the second half' (pp. 121–2); in other words, 'when the plot of the "Deserted Wife" takes over, Helena's soliloquies disappear and her dialogue is much reduced, as if her speeches are redundant' (p. 122). Hence, Shakespeare must have assumed in the audience a certain familiarity with the folk tale; otherwise, play-goers would hardly have been able fully to appreciate the play's resolution.

In a plea for a return to the analysis of Shakespeare's changes to his sources as a way to appreciate his 'limited originality' (p. 63), Catherine Belsey, 'The Elephants' Graveyard Revisited: Shakespeare at Work in *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Romeo and Juliet* and *All's Well That Ends Well*' (*ShS* 68[2015] 62–72), interprets the structural modifications introduced by Shakespeare to Giovanni Boccaccio's novella of Giletta of Narbonne as intended to echo the parable of the Prodigal Son, especially its early modern declension as a favourite subject for moral plays such as *The Interlude of Youth* and *Lusty Juventus*, with which Shakespeare was familiar, as shown by echoes in *The Rape of Lucrece*, the sonnets, and *1 Henry IV*. The ending of the play, however, seems to act as a sort of counterpoint to that parable, where 'the father is God and divine forgiveness demands unreserved contrition' (p. 72), insofar as human relationships in the play look much less absolute and inevitably conditioned by human fallibility.

A concern for Shakespeare's transformation of his sources is shared by Ariana Traill's 'Shakespeare and the Roman Comic *Meretrix*' (in Dutsch, James, and Konstan, eds., *Women in Roman Republican Drama*, pp. 213–31). Resorting to Louise George Clubb's notion of theatergram as 'a dramaturgic element that exists within a common repertoire and is subject to permutation, combination, and gradual evolution' (p. 214), Traill considers a number of 'Roman comedy-derived theatergrams relating to the *meretrix mala* and associated types (*ancilla*, *lena*)'. As a result of the strict public moral standards that limited the opportunities for prostitutes to appear on the early modern stage, contends Traill, theatergrams centring 'on a *meretrix* in Plautus or Terence [had to] transfer ... to Shakespearian figures whose signal virtue is chastity', and who 'exhibit ... ingenuity, performance skill, and verbal facility in Roman-derived contexts, sometimes in contradiction to more conservative feminine virtues that they show elsewhere' (p. 215). In *All's Well*, Diana takes on these traits, inasmuch as she is 'the adolescent daughter of an old woman ... who plays something of the *lena*', and she 'attracts the unwanted attentions of a braggart soldier, Parolles, and an unhappily married *adulescens*, Bertram, who have both been ... offering a Terentian choice between poverty and prostitution' (p. 223). Diana's 'dedication to virtue' (p. 224), however, is never in doubt, and her taking upon herself 'the theatergrams of a *meretrix*' as some sort of secondary role ultimately 'requires the self-conscious performance of distinct theatergrams in order to dupe an internal audience' (p. 223).

Challenging the tendency of previous criticism 'to overlook the crucial roles money and class occupy in the play' and 'to romanticize the relationship between Helena, the Widow Capilet, and Diana' (p. 188), Emily C. Gerstell, in '*All's* [Not] *Well*: Female Service and "Vendible" Virginity in Shakespeare's

Problem Play' (*JEMS* 4[2015] 187–211), seeks to reassess Helena's role in the play. In Gerstell's view, far from being 'a passive victim of patriarchy', Helena is actually 'a woman keenly aware of both her own financial situation and that of those surrounding her, fluent in the market value of virginity, and masterful at getting what she wants' (p. 189). In Helena's construction of her relationship to Bertram as one of service, where he occupies an elevated position above her (with an inversion of the gender roles normally associated with chivalric romance and love poetry), and in her financial exploitation of her relationship with the other women in the play, not only does she bely 'any dichotomy between the rules that govern men and those that govern women' (pp. 203–4); more importantly, she 'demonstrates a profoundly economic and instrumental view of personal relations'. In its depiction of marriage as 'a manifestation of the power people have over one another' (p. 204) and its obsession with virginity as 'simultaneously the most important thing a woman can possess but [that she] must also dispense [with]' (p. 205), the play disturbingly ends up portraying Helena, the Widow, and Diana as 'not only resist[ing] but also participat[ing] in, benefit[ing] from, and perpetuat[ing] patriarchal structures of marriage and the household' (p. 208).

In *Shakespeare and Psychoanalytic Theory* Carolyn E. Brown discusses the incestuous overtones of the Countess's and Helena's relationship to Bertram, seeing the two women 'as active negotiators of the oedipal complex' (p. 108), in contrast to 'the standard view of early modern women as always victims[,] and illustrating they can enact their own sexual fantasies, even forbidden ones' (p. 129). Although Helena and Bertram are not consanguineous, their relationship is akin to 'that of a sister and brother, which makes a sexual relationship taboo' (p. 111). For Brown, Helena's attraction probably results from 'her projection or transference of her feelings for her father' onto Bertram as a mere substitute figure, which would explain 'her dedication to a man with whom she shares no compatibility and who displays no redeeming character traits' (p. 117). In addition, the incestuous nature of Helena's attraction to Bertram is borne out by her possessiveness and obsessive behaviour, which are typical traits in the perpetrators of incest. Moreover, argues Brown, Helena regularly 'enlists the defence mechanism of splitting . . . typically employed by people involved in incestuous bonds' (p. 126), which 'allows her to engage in unchaste, immoral acts while disavowing them at the same time' (p. 127). Finally, the Countess's 'gradually attenuated role can suggest she symbolically becomes submerged into Helena, as Shakespeare correlates Bertram's having sex with Helena with his consummating his repressed oedipal desires for his mother' (p. 125).

The issue of desire is also at the core of Meredith Evans's discussion of the play in ' "Captious and inteemable": Reading Comprehension in Shakespeare' (in Yachnin, ed., *Shakespeare's World of Words*, pp. 211–35). Starting from a new reading of 'the captious and inteemable sieve' (I.i.204) to which Helena compares her own desire (and whose meaning has divided editors of the play for decades), Evans—taking ' "captious" possibly to mean deceitful; "inteemable" to mean bottomless' (p. 213)—argues that the description of Helena's desire, as characterized by 'infinite capacity and law-defying retention, tells of a miraculous performance she must replicate: to enter a

scene where her integrity is tested and proved' (p. 216). This is made difficult by the fact that 'Helena's relationship to her own desire is defined by the object of desire and the sovereign power that can as easily obstruct as facilitate it' (p. 226): as a matter of fact, 'For *All's Well* to end well, the play must see its heroine legitimately coupled with the guy she somewhat inexplicably desires, and she must receive the King's benediction' (p. 229), so that the 'legitimate' heterosexual couple can, in turn, amplify sovereign power.

The analysis of the play's engagement with emotions was also one of the most trodden avenues in criticism of *Troilus and Cressida* over 2015. Alison V. Scott, in 'Making a Virtue of Giddiness: Rethinking Troilus' (E)Motion' (in White et al., eds., *Shakespeare and Emotions: Inheritances, Enactments, Legacies*, pp. 124–36) reads Troilus as engaging in a sort of 'emotional monitoring of the self' (p. 124), especially in the scene in which he admits to his own giddiness in the anticipation of the long-awaited sexual encounter with Cressida. Such an admission is, argues Scott, 'if not entirely unprecedented, certainly distinct and unusual' (p. 126) in Shakespeare's oeuvre. In this scene, 'Troilus first registers strong emotions triggered by his desire for Cressida, then realizes the physiological impact of those emotions, before reappraising the situation' (pp. 124–5). The scene is not meant merely to convey the idea of a straightforward 'failure of masculine self-government in the face of intense effeminizing emotion' (p. 126) in compliance with widespread contemporary moral discourse on the disruptive consequences of overflowing passions; more importantly, it seeks to construe giddiness 'as a force beyond control and problematically associated with positive energy and joy'. Troilus's unusual reflection—in itself a compelling dramatization of the complex 'intersection between emotional experience and cognitive appraisal' (p. 129)—should therefore be read as part of a larger attempt on his part to find 'a form of self-knowledge and self-mastery driven rather than threatened by emotion' (p. 125).

The issues of desire and self-governance are also taken up by Ronald Bedford's essay '"I shall split all / In pleasure of my spleen!": *Troilus and Cressida* and the Expression of Emotion' (in White et al., eds., pp. 137–45). In partial contrast to Scott's claims, Bedford contends that *Troilus and Cressida* 'demonstrates the futility of passion without reason, the folly of impulse over argument, the anarchy wrought by the self in the absence of grace' (p. 143). In Bedford's view, human values lose their meaning in the world of the play as a result of the characters' emotional incontinence, so that the 'disordered, undisciplined self ... becomes the site of subjugation: to self-delusion, self-ignorance, folly, rage, shame and disappointment—and finally becomes, in the moral vacuum of Achilles' empty, crowing ego, the subject of horror' (p. 144).

From a different standpoint, Unhae Langis, in '"Desire is Death" in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*' (*EMLS* 24[2015] 1–31; special issue), suggests that the 'play's focus on choosing the right course of action in an alliance of reason and desire warrants an Aristotelian examination' (p. 9). For Langis, the play highlights 'a corrosive variant of a compelling convergence of *eros* and *thanatos*' in a decadent world where the Trojans and the Greeks 'are afflicted by akratic [i.e. lacking rational self-control] and vicious rather than virtuous desire' (p. 3). While it is true that the titular characters embody 'the

play's potential for virtuous love', such possibility has to 'succumb to the inexorable forces of debased desire' (p. 21) pervading the play. This is especially exemplified by Cressida's fate. Finding herself alone at the Greek camp 'swarming with sex-starved soldiers' (p. 23), she gives herself up to Diomedes because she realizes that 'being the mistress of one man is preferable to being sexual prey for many' (p. 24). Even though she is taking the only possible course of action that can enable her to maintain an acceptable degree of integrity given her circumstances, she has to confront feelings of guilt and self-condemnation, insofar as she 'has internalized the patriarchal rebuke of the inconstant woman' (p. 23). From this perspective, the play therefore looks less like 'a condemnation of female inconstancy than a broad commentary on mutability as a shared human condition' (p. 26).

Cressida's destiny at the Greek camp and what it may suggest about gender construction in the play is also central to Lilly J. Goren's essay, 'Woman's Value on Trial in *Troilus and Cressida*' (in Howe Kritzer and López-Rodríguez, eds., *Woman on Trial: Gender and the Accused Woman in Plays from Ancient Greece to the Contemporary Stage*, pp. 67–86). Goren boldly likens Cressida to 'the women who have been systematically raped in a number of war zones throughout the world', inasmuch as Cressida 'has found herself displaced from her home, in an environment of insecurity where she and her body are under distinct threat' (p. 84). In Goren's view, the play 'poses questions about the position, power, autonomy, and agency of women treated as objects of consumption' (p. 69), and it does so by 'suggesting that the opposition between women who are virtuous and women who are corrupt is imposed on women by men'. More specifically, the play foregrounds the fact that 'the value placed on women's beauty, in a system where men view women as possessions, is constantly threatened by its association with sexuality' (p. 70), all the more so since honour seems to depend on a circular reasoning revolving around women's fidelity as judged by men, with women deprived of any agency whatsoever in the process, even though it is them who are ultimately held accountable for maintaining their own reputation untainted.

The last three critical contributions on *Troilus and Cressida* in this survey concentrate on aspects more closely connected to language and rhetoric. David Schalkwyk, in 'Proper Names and Common Bodies: The Case of Cressida' (in Yachnin, ed., pp. 59–76), observes that *Troilus and Cressida*, like *Romeo and Juliet*, 'explores the burden of the proper name, but . . . in a different mode', namely by reflecting on the complex interplay between the abstractness of proper names on the page—where there are no bodies, which enables names to accumulate 'a series of descriptive properties passed on and reinvented, from poet to poet'—and their physical embodiment in the theatre, where 'the body cannot be reduced or eradicated', for on stage 'the common body of the actor is always forced to bear the burden of a proper name that is . . . improper to it' (p. 64). This, in turn, leads to a de-idealization of paradigmatic names such as 'Troilus' and 'Cressida', which actually 'encapsulate the ideological process whereby these names come to epitomize the concepts of "fidelity" and "faithlessness" ' (p. 68). This way, the play ends up turning 'rule back into sample, reducing paradigm to "instance" ' (p. 65), and

especially poses the question not so much ‘whether Cressida is false or not, but whether her name is inevitably the epitome of falsehood’ (p. 71).

In *Figures of a Changing World: Metaphor and the Emergence of Modern Culture*, Harry J. Berger Jr. proceeds to an examination of Ulysses’ speech in Act I, scene iii. Far from representing the ‘defense of medieval metonymies’ it was once believed to embody, the speech in fact illustrates, for Berger, ‘the process by which metonymies get metaphorized’ (p. 114). Distancing itself from the ‘familiar medieval correspondence between macrocosm and body politic’, Ulysses’ description of the sun makes it emerge not as ‘the metonymic double of a human ruler’ but as ‘a metaphor, an ideological fiction, a hyperbole by which the apprehensive ruler exalts his theatrical display of power to the skies’ (p. 120). It is a sort of propaganda for royal success that, however, simultaneously betrays ‘the precariousness, the anxiety, that motivates the propaganda’ (p. 121). Ulysses’ speech therefore challenges the medieval ‘metonymy of active correspondence between the parts of a single universe’ (p. 122) by exposing the image of the solar system and the order it purports to represent as a sophisticated metaphorical construction of the complexities inherent in, and exclusive to, court politics.

Touching upon the realms of both gender and rhetoric, Lucy Munro, in ‘Staging Taste’ (in Smith, Watson, and Kenny, eds., *The Senses in Early Modern England, 1558–1660*, pp. 19–38), discusses the figurative uses of taste that are interspersed throughout *Troilus and Cressida* as part of a broader examination of the varied ‘imaginative and dramaturgical power’ the sense of taste and its associations ‘with both physical excess and spiritual endeavour, with cultivated appreciation and violent dislike’ (p. 36) had for early modern playwrights. Taste repeatedly serves in *Troilus and Cressida* as a metaphor for both good and bad political advice; moreover, the play repeatedly associates ‘correct and decorous acts of tasting with male martial valour’, as well as ‘ “distasting” with effeminate behaviour or female characters’ (p. 31). All in all, taste seems to emerge as ‘overpowering and uncontrollable, the domain of fevered appetites and famished kisses’ (p. 32).

(c) Poetry

The year 2015 saw the publication of a book-length work on Shakespeare’s sonnets, *Discovering the Hidden Figure of a Child in Shakespeare’s Sonnets as the Key to a New Interpretation: From Literary Analysis to Historical Detection*, by Penny McCarthy. In chapter 1, McCarthy provides contextual information before drawing on similarities between Shakespeare’s sonnets and Philip Sidney’s *Astrophel and Stella* and Mary Wroth’s ‘Pamphilla to Amphilanthus’. In chapter 2, she looks at Sonnets 33–5, and suggests that the speaker’s reputation is tarnished by the arrival of an illegitimate son, who, she suspects, could be Shakespeare’s child. This idea is explored further in chapter 3, where McCarthy examines the possibility that Shakespeare ‘ “lived a life of crime” in engaging in an illicit sexual affair with a woman not his wife, but virtuously gives up the “fruit” of that crime—a child’ (p. 76). Chapter 4 is concerned with the allusions to a baby in Sonnets 18–125. McCarthy argues

that Sonnet 18 is ‘addressed to an older woman, whose presence in the collection has not previously been recognized’ (p. 90). She goes on to analyse Sonnets 74, 55, and 81, deducing that the speaker may not only be saying that, when he dies, his life will continue in the lines of the poems, but may actually be alluding to a bloodline, in that his life will continue through his child. McCarthy then turns her attention to shadows in Sonnets 37 and 53, and suggests that the ‘shadows refer to the shadowy unborn babe’ (p. 107). McCarthy addresses the theme of beauty in chapter 5, and notes that the poems seem to portray beauty being transmitted to a bastard child. She examines Sonnet 126 in chapter 6, and argues that this sonnet is ‘addressed to two lovely boys of different generations’—the young man and a baby (p. 139). McCarthy, then, calls the reader’s attention to Sonnet 26, suggesting that this poem is addressed to the same ‘lovely boys’ as 126. Chapter 7 focuses on the collection’s dedication, drawing attention to its shape on the page and hourglass outline. She observes that ‘this insight strengthens the general suspicion that the dedication is some way upside-down, and should be read from the bottom up’ (p. 159). After examining all possible candidates for the identity of Mr W.H., to whom the poem is dedicated, McCarthy argues that there is a possibility that the Mr is indeed Master W.H.—the baby alluded to throughout the sonnets. Chapter 8 is concerned with the young man, and in an attempt to establish his identity McCarthy studies his character in the poetry as well as his potential existence as a real person. She examines play-scripts and historical documents to try to decipher whether or not Shakespeare’s young man is based on William Herbert, earl of Pembroke, son of Mary Sidney, and cousin of Lady Mary Wroth, as previous critics have argued. The persona of the dark lady is considered in chapter 9, where McCarthy, again, looks for clues in the poetry and external documentation to investigate the possibility that Mary Wroth was the dark lady. Chapter 10 examines the reading of a possible Master W.H. further—McCarthy explores the love triangle between Herbert, Wroth, and Shakespeare, and places the child within this dynamic. The character of the older woman is studied in more detail in chapter 11. McCarthy suggests that her character is likely to have been based on Mary Sidney, and in the final chapter, McCarthy sums up her argument by concluding that Shakespeare seems to have fallen in love with a whole family. She claims that this is the key to an enriched understanding of his sonnets, and argues that in all likelihood, the family he fell in love with was the Sidney family.

Rebecca Laroche’s chapter, ‘Roses in Winter: Recipe Ecologies and Shakespeare’s Sonnets’ (in Munroe, Geisweidt, and Bruckner, eds., *Ecological Approaches to Early Modern English Texts: A Field Guide to Reading and Teaching*, pp. 51–60), provides a fresh reading of the eleven sonnets in Shakespeare’s collection that make reference to roses. Laroche focuses her attention on one early modern recipe book, in which almost 20 per cent of the recipes include roses in some form, and observes that in Shakespeare’s sonnets the roses mentioned are not only the preserved flowers, but living roses, which often get destroyed by worms and harsh weather, and that even distilled roses do not last for ever and must be replaced. Most importantly, she argues that the distillation process is described differently in

each sonnet, just as the distillation processes of making rose oil and rose water differ, so, in a sense, the sonnets are their own mini-recipes.

In his article 'Revising Obsession in Shakespeare's Sonnets 153 and 154' (*SIP* 112[2015] 114–38) David Harper examines the 1609 quarto edition of these two poems, proposing that 154 had been unintentionally included in the collection by the printers. After observing inadvertent repetition in manuscripts of Shakespeare's earlier work, he argues that Sonnet 154 was a draft of Sonnet 153 added to the quarto for convenience. He also makes reference to the theme of sexual obsession in Sonnets 152, 153, and 154, and notes that 154 does not have the same intensity as the other two and does not seem to fit as well into the whole sonnet sequence as, perhaps, one would expect it to.

'Pyrrhonist Uncertainty in Shakespeare's Sonnets', by Amanda Ogden Kellogg (*Shakespeare* 11[2015] 408–24), explores the effect of Pyrrhonism on Shakespeare's poetry. Pyrrhonism, of course, encourages the thinker to consider multiple explanations to avoid making a judgement on a particular issue, in an attempt to reach tranquillity. Ogden Kellogg argues that Shakespeare's sonnets are ambiguous enough to appeal to Pyrrhonist philosophy in that they are susceptible to multiple interpretations, going beyond the Petrarchan convention of creating certainty by using metaphors which lead the reader to specific conclusions. She states that, although Shakespeare uses Petrarchan metaphors, they are used in a way that deviates from convention in that their meanings are unclear and subject to a number of different interpretations, which, according to Pyrrhonists, makes the reading experience a highly pleasurable one.

In her article, 'The Outmodedness of Shakespeare's Sonnets' (*ELH* 82[2015] 759–87), Emily Vasiliauskas argues that part of Shakespeare's sonnet collection was written after the trend for sonnets of love and passion had passed. Despite this, she observes, he indulges in outmodedness—'the persistence in a style after the expiration of its social utility' (p. 760). Style was closely associated with class in the period, with the people of a higher social standing setting new trends, and being outmoded was a sign of being of a lower class. But, by not striving to appeal to the fashion of the time, Vasiliauskas notes that Shakespeare, unlike Jonson and Hoskins, 'tried something different, remaining faithful to a style and discovering new energy within it, by virtue of its outmodedness' (p. 765). She adds that, by not following popular trends, he even forces style itself to question his poetic decisions.

There has also been a lot of scholarly interest in *The Rape of Lucrece* this year. In his article 'Rape and Republicanism in Shakespeare's *Lucrece*' (*SEL* 55[2015] 1–20), John Kunat investigates the topic of consent, arguing that it is not just a political issue, but an issue associated with gender and sexuality. Kunat looks as Shakespeare's poem alongside Livy's rape narrative, which discusses the beginning of the republic and how different forms of consent were related to sexual and gender politics.

'Hiding the Peacock's Legs: Rhetoric, Cosmetics and Deception in Shakespeare's *Lucrece* and Trussell's *Hellen*' (*EJES* 19[2015] 148–62), by Anna Swärdh, assesses the concepts of rhetorical and cosmetic deception in these two rape poems. By looking specifically at references to 'colouring' and

'cloaking', she observes that the colouring and cloaking metaphors are used to conceal the rapists' true intentions before they pounce on their innocent victims, and are also used by the women in different ways—for Lucrece through vocalizing her emotional state, and for Helen through using cosmetics—as ways to hide but also reveal their plight.

Christy Desmet, in her article 'Revenge, Rhetoric, and Recognition in *The Rape of Lucrece*' (*MultSh* 12[2015] 27–40), demonstrates how the poem associates justice with revenge, but 'also complicates its sense of public justice, mostly through Lucrece's own evolving ethics' (p. 29). She explores the concept of 'the borrowed bed' as an association with theft, debt, and crime, and notes that 'Shakespeare's poem also offers us a brief glimpse of a possible politics of recognition, located primarily in Lucrece's exploration of her physical and moral condition after the rape' (p. 34).

In his article, 'Shakespeare's Lady 8' (*SQ* 66[2015] 47–88), Douglas Bruster investigates the printers' ornament that was used on the title pages on the first publication of *The Rape of Lucrece* and *Venus and Adonis*, and examines the meanings and associations generated by the imprint it produced. Bruster states that the ornament was linked to the French and Huguenot print culture, and that it was very popular with Shakespeare's early followers as it provided a representation of the diverse content included in his work. Bruster adds that this stamp established Shakespeare's works as an 'Elizabethan brand' as well as establishing him as an author.

The two works published solely on *Venus and Adonis* this year both concern Ovid's influence on Shakespeare. In her book chapter 'Out-Oviding Ovid in Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*' (in Chiari, ed., pp. 175–87), Laetitia Sansonetti investigates Shakespeare's borrowings from Ovid, particularly those of sexual misdemeanours. She comments on the techniques used by Shakespeare in *Venus and Adonis*, and argues that 'criss-cross verbal quotation, narrative allusion and authorial recombination seem to have allowed Shakespeare not only to emulate Ovid, but also to overtake him' (p. 175).

Sarah Carter concentrates on the themes of love and death in her article '"With kissing him I should have killed him first": Death in Ovid and Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*' (*EMLS* 24[2015] 1–13; special issue). She explores the ways in which death is portrayed in both poems, and how death is seen to be continually linked with passion, desire, and unrequited love. Although she traces the influence of Ovid on Shakespeare with respect to the deployment of mythical characters, Carter focuses predominantly on Shakespeare's poem in this article, suggesting that the poem's use of irony and antithesis emphasizes irony in the poem's representation of the different types of love.

(d) Histories

Despite the fact that Shakespeare's history plays, with the exception of *Richard III*, have not often been popular in theatre repertory, they have somehow made a significant impact in film and television adaptations. The reason for

this, perhaps, is that the relatively dry and uneven nature of the dramatic material has prompted practitioners to take experimental approaches to form and narrative. Laurence Olivier's *Henry V* [1944], Orson Welles's *Chimes at Midnight* [1965], and the BBC/RSC production of *The Wars of the Roses* [1965] are among the most prominent examples of this trend. Analyses of Olivier's *Henry V* are nothing new; however, historian Richard Inverne, in 'Henry V in the Cinema: Laurence Olivier's Charismatic Version of History' (*Historian* 127[2015] 24–9), contributes something original to the discussion by offering a comparative reading of Olivier's film and Kenneth Branagh's later adaptation to clarify how 'public attitudes' to the play's titular monarch have been shaped through the twentieth century (p. 24). Such an undertaking inevitably invites comparison with the recent popular re-evaluations of Richard III's reign that have occurred since the recovery of his remains in 2012. Inverne argues that Olivier's 'jingoistic' approach of portraying Henry as a national hero prompted the removal of the more 'controversial' moments in Shakespeare's play, such as the ruthless execution of French prisoners. As a result, the monarch is portrayed as heroic, but barely 'human' (p. 28). In contrast, Branagh's 'post-Vietnam' reworking is recognized as establishing Henry as a more fallible and human figure, one who is never quite sure if his campaign is anything more than an expression of vanity and pride (p. 29). However, Inverne observes that Branagh's film also falls short of historical iconoclasm in its failure to restore some of the textual cuts that Olivier made, perhaps in fear that it might result in the controversial depiction of a figure who has, accurately or otherwise, been established as a national hero in Britain.

During 2015, John Wyver published two separate articles relating to the RSC's tradition of filming stage productions of Shakespeare. The first article, 'Between Theatre and Television: Inside the Hybrid Space of the Wars of the Roses' (*CritSTV* 10:iii[2015] 23–36), addresses the BBC–RSC production of *The Wars of the Roses*, a 1965 adaptation of the first tetralogy by John Barton and Peter Hall. The article outlines the somewhat radical staging process of the production, whereby the RSC theatre was modified to function as a 'multi-camera' television studio for eight weeks of performances. Wyver's key focus here is on how this production created a hybrid performance idiom that combined elements of television and theatre staging, as well as editing techniques characteristic of both television and cinema (p. 33). Confirming the hypothesis about the difficulty of staging Shakespeare's history plays for modern audiences, Wyver asserts that the adaptation process was considered a necessity by Hall, an experienced director who felt that the *Henry VI* plays could not meet the needs of modern audiences without serious modification (p. 24; Wyver additionally notes that the heavily cut Shakespearean text was augmented by 'cod-Elizabethan' language written by its adapters). However, Wyver also cites instances of successful productions of uncut versions of the plays, thus casting doubt on Hall's hypothesis (pp. 25, 34).

The second of Wyver's articles, 'Screening the RSC Stage: The 2014 Live from Stratford-upon-Avon Cinema Broadcasts' (*Shakespeare* 11[2015] 286–302), takes this discussion of 'hybrid' performances to its most modern extreme by addressing the recent trend of screening filmed stage productions in

cinemas. Wyver notes that this form has proliferated in the last five years, most notably with the *NTLive* template, which the RSC has followed belatedly (p. 292), but he also notes that this trend has not yet attracted proper critical analysis. In light of Wyver's first article, it appears that an approach that accounts for the hybridity of cinema, theatre, and television media will provide a suitable methodological basis for analysing this recent phenomenon in Shakespearean performance. The process of filming stage performance in more modern times, when cameras are both more sophisticated and much smaller, is, of course, easier than in 1965, and Wyver acknowledges that this feeds into the hybridizing process that these productions explore (p. 296). The article notes that the RSC's 2014 season of filmed productions uses both parts of *Henry IV*, although the survey of ongoing practices of filming stage performances in previous years has not given any special attention to the history plays. Interest in stage productions of *Henry IV* is often generated by the casting of a great actor in the role of Falstaff, in this case Antony Sher, and the degree to which these productions are successful is acknowledged to be related to the manner in which they mimic the experience of live theatre rather than making any attempt to employ cinematic values (p. 298).

Further supporting the premise that Shakespeare's history plays often attract a degree of innovation in performance to offset the dry and unfamiliar material of the texts, Cristina Gutierrez-Dennehy, in '"Our lives and all are Bolingbroke's": Alternating Double Casting in *Richard II*' (*ThTop* 25[2015] 127–37), reports on a production of *Richard II* that identifies the duality of King Richard and Henry Bolingbroke as a point of experimental focus. The play was staged by the Poor Shadows of Elysium company in Austin, Texas, in 2013, and its central point of innovation was to cast two lead actors to alternate between the roles of Richard and Henry on a nightly basis. Central to this experiment was the use of a specially written prologue, during which a coin was tossed to determine which actor would play which role (p. 127). As the insertion of this prologue demonstrates, the value of such an innovation appears to be limited if it is not made visible to the audience; indeed, the apparent level of risk that is produced through this technique gives the performance the quality of 'theatre sports'—a performance spectacle that exists independently of the Shakespearean text that is being performed. However, Gutierrez is at pains to argue that the 'double casting' strategy actually serves to emphasize the thematic material of the play, which it does by illustrating the cyclical nature of history (p. 130). This, of course, assumes that Kott's post-Brechtian hypothesis, that the history plays are intended to elucidate this cycle, is authoritative. More recent critical approaches to the histories have sought to engage with analyses of the dominant ideologies of their time, and Kott's approach therefore reflects a residual methodology (see Ton Hoenselaars, 'Shakespeare's English History Plays', in Margreta De Grazia and Stanley Wells, eds., *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare* [2011], pp. 137–52: 149). Considered in this light, Gutierrez-Dennehy's justification of the 'double casting' technique by citing its relevance to the themes of the text remains, at best, a selective perspective.

Countless sources assert that the most frequent dramatic conflict to occur in Shakespeare is that which breaks out between brothers over inheritances—a

quality equally present in the tragedies, comedies, and histories. Some sources have asserted that the recurrence of this conflict is typological, such as we find in Heather Anne Hirschfeld's article, 'Hamlet's "First Corse": Repetition, Trauma, and the Displacement of Redemptive Typology' (*SQ* 54[2003] 424–48), which argues that the specific citation of the 'primal eldest curse' (III.iii.41) in *Hamlet* situates the play as a coded treatment of Genesis 4:1–16. Maurice Hunt, in 'Brothers and "Gentles" in *The Life of Henry the Fifth*' (*CompD* 49[2015] 71–93), notes that *Henry V* is an exception to the rule of fraternal conflict in Shakespeare, and argues that the positive images of brotherhood in the play support an image of the ideal Christian king as one whose reign is secured through brotherly bonds. This is explored through the play's thematic alignment of ideal brotherhood with the notion of 'gentility' that exemplifies a Christian ideal in social terms. The article focuses on the foot-soldier Williams who addresses the disguised king prior to Agincourt. Hunt analyses the exchange between the two to identify the limits of Henry's gentility and magnanimity, revealing in the play a critique of the ideal of 'brotherhood' that has been fostered by the 'We few, we happy few' speech of IV.iii.60–7. In contrast, Williams is characterized as an exemplar of 'imaginative empathy' (p. 76) and is compared several times to Prospero in *The Tempest*, whose 'discovery' of empathy in Act V, scene i, replaces vengeance with forgiveness, and moreover places the magician of Shakespeare's late play as the true ideal of noble gentility (p. 84). Taken in the wider perspective, then, Hunt's reading of *Henry V* finds in the play the same critiques of power that are present in the historical tragedies *Richard II* and *Richard III*; however, Hunt also sees this critique as being penned by a Shakespeare who believed in the possibility of an ideal kingship that could be attained by the ruler's rigorous and expansive application of Christian principles.

Further pursuing the hypothesis that Shakespeare's history plays may be read as critical meditations on the nature of kingship, Eric Pudney's analysis of *Henry V* and *Richard III*, in 'Mendacity and Kingship in Shakespeare's *Henry V* and *Richard III*' (*EJES* 19[2015] 163–75), proposes that these two plays may be interpreted as demonstrating how historical judgements of 'virtuous' or 'evil' rulers are largely a matter of effective rhetoric. Pudney locates in these plays articulations of public discourse, both within the drama and in the engagements that occur between the king and the audience, as a theme of central importance. He identifies in both kings a preoccupation with a self-image crafted through rhetorical strategies, the chief difference being that Henry crafts an image of heroism while Richard fashions himself as a villain. Pudney argues that this process is subject to tension in the dramas, whereby Henry's heroic rhetoric conceals qualities, if not of outright villainy, then at least ones that we may not easily reconcile with the image of the ideal Christian monarch; in Richard's case, the power of individualism that villainy brings is shown to exhaust itself long before the villain meets his destiny at Bosworth Field.

Rhetorical studies of Shakespeare are usually a safe bet, primarily because the exploration of tropes in the plays is so fruitful that it safely pushes the question of the author's ideological alignment further and further into the background. In this sense, the thorny problem of Tudor ideology in both of

these plays can be neatly avoided by observing that their rhetorical designs are so complex, and their critical functions so developed, that they almost attain the status of being politically neutral. Pudney takes a broadly egalitarian approach to this question by citing the contemporary writings of Jean Bodin on kingship; Bodin's comparative approach to anatomizing 'good' kings and 'bad' tyrants becomes a framework for comparing Henry and Richard, and therefore sees the two plays as largely expositional exercises in rhetoric, in which the distinction between 'good' and 'bad' is further blurred. Nonetheless, as in Hunt's analysis, we are reassured by the presence of a liberal 'Shakespeare', who is concerned with revealing the rhetorical 'tricks' by which a ruler may assert power, and thereby arming the masses with a means of resisting them.

In his article 'Shakespeare's Machiavellian Moment: Discovering Ethics and Forming a Leadership Narrative in *Henry V*' (*Public Integrity* 17[2015] 265–78), Jerry E. Herbel Jr. takes an interdisciplinary approach to reading Shakespeare's *Henry V*, drawing on management theory and training manuals as a means of assessing the model of leadership that Shakespeare constructs in King Henry. Conversely, Herbel also cites Shakespeare's play as an effective manual of leadership ethics, one that may profitably be used by modern executives. Such a reading need hardly come as a surprise; recent scholarship on *Henry V* has moved away from the traditional reading of the play as a 'historical' or 'patriotic' epic, and found in it a penetrating critique of political power. Pudney's article, for example, asserts that the depiction of King Henry, in its own way, shows as cunning a political mind as that found in *Richard III*. This is not a point that Herbel disputes, but he is also at pains to note that the political focus of the play is not primarily critical, but presents an ideal of ethical management that surpasses in its impact any expedient shows of manipulation or deception. He notes that Machiavelli himself was not a cynic, but a realist who had observed that 'Christian ethics sometimes has a debilitating effect on politics by making leaders too weak and hesitant to rule well' (p. 269). This is not a new insight, but it is one that clearly bears repeating in view of the frequency with which the term 'Machiavellian' is conflated with 'malevolent' in our culture.

Herbel's article is simple and clear, and it makes its case effectively through reference to the play and text; however, as is often the case with interdisciplinary analyses, there is a risk of oversimplifying the discourses of one or the other discipline being cited. In this case, Herbel approaches *Henry V* via the problem of seeking a definitive reading of the play's purpose and meaning. The active Shakespeare scholar can readily accept that *Henry V* may be read in the light of early modern 'manuals' of ideal leadership, but the claim that this reflects Shakespeare's authorial intention should be met with resistance and scepticism. Herbel's analysis is both valid and original, but his observations should be understood within the dialectical framework that has long been the standard in the discipline, where the presence of any one literary genre is just one of many influences that have shaped the play's text.

Paul Brown has contributed a short but substantive article to *Vides*, an online journal produced by the students of the Department for Continuing Education, University of Oxford: 'Stealing Soldiers' Hearts: Appropriating

Henry V and Marching *Shakespeare's Boys* off to the Great War' (*Vides* 3[2015] 33–43). The article examines the reception of Shakespeare's *Henry V* in the period prior to the First World War, where it is interpreted largely as a patriotic epic, and it considers how the trauma of the war prompted a drastic reconsideration of the play's themes, where it came to be performed as an 'anti-war satire'. This reconsideration is aligned with Brown's own conviction that the play is a 'subversive attack on imperialism, military rhetoric, and the dangers of charismatic leaders' (p. 34). Brown uses the pathos of the Great War generation to make his case: he cites instances where the play's most jingoistic speeches are used in recruitment drives to condemn imperialistic or militaristic readings of Shakespeare.

While this is perhaps the most radically extreme reading of *Henry V* to emerge in 2015, Brown's analysis should not be taken as negating the viability of the more moderate or conservative readings of the play, such as those are outlined elsewhere in this section of *YWES*. Nonetheless, it remains an important piece for its acknowledgement that anti-establishment feeling permeates the history plays: like the ruthlessly violent tragedies, the histories were the mainstay of the public theatres, which were the site in which the early modern 'crisis of confidence' in the feudal order found its fullest expression (Jonathan Dollimore, *Radical Tragedy* [1984], p. 3). While it might be hasty to conclude that any Shakespeare play has a clearly articulated or single political purpose, we should always remain receptive to the possibility that such anti-establishment sentiments may frequently be found throughout the histories.

It is no surprise that Shakespeare's *Richard III* became something of a hot topic in Shakespeare studies after the 2012 recovery of the historical monarch's remains in Leicester; however, in many cases, the recent rise in interest has primarily benefited those scholars already working in the field established by the play's historical framework. Dana Percec, whose article 'Shakespeare and War: *Richard III*—The Long Shadows of Early Modern English History' (*Brukenthalia* 5[2015] 687–94) appears in a journal concerning itself with 'war studies', offers an overview of the recent trend in historical interest, identifying a significant tension between the Richard apologists and the mainstream perceptions of Richard as a historical villain. Percec argues that accounts of the historical figure feature enough 'dark spots' to make it difficult to dismiss Shakespeare's villainous characterization as wholly Tudor propaganda (p. 689). The centrepiece of Percec's analysis is a focus on how the tensions surrounding Richard's character impact on historical understandings of the battle of Bosworth. Percec identifies Richard as belonging to the late age of medieval 'warrior kings', and argues that Shakespeare's depiction of the battle, including the dream/ghost scene (V.iii) that precedes it, centres on the recurrent image of the king facing the enemy alone (p. 692). Like Pudney, Percec draws the comparison with Shakespeare's *Henry V*, whose own entry into battle is similarly couched in the trappings of a solitary endeavour, and argues that Shakespeare's vision of medieval kingship involves the conviction that leading an army into battle is a personal undertaking, akin to single combat but enacted on a national scale, with the king as the bodily focus of the process. Citing Michael Jones, Percec concludes with a familiar reading of Shakespearean politics, where Richard's defeat is shown to be predicated on

his adherence to a medieval code of combat, which ultimately cannot withstand the pragmatism of Henry Tudor's modern invasion force, with its mercenary ranks and questionable legitimacy (p. 693).

Persisting with the familiar reading of Shakespeare's *Richard III* as Tudor 'propaganda', Elizabeth Zauderer, in '"... Neither mother, wife, nor England's queen": Re-visioning Queen Margaret of Anjou in Richard Loncraine's Film *Richard III* (1995)' (*LFQ* 43[2015] 146–59), addresses the ahistorical appearance of Margaret of Anjou in Shakespeare's play, as well the modification of the character in that mainstay of Shakespeare film studies, Richard Loncraine's 1995 adaptation of the play. Zauderer proposes that the figure of Margaret may have been intended to promote the Tudor world-view through the invocation of a historical warrior queen, supported by the earlier portrayal of Margaret in the *Henry VI* plays, Margaret's career loosely matching that of Elizabeth I; yet, as Zauderer argues, this claim stumbles on the corresponding portrayal of Margaret as a malevolent, curse-dispensing witch, an analogue unlikely to be taken as flattering the reigning monarch. Accepting these contradictions as part of the fabric of Shakespearean drama, the author then examines the conflation of Margaret with the Duchess of York (played by Maggie Smith) in the 1995 film. No plausible purpose of combining these characters is fully articulated in the article in terms of the play's ideological status, beyond the supposition that the Duchess's occasional use of Margaret's lines identifies her as the guarantor of legitimate rule in the face of Richard's usurpation. Although this replicates the function of Margaret in the play in the face of the claims of Yorkist illegitimacy, it does not clarify the recurrence of Tudor ideology in the film adaptation. There are some factual errors that a close reading of the play or its adaptations should eliminate, such as the claim that the dynastic dispute between York and Lancaster was resolved by the marriage of Princess Elizabeth and Edward of Lancaster (p. 147). These errors suggest that the article is perhaps attempting too much for its own good, and that its orientation to the discipline of film studies means that its historical claims are not being properly evaluated at the review or editing stages. There are perhaps interesting ideas yet to be explored in this film, which is still only twenty years old; this article suggests as much, but its own analysis retreats into somewhat safe and predictable analyses of how film language articulates what we may already know about the characters.

Rosemary Gaby, in her essay '"The days we have seen": The History of Regret in *Henry IV Parts One* and *Two, The Hollow Crown* (2012)' (in White et al., eds., pp. 231–9), highlights another reason why the history plays, while perhaps not totally engaging for modern audiences, have nonetheless remained a mainstay of theatre repertory: namely, that their reflections on monarchy have emerged as an important touchstone in British culture during periods of national importance. Citing the occasion of the 2012 London Olympics as the backdrop to the prestige adaptation of the second tetralogy as *The Hollow Crown*, Gaby observes that the emphatically dark tone of the plays, as well as their adaptation, seem somewhat at odds with the triumphal tone of the national occasion. Gaby offers an engaging analysis of the series from the perspective of performance tradition, noting, for example, that the portrayal of Henry IV by Jeremy Irons atypically overshadows the performance of

Simon Russell Beale as Falstaff (p. 234). Likewise, the portrayal of Henry V by Tom Hiddleston counters the recent critical readings of the character as Machiavellian, instead placing him as the 'heroic centre' of the series. Gaby's essay, which appears in a volume that has arisen out of the benighted 'History of Emotions' project that has dominated Shakespeare studies in Australia for several years, is relatively short, and it is to some extent hijacked by the need to discuss *The Hollow Crown* in terms of a nominated 'emotion'. So while Gaby begins and ends the essay by recognizing that the dark tone of the series is at odds with the celebratory spirit of Britain's 'Cultural Olympiad', the reason for this is left as an open question, with the concept of 'regret' being posited as a possible explanation. More welcome would have been a recognition of the tensions embodied in the 'national spirit' of the English people, and an acknowledgement of how such a latent tension may shape the works of the national poet, as well as the politics of the present.

Few Shakespeare scholars could have benefited from the discovery of Richard III's remains more than Philip Schwyzer: prior to 2012, Schwyzer had been heavily invested in the material analysis of the century that separates the eras of Richard III and William Shakespeare, tracing not only the significant cultural overlap between the late medieval and early modern periods, but also the discourses of historiography through which the image of Richard that dominated in Shakespeare's time had taken shape. Materialist analyses of this nature typically question the 'periodization' of history, where different eras are arbitrarily identified, distinguished, and made homogeneous, and Schwyzer is at pains to distinguish those elements of Richard's era that were still manifestly present in England by the late sixteenth century. The discovery of Richard's remains not only rendered this research area of increased value to scholarly and general readerships; the discovery itself also meant that the research would develop in exciting and unexpected new directions.

The resulting book, *Shakespeare and the Remains of Richard III* [2013; paperback published in 2015], is typified by this split between its pre-2012 and post-2012 impulses. The focus of the former is closer to the materialist criticism of Shakespeare that begins with Raymond Williams's concern with the 'crisis of confidence' in monarchy that drove the events of the seventeenth century, and which culminated in the Civil War and Commonwealth (Dollimore, *Radical Tragedy*, p. 3; Williams, *Marxism and Literature* [1977]). The primary historiographical shift this criticism represented was a rejection of the Tillyardian 'world picture' that had seemed to circumscribe and homogenize the eras of early modern England, and the move towards identifying the 'dominant', 'residual', and 'emergent' forces in culture (Dollimore, introduction to *Radical Tragedy*, p. 10). Schwyzer applies this historiography to the century that precedes Shakespeare's lifetime, and moreover identifies that the shift in perceptions of the last Plantagenet king was a dominating influence in a century that saw massive changes in English culture and society. For example, a large section of this book offers an impressive overview of the literary and dramatic folk traditions through which the image of Richard, as he appears in Shakespeare, was crafted; yet, this is contrasted with another section that outlines the substantial contribution that Richard made to English infrastructure, a legacy that stands even in spite of

judgements of his historical villainy. As the analysis makes clear, it is no simple matter to identify any 'dominant' view of Richard.

Although such material is sufficiently engaging in its own terms, the archaeological discovery of 2012 appears to have subtly shifted Schwyzer's focus, with the result that the project has developed a characteristically New Historicist bent. In this context, the process of investigation is driven by a preoccupation with material particularities, arcane objects, and rituals, the gradually changing significance of which becomes a key site for questioning how we construct historical meaning. An apt example of this is found in the chapter that begins with the episode in which Richard woos Lady Anne (I.ii). Schwyzer draws a great deal of historical intrigue out of the presence of Henry VI's corpse throughout the scene; this develops into a detailed discussion of the rituals by which the bodies of monarchs were conventionally laid to rest. One of the key attractions of this type of analysis is how it prompts closer readings of the plays themselves, uncovering overlooked details. For example, Schwyzer observes that *Richard III* is one of the few Shakespearean tragedies in which the burial rites for the tragic protagonist are not discussed; instead, Richmond refers only to the burial of those who died nobly in battle. We cannot fail to see the significance of this reading of the play in light of the long-standing misplacing of Richard's remains. In respects such as these, *Shakespeare and the Remains of Richard III* not only forms a valuable response to the questions raised by the discovery of Richard's resting place, but also emerges as the essential companion piece to one of Shakespeare's better-known plays.

One point of criticism that this book has raised for me is that, while the type of analysis that Schwyzer offers is clearly indebted to the 'radical' readings of Shakespeare that began in the mid-1980s, as well to other sources of critical methodology, these sometimes appear to be used without adequate recognition of their origins. For example, a later chapter entitled 'Walking in the City' (pp. 158–72) identifies the detailed London geography that the first three acts of the play encompass, which centralizes the 'everyday' experience of the city into its dramatic framework (p. 158). Schwyzer connects this quality to the 'quotidian' details that inevitably accompany, and consequently personalize, the progress of history, as well as the experience of civic life. Is it a coincidence that French theorist Michel De Certeau's most famous essay, translated into English as 'Walking in the City', is also concerned with these matters, and that the essay appears in his book *L'Invention du quotidian* [1980], translated as *The Practice of Everyday Life* [1984; trans. Steven Rendall]? There appears to be a clear debt to Certeau, whose work aligns with the methodological innovations that cultural materialism and New Historicism applied to Shakespeare, yet the theorist is not mentioned in the book, even in passing. It is perhaps the case that the outcomes of these critical innovations have become so widespread that they are assumed to be commonplaces not originating in the work of individual innovators. Nonetheless, one would hope that a work of such penetrating historiography would be equipped with the means of recognizing one of its own antecedents.

(e) Tragedies

Nicolas Tredell's book *Shakespeare: The Tragedies* is a volume in Palgrave's Reader's Guides to Essential Criticism series, and as such the book presents discussion of criticism of the texts, introducing key critical debates and discussing the texts themselves at one remove. Tredell acknowledges that the 'critical response to the tragedies is itself, in microcosm, a history of global culture', but the book selects 'what seems essential from the Anglo-American strand of that response' (p. 1). The introduction addresses different versions and editions of the plays, issues of (co)authorship, and genre. There are then twelve chapters covering responses to the plays from the period 1693–2013. The first three chapters are chronological in their approach. There is then a chapter on A.C. Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy* [1904], and thereafter the chapters on twentieth- and twenty-first-century criticism are organized thematically. There are chapters on psychoanalytical approaches; important criticism from the 1930s and 1940s (presented under the heading 'Image and Form'); New Historicism, cultural materialism, and poststructuralism; gender and sexuality; ethnicity and ecology; philosophy and ethics; and religion. Critics covered include Stephen Greenblatt, Jonathan Dollimore, L.C. Knights, Ania Loomba, Jacques Derrida, and Jacques Lacan. The book concludes by suggesting possible directions for future study of Shakespeare's tragedies.

Shakespeare's Roman Plays by Paul Innes discusses the more obviously 'Roman' plays (*Titus Andronicus*, *Julius Caesar*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *Coriolanus*) along with the less obvious *Cymbeline*. Innes states that the theme of the book is the relationship between Rome and Britain and that he includes *Cymbeline* because of this. The intention of the book is to draw 'attention to the meanings of Rome as they are starting to be incorporated into the nascent British state contemporary to Shakespeare, and thus the emerging British Empire' (p. 4). The book treats each play separately while acknowledging points of contact across some or all of them. Chapter 1 covers *Titus Andronicus*, focusing especially on the first act and the potential of the Renaissance stage. Innes addresses the initial success of the play and later critical vilification. The social and dramatic construction of tragedy is also addressed. In chapter 2, Innes develops ideas from chapter 1 about the tragic form through the play *Julius Caesar*. He looks closely at the meanings that are generated by the figure of Caesar and the aftermath of his death. Chapter 3 focuses on *Antony and Cleopatra* and addresses the play's critical reception (rather than the text itself). Innes looks at historical material, reading Cleopatra as a figure in imperialist discourse. He adopts a 'doubled perspective' by which to talk about both the representation of Roman history and contemporary presentations of Rome. Using Brecht's well-known discussion of the opening of *Coriolanus*, the next (and longest) chapter looks at the meanings generated by the figure of Coriolanus in relation to the mixed constitution of the Roman Republic. Innes concludes the book with a chapter on *Cymbeline*, bringing discussions from the other chapters together under the title 'Empire Studies'. He addresses *translatio imperii*, but is more interested in

the figure of Cymbeline, who hardly appears in the play named after him, seeing him as a figure who is 'enacted upon' (p. 7).

In *Shakespeare's Storms* Gwilym Jones poses three key questions, asking what Shakespeare understood weather to be; how the storms in his plays affect current critical discourse and change the way we experience early modern theatre; and how the storms achieve this. Jones writes of Shakespeare's storms as being both actual and metaphorical, and he argues that Shakespeare can be seen to be developing the dramatic immediacy of storms and their symbolic possibilities (p. 9). Across the book, he uses the approaches of performance history and ecocriticism to show how the storms have thus far been misread or ignored by critics. Each chapter on individual plays is preceded with a chapter on the various features of storms (such as thunder and wind) and early modern understanding of these meteorological phenomena. Jones argues that the storm in *Julius Caesar* (Shakespeare's first staged storm) is a 'prime example of theatrical bravado' by Shakespeare, who was at this point using spectacular stage elements to present the Globe theatre as an exciting venue (p. 32). In the chapter on *King Lear*, he argues that weather is used to show the separation of the body from the environment and that 'the external storm allows for the creation of the internal' (pp. 23–4). Jones links the weather in the play, and how it is created by and for those involved in it, to the developing field of ecocriticism. In the chapter on *Macbeth*, he 'details the way in which early modern anxieties about the supernatural allow for, or prompt, a play with discrete weather systems' (p. 24). Overall, he argues that Shakespeare's storms represent the 'evolving understanding of meteorological phenomena in late 16th and early 17th century England' (p. 24).

In the article, 'A Matter of Life and Death: The Fourth Act in Shakespearean Tragedy' (*BJJ* 22[2015] 188–207), Lisa Hopkins argues that the fourth acts of Shakespeare's tragedies provide far more than just a simple link between Acts III and V. Hopkins takes us through the fourth acts of the major tragedies (*Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus*, and *King Lear*), arguing that each play's Act IV offers alternative paths for characters to take, other modes of behaviour, alternative identities for the play itself, none of which are acted upon or followed through. Hopkins concludes that 'as the fourth act stops and breathes before the climax of the fifth, it is nevertheless a road which is glimpsed and whose possibilities haunt and energize the events that follow' (p. 205).

Dympna Callaghan's *Hamlet: Language and Writing* is aimed specifically at undergraduate students starting courses in Shakespeare studies. It is a book that acts as an introduction to the play, guiding students in writing about it. It has four chapters, all with self-contained subsections. Information is given about Shakespeare's development as a writer and the context of the play, and problems that students might encounter are addressed. Chapter 1 addresses the three different texts of the play, comparing and contrasting passages, and exploring the implications of the different versions. Chapter 2 looks at Shakespeare's use of, and his interest in, language. Among other elements, Callaghan covers soliloquies, asides, and blank verse. In chapter 3, Callaghan addresses why *Hamlet* is so important to theatre history and the play's significance in Shakespeare's own time. Each chapter ends with exercises for

students to practise writing about Shakespeare, and chapter 4 is given over entirely to 'writing an essay'. This chapter offers guidelines for, for example, structuring an essay and constructing a thesis statement.

Rather than focusing on the isolation of Hamlet, in 'Ophelia's Loneliness' (*ELH* 82[2015] 521–51) Amelia Worsley investigates what she views as Shakespeare's 'new' concept of loneliness in relation to the character of Ophelia. Worsley contends that because Ophelia remains silent throughout Hamlet's soliloquy in Act III, scene i, she is more truly isolated than Hamlet because the act of speaking in itself conjures an audience. Worsley states that 'because Ophelia withholds her thoughts, she is less readable and more isolated onstage than Hamlet is. And perhaps this is why Shakespeare needs a new word to describe Ophelia, but not Hamlet' (p. 525). Worsley offers a review of previous approaches of critics, editors, and directors to Ophelia's loneliness, and invokes critical debates about inwardness and interiority in *Hamlet* to inform her discussion, in part because Ophelia has previously been omitted from such debates.

In 'Feigned Soliloquy, Feigned Argument: Hamlet's "To Be or Not To Be" Speech as Sophistic *Dissoi Logoi*' (*BJJ* 22[2015] 101–18), Phillip Arrington begins with James E. Hirsh's idea that Hamlet's 'To be or not to be' soliloquy is not 'real' but rather feigned to show that Hamlet is aware that he is being overheard (Hirsh, *Shakespeare and the History of Soliloquies* [2003]). Arrington builds on Hirsh in arguing that Hamlet overhears his own speech and in so doing adopts the sophistic rhetoric of *dissoi logoi* within the single speech. Arrington looks first at why Hirsh believes Hamlet's soliloquy to be feigned, before going on to examine *dissoi logoi* as the strategy best suited to 'To be or not to be'. He concludes that 'Hamlet's is a doubling argument of redoubling doubt, meant to give pause to any who overhear its vibrant, restless movements' (p. 114) before finally asserting that 'His *show* of *dissoi logoi* dramatizes why none of us, if we think about it, can ever *know*' (p. 115).

In 'Re-proofing the "Zero Part of Speech" in *Hamlet*' (*CompD* 49 [2015] 289–312), John Freeman readdresses the issue of 'O' and 'Oh' in Shakespeare's text. Freeman looks at how the difference between the two expressions has essentially been elided by scholars, and suggests this risks 'erasing an important discourse marker from the play' (p. 290). Freeman argues that work of discourse analysts can help editors to select the most appropriate form: put simply, 'O' is a marker in everyday speech, where 'Oh' is more refined. Freeman argues that these markers indicate the social class of the speaker. Furthermore, Freeman considers that the struggle of early modern compositors in choosing between the two represents efforts to define national character and a literary tradition distinct from those of Greek or Latin.

In 'Hamlet and the Limits of Narrative' (*EIC* 65[2015] 368–82), Rebecca Yearling judges *Hamlet* as having two possible narrative interpretations: Hamlet's own and that of Horatio at the end of the play. Yearling contends that Horatio's narrative might suggest a less favourable interpretation of the character, arguing that Horatio's story 'Of carnal, bloody, and unnatural acts' is about the messiness of human life (V.ii). Yearling concludes that neither account is 'correct' and that narrative itself is never innocent but always involves the selection and manipulation of facts.

In the short essay '"Remember me": Hamlet's Corrupted Host and the Medieval Eucharistic Miracle' (*ANQ* 28[2015] 15–20), Courtney Bailey Parker argues that understanding of the eucharistic moment in *Hamlet* is darker than has been previously thought especially when read in the light of medieval miracle accounts of the eucharistic moment. Parker uses the Ghost's 'fleshy description' (p. 16) of the transformation of his flesh as a result of the poison to show how the speech actually presents a corrupted Eucharist. Parker concludes that Hamlet's experience of the eucharistic moment does not cause him to turn to Christ for renewal (as it should), but to rely on his own actions as revenger.

In his short essay 'Prince Hamlet and the Problem of Succession' (*ANQ* 28[2015] 63–7), Ronald B. Jenkins addresses the Danish elective monarchy in the play, asking why the Electors chose not to elect Hamlet as king. Jenkins provides evidence from the text that suggests sound reasons for finding the Prince unfit to rule.

In '"O Jephthah, judge of Israel': From Original to Accreted Meanings in Hamlet's Allusion' (*ShS* 68[2015] 48–61), Péter Dávidházi discusses allusions as links in cultural memory. The essay is focused on this short line from Hamlet to Polonius in Act II, scene ii, which is from a ballad based on the biblical Jephthah, but also refers to the story of Jephthah in the book of Judges. Therefore, Dávidházi argues, Shakespeare is making both direct and indirect allusions. Through the article Dávidházi explores both what Hamlet meant (the details of the stories to which he alludes) and what function this allusion serves in the play, arguing that both the ballad and the book of Judges are appropriate comparisons for *Hamlet*. Dávidházi argues that Hamlet's allusion to Jephthah provides an interpretative model for the play, highlighting the 'interpretative significance of the suggested correspondences ... between the two fathers and daughters and [revealing] the ensuing relevance of such terms as sacrifice, burnt offering, victim, obedience, virginity, providence and responsibility' (p. 50). Dávidházi also explores meanings that are created by 'later and unintended accretion of meaning', arguing that 'Hamlet's reference is a striking example of an *accretive* allusion, unintended, but with grave consequences for interpretation. For a moment the ensuing new perspective shows the possible future of Ophelia as repeating the fate of Jephthah's daughter, yet not only as the biblical example of *holocaustum* but also as the first victim of what was to be called *the* Holocaust' (p. 57).

In 'My Kingdom for a Ghost: Counterfactual Thinking and *Hamlet*' (*SQ* 66[2015] 29–46), Amir Khan offers a counterfactual approach to tragedy and a new methodology for reading tragedy. Khan poses the questions of when we know that Claudius is guilty and how this affects our response to Hamlet's delay. In so doing, Khan discusses and refutes W.W. Greg's argument that the Ghost's story of murder is a fabrication.

Paul Cefalu's Iago-centric book *Tragic Cognition in Shakespeare's Othello: Beyond the Neural Sublime* is published as part of Arden's 'Shakespeare Now!' series. Cefalu addresses how recent theories of cognition inform our understanding of Othello and Iago, and raises questions about the relationship between cognition and consciousness. He begins with a discussion of how we can imagine what it is like to be Iago, positing that 'recent debates in the

philosophy of mind can help us provide a more fine-grained context in which to describe Iago's discontentment' (p. 4). In introducing these debates, he also introduces key points of and contributors to cognitive theory. Cefalu posits phenomenology and psychoanalysis as means by which to gain insight into characters' 'consciousness'. The central argument of the book is that Iago is a 'neuro-reactionary' character: 'his well-known egotism and solipsism stand as a fragile bulwark against an assailing cognitive unconscious; he is a character for whom the neural sublime is so constricting that he stages, through the route of masochism and the eventual toppling of Othello, his own death' (p. 6). Cefalu argues that Iago comes close to closing the 'explanatory gap' between cognition and consciousness, which is unachievable for real people.

In 'Anxious Householders: Theft and Anti-Usury Discourse in Shakespeare's Venetian Plays' (*SC* 30[2015] 285–300), Jordi Coral's purpose is to refine understanding of the extent to which Shakespeare's Venice is 'constituted by the "psychological phenomenon" of usury' through discussion of the usurer's fear of theft (p. 287). Coral uses both *Othello* and *The Merchant of Venice* to do this, with the greater focus of the argument being on *Othello*. Coral sets up the argument with a discussion of the various responses to early modern capitalism, including credit systems and moral confusion, and explores how Elizabethans tended to read greed as the cause of all new instabilities. In the discussion of *Othello*, Iago is cast as the usurer, which is achieved through Iago 'using' Desdemona, thus presenting her as a commodity, in order to destroy Othello.

In '*Othello* and the Unweaponed City' (*SQ* 66[2015] 137–66), Andrew Sisson argues for a reading of the play in terms of the opposition between disarmed Venice and armed Rome. Sisson states that there is in Shakespeare's play a distinct self-consciousness about the nature of the division of the military and the political in Venice and the consequences of that division. There are three strands to Sisson's argument: in the first, he addresses the dialectic of the citizen-soldier and the mercenary as an interpretative scheme which is powerfully used in *Othello*. He then goes on to discuss one of the main sources of the play, Gasparo Contarini's *The Commonwealth and Government of Venice* (translated in 1599 by Lewes Lewkenor). Through this discussion, the choice between armed or disarmed citizenry is related to different kinds of virtue (which Sisson identifies as Roman and Venetian). In the third part of the article, Sisson argues that the tragedy of the play arises from the incommensurability of each of these virtues with the demands and expectations of its opposite.

Timothy A. Turner also addresses the unarmed aspect of *Othello* in 'Othello on the Rack' (*JEMCS* 15:iii[2015] 102–36). Turner discusses torture in the play, arguing that Iago, the 'unweaponed' Venetian, subjects Othello to psychological torture. He argues that Othello 'examines the effectiveness' of different types of torture against the backdrop of 'an early modern culture of pervasive, public, and brutal forms of corporal punishment' (p. 103). While looking at the contemporary context of the play, Tuner also addresses its sources, and looks to a more recent context, the KUBARK Counterintelligence Interrogation Manual produced by the CIA in 1963. He concludes that the way Iago's 'psychological approach unveils the mind's

susceptibility to coercive refashioning, and not merely the body's vulnerability to corporal action, turns out to be the most chilling, and perhaps the most modern, feature of the play' (p. 129).

In Adam Hall's note, 'Othello as *Morisco*' (*ANQ* 28[2015] 68–73), Moorishness is put forward as being not about race but about religion. Hall reads Othello as a *Morisco*, a term contemporary with the play that was used in the West to refer to converts from Islam to Christianity. He discusses origins of the term and its contexts, explores elements of Othello's character that might be read as Islamic, and frames distrust felt by other characters towards Othello in terms of real-life concerns that *Moriscos* might not have really converted.

In ' "Too Gentle": Jealousy and Class in *Othello*' (*JEMCS* 15:i[2015] 3–25), Rebecca Olson addresses the notion that Shakespeare's most jealous husbands are married to only children of high-class men. In relation to *Othello*, Olson argues that Desdemona's social class is an important factor in the creation of Othello's jealousy and that this taps into contemporary anxieties around class. Olson shows how Othello attempts to claim equal status to his wife but that this is not achieved before it is fatally undermined. In this, Olson highlights the emasculating element of a lower-class man rising by virtue of his wife's social position. Olson concludes that 'Like a valuable garment, Desdemona deserves or even requires careful attention. The problem, for Othello and other Shakespearean husbands, is that their wives can also inspire tormenting imagined narratives, that in extreme cases such as Othello's, lead them to destroy what they most feared to lose' (p. 20). Olson finishes by acknowledging the implications of this view of tragedy for Shakespeare's comedies and their heroines.

In ' "Then let no man but I / Do execution on my flesh and blood": Filicide and Family Bonds in *Titus Andronicus*' (*MRDE* 28[2015] 110–22), Emily Detmer-Goebel looks at filicide in *Titus Andronicus* in order to address how Shakespeare invokes Roman law sanctioning the right of fathers to kill their children. By so doing, Detmer-Goebel argues that the play critiques *vitae necisque potestas* and confirms sixteenth-century systems limiting a father's power over his children. Thus, Detmer-Goebel explores attitudes to and treatises on the rights of parents and children. Detmer-Goebel discusses Titus's views of honour in the light of his behaviour, and contrasts them with the behaviour of Tamora, who is seen as the least honourable character in the play but displays the same behaviour. Detmer-Goebel concludes that the play dramatizes the danger of a father's power. However, in pointing out that fathers did not wield such power in Shakespeare's England, she also suggests similarities between the power of a father and the power of a monarch.

In ' "Groaning shadows that are gone": The Ghosts of *Titus Andronicus*' (*ES* 96[2015] 403–23), Lindsey Scott discusses the recurring presence of mutilated body parts as ghosts in *Titus Andronicus*. Scott examines the outcomes of subverted graves, and how and to what end characters are haunted by spectral returns. She argues that such spectres 'persistently hover at the margins of the play's presentation of violence' (p. 405), and that such returns reflect contemporary theological anxieties. In so doing, she discusses how it is the male characters (and not Lavinia as is usually assumed) who are

haunted by such ghosts. Scott does much to establish the presence of such ghosts—addressing, for example, how the language used pictures Rome as neither living nor dead—and invokes the figures of Titus's dead sons. She demonstrates how the play suggests opposing cultures mix and seep into one another, thereby suggesting an overlap with anxieties regarding ghosts and burials in Catholicism and Protestantism. She argues that it is the attempt to appease the ghosts of Titus's already dead sons in the execution of Alarbus that sets the tragedy of the play in motion. Scott concludes that 'What remains so striking about *Titus*'s ghosts is the ways in which they meticulously document, often through gruesome permutations and violent spectacle, early modern relations between the living and the dead' (p. 421).

In 'Killing Time in *Titus Andronicus*: Timing, Rhetoric, and the Art of Defense' (*JEMCS* 15:iv[2015] 52–80), Dori Coblentz uses readings of interruptive good timing in early modern English and Continental fencing manuals to discuss inaction. Coblentz discusses how *Titus Andronicus* associates rhetoric with swordplay, and argues that Shakespeare explores the relationship between timing in both swordplay and rhetoric most fully in this play. Coblentz explores the tactics of waiting found in fencing texts and theories of *kairos*, and argues that such theories informed the pacing of the play.

In 'Hybrids: Animal Law and the Actaeon Myth in *Titus Andronicus*' (*ShIntY* 15[2015] 65–79), Miranda Garno Nesler discusses how *Titus Andronicus* is preoccupied with the Actaeon myth and notions of humanness, and shows how through this the play engages with Elizabethan debates on the legal definition of human and animal. Nesler focuses her argument primarily on the character of Lavinia, who is aligned with the Actaeon myth while also demonstrating rhetorical power, and posits her as a 'human-animal hybrid'. Nesler argues that such a character (with attributes which are also found in Tamora and Aaron) challenges the traditional status of 'non-human animals and human Others' (p. 66).

In ' "'Twixt two extremes of passion, joy and grief": Shakespeare's *King Lear* and Last Plays' (*YR* 103:i[2015] 26–47), Arthur Kirsch suggests that Shakespeare was less interested in writing about the orthodoxies of his time than we think, and that he seems rather, to have been more interested in creating a theatrical experience. The bulk of Kirsch's article discusses the relationship between joy and grief. He reads *King Lear* as prologue to the last plays, and argues that it 'relentlessly juxtaposes the hope for the joy of renewal in the play with the inexorability of death and grief' (p. 28). This is illustrated with various examples and close attention to the text. For example, Kirsch shows how the sense of characters' suffering is intensified through the love that characters feel (that of Edgar for Gloucester, and that of Kent, Cordelia, and the Fool for Lear) throughout the play. This discussion of *Lear* is then related to the last plays (*Pericles*, *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *The Tempest*).

In 'Things I Should Have Known: Tardiness in *King Lear*' (*LitI* 17[2015] 131–52), Francisco Unger takes Kent's statement, 'Sir, I am too old to learn', as his starting point, asking 'can the person for whom it is too late to learn anything of consequence be pardoned, again and again? Does lateness obviate guilt, or make it frivolous in the greater scheme of expired possibilities for true

justice?' (p. 131). Unger argues that lateness is a cathartic device in the play, and he relates the issue of tardiness to that of endurance and survival.

In ' "Where am I now?": The Articulation of Space in Shakespeare's *King Lear* and Marlowe's *Dido, Queen of Carthage*' (*CahiersE* 88[2015] 81–93), Andrew Duxfield discusses the fluid Elizabethan stage and the vagueness of location which is created by such stages. Although primarily discussing *Dido*, Duxfield uses *King Lear* to illustrate the flexibility of the stage, focusing on the scene between Gloucester and Edgar at Dover. He suggests that the blind Gloucester's experience is analogous to that of the audience: the audience themselves only 'see' what Edgar describes.

Robert N. Watson, in his article 'Lord Capulet's Lost Compromise: A Tragic Emendation and the Binary Dynamics of *Romeo and Juliet*' (*RenD* 43[2015] 53–84), addresses the attribution of III.i.184–8 to Lord Montague in all but one modern edition, despite early folios and Q2 and 3 attributing the lines to Lord Capulet. Watson poses the question of why editors and directors are so quick to assume that Shakespeare and/or his printers got the attribution wrong. Could not Lord Capulet defend Romeo against Tybalt? From this starting point, Watson goes on to explore the binary themes of the play. He argues that Shakespeare creates such binaries in order to knock them down, and that 'these invitations to facile binary distinctions can provoke editors and readers—as they provoke many of the play's characters—to overlook a more complicated and potentially redemptive blending of the seemingly paradoxical juxtapositions' (p. 58).

In the article 'Live Boys—Dead Girls: Death and False Death in *Romeo and Juliet*' (*LitI* 17[2015] 18–34), John Kleiner discusses the Renaissance interest in displaying the dead in relation to another contemporary interest: the idea of fake death. The instance of false death in *Romeo and Juliet* (Juliet in the Capulet tomb) is discussed in relation to its chief sources: Arthur Brooke's poem *The Tragical History of Romeus and Juliet* [1562] and Samuel Daniel's *The Complaint of Rosalind*. Kleiner argues that Shakespeare merges the sources to create a more complex dead girl than is presented in either source text. He states that in this scene Shakespeare 'brings into relief a constitutive problem with tragic spectacle; on the stage, as in the tomb, passion and its object are incommensurate' (p. 19). He argues that Shakespeare's Juliet is a 'hybrid corpse', one that is 'both Brooke's girl and Daniel's. She is, as she appears to Romeo, two women at once' (p. 23). Kleiner suggests that this shows Shakespeare developing a new theory of tragedy which will be seen in his later tragedies (he looks briefly at *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Othello*, *Hamlet*, and *King Lear*), arguing that 'Romeo's refusal of Juliet's vitality models the way subsequent characters will reject life and love, the way they will insist on death' (p. 33).

In 'Shakespeare's Franciscans' (*NewC* 33[2015] 19–24), Kenneth Colston addresses how Shakespeare 'gave several pivotal roles to characters belonging to an order that had virtually disappeared from England several generations earlier' and argues that in presenting Franciscans on the stage Shakespeare took a huge political risk. Colston focuses on Friar Lawrence in *Romeo and Juliet*, arguing that the character is 'the guardian of reckless virtue' (p. 20). He

concludes that through Shakespeare's staging of Franciscans we see his attitude to religion and the Catholic Church.

In 'The Image of Both Theaters: Empire and Revelation in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*' (*SQ* 66[2015] 167–87), William Junker juxtaposes two models of theatre: that practised by Caesar, of triumphal imperialism, and that performed by Cleopatra when she commits suicide. Junker argues first that through *Antony and Cleopatra* Shakespeare 'tracks the emergence of Caesar Augustus's imperium from the practice of triumphal procession that imperium both extends and displaces' (p. 167), before moving on to address the alternative theatrical model which is embodied in Cleopatra.

In 'Water, Absorption, and Cleopatra's Barge' (*ShIntY* 15[2015] 147–66), Ellen MacKay begins by referencing the various ways in which fire has been used to describe the audience's experience of theatrical absorption, before arguing that 'it is easy to underestimate the extent to which absorbing theatricality took place within an aquatic register, but the repeated citation of Cleopatra's barge brings out the metonymic relation the culture draws between the inventory of a royal boat's splendor and the incitement to thought-arresting, self-submerging awe' (p. 150).

(f) Late Plays

Shakespeare in London, by Hannah Crawforth, Sarah Dustagheer, and Jennifer Young, sets out to show the influence that the city of London had on Shakespeare and his works. It does so not only through the places in the city Shakespeare would have frequented, including the various theatres with which he was associated, but through the response of dramatists and literary figures in London, and the cultural and social influences of the city's teeming multitudes, from the wealthiest to the poorest. The final chapter, 'Experimentation in Shakespeare's London: *The Tempest* (1610–11) and Lime Street' (pp. 195–219), explores how 'Shakespeare's play draws on differing types of scientific knowledge circulating around his city' (p. 196). The chapter differentiates between and interrelates with two streams of scientific knowledge: natural sciences, on the one hand, and Renaissance magic on the other.

As Crawforth, Dustagheer, and Young point out, 'Shakespeare's writing absorbs and transfigures the wide ranging printed texts circulating around early modern London. The play in its own way displayed "the wonders reported therein for his playhouse audiences to marvel at", just as they had marvelled at sights from foreign lands and the New World, from the bodies of dead Native Americans to exotic beasts and birds' (p. 205). The nature of Prospero's arts, and their origins in his books, from astrology to alchemy, are discussed in relation to the emerging scientific culture of experimentation. Prospero is both a skilled and dynamic magus and an early modern scientist.

Donald Carlson's article on power, magic, and early science in *The Tempest* mines some similar ground to Crawforth, Dustagheer, and Young, but does not use London's geography as a starting point for his discussion. '"'Tis new to thee": Power, Magic, and Early Science in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*' (*BJJ*

22[2015] 1–22) argues that the play is 'an especially fertile source for mining the playwright's mature perspectives on the intellectual climate for which and in which he composed the play' (p. 1). In the first half of the article Carlson explores the play's examination of theatricality and its use of both classical and contemporary conceptions of science and magic, in relation to architecture and thaumaturgy in particular. The connection between the mechanics of effects on stage and the relationships between the Renaissance magus and the Renaissance scientist is explored in part through the play's role as a court masque. The second half of the essay examines biblical resonances, particularly those which examine power and acts of 'magic'. At first glance these seem two different pieces that could almost be examined separately, but Carlson capably connects the two, and ably elucidates the connections between theology, magic, and science in early modern Europe.

Gwilym Jones's *Shakespeare's Storms* also addresses theatricality and the use of effects on stage in Shakespeare's plays, and the last two chapters focus on *The Tempest* and *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*. Jones connects physical effects with literary and dramatic effect. Chapter 8 (pp. 108–24) focuses on *Pericles*, and examines the play's biblical allusions, while chapter 9 (pp. 125–50), on *The Tempest*, focuses strongly on the theatricality of the storm in Act I. This chapter focuses not only on the storm's theatricality, and how both the effects and language were influenced by the original playhouse, but on the way that the storm itself is not natural. As with Carlson, Jones argues that there was a deliberate invocation of magic in the use of stage effects in plays.

Duke Pesta's ' "Thou dost here usurp the name thou ow'st not": *The Tempest* and Intercultural Exchange' (*Renascence* 67[2015] 127–46), is another article that examines the problematic and reductive postmodern and postcolonial readings of Caliban. Pesta critiques noted Shakespearean Stephen Greenblatt's works on *The Tempest*, and argues that they contain internal inconsistencies of argument and problematic uses of sources. For Pesta this reading of *The Tempest* is anachronistic and deeply problematic: 'In the same way that Greenblatt's assumptions minimize a typically Renaissance commitment to polyglossic humanistic learning, so too they make a typically postmodern elision between historical reality and imaginative fiction' (p. 136). The article argues that postcolonial readings and postcolonial critics are 'forcing their shaping fantasies on other cultures and their texts' (p. 137).

Pesta's argument is pointed and thorough, but not entirely comfortable for those used to a postmodern reading of *The Tempest*. The concerns it raises over the anachronistic nature of postcolonial readings of the play are considerable and cogent. In previous years, works pointing to geographical inconsistencies between the site of the play and New World readings have been reviewed. Pesta takes a different approach, arguing that the context of the play lacked many of the preconceptions of Enlightenment and postmodern thinking. As he concludes, 'radical binary distinctions between colonizer and colonized [are] unable to accommodate a more humane vision of cultural and linguistic exchange, one readily available to Renaissance thinkers and poets and very much on display in *The Tempest*' (p. 145). However, just as Greenblatt's work is uncomfortable in its defence of Caliban, the lack of acknowledgement by Pesta that the exchange envisioned and understood by

Renaissance writers was experienced as violent and often destructive conquest in South and North America during the early modern period is this piece's major failing.

Theories related to the cultural history of emotions continue to be a strong area in early modern history, and are also appearing with more regularity as a framework for discussing literature. In a three-part discussion, Anne Sophie Refskou discusses in depth Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and *Titus Andronicus*, and briefly references the final scene of *The Winter's Tale*. The first and third of these sections will be discussed here. In 'Compassionate Perception and Touching Experiences in Shakespearean Drama' (*CS* 27:i[2015] 60–8) Refskou first examines theories of compassion and the importance of interaction to provoke it in relation to both Miranda's response to the shipwreck in Act I and Ariel and Prospero's discussion of the afflictions of the shipwrecked in Act V. It is from the second example that the two main points from the play are made clear: Ariel tells his master that if he saw the stranded survivors of the wreck he would be moved, and when Prospero questions whether he would, Ariel replies that he would, 'were I human' (p. 62).

Refskou's work examines not only the play's internal conceptions of emotion, but also how contemporaries viewed not only the emotions on display in the play but also their effect on the audience. A striking point is made on these contrasts, when Refskou points out that, while Miranda's horrified reaction to the shipwreck 'is a sign of her virtue (if not necessarily her reason) ... [Stephen] Gosson sees both virtue and reason as overthrown by the sights, sounds, tastes and touches of the theatre' (p. 68). The discussion of compassion as a virtue or vice is one of the strongest parts of this article. While the underlying arguments are not wholly new, the relating of Gosson and Philip Sidney to *The Tempest* is ably done, and insightfully argued. Having discussed *The Tempest*, Refskou goes on to discuss compassion and reason in *Titus Andronicus*, and then finally *The Winter's Tale*'s last scene.

Refskou notes how 'King Leontes's sensory perception of the newly "awakened" warm hand of Hermione is followed by the somewhat enigmatic statement: "If this be magic, let it be an art / Lawful as eating" [V.iii.10–11]' (p. 79). Refskou uses this moment to 'reiterate and illuminate a question central to the discussions of this article: Is the experience of (com)passion "magically" provoked by theatre "lawful"?' (p. 79). The role of sensory perception in the plays, and in critics of theatre, from early modern England suggests a tactile or perceptive quality to the provocation of emotion.

Jessica Murphy's *Virtuous Necessity: Conduct Literature and the Making of the Virtuous Woman in Early Modern England* has several interesting underpinning ideas, including the use of digital humanities software, and the examination of a variety of sources on the cultural and behavioural expectations for women in early modern England. Murphy raises interesting questions about how virtue may have given those women who conformed a form of power of their own. However, the example from the late plays that Murphy uses here is Paulina, a woman who is obviously not conforming to the majority of the conduct literature in early modern England. She is contrasted with Ophelia, a young girl who, Murphy argues, receives the best of advice to no avail. But while Ophelia's failure ends in tragedy, another woman,

Hermione, who also does not conform to typical feminine virtues of obedience and silence and who openly, if honourably, disobeys both her husband and her king, ends her story in triumph.

However Murphy's discussion of *The Winter's Tale* has a problematic approach to the accusations of witchcraft in relation to Paulina. This is partly the result of the use of Diane Purkiss's problematic concept of counter-magic or '*un*witching', and partly the result of how Murphy frames witchcraft in the text (p. 71). Despite these problems, there is a thoughtful if brief exploration in *Virtuous Necessity* of the role of women as protectors of the domestic sphere in conduct literature, and their obligation 'to use their virtue to reform husbands' (p. 74). While underpinned by interesting new avenues of research, and examining an interesting concept in female virtue, conduct books, and the portrayal of women on the early modern stage, this work unfortunately falls short through its focus on problematic concepts related to witchcraft.

Sarah Beckwith's 'Are There Any Women in Shakespeare's Plays? Fiction, Representation, and Reality in Feminist Criticism' (*NLH* 46[2015] 241–60) uses ordinary language philosophy to interrogate feminist critiques of the representation of women in Shakespeare. Beckwith begins with Stanley Cavell's work on *King Lear* in 1966, using his discussion of the importance of each character's language—their words—and its context. For Beckwith, Cavell's questioning of how critics could forget the words a character uses, why they used them and in what context, is still as pertinent in 2015 as it was in 1966. Beckwith is attempting to move beyond questions of representation and gender and into the assessment of language as it relates to gender, and how fiction plays a role 'in our lives as event, expression, and act, to let it read us, as much as we read it'. Therefore Beckwith wishes to renew an effort 'to describe and justly respond to the fiction in our lives'; 'we might also restore some of the ancient pleasures of the text for feminism' (p. 257)

Judith Wolfe, in 'Hermione's Sophism: Ordinariness and Theatricality in *The Winter's Tale*' (*P&L* 39:i[2015] A83–A105), likewise begins with Cavell's—and Rush Rhees's—reading of *The Winter's Tale*, through an examination of the language and character of Hermione. Wolfe lays out Cavell's arguments regarding Leontes, and moves beyond them to examine Hermione, and to show how the play 'complicates both Cavell's and Rhees's accounts of the possibility of discourse' (p. A86). Wolfe then engages in a long discussion of how Hermione's use of language as a rhetorical form of play-acting (a performance designed to persuade) has an unsettling implication of falseness for her husband, and that this ultimately affects Leontes' mental state. In this reading of the play, Hermione's sophistry, her contrived behaviour, leave Leontes questioning every aspect of his wife's faithfulness and honesty, not only in the present but in the past.

Uncertainty, instability of the relationship between language and meaning, and the impossibility of truly knowing another's intent is a complex series of ideas, but Wolfe ably navigates them. Though Wolfe's arguments are based on Cavell's and Rhees's work, she takes them beyond the idea that Hermione, like Cordelia in *King Lear*, is a passive and 'entirely innocent victim of "skeptical" mania' (p. A91). But for Wolfe, a character like Hermione also contributes through her 'refusal to acknowledge the wider implications of her actions, to

use language as more than a game in which she knows all the right moves'; this 'is, in its way, a failure almost as great as Leontes's to acknowledge others in their freedom and inscrutability' (p. A91). Performance of honesty and dishonesty itself unfolds as an ongoing theme for Wolfe, from Hermione's sophistry to the mask assumed by Florizel in his courtship of Perdita. The restoration of Hermione only occurs, for Wolfe, after her husband has renounced 'the claim that he can authoritatively decipher Hermione's behaviour' (p. A101).

Patricia Wareh's 'Literary Mirrors of Aristocratic Performance: Readers and Audience of *The Faerie Queene* and *The Winter's Tale*' (*RenD* 43[2015] 85–114) likewise begins with a discussion of Leontes' 'terrible recognition of what his jealous imagination has cost him' and moves on to declare that 'it also initiates the play's movement into the world of fairy tale' (p. 85). Wareh shows that Hermione, Leontes, and Polixenes are engaged in a game of courtly self-representation that undermines Leontes' confidence in his wife's integrity. For Wareh the courtly characters of *The Winter's Tale* are engaged in 'sprezzatura' rather than the sophistry of Wolfe's article.

Wareh argues, like Wolfe, that there is a contrast between the false courtesies and theatricality of the court scenes and the use of the pastoral, artful landscapes of Act IV. For Wareh those scenes engage with 'the question of aristocratic self-presentation' (p. 104). Furthermore Wareh argues that *The Winter's Tale* 'provokes reflection on the costs of the courtier's hidden arts by depicting how a culture of sprezzatura may lead to tragedy' while also making use 'of metatheatrical moments, especially in Perdita's reported recognition, in order to enlist the audience in the collaborative pleasure of recognizing the play's artfulness' (p. 104).

That artfulness reaches its high point in the final scene. The relationship between drama on stage and fiction on the page is played out in the final scenes, with the revelations and the tying up of all the play's narratives in romantic happy endings—including what Wareh calls the bizarre marrying off of Paulina and Camillo in response to the return of Hermione. For Wareh these final moments provide 'the audience with the happy ending of a comedy that it recognizes as all part of the fun, and which the play encourages it to accept, in the moment, despite any misgivings it may have' (p. 111).

Jeremy Tambling's '*The Winter's Tale*: Three Recognitions' (*EIC* 65[2015] 30–52) presents familiar themes of charge and forgiveness within an interesting framework of psychological recognitions and thematic dualisms, or as Tambling calls them 'double situations inscribed throughout the text' (p. 30). The appearance and reappearance of figures in Leontes' life are intertwined with the melancholy and regret that transform his personality over time. Tambling's work examines time, the psychology of loss and restoration, and the contrast between things that are and things that seem to be in *The Winter's Tale*.

While not focused solely on *The Winter's Tale*, Victoria Sparey's work on puberty in early modern drama does use the Old Shepherd's speech from Act III, scene iii, as an entry point into views of adolescence and their consequences in early modern drama. In 'Performing Puberty: Fertile Complexions in Shakespeare's Plays' (*ShakB* 33[2015] 441–67), Sparey

analyses the presentation and representation of youth and youthfulness. Much of Sparey's analysis of adolescence relates to Perdita, and to how her social class—both actual and assumed—affected the portrayal of her 'ripeness', and burgeoning adulthood. At the shepherds' celebrations Perdita's exceptional qualities lead to a 'provocative framing of Perdita's maturation when she both is and is not viewed in the context of being a low-born pubescent woman' (p. 461). Sparey goes on to discuss how the physical attributes of youth and femininity functioned within the context of early modern performance in which 'adolescent male actors' bodies' acted out adolescent, female roles (p. 463). The role of gendered bodies is a central pillar of Sparey's work, not only on how both male and female teenage bodies were viewed and understood in early modern England, but also on how they were portrayed on stage.

Theology and religious denomination, particularly Protestant and Catholic influences, are once again a matter of discussion in relation to *The Winter's Tale*. Lysbeth Em Benkert envisions Hermione as a Marian figure, the font of grace and redemption for her husband Leontes. 'Faith and Redemption in *The Winter's Tale*' (*ReAr* 19[2015] 31–50) centralizes faith with respect not only to spiritual relationships, but also to temporal relationships. Unlike earlier interpretations of the play which focused on its apparent Roman Catholic origins, Benkert argues that the play presents 'an interpretation of faith consistent with the central Protestant doctrine of justification by faith rather than by works' (p. 35). While her argument is cogently presented, and the parts of the play cited can be interpreted as influenced by Protestant theology, there are other decidedly Catholic moments and themes that are inadequately covered here. Given Shakespeare's background and the period in which he lived, most people could not have avoided being influenced by both Protestant and Roman Catholic doctrine, as well as classical literature.

Maurice Hunt's works continue to be some of the most cogent examinations of theology in literature, and in particular of the conception of religion in Shakespeare's late plays. In *The Divine Face in Four Writers: Shakespeare, Dostoyevsky, Hesse, and C.S. Lewis*, Hunt examines the idea of the divine face in both Judaeo-Christian literature and classical literature. Shakespeare's works, from histories to tragedies and comedies, are examined and there is a discussion of *The Tempest*. This is not Hunt's first foray into religion and Shakespeare. In 2011 he published an article called 'Syncretistic Religion in Shakespeare's Late Romances' (*SCRev* 28:ii[2011] 57–79), which shares some features with *The Divine Face*. However the article also tackles religious questions in relation to other plays, in particular *Cymbeline*, with Hunt noting that 'Shakespeare crafts a calculated religious syncretism in *Cymbeline* through repeated allusions to the impending Nativity of Christ, which occurred during the historical Cymbeline's reign' (p. 64).

Indeed Hunt spends considerable time on his article's discussion of syncretistic religion in Shakespeare's late plays, with *Cymbeline*, *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, and *The Winter's Tale* all having apt moments of both classical and Christian significance, often allusive or symbolic, but always present. It is worth noting that Stephen Greenblatt is once again criticized here, with Hunt using a statement by Greenblatt as his starting point, and returning to it at the end with: 'When Stephen Greenblatt speculates that Shakespeare's plays show

him “at once Catholic, Protestant, and deeply skeptical of both,” he possibly did not have the late romances in mind’ (p. 74).

For Hunt, the late plays show Christian values which transcend denominational religious differences, and, for Hunt, reflect the ‘primitive Christianity that Edmund Spenser and many Protestants believed that the Church of England could recover’ (p. 74). Hunt also points to the influence of classical literature in the late plays, arguing that ‘Stephen Greenblatt did not consider the third religion that Greek and Roman mythology embedded in English versions of Hellenistic romance’ and that this ‘third religion’ offered a comforting unifying alternative to’ Elizabethans and Jacobeans disoriented by the ebb and flow of sixteenth-century Protestantism and Roman Catholicism and revolted by the horrific executions of hundreds of their dissenting countrymen and women’ (p. 74)

Paul Raffield’s article ‘Common Law, *Cymbeline*, and the Jacobean *Aeneid*’ (*LawL* 27[2015] 313–42), begins with the striking argument that *Cymbeline* is ‘a Jacobean *Aeneid*: an epic poem, for a new century and an uncharted epoch’ (p. 314). The article aims to explore the ‘marked contrast between the absolutist leanings of James I and the artificial reason of common law’ while reading *Cymbeline* ‘not only as a dramatic symbol of national identity, but also as a representation of the journey of intellectual and political self-discovery upon which the subject of law was tentatively embarked in Jacobean England’ (p. 314). These are ambitious goals, and are explored through several metaphors. Firstly, they are explored through the connection or disconnection between internal and external in the play, and the connection and disconnection between the English and Scottish states; secondly, Raffield explores journeys, both real and literary.

Connecting legal and political events and literary themes is complicated, but Raffield succeeds in drawing thematic links between the rival temporal and judicial jurisdictions and national jurisdictions with King James VI and I’s realms, and the ‘theme of rival jurisdictions is one only of several narrative threads that bind the central plot of Posthumus and his reconciliation with Innogen’ (p. 326). Raffield concludes with a series of thematic connections between various events and legal conceptions from early modern England and events in *Cymbeline*, and while some are tenuously drawn, overall the argument is well made. Raffield concludes that in *Cymbeline* ‘Shakespeare presents a myth of nationhood the allusion of which to aspects of Jacobean rule is compelling’, and that the ‘play provides a distorted image of a dysfunctional society, at the centre of which was an acephalous body politic’ (p. 336).

J.K. Barret’s article on *Cymbeline*, ‘The Crowd in Imogen’s Bedroom’ (*SQ* 66[2015] 440–62), discusses in depth the role of allusion in the play. In particular it examines the way in which stories given in the play narrate events we have previously seen in relation to Iachimo’s presence in Imogen’s bedroom in Act II. The problematic nature of narrative and rhetoric, and the theatricality of performing a narrative, have also appeared in relation to *The Winter’s Tale*, above. Barret draws particular attention to Iachimo’s use of classical stories and allusions in both his foray into Imogen’s bedroom and his

recounting to Posthumus. The classical allusions in Iachimo's scenes are then echoed at a wider level with the appearance of a classical apparition of Jupiter.

Dana Percec, like Barret, also focuses on the scenes relating to Imogen's bedchamber, but focuses less on the use of allusion and memory, and more on how the scene relates to early modern conceptions of privacy, and its role as an emerging phenomenon. Gendered space, and its illustration in several Shakespearean plays, is approached in an onion style: 'proceed from the most visible level to the subtler ones, from evidence of material life, to the more intricate notions of domesticity and intimacy for families and individuals' (p. 91). Percec's 'It's a Private Matter: Space and Gender Issues in Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*' (*RJES* 12[2015] 88–94) also compares two spaces within the play, Imogen's richly decorated bedroom, which alludes to classical mythology and stories, and the 'rude' and 'savage' cave in which Belarius and her brothers are living (p. 93). The material objects of Imogen's bedroom are lavish and described in detail, yet the room is a locus of repeated dishonest narratives, while for Percec the cave is both more natural and more honest. For Imogen, a happy ending comes from the stripping away of lies that are related to material objects and space.

The last item on *Cymbeline* comes from a collection on emotions in Shakespeare. One of the fastest-growing areas of study over the last decade has been the study of emotions in history and literature. This year saw several publications on Shakespeare in the field of emotions, and more will undoubtedly appear in the years to come. Anne Sophie Refskou's work on emotion and tactile interaction is reviewed above in relation to *The Tempest*. Ciara Rawnsley's 'Once upon a Time: Cymbeline, Fairy Tales, and "the Terrifying Truths of the Inner Life" ' (in White et al., eds., pp. 39–48), focuses on its more fantastical aspects, pointing to earlier examinations of *Cymbeline* which tend to dismiss the story as frivolous because of its fantastic elements, rather than recognizing the emotional impact of fairy tales. Rawnsley concludes that 'Embellishing the improbable, fairy-tale elements of the play ... does not trivialize the action or distance us from the emotional reality' (p. 46). Rawnsley's work on *Cymbeline* suggests we not dismiss the play's fantastical elements as detrimental to the plot and character development, but instead recognize how those elements appeal to and elicit emotional responses.

Jose Roberto Basto O'Shea's 'With a "Co-adjutor": Collaboration between William Shakespeare and John Fletcher in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*' (*Revista Letras* 92[2015] 49–65) argues that the play's authorship was a collaboration between an older, experienced dramatist and his junior colleague, John Fletcher. O'Shea uses half a dozen procedures to determine 'authorship and co-authorship', including verse tests, parallel passages, vocabulary, diction preferences, stylometry, and socio-historical linguistic evidence. Though the argument here is not new, the systematic approach is thorough and O'Shea presents a compelling argument.

Suparna Roychoudhury, in 'Mental Tempests, Seas of Trouble: The Perturbations of Shakespeare's *Pericles*' (*ELH* 82[2015] 1013–39), examines the layers of stormy metaphors in *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*. Images of storms, tempests, troubled waters, blowing winds, thunder, and shipwrecks appear in reference not only to Pericles, but to the experiences of his daughter Marina—

whose name and birth at sea are yet further allusions to the play's oceanic themes. In particular Roychoudhury creates a framework for thinking about the play as a metaphor for the troubled mind, and the 'plurality of . . . semantic possibilities, and dramatizing the challenge of navigating them' (p. 1037). Each character encounters and endures different forms of tempest, one in a journey both at sea and in his own mind, and one who faces down a series of external tempests while onshore.

Gwilym Jones's *Shakespeare's Storms* likewise examines the storm-tossed seas and coasts of Pericles' story, but with a focus on how the two authors of the play present storms in very different ways. Jones argues that while Shakespeare's co-author George Wilkins sees storms as 'heavenly judgement', Shakespeare's storm of Act III, scene i, is a 'personal experience', presented with both an 'intimacy' and 'immediacy' lacking in Wilkins's storm of Act II, scene i (p. 109).

Michelle M. Dowd's *The Dynamics of Inheritance on the Shakespearean Stage* is a striking work, well written and argued. However, there is an aspect of it that remains troubling. The conceit that literature, specifically Shakespearean drama, had the effect on early modern society claimed by the book's blurb is somewhat problematic. Thankfully the actual work itself limits this and instead aims to analyse 'the dramaturgical and rhetorical strategies that early modern playwrights deployed to represent and reimagine changing inheritance practices'. Dowd wants to show that 'attending to *how* the drama engaged its historical moment—not just to the fact of its doing so—can yield rich interpretive benefits, expanding the range of our practice as literary historicists' (p. 29).

The loss of an heir or heirs, and the problems of there being only female heirs, recur in many of Shakespeare's works, as does travel. In *Pericles* the lack of an heir is the 'issue' at hand, both literally and figuratively (p. 163). Dowd points to the frequent 'failure of wealthy families to produce a male heir' and the subsequent 'significant questions about the material stability of many landed estates' (p. 167). Like other rulers in the late plays, including King Cymbeline and King Leontes, Pericles' rule is made unstable throughout the play by the lack of an heir. The movement inherent in the romantic narrative lends the play its oft-derided episodic and dislocated quality. Dowd highlights the role of grief and the lack of offspring in Pericles' story, as well as the way in which 'physical and symbolic seclusion' provides 'opportunities to resist wayward expansion in both narrative and patrilineal terms' (p. 173). Dowd suggests that Gower, particularly in his chorus in Act IV, 'participates in a pattern of chorographic marking that permeates the play, drawing attention to the ways in which individual places encapsulate . . . dynastic interests', ultimately imposing 'narrative order on disparate dramatic events'; 'spatial movement . . . is . . . dictated by the desire to solidify and recuperate lineage' (pp. 183, 185). Inheritance and heritage are important themes not only in Pericles' journey to his child and wife, but also in his rediscovery of his own heritage.

There are few themes to be found across the late plays this year, but within the works on each play there are some common elements: from storms in *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, to connections between magic and science in *The*

Tempest, to theatrical falsehoods and courtly behaviour in *The Winter's Tale*. The influence of classical literature continues to play a role in the study of the late plays, along with works that reference geography and the role of religion. Although this year only two of the works on the late plays reviewed here focused on the study of emotions, it seems likely this is a trend that will continue in future years.

(g) Comedies

While no full-length monographs focusing solely on Shakespeare's comedies were published in 2015, many volumes devoted chapters to them. One full edited collection covered *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and several edited collections featured more than one chapter on Shakespeare's comedies. Many journal articles relevant to this section were also published. These different forms of criticism were spread across a variety of approaches and texts, so many of them cannot be grouped easily together into a theme. What the 2015 criticism on Shakespeare's comedies does indicate, however, is a large difference in critical interest in the plays which fall under this remit. *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Merchant of Venice* seemed to receive the most attention, while *Twelfth Night* and *The Comedy of Errors* received notably less.

One of the few clearly definable themes surrounding work on Shakespeare's comedies in 2015 was ecocriticism, with three monographs and one edited collection devoting full chapters, or significant sections of them, to this approach. Randall Martin's *Shakespeare and Ecology*, for example, assigns a chapter apiece to *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and *As You Like It*. In his chapter on the former play, 'Localism, Deforestation, and Environmental Activism in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*' (pp. 32–53), Martin convincingly argues for the influence of the increased levels of deforestation which were occurring around the time of its composition. He highlights how the Windsor community's naming of 'Herne's Oak' reflected one way of protecting certain trees that were in danger of being felled, and then rereads such objects as the Pages' fireplace as evidence of the high consumption of wood. The chapter 'Land-Uses and Convertible Husbandry in *As You Like It*' (pp. 56–77) locates the play in relation to enclosure. Martin examines various characters' attitudes towards the forest, and asserts that the comedy is an example of 'bioregional drama' (p. 61). This second chapter integrates early modern environmental issues with a reading of the play in a most effective and convincing fashion.

Tom MacFaul's monograph *Shakespeare and the Natural World* offers extensive commentaries on a number of the comedies. The 'second world' section of chapter 1, 'Country Matters' (pp. 45–90), focuses exclusively upon the role of the countryside in these types of plays. MacFaul asserts that *As You Like It*'s Duke Senior vainly tries to escape the court in the countryside, and highlights how the rural environment impacts upon Valentine of *Two Gentlemen of Verona*'s identity. MacFaul's discussion of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* reveals that the human characters are far more connected to the forest than the fairies because of their awareness of the transience of the seasons. The countryside of *Love's Labour's Lost*, meanwhile, is suggested 'not

[to be] a place of happy meditation but a compromise based on the men's attempt to break their oath as little as possible' (p. 58), while such a place is linked with daily life in the treatment of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. In his exploration of the countryside in these comedies, then, MacFaul interrogates its transformative nature, and convincingly demonstrates that 'while the rural world is a place of translation, it is never simply so, because people bring the weight of their own histories and identities to it' (p. 89). Chapter 2, 'Man and Other Animals' (pp. 91–131), argues among discussions of other plays that *As You Like It*'s reference to deer, and the interactions between Launce and Crab of *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, both suggest that animals can function to illuminate aspects of human relationships. In 'Lawful as Eating? Food, Natural Magic and the Arts of Health' (pp. 132–78), chapter 3's examination of diet, three comedies feature among the discussions of plays. MacFaul asserts that *Love's Labour's Lost* reveals the need to feed the body as well as the mind. He then illustrates that many of the problems in *The Comedy of Errors* arise because Adriana and Antipholus of Ephesus do not eat together at the correct time, and argues that *As You Like It*'s starving Adam reveals the importance of food and mercy. MacFaul handles his analysis of multiple plays in an accomplished manner, and his readings are consistently insightful.

Whilst Gabriel Egan's monograph *Shakespeare and Ecocritical Theory* does not devote chapters to any specific play, many of its discussions resonate with other works of ecocriticism that are relevant to this section. Chapter 1, 'The Rise of Ecocriticism' (pp. 17–40), offers an outline of significant works on ecocriticism, with chapter 2, 'Shakespeare and the Meaning of "Life" in the Twenty-First Century' (pp. 41–94), discussing nature, nurture, and the extent to which an unborn child can be affected by events which happened to their mother. Chapter 3, 'Animals in Shakespearean Ecocriticism' (pp. 95–120), is the most relevant to the comedies, as its treatment of the early modern uncertainty over the distinction between humans and animals is present in other ecocritical works. Among other plays, this chapter examines Theseus's attitude towards his dogs in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and how the relationship between Crab and Launce in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* ultimately reveals how similar humans and animals can be. 'Crowds and Social Networks in Shakespeare' (pp. 121–54) is the fourth and final chapter of Egan's monograph, and it explores the behaviour of various crowds. This work successfully outlines current thinking on ecocriticism, and demonstrates the relevance of that theoretical approach to Shakespeare studies.

An ecocritical approach is also evident in Jennifer Munroe, Edward J. Geisweidt, and Lynne Bruckner's edited collection *Ecological Approaches to Early Modern English Texts: A Field Guide to Reading and Teaching*, in which two chapters offer literary analyses of two comedies. Robert N. Watson's contribution, 'Tell Inconvenient Truths, But Tell Them Slant' (pp. 17–28), suggests that as *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is very aware of the interconnectedness of humans and other beings, it is a text which can help readers to become more informed environmental thinkers. Keith M. Botelho's chapter, 'The Beasts of Belmont and Venice' (pp. 71–80), on *The Merchant of Venice*, meanwhile, is informed by animal theory; stressing how intertwined humans and animals were held to be during the early modern period, it argues

for the need to look past reading animals as metaphors. Botelho asserts that the Christian characters link Shylock with animality on account of his religion and personality, while the merchant responds by suggesting that the Christians already exhibit animal characteristics.

The following two monographs draw attention to the way in which Shakespeare was influenced by particular types of sources. Charlotte Artese's excellent *Shakespeare's Folktale Sources* is an engaging examination of how the playwright adapted the folk tales that directly influenced seven of his plays. Three of the works that she covers—*The Taming of the Shrew*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *The Merchant of Venice*—are relevant to this section. In chapter 1, ' "Tell thou the tale": Shakespeare's Taming of the Folktale in *The Taming of the Shrew*' (pp. 29–50), this comedy is linked to two folk tales which engage separately with ideas of gender and class. Artese highlights how Shakespeare makes Petruchio less violent, and Katherine more performatively submissive, than the folk-tale husband and wife. She also discusses how Shakespeare fails to end Christopher Sly's tale, which allows the audience to choose their own positive or negative ending from those which circulate in folk tales, and means that the playwright does not have to articulate a position on class hierarchies. In chapter 3, ' "Have I encompassed you?": Translating the Folktale into Honesty and English in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*' (pp. 79–98), Artese then explores how the women of this play are represented more sympathetically than in the folk tale which influenced it, while the men are rendered more ridiculous. She also illustrates the ways in which the original folk tale was anglicized. In chapter 4, ' "You shall not know": Portia, Power, and the Folktale Sources of *The Merchant of Venice*' (pp. 99–118), this comedy is shown to draw upon a number of folk tales which the audience would know, so Artese suggests that their pleasure in watching the play would come from knowing that the lead casket is the correct one, and that Shylock will not be able to exact his pound of flesh. To prevent the audience from feeling too masterful, however, Shakespeare includes the mysterious discovery of three of Antonio's ships, but never has Portia explain how they came to survive. With a bibliography of folk-tale sources at the end of each chapter on the plays, Artese's monograph is an admirably thorough work of scholarship. It is written with such clarity that it should be a source of interest and enjoyment for scholars with any level of familiarity with the field of folk-tale studies.

Stuart Sillars's equally excellent monograph *Shakespeare and the Visual Imagination* meanwhile offers a rich and compelling treatment of the way in which visual allusions function in four of the comedies. Chapter 2, 'Allusion and Idea in *The Taming of the Shrew*' (pp. 34–54), focuses upon the Sly episode, and highlights how allusions to artistic representations of classical figures raise questions around theatrical identity. In chapter 4, '*Love's Labour's Lost* and Visual Composition' (pp. 95–132), Sillars asserts that Shakespeare had moved from simply alluding to artworks to transferring aspects of their structure into his drama. It outlines how the artistic grouping of three people against a landscape is echoed in Shakespeare's placing of three characters together, and the many verbal references to that number. Chapter 6, 'Visual Identities in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*' (pp. 163–89), argues that Shakespeare's visual allusions are concentrated into four moments between

Acts II and IV. Titania is linked parodically to the 'reclining Venus' tradition, and Bottom in relation to the part-human, part-animal figure of the babwyne; in this way, classical and folk tales are merged. 'Emblem, Tradition, and Invention' (pp. 190–233), chapter 7's discussion of *As You Like It*, is perhaps the most important in the monograph, as Sillars maintains that this play reveals a shift in Shakespeare's references to the visual. By focusing on Jacques and the 'sobbing deer' and 'seven ages of man' extracts, which are both shown to be more allusive to the literary than to the visual, the author argues that 'The leisured variation of the early plays, as they absorb visual forms into their structures, has been displaced by something of far greater integration of the theatric and the literary' (p. 231). The monograph is not only impressive for the controlled and compelling way in which its argument develops over the chapters on the comedies, but also for how it makes compositional aspects of artwork easily understandable for a reader with no prior knowledge of such matters.

The last noticeable theme of the work published in 2015 on Shakespeare's comedies is the way in which early modern readers may have read them. In *Shakespeare's Verbal Art*, William Bellamy analyses that dramatist's use of anagrams, and argues that such a technique can either reinforce or contradict the surface meaning of his works. The final chapter, '*Twelfth Night*' (pp. 494–522), highlights various anagrammatical instances within the play which Bellamy believes would be detected by early modern readers. Anagrams are suggested to reveal references to the date, authorship, and sources of this comedy, as well as to indicate Shakespeare's response to John Marston's anagrammatical attack upon him. Bellamy declares that Malvolio represents Marston, and by extension Marsyas, the satyr who challenged Apollo (or Shakespeare in this instance), and was subsequently flayed alive. These likenesses are suggested to reveal more than Shakespeare's attitude towards Marston, for Bellamy maintains that they show the play's 'generic integrity . . . A coherent inter-relationship between the cruel and the comedic' (p. 519). The monograph is notably well presented, with anagrammatic letters capitalized whenever relevant, and the anagram itself is shown to the right of a passage of text. Readers can follow the argument clearly, and reflect upon early modern reading practices regarding anagrams as they do so.

Laura Estill's monograph *Dramatic Extracts in Seventeenth-Century English Manuscripts: Watching, Reading, Changing Plays* will be of interest to anyone working on early modern reading practices. Estill examines how extracts from various plays were copied into notebooks by seventeenth-century readers, and argues that they reveal insights into how drama related to life outside of the theatre. Chapter 6, 'Proverbial Shakespeare: The Print and Manuscript Circulation of Extracts from *Love's Labour's Lost*' (pp. 201–16), is of interest to this section. It considers the circulation of the extract 'fat paunches have lean pates, and dainty bits / Make rich the ribs, but bankrupt quite the wits' (I.i.26–7). Estill charts the appearances of the extract in print and manuscript, and highlights differences in phrasing. Since the extract is not always attributed to Shakespeare, Estill concludes that 'for early modern readers (and writers), a quotation by Shakespeare was not always a quotation from

Shakespeare, nor was it always meant to bring up associations with a particular play' (p. 211).

The final three monographs which are of relevance to this section cover very different topics and plays. In *Shakespeare and Abraham*, Ken Jackson examines how the playwright engages with Abraham's near-sacrifice of Isaac as told in Genesis 22. With remarkable clarity and efficiency, Jackson neatly presents the readings which such figures as Kierkegaard and Derrida offer of this episode, before turning his attention to Shakespeare's plays. His examination of *The Merchant of Venice* is much less interested in Shylock's conversion than the trial which precedes it, and Jackson convincingly argues that readers should obey Portia's suggestions to process events more slowly. He asserts that when Shylock pauses after Portia tells him that he must cut off exactly a pound of Antonio's flesh, he is placed in the Abrahamic position. Shylock realizes that because he has sworn an oath, he must fulfil it and kill Antonio even if he does not want to. Although he does not ultimately carry out the oath, Jackson maintains that this decision does not arise because he has forgiven Antonio, but because 'It is no more Shylock's choice to be merciful than it is Shylock's choice to kill Antonio' (p. 108).

In *At Work in the Early Modern English Theater: Valuing Labor*, Matthew Kendrick devotes half of chapter 5, 'Labor and Theatrical Value on the Shakespearean Stage: *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest*' (pp. 129–64), to one of Shakespeare's comedies. Kendrick focuses mainly on the Mechanicals, asserting that these characters are informed by medieval theatre because they privilege their identities as labourers over their identities as players. Bottom offers the most overt example of this mindset, for he still views himself as a labourer even when he has been physically transformed. Kendrick detects conflict between the moneymaking side of the theatre and the craft it required in order to function. He argues that 'The play attempts to resolve these tensions by representing the artisanal dimension of the professional theater as a nostalgic touchstone or criterion of communal value capable of pushing against the reifying logic of the market' (p. 130). Kendrick's chapter stands as evidence of the value of a Marxist approach to this comedy.

Astrology is the focus of Peter D. Usher's *Shakespeare and Saturn: Accounting for Appearances*. One of the monograph's key and somewhat unconvincing arguments is that Shakespeare was actually the controversial astronomer Leonard Digges. Usher asserts that because Digges had to keep a low profile on account of some of his ideas, he expressed his astrological findings in play form instead. In chapter 3, '*Much Ado About Nothing*' (pp. 125–62), Usher posits that the characters of Hero, Beatrice, Benedick, and Claudio are used to show that Saturn has two invisible rings. In the fourth chapter, '*The Comedy of Errors*' (pp. 163–99), Usher suggests that the play reveals various sub-cycles of Saturn. Both chapters tend to spend a considerable amount of time recounting the plots of the plays, which could have instead been used to show more of an awareness of the critical background surrounding them.

Evelyn Gajowksi and Phyllis Rackin's edited collection *The Merry Wives of Windsor: New Critical Essays* is the most comprehensive work of its kind

published on any of Shakespeare's comedies in 2015. It features fifteen different essays relevant to this section, which are split into six themed parts. This work makes a varied and valuable contribution to scholarship on this play, while remaining accessible enough for undergraduate students. The editors' introduction concisely outlines the changing critical opinions surrounding the comedy since its first performance, and points towards its burgeoning interest to historicist and feminist scholars. Catherine Belsey's chapter, 'Agonistic Scenes of Provincial Life' (pp. 27–37), analyses the speech patterns within the play, and highlights the very similar and supportive ways in which Mistresses Ford and Quickly use language. Cristina León Alfar's contribution, '"Let's consult together": Women's Agency and the Gossip Network in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*' (pp. 38–50), draws upon Judith Butler's ideas surrounding power and agency in order to argue that the wives do not allow Falstaff to impose a narrative on their bodies. While Falstaff equates their hospitality with promiscuity, Quickly and Ford mobilize a strong female community in order to disprove that connection. Rachel Prusko's chapter, '"Who hath got the right Anne?": Gossip, Resistance, and Anne Page in Shakespeare's *Merry Wives*' (pp. 51–60), asserts that Anne does not only resist the considerable amount of gossip which circulates about her, but actually turns it to her advantage. In '"May we, with the Warrant of Womanhood and the witness of a good conscience, pursue him with any further revenge?": Feminist Citizen Revenge Comedy in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*' (pp. 60–9), Susanne Gushee O'Malley questions the extent to which the play repays a feminist reading, and concludes that its middle section is the most profitable part for such an approach.

Jean E. Howard's piece, 'Sharp-Tongued Women and Small-Town Social Relations in Porter's *Two Angry Women of Abington* and Shakespeare's *The Merry Wives of Windsor*' (pp. 73–83), highlights the existence of the former play, which was contemporaneous with Shakespeare's comedy, is also set in a small town, and similarly features older, married female protagonists. Howard draws attention to the differences in setting, gender relations, and location between the two comedies, but suggests that one play (unspecified) was written in reaction to the other. Kay Stanton's essay, 'Shakespeare's Quantum Physics: *Merry Wives* as a Feminist "Parallel Universe" of *Henry IV, Part 2*' (pp. 84–95), argues that the differences in the Falstaff of the *Henry IV* plays and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* can be explained as evidence that these works are 'parallel universes' which the character travels between. In her convincing argument for the value of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*'s apparently 'bad Quarto', Helen Ostovich's chapter, 'Bucking Tradition in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 1602: Not a Bad Quarto, Really' (pp. 96–106), explains that this version of the play functions effectively as a fast-paced farce. Jennifer Higginbottom's wide-ranging chapter, 'Teaching Children Their Behaviours in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*' (pp. 109–20), considers child actors and characters as well as the quarto and Folio editions in order to demonstrate how Shakespeare 'constructs childhood as a site of instruction in theatrical and social performance' (pp. 110–11). Barbara Traister's piece, 'A French Physician in an English Community' (pp. 121–9), discusses how Doctor Caius's name and nationality confirm his medical occupation, then

highlights how he is both accepted into, and punished by, the Windsor community.

Wendy Wall's chapter, 'Finding Desire in Windsor: Gender, Consumption, and Animality in *Merry Wives*' (pp. 132–43), examines the problems and questions that arise when the desires of the play's characters—especially the female ones—are analysed, and she outlines the many different types of desire that are in evidence. Jessica McCall's article, 'Hysterical Shakespeare: Celebrations of Merry Sexuality' (pp. 144–53), argues that *The Merry Wives of Windsor* has been overlooked because of its portrayal of two older, married women who are in control of their sexuality. McCall asserts that the comedy is of extreme importance because it 'offers a unique site for explorations of established heterosexual relationships where chastity is obviously distanced from virginity' (pp. 151–2). Carolyn E. Brown's chapter, '"Preposterous" Actions and "Tainted" Desires in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*' (pp. 154–68), is likely to provoke a good deal of debate, for it suggests that Falstaff is the innocent victim of the wives' masochism. She supplements this contentious reading with the more convincing suggestion that Ford suffers from dissociative personality disorder, which emerges on account of his wish to suffer from having an adulterous wife.

Rebecca Ann Bach's contribution, 'Falstaff Becomes the (Hu)man at the Expense of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*' (pp. 171–83), meanwhile takes issue with the prominent critical belief that Falstaff represents man. She argues that the Elizabethan audience would have understood him to be connected with animals, and then explains how his position has since shifted to seem totally human. The final chapter of relevance to this section is Rebecca Larochi's '"Cabbage and Roots" and the Difference of *Merry Wives*' (pp. 184–93), which offers the fascinating argument that the comedy's use of vegetables is not linked so much to domestic matters as to the scatological and sexual features of the characters' and audience's bodies.

Other edited collections feature a number of chapters that are of relevance to this section. Paul Yachnin's edited collection *Shakespeare's World of Words* features three chapters which explore *The Merchant of Venice*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, and *The Comedy of Errors* respectively. Michael Bristol and Sara Coodin's article, 'Well-Won Thrift' (pp. 33–57), analyses the word 'well' and words connected to wealth in the first of these comedies. The authors refer to aspects of Jewish theology in order to argue that Shylock sees himself as earning his living through work that is respectable but necessary, as Jacob did with Laban. Jessica, meanwhile, is linked to both Dinah and Rachel, but the authors maintain that neither comparison is wholly satisfactory. Lucy Munro's chapter, 'Antique/Antic: Neologism and the Play of Shakespeare's Words in *Love's Labour's Lost* and *2 Henry IV*' (pp. 77–101), examines the uses of 'antique' and 'antic' in *Love's Labour's Lost* alongside *2 Henry IV*. Munro's discussion of the comedy focuses upon how artificial Armado's language sounds because of its use of old and new words—a combination which would resonate with Elizabethan discussions over language. Jennifer Roberts-Smith's article, '"Time is their master": Men and Metre in *The Comedy of Errors*' (pp. 237–62), focuses upon the metre of *The Comedy of Errors*, particularly how accentual metre works in the 'lock-out' scene, and

how its iambic counterpart functions in the final scene. The argument that the two types of metre affect how the characters interpret time is sound, but readers who have some knowledge of metrical terms would receive the full benefit of the detailed scholarship that is evident in this article.

Two chapters in the edited collection *Mapping the World of Anglo-American Studies at the Turn of the Century*, edited by Aleksandra Nikčević-Batrićević and Marija Krivokapić, focus on *The Merchant of Venice*. Esmerelda Subashi's chapter, 'The Universal and Timeless World of Shakespeare's Work' (pp. 65–73), offers a well-intentioned but sadly somewhat simplistic treatment of the comedy in order to argue that 'Shakespeare is as modern as contemporary writers who believe in feminism, the right of a person to their sexual preferences and the equality of all people' (p. 72). Subashi discusses the role of women, anti-Semitism, and homosexuality within the plays, but could have demonstrated a greater awareness of the critical complexities surrounding these topics, as there are a number of generalized arguments which impact upon the effectiveness of the readings. In her chapter 'Modern Critical Approaches to Shakespeare: New Readings of *The Merchant of Venice* and *Measure for Measure* (pp. 75–84), meanwhile, Tatjana Dumitrašković asserts that the trial scene of *The Merchant of Venice* has been the subject of the most critical interest. Dumitrašković explains the ideas of such critics as John Palmer, Stephen Greenblatt, and Terry Eagleton effectively, but the chapter could have benefited from a greater discussion of her own views on the play.

David Loewenstein and Michael Witmore's edited collection, *Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion*, contains two chapters that make Shakespeare's comedies the main focus of their arguments. Alison Shell's essay, 'Delusion in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*' (pp. 81–95), presents the intriguing possibility that Demetrius is not in love with Helena at the end of the play, but with an 'eidolon' or 'imaginative phantom' (p. 86) of her, and links this idea to notions of idolatry. Matthew Dimmock's chapter, 'Shakespeare's Non-Christian Religion' (pp. 280–99), meanwhile, uses Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* to demonstrate how Shakespeare places Judaism to the side in *The Merchant of Venice*. Dimmock convincingly asserts that 'Shakespeare's recreation of Judaism for the early modern stage is ... one that is always already past, defeated by the truth of Christ' (p. 291).

Donald Beecher, Travis DeCook, Andrew Wallace, and Grant Williams's edited collection, *Taking Exception to the Law: Materializing Injustice in Early Modern English Literature*, contains two chapters that discuss Shakespeare's comedies. The first of these pieces, written by Tim Stretton, is entitled 'Conditional Promises and Legal Instruments in *The Merchant of Venice*' (pp. 72–89). Stretton compellingly links the comedy to anxieties surrounding people's ability to keep verbal or paper bonds. While the play reveals the harshness of certain types of legal practices and penalties surrounding bonds, Stretton maintains that Shakespeare does not identify the most secure way of making a bond; rather, he implies the importance of exercising mercy when engaging with the law. The second of the chapters, by Barbara Kreps, is entitled 'Two-Sided Legal Narratives: Slander, Evidence, Proof, and Turnarounds in *Much Ado About Nothing*' (pp. 162–78). Kreps argues that practices in this comedy would have been recognizable to contemporary law.

She posits that characters have 'contrasting attitudes towards the issues, fundamental to the play, of reliable evidence and what constitutes proof' (p. 163); while Leonato refuses to believe something he has been told until he has evidence of it, Claudio is nowhere near as discerning. Such impulsiveness combines with the unreliability of language to lead him to believe and perpetuate the slander that is made against Hero. As the defamed Hero is unrecognizable to the broader community, 'death provides her and her family with a singularly apt metaphor for slander' (p. 173).

Merry E. Wiesner-Hank's edited collection *Mapping Gendered Routes and Spaces in the Early Modern World* contains a chapter by Tara Pedersen, 'Bodies by the Book: Remapping Reputation in the Account of Anne Greene and Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing*' (pp. 117–30), which has some resonance with Kreps's article. Pedersen examines *Much Ado About Nothing* in relation to a contemporaneous account of Anne Greene, a servant who was hanged for miscarrying her master's child, but somehow survived the ordeal. The author argues that Shakespeare's comedy interrogates whether a person comes to be recognized by performing an action, or by being seen to perform that action. She focuses primarily on the female body and reputation, and convincingly argues that Hero has to 'die' because her body seems to confirm the slanderous accusation made against her.

Stefan Horlacher's edited collection, *Configuring Masculinity in Theory and Literary Practice*, contains Mark Bracher's 'From Antisocial to Prosocial Manhood: Shakespeare's Rescripting of Masculinity in *As You Like It*' (pp. 95–125), which is a fascinating combination of psychology and literary analysis. Bracher explains how certain 'scripts' of dominant masculinity are initially acted through by Oliver and Orlando, but are shown to be harmful. The play then advocates alternative, less harmful, 'scripts' of masculinity through Corin and Duke Senior, as well as Rosalind's advice to Orlando.

Some of the journal articles which are of relevance to this section focused upon multiple plays of interest, but the vast majority treated them separately. One member of the former group is Kay Stanton's lively article, 'Intersections of Politics, Culture, Class, and Gender in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, and *The Merchant of Venice*' (*MultSh* 12[2005] 41–54). Stanton uses the 'rabbit and duck' illustration that was popularized by Ludwig Wittgenstein in order to conceptualize the ambiguous nature of Shakespeare's works. For *The Taming of the Shrew*, Stanton argues that Katharine's speech on the role of wives is written so that the audience can choose whichever interpretation they like. She also highlights some of the ambiguities surrounding Antonio, Shylock, and Portia in *The Merchant of Venice*.

In her article 'Shakespeare and Thomas Underdowne's *Theseus and Ariadne*' (*RES* 66[2015] 465–79), Sarah Annes Brown considers how the latter's 1566 text may have influenced *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Merchant of Venice*, as well as *The Tempest*, a play which is not covered by this section. She suggests that a prefatory poem of Underdowne's influences the way in which Egeus and Theseus talk about Hermia in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Brown goes on to discuss how Underdowne's Phaedra and Ariadne influence Shakespeare's Helena and Hermia, arguing that, while the latter pair are not sisters, they are as close and as jealous as Underdowne's characters are. Brown

also suggests that the way in which Underdowne's sisters attempt to situate Ariadne in relation to classical heroines informs Jessica and Lorenzo's exchange in *The Merchant of Venice*: 'Jessica deploys her reference to Thisbe in order to reject any implications that she is a Cressida' (p. 474).

Of those articles which focus only upon one of the plays relevant to this section, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is the most popular text to analyse, but critical approaches vary. Louise Geddes, for example, argues in her excellent article, 'Playing No Part But Pyramus: Bottom, Celebrity and the Early Modern Clown' (*MRDE* 28[2015] 70–85), that the role of the clown is split between Puck and Bottom so as to control the celebrity figure whose presence and improvisational skills had the potential to disrupt the entire play. Geddes discusses how playwrights would have to balance the audience's wish to see the clown with their own dramatic vision. She then outlines instances where Bottom's comic potential is diluted or contained, and Puck is given a controlled area for improvisation. In this way, Geddes concludes, the role the performer inhabits is privileged over the performer themselves.

Adam Rzpeka's fascinating article, ' "How easy is a bush supposed a bear?": Differentiating Imaginative Production in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*' (*SQ* 66[2015] 308–28), meanwhile, draws upon Aristotelian and early modern understandings of imagination. It argues that the audience are made to participate in, or acknowledge, a number of imaginative practices. Through Titania's and Oberon's continued references to landscapes, Rzepka asserts, the audience is made to imagine something very different from what is onstage, and the flower juice is then designed to trick those watching the play into thinking that the lovers see more than they really do. Rzepka also discusses how the Mechanicals and Puck cause the audience to become aware of the limits or persistence of the imaginative process.

Andrew Barnaby's article, ' "The botome of Goddes secretes": 1 Corinthians and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*' (*RenD* 43[2015] 1–26), highlights the allusion which this comedy makes to the biblical book in the title. Barnaby argues that 1 Corinthians' criticism of the rich for failing to feed the poor has links to Theseus's relationship with the Mechanicals. While Theseus expects the Mechanicals to perform because they admire him, they expect to be paid. Theseus's attitude echoes that espoused by the criticized rich, so Barnaby suggests that the play encourages audience members who share that mindset to alter their ways.

In 'The Humorous Unseemly: Value, Contradiction and Consistency in the Comic Politics of Shakespeare's A Midsummer Night's Dream' (Shakespeare 11[2015] 425–45), an article which draws extensively upon critical and classical ideas surrounding humour and laughter, Daniel Derrin, argues that these two features can be used to both contradict and support the status quo. Focusing on *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, he argues that 'Shakespeare associates much of the play's humour with the political and rational power to make distinctions' (p. 439). Whether it is the lovers' inability to realize that they are acting on emotion rather than intellect, or Theseus's contradictory denigration of lovers and poets, humour has the potential to highlight societal problems, and to suggest a way of solving them.

Theseus's oft-quoted description of the figure of the poet is used by Christopher Thurman to frame his exploration of Shakespeare's ideas regarding poets in his article 'Fine Frenzies: Theseus, Shakespeare, and the Politics of Their Poets' (*Shakespeare* 11[2015] 115–34). By focusing on a number of Shakespearean references to poet-figures and poetry across various plays, Thurman convincingly argues that Shakespeare understands the many accusations levelled against poetry, but sees it as a form with the potential to create social change. While Thurman quite rightly does not engage only with *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, his article is an effective demonstration of how the play can prompt a broader examination of Shakespeare's works or attitudes.

In 'The Complexity of Dance in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*' (*EMLS* 18:i–ii[2015] 1–26), Claire Gwendoline Hansen combines complexity theory with admirable close reading. She argues that 'Shakespeare uses dance in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* to create and negotiate turbulent communications and to transform the social and environmental systems and their various parts' (p. 10).

Joe Luna's article, 'Money, *die Ware*, and Marx's Shakespeare' (*TPr* [2015] 427–47), demonstrates another approach to *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. It examines Marx's use of the quotation 'the course of true love never did run smooth' from the play in the third chapter of *Das Kapital*. Luna is most concerned with what this quotation implies about the relationship between money and commodities, but he also comments upon why the play was relevant to Marx. He asserts that 'the plot ... is so deeply dependent on illusion and exchange, so riven with the entire spectacle of agency and unawareness ... that it provides not just a fitting or apposite reference, but a deeply ironical articulation of a state of mis-recognition' (p. 440).

The Merchant of Venice was also a popular text for analysis in journal articles, with a number of approaches to the comedy evident. Zachary Hutchins and Amy Lofgreen argue, in their article 'More Greek than Jonson Thought? Euripides' *Medea* and *The Merchant of Venice*' (*Shakespeare* 11[2015] 388–407), that contrary to general critical opinion, Shakespeare had read Greek drama. They convincingly outline the influence of the former titular play upon the latter, pointing out similarities in language and suggesting that Antonio, Portia, and Shylock all have Medea-like qualities. Hutchins and Lofgreen also assert that the influence of *Medea* supports the scholarly notion that Antonio has feelings for Bassanio, and contradicts the critical idea that Portia's cross-dressing is a homoerotic act. Matthew Scott Stenton's article, 'Unlocking Meaning: The Act of Reading in Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*' (*C&L* 64[2015] 377–99), meanwhile, focuses upon the reading practices of characters within this play. Stenton argues that Bassanio is successful in the casket scene because he reads the caskets rather than the riddles, while Portia resolves the dilemma of the bond by reading it so literally as to make it seem ridiculous—a technique she learned from Shylock.

Jordi Coral's fascinating article, 'Anxious Householders: Theft and Anti-Usury Discourse in Shakespeare's Venetian Plays' (*SC* 30[2015] 285–300), argues that Shylock fears being robbed because he is uncomfortable with his profession as a usurer. Coral examines his reference to the biblical story of Jacob and Laban, and explores Jessica's own act of theft, before suggesting

that Shylock's anxiety is also evident in Iago's victims. Huey-ling Lee's article, 'The Social Meaning of Money in Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday* and Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*' (*CD* 49[2015] 335–66), maintains that money had a vital part to play in perpetuating early modern social relations. Lee argues that the Christian and Jewish characters initially constitute two social groups which are connected by money because they trade with one another. After Jessica's elopement, however, this connection becomes more strained, and Shylock comes to view Antonio as an object he can own. The comedy thus offers examples wherein money supports relations between social groups, but it also illustrates how money may endanger them too.

Two other comedies, *Love's Labour's Lost* and *Twelfth Night*, are the focus of two journal articles apiece. In ' "Concolinel": Moth's Lost Song Recovered?' (*SQ* 66[2015] 84–94), Ross W. Duffin suggests that the French song 'Qvand Colinet faisoir l'amour' could be the song connected to Moth in *Love's Labour's Lost*. Duffin's argument is supported by a range of material, including the lyrics of the French song, an English translation, and a suggested score. Dermot Cavanagh's article, 'William Drummond of Hawthornden as Reader of Renaissance Drama' (*RES* 66[2015] 676–97), examines the way in which Drummond responded to a number of early modern plays, including *Love's Labour's Lost*. Through a fascinating examination of Drummond's commonplace books and annotations of the play, Cavanagh demonstrates that Drummond was not only searching for extracts as he read the play, but was also 'engaging with [its] moral process and concerns' (p. 690).

The two articles on *Twelfth Night*, meanwhile, take different approaches. J.A. Smith's article, 'Telling Love: *Twelfth Night* in Samuel Richardson, Teresa Constantia Phillips, and William Blake' (*SP* 112[2015] 194–212), discusses how Viola's 'She never told her love' speech was employed in a number of eighteenth-century texts written by the authors referred to in the title. Smith argues that Viola's speech has an ambiguous attitude towards virginity and the expression of love, then considers how Richardson, Phillips, and Blake employ the quotation to varying effect. These texts, Smith maintains, suggest that the eighteenth-century attitude towards Shakespearean quotation was far more complex than critics generally assume. James P. Bednaz's note, 'Suspect Evidence for the Late Dating of *Twelfth Night*' (*N&Q* 62[2015] 563–7), argues that this comedy was written before 1601. Bednaz suggests that, contrary to critical opinion, Shakespeare was not alluding to Dekker's parody of Jonson through Feste's 'out of my element' comment, but rather that Dekker alluded to Shakespeare.

Some of the other comedies were also discussed in journal articles. Tristan Samuk's piece, 'Satire and the Aesthetic in *As You Like It*' (*RenD* 43[2015] 117–42), examines how Jacques and Rosalind function as the play's two main satirists, with the latter being more successful than the former because she eventually realizes that art can alter the world. Rosalind's belief in the aesthetic is not wholly shared by Jacques, however, nor is it fully supported by the end of the comedy. In her article ' "I will be master of what is mine own": Fortune Hunters and Shrews in Early Modern London' (*SCJ* 46[2015] 331–58), Eleanor Hubbard convincingly argues for the connection between *The Taming of the Shrew* and a 1590 London divorce suit. Hubbard draws parallels

between Petruchio's 'taming' methods and those attributed to Christopher Percy in the suit. She proposes that the case could have been a source for *The Taming of the Shrew*, or that Petruchio may have inspired Christopher Percy's behaviour, or that Margery Percy's friends and relatives linked her husband's actions with that character when they described them.

Last but certainly not least, Sophie Tomlinson's 'The Actress and Baroque Aesthetic Effects in Renaissance Drama' (*ShakB* 33[2015] 67–82) explores *Two Gentlemen of Verona* alongside other canonical and non-canonical works. Tomlinson explains that the figure of the suffering Ariadne was an important focus for baroque work, and argues that *Two Gentlemen of Verona* can be classified as such on account of the cross-dressed Julia's speech which recalls how s/he once played that character. Through a focus on this speech, Tomlinson asserts that there is 'a baroque *affect* that conjures and imparts theatrical pleasure' (p. 71) for the audience, who know that the boy-actress is highly conscious of expressing emotions.

Books Reviewed

Anderson, Miranda. *The Renaissance Extended Mind*. Palgrave. [2015] pp. xix + 278. £60 ISBN 9 7811 3741 2843.
Artese, Charlotte. *Shakespeare's Folktale Sources*. UDelP. [2015] pp. ix + 243. $80 ISBN 9 7816 1149 5553.
Beecher, Donald, Travis DeCook, Andrew Wallace, and Grant Williams, eds. *Taking Exception to the Law: Materializing Injustice in Early Modern English Literature*. UTorP. [2015] pp. 288. $52.50 ISBN 9 7814 4264 2010.
Bellamy, William. *Shakespeare's Verbal Art*. CambridgeSP. [2015] pp. 530. £62.99 ISBN 9 7814 4388 3849.
Berger, Harry Jr. *Figures of a Changing World: Metaphor and the Emergence of Modern Culture*. FordhamUP. [2015] pp. xi + 160. $20 ISBN 9 7808 2325 7485.
Bevington, David, ed. *Troilus and Cressida*. . ArdenS. Bloomsbury. [2015] pp. xxiii + 515. £12.99 ISBN 9 7814 7258 4748.
Brown, Carolyn E. *Shakespeare and Psychoanalytic Theory*. Bloomsbury. [2015] pp. xii + 226. hb £75 ISBN 9 7814 7250 3244, pb £21.99 ISBN 9 7814 7250 3237.
Bugliani Knox, Francesca, and David Lonsdale, eds. *Poetry and the Religious Imagination: The Power of the Word*. Ashgate. [2015] pp. xii + 268. £60 ISBN 9 7814 7242 6246.
Callaghan, Dympna. *Hamlet: Language and Writing*. Bloomsbury. [2015] pp. 232. £40 ISBN 9 7814 7252 0289.
Cefalu, Paul. *Tragic Cognition in Shakespeare's Othello: Beyond the Neural Sublime*. Bloomsbury. [2015] pp. 136. pb £16.99 ISBN 9 7814 7252 3464.
Chanan, Gabriel. *Shakespeare and Democracy: The Self-Renewing Politics of a Global Playwright*. Troubador. [2015] pp. x + 218. pb £12.99 ISBN 9 7817 8462 4248.

Chiari, Sophie, ed. *The Circulation of Knowledge in Early Modern English Literature*. Ashgate. [2015] pp. xxii + 268. £65 ISBN 9 7814 7244 9153.
Clark, Sandra, and Pamela Mason, eds. *Macbeth*. ArdenS. Bloomsbury. [2015] pp. xix + 381. £8.99 ISBN 9 7819 0427 1413.
Crawforth, Hannah, Sarah Dustagheer, and Jennifer Young. *Shakespeare in London*. Bloomsbury. [2015] pp. xviii + 262. $25.99 ISBN 9 7814 0815 1808.
Desai, R.W., ed. *Shakespeare the Man: New Decipherings*. FDUP. [2014] pp. xxx + 278. hb $90 ISBN 9 7816 1147 6750, pb $44.99 ISBN 9 7816 1147 8693.
Dowd, Michelle M. *The Dynamics of Inheritance on the Shakespearean Stage*, CUP. [2015] pp. xiii + 290. $99.99 ISBN 9 7811 0709 9777.
Dutsch, Dorota, Sharon L. James, and David Konstan, eds. *Women in Roman Republican Drama*. UWiscP. [2015] pp. vii + 260. $55 ISBN 9 7802 9930 3144.
Edmondson, Paul, and Stanley Wells. *The Shakespeare Circle*. CUP. [2015] pp. x + 358. pb £18.99 ISBN 9 7811 0769 9090.
Egan, Gabriel. *Shakespeare and Ecocritical Theory*. Bloomsbury. [2015] pp. 208. £15.39 ISBN 9 7814 4119 9300.
Ellrodt, Robert. *Montaigne and Shakespeare: The Emergence of Modern Self-Consciousness*. ManUP. [2015] pp. x + 192. £70 ISBN 9 7807 1909 1087.
Estill, Laura. *Dramatic Extracts in Seventeenth-Century English Manuscripts*. UDelP. [2015] pp. xxviii + 256. $39.99 ISBN 9 7816 1149 5546.
Evans, Robert C., ed. *Othello: A Critical Reader*. Bloomsbury. [2015] pp. xviii + 273. £22.99 ISBN 9 7814 7252 0364.
Gajowski, Evelyn, and Phyllis Rackin, eds. *The Merry Wives of Windsor: New Critical Essays*. Routledge. [2015] pp. 266. £95 ISBN 9 7804 1584 5045.
Hawkes, David. *Shakespeare and Economic Theory*. ArdenS&Theory. [2015] pp. xiv + 223. pb £21.99 ISBN 9 7814 7257 6972.
Heffernan, Julián Jiménez. *Shakespeare's Extremes: Wild Man, Monster, Beast*. Palgrave. [2015] pp. xi + 234. £55 ISBN 9 7811 3752 3570.
Horlacher, Stefan, ed. *Configuring Masculinity in Theory and Literary Practice*. Brill. [2015] pp. 328. $102 ISBN 9 7890 0429 8996.
Howe Kritzer, Amelia, and Miriam López-Rodríguez, eds. *Woman on Trial: Gender and the Accused Woman in Plays from Ancient Greece to the Contemporary Stage*. Teneo. [2015] pp. vi + 325. $35 ISBN 9 7819 3484 4595.
Hunt, Maurice. *The Divine Face in Four Writers: Shakespeare, Dostoyevsky, Hesse, and C.S. Lewis*. Bloomsbury. [2015] pp. xii + 175. $89.99 ISBN 9 7815 0131 1048.
Hutson, Lorna. *Circumstantial Shakespeare*. OUP. [2015] pp. x + 190. £25 ISBN 9 7801 9965 7100.
Innes, Paul. *Shakespeare's Roman Plays*. Palgrave. [2015] pp. 260. £55 ISBN 9 7811 3702 5913.
Jackson, Ken. *Shakespeare and Abraham*. UNDP. [2015] pp. 184. $27 ISBN 9 7802 6803 2715.
Jones, Gwilym. *Shakespeare's Storms*. ManUP. [2014] pp. xi + 198. £75 ISBN 9 7807 1908 9381.
Kendrick, Matthew. *At Work in the Early Modern English Theater: Valuing Labor*. FDUP. [2015] pp. 206. £49.95 ISBN 9 7816 1147 8242.

Kirwan, Peter. *Shakespeare and the Idea of Apocrypha: Negotiating the Boundaries of the Dramatic Canon*. CUP. [2015] pp. xii + 258. £62 ISBN 9 7811 0709 6172.

Labaune-Demeule, Florence, ed. Authority and Displacement in the English-Speaking World, vol. 1: *Exploring Europe/from Europe*. CambridgeSP. [2015] pp. xiv + 142. £41.99 ISBN 9 7814 4388 0947.

Loewenstein, David, and Michael Witmore, eds. *Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion*. CUP. [2015] pp. xii + 318. £65 ISBN 9 7811 0702 6612.

Martin, Randall. *Shakespeare and Ecology*. OUP. [2015] pp. 224. £16.99 ISBN 9 7801 9956 7010.

McCarthy, Penny. *Discovering the Hidden Figure of a Child in Shakespeare's Sonnets as the Key to a New Interpretation: From Literary Analysis to Historical Detection*. Mellen. [2015] pp. viii + 330. £147.04 ISBN 9 7814 9550 3030.

MacFaul, Tom. *Shakespeare and the Natural World*. CUP. [2015] pp. 220. £64.99 ISBN 9 7811 0711 7938.

Meek, Richard, and Erin Sullivan, eds. *The Renaissance of Emotion: Understanding Affect in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. ManUP. [2015] pp. xi + 276. £70 ISBN 9 7807 1909 0783.

Mullaney, Steven. *The Reformation of Emotions in the Age of Shakespeare*. UChicP. [2015] pp. x + 231. $35 ISBN 9 7802 2654 7633.

Munroe, Jennifer, J. Geisweidt Edward,, and Lynne Bruckner, eds. *Ecological Approaches to Early Modern English Texts: A Field Guide to Reading and Teaching*. Ashgate. [2015] pp. xviii + 256. £102.42 ISBN 9 7814 7241 6728.

Murphy, Jessica C. *Virtuous Necessity: Conduct Literature and the Making of the Virtuous Woman in Early Modern England*. UMichP. [2015] pp. x + 179. $60 ISBN 9780 4721 1957 8.

Nikčević-Batrićević, Aleksandra, and Marija Krivokapić, eds., *Mapping the World of Anglo-American Studies at the Turn of the Century*. CambridgeSP. [2015] pp. 315. £52.99 ISBN 9 7814 4387 6599.

Ormsby, Robert. *Coriolanus: Shakespeare in Performance*. ManUP. [2014] pp. xii + 281. £75 ISBN 9 7807 1907 8675.

Parvini, Neema. *Shakespeare and Cognition: Thinking Fast and Slow through Character*. Palgrave. [2015] pp. ix + 75. £45 ISBN 9 7811 3754 3158.

Potter, Lois, ed. *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. . ArdenS. Bloomsbury. [2015] pp. xix + 451. £12.99 ISBN 9 7814 7257 7542.

Prescott, Paul, and Erin Sullivan, eds. *Shakespeare on the Global Stage: Performance and Festivity in the Olympic Year*. Bloomsbury. [2015] pp. xvi + 356. £21.99 ISBN 9 7814 7252 0326.

Radasanu, Andrea, Ryan Balot, and Timothy W. Burns, eds. *In Search of Humanity: Essays in Honor of Clifford Orwin*. Lexington. [2015] pp. xi + 546. $140 ISBN 9 7807 3918 4165.

Rickard, Jane. *Writing the Monarch in Jacobean England: Jonson, Donne, Shakespeare, and the Works of King James*. CUP. [2015] pp. x + 278. $64.99 ISBN 9 7811 0712 0662.

Schwyzer, Philip. *Shakespeare and the Remains of Richard III*. OUP. [2015] pp. xii + 272. pb £27.50 ISBN 9 7801 9872 8030.

Shapiro, James. *1606: William Shakespeare and the Year of Lear*. Faber. [2015] pp. xi + 423. hb £20 ISBN 9 7805 7123 5780, pb £9.99 ISBN 9 7805 7123 5797.
Sillars, Stuart. *Shakespeare and the Visual Imagination*. CUP. [2015] pp. 333. £67 ISBN 9 7811 0702 9958.
Slights, Jessica, ed. *Othello*. ISE. [2015]. internetshakespeare.uvic.ca. Open access. ISBN 9 7815 5058 4660.
Smith, Simon, Jacqueline Watson, and Amy Kenny, eds. *The Senses in Early Modern England, 1558–1660*. ManUP. [2015] pp. xii + 243. £70 ISBN 9 7807 1909 1582.
Tredell, Nicolas. *Shakespeare: The Tragedies*. Palgrave. [2014] pp. 216. £60 ISBN 9 7811 3740 4893.
Usher, Peter D. *Shakespeare and Saturn: Accounting for Appearances*. Lang. [2015] pp. 241. £54 ISBN 9 7814 5419 2695.
Wells, Stanley. *William Shakespeare: A Very Short Introduction*. OUP. [2015] pp. xv + 125. pb £7.99 ISBN 9 7801 9871 8628.
White, R.S., Mark Houlahan, and Katrina O'Loughlin, eds. *Shakespeare and Emotions: Inheritances, Enactments, Legacies*. PalMac. [2015] pp. xii + 270. £58 ISBN 9 7813 4969 0749.
Wiesner-Hanks, Merry E., ed. *Mapping Gendered Routes and Spaces in the Early Modern World*. Routledge. [2015] pp. 398. £63.71 ISBN 9 7814 7242 9605.
Yachnin, Paul, ed. *Shakespeare's World of Words*. Bloomsbury. [2015] pp. xii + 292. £84.99 ISBN 9 7814 7251 5292.