2. EDITIONS AND TEXTUAL STUDIES

reviewed by EMMA DEPLEDGE[1]

The years 2019–20 saw the publication of editions and monographs that offer new insight into the afterlives of Shakespeare's plays and poems, and their reception and circulation, especially in continental Europe. The final edition in the Arden Third Series was released, as was an Arden Early Modern German Shakespeare edition containing two re-translations of early modern German versions into English, as well as an updated New Cambridge *King Lear* and an edition of the *First Quarto of The Merry Wives of Windsor*. It was also a very exciting year for textual studies, with a new generation of scholars returning to the work of New Bibliographers with renewed energy and new methodologies, and an open-access database reshaping our knowledge of and access to extant copies of the Shakespeare folios and pre-1700 quartos.

EDITIONS

The third series of the Arden Shakespeare is now complete, as demonstrated by the full shelves of paperback copies bringing colour to Zoom backgrounds the world over in 2020. A variant noted by those opting to buy the complete set was that some copies of the *Sonnets* lacked the characteristic black stripe found on the upper spine of all other editions within the series. Corrected copies, complete with spine stripes, were then sent out, with Arden putting the variant down to a 'warehouse glitch'. Whatever the reason for the variant covers, they were a welcome reminder of the early print history of the *Sonnets* which, as Erin A. McCarthy's new study (discussed below) demonstrates, sometimes were and sometimes were not presented in a material form that resembled editions of the individual plays and narrative poems already on the market.

The final entry in the third series of the Arden Shakespeare was *Measure for Measure*, with A. R. Braunmiller editing the text, Robert N. Watson contributing the Introduction and index, and Richard Proudfoot providing 'extensive assistance' (xviii). The Introduction returns to the issue of the play's genre, its status as a 'problem' play, and its position in the likely chronology of Shakespeare's oeuvre. The question of collaborative authorship is handled both in the Introduction and in Appendix I. The Introduction states that 'the 1623 text of *Measure for Measure* may well include changes made by Thomas Middleton, probably late in 1621' (117), before specifying why the editors believe there is good reason to attribute 1.2.1–18, in particular, to him. Sections of the Introduction are also dedicated to the play's sources, to individual characters and to topics such as 'Morality', 'Sexuality, law and marriage' and 'Catholicism, Protestantism and Puritanism'. A particularly strong section is dedicated to the play's handling of 'substitution', of its 'insistent indifference about the unique personhood of bodies in either sex or death' (16), in which Watson combines close textual analysis with performance analysis and discussion of the practice of doubling in productions from 1992 to 2019.

The framing of certain topics in the Introduction is, however, disquieting. For example, Watson is keen to present *Measure for Measure* as a play that portrays 'many levels of consent [each occurring] in a different matrix of forces' (30), but some of the examples of 'consent' he provides would more accurately (not to mention responsibly) be defined as rape and sexual violation. He writes of 'women who consent to sexual intercourse . . . under legal extortion . . . or who are at least under pressure to consent, whether under the influence of alcohol (Elbow's wife) or under a more benign form of obligation' (30). In fact, so many different things are discussed under the heading 'consent', from 'a couple's wholly voluntary consent' to 'consent to the body's death' (30), that the word is in danger of

[1] I wish to thank Honor Jackson for precious help and assistance with this review.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

losing all meaning and of obscuring the play's treatment of sexual coercion.

Later in the same section, Watson laments that 'commentary on consent in *Measure for Measure* has mostly focused on Isabella's reluctance to consent to sexuality' – I assume he means Isabella's wish to remain celibate as one might consent to sex, but it is problematic to suggest that one *consents to sexuality*. Watson adds that 'such an emphasis is intensified by a feminist era in the academy, and an era also when many institutions are struggling with definitions of women's consent during sexual harassment or sexual assault by more socially or physically powerful men' (30). He fears that the emphasis on Isabella has caused critics to overlook 'the way the play encourages its audiences to consider men's consent as well' (30), but scholars such as Pascale Aebischer – whose 2008 *Shakespeare Bulletin* article, 'Silence, rape and politics in *Measure for Measure*: close readings in theatre history' is not cited in the edition – have in fact offered sensitive analysis of the play's treatment of both male (in the bed-trick) and female rape.

The text, which is based on F1, as one would expect – F1 being the earliest surviving textual witness for *Measure for Measure* – is conservative but clear and contains a wealth of explanatory notes. Braunmiller records readings from William Davenant's adaptation of *Measure for Measure* and *Much Ado* into *The Law Against Lovers* (first published in Davenant's *Works* of 1673), which is only briefly touched on in the Introduction, as well as significant textual variants introduced in later reprints of the Folio and in editions beginning with Nicholas Rowe's *Works* (1709), but amends little, even retaining F1's arrangement of Claudio's (verse) lines to Escalus as prose (4.4.13–15). The collation line of the text pages is slim, with most textual notes handled in the appendices, as is often the case with Arden editions.

The 'Note on the text', presented in Appendix I (and attributed to Richard Proudfoot), carefully explains the different theories regarding Folio compositors, including reference to Pervez Rizivi's 2016 challenge to Charlton Hinman's *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare* (1963). Proudfoot offers detailed discussion of the ways in which the printers' casting off of copy may have impacted the text, with careful consideration given to moments in the text where contractions appear to have been used to counter a lack of space, or else where short verse lines have been split in order to fill empty spaces when typesetting. There are also helpful sections on the role, idiosyncratic practices and influence of Ralph Crane, the professional scrivener behind the manuscript from which *Measure for Measure* was set, and on the impact that the 1606 Act to Restrain Abuses of Players may have had on the text of the play.

This edition does not, however, follow John Jowett's decision (here described as 'bold': 373), in the Oxford Middleton, to restore references that would have been deemed too profane for safe inclusion in the wake of the Act. It is therefore curious to read in the Introduction the opinion that 'several times the word "heaven" fits neither the metre nor the sense as well as "God," which was therefore probably the original word' (121), or that 'Angelo's "Heaven in my mouth"' (2.4.4) – the reading offered in the text of this edition – 'seems more like an advertisement for candy than a lament for failed transubstantiation or insincere prayer' (121). The present text's choice of 'coin heaven's image' is also dismissed in the Introduction as 'a similarly nonsensical substitution' without further discussion of the reasons why it has been retained (121). In sum, this edition of a text with debated authorship is in itself a mixed bag. It offers lucid accounts of the play's textual and performance history and provides a clear and reader-friendly text, but it is debatable whether the different editors shared the conservative principles applied to the text of *Measure for Measure*. Regretfully, the Arden third series is thus rounded off with more of a fizzle than a bang.

The Arden series was supplemented this year by English translations of early German versions of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet*: *Der Bestrafte Brudermord / Fratricide Punished* and *Romio und Julieta* respectively, edited by Lukas Erne and Kareen Seidler. The two-play volume, which will

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

be followed next year by a second volume containing translated editions of *Tito Andronico* (*Titus Andronicus*) and *Kunst über alle Künste, ein bös Weib gut zu machen* (*The Taming of the Shrew*), makes the plays available in annotated English translations for the first time. The plays – which fall somewhere between adaptations and translations, but which (as Erne and Seidler argue persuasively) remain sufficiently close to their source texts for them to be considered versions of Shakespeare's plays – are thought to be the products of collaboration and exchange between itinerant English players performing in central Europe (from the 1580s), the local actors with whom they performed, and the performance practices of later German acting troupes.

The plays may be considered witnesses to early performances of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet*, as they represent versions of the plays taken to continental Europe in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries which were adapted and translated to cater for German-speaking audiences. Unfortunately, the surviving textual witnesses for these plays do not date from the Renaissance period. However, as the editors demonstrate in their Introduction, it is nonetheless possible to distinguish between the plays in their current state, and the versions (probably) performed by the English itinerant players at the start of the seventeenth century. No manuscript has survived for *Brudermord*. The earliest extant text is that published in Heinrich August Ottocar Reichard's 1781 journal *Otta Potrida*, which is based on a lost manuscript from 1710. Erne and Seidler offer detailed analysis of how and why the text may have been adapted in the 1660s. For example, we are informed that the added prologue and the character of Prinzipal Carl likely date from Carl Andreas Paulsen's company and their late seventeenth-century productions of the play, whereas other passages, such as those unique to Q1 *Hamlet*, reflect *Brudermord*'s earliest state. *Romio und Julieta* survives in the form of an extant manuscript, held at the Austrian National Library in Vienna, that originates from the court theatre of Česky Krumlov in *c.* 1688, where the play was performed by a company known as Eggenberg's Comedians. Again, the editors' analysis and detailed knowledge of continental European theatre traditions and history leaves readers of the Introduction with a clear idea of the additions made for later productions and the version of the play performed in Germany at the start of the seventeenth century.

The German Shakespeare plays have been known to the scholarly community for some time – *Der Bestrafte Brudermord* in particular – but until now they have remained largely inaccessible to Anglophone readers. These are not bilingual editions with the English and German on facing pages, but instead fully edited and annotated English translations of the plays. The commentary alerts readers to echoes and departures from Shakespeare's early texts, and a series of appendices then alert us to more detailed, localized correspondences between the German plays and Q1, Q2 and F1 *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet*. Appendix 1, on *Brudermord* and *Hamlet*, details 'thirty-three instances that are found in *BB* and Q2/F, but not in Q1'; 'three instances that are found in *BB* and Q2, but not in Q1 or F'; and 'seventeen instances that are only found in Q1 and *BB*, but not in Q2/F'. Appendix 2, on *Romio und Julieta*, presents 'thirty-five instances that are found in *RUJ* and Q2, but not in Q1'; and 'six instances that are found in Q1 and *RUJ*, but not in Q2'. In the case of *Brudermord*, we are told that the Folio text of *Hamlet* rarely features in the collation because 'the differences between Q2 and F have little bearing on *Brudermord*' (52); regarding *Romio und Julieta*, similarities with the Folio are said to be restricted to coincidental agreements between stage directions or the omission of the prologue. The editors are thus able to draw important conclusions about the relationship between the German plays and the early quartos of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet*: 'it is clear that *Brudermord* was not Shakespeare's source'; this is not a German translation of the infamous Ur-*Hamlet*; and the presence of Q1-only and Q2-only passages in *Brudermord* likely points to an 'early acting version' (59–60). *Romio und Julieta*, the editors demonstrate, is based on

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Q2, with very close correlation in a number of passages. Thus, the edition makes early foreign-language versions of Shakespeare's plays available to a wider readership, whilst making important contributions to ongoing debates about the status of the early texts of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*.

The two plays make for fascinating and entertaining reading, and they merit consideration in their own right, but they will also be valuable to anyone with an interest in *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet*, the reception and alteration of Shakespeare's plays and characters, and the relationship between English and continental European theatre traditions more generally. The text of *Hamlet* is much streamlined in *Brudermord*: the soliloquies and philosophy replaced by new scenes of action, farce and slapstick comedy. Ophelia, no longer grieving for her father and Hamlet's absence, is instead sexually aroused and hot in pursuit of Phantasmo (loosely based on Osric who, incidentally, is in on the fencing plot against Hamlet); the Queen's monologue on Ophelia's death, with its deferral of homicidal agency onto branches and Ophelia's clothes, is likewise rendered less tragic through replacement with a straightforward statement that Ophelia 'has taken her life' by throwing herself off a 'high mountain' (5.6.4–5). As the editors state, this is *Hamlet* 'with the foot on the accelerator'; it is short (*c.* 1,200 lines) and fast-paced and, as such, it is not hard to see how it would have facilitated both comprehension for a non-Anglophone audience and performance by a small troupe of actors (18).

A key example of *Brudermord*'s use of physical theatre to traverse language barriers is the replacement of letters (or Q1's scene between the Queen and Horatio) with a new scene in which Hamlet tricks his would-be-assassins – Rosencrantz and Guildenstern have been replaced by two characters referred to variously as 'bandits' and 'servants' – into shooting each other. Audiences/readers are thus prepared for the later reported action (as in Q2 and F, Hamlet tells Horatio about his journey to England) by a very physical display of how Hamlet cheated death not through the intervention of pirates, but instead by begging the opportunity to deliver a final prayer, spreading 'out his hands', yelling 'shoot', and then falling 'forward between the two' bandits so that they accidentally 'shoot each other' (4.1.53). *Brudermord*, as this example suggests, is in places farcical and very amusing, but it should not, the editors insist, be taken as a mere parody of *Hamlet*. To see either German play as such would be to accord Shakespeare's texts a measure of importance and fame that they had yet to acquire. Shakespeare's *Hamlet* was the source of *Brudermord* (and not vice versa, as was once suspected) and this German version helped *Hamlet* to achieve popularity in continental Europe.

Romio and Julieta, presented here in a new edition after a hiatus of over 150 years, largely follows Shakespeare's texts, but reorders scenes and takes 'longer to reach the topic of Juliet's marriage', before moving 'swiftly towards the final catastrophe' (67). Major changes to the characters of *Romeo and Juliet* include the augmentation of Paris's role and the addition of a new character known as Pickleherring, a stock comic figure in the German stage tradition, who helps to add to the humour of the piece (like the changed role of Phantasmo/Osric in *Brudermord*), whilst also delivering asides and bawdy commentary, particularly at moments of heightened tension or pathos. Examples include his allusion to Romeo kissing Rosalina 'where her spine ends' (1.4.51) and Tipald(Tybalt)'s death, which is swiftly followed by Pickleherring's description of the dead body as a drunkard that lies 'bleeding like a pig' (4.2.85–6). I can see how this new character would have added to the play's appeal, with his direct addresses creating 'a special relationship with the spectators' (75), but I am less convinced by the editors' argument that 'Pickleherring's foolery . . . results in a *complex* blend of the serious and the comic in which neither cancels the other out' (emphasis mine: 77–8). To my mind, his lines do tend to undermine the serious scenes in which he appears.

The strength of the Introduction, which treats the two plays individually, is its illuminating examples of ways in which the action found in the German texts can help modern scholars to solve ambiguities in the Shakespearian texts,

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

particularly at the level of implied stage directions (for example, Romeo and Juliet's kisses on first meeting). The German play again shows a concern for performance in that Julieta's (supposed) death remains off stage, with the Nurse and Pickleherring withdrawing to observe her before voicing their sorrow on stage. As Erne and Seidler note, this eliminates a problem that has often troubled modern directors in that it removes the need to conceal or remove Juliet's (supposedly dead) body at the end of the scene. Scholars of early modern drama will further appreciate Erne and Seidler's discussion of the presence and reception of other early modern English plays in continental Europe, with Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *King Lear*, *Julius Caesar*, *Othello*, *The Comedy of Errors* and *Richard III* joined by Christopher Marlowe's *Dr Faustus*, Thomas Dekker's *Old Fortunatus*, Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*, James Shirley's *The Maid's Revenge,* and others.

The translated texts are easy to read, they flow naturally without forcing the texts to sound more like Shakespeare's texts than they really do, and Erne, Seidler and Anthony Mortimer – who is credited with assisting them – are in particular to be congratulated for the skilful rendering of German verse passages into English. (Those keen to consult an edited version of the German originals can do so via an open-access platform hosted by the University of Geneva.) The decision to translate the plays into modern British English – as opposed to early modern – was wise as the alternative would have risked readings of the texts as pastiches of Shakespeare, or of Shakespearian English more generally. The translation into an English that is neither archaic, nor 'aggressively modern', instead supports the editors' appeal for readers to put in the effort of 'historical imagination' and accept that these plays were not conceived as parodies of their Shakespeare source texts (52, 114). In sum, the printed volume is an Arden edition through and through and the plays' presentation in the Arden house style provides *Brudermord* and *Romio und Julieta* with a platform for further serious scholarly enquiry, whilst the quality of the translations and the appeal of the playtexts promise to establish them as firm favourites in the extended Shakespeare canon.

The updated New Cambridge critical edition of *The Tragedy of King Lear* likewise provides sensitive analysis of the afterlife of the play in a brand-new Introduction, written by Lois Potter. Potter provides a plot summary, entitled 'experiencing the play', and sections on conventional topics, such as contexts, sources and the play's genre, as well as more novel approaches to the play, like *Lear*'s relationship to ecocriticism, changing audience expectations for – and actors' handling of – the main characters, the politics of casting, and '*Lear* in Europe before 1900'. In the latter, Potter analyses the 1778 adaptation by the German actor Friedrich Schröder, and Jean-François Ducis's influential *Léar*, famous for being the first Shakespeare play acted at the Comédie-Française (19). Potter also discusses responses to performances by Ira Aldridge when he played 'Lear in whiteface on the European continent and in provincial English theatres between 1858 and his death in 1867' (19); the performances delivered by female Lears, from Marianne Hoppe in Frankfurt (1990) to Glenda Jackson in New York (2019); and more recent adaptations of *Lear*, from Gordon Bottomley's *King Lear's Wife* and Edward Bond's *Lear*, of 1920 and 1970 respectively, to Edward St Aubyn's *Dunbar* (2017), written for the Hogarth Press's Shakespeare retellings series, and Preti Taneja's magisterial 2017 novel *We That Are Young*. The section on 'Global *Lear*s' is mostly dedicated to Asian and Russian productions. *The Shadow King*, 'a free adaptation performed by a company of black Australians in a mixture of English and Kriol', is also mentioned (44), but Potter does not provide sustained engagement with many of the listed productions. There is, nonetheless, plenty in this Introduction to inspire new work on *Lear*, and it is understandable that the payoff for the rich range of topics covered is that the subsections tend to be short, with some subjects given only light coverage.

J. L. Halio's Folio-based text, along with his notes, and his masterful textual introduction –

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

essential reading for students of textual scholarship – have been retained, though the latter has been slightly abbreviated, and it is now prefaced by a short piece by Brian Gibbons that clearly aims to make the edition accessible to a much wider audience. Gibbons offers a brief account of the journey of an early modern play from foul papers, through casting off, to typesetting, and he does a good job of simplifying matters for non-experts. An illustration to demonstrate his discussion of printing in formes would have been helpful, and the piece contains some unacknowledged generalizations, but that is only to be expected with simplification. In sum, it remains a very accomplished edition, with Quarto-only passages printed in an appendix, and a number of passages from the Quarto and Folio texts offered for comparison on facing pages after the Introduction. Potter's Introduction brings the edition and the play into the twenty-first century, and Gibbons's preface to Halio's 'Textual analysis' helps to translate an edition ideal for graduate students and scholars of the play into an edition that will also appeal to readers approaching textual criticism for the first time.

In the latest addition to the New Cambridge Shakespeare's series of stand-alone editions of the early quarto texts of Shakespeare's plays, David Lindley argues that the first Quarto of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* 'was intended as a reading text, rather than as a theatrical script', and he accordingly provides a text that is 'as "readable" as possible' (29). For Lindley, the Quarto, which differs radically from the Folio version of the play, 'undoubtedly derives from theatrical performance', but does not reflect an abbreviated version prepared by Shakespeare's company; instead, he argues for a case of 'disruptive textual transmission', borrowing Jowett's helpful phrase, and believes that note-takers (perhaps with the help of 'an editor or actors' memories') likely provided the manuscript printed in 1602 by Thomas Creede for the bookseller Arthur Johnson. The Introduction to the edition makes reference to two recent performances of the Quarto: an impromptu reading at the University of Leeds, and a 2018 stage production by Ohio State University's Lord Denny's Players, directed by Sarah Neville, the editor of the Folio text of *Merry Wives* for the *New Oxford Shakespeare* (2016). Lindley acknowledges that the latter performance in particular convinced him that 'the Q text could indeed function successfully in the theatre' (19). However, he maintains that 'a narrative creakiness' remains and that this 'renders the proposition that the Quarto text we now have is straightforwardly a company playhouse script less certain' (19).

It is true that we cannot offer incontrovertible proof for the issues of the play's dating, for whether the shorter Quarto or the Folio derives from the earliest version of the text, or for the relationship between this play and Shakespeare's other Falstaff plays, and nobody can accuse Lindley of pushing his own agenda at the expense of clear presentation of the facts (and a lack thereof). Concerning the much-debated issue of *Merry Wives*' relationship to the *Henry IV* plays and *Henry V*, Lindley offers the view that '*Merry Wives* is neither sequel nor prequel, and its composition was not predicated on the kinds of narrative consistency and continuity that have come to be our conventional expectations in novelistic or filmic series', adding that, as a comedy, *Merry Wives* 'stands generically apart from the history plays, and though it is entirely plausible to date its origin to roughly the same time, any attempt to place it more precisely in a historical sequence on grounds of narrative consistency is bound to fail' (5). He dates the first composition of the play to *c.* 1600 – thus rejecting the oft-touted theory that the play was written for the Garter Feast of 1597 – and is persuaded that the Folio's version of the last scene 'was probably part of a later revision of the play, possibly prepared for court performance', but adds that 'how thorough a revision that might have been of the play as a whole is a matter for conjecture' (7). It is thus an introduction that provides a helpful overview of the various issues at stake when editing *Merry Wives* without threatening to obfuscate matters with dogmatism.

Lindley is most forthright in his discussion of the play's problematic mixing of prose and verse. The typography often suggests verse where the metre

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

makes it clear that what we actually have is prose – 'there are many lines which are printed with an initial upper-case letter and do not extend to the right-hand margin, but transparently are not verse of any kind' (13) – but there are also pages in which prose is accurately set as prose (Lindley gives Sig. E2v as an example: 14). Rather than see the discrepancies as the result of scribes failing to distinguish prose and verse during dictation, or stationers' attempts to use the appearance of verse to appeal to consumers, Lindley suggests that they may be due to 'decisions made in casting off the copy' (14). His second proposition, which is supported by Creede's use of larger than usual type is that, rather than attempt to save money on paper, as one might expect, Johnson and Creede were trying to make the play – which runs to only 1,624 lines – appear longer so that consumers felt they were getting more for their money. The Quarto's full title, 'A Most pleasant and excellent conceited Comedie, of Syr *Iohn Falstaffe*, and the merrie Wiues of *Windsor*. Entermixed with sundrie variable and pleasing humors, of Syr *Hugh* the Welch Knight, Iustice *Shallow*, and his wise Cousin M. *Slender*. With the swaggering vaine of Auncient *Pistoll*, and Corporall *Nym*', promises more than is actually contained in the playtext, particularly concerning the role of Shallow – a point Lindley himself makes earlier in the Introduction (2) – and this detail further supports his theory that Johnson and Creede were padding the text to make their product appear more substantial.

Although he largely rejects the suggestions of memorial reconstruction involving an actor / the actor playing the Host, Lindley does find that the substantive differences between the Quarto and Folio texts may be explained, at least in part, by the theory that the Quarto was produced by a notetaker within the audience. The shorthand argument, he reflects, 'draws strength from its apparent ability *in principle* to account for the mixed nature of the text' (emphasis mine: 24). The Quarto contains scenes – such as Scene 5 – that 'pose a real challenge to any theory of notetaking' (27) and, Lindley further acknowledges, there are a variety of explanations that one might put forward for the presence of homophones (e.g. Q's 'Hugh and cry' and F's 'hue and cry', 16.50) and what appears to be evidence of mishearings (e.g. Q's 'bullies taile' and F's 'bully stale', 7.15). He nonetheless sees the shorthand theory as a possible explanation for the abbreviation of Mistress Quickly's speeches and the overall close resemblance between Q Scene 6 and 2.2 of F – especially in the opening exchange between Pistol and Falstaff (24) – and between Q Scene 13 and 4.2 of F.

Spelling has been modernized throughout, as per Cambridge conventions. Lindley is sometimes more and sometimes less interventionalist than Helen Ostovich, whose editions are collated in the present volume. For example, he often refrains from emending possible turned letters where the Quarto text makes sense as is (thus retaining 'yon' rather than opting for 'you', 1.67–9), and he chose not to modernize or impose consistency on Q's efforts to convey Sir Hugh Evans's Welsh and Dr Caius's French accents. He does, though, opt for ''tis' over Q1's 'it tis' and Q2's 'it is' in Sir Hugh's first speech of '[scene 2]', where meaning is in no way impeded by Q1's text and where, as Ostovich rightly argues, we may again have an example of idiolect (this time a stammer) being conveyed. I appreciate Lindley's decision not to overly amend Caius's speeches, though I do find plausible Ostovich's suggestion that 'Bully-moy, mon rapier' might be read as a corruption of 'baille-moi' (from *bailer*, 'to give'), but I would have appreciated further discussion of his choices regarding the French he retains. For example, unlike Ostovich – who amends to 'ma rapière', in line with modern (and early modern) French usage – he retains Q1's 'mon rapier' but does so without explaining why. Is it because he finds the choice of article irrelevant as either ('mon'/'ma') is enough to convey French to an early modern English audience? Or does he see it as an example of Shakespeare / the hypothetical notetakers making a mistake? It is a missed opportunity, given his otherwise compelling analysis of Q1's handling of Caius's speeches.

On the whole, the text is clearly presented and annotated. It has not been collated fully against F –

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a wise choice given the large number of substantive differences between the two versions – but Lindley nonetheless offers detailed notes under passages where there is close proximity between the texts; he here records localised variants. He also collates the Folio when it 'casts light on some kind of textual problem or option in Q' (29), and substantial textual criticism is offered in the notes on these occasions. These analyses are one of the real strengths of the edition, especially when discussing choices regarding Caius's English (though, as noted above, I do not always agree), and where Lindley uses etymology and definitions to defend and uphold Q1 readings that previous editors may have rejected. In sum, this is a very competent edition that is to be applauded for its clear presentation of the text and for its lucid explanation of theories about Quarto and Folio variants, and the kinds of cruxes that need to be addressed when staging or editing *The Merry Wives of Windsor*.

TEXTUAL STUDIES

The importance of dialogue analysis for Shakespeare editions and textual studies is demonstrated in Oliver Morgan's *Turn-Taking in Shakespeare*, an intelligent study that encourages us to return to Shakespeare's plays with 'a heightened sensitivity to dramatic dialogue' (259), by which he means an awareness not of oratory and rhetoric so much as of conversations and their typographical layout within the plays. Shakespeare, Morgan argues, scripts more than the words characters speak as he also represents 'an ongoing negotiation between them about whose turn it is to speak' (10). Drawing on, critiquing and adapting linguistic analysis to offer a 'literary critical point of view' (23), Morgan redefines dramatic speeches as 'turn[s] at talk' and encourages us to approach them, not as 'a series of rhetorical set-pieces – lengthy, poetic, persuasive, a treasure-trove for auditioning actors and aspiring anthologists' – but instead as dialogue (3). His aim is to provide us with new terminology with which to discuss how turn-taking operates in Shakespeare's plays and I imagine most readers will indeed feel 'more alert to the interactional shape of [Shakespeare's] writing and better able to describe it' after reading Morgan's two-part book (259).

Each part of the book is made up of an initial chapter outlining the theoretical framework on which Morgan builds in the three short chapters that follow. The first part, entitled 'Sequence', focuses on groups of characters engaged in dialogue (what he terms 'conversational sequence'); the order in which they speak (the sense in which he uses the word 'sequence'); the ways in which they negotiate turns at speaking; and exactly what is at stake when a character speaks out of turn. Chapter 1 draws on examples as varied as Geoffrey Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* and *King Lear*, and the work of conversation analysts Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferon, to introduce what Morgan calls the 'speak-when-you're-spoken-to assumption' (38). If we assume that it is normative for a speaker to speak when spoken to, 'as the default solution to the speaker sequencing problem', then examples where speakers fail to respect this rule in Shakespeare's plays can prove meaningful. Chapter 2 considers 'Figures of dialogue'; Chapter 3, concerned with apostrophizing in history plays and their sources, offers fascinating discussion of Edward Capell's use of dashes and other punctuation marks in his 1768 edition of Shakespeare's plays; and Chapter 4 is dedicated to 'Asides', which he sees as 'speeches which are not, or not quite, turns at talk' (106).

The second part, entitled 'Timing', consists of chapters interested in the ways in which individual speakers know when it is and is not their turn to speak, and in the important role punctuation plays in our understanding of Shakespearian dialogue. Morgan here considers ways in which syntax, punctuation and metre can be used 'to suggest abandoned, interrupted, or overlapping speech' (17), topics which are also central to Claire M. L. Bourne's *Typographies of Performance* (discussed below), and it is a shame that the timing of these two studies did not allow them to engage with each other's work.

Morgan's central thesis is demonstrated through examples such as the Queen's intervention when

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the King is appealing for Hamlet not to return to Wittenberg. The Queen has not been spoken to, but she nonetheless speaks before Hamlet has had chance to reply and the failure to recognize the rule of speaking-when-spoken-to enables her to 'relieve Hamlet of the obligation to reply to Claudius' whilst also anticipating an impertinent response and preventing either man from losing face: Hamlet gets to answer (and 'obey') his mother and not his 'uncle-father', and the King gets what he requested in that Hamlet agrees to stay in Denmark. Morgan compares the Queen to 'a barman stepping between two drunks in a pub', but I would instead think that this characterizes her as precisely what she is: a mother intervening in a (potentially) confrontational exchange between her son and his stepfather. Morgan also gives examples of what he terms 'blanking', blanking without ignoring, and apostrophe, which is defined as 'a turning away of the voice from one addressee to the other' as ways in which speakers engaged in a conversation can avoid 'lapsing into duologue' (47).

The importance of dialogue analysis for editing and textual criticism is again demonstrated through Morgan's discussion of the 'Abhorred slave' speech in *The Tempest*, a speech once reassigned from Miranda to Prospero in editions of the play, and one that is at times still reassigned in performances of the play (Chapter 2). Morgan explores the ways in which characters of the play interact with each other and, more importantly, with Prospero, reasoning that the decision of Lewis Theobald – the first editor to reassign the speech in 1733 – may spring less from concerns over the propriety of a 15-year-old girl delivering such a speech, and more from the play and its 'patterns of interaction and habits of speech' (73).

In his discussion of the scene in which Cleopatra manages to delay Antony's delivery of the news that he must return to Rome, Morgan defends Cleopatra from an editorial tradition that he feels has been 'unjust' in its handling of her interjections. He claims that 'Cleopatra's ability to hold the floor has more to do with skill than brutality. Rather than ignore the rules of conversation, she exploits them'; through analysis of metre and syntax, he offers a persuasive case for instead seeing Antony as 'reluctant to go on because he knows how Cleopatra is likely to react', adding that 'it is this reluctance that gives her the opportunity to speak' before providing illuminating discussion of Cleopatra's figures of dialogue (228). He elsewhere argues that 'there are ways of understanding consistency of character that do not rest on unexamined impressions of psychological credibility', but instead on 'figures of dialogue that can be identified in the text with as much confidence as alliteration, chiasmus, or feminine rhyme' (73). One of the most exciting suggestions made by this study is that dialogue analysis has the potential to open up new readings of Shakespeare's female characters as more verbally assertive than is often thought.

Charles Dickens crops up more often than necessary, and some of the chapters take a while to get going, but Morgan's analysis of Shakespeare's plays and characters is a joy to read. He ends his book with a tentative offer to pay 'the same kind of attention to a wider range of material' in order to offer analysis of the 'development of dramatic dialogue across the period and to draw comparisons between the turn-taking styles of different playwrights' (259), and my own reply would be 'yes, please' as a study that does for turn-taking what Bourne's study (discussed below) has done for typography would be a very welcome addition to scholarship. In welcoming such a study, I do not wish to detract from the achievements of *Turn-Taking in Shakespeare*; on the contrary, this is a field-reshaping monograph that promises to encourage new thinking and rich discussions about Shakespeare's handling of dialogue. Morgan's study has much to teach us about the structure and presentation of dramatic dialogue, and I look forward to seeing the impact it has on future editions of Shakespeare's plays.

New attention is given to Shakespeare's *The Comedy of Errors* in Chapter 5 of Alice Leonard's *Error in Shakespeare, Shakespeare in Error*. The book's other chapters focus on error and figurative language, error and the 'mother tongue', and 'Error and the nation', but in the final chapter, Leonard suggests that 'the editorial tradition has played an equal, if not

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more crucial part than the theatre, the educational institution or the film industry, in determining what Shakespeare means to us today' (8). 'Error and the text' focuses on printing errors concerning the two sets of twins in *The Comedy of Errors*. Leonard analyses both ambiguous speech prefaces and stage directions in the Folio text, as well as early readerly interventions documented in material copies, in order to suggest that what have often been perceived as textual errors in need of correction instead convey 'the easy exchangeability of the twins' whose 'distinguishing features disappear under each further textual error' (180). Indeed, readers, like audience members, are challenged to try to make sense of the ambiguities introduced by both the dramatic plot and the printed text. She concludes that the printed text 'returns the genre to farce in the constant maintenance of the confusion of the twins' (180). Thus, the textual and the dramatic, print and performance, intersect in ways previously overlooked, particularly by editors from Nicholas Rowe onwards, who have tended towards emendation over textual preservation. Audience and readerly confusion, Leonard contends, are something that the play actively encourages. *Error in Shakespeare, Shakespeare in Error* thus makes an important contribution to the field by arguing for the need to push back against an editorial tradition that seeks to canonize Shakespeare through standardization and the eradication of 'errors' that never needed correction.

I turn now to two terrific new texts that focus on the material forms in which Shakespeare's poems and plays – and those of a wealth of other early modern writers – circulated. Building on recent work by Adam G. Hooks (*Selling Shakespeare: Biography, Bibliography, and the Book Trade*) and the chapters collected in *Shakespeare's Stationers* and *Canonising Shakespeare*, Bourne's *Typographies of Performance in Early Modern England* and Erin A. McCarthy's *Doubtful Readers: Print, Poetry, and the Reading Public in Early Modern England* highlight the important role stationers have played in shaping literary history and the posthumous fortunes of specific authors and texts.

Bourne argues that typography, by which she means 'the arrangement and appearance of printed matter on the page' (as opposed to the more limited definition of typography as type design), was mobilized by stationers 'to make the extra-lexical effects of performance – from the most basic (like textually articulating a change in speaker) to the more complex (like registering on the page the meaningful kinesis of bodies on stage) – intelligible on the page' (2). McCarthy highlights the vital role publishers played 'in translating poems from their original social contexts into the broader print market' (2), arguing that stationers consistently strove 'to identify and accommodate new readers of verse that had previously been restricted to particular social networks' (1). Both monographs thus take a formalist view of literature that takes seriously the 'expressive possibilities' of material books (*Doubtful Readers*, 2) and encourage us to rethink the relationship between the different media – performance, print, manuscript, oral – in which early modern drama and poetry circulated.

Like Bourne, whose monograph includes discussion of playbooks by a wide range of canonical and lesser-known dramatists, from Richard Pynson's collection of Terrance's comedies in 1495–7 through to the early eighteenth century, McCarthy focuses not simply on Shakespeare, but also on a wealth of other early modern poets to 1660, including John Donne and Aemilia Lanyer. Recognizing that 'print did not change poetry in a single way', she offers a series of case studies that focus on the editorial practices, material presentation and structure of poetry collections, whilst providing sensitive readings of the poems they contain to demonstrate how 'material instantiations create meaning' (2).

Bourne's monograph, which is the most richly illustrated academic text I have ever seen, is structured around typical, but often overlooked, elements found in early modern plays. The first chapter deals with dramatic pilcrows – paragraph markers first used in the scribal tradition, as evidenced in medieval manuscripts – and the ways in which they helped to make dialogue legible; the second explores action, which is translated, she argues, through the use of dashes and asterisks in particular. Chapter 3 focuses on the use and demarcation of scene

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

divisions; Chapter 4 concentrates on plot, with woodcuts, engravings and other illustrations seen as 'indicative of a publishing strategy aimed at adapting into print the new kind of suspenseful, plot-driven plays that seventeenth-century commentators regularly identified with Beaumont and Fletcher's dramaturgy' (186), and as ways of conveying 'the ingenuity and effects of their formal structures' in ways that would remain visible on the printed page (228). The final chapter is dedicated to scene changes, the ways in which noting fictional places in playbooks became more prevalent in response to both the renewed interest in neoclassical decorum after 1660 and the introduction of movable scenery on the Restoration stage. A part entitled 'Coda' concludes the study through attention to Edward Capell's use of glyphs in his 1768 edition of Shakespeare. Through analysis of these features, which she claims stationers exploited in order to mediate performance or theatricality, Bourne's monograph offers illuminating ways of rethinking the relationship between print and performance.

Bourne's study also aims to revise histories of printed drama. She does so by surveying the typographical make-up of printed plays over a 200-year period, drawing on approximately 1,900 editions of plays printed in England. In a breath-taking commitment to bibliographical research, she consulted at least one copy of every edition published from the late fifteenth century to the 1660s, and at least one copy of every first edition of plays printed between 1660 and 1709. In doing so, Bourne surpasses D. F. McKenzie's influential study, 'Typography and meaning: the case of William Congreve' (1981), in which he used the example of Congreve's collaboration with the publisher Jacob Tonson (to produce the early eighteenth-century edition of Congreve's *Works*) to make broader points about the book as 'an expressive means', stating that 'the material forms of books, the non-verbal elements of the typographical notations within them, the very disposition of space itself, have an expressive function in conveying meaning' ('Typography and meaning', 82). McKenzie's narrow focus led him to see novelty in how Tonson used typography to offer readers 'a theatrical experience in book form' ('Typography and meaning', 83). The wider scope of Bourne's study enables her to observe subtle changes in typography over more than 200 years of theatre and print history.

By starting in the late fifteenth century, Bourne is able to demonstrate the 'design acumen' of early playbook printers, such as John Rastell, Wynkyn de Worde, Richard Pynson and others. She offers a corrective to the 'false sense' that Tonson in the early eighteenth century 'inaugurated a set of consistent typographic principles for printed plays that marked a vast improvement in legibility and intelligibility over the relative messiness of earlier editions' (18). Indeed, one of *Typographies of Performance*'s greatest contributions is Bourne's astute analysis of short-lived or isolated experiments with playbook design. As she rightly argues, both temporary and more permanent developments in page design help to 'expose which aspects of modern theatricality were thought to need a way of signifying on the page' (6), and it is only by taking a long view of the so-called 'early modern' period that scholars can hope to draw reliable distinctions between fleeting experiments with *mise-en-page* and layouts that can be considered conventional for playbooks printed at a given moment.

She challenges the assumption that early playbooks, with what may now strike us as unconventional use of typography, disrupt readings that engage simultaneously with text and performance. Instead, Bourne suggests that this typography was specifically designed to allow the early modern reader access to drama's dual media. However, she does not wish to imply that page design recorded real past performances, nor that it necessarily provided 'scores for future performances', but rather that it materializes the promises stationers made – usually on the title pages to playbooks – to give consumers the play as it was performed at a particular venue. In other words, 'the book is a viable version of what audiences might have seen and heard on a London stage' (10). She demonstrates how, by recognizing the ways in which drama was fashioned as a distinct print genre, we can learn to 'cultivate new (old)

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ways of seeing and understanding these books' textual designs' (3). Put differently, modern readers can potentially learn to respond to typographical features in the way that stationers hoped early moderns would. Her study also promises rich insight into the concerted efforts stationers across the period made to experiment with, and help to bring about, what we now recognize as conventional dramatic *mise-en-page*.

Studies of early modern drama and poetry frequently impose arbitrary cut-off dates, such as 1600, 1640 or 1660, but this is not the case here. Indeed, *Typographies of Performance*, like *Doubtful Readers*, provides a blueprint for the kind of discoveries that await scholars willing to think beyond traditional period boundaries. I was disappointed not to see Bourne interact with Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume's *The Publication of Plays in London, 1660–1800: Playwrights, Publishers and the Market* (2015), Don-John Dugas's *Marketing the Bard: Shakespeare in Performance and Print, 1660–1740*, and some other key studies on the trade in playbooks during the Restoration and early eighteenth century. However, her handling of the many twists and turns of recent (and historical) scholarly debates about the earlier early modern book trade is impeccable, and I do appreciate that there is a limit to how much scholarship one can hope to cite in any monograph, let alone one that includes analysis of thousands of playbooks.

McCarthy's study is also full of compelling analysis that draws on the methodologies of book history and bibliography. The case study offered in Chapter 2 is of most relevance to this review as she here reads the material features of the 1609 edition of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* and William Jaggard's *The Passionate Pilgrim* (1599) in the context of other English sonnet sequences then in vogue. She urges us to read Jaggard's publication not as a printed miscellany, but instead as a sonnet sequence in its own right. The argument is particularly thought-provoking as she goes on to suggest that the reason why Thomas Thorpe's 1609 collection of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* did not reach a second edition is because it was 'stymied by the success of *The Passionate Pilgrim*' – reprinted in 1599 and 1612 – in which Jaggard had offered a product that seemed both more 'sequence-like' and more Shakespearian than the book of *Shake-speares Sonnets* (58). Modern scholars may protest that *The Passionate Pilgrim* bore Shakespeare's name on the title page but contained only a handful of poems now thought to have been by Shakespeare. No matter, McCarthy insists, as the collection's authorship 'was mostly unquestioned until 1780' and was 'for early modern readers, a real and significant part of Shakespeare's poetic reputation' (60).

Thus, the argument goes, if Shakespeare's *Sonnets* did not sell well enough to justify a second edition, then this is not due to a lack of demand for Shakespeare, nor to a loss of interest in sonnet collections, or even to Jaggard having hampered the market for authentic Shakespeare poems, as some scholars have claimed. Instead, it was the result of Thorpe's failure to match Jaggard's efforts to align his publication bibliographically 'with a genre for which there was continued demand', or with editions of Shakespeare's oeuvre already circulating in the London book trade (57–8). By the time Thorpe's *Shake-speares Sonnets* was released in 1609, McCarthy argues, 'as far as most early modern readers knew, [the book market] already included a book of Shakespeare's sonnets' (58).

McCarthy traces not just the poetic form and content, but also – importantly – the bibliographical history of the English sonnet tradition. She notes that scholars have long recognized the 'powerful authorial paradigm established in the editions of *Astrophel and Stella* authorized by the Countess of Pembroke' and the volume's significance as a 'landmark in poetry's emergence as an English literary genre', but she claims that the effect of *Astrophel and Stella* will have been less apparent to early modern readers (62). They, McCarthy claims, will have been more influenced by the bibliographical precedent established by Samuel Daniel's *Delia*, and further bolstered by Constable's *Diana*. In his *Delia*, which 'featured one poem per page between decorative borders for the first time in printed English collections' (71), Daniel, she claims, introduced 'a set of

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

recognizable typographical conventions for printing English sonnet sequences' (60), and it is these material features that made the *Passionate Pilgrim* legible and appealing in ways that the 1609 *Sonnets* was not (76).

The Passionate Pilgrim entered a market in which demand for both Shakespeare and sonnet sequences was high (77). Jaggard marketed his collection as a sonnet sequence by including twelve- or fourteen-line poems 'flanked by ornamental borders', thereby linking their *mise-en-page* to that of Daniel's collection. All but the final three leaves have blank versos and the fact that Jaggard retained this feature, along with the second title page identifying the content as falling within the genre of sonnets, lead McCarthy to claim that 'the book's appearance thus seems to have been an integral part of Jaggard's strategy' (80). It is further argued that Jaggard's choice of format – octavo – and size may have encouraged consumers to purchase it alongside other Shakespeare poetry books, particularly his bestsellers *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*, so that they could be bound as *Sammelbände*. McCarthy convincingly supports this claim by pointing to the fact that three of the five surviving copies of *The Passionate Pilgrim* are bound with 'at least one of Shakespeare's narrative poems' (81). She also suggests that frequent reference in the texts collected in *The Passionate Pilgrim* to Venus and Adonis (the characters), like the inclusion of poems from *Love's Labours Lost*, may have attracted early modern readers looking for more Shakespeare.

McCarthy's talent for bibliographic analysis is on show throughout, but she also provides sumptuous literary analysis, particularly when she explores the impact the ordering of Shakespeare's sonnets in *The Passionate Pilgrim* (it opens with what is now known as 138, followed by 144), and textual variants between the poems' appearance here and in the 1609 collection, have on the way in which we read them. This chapter is so rich that one feels it could have formed the basis of an entire monograph. I regret that Table 2.1, containing 'Sonnet sequences published individually, 1580–1640' – a wonderful resource that will be of great use to anyone studying or teaching English sonnet sequences – and which surely reflects a sustained period of research, was not utilized more. A breath-taking amount of data has been collected, surveyed and analysed by both Bourne and McCarthy, and readers will be grateful for the lucid ways in which complex material is handled in both studies.

Shortly after reading McCarthy's account of the ways in which Shakespeare's sonnets and other poems appeared in print accompanied by sonnets from within the plays, I received a copy of Stanley Wells and Paul Edmondson's *All the Sonnets of Shakespeare*. Like Jaggard in *The Passionate Pilgrim*, the editors and publishers (Cambridge) have been generous with paper, allowing one page per sonnet, though they have not left versos blank. It is a gorgeous material book, complete with lilac end papers and a gold-ribbon bookmark, that presents all of Shakespeare's sonnets in the (conjectured) chronological order in which they are thought to have appeared. By 'sonnets', the title refers not simply to those of the 1609 volume, but also to the numerous other examples of Shakespeare's use of the sonnet form, be it in the creation of prologues and epilogues, or else as key sequences within the main body of the plays. Each poem is summarized through paraphrase, and essential context is provided by Edmondson and Wells, who situate Shakespeare's use of the genre and his use of paired poems in the context of Sir Philip Sidney and Robert Greene's work and Shakespeare's career as a whole. They also offer a lucid overview of the publication history of Shakespeare's sonnets and the ways in which they were shaped by the work of editors and collectors in manuscript and print, from the early editions of Thorpe and John Benson (1640) through those of Bernard Lintott (1711), George Steevens (1766) and Edmond Malone (1778), many of which were designed as appendages to collected editions of the plays.

The online Shakespeare Census, a magisterial new resource for Shakespeare and textual studies, went from strength to strength in 2019–20. Building on the work of Henrietta C. Bartlett (1873–1963), one of the most tenacious and talented bibliographers in the history of Shakespeare

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

studies, Adam Hooks and Zachary Lesser set themselves the challenge of recording not just the current location of all extant copies of all pre-1700 Shakespeare editions, but also physical descriptions of the size, binding, marks of ownership and provenance, annotations, damage and other distinguishing features found in each material copy. From 1913 to 1916, Bartlett worked alongside A. W. Pollard to co-edit the first *Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto, 1574–1709*, a project commissioned by the Elizabethan Club of Yale. Bartlett, whose extensive correspondence with private collectors, scholars and libraries around the world is now housed at the Beinecke Library, went on to produce an updated and expanded version of the Census on her own in 1939. The new Census, which is open access, may not consider editions published after 1700, but it is nonetheless more comprehensive in scope than the censuses of 1916 and 1939, and the distinctions Hooks and Lesser make between different editions, variant issues, and checked versus potential 'ghost copies' make it a more reliable source for Shakespeare and textual studies than the *English Short Title Catalogue* hosted by the British Library website.

Hooks and Lesser use early modern attributions, as opposed to the attribution practices of modern scholarship, to determine what constitutes a Shakespeare play or poetry book. At the time of going to press, the Census included 1,863 copies of the plays and poems, and the creators were in the process of integrating data on all four folios, having taken over from the Shakespeare Folios Project led by Cyrus Mulready. Poems and plays, quartos and other formats are already included, and the addition of data on the Shakespeare folios will make this the most comprehensive database of Shakespeare books of all time.

Some of the most exciting features of the Census are the clarification it provides concerning ghost copies, which are copies listed in the ESTC's Holdings Details, or in library catalogues, that do not exist; verified links to digital facsimiles of not just the correct edition, state and issue of a given text, but the specific copy described in the Census (this currently applies to 622 of the listed copies); information concerning the other books with which Shakespeare texts are currently bound; and a search function that includes 'keywords', 'provenance name' and 'specific features', meaning that users can gain valuable insights into the number of Shakespeare books linked to a specific name, 'with a known woman owner', including marginalia, or else bound in an early *Sammelbände*. The resource has yet to be exploited to its full potential and it will be a vital source of evidence for future editors, bibliographers, libraries and general readers. The kinds of new research it will allow for are staggering.

The Census is also a fantastic example of scholarly collaboration, with Hooks and Lesser receiving precious assistance from researchers and library staff the world over. Entries in the Census have been given a unique identifier (SC#) for ease of citation, and these are cross-referenced with the numbers Bartlett used in 1939 and 1916, ESTC numbers and, where relevant, whether they are included in *The Database of Early English Playbooks*, another invaluable resource Lesser co-edited with Alan Farmer. Work on the Census has already led to the discovery of a number of previously unknown copies, including a fifth quarto of *Hamlet* (1637), complete with a 1664 performance record, at Herzog August Library, Wolfenbüttel (see SC#89.3 and Erne's forthcoming *Notes and Queries* article), and a copy of *Pericles* (1611) listing its original owner and price in the Zurich Central Library (see SC#55 and more forthcoming work from Erne). Those wishing to assist in the project can consult a list of copies yet to be verified and the downloadable list of known ghost copies will provide welcome relief to anyone who has ever trogged to a far-flung library only to find that what the library actually contains is not a material copy but merely microfilm or access to Early English Books Online.

It is wonderful to have so many related monographs arrive at once and my only regret is that the timing of Bourne's, Leonard's, McCarthy's and Morgan's studies meant that they were not able to engage with each other's ideas and arguments. Faith Acker's *First Readers of Shakespeare's Sonnets, 1590–1790* and *Bel-vedére or the Garden of the Muses: An Early Modern Printed Commonplace Book*, edited by Lukas Erne and Devani Singh, did not arrive in

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

time for inclusion in this year's review, but I look forward to discussing them next year. Another monograph to look forward to is Zachary Lesser's *Ghosts, Holes, Rips and Scrapes: Shakespeare in 1619, Bibliography in the Longue Durée*, which promises to reshape our thinking about one of the most famous case studies in the history of Shakespeare bibliography: the so-called 'Pavier Quartos' of 1619. The field is not only alive and well but thriving, and I am excited to follow the conversations and debates inspired by the publication of the excellent monographs discussed in this review.

WORKS REVIEWED

Bourne, Claire M. L., *Typographies of Performance in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2020)

Braunmiller, A. R., and Robert Watson, eds., *Measure for Measure*, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 2020)

Edmondson, Paul, and Stanley Wells, eds., *All the Sonnets of Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 2020)

Erne, Lukas, and Kareen Seidler, eds., *Hamlet and Romeo and Juliet: Der Bestrafte Brudermord and Romio und Julieta in Translation*. Early Modern German Shakespeare 1, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 2020)

Halio, Jay, ed., *The Tragedy of King Lear*, 3rd edn, with new introduction by Lois Potter, New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge, 2020)

Hooks, Adam G., and Zachary Lesser, eds., Shakespeare Census (2018): www.shakespearecensus.org

Leonard, Alice, *Error in Shakespeare, Shakespeare in Error* (London, 2020)

Lindley, David, ed., *The First Quarto of The Merry Wives of Windsor*, The New Cambridge Shakespeare Early Quartos (Cambridge, 2020)

McCarthy, Erin A., *Doubtful Readers: Print, Poetry, and the Reading Public in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2020)

Morgan, Oliver, *Turn-taking in Shakespeare* (Oxford, 2019)

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009036795.029 Published online by Cambridge University Press