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Abstract

Subjects the current assumption that Shakespeare's texts are theater scripts to what is known about the length of play texts and performances during Shakespeare's time. Focuses on Hamlet to argue that in several plays Shakespeare wrote more than could ever be acted on the early modern stage and that we must thus revise our notion that he wrote unmindful of his plays being read.
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"THE TWO HOURS' TRAFFIC OF OUR STAGE":
PERFORMANCE CRITICISM
AND THE LENGTH OF PERFORMANCE OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS

BY

LUKAS ERNE

It is one of the premises of performance criticism that Shakespeare's plays were meant to be performed on stage rather than read on the page. This view is supported by the main thrust of recent editorial policy which has increasingly abandoned the fiction of the ideal authorial text and dealt instead with the texts as for and of the stage. Shakespeare's texts are thus commonly viewed as "theatre scripts", that is as reflecting what Shakespeare intended for performance in the London theatres. I propose to examine these assumptions by investigating what is known about the length of, on the one hand, dramatic texts, and, on the other hand, dramatic performances during Shakespeare's times.

Anyone who has had the courage and time to sit through an un-cut performance of *Hamlet* may have been awe-struck by the thought of the Elizabethan groundlings standing in the pit of the Globe, realizing the same achievement on their feet. The playing time of Kenneth Branagh's un-cut RSC production in 1993 was four hours and a quarter, and his recent movie is only slightly shorter. Lavish nineteenth century productions of *Hamlet* lasted up to six merciless hours. The playing time of the latest RSC production of *King Lear*, from which four hundred lines had been cut, was three and a half hours, while the 1997 Stratford production of *Cymbeline* played for nearly three hours, even though a full thousand lines had been cut.

These figures are in striking contrast with what we gather from Shakespeare and his contemporaries about the length of performance of their plays. The prologue to *Romeo and Juliet* famously refers to "the two houres trafficque of our Stage" (1. 12). The *Two Noble Kinsmen* speaks of "two houres travell" (Prologue, l. 29) while *All is True / Henry VIII* is said to last "two short houres" (Prologue, l. 13). It may well be that the various references to two hours' playing time in Shakespeare and elsewhere correspond to no more than a convention and that no great importance must be attributed to the precise duration. Other references indeed imply that there must have been some variety: Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* speaks

of "the space of two houres and an halfe, and somewhat more."² We are on firmer ground with the following non-fictional reference. In October 1594, it was agreed between George Carey, Lord Hunsdon, the future Lord Chamberlain, patron of Shakespeare’s company and the Lord Mayor of London that "where heretofore they began not their Plaies till towards fower a clock, they will now begin at two, & haue don betwene fower and flue".³ Considering the on-going tensions between the city authorities and the players, it would be surprising if the latter could have consistently disregarded the agreement between their patron and the Mayor of London. When playing resumed in 1594 after a long period of plague, the Lord Mayor and the city authorities kept voicing objections to plays, and in 1597 it looked for some time as if Whitehall would grant the Lord Mayor’s wish to have all playhouses torn down. Also, plays were performed all year and for all we know, performances in summer were not longer than those in winter when darkness falls early over London. In a virtually unabridged Hamlet at the Globe in December, the Prince would have held up Yorick’s skull in utter darkness. References from both fictional and non-fictional sources thus converge to suggest that the length of performance, including songs, dances, and the concluding jig, did not exceed the length of three hours. In a recent survey of playing times, Andrew Gurr comes to the similar conclusion that “there was a fairly uniform amount of time for most performances, and that they lasted somewhere between two and three hours in all”.⁴ We must be wary in comparing stage practice in Shakespeare’s and in our own times. Acting styles may have been substantially different and it is possible that, in general, the lines were delivered at a higher speed than they are today. Yet, clowning and extemporizing seem to have been regular features, and the Elizabethans’ taste for pageantry as well as for songs, both taking up additional time, is reliably documented. The Australian scholar Alfred Hart estimated that the Elizabethans performed approximately 2300 lines in two hours.⁵ This would be considerably faster than modern practice. Over the last few years, the RSC provided their customers with an average of less than nine hundred lines of Shakespearean text per hour.⁶ Even assuming the delivery was substantially faster as Hart’s figures


⁶ This figure is based on my own research carried out in the library of the Shakespeare Centre in Stratford-upon-Avon on a sample of twenty-five recent productions of plays by Shakespeare.
presuppose, *Hamlet* and *Richard III* would still have taken three and a half hours to perform.

One possibility that would allow us to reconcile the length of some of Shakespeare’s play-texts with the indications about the length of performance is to argue that many of Shakespeare’s plays must have been heavily cut before being performed in the theatre. However, this suggestion is resisted by recent editors and critics alike. David Bradley, in his study *From Text to Performance in the Elizabethan Theatre*, objects that “it implies that Shakespeare’s originals were filled out with irrelevant and tawdry material which he must have composed in the sure expectation that it would be jettisoned in performance”.7 This fits badly the established image of the Chamberlain’s and King’s Men’s playwright only interested in providing his company with material for the stage. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, whose edition of the *Complete Works* of Shakespeare has been called “certainly the most innovative and daring in its editorial decisions to have appeared this century” and “the basis for much future work”,8 conservatively assume that “the full text of *Hamlet* and of *Antony and Cleopatra* could scarcely be played in under three and a half hours, and it looks as though performances varied considerably in length. It is probable that plays were cut for provincial performances”.9 Wells and Taylor, and with them many other editors, clearly assume that “the full text” was performed in the London theatres and a cut version only on tour in the provinces. Steven Urkowitz has recently spent several pages trying to show that “even a 3800-line *Hamlet* wouldn’t strain anyone’s patience”.10 If it could be shown that a length of performance of under three hours would imply that playwrights consistently wrote much more than could possibly be acted, my hypothesis would seem to stand on shaky legs. It seems therefore useful to compare the length of Shakespeare’s plays with the ones by his contemporaries.

In the 1930s, Alfred Hart carried out detailed research on the length of plays printed or known to have been acted between 1590 and 1616.11 The results show that of Shakespeare’s thirty-seven plays, eleven, nearly one in three, exceed three thousand lines. Jonson’s eleven plays written before 1616 are all longer than three

---

thousand lines. Shakespeare and Jonson being the authors who are best known and
most often studied and performed, this may give the impression that “long” plays
were the norm. Yet, this is far from true. Three-quarters of all plays exceeding
three thousand lines were written by Shakespeare and Jonson. Out of the 233
extant plays, twenty-nine are longer than three thousand lines, of which only seven
were not written by Shakespeare and Jonson. Less than one in twenty-five of the
plays written by their contemporaries exceeded this limit. Gurr’s ‘fairly uniform’
performance time does not easily square with the marked discrepancy between the
average length of plays and the length of Jonson’s and some of Shakespeare’s
plays.

We have no problems understanding why Jonson’s plays are, from the point of
view of the stage, inconveniently long. Considering himself an author rather than a
provider for the stage, he held the players in low esteem and, at times, wrote for his
readership more than for a theatre audience. The title-page of Every Man Out of
His Humour (Q1, 1600) famously points out that the text contains “more than hath
been Publickely Spoken or Acted”. If we hold that Shakespeare produced plays
solely for the theatre without any considerations for their appearance in print, the
length of his plays clearly poses a problem.

It is not implausible, I believe, that Shakespeare, like Jonson, may not have been
unmindful of the possibility that his plays would either appear in print or circulate
in manuscript “among his private friends” as his poems did, according to Francis
Meres’ Palladis Tamia. Not only the unactable length of some of his plays may
suggest that they were meant to be read. The Cambridge scholar Gabriel Harvey, in
a note which he added on a blank half-page in his copy of Speght’s edition of
Chaucer, wrote that “the younger sort takes much delight in Shakespeares Venus,
& Adonis: but his Lucrece, & his tragedie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke, haue it
in them, to please the wiser sort”. It is difficult to imagine that Harvey thinks of
Hamlet as a play he saw in the theatre rather than a text to be read, like Shake-
spere’s narrative poems. Yet, the context of Harvey’s comment makes clear that
his entry was written before the execution of the Earl of Essex in 1601, a date at
which he could have read Hamlet only in manuscript.

12 This view has been advanced by L. L. Schüicking (Zum Problem der Überlieferung des
Hamlet-Textes [Leipzig: Hirzel, 1931], p. 42) and, more recently, by Richard Dutton (“The
Birth of the Author”, in R. B. Parker and S. P. Zitner [eds.], Elizabethan Theatre: Essays in
interesting article, of which I became aware after completing mine, provides persuasive col-
lateral support to my argument. He argues that company ties rather than lack of interest kept
Shakespeare from having his plays printed and agrees that the overlength of some of Shake-
spere’s plays is evidence for his interest in a readership.

13 G. C. Moore Smith (ed.), Gabriel Harvey’s Marginalia (Stratford-upon-Avon: Shake-
In Hart's count, Shakespeare's overlong plays, in the order of diminishing length, are *Hamlet* (3762 lines), *Richard III* (3600), *Troilus and Cressida* (3329), *Coriolanus* (3279), *Cymbeline* (3264), *Othello* (3229), *King Lear* (3205), *2 Henry IV* (3180), *Henry V* (3166), *2 Henry VI* (3069), and *Antony and Cleopatra* (3016). It is notable that comedies are not among Shakespeare's long plays, unless we are willing to credit *Troilus and Cressida* or *Cymbeline* with this generic label. The four longest plays, *Hamlet* with its profound philosophical and metaphysical issues, *Richard III* with its narrative ancestors by Holinshed, Hall and More, and *Troilus and Cressida* and *Coriolanus* with their Greek and Roman subject matters would clearly be more respectable reading matter for Shakespeare's contemporaries than the comedies.

If stage abridgement was a normal feature not just of plays performed on tours in the provinces but also of those acted in the London playhouses, we might hope to find positive evidence for this practice. Webster's *Duchess of Malfi* (printed 1623) was, according to its title-page, "with diuerse things Printed, that the length of the Play would not beare in the Presentment". With close to three thousand lines, the play is among the longest written by Shakespeare's and Jonson's contemporaries, but much shorter than some of Shakespeare's plays. Also, in the Stationer's address in the Folio edition of the collected plays of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher (1647), it is stated:

> When these Comedies and Tragedies were presented on the Stage, the Actours omitted some Scenes and Passages (with the Authour's consent) as occasion led them; and when private friends desir'd a Copy, they then (and justly too) transcribed what they Acted. But now you have both All that was Acted, and all that was not [...].

The cutting of "some Scenes and Passages" implies fairly drastic abridgement. Nothing suggests that this was not the habitual practice. Significantly, Beaumont and Fletcher were Shakespeare's successors as playwrights for the King's Men and the actors referred to were the ones Shakespeare had written his plays for and who kept performing them after Shakespeare's retirement and death. Many of Shakespeare's plays are longer, some much longer than Beaumont and Fletcher's. The inference that even more scenes and passages were omitted from Shakespeare's plays seems at least plausible.

---

14 See also W. M. Blayney, "The Publication of Playbooks", in John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (eds.), *A New History of Early English Drama* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 383-422, who argues that the texts the "private friends" obtained were not fair copies of the promptbook made by the playhouse scribe or the playwright himself on behalf of the company, but performance texts written down by actors often partly or wholly from memory, in other words, the texts that served as copy for the "bad" quartos (pp. 393-94).
In the first part of this article, I have argued that several of Shakespeare's plays are too long ever to have been intended to be performed in their entirety. If we do not consider the above evidence as mere chimera, then what are the possible implications for a critic of these "long" plays? In the 1930s, when Hart was publishing his findings, their importance was relatively modest. At a time when the central aim of editing was still the best-possible recovery of a final authorial intention represented by a definitive text to be analyzed by the critics, the fact that this text was subsequently mutilated for the needs of the stage did not much alter the critics' and the editors' task. If today, however, critical attention has shifted to the plays as presented on stage, the implications of the practice of stage abridgement are considerable and would deserve to be explored in full.

Caution is required when inquiring into performances whose relationship to the actual material witnesses that have come down to us can never be more than well-informed conjecture. By its very nature, the theatre is a very unstable medium and significant changes between performances at the Globe and Blackfriars, between one year and the next, indeed between one evening and the next are possible if not probable. But all these cautions granted, an investigation of the relationship between the extant texts and what may or may not have been performed on the Elizabethan stage can give us important insights.

In the second part of this article, I will briefly look into one of Shakespeare's "long" plays, indeed the longest, *Hamlet*. I shall examine how the implications of the likely length of "Hamlet in performance" may affect our understanding of the extant early texts. As is well-known, the play is unique among Shakespeare's in having been printed in three substantive texts, the First Quarto (Q1) of 1603, the Second Quarto (Q2) of 1604, and the First Folio (F1) published in 1623. Q1 has been counted among Shakespeare's "bad quartos" ever since A. W. Pollard coined the phrase at the beginning of this century. Q2 is an authoritative text on which most modern editions are based. It is likely to have been set up from Shakespeare's autograph, whereas the Folio text appears to derive both from a playhouse transcript that has undergone some adaptation for the stage and from Q2. The Folio text includes some seventy lines which are not in Q2, but lacks over 230 lines that Q2 has. Nevertheless, the two texts are to a large extent the same. In Q1, on the other hand, various passages are transposed, nearly all lines differ at least in accidentals, most lines in essentials. Whereas Q2 is close to 3800 lines long and the Folio text only a little shorter, Q1 has less than 2200 lines.

First thought to be Shakespeare’s early draft of his later masterpiece, Q1 is now commonly regarded to be derivative.\textsuperscript{17} The theory of memorial reconstruction has been advocated, among others, by the four most recent editors of the play, Harold Jenkins (Arden, 1982), Philip Edwards (New Cambridge, 1985), Gary Taylor (\textit{Complete Works}, 1986), and G. R. Hibbard (Oxford, 1987). Detailed analyses strongly suggest that the actor playing Marcellus, possibly doubling in the role of Lucianus in the play-within-the-play, undertook the memorial reconstruction.\textsuperscript{18} His own lines are remembered with accuracy, and lines spoken when the actor is on stage are recalled in greater detail than the rest. Scenes and passages during which “Marcellus” is not on stage are often poorly recorded as the example of Hamlet’s “To be or not to be” soliloquy illustrates:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verbatim}
Hamlet To be, or not to be, I there’s the point,
To Die, to sleepe, is that all? I all:
No, to sleepe, to dreame, I mary there it goes,
For in that dreame of death, when wee awake,
And borne before an euerlasting Iudge,
From whence no passenger euer retur’nd,
The vndiscouered country, at whose sight
The happy smile, and the accursed damn’d.
But for this, the ioyfull hope of this,
Whol’d beare the scomes and flattery of the world,
Scorned by the right rich, the rich curssed of the poore?
\end{verbatim}
\end{quote}

(Hamlet, Q1 (1603), D4\textsuperscript{v})

The actor’s faulty memory alone does not account for the important difference in length between the first and the second quartos. Apart from being a memorial reconstruction of Q2, Q1 simultaneously represents a theatrical abridgement. Reading the texts side by side allows to distinguish between, on the one hand, faulty or partial recollection which often blends several lines into one and, on the other hand, deliberate excision where entire passages leave no trace amidst otherwise accurately remembered lines. Among the deliberate cuts reflecting stage abridgement are the first twenty-six lines of Claudius’s opening speech of the second scene (1.2.1–26),\textsuperscript{19} all but the first lines of the Pyrrhus speech (2.2.470–493), Hamlet’s “mirror up to nature” speech (3.2.16–35) and all but the first two

\textsuperscript{17} See Ian Duthie, \textit{The “Bad” Quarto of “Hamlet”} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1941).

\textsuperscript{18} “Marcellus” was first suggested as reporter by H. D. Gray (“The First Quarto of \textit{Hamlet}, Modern Language Review 10 (1915), 171–80). For a more detailed theory including the doubling of roles, see J. M. Nosworthy, “\textit{Hamlet} and the Player Who Could Not Keep Counsel”, \textit{Shakespeare Survey} 3 (1950), 74–82.

\textsuperscript{19} Line references are to Harold Jenkins’s Arden edition.
and the last four lines of the Player King's long speech (3.2.183–206). The cut passages share certain characteristics. They are neither necessary for the understanding of the plot, nor particularly stage-worthy; they are good reading material, appealing to a fairly educated readership, in short, they are "stuff to please the wiser sort", as Harvey put it. In an address to the reader, the Hamlet quarto of 1676 announces that "This play being too long to be conveniently acted, such places as might be least prejudicial to the Plot or Sense are left out upon the Stage",20 and it appears that theatrical cuts of this kind were not a Restoration invention.

Taking for granted that substantially uncut texts would have been performed in the London theatres, scholars from W. W. Greg to Harold Jenkins have argued that Q1 is "a version of the play acted by a company touring in the country".21 This topologic marginalization goes hand in hand with a more general critical and editorial marginalization and denigration of Shakespeare's so-called "bad quartos" which may have obscured their real importance. For if we take the problem of the length of Hamlet and its incompatibility with the normal length of performance in the London theatres seriously, we realize that a text of the length of the one behind Q1 rather than Q2 or the Folio text is likely to have been performed in London.

A. W. Pollard's study of the "bad quartos" entitled Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates22 exemplifies the rhetoric with which these texts have been marginalized. Once their "badness" had been established, the texts could be discarded altogether. Only recently have editors become more willing to pay attention to the "bad" texts and their bearing on stage practice. G. Blakemore Evans in his edition of Romeo and Juliet for the New Cambridge series, points out that the "bad" Q1 may "reflect cuts in the production on which the attempted reconstruction was based".23 Whereas the usefulness of "bad quarto" stage directions has now been generally recognized and is acknowledged in modern editions, the inferences some of these texts allow about what was actually performed have only started to be realized.

A compositor's error in Q2 lends further credibility to the theory that Shakespeare's manuscript was heavily cut before the play reached the stage. In F1, the Pyrrhus speech is twenty-nine lines long of which I quote the first ten:

---

1. Player. Anon he findes him,
    Striking too short at Greekes. His anticke Sword,
    Rebellious to his Arme, lyes where it falles
    Repugnant to command: vnequall match,
    Pyrrhus at Priam driues, in Rage strikes wide:
    But with the whiffe and winde of his fell Sword,
    Th'vnnerued Father fals. Then senselesse Illium,
    Seeming to feele his blow, with flaming top
    Stoopes to his Bace, and with a hideous crash
    Takes Prisoner Pyrrhus eare.

Q1 reproduces the first six lines with minor changes whereas the remaining twenty-three lines are cut.

Player. Anone he finds him striking too short at Greeks,
    His antike sword rebellious to his Arme,
    Lies where it falles, vnable to resist.
    Pyrrus at Pryam driues, but all in rage,
    Strikes wide, but with the whiffe and winde
    Of his fell sword, th'unnerued father falles.

In Q2, probably set up from Shakespeare’s autograph, the speech has the same length as in Fl. But at the exact position where the cut occurs in Q1, it omits half a line (“Then senselesse Illium”) without which the remaining sentence in Q2 fails to make sense:

Player. Anon he finds him,
    Striking too short at Greekes, his anticke sword
    Rebellious to his arme, lies where it fals,
    Repugnant to commaund; vnequall matcht,
    Pirrhus at Priam driues, in rage strikes wide,
    But with the whiffe and winde of his fell sword,
    Th'unnerued father fals:
    Seeming to feele this blowe, with flaming top
    Stoopes to his base; and with a hiddious crash
    Takes prisoner Pirrhus eare,

The most plausible explanation for this is that the compositor mistook a sign indicating the beginning of a theatrical cut for a sign of deletion.24 As some of the extant theatrical manuscripts, Shakespeare’s manuscript of Hamlet appears to have been marked for cutting.

24 See Jenkins (ed.), p. 43.
This evidence is corroborated by the only extant substantive text of *Macbeth*, printed in F1, which may well be an example of a product of stage abridgement for the London stage. It is based on a prompt-book and contrary to other plays where Jaggard may also have had access to the prompt-book (e.g. 2 Henry IV, Troilus and Cressida), no ‘long’ quarto of *Macbeth* had been printed earlier with which the Folio text could be complemented. Its length bears comparison with the one *Hamlet* Q1 attempts to record. Whereas *Hamlet*, *Othello*, and *King Lear* are all well over three thousand lines long, *Macbeth* has only just over two thousand. Nicholas Brooke, recent editor of *Macbeth* in the Oxford Shakespeare series believes “Macbeth’s brevity to be entirely a matter of its derivation from performance”.25 This means that Shakespeare may well have written a substantially longer *Macbeth* which is now lost. The implications for our understanding of the play would be far-reaching: the great artistic economy which characterizes *Macbeth* would seem to be not so much a feature of the play as of the text that has come down to us. Despite the text’s brevity, Brooke is confident that “the play as we have it is a generally sound, though not perfect, text of what was performed between about 1610 and 1620”.26 If we consider the short text of *Macbeth* as a result of stage abridgement for the London stage, it is not clear why the long *Hamlet* texts should not have been cut down to a similar length.

The abridged but textually “good” *Hamlet* which we guess behind the report in Q1 would be a different play from the one we normally study. The Prince’s delay in achieving revenge would weigh less heavily, and his tortured mind, developed in soliloquies which are typically much abridged, would be somewhat relieved. *Hamlet*, shorn of most of its long speeches and soliloquies, cut down from nearly four thousand to roughly two thousand five hundred lines, may be understood by the theatregoer as a play with very different concerns. Q2 and F1 may warrant Hazlitt’s comment that the Prince’s ruling passion is “to think, not to act” and Schlegel’s generic description “Gedankentrauerspiel”. The play as it was performed at the Globe, however, was more likely to bring into focus the play’s interest in politics and intrigue. Schlegel and the German romantics, fascinated by Shakespeare’s tragedies, considered him an author to be read rather than to be performed. They may have been right insofar as several of the versions as they have come down to us “according to the original copy” were in fact intended for the page.

Going against what seems to be the established wisdom of current critics and editors, I have argued in this article that several of Shakespeare’s plays were too long ever to be performed in their entirety on the early modern stage. Odd though

26 Ibid., p. 56.
this may seem, Shakespeare appears to have written more than he knew would be acted, especially in some of the tragedies and the histories. It may be that we should consider revising our image of Shakespeare as a playwright who was completely unmindful of his plays ever being read, either in print, or in manuscript. I have further argued that in the crucial case of Hamlet, we may have oblique access through Q1 to a version acted in the London theatres. Taking the title-pages of Q1 and Q2 straight may be all that is required to understand their origins. Q1 tries to recollect the play “[a]s it hath beene diuerse times acted by his Highnesse seruants in the Cittie of London” whereas Q2 prints the text “according to the true and perfect Coppie”, that is Shakespeare’s manuscript. Hamlet Q1 may have an importance with which it has not normally been credited. This does not mean that I argue for an egalitarian theorizing about texts as advocated by Graham Holderness and Brian Loughrey, the editors of the recent series of ‘Shakespearean Originals’, who would like to promote Hamlet Q1 as a stage-worthy text in its own right.27 Hamlet Q1 is a “bad” text, with plenty of badly versified passages, misplaced lines, and expressions distorted by faulty memory. But a detailed consideration of Hamlet Q1 side by side with Q2 can give us important clues about the practice of theatrical abridgement of Shakespeare’s long plays which, I hold, was the rule in London’s theatres rather than an exception when the players toured the provinces.

I was a groundling at the opening performance of The Two Gentlemen of Verona at the newly-risen Globe theatre in London. It was a memorable experience, notably for my legs. The Two Gentlemen of Verona is a short play. Anyone who disagrees with the conclusions of this article is invited to stand through an un-cut production of Hamlet.28

Zusammenfassung

Der Artikel untersucht die Frage, ob Shakespeare seine Stücke nur im Hinblick auf die Bühne geschrieben hat, wie gemeinhin angenommen wird, oder ob sich zumindest die langen Texte der Tragödien und Historien nicht auch an ein Lesepublikum gerichtet haben. Die Aufführungsduer in den Theatern Londons scheint einheitlich zwischen zwei und drei Stunden betragen zu haben, was schwer mit der Länge von Shakespeares Stücken zu vereinbaren ist, von denen viele bedeutend länger sind als die der meisten Zeitgenossen. Wie an Hand von Hamlet aufgezeigt wird, können hinter dem Text der ‘schlechten’ Quarto-Ausgaben somit die Konturen der gekürzten, ursprünglich aufgeführten Fassung erkennbar werden.

28 I am grateful to the Marquis de Amodio for the Berrow Scholarship at Lincoln College, Oxford which made research for this article possible.