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einandersetzungen über die Zeit des Bürgerkriegs hinweg zu verfolgen. So läßt sich etwa erkennen, daß bis zum Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts die Konfessionszugehörigkeit die Haltung zur Vergangenheit bestimmt; danach scheint die Parteizugehörigkeit der wesentlichere Faktor zu werden (Mark Knights, Eve Tavor Bannett). Die Frage, wie sich ein Geschichtsbewußtsein entwickelt hat (Daniel Woolf), läßt sich anhand von mehreren Beiträgen über den Zeitraum von dreihundert Jahren verfolgen: Hier spielen zum einen die Ausdifferenzierung historiographischer Genres wie Chroniken (John N. King), politic history (Paul Seaward) oder Skandalbiographien (Bannett) eine Rolle – wobei sich Geschichtsschreibung und Fiktion mehrfach überlagern und gegenseitig konturieren (Blair Worden, Richard Dutton, Karen O’Brien) –, zum anderen konfessionelle (u. a. David Womersley, Christopher Highley, David Cressy), ständische (Ian W. Archer) und politische Affiliationen (Martin Dzelzains, Mark Knights).

Die achtzehn substantiellen Beiträge bieten auf 450 Seiten eine Fülle an Details, Material und Perspektiven zur strategischen Nutzbarmachung von Vergangenheit; dies ist das Verdienst der Sammlung wie auch ihr Problem. Im Vergleich zu den anderen hier besprochenen Publikationen, die aufgrund ihrer konzisen, eleganten Beiträge zum Weiterlesen einladen, lassen der schierre Umfang und die teils ausladende Argumentation der Aufsätze in The Uses of History eher eine gezielte Rezeption in homöopathischen Dosen anraten sein (wobei das gezielte Aufsuchen von Beiträgen durch eine fehlende Übersicht im einführenden Aufsatz erschwert wird). Dieser Eindruck mag zu einem guten Teil den spezifischen Interessen der Rezensentin geschuldet sein; er findet sich auf andere Weise aber auch bestätigt von Apologeten der frühneuzeitlichen Bühne wie Thomas Nashe und Thomas Heywood, die jeweils den Nutzen der Geschichte im Theater proklamieren – Heywood spricht von “lively and well spirited action” (An Apology for Actors) –, wo sie uns eher zu fesseln vermag als zwischen den Deckeln, wie Nash formuliert, von “worm-eaten books” (Pierce Penniless). Es ist zu hoffen, daß dem Band von Kewes ein solches Schicksal erspart bleibt; verdient hätte er es nicht.

Isabel Karremann (München)

Zur Revolution des Werkbegriffs: Textkritisches


Three of the four books under review here contribute to what Catherine Belsey has recently called “a quiet revolution in Shakespeare studies” which calls into question “the Shakespeare
most of us have come to take for granted, man of the theater, populist, indifferent to posterity and, indeed, to his own writing as art" (Shakespeare Studies 34 [2006], 170). John Jowett begins his book by addressing the current shift: "We are used to thinking of [Shakespeare] as a writer for the theatre; here, in contrast, we encounter him as an author many of whose works circulated in print during his lifetime" (pp. 8–9). Reminding us that "[b]y 1600 Shakespeare had become the most regularly published dramatist" (p. 8), he points out that "[a]s both sharer and principal dramatist, he would have been in a position of unusual influence over decisions relating to publication" (p. 9). The Companion edited by Andrew Murphy similarly points out that "[b]y 1600, Shakespeare was already a very successful writer" (p. 37), and establishes in some detail what led to his early authorial status. Sonia Massai’s important monograph disposes of the time-honoured myth that Shakespeare’s early playbooks were left to deteriorate in reprints throughout the seventeenth century, until Nicholas Rowe, “Shakespeare’s first editor”, took pity on them in 1709. Instead, she shows that Shakespeare’s dramatic texts received “conscious editorial mediation” (p. 2) from the very beginning, by a variety of agents, perhaps including Shakespeare himself, who “may indeed have decided to check” (p. 105) some of the playbooks before they received a reprint. Collectively, these books do much to heighten our awareness that Shakespeare was not only a consummate “man of the theatre” but also a dramatist with a distinguished career in print.

Murphy’s Concise Companion to Shakespeare and the Text and Jowett’s Shakespeare and Text (a “guide to its topic” according to the book jacket) simultaneously signal a shift in the status of their field. Until not too long ago, textual studies were entrusted to experts, published in specialized journals or in unread textual introductions to editions, safely quarantined from mainstream Shakespeare studies. Over the past twenty-five years, however, textual studies have become much harder to ignore. The Oxford Complete Works prints two texts of King Lear, the Norton Shakespeare even three, but Arden only one, whereas Oxford and Norton print only one Hamlet, but Arden has three, raising fundamental questions about the texts of these plays, their provenance and authority, and the editorial intervention applied to mediate the plays to modern readers. What is King Lear? What is Hamlet? Textual studies have become so important for what we think Shakespeare’s plays are, and to what kind of artist Shakespeare is perceived to be, that they have become increasingly central to Shakespeare studies as a whole.

Murphy’s Companion provides an authoritative introduction to the field, with a useful division into three main parts: “Histories of the Book”, “Theories of Editing”, and “Practicalities”. In the first part, Helen Smith places Shakespeare squarely among the publishing trade of his time, Peter Stallybrass and Roger Chartier investigate the readerly reception of Shakespeare in his own time, Thomas L. Berger surveys the early quarto editions, while Anthony James West focuses on the Folios. Part II begins with the past (Andrew Murphy on Shakespeare’s eighteenth-century editors) and ends with the future (Michael Best on digital editions). In-between Paul Werstine argues that last century’s New Bibliography (Greg, Bowers, and others) has left this century’s editors with more questions than certainties, and Leah Marcus investigates how, in the absence of textual certainties, post-modern Shakespeare editing might proceed. Part III turns to the nuts and bolts of textual scholarship: David Bevington grants us insight into the manifold decisions a Shakespeare editor has to take, and Sonia Massai demonstrates why awareness of the multiple texts of a play like King Lear matters. Neil Rhodes, finally, provides
expert guidance on how recent digital databases (Early English Books Online, Literature Online, the online English Short-Title Catalogue) can inform our understanding – and our teaching – of Shakespeare's, and other early modern, texts.

Jowett's *Shakespeare and Text* covers similar ground as Murphy's collection and adopts the same chronological structure, moving from Shakespearean origins to present-day editorial reproductions. However, its approach is more firmly anchored in the theatrical environment in which Shakespeare worked, the first two chapters being devoted to Shakespeare as not only author but also collaborator ("Sir Thomas More"; "Shakespeare as co-author") and to texts produced specifically in and for the theatre ("theatrical manuscripts", "plots and parts", "revision and adaptation"). Chapter 3, devoted to "The Material Book", shows that Jowett takes seriously his study's function as a "guide": basing himself on a single playbook, the first quarto of *Troilus and Cressida*, he surveys with exemplary clarity features of publication, presentation, and physical construction of quarto playbooks, ranging from publisher's arrangements, composition and press correction, and paratexts, to technical features such as typography, catchword, signature, the sheet, and the quire. Turning to the First Folio, Chapter 4 constitutes well-charted territory, but it concludes with a particularly fine section devoted to how the makeup of the First Folio has skewed the reception of Shakespeare for centuries, foregrounding the dramatist at the expense of the poet, the solitary author at the expense of the collaborator, and so on (pp. 86–92). Chapter 5 is devoted to the texts contained in the books addressed in the two preceding chapters, their origins and makeup (authorial and theatrical texts, "bad" and "good" quartos). It is in this chapter in particular that Jowett positions himself as a descendent of the New Bibliography, in the wake of W. W. Greg, Fredson Bowers, and Ernst Honigmann, whose "persuasive textual scholarship" (p. 109) is praised, whereas Jowett repeatedly parts company with Paul Werstine (e.g. pp. 12, 42, 97, 101–104). The remaining chapters, 6 to 8, address the modern editorial reproduction of Shakespeare texts, in particular questions of emendation and modernization (Chapter 6), versification and stage directions (Chapter 7), and design (layout, parallel-text editions) and medium (electronic editions) in Chapter 8. The discussion of editorial operations is somewhat selective (addressing stage directions but not speech headings, the modernization of spelling but not punctuation), yet it is endowed with a sure sense of editorial responsibility, demonstrating how readers have much to benefit from well-informed editorial intervention. An appendix presenting a useful bibliographical survey of "Shakespeare in Early Editions and Manuscripts" and a "Glossary of Key Terms", from "accidentals" to "watermarks", contribute to making this a thoroughly useful guide to Shakespearean textual studies.

Whereas Jowett and Murphy's books survey a large scholarly field, Massai's concentrates on a small part of it but in doing so breaks new ground. That the history of Shakespeare's texts in the seventeenth century constitutes "a process of progressive textual degeneration" (p. 180) has long been uncritically accepted, a contention in line with the now exploded myth, propagated by Bowers among others, that "plays were not regarded as 'literature' but as relatively ephemeral entertainment reading" (Fredson Bowers, "The Publication of English Renaissance Plays", in Fredson Bowers [ed.], *Elizabethan Dramatists*, 1987, p. 414). As Massai shows, substantial care went into the preparation of dramatic copy. Title-page announcements according to which a text has been "Newly corrected" are thus more than publishers' puffs, and the traditional
distinction between seventeenth-century ‘derivative reprints’ and eighteenth-century ‘editions’ is in need of revision.

Massai argues her case by first analyzing the external evidence for careful annotation of dramatic copy, demonstrating that “annotation of the printer’s copy for the press was widely recognized as a desirable practice” (p. 4). The case is substantiated in the course of her study by various editions which Massai shows to have been set up from printed copy which had been carefully annotated by a reader, including the third quartos of *1 Henry IV* (1599) and *Richard III* (1602) (pp. 10–11), the second (1593) and the third quartos (1597) of *Tamburlaine* (pp. 84–87), the second quarto of *Richard II* (1598) (pp. 93–95), the First Folio editions of *Romeo and Juliet* (pp. 140–144), *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (pp. 144–149), *1 Henry IV* (pp. 153–155) and *Much Ado about Nothing* (pp. 156–58), and the third and fourth quartos of *Romeo and Juliet* (pp. 174–179). On several occasions, Massai’s analysis reveals that editors were responsible for changes which earlier scholars had attributed to someone else: the changes in Q2 *Tamburlaine* had been attributed to the author, those in Q2 *Richard II* to the compositor, and those in various First Folio texts to playhouse personnel. By means of her own analysis and the refinement of that of earlier scholars, Massai manages to do nothing less than identify a new category of (usually non-authorial) textual agents in early modern playbooks: annotating and correcting readers, who were “often publishers or professional writers and gentlemen readers who supplied annotated copies to them” (p. 196).

The argument about “Shakespeare and the rise of the editor” is at the heart of Massai’s study, but the scope of her study is in fact broader than the title suggests: two early chapters investigate the rise of printed drama before Shakespeare, focussing on John and William Rastell on the one hand and Richard Jones on the other, who were instrumental in creating a market for respectively English interludes at the beginning of the sixteenth century and English commercial drama towards the end of the sixteenth century. Chapter 3 argues that Andrew Wise, publisher of several Shakespeare plays around the turn of the seventeenth century, may have had an even closer connection to Shakespeare than has hitherto been supposed. Chapter 4 includes a new account of the genesis of the so-called “Pavier quartos” (the abortive collection of ten Shakespearean or pseudo-Shakespearean playbooks of 1619), arguing that Pavier decided to publish the playbooks separately as a marketing device in order to whet customers’ appetite for the First Folio which reached publication four years later. Chapter 5 takes to task the editors of the influential Oxford Complete Works (1986) for their illusory attempt at recovering the play “as it was performed” when the extant evidence in fact allows no such thing. Chapter 6, finally, anatomizes the extent of the editorial work going into the Fourth Folio edition of 1685, with Henry Herringman and Nahum Tate emerging as two key agents, illustrating once more how misleading it is to hold that the editing of Shakespeare did not begin until Rowe in 1709.

Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern’s Shakespeare in Parts is also interested in early Shakespearean texts, but whereas Massai’s study is devoted to seventeenth-century editions, theirs, more unusually, deals with texts that are lost: the “parts”, meaning the papers, usually made into rolls, that contained the speeches actors had to learn by heart. As is well-known, early modern actors did not have access to the full script but only to what each one of them was to perform. A single part survives from Shakespeare’s time, that of “Orlando” in Robert Greene’s *Orlando Furioso*, but given that companies acted in as many as forty different plays per year –
Palfrey and Stern mention that the Lord Admiral’s Men performed thirty-eight plays in their 1594-5 season, of which twenty-one were new (p. 76) – thousands of parts must have existed. In the short-lived theatrical industry of the time, with a new play every fortnight, usually only one group rehearsal, and no guarantee of any performances beyond the first, the actor’s part, Palfrey and Stern argue, was “the indispensable unit of learning, practising, and performing” (p. 72).

Their capacious study, totalling more than 500 pages, is divided into four sections. The first one may be the most enduring, the fullest history of the part ever published. Since Shakespeare in Parts comes more than seventy years after E. K. Chambers’s Elizabethan Stage (1930) and W. W. Greg’s Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Stage (1931), one might assume that what evidence there is has been unearthed and interpreted, but Palfrey and Stern, who “draw upon several hundred ‘new’ sources” (p. 9), add much to earlier scholarship. Ranging widely in time and space, their history shows that even though few parts have survived from early modern Britain, many more do so from later periods, or from the Continent, parts whose make-up is remarkably similar to that of “Orlando” and thus allow important insights into the workings of parts.

What underlies the remainder of the book is that parts — “never considered interpretatively until now” (p. 2) – deserve to be analyzed not only as historical documents but also for how they impact dramatic composition and performance. Sections II and III are devoted to a particular feature of theatrical parts: the cues, usually consisting of the one, two or three words with which the preceding speech ends, written into the part, to the right of the actor’s text, preceded by a long horizontal stroke, or ‘tail’. Since cues constitute the only glimpse the actor has of the play beyond his own words, they interact in complex ways, Palfrey and Stern argue in Section II, with the actor in his attempt to make sense of the play, giving and withholding information, serving as “a fundamental tool of Shakespearean characterization, as well as a vehicle and epitome of the dynamic ‘dramatic moment’” (p. 94).

Section III addresses “Repeated Cues”, meaning cue-phrases that are “said more than once within a short space of time,” which may lead the cued actor to “interrupt or talk over another speaker” (p. 157), in order to produce effects that were “meticulously orchestrated and gradually refined by Shakespeare: first to produce specific, foreseen responses in his actors, and from this to produce very particular expressive or thematic results” (p. 78). To give a simple example, when Richard III famously shouts, “A horse, a horse, a kingdom for a horse”, “a horse” is a cue that is twice repeated, whose effect, Palfrey and Stern comment, “is to open up the possibility for interruption and cross-purposes. As he does quite often, Shakespeare uses the repeated cue in part to orchestrate the chaos of battle” (p. 185). Producing similar dramatic effects is a staple of Shakespeare’s dramatic writing, Palfrey and Stern contend, but one which we have missed so far because we have failed to approach the plays from the angle of the cued parts.

The concluding section, “The Actor with his Part”, examines how Shakespeare’s theatrical parts embed prompts for action. These prompts take the form of enacted emotion, highlighted words or pronunciation, or dramatic action – prompts which Shakespeare is argued to have encoded through a variety of signs, including stylistic signs such as “short lines, complete and incomplete pentameters, and shifts between prose, blank verse, and rhyme” (p. 328). The book
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concludes with a series of case studies (pp. 390–494) devoted to “five romantic heroines” (Portia, Rosalind, Olivia, Helena in *All's Well*, and Isabella) and “three lonely men” (Mercutio, Shylock, and Macbeth), in which Palfrey and Stern analyze in detail “the ‘linear’ unfolding of [...] the part-based techniques” (p. 392). A successful collaboration between two leading Shakespeare scholars about Shakespeare's successful collaboration with his actors, this innovative study presents the fullest case imaginable for the argument that writing in and for parts shaped the way in which Shakespeare composed his plays.

Lukas Erne (Genève)


Editions of Shakespeare proliferate. In the past decade there have been at least ten ‘new’ ones from major publishers. Why? No archive of manuscripts has been uncovered and no discoveries of unknown quartos in the attics of country houses have come to light. It is true that many scholars are increasingly inclined to view more of *Edward III* as by Shakespeare than previous generations were, but few recent editions, including *The RSC Shakespeare*, include it.

There has, though, been a gradual sea change among Shakespearean editors – notably since Stanley Wells’ and Gary Taylor’s 1986 Oxford edition – to recognise that Shakespeare’s plays exist in different versions. It is now largely accepted that Shakespeare revised plays throughout his career. So where previous editorial practice worked mainly on an attempt to reconstruct some form of single idealised authorial version – one that was often imagined as leaping complete from Shakespeare’s mind, but which had been corrupted through careless publication – it is now deemed that there is no definitive single edition of those plays that exist in at least two versions. So in one sense, Shakespeare is growing, though, of course, in the case of about half the plays there is only the First Folio as an early text, and other versions, if they existed, are lost. Additionally, editors now generally acknowledge that Renaissance drama was frequently the result of collaboration, both among various authors when plays were first devised and subsequently by acting companies who paid for older plays to be revised to fit current performance needs. This understanding about collaboration now raises the possibility of locating some Shakespeare in plays such as *Arden of Faversham* and increasingly involves editors in all types of ingenious exercises to identify Shakespeare’s contributions. And it has not only been a matter of Shakespeare expanding; he has been slimming in parts, too. The new Oxford edition of Thomas Middleton (2007) assigns parts of *Macbeth* and *Measure for Measure* to its man; while Brian Vickers has recently argued that John Davies of Hereford is the author of the poem *A Lover’s Complaint*. Despite the huge Shakespeare editorial enterprise since the eighteenth century, his canon remains shifting, protean, and notably contested.

A look at the most recent editions of Shakespeare’s complete works, though, reveals that their plenitude emerges principally from commercial designs, rather than contending editorial endeavours, since they simply recycle old texts with new introductory materials. Even the most recent Collins *Complete Works* (1994, revised 2006) is still basically using the 1951 Alexander