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Some thirty years after Michel Foucault taught us that authors are not born but made, Douglas Brooks has set himself the fascinating task of exploring what brought about the making of Shakespeare and contemporary dramatic authors. Investigating the territory leading from the playhouse to the printing house, Brooks convincingly argues that 'the authorship of drama in the period was shaped by emergent modes of textual production' (p. xiii). In other words, Shakespeare and his peers were made in the printing house rather than in the theatre, in St Paul's Churchyard rather than at the Globe.

Brooks's study is organized so as to illustrate 'the manifold materializing processes that constituted the passage from playhouse to printing house, that transformed acting scripts into published dramatic texts' (p. xiii). The publications to which Brooks pays close attention span from Gorboduc (1565; 2nd edn 1570), the earliest English tragedy in print, to the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio (1647), published five years after the Puritans had shut down the playhouses. The exploration of the parallels between the Norton collection of 1570, which includes the second edition of Gorboduc, and the Shakespeare Folio is particularly valuable and original. Brooks shows that as early as 1570, a publisher's address deploys much of the rhetoric with which we are familiar from Heminge and Condell's address 'To the great Variety of Readers', raising the question of how seriously either should be taken. In his chapter on Jonson, Brooks argues convincingly that the way Jonson authored the 1616 Folio edition of his Workes was far more permeated by the 'collaborative environment of the theatre and the court' (p. 131) than the modern 'idealization of [Jonson's] involvement with the publication process' (p. 130) suggests.

The dichotomy Brooks constructs between, on the one hand, Jonson, Beaumont, and Fletcher, who all wrote over-length plays 'with the expectation of a print readership' (p. 54), and, on the other hand, Shakespeare who showed a 'lack of interest in publication' (p. 58) and Heywood, who 'never admitted to purposefully publishing his plays' (p. 212), may well be too clear-cut, however. If we take seriously Peter Blayney's argument that the supply of printed playbooks often exceeded the demand, then the many manuscripts that did reach print, often Shakespeare's own foul papers, surely require explanation. As for Heywood, that we need not take too seriously his prefatory professions of lack of interest in print was convincingly argued in Evelyn May Albright's Dramatic Publication in England, 1580-1640 (London: Oxford University Press, 1927), one of the few monographs devoted to the topic of Brooks's study that is regrettably absent from the bibliography, and from Brooks's study as a whole.

Other oversights are more serious: claiming that Lodge and Greene's A Looking Glasse for London and England (1594) is 'the first extant printed drama after Gorboduc to be attributed to more than one author' (p. 37), Brooks has failed to consider Jocasta, 'by George Gascoigne, and Francis Kynvelmershe' (1573), The Misfortunes of Arthur, 'by the Gentlemen of Grayes-Inne' (1587), and Tancred and Gismund, 'by the Gentlemen of the Inner Temple' (1591/2). Even Dido, Queen of Carthage, attributed
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to Marlowe and Nashe on the 1594 title page, passes unmentioned. Commenting
on the various Pavier quartos of 1619 that were wrongly attributed to Shakespeare,
Brooks affirms that '1619 can be said to have commenced the era of Shakespeare
apocrypha' (p. 68). In fact, the first decade of the seventeenth century had seen four
non-Shakespearean plays with title pages bearing Shakespeare’s name or initials,
Thomas Lord Cromwell, ‘by W. S.’ (1602), The London Prodigal, ‘By William
Shakespeare’ (1605); The Puritan, by ‘W. S.’ (1607); and A Yorkshire Tragedy, ‘by
W. Shakespeare’ (1608). Even earlier, in 1599, William Jaggard had published The
Passionate Pilgrim, attributed to ‘W. Shakespeare’, a poetical miscellany with twenty-
one poems of which only four are attributable to Shakespeare. Brooks discusses
none of these publications even though they must have had a definite impact on the
construction of Shakespeare’s authorship.

It is Brooks’s chapter on Shakespeare that does most harm to the credibility of his
study. Brooks argues that the controversy over The First Part of Henry IV, famously
resulting in the change from ‘Oldcastle’ to ‘Falstaff’, was responsible for the
emergence of Shakespeare’s dramatic authorship. Affirming that the title page of
the first quarto of The Second Part of Henry IV features ‘the first instance of an
unambiguously authorial attribution to Shakespeare on the title page of an early
modern play’ (p. 71), Brooks believes that it is ‘extraordinarily significant’ that this
should have occurred ‘after its prequel, i Henry IV, had recently embroiled our
playwright in something of a political — and perhaps religious — scandal’ (p. 73).
Around this, Brooks forms a neat narrative according to which ‘the author-function
comes to lodge itself where previously the martyr-function served to individualize
and embody England’s national consciousness’ (p. 95). The narrative has the further
attraction of conforming to Foucault’s theory that books started having authors to
the extent that their writings could be transgressive and thus subject to punishment.
That the title page of Q1 2 Henry IV should be the first to record Shakespeare’s
dramatic authorship is so central to Brooks’s argument that he states it no fewer
than seven times (pp. 71, 73, 80, 95, 99, 103, 133). It is no less than distressing then
that Brooks has simply got his facts wrong. Even if we are ready to discount the first
extant edition of Love’s Labours Lost (1598) and the second quarto of i Henry IV (1599)
which ambiguously assert that they have been ‘Newly corrected and augmented | By W. Shakespere’ and ‘Newly corrected by W. Shake-speare’, there are still the
second and the third editions of Richard II and the second edition of Richard III, all
dated 1598, which are unambiguously ‘By William Shakespeare’. In fact, there is no
convincing evidence linking Oldcastle to the emergence of Shakespeare’s name on
the title pages of his playbooks. Early in his study, Brooks announces that what some
of the early modern playbooks record are ‘dramas of authorship’ (p. xiii). In this
instance, the drama appears to have been invented by Brooks himself. It is a pity
that factual errors end up undermining what would otherwise have been a
fascinating study of an eminently worthwhile topic.

Temperate Conquests: Spenser and the Spanish New World. By DAVID READ. Detroit, MI:
Wayne State University Press. 2000. 164 pp. $34.95.

In this intriguing study of Book II of The Faire Queene, David Read argues a thesis
that can often seem narrowly dogmatic with considerable subtlety and sophistica-
tion. The thesis, that Book II is ‘an allegorical representation of a colonial “geography”’ (p. 19), has often been argued before, most famously by Stephen
Greenblatt in a chapter on the Bower of Bliss in Renaissance Self-Fashioning. Read is