

# VII

## Shakespeare

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

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

### 1. Editions and Textual Studies

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 2. Shakespeare in the Theatre

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