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OVERVIEW

Deliberative dogs (Laurie Shannon), metonymic gardens (Mariko Ichikawa), melancholic monkeys (Drew Daniel), Utopian trees (Vin Nardizzi), sympathetic wombs (Mary Floyd-Wilson), pastry coffins (David B. Goldstein), and crows dressed up as cardinals (Martin Wiggins), plus the economics of identity (Katharine Eisaman Maus), the life of Ben Jonson (Ian Donaldson), Shakespeare’s Bible (Hannibal Hamlin), the poetics of piracy (Barbara Fuchs), mortal thoughts (Brian Cummings), five Renaissance words (Roland Greene), Shakespeare in forty languages (Shakespeare beyond English: A Global Experiment), and poetry read as it should be (Shakespeare Up Close: Reading Early Modern Texts): these are among the highlights of this year’s copia of books on English Renaissance drama. Objects, animals, and affects enliven the outer edges of our field, while religion, globalism, and legal studies continue to generate responses at once creative and considered. Although the field remains primarily historical, other orientations do make themselves heard, whether through presentist, philosophical, humanist, readerly, or cognitive efforts. Since discussions about the future of the humanities at large emphasize connectivity among epochs, I give some attention to these alternative approaches while acknowledging the field-appropriateness of historicism to the study of a period that can claim to have mainstreamed, if not invented, the lineaments of historical method and historical consciousness.

Julia Reinhard Lupton is Professor of English and Comparative Literature at the University of California, Irvine. She is the author or coauthor of four books on Shakespeare and many articles on Shakespeare, religion, and critical theory. Her most recent book is Thinking with Shakespeare: Essays on Politics and Life. She is writing a book titled “Shakespeare Dwelling.”
Although scholars continue to pursue particular themes, demonstrate the virtues of chosen methods, or treat text apart from performance, there also appears to be a resurgence of interest in the composite unity of dramatic works. Assemblage theory (in the work of Daniel) provides one way of integrating the diverse matter of drama. Cognitive approaches, whether advanced through contemporary science (Raphael Lyne) or through Renaissance mnemonics and emblems (William E. Engel), also address the simultaneously philosophical, poetic, and theatrical scene of Renaissance drama. As reviewers before me have noted, Shakespeare continues to dominate the field. Often, however, his name is used to market broader projects, providing welcome cover for other dramatists and poets. Big-tent Shakespeare defines a historical moment in which reaching broader audiences and establishing a vibrant humanities commons are growing institutional priorities. At the same time, cultivating the diversity and vitality of our scholarly legacies remains as urgent as ever.

WAGGING THE DOG: OBJECTS, ANIMALS, AND AFFECTS

Animal studies, ecocriticism, and the study of emotions as part of larger ecologies remain engines of invention in Renaissance studies, since these topics allow scholars to examine unfamiliar archives and integrate text with dramaturgy in response to current environmental and technological urgencies. Although the lead authors featured in this section, Shannon and Floyd-Wilson, are established voices, quite a few of the volumes in this category are first books (see Goldstein, Nardizzi, and Daniel), indicating the youthful momentum animating this area of inquiry.

Shannon’s much-anticipated The Accommodated Animal: Cosmopolity in Shakespearean Locales examines the self-organizing capacities and multiple jurisdictions enjoyed by creatures in pre-Cartesian Europe, especially England. Shannon rereads such topoi as man’s governance over the animals in the creation story and the organization of creaturely talents and propensities in the Great Chain of Being in terms of a “zootopian constitution” (p. 40) that engages human and nonhuman citizens in relationships of reciprocity and accountability. Shannon, the Renaissance dog’s best friend, is thus able to recover from apparently conservative scenarios of human dominion a vision of creaturely capacities that was quarantined in the rise of Cartesian dualism and only imperfectly recovered in modern animal rights movements. This big, beautiful, growling, howling book is as revelatory about lan-
guage as it is about the natural history of our animal kinships: the “curtailed” dog, the “sovereignties” of motion, and the “race” of locomotive animals invite us to encounter familiar words on all fours, our phantom tails and impotent noses newly alert to semantic climate changes. The idea of locale announced in the title is not fully delivered (this is not a book about place or environment), and her critique of Giorgio Agamben has more bark than bite, but Shannon’s focus on the citizenship protocols of the animal kingdom is as satisfying as it is unexpected.

Another significant achievement is Floyd-Wilson’s *Occult Knowledge, Science, and Gender on the Shakespearean Stage*, which both contributes to Gail Paster’s humoral renaissance by emphasizing human participation in an ecology of flux, and supplements the psycho-physiology of bile and spleen with the secret sympathies of a nature whose effects are visible but whose causes often remain hidden. These occult signatures disjoin the visible form of an individual’s humoral complexion from the undertow of attractions and repulsions that organize diverse strata of the natural and preternatural world. Floyd-Wilson’s readings of a range of Shakespearean and non-Shakespearean plays for their cultures of cunning as well as their cosmic metaphysics is at once meticulous and revelatory. Especially beautiful is her reading of the webs of sympathy that echo and rebound in the twin attractions, retentive wombs, and emotional lodestones of *Twelfth Night*. Although Floyd-Wilson prefers Renaissance sources to contemporary theorizing, the work of Jane Bennett on vibrant matter and onto-sympathy is clearly relevant to the larger terrain visited here.

In *The Melancholy Assemblage: Affect and Epistemology in the English Renaissance*, Daniel makes the kinds of vibrant connections between earlier and later theoretical regimes that Floyd-Wilson largely eschews. Daniel uses the concept of assemblage to at once reconcile and move beyond the reigning psychoanalytic and humoral dogmas concerning melancholy. Borrowed from Gilles Deleuze and Bruno Latour and leavened by avant-garde art practices, an assemblage is a mixed structure of ideas, things, postures, texts, and affects that presents a certain coherence over time but is never self-identical, its elements flying free, remixing, and attracting new items and attitudes as it shifts and regroups in response to internal contradictions, external pressures, and new communities. Daniel attends to gender variation and the crises in masculinity that occur under the sign of Saturn: Samson, Hamlet, and Antonio (in *The Merchant of Venice*) all attract what
Daniel calls “queer fear,” becoming “gender recusants” in the uneven normalizing of sexuality undertaken in England’s Protestant Renaissance. Melancholia is social networking for misanthropes, joining together its sufferers into tentative collectivities formed around repulsions as well as attractions, “affinity groups” of pain and shame. This is alert and edgy work by a major new voice in Renaissance studies.

In Wooden Os: Shakespeare’s Theatres and England’s Trees, Nardizzi shows how theaters made of wood could be called upon to “perform” as forest and woodland, thanks to the deictic gestures of actors and the plank, post, and timber construction of the theatrical spaces themselves. This intriguing and innovative book begins with the “wooden O” of the Globe and then follows the wood, first to the scene of the disassembly and reassembly of the Theatre and then to the forest economy that produced its timber in the first place. Nardizzi reads a range of plays for their conscription of the wooden architecture of the stage into the sylvan world-building of the dramas performed on its boards. This is inventive work that draws on ecocriticism, object studies, and theater history in the service of original readings of plays by Shakespeare, Thomas Kyd, and Robert Greene.

More humanist than posthumanist, Goldstein’s first book, Eating and Ethics in Shakespeare’s England, is an innovative study of commensality and conviviality in Renaissance England that subjects one of our most essential bodily and environmental interactions to ethical analysis. Emphasizing religious themes and praxes derived from both Christianity (the Eucharist) and Judaism (kashrut), Goldstein homes in on the formation of community through acts of eating in concert. Citing Mary Douglas on “food as a field of action,” Goldstein demonstrates how acts of eating are always relational, both drawing people together into cohesive groups and excluding others from the table. His focus is not on what we eat, but rather on those with whom we eat, an emphasis that resonates throughout the Renaissance as an “age of obligation” founded on ethics of hospitality, charity, and duty. Like an experienced chef, Goldstein deftly intermixes literary texts by Shakespeare and Milton with Renaissance cookbooks, works of art, and readings in philosophy, medicine, and theology.

Living with objects and animals is also at stake in John Michael Archer’s experimental and inventive Technically Alive: Shakespeare’s Sonnets. Critically reworking Martin Heidegger’s “Question concerning Technology” as well as responses to Heidegger by Agamben, Eric Santner, and others, Archer revisits such
tropes as husbandry, waste, and breeding in order to disclose their technological and biopolitical tendencies and implications. In *Androids and Intelligent Networks in Early Modern Literature and Culture: Artificial Slaves*, Kevin LaGrandeur takes a more intellectual-historical approach to artificial life in the Renaissance. A fascinating survey of real and imaginary androids from the ancient period through early modernity leads into readings of plays by Robert Greene, Christopher Marlowe, and Shakespeare. The book ends, appropriately, in the present, where today’s “servant networks” appear in the form of intelligent machines, drones, prostheses, and bots.

WHAT’S PAST IS PROLOGUE: HISTORICISM AND ITS OTHERS

Despite the energy of this new work on Renaissance environments of action, the vast majority of books published this year participate in more familiar variants of literary historicism, whether cast in the theory-open mode of New Historicism or committed to traditional forms of contextual reconstruction and literary history. Alternatives to historicism do, however, appear, whether identified as presentism, affiliated with philosophy, connected to “reading” in its deconstructive lineage, or courting the alternative empiricisms of neuroscience and evolutionary biology. Elements of both historical and present-oriented reflection enter in some way into every book published in our field; in this section, I have chosen to highlight a few works that either exemplify historicism at its best (Maus, Marianne Novy, Tom MacFaul; Emily C. Bartels and Emma Smith, eds.) or self-consciously take on the legitimacy of historicism as a method by posing alternatives (Neema Parvini; Cary DiPietro and Hugh Grady, eds.; Kevin Pask; and others). At work in this ensemble of scholarly efforts are both the evolving fronts of historicism and other modes that explicitly aim to identify or create connections between Renaissance and twenty-first century worlds.

Parvini’s *Shakespeare and Contemporary Theory: New Historicism and Cultural Materialism* provides a history and critique of modern Shakespeare criticism from A. C. Bradley and New Criticism to New Historicism, cultural materialism, and what Parvini calls “The Alliance,” which includes cultural bibliography and postcolonial studies. Parvini does not address phenomenologies of various kinds (whether historical, theological, cognitive, or theatrical); indeed, he barely acknowledges Renaissance theater and performance studies. The book ends by calling for a renewed
humanism, understood as a universal core of human nature transmitted by major works of world literature and confirmed by genetics and hormones. In support of this new biohumanist universalism, Parvini cites evolutionary critics such as Joseph Carroll and William Flesch, as well as A. D. Nuttall’s philosophical approach and Parvini’s own work on literary character. Unfortunately, this is a polemic masquerading as a textbook, complete with timelines and reading questions; although the argument is not without merit, I worry about the book’s use in classrooms.

Thankfully, the craft of historicism is beautifully represented in Maus’s *Being and Having in Shakespeare*, which takes a legal-historical and economic approach to the problem of property and identity in the history plays, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *King Lear*. Opposing her concertedly anthropocentric approach to the object orientation of materialist critics such as Margreta de Grazia, Julian Yates, and Jonathan Gil Harris, Maus argues that property relates persons to persons through things, according to shifting economic and legal arrangements that are fundamentally social in nature. Her lucid, concise readings of issues such as trust law in *The Merchant of Venice*, the rise of chattel in the second *Henriad*, and tax farms in *Richard II* disclose the dramatic significance of legal categories. Always remaining close to the texts, Maus’s “poetics of property” is attuned to the difference between dramatic works and the reality of daily economic transactions; unlike much historicist work, the context never overwhelms the plays, which instead are allowed to establish the terms of their own hermeneutic reckonings. Maus’s taut, original readings of the plays certainly belie Parvini’s claim that historicism is boring.

Another demonstration of historicism’s continued claims is *Christopher Marlowe in Context*, a book whose dual editorship reflects the strengths and commitments of American-style multiculturalism (Bartels) and UK historiography (Smith). This collection of thirty-three short essays by leaders in the field construes a range of possible contexts for Marlowe, including theatrical realities (Brian Walsh, Tom Rutter, Holger Schott Syme) and political and ideological frameworks (Bartels on race and nation; Patricia Cahill on warfare; Gillian Woods on religion). The title word “context” announces the historicist orientation, but yields a range of approaches, from pieces that barely touch the plays themselves (Elizabeth Hanson on the Renaissance university) to essays that home in on an issue raised by a particular play: David Clark on the queerness of *Edward II*, Thomas Cartelli on Shakespeare’s *Richard II* as a response to *Tamburlaine*, and Lars Engle on the
proto-Arminian atheism of Faust. Elizabeth Spiller occupies the middle ground between text and context in her able pivoting between Dr. Faustus and Elizabethan scenes of reading. Radical Marlowe exists beside a more normative image of the playwright: myth-buster Syme argues that Marlowe probably enjoyed little impact in a noisy and largely retrograde theatrical scene, while Paul Menzer ends the volume by asking us to read “Marlowe without Marlowe”—or at least without the romantic glamour of his death. Two lone pieces resist the periodization schemes implied by the context rubric: Chris Chism delivers a dazzling account of Marlowe’s medievalism, while Jacques Lezra, exercising his trademark lexical brilliance, uses Renaissance geography to twist the topology of context in favor of the incommensurate in Marlowe’s theatrical phenomenology. This substantial volume offers a multifaceted reconstruction of Marlowe’s world, along with several exits out of it.

Novy’s Shakespeare and Outsiders practices a gentler, more readerly historicism. Her book draws on social, economic, and political history to examine the role of excluded characters in Merchant, Twelfth Night, King Lear and The Tempest, but her theme- and character-based readings of the texts are designed to engage readers interested in what makes Shakespeare tick, not in historiographical controversies per se. Unlike a strict historicist, Novy draws on later performance traditions to test the range of interpretations afforded by the texts. Emphasizing the elasticity and variety of Shakespearean forms of belonging, Novy prefers to end her chapters with questions, not answers. An update of Leslie A. Fiedler’s ground-breaking The Stranger in Shakespeare (1972), Novy’s book deserves to enjoy a wide readership.

MacFaul’s Problem Fathers in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama does not reconstruct worlds or discourses, and is thus not “historicist” in the contextualizing sense. Because MacFaul pursues his theme, however, by reading every surviving Elizabethan and Jacobean play, his book manifests a peculiarly literary-historical ambition. The result is, among other things, a whole lot of plot summary. Since plot is one of MacFaul’s main topics, however, this wealth of narrative recitation deepens our knowledge of the sea of action possibilities in which Shakespearean drama found its bearings. Tracking the various roles that fathers play or fail to play in Renaissance drama, and the generic exchanges and mutations that occur as a result of what dad does and doesn’t do, MacFaul divides father dramas into four phases: the father who acts as a stay or restraint on action; the father of excessive
respect and identification; the father whose powers are purged or limited; and the father who cedes to new forms of authority. MacFaul provides lovely readings of Capulet, a sunset dad who asserts his authority in act IV out of a general weariness; Shylock, whose failure to bless his daughter with a simple farewell becomes a form of curse; and Lear, who, as both mother and father, experiences the death of a daughter as the end of the world.

On the presentist side, DiPietro and Grady’s co-production, *Shakespeare and the Urgency of the Now: Criticism and Theory in the Twenty-First Century*, demonstrates the benefits of approaching Shakespeare as our contemporary. Originally a pejorative description of any approach to the past that imposed its own reality, presentism was revamped as a theory-friendly response to New Historicism. One present consistently at stake in the volume is the environment, considered in terms of green economics in *As You Like It* (Charles Whitney), the performance of ecology in *The Tempest* (DiPietro), and political expedience and environmental degradation in *Richard II* (Lynne Bruckner). The most skeptical presentist in the volume is Gabriel Egan; despite his own heroic contributions to ecocriticism elsewhere, here Egan focuses on the deficits of presentist textual editing. On the performance front, W. B. Worthen examines Shakespeare’s texts as the scene of compulsory immersion into literary study for generations of young people, and he gamely takes on the “Shakespeare in American Communities” project hosted by the National Endowment of the Arts. Grady, in an excellent essay that seems only nominally presentist, argues for the emergence of the aesthetic in *Antony and Cleopatra* and *The Winter’s Tale* as that which holds the place of the sacred but asserts its own craftedness in order to measure the difference between the forms of redemption and reconciliation the plays depict and the limited capacity to achieve these ends in the world as it actually exists (then and now). In this beautiful essay, “presentism” concerns not a search for newsworthy relevance, but rather an alertness to the way in which works from the past solicit futures by which we can measure our own failures.

*Sex before Sex: Figuring the Act in Early Modern England*, edited by James M. Bromley and Will Stockton, toggles between historicism and presentism. Although the title phrase implies a movement back to a period before our modern categories of gender and sexuality came into play (sex *before* sex), the doubling of that almost-palindrome “sex” also implies phenomenological continuities laid down by our involuntary experiences of arousal. Eroticism both has a history that requires reconstruction and
plugs us into scenes across time and space. Virtuoso performances include Melissa J. Jones on “spectacular impotence,” Will Fisher on “chin-chucking,” and Bromley on “rimming the Renaissance” (anilingus). The most innovative essay, however, is Stephen Guy-Bray on vegetable love in Thomas Browne, John Donne, and Andrew Marvell, in which he tracks the intimate relationship between sex and metaphor across plant, animal, and insect kingdoms.

Daniel Juan Gil’s *Shakespeare’s Anti-Politics: Sovereign Power and the Life of the Flesh* is historicist in its emphasis on conflicts between common law and equity, but presentist in its application of modern readings of sovereignty and emergency, especially Carl Schmitt and Agamben, to Shakespearean drama. Gil argues that Shakespeare’s plays pit republican possibilities against absolutist forces in order to expose the core of unmitigated and arbitrary force at the heart of all sovereign formations, including liberal ones. Such exposure, although often brutal and horrific, can nonetheless generate emancipatory effects, by reducing persons to their being as “flesh” capable of new forms of sociality. The strength of the book lies in the clarity of Gil’s basic thesis and the consistency with which it is applied. Yet this reader hungers for some qualification of key terms such as “raw sovereign power” and a moderation of the claim that such power infects all forms of civil society.

William Kuskin’s *Recursive Origins: Writing at the Transition to Modernity* is an intriguing critique of the periodization schemes that rule literary history. Working from sixteenth-century texts by Shakespeare and Spenser back to fifteenth-century works, Kuskin argues for a “recursive” model of textuality in which new works loop back into and include past texts in their web of meaning. Like Daniel, Kuskin is interested in the assemblage-character of the textual moments he curates, which include the physical book, its printing history, and its editorial regimes. He borrows the idea of recursion from computer science and artificial intelligence, drawing modern forms of technicity into a productive circuit with earlier works of literature.

Although not exactly presentist, Pask’s *The Fairy Way of Writing: Shakespeare to Tolkien* boldly reads Shakespeare’s fairies, especially *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and *The Tempest*, as leavening agents in the “literary system” formulated in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries around the topoi of imagination, genius, and poetic license. Whereas for Samuel Taylor Coleridge, the fabulous elements in Shakespeare establish the parameters
for the willing suspension of disbelief as the mode of literary pleasure and detachment appropriate to a disenchanted world, J. R. R. Tolkien is both antimodern and anti-Shakespearean in his desire to craft immersive worlds that are at once fantastic and seamlessly compelling. Although we might disdain Tolkien’s reactionary political aesthetics, Pask notes Tolkien’s appeal to avant-gardists such as Kenneth Anger and to the counterculture of the 1960s; he also acknowledges the enormous impact of the fantasy genre, which has largely eclipsed literary fiction in bookstores and in the affections of twenty-first century readers, including our students. Better understanding the path from Shakespeare to Tolkien and the crystallizing role of fantasy in the formulation of literary, audio-visual, and erotic pleasures seems like an urgent task not only for Renaissance scholars, but for humanists more generally. Pask’s ability to tell a literary-historical story over a series of centuries is both notable and admirable in our increasingly period-bound field.

From philosopher Raymond Angelo Belliotti comes Shakespeare and Philosophy: Lust, Love and Law. Divided between The Merchant of Venice and Measure for Measure, the book evaluates the major episodes and dilemmas of each play by deploying a range of philosophical concepts, ranging from the legal (equity, contract, desert, entitlement) to the existential (nihilism, inauthenticity, moral freedom, love). Belliotti unabashedly derives a series of “lessons” from each play, which range from the obvious (“Patriarchy Dehumanizes Women,” “Sex Can Be Dangerous”) to the thought-provoking (“We Find Solace, but Not Salvation in Love”). His bibliography on matters such as the philosophy of just desert and the legal history of desuetude will be new to most readers of this journal. Although I wish he acknowledged the long discussion of Shakespeare and philosophy (where are Nuttall, Stanley Cavell, Paul Kottman, and Tzachi Zamir?), his audience is presumably other philosophers as well as a general readership interested in using drama to exercise moral and legal reasoning.

Pursuing presentism as a form of fiction, Shakespeare scholar Linda Bamber has written an intriguing collection of stories, Taking What I Like, that updates Shakespeare through a series of imaginative transpositions. The lead story, which is also the strongest, takes place in an English department populated largely by characters from Othello. Narrated by Desdemona, come back to life as department chair, the story tests the paradoxes of affirmative action. The story is alive with nice touches, such as Iago with a comb-over. The second story is set during the rehearsal
of the *Henriad* at a regional theater, told through the perspective of Claire, an actress unwillingly cast as Henry. The piece lightly weaves Claire's own father stories from the 1970s into her struggle with the director and her search for an authentic connection with Bolingbroke. Other pieces feel less tightly structured, and there is an occasional whiff of fan fiction (as when Rosalind, jilted by Orlando, wanders into *2 Henry IV* and hooks up with Hotspur). Still, this is a brave and engaging volume that tests the affinities between scholarly and creative work.

Exercising a very different, illiberal form of presentism, *Shakespeare and the Body Politic*, edited by Bernard J. Dobski and Dustin Gish, seeks to derive “political wisdom” directly from Shakespeare’s plays. Written in partial homage to Allan Bloom, these essays on the corporate metaphor emphasize the virtuous subordination of individuals to the well-being of the whole. Shakespeare’s plays, the volume editors argue, teach us that “we fulfill our most profound human aspirations by living within, and in accordance with, the limits of a higher law” (p. 4).

After reading this range of work, from the accomplished New Historicism of Maus and the comprehensive literary history of MacFaul to the vibrant time travel of Pask and the creative anachronism of DiPietro and Grady’s crew, my own conclusion is that the difference between presentism and historicism is often one of emphasis. Both the historicist and the presentist accept that historical consciousness shields us from assuming false continuities, and both accept that the meanings we find in the past are always stamped by our own values and situation. The presentist, however, places more weight on the second condition of interpretation, while the historicist makes a greater investment in the first. Higher criticism from either camp must accomplish some of both, as the best work featured in this section does. Drama in particular builds self-renewal over time into its very being as an art form, and thus invites thoughtful movement between the past and its manifold futures.

**A WORLD OF WORDS: READING AND CLOSE READING**

If history of one variety or another dominates the kinds of truth claims that many scholars seem most confident in making, reading plays carefully and inventively remains for many of us the real work, and the true reward, of critical practice. Close readers use history as a check against wild analysis, but do not lionize history as the professional knowledge base whose augmentation
authorizes what we do. Close reading is a necessary feature of many of this year’s books on drama, but a few stand out in their identification and cultivation of reading as an art.

Reading gets its close-up in Shakespeare Up Close: Reading Early Modern Texts, edited by Russ McDonald, Nicholas D. Nace, and Travis D. Williams in honor of Stephen Booth. In this lovely volume, a gathering of extraordinary exegetes share their intimate art. Brian Gibbons, Susan Wolfson, and Heather Dubrow are among those who provide tour de force readings of Shakespearean verse. The volume also addresses other poetry of the period: special pleasures include Linda Gregerson on Spenser’s temporal poetics of mutability, Norman Rabkin on the monosyllabic line in the English Renaissance sonnet tradition, and Jeff Dolven on pastoral poetry as a form of master class. Although most of the volume puts on display the special affinity between close reading and lyric form, Robert Watson thinks dramatically in his commentary on Volpone.

What’s the Worst Thing You Can Do to Shakespeare? by Richard Burt and Julian Yates takes up the question of Shakespeare’s difficulty, not in order to provide another how-to-read (or not-read) Shakespeare guide, but instead to address the very idea of Shakespeare’s unreadability as a phenomenon worth pondering, and worth valuing. The authors map the media-scape (equal parts print culture, theater industry, academic scholarship, paper mill, and pop remediation) occupied by “Shakespeare,” beginning with the First Folio conceived as media launch. No simple history of adaptation or reception, chapters on Hamlet, Romeo and Juliet, The Tempest, and the film Anonymous travel deftly among texts of Shakespeare; their recent critical reworking around problems of print and performance; works in critical theory (including media theory, political theory, and deconstruction); and film adaptations. The punster style will not delight everyone, but the issues raised here are real.

A more conventional book on reading is Michael Alexander’s Reading Shakespeare. Unlike either the Booth Festschrift or the Burt-Yates torpedo, the first celebrating academic community and the second taking aim at its insularity, this little book seeks a general readership. The book includes chapters on single plays (e.g., The Merchant of Venice) as well as groups of plays (“The Tragedies,” “Histories,” “Late Romances”), an organization that moves both generically and chronologically through the corpus. At 161 pages of text, Alexander delivers a thoughtful and compact guide alive with insights, such as the comparison of plays-within-plays
to mirrors in Renaissance paintings, which “show the subject from two angles and bring the spectator into the room” (p. 56). With Alexander as our host, that room is a good place to be.

One of the great masters of close reading in the history of modern Shakespeare criticism, Harry Berger Jr., has finally published his double interpretations of The Merchant of Venice and Othello as A Fury in the Words: Love and Embarrassment in Shakespeare’s Venice. Berger moves between interlocution (what the actors in plays are doing to each other when they speak) and intralocation (what their language reveals about themselves despite their efforts at rhetorical self-monitoring). In Berger’s microhermeneutics of action and motive, what connects the Venetian plays is not a shared geopolitical vista but rather the passive-aggressive violence of the gift (Portia’s ring, Othello’s handkerchief) and the triangles of murderous affection that hold together the play’s plots. In Berger’s virtuoso readings, Antonio, not Shylock, is Portia’s true antagonist, and Cassio, not Iago, is Othello’s real nemesis. Berger sniffs out bad faith everywhere, yielding what he himself calls a “bitter book” (p. 182); in Berger’s Venice, Desdemona and Othello lose the handkerchief together, and the callowness of Shylock’s Christian neighbors knows no limits. Yet Berger also manages moments of generosity: tempted to badger Emilia for faking the extent of her complicity, he relents: “Emilia owes me less than she owes Desdemona. Why shouldn’t she drown her silence at the end and draw as close to Desdemona as she’ll ever get?” (p. 182). In moments like these, Berger enacts the power of the gift that so many of his characters abuse with such abandon. In the process, he, like others reviewed in this section, demonstrate close reading as itself a gift, an act of mutually enriching exchange between scholar and text in a play of benefits that moves outwards to new readers.

FAITH IN DRAMA: BETWEEN RELIGION AND SECULARIZATION

The vast majority of books on Renaissance drama approach the plays in secular terms. The “religious turn,” however, has enjoyed enough impact that at least one scholar, Richard C. McCoy, himself a gifted reader of Shakespeare and the Reformation, has written a manifesto in defense of Shakespeare’s secularism, while a range of other authors continue to argue for the potency of Renaissance drama’s biblical sources and religious strains. Three major books published by Oxford this year lay out the stakes in
this ongoing discussion in the field, circled by a range of other works on religion and drama by both new and established voices. Religious belief and belief in literature intersect in key ways: around the power of images and stories, the interest in the unseen and intangible, and the investment in values and in the social and psychic processes by which values are affirmed and transmitted. Yet they also clearly diverge, the one requiring a different order of commitment than the other. Richard McCoy’s *Faith in Shakespeare* works out these different kinds of belief with great care, first by looking at how Eucharistic debates reveal sophisticated phenomenologies of belief and then at the difference between all of those religious articulations of wonder and the more tempered and skeptical forms of attention cultivated by theater. In his even-handed, broadly humanistic readings of *The Comedy of Errors*, *As You Like It*, *Othello*, and *The Winter’s Tale*, McCoy argues that “faith in Shakespeare” is “a fundamentally literary and human phenomenon” (p. 16). It is not clear, however, that his readings of the plays require the polemics of the cranky first chapter in order to deliver their insights. McCoy’s double dismissal of Sarah Beckwith, for example, ignores the delicacy and precision of the settlement between faith and art as well as between historicism and philosophy brokered by one of our field’s most original critics. Ironically some of the strongest pages of McCoy’s book are not about Shakespeare at all, but about Thomas Cranmer, a sign that exegesis continues to offer something indispensable to literary studies.

Cummings’s *Mortal Thoughts: Religion, Secularity, and Identity in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture* can be read as a rejoinder to McCoy. Laying out the history of the secularization thesis in Max Weber, Jacob Burckhardt, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Hans Blumenberg, Cummings notes that secularization’s best thinkers always couched this process not as an epochal cancelation but as an interface in which sacralization and desacralization remain twinned processes and possibilities. Like McCoy, Cummings enjoys an argument. Each chapter overturns a received idea associated with the secular narrative: the soliloquy is Augustinian, not liberal-individual; new philosophies of chance and probability belong to providential thinking, not to the rejection of predestination; Thomas More was not a proto-liberal dissident but a creative scholastic; *Othello*’s murderous work with oaths stages contemporary controversies around swearing and inquisition. Yet the overall theme of the book is not the triumph of John Calvin over Ovid, but rather the cohabitation of humanist and theologi-
cal inquiries into being in the world, especially as those explorations are taken up in art (Albrecht Dürer), theater (Shakespeare), philosophy (Michel de Montaigne), and poetry (Milton). In great art, polemic yields to phenomenology, and in great criticism, we experience “the urgency of the present” in works of the past (p. 11). Cummings most certainly succeeds in writing great criticism: his most stunning readings immerse us in the intricate workings of a simple gesture like the hand thrust into fire in John Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* or the naked body emerging from a dark door in Dürer’s enigmatic self-portrait. These and other Renaissance scenes launch a range of reflections on embodiment and mortality that belong to no single faith or anti-faith yet draw sustenance from scripture and the deep intelligence of the human responses to it, while also addressing the extraordinary acts of violence executed in religion’s name. I somehow doubt that McCoy would disagree with Cummings’s more measured representations of his own project, which “transcends the narrow division of religious and secular to suggest a more open-ended approach to the history of identity” (p. 18).

The Oxford triptych is completed by Hamlin’s substantial study, *The Bible in Shakespeare*. Hamlin does not argue for Shakespeare’s fidelity to a particular religious tradition per se. Instead, he demonstrates the centrality of what he calls “Biblical culture”—the Bible itself, but also its dissemination in liturgy, sermon, song, and visual décor—to Shakespearean drama. The first two chapters provide historical, bibliographical, and conceptual maps of his object of study, with one chapter devoted to the different translations and editions of the Bible and the spread of biblical knowledge throughout literate, oral, and visual life, and another on the mechanics of biblical allusion in Shakespeare and his contemporaries. Although few scholars will be surprised to learn that *Hamlet* and *As You Like It* borrow deeply from Genesis 1–3, most will be impressed by Hamlin’s virtuosic reading of biblical imagery in *Macbeth*. Hamlin’s apocalyptic net draws together Old and New Testament prophetic writings with medieval hell harrowings, the witch of Endor, and the Gunpowder Plot, and he ingeniously traces a stream of echoes that connect the Scottish play to *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and *The Winter’s Tale* via shared biblical topoi. Hamlin’s real passion is for the flow of allusion among the many conduits, outposts, and media of Renaissance life and letters; thus he reads husbandry, gardening, and midwifery literature for their cultivation of Edenic allusion in order to infuse the spaces of *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Winter’s*
*Tale* with a Marian tinge that is only nominally religious. Hamlin is a gifted reader of Wisdom literature and its precocious modernism, whose dust-to-dust cadences darken *Lear* as well as *Macbeth*. This is a major book that establishes new readings of individual plays as well as an approach to biblical culture that is ready to be developed freshly in other contexts.

Dante scholar Piero Boitani’s *The Gospel According to Shakespeare* takes a more belletristic approach to Shakespeare’s Bible. Whereas Hamlin excels in reconstructing the acts of translation, exegesis, and allusion that micro-cast topoi among diverse media on the English Reformation scene, Boitani is at his best when he draws unexpected biblical parallels (Pericles as Mary Magdalene, Hermione as Lazarus, Ferdinand and Miranda as Adam and Eve), and when he brings Shakespeare’s corpus into contact with Italian and European traditions. For most Shakespeare scholars, the basic arguments are already familiar (see Beckwith’s *Shakespeare and the Grammar of Forgiveness* (2011), or Hamlin on Lear and Job). This is not a work of original scholarship but rather a singular act of appreciation and testimony by a great scholar with a pan-European grasp of literary and scriptural traditions.

Woods’s first book, *Shakespeare’s Unreformed Fictions*, takes a largely historicist approach to religion and Shakespeare. Arguing for the sectarian dimensions of questions such as whether icons are idols and whether corpses can reanimate, Woods seeks out Shakespeare’s residual Catholicism in order to alert us to the doubleness of dispensations in Elizabethan and Jacobean England. Her thoughtful readings of Shakespeare are well supported by copious annotations from tracts and sermons as well as by parallel readings from a range of dramatic works from the period. Although Woods emphasizes the religious meanings of dramatic forms, she and McCoy concur that the plays ultimately espouse a form of fictional faith.

Another unexpectedly strong first book on faith in Shakespeare is Joseph Sterrett’s *The Unheard Prayer: Religious Toleration in Shakespeare’s Drama*. Prayers, Sterrett argues, are quasi-dramatic acts that use words, posture, and gesture to adjust the speaker’s mood and thoughts to audiences both divine and congregational. Acknowledging the mixture of Catholic, Protestant, and classical elements in the plays as well as the ongoing debates about Shakespeare’s own confessional commitments, Sterrett argues persuasively that Shakespearean drama yearns to reconcile sectarian differences. In passionate yet judicious prose, Sterrett illuminates the dramaturgy of prayer as both object of
controversy and equipment for living in order to tune his project to Shakespeare’s entertainment of pluralist futures.

The curse as a form of speech both issues from religious formations and can be directed against its regimes of providential justice. Drawing on speech-act theory and political theology, Björn Quiring’s *Shakespeare’s Curse: The Aporias of Ritual Exclusion in Early Modern Royal Drama* follows the actions of the curse in *Richard III*, *King John*, and *King Lear*. Originally attached to covenants as clauses encouraging compliance, the curse is a kind of script, in the software as well as the dramatic sense: a discrete, procedure-based bit of media that enables certain actions in the world. Liturgical rather than hermeneutic, instantiations of the curse in Shakespearean drama unfold in dynamic sets of circumstances with their own contingencies and consequences. Quiring demonstrates the dramatic properties of the curse, whose actions include prophecy, disinheritance, banishment, and execration.

*Religious Diversity and Early Modern English Texts: Catholic, Judaic, Feminist, and Secular Dimensions*, edited by Arthur F. Marotti and Chanita Goodblatt, appears to be the only book on religion in this year’s batch that takes up Judaism and women’s writing as further pluralizing factors in England’s landscape of uneven reform. The volume also includes secularism as a strand entangled with and dependent on scriptural cues rather than opposed to them. Most of the contributions are on poetry and prose, but the volume ends with a stunning reading of *King Lear* and secular benediction by Sanford Budick. Sounding the play for its intimate dependencies on religious resources such as the Book of Job and the liturgy of benediction, Budick argues that Immanuel Kant and Shakespeare are equally committed to respect for moral personality, which emerges *in extremis*, when reduction of the tragic hero to mere life both threatens and regenerates his or her humanity from the zero point of humiliation. Budick argues for the secular character of Shakespearean blessing (“benediction of the human by the human” [p. 347]), but his is an abounding secularism unafraid to draw strength from the existential opportunities of religious literature and practice. Budick’s linkage of religious and secular as well as Jewish and Christian forms of benediction exercised in the present time of philosophical analysis offers a salutary supplement to historical approaches to Shakespeare and religion.

*Staging the Superstitions of Early Modern Europe*, edited by Verena Theile and Andrew D. McCarthy, is a largely historicist
account of magic and witchcraft on the Renaissance stage, with considerations of the uneven character of the Reformation in Lancashire (essays by Deborah Lea and Meg F. Pearson) and an intriguing account of joint stools as symbols of status in *Macbeth* and *Arden of Faversham* (Kristina E. Caton).

What emerges from this range of works on Renaissance drama and religion is a sense of the diversity, intelligence, and dramatic affordances of religious life and thought in Tudor-Stuart England as well as the preciousness of secularism as a position wrested with great effort from punitive orthodoxies.

WORLDS ELSEWHERE: RENAISSANCE DRAMA BEYOND ENGLAND

Scholars continue to test the international dimensions of early modern drama, whether this means mapping the internal divisions of language, religion, and culture within the British Isles, exploring England’s rivalry with and debt to Spain, or tracking global responses to Shakespearean drama.

Beginning close to home, *Celtic Shakespeare: The Bard and the Borderers*, edited by Willy Maley and Rory Loughnane, takes an “archipelagic” view of greater Britain and its “rim” and “fringes.” Key here is the Celtic paradigm, a designation that convenes Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, but also Cornwall, Brittany, and even France more generally in a shared geocultural tradition. John Kerrigan’s astonishingly substantive prologue lays out the history, conceptual parameters, and critical stakes of the Celtic frame, including its successive development in the centuries after Shakespeare and the invention of Shakespeare himself as a Celtic-style “bard.” The editors reinforce the Celtic idea in their introduction, and Richard Wilson ends the volume with a Welsh farewell. The intervening essays, however, tend to emphasize one or the other group or region (Ireland in *Othello*, the Scots in the *Henriad*) or address the political unity of Great Britain without necessarily developing its Celtic dimensions (Nicholas McDowell on Milton’s Shakespeare). Nonetheless, the volume as a whole gathers up the composite character of the British Isles and the crossovers and contests holding them together in a manner not attempted in previous volumes. Special pleasures include Stewart Mottram on ruins in *Cymbeline* and Rob Doggett on the impasses of Irish cosmopolitanism in the work of Edward Dowden and William Butler Yeats.

A cluster of books concern English Renaissance drama in dialogue with Spain. Roland Greene’s beautiful and evocative *Five*
Words: Critical Semantics in the Age of Shakespeare and Cervantes delivers five multilingual word stories, beginning with “invention” and “language” and moving on to “resistance,” “blood,” and “world.” Written with the deep learning and associative sensibility of a true humanist and drawing on an astonishing range of works in order to capture the semantic explosion of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Roland Greene’s book is itself both inventive and worldly: an “exploration of human capacities” (p. 26) exercised in response to the plurality and incommensurability of the burgeoning contexts for action and knowledge in the Renaissance.

In The Poetics of Piracy: Emulating Spain in English Literature, Fuchs documents the forms of imperial, coercive, domesticating, and disavowing appropriation that characterize both Renaissance England’s Spanish translation projects and the odd denial of Spanish influence that has characterized English scholarship of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. “Piracy” concerns both the marauding activities of Elizabethan swashbucklers and acts of calculated cultural theft: Fuchs deftly establishes “the transnational dimension of intellectual piracy in an era when England turned to actual piracy as a central strategy for negotiating its imperial, military, and cultural belatedness” (p. 8). Miguel de Cervantes looms large in this book as well as Roland Greene’s: Fuchs honors Cervantes as a source for The Knight of the Burning Pestle, as a member in the problematic canon of “world literature” (great works deprived of their national origins), and as the source of the lost play Cardenio. In her two chapters on Cardenio, Fuchs argues that the focus on Shakespeare’s imagined contribution to that play has distorted the extent and vibrancy of Spain’s literary achievements, and she criticizes Gregory Doran’s 2011 RSC for its Club Med view of Spain (guitars! Flamenco! Olé!).

The Cardenio debates continue in a slew of new books devoted to Shakespeare’s most notorious “lost play,” a debate that took off with the 2009 “unadaptation” of the play by Gary Taylor in 2009 and the controversial 2010 publication of an edition of Double Falsehood for the Arden Shakespeare series. The most heated issues involve whether or not the play’s eighteenth-century editor Lewis Theobald forged a play that he claimed to have “Revised and Adapted” in 1727. A fascinating complex of interpretive and historical issues has also formed around the play, however, including the impact of Cervantes on English literary and dramatic culture, the nature of collaboration in theater during and after Shakespeare, and the development of eighteenth-century editorial practices and standards of evidence in response to the trauma of
forgery. All of these issues (and more) are addressed in *The Quest for “Cardenio”: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, edited by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor, the most substantial and comprehensive volume on the *Cardenio* affair to appear this year, or ever. In his two contributions to the volume, Taylor, using computer-aided stylometric, bibliographical, and documentary evidence, argues for the likelihood of Shakespeare’s partial authorship along with that of John Fletcher. In the same volume, Tiffany Stern, analyzing the role of “plots” or written scenarios in the construction of play texts, mounts a vigorous skeptical counterargument. Other contributors address the literary construction, performance history, and Spanish origins of the play. Roger Chartier’s “*Cardenio* between Cervantes and Shakespeare: *The Story of a Lost Play*, translated by Janet Lloyd, provides a more pan-European view of *Cardenio’s* fortunes, with chapters on the French and Spanish stages as well as English theater and publishing. Although Chartier supports Taylor’s view (and that of Brean Hammond, editor of the Arden *Double Falsehood*) that Theobald was likely adapting a text authored by Shakespeare and Fletcher, his larger interest lies in the shifting senses of the literary disclosed by this work’s vexed history. Doran’s *Shakespeare’s Lost Play: In Search of “Cardenio,”* provides a director’s view of the text, which he adapted for performance with Antonio Álamo in the RSC production critiqued by Fuchs. The script, photographs, and historical research associated with Taylor’s own adaptation and production are collected in *The Creation and Re-Creation of “Cardenio”: Performing Shakespeare, Transforming Cervantes*, edited by Terri Bourus and Taylor.

In his first book, *The Tears of Sovereignty: Perspectives of Power in Renaissance Drama*, Philip Lorenz addresses Spain through inventive political-theological readings of the Jesuit theologian Francisco Suárez and Lope de Vega’s *Life Is a Dream*. The emphasis on Suárez is fresh and urgent, inviting us to think the Catholic question in a Counter-Reformation and Baroque rather than medieval/archaic frame, and to do so through a substantial, fascinating, and under-examined body of texts. The case of Suárez (his texts, his notoriety, his originality), as well as Lorenz’s facility with a wide range of texts in Spanish philosophy and philology, including Baroque dictionaries and emblem books, establishes the English-Spanish connection at the conceptual level rather than as a matter of context or world view. In these intriguing readings, Lorenz constructs and deploys a Spanish-English-German triangle to supplement Shakespeare’s normative Protestantism with scholastic, Tridentine, and Jewish counter-
narratives of modernity, the latter entering by way of Benjamin and the messianic theme of anticipatory action.

_The Spanish Bawd_, a 1631 translation of _La Celestina_ by James Mabbe, “the first English Hispanist” (p. 7), has been edited by José María Pérez Fernández, whose introduction addresses the web of Spanish and English as well as French and Italian exchanges that lie behind this intriguing work.

Leaving Spain for broader vistas, _Shakespeare beyond English: A Global Experiment_, edited by Susan Bennett and Christie Carson, documents and analyzes the 2012 Globe to Globe Festival that accompanied the London Olympics. An extraordinary feat of both brand management and stage management, the event brought thirty-eight different theater companies to London’s Globe for productions of thirty-seven plays plus _Venus and Adonis_, all performed in the languages of the visiting groups. The anthology includes essays on every single production, written by academics (including Michael Dobson and Randall Martin) as well as theater people (including Harriet Walter, Janet Suzman, and Samuel West). Responses range from Elizabeth Schafer’s ode to the “un-queering” of _Twelfth Night_ in the unrepentantly Bollywood production by the Company Theatre of Mumbai to Kim Solga’s self-styled “cynical” critique of the neoliberal packaging of the much-hyped South Sudan Theatre Company’s rendition of _Cymbeline_. Aimed at multilingual residents of London, the Globe program was as much about the languages and communities of London as it was about Shakespeare’s global reach, and the organizers are rightly proud that eighty percent of the ticket holders were first-time visitors to the theater. This book is a fascinating testament to those place-making and world-acknowledging efforts.

Another significant achievement is Mark Thornton Burnett’s _Shakespeare and World Cinema_. The book is divided into sections devoted to global auteurship, regional responsiveness, and case studies of two plays that have attracted transnational adaptation (_Macbeth_ and _Romeo and Juliet_). This conceptual layout allows Burnett to survey a rich and fast-growing body of work while employing a range of interpretive techniques that reveal different aspects of his subject. In reading after insightful reading, Burnett shows how world cinema self-consciously stages its own acts of adaptation, responding to Shakespeare as a “stimulus to action and an agent of cohesion” on diverse geopolitical terrains and from within distinct performance traditions (p. 221).

_Early Modern Encounters with the Islamic East_, edited by Sabine Schütting, Sabine Lucia Müller, and Ralf Hertel, is no simple thematic study of foreigners on stage. Instead, this historically
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focused volume analyzes recorded ambassadorial encounters as “situated performances” and “strategic improvisation” (pp. 5–6). Other essays study the role of props and costumes on stage, in works of visual art, and as agents of diplomacy. Genuinely international as well as interdisciplinary in its scope, this volume does not feature the ubiquitous Shakespeare at all; instead, drama enters the scene in the form of an essay by Hertel on The Travels of the Three English Brothers and a piece by Clemens Risi on Claudio Monteverdi’s Combattimento di Tancredi e Clarinda. Claudia Breger ends the volume with an intriguing essay on post-9/11 performances of Elfriede Jelinek’s Bambiland and The Persians.

Thanks to Cardenio, Spain looms large in this year’s global Renaissance, but continued urgencies in the Middle East, the cultivation of Great Britain’s own archipelagic diversity, and the variety of world responses to Shakespeare on stage and screen refer English Renaissance drama to its neighbors, rivals, post-colonies, and fellow travelers.

THE PLAY’S THE THING: ACTORS, STAGE SPACE, AND THEATER HISTORY

The richness of recent archaeological finds, the advancing sophistication of theater history, the digitalization of play texts, and the ongoing public interest in drama as an immersive temporal experience in a unique environment animate this year’s crop of works devoted to stage practice.

In The Shakespearean Stage Space, Ichikawa draws on stage directions from a huge range of Renaissance dramas in order to demonstrate the elasticity of Renaissance stage space, stretched “above, below, beyond and behind the stage” (p. 26) through the concentrated use of sound and gesture. Ichikawa argues, for example, that the presence of a garden on stage could be announced simply by having an actor enter “walking up and down,” as if tracing the paths and allies of a planted plot. In another chapter, she suggests that closed doors usually signified fictional doors, while open stage doors were neutral, capable of belonging to an outdoor space or to an edifice. Ichikawa’s emphasis on details such as these unfolds her larger claims that London actors exercised their art in a schematic and largely undecorated stage architecture whose flatlands, doors, and galleries were brought to life by word and gesture. This is meticulous and beautiful work that praises minimalism by practicing it.
The physical and geographical spaces of the London stage are detailed by Julian Bowsher in *Shakespeare’s London Theatreland: Archaeology, History, and Drama*. Bowsher describes the physical layouts of thirty-eight different playing spaces used in London between 1567 and 1642, including inns and bear gardens as well as the more familiar public playhouses, private theaters, and Court venues. The emphasis is by no means purely archaeological, although the Theatre, the Rose, and the Globe, all the subjects of recent digs, receive special attention. The book ends with a series of “walks” through eight different districts where playing took place. Bowsher’s comprehensive topographical and architectural survey, illustrated with a range of images both familiar and new, is aimed at general readers, travelers, and museum goers.

*The Routledge Companion to Actors’ Shakespeare*, edited by John Russell Brown, assembles twenty critics to address the work of twenty living Shakespeare actors, from Mariah Gale (the youngest featured artist) to Ian McKellen (the most senior). The best of these essays (Carol Rutter on Simon Russell Beale; Jeremy Lopez on John Harrell; Peter Holland on McKellen) use their encounters with these actors to extend our appreciation of Shakespearean acting as a nest of skills, comportments, and commitments sheltered and sustained by the plays and the institutions devoted to them. The collection as a whole is revelatory in its accounts of how these artists work with verse (Paul Edmondson on Harriet Walter), navigate different stage spaces (Kevin Ewert on Colm Feore), and engage their acculturated selves (the Irishness of Sinead Cusack, the blackness of Adrian Lester, the Jewishness of Greg Hicks). In these deftly managed essays, the voices, styles, and theatrical intelligence of the actors animate each essay with the charisma of intimacy while delivering real insight into the meaning and momentum of individual lines and scenes.

*Performing Early Modern Drama Today*, edited by Pascale Aebischer and Kathryn Prince addresses the academic, institutional, and theatrical factors contributing to the performance of plays by Shakespeare’s contemporaries in the last few decades. Although the editors’ introduction emphasizes experimental, sensationalist, and immersive approaches to “Jacobethan” drama, the main chapters focus on the canon-building, history-sensitive work of three established theaters with commitments to classical drama. Farah Karim-Cooper provides an insider’s view of the Globe Theatre, especially Globe Education, which she runs; whereas the commercial wing to the Globe brand is focused almost exclusively on the Bard, the academic and pedagogic sectors at the Globe
promote a broader picture, especially through staged readings of non-Shakespearean drama. Coen Heijes provides a history of the RSC’s engagement with drama by Shakespeare’s contemporaries, including the rise and fall of The Other Place and the Swan as spaces dedicated to this body of work. Meanwhile, Doran has championed an inclusive repertory at the RSC through themed seasons on the Gunpowder Plot and the Spanish Golden Age. Jacquelyn Bessell documents the contributions of the Blackfriars Theater in Staunton, Virginia, while Lopez argues for the crucial role of student performances in animating the non-Shakespearean archive. What emerges in all of the essays is the vibrancy but also the precariousness of works from this period, which both gain prestige and suffer eclipse by their association with their famous contemporary.

Wiggins’s *Drama and the Transfer of Power in Renaissance England* is smaller than the title might imply, both in pages (151) and scope: the book consists of a series of performance case studies culled from moments of transition in the English state, with chapters focusing on 1535, 1559, 1603, 1626, and 1642. The book might feel small, too, in its nose-on-the-ground archivalism, which tracks both closely and cautiously the relationship between Court performance and Court politics. Yet the book is expansive in its implications. Defining drama to include masques and entertainments of all kinds, Wiggins, not without a sense of humor, announces as “the first work of Jacobean drama” a speech made by a woodsman to the King on progress and briefly mentioned in a print report of James’s entertainment from Edinburgh to London in 1603 (p. 46). Wiggins’s exacting reconstructions of the political context and epistemological status of these and other courtly performances correct the field’s bias toward both Shakespeare and the public theater while asking us to rethink drama as a category.

In *Music and Gender in English Renaissance Drama*, Katrine K. Wong takes a dramaturgical orientation toward music in Renaissance drama. She addresses the material conditions of stage music, such as the availability of strong singers and the effects of music “within” on the unfolding of plots. Wong emphasizes the role that music plays in knitting together the action of plays. This is a highly commendable first book by a promising young scholar well-versed in both Renaissance drama and music.

Manchester’s Shakespeare in Performance series has issued a second edition of their volume on *Titus Andronicus*, by Michael D. Friedman with Alan Dessen. More than simply a history of performance, the book uses recurrent challenges in the play’s staging,
such as inconvenient laughter, unwieldy rhetorical speeches, and awkward or excessive actions, in order to disclose the nature of motive and meaning in the play’s force fields, considered both historically and in the renewable frame of performance. Cuts and adaptations are taken not as signs of betrayal or accommodation, but as keys to better understanding and evaluating Shakespeare’s bloodiest play.

Things get practical in *Rhythm and Meaning in Shakespeare: A Guide for Readers and Actors*, in which prosody specialist Peter Groves discloses the intimacies between meter and meaning in a wealth of examples from the plays and sonnets, plus lines of blank verse overheard in everyday speech (my favorite: “I've never farted in a crowded lift.”) Although actors and acting instructors may be the main beneficiaries, anyone who teaches Shakespeare or simply enjoys sounding off will benefit from this deft little book.

The books featured in this section focus exclusively on issues of acting, staging, and theater architecture. Yet what is perhaps most exciting about this year’s publishing record taken en masse is the extent to which literary critics are increasingly integrating performance history directly into interpretive and editorial projects. Although many guides still stick performance traditions at the end of period-based projects, other books and essays approach performance as a legitimate key to interpretation that belongs to drama as part of its ontology. (See Holland’s edition of *Coriolanus*, or the fine essay by Janice Valls-Russell on erotic mythology and theatrical space in *Romeo and Juliet*, both discussed later in this review.) Such work, attending to drama’s self-renewal as a feature integral to rather than added onto its mode of being, cultivates a kind of presentism native to drama as a medium. This may be the most resilient, because the most necessary, presentism of all.

**NEIGHBORS, RIVALS, AND COLLABORATORS:**
**SHAKESPEARE’S CONTEMPORARIES**

Ben Jonson and Marlowe remain Shakespeare’s main contemporaries, but the diversity of English drama is celebrated in works that take on the persistence of medieval drama into the sixteenth century (*The Chester Cycle*, edited by Jessica Dell, David Klausner, and Helen Ostovich), the sheer quantity and range of theatrical work before 1589 (Wiggins), and the quality of theatrical work beyond Shakespeare in Tudor and Stuart drama (Ton Hoenselaars’ *Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Contemporary Dramatists*).
The major event of the year in the “non-Shakespearean drama” category is surely the publication of Donaldson’s *Ben Jonson: A Life*. At 500+ pages, this comprehensive study tells the story of Jonson’s well-documented and colorful life in a lively style that should engage readers from a range of backgrounds while also addressing major scholarly debates. Donaldson argues, for example, that Inigo Jones’s and Jonson’s artistic philosophies were more harmonious than many scholars have contended, and that they enjoyed an active and successful collaboration for over twenty years. Similarly, Donaldson downplays differences between Shakespeare and Jonson, noting instead that both sought advancement and that Jonson actually achieved a more spectacular social ascent than his contemporary. Donaldson asserts Jonson’s associations with the Essex circle, including “many expectant Catholic followers” (p. 149). The book attests to the plurality of Jonson’s poetic community, which reflected the divisions within Jonson himself, as royal subject, recusant, satirist, and entertainer, and as a writer of masques and poems as well as plays. Although the emphasis is on the life, Donaldson frequently comments on passages from Jonson’s writing in order to sample the shifting intensities of his subject’s theatrical commitments and ambivalences. To say that this book is a major achievement is an understatement; coupled with the publication of *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson* in 2012 (edited by Donaldson, David Bevington, Martin Butler, and a team of other editors), Jonson’s life and works have been delivered to us anew, in all their variety, brilliance, and spunk.

Equally formidable is *British Drama, 1533–1642: A Catalogue*, written by Wiggins in association with Catherine Richardson. Volume One (1533–1566) appeared in 2012; Volume Two covers 1567–1589. The project aims to document every play composed by English, Welsh, Irish, and Scottish authors in the early modern period. The latest volume witnesses the birth of the London public theaters and will be of immense and immediate interest to any scholar interested in the bibliographical and cultural geography of drama in the period just before Shakespeare. Entries include all titles associated with the work, authorship if known, evidence for the play’s existence (such as Revels accounts, manuscript or print copies, or references in other texts), sound and staging information, date of composition, plot summary, setting for the original production plus subsequent stage history, *dramatis personae*, setting, prop lists, animal actors, costumes, sources, and production costs. The 839 entries include biblical dramas,
masques, tilts, dialogues, and other entertainments as well as plays in the usual sense. We get tantalizing glimpses of works such as *Beauty and Housewifery*, a comedy performed by Lord Hundsdon’s Men at Windsor Castle in 1582, or *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, a historical drama based on Josephus staged by the Guilds of Coventry in 1584, or *Satire at Galway* (‘possibly a play’), set in Ireland and performed in an abbey chancel in Galway in 1589. The catalog is a fascinating document of the magnitude and multiplicity of theatrical work in the early Elizabethan period and an extraordinary scholarly enterprise that will forever alter our picture of what theater was.

*The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Contemporary Dramatists*, edited by Hoenselaars, provides succinct and informative chapters on drama before, around, and after Shakespeare. The volume begins with John Lyly and the University Wits, presented by Arthur F. Kinney in a compact and thoughtful account that considers Lyly’s foundational contributions to the development of English style and humanism and to the generic potentialities of Elizabethan drama. Jean E. Howard provides a compelling overview of Thomas Heywood as “playwright of the passions.” Heather Hirschfeld delivers a compelling account of the drama of Richard Brome, Jonson’s man and a dramatist whose work for the Court enabled rather than compromised his commitment to the legacy of the public theater. Some of the essays mention Shakespeare in passing; others focus more systematically on rivalries and collaborations. Wilson, in the most speculative essay of a largely cautious volume, addresses the Marlowe-Shakespeare relationship, with an especially revelatory account of the way in which *Edward II* borrows from Shakespearean models of the history play, while *Richard II* responds to Marlowe, rejecting not only the sex and sadism of Marlowe’s play but the masque aesthetic that funded Marlowe’s ambition to dissolve the difference between reality and representation. Editor Hoenselaars himself devotes a full essay to Shakespeare as collaborator, emphasizing not only joint authorship but also the creative conditions of rivalry with other playwrights, the dramatic consequences of writing for particular actors such as William Kempe and Robert Armin, and the role of the publishing industry, including scribes and censors, in shaping the texts that we study today. The collection ends with a fine piece by Schafer on non-Shakespearean drama in performance. Focusing on three plays, she champions a politically engaged, specifically feminist approach to plays in performance that synthesizes macrohistory (epochal changes in theatrical conditions
over time) and microhistory (detailed engagement with the artistic decisions and audience responses that distinguish a particular performance). She understands dramaturgy as the elastic set of changing meanings and performance possibilities tested and expanded by the record of productions over time. This book is an invaluable survey, synthesis, and revaluation of contemporary scholarship on Shakespeare’s contemporaries.

David Nicol has written a thorough and thoughtful account of coauthorship in *Middleton and Rowley: Forms of Collaboration in the Jacobean Playhouse*. Taking issue with Jeffrey Masten’s rejection of authorship as an appropriate category for sorting out collaboration in the playhouse, Nicol relies on attribution analysis to determine and evaluate the relative roles of Thomas Middleton and William Rowley in *The Changeling*, *All’s Lost by Lust*, and *Wit at Several Weapons*; Nicol also includes a chapter on Calvinism in Middleton’s tragedies and another on Rowley’s clown plots. Nicol’s main contribution is to take seriously Rowley’s writing, which has often been overshadowed by Middleton’s more august presence in scholarly treatments of these plays.

The Arden Early Modern Drama Guides (previously the Continuum Renaissance Drama series) has issued two volumes this year, one on *The Jew of Malta* edited by Robert A. Logan, and another on *The Alchemist*, edited by Erin Julian and Ostovich. Both are handy, resource-rich handbooks for instructors, students, and scholars in search of both essential information and new readings of the plays. The volume on *The Alchemist* is distinguished by muscular introductory essays by Bevington (earlier criticism), Schafer and Emma Cox (performance history), and Matthew Steggle (contemporary criticism). These pieces have a strong sense of conceptual and narrative structure: the performance essay focuses on six major productions in order to develop a range of recurrent themes and problems, while Steggle’s contribution highlights major areas of critical activity and debate in order to give us a memorable digest of the contemporary critical landscape. The four works of original criticism share concerns with place and space, especially London and Blackfriars, which receive an ecological framing under the able ministration of Bruce Boehrer. Performance constitutes another through line, pursued by Ian McAdam (on masculinity) and Julie Sanders (on female roles). Not unexpectedly, alchemy recurs as both context (Mark Houlahan) and metaphor (in, for example, paratextual contributions by the editors).
The \textit{Jew of Malta} volume begins with thorough but less sinuous discussions of “The Critical Backstory” (Bruce E. Brandt), “Performance History” (Sara Munson Deats), and “The State of the Art: Current Critical Research” (Andrew Duxfield). These service pieces are followed by four essays under the rubric “New Directions,” including ventures in theater history, bibliography, and literary criticism. Roslyn L. Knutson’s “\textit{The Jew of Malta in Repertory}” looks at the play in relationship to the commercial environment of its many productions before 1633, using the record of plays in performance as a way of assessing the marketing strategies of the emerging entertainment industry. McAdam contributes to this volume as well, here arguing that Barabas and Antonio are more modern than Shylock considered as emergent capitalists, but less successful than Shylock when it comes to embodying manliness. Kirk Melnikoff reconstructs the efforts of the early publishers Nicholas Ling and Thomas Millington to publish the play—an enterprise driven not by the profit motive alone, he argues, but also by the goal of cultivating communities of readers. Finally, M. L. Stapleton energetically tracks the birth of Marlowe’s sense of dramatic voice from his early translation of Ovid’s \textit{Amores}. Both volumes are compact, state-of-the-art contributions to understanding the plays at hand.

\textit{The Chester Cycle in Context, 1555–1575: Religion, Drama, and the Impact of Change} focuses on the final decades in which the Chester Cycle was performed, a period of uneven development in the process of reformation. Paul Whitfield White demonstrates how the plays could have appealed to a broad sector of the population, who may have been nominally Protestant but still enjoyed a “popular religion” characterized by story-driven packaging of sports, pastimes, music, and spectacle. Kurt A. Schreyer shows how the late Chester Cycle was able both to acknowledge the break between Catholic and Protestant epochs and preserve mesmerizing elements from the past, especially the splendid and beloved props (Balaam’s ass, Noah’s ark, the nativity star) that contributed far more than doctrine to the plays’ appeal. Margaret Rogerson posits affective piety as a form of medieval method acting, while Mark Faulkner connects the plays’ urbanism to earlier instances of topographical writing in Chester. The collection as a whole demonstrates the lively state of scholarship in sixteenth-century religious drama, including its connections to the more famous public theater that succeeded it.
POETIC JUSTICE: LAW AND LITERATURE

Renaissance drama bore an intimate relationship to the Inns of Court and the men who were educated and socialized there; meanwhile, court proceedings were themselves quasi-dramatic events featuring major actors, supporting players, and audiences in conflicts organized by accepted scripts and procedures. Works this year on drama and law touch on the law as practice and profession; law as body or doctrine; and law as theme or idea, in approaches that include dramaturgical, legal-historical, legal-philosophical, sociological and economic, and formal and linguistic methods and frameworks.

The major achievement in this area this year is *Shakespeare and the Law: A Conversation among Disciplines and Professions*, edited by Bradin Cormack, Martha C. Nussbaum, and Richard Strier. The volume brings together professors of law with Shakespeare scholars for a lively and often original discussion of Shakespeare’s relationship to legal practice. The Shakespeare who comes forward here is a man often suspicious of the law’s formalisms and who even elects to judge judgment itself. The authors concur, however, that a world without law is no utopia in Shakespeare’s plays. Instead Shakespeare seeks out and celebrates the forms of equity that might qualify and contextualize the law read strictly, as well as alternative forms of civility and fellowship through which human beings might resolve their conflicts and build their worlds. Highlights include Cormack on *The Winter’s Tale* and the Sonnets; Lorna Hutson on legal inquiry and evidence in *Othello*; Constance Jordan on statute law in *Measure for Measure*; Richard A. Posner on equity and commerce in *The Merchant of Venice*; Strier on justice versus friendship in *2 Henry IV*; Kathy Eden on loyalty and royalty in *King Lear*; and Nussbaum’s shamelessly liberal and fearlessly anti-Shakespearean account of anti-republicanism in *Julius Caesar*. The conference came out of a seminar taught at the University of Chicago by Nussbaum, Posner, and Strier. The introduction establishes what the book aims to do, and also what it doesn’t aim to do: it does explore the law-and-literature line of thinking associated with Posner; it doesn’t represent other schools of thought, such as the more left-leaning Critical Legal Studies approach. The volume’s goals are ultimately more normative than transformative.

Amanda Bailey’s *Of Bondage: Debt, Property, and Personhood in Early Modern England* focuses on the legal instrument of the bond, in which individuals borrowed money using their persons
as collateral. Rather than paying interest, borrowers used money *gratis*, but forfeited their bodies if they were unable to repay their debt. *Of Bondage* is thick with compelling insights, such as the idea that money was unfungible, or that property was largely considered partial (property *in*, not property *of*). Bailey’s readings of individual plays are sharp and new. For example, she claims that *The Merchant of Venice* is not about usury but about debt: the first involves transferring ownership of funds to the borrower, while the second concerns leasing property that remains with the lender. While her readings of plays by Shakespeare, Middleton, and Fletcher and Philip Massinger are major contributions to our understanding of those works, equally compelling is Bailey’s rendering of financial vocabulary, in which terms such as “pay,” “quit,” “trust,” “possessor,” “interest,” and “estate” yield unexpected semantic richness. Wielding these terms as if they were “bills” (both credit bonds and long-handled axes), Bailey greatly enhances our understanding of personhood and communal connection in the age of Shakespeare.

Jessica Dyson’s *Staging Authority in Caroline England: Prerogative, Law, and Order in Drama, 1625–1642* does not achieve the kind of wide-ranging concept renovation delivered by Bailey, but Dyson meticulously reads plays by Jonson, Brome, Massinger, John Ford, and James Shirley as commentaries on debates about royal prerogative and common law during the reign of Charles I. Each chapter lays out a particular conflict or issue (such as the Petition of Right of 1628 or competing accounts of the sources of royal authority) and then reads a suite of plays as responses to these parliamentary and jurisdictional issues. At stake in these plays, Dyson argues, is not the rule of law as such but rather conflicts between the king’s law and the common law—a debate about “the nature of kingship” rather than whether or not a king should rule England. In these discussions, the private theaters incubated a civil society in which educated gentry were able to meet and consider the politics of law.

Joseph S. Jenkins’s *Inheritance Law and Political Theology in Shakespeare and Milton: Election and Grace as Constitutional in Early Modern Literature and Beyond* is an ambitious legal and theoretical analysis of inheritance, contract, and covenant in a range of works, including *Hamlet, Macbeth, Merchant, and The Tempest*. Integrating recent philosophical work by Agamben with the longer perspective provided by John Locke and the English legal tradition, Jenkins explores the custodial metaphor of the law in St. Paul, for whom the law is a necessary but transitional
protection for a people in their “minority” (the Jews), a support that can be discarded when they enter into grace (the Christians). By emphasizing the problem of testamentary transmissions, Jenkins is able to give a specifically juridical reading of the theological elements that continue to inhere in Western concepts of sovereignty and subjectivity.

Allyna E. Ward’s *Women and Tudor Tragedy: Feminizing Counsel and Representing Gender* studies the interplay between the fact of female monarchs on the Tudor throne and the representation of female rulers as well as female counselors on the public stage. Focusing on non-Shakespearean drama, Ward helpfully places prose texts by Juan Luis Vives, Roger Ascham, and Desiderius Erasmus on women’s education and the education of princes alongside theatrical works in order to examine counsel in the plays, but also the plays as forms of counsel.

In this range of books, the historical and formal confluences between drama and law in early modernity ensure a rich field of inquiry for scholars (and lawyers) interested in the history and narrative shape of justice as well as the sociological and economic contexts and conditions of early modern legal institutions.

**PRINT WORLDS: EDITING, BOOK HISTORY, AND CULTURAL BIOGRAPHY**

Bibliographical and editorial matters are no longer the purview of the most advanced specialists alone, but have become subject for more widespread debate, thanks to the rise of cultural bibliography, advances in computer-assisted editing, and increased knowledge of and interest in the book trade as a dynamic episode in the history of mass media.

Paul Werstine’s *Early Modern Playhouse Manuscripts and the Editing of Shakespeare* aims to do nothing less than dismantle the central premise of the New Bibliography—W. W. Greg’s heuristic and almost entirely hypothetical division of printers’ texts between authorial “foul papers” and theatrical “prompt books.” Werstine poses what he calls “empirical editing” based on extensive examination of all surviving manuscripts as an alternative to Greg’s inferential methods, which derived “ideal” rather than real manuscript types from an imperfectly studied body of materials. Much of the book consists of a patient and respectful but ultimately devastating review of Greg’s scholarship over time; Werstine also provides a painstaking account of what bookkeepers did and did not do in the theaters that employed them. A lengthy appendix...
establishes the distinguishing features of nineteen surviving play text manuscripts and three annotated quartos. An introduction and a conclusion provide helpful guidance and overview for editorial tourists like myself. This iconoclastic book is sure to stimulate controversy in bibliographic circles, with implications for all of us who work in Renaissance drama.

Lukas Erne has published a second edition of his field-shaking book, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*. In 2003 Erne argued forcefully against the prevailing view of Shakespeare as primarily a “man of the theatre,” suggesting instead that Shakespeare wrote his plays with readers in mind, an argument based largely on bibliographical factors such as length of printed versions and the timing of publication. The second edition includes a lengthy preface in which Erne reviews the many scholarly responses the book generated ten years ago. Erne calls our attention to the composite phrase “literary dramatist”: he insists that he was not and is not arguing for a fully literary Shakespeare, but rather for a writer composing single works of art for two institutions whose domains were porous and indistinct.

Erne’s legacy is in evidence in *Shakespeare’s Stationers*, a collection of excursions in cultural bibliography edited by Marta Straznicky and inspired by the work of Zachary Lesser (who contributes the final piece). Douglas Bruster examines prose and poetry ratios; Melnikoff argues that printers could promote particular political goals; and Adam G. Hooks looks at the unlikely pairing of Shakespeare with psycho sermonizer Thomas Playfere on the shelves of publisher and bookseller Andrew Wise. Rather than looking at the men who printed, published, and distributed Shakespeare’s plays as either pirates or profiteers, the authors in this volume support the view that Shakespeare’s stationers are publishers in something like the modern sense: professionals interested in promoting certain kinds of works, developing audiences, cultivating taste, and offering bookshops as distinctive cultural destinations within the mediascape of London. Defining print as a “semantic field,” the authors tend to agree with Erne that print and theater represented a continuum rather than alternatives, though, like Erne, their emphasis is on the efficacy of print.

THE SHAKESPEARE INDUSTRY:
SELECTED GUIDES AND REFERENCE WORKS

This year, Shakespeare scholars have continued the work of consolidating scholarship for broader readerships and for our own
ranks. Two volumes stand out in 2013: *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare*, edited by Kinney, and *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*, edited by Claire McEachern. These two volumes recapitulate the major tensions I noted earlier in this review: between the present and the past (with historicism occupying the majority position), and between religion and secularism (with religion by no means dominating the discussion, but claiming a permanent seat at the table).

Both volumes feature strong, but somewhat different, contributions on religion. McEachern, contributing one of the four new essays to the Second Edition of the *Cambridge Companion*, provides a beautifully dialectical account of the relationship between the two key terms of her essay’s title, “Religion and Shakespearean Tragedy.” She acknowledges that Renaissance tragedy is *not* Christian insofar as it is concerned with “people who find uniquely human concerns matters worth fighting and dying for” (p. 93). This humanism itself, however, owes much of its realization to Reformation theology, with its cultivation of “experiences of enigma and scrutiny” (p. 97). In his piece for the *Oxford Handbook*, Cummings tends to see Shakespeare as rather more exposed to Catholic images and ideas than McEachern’s narrative would seem to allow. Both essays provide thoughtful, nonreductive accounts of the shaping role of religious life and thought in Shakespeare’s world, including the variety as well as the limits of religious experience as a factor in the new drama.

Both the Oxford and the Cambridge guides are largely historical; indeed, Colin Barrow begins his chapter, “What Is a Shakespearean Tragedy?” for the *Cambridge Companion* by admitting that what really interests him is not what Shakespearean tragedy is, but what Shakespearean tragedy *was* (p. 3). In the Oxford volume, historian Ian W. Archer tartly lectures to literary critics who venture into economic criticism. Nascent capitalism? Overrated. The theater a major market force? Not really. Shakespeare interested in economic explanation? Uh-uh. Despite their historical orientations, however, editors McEachern and Kinney have also made room for philosophy. The penultimate piece in the *Cambridge Companion* is Kottman’s “Why Think about Shakespearean Tragedy Today?”, also newly commissioned for the second edition. Kottman argues that the great readers of Shakespeare in the nineteenth century understood the historicity of Shakespeare, newly recovered from the normative genre rules of neoclassicism, not as an end in itself but as an invitation to consider our own historical situation as respondents to Shakespeare. Just as
the plays continually reinvent their conditions of possibility, so too, their heroes act without firm reference to “the dictates and laws of God, society, or nature,” (p. 248) while we as readers are enjoined to consider what it means to actively lead a life. In the *Oxford Handbook*, Zamir rejects any philosophical approach to Shakespeare that would seek articulated philosophical ideas in the plays; instead, he argues, in a Kottmanesque mode, that a properly philosophical criticism attends to “how the work and its close-reading informs our own autonomous engagement and interest in a particular dimension of life” (p. 638). He calls for a “reading-oriented” rather than “culture-oriented” approach attuned to new developments in moral philosophy. In the next essay, Engle argues that pragmatism maps a third way between realism and idealism, challenging essentialism while also draining the essentialist critique of some of its animus by insisting that all ideas emerge within working systems of collective habit, evaluation, and norm formation: “If language is always already in some sense broken, it is also always already in some sense fixed” (p. 642). I applaud editors McEachern and Kinney for breaking up the Elizabethan world picture with these inventive and inspiring thought experiments by Kottman, Zamir, and Engle.

Service to the field also comes in the form of two slim volumes aimed at students and the general public and written by major scholars writing from (yes) historicist perspectives. Dympna Callaghan’s *Who Was William Shakespeare?: An Introduction to the Life and Works* operates from the premise that understanding what Shakespeare shared with his world is more valuable and less mystified than trying to establish his singularity. The book begins with a series of short essays on the basic coordinates of Shakespeare’s productive life: “Writing,” “Religion,” “Status,” and “Theater.” She then provides brief readings of twenty-four plays, organized generically but also chronologically: each introduction includes a historical context of one sort or another (breast feeding, witchcraft, baby naming) as well as topical and biographical connections (Queen Anne as Hermione, Shakespeare as husband and father). Although the main gambit is that understanding the period will enhance appreciation of the plays, Callaghan also invites the plays to pose more perennial questions concerning desire, identity, power, and moral choice. She also provides plot summaries and some textual and performance history. *Thirty Great Myths about Shakespeare* by Laurie Maguire and Smith styles itself as a myth-busting book, but in fact tests a range of truisms about Shakespeare in order to evaluate the state of the
argument on issues ranging from whether Shakespeare wrote his plays (yes) to whether he would be a Hollywood writer were he living today (probably) to whether his marriage was hell (probably not, but we will never know). By refusing to provide the closure that the myth-busting genre promises, Maguire and Smith argue by example for the virtue of the open mind.

Less inventive than the volumes by Callaghan and Maguire and Smith but more comprehensive in its scope is Helen Hackett’s *A Short History of English Renaissance Drama*, which includes chapters on Marlowe, Shakespeare, and Jonson plus additional chapters on major genres and on gender and performance. Chapter 2, “How Plays Were Made,” lays out the conditions of dramatic composition and production during the period.

John Wolfson’s *William Shakespeare and the Short Story Collections* is a slim, handsome volume from Globe Education that documents and celebrates Wolfson’s gift of a major collection of *novelle* and other prose works borrowed by Shakespeare in his plays. The book includes attractive reproductions of frontispieces and illustrations, and a handy chart of Shakespeare’s borrowings along with a comprehensive chronology. If the massive *Oxford Handbook* is graduation-worthy, this intimate book is the perfect thank-you gift for the Shakespearean who thinks she has everything.

**EDITIONS OF NOTE**

Holland’s Arden 3 edition of *Coriolanus* is a true gift to the field. Bucking the “performance history last” convention, Holland enlists performance and reception (including Shakespeare’s own response to history and occasion) as indispensable gateways to the play’s meaning and being. Holland bookends his Introduction with studies in reception, piling a number of 1930s case studies at the front end, including William Poel’s 1931 production and poems by T. S. Eliot and Delmore Schwartz. Holland concludes with postwar productions, with an emphasis on Bertolt Brecht, his followers, and his revisers. In the central sections, he provides dazzling readings of Shakespeare’s engagement with his sources, especially the shaping visions of history derived from Livy, Sir Thomas North, and Plutarch. Even Holland’s discussion of dating is alert to the enlivening affordances of context and pretext, with compelling accounts of popular unrest, hunger games, citizenship paradigms, and plague rhythms in the play’s source-responsive composition and world-attuned early performances. Holland is
especially interested in the representation of the plebeians and the different valences that the crowd scenes gather from Roman sources, Renaissance estate formation, and modern mass politics. There is only one section, “Shaping the Play,” that addresses Coriolanus without reference to its dimensional unfolding in time and space. My only regret is that Holland was not able to devote more time to the play’s structure and semantics, as we are so clearly in the hands of a master.

Michael Neill has edited a stunning Norton Critical Edition of Kyd’s The Spanish Tragedy. A thoughtful illustrated introduction (including Renaissance gardens and arbors) leads into the text of the play, elucidated by Neill’s carefully aimed notes that point readers to emblem sources and to staging cues. The critical section opens with an excellent piece on Kyd’s stagecraft by Michael Hattaway and ends with Andrew Sofer on Kyd’s things, framing invaluable critical discussions by Jonas Barish, G. K. Hunter, and Hutson with the resources of dramaturgy. Of related interest is the Arden edition of The Spanish Tragedy. Edited by Clara Calvo and Jesús Tronch, both professors at Spanish universities, the volume is distinguished by its emphasis on the Spanish and Continental sources, contexts, and afterlives of Kyd’s play: illustrations are liberally drawn from European collections, performances and adaptations on the Continent receive special notice, and the play’s elaboration of Spanish history is traced with special care. Although the volume resembles older Ardens in its emphasis on sources and contexts over performance, a section on the emblematic use of stage props achieves a certain freshness.

Leah Scragg has edited a handy and delightful Revels Student Edition of John Lyly’s Galatea. Her introduction deftly links this courtly entertainment to twenty-first century ecological and psycho-sexual sensibilities, and details Galatea’s creative engagement with Ovid and Virgil and with the performance conditions of the boys’ companies in the age of Elizabeth. Scragg shows how the juvenile casting and choreographic arrangement of the scenes creates an “exquisite, otherworldly drama” (p. 17). Scragg beautifully establishes Shakespeare’s deepening elaboration of themes from Galatea in Love’s Labours Lost, As You Like It, and Twelfth Night, and she recounts the unexpectedly active performance history of the play in this century. Both the play itself and this edition are eminently teachable.

Other editions of note include James Ker and Jessica Winston’s Elizabethan Seneca: Three Tragedies, which includes Troas (1559) and Thyestes (1560), translated by Jasper Heywood, and

ESSAY COLLECTIONS OF NOTE

Essay collections remain one of the major ways in which collaborative work in the humanities gets accomplished and shared. Many such collections have already figured in this review in the context of other topics and debates; I note a few others here in order to close this review on a collaborative note.

Late Shakespeare 1608–1613, edited by Andrew J. Power and Rory Loughnane, assembles a largely UK and Australian group of scholars to revisit Shakespeare’s final plays, beginning with Coriolanus and ending with Two Noble Kinsmen. Proceeding chronologically, the editors prefer “cultural and historical context” to thematic, stylistic, or generic approaches to lateness. Historical topics include print history and writing practices (Grace Ioppolo), the aging of actors in Renaissance companies (Power), and Shakespeare and James I (Stuart M. Kurland). The most exciting essays in the book probe the Shakespearean text for its migration across different orders of experience. Lyne reads recognition scenes in Cymbeline in relation to cognitive theory, and Neill sounds The Tempest for its silences, arguing that Shakespeare used part lines to exploit the theatrical power of the pause. Engel uses the idea of the kinetic emblem in order to integrate stage architecture, dramaturgy, and Renaissance mnemonics and print culture in a dazzlingly comprehensive thematic and scenographic reading of The Winter’s Tale. Thomas Betteridge’s compelling argument for Shakespeare’s yearning for a Christianity not divided by confessional strife is followed by McAdam’s secular reading of the same plays as “anti-Calvinist” stagings of the possibilities of human moral agency within the “exigencies of the natural and social orders” (p. 249). The “late Shakespeare” that emerges from this strong collection is a deeply thoughtful, morally and theologically complex, and dramaturgically inventive playwright whose final plays reward multidimensional forms of critical attention.
Shakespeare and Donne: Generic Hybrids and the Cultural Imaginary, edited by Judith H. Anderson and Jennifer C. Vaught, bills itself as the first collection of essays devoted to the comparison of these two contemporaries. As might be expected in such a venture, language analysis and language theory predominate in close readings of erotic and mortal imagery and sexual puns taken up in a range of essays and delivered with special poignancy in an unfinished piece by the late Marshall Grossman and a response by David Lee Miller. Grossman suggests that both Donne and Shakespeare are haunted by the subjective disremption brought about by generalizing predicates; Miller deepens the thought by passing it through Martin Luther’s “theology of grammar.” The volume as a whole is fittingly dedicated to Grossman’s memory. In the lead essay, Matthias Bauer and Angelika Zirker ably compare the erotic meeting of souls in both Donne’s “The Extasie” and Romeo and Juliet, and they offer a compelling comparison between epilogue and epitaph. Douglas Trevor attempts a more contextual reading in his account of life on the moon in The Tempest and Donne, a venture conducted largely through the reception of celestial globes. Exercising a broader kind of historicism, Judith H. Anderson provides the volume’s tour de force conclusion that uses Aristotelian faculty psychology to reconstruct the drama of thinking and dreaming in the two writers. Shakespeare and Donne, she claims, participated in a common “cultural imagination” that included a theory of the imagination at its core.

Shakespeare’s Erotic Mythology and Ovidian Renaissance Culture, edited by Agnès Lafont, explores the mythographic, bibliographic, and architectural dimensions of English Ovidianism, with an emphasis on the French connection. The volume is attuned to the three-dimensional character of Renaissance metamorphosis, whether enacted on the stage, planted in gardens dedicated to Priapus and Diana, wrapped around the walls of intimate marriage chambers, or woven into window seat cushions in public galleries. A dazzling essay by editor Lafont hunts down Actaeon imagery from Fountainbleau to Hardwick House. Equally compelling is Ilaria Andreoli’s study of illustrated books and their impact on elite home décor, with an emphasis on the traffic between Venice and Lyons. Master of Renaissance ceremonies François Laroque provides an impressionistic but insightful look at the space of fantasy in three works by Shakespeare. Valls-Russell offers a genuinely fresh account of the mythological architecture of Romeo and Juliet; her essay fearlessly seasons Ovidian bookishness with modern performance notes. More than a set of Shakespearean
readings, this compelling volume lets us loose in the evocative spaces of Renaissance Ovidianism.

*Staging the Blazon in Early Modern English Theater*, edited by Deborah Uman and Sara Morrison, takes up the Petrarchan-Ovidian blazon analyzed in primarily lyric contexts by Nancy Vickers and Lynn Enterline in order to probe the conceit’s life on the Renaissance stage. Because theater opposes the dismembering impulse of the blazon with the lively presence of embodied actors and responsive audiences, the fantasies of conquest and mutilation that animate the lyric blazon can be countered by the reality of female persons and by the dynamic multi-perspectival space constituted by witnesses to the blazon on and off stage (see essays by Grant Williams and Morrison). The theater also, however, allows dismemberment to be handled more viscerally, its tropological violence literalized or desublimated in the form of stage properties such as severed heads and prosthetic legs (see essays by Patricia Marchesi, Thomas P. Anderson, and Lisa Dickson). Although the volume emphasizes the eroticized female body, Ariane M. Balizet examines the “somatic household,” while Erin Kelley anatomizes the body politic. The volume delivers a composite picture of the postlyric life of the blazon in the speaking pictures and part objects of Renaissance drama. Developed out of a Shakespeare Association of America seminar, *Staging the Blazon* also manifests the collaborative energy of incorporate exchange.

If the blazon celebrates the body in pieces, the essay collection as a form honors the fragile unities of scholarly conversation. The fruits of such conversation are in evidence throughout the many volumes reviewed here, whether in running footnotes, in prefatory acknowledgments, or in collective tables of content. From the monograph written responsively to centuries of interpretation and performance to the editorial project that takes a new look at play texts to the handbook and essay collection, our field is a sonorous web of teaching and learning, claim and citation, call and response, to which the many books of 2013 add another layer of commentary.

NOTES

1 Lyne’s and Engel’s essays appear in *Late Shakespeare 1608–1613*, edited by Andrew J. Power and Rory Laughnane.

2 My thanks to Robert Folkenflik for hosting a conference at the Clark Library in February 2014 that featured lively discussion of these volumes.