

NOTES

and

BIBLIOGRAPHY

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

NOTES	326
Chapter One	326
Chapter Two	390
Chapter Three	453
Chapter Four	506
Chapter Five	547
Chapter Six	571
Chapter Seven	594
BIBLIOGRAPHY	601
Section I: Editions of Shakespeare	601
Section II: Other Literary Works	607
Section III: Criticism and Scholarship	615

NOTES

CHAPTER ONE

1. I have omitted the internal stage directions inserted by the Oxford editors in this passage to mark who is being addressed, since these tend to obscure, without fully solving, the problems caused by the shifting pronouns of the Soothsayer's opening speech (ll. 445-454). The Folio actually lacks the first speech heading for the Soothsayer here, prefacing the prophetic text and the lines which follow it with the single word, 'Reades' (TLN 3765); but there can be no doubt from the surrounding context that it is the Soothsayer who is supposed to be speaking. The precise nature of the document he reads from, though, is somewhat perplexing - it is variously referred to as a 'tablet' (5.5. 203), a 'book' - with covers? - (5.5. 227-229), and finally, in this instance, a 'label' (l. 432).

2. The unusually lengthy "feel" of this scene is well described by Ann Thompson ('*Cymbeline's Other Endings*', in *The Appropriation of Shakespeare*, edited by Jean I. Marsden (Hemel Hempstead, 1991), pp. 203-220 (see p. 204)). Going by a simple line count, obviously not an entirely accurate indication of performing time, *Cymbeline* has the third longest final scene in Shakespeare, its 486 lines only being surpassed (in the Oxford text, and using the corrected line-numbering supplied in the Compact Edition of 1988) by the 538 lines of *Measure for Measure*, 5.1 and the mammoth 914 lines of *Love's Labour's Lost*, 5.2. Neither of these, however, begins to rival the fabled twenty-four dénouements on offer here, and so crucial to the impact of this scene. These were first calculated and enumerated in Barrett Wendell, *William Shakspeare: A Study in Elizabethan Literature* (London, 1894), pp. 358-361; extracts from this discussion gained more general currency through being cited in Horace Howard Furness, ed., *The Tragedie of Cymbeline, A New Variorum Shakespeare* (Philadelphia, 1913), p. 391. Wendell's total is dependent on definitions and inevitably remains open to question - see J. M. Nosworthy, ed., *Cymbeline, The Arden Shakespeare* (London, 1955; reprinted 1986), p. 164, headnote to Scene V. Whenever I try to count for myself revelations or surprises for the on-stage characters, I seem to arrive at the figure of twenty-three.

3. Compare Harley Granville-Barker's sentiments on the passage: 'one may own perhaps to a little impatience with the postscriptal Soothsayer, and the re-reading (surely once is enough!) of Jupiter's missive. We can call the whipping-boy to account if we will. These fifty lines are, in a strict view, dramatically redundant, and, at such a moment, dangerously so; this cannot be denied. Even so, there is a

quaintness about the business which makes it a not unfitting finish to a charmingly incongruous play. It does not help to hold us spellbound in excitement to the end. But must we always insist on excitement in the theatre?' (*Prefaces to Shakespeare*, Second Series (London, 1930), p. 285). For Granville-Barker's 'whipping-boy' (i.e. some poor theatre hack deemed responsible for supposed interpolations in the play), see pp. 235-236.

4. The placing of the prophecy and of Jupiter's intervention so late in the action, and the little effect either has on the unravelling of the plot, are long-standing critical complaints. See, for example, Bertrand Evans, *Shakespeare's Comedies* (Oxford, 1960), pp. 283-286; Kenneth Muir, 'Theophanies in the Last Plays', in *Shakespeare's Late Plays: Essays in Honor of Charles Crow*, edited by Richard C. Tobias and Paul G. Zolbrod (Athens, OH, 1974), pp. 32-43 (p. 37); and also Bullough, *Sources*, VIII (1975), 37. Comment along the same lines from earlier critics can be found in the various negative assessments of the vision collected together by Furness (*Cymbeline*, pp. 374-378).

Judiana Lawrence, in an important discussion of this sequence which has strongly influenced my approach, contrasts the positioning of the prophecy in *Cymbeline* with the treatment of the oracle in *The Winter's Tale* and with the use of prophecy as a staple device for initiating or propelling the action in romance literature generally ('Natural Bonds and Artistic Coherence in the Ending of *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 35 (1984), 440-460 (see pp. 447-449)). Pointing to the handling of prophecy as an organising structural principle in the English history plays and *Macbeth*, she wryly observes, 'clearly, Shakespeare had little to learn about the importance of the timing of a prophecy' (p. 454).

5. That the prophecy in *Cymbeline* furnishes 'the only instance where the same words are read aloud twice' is a fact noted by Warren D. Smith (*Shakespeare's Playhouse Practice* (Hanover, NH, 1975), p. 32, note 11). Smith's statement occurs in the context of remarks relating to the on-stage reading of documents in the Shakespeare canon, which rules out such incidents as the repetitions of the impromptu epigram in *Love's Labour's Lost* (3.1. 82-95) or the numerous readings of the casket inscriptions in *The Merchant of Venice* (2.7. 4-37, 2.9. 20-57). Even so, I have found it necessary to tighten his parameters (insofar as he gives any), introducing the stress on complete repetition and a lack of interruption. Smith's passing technical observation is picked up and reaffirmed by Leah S. Marcus, in a discussion which sets about exploring the possible significances of such a repetition ('*Cymbeline* and the Unease of Topicality', in *The Historical Renaissance*, edited by Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier (Chicago and London, 1988), pp. 134-168 (see especially p. 139 and p. 163, note 14); this is an abbreviated version of the third chapter ('James', pp. 106-159) of Marcus's book, *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and Its Discontents* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1988) - references here are to the separate essay (henceforth, 'Unease'), preferred for its narrower focus on *Cymbeline*).

Marcus's treatment of both prophecy and play is extremely illuminating and I owe much to her work (including the reference to Smith).

There are actually quite a few documents in Shakespearian drama, particularly letters, which get either re-read in part or quoted from by memory (with varying degrees of accuracy) after an initial full reading. But using the modified terms mentioned above, I have been unable to locate any example to contradict Smith's statement - even Falstaff's duplicated letters in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* only receive one on-stage reading between them (see 2.1. 1-96). However, two episodes from early in Shakespeare's career, both also relevant here in other ways (see below), come close. (1) In the conjuring scene of *2 Henry VI* (a sequence of action preserved in a somewhat confused state in the surviving texts), questions from a prepared script are read to the spirit, Asnath, by Roger Bolingbroke, the spirit's replies being recorded, apparently on the same document, by (presumably) the priest, John Southwell (1.4. 24-40). The questions and their answers then get repeated together later - more or less word for word but with interposed comments - as evidence against the Duchess of Gloucester and her accomplices, though, to complicate the situation further, this repetition occurs at different points in the Quarto and Folio texts (2.1. 179-189 in the Oxford text (*The First Part of the Contention*), which follows the Quarto here and so has King Henry reading the lines; and 1.4. 56-67 in Michael Hattaway's New Cambridge edition (Cambridge, 1991), which prefers the Folio arrangement, where the Duke of York is responsible for the re-reading). (2) More directly comparable to the passage at hand is the sequence of dialogue with the mock construe in *The Taming of the Shrew*, where two lines read out from Ovid's *Heroides* are "interpreted" phrase by phrase by both Lucentio/Cambio and Bianca, with the effect that the text is heard three times, albeit in close succession and with two of the occasions interrupted (3.1. 26-43).

6. 'Unease', p. 139; the quotation from Smith in the previous sentence is found in *Shakespeare's Playhouse Practice*, p. 32, note 11. Smith speculates that the prophecy might have been set up from the very scroll used during performance. This seems implausible (if only because of problems of availability or survival), but it does raise the material question of whether the relevant section of text would actually have been inscribed on the property document(s) concerned in the first place (a likely theatrical practice, which Smith assumes as standard). With regard to the Folio presentation, Marcus appears on much firmer ground in pointing out that 'the exactitude was easily achievable in the printing house, since the same block of type could have been used both times' (p. 163, note 14). Good evidence that this might well have occurred is to be found in the exact repetition in the Folio of all the "be"/"bee" spelling variants within the prophecy and also of the introductory stage direction (similarly centred on each occasion), 'Reades'. The two relevant pages (signatures 3b3^v and 3b6^r, both assigned to Compositor B (*Companion*, p. 154)) belong to different formes (and 3b3^v would normally have been set first as part of the

inner sheet), so a direct transference of the block of text from its first occurrence to its second here should have been possible. This in turn could account for the absence of a speech prefix for the Soothsayer (see note 1). Whatever the exact procedure involved, I follow Marcus in finding it tempting to read this precise repetition 'as indicative of reverence - or mock reverence - for the text in question' (p. 163, note 14).

7. Pisanio quotes a small portion of this letter at 3.2. 17-19, where his master's commands fit easily into the rhythm of his own blank verse; but when Imogen gets to read out the same letter, in what seems to be its entirety, at 3.4. 21-31, what she speaks is cast in prose, and the words heard earlier do not reappear. The minor inconsistency was originally pointed out by Edmond Malone (see Nosworthy, *Cymbeline*, p. 79, note to l. 17). Nosworthy's note, using as evidence the fact that the direction for Pisanio to read from the letter is only first supplied by Nicholas Rowe, offers the possible excuse that Pisanio may just be paraphrasing Posthumus. The discrepancy is not so easily dismissed, though, since Pisanio's act of reading is visibly signalled (in part at least) in the Folio text - on whatever authority - by the italicization of ll. 18-19a (TLN 1486-1487). See further Jonas Barish, "'Soft, here follows prose": Shakespeare's Stage Documents', in *The Arts of Performance in Elizabethan and Early Stuart Drama*, edited by Murray Biggs and others (Edinburgh, 1991), pp. 32-49 (p. 36). The looseness over detail apparent in this instance, trivial in itself, is of course utterly characteristic of Shakespeare's usual practice.

8. Varied expressions of surprise and dismay at this action or comment on its motivational oddity can be found in a number of modern critics, including: M. C. Bradbrook, *The Living Monument* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 196-197; Marjorie Garber, 'Cymbeline and the Languages of Myth', *Mosaic*, 10, no. 3 (Spring 1977), 105-115 (pp. 113-114); Alexander Leggatt, 'The Island of Miracles: An Approach to *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 10 (1977), 191-209 (pp. 206-207); Philip Edwards, *Threshold of a Nation: A study in English and Irish drama* (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 91-93; A. Kent Hieatt, 'Cymbeline and the Intrusion of Lyric into Romance Narrative: *Sonnets*, "A Lover's Complaint," Spenser's *Ruins of Rome*', in *Unfolded Tales: Essays on Renaissance Romance*, edited by George M. Logan and Gordon Teskey (Ithaca, NY and London, 1989), pp. 98-118 (pp. 116-117); and Robert M. Adams, *Shakespeare: The Four Romances* (New York and London, 1989), p. 76.

9. The prevailing tone for responses to the prophecy was set by Coleridge: 'it is not easy to conjecture why Shakespeare should have introduced this ludicrous scroll, which answers no one purpose, either propulsive or explicatory, unless as a joke on etymology' (Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Shakespearean Criticism*, edited by Thomas Middleton Raysor, second edition, 2 vols (London, 1960), I, 107; the comment is recorded by Furness (*Cymbeline*, p. 384); it appears in Coleridge's marginalia in a copy of Lewis Theobald's 1773 edition of Shakespeare, remarks which

were first printed in Coleridge's posthumous *Literary Remains*, edited by H. N. Coleridge, 4 vols (London, 1836-1839); see *Shakespearean Criticism*, I, v-vii, and I, 3, note 1).

10. One genuine, if rather remote, and quite unexpected parallel is identified by Nosworthy. Commenting on the "*mulier*"/"*mollis aer*" etymology, he makes the excellent observation that 'there is just one other place in which Shakespeare uses this word "*mulier*", and that in a tedious elucidation comparable to that of the Soothsayer' ('The Integrity of Shakespeare: Illustrated from *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 8 (1955), 52-56 (p. 53); see too his edition, pp. 185-186, note to ll. 436-53). Nosworthy is referring to the notorious interpretative crux of the Salic Law speech in *Henry V*, with its strangely extended exposition of '*in terram Salicam mulieres ne succedant*' (1.2. 33-95). The Archbishop of Canterbury's use, not noted by Nosworthy, of the phrase 'lion's whelp' to describe the Black Prince later in the same scene (1. 109) confirms the intertextual connection. These two moments in *Henry V* both recall events in the earlier, possibly (to my mind probably) Shakespearian *Edward III* (1.1. 1-50 and 3.5. 1-98). Neither "*mulier*" nor "lion's whelp" appears in *Edward III*, but the play does yield another example of re-reading (nearly complete but once again immediate) in the form of Lodwick's and the King's attempt to compose a poem in praise of the Countess of Salisbury (2.1. 59-183 - 2.1 is the scene most frequently attributed to Shakespeare).

11. It is my impression that the prophetic label has even tended to get sidelined within the context of attempts to excuse Shakespeare of responsibility for the vision. It seems to have suffered an extra layer of neglect due to the difficulty of accounting for it in any cogent theory of interpolation. A comment from Gary Taylor serves to illustrate what I mean: noting that the vision itself has been 'widely condemned as an un-Shakespearian interpolation', he goes on to claim that in fact 'it does satisfy the criteria for such interference, being a discrete and spectacular scene involving a new set of characters which occurs in a text apparently set from a late manuscript' ('The Canon and Chronology of Shakespeare's Plays', in *Companion*, pp. 69-144 (p. 132)). But it is simply not true to say that the vision forms a discrete scene/unit. As G. Wilson Knight long since pointed out, 'if Jupiter is to go, the tablet must surely go too' ('The Vision of Jupiter', in Knight, *The Crown of Life*, second edition (London, 1948), pp. 168-202 (p. 196); the germ of this idea is already present in Knight's earlier defence of this sequence, 'The Vision of Jupiter in *Cymbeline*', *TLS*, 21 November 1936, p. 958); and if the tablet is removed then obviously the prophecy itself disappears, which leaves no reason (or method in the text) for introducing the Soothsayer here and in turn renders his other appearance in 4.2 effectively irrelevant. Only if the second occurrence of the prophecy is ignored can the vision be presented as easily removable. It is this fact which has led to the huge amount of disagreement between disintegrationists as to the exact limits of any proposed interpolation. For various suggestions, see again the complaints collected in Furness,

Cymbeline, pp. 374-378. One recurring solution amongst those who have managed to recognize the problem has been to seek to relieve Shakespeare only of the dialogue (or even just bits of it) accompanying Posthumus's vision, thus somehow preserving the tablet as an original textual presence; the difficulties this argument involves, and the genuine ingenuity it requires, are exemplified in John Dover Wilson's 'Prefatory Note', in J. C. Maxwell, ed., *Cymbeline*, *The New Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 1960), pp. vii-x.

12. Marcus argues strongly (possibly too strongly) for a direct causal link between the prophecy's topicality and the urge to remove it from the canon: 'traditionally for editors and critics of the play, textual palimpsest has been preferable to the specter of a Shakespeare who could be interpreted as celebrating a Stuart political cause' ('Unease', p. 135). I would agree up to a point, but widespread (or unsuppressed) awareness of the topicality of the prophecy seems to me a phenomenon that post-dates the height of the authorship controversy.

13. Most recent commentators on the play have proved willing to accept as definitive the impassioned defence of the Shakespearian authorship of both vision and prophecy put forward by Wilson Knight in *The Crown of Life*. Knight's work is usefully developed in Nosworthy, 'The Integrity of Shakespeare'. One notable dissenting voice on this topic from the last few years is that of Kristian Smidt, for whom the vision of Jupiter still remains a very obvious "unconformity" which is 'both detachable and expendable' (*Unconformities in Shakespeare's Later Comedies* (Basingstoke and London, 1993), p. x). According to Smidt, 'a duplication of visions and prophecies hardly seems necessary and Posthumus' seems the more redundant' (p. 133).

14. This is exactly where a critic like Smidt has difficulties with the last act of the play, entrenched as he is in the view that 'Shakespeare ideally aimed at unity of theme, conservation of character and continuity of plot' (*Later Comedies*, p. 7). Smidt's Shakespeare is a writer who always provides 'a firm story-line in his comedies, and a sense of a *telos* which guides his actions to a satisfying conclusion' (p. 8). Given the way *Cymbeline* actually ends, it is no surprise Smidt finds it a deeply flawed and unsatisfying play (see especially p. 134).

15. Nosworthy offers just a straight gloss here, 'whose contents are so remote from sense' (*Cymbeline*, p. 185, note to ll. 431-2). This suggests a directness of expression at odds with Posthumus's syntax and completely ignores the phrase 'in hardness', which is the element whose exact workings I find hardest to "explain". J. C. Maxwell's note in his edition registers a more appropriate degree of uncertainty, but only in relation to the meaning of 'sense' (p. 220, note to l. 431).

16. Dr Johnson supplied a lengthy, complex paraphrase for these lines which is adopted (even expanded) by Nosworthy, who follows Johnson in describing the meaning as 'too thin to be easily caught' (*Cymbeline*, p. 161, note to ll. 145-51; Johnson's note from his 1765 edition (VII, 381) is reprinted in *Johnson on Shakespeare*, edited by

Arthur Sherbo, 2 vols, *The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson*, VII-VIII (New Haven and London, 1968), VIII, 905). Other glosses available, such as in J. C. Maxwell's edition, pp. 208-209, or Edward Dowden's original Arden Shakespeare *Cymbeline* (London, 1903), p. 178, pursue alternative lines of explication and record (less dismissively than Nosworthy) earlier proposed emendations aimed at clarifying the sense and implying corruption. The central difficulty is not so much *what* Posthumus means as *how* he means it - problems include the significance and proper punctuation of the phrase 'either both, or nothing' (TLN 3184), the multivalency of 'senseless' and 'sense', and which phrase out of 'senseless speaking' and 'a speaking such | As sense cannot untie' relates back to 'dream' and which to the discourse of madmen.

17. The distinctive qualities of late Shakespearian verse have been much discussed. Particularly interesting/illuminating comment on *Cymbeline* can be found in Frank Kermode, *William Shakespeare: The Final Plays* (London, 1963), pp. 22-23; Maurice Hunt, 'Shakespeare's Empirical Romance: *Cymbeline* and Modern Knowledge', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 22 (1980), 322-342 (later expanded in Hunt, *Shakespeare's Romance of the Word* (Cranbury, NJ, 1990), pp. 41-73); Ann Thompson and John O. Thompson, 'The Syntax of Metaphor in *Cymbeline*', in *Images of Shakespeare*, edited by Werner Habicht, D. J. Palmer, and Roger Pringle (Cranbury, NJ, 1988), pp. 80-97; Ann Thompson, 'Casting Sense between the Speech: Parentheses in the Oxford Shakespeare', *AEB*, n.s. 4 (1990), 72-90, and "'Making Him Speak True English": Grammatical Emendation in Some Eighteenth-Century Editions of Shakespeare, with Particular Reference to *Cymbeline*', in *Reading Readings: Essays on Shakespeare Editing in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by Joanna Gondris (Cranbury, NJ, 1998), pp. 71-85; and Elena Glazov-Corrigan, 'Speech Acts, Generic Differences, and the Curious Case of *Cymbeline*', *Studies in English Literature*, 34 (1994), 379-399.

On the language of the late plays more generally, I would point especially to the following: Anne Barton's 1980 essay, 'Leontes and the spider: language and speaker in Shakespeare's last plays', reprinted in *Essays, Mainly Shakespearian* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 161-181; David Solway, 'Intoxicated Words: Language in Shakespeare's Late Romances', *Sewanee Review*, 95 (1987), 619-625; John Porter Houston's chapter, 'Late Developments: *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *The Tempest*', in *Shakespearian Sentences* (Baton Rouge and London, 1988), pp. 198-221; and Stephen Orgel, 'The Poetics of Incomprehensibility', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 42 (1991), 431-437. For an explicitly "metaphysical" approach to the subject, see Patrick Cruttwell's essay, 'The Poetry of the Shakespearian Moment (Donne's "Anniversaries" and Shakespeare's last plays)', in *The Shakespearian Moment and Its Place in the Poetry of the 17th Century* (London, 1954), pp. 73-106. Also relevant here is Thomas de Quincey's famous passing commendation of the language in the first and last acts of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (in 'Rhetoric', reprinted in *Literary Theory and Criticism*, edited by David Masson, *The Collected Writings of Thomas de Quincey*, X (London, 1897), pp. 81-133 (p. 108,

note 1); this is a slightly revised version of an essay originally published as an unsigned review article in *Blackwood's Magazine*, 24 (July-December 1828), 885-908). Personally, I find the complexities and technical extremes of late Shakespearian verse exhilarating; for a much less positive view, but one that comments perceptively on the linguistic "impressionism" and recklessness of Shakespeare's later style, see James Sutherland, 'The Language of the Last Plays', in *More Talking of Shakespeare*, edited by John Garrett (London, 1959), pp. 144-158.

18. The appropriateness of the Soothsayer's name ("Philharmonus" in the Folio (TLN 3762)) and of its only being revealed here has often been remarked upon, especially in connection with the use of music and musical imagery in *Cymbeline*; see Nosworthy, 'Music and its Function in the Romances of Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Survey*, 11 (1958), 60-69 (pp. 64-66); Alan Brissenden, *Shakespeare and the Dance* (London and Basingstoke, 1981), pp. 84-86; and Peggy Muñoz Simonds, *Myth, Emblem, and Music in Shakespeare's 'Cymbeline': An Iconographic Reconstruction* (Cranbury, NJ, 1992), pp. 334-363. On the significance of names and naming in the play, see also G. Wilson Knight's essay, 'What's in a Name?', in *The Sovereign Flower*, second edition (London, 1966; first edition, 1958), pp. 161-201 (pp. 196-198); and John Pitcher, 'Names in *Cymbeline*', *Essays in Criticism*, 43 (1993), 1-16 (especially pp. 1-2). Pitcher points out (pp. 13-14, note 7) the etymological connection between "Philharmonus" and the name of Posthumus's host in Rome, "Philario" (Oxford prints as "Filario", after the Folio's single 'Filorio' (TLN 114); elsewhere, the Folio uses "Philario" or the speech prefixes "Phil."/"Phi."); on the implications of the root "Phil-", see also Murray J. Levith, *What's in Shakespeare's Names* (London, 1978), p. 108. Philario/Philharmonus suggests itself to me as an obvious doubling, particularly as Philario is the only significant character not known or discovered to be dead who is absent from the final scene.

19. *OED*, III, 794, "construction", sense I and sense II, main entries; *OED*'s etymology traces the ultimate root of "construction" back to the Latin verb 'construere', having a similar double meaning, 'to construe, construct'. Unless otherwise stated, all definitions cited from *OED*, here and throughout, reflect meanings indicated to be available during the early seventeenth century.

20. The crucial role allotted to the practice of construction in the educational programme of the Elizabethan Lower Grammar School is dealt with at length in T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakspeare's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke*, 2 vols (Urbana, IL, 1944), I, 581-681. This educational context inevitably closely associated construction with the teaching of Latin, passages for study being culled from sources as diverse as Cato, Terence, Mantuan, and Latin translations of Aesop. The best comparable example in Shakespeare, the mock construe of Ovid in *The Taming of the Shrew* already mentioned above (see note 5), is itself set in the context of a private tutorial. Baldwin furnishes various examples of other references to construction, literal and metaphorical, in the canon, and

expresses the opinion that 'in some way, construction had been well impressed' on Shakespeare (I, 590).

21. *OED*, III, 794, "construction", senses II.7 and II.6; compare also the most relevant definition for the verb "construe" (*OED*, III, 796, sense 3): 'to analyse or trace the grammatical construction of a sentence; to take its words in such an order as to show the meaning of the sentence; spec[ifically] to do this in the study of a foreign and especially a classical language, adding a word for word translation'.

22. *OED*, III, 794, "construction", sense I.1.a.

23. Judiana Lawrence expresses the situation well in wondering whether what we get here is 'the construing of an already predetermined meaning, or the creating, by an imaginative interpreter, of meaning from apparent nonsense. The phrase "his skill in the construction" supports either sense of "construction" and, I believe, means both' (p. 450).

24. Most of this section, apart from the final speech, seems to have been a standard *en bloc* cut regularly observed in the theatre well into the twentieth century. See the information presented in Halstead, XII, G975c-G976b/SS975c-SS976b, and (rather more manageably) XIII, 223-224. Theatrical habits would appear to have changed a little in recent years, however; see below, notes 26 and 29.

25. Various emendations of possessives and demonstratives have been proposed in the attempt to clarify the Soothsayer's syntax - see Nosworthy, *Cymbeline*, p. 186, note to l. 450. The Oxford editors offer the conjecture "this" for 'thy' in l. 448 and record Edward Capell's "thy" for 'this' in l. 451, raising the possibility of some sort of linked confusion, removal of which would mean 'the entire speech can be addressed to Posthumus' (*Companion*, p. 609, notes to 5.6. 448, 451). Whilst this is neat and plausible, other problems remain, notably the ambiguous use of 'who' in l. 451. J. C. Maxwell suggests that 'if the Soothsayer has turned to Post[humus], the audience will not be worried by the oddity of "who" not referring to "wife"' (*Cymbeline*, p. 221, note to l. 448). I, on the other hand, can envisage a performance that could easily gain comic mileage from the Soothsayer's pronominal (and physical?) contortions here and throughout.

26. This is a factor Roger Warren remarks on in connection with Peter Hall's 1988 National Theatre production of *Cymbeline*, where the style of the Soothsayer's speeches apparently proved an obstacle to achieving the effect for which the director was striving: 'it is hard to make something radiant out of the Soothsayer's tawdry exposition of the prophecy, with its lumbering derivation of "mulier" from "mollis aer", and so on. Such threadbare writing was a hindrance to the "sense of the numinous" which the production strove to achieve in its formal peace tableau, crowned by tilting the brilliantly lit heavens as a kind of halo over the heads of the performers' (*Staging Shakespeare's Late Plays* (Oxford, 1990), p. 87; Warren attributes the phrase 'sense of the numinous' to Geraldine James, who was playing "Innogen").

27. The basic details concerning the history of the etymology are most carefully summarized in J. C. Maxwell's note on 'mollis aer', *Cymbeline*, pp. 220-221. Baldwin points out that 'the word *mulier* seems to have been peculiarly fruitful of fanciful etymologies'; with regard to the example used here, he feels 'Shakespeare could have quoted, no doubt, very learned authority for it' (*Small Latine*, I, 719). There are, in fact, two distinct historical branches to this etymology:

(1) The identification of an etymological link between "*mulier*" and "*mollitie*" ("tenderness"), via the form "*mollier*" ("more tender"), is attributed to the Roman grammarian Varro (116-27 BC) by the Christian theologian, Lactantius (c.240-c.320), in his *De opificio Dei*, 12. 17. The etymology itself is repeated, without the reference to Varro, but otherwise in similar terms, in the influential study of the subject by Isidore of Seville (c.560-636), *Etymologiae* (or *Origines*), XI. ii. 18. It also appears in a number of other early texts, such as the forty-third *Sermon* of Caesarius of Arles (c.470-542). For details of the editions consulted here, see the relevant entries in the Bibliography. There is a full listing of all the known early uses of this etymology, covering the period from Varro to Isidore, in Robert Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds, 1991), p. 395. Some examples from closer to Shakespeare's own time are noted by Baldwin (I, 720).

(2) The "*mollis aer*"/"*mulier*" connection seems to be a much later phenomenon. It has been found in William Caxton's *The Game and Playe of the Chesse* (first published c. 1475 and reprinted c. 1483 (STC 4920, 4921)), where it derives from the French translation by Jean de Vignai which underlies the relevant section of Caxton's English version, rather than from the Latin original of Jacobus de Cessolis (a point noted by Maxwell, p. 220; and see Robert H. Wilson, 'Caxton's Chess Book', *Modern Language Notes*, 62 (1947), 93-102, and Christine Knowles, 'Caxton and his Two French Sources', *Modern Language Review*, 49 (1954), 417-423). The passage concerned occurs in Book 3, Chapter 5 - see William E. A. Axon's 'Verbatim Reprint' of Caxton's first edition (London, 1883), p. 123 (Axon himself highlights the link with *Cymbeline*, p. lxxviii). The longer form of the etymology also appears, contemporaneous with Shakespeare, in Henrie Stephen [Henri Estienne], *A World of Wonders*, translated by "R. C." (London, 1607), p. 292 (STC 10553). *A World of Wonders* probably stands for now, so far as I am aware, as Shakespeare's most likely source for the etymology as a whole.

The complex history set out above was largely traced during the nineteenth century, and the passage of the etymology into *Cymbeline* seems to have received only negligible attention (in print, at least) since. For the work in question, see S. Singleton, 'Cymbeline, Act V, Sc. 5', *Notes and Queries*, Series II, vol 3 (January-June 1857), 163-164; W. Aldis Wright, 'Shakspeare: *Cymbeline*, V.v. 447, 448', *Notes and Queries*, Series VII, vol 2 (July-December 1886), 85; and F. C. Birkbeck Terry, 'Cymbeline, V.v. 447, 448', *Notes and Queries*, Series VII, vol 4 (July-December 1887), 105. Also useful, though not wholly accurate, is the long footnote provided by Furness (*Cymbeline*, p. 435), which offers

additional evidence for the etymology's widespread dissemination in its "*mollis aer*"/"*mulier*" form. For a recent examination of Shakespeare's interest in etymology generally, though regrettably with no comment on the example at hand, see Marvin Spevack, 'Etymology in Shakespeare', in *Shakespeare's Universe*, edited by John M. Muccio, with others (Aldershot, 1996), pp. 187-193.

28. A sense of strain in Philharmonus's use of the etymology is identified by most critics who discuss this passage. Judiana Lawrence finds 'something exquisitely droll about deriving the meaning of the oracle's homely English phrases from these double translations, first into Latin, then back again into English' (p. 451); and Marcus stresses the infelicitous style of the Soothsayer's 'niggling, labored mode of interpretation' ('Unease', pp. 157-158). Solway (p. 621) and, directly following him, Glazov-Corrigan ('Speech Acts', p. 388) find irony in the fact that the Soothsayer's etymologies depend upon false derivations. And it is true that Henrie Stephen invokes 'the notation of *Mulier, quasi mollis aër*' in the course of an attack on scholarly habits of over-ingenious, 'subtil and curious Etymologizing' (p. 292). But the accuracy of Philharmonus's professional knowledge does not really seem to be the issue here, and the etymology itself, however unconvincing, is, as J. A. K. Thomson notes, 'not more absurd than many that passed current in Shakespeare's time' (*Shakespeare and the Classics* (London, 1952), p. 135). Some of its implications, which I return to below, are certainly very real and entirely serious.

29. The most recent production of *Cymbeline* by the RSC (directed by Adrian Noble, first performance Stratford-upon-Avon, 20 February 1997) was particularly unusual in that it actually went out of its way to highlight the prophetic label, even printing it as an epigraph in the programme ([p. 11]). In performance, though, at least when I saw it, the actor playing the Soothsayer spoke the four lines containing the etymology as quickly as possible, *sotto voce*, and in a half-aside, turning away from the audience. Whilst this effectively got round any sense of the ludicrous, the perceived need to cover up this moment, which is what this mode of delivery suggested to me, leads precisely to the point I am making.

30. On the scholastic feel of the Soothsayer's exposition, see Marcus, 'Unease', p. 157; and Brian Gibbons's essay, 'Fabled *Cymbeline*', in his book, *Shakespeare and Multiplicity* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 18-47 (this is a revised version of an article first published in *Jahrbuch 1987*, 78-99); Gibbons describes the interpretation of the label as 'in the worst tradition of allegorical exegesis' (p. 23). Another of the play's characteristic anachronisms is at work here. On the one hand, Philharmonus speaks both as a Roman *vates* and as something of a Roman grammarian, following in the footsteps of Varro. On the other hand, though, his phrase 'we term it' also places him within the real-time history of the whole post-Varro tradition of learned repetition and elucidation outlined above (note 27). For evidence that the ascription

to Varro of the first branch of the etymology was culturally available to Shakespeare, see the Latin epigram by John Owen cited in Baldwin, *Small Latine*, I, 720 ('*Mulier*', Book 1, no. 70, in Owen, *Epigrammatum Libri Tres* (London, 1606), p. 11 (STC 18984.5)).

31. As Leggatt comments, 'his line is not really prophecy but exegesis' ('*Island of Miracles*', p. 198). David L. Frost views the entire final sequence as a deliberately laughable end to a play that is itself best seen as a full-scale parody: 'the Soothsayer steps forward to exercise his ingenuity in squaring the prophecy with the facts, and the oracle becomes a hilarious coda to the whole piece' ('*"Mouldy Tales": The Context of Shakespeare's Cymbeline*', *Essays and Studies*, n.s. 39 (1986), 19-38 (p. 36)). Even critics who emphasize Philharmonus's insight over his hindsight still tend to acknowledge some sense of strain in the exposition as a whole. Thus Hunt, in the context of a reading stressing appropriate closure and the power of Providence, feels the passage reveals Shakespeare's understanding that 'any human claim to professional authority in the verbal translation of divinity remains suspect' (*Shakespeare's Romance of the Word*, p. 73).

32. 'Natural Bonds', p. 450; Lawrence's further comments at this point are also relevant to my following remarks. Thus she notes that 'the root meaning of *harmony* is joining, and Shakespeare's wordplay penetrates not only the interpretation of oracles, but also the very structure of romance itself, enacting as it does the reunification of families, friends, and nations after separation and loss' (p. 450).

33. For a recent treatment of this subject, see Cynthia Lewis, "With Simular Proof Enough": Modes of Misperception in *Cymbeline*', *Studies in English Literature*, 31 (1991), 343-364. Bertrand Evans's consideration of the play's manipulation of "discrepant awarenesses" remains standard and exemplary (*Shakespeare's Comedies*, pp. 245-289). Nosworthy's closing paragraph of his Introduction provides possibly the most visionary assessment (and I am not forgetting Wilson Knight) of the play's movement towards insight (*Cymbeline*, p. lxxxiii).

34. The best discussion of this aspect of the play is found in Gibbons's excellent essay, 'Fabled *Cymbeline*'; as Gibbons points out, the Soothsayer's 'excruciating pun' is but 'the very last pun of many in the play' (p. 23). Puns (linguistic and visual), image-patterns, and minor verbal details echo across *Cymbeline* bewilderingly. Gibbons puts forward the idea that 'it is almost as if such tiny links constitute a private code for Shakespeare himself, or are intended to represent the operation of the supernatural, however defined, or of the subconscious, ceaselessly transposing or displacing images in its dream-work' (p. 37). In the theatre, such effects may be only partially perceived at best, but I follow Gibbons (see pp. 40-41) in feeling that some sense of the complex artistic patterning at work can at least be glimpsed there.

35. The numerous threads of imagery in *Cymbeline* have been much discussed. For the basic work, covering the various aspects highlighted here, see Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, *Shakespeare's Imagery*

and *What It Tells Us* (Cambridge, 1935), pp. 291-300; Wilson Knight, *The Crown of Life*, especially pp. 196-202; and Nosworthy, *Cymbeline*, pp. lxxi-lxxiii, lxxx-lxxxii. F. C. Tinkler is a good guide on images of joining and union ('*Cymbeline*', *Scrutiny*, 7 (1938-39), 5-20). Many of the elements I have mentioned are treated in Simonds's study of the iconography of the play, *Myth, Emblem, and Music* (as at, for instance, pp. 198-271). Recent comment on the tree/growth motif can be found in Dorothea Kehler, 'Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*', *The Explicator*, 54 (1995-96), 70-72. Images of lessening and vanishing connect with the play's repeated focus on diminution and perspective (see 1.3. 8-22 and 3.3. 10-13); there are some interesting remarks on this in Jonathan Goldberg, 'Perspectives: Dover Cliff and the Conditions of Representation', in *Shakespeare and Deconstruction*, edited by G. Douglas Atkins and David M. Bergeron (New York, 1988), pp. 245-265 (p. 257); and see also Lisa Hopkins, "'It is place which lessens and sets off": Perspective and Representation in *Cymbeline*', in *Shakespeare and Italy*, edited by Holger Klein and Michele Marrapodi (Lewiston, NY and Lampeter, 1999), pp. 252-268.

36. For the puns on "fit" and its derivatives, see 2.1. 26-44 and 4.1. 2-6; those on "tender", notably 3.4. 11-12. The word "air" obviously connects with the bird imagery, and also with the language of perspective (see 1.3. 21); for other 'aerial images' associated with Imogen, see Knight, *Crown of Life*, pp. 197-201 (p. 197); note too, in a different vein, the jokes at 1.2. 1-4. "Piece", already juxtaposed with "tender" at 4.2. 127-128, offers a number of echoes of moments from earlier in the play, especially 2.4. 72, 81, and the editorial crux at 5.1. 20 (see the note in *Companion*, p. 608).

Two of the major strands of imagery in *Cymbeline*, those to do with clothing and economics, are, perhaps surprisingly, largely noticeable by their absence from these closing moments. But "piece" is a word directly associated, via the repeated term "to pieces" (3.4. 51-53 and 4.1. 17), with garments (and note in addition the echo of 'his meanest garment | That ever hath but clipped his body' (2.4. 130-131) in the Soothsayer's 'clipped about' (l. 453)); and it is also applied in a financial context by Posthumus, in his 'take pieces for the figure's sake' (5.5. 119). Even "tender" is linked to the language of payment, in the reference to the three thousand pound tribute 'left untendered' by the Britons (3.1. 8-10). The pervasiveness of the play's commercial imagery is highlighted by Spurgeon (*Shakespeare's Imagery*, pp. 296-300); see further A. A. Stephenson, 'The Significance of *Cymbeline*', *Scrutiny*, 10 (1941-42), 329-338; and Bullough, *Sources*, VIII, 403-405. I find it tempting to see here, however unlikely, a related submerged pun on shareholding in the phrase 'jointed to the old stock' (ll. 441-442). No pun seems too far-fetched once one has become aware of the bizarre parallels the motif of the 'lopped branches' offers to the sacrifice of Alarbus (1.1. 141-145) and the mutilation of Lavinia (2.4. 16-19) in *Titus Andronicus* (commented on in Ann Thompson, 'Philomel in *Titus Andronicus* and *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 31 (1978), 23-32 (see pp. 27-28)). Certainly, "jointed" is an unusual word in this context (in

contrast to "joined", which is the only form found in the analogue texts I have consulted), and this is in fact *OED*'s first citation for this particular meaning (VIII, 265, "joint" (verb), sense 1).

37. The notion of purification is relevant with regard not only to syntax but also to some of the obscenities associated with Cloten (see again his puns on "fit" at 4.1. 2-6). Thus Philharmonus's lines quoted above, 'the fingers of the powers above do tune | The harmony of this peace' (ll. 468-469), offer multiple echoes of Cloten's suggestive remarks to the musicians: 'come on, tune. If you can penetrate her with your fingering, so' (2.3. 13-14); the reference there by Cloten to 'a wonderful sweet air' (ll. 16-17) strengthens the connection.

38. Philharmonus's explanation of the literal etymological roots of the name "Leonatus" itself belongs to another of the play's extended puns and patterns (and one highly relevant in this context), finishing the process of "delving" Posthumus 'to the root' started but explicitly left incomplete by the First Gentleman in the opening scene (1.1. 28).

39. Judiana Lawrence writes well about the way in which the tone of the end of the play 'balances on a knife-edge between solemnity and farce, between affirmation of and skepticism toward the premises of romance, right up to the concluding lines' (p. 441). There are some useful comments on this subject too in Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare: The Poet and his Plays* (London, 1997), pp. 350-359.

40. Nosworthy does not bother with any gloss for 'seeming' here (*Cymbeline*, p. 186), and the term appears to have attracted little attention from other editors - but see the Glossary in J. C. Maxwell's edition, which suggests 'appearance of truth', in distinction to the 'outward appearance' it gives for the other, more obviously negative, uses of the word in the play (p. 240). The differences in implication so simply asserted in a gloss are much less clearly defined in the text itself, however, and performance choices could as easily enhance the ambiguities surrounding "seeming" at this moment as attempt to close them off; and see further the following section.

41. And is in any case historically a little questionable since "construct" as a verb was apparently not really widely available in its modern sense until the second half of the seventeenth century (see the *OED* entry, III, 793-794; the etymological note here describes "construct" as 'a late formation'). *OED* does give a Scottish usage of the verb, though, recorded in c. 1610, 'to put a specified construction or interpretation on' (sense 4); and see also its previous entry for "construct" as a participle adjective (p. 793).

42. *OED*, III, 796, "construe" (verb), senses 4 and 4b.

43. *OED*, VII, 1131, "interpret" (verb), senses 1a and 2a.

44. More fully, Derrida writes, towards the end of an extended argument, 'there are thus two interpretations of interpretation, of structure, of sign, of play. The one seeks to decipher, dreams of deciphering a truth or an origin which escapes play and the order of

the sign, and which lives the necessity of interpretation as an exile. The other, which is no longer turned toward the origin, affirms play and tries to pass beyond man [sic] and humanism, the name of man being the name of that being who, throughout the history of metaphysics or of ontotheology - in other words, throughout his entire history - has dreamed of full presence, the reassuring foundation, the origin and the end of play' ('Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences', in Jacques Derrida, *Writing and Difference*, translated by Alan Bass (London and Chicago, 1978), pp. 278-293 (p. 292); Bass acknowledges that his translation of this essay is a revision of an earlier one by Richard Macksey (p. xx)).

The body of available commentary on the subject of interpretative theory is of course vast, and I have only been able to dip a toe into it in this thesis. Here and throughout, I have drawn particularly, if variously, on the following works: Paul de Man, *Allegories of Reading* (New Haven and London, 1979); Jonathan Culler, *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism* (Ithaca, NY, 1982; reprinted London, 1994); Christopher Norris, *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice* (London and New York, 1982); Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, second edition (Oxford, 1996; first edition, 1983); K. M. Newton's two books, *In Defence of Literary Interpretation: Theory and Practice* (Basingstoke and London, 1986), and *Interpreting the Text: A Critical Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Literary Interpretation* (Hemel Hempstead, 1990); David Lodge, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader* (London and New York, 1988); Umberto Eco, with others, *Interpretation and overinterpretation*, edited by Stefan Collini (Cambridge, 1992), which has a very useful introduction by the editor (pp. 1-21); Seán Burke, *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida* (Edinburgh, 1992); and Paul Hamilton, *Historicism, The New Critical Idiom* (London and New York, 1996).

45. The many references to "seeming" and "sense" in this closing sequence and across the rest of *Cymbeline*, and the interest the play shows in perception and the problems of knowing, remind me strongly of a key passage on scepticism in Montaigne's *Apology for Raymond Sebond*: 'the senses are to some more obscure and dimme, and to some more open and quicke. We receive things differently, according as they are, and seeme vnto vs. Things ["*nostre sembler*"] being then so vncertaine, and full of controversie, it is no longer a wonder if it be told vs, that we may avouch snow to seeme white vnto vs; but to affirme that it is in essence and in truth, we cannot warrant ourselves: which foundation being so shaken, all the Science in the world must necessarily goe to wracke' (quoted from *The Essayes; Or, Morall, Politike and Millitarie Discourses of Lo: Michaell de Montaigne*, translated by John Florio (London, 1603), p. 348; I have used the Scolar Press facsimile reprint (Menston, 1969); for the French text, see the edition of the *Essais* by Pierre Villey (Paris, 1924; reissued 1965), pp. 598-599). Montaigne is obviously not a source for *Cymbeline* in any conventional sense, but he does seem to me to be a vital and considerable influence/presence.

46. 'Cymbeline and the Perils of Interpretation', *New Orleans Review*, 10, nos. 2-3 (Summer-Fall 1983), 137-145 (p. 137); I am much indebted to Thomas's essay. For a more recent (albeit less adventurous) exploration of the play's concern with the "perils" of interpretation, see Alison Thorne, "'To write and read / Be henceforth treacherous": *Cymbeline* and the problem of interpretation', in *Shakespeare's Late Plays: New Readings*, edited by Jennifer Richards and James Knowles (Edinburgh, 1999), pp. 176-190.

47. 'Cymbeline and the Perils of Interpretation', p. 137; Thomas comments specifically on the importance of "seeming" in the play later in his essay (pp. 142-143); and see further Garber, 'Cymbeline and the Languages of Myth', pp. 105-107. Highly relevant here too is Cynthia Lewis's similar exploration of simulation and misperception.

48. For the passage quoted, see 'Cymbeline and the Perils of Interpretation', p. 143. Faith and a transcendence of the rational are treated as elements central to the experience of the play in much of the criticism on *Cymbeline* (as indeed they are in commentary on the late plays as a group). Cynthia Lewis, for example, argues that (religious) faith is seen to be 'the only viable means to living harmonious spiritual and social lives', with the drama itself offering its audiences 'a test of faith in its own aesthetic and moral integrity' (p. 361). Thomas, however, is much more aware of the pressures working against belief here, and adopts an essentially dialectical position in relation to this subject - one that is generally a lot more convincing as a result. This leads him to acknowledge that the play allows of (encourages) a sceptical response to the willingness to believe of its own characters - though he still feels it implies at the same time that there may actually be negative or dangerous consequences in any failure to believe along with them (see pp. 143-145).

49. For my stress here on the interpretation of interpretation, I would own a debt to Montaigne, via Derrida. Thus the English text of Derrida's 'Structure, Sign, and Play' renders that essay's epigraph from Montaigne as the injunction, 'we need to interpret interpretations more than to interpret things' (p. 278). This strikes me as quite a useful motto, but it is actually rather a loose translation of the original French, which appears in Montaigne's final essay, 'On Experience', as part of an equally useful but somewhat more ambivalent discussion of the proliferation of commentary, and the habit of grafting opinion upon opinion: 'il y a plus affaire à interpreter les interpretations qu'à interpreter les choses, et plus de livres sur les livres que sur autre subject: nous ne faisons que nous entregloser' (*Les Essais*, p. 1069). Florio's version of this provides my first epigraph; for a modern English translation, see M. A. Screech, ed., *The Complete Essays*, Penguin Classics (Harmondsworth, 1993; first published, 1991), p. 1212.

50. In invoking a power/authority/discourse/interpretation nexus of relations, I owe an obvious debt to New Historicist criticism and its reliance in turn on the work of Michel Foucault. On the concept of discourse in general, see Foucault's essay, 'The Order of Discourse',

translated by Ian McLeod, in *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*, edited by Robert Young (Boston, MA and London, 1981), pp. 48-78. In particular in this context, I would draw attention to Foucault's basic proposition that 'in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organised and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality' (p. 52); and note too his comments on some of the functions of commentary (pp. 56-58).

51. Nor, for that matter, is deception itself always presented as a bad thing - see the well-known comments by Cornelius (1.5. 42-44) and Pisanio (4.3. 42) on the parallel ideas of truth-in-falsehood and faithfulness-in-deceit. This is a further element stressed by Brook Thomas, who notes too the way "seeming" in the play 'takes on positive as well as negative connotations' (p. 142). The paradoxes involved are embodied in the disguised, emblematic, prone-to-lying (as, for example, at 4.2. 369-381) persona of "Fidele" adopted by Imogen.

52. The same could probably be said of Cloten where Imogen is concerned, but then Cloten is characterized by his lack of perception in general. However, the most impressive example of "misreading" in the entire play is of course perpetrated by Imogen herself, when faced with Cloten's headless corpse (4.2. 293-334). And whilst the audience is given enough information to know the truth regarding almost every intrigue, Cynthia Lewis rightly offers a warning about 'how easily the play may deceive any of us', noting that 'few of Shakespeare's plays prove more of a challenge for the audience to follow' (p. 344).

53. *On Deconstruction*, p. 132. Culler's comments here form part of an exposition (see pp. 131-134) of the discussion of interpretation in Derrida's 'Structure, Sign, and Play' which I quote from above. In Culler's view, Derrida's argument implies that 'one cannot simply or effectively choose to make meaning either the original meaning of an author or the creative experience of the reader' (p. 132). I have found Culler's work most useful, but the fact that he can manage to make Derrida's ideas sound like common sense has been taken by others as evidence that he must be deflecting their force. I am not committed enough to a deconstructionist approach to be all that bothered by this, but see further John M. Ellis, *Against Deconstruction* (Princeton, NJ, 1989), pp. 9-10, 60-62, 72-74, where some of the criticisms of Culler made by certain proponents of deconstruction are rehearsed, within the context of a strongly antagonistic (and one-sided) critique of Derrida and deconstructive theory.

54. *On Deconstruction*, p. 128; and see also p. 123, where this formula is introduced, and generally pp. 122-128, 132-134. Context is boundless because no context can ever be exhaustively described and because no context can be isolated as discrete or self-sufficient to a degree that could ever prevent the grafting on of additional contexts. Meaning is of course hardly fully definable even within any given

context, but it can perhaps be thought of as being at least asymptotic. Culler himself insists that the overall view of meaning he advances is not especially compatible with the idea of unlimited interpretative "free play" typically associated with deconstruction. He also seeks to defend the continuing validity of textual interpretation, complaining against the way in which 'the humanities [. . .] often seem touched with the belief that a theory which asserts the ultimate indeterminacy of meaning makes all effort pointless' (p. 133).

55. Edward W. Said, 'The Text, the World, the Critic', in *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*, edited by Josué V. Harari (Ithaca, NY, 1979), pp. 161-188; this is reprinted in revised form as the title essay in Said, *The World, The Text, and the Critic* (Cambridge, MA, 1983), pp. 31-53; the quotation here is from the original version (p. 165). It is a well-known standard objection to deconstructive criticism that it has a tendency to ignore the actuality of history, that its scepticism can serve to obscure and even circumvent real political struggle (see, for example, Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, pp. 124-128, 196-197 (references throughout are to the second edition)). In the realm of Renaissance studies, this attitude has of course been expressed on a practical level over recent decades in the broad shift of favour within poststructuralism from deconstruction to New Historicism. I have turned back to Said's essay here partly because in the context of its original publication it rather neatly bridges such theoretical oppositions, and also because it is explicitly concerned with the role (and the worldliness) of critics and criticism. But similar ideas can be encountered in such work as Stephen Greenblatt's Introduction to *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* (Chicago and London, 1980), pp. 1-9.

56. The problematics of literary referentiality are a recurring concern throughout Paul de Man's *Allegories of Reading*. Thus in his opening chapter, de Man notes that 'critics cry out for the fresh air of referential meaning', but he also argues that 'literature cannot merely be received as a definite unit of referential meaning that can be decoded without leaving a residue' (p. 4). Indeed, a key question for de Man, the answer to which cannot be presumed, 'is precisely whether a literary text is *about* that which it describes, represents, or states' (p. 57). As he writes in his 1982 essay, 'The Resistance to Theory', 'it is [. . .] not *a priori* certain that literature is a reliable source of information about anything but its own language' (reprinted in Lodge, pp. 354-371 (p. 362)).

57. *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*, p. 88; and see generally pp. 85-89. Said himself makes the relevant point that 'texts are a system of forces institutionalized at some expense by the reigning culture, not an ideal cosmos of ideally equal poems' ('The Text, the World, the Critic', p. 188). He also stresses the fact that 'critics are not merely the alchemical translators of texts into circumstantial reality or worldliness; for they too are subject to and producers of circumstances, which are felt regardless of whatever objectivity the critic's methods

possess' (quoting in this instance from the revised version of Said's essay, *The World, The Text, and the Critic*, p. 35).

58. *On Deconstruction*, p. 133. For the distinction invoked here between performative and constative speech acts, see J. L. Austin, *How to do Things with Words*, edited by J. O. Urmson (Oxford, 1962), pp. 1-11. My own use of speech-act theory and its terminology is, however, almost entirely dependent on its reconfiguration within deconstruction. For a summary of the work (and the controversy) involved, see Culler's extended discussion, pp. 110-134. Culler's central argument is that the constative/performative distinction reflects 'a difference *within* each speech act' (p. 133); and note besides the way in which de Man reads 'the aporia between performative and constative language' as 'merely a version of the aporia between trope and persuasion that both generates and paralyzes rhetoric' (*Allegories of Reading*, p. 131; remarks also quoted by Culler, p. 134). On a broader level, Eagleton offers some particularly helpful comments on the relevance of Austin's ideas and speech-act theory to literature and literary studies in general (see *Literary Theory*, pp. 102-104).

59. 'The Text, the World, the Critic', p. 171; this idea is put forward by Said as a direct riposte to certain trends prevalent in critical theory at the time he was writing, primarily what he identifies as an 'undue emphasis upon the limitlessness of interpretation' deriving from 'a conception of the text as existing entirely within a hermetic, Alexandrian textual universe, having no connection with actuality' (p. 171).

60. See Eco and others, *Interpretation and overinterpretation*, particularly Eco's essays 'Interpretation and history', pp. 23-43 (in which the idea of *intentio operis* is introduced and explained, p. 25); and 'Overinterpreting texts', pp. 45-66 (notably pp. 64-66). Despite my basic enthusiasm for Eco's ideas here, I share Collini's reservation that the 'provocative notion' of *intentio operis*, as set out in these essays, seems 'to call for further elaboration' regarding its 'nature, status, and identification' (see Collini's Introduction, 'Interpretation terminable and interminable', pp. 9-10). Eco's choice of terminology reflects his awareness of interpretative theory from across centuries of Western history, in the light of which, as he notes, 'most so-called "post-modern" thought will look very pre-antique' ('Interpretation and history', p. 25).

61. 'Overinterpreting texts', p. 64. Eco's position is at root avowedly traditional. Thus as he acknowledges, 'more than a parameter to use in order to validate the interpretation, the text is an object that the interpretation builds up in the course of the circular effort of validating itself on the basis of what it makes up as its result. I am not ashamed to admit that I am so defining the old and still valid "hermeneutic circle"' (p. 64). What this perspective (as so much other interpretative theory until recently) notably omits is any sense of the text *qua* text - of textual transmission, textual instability, the text as editorial construction, and so on. See especially on this subject Gary

Taylor, 'What is an Author [not]?', *Critical Survey*, 7 (1995), 241-254 (pp. 246-247).

62. To quote de Man (though he is writing here exclusively with narrative fiction in mind): 'even if we free ourselves of all false questions of intent and rightfully reduce the narrator to the status of a mere grammatical pronoun, without which the narrative could not come into being, this subject remains endowed with a function that is not grammatical but rhetorical, in that it gives voice, so to speak, to a grammatical syntagm. The term *voice*, even when used in a grammatical terminology as when we speak of the passive or interrogative voice, is, of course, a metaphor inferring by analogy the intent of the subject from the structure of the predicate' (*Allegories of Reading*, p. 18). There is an illuminating exploration of certain aspects of the wider idea of "voice" in literary texts in Jonathan Goldberg, *Voice Terminal Echo: Postmodernism and English Renaissance texts* (New York and London, 1986), a book which also offers some specific comments on *Cymbeline* and the exposition of the oracle (pp. 84-86). Obviously, I am myself only just touching here on what is an extremely complex issue; but see further below, note 65.

63. 'Overinterpreting texts', p. 64. For the notion of a text's performative rhetoric, I am also drawing, although my emphasis is very different, on de Man's arguments in *Allegories of Reading* (notably from chapter six onwards); and see besides Norris's discussion of de Man's approach here (*Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*, pp. 105-108). But I am evidently not working at anything remotely like the same level of theoretical abstraction as de Man, and in any case, with my focus on Shakespearian drama, I am dealing with a type of text totally different from any of those on which he concentrates. That difference is in fact absolutely fundamental, since the issue of theatrical performance (a subject which none of the theoretical material discussed so far really addresses) thoroughly complicates any of the questions raised here concerning intentionality and "willed" meaning, not to mention the entire concept of "the text". And even at a "purely" textual level, there is still plenty of scope for a gap (aporia) between "willed" and "achieved" meaning.

64. In fact, Eco is himself very much interested in the subject of authorial intention here, and his *intentio operis* is conceived of as mediating between this and the intention of the reader/interpreter ('Interpretation and history', p. 25; and see too the essay, 'Between author and text', in *Interpretation and overinterpretation*, pp. 67-88). It should be clear that I am not trying to advocate the exploration of some form of intention as the only (or primary) goal of interpretative criticism. As Jonathan Culler argues in his essay in the same volume ('In defence of overinterpretation', pp. 109-123), it can often prove productive or desirable to read against the grain of a text, to call into question its values and assumptions or challenge whatever ideas and opinions its author might seem to be expressing. Even so, such a project still

requires one to be able to identify authorial/textual intention in the first place. On what is in fact, contrary to received opinion, the crucial function of the concept of authorial intention in much poststructuralist (and particularly deconstructive) criticism, see Burke, *The Death and Return of the Author*, pp. 138-150 especially. For a defence of the value of sometimes pushing critical interpretation into speculation about Shakespeare's own intentions, see Peter Erickson, 'Shakespeare and the "Author-Function"', in *Shakespeare's "Rough Magic"*, edited by Erickson and Coppélia Kahn (Cranbury, NJ, 1985), pp. 245-255. And for some alternative recent expressions of interest in the topic of Shakespeare and intentionality, see Marcus, *Puzzling Shakespeare*, pp. 40-42; and Richard Wilson's Introduction, 'The return of the author', in *Will Power: Essays on Shakespearean authority* (Hemel Hempstead, 1993), pp. 1-21.

65. *The Death and Return of the Author*, p. 173; note also his comments (in relation to Nietzsche) on 'autobiographical performance' and 'the performance of a subject within his text' (p. 171), and see generally pp. 110-115, 170-174. As Burke emphasizes, the nature and significance of authorial inscription, and its appeal and importance, vary enormously 'from author to author, text to text, textual moment to textual moment'; and furthermore, 'each new act of reading itself presupposes a different or modified philosophy of the author' (p. 173). In particular, and not unnaturally, the whole subject of authorship takes on vital extra resonances where marginalized or disempowered "voices" are involved. But the concept of "voice" at a textual level always remains a metaphor, very precisely a "figure of speech", for as Roland Barthes famously remarks, 'writing is the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin' ('The Death of the Author', in Barthes, *Image Music Text*, edited and translated by Stephen Heath (London, 1977), pp. 142-148 (p. 142)). Performance, on the other hand, offers a multiplicity of actual, individual (and contending?) voices.

66. Posthumus's lines mentioned here read: 'What fairies haunt this ground? A book? O rare one, | Be not, as is our fangled world, a garment | Nobler than that it covers. Let thy effects | So follow to be most unlike our courtiers, | As good as promise'; and note also his reference to 'this golden chance' (5.5. 226). The allusion in this speech to the false seeming of courtiers invokes another of the play's recurring images, linking right back to its opening lines (1.1. 1-3 - a notable interpretative crux in themselves). The unusual prevalence of disguise in *Cymbeline* has been much discussed, but for particularly concentrated attention see John Scott Colley, 'Disguise and New Guise in *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 7 (1974), 233-252; and Nancy K. Hayles, 'Sexual Disguise in *Cymbeline*', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 41 (1980), 231-247. On the play's language of clothing and economics, see again my comments above (note 36). Given its associations with the wager, the dispute over the tribute, and the action's many intrigues and deceptions, the general absence of such imagery from the closing moments seems to carry a tonal dimension which relates to the effects I am describing in this paragraph.

67. See Howard Dobin, *Merlin's Disciples: Prophecy, Poetry, and Power in Renaissance England* (Stanford, CA, 1990). For an outline of Dobin's basic theoretical framework, consult particularly pp. 1-18; on traditions of political prophecy in the sixteenth-century, pp. 19-60; and on the instability of prophetic interpretation generally, pp. 61-104.

68. The indented quotation is from p. 22, the following two from p. 25. I am particularly indebted here and below to Dobin's sections on 'Merlin and His Prophecies' (pp. 19-26) and 'Plural Meanings, Plural Voices' (pp. 94-104 - see especially p. 98).

69. Dobin argues that 'prophecy remains true only in the absence of interpretation, when all possibilities coexist; prophetic truth is the fact of undecidable, multiple meaning'. He goes on to suggest in the same paragraph that 'misinterpretation is not the symptom of the flawed human attempt to construe divine truth, as the Renaissance would have it; instead, it is the inevitable consequence of trying to place limits on the indeterminacy of prophetic discourse. The occasion of meaning offered by prophetic discourse is inevitably an invitation to error' (p. 101). Dobin quotes here the *locus classicus* of amphibolous prophecy, "*Aio te, Acacida, Romanos vincere posse*" (p. 101; and see in addition p. 127), which can be construed equally in two mutually incompatible ways ("I tell you that you, a descendant of Aeneas, can conquer the Romans", or vice versa'). Shakespeare invokes this same oracle at the end (in both versions) of the conjuring scene in *2 Henry VI* (1.4. 59), mentioned above (see note 5; I have quoted the gloss on the Latin given in Hattaway's edition, p. 108).

70. Dobin, p. 22; such subversion is achieved 'most obviously by challenging the divine sanction of the status quo, but more insidiously by multiplying meaning and encouraging interpretation'. For strategies of political containment in relation to prophetic discourse in Renaissance England, see Dobin's chapter, 'Technologies of Power', pp. 105-133 (and particularly, pp. 115-126). Dobin emphasizes the fact that prophecy flourished during times of political instability and tension, frequently concerning itself with the subject of succession (pp. 105-106, 126-133). He comments specifically here on the topic of amphibology (pp. 126-128), but there is a more impressive exploration of the anxieties released by amphibolous language and its associations with 'the riddle of treason' (p. 121) in Steven Mullaney's well-known chapter, 'Lying Like Truth: Riddle, Representation, and Treason', in *The Place of the Stage: Licence, Play, and Power in Renaissance England* (Chicago and London, 1988), pp. 116-134 (especially pp. 119-121). On the role of prophecy in British political history more generally, its directly legitimating applications as well as its oppositional/revolutionary potential, see Sharon L. Jansen Jaech, 'Political Prophecy and Macbeth's "Sweet Bodements"', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 34 (1983), 290-297; and Marjorie Garber, "'What's Past Is Prologue": Temporality and Prophecy in Shakespeare's History Plays', in *Renaissance Genres*, edited by Barbara Kiefer Lewalski (Cambridge, MA and London, 1986), pp. 301-331 (pp. 308-312).

71. *Merlin's Disciples*, p. 164; and see generally here Dobin's chapter on 'Textual Containment', pp. 134-183. The remarks quoted are directed by Dobin specifically at Shakespeare's history plays (see the section 'History and Prophecy', pp. 154-165), fiction supplying history with those 'arbitrary moments of beginning and ending' necessary for any narrative closure, and within whose 'epic form, prophecies lose their subversive, indeterminate quality' (pp. 163-164). For Dobin, then, the use of prophecy in the histories serves a clearcut ideological function, 'to affirm the presence of God, the ultimate authority of unequivocal truth, and the operation of divine providence' (p. 165). This seems to me absolutely wrong (see further note 73). And I also want to stress that indeterminate meaning is not a universal subversive, that it only works to undermine specific types of authority. As Terry Eagleton comments in relation to the politics of critical theory: 'it is unwise to assume that ambiguity, indeterminacy, undecidability are always subversive strikes against an arrogantly monological certitude; on the contrary, they are the stock-in-trade of many a juridical enquiry and official investigation' (*The Ideology of the Aesthetic* (Oxford, 1990; reprinted 1996), pp. 379-380). Certainly, in the world of Shakespeare studies, the idea of interpretative indeterminacy or textual openness has frequently been invoked precisely to deflect or contain the force of radical readings.

72. Though having said that, there is probably no real reason to suppose that Dobin could not have assimilated these examples to his overall model had he attempted to do so. The omission of *Cymbeline* (there is no index entry for the play and I can recall no reference to it in the main text) is hardly surprising given its marginal status in the canon, and can probably be safely assumed to be due simply to questions of space or lack of interest. Dobin also manages to ignore Shakespeare's Roman plays in general. The date of *Cymbeline* is not an issue here, since he does include comment on *Henry VIII* (pp. 173-178), remarks I return to in Chapter Six.

73. In fact, this is largely also Dobin's assessment of the way in which prophecy actually functions in the literary/dramatic texts he considers. So whilst he argues that 'each work resorts to a strategy of textual containment to manage and make safe the subversive impulses of the prophetic material' (p. 135), in practice 'the plural meanings of prophetic discourse resist the ideological and textual containment of epic form' (p. 165). Where I fundamentally disagree with Dobin is in locating the resistance involved. His theoretical paradigms, rigidly applied, lead both to a reading of the deconstruction of meaning as merely a textual accident resulting from the uncontrollable force of prophetic language, and to the assumption that the literature in question is pursuing an active project of ideological containment. Dobin specifically rejects any model of authorial intention (p. 155), but he is still very clearly making use of (even deeply reliant on) one of textual intention. What is really at stake here is the issue of the "willed" meaning of the texts concerned, and that is primarily a question of interpretation.

74. On the temporal paradoxes involved in presenting prophecies within the framework of historical fiction, the peculiar 'logic of the anterior future', see Garber, "What's Past Is Prologue", pp. 306-308 (p. 307). Nosworthy actually (mis)prints 'foreshadow'd' at this point in his text (5.5. 474) - the form is not recorded as an emendation, and indeed there can be no real reason for proposing it as an emendation either. The potential for graphic confusion in this case is partly an unfortunate side-effect of modern spelling; the Folio itself reads 'fore-shew'd' (TLN 3805). But Nosworthy's editorial slip reflects my sense that "foreshadowed" would be the more obvious word to expect in this context. *OED* offers two relevant glosses for "foreshow" as a verb (VI, 59): 'to show or make known beforehand; chiefly, to foretell, prognosticate' (sense 2); and 'of things: To indicate beforehand, give promise or warning of; to foreshadow, prefigure' (sense 2b). Whilst this makes explicit some overlap of meaning between the two terms, the entry for the verb "foreshadow" firmly reflects its more provisional quality: 'to serve as the shadow thrown before (an object); hence, to represent *imperfectly* beforehand, prefigure' (VI, 58, my emphasis). It is precisely any such suggestion of imperfect foreknowledge which Philharmonus's "foreshowed" works to obscure.

75. For some discussion of medieval and Renaissance dream-theory and its relevance to Shakespearian drama, see especially Marjorie B. Garber, *Dream in Shakespeare* (New Haven and London, 1974), pp. 1-13; and also Peter Holland, ed., *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 1994), pp. 1-21. As both these critics point out, the major traditions and discourses available were made up as much of literary writings (dream-visions, dream-plays) as of (quasi-)scientific treatises or commentaries.

76. This idea comes partly from Dobin, who suggests that the 'superabundance of possible meanings transforms prophecy into pure text' (p. 99). He also writes, whilst discussing general attitudes to prophetic discourse in the sixteenth century: 'prophetic texts - like the classical texts with which the Renaissance occupied itself - were simply there, offering themselves for interpretation and promising eventual revelation' (p. 96).

77. To quote Freud on just one aspect of the problems of knowing raised here: 'since the only check that we have upon the validity of our memory is objective confirmation, and since that is unobtainable for dreams, which are our own personal experience and of which the only source we have is our recollection, what value can we still attach to our memory of dreams?' (Sigmund Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, translated by James Strachey, edited by Angela Richards, The Penguin Freud Library, IV (Harmondsworth, 1976), p. 111; and see further the later section on 'The Forgetting of Dreams', pp. 656-680). I have also found useful in this context Derrida's essay, 'Freud and the Scene of Writing', in *Writing and Difference*, pp. 196-231 (most notably, pp. 206-215).

78. They are certainly totally unnecessary from a syntactic or semantic perspective, and are just as gratuitous in narrative terms as the Soothsayer's prophecy itself, being of use for no obvious reason other than that suggested here. Their parenthetical nature is somewhat clearer in the Folio, where they are both actually placed in round brackets (TLN 2673, 2677). The considerable presence of such brackets in the Folio text of *Cymbeline* is generally thought to reflect a scribal characteristic, probably attributable to Ralph Crane (see *Companion*, p. 604). But as is well known, contorted and parenthetical syntax is pervasive in *Cymbeline*, however it may be punctuated. See especially on this Roger Warren, *Cymbeline, Shakespeare in Performance* (Manchester and New York, 1989), pp. 6-7; and, with interesting specific comment on editorial solutions to some of the unusually complex problems/challenges with regard to punctuation posed by this play, Ann Thompson, 'Casting Sense between the Speech'.

79. This effect of replicating a sense of a dream-state within the reality of the dramatized world is by no means confined only to this part of the play. Thus Posthumus's uncertainty about the divide between dream and waking parallels exactly Imogen's earlier response when she awakens to find herself beside Cloten's headless corpse ('the dream's here still. Even when I wake it is | Without me as within me; not imagined, felt' (4.2. 308-309)). The audience itself soon goes on to experience another vertiginous shift in perspective when Posthumus's reading of the label leads straight on into his extraordinary dialogue with the Jailer (5.5. 245-300). But the idea of a dream-like play-world also relates to the wider metaphoric overlap between dream and theatre already heavily exploited by Shakespeare in such works as *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Taming of the Shrew*. See generally on this theme Jackson I. Cope, *The Theater and the Dream: From Metaphor to Form in Renaissance Drama* (Baltimore and London, 1973).

80. The recurring focus on dream-experience in *Cymbeline* is well reflected in the way the play has proved an especially rich vein for psychoanalytical criticism, going back to Charles H. Hofling, 'Notes on Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 1 (1965), 118-136. The most extended consideration, but one I find deeply unconvincing, is an essay by Murray M. Schwartz, 'Between Fantasy and Imagination: A Psychological Exploration of *Cymbeline*', in *Psychoanalysis and Literary Process*, edited by Frederick Crews (Cambridge, MA, 1970), pp. 219-283. More useful and far more restrained is Janet Adelman's discussion in her book, *Suffocating Mothers* (New York and London, 1992), pp. 198-219. One of the best treatments of the dream of Jupiter is that by Meredith Skura, 'Interpreting Posthumus' Dream from Above and Below: Families, Psychoanalysts, and Literary Critics', in *Representing Shakespeare: New Psychoanalytic Essays*, edited by Murray M. Schwartz and Coppélia Kahn (Baltimore and London, 1980), pp. 203-216. On some of the wider parallels between the action of the play and the strange patterning of dreams, see Garber, *Dream in Shakespeare*, pp. 157-163; Arthur Kirsch, *Shakespeare and the Experience of Love* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 144-172;

D. E. Landry, 'Dreams as History: The Strange Unity of *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 33 (1982), 68-79; and Peter J. Smith's chapter, 'Dreaming Drama and Dramatising Dreams: Towards a Reading of Sexuality in *Cymbeline*', in his *Social Shakespeare* (Basingstoke and London, 1995), pp. 95-119. Naturally enough, the psychoanalytical line of criticism has been able to make great play with the play's obsessive punning; see in particular here Skura's essay (pp. 212-215), and the remarks from Brian Gibbons quoted in note 34.

81. *Shakespeare's Ghost Writers: Literature as uncanny causality* (New York and London, 1987), p. 13. Garber is primarily concerned here with the authorship controversy in Shakespeare in its broadest terms, as anti-Stratfordianism (see pp. 1-12). But her overall perspective illuminates issues of authorship in general, and her arguments are easily adapted to apply to the sort of smaller-scale dispute that is involved in this case. I should perhaps make it unequivocally clear, though I hope this is already obvious, that in referring to Garber's question, I am in no way myself seeking to raise or revive any doubts concerning Shakespeare's actual personal authorship of the whole of the vision-of-Jupiter sequence.

82. *Shakespeare's Ghost Writers*, p. 18; and see too pp. xiii-xv. The link detected here is of central importance to Garber's whole idea of "ghost-writing", which also draws upon more general images of the author as both ghostly textual presence and ghostly father-figure. Her invocation of Freudian notions of the unconscious and the uncanny (see pp. 13-16) has a special resonance for my own work in the light of the collocation of ghosts and dreaming at this point in *Cymbeline*.

83. See generally *Shakespeare's Ghost Writers*, pp. 1-27. Garber argues that the uncanniness associated with the appearance of ghosts is a pointer to 'the loss of the certainty of the concept of origin' (p. 15). With regard to the Shakespeare canon in general, she writes: 'again and again, the plays themselves can be seen to dramatize questions raised in the authorship controversy: who wrote this? did someone else have a hand in it? is the apparent author the real author? is the official version to be trusted? or are there suppressed stories, hidden messages, other signatures?'. For Garber, moreover, 'the plays not only thematize these issues, they also theorize them, offering a critique of authorship and, in particular, of the possibility of origin. Authorship itself will be seen as a belated and disputable matter' (p. 26). Even so, Garber's own focus, along with the interest she describes, is still of course very much linked to the work of one particular individual author. So it seems highly appropriate in this context to quote from Seán Burke's closing remarks in *The Death and Return of the Author*, where the 'question of the author' is viewed as 'an interminable haunting', 'that unquiet presence which theory can neither explain nor exorcise' (p. 174).

84. Garber's own earlier work, rather disappointingly, actually exemplifies the standard negative critical treatment accorded this part of the play. Thus in *Dream in Shakespeare*, having dismissed the

Soothsayer's dream as 'a curiously sterile incident, without either poetry or symbolism to redeem it from mere linear plot prediction', she goes on to condemn Posthumus's vision itself as 'similarly flawed', characterizing its verse, 'in undistinguished fourteeners', as 'less dense and rewarding than we have come to expect from the language of the visionary moment' (p. 161). This attitude no doubt does much to account for the fact that Garber makes no mention at all of the vision of Jupiter in *Shakespeare's Ghost Writers*, despite its very obvious relevance to her major themes.

85. The vision sequence as a whole can be plausibly related to the dream-vision tradition of medieval poetry, and I find it tempting in particular to see in Jupiter's eagle a hint of an allusion or debt to Geoffrey Chaucer's *The House of Fame*, where an eagle serves as both a guide (authority-figure) and a mount for the dreamer/narrator. The possibility of some such connection is appealing in terms of the reading I am proposing here, given the deep scepticism concerning authority (*auctoritee*) modern criticism has been able to discover in Chaucer's dream-visions, most especially *The House of Fame*. See the comments on this work in, for example, Alice S. Miskimin, *The Renaissance Chaucer* (New Haven and London, 1975), pp. 67-80; A. C. Spearing, *Medieval Dream-Poetry* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 73-89; Lisa J. Kiser, *Truth and Textuality in Chaucer's Poetry* (Hanover, NH and London, 1991), pp. 25-41; and John Burrow, 'Poems Without Endings', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 13 (1991), 17-37 (pp. 33-36). There is no real reason to suppose any precise (or even close) correlation between twentieth-century attitudes to *The House of Fame* and what Shakespeare might have found in it, but it is worth noting that, at least from a modern perspective, the poem's bewildering disjunctions and sceptical tone are hardly vitiated by the brief spurious ending it carried in all the editions of Chaucer printed during the dramatist's lifetime.

86. Two obvious works to mention in this connection, sources for the play (of one sort or another) which both, like it, thoroughly mix history with legend and romance, are Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* and Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* (*The History of the Kings of Britain*). In each of these, visions, oracles, and prophecies are linked directly to British national destiny, notably through the paradigm figure of Merlin (on whom, see Dobin, *passim*). The importance to *Cymbeline* of *The Faerie Queene*, and in particular of that poem's use of legendary history, is impressively discussed in Gibbons, 'Fabled *Cymbeline*', pp. 29-35. The general influence (whether immediate or via the chronicle tradition) of the material of Geoffrey's *Historia* is given valuable consideration in J. P. Brockbank's pioneering essay of 1958, 'History and Histrionics in *Cymbeline*' (reprinted in Brockbank, *On Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 272-282). Brockbank picks out some interesting parallels between Posthumus's dream and prophetic visions carrying national significance attributed to such key pseudo-historical personages as Brute (legendary founder of Britain) and Cadwallader (the last "British" king). But whilst Spenser and Geoffrey are usefully exemplary here, there are plenty of other texts which could also be

invoked, including major classical antecedents. In the Shakespeare canon itself, actual designated "Soothsayers" are a notable feature of (indeed, a feature confined to) Roman plays.

87. The Biblical analogues involved are especially well covered in Naseeb Shaheen, 'The Use of Scripture in *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 4 (1968), 294-315. Shaheen points to a precise parallel for the 'lion's whelp' in Genesis 49. 9; some strong similarities between Job 14. 7-9 and the label's dead tree-stock and new growth references; and the presence of a cedar and its branches in Ezekiel 31. 3-12, and of an eagle and a cedar branch in Ezekiel 17. 3-4 (p. 303). See also John Boe ('*Cymbeline* and Ezekiel', *Notes and Queries*, 240 (1995), 331-334), who stresses further the relevance of Ezekiel 17, and notes too additional uses of the lion's whelp motif in Ezekiel 19. 1-7. There may well be additional parallels awaiting identification, since Biblical prophecy is of course intensely intertextual across itself; and see the following note.

88. The probable relevance of the "off-stage" birth of Christ to *Cymbeline* is suggested by Northrop Frye (see 'The Argument of Comedy', in *English Institute Essays: 1948*, edited by D. A. Robertson, Jr. (New York, 1949), pp. 58-73 (p. 72); and *A Natural Perspective* (New York and London, 1965), pp. 66-67). There is a sustained exploration of most of the connections involved in Robin Moffet, '*Cymbeline* and the Nativity', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 13 (1962), 207-218, though I have considerable reservations about his reading of the play. Moffet himself highlights the Biblical language of the label and the general atmosphere of the fulfilment of prophecy that makes itself felt in the closing moments (pp. 214-217). He notes especially the Messianic dimensions of the parallel passages in Ezekiel and of the image of the lion's whelp (on this last, see again Shaheen, 'Use of Scripture', p. 314), and comments as well on the flight of the eagle into the sun, with its hint 'of the familiar sun/Son pun' (p. 217). On Christian allegorizations and moralizations of the eagle-and-sun topos in bestiaries and the emblem tradition, see further Simonds, *Myth, Emblem, and Music*, pp. 213-227. That *Cymbeline* was ruling at the time of Christ's birth is the principal "fact" about his reign recorded in both Holinshed ('The Historie of England', Book 3, Chapter 18; *Holinshed's Chronicles*, I, 478-480) and *The Faerie Queene* (II. 10. 50). Modern archaeological evidence (chiefly, that from coinage) suggests that the historical *Cymbeline* (Cunobelinus) actually came to power some time during the first decade AD; see Peter Salway, *A History of Roman Britain* (Oxford, 1997), p. 47; and Barry Cunliffe's brief essay, '*Cymbeline's* Britain', in the programme for the 1989 RSC Stratford main-house production of *Cymbeline*, directed by Bill Alexander ([pp. 10-12]). For Augustus and the birth of Jesus, see Luke 2. 1-7.

89. Such allusions are argued for quite strongly by Nosworthy (*Cymbeline*, pp. lxxxi-lxxxiii), on the basis of both the play's earlier reference to Imogen as 'th'Arabian bird' (1.6. 17), and the importance of the sun and a tree (identified on occasion as a cedar) in phoenix mythology and iconography. Nosworthy acknowledges a debt here to

Roger Lancelyn Green, 'The Phoenix and the Tree', *English*, 7 (1948-49), 11-15. There is a good discussion of the early history of the phoenix myth and of the development of the Christological symbolism that became attached to it, in N. F. Blake's edition of the Anglo-Saxon poem, *The Phoenix*, revised edition (Exeter, 1990), pp. 8-16.

90. And of course, the characteristic language and imagery of Biblical prophecy also served very much as a fundamental stock-in-trade of literary and artistic symbolism, furnishing many of the commonplace motifs of romance writings, fables, allegories, proverbs, emblem-books, religious iconography, and the like. Of immediate relevance to the passage at hand, Judiana Lawrence (p. 451) has noted a comparable use of the symbol of the "lion's whelp" in an emblematic riddle conveying details of royal genealogy in Robert Greene's quasi-historical drama, *James IV* (c. 1590-1591); see 5.6. 119-140, referring to the Revels Plays edition by Norman Sanders (London, 1970) - Sanders himself identifies Greene's play as 'an early attempt at that dramatic hybrid of which *Cymbeline* is probably the best example' (p. xxxvii). The Shakespeare canon yields at least one very direct parallel of its own to the cluster of imagery here, with cedar, eagle, and lion (and the name of Jove) all appearing together within a short space of time at *3 Henry VI* (*Richard Duke of York*), 5.2. 11-15 (the link is pointed out by Wilson Knight, *The Crown of Life*, p. 201; the lines in question form another echo of Ezekiel 31 - see Michael Hattaway, ed., *The Third Part of King Henry VI*, *The New Cambridge Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 183, note to ll. 11-14). Worth mentioning too in this context is Hieatt's discussion of the play's eagle imagery and the connections he draws between this and Spenser's poem, *The Ruins of Rome* ('*Cymbeline* and the Intrusion of Lyric', pp. 108-110). And see again, generally, Simonds, *Myth, Emblem, and Music*, with its thorough survey of the many symbols, myths, and topoi invoked or alluded to in *Cymbeline*.

91. See H. L. Rogers, 'The Prophetic Label in *Cymbeline*', *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 11 (1960), 296-299. Rogers briefly traces the transmission of this vision from the anonymous eleventh-century *Vita Aedwardi Regis* (*The Life of King Edward*), through Caxton's translation of *The Golden Legende* (Westminster, 1483, and many subsequent editions (*STC* 24873 ff.)), and on into the chronicle tradition. His modest note appears not to have attracted much attention. A personal interest on Shakespeare's part in the figure of Edward the Confessor is testified to by *Macbeth*, 4.3. 141-160. In the general emphasis there on Edward's saintliness (and see also 3.6. 24-37), it is specified that 'he hath a heavenly gift of prophecy' (4.3. 158). As Rogers points out (p. 297), Holinshed's account of King Edward's vision occurs in a section of 'The Historie of England' (Book 8) which (as far as it is possible to tell) must have been consulted by Shakespeare for details of the death of Young Siward in *Macbeth* (see *Holinshed's Chronicles*, I, 739-766). That *Cymbeline* makes use of other material from Holinshed which probably formed part of Shakespeare's reading for *Macbeth* is well known (see Bullough, *Sources*, VIII, 11, and 46-50).

92. For the earliest surviving version of this vision, see the text of the *Vita Aedwardi Regis*, edited and translated by Frank Barlow (London, 1962), pp. 75-76. The later development of the official line of interpretation, which treated the prophecy as being fulfilled in the person of Henry II, is traced by Barlow in an appendix, pp. 89-90; and see too Rogers, p. 296. The latter, noting that Holinshed omits the traditional exposition of the prophecy, offers the tentative suggestion (pp. 298-299) that Shakespeare might have known this from *The Golden Legend*. In support, he points to some possible parallels between the Soothsayer's reading of the label and Caxton's exposition of Edward's vision; for the relevant passage, see *The Golden Legend; or, Lives of the Saints*, edited by F. S. Ellis, 7 vols (London, 1900), VI, 30-32. Some form of connection here is not implausible, and it is perhaps worth mentioning that *The Golden Legend* is cited for its absurd etymologizing by Henrie Stephen (*A World of Wonders*, p. 292), on the exact same page on which he quotes the "mollis aer" etymology. Edward the Confessor's exemplary status in Holinshed as the last British king (in effect), creator of equitable laws, ideal monarch, and historical precedent, is stressed in Annabel Patterson, *Reading Holinshed's 'Chronicles'* (Chicago and London, 1994); see especially pp. ix-x, 104-109. Edward's reputation as a pre-conquest native law-giver certainly renders him a thoroughly appropriate figure to be alluded to in a play that has already invoked the legendary first British King, Mulmutius, in precisely that capacity (see 3.1. 53-61).

93. On the term, "Galfridian", here, see Dobin, who explains its use to identify the 'most common device' found in the prophecies of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia*, namely 'animal symbolism' (p. 21); see in particular the section entitled 'The Prophecies of Merlin', in Lewis Thorpe's translation of *The History of the Kings of Britain*, Penguin Classics (Harmondsworth, 1966), pp. 170-185 (subsequent references to Geoffrey's text are all to this edition). The image of the 'lion's whelp' can clearly be related to this tradition, in the interpretation of which genealogy and heraldry had come to be much exploited (Dobin, pp. 69-73). For further comment, see Garber, who notes in addition a general connection between the play's Welsh elements and the worlds of Celtic and Merlinic prophecy ("What's Past Is Prologue", pp. 309-312).

94. This is most obviously demonstrated by the pervasive use of such material in the Jacobean masque and other court entertainments, and in civic pageants, ceremonial entries, and similar forms of public laudation. The broad realm of Jacobean political imagery and artistic panegyric is examined in such studies as: Stephen Orgel, *The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1975); Jonathan Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature* (Baltimore and London, 1983); Graham Parry, *The Golden Age restor'd: The culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Manchester, 1981); R. Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia, 1987); Vaughan Hart, *Art and Magic in the Court of the Stuarts* (London and New York, 1994), especially

pp. 12-59, 155-173; and, with particular reference to late Shakespeare, Glynne Wickham, 'From Tragedy to Tragi-Comedy: *King Lear* as Prologue', *Shakespeare Survey*, 26 (1973), 33-48. Still useful on the treatment of Arthurian mythology during the early years of James's reign is Roberta Florence Brinkley, *Arthurian Legend in the Seventeenth Century* (Baltimore and London, 1932), pp. 1-25. On the important Tudor and Elizabethan background and legacy here, see particularly Frances A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London and Boston, MA, 1975), pp. 29-120; and for comment on the Elizabethan revival during the first decade of James's reign, although this work needs to be treated with some caution, Yates, *Shakespeare's Last Plays: A New Approach* (London, 1975), pp. 1-37.

95. The seminal article on this subject is the extended review of J. C. Maxwell's New Shakespeare edition of the play by Emrys Jones, 'Stuart *Cymbeline*', *Essays in Criticism*, 11 (1961), 84-99. Jones owes a debt to the important exploration of the historical dimensions of *Cymbeline* to be found in the criticism of Wilson Knight and Brockbank. His approach is developed in such work as Bernard Harris, "'What's past is prologue": *Cymbeline* and *Henry VIII*', in *Later Shakespeare*, edited by John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris (London, 1966), pp. 203-233; Wickham, 'From Tragedy to Tragi-Comedy', and more specifically relevant in this context, 'Riddle and Emblem: A Study in the Dramatic Structure of *Cymbeline*', in *English Renaissance Studies*, edited by John Carey (Oxford, 1980), pp. 94-113; Yates, *Shakespeare's Last Plays*, pp. 39-61; and David M. Bergeron, *Shakespeare's Romances and the Royal Family* (Lawrence, KS, 1985), pp. 136-157. The greater sophistication (broadly speaking) of more recent considerations of the play's topicality is exemplified by Leah Marcus's "local" approach, and by Jean E. Howard's excellent brief introduction in the *Norton Shakespeare*, pp. 2955-2963. Despite this large body of commentary, however, it seems clear that the topical resonances of *Cymbeline* are far from being exhausted yet. One line of interest particularly opened up of late has involved issues to do with law, contract, prerogative, and other related constitutional concerns; see for example, Constance Jordan, 'Contract and Conscience in *Cymbeline*', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 25 (1994), 33-58.

96. Wickham's 'Riddle and Emblem' (notably pp. 94-95, 100-106) is at its most helpful here, recording important examples of panegyric material using this strain of symbolism, and quoting relevant extracts from the King's own writings. On the regal associations of the eagle (very obviously invoked during the vision of Jupiter), see Nosworthy, *Cymbeline*, p. lxxiii; and on the cedar as 'the king of trees', p. lxxxii. The lion was one of James's personal heraldic devices, and as Marcus points out, 'was also associated with Britain and was considered to have been the heraldic animal of King Brute himself' ('Unease', p. 165, note 24, and see further p. 144). In connection with this last aspect, see the pseudo-Shakespearian play, *Lochrine* (1591-1595) - like Greene's *James IV* (see note 90), something of a generic precursor of *Cymbeline* - which in the space of a few lines compares its figure of Brutus (Brute) to both a

lion and a cedar (in the Act 1 Prologue and at 1.1. 12-19 respectively, using the text in Tucker Brooke, pp. 37-65).

97. The relevance to *Cymbeline* of the strong pacific emphasis in James's foreign policy is touched upon in Warren D. Smith, 'Cloten with Caius Lucius', *Studies in Philology*, 49 (1952), 185-194, and explored further in Paul A. Jorgensen, *Shakespeare's Military World* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1956), pp. 197-204. But the key study of this topic, in terms of its influence on later work, is again Emrys Jones's 'Stuart *Cymbeline*', which lays great stress on the parallels mentioned here (especially the significance of the King's motto), and draws attention besides to the importance in this context of James's image of himself as a second Augustus, presiding over a British equivalent of the *pax Romana* (pp. 90-93; see too on this Wickham, 'Riddle and Emblem'). The consciously Roman political symbolism and public style adopted by James are well discussed in Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature*, pp. 27-54; and note in addition the way he focuses on *Cymbeline* in his brief conclusion, pp. 240-241. There are some useful comments on the value and meaning attached to Rome in early Jacobean historical writings in D. R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England* (Toronto, 1990), pp. 170-175. For the source of the King's "*Beati pacifici*" motto itself, see Matthew 5.9.

98. There is now at last a full-length study of Shakespeare's recurring engagements with the theory and tradition of the *translatio imperii*, across the entire length of his dramatic career, in the shape of Heather James's excellent book, *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, politics, and the translation of empire* (Cambridge, 1997); see especially her chapters, 'Shakespeare and the Troy legend', pp. 7-41 (for the background and history to the topos); and '*Cymbeline*'s mingle-mangle: Britain's Roman histories', pp. 151-188. Valuable too on this topic is Patricia Parker's essay, 'Romance and Empire: Anachronistic *Cymbeline*', in Logan and Teskey, pp. 189-207; and see also the discussions of *Cymbeline* in Robert S. Miola, *Shakespeare's Rome* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 206-235; and Coppélia Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women* (London and New York, 1997), pp. 160-170 (specifically p. 169, note 2).

99. On the place of the *translatio imperii* in both Elizabethan and Jacobean culture and politics, and what Heather James describes as 'the ideological legacy of Troy', see her section thus entitled, pp. 13-22. The Reformation background for this line of imperial imagery is treated in Yates's essay, 'Queen Elizabeth I as Astraea' (originally published in 1947, and reprinted with revisions in *Astraea*, pp. 29-87). For the specific relevance of this Reformation context to *Cymbeline* itself, see Yates, *Shakespeare's Last Plays*, pp. 41-43; Patricia Parker, 'Romance and Empire', pp. 203-207; and Jordan, who finds a sequence of puns in Philharmonus's final exposition which she feels reveal 'a figuratively contrived perspective on salvation history' ('Contract and Conscience', p. 54). An interesting, though ultimately rather far-fetched reading of the play as, in effect, an elaborate allegory of providential Church

history, is advanced in Lila Geller, 'Cymbeline and the Imagery of Covenant Theology', *Studies in English Literature*, 20 (1980), 241-255. The *translatio imperii* forms another close connection between *Cymbeline* and *Titus Andronicus*, and there is a useful discussion of the whole motif, covering its imperial and religious dimensions, as these were developed in sixteenth-century Protestant England, in Jonathan Bate, ed., *Titus Andronicus*, The Arden Shakespeare (London and New York, 1995), pp. 16-21. The link between the concept of the translation of empire and the Jacobean imperial ideal of British Union is obvious and crucial. That the union of the kingdoms (i.e., England and Scotland) was one of James's central projects on his accession to the English throne is a point that has been heavily stressed in topical criticism, particularly by the likes of Wickham ('From Tragedy to Tragi-Comedy', 'Riddle and Emblem') and Marcus (whose work in this area is a good deal more reliable and astute; see 'Unease', generally, and also *Puzzling Shakespeare*, pp. 148-159). The prominence in public discourse during the early years of James's reign of imagery associated with the idea of union is highlighted in D. R. Woolf, pp. 55-64; but see further below.

100. This aspect of the *Aeneid* and its reception history is well covered (in terms of its relevance here) by Heather James; Virgil's poem may stand as the exemplary literary celebration of imperialist power, but as James emphasizes, it is nevertheless a text which still incorporates an 'interrogative' as well as a 'panegyric' perspective on Roman/Augustan empire (p. 24). On the afterlife of Geoffrey's *Historia*, the many ends the "British history" was made to serve, the Christian legends associated with it, and the genealogical accretions it acquired, see primarily T. D. Kendrick, *British Antiquity* (London, 1950), especially chapters I, III, and V; and on the questions of racial and national consciousness involved in all this, Hugh A. MacDougall, *Racial Myth in English History* (Montreal, 1982), pp. 5-27. Geoffrey and Virgil are of course palpable presences in *Cymbeline* long before its closing sequence. As has often been pointed out, the realm of British legendary history is explicitly recalled via the names given to many of the play's principal "non-historical" characters: Imogen/Innogen - the wife of Brute; Posthumus - Brute's father; Cloten - father to Mulmutius (Dunvallo); and (Caius) Lucius - the supposed first Christian king of Britain; the invented aliases, "Cadwal" and "Polydore", seem to have something to do with this pattern too (see Brockbank, 'History and Histrionics'; and in particular, Donna B. Hamilton, *Shakespeare and the Politics of Protestant England* (Hemel Hempstead, 1992), pp. 150-152); I would note in passing that *Cymbeline*'s own name contains within it (though Shakespeare himself is obviously not personally responsible for this) that of one of the great heroes of Geoffrey's narrative, Belinus (see *The History of the Kings of Britain*, pp. 90-100). Added to all this, Posthumus can plausibly be seen as a "figure" of Brute, and is also connected, both through Brute and directly, with Aeneas; see Patricia Parker, 'Romance and Empire', pp. 190-195. Parker and James between them offer easily the best explorations of the play's links with the *Aeneid* (which go far beyond any allusions

inherent in the Brute-story, or a simple evocation of the poem's imperial theme).

101. As D. R. Woolf remarks, 'the union of the kingdoms did not occur for another century. James abandoned his plans in 1608, though he continued to style himself "King of Great Britain"' (p. 61). On the progress of Anglo-Scottish union at this time, the hostility the project engendered, and the practical deadlock in which it ended, see Bruce Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland, 1603-1608* (Edinburgh, 1986); Brian P. Levack, *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union, 1603-1707* (Oxford, 1987); and Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714* (Harmondsworth, 1997; first published, 1996), pp. 77-82; and on the subject of British union more generally, Steven G. Ellis and Sarah Barber, eds., *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725* (London and New York, 1995). I address the problem of the date of *Cymbeline* further in Chapter Two; convincing limits run from about 1608 to early 1611. Critics who read the play as celebrating the "Union" tend to opt for the earlier end of this period (see Wickham, 'Riddle and Emblem', p. 94; and compare too Levack's assertion that *Cymbeline* 'was written in 1608' (pp. 223-224, note 24)); composition somewhere around 1610/1611 seems much more likely to me. But in any case, as Marcus points out, 'by the time *Cymbeline* was staged in 1608 or 1609 or 1610 [or 1611 (my addition)], James's Project for the Union of the Kingdoms and the creation of Great Britain had reached political stalemate' ('Unease', p. 160).

102. Heather James argues convincingly that 'royal flattery is not a mainstay of Shakespeare's translations of empire' (p. 13). My reading of the play's treatment of the *translatio imperii* differs a little from hers, but the discussion that follows adheres to precisely this premise. Moreover, I agree entirely with James's proposition that what she describes as 'the idiosyncratic character of *Titus Andronicus*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Cymbeline*, and *The Tempest*' needs to be viewed 'against encomiastic uses of the Troy legend in histories, lyric, masques, and pageantry and within the context of the interrogative tradition suggested by Vergil, launched by Ovid, Englished by Chaucer and Spenser, and strategically debased by Nashe' (p. 13). James's work on the *translatio imperii* incidentally signals another respect (see above, note 85) in which Chaucer's *House of Fame* is highly relevant to the ending of Shakespeare's play (compare her section, 'The legacy of Fame: authority and ambiguity in the Troy legend', pp. 22-30). She also makes the important point that 'the *translatio imperii* at times involves a shadowy *translatio republicae*' (p. 12), and it is worth remarking in the light of this on the way the name of Shakespeare's Caius Lucius recalls that of Lucius Junius Brutus (whose role in the expulsion of the Tarquins and the consequent establishment of the Roman republic is of course highlighted in *Lucrece*, both at the end of the poem, and during 'The Argument'). See further the brief comments on the name, "Lucius", and its significance here and elsewhere in the Shakespeare canon, in Charles Wells, *The Wide Arch: Roman Values in Shakespeare*

(New York, 1992), pp. 179-180; once again, *Titus Andronicus* is an obvious analogue.

103. Wilson Knight appears to have been the first critic to draw attention to the way the resonances of the Soothsayer's vision extend beyond the confines of the play. Commenting on Philharmonus's second attempt at an exposition, he points out that 'the meaning need not be limited to this interpretation, though the union of Rome and Britain is, of course, central' (*The Crown of Life*, p. 165). Knight recognizes in the flight of the eagle the idea of 'the heritage of ancient Rome' being passed on to Britain, and he suggests that 'the western, sunset emphasis may even hold a hint of Elizabethan sea-adventures. Certainly we are to feel the Roman power as vanishing into the golden skies of a Britain destined to prove worthy of her Roman tutelage' (p. 166; and see too pp. 185-186, and the discussion in Heather James, pp. 152-154). But whilst Knight's work effectively sets the terms for the reading of the dream outlined here, he himself makes no explicit reference either to the *translatio imperii* as such, or to the specifics of Jacobean political imagery. This reflects, as much as anything, the fact that what Knight is expressing in all this are basically his own political beliefs and ideals. Then again, these pretty much chime with the terms of the *translatio imperii* anyway, and the "British" imperialist enterprise is an obvious (romanticized) presence in the remarks just quoted.

104. Precedent for the presence/discovery of multiple layers of meaning and referentiality within a single text comes easily to hand in the shape of a culturally standard hermeneutic system, the familiar model of the four-fold exegesis of Scripture (usefully outlined in Robert Carroll and Stephen Prickett, eds., *The Bible: Authorized King James Version*, *The World's Classics* (Oxford, 1997), pp. xxix-xxxii; and A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, second edition (Aldershot, 1988), pp. 33-36; and see too the discussion in Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1981), pp. 28-35). The tradition of figural interpretation is effectively what enables and justifies the very practice of applying Biblical imagery to political ends, and seems particularly relevant to the action here, given the conjunction in this sequence of Biblical allusion, sanctified "texts", divine blessing, and providential grand narratives of history. But despite its undeniable cultural authority, even such an interpretative model is not completely beyond the range of the tensions I am seeking to pursue at this point.

105. Though it is a fair generalization to say that topical criticism has, until recently, been perfectly content to treat it as such, and indeed to present the play as a whole as simply complimentary to the King, reading all its contemporary allusions as nothing but unproblematic expressions or reflections of Jacobean ideology. Wickham articulates the long-standard assumption behind this approach, that writers such as Shakespeare set about invoking the monarch's political mythology and ideals just because 'it was politic to do so: it was expected' ('Riddle

and Emblem', p. 98). Marcus provides the first extended topical reading of *Cymbeline* really to challenge this basic position: I return to her arguments below; and see Heather James, pp. 187-188. The entire issue of the identification and interpretation of topical allusion raises a number of complex questions relating to political climate, theatrical censorship, audience reception, audience demographics, the place of the stage, and so on, which I have been unable to address in any detail here (though I touch on some of them in the following paragraphs, and also later on in this thesis - notably in Chapter Four). To deal quickly with one particularly intractable area of controversy, however, I am assuming that the political meaning and interpretation of Shakespearian drama (performance or text) in its own time would not - could not - have been confined merely to some sort of "official" line.

106. I am thinking in terms here not only of the public realm of debate and controversy that constitutes (in whatever form, however constrained, ritualized, or ineffectual) overt political discourse, but also of the kinds of alternative meanings and outlooks associated with the marginal and repressed voices, perspectives, and histories that have attracted particular attention in recent poststructuralist historiography and (especially Cultural Materialist, postcolonialist, and feminist) criticism. Work that has influenced my approach includes: Catherine Belsey, *The Subject of Tragedy* (London and New York, 1985), along with her essay, 'Making histories then and now: Shakespeare from *Richard II* to *Henry V*', in *Uses of history: Marxism, postmodernism and the Renaissance*, edited by Francis Barker, Peter Hulme, and Margaret Iversen (Manchester and New York, 1991), pp. 24-46; the editors' Introduction to the same volume, pp. 1-23; Alan Sinfield, *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading* (Oxford, 1992), notably pp. 1-28; Jean E. Howard, *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England* (London and New York, 1994); and Louis Montrose's essay, 'Texts and Histories', in his book, *The Purpose of Playing: Shakespeare and the Cultural Politics of the Elizabethan Theatre* (Chicago and London, 1996), pp. 1-16. On the issue of possible parallels between the interpretation of history and the interpretation of texts, see too Jameson's crucial formulation, 'that history is *not* a text, not a narrative, master or otherwise, but that, as an absent cause, it is inaccessible to us except in textual form, and that our approach to it and to the Real itself necessarily passes through its prior textualization, its narrativization in the political unconscious' (*The Political Unconscious*, p. 35). Of course, "history" is a multiply ambiguous term, a fact which I am rather exploiting in this context to link together a number of different-but-related areas; on some of the difficulties these ambiguities pose for critical practice, however, see Michael D. Bristol, 'Recent Studies in Tudor and Stuart Drama', *Studies in English Literature*, 38 (1998), 363-409 (pp. 388-390).

107. *The Idea of History*, p. xiii; Woolf continues: 'historians used the past to sanction certain types of behaviour and to deplore others; they also used it to justify the authority structures of their present, structures which in turn shaped and coloured what they said about the

past'. As he acknowledges, however, this situation 'in no way precluded the possibility of early Stuart historians saying different things about various episodes in the past' (p. xiii); and see further below.

108. *The Idea of History*, p. xiv. It is a construction of this broad consensus, of course, conceived of as an overriding and fully-adhered-to "metaphysic of order", which E. M. W. Tillyard sets about in *The Elizabethan World Picture* (London, 1943); see Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, 'History and ideology: the instance of *Henry V*', in *Alternative Shakespeares*, edited by John Drakakis (London and New York, 1985), pp. 206-227 (pp. 206-215 in particular). The elements of consensus and standardization that go to make up a ruling ideology can bear a fair degree of disagreement and internal debate without much disruption. So whilst, to quote from Woolf again, 'within any given political or religious community [. . .] there are likely to exist differences of belief among individuals or subgroups, which may lead to the formulation of slightly different visions of the world', it is also the case that these 'will often conform in their essentials, as they did, with some exceptions, in the Elizabethan and early Stuart periods' (p. xiii). But in registering this, I want to negotiate much more clearly than Woolf a path between his generalized point, which is undeniable, and the potentially totalizing force of the way he applies it - precisely in the difference between "general" and "total". And indeed, I would resist any descriptive construction of an ideology, world-picture, episteme, or interpretative paradigm, as successfully universalized, self-consistent, or irresistible. To apply this view at the level of critical practice is obviously to stake out something of a position within the containment/subversion debate of recent years. I share the desire of others, however, to move beyond the (often overly-simple, overly-broad) terms of that dichotomy, and find appealing in this context (though the hyperbole in the second half of his remark leaves it open to question) Richard Strier's express opposition to 'any sort of approach to texts that knows in advance what they will or must be doing or saying, or, on the other hand, what they cannot possibly be doing or saying' (*Resistant Structures* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1995), p. 2; and see generally pp. 1-9, and Strier's telling critique of the notion of "unthinkability").

109. 'Unease', p. 137; and see generally pp. 136-138, for evidence of how James demonstrated an active concern for his personal authorial "prerogatives", insisting on the authority of 'his own governing line of interpretation and political action' (p. 137), and vigorously asserting the "legibility" and internal consistency of his various writings and pronouncements. See too on this aspect of the reign, Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature*, pp. 1-54; and Curtis Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 15-22; and, specifically on the King's literary endeavours and publications, King James VI and I, *Political Writings*, edited by Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge, 1994), 'Introduction', pp. xv-xxviii; and Kevin Sharpe, 'The King's Writ: Royal Authors and Royal Authority in Early Modern England', in *Culture and*

Politics in Early Stuart England, edited by Sharpe and Peter Lake (Basingstoke and London, 1994), pp. 117-138 (pp. 123-131). James's proprietorial and authorial power is invoked in the 'Epistle Dedicatory' to the 1611 ("Authorized") Bible (included in Carroll and Prickett, pp. lxxi-lxxii; and see Marcus, p. 136), and of course the subject of interpretative authority already had a long pedigree, as an area of both study and struggle, in the realms of Christian polemics and religious history. For some of the issues involved in this, many of which are of relevance here, see the prefatory essay to the King James Bible, 'The Translators to the Reader' (also included in Carroll and Prickett, pp. liii-lxix).

110. This is obviously a very bald and simple characterization of what was inevitably a complex and fluid socio-political situation. For a sense of the historical context and intellectual milieu of the early Jacobean period, and the struggle and debate occasioned by the King's "absolutist" policies, see especially J. P. Sommerville, *Politics and Ideology in England, 1603-1640* (London and New York, 1986); and also Kishlansky, pp. 34-40, 67-88; and, for a decidedly more revisionist line of approach, Glenn Burgess, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution* (Basingstoke and London, 1992), and *Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution* (New Haven and London, 1996). Useful here too is the introduction in Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, eds., *Conflict in Early Stuart England* (London and New York, 1989), pp. 1-46 (which offers something of a critique of revisionist work); and see besides, for a variety of different perspectives, the essays which make up 'Part I' of *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, edited by Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 19-95. There is a particularly good treatment of the relevance of contemporary discourses (and practices) of kingship and government to late Shakespeare in Constance Jordan's recent book, *Shakespeare's Monarchies* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1997), pp. 1-33. My own thinking in this whole area owes a significant debt to the work of my colleague, Ann Kaegi.

I should note that, amongst the above-mentioned critics, Burgess has gone a long way towards undermining conventional views about the "absolutist" nature of Jacobean monarchy. His work refines the terms of the modern historiographical and critical debate considerably, and is especially helpful in outlining the basis of the Jacobean "consensus"; but his contention that 'there was no rise of "absolutism"' in late Elizabethan or early Jacobean England - and its corollary, that those who find such a rise expressed or reflected in the literature of the period (including Shakespeare's plays) 'have put it there themselves' - seems a lot more problematic (see *Absolute Monarchy*, p. 9). James's public concern for his own prerogative and his well-known penchant for asserting the god-like stature of kings clearly aroused anxieties amongst some of his subjects; and the form of monarchy that Burgess describes ('limited but irresistible' (p. 212)), however much it fails to fit in with seventeenth-century notions of absolute rule, sounds to me like a kind of "benign absolutism" (or as Sommerville puts it, 'a nuanced, moderated

absolutism' ('Introduction', p. xv)). What I miss most from Burgess is any sense of the power relations (however theoretical) inherent in this set-up. It is an absence that really shows itself in the emphasis he repeatedly has to place on the King's personal responsibilities - as figured in the twin principles of the binding force of the Coronation oath and the monarch's moral duty before God - and the seriousness with which the period took 'the idea of voluntary self-limitation' (p. 153).

111. There is a good discussion of current critical thinking in this area, and of the historiographical issues and power relations at stake, in Perry, pp. 1-12. Drawing attention to 'the variety of kinds of circulation and dissonance found everywhere in cultural production' (p. 7), he outlines a particularly convincing model of early Jacobean culture as a site of internal conflict and complex negotiations. Also relevant here (again) is most of the material cited in note 106; and see too, generally, Robin Headlam Wells, *Shakespeare, Politics and the State* (Basingstoke and London, 1986). The more important institutions and power bases of Shakespeare's time are nicely brought together in Montrose's declared interest in exploring 'the unstable relationship between the official centers of political and cultural authority in the state, the city, and the church and the unofficial and marginal site of performative authority in the playhouse' (*The Purpose of Playing*, p. xi).

112. 'Prologue: "The Histories" and History', in Holderness, Nick Potter, and John Turner, *Shakespeare: The Play of History* (Basingstoke and London, 1988), pp. 13-19 (p. 15). In related terms, David Norbrook makes the crucial point that Renaissance models of order and 'arguments from natural analogy' can themselves be seen to have functioned not as inescapable, monolithic 'deep structures of thought', but as 'a set of representations designed to legitimise specific social interests' - that is (to extrapolate a little), they stand as rhetorical and ideological strategies evincing the need (and the scope) for persuasion, rather than the coercive power of consensus or the wholesale acceptance of a single, overriding world-view; see Norbrook's essay, 'Rhetoric, Ideology and the Elizabethan World Picture', in *Renaissance Rhetoric*, edited by Peter Mack (Basingstoke and London, 1994), pp. 140-164 (p. 140).

113. *Historiography and Ideology in Stuart Drama* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 27. For closely comparable views of the historical drama in other recent criticism, see Graham Holderness's body of work in this area; Larry S. Champion, *'The Noise of Threatening Drum': Dramatic Strategy and Political Ideology in Shakespeare and the English Chronicle Plays* (Cranbury, NJ, 1990); and Paola Pugliatti, *Shakespeare the Historian* (Basingstoke and London, 1996). Kamps's position here (and see too in this context his Introduction, pp. 1-25) very much chimes with my own thinking, and facilitates my ensuing argument, but it is pushing the terms of his remark - if only slightly - to apply it (as I do below) to the realm of "pseudohistory" in which *Cymbeline* moves. On the issue of radical opinions in the chronicle histories and other such writings, Kamps himself offers a challenge to Woolf's conventionally "hardline"

assessment (cited above), commenting that 'historians may have cared little to make conspicuous the seeds of their dissent, but these seeds are nonetheless there for anyone who wishes to discern them' (pp. 26-27; as he adds, 'the playwrights did just that'). In advancing this assessment, Kamps rightly refers to Annabel Patterson's work in *Reading Holinshed's 'Chronicles'*; I would point also to Henry Ansgar Kelly's *Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeare's Histories* (Cambridge, MA, 1970).

114. Most of these same concerns - matters of historiography and royal compliment, topicality and radical politics - also come together significantly in *Macbeth* (a play which connects to *Cymbeline* in so many ways). They are taken up and addressed, in much more detail than I have been able to manage (especially on the vital question of what constitutes radicalism - radical in relation to what?) in two studies that have particularly informed my thinking here: Alan Sinfield's 1988 essay, 'Macbeth: History, Ideology, and Intellectuals', reprinted in *Faultlines*, pp. 95-108; and, written partly in response to Sinfield, David Norbrook's 'Macbeth and the Politics of Historiography', in *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1987), pp. 78-116.

115. *Shakespeare's Troy*, p. 1; and see generally pp. 1-13. The legendary history of the founding and early growth and development of London, and the mythic force this carried in Tudor/Stuart England, are traced in Lawrence Manley, *Literature and culture in early modern London* (Cambridge, 1995), especially pp. 168-211. The civic aspect of the *translatio imperii* is (all-but-directly) invoked during the closing scene of *Cymbeline* by means of the King's reference to 'Lud's Town' (1. 483; and compare 3.1. 32 and 4.2. 101). That the play should focus on this "native" name for the city at this point, and through it, on the figure of Lud, rather than on Brute and the myth of Troynovant, is obviously in keeping with the moment of its own "historical" setting, and with the dynamics of its dramatization of Romano-British relations. But it also seems to link up with James's sense that Shakespeare's text represents national identity as having 'broader interests than strictly royalist, parliamentary, or civic ones' (p. 188). In this connection, I would note that Lud's heroic status as the first great "re-edifier" of London served to associate his name particularly closely with the area around Ludgate, St Paul's, and the Blackfriars precinct - some of the primary demesnes of the London theatre. On King Lud himself, his "history" and his reputation, see further: *Holinshed's Chronicles*, I, 463-464 ('The Historie of England', Book 3, chapter 9); Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, II. 10. 46; the entries for "Ludgate" and "Lud's Town" in Sugden, pp. 321-323; the material assembled and discussed in Lewis Spence, *Legendary London* (London, 1937), pp. 190-197; and Manley, pp. 143-145; and on the local topography mentioned here, see too Irwin Smith, *Shakespeare's Blackfriars Playhouse: Its History and Its Design* (New York, 1964), pp. 7-10.

116. British internal politics was of course a crucial subject of (on occasion, violent) dispute in the Jacobean age, as it has been ever since. The question of union has a bearing not only on Anglo-Scottish affairs in the period, but on Anglo-Irish relations as well, and the whole murky area of English imperialism. There is a good treatment of this topic in Willy Maley's essay, "'This sceptred isle": Shakespeare and the British problem', in *Shakespeare and national culture*, edited by John J. Joughin (Manchester and New York, 1997), pp. 83-108, which comments perceptively too on the common elision of "England" and "Britain" in Shakespeare studies, and the accompanying critical neglect of the issue of British "'internal colonialism"' (p. 101) in the dramatist's works; and see further Maley's more recent 'Postcolonial Shakespeare: British identity formation and *Cymbeline*', in Richards and Knowles, pp. 145-157; and, for the general historical background here, John Morrill, 'The fashioning of Britain', in Ellis and Barber, pp. 8-39; and Steven Ellis's own 'Tudor state formation and the shaping of the British Isles', in the same volume, pp. 40-63. The relevance of Anglo-Irish politics to *Cymbeline* is also touched upon in Andrew Hadfield, "'Hitherto she ne're could fancy him": Shakespeare's "British" Plays and the Exclusion of Ireland', in *Shakespeare and Ireland*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett and Ramona Wray (Basingstoke and London, 1997), pp. 47-67 (p. 63). But I want to go back to a remark made by Philip Edwards in 1979, and barely picked up on by the critical tradition since: 'those critics who maintain that *Cymbeline* was written by Shakespeare as a tribute to the pacific policies of James and his belief in world peace may wish to reflect on how diametrically opposed to the spirit of the ending of *Cymbeline* were the policies being actively and personally pursued by James in Ireland at the very time when Shakespeare was writing his play'. For Edwards, and my own reading of the play pushes in the same direction, '*Cymbeline* implies a total rejection of the prevalent idea of civilising Ireland by conquest, and a rejection of the Roman analogy which was used to justify the idea' (*Threshold of a Nation*, p. 94).

117. Doubts about the historical veracity of much of Geoffrey's narrative had in fact surfaced as early as the twelfth century (almost immediately upon its first appearance), but these were soon largely brushed aside or forgotten. Two key figures in the development and eventual victory of the later sceptical tradition were the historian, Polydore Vergil (c.1470 - c.1555), and probably the most prominent of the Elizabethan antiquarians, William Camden (1551-1623). Kendrick's study of the reception and influence of the *Historia Regum Britanniae* remains standard; see especially pp. 78-133 (and also, for the sources available to Geoffrey, pp. 3-11; and for the misgivings of some of his contemporaries, notably William of Newburgh (c.1135 - c.1198), pp. 11-15). Further discussions of the changing fortunes of the British history can be found in: F. J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA, 1967), pp. 124-166; May McKisack, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 95-125; and Arthur B. Ferguson, *Utter Antiquity: Perceptions of Prehistory in Renaissance England* (Durham, NC and London, 1993),

pp. 84-105, as well as his earlier book, *Clio Unbound: Perception of the social and cultural past in Renaissance England* (Durham, NC, 1979), pp. 104-115; Brinkley comments usefully on the gradual decline in the symbolic use of Arthurian legend during the Jacobean period (see especially p. 25).

Of course, people did not stop believing in the British history overnight, or suddenly cease invoking its authority. The King himself was happy to exploit the story of Brute for its political implications (he cites it as precedent, for example, in *Basilicon Doron* (I have used the text in James VI and I, *Political Writings*, pp. 1-61; the passage in question is on p. 42); and see Galloway, pp. 32-50); and as most of the above critics point out, the defenders of the British history at this time were a good deal more vocal than the sceptics. This does not detract from the fact, though, that the play was here entering another specific arena of controversy. So what are we to make of Shakespeare's turning to pseudohistory in such a context (beyond any purely practical theatrical considerations)? Does it reflect a desire to explore and celebrate British national origins, or an interest in exploring the celebration of British national origins during the early years of the seventeenth century? Is the fact that the critical history has found it difficult until recently to treat the historical side of the play as serious or relevant itself of any relevance to the seriousness of the play's own treatment of its historical material? I would merely observe for now that the direct influence of Camden's work on *Cymbeline* is plausibly argued for in Pitcher, 'Names in *Cymbeline*', pp. 10-11; and that Guiderius's "Polydore" alias inevitably serves to summon up (whether intentionally or not hardly matters in practice, but it is hard to believe the coincidence of names can be entirely accidental) the iconoclastic figure of Polydore Vergil. For a recent reading of the play as closely aligned with the new developments in historiography, and actively antagonistic to the tradition descending from Geoffrey (though the argument seems seriously oversimplified to me), see John E. Curran, Jr., 'Royalty Unlearned, Honor Untaught: British Savages and Historiographical Change in *Cymbeline*', *Comparative Drama*, 31 (1997), 277-303.

118. In stressing, here and above, the failings of Philharmonus's first effort at interpreting his own dream-vision, I have been taking this reading at face value, and relying on the fact that its obvious surface meaning remains unfulfilled. There is a sense, though, in which his forecast of 'success to th' Roman host' (4.2. 354) is elastic (or almost elastic) enough to encompass the political resolution achieved during the closing moments - the Roman mission, at least, turns out to be something of an overall success, in the way fealty and tribute from the British are re-established in the end. One could perhaps go on to argue from this that the language of the Soothsayer's prediction is left deliberately vague and open, that either an intentional ambivalence or a kind of automatic professional caution allows his first exposition to be redeemed - and hence, in other words, that it is wrong to attribute any error to him in this matter. The example of the rest of the canon,

however, suggests that Shakespeare generally takes pains to spell out the ironies and equivocations of prophetic discourse unmistakably wherever he wants them to be noticed. And in any case, Philharmonus's specific guarantee of success for the Roman "host" is hard to reconcile with the particular details of the play's outcome, in terms of both the actual result of the battle and the fact that the army has no practical input whatsoever in the bringing about of the final reconciliation.

119. The quoted phrase is from Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (London, 1991), p. ix; and note too in this context her stress on the '*mise en abîme*' in which historiographic practice always seems to be trapped. The terminology employed here may be thoroughly modern, but the ideas involved relate closely to aspects of the Renaissance sceptical tradition, and as Rackin points out, it is possible to see strong resemblances between current poststructuralist (deconstructive) attitudes towards history and 'the unstable status of historiography in Shakespeare's time' (p. 35) - though, of course, this observation itself is bound up in the layers of regress she describes. See generally pp. ix-xi, and Rackin's opening chapter, 'Making History', pp. 1-39, which is relevant to many of the concerns raised during the course of this section. My entire understanding of the relationship between history and historiography owes much to Rackin's study (see in particular pp. 33-39).

120. I borrow the concept of the "quibble" in this context from Heather James; see especially her section, 'Quibbling with authority: Shakespeare's translations of empire', pp. 30-37, and also her brief Introduction, 'Shakespeare's fatal Cleopatra', pp. 1-6. As the allusion to Dr Johnson in this latter title suggests, James finds a connection between the treatment of the *translatio imperii* across the Shakespeare canon and the dramatist's characteristic (infamous) interest in puns, quibbles, and word-games. This is a topic of particular relevance to my discussion here, given the kind of features I have been emphasizing - the riddling nature of Jupiter's label, the "*mollis aer*" etymology, the double meaning present in "construction". A comment by James with regard to her own work could apply almost equally well to mine: 'when Johnson implicitly connects quibbling rhetoric, epistemology, gender, and politics, he performs an act of literary criticism felicitous to this study of Shakespeare's contaminated authorities' (p. 4). I address some of the gender issues that arise in the current passage during the next section of this chapter.

121. This line of interpretation is most closely associated, of course, with the "Romance" reading of *Cymbeline* and the other late plays. I touched on my reservations regarding this type of approach in the Preface, and shall be returning to them in Chapter Two. For some recent comment on the romance elements of *Cymbeline*, see Roger Warren's edition of the play for the Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 1998), pp. 15-18. Warren is notably less keen than certain other editors (most obviously, Nosworthy) to define *Cymbeline* categorically as a dramatic "Romance" -

which has to be a good thing. Having said that, however, much about his own interpretation remains fundamentally "romantic" in tone. The relevance of romance, Warren implies (see p. 16), stems above all from the genre's characteristic quest-like structure, and this is a feature he connects in turn to the concept of "spiritual journeys" - a particular concern, as Warren points out, of many twentieth-century productions of the late plays, and his own favourite image for these works in general (as is made abundantly clear in his earlier book, *Staging Shakespeare's Late Plays*). The idea of a "spiritual journey" can be profitably applied to *Cymbeline* at both a personal and a national level, but it pretty much misses entirely any sense of the political and ideological dimensions of the play. The dominance of this kind of psychological/emotional focus in criticism and performance goes a fair way towards explaining why the elements I discuss below have hardly ever received any detailed attention.

122. So despite the fact that it is the victorious British king who comes across as the prime mover in the processes of reconciliation, agreeing on his own initiative to meet Roman demands and to restore Romano-British relations to their pre-war footing, in Philharmonus's Roman view of the situation, it is 'our princely eagle | Th'imperial Caesar' who emerges as the chief instigating force in the political equation, the figure who has chosen to 'unite | His favour' with 'the radiant Cymbeline, | Which shines here in the west' (ll. 475-478). In other words, I am trying to suggest, beneath all the due diplomatic pleasantries here, there is a struggle taking place to assert authority and to (re-)establish "proper" hierarchy - to define, that is, the nature of the respective power relations in the new political climate. I do not want to pin too much weight on a single word, but Cymbeline's unequivocal reference to 'My peace' at l. 461 (my emphasis) can be seen to contribute to this pattern, in the way it stakes an implicit claim to sole agency and dominion. This would seem to strike an antagonistic and proprietorial tone rather out-of-keeping with the surface emphasis in the dialogue on collective harmony and international accord - and interestingly enough, the King's use of the possessive at this point troubled some of the play's earlier editors (see Furness, *Cymbeline*, p. 436, note to l. 544), presumably at least in part for exactly this reason. On a more general level, it would certainly be possible in performance to "play up" (through emphasis, gesture, insinuation, and the like) the various hints of a jostling for position or precedence that are contained (or so it appears to me) within this section of the text.

123. My assessment of the impact of the exposition of Jupiter's message contrasts with that of Marcus, who takes the view (in support of her argument that 'the translation of interpretation into action is not once effected within the play itself') that any connection between the Soothsayer's interpretation of the label and Cymbeline's subsequent proclamation of peace remains 'indecipherable' ('Unease', p. 156). But Cymbeline's penultimate response to Philharmonus proclaims submission as well as peace, and its opening word, 'well' (l. 460), seems to imply

(serves to imply) some sort of causal or logical progression from what has just been said. In much the same way, the King's talk of 'the gods' at the start of his final speech (l. 478) picks up directly on the Soothsayer's preceding reference to the influence of the 'powers above' (l. 468). I would still agree with Marcus's claim that 'the play calls into question the relationship between texts and action' (p. 156), only my sense of how it does so in this instance is slightly different to hers. For me, that relationship is problematized here by a stress on the suasive and ideological dimensions of textual interpretation, on what interpretation *does*, and how and why it does it.

124. Once Philharmonus has set the ball rolling with his reading of the label, the process of creating a mood of harmony and religious awe becomes mutual, with soothsayer and monarch effectively encouraging each other on to more and more grandiose statements of peace and well-being, culminating in Cymbeline's closing call to worship and feasting (ll. 478-487). My own focus during this chapter on tablet, prophecy, and vision, and Philharmonus's role as interpreter, has left little space to say anything about this final speech of the King's. There are some interesting comments on it, however, within the context of a discussion that addresses the ending of the play in terms similar to mine (if a little more extreme), in Simon Palfrey, *Late Shakespeare: A New World of Words* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 243-250 (pp. 248-250); and see the following note.

125. In other words, a kind of split perspective is set up at this point, which gets in the way, I would argue, of any "purely" emotional or aesthetic response to the action. This dual focus - simultaneously involved and distanced, empathetic and analytical - connects fairly obviously to the double tone of the final scene as a whole, and can even be seen to carry through to the very last sentence of the play, 'never was a war did cease, | Ere bloody hands were washed, with such a peace' (ll. 486-487). Cymbeline's confident assertion here, with its categorical opening 'never was', represents events in the on-stage world as new and unprecedented, conveying a firm sense of a situation never-before-achieved in human affairs. In this respect, it connects within the play's symbolic economy to the utopian moment of the Jailer's 'I would we were all of one mind, and one mind good' (5.5. 296-297), and also, of course, to the shadowy semi-presence (whether invoked as hope, myth, assurance, or possibility) of the birth of Christ, with its place in orthodox Christian theology as the fundamental turning-point in the entire path of human history. But with its rhetorical hyperbole and notably contorted syntax, the King's turn of phrase is also open to being read/heard rather differently. Taken literally (ignoring its manifest figurative force, that is), it can serve as a statement of historical fact, a reminder of the fictionality both of the play's narrative, and of its neat and perfect resolutions of armed struggle - and therefore too, by extension, as a comment on the unlikelihood of any such ideal resolution ever being achieved within the world of actual history. "Never was" such a war as the King describes indeed; it just doesn't happen.

126. This is not in any way to decry these ideals in themselves, or to imply that they are simply dismissed or ironized during this sequence. Clearly, a strong idealization of the concept of union does emerge at the end of the play, and with it, a powerful representation of political peace and emotional harmony. Nevertheless, it seems to me that a far more complex perspective on contemporary notions of peace and union is to be found in *Cymbeline* - and in Shakespeare's Jacobean drama in general - than is acknowledged in a large amount of topical commentary (including such recent work as Steven Marx, 'Shakespeare's Pacifism', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 45 (1992), 49-95; and Christopher Wortham, 'Shakespeare, James I and the Matter of Britain', *English*, 45 (1996), 97-122). Much the same could be said about the play's treatment of religious issues and any of the more straightforward/enthusiastic Christian (or mystic/esoteric) readings it has received. The point I am trying to make is that the ideals and beliefs concerned in all this are not merely invoked or propounded here, they are also examined and subjected to scrutiny, especially in terms of their political function, their cultural use-value. In the process, a keen sense of the gap between the ideal and the real is conveyed - though my understanding of the significance of this is very different from that lately argued for by Glenn Clark, who sees the play as championing the King's desire for union and his 'ideal geography' in the face of political impasse and historical failure ('The "Strange" Geographies of *Cymbeline*', in *Playing the Globe*, edited by John Gillies and Virginia Mason Vaughan (Cranbury, NJ, 1998), pp. 230-259 (p. 255)).

This sense of a gap between the ideal and the real casts its shadow over even something as seemingly unproblematic as Cymbeline's call for the flying of a British flag ('let | A Roman and a British ensign wave | Friendly together' (ll. 481-483)). In a King-pleasing, pro-Union realization, such as would chime with Clark's reading, this could have served as a moment to display with pride and enthusiasm the newly-created Union flag; but the pointed absence of any such emblem in the theatre, or just the general tone and context at this stage in the action, might equally well have had the effect of evoking some of the disputes and wrangles that characterized the history of the design and adoption of the first British flag at the start of the seventeenth century. On the relevance of performance choices and possibilities to topical/political meaning, see further below; for the events surrounding the creation of the Union flag, see the discussion in Galloway, pp. 82-84, and the prototype designs he reproduces, plate facing pp. 88-89; the new flag was proclaimed in 1606, but appears not to have proved all that popular to begin with, and as Galloway remarks, 'the early history of the Union Jack was in some ways a microcosm of the overall [Union] project' (p. 82); the question of the flying of a Roman and a British ensign *together* opens up a whole other kettle of fish.

127. 'Unease', p. 153. I would stress that I am not suggesting that the play can be pinned down (or reduced) to the level of direct allegory. And it is also worth emphasizing that topical meaning in

Cymbeline works on a number of levels. Thus any "local" references to the issue of British Union are complicated by the international dimensions of the drama's closing peace, and the religious implications of its image of Romano-British unity. In any case, political meaning and topical meaning are obviously not exactly the same thing. For me, the play's interest in the historical and political issues it touches on extends well beyond the specifics of its own originating context. Having said that, though, the Jacobean dimension of the final scene is much more than the "grace note" it is effectively dismissed as by Roger Warren in his recent edition of the play (p. 63; and see generally pp. 61-63). Warren is reacting here against Emrys Jones's heavily allegorized topical reading, and the latter's view that the "key" to unlocking the mystery of *Cymbeline* lies in recognising its deliberate flattery of King James (see 'Stuart *Cymbeline*', pp. 95-98; Warren is strangely (conveniently?) behind the times in picking on Jones as his representative of topical criticism). I share some of Warren's reservations on these matters, largely because I reject the notion of straightforward compliment, and the simplistic one-to-one correspondences of character and idea that are usually propounded with it. None of this, however, should be allowed to detract from the fact that topical meaning is inbuilt in *Cymbeline* - not, it is true, as an explanatory key, but very much as a key element in the play's discursive field.

128. 'Unease', p. 138; for a fuller sense of Marcus's concept of topical "unease", see generally *Puzzling Shakespeare* (especially pp. xi-xii, 32-43). I concentrate on Marcus's arguments in some detail over the next few pages, since her work on *Cymbeline* stands, to my mind, as the most probing and first truly sensitive and theoretically-informed consideration of the complex political engagement inherent in the play's topicality.

129. I have never understood how anyone could seriously propose that Cymbeline himself is meant to stand as some sort of compliment to King James. Apart from anything else, he spends virtually the whole of the final scene finding out what has actually been going on (largely behind his back) in the realm he is supposed to have been ruling. Commentators in the "compliment-to-the-King" school of criticism have of course noticed the difficulties involved here for themselves, and come up with a number of strategies (most of them stemming directly from Emrys Jones) for distancing the more problematic aspects of the on-stage king from his real-life counterpart. Thus they have invoked, for example, the flimsy characterization of Cymbeline, his peripheral status within the main stream of the action, or the malign influence exerted on him by the scapegoat figures of Cloten and (especially) the Queen. Many of the arguments raised are very obviously makeshift; and even in the last of these areas, the text is a little less quick to exonerate the King of responsibility for his actions than is often suggested. Cymbeline is still behaving tyrannically up until almost the last moment of the drama, and his attempt to blame the war entirely on his wife (see ll. 461-467) can easily sound like an all-too-convenient excuse. In any case, the Queen is also a significant stumbling-block when it comes to

sustaining any complimentary topical allegorization of the fictional royal family. Palliative explanations are again needed - she's deliberately made anonymous, conventional, a fairy-tale monster, etc., so as to avoid any possible comparison with Queen Anne. Or alternatively, Queen Anne herself can just be written out of history, as in Bergeron's blithe assessment that the play's 'final ruling image coincides with the images of rule of James and his family' (*Shakespeare's Romances and the Royal Family*, p. 157).

130. The association of Jupiter with James, evident in political commentary and various forms of artistic panegyric, inevitably has a strongly conventional element to it, but it also extends out "naturally" from the King's appropriation of the imagery of imperial Rome, and his conscious "style of Gods" (see again Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature*, pp. 26-54). Erica Sheen makes the point that 'most critics concerned with the topicality of *Cymbeline* are prepared to see Jupiter in his analogy to James I - as a quasi-monarchical source of transcendent power' ("The Agent for His Master": Political Service and Professional Liberty in *Cymbeline*', in *The Politics of Tragicomedy: Shakespeare and After*, edited by Gordon McMullan and Jonathan Hope (London and New York, 1992), pp. 55-76 (p. 69)). The fullest treatment of the relevance of this analogy to *Cymbeline* comes from Marcus, who asserts confidently that, 'in terms of the play's contemporary context, Jove is clearly to be identified with King James I' ('Unease', p. 135). She emphasizes in particular how, 'in the third year of his reign, James I more than once descended upon Parliament like Jove with his "thunderbolts" to chide its members for their sluggishness' over his project of Union, to the extent that 'the image of James as Jove swooping down with his thunder became a leit-motif of the parliamentary session' (p. 134). But Marcus probably overstates the details of her comparison a little, and I would not want to go so far, with whatever provisos or allowances, as to make the explicit equation, 'Jupiter is James' (p. 153). The James-like aspects of the god are what stand out for me in the context of my present discussion, but Jupiter as a figure carries plenty of other resonances and associations - as father, Christian God, serial adulterer, incarnation of sovereign or arbitrary power in general, and so on - that have a bearing on his appearance in the play, and that consequently make it important not to delimit the symbolic significances of this character too precisely. See further here, Simonds, *Myth, Emblem, and Music*, pp. 289-295; Palfrey, pp. 244-245; and the entry on Jupiter in Brumble, pp. 192-196.

131. Marcus makes much of the idea of a shared reliance on texts, in terms that are particularly pertinent to my argument here (though again, she rather exaggerates on the details of her comparison): 'like Jupiter in the play, James was forever disconcerting his subjects by producing oracular documents, long speeches, or proclamations which he liked to think of as *Books* - divine, arbitrary texts that heralded magnificent transformations for the nation but were too often relied on by the scholar-king as though they could substitute for the painstaking political maneuvering that actually got things done' ('Unease', p. 158).

And see too Palfrey, who writes, with Marcus's work explicitly in mind: 'so, Jove, riding on an eagle, delivering sulphurous but ultimately benevolent thunderbolts, evokes the iconography of James; so too does the god's pedantic self-advertising, and his compulsion to declare his prerogative in print. But even if one grants that Jupiter's descent is supposed seriously to symbolize the intervention of authority, then Shakespeare's text can still seem designed more to undercut than praise the god's percipience' (p. 244).

132. 'Unease', p. 158; Marcus's concern here is exclusively with *Cymbeline* in its seventeenth-century context, but her comment also holds good in relation to the politics of the play on the modern stage. Of course, the precise problematics in either case are very different, and it is in fact a standard objection to topical readings such as Marcus's that they are largely irrelevant to present-day audiences - and practically impossible to make relevant, too (see, for example, Ann Thompson, '*Cymbeline's* Other Endings', pp. 214-216, and Palfrey, pp. 7-8; the same perspective lies behind Roger Warren's efforts to minimize the importance of the play's topical elements - see above, note 127). This is hard to deny, but it by no means follows that the text's political content *per se* is now inevitably irrelevant in performance. My own view is that, apart from its intrinsic value, attending to the topical politics of *Cymbeline* is a useful way (once one gets beyond the issue of royal compliment) of releasing broader, more general political meanings that could certainly be made relevant, and vibrant, in the theatre of today - meanings that operate within any 'self-sufficient theatrical world' the play might create (see Warren, ed., *Cymbeline*, p. 63).

133. 'Unease', pp. 154-155; she continues: 'it is "double written" or overwritten in a way that calls special attention to it and invites political decipherment but that also provides a mechanism by which the "authorized" political reading can be dispersed or ridiculed' (p. 155). For useful comment on the "doubleness" of the vision sequence from a more theatrical/aesthetic perspective, see Marion Lomax, *Stage images and traditions: Shakespeare to Ford* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 30-31, 121-124.

134. Both quotations from 'Unease', pp. 158-159; for Marcus's wider argument, see generally pp. 153-161 (there is a slightly fuller version of this section of her discussion in *Puzzling Shakespeare*, pp. 137-148); the idea of the "Jacobean line" of interpretation is a recurring motif throughout her essay. A necessary premise behind Marcus's position is the assumption, which I would go along with, that any of Shakespeare's contemporaries who were able 'to read *Cymbeline's* Jacobean message at all were perhaps also capable of reading its portrayal of disjunctions between James's theory and his political practice'. As she then adds: 'upon such a contemporary audience, *Cymbeline* might well have produced dissatisfaction with the "Jacobean line." Or at least, through its critique of the wonders of the almighty authored text, it may have intensified existing dissatisfaction with James, his clerkish political blundering, and his odd notions of kingship' ('Unease', p. 158).

135. Marcus actually goes so far as to suggest that 'the play may well have taken markedly different forms at different times and in different places' ('Unease', p. 159). She cites in support of this position one very specific manifestation of the gap between text and performance, the fact that Simon Forman's eye-witness account of a performance of *Cymbeline* (presumably at the Globe, presumably in 1611) makes no mention whatsoever of the vision of Jupiter. This leads her to speculate in particular about possible contrasts of emphasis - and variations of content - between Court and public theatre performances; was Posthumus's vision omitted or 'massively deemphasized' (p. 154), for example, on the occasion when Forman saw the play? I do not want to dismiss Marcus's argument (which in any case is only baldly summarized here) out of hand, but it has to be said that Forman is not the most reliable of witnesses (indeed, the very concept of reliable/eye-witness reporting may not really be relevant to what his remarks are about); and there is, moreover, no explicit evidence to confirm that *Cymbeline* ever was performed in the Jacobean court (though that in itself, of course, doesn't mean that it wasn't). It is true that the staging of the descent of Jupiter might have had to change of necessity in relation to the differing technical capabilities of the venues available to the King's Men. The kind of unforced, functional alterations Marcus has in mind, however, are another matter, and I would set against her views in this area, as a general caution, Graham Holderness's observation that, 'while it is obviously the case that plays existed, and have been transmitted to us, in remarkably varied textual forms, there is no hard evidence to suggest that the King's Men tailored their wares specifically for the robust appetites of the many-headed multitude, or the refined tastes of courtly society' (see Holderness, Nick Potter, and John Turner, *Shakespeare: Out of Court: Dramatizations of Court Society* (Basingstoke and London, 1990), p. 137). Marcus herself is probably on firmer ground when she says of the presentation of *Cymbeline* at the court of Charles I on 1 January 1634, 'it seems fair to assume that in this performance, the play's "Stuart line" was allowed to shine forth in its full flush of idealism and promise' (p. 160).

I return to Forman's status and reliability as a witness in later chapters. His failure to mention the vision-scene has of course also been invoked in support of the argument that this whole sequence is a later - and non-Shakespearean - interpolation. The record of the 1634 Court performance of *Cymbeline*, from the office-book of the Master of the Revels, survives now only in transcript; see *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, 1623-1673*, edited by Joseph Quincy Adams (New Haven and London, 1917), p. 53.

136. A similar view is expressed by Lomax. Having noted that 'it is not known whether Shakespeare's eagle creaked down like Jonson's criticism of a playhouse throne, deliberately drawing attention to the naive artifice of the moment, or whether it was executed with all the splendour of the contemporary masques and appeared as a spectacle inspiring wonder and admiration', she concludes with the opinion, 'it

seems more likely that the reality may have been a mixture of the two - both self-conscious artifice and awe-inspiring spectacle' (*Stage images and traditions*, p. 121; Lomax's allusion is to Jonson's 'Prologue' to *Every Man in his Humour* - see H&S, III, 303).

137. For the particular descriptions/conceptual frameworks cited, see respectively (though I am extrapolating a little with the first of my examples): A. P. Rossiter's seminal lecture of 1951, 'Ambivalence: The Dialectic of the Histories', reprinted in Rossiter, *Angel with Horns*, edited by Graham Storey (London, 1961), pp. 40-64; Norman Rabkin, *Shakespeare and the Common Understanding* (New York and London, 1967), and *Shakespeare and the Problem of Meaning* (Chicago and London, 1981); and Graham Bradshaw, *Shakespeare's Scepticism* (Brighton, 1987), and *Misrepresentations: Shakespeare and the Materialists* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1993). Pugliatti provides a useful discussion of the broader current of critical responses to this well-known Shakespearian trait (see her chapter, 'Perspectivism', in *Shakespeare the Historian*, pp. 42-59). Her own summary of the range of terminology that has been employed by the critical tradition takes in 'illogicality, irregularity, complexity, contrariety, complementarity, polyphony, doubleness, ambivalence, even *discoherence*' (p. 46, and see too the note to this passage, p. 57). Some of the roots of modern thinking in this area go back at least as far as the Romantics - commentators in the field often invoke Keats's notion of Shakespeare's '*negative capability*' (e.g., Pugliatti, p. 8), and Coleridge's '*myriad-minded Shakspeare*' also comes readily to mind. See further in this connection, Jonathan Bate, ed., *The Romantics on Shakespeare* (Harmondsworth, 1992), 'Introduction', pp. 1-36 (and for the relevant passages from Coleridge and Keats, pp. 147, 198); and the closing chapter in Bate's book, *The Genius of Shakespeare* (London and Basingstoke, 1997), pp. 294-340, where he sets out besides his own related ideas of Shakespearian "aspectuality" and "performativity" (see especially pp. 327-337).

138. Talk about the openness of the Shakespearian text often goes hand-in-hand with assertions regarding the universality and timelessness of Shakespeare, as is well known, and hence routinely gives rise to the kind of sentiments alluded to here. In its more banal and vapid manifestations, it forms a staple element of "orthodox" bardolatry. It is also closely tied up with the popular critical and cultural habit of locating Shakespeare's genius, and the reason for his widespread appeal, in his infinite interpretability, his reputed capacity to be all things to all people - a tactic that is perpetually in danger of emptying the texts themselves of any intrinsic meaning even as it seeks to celebrate their exceptional meaningfulness. In this respect, the entire notion of openness is symptomatic of a rather woolly pluralism characteristic of the main currents of Shakespeare reception in the twentieth century, a *laissez-faire* position that refuses to engage with (or face up to) the actual problematics of authorizing interpretation and the politics of interpretative difference. I especially want to distance myself in the present context from the type of post-Coleridgian perspective that

reads Shakespeare as essentially (and commendably) "above" politics, and yet somehow inevitably always politically "right-thinking" whenever it really matters (see Bate, *The Romantics on Shakespeare*, pp. 15-26 (I am paraphrasing a remark from p. 19); and compare too the discussion in his *Shakespearean Constitutions: Politics, Theatre, Criticism 1730-1830* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 174-180, where Coleridge's influential attitude and line of approach are contrasted rather unfavourably with Hazlitt's more politicized outlook and methodology). That the Shakespearian text does indeed lack any stable, intrinsic meaning is of course a point of view cheerfully championed (not least for its iconoclastic force) in certain strands of contemporary poststructuralist criticism. I am drawing on aspects of this work - particularly, the political critique of idealizing, universalizing, "essentialist" readings of Shakespeare to be found in such studies as Malcolm Evans, *Signifying Nothing: Truth's True Contents in Shakespeare's Text* (Brighton, 1986), and Terence Hawkes, *Meaning by Shakespeare* (London and New York, 1992) - here and below. But pushed to its obvious extreme, the denial of intrinsic meaning seems to me to suppress pressing issues relating to the question of validity/invalidity in interpretation, and to reduce all interpretative difference to, so to speak, the same difference.

139. 'Unease', p. 158. The kind of subversion Marcus has in mind is decidedly context-specific. As she notes at an earlier point in her essay, 'the play's resistance to political "reading" according to the constraints of an authored document would not have the destabilizing effect it does in terms of the play's Stuart interpretation if James I had been a different type of monarch' (p. 136). Marcus believes 'it was part of Shakespeare's intent in *Cymbeline* to be able to sidestep the "self-sameness" and internal coherence growing out of emerging conventions of authorship' (p. 158); and she goes on to claim that, by imbuing the drama with 'a subtle critique of ideas about textual authority', Shakespeare managed to give the play 'back to the institution of the theater', with all its scope for 'multiplicity and diversity in performance' (p. 159). The argument is dependent on certain customary New Historicist assumptions concerning the relative stability/subversiveness of text and performance. Without wanting to deny the radical potential of the theatrical moment, I would endorse Palfrey's reservations on the subject of the way 'much recent criticism has tended to see material practices as "destabilizing" and dramatic scripts as mostly not' (p. 10; and see generally pp. 7-14). It is also worth emphasizing that it is a very specific model of authorship that Marcus describes as being resisted here, not (strictly speaking, at least) authorship *per se*. She herself invokes notions of authorial intention and agency in advancing her argument, whilst the very factors that create the critique of authority to which she draws attention are those elements which for me most fully reveal the inscription of the author/dramatist within the dramatic text.

140. *Shakespeare the Historian*, p. 8; and compare her comment that 'the conflicts, contradictions, disharmony, confusion and illogicality that might be safely predicated of life in general acquired dangerous

meanings when attributed to political issues. Indeed, showing disorder and disharmony in things historical constituted a radical overturning of the stagnant idea of history as dominated by a deterministic pattern, which was the norm among contemporary historians' (p. 47). I would stress that the force of this argument is easily extended to take in the arena of the plays' political topicality - Shakespeare's engagement with his own contemporary history, the history of the Jacobean present. Pugliatti acknowledges a debt on this subject to the work of Michael Hattaway (see his edition of *2 Henry VI*, pp. 1-10); and she sketches in besides (pp. 45-48) an important theoretical framework for the concept of perspectivism, relevant to my own approach, which embraces elements of modern-day historiographical theory and, in particular, Bakhtinian notions of dialogism, heteroglossia, and polyphony. She also deals well (pp. 42-45) with the wider Renaissance intellectual background to this whole mode of thinking - in the shape of the *controversiae* tradition, and rhetorical techniques of arguing both sides of the question (*in utramque partem*); and see further on these latter topics such studies as Joel B. Altman, *The Tudor Play of Mind: Rhetorical Inquiry and the Development of Elizabethan Drama* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1978); and Robert Grudin, *Mighty Opposites: Shakespeare and Renaissance Contrariety* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1979).

141. It is this sense of the opposition and interference between different perspectives, of the impact they have upon each other and the way one reading can qualify or invalidate another, that leads for me of necessity beyond straightforward questions of interpretative choice, or the rejection of one-sided interpretations in favour of a "balanced", all-inclusive approach; and indeed, beyond "either/or", "both/and", or *gestalt* models of interpretation, and their like; and that therefore makes notions of dialectic and perspectivism so much more appropriate in this context than the concept of "openness" alone. This in turn also helps to some extent to get round certain obvious stumbling-blocks that are always threatening to demolish the kind of argument for Shakespearian radicalism advanced here - the fact that the plays can be (have been) made to mean almost anything; and that the idea of "openness" in itself inevitably tends to imply that Shakespeare's texts are equally and untroublesomely appropriable to any interpretative position whatsoever, including the most orthodox or reactionary of ends (see further below).

I am struggling to deal briefly here with what is of course one of the fundamental problematics of Shakespearian reception. *Henry V* stands as an obvious paradigm case, and there is a good discussion of this whole topic in Bradshaw's essay on this play in *Misrepresentations* (pp. 34-124). Bradshaw's work is particularly useful for its emphasis on juxtaposition, argument, and the temporal processes of performance, as well as for the stress it places on the way a text like *Henry V* can have an inbuilt resistance to certain lines of interpretation - the way some readings are more limited, more "partial" than others. The idea of "openness" clearly remains crucial in certain respects - in relation to the scope for performance choice which the Shakespearian text

makes/leaves available, and especially, to those moments where the text is demonstrably insufficient to determine the nature of the action that accompanies it. And the difficulties of authorizing interpretation and of justifying the rejection of specific (politically "conservative") lines of interpretation persist as a backdrop to all of the "readings" advanced in this thesis, and the strategies of persuasion they adopt. But one effect of the dramaturgical techniques under discussion, and of the competition and conflict between meanings they create, is, it seems to me, to highlight the political and ethical dimensions of the interpretative agon - to convey, that is, some of the implications and discursive consequences of setting alternative perspectives against each other, of elevating one reading, one perspective, over another, or of viewing opposing interpretations as equally valid and viable.

142. 'Unease', p. 151.

143. The standard deconstructive line of attack on "essentialist" models of interpretation, so often open to criticism as being overly pat or simplistic, feels entirely to the point in the present context, in the light of what Marcus terms 'James's political doctrine of essences' ('Unease', p. 158). It is worth noting that the King himself seems to have resisted *any* attempt to define, delimit, or "dispute" the "intrinsic" nature of his power and prerogative, including seemingly favourable accounts in which some of the more controversial implications (or potential implications) of his own position were spelled out too fully, or not carefully enough. I am thinking in particular of the stance he adopted during the 1610 controversy over the publication of John Cowell's legal dictionary, *The Interpreter* (Cambridge, 1607); see the (contrasting) discussions of this episode in Sommerville, *Politics and Ideology*, pp. 121-127, and Burgess, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution*, pp. 148-155. The latter rightly emphasizes that 'a king's power in essence could not be disputed' (p. 154), and similarly, that 'royal authority, in its essence, was a mysterious matter beyond the reach of human words' (p. 155). Many of the issues raised by the case of Cowell's volume could probably bear further exploration in relation to *Cymbeline*, a play which to my mind certainly gestures, however obliquely, towards "disputing" aspects of Jacobean royal authority and its underlying premises.

144. As opposed, that is, to being just an inevitable consequence of the nature of the interpretative process and the uncontrollable play of language; or, for that matter, a perspective that is revealed only by accident or mistake, that the text/dramatist has failed adequately to suppress or gloss over.

145. 'Unease', p. 159; this section of Marcus's argument is more fully developed in *Puzzling Shakespeare*, pp. 144-147.

146. Quoting in this instance from *Puzzling Shakespeare*, p. 145. Marcus continues:

the fissures in question are not the same as those created by repression in that materials on both sides of the split are almost equally available to the self, but not at the same

time or along the same perceptual continuum. Naming the word or constellation of words and events which underlies the fissure and constitutes it at least potentially allows a structural transformation that permits the two discursive spaces, the split-off areas of self, to flow together. The same "healing" process can be invoked for political and artistic discontinuities to the extent that such splits follow a similar morphology, and to the extent that they are perceived as pathological, insufferable, urgently requiring repair.

For Marcus's sources/references here, see her note to this passage, p. 247; and compare too 'Unease', p. 167, note 43.

147. Or as Marcus goes on to add, 'it would disperse the pedantic, orderly rituals of reading in order to "decrypt" the sacred immanence of royal power' (all quotations here from *Puzzling Shakespeare*, p. 145; the indented passage in particular is an extension on the corresponding sentence in 'Unease' (p. 159)).

148. Marcus herself connects *both* the opposing perspectives she identifies, deconstruction and cryptonymy, to specific positions in the world of Jacobean politics. Thus she writes:

in the Renaissance, the two mutually reversing operations were equally possible and available (under different labels than I have been using here) as counters in political debate. Legal and parliamentary "deconstructionists" challenged the doctrine of essences in its particular Jacobean form of official "state" organicism associated with the body of the monarch, by pointing toward those elements of the national life that the Jacobean vision of unity had to disallow in order to constitute itself. Cryptonymy - "Platonic politics" might be a more fitting label for it in its English Renaissance form - was a reading of underlying essences which "healed" social rifts and political fragmentation by pointing toward deeper unities already invisibly in place through the fact of James I's kingship ('Unease', p. 160).

For a sense of the wider ramifications of neoplatonism in the period, see generally Orgel, *The Illusion of Power*. The idea that there was anything that amounted to an organized or recognizable "opposition" in Jacobean England has been called into question over the last few years (see, for example, Glenn Burgess, 'Revisionist History and Shakespeare's Political Context', in *Shakespeare and History*, edited by Holger Klein and Rowland Wymer (Lewiston, NY and Lampeter, 1996), pp. 5-36 (pp. 10-12)). But in spite of the current emphasis in certain quarters on political consensus, I see no reason why the kind of "theatrical deconstruction" held up by Marcus as one performance possibility would have been (a) unachievable in the theatre of the time, or (b) incapable of carrying some sort of "oppositional" or destabilizing (anti-hegemonic) force. By the same token, a specifically "anti-oppositional" dimension (whether as a process of controlled containment or uncomfortable shoring-up) would then attach to Marcus's whole idea of a "theatrical cryptonymy", and the political perspectives associated with it.

149. Marcus's evocation of an 'idealized realm', with its glimpse of some sort of perfected "order beyond", is of obvious relevance here; and of course the whole concept of "Romance" as it has been applied to late Shakespeare brings with it its own influential principles of "deep structure", in the form of underlying mythic archetypes and overriding generic patterns (see the following chapter).

150. As far as her own argument is concerned, Marcus just about manages to maintain throughout the idea of interpretative "openness" and equally available alternatives in this context, the sense that the political meaning of the play essentially boils down to a matter of performance choices and personal predilections. But one can still come away from her essay with the feeling that cryptonymy wins out in the end, that it is this that the play is really all about after all. Apart from anything else, the fact that it is a perspective that upholds the political status quo - the power structures already set in place or striving to impose themselves - immediately gives the "Jacobean line" of interpretation an inbuilt advantage in Marcus's relationship of "equal" interpretative possibilities. In this and other respects, Marcus's reading seems ultimately to resolve into a fairly standard containment model - a position which, it has to be said, does generally reflect the nature of the play's afterlife in criticism and performance. My own approach depends on regarding the play's "openness" to interpretation not so much as a method of making different interpretative choices available, as a specific refusal to endorse the "Jacobean line" with the enthusiasm and single-mindedness which that line itself effectively requires (an idea I feel rather gets lost somewhere in the course of Marcus's discussion). To my mind, this at least begins to counteract Marcus's problems when it comes to "authorizing" the oppositional dynamic she finds in the text. For a somewhat different (and possibly subtler) response to Marcus's position on the issue of intentionality, see Paola Pugliatti, 'Shakespeare's Historicism: Visions and Revisions', in *Shakespeare and the Twentieth Century*, edited by Jonathan Bate, Jill L. Levenson, and Dieter Mehl (Cranbury, NJ, 1998), pp. 336-349. The work of Kiernan Ryan, which I have already invoked in the Preface, is also relevant here - not least for the critical collection he has recently edited, *Shakespeare: The Last Plays*, Longman Critical Readers (London and New York, 1999), which includes a reprint of Marcus's essay (in its shorter form). See Ryan's Introduction to this volume, pp. 1-21, and his perceptive remarks on Marcus's paper and the question of Shakespearean scepticism/radicalism more generally, pp. 134-135, 245-246.

151. The first critic I am aware of to call attention (if only in passing) to the self-referential dimensions of Posthumus's phrase, its contribution to the play's deliberate and knowing artifice, is Brockbank; see 'History and histrionics', p. 280.

152. The obvious critical reference point here is Johnson, whose strictures on the play are far too well-known to require quoting by me (see *Johnson on Shakespeare*, VIII, 874-908 - above all p. 908, for the

famous passage (from Johnson's 1765 edition, VII, 403) that is cited by almost everyone). Objections to the dramaturgy of *Cymbeline* have of course tended to cluster in particular around the final act. As Ann Thompson observes, whilst it has now 'become standard for critics to admire the ending of Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*', such admiration 'is a relatively recent phenomenon and is not universally shared' (*Cymbeline's Other Endings*, p. 203); and see the comments in Nosworthy, *Cymbeline*, pp. xl-xli. In terms of the twentieth century, concerns over the quality of the fifth act came to a definite head in connection with George Bernard Shaw's *Cymbeline Refinished* of 1936. This was first performed in 1937, and first published in *The London Mercury*, 37 (1937-38), 373-389; I have used the text in *The Bodley Head Bernard Shaw, Volume VII* (London, 1974), pp. 177-199; and see also *Shaw on Shakespeare*, edited by Edwin Wilson (New York, 1961), pp. 43-78, which collects together the complete range of Shaw's fascinating responses to *Cymbeline* in general. The now-largely-forgotten question of the relative merits of Shaw's and Shakespeare's endings occupied a number of the early commentators on Shaw's "refinishing", and offers in turn a glimpse into wider cultural attitudes to *Cymbeline* itself during the middle decades of the century; see the contrasting assessments in E. J. West, 'Shaw, Shakespeare, and *Cymbeline*', *Theatre Annual*, 8 (1950), 7-24; and Rudolf Stamm, 'George Bernard Shaw and Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*', in *Studies in Honor of T. W. Baldwin*, edited by Don Cameron Allen (Urbana, IL, 1958), pp. 254-266. Shaw himself came to profess a somewhat surprising (if loaded) enthusiasm for the whole of Shakespeare's original final act - so long as those producing the play 'have the courage and good sense to present the original word-for-word as Shakespear [sic] left it' (remarks quoted from towards the end of the 1945 version of Shaw's 'Foreword' (see *Cymbeline Refinished*, pp. 185-186), a passage notably tempered from the original *London Mercury* text (p. 377)).

153. Compare Judiana Lawrence's observation that 'in the last act of *Cymbeline* Shakespeare lays on so many of the staples of romance that the least one can say is that he seems to have wished the audience to recognize them as such' (p. 441).

154. Although she quickly goes on explicitly to invoke it as 'a terminus upon the fragmenting process of deconstruction', Marcus herself acknowledges that 'cryptonymy can, of course, be deconstructed itself, become part of an endless series of displacements, replacements, new displacements' (*Puzzling Shakespeare*, p. 145 - remarks absent from the shorter version of Marcus's essay). A similar series of displacements, a similar multiplying of perspectives, operates the other way around as well, and my own "deconstruction" at this point is inevitably open to further deconstruction(s) - and indeed, is, in its own way, just another form of "cryptonymy", reconciling meanings and contradictions at the level of dramaturgical design and technique, seeking out a "deeper structure" behind the already deep structure of the "Jacobean line". Despite this, though, I would argue that my position is truer to the text and its performative possibilities than Marcus's; and I would claim

besides that it is rather more enabling, that it allows an alternative - and more positive - politics the chance of benefiting from the cultural cachet of seeming to be "authorized" by Shakespeare. But in any case, the difference of opinion involved here is, once again, a good deal more than merely a question of interpretation. My own inclination is to suggest that the opposition between the deconstructive and "cryptonymic" lines of interpretation translates into contrasting readings in which the play emerges as embarked on a process of either exploring the politics (and the politicization) of the aesthetic, or pursuing what Francis Barker refers to as 'the aestheticisation of politics that Walter Benjamin warned against' (*The Culture of Violence* (Manchester, 1993), p. 200; and see too, though his original terms are obviously a long way away from anything I am saying here, Benjamin's essay, 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' (1936), included in Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt, translated by Harry Zohn (London, 1992), pp. 211-244 (pp. 234-235)). I would contend, in addition, that the former process offers a critique or exposé of the latter, in another equation that is by no means simply reversible.

155. 'Cymbeline and the Perils of Interpretation', p. 144. It is possible to see a parallel here again between the play as a whole and the inset text of the prophetic label - in terms of the power this is invested with, the appeal of its interpretation, the ends which that interpretation can be seen to serve, the way it is contextualized, and so on. Thomas himself stresses what is perhaps the most obvious point of all concerning the issue of laying bare the processes of fiction-making in this context, the fact that 'we know that Jupiter's text is not Jupiter's but a text appearing in a play fabricated by a mortal playwright. Because Shakespeare is not God, he cannot create a world but only a text that produces a play that produces a text masquerading as a text of Jupiter' (p. 143).

156. *Norton Shakespeare*, p. 2963.

157. The extract just cited from Howard, for example, comes right at the end of her *Norton Shakespeare* introduction to the play, which gives very little hint until its final paragraph of the possibility of any such effect. Brook Thomas's article, however, is a significant exception in this respect, which is just one of a number of reasons why it is a pity that his study has not been taken up more widely by the critical tradition.

158. It has of course taken feminist criticism and its influence to make this element of *Cymbeline*, and its invidious ethical and ideological implications, properly apparent. See in particular here Jodi Mikalachki, 'The Masculine Romance of Roman Britain: *Cymbeline* and Early Modern English Nationalism', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 46 (1995), 301-322 (revised in Mikalachki, *The Legacy of Boadicea* (London and New York, 1998), pp. 96-114); and also Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers*, pp. 200-220; Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare*, pp. 160-170; Jean Howard's comments in the *Norton Shakespeare*, pp. 2961-2963; and such other recent articles

as Karen Cunningham, 'Female Fidelities on Trial: Proof in the Howard Attainder and *Cymbeline*', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 25 (1994), 1-31; and Rhonda Lemke Sanford, 'A Room Not One's Own: Feminine Geography in *Cymbeline*', in Gillies and Vaughan, pp. 63-85.

159. *Norton Shakespeare*, p. 2962; Howard makes the point that for many present-day commentators, '[Imogen's] role in the play's narrative of nation is a troubling one'; and see too here Ann Thompson, 'Person and Office: The Case of Imogen, Princess of Britain', in *Literature and Nationalism*, edited by Vincent Newey and Ann Thompson (Liverpool, 1991), pp. 76-87. Critics have made much of late in this context of Imogen's remaining in her masculine attire, but it is worth remembering that performance - especially modern performance - has all sorts of strategies available (if required) for allowing the "true" gender of the character to become apparent, without recourse to a full-scale change of costume. And it is possible to overstate the play's exclusion of the feminine. Howard's carefully-phrased remark that, 'in the last scene, no persons appareled as women are to be seen' (*Norton Shakespeare*, p. 2962), is simply wrong. They may not have much of a part to play, and their presence qualifies rather than invalidates the point Howard is driving at, but the Queen's waiting-women do appear during the closing scene (5.6. 23.2/TLN 3277), and indeed get to speak, in a significant act of ratification (l. 63), and there is no reason/requirement for them to depart prior to the final clearing of the stage.

160. The potent ideological ramifications of the double meaning in "*mulier*", the incorporation of "woman" and "wife" within the same signifier, are of course mirrored in Latin "*vir*", and its concomitant etymological association with "*virtus*", the gendering of Roman "virtue" as a specifically male quality; see especially Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare*, pp. 1-26. The patriarchal ends served by the supposed etymological connection between "*mulier*" and "*mollis*" (and its related forms) are only too evident from the context in which the "*mulier*"/"*mollitie*" etymology is cited by the likes of Isidore and Lactantius (see above, note 27). The etymology itself may have been credited with linguistic accuracy and authority, but it would seem to fit more within the realm of what Spevack identifies as 'popular etymologizing', a back formation used as 'a way of coming to terms with the present', of helping 'to foster' a very particular form of 'social stability' ('Etymology in Shakespeare', p. 187). Having said that, an etymological link between "*mulier*" and "*mollis*" was still being asserted in Latin dictionaries well into the twentieth century (see again J. C. Maxwell, *Cymbeline*, p. 220, note to l. 446). The current *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (2 vols (Oxford, 1968-1976)) lists the etymology of "*mulier*" as dubious or doubtful (II, 1141).

161. Both quotations taken from Donawerth, *Shakespeare and the Sixteenth-Century Study of Language* (Urbana and Chicago, 1984), p. 30; and see the whole of her section, 'The Connection between Words and Things', pp. 25-31, a discussion that is pretty much structured around the interpretation of the prophetic label and its etymologies. According

to Donawerth, 'in teaching the "fit and apt construction" of words, the soothsayer actually teaches that the universe, reflected in language, has an order and a significance not immediately apparent, but nonetheless profound' (p. 30). Her views are echoed in Frederick Kiefer, *Writing on the Renaissance Stage* (Cranbury, NJ, 1996), pp. 100-101. For wider discussions of attitudes to language and meaning in the Renaissance, see Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things*, [translated by Alan Sheridan] (Tavistock, 1970; reprinted London, 1994), pp. 17-45; and, offering a somewhat less monolithic perspective on the situation, Richard Waswo, *Language and Meaning in the Renaissance* (Princeton, NJ, 1987); Ian Maclean, *Interpretation and Meaning in the Renaissance: The Case of Law* (Cambridge, 1992), particularly pp. 1-11; and Judith H. Anderson, *Words That Matter: Linguistic Perception in Renaissance England* (Stanford, CA, 1996). The outlook reflected in Philharmonus's approach, what Donawerth terms the attitude 'favored in Renaissance England' (p. 30), and which incorporated besides the whole theory of microcosm-macrocosm similitudes, had very deep roots. As Sheila Delany suggests, it is an ideology that 'found perhaps its clearest practical expression in the sixth-century *Etymologies* of Isidore of Seville, with their intense desire for connection between word and meaning, word and thing' (*The Naked Text: Chaucer's 'Legend of Good Women'* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1994), p. 72). Aside from the reference to Isidore, I mention Delany's work at this point because her study of *The Legend of Good Women* - a poem which Shakespeare evidently knew well and returned to often; which displays its own interest in etymology, construal/construction (see the Prologue ("F" Text), ll. 152, 184), and the problematics of "reading" (and "writing") women within patriarchal discourses and structures; and which too has posed significant problems of reception and interpretation to modern criticism - has influenced my own arguments here and below; see especially her chapter, 'Women, Nature, and Language', pp. 70-114.

162. Which is to say, the language of the label and its exposition encodes most of the basic principles of the governing early-seventeenth-century episteme. On some of the specific connections involved here, see again Spevack, 'Etymology in Shakespeare', as well as his earlier article, 'Beyond Individualism: Names and Namelessness in Shakespeare', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 56 (1993), 383-398; and also Martin Elsky, *Authorizing Words: Speech, Writing, and Print in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1989), pp. 84-86 especially.

163. Shakespeare's penchant for exploring gender issues and the conflicts of sexual politics within the context of "language lessons" is apparent from the mock construe in *The Taming of the Shrew* (see above, note 5), not to mention such whole scenes as *Henry V*, 3.4, and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 4.1. For relevant comment on the latter in particular, see Elizabeth Pittenger, 'Dispatch Quickly: The Mechanical Reproduction of Pages', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 42 (1991), 381-408; and Patricia Parker, *Shakespeare from the Margins* (Chicago and London, 1996), pp. 116-148. The phrase, "tender heir", has its own distinctive Shakespearian ring to it, given its appearance in Sonnet 1.4 - see the

appropriate note to this passage in John Kerrigan, ed., *'The Sonnets' and 'A Lover's Complaint'*, The New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1986), p. 170. I owe my own awareness of the relevance of the "tender heir" reading at the end of *Cymbeline* to Kerrigan; but see too Pitcher, 'Names in *Cymbeline*', pp. 1-2; and Jean Howard's comments in the *Norton Shakespeare*, p. 2962. Noticing the "tender heir"/"tender air" pun (and the connection to *Cymbeline*) seems to have become a part of the editorial tradition in the *Sonnets*. This is not the case with the play, however. The availability of the "heir" meaning/sound at this point in the action is not noted in most editions (including Warren's).

164. Precisely how royal succession is conceived of as working in the play's world of pre-Roman Britain is never made explicit. It is clear that Guiderius takes precedence over his brother in the line to the throne by dint of being the elder of Cymbeline's two sons; whether he is the King's eldest child, however, is another matter. As far as I can make out (though it is unwise to delve too deeply into the complex pre-history of *Cymbeline*), nothing in the text of the play determines for certain the relative ages of Imogen and Guiderius; and that inexplicitness in itself is a good enough indication that, when it comes to their place in the succession, it is gender that really matters, not age. For a sense of the way the play in general can be seen to call into question some of the central fictions and fantasies of patriarchy and patrilineage, see again Brook Thomas.

165. Construed unsympathetically, the phrase, 'a piece of tender air', has a distinctly reductive side to it, serving both to objectify and commodify Imogen, and also virtually to disembody her, to render her incorporeal, insubstantial. I see something of a parallel to this, a similar demonstration of the double-edged nature of the language patriarchal society uses to idealize women, in another of the most distinctive phrases the play applies to Imogen, Posthumus's reference in his misogyny soliloquy to her 'pudency so rosy' (2.5.11). Here, the image of chaste forbearance and modestly blushing cheeks simultaneously embodies - though most critics and editors, and even commentators on Shakespeare's bawdy, seem to have shied away from acknowledging this - the most explicit and quasi-pornographic of erotic imaginings. See the gloss on "pudency" in Rubinstein, p. 206; and the discussions of this passage in Lisa Jardine, *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare* (Brighton, 1983), pp. 12-14; Peter Smith, p. 113; and John Pitcher, 'Why Editors Should Write More Notes', *Shakespeare Studies*, 24 (1996), 55-62 (p. 56).

166. There is an obvious danger in making too much out of what is after all a textual silence - the play itself draws attention to the way a silent denial can easily be read as acquiescence (see the dialogue between Imogen and Cloten at 2.3.88-93). And it is also true, as the disturbing phenomenon of "Imogenolatry" makes only too clear, that the reception tradition has frequently bought in entirely to the notion of Imogen as ideal (and ideally reticent), perfected womanhood. But some

forms of denial can only be expressed implicitly, or in silence. And I would stress besides, that, whatever one makes of it, the presence of the "heir" sense here was probably stronger for the play's original audiences than it has since become, given that "air" and "heir" were still not entirely orthographically distinct in this period. Indeed, to some extent, as Margreta de Grazia and Peter Stallybrass have argued, "air", "heir", and even "hair" were not yet so much rigidly separate words as different aspects of the same "semantic field" (see 'The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 44 (1993), 255-283 (pp. 262-266)).

167. A connection between Philharmonus and the present-day critic is made by Brook Thomas, who notes that 'it takes the special qualities of a soothsayer (today he [sic] would be a professor) to perform the act of interpretation which allows the text properly to clarify the world of the play' (p. 143). The parallel with my own position rather breaks down (in addition to anything I have just been saying) in the fundamental distinction in the nature of the texts under consideration in either case - specifically, that is, the complicating factor of the text/performance dynamic that necessarily enters into any discussion of *Cymbeline*. And yet, no matter how much I seek to distance myself from the Soothsayer's general line of approach, an underlying relationship still remains. When all's said and done, my own interpretations of Shakespeare's late plays are themselves only exercises in "construction" (or even "translation"), and are thus ultimately subject to the same construal/construction dichotomy, the same hermeneutic circle, I have been tracing throughout.

168. For a concentrated exploration of this topic, see David M. Bergeron, 'Reading and Writing in Shakespeare's Romances', *Criticism*, 33 (1991), 91-113 (reprinted in revised form as 'Treacherous Reading and Writing in Shakespeare's Romances', in Bergeron, ed., *Reading and Writing in Shakespeare* (Cranbury, NJ, 1996), pp. 160-177). A notable exception amongst the late plays in this respect is *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, identified by Jonas Barish as the only play in the Shakespeare canon 'in which no stage document is either brought forth or alluded to as playing a role in the drama' ("Soft, here follows prose", p. 32). This is not to say, however, that interpretation - the reading of the visual - is not an important element within this play as well.

169. I would call attention here to Graham Bradshaw's exploration of the relevance to the Shakespeare canon of what he terms 'Nietzsche's constant insistence that we interpret the world as we interpret a text'. For Bradshaw, and I would very much go along with this, 'Shakespeare is in this respect his own deconstructionist' (*Shakespeare's Scepticism*, p. x). Also relevant in this context are some comments by Darryl J. Gless in relation to the way meanings are created and manipulated in the opening scenes of *Julius Caesar*: 'interpreters who focus on these recurrent acts of construal and misconstrual are responding to a concern our own time shares with Shakespeare's - a concern with ways in which

language creates what we perceive as "reality" ('*Julius Caesar*, Allan Bloom, and The Value of Pedagogical Pluralism', in *Shakespeare Left and Right*, edited by Ivo Kamps (New York and London, 1991), pp. 185-203 (p. 191)).

170. Paul de Man provides a useful exploration of one side of the concept of textuality in a discussion of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's novel, *Julie, ou la Nouvelle Héloïse*, and its various epigraphs and prefaces, its numerous "framing" devices (I extract from de Man's remarks):

the innumerable writings that dominate our lives are made intelligible by a preordained agreement as to their referential authority; this agreement however is merely contractual, never constitutive. It can be broken at all times and every piece of writing can be questioned as to its rhetorical mode, just as *Julie* is being questioned in the Preface. Whenever this happens, what originally appeared to be a document or an instrument becomes a text and, as a consequence, its readability is put in question. The questioning points back to earlier texts and engenders, in its turn, other texts which claim (and fail) to close off the textual field. For each of these statements can in its turn become a text [. . .] (*Allegories of Reading*, p. 204).

But the "textuality" of late Shakespearian drama takes in all sorts of other elements as well. In the first place, following on from de Man's remarks, there is the whole area of intertextuality to consider (see in particular in this context Barbara A. Mowat's essay, 'The Theater and Literary Culture', in *A New History of Early English Drama*, edited by John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York, 1997), pp. 213-230, which contains some highly pertinent observations on the literary backgrounds of *Pericles* (pp. 218-222)). I would also include in the equation the relationship between text and performance; questions of canonicity; the whole realm of textual transmission; and, connecting with and adding to all of these fields, the New Historicist dictum of "The Historicity of Texts and Textuality of History" (as expressed in Louis Montrose, 'Renaissance Literary Studies and the Subject of History', *English Literary Renaissance*, 16 (1986), 5-12 (p. 8)) - or in its more refined, more recent manifestation, 'the historicity of texts and the textuality of histories' (Montrose, *The Purpose of Playing*, p. 5). I have in mind too, as something of an underlying principle to my entire approach, Schleiermacher's argument for the interdependence of what he refers to as 'hermeneutics and criticism', his sense that 'the practice of one presupposes the other' (see Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Hermeneutics and Criticism, And Other Writings*, edited and translated by Andrew Bowie, Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy (Cambridge, 1998), p. 3).

171. *Shakespeare: The Last Plays*, p. 19. For Ryan, 'historicist and allegorical critics have generally displayed a marked indifference to the claims of sustained close reading, while close readings that illuminate the verbal patterns and dramatic techniques of the last plays have steered equally clear of pursuing the theoretical and political consequences of their formal analyses' (p. 19; and see generally pp. 12-

19). I would stress that my own sense of the need for a *rapprochement* between political and formalist approaches has little in common with the position adopted, say, in Claus Uhlig's recent essay, 'Shakespeare between Politics and Aesthetics', *Shakespearean International Yearbook*, 1 (1999), 26-44.

172. *The Ideology of the Aesthetic*, p. 9; compare too Eagleton's earlier argument that, whilst 'the construction of the modern notion of the aesthetic artefact is [. . .] inseparable from the construction of the dominant ideological forms of modern class-society, and indeed from a whole new form of human subjectivity appropriate to that social order', the aesthetic, 'understood in a certain sense', also provides 'an unusually powerful challenge and alternative to these dominant ideological forms, and is in this sense an eminently contradictory phenomenon' (p. 3). And as he argues in another context:

the avant garde's response to the cognitive, ethical and aesthetic is quite unequivocal. Truth is a lie; morality stinks; beauty is shit. And of course they are absolutely right. Truth is a White House communiqué; morality is the Moral Majority; beauty is a naked woman advertising perfume. Equally, of course, they are wrong. Truth, morality and beauty are too important to be handed contemptuously over to the political enemy (p. 372).

173. *The Political Unconscious*, p. 9. Jameson goes on to argue, in words that relate closely to the crux of my own approach in the next two chapters, 'this presupposition [. . .] dictates the use of a method (which I have elsewhere termed the "metacommentary") according to which our object of study is less the text itself than the interpretations through which we attempt to confront and to appropriate it' (pp. 9-10). For my own part, though, the exploration and assessment of existing interpretations involves not only a questioning of their practical and ideological applications, but also a testing of their hermeneutic validity in relation to "the text itself".

CHAPTER TWO

1. For reasons touched on already and set out in detail in the next section of this chapter, I have myself refrained from adopting the generic classification "Romances" as a description either for the late plays as a whole, or for any combination of individual works within this grouping. The idea of the "four Romances" is an image I especially want to get away from. Where I do have cause to speak of the "Romances" or the "four Romances" during this thesis, therefore, this is simply as a reflection of the general currency of these categories, or in discussing the work of particular critics who have accepted or advocated their use. In line with this approach, I have always placed both terms within inverted commas, as a sign of my purely provisional acceptance of them. Appropriate terminology has proved a recurring problem with late Shakespeare. I have explained how I am using my own preferred appellation, "late plays", in the Preface. I have on occasion, however, found it convenient to treat the terms "Romances" and "late plays" (and even "four Romances") as though they were interchangeable, whereas in any estimation they can only really be thought of as being at best loosely synonymous.

2. 'Autolycus' was first published in *New Writing and Daylight*, 7 (1946), 13-14, and later included in MacNeice's collection, *Holes in the Sky: Poems 1944-1947* (London, 1948). I have used the text in *The Collected Poems of Louis MacNeice*, edited by E. R. Dodds, second edition (London, 1979), p. 233. Dodds dates the poem to August 1945.

3. MacNeice is clearly writing aware of the critical tradition descending from Edward Dowden (discussed below), and I have maybe read between the lines a little in the light of this tradition in teasing out some of the details highlighted here. Obviously, the poem's tone and content are more likely to have been shaped by aesthetic considerations than by any concern for literal critical accuracy; and I should point out that its image of the late plays gets complicated noticeably in the remaining two stanzas, which focus on Autolycus as a surrogate for the dramatist, and on what MacNeice identifies as the balance provided by Shakespeare using 'what we knew already, gabbing earth | Hot from Eastcheap' (ll. 26-27).

4. Dowden writes importantly on the late plays in the first edition of his best-known book, *Shakspeare: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art* (London, 1875), pp. 378-430, where he speaks about 'a certain romantic element in each' (by which he means *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *The Tempest* - *Pericles* only gets mentioned in a footnote

(p. 403)). But it is in his much shorter, popular Literature Primer, *Shakspeare* (London, 1877), that he first provides his famous descriptive tags for Shakespeare's four periods (p. 48) and outlines the "Romances" as we know them today (pp. 54-56). The chronological table included in the Primer (pp. 56-57), which shows *Pericles* fully incorporated within the "Romances", reappears in the Preface added to the third edition of *Shakspeare: His Mind and Art* (London, 1877), pp. v-xii (p. x).

It is in the division of Shakespeare's career into four periods that Dowden is most indebted to the work of Furnivall and the New Shakspeare Society (see further below, note 118). The personal genesis of Dowden's work and the path of his connections with Furnivall and the NSS are explored in Kathryn R. Ludwigson, *Edward Dowden* (New York, 1973), pp. 24-26, 112-126; see also Hugh Grady, 'Disintegration and its Reverberations', in Marsden, *The Appropriation of Shakespeare*, pp. 111-127 (pp. 112-113); and Gary Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present* (London, 1990), pp. 173-182. The long printing history of Dowden's Primer and the unmatched dissemination and influence of his biographical pattern are traced in S. Schoenbaum, *Shakespeare's Lives* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 490-500.

5. According to Dowden, 'there are moments when Shakspeare was not wholly absorbed in his work as artist at this period; it is as if he were thinking of his own life, or of the fields and streams of Stratford, and still wrote on; it is as if the ties which bound him to his art were not severing with thrills of strong emotion, but were quietly growing slack'; he goes on to refer to material which 'could only have been written when the poet did not care to energize over the less interesting, but still necessary passages of his drama' (*Shakspeare: His Mind and Art*, p. 404).

6. See 'Shakespeare's Final Period', in Lytton Strachey, *Books & Characters* (London, 1928; first published, 1922), pp. 39-56 (p. 52); the essay was originally printed in the *Independent Review*, 3 (August 1904), 405-418. Strachey's conclusions about late Shakespeare may be diametrically opposed to Dowden's, but his approach is predicated on exactly the same principles of biographical interpretation; indeed, the terms of his critique are in effect just the flip-side of Dowden's own. On this idea, see especially Schoenbaum (*Shakespeare's Lives*, pp. 662-666), who provides the information that 'Shakespeare's Final Period' first entered the public domain as a paper delivered before the Sunday Essay Society, Trinity College, Cambridge, 24 November 1903 (pp. 663-664). The passage quoted here has been repeatedly excerpted.

7. The force of Strachey's work is perhaps most clearly evinced in the way his opinions were for decades almost routinely invoked in late play criticism and Shakespearian biography in order simply to be dismissed or disparaged - a process of critical exorcism rather than critical history. Representative examples of this practice can be found in E. M. W. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's Last Plays* (London, 1938), pp. 1-4; John Middleton Murry, *Shakespeare* (London, 1936), pp. 380-381;

S. C. Sen Gupta, *Shakespearian Comedy* (Calcutta, 1950), pp. 215-221; and George Ian Duthie, *Shakespeare*, fifth impression (London, 1966; first printed, 1951), p. 198. A residue of the habit, but here with more than a hint of admiration for Strachey suggested, is present in Philip Edwards's influential survey article, 'Shakespeare's Romances: 1900-1957', *Shakespeare Survey*, 11 (1958), 1-18 (pp. 3-4). Something of Strachey's tone, though with little of his impact, makes its way into another attempt at a critical corrective, F. R. Leavis's 'The Criticism of Shakespeare's Late Plays: A Caveat', *Scrutiny*, 10 (1941-42), 339-345.

8. This is not to say that they did not find their champions earlier in the century - the obvious example to cite is Wilson Knight, whose original work in this area dates back to the late 1920s (see the following note). My point here is that, with Strachey's attack still being keenly felt, the sort of assurances about the value and quality of the "Romances" as a group that prevail in the years after 1945 were simply not available pre-War. This is well reflected in the ambivalences that surface in two key works from the period (both owing some debt to Knight), D. G. James's essay, 'The Failure of the Ballad-Makers', in his book, *Scepticism and Poetry* (London, 1937), pp. 205-241, and Tillyard's influential monograph of 1938, *Shakespeare's Last Plays*. Compare also H. B. Charlton's confidence that the "Romances" reveal an old Shakespeare 'declining in dramatic power' (*Shakespearian Comedy*, second edition (London, 1938), p. 268). The more positive assessment that emerges from James's later *The Dream of Prospero* (Oxford, 1967) is itself an indication of the different atmospheres involved.

The early critical histories of the "four Romances" are generally well related in the introductions to their mid-century Arden 2 editions, all long-term standard texts, revised from time to time, and regularly reprinted. See J. M. Nosworthy, ed., *Cymbeline* (1955, reprinted 1986), pp. xl-xlviii; Frank Kermode, ed., *The Tempest*, sixth edition (London, 1958; reprinted 1988), pp. lxxxi-lxxxviii (Arden's sixth edition is Kermode's second; his first, Arden's fifth, appeared in 1954); and J. H. P. Pafford, ed., *The Winter's Tale* (London, 1963; reprinted 1989), pp. xxxvii-xliv; not quite so useful in this respect (but see pp. lxix-lxxi) is F. D. Hoeniger's *Pericles* (London, 1963; reprinted 1984).

9. As just noted, Knight's earliest writings on the late plays pre-date the War by some years. Besides essays on individual texts, these include his seminal study *Myth and Miracle* of 1929, as well as the section on 'The Final Plays' in *The Shakespearian Tempest* (Oxford, 1932), pp. 218-266; further relevant comment is also present in his war-time *The Olive and the Sword: A Study of England's Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1944), pp. 64-85. Yet Knight's key work - probably the key book in the entire history of late play criticism - is unquestionably *The Crown of Life* (Oxford, 1947; reprinted London, 1948), described by Knight as 'the culmination of twenty years' work on Shakespeare' (p. vi). Despite his crucial influence, though, Knight's approach is always individual and often eccentric. He is not a proponent of the category "Romances", usually preferring "Final Plays" (see his Preface in *The Crown of Life*,

third impression (1952), p. vii); he incorporates *Henry VIII* squarely into his thinking; and he is typically far more interested in relating the late plays to grand patterns of development within Shakespeare's overall career than in stressing their identity as a group in themselves (see especially the essays 'The Principles of Shakespeare Interpretation' (1928) and 'The Shakespearian Integrity' (1939), both reprinted in *The Sovereign Flower* (pp. 287-293, 203-241 respectively)). Even so, Knight's "mythic" approach does place his work firmly behind Frye's, for whom myth and romance are closely connected. For some recent discussion of Knight, exploring the influences on his work and his overwhelmingly important contribution to the criticism of the late plays, see Hugh Grady, *The Modernist Shakespeare: Critical Texts in a Material World* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 74-112; and Philip Edwards, 'Wilson Knight and Shakespeare's Last Plays', in Mucciolo and others, *Shakespeare's Universe*, pp. 258-267. Knight briefly alludes to certain critical debts himself in the prefatory material added for the 1965 edition of *The Crown of Life*, p. viii. Edwards stresses the excitement of Knight's early, pioneering (pre-War) efforts (including the unpublished *Thaisa* of 1928) and views *The Crown of Life* as 'more stolid', dulling the earlier 'sharp sense of discovery' (p. 258). But it is *The Crown of Life* that is most read, and that has made 'Myth and Miracle' (pp. 9-31) available to post-War generations.

Frye's main contributions to late play criticism are found in central stretches (notably pp. 158-223) of the *Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton, NJ, 1957), and in the whole of *A Natural Perspective: The Development of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance* (1965); but he returns to the "Romances" across his entire career, from 'The Argument of Comedy' (1949), through several separate essays, the closing paragraphs of *Fools of Time* (Toronto, 1967), pp. 120-121, passing remarks in *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1976), to significant passages at the end of all three chapters in *The Myth of Deliverance* (Toronto, 1983; second edition, 1993). Some of Frye's most direct commentary on individual plays is included in his edition of *The Tempest*, *The Pelican Shakespeare* (Baltimore, 1959), and in the last two essays in *Northrop Frye on Shakespeare*, edited by Robert Sandler (New Haven and London, 1986), pp. 154-186; these writings tend to be disappointingly superficial, however, and do not reflect what is most interesting or distinctive in Frye's work. Frye's criticism and influence have been much discussed. In connection with the late plays, see especially Wayne A. Rebhorn, 'After Frye: A Review-Article on the Interpretation of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 21 (1979), 553-582; also, F. David Hoeniger, 'Shakespeare's Romances since 1958: A Retrospect', *Shakespeare Survey*, 29 (1976), 1-10 (pp. 9-10); and Lawrence Danson, 'Twentieth-century Shakespeare criticism: the comedies', in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, edited by Stanley Wells (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 231-239.

10. Frye's crucial defence of the aesthetic worth and potential seriousness of Romance is examined in the next section of this chapter.

Knight's work is especially to be valued for its pioneering support of maligned plays (*Pericles*, *Cymbeline*, *Henry VIII*); its unapologetic, revelatory new interest in passages previously rejected or ridiculed, and the critique of disintegration (and the habits of thought behind it) that accompanies this; and its unprecedentedly close attention to verbal texture and patterns of imagery.

11. Metaphysics is well to the fore in Knight (to say the least), as in his notorious description of the manifestation of Jupiter in *Cymbeline* as 'our one precise anthropomorphic expression of that beyond-tragedy recognition felt through the miracles and resurrections of sister-plays and reaching Christian formulation in *Henry VIII*' (*Crown of Life*, p. 202). Knight's particular brand of mysticism was probably only fully comprehensible to himself, but the influence of his focus on Providentialism and spirituality in the late plays has been vast. A prevailing mood of quasi-religious consolation and unabashed wish-fulfilment informs much work, as seen, for example, in Anne Barton's perception of a redemptive quality in the way the late plays 'appeal so poignantly to our sense of how we should like the world to be, and know that it is not' (quoting from her 1986 essay, "'Enter Mariners wet": realism in Shakespeare's last plays', reprinted in Barton, *Essays, Mainly Shakespearean*, pp. 182-203 (p. 203)). The "Romances" could certainly figure highly in any consideration of literary studies as displaced religion. For some exploration of the Shakespearian theatre itself in similar terms, with specific reference to *The Winter's Tale*, see Louis A. Montrose, 'The Purpose of Playing: Reflections on a Shakespearean Anthropology', *Helios*, n.s. 7 (1980), 57-74 (pp. 61-62).

12. The history of the professionalization of "English" from the late nineteenth century onwards and the impact of this process on the study and understanding of Shakespeare have been much discussed in recent years; see especially Grady, *The Modernist Shakespeare*, and, for a wider cultural focus, Terence Hawkes's two books, *That Shakespeherian Rag* (London and New York, 1986) and *Meaning by Shakespeare* (1992), and Gary Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare*. In alluding here to probable extra-critical influences on reception, I am trying to acknowledge, if only in passing, something of the principle, as expressed by Grady, that 'literary-critical discourse is the over-determined product of a number of competing and contradictory aspects' within 'the complex differentiations of modernized societies' (pp. 2-3).

13. Perhaps most especially so because of their popularity with students as well as critics - a situation that is reflected in turn in the unstinting flow of dissertations and theses which they continue to spawn. Formal academic criticism of the "Romances" is certainly one area in which a clear progression in the sophistication of twentieth-century thought can be traced. So Danson, comparing the work of Tillyard with that of later commentators, such as David Young and Howard Felperin, declares that 'criticism is not an art that steadily improves, but criticism of the romances (and of comedy from the romantic-pastoral

point of view) genuinely *has improved*' ('Twentieth-century Shakespeare criticism', pp. 233-234).

14. The point is obvious, if not always acknowledged. I have in mind, though, not simply the fact that critical histories tend to distort, but also that there is much they are bound to omit - thinking in the light of Jonathan Culler's characterization of deconstruction as 'a practice of reading and writing attuned to the aporias that arise in attempts to tell us the truth' (*On Deconstruction*, p. 155). It is perhaps worth citing in this context some remarks from Howard Felperin in a discussion of *The Tempest*: 'if a canonical text is a text with a history, that history is more than the sum of its critical approaches set out in chronological order on a contents page. It is the history of struggle represented by their successive attempts to displace one another and occupy, but not annihilate, the space of the text' ('*The Tempest* in our Time', in Felperin, *The Uses of the Canon* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 170-190 (p. 190)).

15. Two prominent and hugely influential studies to have emerged from these other fields of research are Ashley H. Thorndike's *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspeare* (Worcester, MA, 1901; reissued New York, 1965), and Gerald Eades Bentley's 'Shakespeare and the Blackfriars Theatre', *Shakespeare Survey*, 1 (1948), 38-50. Both these critics managed to stir up just about as much controversy and debate as Dowden and Strachey - see again the passages in Murry and Sen Gupta referred to above (note 7).

There are plenty of useful surveys of the realm of late play criticism, covering all the main lines of enquiry. Besides articles already mentioned (Edwards, 'Shakespeare's Romances'; Hoeniger, 'Shakespeare's Romances'; and Rebhorn), these include: Hallett Smith, 'Shakespeare's Romances', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 27 (1964), 279-287; Philip Edwards, 'The Late Comedies', in *Shakespeare: Select Bibliographical Guides*, edited by Stanley Wells (Oxford, 1973), pp. 113-133; Norman Sanders, 'An Overview of Critical Approaches to the Romances', in *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*, edited by Carol McGinnis Kay and Henry E. Jacobs (Lincoln, NE and London, 1978), pp. 1-10; Michael Taylor, 'The Late Comedies', in *Shakespeare: A Bibliographical Guide*, edited by Stanley Wells, new edition (Oxford, 1990), pp. 159-179; Boika Sokolova's opening chapter in her *Shakespeare's Romances as Interrogative Texts* (Lampeter and Lewiston, NY, 1992), pp. 4-13; and the editors' introduction in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 1-21. Valuable too, for its focus on the criticism most popular amongst teachers, is the introductory material in Maurice Hunt, ed., *Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare's 'The Tempest' and Other Late Romances* (New York, 1992), pp. 1-22. For more detailed surveys regarding individual plays, see the available annotated bibliographies in the Garland Shakespeare Bibliographies series: Henry E. Jacobs, comp., '*Cymbeline*' (New York, 1982), and Nancy C. Michael, comp., '*Pericles*' (New York, 1987).

16. There is nothing particularly new in trying to escape the strait-jacket of Dowden's classification. Many of my own objections are

anticipated in an excellent essay by Diana T. Childress (from as long ago as 1974), 'Are Shakespeare's Late Plays Really Romances?', in Tobias and Zolbrod, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 44-55 (this essay's title makes its own illustrative contribution to the instability and interchangeability of terminology that afflicts late Shakespeare, since the version given on the contents page of the book reads "last" instead of "late"). A quite different (and less convincing) line of attack on the "romance" reading can be found in one of the more idiosyncratic books on the late plays, John P. Cutts's *Rich and Strange: A Study of Shakespeare's Last Plays* ([Pullman], WA, 1968).

17. The available details are conveniently summarized in Hallett Smith, 'Shakespeare's Last Plays: Facts and Problems', *Shakespearean Research Opportunities*, 3 (1967), 9-16.

18. For example, on such issues as exactly where and when Simon Forman saw *Cymbeline*, or whether *Henry VIII* and *All Is True* really are one and the same play. In both these cases, the existing evidence best lends itself to interpretation in one direction, but remains not quite sufficient to prove the point (that is, to provide the level of surety that resists everything but the most radical scepticism or the theories of the lunatic fringe). For consideration of theoretical problems relating to the assessment and application of evidence, see the interesting essay by Michael D. Bristol, 'How Good Does Evidence Have to Be?', in *Textual and Theatrical Shakespeare: Questions of Evidence*, edited by Edward Pechter (Iowa City, 1996), pp. 22-43. On Forman's description of his visit to a performance of *Cymbeline*, see further below (note 39). I pursue the *Henry VIII/All Is True* problem in detail in Chapter Six, but proceed throughout as though the two titles do refer to the same play.

19. Arguments proposing divided authorship or adaptation tend to require some sort of attempted reconstruction of a text's compositional history, but in the more extreme theories these can become utterly divorced from reality. Robert Boyle's case for *Henry VIII* as a John Fletcher/Philip Massinger collaboration provides a perfect example of truly preposterous speculation ('*Henry VIII*. An Investigation into the Origin and Authorship of the Play', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 8-10 (1880-6), 443-487). But I have in mind as well more avowedly imaginative approaches - Bentley's vision of the King's Men debating what to do with the Blackfriars theatre and instructing Shakespeare accordingly ('Shakespeare and the Blackfriars', pp. 42-47); John Dover Wilson's picture of a locally-preoccupied dramatist back in Stratford, working in response to news from London (in his 'Prefatory Note' to J. C. Maxwell's New Shakespeare *Cymbeline*); or Anthony B. Dawson's comic mini-play positing a Shakespeare forced into retirement by his bemused colleagues ('*Tempest* in a Teapot: Critics, Evaluation, Ideology', in "*Bad*" *Shakespeare: Revaluations of the Shakespeare Canon*, edited by Maurice Charney (Cranbury, NJ, 1988), pp. 61-73 (pp. 63-64)). Critical readings that depend upon evoking the image of an elderly (or "old-before-his-time") Shakespeare are relevant here too, such as Herbert

Howarth's 'An old man looking at life: *Henry VIII* and the late plays', in *Stratford papers on Shakespeare: 1961*, edited by B. W. Jackson (Toronto, 1962), pp. 177-194. And some of the more undisciplined topical treatments of the late plays also fit easily into this context. Thus, effortlessly matching Boyle's work for uninhibited speculation careless of anything as mundane as evidence, there is Glynne Wickham's recent 'presumptive chronology' for the writing of *Henry VIII* (in 'The Dramatic Structure of Shakespeare's *King Henry the Eighth: An Essay in Rehabilitation*', in *British Academy Shakespeare Lectures 1980-89*, with an Introduction by E. A. J. Honigmann (Oxford, 1993), pp. 117-136 (pp. 135-136)).

20. "Myth" feels precisely the right word in its casual everyday sense, but I also want to invoke something of the force it acquires in Roland Barthes, *Mythologies* (Paris, 1957; reprinted 1970); I have used the selected translation by Annette Lavers (St Albans, 1972; reprinted 1973).

21. The Prospero/Shakespeare identification seems to have first been made by Thomas Campbell in 1838, in the Preface to his edition of Shakespeare's *Dramatic Works* (London, 1838), p. lxiii; the relevant remarks are reprinted in Horace Howard Furness, ed., *The Tempest, A New Variorum Shakespeare* (Philadelphia, 1892), pp. 356-357. The importance and influence of Campbell's theory are traced in Stephen Orgel, ed., *The Tempest, The Oxford Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 1, 10; and in Schoenbaum, *Shakespeare's Lives*, pp. 312-315. The interdependence of the autobiographical reading of Prospero and the view that *The Tempest* represents Shakespeare's farewell play is, as Orgel points out (p. 10), 'revealed by the fact that Campbell abandoned the thesis when he was persuaded that *The Tempest* was in fact an early play'; Campbell's private retraction on this matter, made in a letter to Joseph Hunter of 12 December 1839, is quoted by Schoenbaum (p. 314). Despite its originator's change of heart, 'the notion of Prospero as autobiography has remained solidly within the critical canon' (Orgel, p. 10), finding its way into 'innumerable prefaces to *The Tempest* by critics who (one suspects) never heard of Campbell's edition' (Schoenbaum, p. 314).

Meanwhile, the belief that *The Tempest* served as Shakespeare's valediction has been able to boast many a notable supporter. It is a central premise, for example, in D. G. James, *The Dream of Prospero*, (see pp. 1-2), and was endorsed by some of the most notable twentieth-century Shakespearians: see J. Dover Wilson, 'The Enchanted Island', in *The Essential Shakespeare: A Biographical Adventure* (Cambridge, 1932; reprinted 1935), pp. 128-145; E. K. Chambers, *Shakespeare: A Survey* (London, 1925), pp. 304-315; and Peter Alexander, in the Introduction to his widely-used edition, *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works* (London and Glasgow, 1951; reprinted 1988), pp. xxi-xxii. More recently, I have myself encountered all too many lecturers still eager to read Prospero's epilogue as Shakespeare's final - personal - artistic statement.

22. Such "popular" opinion is hard to document, but can perhaps be found reflected in, or being shaped by, the rhetoric of advertising

material. Thus the Stratford-upon-Avon theatre-going public was given at least two opportunities during the course of the 1990s to attend productions of *The Tempest* happy to announce it as 'Shakespeare's last and most mysterious play' (quoting from the RSC publicity schedules for the 1993-94 and 1995 Stratford seasons). And in similar terms, the blurb on the back of the anonymous Penguin Popular Classics edition of the play (Harmondsworth, 1994) describes *The Tempest* unambiguously as 'Shakespeare's last play'. In situations of this sort, the usual critical hedging with regard to *Henry VIII* or (rather less often) *The Two Noble Kinsmen* that qualifies responsible academic discussions concerning the "lastness" of *The Tempest* quickly disappears.

23. The critical histories of both these plays are discussed or alluded to in most of the survey articles so far mentioned; and see in addition, G. R. Proudfoot, 'Henry VIII (*All Is True*), *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and the Apocryphal Plays', in Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare: A Bibliographical Guide*, pp. 381-403. More detailed discussions are to be found in the appropriate Garland Shakespeare Bibliographies: Linda McJ. Micheli, comp., 'Henry VIII' (New York, 1988); and G. Harold Metz, comp., *Four Plays Ascribed to Shakespeare* (New York, 1982), which deals with the lost *Cardenio* (see below) as well as *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. On the latter, see also Will Hamlin, 'A Select Bibliographical Guide to *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, edited by Charles H. Frey (Columbia, MO, 1989), pp. 186-216.

24. These various critical developments (and political criticism in particular) have generated a vast bibliography. For work giving a sense of the state of the different fields of research around the time of writing, see: James C. Bulman, ed., *Shakespeare, Theory, and Performance* (London and New York, 1996), especially the introduction by the editor (pp. 1-11); Margreta de Grazia and Peter Stallybrass, 'The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text' (1993), and Leah S. Marcus, *Unediting the Renaissance* (London and New York, 1996), pp. 1-37; Ivo Kamps, ed., *Materialist Shakespeare: A History* (London and New York, 1995), which also comes with a useful introduction by the editor (pp. 1-19), and Steven Mullaney, 'After the new historicism', in *Alternative Shakespeares*, Volume 2, edited by Terence Hawkes (London and New York, 1996), pp. 17-37 (this whole volume is relevant here); Deborah Barker and Ivo Kamps, eds., *Shakespeare and Gender: A History* (London and New York, 1995), with yet another handy editorial introduction (pp. 1-21), and Ann Thompson's 'Series Editor's Preface' (1996) to the 'Feminist Readings of Shakespeare' series currently being published by Routledge.

Turning to earlier surveys and discussions, covering primarily the more political work, my own understanding and methodology have been most influenced by the following: Louis Montrose, 'Renaissance Literary Studies and the Subject of History' (1986); Jean E. Howard, 'The New Historicism in Renaissance Studies', *English Literary Renaissance*, 16 (1986), 13-43; Peter Erickson, 'Rewriting the Renaissance, Rewriting Ourselves', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 38 (1987), 327-337; and Jonathan Dollimore, 'Critical Developments: Cultural Materialism, Feminism and

Gender Critique, and New Historicism', in Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare: A Bibliographical Guide*, pp. 405-428; and also, generally, Felperin, *The Uses of the Canon*.

25. The same point is made by Sokolova (p. 10). Two examples of truly excellent criticism stand out as exceptions to this general rule: Graham Holderness's section, 'Late Romances: Magic, Majesty and Masque', in Holderness, Nick Potter, and John Turner, *Shakespeare: Out of Court* (1990), pp. 127-235; and Marilyn L. Williamson's chapter (with a title that is not actually particularly borne out by her readings of the plays), 'The Romances: Patriarchy, Pure and Simple', in her book, *The Patriarchy of Shakespeare's Comedies* (Detroit, 1986), pp. 111-175. Even in the work of these critics, however, a number of traditional paradigms pass by disappointingly unquestioned.

26. Again, the bibliography is vast, and it has been repeated *ad infinitum* already. The seminal articles include Stephen J. Greenblatt, 'Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century', in *First Images of America: The Impact of the New World on the Old*, edited by Fredi Chiappelli, with others, 2 vols (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1976), II, 561-580 (reprinted in Greenblatt, *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture* (New York and London, 1990), pp. 16-39); Lorie Jerrell Leininger, 'The Miranda Trap: Sexism and Racism in Shakespeare's *Tempest*', in *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, edited by Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Gayle Greene, and Carol Thomas Neely (Urbana, IL, 1980), pp. 285-294; Paul Brown, '"This thing of darkness I acknowledge mine": *The Tempest* and the discourse of colonialism', in *Political Shakespeare: New essays in cultural materialism*, edited by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield (Manchester, 1985), pp. 48-71; and also from 1985, Francis Barker and Peter Hulme, 'Nymphs and reapers heavily vanish: the discursive con-texts of *The Tempest*', in Drakakis, *Alternative Shakespeares*, pp. 191-205. A crucial landmark in all this was Orgel's Oxford Shakespeare edition, with its (especially when first published) stunning introduction (pp. 1-87). This veritable explosion in political criticism has itself been much examined; for some early contributions to this process, see such work as Dawson, 'Tempest in a Teapot'; Meredith Anne Skura, 'Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 40 (1989), 42-69; Felperin, 'The *Tempest* in our Time'; and Russ McDonald, 'Reading *The Tempest*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 43 (1990), 15-28.

27. There has, inevitably, been something of a backlash during the last few years against postcolonial and materialist interpretations of *The Tempest*. Graham Bradshaw, for example, has drawn attention to the way the play's reception history gets simplified and caricatured in a lot of this work, to produce a convenient straw target to debunk (see *Misrepresentations* (1993), pp. 3-5). He cites in support of this claim both the ready availability of relatively mainstream "humanist" critiques of Prospero, and the negative treatment the character has often endured at the hands of poets, as in W. H. Auden's *The Sea and*

the Mirror (see p. 284, note 7; and compare besides Orgel, *The Tempest*, p. 13, note 2). And Bradshaw highlights as well, as another factor not always accounted for in the rush to declare new perspectives and critical advances, the important tradition of earlier anti-colonialist responses to the play (on which, see further Thomas Cartelli, 'Prospero in Africa: *The Tempest* as colonialist text and pretext', in *Shakespeare Reproduced: The text in history and ideology*, edited by Jean E. Howard and Marion F. O'Connor (New York and London, 1987), pp. 99-115 (and now available in Cartelli, *Repositioning Shakespeare: National formations, postcolonial appropriations* (London and New York, 1999), pp. 87-104); and Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 144-171). Representations of Prospero in the theatre over the second half of the twentieth century, as Vaughan and Vaughan point out (see p. 280), also tended toward the negative. Irrespective of these and other problems, however, modern political criticism of *The Tempest* has effected a genuine paradigm shift in our understanding of this play, that should not be too-eagerly devalued in any (necessary) processes of reassessment. Having said that, none of this attention has done much to challenge the central canonicity of *The Tempest*, rather the reverse, in fact. As Felperin noted in 1990, after a decade or so already of intense interest from materialist critics, 'the canonical standing of the play is at least as high, arguably higher than ever' ('*The Tempest* in our Time', p. 181).

28. New Historicist and Cultural Materialist work in particular has seemed to come together where the late plays are concerned to discover - not unlike more "traditional" readings, though obviously from a very different perspective - a deep political conservatism in late Shakespeare (for comment on this subject, see especially Walter Cohen, 'Political criticism of Shakespeare', in Howard and O'Connor, pp. 18-46). Kiernan Ryan has expressed reservations similar to mine about the tendency of the newer modes of criticism to produce negative (and disabling) conservative readings of the politics of Shakespearian drama (*Shakespeare*, second edition (Hemel Hempstead, 1995), pp. 1-45). He complains in vigorous terms against the way conventional readings and recent political studies alike have obscured what he identifies as 'the radical possibilities of romance' (p. 110; see also the broader discussion here, pp. 106-111). I find Ryan's commitment to a vision of Shakespeare as a genuinely progressive, radical thinker thoroughly refreshing.

29. On the pros and cons of adopting a specifically oppositional or anti-institutional critical practice, see respectively Culler, *On Deconstruction*, pp. 156-179, and John Ellis, *Against Deconstruction*, pp. 67-96. In pursuing any disagreements with existing work, I have tried to be wary of reproducing the kind of too-easy construction of a caricatured "traditionalist" position that is often associated with some of the more recent critical discourses (see above, note 27).

30. The widespread currency of "Romance" as a descriptive category is easily discernible from its use in the titles of numerous

articles and books. That it has acquired authoritative status is further confirmed by its adoption in works of reference, editions of Shakespeare, and various Shakespearian bibliographies: thus each of the four plays is designated a 'Romance' in the relevant entries in *A Shakespeare Encyclopaedia*, edited by Oscar James Campbell, with Edward G. Quinn (London, 1966); they are printed together under the heading 'Romances' in *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, third edition, edited by David Bevington (Glenview, IL, 1980), pp. 1379-1525; and the term has been employed since 1975 as one of the generic sub-divisions for the canon in the 'Shakespeare: Annotated World Bibliography' that appears annually in *Shakespeare Quarterly*. Moreover, as Maurice Hunt observes in a discussion of the question of appropriate terminology, 'most of the teachers and critics of these plays call them romances in print if not in their minds or conversation' (*Approaches to Teaching*, p. xi).

31. These figures are intended to represent a twentieth-century consensus, reflecting those opinions concerning dating and chronology which have most influenced treatment and interpretation of the "four Romances". I address the evidence available for precise dating of the individual plays in more detail later in this chapter, where I also take into consideration recent work on Shakespearian chronology which is only just beginning significantly to affect the critical tradition. The dates suggested parallel exactly those supplied in the influential one-volume complete works, *The Riverside Shakespeare*, textual editor G. Blakemore Evans (Boston, MA, 1974), pp. 55-56; and also those given, in another attempt to capture consensus opinion, in Philip Brockbank's 'A Note on Chronology', in *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare: The Cambridge Text*, [general editor] John Dover Wilson, Octopus Books Edition (London, 1980), p. 12. There has inevitably been a modicum of disagreement on this subject, however. Of the four relevant Arden 2 editors, Hoeniger (pp. lxiii-lxv), Pafford (pp. xxi-xxiv), and Kermode (pp. xv-xxiv) all basically agree with the figures here, but Nosworthy places *Cymbeline* slightly earlier, in 1608-09 (pp. xiv-xvii). A more general reference work, the fifth edition of *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, edited by Margaret Drabble (Oxford, 1985), concurs with the dates chosen, except in the case of *Pericles*, for which it proposes 1606-08 (see the individual entries for the plays, supplied by Stanley Wells). This conforms with the date for *Pericles* given by Bevington, who also expands the limits for *Cymbeline* to 1608-10, and for *The Tempest* (by implication) to 1610-11 (*Complete Works*, third edition, pp. 1380, 1414, 1497). These slight discrepancies, or others I might have mentioned, are of no great significance. The basic pattern for the dating and ordering of the late plays remained constant and undisturbed for pretty much the whole of the last century.

The most respected twentieth-century authority in the field of Shakespearian chronology was undoubtedly E. K. Chambers. I have not cited Chambers's figures here, however, since his suggested datings for the late plays are actually somewhat idiosyncratic. On the basis of complicated theories to do with the possibility of adaptation and/or

revision, he places *Pericles* in 1608-09 and *The Tempest* in 1611-12 (see Chambers, *Facts and Problems*, I, 243-274; 490-494; 518-528; Chambers's dating is by theatrical season). Again, such variations are minor, but most critics would probably accept that both these plays were already in existence by the end of the first year (or the season before the one) proposed in either case. Having said that, the acknowledged expertise and authority of Chambers on this subject has led to his conclusions being adopted with some regularity (not always identified as season-based figures) by other scholars. In this connection, when James G. McManaway undertook a survey of critical developments in the field of Shakespearian chronology during the first two decades after Chambers's study ('Recent Studies in Shakespeare's Chronology', *Shakespeare Survey*, 3 (1950), 22-33), he offered revised figures for a number of works, but was surprisingly unable (or unwilling) to express any significant doubts concerning Chambers's dating of the late plays (see p. 30). Endorsed by McManaway, Chambers's figures for the four plays concerned found their way into F. E. Halliday's popular reference handbook, *A Shakespeare Companion: 1564-1964* (Harmondsworth, 1964), p. 102.

32. This imbalance in attention is easily demonstrated using the *Shakespeare Quarterly* 'Annotated World Bibliography'. A rough count of the entries in the 'Criticism' sections for the individual plays in the issues covering the years from 1990 to 1995 (volumes 42-47) yields the following figures: *Pericles*, 61 items; *Cymbeline*, 75; *The Winter's Tale*, 190; *The Tempest*, 435. Not all of these entries represent critical works devoted exclusively to the individual texts concerned, but the overall pattern is still obvious. A comparable imbalance emerges in the figures for 'Stage Productions' (*Pericles* and *Cymbeline*: 52 each; *The Winter's Tale*, 119; *The Tempest*, 310). Critical preference for *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* is perhaps even more clearly signalled by the fact that it is almost always these two plays which serve as the representatives of the "Romances" in more general studies of Shakespeare's comedies or the canon as a whole. A similar tendency informs teaching practices and the organization of lecture courses (see Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 25-27).

33. Nosworthy's edition has now at last been superseded by Roger Warren's 1998 Oxford *Cymbeline*, and further editions from New Penguin, New Cambridge, and Arden 3 are all in the pipeline. But prior to the appearance of Warren's work, *Cymbeline* was the only canonical play not to have been issued in at least one of the four series mentioned here. That ongoing absence meant that, not so long ago, and yet forty years and more after its initial publication, Nosworthy's text was the only fully-annotated single-volume edition of *Cymbeline* easily available in Britain. Its one previous successor, J. C. Maxwell's New Shakespeare edition, has long been out of print, and is in any case in execution little more than a supplement to Nosworthy. Richard Hosley's New Signet edition (New York, 1968) is perfectly adequate of its kind, but naturally reflects the constraints of its series. *Cymbeline* has had a strangely

unfortunate modern editorial history in general. Furness's *Variorum* (1913), which Nosworthy's Introduction spends a disproportionate amount of its time countering, is excessively negative about the play, propounds an extreme line of disintegration, and is lacking in much of the usual information for this series, including any basic list of references, as a result of its posthumous publication.

34. *Cymbeline*, p. xxxi. Nosworthy suggests that 'Shakespeare, who had proved himself the supreme master of both tragedy and comedy, was yet unpractised in the art of blending the two in the service of romance' (p. xxx); and on the subject of dramatic romance, he argues (with obvious exaggeration and bias) that 'a tradition that rests on things no better than *Mucedorus* or Peele's *Old Wives Tale* scarcely merits the name of tradition' (p. xxxi).

35. Nosworthy, *Cymbeline*, p. xlvi. This view of the two plays is developed throughout the subsection of Nosworthy's Introduction entitled '*Cymbeline* as Experimental Romance' (pp. xlvi-lxi); compare the comment that 'with *Cymbeline*, still more with *Pericles*, we are back at one of the root positions of Shakespeare's art' (p. xlvi). It is not exactly all that difficult to find other critics who have been just as (or far more) disparaging about both these works. For a variety of typically censorious judgements see: D. S. Bland, 'The Heroine and the Sea: An Aspect of Shakespeare's Last Plays', *Essays in Criticism*, 3 (1953), 39-44; Derek Traversi, *Shakespeare: The Last Phase*, second impression (London, 1965; first impression, 1954), pp. 19-104; R. J. Kaufmann, 'Puzzling Epiphanies', *Essays in Criticism*, 13 (1963), 392-403; Larry S. Champion, *The Evolution of Shakespeare's Comedy* (Cambridge, MA, 1970), pp. 97-99; Alan R. Velie, *Shakespeare's Repentance Plays: The Search for an Adequate Form* (Cranbury, NJ, 1972), pp. 67-90; Alexander Leggatt, *Shakespeare's Comedy of Love* (London, 1974), pp. 259-260; Kenneth Muir, *Shakespeare's Comic Sequence* (Liverpool, 1979), pp. 151-163; and Robert Adams, *Shakespeare: The Four Romances* (1989), pp. 24-89.

36. This pattern can be traced back at least as far as the work of Arthur Quiller-Couch, who conjured up a characteristically picturesque vision of Shakespeare 'in his later years essaying about the hardest technical difficulty a dramatist can propose to himself, and, beaten thrice - in *Pericles*, in *Cymbeline*, in *The Winter's Tale* - with a fourth and last shot, in *The Tempest* bringing down his quarry from the sky' (from Q's 'General Introduction' in Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson, eds., *The Tempest*, *The New Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 1921), pp. vii-xxvii (p. xxvii); see also Quiller-Couch, *Shakespeare's Workmanship*, third impression (London, 1919), pp. 290-297, 316-336; and Quiller-Couch and Dover Wilson, eds., *The Winter's Tale*, *The New Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 1931), pp. xviii-xxv).

Nosworthy's opinions on this subject clearly stand in a direct line of descent from Quiller-Couch - compare the former's remark that 'the technical perfection of *The Tempest* is generally admitted to verge on the miraculous, and we must be prepared for lapses at the experimental

stage' (*Cymbeline*, p. xlix). Whereas Quiller-Couch, like many earlier commentators, expresses considerable criticisms of the design of *The Winter's Tale*, Nosworthy, as Pafford correctly points out (p. xl), 'holds that full success is reached both in *The Winter's Tale* and in *The Tempest*'. In the first of the passages just quoted in my main text, however, Nosworthy gives the distinct impression that he has certain slight reservations concerning the aesthetic success of *The Winter's Tale*. Since he never really articulates what these are, it seems likely that his minor qualification is included here for no other reason than to preserve the sense of a step-by-step development in the four plays, confirming the position of *The Winter's Tale* as slightly below that of *The Tempest* in quality. The point in itself is trivial, but it does serve to suggest the lengths to which the critical mainstream has gone in order to preserve its developmental reading of the four "Romances". Even so, there has been a minor, but not insignificant, undercurrent of critical dissatisfaction with *The Tempest*, and a parallel mini-history of preference for *The Winter's Tale*. This is a judgement to which both Tillyard (*Shakespeare's Last Plays*, pp. 48-58, 84-85) and Leavis (pp. 344-345) to a large extent subscribe; and see too, for example, Bonamy Dobrée, 'The Last Plays', in *The Living Shakespeare*, edited by Robert Gittings (London, 1960), pp. 140-154. For some sense of the improving critical fortunes of *The Winter's Tale* in general during the first half of the twentieth century, see again Pafford, pp. xxxvii-xliv; and also Bill Overton, *The Winter's Tale*, *The Critics Debate* (Basingstoke and London, 1989), pp. 13-53.

37. Representative examples include: Traversi, *Shakespeare: The Last Phase*; Frank Kermode, *William Shakespeare: The Final Plays* (1963); Thomas Allen Nelson, *Shakespeare's Comic Theory: A Study of Art and Artifice in the Last Plays* (The Hague, 1972); Douglas L. Peterson, *Time, Tide, and Tempest: A Study of Shakespeare's Romances* (San Marino, CA, 1973); Sidney R. Homan, 'The *Tempest* and Shakespeare's Last Plays: The Aesthetic Dimensions', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 24 (1973), 69-76; Kenneth J. Semon, 'Fantasy and Wonder in Shakespeare's Last Plays', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 25 (1974), 89-102; Marco Mincoff, *Things Supernatural and Causeless: Shakespearean Romance* (Sofia, 1987; revised reprint, Cranbury, NJ, 1992); Ruth Nevo, *Shakespeare's Other Language* (New York and London, 1987); Robert Adams, *Shakespeare: The Four Romances*; Elizabeth Bieman, *William Shakespeare: The Romances* (Boston, MA, 1990); and Maurice Hunt, *Shakespeare's Romance of the Word* (1990). Virtually every book that devotes separate chapters to all four of the plays concerned arranges those chapters in accordance with the conventional chronological order I have described. Knight's *The Crown of Life* is one obvious exception, but the only other that now comes to mind is Cynthia Marshall's *Last Things and Last Plays: Shakespearean Eschatology* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL, 1991).

38. See respectively here: John H. Long, *Shakespeare's Use of Music: The Final Comedies* (Gainesville, FL, 1961), pp. 35-129, and R. W. Ingram, 'Musical Pauses and the Vision Scenes in Shakespeare's

Last Plays', in *Pacific Coast Studies in Shakespeare*, edited by Waldo F. McNeir and Thelma N. Greenfield (Eugene, OR, 1966), pp. 234-247; Richard Paul Knowles, "'The More Delay'd, Delighted": Theophanies in the Last Plays', *Shakespeare Studies*, 15 (1982), 269-280; Marjorie Garber's chapter, 'The Truth of Your Own Seeming: Romance and the Uses of Dream', in her *Dream in Shakespeare* (1974), pp. 139-214; Thomas Marc Parrott, *Shakespearean Comedy* (New York, 1949), pp. 366-401; Richard Wincor, 'Shakespeare's Festival Plays', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 1 (1950), 219-240; Traversi, *Shakespeare: The Last Phase*; Maurice Hunt, "'Stir" and Work in Shakespeare's Last Plays', *Studies in English Literature*, 22 (1982), 285-304; and Theodore Spencer, 'Appearance and Reality in Shakespeare's Last Plays', *Modern Philology*, 39 (1941-42), 265-274 (reprinted in Spencer, *Selected Essays*, edited by Alan C. Purves (New Brunswick, NJ, 1966), pp. 282-291; and compare the similar material in Spencer, *Shakespeare and the Nature of Man*, second edition (New York, 1949), pp. 177-202).

39. *Pericles* was definitely in existence by 1609, when the first quarto edition (Q1) was published, but there is a Stationers' Register entry for 20 May 1608 which is usually taken to refer to the extant play, or at least to that version of it underlying Q1 (see Hoeniger, *Pericles*, pp. xxiii-xxv). 1608 also saw the publication of George Wilkins's prose version of the story, *The Painfull Aduentures of Pericles Prince of Tyre. Being The true History of the Play of 'Pericles'* (I have used throughout the edition by Kenneth Muir (Liverpool, 1953)). The earliest references to *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale* appear in Simon Forman's descriptions of performances he attended. His theatre-visit to see *The Winter's Tale* is dated 15 May 1611, that to see *Cymbeline* undated, though it probably occurred some time in April 1611. *The Tempest* is first heard of in a record of a performance at court on 1 November 1611, and can hardly be earlier than late 1610. Dating is complicated by the possibility of additions and/or revisions in the surviving texts, but regardless of this, there is no external evidence that might confirm the priority of any of the three plays, except for the potentially quite incidental fact that *The Tempest* has the latest *terminus ad quem*. See Stephen Orgel, ed., *The Winter's Tale*, *The Oxford Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 79-80, and *The Tempest*, pp. 62-64; and Gary Taylor, 'The Canon and Chronology of Shakespeare's Plays', pp. 131-132. The Forman documents are discussed and reproduced in S. Schoenbaum, *William Shakespeare: Records and Images* (London, 1981), pp. 3-20, where their authenticity is vigorously defended. They are transcribed in Chambers, *Facts and Problems* (II, 337-341), as is the entry from the 1611 Revels Accounts concerning the Hallowmas performance of *The Tempest* (II, 342; and see too I, 491). For some speculation about *Cymbeline's* claim to being Shakespeare's supposed final/farewell play, see J. W. Mackail, 'The Note of Shakespeare's Romances', in *Lectures on Poetry*, new impression (London, 1914), pp. 208-230; Philip Edwards, *Shakespeare: A Writer's Progress* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 178-179; and also Dawson, 'Tempest in a Teapot', pp. 62-64.

40. Dowden classifies *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* as 'fragments' in *Shakspeare*, pp. 56-57, whilst remarking that 'the same spirit appears in these as in the Romances' (p. 56). In *Shakspeare: His Mind and Art*, *Pericles* had been grouped with these other two plays as 'Shaksperian fragments' (p. 380, footnote), and Dowden even follows NSS (and earlier) precedent in referring to Shakespeare's "'Marina'" as a separate entity (p. 405; see F. G. Fleay, 'On the Play of *Pericles*', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874), 195-209, and his text of "Marina" that follows, pp. 211-241; both writers are anticipated in the use of this "title" by George Lillo's adaptation, *Marina* (1738), reprinted in the Cornmarket Press facsimile series (London, 1969)). The differences in Dowden's treatment of *Pericles* across his Primer and the early editions of his critical biography are described above (note 4).

41. The play is omitted, for example, by Tillyard (*Shakespeare's Last Plays*), and from such later books as David Grene, *Reality and the Heroic Pattern: Last Plays of Ibsen, Shakespeare, and Sophocles* (Chicago and London, 1967), and Barbara A. Mowat, *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances* (Athens, GA, 1976). It is separated from the rest of the group in Bullough, *Sources*, where *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *The Tempest* are all dealt with in the final volume, *Romances* (1975), but *Pericles* is treated in volume six, *Other 'Classical' Plays* (1966). Robert Ornstein briefly offers the usual excuses for ignoring the play in his broader study of Shakespearian comedy, *Shakespeare's Comedies: From Roman Farce to Romantic Mystery* (Cranbury, NJ, 1986), p. 9. For a recent survey of the critical and theatrical fortunes of *Pericles*, see David Skeele, *Thwarting the Wayward Seas* (Cranbury, NJ, 1998). How much its status improved over the first two thirds of the twentieth century is powerfully evident from a comparison of Hoeniger's Arden edition with the authorship-dominated, pedestrian, and uninterested original Arden text edited by K. Deighton (London, 1907; second edition, 1925). Wilson Knight's championing of the play was crucial for the growth of its reputation, but the impact of T. S. Eliot's poem *Marina* (1930) should not be forgotten. *Pericles* poses a particular problem for the theories of Thorndike and Bentley (see note 15); the latter simply ignores the play, whilst the former argues, with obvious special pleading, for its being 'altogether unlike the romances' (p. 173).

42. Some of the strongest arguments for accepting *Henry VIII* as one of the "Romances" have been put forward by R. A. Foakes; see his edition, *King Henry VIII*, *The Arden Shakespeare* (London, 1957; reprinted 1984), especially pp. xxxix-xlvii; and the chapter on the play in his book, *Shakespeare: the dark comedies to the last plays: from satire to celebration* (London, 1971), pp. 173-183. Other studies along "Romance" lines to devote serious space to *Henry VIII* include: Howard Felperin, *Shakespearean Romance* (Princeton, NJ, 1972); Robert W. Uphaus, *Beyond Tragedy: Structure & Experience in Shakespeare's Romances* (Lexington, KY, 1981); Eugene M. Waith's essay, 'Shakespeare and the Ceremonies of Romance', in *Shakespeare's Craft*, edited by Philip H. Highfill, Jr.

(Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL, 1982), pp. 113-137; and David Bergeron, *Shakespeare's Romances and the Royal Family* (1985); and see further below, note 90.

43. *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is included amongst 'The Romances' in *The Complete Signet Classic Shakespeare*, general editor Sylvan Barnet (New York, 1972), pp. 40-43; in the list of contents in Blakemore Evans, *The Riverside Shakespeare*, p. viii; and in the recent updated fourth edition of Bevington's *Complete Works* (New York, 1997), pp. 1559-1606; it is rather tentatively similarly classified by Halliday (*A Shakespeare Companion*, p. 419). The play has hardly ever been given any properly detailed attention (such as a chapter to itself) in books devoted to the "Romances"/late plays (though there are signs that this situation is beginning to change). The rare examples of critics happy to admit it properly into their discussions of Shakespearian "Romance" include E. C. Pettet, *Shakespeare and the Romance Tradition* (London and New York, 1949), pp. 170-174; Northrop Frye, 'Romance as Masque', in Kay and Jacobs, pp. 11-39; and Waith, 'Shakespeare and the Ceremonies of Romance'.

44. Hoeniger, 'Shakespeare's Romances', p. 1. The labyrinth of the *Cardenio/Double Falsehood* problem is clearly far beyond my scope here. The best, most respected discussion is that of John Freehafer, 'Cardenio, by Shakespeare and Fletcher', *PMLA*, 84 (1969), 501-513. Charles Hamilton's ridiculous arguments in *Cardenio; or The Second Maiden's Tragedy* (Lakewood, CO, 1994) can safely be ignored. For a thorough survey of earlier critical opinion, see G. Harold Metz, ed., *Sources of Four Plays Ascribed to Shakespeare* (Columbia, MO, 1989), pp. 259-283. The payments made to the King's Men in May and June 1613 for performances at court of 'Cardenno'/'Cardenna' are transcribed in Chambers, *Facts and Problems*, II, 343. Humphrey Moseley's Stationers' Register entry for 9 September 1653, containing the reference to 'The History of Cardenio, by Mr. Fletcher. & Shakespeare', is reproduced in Schoenbaum, *Records and Images*, p. 230. There is a reprint of the original 1728 edition of Lewis Theobald's play, with an Introduction by Kenneth Muir, in the Cornmarket Press facsimiles, second series (London, 1970); this also includes the altered prefatory material from the second edition. See too Muir's book, *Shakespeare as Collaborator* (London, 1960), pp. 148-160. Whilst her evidence does not justify her conclusions, there is still much useful information in Harriet C. Frazier's *A Babble of Ancestral Voices: Shakespeare, Cervantes, and Theobald* (The Hague, 1974). Interesting comment on the history and context of *Double Falsehood* can also be found in Brean S. Hammond, 'The Performance History of a Pseudo-Shakespearean Play: Theobald's *Double Falsehood*', *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 7 (1984), 49-60. Issues of copyright and other such matters relating to Theobald's play are covered in Peter Seary, *Lewis Theobald and the Editing of Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 25-26, 219-220. I follow the broad weight of current opinion in regarding *Double Falsehood* as Theobald's own adaptation of a Restoration version of a Jacobean original. Some of the questions

of manuscript transmission this raises are pursued in W. W. Greg's 1911 essay, 'The Bakings of Betsy', reprinted in revised form in Greg, *Collected Papers*, edited by J. C. Maxwell (Oxford, 1966), pp. 48-74; and in Alfred Harbage, 'Elizabethan-Restoration Palimpsest', *Modern Language Review*, 35 (1940), 287-319.

With prevailing feeling leaning firmly towards the acceptance of *Cardenio* as a lost Shakespeare-Fletcher collaboration, and given the play's recent "inclusion" in the Oxford Shakespeare (p. 1341), it seems to me a good moment to register a degree of scepticism. Freehafer's essay effectively defends Theobald's integrity and reliability, but at the same time it severely compromises his status as an independent witness by making his claim for Shakespearian authorship entirely dependent, in terms of historical transmission, upon Moseley, whether via the Stationers' Register or an inherited manuscript. And Moseley cannot be trusted. None of his other Shakespeare attributions in the Stationers' Register (which include various lost history plays and the equally lost *Iphis and Ianthe*) are remotely credible on current evidence (see *Companion*, p. 138). Freehafer is far from convincing in his attempt to defend Moseley's honesty (p. 508), whilst Gary Taylor's arguments in this respect are almost entirely specious ('Canon and Chronology', pp. 132-133). The chance of a potential connection between Shakespeare and Cervantes may be appealing, but there is scant evidence for any Shakespearian interest in Spanish literature after *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. *Double Falsehood* remains a fascinating case of possibilities even so, but one to which I have been unable to pay any serious attention. I do occasionally make reference to *Cardenio* where this seems appropriate.

45. Wilson Knight regards *Henry VIII* as a natural successor to *The Tempest*, but this is more to do with patterns of development than issues of quality. For an unusual sequential reading incorporating both *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, see F. W. Brownlow, *Two Shakespearean Sequences* (London and Basingstoke, 1977).

46. That is, if there were any particular logic to this idea in the first place. But such minor issues as historical accuracy have never really interfered with reading *The Tempest* as the final play. Dowden furnishes a clear demonstration of the way biographical pattern has been given working priority over any actual facts of the situation when he comments that 'for the purposes of such a study as this we may look upon *The Tempest* [sic] as Shakspeare's latest play' (*Shakspeare: His Mind and Art*, p. 380). He remarks earlier on, in sentiments that underlie a persistent critical tradition of illogic, 'I have called "*The Tempest*" Shakspeare's last play, but I am quite willing to grant that "*A Winter's Tale*," "*Henry VIII*," and perhaps "*Cymbeline*," may actually have succeeded "*The Tempest*"' (p. vii). Just to confuse things a little further, in his *Literature Primer*, Dowden refers to *The Winter's Tale* as 'perhaps the last complete play that Shakspeare wrote' (*Shakspeare*, p. 151). Dowden's approach neatly sidesteps the problem of evidence, but is none the less evidently absurd for all that. The usual critical excuse

nowadays is to refer to *The Tempest* as Shakespeare's last complete play, but even this begs a number of questions.

47. Strachey usefully draws attention to some of the darkness and cruelty present in the late plays (pp. 45-51), whilst Childress writes well about their humour and grotesquer elements (pp. 49-52). For broader discussion of the relatively neglected subject of comedy and satire in late Shakespeare, see John Russell Brown, 'Laughter in the Last Plays', in Brown and Harris, *Later Shakespeare*, pp. 103-125; Joan Hartwig, 'Cloten, Autolycus, and Caliban: Bearers of Parodic Burdens', in Kay and Jacobs, pp. 91-103; and Richard Paul Knowles, 'Autolycus, Cloten, Caliban & Co.: "Comic" Figures and Audience Response in Shakespeare's Last Plays', *The Upstart Crow*, 9 (1987), 77-95.

48. This may just be wishful thinking on my part, however. I wrote this sentence before consulting the recent *Norton Shakespeare*, which uses "Romances" as one of the four generic categories into which it divides up Shakespeare's plays (p. x; the standard four texts are included, with *All Is True* (*Henry VIII*) placed amongst the Histories and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (bizarrely) amongst the Comedies (p. ix)). More disturbing to me are the blatantly Dowdenesque tendencies of the section of Stephen Greenblatt's 'General Introduction' (pp. 1-76) subtitled 'The Shakespearean Trajectory' (pp. 54-57). Here, Greenblatt manages to reinscribe "romance" as a distinct genre in the Shakespeare canon, whilst noting a supposed decline in critical favour of the terms "problem plays" and "dark comedies", an emphasis I find decidedly odd (p. 56). And this particular trajectory is unashamedly conventional. Greenblatt reaffirms the appeal of seeing Shakespeare's whole career as a 'lived romance' (p. 57), with the author as hero, and culminating in *The Tempest*. *The Two Noble Kinsmen* gets itself mentioned in this section only in passing, out of chronological sequence, and *Henry VIII* is ignored completely. So much for radical criticism.

49. *Shakspeare*, pp. 55-56 (I have omitted only Dowden's numbering scheme for his subdivisions of the canon). This is the very first attempt to classify the group as a whole as "Romances". However, Dowden does have at least two notable precursors when it comes to linking together individual late plays (though they are not conceived of in this sense by either writer) and the world of romance. Thus William Hazlitt, right at the start of the first essay proper of his *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays* (London, 1817), says of *Cymbeline*, 'it may be considered as a dramatic romance' (quoting from the World's Classics edition by Arthur Quiller-Couch (Oxford, 1917), p. 1). And as Stephen Orgel points out (*The Winter's Tale*, p. 2), Coleridge refers to *The Tempest* as a 'romance' and 'a specimen of the romantic drama' in his surviving lecture notes on the play (dating from c. 1817-1818; see *Shakespearean Criticism*, I, 113-123 (pp. 117-118), though only portions of this material (but with the relevant references) would have been available in print to Dowden).

50. Dowden goes on to treat debts and influences in passing in brief sections on the individual plays (*Shakspeare*, pp. 144-153), but

none of the works he mentions in the process is explicitly designated a "romance", so any precise link along generic lines, even if implied, is never made. This is not the case, though, with his later extended treatment of the sources and analogues for the non-historical material in *Cymbeline* (in his 1903 Arden edition, pp. xviii-xxxviii). However, whilst Dowden does here identify certain related texts unambiguously as "romances", he still shows no actual interest in defining the genre or determining its characteristics.

51. *Shakespeare and the Romance Tradition*, p. 174. Pettet takes Dowden to task specifically for using "romance" with 'the usual smudge of imprecision' (p. 161), but is himself little better at providing a firm definition. His argument here is not much helped by his earlier comment that 'above all else romance literature was a literature of love and love-making' (pp. 12-13).

52. Criticism that concerns itself with the romance connections of the late plays is virtually as plentiful as the proposed sources themselves. The manifold literary traditions mentioned here are all more or less covered in the major studies of Shakespearian "romance". See especially the following: Pettet, pp. 161-199; Robert Grams Hunter, *Shakespeare and the Comedy of Forgiveness* (New York and London, 1965), pp. 132-141, 176-184; Northrop Frye, *A Natural Perspective*, and also 'Romance as Masque' (notably pp. 11-18); Stanley Wells, 'Shakespeare and Romance', in Brown and Harris, pp. 49-79; L. G. Salingar, 'Time and Art in Shakespeare's Romances', *Renaissance Drama*, 9 (1966), 3-35 (and compare too the further development of this essay's approach in Salingar's book, *Shakespeare and the Traditions of Comedy* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 28-75); Carol Gesner, *Shakespeare & the Greek Romance* (Lexington, KY, 1970); Felperin, *Shakespearean Romance*; Hallett Smith, *Shakespeare's Romances: A Study of Some Ways of the Imagination* (San Marino, CA, 1972); Mowat, *Dramaturgy*, pp. 88-92, 129-132; John Dean, *Restless Wanderers: Shakespeare and the Pattern of Romance* (Salzburg, 1979); Mimi Still Dixon, 'Tragicomic Recognitions: Medieval Miracles and Shakespearean Romance', in *Renaissance Tragicomedy*, edited by Nancy Klein Maguire (New York, 1987), pp. 56-79; and Elizabeth Archibald, *Apollonius of Tyre: Medieval and Renaissance Themes and Variations* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 100-105, 182-216 - I have relied on Archibald's conclusions with regard to the date and likely provenance of the Latin *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* (see particularly pp. 3-26).

Most of this material is also covered in studies of the full range of sources for the late plays. Bullough's survey obviously dominates the field (see *Sources*, VI, 347-564, VIII, 1-339, and, for *Henry VIII*, IV (1962), 433-510), but useful too in its own right is Kenneth Muir's far briefer contribution, *The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays* (London, 1977), pp. 252-288. Regrettably, Bullough omits *The Two Noble Kinsmen*; his work has been (less effectively) supplemented for this play in Metz, *Sources of Four Plays*, pp. 371-496. Metz covers the putative sources of *Cardenio* as well (pp. 255-370); and for some more recent comment on this latter subject, see A. Luis Pujante, 'Double Falsehood and the

Verbal Parallels with Shelton's *Don Quixote*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 51 (1998), 95-105. All the better major editions of the individual plays concerned will of course also treat sources in detail.

53. Many of the works mentioned in the preceding note are again relevant, chiefly those by Bullough, Metz, Stanley Wells, R. G. Hunter, Pettet, Felperin, John Dean, and Hallett Smith. On these Elizabethan romance traditions in general, see especially R. S. White, *'Let wonder seem familiar': Endings in Shakespeare's romance vision* (London and Princeton, NJ, 1985). Useful studies treating the individual authors or areas mentioned here include: John F. Danby's chapter, 'Sidney and the Late-Shakespearian Romance', in his *Poets on Fortune's Hill* (London, 1952), pp. 74-107; Abbie Findlay Potts, *Shakespeare and 'The Faerie Queene'* (Ithaca, NY, 1958), pp. 208-233, and Brian Gibbons, *Shakespeare and Multiplicity* (1993), pp. 13-14, 18-47; Leah Scragg's brief epilogue, 'The Last Plays', in her book, *The Metamorphosis of Gallathea: A Study in Creative Adaptation* (Washington, DC, 1982), pp. 117-124; Inga-Stina Ewbank, "'What words, what looks, what wonders?": Language and Spectacle in the Theatre of George Peele', *The Elizabethan Theatre*, 5 (1975), 124-154, and Philip Edwards, "'Seeing is believing": action and narration in *The Old Wives Tale* and *The Winter's Tale*', in *Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, edited by E. A. J. Honigmann (Manchester, 1986), pp. 79-93; and in the same volume, H. Neville Davies, 'Pericles and the Sherley brothers', pp. 94-113. For a broad overview of the wide field of Elizabethan and Jacobean romantic drama, see Gibbons, 'Romance and the heroic play', in *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, edited by A. R. Braunmuller and Michael Hattaway (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 207-236. The romance nature of New World voyage literature and pamphlets - the way this material turns history into romance - is stressed in Charles Frey, 'The Tempest and the New World', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 30 (1979), 29-41; on travel literature more generally, see Jean-Pierre Maquerlot and Michèle Willems, eds., *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time* (Cambridge, 1996). Some of the more ephemeral material referred to here is treated in Honigmann, 'Secondary Sources of *The Winter's Tale*', *Philological Quarterly*, 34 (1955), 27-38. For oral and romance traditions of history, see especially Anne Barton's 1975 essay, 'The King Disguised: Shakespeare's *Henry V* and the Comical History', reprinted in *Essays, Mainly Shakespearean*, pp. 207-233; and Graham Holderness, *Shakespeare's History* (Dublin and New York, 1985), pp. 33-37.

54. Most of the connections involved are clearcut: the *Pericles* story derives from *Apollonius of Tyre*; *The Winter's Tale* is based on *Pandosto*; *Cymbeline* utilizes material from a number of texts that fit the romance paradigm, Elizabethan dramas such as *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune* (1582) and *Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes* (1570), or different versions of the wager story, including *Frederyke of Jennen* and even its treatment in the *Decameron*; *Cardenio* can be presumed to have made use of a section of *Don Quixote*; and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* has a primary source in one of the central medieval English chivalric

romances, Chaucer's *Knight's Tale*. It is perhaps stretching the point a little to include the New World voyage literature as a major source for *The Tempest*, but I am also thinking of the play's specific invocation of the world of outlandish travellers' tales (3.3. 21-49). *Henry VIII*, quite clearly something of an exception where sources are concerned, alludes to two of the most popular of English medieval romances, *Bevis of Hampton* (see 1.1. 36-38) and *Guy of Warwick* (5.3. 21).

55. Hoeniger expresses the opinion that 'accounts of romance have been all too general, ignoring the vast differences in plot and characterisation and tone between Alexandrian, pastoral and chivalric romance. Of these, the last is probably least relevant for Shakespeare' ('Shakespeare's Romances', p. 6). But Hoeniger largely excludes from consideration *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, two plays for which chivalric romance is easily the most relevant of the three different branches he identifies.

56. Or, to use Howard Felperin's frames of reference, from the *Odyssey* to Erich Segal's *Love Story (Shakespearean Romance)*, pp. 8-9). On the copious variety in historical manifestations of romance, see generally Felperin's chapter, 'Golden-Tongued Romance', pp. 3-54; and also Gillian Beer, *The Romance, The Critical Idiom*, 10 (London, 1970); and Patricia A. Parker, *Inescapable Romance: Studies in the Poetics of a Mode* (Princeton, NJ, 1979).

57. 'Shakespeare and Romance', p. 49. See further the range of meanings covered by *OED*'s definitions for the noun "romance", senses II. 2-6 (XIV, 61-62), and also the relevant entry in Chris Baldick, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 191-192. John Dean has a most useful chapter on 'The Nature of Romance', in which he identifies eleven principal lines of critical approach to the problem of defining or pinning down the essential characteristics of the genre (*Restless Wanderers*, pp. 87-115).

58. Orgel, *The Winter's Tale*, p. 3; the opinions advanced here carry further the telling reservations about the "Romance" category already expressed in Orgel, *The Tempest*, pp. 4-5.

59. 'Shakespeare and Romance', pp. 49-50. For the distinction between romance as mode and romance as fixed form, I am drawing upon Fredric Jameson, 'Magical Narratives: Romance as Genre', *New Literary History*, 7 (1975-76), 135-163 (particularly pp. 136-138); and see too the rather different treatment of material from this essay in Jameson, *The Political Unconscious* (1981), pp. 103-150.

60. Many writers on the late plays devote space to this pursuit. For an impressively comprehensive exploration of shared motifs in the "four Romances", see D. G. James, 'The Failure of the Ballad-Makers', pp. 214-238. More concentrated, but still extensive, listings can be found in Robert Adams, pp. 4-5, and, as part of a comparison of late Shakespeare with the near-contemporary drama of Calderón de la Barca, in Walter Cohen, 'Shakespeare and Calderón in an Age of Transition',

in *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt (Norman, OK, 1982), pp. 123-137 (pp. 124-126; and see the re-working of this passage in Cohen, *Drama of a Nation* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1985), pp. 385-387).

61. *Shakespearean Romance*, p. 7. A similar sense of the romance mode is conveyed in Patricia Parker's introduction to her book (and for that matter, in its very title), *Inescapable Romance*, pp. 3-15. As part of his own attempt at defining the genre, Felperin suggests that 'all romance is in some sense or on some level a love story and an odyssey' (p. 9), and furthermore that 'all romance moves toward poetic justice' (p. 27).

62. According to one disciple, Frye's 'theory is to romance what Aristotle's is to tragedy' (A. C. Hamilton, *Northrop Frye: Anatomy of his Criticism* (Toronto, 1990), p. 140). Frye discusses in detail the disparagement of romance in Christian and Platonic critical frameworks in *The Secular Scripture*, pp. 17-26. See too Beer's section, 'Objections to the Romance', pp. 13-16, and Felperin's 'Bibliographical Appendix: The Fortunes of Romance', in *Shakespearean Romance*, pp. 287-316. Choice in the comparison of romance with either tragedy or epic depends respectively upon whether a dramatic or a narrative context is being invoked. W. P. Ker argues specifically for the inferiority of romance to epic in his magisterial study, *Epic and Romance: Essays on Medieval Literature* (London, 1897), pp. 18-39. For a modern countering of Ker's position, stressing in contrast the often close connections between epic and romance, see Colin Burrow, *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 1-4. That there has been a persistent preference in criticism and theory for tragedy over romance requires little documentation, but there are some useful remarks on the subject in Cohen, *Drama of a Nation*, p. 391. On hierarchies of genre more generally, see Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 213-255.

A recent explicit manifestation of the denigration of romance in the published criticism of the late plays occurs in Mincoff, *Things Supernatural and Causeless* (this first appeared in print in 1987, but Barbara A. Mowat's introduction to the posthumous 1992 edited reprint points out that the book was clearly written during the 1970s (p. 9; all references are to the 1992 edition)). Mincoff asserts that the "Romances" 'do not stir us as do the tragedies, nor delight us as much as the comedies proper. They do belong to an intrinsically inferior genre and it is doubtful whether even the genius of Shakespeare could so far transcend the weaknesses of that genre as to produce work really equal to that in the other kinds' (p. 25). I have my disagreements with Frye's work, but its superiority to such commentary is incalculable.

63. Beer suggests that romance, 'however lofty its literary and moral qualities, is written primarily to entertain' (p. 3); she also feels the genre 'constantly tends towards decadence' (p. 16). Both comments point to recurring criticisms, which Beer herself seems to come close

to endorsing. Frye argues that 'any serious discussion of romance has to take into account its curiously proletarian status as a form generally disapproved of, in most ages, by the guardians of taste and learning, except when they use it for their own purposes' (*Secular Scripture*, p. 23; see too the wider context here, pp. 20-31, and *Anatomy*, pp. 186-206). A connection between romance and the realm of entertainment, manifested particularly in forms of popular literature and culture, can hardly be denied. As Frye's work indicates, however, it does not have to give rise to any totalizing negative judgements of the genre.

64. This is something of a familiar complaint. Thus Hunt, for example, suggests that 'Frye's notion of romance is self-confessedly general, even vague' (*Approaches to Teaching*, p. 9); and see besides the critique of Frye's approach in Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, pp. 79-82; and in Felperin, *Shakespearean Romance*, pp. 314-316. Frye is himself quite happy to admit to the charge suggested here: 'in the criticism of romance', he remarks, 'we are led very quickly from what the individual work says to what the entire convention it belongs to is saying through the work' (*Secular Scripture*, p. 60). A similar idea emerges from his explanation of his critical methodology in *A Natural Perspective*, p. viii.

65. For this aspect of Frye's reading of romance, see especially the section 'Theory of Mythos', in *Anatomy of Criticism*, pp. 158-239, and the chapter, 'The Recovery of Myth', in *The Secular Scripture*, pp. 159-188. According to A. C. Hamilton, in Frye's work, 'romance emerges as *the* fictional mode, uniquely privileged in being closest to myth' (p. 195). Frye himself writes that 'romance, the kernel of fable, begins an upward journey toward man's [sic] recovery of what he projects as sacred myth' (*Secular Scripture*, p. 183).

66. The majority of critical writings on the late plays, by far, fall easily into this broad range of related commentary. That includes most of the romance-oriented studies of the group referred to already, as well as such works as Derick R. C. Marsh, *The Recurring Miracle: A study of 'Cymbeline' and the last plays*, third edition (Sydney, 1980; first edition, Pietermaritzburg, 1962); Cyrus Hoy, *The Hyacinth Room: An Investigation Into the Nature of Comedy, Tragedy, & Tragicomedy* (London, 1964), pp. 267-281; Charles Frey, *Shakespeare's Vast Romance: A Study of 'The Winter's Tale'* (Columbia, MO and London, 1980), pp. 83-113; W. B. Thorne, 'The Cycle of Sin in Shakespeare's Late Plays', *The Upstart Crow*, 4 (Fall 1982), 86-93; David Scott Kastan's section, 'The Romances: "More than History can Pattern"', in his book, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time* (London and Basingstoke, 1982), pp. 123-161; or David J. Greenman, 'Women, Men, and Spirituality in Shakespearean Romance', *Thought*, 61 (1986), 360-369. If I were to include essays devoted to the various individual plays, the list would become endless.

Frye comments in the *Anatomy of Criticism*, 'if we are right in our suggestion that romance, tragedy, irony and comedy are all episodes in a total quest-myth, we can see how it is that comedy can contain

a potential tragedy within itself' (p. 215); this is also a major theme in 'The Argument of Comedy'. For interpretative criticism developing this line of approach, see Uphaus, *Beyond Tragedy*, and Jay L. Halio, 'The Late Plays as the Fulfillment of Shakespeare's Tragic Pattern', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 31-37. Of course, Frye is not solely responsible for initiating the critical paradigms highlighted here, however major the extent of his influence. A similar kind of "beyond tragedy" understanding of late Shakespeare is already strongly present in Tillyard (*Shakespeare's Last Plays*, pp. 16-58), whilst symbolic and religious modes of reading are dependent too on the likes of Wilson Knight; S. L. Bethell, *'The Winter's Tale': A Study* (London, [1947]); Traversi, *Shakespeare: The Last Phase*; C. L. Barber, *Shakespeare's Festive Comedy: A Study of Dramatic Form and its Relation to Social Custom* (Princeton, NJ, 1959; reprinted 1972); and indeed Colin Still's rather eccentric *Shakespeare's Mystery Play: A Study of 'The Tempest'* (London, 1921; later expanded as *The Timeless Theme* (London, 1936)).

I confess to feeling little sympathy for any of the interpretative traditions discussed in this paragraph. To hone in on just one of the critics mentioned, Derek Traversi's work exemplifies for me everything that is most damaging, inadequate, or simply inane in such treatments of the late plays. His is precisely the sort of criticism that merits Edwards's trenchant riposte, 'it is a disservice to Shakespeare to pretend that one is adding to his profundity by discovering that his plots are symbolic vehicles for ideas and perceptions which are, for the most part, banal, trite and colourless' ('Shakespeare's Romances', p. 11). Compare too Ryan's unconcealed scorn, as he sets out his own methodological position, for 'the religious assumptions governing more traditional studies of Shakespeare's last plays' (*Shakespeare*, pp. 150-151, note 12).

67. By which I mean the whole sequence that opens with Gonzalo's line, 'I have inly wept', and goes on to include his speech beginning 'Was Milan thrust from Milan, that his issue | Should become kings of Naples?' (5.1. 203-216). See the remarks on this passage in Kermode's edition (p. 125, note to l. 205, and also p. 1). For examples of other critics who read Gonzalo here as effectively expressing the meaning of the play, or indeed the overall outlook of Shakespearian "Romance", see: Robert Langbaum, ed., *The Tempest*, The Signet Classic Shakespeare (New York, 1964), pp. xxiii-xiv; Joan Hartwig, *Shakespeare's Tragicomic Vision* (Baton Rouge, 1972), pp. 142-152; Jackson Cope, *The Theater and the Dream* (1973), pp. 236-244; Walter F. Eggers, Jr., "'Bring Forth a Wonder": Presentation in Shakespeare's Romances', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 21 (1979), 455-477; and, a bit more recently, Richard Dutton, *William Shakespeare: A Literary Life* (Basingstoke and London, 1989), pp. 147-148. The standard attack on this position, and on sentimental treatments of the play in general, is found in Harry Berger, Jr., 'Miraculous Harp: A Reading of Shakespeare's *Tempest*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 5 (1969), 253-283. It is worth stressing that many critics of *The Tempest* since Berger's time (and before) have expressed doubts about the tone of the play's ending, the genuineness of its reconciliations, or

the validity of Gonzalo's attempted summary (a good instance is Anne Barton (as Anne Richter), in her New Penguin Shakespeare edition of *The Tempest* (Harmondsworth, 1968), pp. 36-41). But there remains the problem that such reservations are themselves often wrapped up in a cloying sentimentality that works to deny them any real force.

68. 'Romance and Romanticism', in *The Uses of the Canon*, pp. 16-34 (p. 19); this is a revised version of an essay first published in 1978 as 'Romance and Romanticism: Some Reflections on *The Tempest* and *Heart of Darkness*, Or, When is Romance No Longer Romance?', in Kay and Jacobs, pp. 60-76 (all references are to the revised text). Felperin uses Frye's name to some extent, as I have been doing, as shorthand to represent a distinct and flourishing interpretative tradition in late play criticism, and his disclaimer about such a treatment could apply equally to my own work: 'it is only fair to Frye, as well as important to my argument, to point out that this reading of *The Tempest* and of earlier romance is not unique to him; it is more or less explicit in the work of Knight, Barber, Tillyard, Traversi, and most of the studies of Shakespearean romance and pastoral that appeared, at an increasing rate, into the early 1970s. Frye's is only the most lucid, systematic, and influential statement of what had become, thanks in part to him, a commonplace of Shakespearean criticism' (p. 20).

69. On the need to accept the conventions of any literary genre, and of romance in particular, see Frye's chapter 'Mouldy Tales', in *A Natural Perspective*, pp. 1-33. As that chapter shows, such a point of view renders *Pericles* especially important to Frye's conception of Shakespearean "Romance". Elsewhere, suggesting that this play 'seems to be a deliberate experiment in presenting a traditional archetypal sequence as nakedly and baldly as possible', Frye argues that 'the profoundest kind of literary experience, the kind that we return to after we have, so to speak, seen everything, may be very close to the experience of a child listening to a story, too spellbound to question the narrative logic' (*Secular Scripture*, p. 51). Within this context, *Pericles* gets to stand as an exemplar of a literary return to roots. It seems therefore to be being placed in what Frye identifies as the "primitive" side of popular fiction, defined as 'the literature that demands the minimum of previous verbal experience and special education from the reader' (*Secular Scripture*, pp. 26-29 (p. 26)). But the play itself, whatever the nature of its actual story, consistently draws attention to the processes by which that story has been transmitted - mediated - through history, and the manner in which it is now being (re-)presented. This approach seems designed specifically to highlight issues of audience response and narrative logic, literary expectations and prior reception, and is consequently liable to break, as it were, any spell. Frye's reading simply ignores the play's dramaturgy.

70. Frye himself actually has much to say on the conventionalism and deliberate archaism of late Shakespeare, but his comments in this area tend to be rather under-theorized, and I never find him all that

convincing on the subject. See for example his essay, 'Recognition in *The Winter's Tale*', in Frye, *Fables of Identity: Studies in Poetic Mythology* (New York and London, 1963), pp. 107-118; and the remarks on the same play in *A Natural Perspective*, pp. 112-117. For Frye, archaic conventions come with the territory of romance; the conventions obtrude simply in order to focus attention on the genre *qua* genre, on the romance structure - and crucially, this attention is conceived of as being wholly uncritical, fully absorbed and involved (see *A Natural Perspective*, pp. 4-10). Thus there is little room in Frye's reading of the late plays not only for irony and anxiety, as Felperin indicates, but also for parody, alienation, defamiliarization, metadrama, and the like. At stake in all this are competing and contrasting notions of aesthetic distance, a topic I touch on further in Chapter Four. My problems with Frye's attitude are encapsulated in his suggestion that, 'in any art that depends on movement, whether literary or musical, the technical skill of construction is a subordinate factor, and the real skill consists in knowing how to subordinate it' (p. 16). This may be a venerable position, but it does seem to me to be an extraordinarily inappropriate one from which to approach late Shakespeare.

71. See *Anatomy*, pp. 33-35, and *The Secular Scripture*, pp. 3-9. Frye adopts (and adapts) the terms "naive" and "sentimental" from the work of Friedrich Schiller, but his use of them does not come across as particularly consistent, or even entirely relevant. Certainly, the self-conscious (literary?) naivety of late Shakespeare would seem to disrupt rather easily the basic historical system that Frye sets up, which links 'naive romance' to the world of folk tales and 'sentimental romance' to 'a more extended and literary development of the formulas of naive romance' (*Secular Scripture*, p. 3).

72. It is perhaps important to exempt Frye's work, if not his effective influence, from the force of this generalization. Frye is very much interested, in his own way, in the politics of romance and myth. Thus Jameson can even praise Frye as follows: 'the greatness of Frye, and the radical difference between his work and that of the great bulk of garden-variety myth criticism, lies in his willingness to raise the issue of community and to draw basic, essentially social, interpretive consequences from the nature of religion as collective representation' (*The Political Unconscious*, p. 69). Not surprisingly, though, Jameson still finds some serious limitations to the political side of Frye's reading of romance (pp. 69-74).

73. I have found useful on this subject W. R. J. Barron, who writes, in the course of a discussion of medieval romance, that 'the romance mode, by its projection of an ideal in defiance of reality, is inherently revolutionary and reformist, though comparatively oblique in its didactic means' (*English Medieval Romance* (London and New York, 1987), p. 199). The utopian possibilities of romance are very strongly emphasized in the work of Cohen (*Drama of a Nation*, pp. 384-404) and Ryan (*Shakespeare*, pp. 106-135). For a contrasting position, see the way

Jameson is perturbed by some of the ideological implications of what he terms 'the persistence of romance' ('Magical Narratives', p. 161). I must admit that at times I find both Cohen and Ryan a little too optimistic or one-sided in their frank utopianism - though my reservations with their work also relate to their generic approach and primary focus on *The Tempest*. Utopianism itself is clearly a deeply complicated, even contradictory, discourse, one that can easily lead away from political radicalism to wishful-thinking or mere regret, politically ineffectual longing for a never-to-be-achieved or always-already lost perfection. In this connection, see the section on 'Some Paradoxes of Utopia', in Harry Levin, *The Myth of the Golden Age in the Renaissance* (London, 1970), pp. 187-193. Equally relevant are Richard Hillman's thoughts on the inherent ambivalences (social and psychological) of romance nostalgia (in his *Intertextuality and Romance in Renaissance Drama: The Staging of Nostalgia* (Basingstoke, 1992), pp. 18-20).

74. One obvious symptom of this can be located in the resistance to political readings of *The Tempest* that was so evident in the 1980s. I see another in the way a recent avowedly "traditionalist" collection of criticism (*Shakespeare's Political Pageant: Essays in Literature and Politics*, edited by Joseph Alulis and Vickie Sullivan (Lanham, MD, 1996)) manages to ignore the late plays/"Romances" almost completely, being divided into three separate sections covering just the comedies, histories, and tragedies, and showing little interest in incorporating individual late plays into any of these.

75. There has of course been, as the close connections between romance and wish-fulfilment alluded to here might suggest, a strong tradition of psychoanalytical criticism of late Shakespeare. Although largely cast within a "Romance" paradigm, this has occasioned at least some exploration of the considerable psychological and psychosocial implications of the "romance" aesthetic. For work in this field, in addition to that on *Cymbeline* already cited in Chapter One (note 80), see: R. E. Gajdusek, 'Death, Incest, and the Triple Bond in the Later Plays of Shakespeare', *American Imago*, 31 (1974), 109-158; Coppélia Kahn, 'The Providential Tempest and the Shakespearean Family', in Schwartz and Kahn, *Representing Shakespeare*, pp. 217-243; also in this volume, David Sundelson, 'So Rare a Wonder'd Father: Prospero's *Tempest*', pp. 33-53; the closing chapter, '"The masked Neptune and / The gentlest winds of heaven": *Pericles* and the Transition from Tragedy to Romance', in C. L. Barber and Richard P. Wheeler, *The Whole Journey: Shakespeare's Power of Development* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1986), pp. 298-342; Nevo, *Shakespeare's Other Language*; and the whole of Janet Adelman's chapter, 'Masculine Authority and the Maternal Body: The Return to Origins in the Romances', in *Suffocating Mothers* (1992), pp. 193-238.

76. I would place in this broadly "old" historicist tradition of topical readings such work as: Frances Yates, *Shakespeare's Last Plays* (1975); Gary Schmidgall, *Shakespeare and the Courtly Aesthetic*

(Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1981); and, on the whole, Bergeron, *Shakespeare's Romances and the Royal Family*. But the most vigorous exponent of this approach has been Glynne Wickham, who has produced an entire series of his highly speculative, logic-defying articles reading the late plays as straightforward mirrors of official Jacobean policy and direct allegories of events and personages at Court. These include: 'The Winter's Tale: A Comedy with Deaths', in his book, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Heritage* (London, 1969), pp. 249-265; 'Romance and Emblem: A Study in the Dramatic Structure of *The Winter's Tale*', *The Elizabethan Theatre*, 3 (1973), 82-99; 'From Tragedy to Tragi-Comedy' (1973); and further essays on *Cymbeline* and *Henry VIII* (already mentioned), *The Tempest* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (for full details on these, see the Bibliography). Essentially the same view of the late plays emerges in New Historicist criticism, with the obvious qualification that in this case Shakespeare is now lambasted for his mystificatory celebration of Jacobean absolutism and its oppressive ideologies. A prime example of this sort of commentary is provided by Leonard Tennenhouse's discussion in *Power on Display: The politics of Shakespeare's genres* (New York and London, 1986), pp. 147-186. In order to sustain his condemnatory perspective, though, Tennenhouse has to resort to such traditional, questionable strategies as equating the content of Gonzalo's well-known summing-up towards the end of *The Tempest* with 'the objective of the play itself' (p. 183).

77. 'Romance and Romanticism', p. 25. Felperin is one of those (all-too-rare) critics firmly opposed to reading this play through the eyes of Gonzalo. Commenting on Gonzalo's attempted summary, he writes: 'were *The Tempest* the archetypal romance it is supposed to be, the play would end right here on this uplifting note, which should accord with the ostended dramatic action. But Gonzalo's summing-up is clearly wishful thinking' (p. 22).

78. Felperin is particularly intent on attacking a persistent critical tradition that treats 'literary history since the Renaissance as a progressive demystification or displacement or ironization or secularization or internalization of romance', a point of view 'all but explicit in its condescension towards the Elizabethans' (p. 34). To adopt this paradigm, as Frye's work is seen to come close to doing (pp. 18-19), is 'at once to underread the past by oversimplifying it and to overread the present by making it the locus of all complexity' (p. 34). I agree entirely, but would also want to extend this argument to draw attention to the related powerful perspective in Renaissance criticism that similarly simplifies (under-reads) medieval literature whilst constructing the Renaissance as a locus of much greater or new-found complexity.

79. The use of romance elements and/or sources in Shakespeare's career prior to the late plays is commented on in Pettet, pp. 67-160, Gesner, pp. 49-79, Hallett Smith, *Shakespeare's Romances* (throughout), R. S. White, pp. 21-114, and Stanley Wells, 'Shakespeare and Romance', pp. 57-63. The presence of romance motifs in *King Lear* and its related

thematic connections to late Shakespeare have often been noticed, but see especially the discussion in Leo Salinger, 'Romance in *King Lear*', *English*, 27 (1978), 5-21. I regard the phrase, "Romantic Comedies", as nothing more than a stop-gap classification. Wells supplies a handy definition: 'a term sometimes used to distinguish *The Merchant of Venice*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, *As You Like It*, and *Twelfth Night* from the Early Comedies and "Problem Comedies", though it may also be applied to a wider range of plays' (Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare: An Illustrated Dictionary* (London, 1978), p. 149). Interestingly enough, Dowden himself describes the final three comedies in Wells's list as 'joyous, refined, romantic' (*Shakspeare*, p. 57).

80. See in particular here the Introduction to *Intertextuality and Romance in Renaissance Drama*, pp. 1-25. Hillman draws on intertextual, poststructuralist, and deconstructive theory to argue that there is a 'strong case for theorising a broad affinity between intertextual signifying practices and romance, considered as a mode whose constant project is the mediation between polarities of present and past, real and ideal, beginning and end' (p. 22). Of course, "intertextuality" is itself a deeply multivalent concept - see Hillman's comments, pp. 4-11, and the usefully detailed entry provided in Jeremy Hawthorn, *A Concise Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory* (London, 1992), pp. 85-87. I am mainly using the term to refer to the direct evocation of specific "intertexts" in late Shakespearian drama, the way certain other texts get brought into play as the result of an identifiable textual process or rhetorical effect within the works I focus upon. As with Hillman's own approach (see pp. 10-11), this position relies to some extent on notions of textual intention and textual primacy that would clearly be anathema to more radical theorists of intertextuality.

81. The influence of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* on late Shakespeare is of course obvious and has been much discussed; for recent comment, see especially Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 215-270; and also Charles and Michelle Martindale, *Shakespeare and the Uses of Antiquity* (London and New York, 1990), pp. 45-90; and Leonard Barkan, *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis & the Pursuit of Paganism* (New Haven and London, 1986), pp. 243-288. The relevance of the *Aeneid* to *The Tempest* has been pursued by a number of critics in the wake of J. M. Nosworthy's essay, 'The Narrative Sources of *The Tempest*', *Review of English Studies*, 24 (1948), 281-294; I have myself touched on the poem's importance to *Cymbeline* in Chapter One. It is worth noting that the presence of Ovid and Virgil in the late plays is not solely dependent on these two central texts (for a suggestion of other influences, see Orgel, *The Winter's Tale*, pp. 43-46). On the rather less-obvious use of Seneca in the late plays, see Robert S. Miola, *Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy: The Influence of Seneca* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 188-214. North's Plutarch supplies a good many of the names in *Pericles* and *The Winter's Tale*, as well as one or two interesting passing details in *Cymbeline* (see respectively: MacD. P. Jackson, 'North's Plutarch and the Name "Escanes" in Shakespeare's *Pericles*', *Notes and Queries*, 220 (1975), 173-

174; Pafford, pp. 163-165; and Danielle Clarke, 'Cymbeline and Plutarch', *Notes and Queries*, 240 (1995), 329-331). It also makes something of a reappearance as a more conventional, if minor, "source" for *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (see Metz, *Sources of Four Plays*, pp. 424, 490-494; and Eugene M. Waith, ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 1989), p. 28). The echoes of Montaigne in *The Tempest* are well-enough known to require no documentation here, whilst I have already speculated in Chapter One about possible connections between the *Essais* and *Cymbeline*. Montaigne's relevance to *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is briefly covered in Waith's edition (pp. 49-51), and in Lois Potter, ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, The Arden Shakespeare (Walton-on-Thames, 1997), pp. 55-56.

82. Robert Adams's long list of such features (mentioned above, note 60) is forced to except *The Tempest* and *Cymbeline* three or four times each (*Shakespeare: The Four Romances*, pp. 4-5); similar problems afflict Traversi's shorter effort in this direction (*Shakespeare: The Last Phase*, p. 2). Even so, Traversi shows no qualms in describing *Pericles*, *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *The Tempest* as 'a series of plays [. . .] as closely related in conception as any previously written by Shakespeare' (p. 2). Edwards even manages to outdo this by claiming that the "Romances" 'seem more closely related than any other group of Shakespeare's plays' ('Shakespeare's Romances', p. 1). Quite where the two historical tetralogies fit into the thinking of these last two critics is hard to fathom.

83. Links between *Pericles* and *The Winter's Tale* are considered, for example, in C. L. Barber's "'Thou that beget'st him that did thee beget": Transformation in *Pericles* and *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 22 (1969), 59-67 (further developed in Barber and Wheeler, *The Whole Journey*, pp. 298-342); and in Miriam Gilbert, "'This Wide Gap of Time": Storytelling and Audience Response in the Romances', *Iowa State Journal of Research*, 53 (1978-79), 235-241. The individual nature of *The Tempest* - its observance of the unity of time, the absence of any father-daughter or husband-wife reunions, its lack of a theophany - has often been noted, without really being seen to be all that significant. Recent criticism has tended to suggest that this play also stands apart from the others in its treatment of gender issues. See for example, though they offer quite different perspectives on the subject: Paula S. Berggren, 'The Woman's Part: Female Sexuality as Power in Shakespeare's Plays', in Lenz, Greene, and Neely, *The Woman's Part*, pp. 17-34 (pp. 26-31); Linda Bamber, *Comic Women, Tragic Men: A Study of Gender and Genre in Shakespeare* (Stanford, CA, 1982), pp. 169-191; Marianne Novy, *Love's Argument: Gender Relations in Shakespeare* (Chapel Hill, NC and London, 1984), pp. 164-187; Marilyn Williamson, *The Patriarchy of Shakespeare's Comedies*, pp. 15-24, 111-175; and Adelman, pp. 236-238.

84. *Cymbeline*, pp. xlix-1. Nosworthy adds that the genre 'can encompass a half-civilized Britain but not the ordered state of Rome' (p. 1); so pseudohistory and primitivism are appropriate for romance,

but not (classical) history and civilization. There is an interesting and cogent critique of Nosworthy's treatment of *Cymbeline*, especially its stress on romance experimentation, and of critical attitudes to this play in general, in Jeffrey Rayner Myers, *Shakespeare's Mannerist Canon: 'Ut Picturae Poemata'* (New York, 1989), pp. 81-110.

85. As is well known, Jonson seems to glance at Shakespeare's late plays in a number of critical sideswipes, most notably a passage from the Induction to *Bartholomew Fair* (1614), found at the end of an outline of the 'promise' of 'the Author' (ll. 118-119), part of a speech belonging to the Scrivener: 'if there bee neuer a *Seruant-monster* i'the *Fayre*; who can helpe it? he sayes; nor a nest of *Antiques*? Hee is loth to make Nature afraid in his *Playes*, like those that beget *Tales*, *Tempests*, and such like *Drolleries*, to mixe his head with other mens heeles, let the concupiscence of *Iigges* and *Dances*, raigne as strong as it will amongst you: yet if the *Puppets* will please any body, they shall be entreated to come in' (ll. 127-134; quoted from H&S, VI (1938), 16-17).

There is certainly an allusion here to *The Tempest* and probably also one to *The Winter's Tale* (see the editorial notes on this passage in H&S, X (1950), 175-177; and the comments at X, 51-53 on the rather similar remarks in Jonson's 'To the Reader' from the 1612 quarto of *The Alchemist*). Jonson's own description elsewhere of *Pericles* as a 'mouldy tale' (*Ode to Himself*, ll. 21-22, in H&S, VI, 492-494) works to invoke that play's presence as well. But there is nothing in these lines that relates specifically to *Cymbeline*, and in fact Jonson seems never to have passed any comment on this play (a point noted in David Frost, "'Mouldy Tales": The Context of Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*' (1986), p. 38). Furthermore, as Paul Bertram argues, Jonson's scorn here might well extend to *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, a play explicitly identified as a 'tale' by its own epilogue (ll. 12-13), and clearly parodied within the main action of *Bartholomew Fair*, notably during its Act 5 puppet-show (see 'The Date of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 12 (1961), 21-32 (p. 24)). If this were the case, Jonson, for one, could be seen to have associated *The Two Noble Kinsmen* directly with other late Shakespearian texts. That *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is alluded to in *Bartholomew Fair* has sometimes been doubted and is often felt to be open to question, but there is really very little scope for debate on the matter; for confirmation of this, see Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 69-70.

86. And *Pericles* does not appear at all, remaining excluded from the Folio tradition until the second impression of the Third Folio (F3) in 1664 (for comment on which, see Marvin Spevack's introduction in the *Third Folio Facsimile*, [p. 1]). Besides raising all sorts of generic anxieties, the arrangement of the late plays that are included in the First Folio has occasioned much speculation along other lines. It might just be noteworthy that the four plays concerned are all given "significant" positions, either opening or closing the group in which they are placed. The use of *The Tempest* to begin the collection has suggested some degree of extra importance, and thus fuelled the theory that it formed Shakespeare's farewell play. But the positioning of

Cymbeline at the very end could just as easily be taken as a signal of "finality". Any conclusions about Shakespearian chronology drawn from the Folio remain speculative in the extreme, and there is in fact no real reason to believe that date of composition had anything to do with the printing/editorial choices involved in the ordering of the plays. I have many times heard Dr Tom Matheson comment on the way the overall organization of plays in the volume enacts a kind of order-restoring, metaphysical movement from the disruptive tumult of 'a tempestuous noise of Thunder and Lightning heard' (*The Tempest*, TLN 2) through to the calming last word of *Cymbeline*, 'Peace' (TLN 3818); and see further on this, *Companion*, p. 39.

87. Orgel argues that 'modern conceptions of genre are not those of the Renaissance, and our categories tend towards different ends: ours are exclusive and definitive, theirs tended to be inclusive and analytic' (*The Tempest*, p. 4); see also *The Winter's Tale*, pp. 2-6, and Orgel's earlier essay, 'Shakespeare and the Kinds of Drama', *Critical Inquiry*, 6 (1979-80), 107-123.

88. The pastoral dimensions of these plays are nicely covered in David Young, *The Heart's Forest: A Study of Shakespeare's Pastoral Plays* (New Haven and London, 1972), pp. 1-37, 104-191; Rosalie L. Colie, *Shakespeare's Living Art* (Princeton, NJ, 1974), pp. 261-302; and, to a lesser degree, Thomas McFarland, *Shakespeare's Pastoral Comedy* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1972), pp. 122-175. Some of their tragic characteristics are briefly surveyed in Michael E. Mooney, 'Defining the Dramaturgy of the Late Romances', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 49-56 (pp. 49-50). Given their "happy endings", some or all of the "Romances" naturally find their way into many of the books on the comedies. In addition to those already mentioned, see John Russell Brown, *Shakespeare and his Comedies*, second edition (London, 1962), pp. 205-252; William O. Scott, *The God of Arts: Ruling Ideas in Shakespeare's Comedies* (Lawrence, KS, 1977); A. P. Riemer, *Antic Fables: Patterns of Evasion in Shakespeare's Comedies* (Manchester, 1980); and William C. Carroll, *The Metamorphoses of Shakespearean Comedy* (Princeton, NJ, 1985), pp. 205-243. Mowat's opening chapter in *Dramaturgy* (pp. 5-34) is particularly useful on the relationship of the late plays to the worlds of Shakespearian comedy and tragedy.

89. The idea of adopting Polonius's unlikely category (*Hamlet*, 2.2. 399-400) as a "classification" has become something of a standing joke in *Cymbeline* criticism these days; and see the note on the phrase in Philip Edwards, ed., *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1985), p. 135. The historical dimensions of *Cymbeline* have gained much more attention in recent years, and I have sought to emphasize them myself in Chapter One. Like both *Lucrece* and *Titus Andronicus*, though, *Cymbeline* has generally been neglected in treatments of Shakespeare's Rome. It is almost completely passed over in M. W. MacCallum's seminal book, *Shakespeare's Roman Plays and their Background* (London, 1910; reissued 1967); and even more strangely

absent, considering the scope of the work's title, from Vivian Thomas, *Shakespeare's Roman Worlds* (London and New York, 1989). There are of course valid ways available for excluding *Cymbeline* from intentionally partial studies of Shakespeare's Roman plays (see the careful limits set in Geoffrey Miles, *Shakespeare and the Constant Romans* (Oxford, 1996), pp. vii-viii), but silently omitting it is certainly not among them. Finally in this context, with all the generic indeterminacy that has surrounded the play, it was perhaps inevitable that *Cymbeline* should have found its way some day, if only by means of one of its many plot-strands, into the ever-changing category of the "problem plays": see the chapter, 'The Wager in *Cymbeline*', in William Witherle Lawrence, *Shakespeare's Problem Comedies*, second edition (New York, 1960; first edition, 1931), pp. 174-205.

90. It is probably fair to say that *Henry VIII* has been ignored or barely noticed in most books on Shakespeare's history plays. It is certainly treated in this way in many of the basic critical texts on the genre, including: E. M. W. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays* (London, 1944); Lily B. Campbell, *Shakespeare's "Histories": Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy* (San Marino, CA, 1947); M. M. Reese, *The Cease of Majesty: A Study of Shakespeare's History Plays* (London, 1961); Holderness, *Shakespeare's History*, and its subsequent re-working as *Shakespeare Recycled: The Making of Historical Drama* (Hemel Hempstead, 1992); and Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History* (1991). And see besides the books on the history plays by John W. Blanpied, John C. Bromley, Wolfgang Iser, Robert C. Jones, Michael Manheim, C. W. R. D. Moseley, Robert B. Pierce, Moody E. Prior, Robert Rentoul Reed, Jr., and James Winny, all of which are included in the Bibliography.

It seems that the decision to exclude *Henry VIII* from such studies has not always been entirely the responsibility of the actual author. Thus Hugh M. Richmond has blamed the absence of a chapter on this work from his own book on the histories (*Shakespeare's Political Plays* (New York, 1967; reissued Gloucester, MA, 1977)) on the direct opposition of his publisher (see his *King Henry VIII*, *Shakespeare in Performance* (Manchester and New York, 1994), p. vii). Removing *Henry VIII* from the history plays and including it instead among the "Romances" has become effectively standard practice, as is shown by its recent omission, on the excuse of being saved for a later volume in the series, from Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering A Nation: A feminist account of Shakespeare's English histories*, *Feminist Readings of Shakespeare* (London and New York, 1997); see p. 216, note 2. I explore the generic tensions in this play in more detail in Chapter Six.

91. The connections between these plays have often been noted. See, for example, Joyce H. Sexton, *The Slandered Woman in Shakespeare* (Victoria, BC, 1978); Dorothea Kehler, 'Teaching the Slandered Women of *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale*', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 80-86; and (omitting *Much Ado*) Lawrence Danson, "'The Catastrophe is a Nuptial": The Space of Masculine Desire in *Othello*, *Cymbeline*, and *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 46 (1993), 69-79. Any simple

thematic links here are of course boosted by the well-known overlapping of names: Leonato/Leontes/Leonatus, Iago/Iachimo, and the ghost/silent Innogen as wife to Leonato in *Much Ado About Nothing* (see the original entry direction to the opening scene - TLN 2 in the Folio text).

92. One of the few generic categories to which *Cymbeline* cannot be made to belong! On the neglect suffered by "Shakespeare's Greece", see John W. Velz, 'The Ancient World in Shakespeare: Authenticity or Anachronism? A Retrospect', *Shakespeare Survey*, 31 (1978), 1-12. Velz notes that Greek worlds are as common as Roman ones in the canon, and offers (pp. 5-7) some of the very little criticism I have come across pursuing generic links between the plays concerned (but see too the recent essay by Sara Hanna, 'Shakespeare's Greek World: The Temptations of the Sea', in Gillies and Vaughan, *Playing the Globe*, pp. 107-128). I would point out that none of the late plays make it into James Emerson Phillips, Jr., *The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays* (New York, 1940). A few of them (both Greek and Roman) do get considered in a decidedly non-mainstream book on Shakespeare and the classical world by Howard B. White, *Copp'd Hills Towards Heaven: Shakespeare and the Classical Polity* (The Hague, 1970). Useful comment on the Greek atmosphere of *The Winter's Tale* (a subject much neglected in later criticism) can be found in F. W. Moorman's original Arden edition (London, 1912; second edition, 1922), pp. xxiii-xxv.

There are perhaps really two mini-groups/sub-genres involved here (with *Troilus and Cressida* typically anomalous): the three plays that are set mainly in or near Athens (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Timon of Athens*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*); and the three Mediterranean/Hellenistic plays (*The Comedy of Errors*, *Pericles*, *The Winter's Tale* - to which, strictly speaking, should also be added the rather different *Twelfth Night* (see Hanna, pp. 107, 113)). These last have in fact received quite a bit of critical attention as a related group, but this is not usually cast in generic terms (see below, note 109).

93. It is not difficult to come up with other potential "genres" based simply on location - Shakespeare's Italian or European plays, for example. Of more immediate critical interest are the numerous standard plot-devices and motifs in the late plays already familiar from earlier in Shakespeare's career - bed tricks, disguised heroines, apparent deaths, sleeping potions, and so on. For recent commentary exploring the connections involved here, see especially Leah Scragg, *Shakespeare's Mouldy Tales: Recurrent Plot Motifs in Shakespearian Drama* (London and New York, 1992); and also, adding further examples, Kehler, 'Teaching the Slandered Women'; and Raymond B. Waddington, 'Entertaining the Offered Phallacy: Male Bed Tricks in Shakespeare', in Mucciolo and others, pp. 121-132.

94. For a generally thorough survey of the tragicomic genre, see Marvin T. Herrick, *Tragicomedy: Its Origin and Development* (Urbana, IL, 1955); David L. Hirst's *Tragicomedy, The Critical Idiom*, 43 (London and New York, 1984) is more limited in both scope and quality. There

are also two excellent collections of essays on tragicomedy in the period: Nancy Klein Maguire, ed., *Renaissance Tragicomedy*; and McMullan and Hope, eds., *The Politics of Tragicomedy* - see especially the respective editorial introductions: Maguire, 'Towards Understanding Tragicomedy', pp. 1-10; McMullan and Hope, 'The Politics of Tragicomedy, 1610-50', pp. 1-20; and also John T. Shawcross's essay, 'Tragicomedy as Genre, Past and Present', in *Renaissance Tragicomedy*, pp. 13-32. In addition to these, I have found particularly useful Madeleine Doran's chapter, 'Tragi-Comedy', in her *Endeavors of Art: A study of form in Elizabethan drama* (Madison, WI, 1954), pp. 186-215.

Just about the only other generic description not so far mentioned to be invoked with any frequency for (at least some of) the late plays has been the term "miracle play"; see Felperin's chapter on *Pericles* in *Shakespearean Romance*, pp. 143-176 (developing his earlier article, 'Shakespeare's Miracle Play', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 18 (1967), 363-374); and, though it is easily the most incomprehensible book on late Shakespeare which it has been my misfortune to read, H. W. Fawcner's *Shakespeare's Miracle Plays: 'Pericles', 'Cymbeline', and 'The Winter's Tale'* (Cranbury, NJ, 1992).

95. *The Two Noble Kinsmen* was registered to John Waterson, the printer of the quarto edition, in an entry dated 8 April 1634, which reads: 'a TragiComedy called the two noble kinsmen by Jo: ffletcher & Wm. Shakespeare' (the entry is reproduced in Schoenbaum, *Records and Images*, p. 226, and transcribed in Waith, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, p. 1). For criticism treating the late plays (or at least the "four Romances") specifically as tragicomedies, see in particular Hartwig, *Shakespeare's Tragicomic Vision*; and also Herrick (pp. 249-260), who refers to *The Winter's Tale* as 'certainly a tragicomedy' (p. 258); Hirst, pp. 3-34; and Caesarea Abartis, *The Tragicomic Construction of 'Cymbeline' and 'The Winter's Tale'* (Salzburg, 1977). However, as Nancy Klein Maguire rightly points out, 'many modern Shakespearians avoid the term "tragicomedy" entirely' ('Towards Understanding Tragicomedy', p. 1).

96. Actually, it could be said that the neglect of the genre goes back to Shakespeare himself, since "tragicomedy" is a category peculiarly absent from Polonius's list of the many theatrical genres in which the visiting troupe of Players are supposed to be expert (*Hamlet*, 2.2. 397-402).

97. The problems of classification involved here are discussed in Barbara A. Mowat's essay, 'Shakespearean Tragicomedy', in Nancy Klein Maguire, *Renaissance Tragicomedy*, pp. 80-96. Such difficulties derive in part from the multiple historical traditions of tragicomedy - the way the genre takes in both satire and pastoral, and the fact that it enjoyed quite distinct lines of development in England and on the Continent. The general relevance of Italian tragicomedy to the "problem" comedies is considered in G. K. Hunter, 'Italian Tragicomedy on the English Stage', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 6 (1973), 123-148. Similarities in the treatment of gender politics across the two forms of Shakespearian

"tragicomedy" are explored in Helen Wilcox, 'Gender and Genre in Shakespeare's Tragicomedies', in *Reclamations of Shakespeare*, edited by A. J. Hoenselaars (Amsterdam, 1994), pp. 129-138. Along completely different lines, but offering further evidence of the complex nature of the tragicomic genre (and of the real challenges to categorization posed by Shakespearian drama in general), *Antony and Cleopatra* can also be plausibly related to the domain of tragicomedy; see Barbara J. Bono, *Literary Transvaluation: From Vergilian Epic to Shakespearean Tragicomedy* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1984); and Michael Neill, ed., *Anthony and Cleopatra*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 1994), p. 70. Bono herself feels that 'Shakespeare's final plays are as much tragicomedies as romances' (p. 149).

98. Prejudice is surely precisely the right word, a prejudice that has been active, moreover, on many levels - against collaborative authorship, tragicomedy as a mixed/impure genre, style and morality, the supposed politics and supposed audience of the plays, and so on. The neglect and full-scale abuse which the "Beaumont-and-Fletcher" canon has suffered from the literary establishment is quite extraordinary, and clearly reflects (especially where Fletcher is concerned) a pronounced critical blind-spot. Even the standard twentieth-century analysis of "Beaumont-and-Fletcher" tragicomedy (Eugene M. Waith, *The Pattern of Tragicomedy in Beaumont and Fletcher* (New Haven, 1952)) is anything but overwhelming in its praise and enthusiasm; and compare too the way the Fletcher "expert", Cyrus Hoy, is perfectly happy to put forward a pretty damning indictment of the triviality of Fletcherian tragicomedy (see *The Hyacinth Room*, p. 213). In Fletcher's case, of course, the peculiar progress of the authorship debate surrounding *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* has been a crucial factor in aggravating critical hostility, a subject I return to in the next chapter.

99. In his 'To the Reader' remarks in the undated quarto edition of *The Faithful Shepherdess* (c. 1608-1610), Fletcher famously writes: 'a tragie-comedie is not so called in respect of mirth and killing, but in respect it wants deaths, which is inough to make it no tragedie, yet brings some neere it, which is inough to make it no comedie' (Bowers, III (1976), 497). For some typical commentary on Fletcher's theory and the extent of his probable debt to Guarini, see Waith, *The Pattern of Tragicomedy*, pp. 43-50; Herrick, pp. 261-262; and Hirst, pp. 18-24. The obvious inappropriateness of the above definition as a description for *Pericles*, *Cymbeline*, and *The Winter's Tale* has been seized on with real relish by many Shakespearians, whose zealous desire to distinguish Shakespearian from Fletcherian tragicomedy (to the advantage of the former, it goes without saying) has often amounted to nothing short of a moral crusade.

On the rather more open question of the possible direct influence of Guarini, and Italian tragicomic theory and practice in general, on late Shakespearian drama itself, see Robert Henke, 'The Winter's Tale and Guarinian Dramaturgy', *Comparative Drama*, 27 (1993), 197-217 (and also the fuller discussion in his more recent *Pastoral Transformations*:

Italian Tragicomedy and Shakespeare's Late Plays (Cranbury, NJ, 1997)); Louise George Clubb, *Italian Drama in Shakespeare's Time* (New Haven and London, 1989), pp. 125-187; and Robert Y. Turner, 'Slander in *Cymbeline* and Other Jacobean Tragicomedies', *English Literary Renaissance*, 13 (1983), 182-202. We have very little evidence to prove Shakespeare's personal knowledge of contemporary developments in Italian drama, but as Clubb points out (p. 184), *The Tempest*, at least, offers links with Italian *scenari* that do seem undeniable (a topic considered further in Bullough, *Sources*, VIII, 259-261; and Cope, p. 242).

100. On this subject, see McMullan and Hope, who deliberately set out to minimize the importance of Fletcher's 'To the Reader' manifesto as a (predictive) definition of Fletcherian tragicomedy, pointing out that it is an after-the-fact justification of an anomalous, initially unsuccessful play ('The Politics of Tragicomedy', pp. 1-7). A similar position is also expressed in McMullan's book, *The Politics of Unease in the Plays of John Fletcher* (Amherst, MA, 1994), pp. 55-60; and see in addition Philip J. Finkelpearl, *Court and Country Politics in the Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (Princeton, NJ, 1990), pp. 103-104.

101. For a good sense of the generic overlap involved, see Doran, who suggests that 'in writing a history of English tragi-comedy, one would traverse the same ground as in writing a history of romantic drama generally, with special emphasis on romantic comedy' (*Endeavors of Art*, p. 188). Shawcross argues for "tragicomedy" as a much more appropriate description for the late plays than "romance" on the basis of the distinction that romance deals in unrealistic narratives, but tragicomedy in unrealistic treatments of narrative (pp. 27-28). This seems too precise for such multivalent terms, however.

102. Herrick virtually omits *The Tempest* from his section devoted to Shakespearian tragicomedy, arguing that 'there is never much doubt that the outcome will be prosperous for all the characters' (p. 249). Hirst, in contrast, treats it as Shakespeare's consummate tragicomedy (pp. 33-34), but I find his understanding of late Shakespearian drama to be facile and trite, and incline much more to Herrick's opinion here, at least as this relates to the play's generic connections to tragicomedy. That tragic themes are very much present in *The Tempest* is stressed by Orgel in his edition (p. 5). For some recent comment on the play's strong structural relationship to revenge tragedy, see John Kerrigan, *Revenge Tragedy* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 194-216.

103. This classification has already been proposed by Herrick (pp. 255-258), whose book traces in passing the history of this "genre" (see especially pp. 1-15, 92-124). The form has perplexed theorists since the time of Aristotle (for the relevant section of the *Poetics*, see the translation by M. E. Hubbard, in *Classical Literary Criticism*, edited by D. A. Russell and M. Winterbottom, The World's Classics (Oxford, 1989), pp. 51-90 (pp. 66-69, with notes on p. 227)). Euripides furnishes the key classical examples of the type, in plays which may well have had a direct influence on late Shakespeare. Certainly, as Doran stresses, the model

of Euripidean drama provided precedent and warrant in the period 'for the serious play with a nontragic conclusion' (*Endeavors of Art*, p. 200; and see generally pp. 198-201). All of which helps to suggest that the Folio placing of *Cymbeline* is not as simply anomalous in generic terms as it is usually taken to be.

104. Very few critics have in fact sought to approach *Henry VIII* specifically as a tragicomedy (or even a Shakespearian tragicomedy) - see rather the way the play gets sidelined in Hartwig, *Shakespeare's Tragicomic Vision*, pp. 184-189, and distanced from the genre in Waith, *The Pattern of Tragicomedy*, pp. 117-132. Roland Mushat Frye, however, finds 'the pervasive influence' on the play 'of the tragicomic genre with which Shakespeare's mind was now preoccupied' (*Shakespeare: The Art of the Dramatist* (Boston, MA, 1970), p. 123), whilst Dutton, contrasting it to Shakespeare's other histories, regards *Henry VIII* as being essentially tragicomic in mode (*William Shakespeare*, p. 86). One approach which does argue firmly for this precise generic focus is the rather slight article by J. Madison Davis, 'The Problems of *Henry VIII*: History and National Pageant in the Tragicomic Mode', *Selected Papers from the West Virginia Shakespeare and Renaissance Association*, 14 (1989-90), 44-62.

105. And it is also, no less than "Romances", an entirely modern invention as a classification for Shakespearian drama. With regard to the latter, Stanley Wells notes that, 'though in Shakespeare's day the word "romance" had been in the language for two centuries, it occurs in none of his writings. The Elizabethans generally found little use for it, and so far as I know it was never used to describe a play' ('Shakespeare and Romance', p. 49). I find it tempting to think of "late plays" as at least potentially less anachronistic - in the sense that some (or many) members of the Jacobean audiences who encountered these plays as new over a short sequence of theatrical seasons can be assumed to have been aware that they were experiencing the latest work of a long-established talent. The fact remains, though, that most of the term's current connotations are dependent upon the succeeding history of Shakespeare reception.

106. Full-length studies which choose to emphasize "lastness" in their title (or subtitle) but then contrive to ignore both *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* include: Tillyard, *Shakespeare's Last Plays*; Traversi, *Shakespeare: The Last Phase*; Cutts, *Rich and Strange*; and Thomas Nelson, *Shakespeare's Comic Theory*. A small fact that I find rather perplexing is the way "last" has proved an extremely popular term in the titles of essays devoted to just the usual four "Romances"; see, among others, the examples by Bland, Dobrée, R. W. Ingram, Homan, Semon, and R. P. Knowles. With changing attitudes towards collaboration and a far greater willingness amongst critics (and editors) to accept *The Two Noble Kinsmen* into the canon, "last" and "final" appear to have declined in popularity during recent years. Cynthia Marshall's 1991 book, *Last Things and Last Plays*, is something of an exception in this respect, and here the choice of title category is clearly governed by

subject-matter - not that that seems sufficient excuse for the silent omission of *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*.

107. *All Is True* can be placed with unusual precision. A letter dated 4 July 1613 from one Henry Bluett to his uncle, Richard Weeks, describing the burning of the Globe Theatre on 29 June, refers to the work being performed at the time as 'a new play called all is triewe w[hich] had beene acted not passage 2 or 3 times before' (see Maija Jansson Cole, 'A New Account of the Burning of the Globe', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 32 (1981), 352; the relevant passage of Bluett's original is reproduced and transcribed in *Companion*, p. 29, from which I quote). This safely fixes the date of the first performances of *Henry VIII* to mid-1613, provided its co-identity with *All Is True* is accepted. *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is usually felt to be the later play, deriving from sometime in the period 1613-1614 (though Chambers (followed by others) suggests 1612-1613 (*Facts and Problems*, I, 271)). The reference in its Prologue to 'our losses' (l. 32) is often taken to be an allusion to the burning of the Globe. This would seem to establish beyond doubt the priority of *All Is True/Henry VIII*, but the allusion remains uncertain/unprovable, and there has in any case been much debate as to whether the Prologue was written for the first production of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* or for a later revival. For useful discussion of such difficulties, see Bertram, 'The Date of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*' (also included in revised form as an appendix in his book, *Shakespeare and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1965), pp. 283-296); and Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 34-35. Like both these critics, I regard the Prologue as probably integral to the original version of the play, and accept 'our losses' as an allusion to the Globe fire. From the point of view of first performance, then, this would make *The Two Noble Kinsmen* later than *Henry VIII*, though their actual writing could still have overlapped. But even with the exact details unknowable, the very existence of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* should be enough to give reason for caution in any attempt to read *Henry VIII* as the culmination of Shakespeare's career. It has no such effect, however, on Wilson Knight's commitment to this position (*Crown of Life*, pp. 256-336), nor on the similar approach more recently adopted by Myers (pp. 199-219). Indeed, quite a few critics manage to take one step beyond *The Tempest* (generally *Henry VIII*, occasionally *Kinsmen*) whilst ignoring completely the possibility of a second. *Cardenio*, meanwhile, first referred to in May 1613 (with the payment record concerned relating to performance at some stage during the 1612-13 Court season), seems to have pre-dated both *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, whatever the truth about its authorship.

108. I am thinking of the extreme level of "seriousness" and the sense of "significance" that has often been attached to *The Tempest*, and to Prospero's Epilogue in particular. Some of Knight's absurder rhapsodizings over *Henry VIII* also come to mind (most evident in *The Crown of Life*, pp. 329-336). The discomfortingly bleak tone of the end of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* offers the appealing possibility of a decidedly un-Dowdenesque take on the close of Shakespeare's career. I have not

pursued this, though, since uncertainties about chronology remain, and I have no desire simply to produce another Strachey-like inversion of Dowden's simplistic mode of biographical interpretation.

109. The common Mediterranean setting of *The Comedy of Errors*, *Pericles*, and *The Winter's Tale*, mentioned above (note 92), also links all three plays closely to the world of the New Testament (primarily The Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles - Paulina being a key figure in *The Winter's Tale* in this respect). Resemblances across these plays have often been noted; see especially the recent work by T. G. Bishop, *Shakespeare and the theatre of wonder* (Cambridge, 1996). The *Comedy of Errors/Tempest* connections are also well-known, covered, for example, by Stanley Wells in his New Penguin edition of the former play (Harmondsworth, 1972), pp. 19-21 (and often commented on to me by him). Besides structure, a Mediterranean setting and the active role of the sea in the plot again provide common motifs. Given all these similarities, there is certainly something in Ralph Berry's suggestion that 'to see *The Comedy of Errors* as the first of the final romances is no great paradox of vision' (*Shakespeare and the Awareness of the Audience* (London, 1985), p. 30). And see further Kahn, 'The Providential Tempest', which treats *Twelfth Night* alongside the four plays already mentioned here, but noticeably omits *Cymbeline*.

110. Some of the links between *Henry VIII* and *King John* (which go beyond mere critical neglect and non-tetralogy status) are explored in Frances A. Shirley, ed., '*King John*' and '*Henry VIII*': *Critical Essays* (New York and London, 1988), pp. xi-xxii; and in Eugene M. Waith, '*King John*, *Henry VIII*, and the Arts of Performing Shakespeare's History Plays', in Biggs and others, *The Arts of Performance*, pp. 70-83. The resemblances between *Henry VIII* and the *Henry VI* plays are primarily structural, but its connections with *Richard III* have more to do with overlapping historical material. I return to this subject in Chapter Six, but see also Hugh M. Richmond, 'The Resurrection of an Expired Form: *Henry VIII* as Sequel to *Richard III*', in *Shakespeare's English Histories*, edited by John W. Velz (Binghamton, NY, 1996), pp. 205-228. I touched on the many *Cymbeline/Titus* parallels in Chapter One; and see again Ann Thompson, 'Philomel in *Titus Andronicus* and *Cymbeline*'; on *Cymbeline* and *Lucrece*, see especially Nancy Vickers, '"The blazon of sweet beauty's best": Shakespeare's *Lucrece*', in *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, edited by Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman (New York and London, 1985), pp. 95-115 (pp. 100-101). A relationship between *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and both *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* is obvious. With *Love's Labour's Lost*, Holofernes is one of the models for Gerrold, and there are also a good many minor allusions and verbal details shared across the two plays.

111. Two books, at least, have sought to address the late plays in this manner: Kenneth Muir, *Last Periods of Shakespeare, Racine, and Ibsen* (Liverpool, 1961); and Grene, *Reality and The Heroic Pattern: Last Plays of Ibsen, Shakespeare, and Sophocles*; neither is especially

enlightening. Considerably more interesting to my mind, though, is Norman Rabkin's discussion comparing to late Shakespearian drama the final novels of Thomas Mann (in *Shakespeare and the Problem of Meaning* (1981), pp. 118-140). The example of Beethoven is often cited in this context (see, for instance, Muir, pp. 3-5), and similarities between his late-period works, in the shape of the last five piano sonatas and string quartets, and late Shakespeare have often been suggested (as they are in Nosworthy, *Cymbeline*, p. lxxviii). I find this idea appealing, but only if it takes into account the deeply serious, radical, and still genuinely challenging artistry of the Beethoven pieces concerned. The truly extraordinary late chamber works of Dmitri Shostakovich provide another relevant example from the world of music of what "lateness" in art can be about. However, it should be stressed that, as is the case with Shakespeare himself, neither of these composers need really be thought of as "old" at the time of their "late" period.

112. Nosworthy sentimentalizes late Beethoven quite abominably (and I have doubts about the quality of his music criticism), but his description of the distinctive artistry of the composer's final-period works relates well to what I am saying here: 'the late sonatas and quartets seem to adhere to no recognized musical form; the melodies are often so artless as to appear childish; treble twitterings are followed suddenly, and without any perceptible formula, by rumblings deep in the bass; the development sometimes appears to take the form of five-finger exercises; fugal episodes have an unaccountable habit of turning into something altogether different; archaic elements are introduced; and there are remote modulations and decidedly queer harmonies' (*Cymbeline*, p. lxxviii).

113. We have very little reliable information about such things, but critics have still speculated, directly or indirectly, as to when any possible credit Shakespeare may have had with his professional associates in this regard finally ran out. Thus Theodore Spencer, for example, at the close of a reading of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* that recognizes the play's technical idiosyncrasies but attributes these to the dramatist's age and exhaustion rather than anything else, imagines a deputation of his colleagues calling on Shakespeare 'to suggest that, all things considered, it would be wise to go home and write no more' (see 'The Two Noble Kinsmen', *Modern Philology*, 36 (1938-39), 255-276 (p. 276); reprinted in Spencer, *Selected Essays*, pp. 220-241). This idea forms the core of Dawson's mini-play in his 'Tempest in a Teapot' article, although here it is *Cymbeline* and *Henry VIII* that stand as the offending works (pp. 63-64). Both critics make much of Shakespeare's supposed tiredness, for which I can see no evidence at all.

114. Much of the discussion of the connections involved here has been polemical - unproductively dogmatic and unnecessarily obsessed with issues of artistic quality and evaluation. The relevance of the masque is played down by Allardyce Nicoll ('Shakespeare and the Court Masque', *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 94 (1958), 51-62), but rather less

negatively addressed in Jean Jacquot, 'The Last Plays and the Masque', in *Shakespeare 1971*, edited by Clifford Leech and J. M. R. Margeson (Toronto, 1972), pp. 156-173. It can tend to get forgotten that the Jacobean court masque was still in its relative infancy at the time of the late plays, and that Shakespeare's own example in *The Tempest* itself seems to have helped mould the later development of the form (see Orgel's edition, pp. 43-47; and also his essay, 'The Poetics of Spectacle', in Orgel and Roy Strong, *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1973), pp. 1-14 (see p. 10)). The guiding influence of *Philaster* on *Cymbeline* is asserted by Thorndike (pp. 152-160), questioned by Daniel Morley McKeithan (*The Debt to Shakespeare in the Beaumont-and-Fletcher Plays* (Austin, TX, 1938; reissued New York, 1970), pp. 223-224), and vigorously denied by Harold S. Wilson ('*Philaster and Cymbeline*', in *English Institute Essays: 1951*, edited by Alan S. Downer (New York, 1952), pp. 146-167). The relative dating of the two plays remains problematic, but it seems better in any case to assume a period of intense cross-fertilization between the three dramatists involved (see further *Philaster*, edited by Andrew Gurr, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1969), pp. xlv-1; and note the additional factors raised in John H. Astington, 'The Popularity of *Cupid's Revenge*', *Studies in English Literature*, 19 (1979), 215-227). The various problems with Bentley's thesis about the shaping effects on the late plays of the Blackfriars Theatre are neatly pointed out in J. A. Lavin, 'Shakespeare and the Second Blackfriars', *The Elizabethan Theatre*, 3 (1973), 66-81, but this essay is in turn yet another over-reaction. I would want to resist all interpretations that sought to read any of the influences here as either simply deterministic or working in only one direction.

115. Such retrospective elements have been much discussed, and I shall have more to say on them myself in later chapters. Particularly thoughtful comment on Shakespeare's continuing interest in the drama of his early years can be found in M. C. Bradbrook, *The Living Monument* (1976); on the late plays specifically, see pp. ix, 184-226. Compare too her *Shakespeare: The poet in his world* (London, 1978), which links this aspect of late Shakespearian drama (including *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*) to the playwright's return to the home town of his youth (see pp. 221-237, especially p. 224). I prefer to think of it as reflecting more a professional interest in the history of the English drama.

116. This is perhaps truest of all where *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is concerned, as Potter's wonderfully succinct description of the play indicates: '*The Two Noble Kinsmen* is a Jacobean dramatization of a medieval English tale based on an Italian romance version of a Latin epic about one of the oldest and most tragic Greek legends' (*The Two Noble Kinsmen*, p. 1). It is also intriguing to consider the recurring presence in late Shakespeare of the legendary poet Orpheus in the light of the interest suggested here (on the references and possible allusions to Orpheus across the late plays, see David Armitage, 'The Dismemberment of Orpheus: Mythic Elements in Shakespeare's Romances', *Shakespeare Survey*, 39 (1986), 123-133).

117. On the problems involved in dating Shakespeare's works, and the various forms of evidence available, see Gary Taylor, 'Canon and Chronology', pp. 89-109; the history of Shakespearian chronology is commented on further in *Companion*, pp. 36-37. Malone stands as the key historical influence, and modern Shakespeare chronologies remain close in most respects to his final thoughts on the subject (see Schoenbaum, *Shakespeare's Lives*, pp. 162-171; and Peter Martin, *Edmond Malone, Shakespearian Scholar* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 30-35). Whilst it has little immediate relevance to my main concerns, I have certainly benefited from the critique of Malone's work on chronology and his legacy in Margreta de Grazia, *Shakespeare Verbatim* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 132-152. Studies of Shakespearian chronology have generally elided the issue of whether a play is properly dated by its first performance, the "completion" of its script or first draft, or the period during which it was written. Furthermore, we do not even know whether Shakespeare worked on his plays in succession or concurrently, or indeed if he varied his habits in this regard. The persistent ability of critics, so dominant in late play criticism, to identify progression, development, improvement between one play and its "successor", is merely a fantasy.

118. Dowden borrows the idea of the four periods in Shakespeare's career (but not his descriptive tags for them) from Furnivall. Thus the 'Trial Table of the Order of Shakspeare's Plays' he includes in the original Preface to *Shakspeare: His Mind and Art* (pp. viii-ix) is taken from Furnivall's 'Introduction' in the 1874 edition of G. G. Gervinus, *Shakespeare Commentaries*, translated by F. E. Bunnètt, pp. xxi-lv (see pp. liv-lv; I have used the sixth edition of this work (London, 1903)). Gervinus himself influences both these critics through his division of the canon into three main periods (the scholarship cited in note 4 is relevant here, and see further William Benzie, *Dr. F. J. Furnivall: Victorian Scholar Adventurer* (Norman, OK, 1983), pp. 179-220). Once again, Coleridge had arrived at the subject first (see *Shakespearian Criticism*, I, 208-214). Furnivall's own project, perfectly realized in Dowden's work, was precisely to make interpretation dependent upon chronology. His presence can still very much be felt in the tradition of critical biography or in complete editions that attempt to order Shakespeare's plays by date.

119. Despite the disagreements over detail already mentioned, a basically late dating for *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, *The Tempest*, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* has been widely accepted since at least the time of the NSS. The lateness of *Henry VIII* is now rarely questioned, given its presumed identity with *All Is True*, but up until the last quarter of the nineteenth century it was often perceived to be mainly an Elizabethan play, revised/modified sometime during James's reign. For a belated and deeply unconvincing version of this theory, see Karl Elze, 'King Henry VIII', in his *Essays on Shakespeare*, translated by L. Dora Schmitz (London, 1874), pp. 151-192; the idea that the play is a revision was rather oddly revived in the twentieth century by Chambers (*Facts and Problems*, I, 497-498). The only real doubts that remain, however,

concern *Pericles*, cited by Dryden (possibly on the authority of some oral tradition now lost) as an example of Shakespeare's very earliest work (see 'An Epilogue (Were you but half so wise as you're severe)', ll. 16-19, in *The Poems of John Dryden, Volume I: 1649-1681*, edited by Paul Hammond (London and New York, 1995), pp. 339-340; the poem was first printed in *Miscellany Poems* (London, 1684); Dryden's lines are discussed in Hoeniger, *Pericles*, p. lxiii, though their source is there misidentified). The argument that the surviving text represents an early play by Shakespeare revised or even completed during his later years cannot be dismissed out of hand. One recent proponent, adopting his usual charmless tone of polemic and exaggeration, has been Eric Sams ('The Painful Misadventures of *Pericles* Acts I-11', *Notes and Queries*, 236 (1991), 67-70). A much more considered approach to this possibility is offered by James O. Wood, over a series of articles (in particular, 'The Shakespearean Language of *Pericles*', *English Language Notes*, 13 (1975-76), 98-103; 'Shakespeare, *Pericles*, and the Genevan Bible', *Pacific Coast Philology*, 12 (1977), 82-89; and 'The Case of Shakespeare's *Pericles*', *San José Studies*, 6, no. 2 (May 1980), 39-58). The thesis is not one that convinces me, but I do feel that the problems and anomalies that surround *Pericles* have yet to be solved or explained at all adequately; I address some of the issues involved further in Chapter Three.

120. Thus *Pericles* is assigned to 1607 and *Coriolanus* to 1608; see *Companion*, pp. 130-131, where it is remarked that 'most editors place *Coriolanus* before *Pericles*, but that arrangement seems based upon nothing more than a desire to lump the romances together in a single chronological sequence' (p. 131). And of course, the Oxford editors break with tradition further in positioning *Cymbeline* (1610) after *The Winter's Tale* (1609).

Another major reputable dissident voice in recent years on the subject of late Shakespearian chronology has been that of J. Leeds Barroll (see 'The Chronology of Shakespeare's Jacobean Plays and the Dating of *Antony and Cleopatra*', in *Essays on Shakespeare*, edited by Gordon Ross Smith (University Park, PA and London, 1965), pp. 115-162; and especially *Politics, Plague, and Shakespeare's Theater: The Stuart Years* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1991; reprinted 1995)). Barroll's main area of interest lies in reassessing the dating of the tragedies (work I make use of below), and his conclusions regarding the late plays are quite conventional (*Politics*, pp. 172-209). So he draws attention to the lack of surviving records for court performances in the 1610-11 season to suggest that *Cymbeline* was put on at that time, using this idea to locate the play before *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* (pp. 199-205). Whilst this is certainly plausible, the theory, as I see it, bases rather a lot on an absence of evidence.

121. In two Stationers' Register entries for 20 May 1608 (see note 39), reproduced in Schoenbaum, *Records and Images*, pp. 218-219. Both *Pericles* and *Antony and Cleopatra* are here assigned to Edward Blount, in what are usually taken to be attempted "blocking entries", since no

editions appear to have followed. Shakespeare himself is not actually named, but there is no good reason to doubt that the two plays involved are both his. Oxford places *Antony and Cleopatra* in 1606 (*Companion*, p. 129), and there is a firm consensus amongst recent editors for 1606-1607 (see Neill, pp. 20-22, and the editions by David Bevington and John Wilders included in the Bibliography; and see too Barroll, 'Chronology'). This dating is mainly based on evidence for the play's influence, which does seem genuinely convincing, but is by no means incontrovertible. And in any case *Pericles*, even with only one layer of composition, could conceivably be just as early. It is always worth remembering that, as Gary Taylor points out, 'references to a play usually only establish its existence, not its age' ('Canon and Chronology', p. 90).

122. The focus on "naming" in *Pericles* and *Coriolanus* has been much discussed in the individual critical traditions for each play, but I cannot remember any direct comparisons having been drawn. A shared interest in exile provides a further connecting theme. One of the obvious advantages of the Oxford re-ordered juxtaposition of these two works is the encouragement it can provide to see beyond what has usually been taken to be the deep stylistic and thematic divide between them.

Critical treatment of *Antony and Cleopatra* as a "romantic tragedy" is a pointer to the way this text has been read as leading on to the late plays. Its multiple generic pulls and technical audacity are surveyed in Neill, pp. 1-5. Thematic, verbal, and source connections with *Cymbeline* abound, and indeed this latter play stands as something of a direct sequel to *Antony and Cleopatra*, occupying third place in a chain stretching back to *Julius Caesar*; see on this Hugh M. Richmond, 'Shakespeare's Roman Trilogy: The Climax in *Cymbeline*', *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, 5 (1972), 129-139.

123. It is in fact this existence of a group of tragedies (*Timon of Athens*, *Coriolanus*, *Antony and Cleopatra*) often regarded as "late" which creates some of the biggest problems and greatest scope for confusion in the use of the category, "late plays". The overlap of meaning involved is easily illustrated. For example, the collection by Tobias and Zolbrod, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, also includes essays on *Timon* and *Coriolanus* (and even *King Lear*); and in similar terms, Russ McDonald focuses on *Coriolanus* and *Antony and Cleopatra* in his article, 'Late Shakespeare: Style and the Sexes', *Shakespeare Survey*, 46 (1993), 91-106. The ambiguities that arise here are of course one of the primary reasons why "last plays" has proved such an appealing alternative, since it can effectively be employed to exclude the tragedies concerned.

124. The manuscript payment record, dated 31 March, preserved in the 'Account' of Thomas Screvin, steward to the sixth Earl of Rutland, is reproduced and discussed in S. Schoenbaum, *William Shakespeare: A Documentary Life* (Oxford, 1975), p. 220, and transcribed in *Companion*, p. 124. The obvious potential relevance of this *impresa* to *Pericles*, Scene 6, is considered in Alan R. Young, 'A Note on the Tournament

Impresas In *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 36 (1985), 453-456; see too the brief comment in Oxford, p. xxi. Shakespeare would presumably have been responsible for writing the motto text, but he might perhaps also have designed (or have been involved in designing) the device.

125. On Shakespeare's epitaph and its attribution, see *Companion*, pp. 459-460. The date and authorship of the other occasional pieces ascribed to Shakespeare included in the Oxford edition (pp. 881-887) are discussed in *Companion*, pp. 449-459. If accepted as Shakespearian, the epitaph on Elias James and the two on John Combe would probably be late period "works", whilst the Stanley Tomb verses and the Ben Jonson comic epitaph could be. The Oxford editors, quite impressively to my mind, find a parallel between the three-line 'Upon a pair of gloves' and *Pericles*, Sc.14. 17 (*Companion*, p. 455), which may or may not have a bearing on the dating of either work. The poem they call 'Upon the King' was included in the 1616 edition of the *Works* of King James I (*Companion*, p. 459), and was presumably written sometime around that date, which would place it right at the end of Shakespeare's career. It is a piece that has gained a minor role for itself in the debate over the authorship of *Henry VIII* (discussed in Chapter Six). Given the badly neglected state of the poetic apocrypha, there could still be other relevant texts "out there". But I would hasten to stress after all these examples the need to remain rigorously sceptical about the possibility of Shakespearian involvement in any of these poems.

126. See primarily Donald W. Foster, 'A *Funeral Elegy*: W[illiam] S[hakespeare]'s "Best-Speaking Witnesses"', followed by a text of the poem, *PMLA*, 111 (1996), 1080-1105. The validity of the ascription and the controversy that has surrounded it are discussed in Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare: The Poet and his Plays* (1997), pp. 393-398; and see the 'Forum' on the poem, edited by Leeds Barroll, in *Shakespeare Studies*, 25 (1997), 89-237. As Wells notes, the new case for Shakespearian authorship fails to answer some of the main objections Foster himself raised in his earlier book on the subject (*Elegy By W.S.: A Study in Attribution* (Cranbury, NJ, 1989), a work which had the rare courage in authorship studies to sit firmly on the fence). My own view, for what it's worth (and on limited acquaintance), is that, as an aesthetic achievement, *A Funeral Elegy* is rather less impressive even than the much-ridiculed 'Shall I Die?' (Oxford, p. 883), whilst the evidence for its ascription to Shakespeare seems more dubious still. Possible thematic parallels between "W.S."s poem and late Shakespeare are pursued, with questionable enthusiasm, in Richard Abrams, 'W[illiam] S[hakespeare]'s "Funeral Elegy" and the Turn from the Theatrical', *Studies in English Literature*, 36 (1996), 435-460.

127. The phrase quoted is part of the head-title on the first page of text (see *BEPD* 272a); whether the three other plays to which it refers ever actually existed is obviously a moot point. Shakespearian involvement in both *A Yorkshire Tragedy* and *The Puritan* has been quite unconvincingly reasserted in recent years in Mark Dominik, *Shakespeare-*

Middleton Collaborations (Beaverton, OR, 1988). For the usual position on this issue, see MacD. P. Jackson, *Studies in Attribution: Middleton and Shakespeare* (Salzburg, 1979), pp. 41-53, which also gets to grips with the subject of dating; and see too *Companion*, pp. 140-141, where the intriguing possibility mentioned here is discussed. One reason for pursuing speculation about the idea that Shakespeare had something to do with *A Yorkshire Tragedy* is that this is the hardest of the Third Folio supplementary plays (other than *Pericles*) to discount. Thus the attribution in the 1608 quarto is backed up by the original Stationers' Register entry for the play, its unfeigned inclusion in the 1619 Pavier quartos, and its subsequent copyright history. For further details, see the *BEPD* entry (I, 405-407); *Companion*, pp. 76-77; and the edition by A. C. Cawley and Barry Gaines, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1986), pp. 2-6. The remaining four additional plays in F3 are of no concern in this context, since each is certainly earlier than 1606. Dominik has tried to revive the case for Shakespeare's part-authorship of *The Birth of Merlin* (attributed to Shakespeare and William Rowley in its 1662 quarto (*BEPD* 822)), claiming this as another late Shakespearian collaborative work. Again, his main argument has very little going for it, but he does make clear the relevance of the late plays to *The Birth of Merlin*; see *William Shakespeare and 'The Birth of Merlin'*, revised edition (Beaverton, OR, 1991), especially pp. 160-183.

128. See Gary Taylor, 'Canon and Chronology', pp. 89-93. There is a useful table setting out the evidence available for dating the canon in Blakemore Evans, *The Riverside Shakespeare*, pp. 47-56. I should note that I have ignored below cases where minor doubts might obtain to the authenticity of the surviving documentary records. And of course, external evidence is not the only tool available to us for dating Shakespeare's works. Echoes and allusions in other plays, though never absolutely reliable, can be used to help pin down *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Macbeth*, and, for that matter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. The various existing stylistic and linguistic tests strike me as being of little use where precise dating and ordering is concerned, but they obviously serve well in terms of establishing broader patterns. Barroll's work on the dating of the Jacobean tragedies is particularly relevant to my ensuing paragraph. He notes: 'if we acknowledge the strong possibility that "stylistic evidence" and "topical allusion" are not really very definitive in chronology, we are thus left with any possible order of Shakespeare's tragedies after *Hamlet* and *Othello*' ('Chronology', p. 153; and see further the fairly dismissive discussion of internal evidence in *Politics*, pp. 233-239).

129. For likely topical references in *Coriolanus*, see *Companion*, p. 131. The case for identifying *All's Well That Ends Well* with the non-extant, but necessarily sixteenth-century, *Love's Labour's Won* has long since been discredited. With this myth dispelled, there is no evidence that can safely date *All's Well* at all. Oxford assign it to 1604-05, later than has been usual (*Companion*, pp. 126-127). A more recent editor, Susan Snyder, concurs (see her Oxford Shakespeare text (Oxford, 1993),

pp. 20-24). The play's well-known stylistic and thematic connections with the *Sonnets* and *A Lover's Complaint* (see Snyder, pp. 44-48) could, to my mind, push it later still. The tendency towards an earlier dating has largely resulted from critical dissatisfaction with *All's Well*. There again, acknowledging its artistic quality need not have any implications whatsoever with regard to its period of composition.

Timon of Athens is perhaps even harder to locate precisely with proper confidence. Dowden assigned it to 1607-08, treating it as the last of the tragedies (see *Shakspeare: His Mind and Art*, pp. 378-393, and *Shakspeare*, pp. 54-57, 142-144), whilst for Chambers (adopting the same date), *Timon* marked the moment of psychic breakdown that precipitated Shakespeare's turn to romance (*Facts and Problems*, I, 271-274). This is certainly how I was introduced to the play. Oxford, however, as a side-effect of their particular theory of collaborative authorship, place it rather earlier, in 1605 (*Companion*, pp. 127-128). *Timon* does feel very much like a Jacobean play, but even so it really could still belong anywhere in Shakespeare's seventeenth-century career. For an unusual reading of it as some sort of attempted but aborted sequel to *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, see Brownlow, pp. 216-234.

130. Thematic connections between *All's Well* and the late plays are usefully explored in Richard P. Wheeler, *Shakespeare's Development and the Problem Comedies* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1981), pp. 75-91; and G. K. Hunter, ed., *All's Well That Ends Well*, third edition, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1959), pp. liv-lvi; the latter suggests that 'there is a strong case for avoiding the traditional separation of "problem-plays" from "romances" and considering as a group the "later comedies"' (p. lv). *Timon*, meanwhile, has quite often been viewed as having prepared the way along which the late plays were to follow. See especially Northrop Frye, *A Natural Perspective*, pp. 98-100; and two essays by Clifford Leech, 'Timon and After', in his book, *Shakespeare's Tragedies* (London, 1950), pp. 113-136; and 'Masking and Unmasking in the Last Plays', in Kay and Jacobs, pp. 40-59.

131. Oxford conforms with common opinion in assigning *Macbeth* to 1606, but there is no firm evidence to necessitate this traditional dating; the editors are far from explicit with regard to a date for the presumed revision (*Companion*, pp. 128-129). See further Nicholas Brooke, ed., *The Tragedy of Macbeth*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 1990), pp. 59-66, which suggests 1609-10 for the revised version. We know from Forman that *Macbeth* was being performed around the same time as some of the late plays, but we do not know what form of the play he saw. For an excellent essay on the relevance of this play to late Shakespeare, see Alexander Leggatt, 'Macbeth and the Last Plays', in *Mirror up to Shakespeare*, edited by J. C. Gray (Toronto, 1984), pp. 189-207.

132. In proposing the date of 1610 for what they refer to as *The Tragedy of King Lear*, the Oxford editors draw attention particularly to the Folio text's strong "rare vocabulary" links with many of the late plays, and its close subject-matter and source connections with

Cymbeline (*Companion*, p. 131; and see my following note). These issues are treated in greater detail in Gary Taylor, 'King Lear: The Date and Authorship of the Folio Version', in *The Division of the Kingdoms*, edited by Gary Taylor and Michael Warren (Oxford, 1983), pp. 351-468 (on the Folio version and the late plays, see pp. 382-393). No obvious consensus on this controversial subject has emerged as yet, and there is only scanty (and questionable) evidence available; but the possibility that Shakespeare returned to *King Lear* during his "late" period is one full of interest.

133. That close connections exist between *Cymbeline* and *King Lear* is well known. Their similarities are noted by Gervinus (pp. 644-646), and pursued in detail in generic terms in Irving Ribner, 'Shakespeare and Legendary History: *Lear* and *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 7 (1956), 47-52; and see the wider contextualization given this material in the chapter, 'Legendary and Anglo-Saxon History', in Ribner, *The English History Play in the age of Shakespeare*, revised edition (London, 1965; first edition, Princeton, NJ, 1957), pp. 224-265. I have referred to the sharing of similar source material across *Macbeth* and *Cymbeline*, much discussed by others, in Chapter One. *Macbeth* also finds its way, quite rightly, into Ribner's chapter here (pp. 253-259), and all three plays can in fact be profitably thought of together as Shakespeare's "legendary British histories". On the associations involved, see further Geoffrey Bullough, 'Pre-Conquest Historical Themes in Elizabethan Drama', in *Medieval Literature and Civilization*, edited by D. A. Pearsall and R. A. Waldron (London, 1969), pp. 289-321 (p. 321); and Willy Maley, "'This sceptred isle": Shakespeare and the British Problem' (1997), pp. 104-105. Setting aside its obviously different national setting, even *Hamlet* is not entirely irrelevant here (see Bullough, p. 297).

134. Amongst recent critics, Grace Ioppolo, for example, keen to argue that revision was usually undertaken by the original author of a play, naturally has little to say on Shakespearian revision of the work of other playwrights (see *Revising Shakespeare* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1991), especially pp. 55-57). Most study in this latter area has concentrated on the case of *Sir Thomas More* (see below), but the subject of Shakespeare's possible professional (jobbing) involvement in revision surfaces at a number of points in the Introduction to Tucker Brooke, pp. vi-lvi. On the practice of revising or adapting plays for revival in general, see the relevant chapter in Gerald Eades Bentley, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time, 1590-1642* (Princeton, NJ, 1971), pp. 235-263; and Eric Rasmussen's essay, 'The Revision of Scripts', in Cox and Kastan, *A New History of Early English Drama*, pp. 441-460.

135. At least as these exist at the moment, that is. Having said that, though, the current proliferation of computer-based statistical examinations of authorship problems probably offers little hope for an improvement in testing procedures in this area. As most practitioners acknowledge, small samples inevitably skew statistics significantly. They also provide limited raw material on which to build stylistic impressions.

The best chance of producing a convincing case seems to lie, as with *Sir Thomas More*, with revisions to plays surviving in manuscript, where the additional evidence of handwriting and spelling can be available.

136. The date of *Sir Thomas More*, either in its original or its adapted form, is notoriously difficult to determine, but the numerous profanities in the revised passages do seem to indicate composition prior to 1606. The additions could be sixteenth-century, but for a variety of reasons the Oxford editors plump for 1603-1604 (*Companion*, pp. 124-125). See also on this Gary Taylor, 'The date and auspices of the additions to *Sir Thomas More*', in *Shakespeare and 'Sir Thomas More'*, edited by T. H. Howard-Hill (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 101-129; and, for a review of critical opinion, G. Harold Metz, "'Voice and credyt": the scholars and *Sir Thomas More*', in the same volume, pp. 11-44. I touch further on this play in Chapter Six.

137. The 1610 quarto represents *Mucedorus*, according to the claim made on its title-page, 'amplified with new additions, as it was acted before the Kings Maiestie at White-hall on Shroue-sunday night. By his Highnes Seruantes usually playing at the Globe' (BEPD 151c). The probable influence of this play on late Shakespeare has often been noted (for a provocative view, see Frost, pp. 21-23). The possibility that Shakespeare was responsible for adapting/revising *Mucedorus* is given some credence in Tucker Brooke, only to be rejected in a fashion that is not entirely convincing (p. xxvi); see further on this subject, *Companion*, p. 139.

An argument for Shakespeare's revising presence in another play from the years in question, *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* (c. 1611), has lately been advanced (see Eric Rasmussen, 'Shakespeare's Hand in *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 40 (1989), 1-26 - an essay having no connection at all with Charles Hamilton's theories!). This particular play belonged to the King's Men, was licensed in October 1611, and carries a totally unreliable late ascription to Shakespeare in its surviving manuscript (see *Companion*, p. 140). Rasmussen's theory, which concerns itself mainly with some minor pasted-in additions in the manuscript, is speculative in the extreme, but it does offer a further indication of how difficult it is either to pin down such forms of revision or to rule them out entirely.

138. See especially the recent consideration of the date of the writing and compilation of the sequence in Katherine Duncan-Jones, ed., *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, The Arden Shakespeare ([Walton-on-Thames], 1997), pp. 1-28; and also her important earlier article, 'Was the 1609 *Shakespeare's Sonnets* really Unauthorized?', *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 34 (1983), 151-171; and the technical study by A. Kent Hiatt, Charles W. Hiatt, and Anne Lake Prescott, 'When Did Shakespeare Write *Sonnets* 1609?', *Studies in Philology*, 88 (1991), 69-109. Duncan-Jones's reassessment of numerous traditional assumptions, which I find generally persuasive, should have considerable implications for future treatments of the course of Shakespeare's later career.

139. Noticing the vocabulary links between *A Lover's Complaint* and *Cymbeline* has become something of a commonplace in discussions of the poem. See MacD. P. Jackson, *Shakespeare's 'A Lover's Complaint': Its Date and Authenticity* (Auckland, 1965); Eliot Slater, 'Shakespeare: Word Links Between Poems and Plays', *Notes and Queries*, 220 (1975), 157-163; Richard Allan Underwood, *Shakespeare on Love: The Poems and the Plays* (Salzburg, 1985), pp. 112-115; A. K. Heiatt, T. G. Bishop, and E. A. Nicholson, 'Shakespeare's Rare Words: "Lover's Complaint", *Cymbeline*, and *Sonnets*', *Notes and Queries*, 232 (1987), 219-224; and Heiatt, 'Cymbeline and the Intrusion of Lyric into Romance Narrative' (1989). Given its many connections to *All's Well That Ends Well*, composition of *A Lover's Complaint* some time after 1603 and revision or polishing close to 1609 certainly makes for a plausible theory.

140. The Wooer's narrative describing the actions of the Jailer's Daughter beside the palace lake (4.1. 52-103) clearly echoes *A Lover's Complaint* in a number of details, although this has not always been noticed by editors (it is ignored/missed by Waith, and in the editions by Harold Littledale, G. R. Proudfoot, and N. W. Bawcutt, all listed in the Bibliography; Potter does note some of the parallels in her edition (pp. 263, 265), but more are identified in John Kerrigan, 'The *Sonnets* and 'A *Lover's Complaint*' (1986), p. 394). The fact that this echo is found in a part of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (whether by Shakespeare or Fletcher) which alludes simultaneously to *Hamlet* and *Othello* stands for me as potential further testimony to Shakespeare's authorship of *A Lover's Complaint*. Even with Kerrigan's brilliant defence of the poem in his edition, this beautiful, challenging, complex work remains marginal and neglected, probably less well known amongst Shakespearians at the moment than the inconsequential 'Shall I Die?' and *A Funeral Elegy*. As Stanley Wells has reminded me, its use of narrative framing devices recalls early as well as late Shakespeare, its unclosed frame matching the structure of *The Taming of the Shrew*. I am inclined to think of this as another indication of the recursive habits of the later Shakespeare.

141. One of the latest manifestations of the biographical line of approach is Abrams's attempt to read *A Funeral Elegy* as 'a poem not just by Shakespeare but about him' ('W[illiam] S[hakespeare]'s "Funeral Elegy"', p. 436). Putting forward a tendentious argument for why this poem must be the work of a dramatist (pp. 440-441), Abrams argues that the distaste for the theatre it supposedly reveals is a pointer to the reasons and emotions underlying Shakespeare's retirement (pp. 447-449). Deliberately blurring the probable date of *Henry VIII* (p. 449), Abrams sees a parallel for the poem's grief in the content and construction of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (pp. 449-455), 'the single Shakespearean text which we know to postdate the Elegy' (p. 449). I find the whole process of drawing this sort of biographical inference dubious in the extreme, but there are in any case considerable difficulties involved in making certain of the personal references in *A Funeral Elegy* fit in with the details of Shakespeare's own life (see especially ll. 137-152, using the text in the *Norton Shakespeare* (pp. 3303-3320)). And even if there is

any specific biographical information about its author present in this work, this cannot be accessed in isolation from the realm of the poem's textuality, which includes, among other things, the shaping effects (both literary and social) of the elegiac tradition in which it is written.

142. For the biographical details and family history summarized here, see Schoenbaum, *A Documentary Life*, pp. 23-26, 181, 228-242; there remains some element of uncertainty of identification with regard to the various surviving records that are taken to refer to the deaths of the dramatist's brothers. A generally unspeculative and level-headed consideration of the connections between Shakespeare's personal life and his artistic output in his later years is provided in Gareth Lloyd Evans, *Shakespeare V: 1606-1616* (Edinburgh, 1973), pp. 1-23. Directly Dowdenesque biographical readings may have died out almost completely, but psychological and psychoanalytical approaches often take a similar line. Much of this work reflects the appeal of simple patterns and easy correspondences in its failure to consider *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. This is particularly noticeable in Barber and Wheeler, *The Whole Journey*, and Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers*, two books which both seem to want to give the impression of having traced a completed trajectory. Obviously, though, familial relations are very much a central theme in late Shakespearian drama, a topic well surveyed in Gary Waller, 'The Late Plays as Family Romance', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 57-63. But there are no straightforward parallels available between the tone of the plays and anything that is known concerning the events of Shakespeare's later years.

143. All the most significant documentation relating to these events is reproduced in Schoenbaum, *Records and Images*: for the Addenbrooke suit, see pp. 57-64; for the Belott-Mountjoy case, pp. 20-39; and for the Welcombe Enclosures controversy, pp. 64-91. Much of this material is transcribed in Chambers, *Facts and Problems*, II, 114-118, 90-95, 141-152. The Addenbrooke action is placed within the context of Shakespeare's general business dealings in E. A. J. Honigmann, "'There Is a World Elsewhere": William Shakespeare, Businessman', in Habicht, Palmer, and Pringle, *Images of Shakespeare*, pp. 40-46. On the Welcombe affair, see also Robert Bearman, *Shakespeare in the Stratford Records* (Stroud, 1994), pp. 49-59. The documents preserved offer a hint of an echo of Shakespeare's own voice and opinions (see Bearman, pp. 58-59); his personal testimony in the Belott-Mountjoy case is actually recorded (see Oxford, pp. xvi-xvii), albeit in legalese. I should stress that my focus here takes in only a portion (the most obviously interesting public "disputes") of what is known about Shakespeare's later life. For a recent broader (if somewhat lightweight) discussion of his final years, covering all the main information available to us, see Russell Fraser, *Shakespeare The Later Years* (New York, 1992), pp. 247-280. A lot of the information which we now possess, of course, was simply unavailable to Dowden; but Dowden's particular biographical concerns have tended to prevail within late play criticism even in the wake of subsequent discoveries.

144. A similar point is made by Honigmann, in a passage focusing especially on the year 1608, the time of the Addenbrooke suit and the death of Shakespeare's mother. He argues that there were 'extensive business interests in Stratford that needed attention' at this time, and suggests that 'it looks as if Shakespeare intended to tidy his affairs in Stratford and then to resume his career in London'. 1608 was also the year, as Honigmann emphasizes, in which the Blackfriars Theatre syndicate was established. Noting that, as a member of this syndicate, Shakespeare 'pledged himself to pay his share of the rent for twenty-one years', Honigmann puts forward what I find a convincing picture of a dramatist who was anything but 'semiretired and languid' as he embarked on his "late plays", and certainly very far from losing his "interest" in the theatre ("There Is a World Elsewhere", p. 43).

145. See his 'Shakespeare's Will and Testamentary Traditions', in *Shakespeare and Cultural Traditions*, edited by Tetsuo Kishi, Roger Pringle, and Stanley Wells (Cranbury, NJ, 1994), pp. 127-137. There is a photographic reproduction of the will in Schoenbaum, *A Documentary Life*, pp. 242-245, and it is fully transcribed in E. A. J. Honigmann and Susan Brock, *Playhouse wills, 1558-1642* (Manchester and New York, 1993), pp. 105-109. Honigmann views the will as a distinctly atypical example of the form, arguing that Shakespeare was 'largely responsible for its wording and structure' himself ('Shakespeare's Will', p. 131). He also notes 'many signs in it of anger or disappointment, obliquely expressed', which together create a picture, he feels, of an 'afflicted testator' who was anything but contented and forgiving (p. 133). I find the unusual perspective of Honigmann's reading of the will useful and challenging, but that does not mean I am convinced by all of his conclusions. For an equally stimulating, but very different discussion of this document, which comments in passing on Honigmann's position, see Richard Wilson's essay, 'A constant will to publish: Shakespeare's dead hand', in *Will Power* (1993), pp. 184-237.

146. See Bond, *Bingo: Scenes of money and death*, first performed November 1973, and published in Methuen's *Modern Plays* (London, 1974). There are interesting insights on late Shakespeare in many of Bond's published comments about his play. See his Introduction in the above edition, pp. vi-xv; and the associated material reproduced and examined in Malcolm Hay and Philip Roberts, *Edward Bond: A Companion to the Plays* (London, 1978), pp. 57-63; and in Hay and Roberts, *Bond: A Study of his Plays*, Methuen Theatre Profiles (London, 1980), pp. 179-199.

147. I am assuming here some degree of audience awareness of the work of specific dramatists, although Simon Forman, for one, shows no obvious interest in the question of who was responsible for writing the plays which he went to watch. Whatever the knowledge or reactions of individual spectators, however, Shakespeare had undoubtedly acquired a visible public profile as a writer of plays by this time, as various contemporary allusions testify (see Oxford, pp. xxxviii-xli, for examples). The most extended explicit evidence for any revivals from Shakespeare's

pre-1607 canon during his later years is to be found in payment records relating to the 1612-13 Court season, which included the period of celebration for the wedding of Princess Elizabeth. The titles listed leave some room for uncertainty, but *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Othello*, some of the Falstaff plays, and possibly *Julius Caesar* were presented (as were *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* - and *Cardenio*); see Alvin Kernan, *Shakespeare, the King's Playwright* (New Haven and London, 1995), p. 208. Provincial performances of a few plays are also known to us, but clear evidence for revivals in the commercial London theatres is minimal, except in the case of *Othello* (1610) and the version of *Macbeth* seen by Forman (I have used the distillations of the available material supplied in Chambers, *Facts and Problems*, II, 334-345 (where all the appropriate documentation is transcribed); and Roslyn Lander Knutson, *The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company, 1594-1613* (Fayetteville, AR, 1991), pp. 179-209 (see pp. 165-177 as well)). In addition to definitive references, the publication or reprinting of plays (see below) can often furnish direct evidence of theatrical revival, or at least reason for speculation about its possibility.

148. Besides *Pericles*, canonical plays which (so far as we can tell) were first published during Shakespeare's later years - by my terms, 1607-1616 - include *King Lear* (1608) and *Troilus and Cressida* (1609); those republished, *1 Henry IV* (1608 and 1613), *Richard II* (1608 and 1615), *Romeo and Juliet* (1609), *Hamlet* (1611), *Titus Andronicus* (1611), and *Richard III* (1612), plus *Pericles* itself (1609 and 1611); see the table of quarto play editions in Chambers, *Facts and Problems*, II, 394-396. *A Yorkshire Tragedy* (1608) is the single non-canonical play-text from these years to carry Shakespeare's name; other questionable (apparent) attributions are done using initials only (so *The Puritan* (1607) and *Thomas, Lord Cromwell* (1613) are both, like *A Funeral Elegy*, assigned to "W.S." (BEPD 251a and 189b), and *The Troublesome Reign of King John* (1611) to "W.Sh." (BEPD 101/102 b)). Turning to the poems, *Lucrece* was reissued in 1607 and 1616, and *Venus and Adonis* probably once or twice between 1607 and 1609 (the situation in this latter case is complicated by false datings; see John Roe, ed., *The Poems*, The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 287-289). Shakespearian involvement in some of these derivative octavos has occasionally been posited, but seems unlikely (see Roe, pp. 289-292). Robert Chester's *Love's Martyr* (containing *The Phoenix and the Turtle*) was reprinted, re-titled, in 1611 (Roe, p. 42), and the much expanded third edition of *The Passionate Pilgrim* appeared in 1612. In respect of this last publication, it is possible to catch another faint echo of Shakespeare's own voice and feelings, via Thomas Heywood's somewhat cryptic (and no doubt self-interested) remarks recording a displeased response from Shakespeare to the (mis)use of his name by the printer concerned (see Roe, pp. 59-60; and for the relevant passage (still often misinterpreted) from Heywood's epistle to his *An Apology for Actors* (1612), Hyder Edward Rollins, ed., *The Poems*, A New Variorum Shakespeare (Philadelphia and London, 1938), pp. 533-535).

149. See generally 'Chronology', and the substantial development of this essay's ideas in *Politics* (*passim*, but especially pp. 172-192, 216-226). For the possibility of a connection between plague-closures and the publication (and even composition/revision) of the *Sonnets*, see also Duncan-Jones's edition, pp. 8-13. Barroll makes the massive speculative leap that 'it is as if, when the theaters closed, Shakespeare simply did not wish to write plays' (*Politics*, p. 17). It seems just as plausible to me to suggest that the particularly close attention to detail and verbal patterning to be found in such a work as *Cymbeline* might be the result of an increased leisure for composition conferred by persistent plague-closures.

150. There is little material available concerning Shakespeare's career as an actor beyond general listings of players and questionable traditions (see Chambers, *Facts and Problems*, II, 71-87; and Oxford, p. xix). One result of this is that, apart from recent computer-based attempts at identifying Shakespeare's roles, the subject seems to have received most attention in some of the less scholarly biographies, where can be found the inevitable speculation that Shakespeare played Prospero in person (an idea that gets repeated, for example, in the relevant chapter in Ivor Brown, *How Shakespeare Spent the Day* (London, 1963), pp. 106-118 (p. 109)). Slightly more credibly, perhaps, the role of Time, with its first person claim to responsibility for the overall story, has been suggested as possibly intended for Shakespeare himself (see Ernest Schanzer, ed., *The Winter's Tale*, The New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1969), p. 197, note to l. 22). However, there is no specific evidence to confirm that Shakespeare ever acted after 1603, and the very lack of evidence would in itself seem to suggest his lack of activity within this field (Chambers, II, 72-77).

The surviving documentation casting most light on the history of Shakespeare's share-holdings is reproduced and discussed in Chambers, *Facts and Problems*, II, 52-71 ('Shakespeare's Interests in the Globe and Blackfriars' - see particularly pp. 66-68). Our ignorance over the fate of his Globe Theatre holdings is stressed in Schoenbaum, *A Documentary Life*, pp. 154-156; on his Blackfriars Theatre shares, see further Irwin Smith, *Shakespeare's Blackfriars Playhouse* (1964), pp. 245-247, 278-280. The assumption is often made, especially given their lack of mention in his will, that the dramatist disposed of his various holdings in person. For example, Andrew Gurr has recently asserted unequivocally that by the time of his death Shakespeare 'had sold all his shares in the company and playhouses' (*The Shakespearian Playing Companies* (Oxford, 1996), p. 370). In contrast, Honigmann and Brock 'assume, as others have done, that his shares passed to his daughter Susanna with the rest of his estate and were disposed of after his death' (*Playhouse wills*, p. 9). For my own purposes here, I would just note that Shakespeare could well have retained a shareholding presence in the Second Globe (on which topic, see further G. L. Evans, pp. 14-15).

151. Even Schoenbaum, so concerned to sift fact from speculation, leans firmly towards an acceptance of the traditional, idealized image

of Shakespeare ending his days in peaceful and contented retirement in his Stratford home (*A Documentary Life*, p. 228). I would not want to deny that the surviving records do suggest an increased involvement on Shakespeare's part in events in Stratford during his later years, and it does seem clear that he spent his final months there (or thereabouts). But on the evidence available, there is absolutely no need to assume his permanent residence in Stratford from as early as 1610 or 1611.

152. The relevant documents are again reproduced in Schoenbaum, *Records and Images* (pp. 39-48), and transcribed in Chambers, *Facts and Problems* (II, 154-169). The contract required settlement in September 1613. The standard point of view, which Schoenbaum strongly endorses, is that the Gatehouse was purchased simply as a business investment. Honigmann, however, demurs, stressing both the convenience of its location for the Blackfriars Theatre, and Shakespeare's continuing active theatrical involvement (with *Henry VIII*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and (as he adds) *Cardenio*) during 1613 ("There Is a World Elsewhere", p. 43); Irwin Smith takes a similar line to Honigmann's (*Shakespeare's Blackfriars Playhouse*, pp. 250-252). Shakespeare is also named in a Chancery Suit relating to the Gatehouse in the spring of 1615, which might perhaps be an indication that he was again (or still) in London around that time (see Schoenbaum, *A Documentary Life*, p. 228; *Records and Images*, p. 44).

153. Jonathan Bate has lately proposed the Prince's death as a defining moment for Shakespeare, and possibly 'his cue to retire from the theatre' (*Shakespeare and Ovid*, p. 269). The Globe fire has often been treated as a suitable closing date for the dramatist's career, probably for reasons of critical convenience as much as anything. For some examples, see Schoenbaum, *A Documentary Life*, p. 227; G. L. Evans, pp. 109-110; and Barroll, *Politics*, p. 208. It is a point of view that once again ignores the existence of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, as well as Shakespeare's possible interest or involvement in the Second Globe. Situating *Henry VIII* in 1613 and placing *The Two Noble Kinsmen* after it does create something of a hiatus in Shakespeare's career during 1612. This could be taken to reflect a temporary lay-off from writing, but it might equally imply that he was working on something else, such as one or more of the tragedies usually assumed to be earlier, or even, of course (despite my own sense that the available evidence necessitates scepticism), *Cardenio*; see Barroll, pp. 206-208. In response to this whole vexed question of retirement, Fraser rather sardonically suggests that Shakespeare 'couldn't stop saying goodbye' (p. 251).

154. This is to some extent an intentionally eccentric focus, but it is not a capricious or an arbitrary one. *Cymbeline* and *Henry VIII* in fact form a rather obvious pairing as the two "histories" amongst the late plays; some of the connections involved here are discussed in Bernard Harris, "What's past is prologue": *Cymbeline* and *Henry VIII* (1966); and in Felperin's chapter on the two plays in *Shakespearean Romance*, pp. 177-210. *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, meanwhile, often get lumped together in survey-articles or appendices to books on

the late plays/"Romances". Such a linking is usually made almost by default, however, and these two texts have received surprisingly little in the way of joint critical attention. The best of what there is includes: Northrop Frye, 'Romance as Masque'; Waith, 'Shakespeare and the Ceremonies of Romance'; and Charles Frey, "'O sacred, shadowy, cold, and constant queen": Shakespeare's Imperiled and Chastening Daughters of Romance', in Lenz, Greene, and Neely, *The Woman's Part*, pp. 295-315. Frey's essay groups *Henry VIII* and *Kinsmen* together (in company with *Cardenio*) as 'post-romance' Shakespeare (p. 308; and see too the editors' Introduction to this same volume, pp. 3-16 (p. 6)). A book on Shakespeare's 'post-*Tempest* phase' is currently promised from Richard Abrams (see 'W[illiam] S[hakespeare]'s "Funeral Elegy", p. 435, footnote).

155. In line with this overall approach, I also pay only limited consideration to the separate critical traditions for these last three plays (*The Winter's Tale*, *The Tempest*, and *Pericles*), concentrating my attentions on the more important monographs and individual editions, and on those writings most immediately relevant to the small number of passages in these texts which I discuss in any detail.

156. This persistent trend finally seems to have begun to change in the last decade or so. *The Two Noble Kinsmen* in particular is now receiving (by a long way) more serious critical attention than ever before. It is in fact very much a "happening" text at the moment, strikingly relevant to current interests in dramatic collaboration and issues to do with gender construction, friendship, eroticism, and the broad continuum that is desire. See especially the discussion of the play in Jeffrey Masten, *Textual intercourse: Collaboration, authorship, and sexualities in Renaissance drama* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 49-60; and such recent articles as Richard Mallette, 'Same-Sex Erotic Friendship in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 26 (1995), 29-52; and Laurie J. Shannon, 'Emilia's Argument: Friendship and "Human Title" in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *ELH*, 64 (1997), 657-682. Two key contributory factors that can be identified in the rehabilitation of *Kinsmen* are the publication of Frey's 1989 collection of essays, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*; and the RSC production directed by Barry Kyle which opened the Swan Theatre in 1986. The prefatory material assembled in the programme/text that accompanied this production (*The Two Noble Kinsmen*, with commentary by Simon Trussler, Swan Theatre Plays (London, 1986)) provides a good indication of the general state of *Kinsmen* criticism before reassessment set in.

The reputation of *Henry VIII* has not improved to anything like the same degree, and it still remains very much one of the poor relations of the Shakespeare canon. Even here, though, criticism has at last managed to move away of late from an obsessive concern with authorship, and the play is less readily dismissed these days as a failure or an embarrassment. Important work exemplifying this pleasing critical shift includes Peter L. Rudnytsky, 'Henry VIII and the Deconstruction of History', *Shakespeare Survey*, 43 (1990), 43-57; and the chapter on the play ('Shakespeare, Fletcher, and the question of history') in Ivo

Kamps, *Historiography and Ideology in Stuart Drama* (1996), pp. 91-139. Gordon McMullan, whose monumental Arden 3 edition of *Henry VIII* graced the start of the new century, has produced a series of interesting individual essays on both this play and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*; for details of these, see the Bibliography.

157. Recent years have certainly seen quite a number of articles showing a welcome lack of interest in confining the play to a "Romance" paradigm, and proving far more intent on getting to grips with some of its (Romano-British) historical elements and its complex topicality. Attention has been focused especially, in line with wider contemporary concerns, on the subjects of nationalism and national identity. For examples, see James R. Siemon, "'Perplex'd beyond self-explication': *Cymbeline* and Early Modern/Postmodern Europe', in *Shakespeare in the New Europe*, edited by Michael Hattaway, Boika Sokolova, and Derek Roper (Sheffield, 1994), pp. 294-309; Erica Sheen, 'The Pannonians and the Dalmatians: Reading for a European history in *Cymbeline*', in the same volume, pp. 310-320; Jodi Mikalachki, 'The Masculine Romance of Roman Britain: *Cymbeline* and Early Modern English Nationalism' (1995); and the essays on *Cymbeline* in Klein and Marrapodi, *Shakespeare and Italy* (1999). A somewhat different - and quite unprecedented - sign of new (albeit slightly eccentric) regard can be seen in the way Anthony J. Lewis uses *Cymbeline*, in his book on the comedies, as an exemplary pattern of 'Shakespeare's idiosyncratic presentation of the New Comedy love story' (*The Love Story in Shakespearean Comedy* (Lexington, KY, 1992), p. 4). The course of future study is likely to depend heavily on the new editions in the pipeline (or just published), and it is to be hoped that these will allow the individual qualities of *Cymbeline* to shine through, providing in the process a firm basis for twentyfirst-century criticism and appreciation. Having said that, whilst Warren's 1998 Oxford edition obviously marks an advance on Nosworthy's work, it is in many other respects rather disappointing and unadventurous, and certainly by no means ideal.

158. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, one of the play's editors, Alfred J. Wyatt, expressed the opinion that 'probably no play of Shakespeare's is generally appreciated so far below its real merits as *Cymbeline*' (*Cymbeline*, The Warwick Shakespeare (London and Glasgow, [1897]), p. xviii). Unfortunately, Wyatt's observation can be seen to have held pretty close to the truth for most of the course of the twentieth century as well, where ordinary critical opinion, even into the 1990s, tended to swing more in the direction of Hazelton Spencer's equally extreme disparaging assessment: 'of all the completed plays of Shakespeare's unaided authorship, this seems to me the poorest' (*The Art and Life of William Shakespeare* (New York, 1940; reprinted London, 1947), p. 361). The damaging effect of inappropriate critical models and habits of thought on appreciation of the play was emphasized over thirty years ago in an article by R. A. Foakes ('Character and Dramatic Technique in *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale*', in *Studies in the Arts*, edited by Francis Warner (Oxford, 1968), pp. 116-130 (see pp. 116-118)).

But Foakes's essay itself ends up providing an almost perfect testament to the staying-power of conventional thinking, by perpetuating in its conclusions (pp. 128-130) many of the negative judgements and dubious assumptions that were typical at the time (and for years to come), and which its author claims to want to interrogate and move on from. And see too in this connection Jonathan Bate's admiring discussion of the pioneering defence of *Cymbeline* in Hazlitt's *Characters of Shakespear's Plays*, and the sense this conveys of the failure of twentieth-century criticism to catch up with or build upon Hazlitt's positive attitude and insights here (in Bate, *Shakespearean Constitutions* (1989), pp. 148-153; for Hazlitt's own comments, see pp. 1-11 in Quiller-Couch's edition).

159. The three plays have quite markedly different performance histories. To outline these briefly, *Cymbeline* was re-written by Thomas D'Urfey in the late seventeenth century as *The Injured Princess*, a version which seems to have achieved only limited theatrical success (see T. P. Matheson's Introduction to the Cornmarket Press facsimile reprint (London, 1970)). David Garrick's less sweeping adaptation effectively replaced D'Urfey's on the stage during the second half of the eighteenth century (see the discussion in George Winchester Stone, Jr., 'A Century of *Cymbeline*; or Garrick's Magic Touch', *Philological Quarterly*, 54 (1975), 310-322). For some information on subsequent theatrical treatments, see C. B. Young, 'The Stage-History of *Cymbeline*', in J. C. Maxwell, *Cymbeline*, pp. xliii-lv; Janet Birkett, 'Cymbeline in the Twentieth Century: A Study of Major British Productions' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham, 1983); and Roger Warren's 1989 *Shakespeare in Performance* volume. The play was performed only spasmodically during the course of the nineteenth century, and for much of the twentieth, but in 1991 Ann Thompson was able to write, 'there has been something of a spate of productions of *Cymbeline* in recent years' ('*Cymbeline's* Other Endings', p. 214), and to some extent that has kept up since.

After its radical Restoration re-working by William D'Avenant as *The Rivals*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen* was almost totally ignored by the theatre for two centuries. It has been revived increasingly during recent years, however, though it can hardly be said to have become central repertoire - it will be interesting to see when the RSC next want/dare/feel bound to stage it. See G. Harold Metz, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen on the Twentieth Century Stage', *Theatre History Studies*, 4 (1984), 63-69; Hugh Richmond, 'Performance As Criticism: *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 163-185, and 'The Persistent *Kinsmen* of Shakespeare and Fletcher', *Notes and Queries*, 238 (1993), 232-234; and especially Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 74-95. *The Rivals* is included in *The Dramatic Works of Sir William D'Avenant*, [edited by James Maidment and W. H. Logan], 5 vols (Edinburgh, 1872-1874; reissued New York, 1964), V, 213-293, where the evidence for D'Avenant's authorship is presented, analysed, and endorsed (pp. 216-217).

In sharp contrast to these two narratives, *Henry VIII* was one of the most popular of all of Shakespeare's plays on the eighteenth- and

nineteenth-century stages. Heavily adapted as it was throughout this period, it was never actually subjected to the thoroughgoing rewriting which *Cymbeline* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* received. See generally Margaret Isabel Swayze, 'A History of the Literary Criticism and Stage Production of *Henry VIII*' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham, 1973); Hugh Richmond, *King Henry VIII*; and coming further up to date, Jay L. Halio, ed., *King Henry VIII, or All is True*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 1999), pp. 45-61; and Gordon McMullan, ed., *King Henry VIII (All Is True)*, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 2000), pp. 17-57; and note too the comments in Iska Alter, "'To Reform and Make Fitt": *Henry VIII* and the Making of "Bad" Shakespeare', in Charney, *"Bad" Shakespeare*, pp. 176-186 (pp. 180-182). The second half of the twentieth century, of course, saw a massive decline in the theatrical popularity of *Henry VIII*, with the play only being staged by the RSC at an average rate of less than once a decade.

160. Two notable examples are the short scene involving the two Roman Senators and the Tribunes (3.7), and the brief apparent dumb show at 5.5. 94.1-6 (TLN 3029-3031). The latter does not even get itself a mention in Ann Thompson's recent detailed synopsis of the fifth act, part of the purpose of which is supposedly precisely to emphasize that act's unusual features (see '*Cymbeline's* Other Endings', pp. 204-206).

161. Whatever its position relative to *Coriolanus*, all standard chronologies of the canon place *Pericles* closer in time to the later tragedies than to *Henry VIII* or *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, whilst Oxford's dating also puts it a lot nearer to *All's Well That Ends Well*. The play, in fact, has much in common with the three earlier tragicomedies ("problem plays"). Thus it is linked to *Troilus and Cressida* by dint of its medieval source, to *Measure for Measure* by its brothel scenes, and to *All's Well* by a variety of plot motifs (quasi-miraculous acts of healing, riddles, recovered heroines, and so on). In addition, the distinctive stylized gnomic rhyming couplets of *All's Well* remind me very much of some of the unusual verse to be found in the first two acts of *Pericles* - an impression that seems to be backed up a little by Eliot Slater's work on rare words ('Word Links with *All's Well That Ends Well*', *Notes and Queries*, 222 (1977), 109-112). But at the same time, *Pericles* is undeniably closely connected to *The Two Noble Kinsmen* as well - again, through both plays having a medieval source (a parallel increased in this case by the fact that they each acknowledge this debt to the past); and more particularly, because they share something of a common structure, both possessing a first act which is often spoken of by critics as being detachable, but which in truth dramatizes material integral to the respective stories throughout the entire history of their literary transmission.

162. The various elements referred to here all usefully converge in the figure of Gower, who can fairly be said to be one of the most distinctive features of what is itself, in terms of the Shakespeare canon, a decidedly singular play. Of course, Gower can be compared to

the Chorus in *Henry V*, and, for that matter, to the one in *Romeo and Juliet*; but there is little in these earlier examples to parallel his self-conscious presentation and manipulation of dumb-shows (not to mention his linguistic archaisms), or the way in which he specifically contrasts and opposes the different forms of sensory perception needed to appreciate the changing narrative modes of the drama. And nowhere previously in the canon is there anything that quite matches this play's explicit interest in (and acknowledgement of) literary sources and the historical processes of narrative transmission.

CHAPTER THREE

1. English quotations of 'What Is an Author?' are taken from the 1979 translation by Josué V. Harari, in Harari, *Textual Strategies*, pp. 141-160 (see p. 160). Harari's text represents the revised version of Foucault's essay, from 1970; there is an English translation of the 1969 original in Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, edited by Donald F. Bouchard (Ithaca, NY, 1977; reprinted 1996), pp. 113-138. A "definitive" French text, incorporating all the major variants, and with relevant supplementary material and useful editorial annotations, can be found in Foucault, *Dits et écrits, 1954-1988*, edited by Daniel Defert and François Ewald, 4 vols (Paris, 1994), I, 789-821 (quoting here from p. 812). For the history of the delivery and publication of 'What Is an Author?', see *Dits et écrits*, I, 789 and III, 742; the differences between the two versions of the essay are commented on in Harari, pp. 40-44, and Seán Burke, *The Death and Return of the Author* (1992), p. 187, notes 42-46. Burke's wider discussion (pp. 89-94) draws attention to what he regards as some important disjunctions between Foucault's arguments here and the attitudes expressed in the rest of the Foucault canon, and he suggests that because of these, 'Foucault's exegetes have steered well away from this essay' (p. 187, note 47). Such an idea is perhaps hard to credit given the essay's current vogue, but it does serve to indicate the somewhat delayed nature, generally speaking, of the impact of 'What Is an Author?' (in comparison, say, to Roland Barthes's roughly contemporaneous 'The Death of the Author' (1968)), and moreover, the extent to which interest in Foucault's text has really taken off in the years since Burke's book first appeared.

2. Both quotations are from Pask, *The emergence of the English author* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 1. On the question of the historical validity of Foucault's obviously sketchy and highly generalized account of the development of the "author-function", see also Roger Chartier's essay (cited by Pask), 'Figures of the Author', in Chartier, *The Order of Books*, translated by Lydia G. Cochrane (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 25-59 (pp. 29-32, 58-59). Despite seeking to qualify certain aspects of Foucault's argument, Chartier warns that 'a hasty reading must not lead us to reduce Foucault's thought to oversimplified formulas' (p. 31). It is perhaps not unreasonable to feel, however, that 'What Is an Author?' itself actually rather encourages such a "reduction".

3. Though I would stress the need in this context to focus on historically-specific manifestations of the author-function. Part of the difficulty with Foucault's essay (and this carries over very much

into how it has been applied) lies in the way it is so hard to pin down when it comes to precise dates and exact chronology. But the particular form of the author-function for which Foucault reserves most of his criticism seems to be conceived of as a phenomenon of, roughly, the eighteenth century and beyond. Thus he speaks of a 'reversal' in the author-function occurring some time 'in the seventeenth or eighteenth century' ('What Is an Author?', p. 149); and also of the regulatory and restrictive role the author has played 'since the eighteenth century' (p. 159). Foucault himself, moreover, is pretty clearly one of those who are trying to free themselves from 'the historico-transcendental tradition of the nineteenth century' (p. 145).

4. For a concise exploration of the subjects of authorship and collaboration in Renaissance drama, and an excellent general backdrop to most of the issues raised in the opening part of this chapter, see Jeffrey Masten's recent essay (usefully crystallizing current critical concerns), 'Playwrighting: Authorship and Collaboration', in Cox and Kastan, *A New History of Early English Drama*, pp. 357-382.

5. There are some interesting comments on the recent reception of 'What Is an Author?', reflecting a number of my own reservations, in Michael Bristol's 1996 essay, 'How Good Does Evidence Have to Be?'. Bristol notes that Foucault's treatment of the history of the idea of authorship 'does not aim at the careful historical elucidation of that history' (which is probably putting the matter kindly), 'nor does he suggest what ought to count as evidence in support of a particular historical narrative'. He also makes the point that 'Foucault's essay is perhaps less original than many people have realized. The authorship question has been discussed at length in Biblical scholarship and in classical scholarship as well' (all quotations from p. 39); an obvious relevant reference on these latter topics is A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship* (1984; second edition, 1988).

6. Foucault's much-quoted phrase is of course borrowed, as he himself acknowledges on its first appearance ('Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?', p. 792), from Samuel Beckett. The relevant passage reads (in Harari's translation): 'Beckett nicely formulates the theme with which I would like to begin: "What does it matter who is speaking," someone said, "what does it matter who is speaking"' ('What Is an Author?', p. 141). Beckett's own English translation of *his* original French (from No. III of his *Textes pour rien* of 1955) forms the epigraph to this chapter; see Beckett, *Texts for Nothing* (London, 1974), p. 16 (the reference is provided by Foucault's editor, Bouchard, in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, p. 115, note 5). Harari's translation seems the version most in circulation (see, for example, its citation at the start of Jeffrey Masten's path-breaking essay, 'Beaumont and/or Fletcher: Collaboration and the Interpretation of Renaissance Drama', *ELH*, 59 (1992), 337-356 (p. 337)). But Harari adds internal quotation marks absent from both Beckett's and Foucault's texts ((what) does it matter?); and moreover, he translates the key phrase, "qu'importe qui parle", differently at the beginning and

the end of the essay (again, (what) does it matter?). In the latter case, he also supplies a question-mark (as does Bouchard's translation) absent from the French (at least as this stands in *Dits et écrits*). For Foucault, "qu'importe qui parle" would appear to have the status only of 'le bruit ["the stirring"/"murmur"] d'une indifférence' ('Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?', p. 812; and see respectively 'What Is an Author?', p. 160, and *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, p. 138). It rather goes against the grain of both Foucault's essay and its recent reception to bother to spell out such details as these. Yet Foucault's own deliberate acknowledgement of a debt to Beckett, whatever the tone or motive one wants to attribute to it, in itself serves to keep alive some sort of interest in "who" is speaking at the very moment that the subject is supposedly being dismissed. And this process is inevitably perpetuated (and I see no reason for not employing this obvious "*tu quoque*") by the common critical practice of invoking (the name of the author) Foucault as an authority on the disappearance of the author, the immateriality of who is speaking.

7. 'What Is an Author?', p. 160. Foucault concedes that 'it would be pure romanticism [. . .] to imagine a culture in which the fictive would operate in an absolutely free state, in which fiction would be put at the disposal of everyone and would develop without passing through something like a necessary or constraining figure' (p. 159; both this concession and the extract below are absent from the first version of the essay; see the long variant in 'Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?', p. 811 (where the French text is an editorial translation back from the English)). But whilst he admits the inevitability of some sort of 'system of constraint', there is a palpable prelapsarian dimension to his prophetic assertion that 'the author-function will disappear, and in such a manner that fiction and its polysemic texts will once again function according to another mode' (p. 160). Some comments by David Lodge, prefacing a reprint of Foucault's essay, are pertinent at this point (and the second sentence is by no means the *non sequitur* it might appear): 'the essay ends with a vision of a culture in which literature would circulate "anonymously"; but whether this vision [. . .] offers an attractive prospect is open to argument. Though Foucault's focus on the historical and institutional contexts of discourse has inspired many critics on the intellectual left, his Nietzschean insistence on the struggle for power as the ultimate determinant of all human action is not encouraging to progressive political philosophies' (see *Modern Criticism and Theory*, p. 196). Having said all this, however, it is certainly no great falsification of Foucault's position to proclaim the present relevance, the general applicability, of the "indifference" of which he speaks. Beckett's phrase provides the primary theme of Foucault's essay (and see here the abstract printed in *Dits et écrits*, I, 789-790); and Foucault's Delphic-like pronouncements seem to suggest that the longed-for future he describes is meant to be thought of as already in the process of happening, some kind of immanent, implacable force.

8. As far as Foucault is concerned, I am thinking of his rather surprising section discussing authors as "founders of discursivity" ('What Is an Author?', pp. 153-157). This is a passage that sits a little uneasily within his essay as a whole, however, and the typical view of Foucault's text as vigorously "anti-authorial" in its objectives can hardly be dismissed as a major misreading. The extremity of the disjunction between this phase of his discussion and the overriding tone of 'What Is an Author?' (and of its introduction and conclusion in particular) is well analysed by Burke (see pp. 90-93). I find this part of Foucault's argument, and the distinctions he is forced to draw in it, especially unconvincing. Burke (pp. 187-188, note 47) makes the point that the accolade "founder of discursivity" has often been applied to Foucault himself, and the essay's sudden diversion on to this subject might be read, rather cynically, as its author's attempt to legislate for precisely that eventuality. But the persistence of the presence of "the author" even here is of interest in itself.

9. Feminist commentary in particular has found it necessary at times to chafe against theoretical interdicts precluding an interest in the identity of the author. In the words of Kate Chedgzoy, 'since for feminist literary history the gender of the author is often a crucial aspect of the text's interest, one effect of the project to revalorize women's writing and to reclaim forgotten or neglected texts has been a reaffirmation - against the grain, as several feminists have noted, of some influential strands of literary theory - of the significance of the author as subject of her own writing' ('Introduction: "Voice that is Mine"', in *Voicing Women: Gender and sexuality in early modern writing*, edited by Chedgzoy, Melanie Hansen, and Suzanne Trill (Keele, 1996), pp. 1-10 (p. 1)); and see also in this area, Elizabeth D. Harvey, *Ventriloquized Voices: Feminist Theory and English Renaissance Texts* (London and New York, 1992); and Sylvia Brown's recent essay, "'Over Her Dead Body": Feminism, Poststructuralism, and the Mother's Legacy', in *Discontinuities: New Essays on Renaissance Literature and Criticism*, edited by Viviana Comensoli and Paul Stevens (Toronto, 1998), pp. 3-26.

10. One has only to think here, of course, of the frequently heated controversies surrounding the attribution to Shakespeare of the likes of 'Shall I Die?', *Edmond Ironside*, and *A Funeral Elegy*, and the intense media interest that is generated by such disputes, and indeed, by any new Shakespearian "find", no matter how speculative or improbable (Charles Hamilton's "discovery" of *Cardenio*, Peter Levi's *New Verses by Shakespeare* (London, 1988), and so on). Also of relevance in this context is the current resurgence of interest in Shakespeare's "lost years" and the dramatist's possible Catholicism, and the provocative and extravagant claims this seems to be producing about how the new "facts" concerning the history and identity of the author are going to force us to alter the way we read the texts of the Shakespeare canon.

11. 'What Is an Author?', p. 141 ('Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?', p. 792). Foucault does not go into this, but for once, the gendered

terminology is entirely to the point. As is now generally appreciated, prevailing models of authorship and creativity have long been (or have been constructed in retrospect as being) primarily male-centred. For a brief general background here, see Toril Moi, *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory* (London and New York, 1985; reprinted 1995), notably pp. 50-69; and on sex/gender issues and the theory and practice of authorship in the Renaissance, amongst an extensive body of relevant work, such studies as: Wendy Wall, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1993); Margreta de Grazia, 'Imprints: Shakespeare, Gutenberg and Descartes', in Terence Hawkes, *Alternative Shakespeares*, Volume 2, pp. 63-94; Jeffrey Masten, *Textual intercourse: Collaboration, authorship, and sexualities in Renaissance drama* (1997); Jonathan Goldberg, *Desiring Women Writing: English Renaissance Examples* (Stanford, CA, 1997); Josephine A. Roberts, 'The Phallacies of Authorship: Reconstructing the Texts of Early Modern Women Writers', in *Attending to Early Modern Women*, edited by Susan D. Amussen and Adele Seeff (Cranbury, NJ, 1998), pp. 38-57; and the items already cited in note 9, above.

12. See especially here Dowden, *Shakspeare*, pp. 56-57, 153-157; and compare my comments above, Chapter Two, note 40. The very term, "fragments", serves to lower critical expectations, creating images of isolated bits and pieces, *disjecta membra* - material that is not fully worked-out or not properly complete, and that therefore need not be expected to match up to Shakespeare's usual standards. It is also a description that conveniently redeems Shakespeare from the supposed *faux pas* of involvement in anything that might be construed as active and deliberate collaboration. Ideas about why Shakespeare should be in the business of producing mere fragments of plays at the close of his professional career are easily accommodated within Dowden's single-minded psychodrama; see *Shakspeare: His Mind and Art*, p. 405. I return to his speculations in this area later in this chapter.

13. One of the most telling moments of Foucault's 'What Is an Author?' is the passage in which he problematizes the notion of the "work" alongside that of the "author". Thus he writes:

it is a very familiar thesis that the task of criticism is not to bring out the work's relationships with the author, nor to reconstruct through the text a thought or experience, but rather, to analyze the work through its structure, its architecture, its intrinsic form, and the play of its internal relationships. At this point, however, a problem arises: "What is a work? What is this curious unity which we designate as a work? Of what elements is it composed? Is it not what an author has written?" Difficulties appear immediately. If an individual were not an author, could we say that what he [sic] wrote, said, left behind in his papers, or what has been collected of his remarks, could be called a "work"? (p. 143).

Collaborative writing obviously does not enter Foucault's equation here (which is significant in itself), but the attempt to capture standard

approaches and perspectives reveals well how the idea of collaboration sits uneasily within certain conventional conceptions and expectations of what a "work" of literature/art should be.

14. This is another of those moments where there are interesting connections between late and early Shakespeare - both with respect to the issue of collaboration (though I would distance myself from most of the narratives of collaborative authorship that have been applied to the early canon), and in terms of the limits of the canon and the question of the (exclusory) authority of the First Folio. See the discussion in Gary Taylor, 'The Canon and Chronology of Shakespeare's Plays', pp. 71-73.

15. Many of these latter areas too can be understood or spoken of in terms of collaborative practice. I am of course drawing here on some of the central themes of criticism and textual theory of recent years. Work that has particularly influenced my thinking includes: Margreta de Grazia, *Shakespeare Verbatim: The Reproduction of Authenticity and the 1790 Apparatus* (1991), and also her more recent essay, 'Imprints'; de Grazia and Peter Stallybrass, 'The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text' (1993); Gary Taylor, 'General Introduction', in *Companion*, pp. 1-68, 'Canon and Chronology', and 'What is an Author [not]?' (1995); Leah Marcus, *Unediting the Renaissance* (1996); Peter W. M. Blayney, 'The Publication of Playbooks', in Cox and Kastan, pp. 383-422; Eric Rasmussen, 'The Revision of Scripts'; and the various studies by Masten already mentioned.

16. See especially on this Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare's Ghost Writers* (1987), and note my earlier use of this work in Chapter One, whilst commenting on the dream-vision in *Cymbeline*. As important as anything to the locus of interconnections I am emphasizing here is the semantic history of the term, "author". This, as Masten points out, 'continued in this period to inhabit a complex network of meanings', many of which 'are still residual in words like *authority*, *authorize*, and *authoritarian*' (see 'Playwrighting', pp. 369-370). In a Jacobean context, of course, the idea of "authorship" is specifically laden with powerful ideological associations relating to absolutism and patriarchy (something I also touched upon in Chapter One).

17. 'Elegy By W.S.': *A Study in Attribution* (1989), p. 241. A certain degree of conventionalism adheres to the construction of all literary canons (and not just those that are author-based), which is one reason why it is worth pursuing questions concerning the details of authorship or the reliability of traditions of attribution/origin in some depth. Foster himself suggests that 'the Shakespeare canon has not had precisely the same shape for two successive generations' (p. 242).

18. See Orgel, 'The Authentic Shakespeare', *Representations*, 21 (Winter 1988), 1-25, quoting from p. 3 and p. 5 respectively. My own thinking in this chapter is heavily indebted to Orgel's stimulating essay, and especially to his central emphasis on the way attitudes to authenticity are shaped by history. Taking as a starting-point the controversy over the authorship of 'Shall I Die?', Orgel sets out to explore the question, 'what do we mean by authenticity, and what will

we accept as evidence of it?', a subject which is precisely, in his words, 'a historical one' (p. 2). He argues strongly that in practice, authenticity, as in the culturally paradigmatic case of the Biblical canon, is always 'a matter of authentication, something bestowed, not inherent' (p. 5). On the problematic relationship between dramatic authorship, authenticity, and textual authority, see too Orgel's brief but illuminating article, 'What is a Text?', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama*, 24 (1981), 3-6. There is an excellent discussion, specifically relevant in this context, of the challenges marginal and apocryphal texts pose to orthodox notions of canonicity and canonical authority, in Michael D. Bristol, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen: Shakespeare and the Problem of Authority', in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 78-92 (see particularly pp. 78-85).

19. What does set the Shakespearian text apart from the work of his contemporaries is its treatment within history - the extreme over-editing, over-discussion, and over-performance it has been graced with at virtually everybody else's expense. The Shakespeare mythos and its attendant industry have of course been much discussed, most notably of late in the light of materialist interests and insights. Out of a vast array of relevant studies, see especially: Dollimore and Sinfield, *Political Shakespeare*; Malcolm Evans, *Signifying Nothing* (1986); Terence Hawkes, *That Shakespearian Rag* (1986) and *Meaning by Shakespeare* (1992); Graham Holderness, ed., *The Shakespeare myth* (Manchester, 1988); Marsden, *The Appropriation of Shakespeare*; and Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet* (Oxford, 1992). But one hardly needs to be a materialist critic to recognise that Shakespeare's unmatched cultural standing and immense symbolic power within the field of English literature - not to mention the excesses of Bardolatry and anti-Stratfordianism that exist alongside these - mean that any attempts to attribute non-canonical works or to identify collaboration within the accepted canon, like all arguments concerning aesthetic quality or political meaning, enter a world in which battle-lines are firmly drawn, and where every judgement or comment is already implicated in vast networks of belief, idealism, patriotism, morality, educational politics, theatrical economics, (anti-)elitism, cultural imperialism, "anti-Establishmentism", and much, much more.

20. See particularly here the chapters, 'Collaboration' (pp. 197-234) and 'Revision' (pp. 235-263), in G. E. Bentley, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time* (1971); Bentley explicitly notes the way in which revision and collaboration are 'frequently entangled' in the surviving texts (p. 197). Stressing the popularity and prevalence of multiple authorship in the Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre, he also claims that 'altogether the evidence suggests that it would be reasonable to guess that as many as half of the plays by professional dramatists in the period incorporated the writing at some date of more than one man' (p. 199). Bentley's conclusion has been widely cited, but it needs to be remembered that the figure he gives is very much an extrapolation, and one which rather collapses together a diverse range of activities, from

minor tinkering or the provision of new prologues and epilogues, through to active and equal collaboration. It also assumes a general continuity of practice - across the various theatres and theatre companies, between individual playwrights, at the different "ends" of the market, and over a good number of years - which remains open to question.

21. Masten in particular has strongly challenged the validity of approaching the drama of this period in terms of the more conventional cultural images of authorship as a process of writing "alone", arguing rather that 'we must thoroughly reconceptualize our default notions of singular authorship, collaboration, intellectual property, originality, imitation, and even "the individual" in the modern sense [. . .] - in short, the making of lists that divide up intellectual property and its owners' ('Playwrighting', p. 358; and see generally *Textual intercourse*). Amongst much other commentary in this area, de Grazia's *Shakespeare Verbatim* is especially relevant. The impact of the Oxford Shakespeare, with its powerful stress on the inherently collaborative nature of drama and dramatic texts, is also important in this context. But such a focus was hardly all that innovatory in itself, being a reflection of a long-standing commonplace of performance- and theatre-oriented criticism. For instance, like Bentley, Muriel Bradbrook can be found emphasizing that theatre is essentially collaborative back in 1971 (see her lecture, 'Shakespeare and his Collaborators', published in Leech and Margeson, *Shakespeare 1971*, pp. 21-36, and reprinted with slight alterations in Bradbrook, *The Living Monument* (1976), pp. 227-241); and much the same line is taken in Stanley Wells's own *Literature and Drama* (London, 1970). That such criticism sought or had little impact on prevailing paradigms of authorship may well point towards its own limitations, but it perhaps also suggests that it is possible to overstate the tensions between individual agency and collaborative practice highlighted by recent theoretical concerns.

22. The desire to relieve Shakespeare of all responsibility for *Henry VIII* (as the play has come down to us) is most closely associated with the work of Robert Boyle. See again his essay, 'Henry VIII. An Investigation into the Origin and Authorship of the Play' (1885); this is founded on the same (extremely dubious) principles as his earlier paper, 'On "Massinger and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*"', *Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society* (1880-6), 371-399. Boyle's wild speculations are received with particular enthusiasm in H. Dugdale Sykes, *Sidelights on Shakespeare* (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1919), pp. 1-47; and see besides the introductory remarks in this volume by A. H. Bullen, pp. vii-xi, and my comments below, note 80. The authority of the First Folio is certainly not sacrosanct, but it does obviously provide the starting-point for determining the dramatic canon, and nobody has ever come up with a valid argument (and nor do I see how they could given the documentary evidence available) for denying Shakespeare's presence in any single one of the plays it contains. It is another matter entirely, of course, with those plays that carry only early (i.e., pre-1642) quarto attributions. In the case of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, important opposition to the idea of

Shakespeare's involvement appears in Tucker Brooke, pp. xl-xlv; and a sense of the kind of objections towards accepting it into the canon that were felt by many respected Shakespearians during the middle decades of the twentieth century can be gained from Una Ellis-Fermor's 1949 paper, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen', included in her book, *Shakespeare the Dramatist*, edited by Kenneth Muir (London, 1961), pp. 177-186.

23. See particularly here the discussions of the play in Masten, *Textual intercourse*, pp. 73-93; Richard Hillman, *Intertextuality and Romance in Renaissance Drama* (1992), pp. 106-123; and Stephen J. Lynch, *Shakespearean Intertextuality: Studies in Selected Sources and Plays* (Westport, CT and London, 1998), pp. 61-82.

24. Mention should probably be made again at this point of the lost *Cardenio*. I have explained my own approach to the whole *Double Falsehood/Cardenio* scenario above (see Chapter Two, note 44). Needless to say, the question of authorship has always dominated the reception of Theobald's *Double Falsehood*. *Cardenio*, meanwhile, has often played a bit-part (at least) in authorship work on *Henry VIII* and *Kinsmen*, and I refer to it accordingly below, wherever relevant.

25. The contrast in the canonical standing of these three plays is most obviously evinced by the inclusion of *Pericles* within the group of the "four Romances". The disparity in the critical attention they have been afforded can again be partly quantified using figures derived from the *Shakespeare Quarterly* 'Annotated World Bibliography' for the years 1990-1995 (see above, Chapter Two, note 32). So against the 61 entries (with the same proviso as given earlier) for criticism of *Pericles*, there are 48 for *Henry VIII*, and 26 for *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. Performance figures yield an even more pronounced imbalance: *Pericles*, 52; *Henry VIII*, 9; and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 4. Relative interest in the two non-Folio plays differs significantly. *Pericles* has of course long since been admitted to the works of Shakespeare (and consequently to Shakespearian statistics), and its essential canonicity has gone effectively unquestioned for decades. *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, on the other hand, spent most of the last century in the shadowy realm of the apocrypha, remaining outside or on the fringe of the editorial tradition, especially in Britain, where it was excluded - crucially - from Peter Alexander's *Complete Works* of 1951 (thus having to wait until 1986 and the Oxford edition for an appearance in a standard one-volume Shakespeare), and where it has only just achieved, courtesy of Lois Potter's edition, the ultimate cultural accolade of admission to The Arden Shakespeare. As for *Henry VIII*, I have already emphasized the widespread neglect of this work in the criticism of the two obvious groupings to which it belongs, the histories and the late plays. How low its position in the canon has tended to sink is well (if that is the word) illustrated by the expanded third edition of Derek Traversi's *An Approach to Shakespeare*, 2 vols (London, 1968-1969), which contains individual sections on *Pericles* and every single First Folio play, with the exception (totally unexplained) of *Henry VIII*.

26. By which I mean in the work of reputable scholars, operating within the historical mainstream of Shakespeare studies. Indeed, in this whole chapter, I have largely confined my discussion to approaches to authorship issues which lay some claim to being considered as genuine scholarship. In other words, I am cheerfully ignoring the prejudices, conspiracy theories, and general paranoias of the anti-Stratfordians. I have also refrained from taking seriously the contributions of the more extreme proponents of disintegration, who adhere to the same unacceptably loose assessment of what constitutes adequate historical evidence as the anti-Stratfordians themselves. Interesting comment on both these traditions can be found in Howard Felperin, 'Bardolatry Then and Now', in Marsden, pp. 129-144; and Hugh Grady, 'Disintegration and its Reverberations'. The full-scale disintegration of the Shakespeare canon has thankfully never recovered from the demolition it received in E. K. Chambers's lecture of 1924, 'The Disintegration of Shakespeare' (reprinted in Chambers, *Shakespearean Gleanings* (Oxford, 1944), pp. 1-21). However, as F. E. Halliday remarks, 'we are all disintegrators up to a point' (*A Shakespeare Companion* (1964), p. 46); the problem tends to lie in defining that point. To accept Shakespeare's presence in *Pericles* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is to be something of an "integrationist" too, and this is another field which produces its extreme practitioners, those who seek to defend as legitimate just about any Shakespeare ascription or remote association in the documentary record. Mark Dominik, for example, is also happy to accept Humphrey Moseley's attribution of the lost *Henry I* and *Henry II* to Shakespeare and Robert Davenport (see above, Chapter Two, note 44, and *Companion*, p. 138), and to fit both these plays into a late Shakespearian period of extensive collaborative writing (see *Shakespeare and 'The Birth of Merlin'* (1991), pp. 172-173). For a sense of the full range of non-canonical material attributed to Shakespeare over the years, see *Companion*, pp. 134-141; and Lindley Williams Hubbell, 'A Note on the Shakespeare Apocrypha', in his *Studies in English Literature* (Kyoto, 1982), pp. 254-271.

27. The history of Shakespeare criticism has inevitably thrown up numerous attempts to challenge the authorship of these last two plays (or portions of them), none proving in the least bit convincing. Pope provides an early example, questioning the level of Shakespeare's involvement in *The Winter's Tale* (in the Preface to his 1725 edition of Shakespeare, reprinted in *The Prose Works of Alexander Pope, Volume II*, edited by Rosemary Cowler (Oxford, 1986), pp. 1-40 (see pp. 23-24)). More specific theories seeking to deny Shakespeare responsibility for certain parts of *The Winter's Tale* or *The Tempest* (primarily the masque and the epilogue) are discussed and dismissed in J. H. P. Pafford, *The Winter's Tale*, p. xxiv, and Frank Kermode, *The Tempest*, pp. xxiii-xxiv, 133-134 (headnote to the Epilogue). Many of these derive from the heyday of disintegration, and typically elaborate and unconvincing arguments are furnished by two of the "great" disintegrators, Frederick Gard Fleay and J. M. Robertson. See their respective epitomes of their life's conclusions, *A Chronicle History of the Life and Work of William*

Shakespeare (London, 1886), pp. 247-250 (though most unusually for him, Fleay seems to have had no trouble with *The Winter's Tale*); and *The Genuine in Shakespeare: A Conspectus* (London, 1930), pp. 132-142. Such studies are trivial in value now and hardly worth recording - except for the fact that I feel pretty much the same can be said for all the main lines of attack on the Shakespearian integrity of *Cymbeline*.

28. This is a long-standing idea, which still gets periodically revived. It is tried out anew, for example, in David M. Bergeron, 'The Restoration of Hermione in *The Winter's Tale*', in Kay and Jacobs, *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*, pp. 125-133; and another, yet more recent proponent is Kristian Smidt (see *Unconformities in Shakespeare's Later Comedies* (1993), pp. 135-138). As with the case arguing the interpolation of the vision in *Cymbeline*, Simon Forman is often invoked as a supporting witness. Forman totally fails to mention the events of the final scene as it has come down to us, and according to Bergeron, 'how anyone could witness the statue's coming to life and not report it almost defies explanation' (p. 126). But Forman's reports are notoriously jumbled and inaccurate, and it is surely relevant (though rarely mentioned in this context) that he also makes no reference to the Act 4 apparitions during his summary of *Macbeth* (see Nicholas Brooke, *Macbeth*, pp. 234-236). Failure to record vision, statue, and apparitions (and the Hecate scenes?) suggests to me a particular lack of interest in certain spectacular effects. On Forman's response here, see further Orgel, *The Winter's Tale*, pp. 62-63. Most other editors comment on the question of revision: Pafford (pp. xxiv-xxvii) rejects the whole hypothesis, as also does Ernest Schanzer (*The Winter's Tale*, pp. 9-16); but Frank Kermodé remains more open to the possibility (*The Winter's Tale*, The Signet Classic Shakespeare (New York, 1963), p. xxviii).

29. 5.2 is easily the part of the play that has been singled out for the heaviest condemnation in the critical tradition, though it has also been strongly defended in response (see Pafford, pp. xxvi-xxvii). Smidt, typically, sees fit to revive the idea of revision here (*Later Comedies*, pp. 138-141). He even extends it to include the treatment of Autolycus, where he feels 'there are clear indications that he was once to have been more functional and that the petering-out of his role came about as the result of basic changes in the dénouement' (p. 141; and see p. 216, note 18). In pursuing his case, Smidt again cites Forman's report as a witness, suggesting that its description of the reunion between Leontes and Perdita indicates 'that the episode was originally staged' (p. 139). Forman's comments at this point read: 'and the shepherd having showed the letter of the nobleman by whom Leontes sent a was [away?] that child, and the jewels found about her, she was known to be Leontes' daughter, and was then sixteen years old' (quoting from Orgel's modernized transcription, *The Winter's Tale*, p. 233; the square brackets here are Orgel's own). It seems to me that one can just as plausibly (i.e., very tentatively) hear in this a recollection of the dialogue at 5.2. 32-35.

30. For the idea that the masque was inserted (or expanded) in 1613, see in particular Henry David Gray, 'Some Indications that *The Tempest* was Revised', *Studies in Philology*, 18 (1921), 129-140; and Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson, *The Tempest*, pp. xlvi-xlvii, 80-82. The theory was revived and developed by Irwin Smith ('Ariel and the Masque in *The Tempest*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 21 (1970), 213-222), and has been recently reasserted by Smidt (*Later Comedies*, pp. 157-161; and see too Alvin Kernan, *Shakespeare, The King's Playwright* (1995), pp. 156-157). Again, none of the arguments put forward are remotely compelling; and Dover Wilson's more extended imaginings, which posit an original version of *The Tempest* directly comparable in structure to *The Winter's Tale*, are even less convincing; see the whole of his section, 'The Copy used for *The Tempest*, 1623', in the New Shakespeare edition, pp. 79-85. The entire case for adaptation is effectively countered in E. K. Chambers, 'The Integrity of *The Tempest*', *Review of English Studies*, 1 (1925), 129-150 (reprinted in *Shakespearean Gleanings*, pp. 76-97); and see in addition Kermode, *The Tempest*, pp. xv-xxiv; and Orgel's especially level-headed remarks, *The Tempest*, pp. 1-4. The Chamber Account record relating to the 1613 Court performance is transcribed in Chambers, *Facts and Problems*, II, 343; and see also above, Chapter Two, note 147. Despite all sorts of critical suppositions and assertions on the subject, there is no real evidence to indicate that Shakespeare ever re-wrote (or wrote) a play with a single specific performance in mind.

31. A related scenario to consider is that any of the texts we have could be the result of Shakespearian revision of a pre-existing, non-Shakespearian original. Such an idea seems to be present in Dover Wilson's work on *The Tempest*, and certainly, of all the late plays, *The Tempest* is the one with the most shadowy and elusive specific sources (see the discussion of analogue texts, especially the German play, *Die Schöne Sidea*, in Kermode, *The Tempest*, pp. lxiii-lxxi; and Bullough, *Sources*, VIII, 245-249). But the only argument for revision of this sort that has been at all widely accepted concerns *Pericles*. Indeed, it has long been one of the standard explanations for the state of this text that Shakespeare here revised a play (or draft of a play) by somebody else (see K. Deighton's Introduction, *Pericles*, pp. vii-xxix, and J. C. Maxwell, ed., *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, The New Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1956), pp. xxii-xxvi). It is a theory that has some obvious parallels with the proposal that Shakespeare adapted or completed an early play (or draft) of his own (see above, Chapter Two, note 119), and in the end it proves just as difficult to sustain. There are two main lines of thinking involved. (1) In broad terms, the notion of revision has clearly appealed as a way of accounting for the old-fashioned, "un-Shakespearian" style that sets apart much of the first two acts of the play. But revision only really serves to displace any problems in this regard, since it still completely fails to explain why a reviser would choose to leave such a manifest clash of styles in their re-fashioned text. (2) More specifically, it has been suggested that certain narrative differences between the quarto and George Wilkins's *Painful Adventures*

novella are a consequence of the two texts being independently derived from a lost, so-called "ur-*Pericles*". The case is made in Hardin Craig, 'Pericles and *The Painfull Adventures*', *Studies in Philology*, 45 (1948), 600-605 (developed in his book, *A New Look at Shakespeare's Quartos* (Stanford, CA, 1961), pp. 17-26); and also in Kenneth Muir, 'The Problem of *Pericles*', *English Studies*, 30 (1949), 65-83 (material re-worked in Muir, *Shakespeare as Collaborator* (1960), pp. 56-76); a similar view can be found in Bullough, *Sources*, VI, 356-359 (and see further his appendix in the same volume, 'Pericles and the Verse in Wilkins's *Painfull Adventures*', pp. 549-564). A number of telling objections to this position are raised by Maxwell (pp. xiii-xx) and F. D. Hoeniger (pp. xlvii-xlix) in their respective editions, and the argument has now largely fallen out of favour (see further the following note). As a general conclusion to this whole situation, the most economical response to the available evidence (certainly so far as performance records go) is to assume that there was only ever one basic version of this play - or indeed, of any of the rest of the late plays as well. But this remains an assumption.

32. My comment here reflects the simple fact that with each of the late plays, all seventeenth-century editions after the first are derivative. That there is only one substantive text for *Pericles* is something of a moot point, however. By all normal criteria, this is certainly the case, but then there is nothing in the least "normal" about this play's relationship to Wilkins's *Painful Adventures*, which entreats its readers 'to receiue this Historie in the same maner as it was vnder the habite of ancient Gower the famous English Poet, by the Kings Maiesties Players excellently presented' (*Painfull Aduentures*, p. 7). This claims a direct connection, also asserted on its title page (see above, Chapter Two, note 39), between the prose story and the stage-play, which in turn seems to qualify the former as some sort of "reported text" of *Pericles* as performed. Viewing Q1 in the same light, the Oxford editors offer the elegantly outrageous argument that Wilkins's novella is therefore 'a "substantive" text of *Pericles*', heavily contaminated and re-cast, 'but a substantive text nevertheless' (*Companion*, p. 557). The whole idea is closely tied up with Oxford's resurrection of the theory of Shakespeare-Wilkins collaboration, and the volume's massively suspect and controversial editorial treatment of the play (topics to which I return below). *The Painful Adventures* is a fascinating text, not to be dismissed lightly, but the Oxford editors exaggerate its status in this context, talking up the value of Wilkins as a reporter (not to mention their ability to identify his work as such), and talking down the quality of Q1. Wilkins clearly counts as some sort of witness to the play of *Pericles*, but on such vague (and indeterminable) terms, the force of the remark in my main text still stands. Most editors and critics have something to say on the links between the play and the novella, but for specific studies, see Muir's edition of the latter, pp. iii-xv; the items by Muir, Craig, and Bullough mentioned in the previous note; and Nancy C. Michael, 'The Relationship Between the 1609 Quarto of *Pericles* and

Wilkins' *Painful Adventures*', *Tulane Studies in English*, 22 (1977), 51-68. Amongst a deal of earlier commentary on the subject, still useful is Sina Spiker, 'George Wilkins and the Authorship of *Pericles*', *Studies in Philology*, 30 (1933), 551-570.

33. To take the latter categories first, the six texts yield the usual Shakespearian ration of fairly trivial narrative inconsistencies and loose ends (Antonio's disappearing son being one infamous example (*The Tempest*, 1.2. 441-442)), as well as various practical theatrical problems and moments of unclear staging (especially where disguises, dances, and supernumeraries are concerned). Plausible - though by no means definite - instances of minor interpolations, changes of plan, or some form of theatrical adaptation include the satyrs' dance in *The Winter's Tale* (4.4. 322-341); the spoken dirge in *Cymbeline* (4.2. 236-282); and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 4.2 (all discussed in the respective introductions to these plays in *Companion*). Such features have been fully covered by the editorial tradition, though in general they appear to interest recent editors much less than they did earlier ones (Potter is a significant exception in this respect (see *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 26-34), which is a reflection both of her thoroughness and of the play's previous neglect). It would also be fair to say that, whilst they may well furnish evidence of the contingencies of composition and transmission, many supposed errors and inconsistencies only become obtrusive when viewed by the standards of essentially "literary" and inappropriately naturalistic models of reading - interpretative paradigms which take little account of the performative dynamics and specific deictics of the theatrical moment (on which, see Alessandro Serpieri, 'Reading the signs: towards a semiotics of Shakespearean drama', translated by Keir Elam, in Drakakis, *Alternative Shakespeares*, pp. 119-143 (pp. 119-126)).

34. That is, all those features made thoroughly familiar as a result of the efforts of the practitioners of the "New Bibliography" - in work that is now being developed, contextualized, and interrogated in the newest wave of textual criticism. The Oxford Shakespeare usefully subsumes the main conclusions of most previous scholarship in this field (see primarily the individual textual introductions to each of the late plays in *Companion*). Other relevant recent studies include: MacD. P. Jackson, 'Compositors' Stints and the Spacing of Punctuation in the First Quarto (1609) of Shakespeare's *Pericles*', *PBSA*, 81 (1987), 17-23; and the detailed textual analyses supplied in Fredson Bowers's editions of *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, in Bowers, VII (1989), pp. 1-144, 145-298 respectively. Interest in the 1634 quarto of *Kinsmen* has picked up considerably of late; see especially Paul Werstine, 'On the Compositors of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 6-30; and Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 111-129. Some of the wider cultural and theatrical forces to have impinged on the passage of Shakespearian drama to the printed page are discussed in E. A. J. Honigmann, *The Stability of Shakespeare's Text* (London, 1965); and Gary Taylor and John Jowett, *Shakespeare Reshaped, 1606-1623* (Oxford, 1993).

35. As Orgel bluntly remarks, 'what scientific bibliography has taught us more clearly than anything else is that at the heart of our texts lies a hard core of uncertainty' ('What is a Text?', p. 3).

36. Thus in *Henry VIII*, the anonymous gentlemen-narrators of 2.1 and 4.1 have almost always been attributed to (which is as much to say, "blamed on") Fletcher, as has most of the play's on-stage spectacle and pageantry - the coronation procession, Queen Katherine's vision, the christening scene, and so on. A good indication of the unease generated by such features is provided by the work of Fredson Bowers, who extends the standard argument on collaboration here to suggest the presence of Fletcher's hand in all of the text's lengthy stage directions, including those in passages usually allotted unhesitatingly to Shakespeare (see *Henry VIII*, pp. 4-5, and p. 16, note 7). Turning to *Pericles*, a desire to dissociate Shakespeare from Gower and his dumb-shows is especially prevalent among earlier commentators (typified in Fleay's 1874 essay, 'On the Play of *Pericles*', p. 196; and Robert Boyle's 'On Wilkins's Share in the Play Called Shakspeare's *Pericles*', *Transactions* (1880-6), 323-340 (pp. 332-333)). Chambers took a comparable line in the first half of the twentieth century (*Facts and Problems*, I, 521), and the idea that the choruses are a device unworthy of Shakespeare has often been reiterated (as, for example, in Bertrand Evans, *Shakespeare's Comedies* (1960), p. 223). The position with *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is a little different, since most of this play's major pieces of spectacle and reported action occur during the sections most widely thought of as Shakespearian, the first and fifth acts. But critics have still been more than careful to distance Shakespeare from similar material elsewhere in *Kinsmen* which they have found less aesthetically pleasing, the morris dance in 3.5, or the Chaucerian-style narratives of 4.2. And relevant too in this context is Potter's suggestion that the reporting of certain events (such as the concluding tournament) in the play as it stands may be the result of hurried changes to the original plan (see *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, p. 31, and also her essay, 'Topicality or Politics? *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 1613-34', in McMullan and Hope, *The Politics of Tragicomedy*, pp. 77-91 (p. 79)). Potter's thinking in this connects to what seems to be a general critical impression, that the choice over whether to show or to report in Shakespearian drama is determined more by pragmatic considerations than by aesthetic ones. I address some of the implications of this view, which to my mind totally misses the point of the late plays, in Chapter Four.

37. Though as I suggested above, issues relating to authorship always tend to be overdetermined, which means that a variety of other contributory factors can be invoked here as well. So, for example, the growth of Shakespearian disintegration in Victorian times - and the genuine popularity of the whole process of identifying alien matter and major textual instability in the canon - would seem to have been closely tied up with eighteenth- and nineteenth-century historicist and anti-idealist approaches to questions of authorship, authenticity, and transmission in Biblical studies, the so-called "Higher Criticism" (a

trend briefly discussed in Carroll and Prickett, *The Bible*, pp. xxxiv-xxxvi; for a slightly different sense to mine of its influence on the world of Shakespeare studies, see Felperin, 'Bardolatry Then and Now', p. 136). Revision theories in the early twentieth century, meanwhile, such as those propounded by Dover Wilson, were particularly stimulated by the now largely rejected notion of "continuous copy" (on which, see Halliday, p. 11). Then again, Dover Wilson's work also reveals a genuine delight for its own sake in the detective investigation and intellectual conjecture pursued (see Philip Brockbank's 'Preface' in Dover Wilson, *Complete Works* (1980), pp. 9-11). Yet however many - or powerful - the wider pressures and motives involved, the coincidence of the similar type of response I have noted across so many plays seems to me to point clearly to a determining critical anxiety.

38. In principle, my case for the aesthetic purpose and quality of the material concerned here has nothing to do with the question of authorship, and it is certainly not dependent on it. But to seek to defend parts of the Shakespeare canon that have been regularly regarded as irrelevant, accidental, or unimpressive - especially if that defence is combined, as in my own approach, with a scepticism (or agnosticism) regarding the validity of some of the primary theories of collaboration that have been applied to the plays - is inevitably to risk the charge of bardolatry. See in particular in this context the discussion in Gary Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare* (1990), pp. 373-411. My emphasis on matters of aesthetics also connects to a number of wider issues - the long-standing opposition between aesthetic appreciation and theories of multiple authorship, the value critics sometimes find in being able to point to certain parts of the Shakespeare canon as indubitably "bad" - which I return to in my section on 'Collaboration' below, as well as in Chapter Four. I would note for now, though, that there is no really "innocent" position to be adopted in all this. Opinions about aesthetic quality have underpinned pretty much every theory of dual/multiple authorship ever proposed in relation to Shakespeare (see further my following section). And even commentary such as Taylor's, with its much more positive and apparently balanced attitude to the whole idea of collaboration, is bound up in a kind of "anti-bardolatry" that compromises the "objectivity" of many of its judgements - and that leads Taylor himself, as others have noted, to a reliance on some very dubious authorities in his desire to counter the over-idealization of Shakespeare.

39. The history and influence of the NSS, and the place of its work in the overall development of attribution studies in the field of English Renaissance drama, are traced in S. Schoenbaum, *Internal Evidence and Elizabethan Dramatic Authorship* (London, 1966), pp. 1-143 (see especially pp. 3-5, 38-59). My comments below also draw on the discussions of the Society and its methods in Gary Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare*, pp. 164-173; and Grady, *The Modernist Shakespeare* (1991), pp. 33-56, and 'Disintegration and its Reverberations'. Schoenbaum himself makes the point that 'the modern movement in authorship study,

taking as its province the whole sweep of Tudor and Stuart drama, properly begins with the establishment of the New Shakspeare Society' (p. 38).

40. *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, no. 1; volume 2 of the Society's *Transactions*, also covering 1874, is continuously paginated with the first, and there are both separate and joint issues, which differ slightly in the placing and make-up of the 'Appendix to Part I' (where much of the relevant authorship work is to be found - see the following note); I have used an edition that combines the two volumes. Parallels between Oxford's approach to the subject of authorship and the interests of the NSS are noted in Grady, 'Disintegration and its Reverberations', pp. 114-115. A general connection arises from the way the Oxford editors make the issue of attribution more than usually prominent by inscribing their conclusions about dual authorship on the individual title-pages of the plays concerned. Specific links are most noticeable in the case of *Pericles*, since with *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, Oxford essentially just follows the broad acceptance of the NSS position in subsequent criticism. In reviving George Wilkins's claim to part-authorship of *Pericles*, however, the editors go against the main trend of previous opinion in the second half of the twentieth century, and thus effectively align themselves with Fleay's essay (also to be found in the *Transactions* for 1874), 'On the Play of *Pericles*'. Admittedly, Oxford does not share Fleay's belief in the presence of a third hand in the brothel scenes, but the editors do see Wilkins's involvement during the later stages of the play, in material which almost everyone else has regarded as being wholly Shakespearian (see *Companion*, p. 130). The Oxford editors' penchant for pushing to the fore theories of multiple authorship is criticized as a retrogressive tendency in a number of the early reviews of their edition; examples include David Bevington, 'Determining the Indeterminate', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 38 (1987), 501-519; and the essay by Brian Vickers, *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 40 (1989), 402-411. In both of these, Oxford's highly unconventional editorial treatment of *Pericles* is a focus for particularly heavy condemnation. Whilst there is clearly something of a knee-jerk reaction being expressed in such initial responses, many of the strictures advanced are thoroughly valid. Its aims and methods may be very different, but in its drastic attempt to improve on the quality of the quarto text, the Oxford editors' "reconstruction" of *Pericles* comes disturbingly close to Fleay's project in presenting his version of "*Marina*" to the NSS (see further above, Chapter Two, note 40).

41. See the 'Appendix to Part I', pp. 1*-68*, which reprints key essays by James Spedding and Samuel Hickson (discussed below) on the authorship of *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, along with extracts from earlier commentators, and notes on each of the plays by both Fleay and Furnivall, "confirming" the opinions already advanced (see Fleay, 'A Fresh Confirmation [. . .]', and 'Mr Hickson's Division [. . .]'; and Furnivall, 'Another Fresh Confirmation [. . .]', and 'Mr Hickson's Division [. . .]' - full titles/details are given in the Bibliography).

If there is, as critics have so often claimed, a "traditional" division of the authorship of these two texts, then, for better or worse, it is to be found here. Many of the Society's later contributions to the authorship debate might be best forgotten, but it did produce some valuable work on *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. This includes its reprint of William Spalding's *A Letter on Shakspeare's Authorship of 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'* (London, 1876; originally printed, with only Spalding's (rather appropriate) initials appended, Edinburgh, 1833); and above all, Harold Littledale's major three-volume text of the play (London, 1876-1885), far and away the most thorough edition of *Kinsmen* prior to Potter's, and still a mine of genuinely useful information.

42. Furnivall's objectives are set out in his opening remarks at the Society's first meeting, 13 March 1874 (as recorded in *Transactions* (1874), v-xi); and see also 'The New Shakspeare Society (The Founder's Prospectus Revised)', dated 28 March 1874, an item which seems to have been bound in with different issues of the early instalments of the NSS *Transactions* (I have found it at the front of a copy of volumes 3-4 (1875-6)). Furnivall's 1874 'Introduction' to Gervinus's *Shakespeare Commentaries*, written in the wake of the Society's first year, provides a much fuller elucidation of his position. As I have already mentioned above (Chapter Two, note 118), Furnivall's own central interest lay in chronology, but the tests that were used to date the plays were also the ones which supplied evidence for authorship, and the two subjects were therefore utterly intertwined for the NSS (as they have been ever since).

43. Their names may go easily together now, but actual relations between Furnivall and Fleay swiftly became anything but easy, and the latter was to make an early (and bitter) departure from the ranks of the NSS as a consequence (see Schoenbaum, *Internal Evidence*, pp. 39-50; and William Benzie, *Dr. F. J. Furnivall* (1983), pp. 186-190). Despite giving Fleay the room to speak in the first place, Furnivall expressed doubts about the quality of his work almost from the start, and indeed seriously questioned its claim to scientific status (in the course of remarks made during the Society's meeting on 27 March 1874, recorded in *Transactions* (1874), 26-35 (see p. 32)). But an avowed commitment to scientific method is a recurring feature of Furnivall's own writings in general, and was certainly what his contemporaries (if perhaps chiefly his opponents) perceived as distinctive in his approach to Shakespeare; see further on this Benzie, pp. 190-191; and Grady, 'Disintegration and its Reverberations', pp. 112-118, which is also helpful in linking the "scientific" interests of the NSS to the intellectual environment of the Victorian era.

44. 'On Metrical Tests as Applied to Dramatic Poetry: Part I. Shakspeare', *Transactions* (1874), 1-16 (p. 2); Fleay continues: 'in criticism as in other matters, the test that decides between science and empiricism is this: "Can you say, not only of what kind, but how much? If you cannot weigh, measure, number your results, however you may be

convinced yourself, you must not hope to convince others, or claim the position of an investigator; you are merely a guesser, a propounder of hypotheses". Whatever the merits of such sentiments, they are unfortunately comic coming from Fleay himself, whose work reveals a recurring inability to weigh, measure, or number with any accuracy whatsoever, and a persistent tendency to put forward, on remarkably little evidence, some very wild hypotheses indeed.

45. Papers by Fleay dominated the early meetings of the Society, and a good sense of the (changing) reception of his work within the NSS can be gleaned from the records of the ensuing discussions preserved in the 1874 *Transactions*. Disenchantment with Fleay's individual practice did not entail a rejection of the testing procedures that he advocated, however. The Society's efforts in the area of attribution studies did decline noticeably once Fleay had departed, but this would seem to have had as much to do with the fact that Furnivall's primary project of establishing the canon and its chronology was effectively complete by then (to Furnivall's own satisfaction, that is). Certainly, the value of metrical tests is vigorously asserted in the Society's 'First Report, July, 1875' (unsigned, but presumably at least in part by Furnivall, and another item which appears in different places, and which I have found bound in at the front of a copy of *Transactions* (1875-6)); and see too John K. Ingram, 'On the "Weak Endings" of Shakspeare, with Some Account of the History of the Verse-Tests in General', *Transactions* (1874), 442-464; and the use of metrical evidence in Harold Littledale, ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen: Part II. General Introduction* (London, 1885), pp. 17*-23*.

46. Where the late plays are concerned, the supposed objectivity and/or irrefutability of the standard authorship tests is something that has been emphasized with especial frequency in connection with *Henry VIII*, no doubt mainly as a compensatory reaction against the fact that the case for collaboration here is founded entirely on internal evidence, and runs counter to the authority of the Folio. For the kind of attitude that I have in mind, see A. C. Partridge, *The Problem of 'Henry VIII' Reopened: Some Linguistic Criteria for the Two Styles apparent in the Play* (Cambridge, 1949); Marco Mincoff, 'Henry VIII and Fletcher', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 12 (1961), 239-260 (pp. 259-260); MacD. P. Jackson, 'The transmission of Shakespeare's text', in Stanley Wells, *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, pp. 163-185 (p. 165); and Gary Taylor, 'Canon and Chronology', pp. 133-134; and note too the confident tone of the discussion in J. C. Maxwell, ed., *King Henry the Eighth*, *The New Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 1962), pp. xii-xxv. Northrop Frye makes a similar point to mine when he remarks that *Henry VIII* is 'so often said to be largely the work of Fletcher that the statement has come to have the force of an established fact, though it is not one' ('Romance as Masque' (1978), p. 31).

47. Though it is true to say that critics opposed to the idea of collaboration in *Pericles* and *Henry VIII* have the habit of playing down the full extent of the evidence ranged against them (a tendency to

which my own work probably succumbs in places). For example, Doreen DelVecchio and Antony Hammond, in their recent edition of *Pericles* for The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1998), for all that they make a good case for rejecting or resisting theories of dual authorship, are more than a little guilty of this sort of misrepresentation (see the 'Authorship' section of their Introduction, pp. 8-15); and the same goes for Peter Alexander in his early and important trend-bucking essay, 'Conjectural History, or Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*', *Essays and Studies*, 16 (1930), 85-120. Cyrus Hoy expresses a comparable (albeit stronger) complaint regarding Paul Bertram's arguments for sole Shakespearian authorship in *Shakespeare and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'* (1965); see Hoy's review of Bertram's book, *Modern Philology*, 67 (1969-70), 83-88. Then again, criticism propounding collaboration in these three plays is just as likely to come up with misrepresentations of its own, and has indeed consistently shown a lack of appreciation of their aesthetic design and quality. In other words, excesses and inaccuracies have characterized all sides of the debate, with the emphasis here on "all", since the attitudes involved are rarely in fact reducible to simple oppositions.

48. The distinction between internal and external evidence in authorship and chronology studies has of course long been standard; a contrast between quantitative and qualitative forms of internal evidence has not been so rigorously maintained. The more "scientific" work on authorship tends only to acknowledge its use of quantitative evidence, and that is what I am concentrating on here. But as I argue below, qualitative and subjective evidence has always been a central component in authorship attribution, and still lies at the root of much modern opinion. Purely evaluative judgements would seem, in theory, to be the type of evidence most vulnerable to reassessment and rejection with the passage of time. In late play criticism, however, many have managed to prove remarkably persistent.

49. Despite my comments above (note 47), telling criticisms of nineteenth-century authorship work on Shakespeare can be found in both Bertram (*Shakespeare and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 21-34, 136-142) and Alexander ('Conjectural History' - see especially his attack on the various metrical tests and their supposed independence, pp. 103-112). But nineteenth-century critics themselves did much to bring their own approach into disrepute, with a cavalier attitude to external evidence, increasingly extreme and convoluted theories, and a disturbing failure to achieve any real agreement over observation, or even consistency of measurement in their numerical results (on these last, see Grady, 'Disintegration and its Reverberations', pp. 117-118). My emphasis here on the NSS position as of 1874 is important. Though they declared their conclusions at this time to be incontrovertible, both Furnivall and Fleay came to change their mind about *Henry VIII*, being influenced by Boyle's ideas to reduce the extent of Shakespeare's presence still further (partially, in Fleay's case (*Chronicle History*, pp. 250-252), and in Furnivall's, entirely (see his recorded response to Boyle's paper, *Transactions* (1880-6), p. 120*)). And they both also ended up rejecting

any Shakespearian involvement whatsoever in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (see Fleay, pp. 252-254; the remarks by Furnivall just cited; and, out of a number of other retractions the latter made on this subject, his 'Forewords' in the Society's edition of Spalding's *Letter*, pp. v-xi, where he happily notes besides (quoting from the relevant essay) that Spalding himself became a lot less confident on the issue of Shakespeare's participation in this play).

50. Schoenbaum provides a thorough survey of work from the time of the NSS up until the 1960s (*Internal Evidence*, pp. 63-143), and an assessment of some of the most popular methods of testing (pp. 183-195). For a fuller discussion of forms of internal evidence, see Gary Taylor, 'Canon and Chronology', pp. 76-89. The more recent techniques referred to here can be seen in operation in Jonathan Hope, *The authorship of Shakespeare's plays: A socio-linguistic study* (Cambridge, 1994); and Thomas B. Horton, 'Distinguishing Shakespeare from Fletcher through Function Words', *Shakespeare Studies*, 22 (1994), 314-335. My summary is again highly schematic, and is not meant to imply any evolutionary or teleological progression, in what is after all a complex and muddled field. It should perhaps have included some reference to "stylometry", but as first formulated, this was always a deeply suspect methodology, and although the term is still current (it is used by Horton, among others), it seems fair to say that the original line of approach has now been pretty much subsumed into the wider realm of computer-aided analysis in general (see Taylor, p. 80). Certainly, results associated with the early applications of stylometry to Shakespeare (as in, for example, G. Harold Metz, 'Disputed Shakespearean Texts and Stylometric Analysis', *TEXT*, 2 (1985), 149-171) carry no authority.

51. As Schoenbaum emphasizes, internal evidence at best is only capable of supporting (more or less) convincing hypotheses (*Internal Evidence*, pp. 217-219; and see his Signet Classic edition of *Henry VIII* (New York, 1967), pp. xxiii-xxvii). I am drawing in addition here on Bristol's essay, 'How Good Does Evidence Have to Be?', which highlights crucial distinctions between 'theoretical and forensic contexts of inquiry' (p. 23), and veridical and circumstantial forms of evidence (pp. 24-26); Bristol's comments on "wishful thinking" ('the type of situation where beliefs are distorted by interests') are also germane to my argument (pp. 28-29). Apart from Schoenbaum's principles for 'avoiding disaster' (*Internal Evidence*, pp. 162-183), which are in any case mainly practical in outlook (and now inevitably showing their age), authorship work on Shakespeare, very much a realm of forensic inquiry, seems to have paid only minimal attention to theoretical issues relating to methodology and the nature and quality of the evidence available. Having said that, it is best not to exaggerate evidential limitations. Bristol rightly notes that the distinctions he discusses are ones of degree, not opposition, and he makes the point, which connects to my comments below, that forensic inquiry frequently yields reasonably conclusive results. And in the assessment of competing hypotheses, Occam's razor can always be applied. But even so, it still seems worth registering the fundamentally

provisional character of any narratives that are grounded purely on internal evidence.

52. Essentially the same point as mine about the value of the cumulative weight of evidence is made by Schoenbaum, who nevertheless stresses the advisability of not building on foundations known to be unstable (see *Internal Evidence*, pp. 195-196). Gary Taylor has some brief (and slightly belated) comments on the problem of sample size ('Canon and Chronology', p. 89); and see especially Horton, whose work on late Shakespeare addresses aspects of statistical analysis often ignored or bypassed in earlier studies, issues to do with the relative size of control and test samples, methods of comparison, the importance of conducting trial tests that are subject to verification, internal variations within the chosen samples, the probable degree of accuracy in the results achieved, and so on. Horton's essay is a summary of his doctoral thesis (which I have not seen), 'The Effectiveness of the Stylometry of Function Words in Discriminating between Shakespeare and Fletcher' (University of Edinburgh, 1987).

53. A category which includes such material as the prologue and epilogue to *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, the Gower choruses, and the series of whole scenes made up of soliloquies by the Jailer's Daughter (*Kinsmen*, 2.4, 2.6, 3.2, and 3.4). Some critics feel able to go still further and identify as by one author odd lines here and there in scenes attributed to another (see, for example, A. C. Partridge, p. 21; and compare too the long tradition of praising the "blind mole" passage in *Pericles* (Sc.1. 143-145) as an isolated Shakespearian gem). Critical certainty usually also extends to the assignment of prose scenes, which pose their own problems, in that most of the major tests around are geared towards the analysis of verse characteristics. Other symptoms of the kind of dubious confidence I have in mind are editorial commentaries that designate the authorship of individual scenes or sections; title pages that present conjectural attributions in definitive terms; and the common practice of listing or tabulating the separate authorial contributions to a collaborative work, which serves more often than not to level out any degree of difference in the relative probability of the attributions involved (for a more responsible approach, see Horton, pp. 329-330).

54. Quoting again from Furnivall's remarks at the meeting on 27 March 1874 (*Transactions* (1874), p. 32); and see also the Society's 'First Report', pp. 1-3, where metrical tests are praised precisely for their ability to confirm 'the higher criticism' (p. 2). Furnivall's work in fact repeatedly registers an outright suspicion of metrical tests, which could be a defensive reaction to the welter of criticism the Society's endeavours in this area received, but comes across more as a genuine anxiety, as though he felt (as many others have since) that the realm of the aesthetic were somehow being debased or compromised by mathematics. All these tensions surface in a typically categorical pronouncement by Furnivall, 'counting can never be a better judge than real criticism' ('Mr Hickson's Division', p. 65*).

55. Best exemplified in the current context by the obsequious tone Furnivall adopts whenever he discusses the work of James Spedding. For Furnivall, Spedding is 'the scholar, who, of all men I have talkt [sic] to, seems to me to combine most happily, criticism of the spirit and form of poetry' (*Transactions* (1874), p. 26). And in the same vein, he claims of Spedding's analysis of the authorship of *Henry VIII*, that it 'needs no confirmation by lower tests', since it has been 'made by the highest and soundest test, the taste of a highly cultivated man trained in criticism' ('Another Fresh Confirmation', p. 24*).

56. Browning, in his capacity as President of the Society, makes an inglorious contribution to the debate on *Henry VIII* by registering, in a letter to Furnivall, his agreement with Boyle's conclusions (see *Transactions* (1880-6), p. 119*). What concerns me here is not so much Browning's point of view, as why his name gets introduced at all in this context; see the terms of Boyle's response to Browning, pp. 124*-125*. Furnivall's desire to gain the cachet of having 'one of our greatest living poets' occupy the NSS presidency is revealed in his 'Founder's Prospectus' (p. 8). Tennyson is invoked as prime mover behind the NSS position (as of 1874) on both *Henry VIII* and *Pericles*, and his name is invested with a curious talismanic significance. Spedding's own debt to Tennyson (see below, note 73) is emphasized in the Society's 'First Report' (pp. 1-2), as it has been by many later critics, in an obvious attempt to garner further authority for the argument for Fletcher's involvement. And Tennyson's name is the primary force Furnivall relies on (and the awe in his tone is palpable) in defending Shakespeare's partial presence in *Pericles*; see his comments on Fleay's paper, 'On the Play of *Pericles*' (*Transactions* (1874), 252-254), where his own report of Tennyson's opinions on the subject is somehow supposed to allow Furnivall to claim Fleay's study as 'independent confirmation of the poet-critic's result by the metrical-test-worker's process' (p. 253). Bram Stoker's anecdote recounting the elderly Tennyson's remarks on the authorship of *Henry VIII* hardly does much for the poet's reputation as an authority in this discipline (see Stoker, *Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving*, 2 vols (London, 1906), I, 236; cited in A. R. Humphreys, ed., *King Henry the Eighth*, The New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1971), p. 21, footnote); and Hallam Tennyson's records/recollections of his father's views complicate the situation still further at the level of detail (see James O Hoge, Jr., 'Tennyson on Shakespeare: His Talk about the Plays', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 18 (1976), 147-170; and compare too the observations extracted and discussed in Bertram, *Shakespeare and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, p. 136, footnote 11).

57. Or to put this a little more cynically, most critics (and I include myself in this) are happy to invoke the authority of authorship tests where the results concerned coincide with their own pre-formed opinions on the subject. (Though it should also be acknowledged that common opinion is often a useful tool for reigning in some of the more eccentric conclusions which "science" can throw up.)

58. 'The Authentic Shakespeare', p. 2; see also on this subject Maurice Charney's 'Introduction' to *"Bad" Shakespeare* (1988), pp. 9-18, and the issues addressed in that volume as a whole. Orgel's focus here on Shakespeare as poet obviously reflects the particular terms of his own discussion, but it is far from inapt in the current context, given the way authorship work on the plays, like the critical tradition that forms its backdrop, has tended to devote more attention to poetic and "literary" characteristics than to dramatic effects and possibilities - with predictable results. Still relevant in this connection, both for its insights and its limitations, is Hardin Craig's 'Shakespeare's Bad Poetry', *Shakespeare Survey*, 1 (1948), 51-56.

59. To focus on just one of the areas mentioned here, sources, see the essay by Robert Adger Law, 'Holinshed and *Henry the Eighth*', *Texas Studies in English*, 36 (1957), 3-11; and Ann Thompson's chapter on *The Two Noble Kinsmen* in her book, *Shakespeare's Chaucer: A Study in Literary Origins* (Liverpool, 1978), pp. 166-215. Offering evidence that really amounts to nothing more than their own say so, both these critics successfully prove to themselves that Fletcher's treatment of the main source in either case is manifestly inferior to Shakespeare's (and see too Law's 'The Double Authorship of *Henry VIII*', *Studies in Philology*, 56 (1959), 471-488, which adds to his initial argument an equally suspect comparison of the complexity of imagery in the two "shares"). A similar degree of blatant bias is endemic even in studies of a supposedly more "objective" nature. See, for example, Alfred Hart's well-respected essay, 'Shakespeare and the Vocabulary of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Review of English Studies*, 10 (1934), 274-287, which manoeuvres its various lists, totals, and percentages for rare words and neologisms, with no allowance for the narrowness of its own focus, and completely oblivious to all questions of dramatic context, stylistic decorum, or artistic intent, to pour scorn on the 'poverty' (p. 277) of the vocabulary in the "non-Shakespearian" section of the play - for no better reason than because this is classified as being "not by Shakespeare".

60. On some of the issues surrounding the concept of the "sound" of Shakespeare, and the way assessment and understanding of this is constantly changing with time, see Orgel ('The Authentic Shakespeare', pp. 1-4), who makes the point that 'different texts have sounded right or wrong at different periods, without much regard to evidence of any sort' (p. 3), and suggests besides that Shakespeare's contemporaries 'noticed and valued things that we have taught ourselves to ignore' (p. 4). The vision in *Cymbeline* perfectly illustrates the manner in which tastes can alter in this respect - now generally admitted to the realm of the authentic, but once widely perceived as effectively exemplifying the kind of material which Shakespeare could never have written. Less spectacularly, the peculiar doggerel rhyming couplets which pervade the same play fit into much the same category.

61. I am essentially just arguing the case here for rigour, consistency, and a wide-enough focus in authorship work. But there

is a potential for even this kind of methodological conservatism to run into problems, and I would acknowledge that the perspective I am advocating tends to be inimical to any position that challenges either the "safest", most conservative assessment of the surviving documentary evidence (though what that assessment might be is itself often open to question), or the status quo of one's own pre-formed prejudices and opinions on the subject. I have tried to be aware of this danger, but whatever its potential for misapplication, the methodology suggested still clearly seems the best line of approach available.

62. The critic who probably manages to come closest to escaping from conventional expectations or a dependence on specific conceptions of Shakespeare is Cyrus Hoy, whose work on the authorship of *Henry VIII* is virtually unique in approaching the play from the direction of the Fletcher canon. See his 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon (VII)', *Studies in Bibliography*, 15 (1962), 71-90 (the avowed focus of this essay is "Fletcher-Shakespeare" collaborations, but Hoy's treatment of the *The Two Noble Kinsmen* here is entirely perfunctory). Whilst the validity of his methods remains in question, it is particularly striking, in relation to what I have been saying so far, that Hoy's distinctive line of inquiry - which also largely resists supporting its conclusions with evaluative judgements - should yield a significantly different division of the play between Shakespeare and Fletcher to that found in the standard tradition of attribution descending from Spedding, Hickson, and the NSS.

63. Criticism that opposes the standard line on collaboration in the late plays is itself often bound up within the same conservative paradigms as the commentary it seeks to redress. See, for example, the full-scale idealizations of monarchy and absolutist power that emerge in Wilson Knight's work on *Henry VIII* (typified by the chapter in *The Crown of Life* (1948), pp. 256-336), or in Bertram's reading of the same play (*Shakespeare and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 159-176). In both these cases, the reactionary political meaning found in the text is put forward as evidence of Shakespeare's unaided authorship. I touch a little further on the dynamics of "anti-collaborationist" approaches to late Shakespeare, below.

64. Chambers is very much a key figure in this last connection, in the way he omits from his main array of metrical data a whole range of types of (non-blank) verse (more than are suggested by my own list); see *Facts and Problems*, II, 406. His figures have been reproduced and utilized by many other critics, including Gary Taylor (see 'Canon and Chronology', p. 96). Brian Vickers professes to be mystified by the logic of Chambers's approach in this respect (Review, p. 410), but it is clearly designed to remove from the authorship/chronology equation all those elements in Shakespeare which are composed in a significantly different, "atypical" style - in other words, anything that obviously represents deliberate formal/aesthetic variation. Given that style is often the central bone of contention in the entire authorship debate,

however, this is immediately to beg a number of serious (aesthetic) questions. Similar concerns affect Taylor's attempt to construct 'a reliable Shakespearian norm' for function-word usage, from what he refers to as 'an uncontroversial core of undisputed works' (p. 81). Here again, the processes involved in deciding which texts to eliminate as doubtful/collaborative from the core sample are already dependent on aesthetic criteria, value judgements as to what constitutes "anomalous" or suspect material as opposed to intentional variations of style on Shakespeare's part (and Taylor's treatment of *Measure for Measure* is not even consistent by Oxford's own standards). Moreover, the features under analysis are assumed to recur with the same degree of regularity irrespective of any conscious stylistic variation within Shakespeare's own writings (a dubious proposition in any case); and so the fact that the core sample includes plays that themselves contain some decidedly "atypical" work (Pistol's bombast, the Player's speech, to cite two of Chambers's own examples) now seems to be unimportant. In other words, the failure to separate out such material in this instance (there is no indication that it is omitted from the statistics on this occasion) actually ends up serving as just another way of leaving it out of the account.

For comment on some of the methodological problems attached to the whole idea of partitioning off "uncharacteristic" writing from the outset, see Masten, 'Playwrighting', p. 372. There are plenty of other areas I could mention in which "scientific" study has been founded on primarily literary-aesthetic judgements. As for my first point here regarding the choice of features to examine, Leeds Barroll gets to the nub of the matter when he notes that 'any characteristic of a play, including, say, the number of speaking parts, which can be counted and thus transformed into quantitative terms, will form figures that can be grouped into any combination of purely *numerical* categories' ('The Chronology of Shakespeare's Jacobean Plays and the Dating of *Antony and Cleopatra*' (1965), p. 119). The difficulties of applying the information generated, and the role of interpretation and opinion in this activity, are clearly evinced in Taylor's work on function words (pp. 80-89), where the relevance of the data he produces is far from self-evident, and where he distinguishes between meaningful evidence and "anomalous" results largely on the basis of arbitrary decisions, critical expectations, and argumentary convenience. It would perhaps be unfair to make too much in this context of the inconsistencies and inaccuracies (still uncorrected in the 1997 reprint of the *Companion*) that mar Taylor's presentation of his results, but they do reflect something of a traditional failing in Shakespearian attribution studies, and one that again brings the Oxford Shakespeare disturbingly close to the discredited and erratic methods of Fleay. On Taylor's problematic treatment of his material, and the way this impairs the overall value of his approach, see T. Merriam, 'Taylor's Statistics in *A Textual Companion*', *Notes and Queries*, 234 (1989), 341-342; Vickers, pp. 409-410; and, in particular, M. W. A. Smith, 'Statistical Inference in *A Textual Companion* to The Oxford Shakespeare', *Notes and Queries*, 236 (1991), 73-78.

65. Not to mention all the many other agencies that can affect transmission. For any truly viable authorship work to proceed, as Hope remarks, 'we need to know which features of a text are stable, and which are not. We need to know that spelling, punctuation, lineation, contractions, sentence length, oaths, stage directions are all subject to being changed by hands which are not those of the "author" of the play' (p. 4). The range of possible influences involved effectively rules out of court immediately studies based, to take just one example, on comparisons of authorial letter-frequency patterns (as in Gerard Ledger and Thomas Merriam, 'Shakespeare, Fletcher, and the Two Noble Kinsmen [sic]', *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 9 (1994), 235-248). Hope rightly draws attention to the fact that certain elements of poetic and grammatical structure are resistant to scribal or compositorial alteration (see in particular pp. 70-76). But even where this is not the case, authorship critics have generally seemed happy to ignore the issue of mediation by scribes/compositors/etc., except when this can help them get round gaps in particular theories of attribution (and see Masten, 'Playwrighting', p. 373). So most of the time, an ability to filter out all the "unwanted" accretions of transmission is tacitly assumed, although in practice, this would seem to be no easier than identifying individual authorial contributions themselves.

66. Computer-based analysis has obviously become the key tool in the investigation of unconscious authorial practices, allowing the search for the quintessence of Shakespeare's compositional style to concentrate on the most minor and "insignificant" of textual traces. But the definitive method of Shakespearian "fingerprinting" remains elusive. And in any case, the function words and other verbal and graphic incidentals that make up the elements of a text most easily categorized as "unconscious" would also seem to be, because of their relative unimportance in semantic terms, those features most prone to (unconscious?) alteration by the many individuals involved in the mechanical processes of textual transmission. As for the question of aesthetic effects, interpretative significance can be found in the treatment of even the littlest of words. So, picking up on just one of Gary Taylor's chosen function words, DelVecchio and Hammond are able to ask (and the idea is by no means implausible), 'could the prevalence of the word "no" in the first scenes of *Pericles* be an element in the creation of the dismal, negative dramatic atmosphere that pervades these scenes?' (*Pericles*, p. 12, note 5).

Earlier efforts at identifying characteristics representative of Shakespeare's unconscious habits focused primarily on the area of image clusters, but these too cannot always be adequately separated off from the realm of conscious artistic design. Indeed, image clusters, and the debate that can be traced across the main current of the work they have given rise to, perfectly illustrate the complexities of the situation here, and the multiplicity of factors and influences that enter the whole authorship/attribution equation. See in particular the following studies: Edward A. Armstrong, *Shakespeare's Imagination: A*

Study of the Psychology of Association and Inspiration (London, 1946); Muir, *Shakespeare as Collaborator*, pp. 103-123; the second edition of Armstrong's book (Lincoln, NE and London, 1963; reissued 1982), which responds to Muir; MacD. P. Jackson, 'Shakespeare and *Edmund Ironside*', *Notes and Queries*, 208 (1963), 331-332; C. H. Hobday, 'Why The Sweets Melted: A Study In Shakespeare's Imagery', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 16 (1965), 3-17, and the reply to this by Richard Harrier, 'Another Note on "Why the Sweets Melted"', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 18 (1967), 67; Gary Taylor, 'Canon and Chronology', p. 78; and, with its own brief survey of the field, Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 20-22.

67. I stress this point because of the out-and-out antagonism interpretative critics have often demonstrated towards the realm of attribution studies in general. It is true that it is not difficult to become exasperated with authorship work in the area of late Shakespeare, considering how poor much of this has been, especially where *Henry VIII* is concerned. And of course, some theories are just frankly laughable (a particular favourite of mine is Percy Allen's chronology-defying argument - seemingly from his pre-Oxfordian days - that the whole of *Pericles* was written by Wilkins in conscious imitation of Shakespeare's other ("genuine") late plays; see his book, *Shakespeare, Jonson, and Wilkins as Borrowers* (Oxford, 1928), pp. 185-223 (though for all that his main argument is ludicrous, Allen still makes some interesting points on the links between *Macbeth* and the late plays)). Even so, any blanket condemnation of the field, or of certain types of evidence, needs to be resisted (see Gary Taylor, 'Canon and Chronology', p. 77). I would also echo M. W. A. Smith's observation that 'close co-operation between the Shakespearian, statistician, and computer scientist is surely long overdue' ('Statistical Inference', p. 78). The best recent studies have been managing to display such cooperation more and more; but the "Shakespearians" in the equation themselves require expertise on a number of subjects - textual and interpretative issues, theatre and printing-house practices and history, and early modern (and current) discourses of authorship, to name only some of the most obvious.

68. 'What Is an Author?', p. 153; see further p. 150, and, for the material drawn upon here and in the following paragraph, pp. 150-153 generally; the next phrase quoted in my main text, below, is found on p. 150.

69. 'What Is an Author?', p. 151; Foucault claims that 'in order to "rediscover" an author in a work, modern criticism uses methods similar to those that Christian exegesis employed when trying to prove the value of a text by its author's saintliness' (p. 150). As a reflection of this, his criteria here are derived from the *De viris illustribus* of Saint Jerome (c. 342-420). Invoking these in relation to 'modern literary criticism' is justified with the assertion that they 'do define the four modalities according to which modern criticism brings the author-function into play' (p. 151). The relevance of these criteria to the history of Shakespeare attribution studies needs little defence, and similarly,

Shakespeare's cultural standing as one of the ultimate paradigms of literary authorship clearly makes him a perfect candidate for analysis in the light of Foucault's formulation. But, as elsewhere in the essay, there are some real problems and confusions with Foucault's historical model here, which asserts continuity even as it also denies it, and which seems uncertain whether to locate the approach to authorship being criticized in the present or the past. So once again, I am relying on the basic relevance of Foucault's argument, whilst finding its precise historical accuracy and specificity open to question.

70. The least obviously problematic of the four criteria is of course the last. It generally goes without saying that authors are not going to be able to refer accurately to specific historical events and scientific discoveries occurring after their deaths (though I would want to reserve some room here for prophetic literature as at least potentially a special case in this regard). But even this principle can become overly deterministic if it is extended to embrace rigid suppositions about the kind of attitudes, beliefs, political opinions, aesthetic intentions, etc., that could or would have been held by any given author at a particular time. See further below.

71. No harm can come from emphasizing that there is no external evidence *whatsoever* to indicate the involvement of anyone other than Shakespeare in the writing of *Henry VIII*. In Gary Taylor's peculiar own brand of logic, this situation is interpreted to mean 'there is no evidence that Fletcher's share in *All Is True* was common knowledge in the seventeenth century' ('Canon and Chronology', p. 133). A more conventional reading is supplied by Schoenbaum: 'the external evidence, while not ruling out Shakespeare-Fletcher collaboration, gives comfort only to the advocates of single authorship' (*Internal Evidence*, p. 38, note 86).

72. There is an excellent survey of the history of commentary on the authorship of *Henry VIII* in David V. Erdman and Ephim G. Fogel, eds., *Evidence for Authorship* (Ithaca, NY, 1966), pp. 457-478. This covers the debate up-to-and-including the important contributions by Hoy ('Shares (VII)') and R. A. Foakes (*Henry VIII*, pp. xv-xxviii (which takes in the response to Hoy (dated 1962) Foakes added to his original edition)). For a more recent discussion, see John Margeson, ed., *King Henry VIII*, *The New Cambridge Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 4-14. That Margeson adopts the same cut-off point as Erdman and Fogel is a reflection of the absence of any really significant intervening studies (at least until the late 1980s), and of the general respect that Hoy's conclusions have commanded. Having said that, the Oxford editors (see *Companion*, pp. 133-134, 618; and compare *Complete Works*, p. 1343) and, even more strongly, Fredson Bowers (*Henry VIII*, pp. 4-7) reject Hoy's position in favour of the original division proposed by James Spedding (see below). For some interesting recent work, see Hope, especially pp. 67-83; Horton; and MacD. P. Jackson, 'Phrase Lengths in *Henry VIII*: Shakespeare and Fletcher', *Notes and Queries*, 242 (1997), 75-80. Despite

strongly championing Fletcher's presence in the play, Gordon McMullan's Arden 3 edition adds little in the way of evidence to the debate.

73. See J[ames] S[pedding], 'Who Wrote Shakspeare's Henry VIII.?', *Gentleman's Magazine*, 187 (July-December 1850), 115-123; reprinted as 'On the Several Shares of Shakspeare and Fletcher in the Play of *Henry VIII.*', *Transactions* (1874), 1*-18*; all references are to the second printing, since this is the text that is most easily available, and consequently the one most frequently cited by later critics (the only differences are the explicit attribution of the essay to Spedding, minor footnotes by Furnivall, and the important framework which the NSS volume as a whole supplies). Spedding's work received a number of early responses in *Notes and Queries*. His division of the play between Shakespeare and Fletcher was supported in Samuel Hickson's 'Who Wrote Shakspeare's Henry VIII.?', 2 (May-December 1850), 198 (it is Hickson who is the first to tabulate the division and to attribute the Prologue and Epilogue to Fletcher). Hickson then went on to produce a series of additional notes ('Authorship of *Henry VIII.*', 2, 401-403; 'Authorship of *Henry VIII.*', 3 (January-June 1851), 33-34; and 'Shakspeare and Fletcher', 3, 318-319); and see besides (still in *Notes and Queries*) the unsigned editorial contribution, 'Further Notes on the Authorship of Shakspeare's Henry VIII.', 2, 306-307; and the comments on *Henry VIII* in "C. B.", 'Shakspeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*', 3, 190-191. Hickson's initial effort drew a reply from Spedding (with the authorship of this fully acknowledged), 'Who Wrote Shakspeare's Henry VIII.?', *Gentleman's Magazine*, 187, 381-382. A degree of tension between the two critics becomes very evident as the debate progresses. Neither was working in a vacuum, and Erdman and Fogel are particularly useful in tracing prior comments (notably by Ralph Waldo Emerson) on the authorship of the play. As mentioned above, Spedding himself attributed the original idea for Fletcher's involvement to Tennyson (see Spedding's Reply, p. 382).

74. Spedding begins the main line of his argument thus: 'leaving the critics, I might probably appeal to the individual consciousness of each reader, and ask him [sic] whether he has not always felt that, in spite of some great scenes which have made actors and actresses famous, and many beautiful speeches which adorn our books of extracts (and which, by the way, lose little or nothing by separation from their context, a most rare thing in Shakspeare), the effect of this play as a whole is weak and disappointing' (Spedding, 'Shares', p. 2*); such comments are very much in his characteristic vein. For a sense of the cultural context in which Spedding was writing, and the "Victorian values" that underlie his views, see Iska Alter, "'To Reform and Make Fitt": *Henry VIII* and the Making of "Bad" Shakespeare' (1988), pp. 178-180. I examine some of the specifics of his attack on the play in more detail in Chapter Six.

75. Most of what Spedding has to say in support of his theory is derived from his own impressions of the play's style and quality, and of the relative characteristics of Shakespeare's and Fletcher's dramatic

verse. He is some three-quarters of the way through his essay before he resorts directly to the results of a metrical test outlining the use of redundant syllables (see pp. 13*-16*). Indeed, Baldwin Maxwell only slightly overstates the case when he claims that, 'in a strict sense, Spedding cannot be said to have made any tests whatsoever' (*Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger* (Durham, NC, 1939), p. 56). Spedding himself, in a point picked up on by many of his followers, made much of the fact that he and Hickson arrived at their conclusions independently (see Spedding's Reply, p. 382). As Alexander stressed, however, since Spedding borrowed his single verse-test from Hickson, a coincidence in their figures is only to be expected (see 'Conjectural History', p. 103, footnote 3). The debt is acknowledged in Spedding's Reply, and is also clear from the footnote in his original essay that refers to Hickson's unsigned review-article on *The Two Noble Kinsmen* in the *Westminster and Foreign Quarterly Review*, 47 (April-July 1847), 59-88 (see Spedding, 'Shares', p. 18*).

76. The nature and extent of that fall are clearly evinced in changing attitudes to Wolsey's soliloquies in 3.2, once famed (not to say idolized) for their brilliance and pathos, and widely anthologized accordingly (a fact alluded to by Spedding himself - see the passage quoted above, note 74), but in the wake of Spedding's work regularly lambasted for their banality and sentimentality. In similar terms, it is hard to imagine anyone after Spedding allotting *Henry VIII* the kind of representative function which Jane Austen allows it in *Mansfield Park* (1814), where it is this play that Henry Crawford has been reading aloud from prior to his famous comments: 'but Shakespeare one gets acquainted with without knowing how. It is a part of an Englishman's constitution. His thoughts and beauties are so spread abroad that one touches them every where, one is intimate with him by instinct.- No man of any brain can open at a good part of one of his plays, without falling into the flow of his meaning immediately' (quoting from the Penguin Classics text, edited by Tony Tanner (Harmondsworth, 1986; first published, 1966), p. 335 (and see generally pp. 334-336)). I find it interesting that this vocabulary of instinct and intuition is so often paralleled within the body of commentary that seeks to deny Shakespeare large chunks of the very play that forms the point of departure for Crawford's remarks. It is all pure wish-fulfilment, of course, and it is worth noticing that Crawford's own opinions are probably subject to Austen's characteristic irony (though not, it is safe to assume, when it comes to the question of the actual authorship of *Henry VIII*). Crawford himself begins his reading with Wolsey, and it is possible to detect the influence of the anthology tradition behind this whole sequence in the novel (an issue touched upon in Margreta de Grazia, 'Shakespeare in Quotation Marks', in Marsden, pp. 57-71 (p. 65)). But what very few people over the last 125 years will have got to know and love as in any way archetypically Shakespearian is most of the material that Crawford is to be imagined as reading here. Wolsey's soliloquies themselves are notably absent (and this is an accurate reflection of twentieth-century tastes) from a fairly

recent show-piece contribution to the anthology tradition, *An Oxford Anthology of Shakespeare*, edited by Stanley Wells (Oxford, 1987).

77. As William Poel has it, 'so long as Shakespeare's authorship was not doubted there seems to have been no desire on the part of commentators to call attention to faults which are obvious to every careful reader of the play' ('The Authors of *King Henry the Eighth*', in *Shakespeare in the Theatre* (London, 1913; reissued New York, 1968), pp. 85-98 (p. 88)). Once championed by the NSS (and Dowden), the idea of divided authorship was taken up enthusiastically in many quarters, and soon found its way into most of the major editions and works of reference - that is to say, the material which formed the bedrock for twentieth-century studies of Shakespeare. See, for example, Sidney Lee's long article on Shakespeare in *DNB*, 17, 1286-1335 (first published in 1897, and later expanded in Lee, *A Life of William Shakespeare*, revised edition (London, 1915; first edition, 1898), pp. 442-448); and C. Knox Pooler's original Arden edition of *Henry VIII* (London, 1915; revised 1936), pp. xiv-xxviii; and compare too the line taken on this issue in the only major monograph on the play from the first half (and more) of the twentieth century, Cumberland Clark's *A Study of Shakespeare's 'Henry VIII'* (London, [1931]), pp. 40-51.

78. Typically damning appraisals - whether of the play itself, collaborative authorship in general, and/or Fletcherian dramaturgy (not to mention Fletcherian morality) - can be found in: Law's two essays; J. C. Maxwell's New Shakespeare edition; Humphreys's severely blinkered and uncomprehending Introduction in his New Penguin edition (pp. 7-47); Harold C. Goddard, *The Meaning of Shakespeare* (Chicago, 1951), pp. 269-270; Irving Ribner, *The English History Play in the age of Shakespeare* (1965), pp. 287-290; and, to pick out merely one example from the broad mass of less ambitious studies, George J. Becker, *Shakespeare's Histories* (New York, 1977), pp. 132-145. For a particularly extreme manifestation of what might fairly be described as the "Fletcher-bashing" approach to the play - though it is an extreme that is implicit in much other criticism - see Robert Ornstein, *A Kingdom for a Stage: The Achievement of Shakespeare's History Plays* (Cambridge, MA, 1972), pp. 203-220.

79. Hickson's relief at kicking Cranmer's prophecy out of the canon is undisguised: 'the flatteries of James and Elizabeth may now go packing together' ('Who Wrote Shakspeare's Henry VIII.?', p. 198). I return to the Archbishop's encomium and the anxieties it has occasioned in Chapter Six. Whilst on this subject, however, an intriguing hint of a critical path not taken - offering an enthusiastic emphasis on political issues within the realm of the aesthetic, a radical assessment of Shakespeare's own politics, and a tantalizing glimpse of a reading of Cranmer as a time-serving crony who rises to power purely by telling the King what he wants to hear - can be found in Richard Simpson's two essays in (of all places) the NSS *Transactions* for 1874, 'The Political Use of the Stage in Shakspeare's Time', pp. 371-395; and 'The Politics of Shakspeare's Historical Plays', pp. 396-441 (see especially pp. 429-431).

80. Boyle's argument for Fletcher-Massinger collaboration stands out (once again) as the prime example of utterly valueless work being ridiculously well-received. Boyle's reasoning is manifestly lacking in validity - he offers nothing in the way of remotely plausible evidence to justify any of his speculations - yet his opinions influenced plenty of people beyond a few willing members of the NSS, Fleay, and Dugdale Sykes. Thus the notion of Massinger's possible presence in the play gained at least moderate endorsement (enough to keep Boyle's ludicrous ideas alive on into the twentieth century) in a number of important studies (see particularly Pooler's edition, pp. xxi-xxiv); and Boyle's views were still being treated seriously enough to warrant rebuttal in Marjorie H. Nicolson, 'The Authorship of *Henry the Eighth*', *PMLA*, 37 (1922), 484-502 (a problematic study in itself in most other respects). The reception of Boyle's work by the NSS, and the absurdities of this entire affair, are well documented in Erdman and Fogel, pp. 466, 478.

81. The question of the play's date is a crucial element in the whole NSS project of reviving and endorsing the theory of collaborative authorship. Spedding himself argues strongly for composition in 1612-1613 ('Shares', pp. 10*-11*), but it is only with the work of the NSS that this dating comes to be established as (in effect) definitive - as is reflected in the appearance in the 1874 *Transactions* of a note by Furnivall confidently dismissing Karl Elze's arguments for an earlier dating (p. 22*; and see above, Chapter Two, note 119). And it is only when this late dating of the play is confirmed, that *Henry VIII* really starts to get in the way of the narratives of farewell, resolution, and retirement associated with *The Tempest*. For the interpretative models constructed by the NSS and Dowden to succeed, *Henry VIII* simply *had* to be collaborative. That is to say, it is the models themselves that lead on to the acceptance of the arguments for collaborative authorship, and not vice versa.

82. For the theatrical fortunes of *Pericles*, see C. B. Young, 'The Stage-History of *Pericles*', in J. C. Maxwell's edition, pp. xxx-xl; and, covering more recent times, DelVecchio and Hammond, pp. 15-27. As is well known, *Pericles* appears to have been hugely popular in the theatre of its own day. It was also one of the first plays in the canon to be revived after the re-opening of the theatres in 1660 (see the discussion in Gary Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare*, pp. 20-24). But its subsequent stage-history, apart from a couple of pioneering productions and George Lillo's *Marina* (1738), is largely a blank until the twentieth century.

83. It is difficult not to concur with this last point of view: the original quarto is poorly printed, legally dubious, and offers plenty of signs to suggest it is based on copy that was illicitly obtained; and its quality seems worse in practice than that of other similar quartos because of the lack of any separate textual tradition against which to compare it. But in any case, and even setting aside the possibility of revision and the vexed question of authorship, the textual situation in *Pericles* is dauntingly complex. For the more important commentary,

which offers depressingly little in the way of conclusions that can be accepted as definitive, see: Muir, 'The Problem of *Pericles*'; Philip Edwards, 'An Approach to the Problem of *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 5 (1952), 25-49 (later developed in his New Penguin Shakespeare edition (Harmondsworth, 1976)); J. C. Maxwell, *Pericles*, pp. 88-97; Hoeniger, *Pericles*, pp. xxiii-xxxix; S. Musgrove, 'The First Quarto of *Pericles* Reconsidered', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 29 (1978), 389-406; Gary Taylor, 'The Transmission of *Pericles*', *PBSA*, 80 (1986), 193-217; *Companion*, pp. 130-131, 556-560; *Norton Shakespeare*, pp. 2715-2717; and DelVecchio and Hammond, pp. 197-210. Since Edwards's work, there has been a broad consensus that *Pericles* Q1 is a reported/memorially reconstructed text, and consequently a "bad" quarto. This idea is challenged - quite rightly - by DelVecchio and Hammond, and of course the whole notion of "bad" quartos is very much under re-examination at the present time. It is striking how enormously complicated textual histories (such as those proposed by Edwards, Taylor, and Musgrove) have to become in order to maintain the theory for *Pericles*. Laurie E. Maguire, claiming to offer an objective survey, says of the quarto, that, 'if a reported text, it is a very good one' (*Shakespearean suspect texts: The "bad" quartos and their contexts* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 294-295). As Maguire points out (see p. 89), the pioneers of the New Bibliography were in fact far from united on how to classify *Pericles*. Alfred W. Pollard, formulating the concept of the "bad" quartos, referred to Q1 as 'a scandalously bad text', and 'as bad as any upholder of our thesis could desire' (*Shakespeare Folios and Quartos* (London, 1909), pp. 78-79). W. W. Greg, on the other hand, felt that the text 'nowhere approaches the worst of the other "bad" quartos' (*The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare*, third edition (Oxford, 1954; first edition, 1942), p. 74; and see his collotype facsimile of the quarto, *Pericles 1609* (London, 1940), [p. 1]). Personally speaking, I find memorially reconstructed copy a thoroughly implausible explanation for the origins of this text (and I am even less convinced by Taylor's arbitrary proposals about an actor's part underlying Gower's speeches ('Transmission', pp. 215-217), and some form of censorship having been imposed in Scene 19 (*Companion*, p. 559)). In this, I am in agreement with DelVecchio and Hammond (pp. 204-208). But the quarto text still presents some serious problems (see further below), which, despite the current new enthusiasm (idealism) regarding the status of early printed editions, cannot all be brushed aside.

84. See *Companion*, pp. 76-77, 130 (both references are to Gary Taylor's 'Canon and Chronology' essay). The single quarto edition of *The London Prodigal* appeared in 1605, with the clear ascription on its title-page, 'by William Shakespeare' (see *BEPD* 222a); on the quarto of *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, see above, Chapter Two, note 127. Entries in the Stationers' Register do set these three works apart slightly, but in a way that in canonical terms favours *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, since Shakespeare is again named as the author of this, whilst *Pericles* is left unattributed (there is no entry for *The London Prodigal*). The fact that *Pericles* was included in the so-called Pavier quartos of 1619 also fails to distinguish

it adequately from some of the apocryphal plays, since Thomas Pavier's publishing project also produced the second quartos of *A Yorkshire Tragedy* (BEPD 272b) and *Sir John Oldcastle*, the latter falsely dated, but bearing an explicit ascription to Shakespeare (BEPD 166b). On the Pavier quartos in general, see Pollard, pp. 81-104. The somewhat rocky passage of *Pericles* from the Third Folio into the editorial tradition, and consequently the canon, is traced in Hoeniger, *Pericles*, p. xl, and *Companion*, p. 559.

85. Gary Taylor makes a similar point ('Canon and Chronology', p. 77). Tucker Brooke records the inevitable few earlier critics to have championed the ascriptions of *The London Prodigal* and *A Yorkshire Tragedy* (pp. xxix-xxxiv); they include most of the usual suspects.

86. In the first place, there is a tolerable external tradition of allusion linking Shakespeare's name to *Pericles*, which the Oxford editors might well have managed to mention. Thus the play is referred to unequivocally as Shakespeare's in poems by Samuel Sheppard (published in 1646) and John Tatham (1652), writers who both had some connection with the Jacobean theatre (see DelVecchio and Hammond, pp. 17-18, where the relevant lines from the two poems are reproduced). Secondly, if rather more tentatively, the treatment of *Pericles* in the Third Folio differs slightly from that of the other supplementary works included - put at the head of the group of new plays, it is separately paginated and signed, which could be an indication that it was originally the only planned addition to the First Folio contents (see Pollard, pp. 159-162). On still more speculative ground, there is Harold Littledale's interesting suggestion that the appearance in 1635 of the sixth quarto of *Pericles*, along with that of the *The Two Noble Kinsmen* quarto in 1634, might have had something to do with both works being 'improperly omitted' from the Shakespeare Second Folio of 1632 (see *The Two Noble Kinsmen: Part II*, p. 17*; and note also the comments in Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, p. 19.)

87. The prevailing evolutionary model of the "Romances" has made it easy, and indeed necessary, for critics continually to assert the inferiority of *Pericles* relative to the other late plays. Denigration of the first two acts has been absolutely routine, though it is found much less in individual critical writings that approach the play on its own terms, than in work that tries to fit it into the wider contexts of the late plays, the comedies, or Shakespeare's overall career. The issue of authorship is of course again central here. Whilst there has been little agreement over who did write the first nine scenes (see below), there has been widespread and persistent confidence that it was not Shakespeare. So the circular processes described above have been fully in operation, and commentators have found inferiority and incompetence because that is all most of them have really wanted to see.

88. The history of authorship work on *Pericles* up until the early 1960s is surveyed in Erdman and Fogel, pp. 482-486; amongst editors, Hoeniger provides the best overall discussion of the subject (pp. lii-

lxiii). Wilkins is probably the candidate most frequently proposed as Shakespeare's co-writer, mainly because of *The Painful Adventures*. But his involvement has been nothing like as widely accepted as Fletcher's presence in *Henry VIII*, and the case for Wilkins was rather languishing prior to the 1980s, and its renewed advocacy in the Oxford edition (and see also the two recent separate series of articles in support of Wilkins's participation by M. W. A. Smith and MacD. P. Jackson - most of the individual essays from which are listed in the Bibliography). Hoeniger's argument for John Day (first made in 1960, and re-presented in *Pericles*, pp. 171-180) received some support to begin with, but has now largely been rejected (as it came to be by Hoeniger himself, in his pioneering article, 'Gower and Shakespeare in *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 33 (1982), 461-479). The other name most often entertained has been that of Thomas Heywood (as, for example, in Henry David Gray's far-from-convincing 'Heywood's *Pericles*, Revised by Shakespeare', *PMLA*, 40 (1925), 507-529); but William Rowley has also popped up on occasion, following on from Fleay's attribution of the brothel scenes to him ('On the Play of *Pericles*', pp. 196, 201-202). The fact that the individual work of all these other dramatists is itself hard to identify with any security has contributed to the uncertainty and exasperation that has surrounded the authorship question here. Wilkins's own claim was not particularly helped by being most vigorously championed during the first half of the twentieth century by Dugdale Sykes (see *Sidelights on Shakespeare*, pp. 143-204), whose mode of approach in general reproduces so many of the failings associated with the likes of Fleay and Boyle.

89. The influence of Edwards's "two reporters" theory (set out in 'An Approach to the Problem of *Pericles*', and given wider currency in his New Penguin edition (notably pp. 31-41)) is interesting in this context. The theory was intrinsically never hugely plausible, and its particular 'attempt to "save" the entirety of the play for Shakespeare' (*Companion*, p. 557) is effectively pulled apart by the Oxford editors (and see Gary Taylor, 'Transmission', pp. 193-197). Edwards himself has since tended to vacillate somewhat on the question of whether or not he believes the play to be collaborative (compare his comments in *Pericles*, pp. 38-41; *Shakespeare: A Writer's Progress* (1986), pp. 167-170; and *Sea-Mark: The Metaphorical Voyage, Spenser to Milton* (Liverpool, 1997), pp. 142-148), and was in any case always a little hesitant in proposing the possibility of sole Shakespearian authorship (as in his conclusions in 'Approach', pp. 45-46). But this latter idea is clearly the driving force behind his entire argument (Edwards describes it as its 'logical conclusion' ('Approach', p. 46, note 19)), and was certainly one of the reasons why his theory was greeted favourably by various subsequent critics. Edwards's position depends upon a considerably more negative assessment of the quality of the quarto text than is accepted even by most other editors, and in propagating this view, his theory helped to bolster (rather against the logic of his own argument) the situation referred to here. What I find most striking about Edwards's approach, though, is that the play as a whole can only be "saved" for Shakespeare

in this account by distancing him further than ever from the text as we have it - by making it abundantly plain (even with regard to the last three acts, the material that supposedly leaps out as "Shakespearian") that Shakespeare could never have written *that*. Once again, in other words, the usual anxieties about taste and quality can be seen giving rise to all sorts of desperate contortions and illogicalities in the realms of "scientific" study and attribution.

90. For typical examples of the attitude described, see Alfred Hart, p. 274; Muir, *Shakespeare as Collaborator*, p. 122; M. Mincoff, 'The Authorship of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *English Studies*, 33 (1952), 97-115 (p. 115); and, although it carries a slightly different emphasis (more questioning the status of *Pericles* than arguing for the inclusion of *Kinsmen*), Greg, *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare*, pp. 16-17. It is worth remembering that all these critics were writing at a time when *The Two Noble Kinsmen* was still largely excluded from the editorial tradition. For what it matters (which is probably not a great deal), a rough line-count of the so-called "Shakespearian" portions of these two plays (following the commonest division of authorship in either case, and using the Oxford edition - but without going to the trouble of trying to eliminate its extensive additions in *Pericles*, Scene 19) yields Shakespeare just over 1300 lines in *Pericles*, and just under 1300 in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*.

91. The title-page ascription reads (with the names of the two authors bracketed together in the original), 'Written by the memorable Worthies of their time; Mr. *John Fletcher*, and Mr. *William Shakspeare*. Gent.' (BEPD 492a; and see the reproduction in Allen and Muir, p. 836). The attribution is backed up by the entry in the Stationers' Register (quoted above, Chapter Two, note 95), and there is no real reason to doubt its good faith (see the level-headed comments on this subject in Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, p. 19). Furthermore, as Gary Taylor observes, 'although publishers' attributions of plays to Shakespeare before 1623, or after the closing of the theatres, must be regarded with considerable scepticism, *Kinsmen* is the only play attributed to him in the two decades between the Folio and the Civil War, and the only play before the Restoration attributed to him as part-author' ('Canon and Chronology', p. 134; the overall tenor of Taylor's remark is very much to the point here, and he certainly captures the distinctive nature of the quarto attribution, but the quotation itself is potentially rather misleading - though he does not make this entirely clear, Taylor must be talking specifically (else he is simply in error) about ascriptions that appeared in printed editions (and obviously only surviving ones at that); Moseley's part-attributions of *Cardenio*, *Henry I*, *Henry II* in the Stationers' Register all date from 1653).

92. *Fifty Comedies and Tragedies. Written by Francis Beaumont And John Fletcher, Gentlemen* (London, 1679); the text of *Kinsmen* occupies pp. 425-449 of section 1a (sigs. ²3H1-3L1); as is well known, the "Beaumont-and-Fletcher" First Folio (*Comedies and Tragedies* (London,

1647)) omits previously published plays. There is a useful survey of the main line of the play's early editorial history, covering all the major editions from the Quarto and the Folio through to the later nineteenth century, in Harold Littledale, ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen: Reprint of the Quarto, 1634* (London, 1876), pp. v-xii.

93. Needless to say, any such distinction only applies in terms of the "Shakespearian" sections of the play; the passages attributed to Fletcher, whilst attracting far less attention, have suffered all the usual ritual abuse that is the flip-side of bardolatry. And of course, opponents of the attribution to Shakespeare have been happy to talk down the quality of the play as a whole - though even here, generally, not with the kind of venom frequently applied to *Henry VIII*. Two key issues in all this are the way *Kinsmen* is, from the start, so much more "ignorable" than *Henry VIII*; and the fact that it has never occupied a particularly important place in cultural images of Shakespeare. This has meant that those who have wanted to disregard it have often been able to do so without even entering into any debate on the matter; and secondly - and this accounts for the rather more restrained nature of the critical response - that the authorship question has touched much less of a raw nerve than in the case of *Henry VIII*. Both sides of this equation are further reflected in the way Boyle's theory of Fletcher-Massinger collaboration has proved of so much less importance in the reception history of *Kinsmen*, where it simply hasn't been required to fulfil the same type of "social service" it performed for many people in relation to *Henry VIII*.

94. From the practical perspective of working on the play, I have found just as grievous as its omission from Bullough, *Sources* (see above, Chapter Two, note 52), the lack of any real reference to *Kinsmen* in such crucial repositories of information as T. W. Baldwin's *William Shakspeare's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke* (1944), or Caroline Spurgeon's *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells us* (1935). At a more trivial, but still sometimes useful level, I have also been aware of the play's general absence from the now largely outmoded (and mainly nineteenth-century) tradition of studies of what might be termed Shakespeare's "lore" - his references to folklore and contemporary customs, flora and fauna, and so forth (see the likes of James Edmund Harting, *The Birds of Shakespeare* (London, 1871); and Henry N. Ellacombe, *The Plant-Lore & Garden-Craft of Shakespeare* (Exeter, [1878])). One area in which the exclusion of *Kinsmen* has not applied, where it has proved absolutely impossible to ignore the play, is in explorations of Shakespeare's debt to, and use of, Chaucer; see Ann Thompson, *Shakespeare's Chaucer*, pp. 166-215; and E. Talbot Donaldson, *The Swan at the Well: Shakespeare Reading Chaucer* (New Haven and London, 1985), pp. 50-73. Even here, however, the "inclusion" of *Kinsmen* is ultimately only partial, since both these critics choose to treat seriously only the "Shakespearian" portions (and indeed, only the main plot) of the play. Having said all this, of course, any neglect this text has suffered is very much relative; in comparison to the majority of the works in the "Beaumont-and-Fletcher"

canon, *The Two Noble Kinsmen* has been veritably lavished with critical attention.

95. Authorship work on *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is well surveyed in G. Harold Metz, *Sources of Four Plays Ascribed to Shakespeare* (1989), pp. 378-409; and see also Erdman and Fogel, pp. 486-493, and Bertram, *Shakespeare and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 13-57. Various reasons can be adduced for the play's failure to make it fully into the canon on the back of the efforts of the NSS, amongst them: sheer inertia; a reluctance to go entirely beyond the authority of the Folio tradition; and the fact that so many of the principal early advocates (Spalding, Fleay, Furnivall) went on to change their mind (without ever discrediting their own earlier evidence, however). But the issue that always seems to stand out for those with doubts about the attribution (including the recidivists) is simply whether or not the play is good enough for Shakespeare. In the words of Frederick O. Waller, 'the great difficulty in the acceptance of Shakespeare's authorship is the inferiority of the scenes given to him, especially in characterization and thought, in comparison with his known work' ('Printer's Copy for *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Studies in Bibliography*, 11 (1958), 61-84 (p. 84); and compare besides the comments on this subject in G. R. Proudfoot, ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, Regents Renaissance Drama Series (Lincoln, NE and London, 1970), p. xv; and Philip Edwards, 'On the Design of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *A Review of English Literature*, 5, no. 4 (October 1964), 89-105 (pp. 89-90)).

96. This latter conceptual framework is now being taken up more and more widely, and it seems that the very real problems surrounding the attribution of *Cardenio* to Shakespeare are fast being conveniently forgotten. A key argument in all this is the long-standing idea that the three separate cases of possible Shakespeare-Fletcher collaboration are mutually reinforcing, and furnish testimony that is historically independent (see in particular here Mincoff's essays on *Henry VIII* and *Kinsmen*). But the second element of this equation especially is open to question. Spedding's views concerning the authorship of *Henry VIII* are explicitly modelled on the example of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and Hickson's work on that play. And Moseley's attribution of *Cardenio* to Shakespeare and Fletcher could certainly have been influenced by the 1634 quarto of *Kinsmen* (Moseley acquired the rights to *Kinsmen* - 'The Noble Kinsman' by 'Flesher', as the Stationer's Register has it, but no doubt attaches to the identification - in 1646; see *BEPD* 492a, and Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 71-72). Furthermore, if Moseley really did have access to a text of *Cardenio* in 1653, then this play's eventual omission from the 1679 "Beaumont-and-Fletcher" Folio means that Fletcher's involvement in it cannot be taken for granted either.

97. None of Shakespeare's plays are written at the same pitch of poetic intensity throughout, and nobody, one presumes, would seriously expect them to be. But for some reason, such an expectation does tend to hold sway when it comes to "authorially suspect" texts - exactly as if

everything Shakespeare might have contributed to such works has to be good enough to be "anthologizable". It seems to me that there is in fact a deep-seated connection between the history of authorship work and the whole process of anthologizing Shakespeare. The practice of extracting bits of the canon from their original context obviously links in to some extent with the predominating project of authorship studies to identify Shakespeare's writing and separate it off from anybody else's; and both traditions, equally problematically, have a side to them that is all about hearing the authentic voice of genius direct, participating in the illusion of having Shakespeare share his inimitable thoughts with us *in propria persona*. See again in this context, de Grazia, 'Shakespeare in Quotation Marks'.

98. Here and below, I am rather running together a number of different applications of the notion of "style". What critics tend to speak about specifically are two identifiable models of linguistic preferences, or two contrasting habits of versification, and so forth. But even at this more limited level, the existence of two "styles" is only ever really evident in certain parts of the plays - hence all the scenes that are not easily attributable using the standard methods. And the collapsing together of the different meanings of "style", the practice of allowing the term to expand to its widest possible frame of reference, is in any case utterly characteristic of authorship work itself. The difficulty of arguing for the presence of two "styles" in *Henry VIII* is touched upon in Craig, 'Shakespeare's Bad Poetry', p. 53; and see also Masten, 'Beaumont and/or Fletcher', pp. 342-343.

99. Probably the first serious attempt to read the stylistic idiosyncrasies and "crudities" of the first two acts of *Pericles* as a deliberate, controlled effect, part of the play's overall artistic design, is Hoeniger's article, 'Gower and Shakespeare in *Pericles*'. It is those critics who address the question of style in the opening scenes primarily in relation to authorship who tend to be the ones that most play down the conscious experimentation, the imitative archaism, of the Gower choruses. See, for instance, the comments on assonance in D. J. Lake, 'Rhymes in *Pericles*', *Notes and Queries*, 214 (1969), 139-143; and MacD. P. Jackson, 'Rhyming in *Pericles*: More Evidence of Dual Authorship', *Studies in Bibliography*, 46 (1993), 239-249. Variations of style and metre between the earlier and (some of) the later Gower choruses have also been dealt with mainly in terms of authorship, with strikingly different results (compare the opposing positions in Ernest Schanzer, ed., *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, The Signet Classic Shakespeare (New York, 1965), pp. xxix-xxx, and Edwards, *Pericles*, pp. 40-41 (both critics ignore the penultimate chorus (in Scene 22), which disrupts all the patterns they perceive)). In spite of some obvious problems, much of Hoeniger's argument seems to me at least potentially convincing, and the kind of overlap that presents itself here, where there is no definitive means of separating off stylistic variation that represents an intentional aesthetic effect from that which furnishes evidence for authorship, reflects perfectly the point I have been driving at.

100. So, for example, Sidney Thomas, in a highly critical response to Hoeniger's 'Gower and Shakespeare in *Pericles*', declares that 'we do nothing to enhance our understanding of Shakespeare or our reverence for his achievement by claiming for him the status of a twentieth-century litterateur, a self-conscious manipulator of stylistic tricks' ('The Problem of *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 34 (1983), 448-450 (p. 450)). It is probably not an argument one would find being applied to a work such as *Hamlet* - what else are the "Pyrrhus speech" and the inset play, at root, other than self-conscious exercises in stylistic manipulation, the deliberate use of an atypical, old-fashioned style?

101. Quoting respectively from 'What Is an Author?', p. 150, and *Internal Evidence*, p. xv.

102. It is worth making the point, though, that this overriding emphasis on authorship does not apply in every field, and for very good reasons. Authorial anonymity is pretty much the norm in the surviving European vernacular literature from before the fifteenth century; and anyone seeking to read medieval English drama primarily in terms of authorial identity is liable to be seriously frustrated. Even in these areas, of course, to take just the example of early English literature, plenty of canon construction has gone on in critical discourse through the attribution of anonymous works to "named" or "identifiable" authors (as in the cases of the "*Gawain*-poet", the "Wakefield Master", or the shadowy Cynewulf). And elements of the author-function can no doubt be detected in alternative models of reading involving forms and genres, cycles, bodies of romance matter, and the like. But for the personal identity of the author to be invested with meaningful importance, for attribution to be attempted at all with any seriousness, there must be at least some vestige of evidence available, some hint of plausible historical information to build upon. It is only then that authorship can begin to attain the dominance referred to here.

103. *Fanny's First Play*, in *The Bodley Head Bernard Shaw*, Volume IV (London, 1972), pp. 341-449 (pp. 435-436); the passage in question is cited in Jackson, 'The transmission of Shakespeare's text', pp. 163-164. Shaw's play, about the private production of an anonymous play, was itself first produced anonymously in 1911; see the supplementary material reprinted with the text in the above edition, much of which is relevant in the present context. The use here of the phrase, 'a hair's breadth', interestingly parallels a typically extravagant declaration by Swinburne on the authorship of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*: 'we can tell sometimes to a hair's breadth in a hemistich by whom how much was added to the posthumous text of Shakespeare' (Algernon Charles Swinburne, *A Study of Shakespeare* (London, 1880), p. 215).

104. *The Politics of Unease in the Plays of John Fletcher*, p. 136; McMullan has a complete chapter here on collaboration (pp. 132-155), which, especially in its early pages, provides one of the best analyses of the history of attitudes to the subject. And see also Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 16-19.

105. 'Beaumont and/or Fletcher', p. 341. Masten, McMullan, and Potter all draw attention to the way commentary in this area frequently engages in addition in a largely pejorative gendering and eroticizing of collaborative authorship - a discourse from which Fletcher's reputation in particular has emerged seriously impaired. There has also been, at times, a considerably more positive homosocial/homoerotic idealization of specifically *dual* (male) authorship. What tends to happen with all of these models, however, is that *multiple* authorship (composition by more than two authors) rather gets shifted out of the picture - perhaps because it fails to offer any useful or appealing social, political, or moralistic metaphorical possibilities.

106. See Hoy, 'Critical and Aesthetic Problems of Collaboration in Renaissance Drama', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama*, 19 (1976), 3-6 (p. 4). This idea is of course put into practice in Hoy's hugely influential efforts at dividing up the authorship of the plays in the "Beaumont-and-Fletcher" canon, beginning with 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon (I)', *Studies in Bibliography*, 8 (1956), 129-146. For an important critique of Hoy's approach, see Masten, 'Beaumont and/or Fletcher', pp. 341-344; and compare too McMullan's comments on the problematic conception of collaborative work that emerges from the Bowers "Beaumont-and-Fletcher" edition (*The Politics of Unease*, pp. 148-149). The general neglect of the "Beaumont-and-Fletcher" canon in the twentieth century is one of the clearest indications of just how uneasily collaborative authorship has fitted in with modern-day aesthetic and interpretative paradigms.

107. Clifford Leech provides a fair indication of the attitudes involved here when he claims (and it is a singularly unhelpful position from which to approach Fletcherian drama), 'for the deepest kind of apprehension solitude is the essence' (*The John Fletcher Plays* (London, 1962), p. 143). On coherence as a particular problem of collaborative authorship, see again Hoy, 'Critical and Aesthetic Problems'; and note too the article in the same issue by Norman Rabkin, 'Problems in the Study of Collaboration', pp. 7-13. It is hard to credit, but these two equally slight essays stand near the forefront of the best "theoretical" work on collaboration that mainstream criticism had to offer prior to the 1990s.

108. See Stillinger, *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius* (Oxford, 1991); and the brief digest of the main ideas from this study in 'Multiple Authorship and the Question of Authority', *TEXT*, 5 (1991), 283-293.

109. See Charles H. Frey, 'Collaborating with Shakespeare: After the Final Play', in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 31-44 (p. 31); and compare too McMullan, who notes that, although *OED* 'makes it clear that the word collaboration acquired the truly negative connotation it has for us only in 1940 or 1941 [. . .]', the word appears nonetheless to have been used pejoratively in a literary context for centuries, thus presumably paving the way for its wartime usage' (*Politics of Unease*, p. 136).

110. Commentary of this sort (which takes in most of the work of the NSS, and the tradition this established) generally treats multiple authorship simply as a form of corruption. It reduces Shakespeare's contributions to the plays, à la Dowden, to "fragments". The emphasis on disjunctive composition that prevails in such work had an enormous influence on criticism throughout the twentieth century. *Pericles* is the play to have suffered the most literal "fragmentation", as in Fleay's "Marina", or S. Wellwood, ed., *'Marina': A Dramatic Romance by William Shakespeare* (London, 1902). With *Henry VIII*, Spedding himself begins the process of trying to "reconstruct" Shakespeare's original intentions (i.e., the play the critic would like Shakespeare to have written), and a particularly elaborate example of this type of approach is furnished by Nicolson. An interest in looking behind the surviving text to a lost original is also strongly characteristic of the reception of Theobald's *Double Falsehood*, but at least in this instance there is hard documentary evidence to suggest that such an original (whatever its authorship) did actually once exist; see especially Muir, *Shakespeare as Collaborator*, pp. 148-160; and Stephan Kukowski, 'The Hand of John Fletcher in *Double Falsehood*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 43 (1990), 81-89.

111. One might say there has been an unspoken critical motto of "non-collaborative good, collaborative bad". This seems a factor in Bertram's approach to *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. And an equation between "imaginative unity" and single authorship is still very much current, forming a central plank of the argument, for example, in DelVecchio and Hammond's recent edition of *Pericles*, which, problematic in itself, is also rather an odd position for a collaborative work to want to adopt.

112. *Politics of Unease*, p.149; and see generally pp.149-155. For the reasoning behind Masten's position, see particularly *Textual intercourse*, pp.1-27. The depth of the opposition between these two critics' approaches is reflected in the various comments and criticisms they direct at each other's work in the course of these studies.

113. McMullan (*Politics of Unease*, pp.149-155) takes other critics to task for their treatment of collaborative texts, and their unwillingness to attend to the details of authorship. But such unwillingness can often be a reaction against the problems involved in identifying individual authorial shares, and McMullan himself has little to say, either in practical or theoretical terms, about the actual processes and feasibility of attribution. It may be the case that in the Fletcher-Massinger collaborations he is concentrating on at this point in his study, the kind of difficulties I have been emphasizing are less pronounced. And it is certainly true that his own approach is a reaction against the general critical neglect of - and hostility towards - Fletcher's work, and the long-standing imputation of a conservative politics to the plays of the "Beaumont-and-Fletcher" canon. His discussion is still cast in universal terms, however; and his position seems in danger in the end of denying the fundamentally collaborative impulse of so much of Fletcher's work (and indeed, to run counter to the whole experience of performance).

114. The use of "ye" represents Hoy's favoured piece of evidence throughout his study for determining the individual work of Fletcher; see especially 'Shares (I)', pp. 130-137. The lack of sufficient "ye"s in *Henry VIII* and *Kinsmen* can obviously be explained away in terms of either scribal or compositorial practice, though the arguments employed here tend towards the circular. In *Henry VIII*, there does appear to be some variation in the ratio of "ye" to "you" in the work of different compositors (see Hoy, 'Shares (VII)', pp. 78-79; and Philip Williams, Jr., 'New Approaches to Textual Problems in Shakespeare', *Studies in Bibliography*, 8 (1956), 3-14). But the frequently invoked claim that the Folio "Compositor B" regularly altered "ye" to "you" is by no means fully substantiated; and B's supposed interventionist tendencies are in fact strongly called into question in Paul Werstine, 'Compositor B of the Shakespeare First Folio', *AEB*, 2 (1978), 241-263.

115. Hoy regards 3.1 as providing one of the clearest indications of Fletcher's involvement in *Henry VIII*, purely on the basis of its numerous "ye"s (see 'Shares (VII)', p. 80). Similar points to mine on the distinctive distribution of "ye" in this scene are made by Thomas Clayton, in an important review of Schoenbaum's *Internal Evidence*, *Shakespeare Studies*, 4 (1968), 350-376 (see pp. 365-374). As Clayton suggests, the very particular pattern in "ye"-usage here tells against compositorial influence as a major factor in the word's distribution. Clayton also offers parallel insights into the use of "ye" in the rest of the play (and elsewhere in the Shakespeare canon), and his arguments are not easily refuted, which perhaps explains why they have for the most part been ignored by the proponents of Fletcher's presence.

116. It is tempting to suggest that Fletcher himself would be the last person to use "ye" in this manner, given his predilection for the word. And in fact Clayton (p. 374) claims, though I have no idea how true this might be, that the rhetorical use of "ye" is almost never encountered in the Fletcher (or Massinger) canon. On the presence of "ye" in *Kinsmen* generally, see Hoy, 'Shares (VII)', pp. 74-76. It is by no means clear that Gerrold's "ye" and the Fletcherian "ye" actually represent the same "word" (or even sound). The latter is not primarily a grammatical marker at all, but, as Potter notes, a colloquial effect, an indication of metrical stress and elision. And as she also remarks, it may be that Fletcher 'wrote neither "ye" nor "you" but "y^e", which scribes could expand as they pleased' (*The Two Noble Kinsmen*, p. 22).

117. The *overall* internal coherence of *Kinsmen*, the wide range of inner echoes and verbal and visual patterns that draw *all* the different threads of the action together, received virtually no attention in any form of commentary on the play prior to Bertram's book; and the strands of iterative imagery referred to here went pretty much unmentioned (and so unnoticed?) until Frey's 1989 collection, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'* - see especially the essays by Susan Green ('"A mad woman? We are made, boys!": The Jailer's Daughter in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', pp. 121-132), Jeanne Addison Roberts ('Crises of Male Self-

Definition in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 133-144), and Richard Abrams ('*The Two Noble Kinsmen* as Bourgeois Drama', pp. 145-162). Potter now offers the most concentrated discussion of this topic (*The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 101-110).

118. See Douglas Bruster, 'The Jailer's Daughter and the Politics of Madwomen's Language', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 46 (1995), 277-300. On the question of the authorship of the Daughter's scenes, see further below. Many (though by no means all) of the aspects of the Daughter's language referred to here were apparent to me from my own close reading of the play well before Bruster's superb analysis appeared - a point I mention only to note that the fact that it took until 1995 for such features to receive any detailed attention in print goes to show just how much the authorship debate and assumptions about who wrote what have served to impede and discourage "close reading" of *Kinsmen*. The effects concerned are not that hard to spot once one chooses to look.

119. For Bertram's comments, see *Shakespeare and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 277-279, note 26; and on T/V forms, here and in general, Hope, pp. 54-64, 81-83. Potter supplies the figures for the kinsmen's contrasting habits (*The Two Noble Kinsmen*, p. 23). Both occasionally employ "thou" for its greater intimacy (e.g., 3.6. 94-103), but its more regular function, especially in the mouth of Palamon, is evident from 2.2. 172 onwards.

120. The idea of Fletcher's 'deflating hand' is a leitmotif of Clifford Leech's Introduction to his Signet Classic edition of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (New York, 1966), pp. xxi-xli (p. xxxii); and much the same attitude lies behind Humphreys's opinions on the supposedly muddled treatment of the King's motives for the divorce in *Henry VIII* (see his edition, pp. 18-20). For a thoroughly typical view of the "fundamental superficiality" of Fletcher's world, carrying a reading of both these plays along the lines mentioned here, see William W. Appleton, *Beaumont and Fletcher: A Critical Study* (London, 1956).

121. For Dowden, Shakespeare's only partial involvement in certain plays towards the end of his career is indicative of the loosening of his ties to both the theatre and his art (*Shakspeare: His Mind and Art*, pp. 404-405). Appleton again offers a typical development of this kind of attitude (pp. 92-94). What is pretty much the flipside of Dowden's position has also been used as a stick with which to beat the relevant plays, Shakespeare's late collaborative activity being seen by certain commentators as a testament to his purely professional dedication - a case of his loyalty to the King's Men outstripping any genuine artistic interest on his part in the plays concerned.

122. Hoy in particular has argued, in the case of both *Kinsmen* and *Henry VIII*, for the presence of patches of "Fletcherian" writing within otherwise broadly "Shakespearian" scenes ('Shares (VII)'). This sort of possible "mixed" composition is generally conceived of in terms of one dramatist having overseen the final form of the play, however,

rather than as a sign of active collaboration on the same piece of text. The standard mainstream idea of individual contributors only being responsible for their own scenes or acts, which obviously receives a certain amount of support from the Henslowe papers, has, though, been questioned "from the margins" by the likes of Donald Foster ('*Elegy By W.S.*', pp. 162-167) and Mark Dominik (*William Shakespeare and 'The Birth of Merlin'*, pp. 185-215).

123. Critics do still regularly manage to exclude *Kinsmen* (and *Henry VIII*) from their studies of Shakespeare's later works, but the excuses they offer for doing so are becoming more and more feeble as attitudes towards collaboration improve. For two recent examples, see Simon Palfrey, *Late Shakespeare: A New World of Words* (1997), pp. 31-32; and Kiernan Ryan, ed., *Shakespeare: The Last Plays* (1999), pp. 1-2.

124. The idea that Beaumont might have had something to do with the play has long been entertained, partly because of the way his name is so intimately associated with Fletcher's in general, but mainly as a result of the close connection between 3.5 and his *Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn* of 1613. See in particular on this, Proudfoot, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, p. xiv; and Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, p. 28. The details surrounding the performance and publication of *The Masque of the Inner Temple* are set out in the editions by Fredson Bowers (in Bowers, I (1966), 111-144) and Philip Edwards (in Spencer and Wells, pp. 125-148); and see further below. Needless to say, Beaumont has on occasion been proposed as Fletcher's sole collaborator in the play (see for example, Henry David Gray, 'Beaumont and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Philological Quarterly*, 2 (1923), 112-131), but the arguments involved are quite unconvincing.

125. The only real attempt in recent years to deny Shakespeare's presence in *Kinsmen* is found in Donald K. Hedrick's essay, "Be Rough With Me": The Collaborative Arenas of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 45-77. This has received little support from subsequent critics, but the possible links with the play of Hedrick's alternative candidate, Nathan Field, are pursued further in Potter's edition, pp. 32-33, 65-66.

126. Charles Lamb's remarks from 1808 still provide, for better or worse, the keynote identification of the differences in Shakespeare's and Fletcher's respective styles, as well as of the principal characteristics of Fletcher's versification and thought; see Lamb, *Specimens of English Dramatic Poets*, edited by William Macdonald, 2 vols (London, 1903), II, 136-137. Rather more up-to-date comment on the distinctive features of Fletcher's personal style can be found in Cyrus Hoy, 'The Language of Fletcherian Tragicomedy', in J. C. Gray, *Mirror up to Shakespeare*, pp. 99-113; and Eugene Waith, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 13-23.

127. Spalding, admittedly, does attribute this entire section of the play to Fletcher (see his *Letter* (1833), pp. 62-64, and *passim*), but his position is challenged by Hickson, whose views on this matter have been accepted by most later commentators (see the NSS reprint of Hickson's

review-article, 'The Shares of Shakspere and Fletcher in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Transactions* (1874), 25*-61* (pp. 55*-57*). The "traditional" division, therefore, gives Shakespeare 2.1, 3.2, and 4.3 out of the scenes involving the Daughter. I would not rule out his presence elsewhere in this part of the play - nor Fletcher's in these scenes, either.

128. The general critical attitude to the morris-dance plot is well reflected in N. W. Bawcutt's dismissal of it as 'evidently the least interesting section of the play' (*The Two Noble Kinsmen*, The New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1977), p. 16). As far as I know, Bertram is the only major critic to claim Shakespeare's presence in 2.3, and he has little to say on the matter. The connection between this scene and *Pericles*, which extends to the off-stage games and the disguised hero, has often been noted in passing (as in Potter's edition, p. 203, note to l. 62). In itself, it need not have any bearing on the question of authorship. It is a particular oddity of the reception of *Kinsmen*, however, as Bertram indicates (*Shakespeare and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 233-234), that the many echoes in this play of the rest of the Shakespeare canon have generally been read, thanks to a good deal of contorted reasoning, snobbery, and self-deception, as evidence *against* Shakespeare's participation in it, and, especially when it comes to the two subplots (and the evident parallels between the Daughter and Ophelia, Gerrold and Holofernes), as signs of a "typical" Fletcherian debasing of Shakespeare's proper genius.

129. 'The Death of the Author', p. 146; I would draw attention, too, to Masten's use of this same phrase in relation to *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* ('Beaumont and/or Fletcher', p. 349), a play which in turn provides what is at least a close analogue to Gerrold's Prologue, and the events of the morris-dance sequence in general, in the shape of Rafe's parodic May Lord speech (4th Interlude, ll. 25-60). There is, of course, still plenty of scope in this context for seeing meaningful intentions and personal authorial idiosyncrasies in the "orchestration" of the many different cultural "voices" that are present here (compare McMullan's comments, *The Politics of Unease*, p. 155). And on these terms, Beaumont would seem to emerge quite strongly as a candidate for the authorship of 3.5, especially as it is possible to find parallels as well with his early Inns of Court *Grammar Lecture* (c. 1600-1605; for the text of this, see Mark Eccles, 'Francis Beaumont's *Grammar Lecture*', *Review of English Studies*, 16 (1940), 402-414). But the further one takes this, the more unstable the notion (and relevance) of individual authorship actually becomes. The routine ascription of *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* to Beaumont alone is, as Masten rightly emphasizes, a modern critical/editorial invention; the *Grammar Lecture*, although its attribution appears relatively certain, has scarcely achieved the status of a proper "work" in present-day constructions of the Beaumont canon; the extent to which Beaumont can be said to have "authored" the dance that is shared by his masque and the play is a decidedly moot point; and even his "authorship" of the *Masque* itself (intrinsically a highly collaborative affair) is problematized in part by the removal of his

name from the title-page of the second issue of the original quarto (BEPD 309a; see also on this, Edwards's edition of the *Masque*, pp. 127-128, and the comments in Lee Bliss, *Francis Beaumont* (Boston, MA, 1987), p. 12 and p. 142, note 43).

130. I am thinking particularly here of the contributions by Hoy, Hope, and Horton, and also of some of the more technical metrical studies available, the likes of Ants Oras, "'Extra Monosyllables" in *Henry VIII* and the Problem of Authorship', *JEGP*, 52 (1953), 198-213; and Marina Tarlinskaja, *Shakespeare's Verse: Iambic Pentameter and the Poet's Idiosyncrasies* (New York, 1987).

131. This even applies to some of the metrical characteristics that are widely regarded as providing the clinching argument for the presence of Fletcher. For example, W. M. Baillie observes that the characters in Shakespeare's unquestioned later works can often end up sounding distinctly "Fletcherian" (in both tone and rhythm) at moments of high emotion ('Authorship attribution in Jacobean dramatic texts', in *Computers in the Humanities*, edited by J. L. Mitchell (Edinburgh, 1974), pp. 73-81 (p. 81)). And see especially in this context Barbara Hodgdon's outstanding discussion (in *The End Crowns All: Closure and Contradiction in Shakespeare's History* (Princeton, NJ, 1991), pp. 224-229) of "masculine" and "feminine" endings in Cranmer's prophecy, the treatment of the pronoun "her" as final stressed monosyllable, and the 'play of gendered identity' and of 'gendered endings' (p. 226) that is going on throughout the Archbishop's speech - all of which goes to suggest that the habit of reading metrical "abnormalities" purely in relation to differences in authorial identity may well be entirely the wrong kind of approach. Some of the earliest published comments on the metrical peculiarities of *Henry VIII*, those by Richard Roderick (1758), do indeed assume that they have a deliberate purpose, and so imply that they are open to some sort of aesthetic interpretation. But Roderick's exploratory remarks were co-opted to the case for collaboration (far from convincingly, though this does not seem to have bothered anyone) by the NSS (see *Transactions* (1874), 66*-68*); and authorship work in general on this play has shown itself adept at appropriating commentary of all sorts of differing tendencies to its particular cause.

132. Again, the best recent work has succeeded - I would hope for good - in severing the perennial association between collaboration and inferiority; and McMullan, for one (as his Arden edition of the play confirms), is happy to link an appreciative view of *Henry VIII* with a belief in its collaborative authorship. My own reservations on this issue arise, in the main, from the pervasive influence of the earlier attitude, the way it has underpinned the interpretation of the evidence adduced and been at times the very driving force behind the argument for collaboration, since to my mind this leaves the case for Fletcherian involvement seriously compromised right at its core.

133. Scenes 2 and 19, both heavily re-written ("reconstructed") in Oxford, still stand out for me (in part, no doubt, because of the

influence of Edwards's and Hoeniger's editions) as in major respects "not right" or "corrupt", with instances of badly jumbled or confused action, and one or two passages (not easily subject to emendation) that make virtually no sense as they stand. More generally, *Pericles* seems to benefit from a far greater degree of emendation than is appropriate or necessary for any of the First Folio plays. The whole practice of emendation has of course come in for its fair share of stick in recent years, but in many ways, the problems with the quarto text actually become most apparent when critics and editors set out to defend the original reading of passages that have been almost universally emended. Such a mode of approach is particularly characteristic of DelVecchio and Hammond's recent edition - for a typical example of what I mean, see their text and notes at 3.3. 26-29 (Scene 13).

134. See C. J. Sisson, 'Shakespeare Quartos as Prompt-Copies, with some Account of Cholmeley's Players and a New Shakespeare Allusion', *Review of English Studies*, 18 (1942), 129-143; and the discussion in Barbara Mowat, 'The Theater and Literary Culture', pp. 213-220. Sir Richard Cholmeley's Players performed a number of plays in Yorkshire during the Christmas season of 1609, including *Pericles*. Called before the Star Chamber in 1611 to answer a charge of sedition regarding the content of another of the works they had presented at this time, the Players sought to defend themselves with the claim that all the plays they put on were 'played according to the *printed* booke or Bookes', and that they only acted 'according to the contents therein *printed*, and not otherwise' (remarks preserved in the Star Chamber records for the case, quoted here from Sisson, p. 138 (my emphasis)). On the afterlife of *Pericles*-in-quarto, see also Willem Schrickx, 'Pericles in a Book-List of 1619 from the English Jesuit Mission and Some of the Play's Special Problems', *Shakespeare Survey*, 29 (1976), 21-32.

135. On Wilkins in general, see Roger Prior, 'The Life of George Wilkins', *Shakespeare Survey*, 25 (1972), 137-152; and 'George Wilkins and the Young Heir', *Shakespeare Survey*, 29 (1976), 33-39. As Prior's work makes clear, Shakespeare's and Wilkins's paths cross for definite in the documentary record in the Belott-Mountjoy lawsuit of 1612.

136. The imagery of the play, missed or dismissed in most of the principal surveys of the field, is described and analysed, to varying ends, and with varying levels of success and insight, in such studies as: Gerald J. Schiffhorst, 'The Imagery of *Pericles* and What It Tells Us', *Ball State University Forum*, 8, no. 3 (Summer 1967), 61-70; James O. Wood, 'The Running Image in *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 5 (1969), 240-252; Mythili Kaul, 'References to Food and Feeding in *Pericles*', *Notes and Queries*, 227 (1982), 124-126; Anthony J. Lewis, "'I Feed on Mother's Flesh": Incest and Eating in *Pericles*', *Essays in Literature*, 15 (1988), 147-163; and Karen Csengeri, 'William Shakespeare, Sole Author of *Pericles*', *English Studies*, 71 (1990), 230-243; and see now especially, though they show themselves troublingly unaware of much of the earlier work just mentioned, DelVecchio and Hammond, pp. 46-51.

137. This is, in effect, to go with the positive indicators in the external evidence - and I would argue, with all three of these plays, that we have insufficient warrant to go beyond such evidence with any confidence or authority. I have tried to show above why the external evidence concerning *Pericles* is slightly better than that for the other "apocryphal" plays attributed to Shakespeare during his life-time. But the principal obstacle to the case for Shakespeare's sole authorship of *Pericles* is also a piece of external evidence, the negative indicator of the play's absence from the First Folio. The standard discussion of this topic remains that by Greg, who boils the cause for its omission down to three main possibilities - authorship, copyright, and the lack of an adequate copy-text (*Editorial Problem*, pp. 19-21; one might add to the list, sheer contingency). Greg favours divided authorship as the most probable explanation for the play's exclusion, which creates a problem for him regarding the inclusion of *Henry VIII* in the Folio, and leads to what I have always found the rather desperate idea that *Henry VIII* was allowed a place in the volume in order to round off the sequence of English histories (wouldn't *Richard III* already do that quite adequately?). Greg (and many have followed him in this) is very dismissive of the notion that copyright could have been an issue in relation to *Pericles*, but the situation is more complicated than he makes out (as his own work elsewhere testifies). Who exactly held, or had best claim, to the printing rights of *Pericles* in 1623 (or, for that matter, in 1609) is far from clear at the present distance. What is clear, though, is that, by 1630 at least, those rights were felt to have belonged to the publisher of the play's fourth quarto (1619), Thomas Pavier. Pavier's 'right in Shakesperes plaies or any of them' was transferred from his widow to E. Brewster and R. Birde on 4 August 1626, and in the stock phrase of *BEPD*, 'this was no doubt intended and was later assumed to include the present piece' - a situation reflected in the printing of the fifth quarto for "R. B." in 1630 (*BEPD* 284d/284e; and see DelVecchio and Hammond, p. 198).

138. I am drawing again here on Masten's work, and particularly his discussion of the elaborate title-page of the 1609 quarto (*Textual intercourse*, pp. 89-93). A similar dispersal of authorial authority and "slippage" in authorship characterizes the realm of the play's sources and analogues as well - what with the largely anonymous transmission of the story; its frequent "insetting" within larger works; the problematic (and "plagiaristic") relationship of Wilkins's *Painful Adventures* to Twine's *The Pattern of Painful Adventures*; and even the fact that that earlier novella is variously attributed in its two surviving editions (c. 1594 and 1607), respectively, to Laurence Twine, and to his brother, Thomas (*STC* 709, 710; and see *DNB*, 19, 1330-1331).

139. Though in part, one might say, that is because *Kinsmen*, with its manifest multiple echoes of the rest of the canon, is a profoundly "Shakespearian" play regardless of whether or not Shakespeare actually had a hand in writing it.

140. A good recent treatment of *Kinsmen* within the context of the "Beaumont-and-Fletcher" canon can be found in Sandra Clark, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher: Sexual Themes and Dramatic Representation* (Hemel Hempstead, 1994), pp. 132-135. The play connects particularly closely (as, indeed, does *Cymbeline*) with *Bonduca*. Wilkins's oeuvre in general, as Honigmann has shown (*The Stability of Shakespeare's Text*, pp. 193-199), displays a recurring interest in the world of the eastern Mediterranean which *Pericles* inhabits; and see also Schrickx, pp. 24-32. The collaborative nature of much of Wilkins's output and the use of a similar geographical setting mean that it is possible to trace parallels here too with some of the work of other figures whose names have been associated with the play, such as Day and Heywood. The Mediterranean dimensions of *Pericles* have been pursued of late in articles by Constance Relihan and Linda McJannet (see the Bibliography).

141. 'What Is an Author?', p. 159. The anti-authoritarianism of the poststructuralist rejection of "the author", and the force this is intended to carry, is made even more explicit in Barthes's 'The Death of the Author'.

142. It could well be argued, no doubt, that my attempt in this paragraph to turn the sceptical tables is essentially irrelevant, that the real issue involved in the "attack" (for want of a better word) on "the author" is a rejection of a specifically dominant (and domineering, regressive, absolutist) interpretative paradigm. But it still strikes me as important not to over-idealize the alternative approaches available to us. And in any case, as others have noted, the image of "the author" that is placed under fire here is very often little more than a straw target, a symbolic victim. It seems to get forgotten, for example, that even the "New Criticism" had a complicated, ambivalent attitude to "the author" and the concept of intentionality.

143. An overlap or instability in meaning that also extends, of course, to such key nouns as "text", "copy", "author", "script". The ideas and arguments I am invoking here have all now become pretty much commonplaces, but see particularly Masten, *Textual intercourse*, pp. 14-20, 113-121.

144. I would want to maintain, for example, that a reasonable distinction can be drawn, both at a material level and in terms of the transmission and exploration of ideas, between the main type of activity at stake in the initial production/composition/creation of a Renaissance dramatic script - the bulk of the "writing", the "invention" - and the principal work required for its subsequent modes of (re)production and (re)inscription.

145. *Textual intercourse*, p. 14. Similar points about Masten's work are made in John Jowett, 'The Year's Contribution to Shakespeare Studies: 3. Editions and Textual Studies', *Shakespeare Survey*, 51 (1998), 302-337 (pp. 317-318). Masten invokes in particular in this context Bentley's suggestion that up to fifty per cent of the plays of this period contain the work of more than one dramatist (see above, note 20);

but as Jowett remarks, Bentley's position can fairly be taken to indicate that 'at least half the plays were written by a single dramatist, and considerably more if one sets aside the activities of revision and adaptation by a second dramatist' (p. 317). Jowett also offers the interesting observation that, 'relative to its practice, collaboration had consistently weak discursive recognition' (p. 318).

146. It is noticeable that very few critics (possibly for very good reason) have taken my line of accepting the idea of Shakespeare-Fletcher collaboration in *Kinsmen*, whilst rejecting it in *Henry VIII*. On the one hand, the supporters of divided authorship have tended to argue or assume that the internal evidence is essentially identical in either case, and thus that it is bound to lead to the same conclusions. I have tried to explain above why the two plays stand apart in terms of external evidence, and what this means for authorship studies, and I would argue besides that there are important differences in the nature of the internal evidence they yield. On the other hand, the principal opponents to the case for collaboration in *Henry VIII* (Wilson Knight, Peter Alexander, R. A. Foakes) have managed either to ignore (Knight, *The Crown of Life*; Foakes, *Shakespeare: the dark comedies to the last plays* (1971)) or to reject outright (Alexander, *Shakespeare's Life and Art* (London, 1939), pp. 220-221, footnote) Shakespeare's involvement in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* - presumably as much as anything out of fear of admitting a Trojan horse to their own argument.

147. I am drawing once more on Bristol's critique of Foucault's essay and its reception ('How Good Does Evidence Have to Be?', pp. 38-43). On authorship and the negotiation of authorial authority in the prose and poetry of the period, see again Minnis, Alice Miskimin, *The Renaissance Chaucer* (1975), and, amongst much other work, the books by Jonathan Crewe, John Guillory, Richard Helgerson, and Jacqueline Miller listed in the Bibliography. When it comes to the theatre, Jonson stands out as the obvious (if obviously exceptional) figure to mention. And see particularly in the present context, Barbara A. Mowat, 'Constructing the Author', in *Elizabethan Theater: Essays in Honor of S. Schoenbaum*, edited by R. B. Parker and S. P. Zitner (Cranbury, NJ, 1996), pp. 93-110; and in the same volume, Richard Dutton, 'The Birth of the Author', pp. 71-92; and Meredith Skura, 'Is There a Shakespeare after the *New Bibliography*?', pp. 169-183. Ideas from all three of these essays inform my arguments throughout this and the previous few paragraphs.

148. On the role of the Folio in constructing the "Shakespearian" author-function, see especially de Grazia, *Shakespeare Verbatim*, and Marcus, *Unediting the Renaissance*. It is noticeable that neither critic has much to say about the Pavier quartos. For the relevant section of Meres's rather eccentric volume, see *Francis Meres's Treatise 'Poetrie': A Critical Edition*, edited by Don Cameron Allen (Urbana, IL, 1933). An image of Shakespeare as author (in his role as both poet *and* dramatist, that is) can also be extracted from some of the other references to him that survive from his own life-time, including those by Gabriel Harvey,

John Weever, and Anthony Scoloker (see Oxford, p. xxxix; and the *Norton Shakespeare*, pp. 3324-3330). And the same can be said when it comes to responses to Shakespeare in the drama of the period, the plentiful allusions to, imitations of, and reactions against his work in the plays of his contemporaries - on the likes of which, see such (largely author-based) comparative studies as Richard Proudfoot, 'Shakespeare and the New Dramatists of the King's Men, 1606-1613', in Brown and Harris, *Later Shakespeare*, pp. 235-261; John Lemly, "'Make odde discoveries!": Disguises, Masques, and Jonsonian Romance', in *Comedy from Shakespeare to Sheridan*, edited by A. R. Braunmuller and J. C. Bulman (Cranbury, NJ, 1986), pp. 131-147; Verna Foster, 'Ford's Experiments in Tragicomedy: Shakespearean and Fletcherian Dramaturgies', in Nancy Klein Maguire, *Renaissance Tragicomedy*, pp. 97-111; Russ McDonald, *Shakespeare and Jonson / Jonson and Shakespeare* (Lincoln, NE and London, 1988), pp. 137-183; and McMullan, *The Politics of Unease*, pp. 197-256.

149. 'The Birth of the Author', pp. 85-90. Dutton seeks also to question here certain long-standing assumptions about the relationship between the theatre and print-culture, assumptions which have done much to shape both traditional and poststructuralist attitudes to the whole issue of Shakespeare and authorship (including, not least, ideas about what Shakespeare himself might have thought on the subject). And for another important re-evaluation of the available data in this area, again opening up possibilities regarding the relevance of authorship to the drama, see Blayney, 'The Publication of Playbooks'.

CHAPTER FOUR

1. Alternatively, wherever late Shakespeare apparently fails to achieve the proper degree of wonder - as, according to much "Romance" criticism, in *Cymbeline* - this has often been attributed to too close a reliance on the "Beaumont-and-Fletcher" model. Both sides of this equation played a major role in the long debate (never just a question of dating) over the relative priority of *Cymbeline* and *Philaster*. For a much more positive approach to the links between the two "traditions" of tragicomedy involved here, see Lee Bliss, 'Tragicomic Romance for the King's Men, 1609-1611: Shakespeare, Beaumont, and Fletcher', in Braunmuller and Bulman, *Comedy from Shakespeare to Sheridan*, pp. 148-164.

2. So in the case of *Henry VIII*, for example, one often comes across the idea that Shakespeare would have wanted to give a broadly positive depiction of the King, to celebrate national destiny and the mysteries of providential design, and that anything in the text that works against this - that, say, sexualizes Henry's motives for the divorce - must therefore derive from Fletcher, from his 'inadequately consulting Shakespeare's intentions', and general salacious interest in 'worldly court gossip' (quoting from A. R. Humphreys, *King Henry the Eighth*, pp. 19-20).

3. Ariel's song in *The Tempest* (1.2. 400-408) has long served as a kind of symbol or metaphor for Shakespeare's art and artistry in the late plays, as well as on a more general basis. What rarely gets mentioned in the process, but suits perfectly with my own outlook and approach, is that everything Ariel says or implies in it is a lie.

4. For some recent considerations of wonder in the late plays, see: David Richman, *Laughter, Pain, and Wonder: Shakespeare's Comedies and the Audience in the Theater* (Cranbury, NJ, 1990); T. G. Bishop, *Shakespeare and the theatre of wonder* (1996); Peter G. Platt, *Reason Diminished: Shakespeare and the Marvelous* (Lincoln, NE and London, 1997); and, dealing only with *The Tempest*, John G. Demaray, *Shakespeare and the Spectacles of Strangeness* (Pittsburgh, 1998). Bishop and Platt are especially useful in tracing literary and philosophical theories and concepts of wonder from Aristotle to the Renaissance.

5. The significance of Miranda's name has of course often been noted; see especially here Murray Levith, *What's in Shakespeare's Names*, pp. 110-111; and Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan, eds., *The Tempest*, The Arden Shakespeare (Walton-on-Thames, 1999), pp. 26-27.

6. At least, they do to me. But it is a long-standing critical commonplace that the final scene of *Pericles* is an aesthetic blemish, a badly anticlimactic come-down after the emotional highpoint of the Pericles-Marina recognition scene; and that Shakespeare learned from this experience and so avoided the "mistake" of staging two reunions in *The Winter's Tale* through the device of the gentlemen's reports in 5.2 (see, for example, Richman, pp. 109-115). This "evolutionary" reading makes the distancing or muting of wonder here, in the first instance, an error, and in the second, a purely practical consideration - which may serve as a nice "no nonsense" type of approach, but seems to me a terrible simplification of what is actually going on in either case.

7. With the last of these examples especially, much depends on performance, but I would largely go along with Stephen Orgel's reading of the chess-game sequence (*The Tempest*, pp. 29-30), and particularly his suggestion that 'Ferdinand and Miranda play out, at chess, a brief game of love and war that seems to foretell in their lives all the ambition, duplicity and cynicism of their elders' (p. 29). See also here Jan Kott's 1977 essay, 'The Tempest, or Repetition', reprinted in Kott, *The Bottom Translation*, translated by Daniela Miedzyrzecka and Lillian Vallee (Evanston, IL, 1987), pp. 69-106 (pp. 93-94); and (albeit with certain reservations) Bryan Loughrey and Neil Taylor, 'Ferdinand and Miranda at Chess', *Shakespeare Survey*, 35 (1982), 113-118. On chess as a metaphor for human society, see again Caxton, *The Game and Playe of the Chesse, passim*.

8. *The Tempest's* preoccupation with varieties of wonder has long been noted. See in particular in this context Kott, 'The Tempest, or Repetition', pp. 94-96; and for some more recent comment, Vaughan and Vaughan, *The Tempest*, pp. 3-6; and Peter Platt, pp. 169-187. It is tempting to suggest that it is the centrality of *The Tempest* to late play ("Romance") criticism that has pushed the issue of wonder to the forefront of the critical agenda for the group as a whole, more so than is actually appropriate where some of the other works are concerned.

9. *Reason Diminished*, p. 125.

10. *Reason Diminished*, p. 187. For a related sense of the late plays as both resistant to an 'emergent analytico-referential discourse' founded in 'human rationality', and reflective of Shakespeare's ongoing interest in 'that power of the human will subversive of all discursive reason', see William R. Morse, 'Metacriticism and Materiality: The Case of Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*', *ELH*, 58 (1991), 283-304 (p. 287).

11. Platt himself is well aware of the double-edged nature of wonder in late Shakespeare. As he writes:

at its best, wonder can destabilize certainty, prejudices, and rigid, over-rational thought; it can reveal new worlds and New Worlds; it can discover the ways and habits of others, previously unimaginable; it can restore one's faith in a tired, seemingly dead world by making that world strange again. But at its worst, wonder and the marvelous

can entrance and provide escape from responsibility; can lure one away from serious, effective social action - indeed, can provide an excuse for inaction, can establish illusory transcendence as a substitute for sublunary ethical activity (*Reason Diminished*, p. 186).

If, ultimately, I am rather less sanguine than Platt about the benefits of wonder in the late plays, this is in part because I feel that he downplays the political significance of wonder, both inside and outside the action, and over-emphasizes (and sentimentalizes) the potential of Shakespeare's art to transform and renew, at the expense of its power to critique - though it has a lot to do too with the fact that I include *Henry VIII* and *Kinsmen* within my own frame of reference.

12. For the latter, see principally *The Winter's Tale*, 4.4. 112-135; *Cymbeline*, 4.2. 219-229; *Pericles*, Sc.15. 65-72; and also *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 2.2. 118-150. The statue of Hermione constitutes the clearest example of woman-as-art-work. Another obvious point of reference is the scene in Imogen's bedchamber (*Cymbeline*, 2.2), and the subsequent "description" of what he "saw" there by Iachimo (2.4. 66-91). Marina is the heroine most fully celebrated for her artistic accomplishments (see *Pericles*, Scs.15. 17-33, 20. 1-11 (choruses to Acts 4 and 5)); and *Pericles* in general is extremely relevant in this context - one might mention especially the atmosphere of the resurrection/resuscitation of Thaisa (Scene 12), or (though she is an anomalous presence in this company in almost every other respect) the presentation of Antiochus's Daughter in the opening scene; and see Frederick Kiefer, 'Art, Nature, and the Written Word in *Pericles*', *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 61 (1991-92), 207-225. A further important factor in the overlapping image-texture here is the late plays' concern (at the level of both plot and imagery) with issues of pregnancy and maternity, and the metaphoric possibilities and associations available in the language of creation and generativity (and "issue"); see Elizabeth Sacks, *Shakespeare's Images of Pregnancy* (London and Basingstoke, 1980), especially pp. 87-104; and, with a focus on the "marvellous narratives" associated with women and maternity, Helen Hackett, "'Gracious be the issue': maternity and narrative in Shakespeare's late plays", in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 25-39 (see p. 35).

13. Probably the most influential treatments of the issue of Art and Nature in the late plays are Frank Kermode's Introduction to his Arden *Tempest* edition, and Wilson Knight's chapter on *The Winter's Tale* in *The Crown of Life*, pp. 76-128. Important as a pioneering study is Harold S. Wilson's 'Nature and Art in *The Winter's Tale*' (1943), reprinted as 'Nature and Art', in *Shakespeare: 'The Winter's Tale': A Casebook*, edited by Kenneth Muir (London, 1968), pp. 151-158. On the literary and historical contexts and traditions involved here, see especially Edward William Tayler, *Nature and Art in Renaissance Literature* (New York and London, 1964). The single main locus for all these concerns in late Shakespeare (textually and critically) is the discussion about grafting and hybridization in *The Winter's Tale*, 4.4, a passage I touch on briefly

below; for further comment, see Orgel, *The Winter's Tale*, pp. 42-47; the notes in J. H. P. Pafford's edition, pp. 92-95; and also generally Leonard Barkan, "'Living Sculptures": Ovid, Michelangelo, and *The Winter's Tale*', *ELH*, 48 (1981), 639-667; and B. J. Sokol, *Art and illusion in 'The Winter's Tale'* (Manchester and New York, 1994).

14. The debate itself, as Orgel observes, is 'characteristically inconclusive' (*The Winter's Tale*, p. 172, note to ll. 87-103). Certain very obvious ironies emerge regarding the position either character adopts and the line of action they themselves pursue - though one might also be inclined to question the extent to which plant-breeding can serve as a viable model or metaphor for human behaviour, or *vice versa* (and see Orgel, p. 47). Polixenes's arguments would seem to carry the day at the level of logic, but the ethic of Perdita's position, her resistance to the arts of deception, is equally powerful discursively - despite the fact that she is herself, of course (even more than Polixenes), a figure implicated (wittingly and unwittingly) in all sorts of layers of artistic deception and illusion.

15. An aspect of their make-up all-too-obviously reflected (and exacerbated) in much of the (largely male) pre-1980s commentary on the late plays. Specific discussions include D. S. Bland, 'The Heroine and the Sea'; Cyrus Hoy, 'Fathers and Daughters in Shakespeare's Romances', in Kay and Jacobs, *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*, pp. 77-90; and D. W. Harding, 'Shakespeare's final view of women', *TLS*, 30 November 1979, pp. 59-61. Most work of this sort appears frankly embarrassing (at best) in the wake of feminist criticism. My own remarks here only really apply fully to the heroines of the "four Romances". Nineteenth-century critical investment in such figures was particularly powerful, and finds expression not only in the excesses of "Imogenolatry", but in the misogynistic abuse directed, in the name of authorship work, at the likes of Emilia and the Jailer's Daughter (*per se*, or as "corrupted" by Fletcher) in the effort to separate them off from (and so preserve) the "true" late Shakespearian norm (see again, for example, Swinburne, *A Study of Shakespeare*, pp. 214-227; and Furnivall, 'Forewords').

To acknowledge that the heroines (and the "villainesses" too, for that matter) of the late plays are founded on stereotypes is not to imply that the plays themselves necessarily end up just endorsing or reinforcing those stereotypes. It seems to me more a matter of them working with (as opposed to within) a convention. Early feminist commentary on these texts is not entirely distanced from the processes of idealization operative in more "conventional" criticism, finding much to admire, and much that is empowering, in the plays' vocal and self-assertive (good) daughters and wives. But the variety of feminist and feminist-influenced readings now available is a sign that the gender politics of the plays as a group resist easy summary or translation into any single polarized position. Still relevant on this topic is Ann Thompson's "'Miranda, Where's Your Sister?": Reading Shakespeare's *The Tempest*", in *Feminist Criticism: Theory and Practice*, edited by Susan Sellers (Hemel Hempstead, 1991), pp. 45-55; and for some more recent

considerations of the representation of women in the late plays, see Simon Palfrey, *Late Shakespeare* (1997), pp. 194-222; Hackett; Richard Wilson's essay, 'Observations on English bodies: Licensing maternity in Shakespeare's late plays', in *Will Power*, pp. 158-183; and Helen Wilcox, "'If I prove honey-mouthed, let my tongue blister": Women's Language in Shakespeare's Tragicomedies', *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 134 (1998), 97-107.

16. I have more to say on both these prologues and epilogues later on. All four speeches obviously relate closely to the original (or some other early) performance moment of their respective texts, and because of this have often been seen as detached (or detachable) from the main event, occasional pieces not fully relevant to interpretation (a view furthered by their generally being attributed to Fletcher). But many of the issues they raise are also thematized within the body of the action, and I see no reason for treating them as anything other than integral to the overall effect of the plays to which they belong. What is certain, in any case, is that the speeches themselves exist within a complex performative dynamic, which gets in the way of any attempt to take their comments on stage-audience relations simply as statements of fact or uncomplicated expressions of true emotions.

17. Relevant passages here include *The Tempest*, 2.2. 24-33 and *Henry VIII*, 5.3. 30-37; but the single most obvious sequence to mention when it comes to guying a popular taste for wonders is the discussion surrounding Autolycus's ballads in *The Winter's Tale*, 4.4. 257-312.

18. 'New plays and maidenheads are near akin: | Much followed both, for both much money giv'n | If they stand sound and well', as the opening lines provocatively assert. The tone of this speech has, perhaps rightly, occasioned much critical discomfort, but no matter how unsettling or seemingly salacious its imagery, I am assuming that the function of the Prologue is not merely exploitative or derogatory, that there is a serious and analytical side to its shockingly indecorous comparisons. After all, kinship, virginity, and marriage bargains are all key topics within the ensuing action.

19. I am clearly drawing in part here on Steven Mullaney's work in *The Place of the Stage*, and particularly his emphasis on the social and economic links between the public theatre and the various illicit entertainments and other marginal activities that were going on around it in its principal early locale in the Liberties. But I am also partly reacting against Mullaney's own reading of *Pericles* (pp. 135-151), with its heavily theory-driven argument that this play, even in its brothel scenes, looks to suppress its own position in the popular marketplace, that it represents 'Shakespeare's systematic effort to dissociate his art from the marginal contexts and affiliations that had formerly served as the grounds of its possibility' (p. 147). Aside from the fact that this is rather an odd argument to make about a work that is one of the most markedly "popular" and backward-looking of any in the Shakespeare canon, it seems to me that any anxieties the play expresses in this area

are actually directed towards the ideological *limitations* imposed by such contexts and affiliations. In similar terms, Mullaney's view of Gower as another symptom of the process he discerns, a proleptic image of the emergent figure of the individual author and a symbol of a pure, dehistoricized aesthetic, ignores both the long theatrical roots of the choric tradition, and the way the play itself, through the tensions it sets up between narrative and drama, can be seen (rather than trying to conceal or accidentally revealing) to articulate all sorts of misgivings regarding 'Gower's claims to an ageless authority' (p. 149).

20. For a sense of the breadth of critical opinion in this area, see the likes of: Anne Barton (as Anne Richter), *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* (London, 1962), pp. 192-207; Norman Rabkin's two essays on the late plays in *Shakespeare and the Common Understanding*, pp. 192-237, and *Shakespeare and the Problem of Meaning*, pp. 118-140; Arthur C. Kirsch, 'Cymbeline and Coterie Dramaturgy', *ELH*, 34 (1967), 285-306, and 'Jacobean Theatrical Self-consciousness', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama*, 23 (1980), 9-13; Philip Edwards, *Shakespeare and the Confines of Art* (London, 1968); David Young, *The Heart's Forest*; Robert Egan, *Drama Within Drama: Shakespeare's Sense of His Art in 'King Lear', 'The Winter's Tale', and 'The Tempest'* (New York and London, 1975); Roger Warren, 'Theatrical Virtuosity and Poetic Complexity in *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 29 (1976), 41-49; Caesarea Abartis, *The Tragicomic Construction of 'Cymbeline' and 'The Winter's Tale'*; Thomas F. Van Laan, *Role-playing in Shakespeare* (Toronto, 1978); Walter Eggers, "'Bring Forth a Wonder": Presentation in Shakespeare's Romances'; Alvin B. Kernan, *The Playwright as Magician: Shakespeare's Image of the Poet in the English Public Theater* (New Haven and London, 1979); Sidney Homan, *When the Theater Turns to Itself: The Aesthetic Metaphor in Shakespeare* (Lewisburg, KY, 1981); Gary Schmidgall, *Shakespeare and the Courtly Aesthetic*; David Frost, "'Mouldy Tales": The Context of Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*'; and Robert F. Willson, Jr., 'Enframing Style and the Father-Daughter Theme in Early Shakespearean Comedy and Late Romance', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 38-48; and see further below.

21. Prior to Mowat, commentary in this area is largely confined, apart from editorial introductions and the odd individual essay here and there (see below), to the relevant chapters of Arthur Quiller-Couch's *Shakespeare's Workmanship* (1918), and such efforts as S. L. Bethell's curate's egg of a book, *'The Winter's Tale': A Study* (1947), and Harley Granville-Barker's insightful but nevertheless seriously flawed 'Preface' to *Cymbeline* (*Prefaces to Shakespeare*, Second Series (1930), pp. 234-345).

22. *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances*, p. 2. For Mowat's explanation of her own approach, see generally pp. 1-4. Her book does in fact go on to include some specific discussion of *Pericles* (pp. 95-97), treated principally as a theme for later variations, 'a drama in which the pattern of the Romances appears clearly and unambiguously' (p. 95). This section also reveals Mowat to be working firmly within another

standard popular paradigm, the chronologically and aesthetically suspect developmental/evolutionary model of the "four Romances" as a gradually improving sequence.

23. Mowat herself observed that, 'of all the Romances, *Cymbeline* has been most open to attack or apology because of its "primitive" - or, as they are now called, "artificial" - tactics' (*Dramaturgy*, p. 4). It is entirely symptomatic of this situation that, even when a critic like Granville-Barker did come up with some genuine insights into the nature of the play's dramaturgy, these were pretty much negated by the terms of his own reading, the aesthetic codes and particular theories of authorship and textual integrity he adhered to, and the disparaging assessment of the play these imposed. One important early exception, however, to the general failure remotely to appreciate or comprehend the dramaturgy of this play is F. D. Hoeniger's 'Irony and Romance in *Cymbeline*', *Studies in English Literature*, 2 (1962), 219-228 - though Hoeniger's essay is itself indebted to some of Mowat's own preliminary work (and see *Dramaturgy*, pp. 138-139, notes 2-3). The scope of Mowat's achievement is evident not only in the obvious advance her criticism marks on that of Quiller-Couch, probably her single main predecessor in this area, but also in the extent to which her book stands apart from the tedious array of thematic/symbolic/mythic studies of the late plays produced around the same time.

24. *Dramaturgy*, p. 111. The most evident limitation to Mowat's position here, in terms of current concerns, is its typical formalist indifference to the realms of history and social or political context. Then again, as I have been arguing throughout, most recent historicist work shows little real sense or understanding of the significance of form, and its importance to (political and discursive) meaning.

25. See *Dramaturgy*, pp. 35-68 ("A Very Pleasant Thing Indeed, and Sung Lamentably": Dramatic Tactics in the Romances'). As used by Mowat, "dramatic tactics" refers to 'the mechanics of stagecraft', the processes of conveying all the necessary plot information, getting the characters on and off stage, and so on - fundamental elements, but the conventions of which 'change from one dramatic period to another, as stage-audience relationships change and as that which is "natural" in one period becomes "artificial" or "crude" in another' (p. 35; and see p. 139, note 4).

26. Mowat derives her terminology from the work of Alexander Bakshy. Dramatists who set out to produce "'representational" drama', aim to 'avoid obtrusive tactics' and to 'weave entrances and exits and exposition into the fabric of the play'; those, on the other hand, 'who create "presentational" dramas', plays 'in which the thrust is toward the "presenting" of a stage world rather than the "representing" of an illusively "real" world', go about to adopt 'for their own purposes the illusion-breaking properties of obtrusive tactics, and add such tactics to their repertoire of presentational devices' (*Dramaturgy*, p. 36; and see p. 139, note 5). Like most Shakespearians who invoke an opposition

between engagement and detachment, Mowat expresses a debt (p. 139, note 6) to Maynard Mack's seminal (though surprisingly basic) essay, 'Engagement and Detachment in Shakespeare's Plays', in *Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama: In Honor of Hardin Craig*, edited by Richard Hosley (Columbia, MO, 1962), pp. 275-296.

27. *Dramaturgy*, pp. 36, 64; with respect to the second of these quoted phrases, see also p. 59.

28. See *Dramaturgy*, pp. 42-64; and compare the similar history traced in Barton, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play*, pp. 11-86. One can clearly point to certain specific historical changes, developments, and progressions at work in all this, but there is no need to imbue these with a teleology, to translate such movements (for example) into a "natural" advancement from a naive to a sophisticated aesthetic. And in any case, there are plenty of alternative ways of approaching the contrasting techniques at stake here - perhaps most obviously, and most importantly, in terms of Robert Weimann's concepts of *locus*, *platea*, and *Figurenposition*; see Weimann's seminal study, *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theater*, edited by Robert Schwartz (Baltimore and London, 1978).

29. One of the clearest instances of "presentational" dramaturgy in the early canon is provided by Egeon's extended narrative at the start of *The Comedy of Errors* (1.1. 31-139). This, as has often been noted, is in many ways directly comparable to Prospero's narrative to Miranda in *The Tempest* (1.2. 22-185). However, though the latter may benefit from Shakespeare's greater theatrical experience and improved technique towards the end of his career, there is no reason to assume that there is anything less "self-conscious" or conventionalized about the example from the earlier play. Even cursory attention to the design of *The Comedy of Errors* should be enough to indicate that this is a "sophisticated", self-aware piece of theatre, and whatever one's views on the dramatic effectiveness of Egeon's narrative, in such a context, it seems best to assume that his speech involves a highly deliberate and "knowing" use of narrative techniques on the part of the dramatist. Whilst on this subject, I would also suggest that Mowat underestimates the presence of "presentational" effects in "middle-period" Shakespeare. A play like *As You Like It*, for example, possesses possibly the most blatantly artificial and "unmotivated" opening exposition (1.1. 1-23) in the entire Shakespeare canon - an artifice and "non-illusionism" of presentation that is reflected, moreover, right across the ensuing action (compare Mowat, *Dramaturgy*, pp. 45-51).

30. Mowat, *Dramaturgy*, p. 43.

31. See *Dramaturgy*, pp. 37-42; and compare too Bethell's equally perceptive and important discussion ('*The Winter's Tale*', pp. 47-51) of the accumulation of antiquated techniques and obvious plot devices in the second half of *The Winter's Tale*, 4.4. My own allusion here is to the words of a character who is, in person, one of the most palpable of

all "palpable devices" in the early Shakespeare canon, the Scrivener in *Richard III* (see 3.6).

32. *Dramaturgy*, pp. 67, 68.

33. *Dramaturgy*, p. 99; and see generally pp. 95-110. Plays of this type look to escape from 'any obvious line of determined action, and are characterized by an undercutting of the balance, shape, symmetry of the closed-form work by a seeming refusal to allow one incident to demand a particular succeeding incident' (p. 98). Moreover, their tone or mood 'avoids consistency and appears flexible and sometimes multiple, uncertain, or jarringly changeable' (p. 99). Mowat is drawing here on the work of (among others) Heinrich Wölfflin and Kenneth Burke; and see also Clifford Leech, 'The Structure of the Last Plays', *Shakespeare Survey*, 11 (1958), 19-30.

34. The principles and aspirations of Sokolova's 1992 book are manifested in its title: *Shakespeare's Romances as Interrogative Texts: Their Alienation Strategies and Ideology*.

35. See principally here Sokolova's chapter, 'The Relevance of Brecht', pp. 14-31. Brecht's debts to Elizabethan theatrical practice are traced as well in Margot Heinemann's valuable essay, 'How Brecht read Shakespeare', in Dollimore and Sinfield, *Political Shakespeare*, pp. 202-230 (see especially pp. 208-210). There is a useful brief explication of Brechtian "alienation" (the "*Verfremdungseffekt*") in Chris Baldick, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*, pp. 4-5.

36. Sokolova, p. 26. There is a sense, of course, in which all of the terminology invoked here ("presentational", "representational", "open form", etc.) can be dismissed as anachronistic - which is one reason why I am only really using any of it "at arm's length". But there is an obvious distinction available between language whose main impetus (ostensibly at least) is to *describe* a broad range of effects that are recurrent in literature and drama, and language whose terms and ideas form part of a theory which is geared primarily towards a contemporary practical purpose and explicit political agenda. As Heinemann remarks, 'Brecht's distancing effects - including alienation effects that work by surprising us - are, as he said, deliberately combative, *political* effects' ('How Brecht read Shakespeare', p. 223). So whilst I am myself eager to emphasize the political implications and intent of the self-conscious, self-referential dramaturgy of the late plays, there seems little point in associating this side of their construction with the kind of committed political consciousness that is integral to Brechtian alienation - or, for that matter, in berating late Shakespeare for failing to achieve such a consciousness.

37. *Shakespeare's Romances as Interrogative Texts*, p. 29; and see further pp. 32-53. In Belsey's work, the "interrogative text" stands as one category in a group of three, the others being "declarative texts" and "imperative texts"; see her *Critical Practice* (London and New York, 1980), pp. 85-102.

38. *Critical Practice*, p. 92. Even though she goes on to cite examples from the realm of drama, Belsey is obviously writing at this point (as critical theorists so often do) with narrative fiction and the experience of reading at the forefront of her mind.

39. Belsey acknowledges that the categories she is proposing are fairly fluid and provisional (*Critical Practice*, pp. 91-92). And in a later article, she rather questions her own position, arguing that pretty much any text can be read "interrogatively" if one has a mind to it (see 'Literature, history, politics' (1983), reprinted in Lodge, *Modern Criticism and Theory*, pp. 400-410 (pp. 407-408)). For my own part, I have particular reservations about the way Belsey seems to be valorizing the idea of textual incoherence. But the relevance of her work in this context is confirmed by the fact that one of Belsey's own examples of an interrogative text is, in a crucial analysis, *The Winter's Tale* (see *Critical Practice*, pp. 98-102).

40. Thus she feels, for example, that *The Tempest*, 'on balance, strongly endorses the authoritarian Jacobean ideology' (p. 146), whilst Shakespeare himself 'comes close to monarchical propaganda' (p. 147). Sokolova is willing to see the presence of resistance to the dominant ideology in places (pp. 96, 147-151), and indeed, makes the suggestion that the self-conscious artifice of the late plays helps to reveal the intrinsic artifice and theatricality of royal power (an idea I return to below). But even here, the argument is only tentative, and she shows little confidence in accepting this as a deliberate/intentional effect.

41. *Critical Practice*, p. 92; for the source of Belsey's quotation, see Louis Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy, and other Essays*, translated by Ben Brewster (London and New York, 1971), pp. 222-223.

42. *Ideology: An Introduction* (London and New York, 1991), pp. 1-2. My own thinking in this area is heavily indebted to Eagleton's work here; and see too the collection of writings he has edited on the subject, *Ideology*, Longman Critical Readers (London and New York, 1994); and, for a sense of the continuing relevance of ideology and ideology critique in the contemporary world, his more recent *The Illusions of Postmodernism* (Oxford, 1996). Also useful in this latter context, and indeed generally, is David Hawkes, *Ideology*, The New Critical Idiom (London and New York, 1996).

43. Eagleton's work suggests that more or less any attempt at a totalizing description of ideology (apart from those too vague to be of any actual practical value) is going to prove inadequate, to yield significant exceptions. Or as he puts it, 'it is doubtful that one can ascribe to ideology any *invariable* characteristics at all' (*Ideology: An Introduction*, p. 222).

44. The key work to mention as a site for this debate is the collection of essays edited by Ivo Kamps, *Shakespeare Left and Right* (1991); also relevant in this context, if in the end rather less useful or impressive, is Robert P. Merrix and Nicholas Ranson, eds., *Ideological*

Approaches to Shakespeare: The Practice of Theory (Lewiston, NY and Lampeter, 1992). Richard Levin's contributions to both these volumes (see the Bibliography) adopt a deliberately restricted and caricatured notion of ideology, which he then uses to rubbish political criticism and to deny the value of ideology to critical practice. But however inadequate Levin's arguments, the kind of response that insists, as Gayle Greene's does, that 'ideology has a specific meaning' deriving from Althusser and others, only serves to confuse the situation, and to lend ammunition to the opponents of both ideology as a concept and ideologically-oriented criticism (see Greene, 'The Myth of Neutrality, Again?', in *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 23-29 (p. 23)). Kamps's own editorial introduction ('Ideology and its Discontents', pp. 1-12) provides a useful overview of the issues involved here; and see too the essay by Carol Cook, 'Straw Women and Whipping Girls: The (Sexual) Politics of Critical Self-Fashioning', pp. 61-77 (pp. 63-68).

45. It is important to stress this latter possibility. It may not be feasible to define ideology precisely, but that does not mean that one cannot pinpoint some of its operations or suggest serviceable limits to its range of meaning. And this in turn furnishes material with which to resist the kind of arguments advanced in Edward Pechter, 'Against "Ideology"', in Kamps, *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 79-97.

46. Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, p. 1; and see also *OED*, VII, 622, "ideology", sense 4.

47. Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, p. 1; and see further pp. 5-7.

48. Quoting from the essay 'Marxism and Humanism', in Louis Althusser, *For Marx*, translated by Ben Brewster (London, 1969; reprinted 1971), pp. 219-247 (p. 233); and see alongside this, of course, 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)', in Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy*, pp. 127-186 (the subtitle here is worth emphasizing).

49. To cite the 'central thesis' of the essay on ideology (it is expressed as a sub-heading), '*Ideology Interpellates Individuals as Subjects*' ('Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses', p. 170). For relevant summaries of Althusser's arguments here, see Belsey, *Critical Practice*, pp. 56-67, and James H. Kavanagh, 'Shakespeare in ideology', in Drakakis, *Alternative Shakespeares*, pp. 144-165. As Belsey puts it, ideology represents 'the very condition of our experience of the world, unconscious precisely in that it is unquestioned, taken for granted' (p. 5); moreover, 'the destination of all ideology is the subject (the individual in society) and it is the role of ideology to *construct people as subjects*' (p. 58). On the way Althusser's work marks a shift 'from a cognitive to an affective theory of ideology', see Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, pp. 18-19 (p. 19).

50. Though it is also possible actively to embrace aspects of this inscription, to gleefully accept (or cynically exploit) one's own

ideological "unreconstructedness" (see Eagleton, ed., *Ideology*, pp. 9-10, and *Ideology: An Introduction*, pp. 26-27).

51. For a sense of the difficulties with Althusser's position, see Eagleton, ed., *Ideology*, pp. 87-88, and *Ideology: An Introduction*, pp. 18-22, 136-153; David Hawkes, pp. 121-136; and also Peter Erickson, *Rewriting Shakespeare, Rewriting Ourselves* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1991), pp. 17-20. Eagleton makes the point that Althusser's approach 'is covertly constrained by an attention to the narrower sense of ideology as a *dominant* formation' (p. 18). Also seriously problematic, as has often been noted, is Althusser's adherence to a rigid distinction between "ideology" and "science".

52. Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, p. 209. Most of what I have to say below (where I am myself only really sketching in some of the details of the situation) is anticipated or addressed in Eagleton's study. I am especially reliant on his opening chapter and conclusion (pp. 1-31, 221-224).

53. Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, p. 26 (though in context this description is more a reference to a standard notion of ideology than a direct statement on the subject from Eagleton himself).

54. Michael D. Bristol, 'Where Does Ideology Hang Out?', in Kamps, *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 31-43 (p. 36).

55. Marilyn L. Williamson, 'Violence and Gender Ideology In *Coriolanus* and *Macbeth*', in Kamps, *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 147-166 (p. 147).

56. Kavanagh, p. 146.

57. Quoting from the closing essay, 'Myth Today', in Barthes, *Mythologies*, pp. 107-159 (p. 129). As Barthes remarks later on, 'myth has the task of giving an historical intention a natural justification, and making contingency appear eternal'; to which he adds, 'this process is exactly that of bourgeois ideology' (p. 142).

58. See the discussion in Eagleton, *Ideology: An Interpretation*, pp. 156-158; and particularly, for Bourdieu's own work, Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, translated by Richard Nice (Cambridge, 1977).

59. Compare the six characteristics of ideology highlighted by Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, pp. 47-61; and see too pp. 5-6.

60. *Ideology: An Introduction*, p. 223 and p. 9 respectively. In similar terms, ideology can be identified as 'primarily performative, rhetorical, pseudo-propositional discourse' (p. 221), which 'represents the points where power impacts upon certain utterances and inscribes itself tacitly within them' (p. 223); and see generally the chapter, 'Discourse and Ideology', pp. 193-220.

61. This is not to suggest that all performative or persuasive language is ideological, or that that which is, is always necessarily ideological to the same degree. Once again, totalization here would be

misrepresentation; and see Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, pp. 201-202.

62. For a defence of the importance and continuing validity of the concept of representation, see Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, pp. 209-214.

63. On top of the work already mentioned, two more of the essays in Kamps's *Shakespeare Left and Right* are useful here: Gerald Graff, 'Ordinary People and Academic Critics: A Response to Richard Levin', pp. 99-113; and Michael Sprinker, 'Commentary: "You've Got a Lot of Nerve"', pp. 115-128.

64. "'What Cares These Roarers for the Name of King?": Language and Utopia in *The Tempest*', in McMullan and Hope, *The Politics of Tragicomedy*, pp. 21-54 (p. 24); and see too the comments on Norbrook's essay in Ryan, *Shakespeare: The Last Plays*, pp. 13, 245-246.

65. Glynne Wickham's various articles provide the most obvious illustration of the critical impetus to link the late plays directly to the figure of the Prince and his personal interests and policies. For rather more balanced assessments of Henry's relevance to *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (clearly the play in the group that stands out most in this context), see J. R. Mulryne, 'Shakespeare's *Knight's Tale*: [The] *Two Noble Kinsmen* and the Tradition of Chivalry', in *Le Roman de Chevalerie au Temps de la Renaissance*, edited by M. T. Jones-Davies (Paris, 1987), pp. 75-106; and Peter T. Hadorn, 'The *Two Noble Kinsmen* and the Problem of Chivalry', in *Medievalism in England*, edited by Leslie J. Workman (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 45-57. On Henry himself, his life, times, aims, and ambitions, see J. W. Williamson, *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart* (New York, 1978); and Roy Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London, 1986); the second half of this latter title gives a good indication of the levels of idealization that have surrounded this disturbingly militaristic, militantly Protestant, aggressively nationalistic figure - alongside whom even James himself can come to look fairly reasonable and "enlightened".

66. I am assuming a distinction here between a fairly broad-based attention to topical concerns (as found in most of my own comments on this subject so far), and more precisely detailed, almost *roman-à-clef* lines of interpretation, or the kind of specific, "localized" reading advocated by the likes of Leah Marcus. Probably the most high-profile exponent of work in these latter areas in late play criticism at the moment is Donna B. Hamilton; see primarily her *Virgil and 'The Tempest': The Politics of Imitation* (Columbia, OH, 1990); and *Shakespeare and the Politics of Protestant England*; and also 'Shakespeare's Romances and Jacobean Political Discourse', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 64-71. Hamilton certainly introduces a wealth of valuable material into the critical debate, but her readings of the actual plays always seem to me disappointingly reductive, crudely allegorical (and frequently thoroughly implausible) in their one-to-one mappings of text on to history, and reliant on interpretations that are a long way off from being constrained

or demanded by the texts themselves. I get along a lot better with the work of Stuart M. Kurland; see, for example, his 'Henry VIII and James I: Shakespeare and Jacobean Politics', *Shakespeare Studies*, 19 (1987), 203-217; and "'The care . . . of subjects' good": *Pericles*, James I, and the Neglect of Government', *Comparative Drama*, 30 (1996-97), 220-244.

67. Sokolova is particularly useful on the Jacobean political implications of the recurring late Shakespearian themes of providence and the patriarchal family; and see also here (despite its even more narrowly "orthodox" New Historicist approach) Leonard Tennenhouse's discussion of the late plays in *Power on Display*, pp. 171-186.

68. The description itself may be decidedly post-Renaissance, but by no means all of the ideas that it involves are. Thus it is perfectly possible to address the kind of features I focus upon as ideological from a much more strictly historicist perspective, through the areas, for example, of classical and humanist political theory and linguistic and philosophical discourse. I have worked via the notion of ideology mainly because this connects so much more directly to the place of the plays in the world of today. And in the terms set out here, it does capture very precisely the nature of the effects to which I am trying to draw attention.

69. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*, p. 132. He continues: 'normally, direct addresses to the audience in prologues, epilogues, and inductions are metadramatic in that they refer to the play itself and acknowledge the theatrical situation; a similar effect may be achieved in asides'; and so on. It is perhaps worth mentioning that neither "metadrama" nor "metatheatre" is specifically included in the numerous "meta-" compounds listed in the second edition of *OED* (IX, 662-682).

70. 'Playing within the play: Towards a Semiotics of Metadrama and Metatheatre', in *The Show Within: Dramatic and Other Insets*, edited by François Laroque, 2 vols (Montpellier, 1992), I, 39-49 (p. 42). In a further formulation just below this, Maquerlot describes "metadrama" as referring 'first and foremost' to 'the ostension of the codes which at a given, historically determined time ensure and regulate the production, transmission and reception of a meaningful theatrical message'. And in contrast to Baldick, he proposes a distinction between "metadrama" and "metatheatre", with the latter being used to 'designate all forms of playing within the *performance-text* that call attention to the dramatic and theatrical codes subsuming the stage representation'. I find this idea appealing, but ordinary usage makes such a distinction, however desirable, difficult to maintain, and this is compounded by the fact that "metadrama" yields no convenient form equivalent to the derivative "metatheatricity". Maquerlot takes pains (pp. 40-42) to distance his use of "metadrama" from that found in the work of James L. Calderwood (see the Bibliography). I go along with him in this, and would also stress that my own approach has nothing in common with Lionel Abel's *Metatheater: A New View of Dramatic Form* (New York, 1963), or even

Judd D. Hubert's *Metatheater: The Example of Shakespeare* (Lincoln, NE and London, 1991).

71. *Shakespeare's Dramatic Transactions* (Durham, NC and London, 1990), p. 21. The emphasis here again distinguishes my position from the more metaphorical understanding of metadrama associated with the work of Calderwood and others; and see further Michael Shapiro, 'Role-Playing, Reflexivity, and Metadrama in Recent Shakespearean Criticism', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 12 (1981), 145-161 (specifically, p. 148). I have also found useful in this context, Philip C. McGuire's paper, 'Hamlet's "Judicious" Spectator and The Metadramatic Critic', in *Shakespearean Metadrama*, Proceedings of the 93rd MLA Convention, Special Session 206, 28 December 1978 (Rochester, NY, [1978(?)]), pp. 28-49.

72. *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction* (London and New York, 1984), p. 4; and see, for one of the few attempts that I know of to address this aspect of late Shakespearean dramaturgy directly (and also acknowledging a debt to Waugh), William W. E. Slights, 'Trusting Shakespeare's *Winter's Tale*: Metafiction in the Late Plays', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 103-108 (p. 104).

73. See the discussion in *Metafiction*, pp. 63-68; the term, "defamiliarization", derives from the work of Victor Shklovsky. To quote Waugh again, 'the concept of defamiliarization has similarities with the more familiar Brechtian concept of the *Verfremdungseffekt* but, whereas Brecht's aim was to defamiliarize the practices of theatrical realism for political ends, Shklovsky's distinction between mechanical perception (static) and poetic perception (dynamic) makes the renewal of perception *in itself* the aim of art' (p. 152, note 6); and compare Shklovsky's own essay of 1919, 'Art as technique', reprinted in Lodge, pp. 15-30.

74. In many ways, defamiliarization is the most crucial element in the whole equation here. After all, there seems little reason to suppose that aesthetic self-consciousness is somehow intrinsically radical or subversive, that it is always going to challenge expectations or prove ideologically disruptive (a point of view which Belsey, for example, leans strongly towards in *Critical Practice*). The processes of advertising conventions and contrivances, breaking down the illusion, foregrounding the construction of the narrative, and so on, can themselves become, with use, fully conventionalized, tired and worn out, taken for granted. Defamiliarization, on the other hand, brings with it the possibility of constant artistic renewal, ongoing over time, through parody, caricature, the reinvigoration of conventions, and other similar activities. What matters in terms of my present argument is that, in the late plays, defamiliarization and self-referentiality coincide.

75. Roger Warren has been a particularly vigorous opponent in recent years of the idea that the self-referentiality of the late plays has anything to do with distancing or disengaging the emotions of the audience; see his *Shakespeare in Performance* volume on *Cymbeline* (1989) and *Staging Shakespeare's Late Plays* (1990). Warren's own position is badly compromised, however, by dubiously ahistorical arguments derived

from modern performance practice and post-Stanislovskian theories of acting and dramatic character. More generally, commentary in this area has often suffered from a failure to distinguish between competing or contrasting notions of aesthetic distance. Northrop Frye makes the point that 'wherever there is aesthetic apprehension there is emotional and intellectual detachment' (*Anatomy of Criticism*, p. 66); but the kind of detachment Frye focuses on is that which prevents an audience from taking the fiction to be reality, from believing in it too thoroughly ("over-engagement"). This is ultimately very different from the more Brechtian sense of aesthetic distance as a way of jarring the audience "out" of the fiction, a means of preventing any emotional engagement with the invented action. See the appendix, 'Aesthetic Distance and Dramatic Illusion', in Mowat, *Dramaturgy*, pp. 121-128. It seems to me that the self-consciousness of the late plays clearly goes far beyond anything needed to preclude audience over-engagement. What it serves to do, rather, to my mind, as I suggested in Chapter One (and this perhaps treads a line between the two extremes in the understanding of aesthetic distance), is allow the processes of "not believing" in the fiction, and of registering the constructions of aesthetic form, to extend to all sorts of related "fictions" and art-works within the on-stage action.

76. *William Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1986), pp. ix-x.

77. In the field of literary fiction, an example that readily stands out (whether or not it actually has a direct connection to late Shakespearian drama) is Cervantes's *Don Quixote*; and see further here Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things*, pp. 3-16, 46-50.

78. Studies I have in mind here include John Greenwood, *Shifting Perspectives and the Stylish Style: Mannerism in Shakespeare and his Jacobean Contemporaries* (Toronto, 1988); and Frederick O. Waage, 'Be Stone No More: Italian Cinquecento Art and Shakespeare's Last Plays', in *Shakespeare: Contemporary Critical Approaches*, edited by Harry R. Garvin, with Michael D. Payne (East Brunswick, NJ, 1980), pp. 56-87; see too Cyrus Hoy, 'Jacobean Tragedy and the Mannerist Style', *Shakespeare Survey*, 26 (1973), 49-67. Jean-Pierre Maquerlot has lately sought to deny that there is any real connection between mannerist tactics and the dramaturgy of the late plays, but his own treatment of these works is rather perfunctory and superficial (see *Shakespeare and the Mannerist Tradition* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 180-184). The explicit reference (so untypical of Shakespeare) to Giulio Romano has of course elicited all sorts of commentary and speculation. See in particular Barkan, "'Living Sculptures"'; Sokol, pp. 85-115; and, for a general summary, the note to this passage in Orgel, *The Winter's Tale*, pp. 221-222. Perhaps most interestingly in the present context, the mention of Giulio raises the question of Shakespeare's knowledge of Vasari. The dramatist's interest in pictorial art and its complexities of representation and perception stretches the length of his career, from *Lucrece* and the Induction to *The Taming of the Shrew*, to the likes of *Timon of Athens* and *Antony*

and *Cleopatra*. See further on this, Leo Salinger's essay, 'Shakespeare and the Italian concept of "art"', in *Dramatic Form in Shakespeare and the Jacobean* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 1-18; and also (without necessarily endorsing its central thesis), Warren Stevenson, 'Shakespeare's Hand in *The Spanish Tragedy* 1602', *Studies in English Literature*, 8 (1968), 307-321.

79. *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theater*, p. 237; and see generally pp. 73-85, 100-112, 208-252. Weimann's study easily supersedes any earlier work in this field; but see also, in the present context (and giving a sense of the distance travelled), S. L. Bethell, *Shakespeare & the Popular Dramatic Tradition* (London, 1944).

80. See John D. Cox, *Shakespeare and the Dramaturgy of Power* (Princeton, NJ, 1989), in particular the chapter, 'Ruling Taste and the Late Plays', pp. 194-221. Cox's book seems to me one of the best and most important studies of Shakespeare to have appeared during the last twenty years.

81. *Shakespeare and the Dramaturgy of Power*, quoting in the first instance from p. 195, and then p. 40. Cox is not speaking purely (or even primarily) here about the kind of self-reflexive techniques I have been emphasizing, but from a wider perspective, one that takes in issues of form, tone, and content, as well as cultural and intellectual traditions, the elements of 'social criticism' (p. 39) associated with medieval drama, and what he describes as (residual) 'Christian political realism' (p. xi; and see generally pp. ix-xv, 3-40).

82. *Shakespeare and the Dramaturgy of Power*, p. 201; as Cox goes on to explain, 'the assumption that kings are mortal and their power is contingent' is 'an unavoidably demystifying assumption in the context of Stuart court adulation'. The terms are a little different, but there is a connection between Cox's ideas here - the notion, say, of cutting the monarch down to size - and Franco Moretti's arguments in 'The Great Eclipse: Tragic Form as the Deconsecration of Sovereignty', in Moretti, *Signs Taken for Wonders: Essays in the Sociology of Literary Forms*, translated by Susan Fischer, David Forgacs, and David Miller, revised edition (London and New York, 1988; reprinted 1997), pp. 42-82. On scepticism towards absolutist claims and doctrines in the drama of the period generally, see also Jonathan Dollimore, *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Brighton, 1984). Cox's approach, characteristically complicating the situation, usefully extends this sense of opposition (however differently derived or conceived of) to the realm of the late plays. For his own response to the work of Dollimore and Moretti, see pp. 181-183.

83. A similar point is made by Cox; see again *Shakespeare and the Dramaturgy of Power*, p. 201.

84. Something of the double-edged nature of "refinement" in this context, its connections with social power and privilege, is reflected in Cox's comment about Prince Henry's activities as art collector and

connoisseur, that 'the refinement of his esthetic taste was in fact a taste for power' (*Shakespeare and the Dramaturgy of Power*, p. 222). The kind of criticisms I am referring to here are in many ways a symptom of neoclassical objections to Shakespearian dramaturgy in general, but such strictures seem to have held their force far longer in relation to the late plays than to most of the rest of the canon. Complaints about the dramaturgy of late Shakespeare can of course be traced back to Jonson, for whom, as Cox suggests, they would seem to reflect an ethical as well as an aesthetic objection, a sense that Shakespeare's archaic dramaturgy represented a 'violation of courtly social decorum in the theater' (p. 214; and see further pp. 63-64). For a consideration of *The Winter's Tale* as a specific response to (and reaction against) Jonson's position, see E. A. J. Honigmann, *Shakespeare's Impact on his Contemporaries* (London and Basingstoke, 1982), pp. 109-120, though the reading misses any real sense of the wider social dimensions of this process, and seems to me to overestimate Shakespeare's faith in his own art. Sidney's scorn for 'mongrel tragi-comedy' and its 'mingling' of 'kings and clowns' (see *The Defence of Poesy*, in *Sir Philip Sidney*, edited by Katherine Duncan-Jones, The Oxford Authors (Oxford, 1989), pp. 212-250 (p. 244)) also has a certain obvious relevance to *The Winter's Tale*, and furnishes a clear indication of the social ramifications of aesthetic form. For all my talk of indecorum and qualifying privilege, however, the late plays still adhere in one principal respect to 'Renaissance social decorum', as Cox observes, 'bestowing the most serious roles on the social elite and depicting them in greater numbers than their inferiors, in defiance of Jacobean social reality' (p. 194) - although *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (which Cox ignores) manages to make a few inroads even in this area (and not just through the key figure of the Jailer's Daughter).

85. This aspect of late Shakespeare puts me in mind in many ways of John Lyly's deprecatory and powerfully suggestive defence of his own dramaturgy, 'if we present a mingle-mangle, our fault is to be excused because the whole world is become an hodgepodge' (*Midas*, 'The Prologue in Paul's', quoted here from *The Plays of John Lyly*, edited by Carter A. Daniel (Cranbury, NJ, 1988), p. 201). Lyly's plays, with their high level of technical self-awareness and own distinct elements of metadrama and metafiction, remain, to my mind, one of the great underappreciated influences on the late plays, so it seems worth mentioning that many of the archaic and medieval-style features under discussion here are present in Lyly, and thus come to late Shakespeare, in certain respects at least, filtered through Lyly (and, for that matter, through some of the other drama of the 1580s and 1590s - see again Cox, *Shakespeare and the Dramaturgy of Power*, pp. 41-60, and Weimann, pp. 161-207).

86. I would recall in this connection that 'narrative intrusion' and 'spectacle' are the two principal means of breaking the dramatic illusion mentioned by Mowat in the definition of "open form drama" that I quoted earlier in this chapter (see above, p. 198 and note 33).

87. See 'Word and Picture in the Final Plays', in Brown and Harris, *Later Shakespeare*, pp. 81-101; and also Berry, *The Shakespeare Inset: Word and Picture* (London, 1965), which includes its own version of the essay on the late plays (pp. 144-165).

88. I am drawing primarily here on the opening three chapters of *The Shakespeare Inset*, pp. 1-40 (and see in particular pp. 36-37).

89. *The Shakespeare Inset*, pp. 3, 11; and see generally pp. 41-97. There is a basic exploration of "spectacular" insets in Victor Bourgy, 'About The Inset Spectacle In Shakespeare (Stance, Distance, Substance)', in Laroque, *The Show Within*, I, 1-20. One further major type of inset identified by Berry, which is also very much relevant to the world of the late plays (though largely beyond my own scope here), is provided by songs (see pp. 98-115).

90. See especially here the introductory discussion in 'Word and Picture in the Final Plays', pp. 81-84.

91. *The Illusion of Power*, p. 18; and see generally pp. 14-21. Orgel's observation here offers something of a counterbalance to the well-known situation (commented on by Orgel himself) that Renaissance idiom tended to speak of going to "hear" rather than to "see" a play.

92. For a brief listing of the principal "spectacles" of the late plays, see Daniel Seltzer, 'The Staging of the Last Plays', in Brown and Harris, pp. 127-165 (pp. 159-160).

93. Commentary on this topic in relation to *The Tempest*, though, has probably concentrated just as much on Prospero's Epilogue, with the idea that the self-reflexive dimension of this speech transforms the whole of the preceding action into a kind of "play-within-the-play". One might argue that the framing speeches in *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (or Gower in *Pericles*) have a similar effect, but these have received little attention from metadramatic critics.

94. One might mention particularly here the three dumbshows in *Pericles* (in the Gower Choruses of Scenes 5, 10, and 18 (TLN 538-543, 1081-1086, 1764-1767 - and see also, in connection with the latter, the epitaph for Marina "read out" by Gower, TLN 1778-1787)), as well as, of course, the prophetic label in *Cymbeline*. Even in some of the plays' more extended spectacles, where spoken dialogue is necessarily very much a presence, the written word (or ritualized formulae that might be read or remembered by the characters) remains an important factor (as in the trial scenes in *The Winter's Tale* and *Henry VIII*, and quite a few other such ceremonies and state occasions).

95. A reliance on visual effects and non-verbal actions is again not something confined to the more heightened spectacles of the late plays, but part and parcel of their on-stage "spectacle" in general - I am thinking of those sorts of aspects of Shakespearian drama discussed in such studies as David Bevington, *Action Is Eloquence: Shakespeare's Language of Gesture* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1984), and Philip C. McGuire, *Speechless Dialect: Shakespeare's Open Silences* (Berkeley, Los

Angeles, and London, 1985). What I would say, though, is that, during the plays' moments of extended spectacle, such elements take on an extra importance, a particular prominence.

96. On music and musical effects in the group overall, see again Seltzer, pp. 157-161; J. M. Nosworthy, 'Music and its Function in the Romances of Shakespeare'; John H. Long, *Shakespeare's Use of Music: The Final Comedies*; R. W. Ingram, 'Musical Pauses and the Vision Scenes in Shakespeare's Last Plays'; Alan Brissenden, *Shakespeare and the Dance*; and also Catherine M. Dunn, 'The Function of Music in Shakespeare's Romances', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 20 (1969), 391-405; and, for the two plays often ignored in such surveys (without endorsing their arguments concerning authorship, however), John P. Cutts's essays, 'Shakespeare's Song and Masque Hand in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 99 (1963), 184-195, and 'Shakespeare's Song and Masque Hand in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *English Miscellany*, 18 (1967), 55-85. Other sounds that are associated with or accompany the on-stage spectacles of the late plays include thunder, cannon-fire, off-stage cries, and the clash of weapons. In *The Tempest*, of course, 'the isle is full of noises' (3.2. 138); and see further below.

97. According to Aristotle, there are six necessary elements of tragedy, 'plot, character, diction, thought, spectacle, and song'. Of these, though, 'spectacle, while highly effective, is yet quite foreign to the art and has nothing to do with poetry. Indeed the effect of tragedy does not depend on its performance by actors, and, moreover, for achieving the spectacular effects the art of the costumier is more authoritative than that of the poet' (quoting from *The Poetics*, edited and translated by W. Hamilton Fyfe, published in a single volume with "Longinus", *On the Sublime*, and Demetrius, *On Style*, revised edition, Loeb Classical Library (London, 1932), pp. 25, 29; for a more up-to-date and self-consciously careful rendering of Aristotle's Greek here (though the niceties of his original meaning are hardly the central issue when it comes to Aristotle's influence on the history of critical thinking), see again M. E. Hubbard's translation of the *Poetics* (in Russell and Winterbottom, *Classical Literary Criticism*), pp. 58-60; and for further comment, see Orgel, *The Illusion of Power*, p. 18).

98. So, for example, Andrew Gurr, speaking about the field of Renaissance drama as a whole, argues that 'as a general rule the better the playwright the less spectacle there was likely to be in his plays' (*The Shakespearean Stage, 1574-1642*, third edition (Cambridge, 1992), p. 191). It is not hard to infer from this that the Shakespeare canon ought not to contain very much spectacle, and in fact Gurr does manage to go on to suggest (with the implication that he is dealing with a special case) that 'the one play of Shakespeare's that makes great use of stage spectacle and business is *The Tempest*', a view which would seem to leave out of the account not only *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, but even *Cymbeline* and *Pericles* (or for that matter, *Macbeth* and much of the early canon). For a cogent critique of Gurr's position

here, and the wider ambivalence towards spectacle it reflects, see Frances Teague, *Shakespeare's Speaking Properties* (Cranbury, NJ, 1991), pp. 88-92.

99. Throughout this paragraph, I have been drawing to some extent on the discussion in Samuel Schoenbaum's Signet Classic edition of *Henry VIII*, pp. xxviii-xxxii. Schoenbaum looks to be offering a defence of the play's spectacle here, but he does so in terms which really, at best, only end up damning it with faint praise. After quoting some of Aristotle's dismissive opinions on the subject of theatrical spectacle, he makes the important point that, 'even granting the validity of the judgment, the propriety of applying to another genre the criteria Aristotle formulated for tragedy may be doubtful'. But he then goes on to categorize *Henry VIII* as the kind of history play that is primarily interested in 'the pursuit of historical verisimilitude', observing, in a tone which does much to reinforce all the usual old prejudices about this work and its particular spectacular content, 'it cannot be claimed that the genre represents the highest form to which dramatic art may aspire, but there can be no denying its perennial appeal to theatergoers'. He rounds off the argument with a comparison between *Henry VIII* and Peter Shaffer's *The Royal Hunt of the Sun* - an approach which could have a lot going for it if the latter were not being merely conceived of as a 'spectacular dramatization', but recognized for the artistically and intellectually brilliant and challenging play of spectacle *and* ideas that it actually is (all quotations taken from p. xxxii).

100. The elaboration of spectacle in performances of *Henry VIII*, already well under way in the eighteenth century, was taken to new extremes during the nineteenth century by the likes of Charles Kean and Henry Irving, and reached its apogee with the productions of Herbert Beerbohm Tree in the early twentieth century. See in particular here: C. B. Young, 'The Stage-History of *Henry VIII*', in J. C. Maxwell, ed., *King Henry the Eighth*, pp. xxxviii-l; Margaret Swayze, 'A History of the Literary Criticism and Stage Production of *Henry VIII*', pp. 118-241; John Margeson, *Henry VIII*, pp. 48-52; Jay Halio, *King Henry VIII, or All is True*, pp. 45-55; Michael R. Booth, *Victorian Spectacular Theatre, 1850-1910* (London, 1981), especially pp. 127-160; and Richard Foulkes, 'Herbert Beerbohm Tree's *King Henry VIII*: Expenditure, Spectacle and Experiment', *Theatre Research International*, n.s. 3 (1977-78), 23-32. An emphasis on absolute historical verisimilitude, a quasi-archaeological realism, becomes an explicitly central concern with Kean's production of 1855, as can be seen from the 'Preface' and 'Historical Notes' to each act included in the published version of his performance text (see the Cornmarket Press facsimile, *'King Henry VIII': Charles Kean 1855*, with an Introduction by Martin Wright (London, 1970)).

101. *Pericles* is also (not surprisingly, given the nature of the surviving text) something of a special case in this context, since the only really extended stage directions to be found in the quarto (the presence of which rarely seems to get addressed in theories of textual

transmission) all relate to one very distinctive type of action, dumb-shows, and are all located in the Gower choruses. The main body of the drama includes a number of "spectacles" (the procession of knights, the dances in Pentapolis, the appearance of Diana) barely accounted for at all in the stage directions, and there are one or two other effects of this sort (particularly dances) elsewhere in late Shakespeare. As for *The Winter's Tale*, it is fairly clear that the action of this play contains plenty of spectacle of the kind I am interested in (the trial of Hermione, the sheep-shearing festival, the statue scene), but any directions given for such events are decidedly laconic ('*heere a Dance of twelue Satyres*' (TLN 2164), '*enter [. . .] Hermione (like a Statue:)*' (TLN 3184-3185), '*exit pursued by a Beare*' (TLN 1500), etc.).

102. For some basic comment on the stage directions of the late plays, see John Dover Wilson, 'The Copy used for *The Tempest*, 1623'; Chambers, *Facts and Problems*, I, 201-204; and W. W. Greg, *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare*, pp. 150-152, and *The Shakespeare First Folio* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 412-425. Chambers notes the connection with some of the later tragedies and the *Henry VI* plays (I, 201). Dover Wilson puts forward the influential suggestion that the extended directions of *The Tempest* are a side-effect of Shakespeare's retirement to Stratford, a reflection of his efforts to direct the details of production from a distance. Another argument one might (tentatively) make, with regard to the group overall, is that such directions are in some way designed with the reading experience in mind. Whilst it is generally recognized that lengthy stage directions are a characteristic of late Shakespeare (see, for example, Greg, *First Folio*, p. 422), discussion here has been complicated by the way the plays' spectacular episodes have so often been brushed aside as non-Shakespearean interpolations, or dismissively attributed to Fletcher. There seems little reason to doubt that the majority of the directions concerned are substantially "authorial", but Greg points to the likelihood of scribal intervention in the stage directions of *The Tempest* (pp. 419-420), and this idea is developed, pretty much convincingly, in John Jowett, 'New Created Creatures: Ralph Crane and the Stage Directions in *The Tempest*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 36 (1983), 107-120 (but see Alan C. Dessen, 'Stage Directions as Evidence: The Question of Provenance', in *Shakespeare: Text and Theater*, edited by Lois Potter and Arthur F. Kinney (Cranbury, NJ, 1999), pp. 229-247 (pp. 236-238)). Along similar lines, certain characteristics of the stage directions in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (including elements of the (unique in this context) anticipatory, seemingly promptbook-derived directions found in the margins of the quarto) probably derive from the hand of the theatre book-keeper, Edward Knight; see Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 124-127. But whatever the precise origins of any of these stage directions, the main issue in terms of my own argument at this point is that they are not so much determinants as markers of a particular concern with spectacle in the late plays.

103. Commentary on the cultural and theatrical manifestations of spectacle, pageantry, and other similar forms of pomp and display in the

period is of course vast. Work that is worth a mention in the present context includes: E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, corrected edition, 4 vols (Oxford, 1951), I, 106-212; Dieter Mehl, *The Elizabethan Dumb Show: The History of a Dramatic Convention* (London, 1965); Marion Lomax, *Stage images and traditions*; Alice S. Venezky, *Pageantry on the Shakespearean Stage* (New York, 1951); David M. Bergeron, ed., *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater* (Athens, GA, 1985), particularly the Introduction by the editor, pp. 1-16; Stephen Orgel, *The Jonsonian Masque* (Cambridge, MA, 1965); David Bevington and Peter Holbrook, eds., *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque* (Cambridge, 1998); Louis Montrose, 'The Purpose of Playing'; Sydney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy*, second edition (Oxford, 1997); Leah S. Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago and London, 1986); François Laroque, *Shakespeare's festive world: Elizabethan seasonal entertainment and the professional stage*, translated by Janet Lloyd (Cambridge, 1991); Michael D. Bristol, *Carnival and Theater: Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England* (New York and London, 1985); Roy Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London, 1977), and also *Henry, Prince of Wales*, especially pp. 138-183; Arthur B. Ferguson, *The Chivalric Tradition in Renaissance England* (Cranbury, NJ, 1986); Richard C. McCoy, *The Rites of Knighthood: The Literature and Politics of Elizabethan Chivalry* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1989); David Howarth, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485-1649* (Basingstoke and London, 1997); and much, much more.

104. An approach, and a focus, reinforced by the iconic power and status attained by this speech, the way it 'is often extracted from its context and treated as Shakespeare's farewell to his art' (Vaughan and Vaughan, *The Tempest*, p. 253, note to ll. 148-58). One notable other area of critical interest where spectacle is concerned, however, is provided by the realm of the supernatural and the plays' so-called "theophanies" (see, for example, the articles on the latter by Kenneth Muir and Richard Knowles). Even here, though, through the subjects of providence and divine art, the discussion usually manages to come back round to *The Tempest*, and idealized images of Prospero as fount of special insight, god-like purveyor of redemptive art, and embodiment of a beneficent providence.

105. See such studies as: Orgel, *The Illusion of Power*, and 'Making Greatness Familiar', in Greenblatt, *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance*, pp. 41-48; Jonathan Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature*; Bristol, *Carnival and Theater*; Tennenhouse, *Power on Display*; Stephen Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* (Oxford, 1988); Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage*, and also his essay, 'After the new historicism' (especially pp. 31-33); Christopher Pye, *The Regal Phantasm: Shakespeare and the Politics of Spectacle* (London and New York, 1990); and Louis Montrose, *The Purpose of Playing*.

106. 'Proud Majesty Made a Subject: Shakespeare and the Spectacle of Rule', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 37 (1986), 459-475 (p. 466).

107. *Power on Display*, p. 15; and see also Tennenhouse's separate essay, 'Strategies of State and political plays: A *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Henry IV*, *Henry V*, *Henry VIII*', in Dollimore and Sinfield, *Political Shakespeare*, pp. 109-128.

108. 'Proud Majesty Made a Subject', p. 464; and see further here Moretti, 'The Great Eclipse'.

109. I am drawing particularly here on Jean Howard, *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England*, and David Scott Kastan, 'Is There a Class in This (Shakespearean) Text?', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 24 (1993), 101-121. To quote from this essay of Kastan's, 'the successful counterfeiting of social rank raises the unnerving possibility that social rank is a counterfeit' (p. 106). Kastan provides here too a useful consideration of the validity of invoking the concept of class in this context. The opulence of costume and the expense lavished on it in the Renaissance theatre are widely known. At least some of the garments employed in the representation of rank would appear to have been "the thing itself". The Swiss traveller, Thomas Platter, a visitor to England in 1599, recorded (presumably with a fair degree of accuracy) the circulation of apparel from 'men of rank or knights', after their death, 'to their servants', and then on from them, 'since it does not befit them', to 'the play-actors', at the cost of 'a few pence' (quoting from the translation in Ernest Schanzer, 'Thomas Platter's Observations on the Elizabethan Stage', *Notes and Queries*, 201 (1956), 465-467 (p. 466); and see in addition Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, II, 364-366). On sumptuary legislation in the period (from which theatrical performances were of course specifically exempted), see N. B. Harte, 'State Control of Dress and Social Change in Pre-Industrial England', in *Trade, Government and Economy in Pre-Industrial England*, edited by D. C. Coleman and A. H. John (London, 1976), pp. 132-165; and Wilfrid Hooper, 'The Tudor Sumptuary Laws', *English Historical Review*, 30 (1915), 433-449. And on the subject of costume more generally, see Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations*, p. 9, and his comments in the *Norton Shakespeare*, pp. 57-59; Orgel, 'Making Greatness Familiar', and also *Impersonations: The performance of gender in Shakespeare's England* (Cambridge, 1996); and Peter Stallybrass, 'Worn worlds: clothes and identity on the Renaissance stage', in *Subject and object in Renaissance culture*, edited by Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan, and Peter Stallybrass (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 289-320. The Elizabethan sumptuary laws were repealed in 1604, but new legislation remained a possibility well into the 1610s (Harte, pp. 148-153, Hooper, pp. 448-449), and the laws themselves, however laxly enforced, can be presumed to have left behind some sort of residual psychological and sociological effect (and see Orgel, *Impersonations*, pp. 95-100).

110. From a letter to Sir Edmund Bacon, dated 2 July 1613, as originally published in *Letters of Sir Henry Wotton to Sir Edmund Bacon*

(London, 1661 (Wing 3644)), pp. 29-31 (p. 30); the relevant opening of this volume is reproduced in *Companion*, p. 30, figure 12. Date, venue, and the details of the description make it virtually certain that the play Wotton calls *All Is True* is that I am referring to (and generally known to history) as *Henry VIII*; see further below, Chapter Six.

111. 'Making Greatness Familiar', p. 45; this essay has been a particular influence on my thinking here. Partly due to Orgel's work, Wotton's letter has taken on something of a new lease of life in recent years (beyond its value as evidence in the debate over the original title or date of *Henry VIII*) as crucial testimony to the potentially unsettling political dimensions of Shakespearian drama and theatrical spectacle in the Renaissance, a tangible indication of the way these could be seen as threatening or destabilizing the social and political status quo. In addition to Orgel, and also anticipating many of the ideas I have just been raising, useful discussions can be found in Kastan, 'Shakespeare and the Spectacle of Rule'; Montrose, *The Purpose of Playing*, pp. 84-86; and Scott Wilson, *Cultural Materialism: Theory and Practice* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 127-130. It is perhaps noticeable that New Historicists keen to purvey a containment model of the drama (Greenblatt, Tennenhouse, Pye) have not had a lot to say about Wotton's letter. It is also noticeable that, whilst Wotton's remarks attracted plenty of interest at a general level with the rise of political criticism in the 1980s, the marginal status of *Henry VIII* meant that little of that attention was directed towards exploring the letter's possible implications for the politics of the very play Wotton himself is (in all likelihood) talking about. For some recent comment in this area, though, see Gordon McMullan, 'Shakespeare and the End of History', *Essays and Studies*, n.s. 48 (1995), 16-37, and (especially) "'Swimming on bladders": the Dialogics of Reformation in Shakespeare & Fletcher's *Henry VIII*', in *Shakespeare and Carnival: After Bakhtin*, edited by Ronald Knowles (Basingstoke and London, 1998), pp. 211-227; and Anston Bosman, 'Seeing Tears: Truth and Sense in *All is True*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 50 (1999), 459-476. Both these critics rightly point out that the letter itself is not an entirely transparent document (an issue that I touch on further in Chapter Six). But as McMullan nevertheless observes, 'Wotton's attitude to the event of the play - both the production and the ensuing conflagration - is inescapably ambivalent, at once gleeful and unsettled' ("Swimming on bladders", p. 213).

112. Ralph Berry, *Shakespeare and the Awareness of the Audience*, p. 129.

113. Remarks found in the Preface to Johnson's 1765 edition of Shakespeare (where they form part of his famous and highly influential discussion of the dramatist's various faults), quoted here from *Johnson on Shakespeare*, VII, 73. Concerning Shakespeare's specific practice, Johnson writes: 'in narration he affects a disproportionate pomp of diction and a wearisome train of circumlocution, and tells the incident imperfectly in many words, which might have been more plainly delivered in few'. What his comments overall perhaps suggest more than anything

is an inability on Shakespeare's part to judge or control the processes of internal "narration" with any real success. This is not, though, in Johnson's case, simply a question of a straightforward preference for "action" over "report", or (still less) "performance" over "text". The basic critical model he adopts remains (in line with his period) very firmly one of reading (see his subsequent paragraph), as is reflected in his use of the category notion, 'dramatick poetry'.

114. *Shakespearean Narrative* (Cranbury, NJ, 1995), p. 20. In similar terms, Wilson observes that

Johnson initiates, and still best represents, the tradition in Shakespearean criticism that sees the narrative elements in Shakespeare's drama as slowing, or even breaking, the forward movement of the dramatic action. Narrative, or "narration" in Johnson's own word, impedes the action and generally functions, when it is present, as an alien body in the plays (p. 20).

Wilson's highlighting of Johnson's own particular choice of word points to some of the basic problems of terminology in this area, not the least of which, in terms of my approach, is the matter of distinguishing between internal or interior narratives (acts of report or narration embedded within the dramatic action), and the overall plot/story/narrative of the play to which they belong. I am primarily interested in the former. Wilson, on the other hand (whose work came out when mine was already well advanced), is in some respects happy to ignore any distinction here, to address in tandem both major sides of Shakespeare's handling of narrative and narration; and see further below.

115. Such "clumsy", "unrealistic", "unprovoked" declarations of information by one character to another, or even direct to the audience, are particularly common in the late plays. Richard Levin usefully crystallizes the negative view of this type of speech in general when he identifies 'the class of awkward and undramatic expositions in some of Shakespeare's opening scenes' as one of the dramatist's characteristic failings, a clear instance of "bad Shakespeare" ('Shakespearean Defects and Shakespeareans' Defenses', in Charney, *"Bad" Shakespeare*, pp. 23-36 (p. 24)). Levin mentions both *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale* in this context, but treats Prospero's narrative to Miranda (actually from the second scene of *The Tempest*) as paradigmatic. Critical dissatisfaction with the figure of Gower can also be seen as reflecting a distaste for straightforward (direct-address) narration on the stage. Johnson again stands at the head of the tradition here, with his trenchant objections (in the notes to his 1765 edition (VII, 279, 323)) to the "inartificial" soliloquies of Cornelius and Belarius in *Cymbeline* (at 1.5. 33-44 and 3.3. 79-107 respectively); see *Johnson on Shakespeare*, VIII, 881, 892. With their rigid adherence to a realist aesthetic and evident bafflement in the face of late Shakespearean dramaturgy, Johnson's remarks in this area served as another early stimulus for my own work.

116. 'On Shakspeare's Use of Narration in his Dramas. Part I', translated by Eva Gordon, *Transactions of the NSS* (1875-6), 207-218

(p. 207); and see also Part II of this study, translated by Eleanor Marx, in the same volume, pp. 332-345. The definition quoted here is actually applied by Delius to what he refers to as the 'epic elements' in Shakespeare (p. 207), and indeed, the title of his original German paper ('Über die epischen Elemente in Shakespeares Dramen') translates as 'The Epic Elements in Shakespeare's Dramas' (see p. 207, footnote 2). Delius himself, however, treats "epic" and "narrative" as virtually interchangeable descriptions, and this provides a further reflection of the problems of terminology raised by this topic (which Delius himself discusses). Even the word, "narration", in the title of the first of his NSS essays, is given a gloss, 'describing incidents, &c.' (p. 207, footnote 1).

117. 'Shakspeare's Use of Narration, Part I', pp. 207-208. Delius himself is far less negative in his comments on internal narration than many later critics, but he still continually associates the presence of narrative with 'the limited stage capabilities of the time' (p. 210).

118. Conventional critical attitudes and approaches to reported action and the narrative element in Shakespearian drama have involved not just condescension, dissatisfaction, and condemnation, but full-scale neglect. Rawdon Wilson's work extends to a powerful critique of this aspect of the history of Shakespeare criticism in general, and I would go along with the majority of what he has to say; see especially his opening chapter, 'Narrative', pp. 15-47. As Wilson himself describes the situation, Shakespeare's narrative has been on the whole 'ignored, cut, and forgotten' (p. 19). Surveys of the use of internal narrative and related effects in Shakespeare's plays are certainly somewhat few and far between. Apart from Wilson's book and the studies by Delius and Francis Berry, relevant general commentary appears largely confined to: Georg von Greyerz, *The Reported Scenes in Shakespeare's Plays* (Bern, 1965); Anthony Brennan, *Onstage and Offstage Worlds in Shakespeare's Plays* (London and New York, 1989); and Barbara Hardy, *Shakespeare's Storytellers: Dramatic Narration* (London, 1997).

119. This is not to deny, of course, that there were certain genuine practical limits (as there still are) to what could physically be presented on stage. Furthermore, the period itself was inclined to lament the restrictions imposed by its theatre in particular areas, not least in relation to battle-scenes and shipwrecks (for illustration, see the comments reproduced and discussed (respectively) at the start of Charles Edelman, *Brawl ridiculous: Swordfighting in Shakespeare's Plays* (Manchester, 1992), and Andrew Gurr, 'The *Tempest's* Tempest at Blackfriars', *Shakespeare Survey*, 41 (1988), 91-102). But even here, such features of the late plays as the battle sequence in *Cymbeline* and the high-profile storm/shipwreck of *The Tempest* suggest an interest on Shakespeare's part in exploring what could be achieved within the theatre's supposed limitations, and in pushing back the boundaries of its possibilities. See again in this connection, Anne Barton, "'Enter Mariners wet": realism in Shakespeare's last plays'.

120. It is worth emphasizing here that the phrase, "bare-stage theatre", is really only a term of convenience. To quote R. A. Foakes, 'the stage façade was highly decorated, and the Elizabethan playhouses offered their public colour, spectacle, and richness. The stage was anything but bare; even the platform itself was covered with rushes, probably in part to deaden the noise of the actors' movements'. As Foakes goes on to add, however, 'the essential point is not that the stage was bare, but that no attempt at scenic illusion was made; the stage-location was whatever the dramatist made his actors say it was' ('Playhouses and players', in Braunmuller and Hattaway, *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, pp. 1-52 (p. 21)). And see too Andrew Gurr, 'The Bare Island', *Shakespeare Survey*, 47 (1994), 29-43, and for further useful comment on the non-illusionistic nature of the Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre, A. R. Braunmuller, 'The arts of the dramatist', also in Braunmuller and Hattaway, pp. 53-90.

121. This form of "report", however, is not the only tool at the dramatist's disposal when it comes to "placing" events and defining the nature of the on-stage environment. Certain aspects of the on-stage "spectacle" could, as it were, speak for themselves. In this respect, the second quotation from Foakes in the previous note over-states the case a little. The theatrical shorthand of props, in particular, also has a powerful role to play in this theatre in helping to identify where the action is supposed to be set, who certain characters are, and so on. See again here Teague, *Shakespeare's Speaking Properties* (the title says it all!), especially her discussion of "time-place markers", pp. 18-22.

122. I have in mind in this context even such relatively basic and unflamboyant effects as the presentation of "invisible" characters, "split-stage" juxtapositions and other instances of palpably emblematic staging, and the slightly discordant interrelationship of words and images that often comes about in connection with entries and entry cues in the dialogue. The nature of theatrical convention in the period is obviously a key issue here. On this subject, see again Dessen, 'Stage Directions as Evidence', and also, in particular, his book, *Recovering Shakespeare's Theatrical Vocabulary* (Cambridge, 1995). The question of convention connects in turn to the matter of the drama's "realism", which is frequently decidedly at odds with modern conceptions of the term. Further features one might mention in this last respect include the much-maligned notion of "double time schemes" (and the factors this idea seeks to account for), and the contrasting sense of the passage of time or the progress of events that sometimes emerges between different strands of a play's plot (as seems to happen in places, for example, in both *Cymbeline* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*).

123. This is not to say that the imagination of the audience is not still a particular concern in, for example, the Gower Choruses or the Prologue to *Henry VIII*. And similarly, to reverse the perspective, the interest I am arguing for here is by no means entirely new to the late plays, just perhaps more fully or more prominently developed. So

whilst the language of the Chorus to *Henry V* may concentrate primarily on encouraging the audience to use its imagination to see beyond the limitations of the stage-picture, the complex and often contradictory relationship between narrative and action that emerges in this earlier work - which I would see as thoroughly controlled and functional, part of the play's meaning, and which often works directly against the words of the Chorus, problematizing the relationship between the history it describes and that which the audience actually gets to see - very much raises the question of the illusion-building properties of language, not least in terms of the way words can cement images in the mind more powerfully than actual images themselves. There are some interesting comments on Shakespeare's recurring explorations of the intersection between the verbal and the visual, interpretation and viewpoint, in Bruce R. Smith, 'Pageants into Play: Shakespeare's Three Perspectives on Idea and Image', in Bergeron, *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*, pp. 220-246.

124. Not that any of these associations particularly bother Rawdon Wilson, who, with the double focus already outlined, is happy to take his work into areas of narratology and narrativity that are well beyond my scope in this thesis. For a rather less theoretically-sophisticated approach to the question of the handling of the story in Shakespearean drama (a topic which takes in not only the overall construction of the plays, but also their relationship with their sources), see Joan Rees, *Shakespeare and the Story: Aspects of Creation* (London, 1978). Whilst I am attempting to set up certain distinctions here, however, my own interest in the metafictional dimensions of the late plays - their self-consciousness when it comes to their own status as fictions, to their use of narrative devices and treatment of their source material, etc. - obviously does link back in some degree to the wider issue of their basic narrative structure and form (something I expand upon a little further, below).

125. Taking "reported action", that is, to equal material which is reported *in contradistinction* to being acted out. Something of this emphasis is evident in Brennan's repeated linking of reported action (or even "report") with off-stage events, or von Greyerz's overriding focus on the notion of the "reported scene", though both these critics still, like me, extend their discussion to include reports of events that are actually shown on the stage.

126. There is also the fact, moreover, that "report" is a word that resonates powerfully down through the late plays themselves.

127. Not, at least, unless one conceives of the speeches concerned as somehow "reporting" the workings of the inner mind. This is clearly rather to stretch the definition, and yet there is a kind of connection here with the arena of dreams, the way these need to be reported to be anything other than a private experience, and their complex relation to the "reality" of the fictional world - not least as a result of their associations with prophecy - wherever they appear in late Shakespeare.

Dreams and prophecies, in turn, are often linked, of course, with texts (to recall once again the ending of *Cymbeline*), and the contents of texts, too, can either form a report, or be reported to others by their reader(s).

128. This attitude, a basic proposition in much of the negative commentary on the presence of narrative and report in drama, is to some extent perpetuated from the other side by Rawdon Wilson, who suggests that, 'since Johnson there has been a nearly overwhelming disposition to ignore, even to dispraise, the narrative aspects of Shakespeare's plays or to assimilate the embedded narratives, naturalizing them as "lines," "speeches," or "declamations," to the model of drama' (p. 20). Wilson's response is to focus largely on narrative *qua* narrative, and this points to the principal difference between our two approaches. My own interest in the narrative elements in late Shakespeare is directed firmly towards their function as an essential part of the *dramaturgy* of the plays - which means that it is geared, among other things, towards recognizing and taking into account their intrinsic nature as "lines", "declamations", "speeches", etc.

129. Which is as much as to say, the act of narration itself can become a form of spectacle. Something else worth bearing in mind here, as is also the case when it comes to on-stage spectacle in general, are the possible unspoken reactions of the on-stage listeners/spectators to what they can see and hear.

130. *The Reported Scenes in Shakespeare's Plays*, p. 57. Though it is the only specific study I have come across of the use of report in the Shakespeare canon, von Greyerz's work, it would be fair to say, has hardly set the world alight, and I quote from it here not to suggest it has had any influence on critical opinion, but because these remarks reflect what seems to me an unfortunately common perspective. Another manifestation of the type of thinking involved in this position can be seen in the way, when confronted with two competing versions of events not depicted on stage (or opposing descriptions of features that are to be imagined as being present), critics tend to assume, even where there is nothing to corroborate matters one way or the other, the absolute authority and integrity of the outlook associated with the more morally reputable or appealing character. This is especially apparent in the case of *The Tempest*, where the views of Prospero and Gonzalo on past events or the nature of the island, for example, are repeatedly echoed and accepted without question in the commentary.

131. Hugh M. Richmond, 'Teaching *The Tempest* and the Late Plays by Performance', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 125-132 (p. 126).

132. The charge that they make the mistake of starting off with a story that is essentially "undramatic" has been levelled in particular at the two plays that seek to dramatize well-known medieval narratives, *Pericles* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (the brunt of the blame for this is ordinarily laid firmly on Shakespeare's "collaborator"). But *Cymbeline* and, to the inevitable lesser extent, *The Winter's Tale* have also come

in for criticism over the nature of their narrative material, as too, in slightly different terms (over the nature of its episodic structure), has *Henry VIII*. For a sense of the issues and attitudes involved here, though from a more positive perspective than one often encounters, see John Arthos, 'Pericles, Prince of Tyre: A Study in the Dramatic Use of Romantic Narrative', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 4 (1953), 257-270.

133. See again here Miriam Gilbert, "'This Wide Gap of Time': Storytelling and Audience Response in the Romances'; Hackett, pp. 38-39; and especially on the element of narrative recursiveness in late Shakespeare, the promise, as the characters go off stage for the final time, that the process of telling the story is going to begin all over again, Hardy, pp. 79-87.

134. The long last scene of *Cymbeline*, with its powerful self-consciousness (verging strongly towards the parodic) regarding its own extreme and heavily drawn-out processes of resolution and anagnorisis, provides a perfect illustration of this (see again Hardy, pp. 81-84). A particular stand-out effect in this context is the sudden appearance of Guiderius's mole, his 'sanguine star' (l. 366), an age-old narrative contrivance if ever there was one, and itself (characteristically) the second convenient identifying mole to appear in this play. This is to make use, almost recklessly, nonchalantly, of a trick that was already old hat by the time of Aristotle, for whom, of the types of recognition devices available to a dramatist, 'the first and least artistic (and the one most used because people can think of nothing better) is recognition by visible signs. These signs may be birthmarks [. . .], or acquired after birth' (*Poetics*, pp. 70-71 (Hubbard's translation)).

135. For a sense of the range of narrative techniques and devices available to (and exploited by) Shakespeare generally, see Hardy, pp. 33-64. Specific studies in relation to the late plays include Eggers, "'Bring Forth a Wonder'", and 'Shakespeare's Gower and the Role of the Authorial Presenter', *Philological Quarterly*, 54 (1975), 434-443; David M. Bergeron, 'The Beginnings of *Pericles*, *Henry VIII*, and [*The*] *Two Noble Kinsmen*', in *Entering the Maze: Shakespeare's Art of Beginning*, edited by Robert F. Willson, Jr. (New York, 1995), pp. 169-181; and especially influencing my own approach and thinking: Pierre Sahel, 'The Strangeness of a Dramatic Style: Rumour in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 38 (1985), 145-151; Philip Edwards, "'Seeing is believing": action and narration in *The Old Wives Tale* and *The Winter's Tale*', in Honigmann, *Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, pp. 79-93; and Lois Potter, 'The *Two Noble Kinsmen*: Spectacle and Narrative', in Laroque, *The Show Within*, II, 235-251. Valuable comment can also be found in Inga-Stina Ewbank, "'What words, what looks, what wonders?": Language and Spectacle in the Theatre of George Peele'. Some of the features mentioned here have received very little critical consideration. For wider studies of Shakespeare's handling of such devices across his career (though still not necessarily with much to say on the late plays themselves), see the likes of: Clifford Leech, 'Shakespeare's Prologues and Epilogues', in Don Cameron Allen,

Studies in Honor of T. W. Baldwin, pp. 150-164; D. J. Palmer, "'We Shall Know By This Fellow": Prologue and Chorus in Shakespeare', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 64 (1982), 501-521; Morris LeRoy Arnold, *The Soliloquies of Shakespeare* (Columbia, 1911; reissued New York, 1965); Wolfgang Clemen, *Shakespeare's Soliloquies*, translated by Charity Scott Stokes (London and New York, 1987), and 'Shakespeare's Use of the Messenger's Report', in *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art: Collected Essays* (London, 1972), pp. 96-123; Gary J. Scrimgeour, 'The Messenger as a Dramatic Device in Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 19 (1968), 41-54; and J. C. Maxwell, 'Virgilian Half-Lines in Shakespeare's "Heroic Narrative"', *Notes and Queries*, 198 (1953), 100.

136. Off-stage noises are in fact one of the most crucial tools at the dramatist's disposal for creating a sense of action going on beyond the range of the audience's view. The standard work in this context is Frances Ann Shirley's *Shakespeare's Use of Off-Stage Sounds* (Lincoln, NE, 1963). For listings of the effects involved in the late plays (definite and possible), see pp. 190-222. As Shirley's work makes clear, off-stage noises are a particularly prominent feature of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*.

137. The gentlemen's reports in *The Winter's Tale*, 5.2 provide the major case in point here, but see in addition the Duke of Norfolk's disclaimer at *Henry VIII*, 1.1. 39-42, and the comments of the Jailer and the Daughter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 2.1. 26-28. For a sense of some of the difficulties "unrepresented action" can cause for an audience, see Howard Felperin's brilliant and controversial essay, "'Tongue-tied our queen?": the deconstruction of presence in *The Winter's Tale*', in Parker and Hartman, *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, pp. 3-18 (pp. 3-4 especially).

138. Seltzer observes that the late plays are 'particularly full of explicit and implicit directions to walk or carry forward other business while speaking' (p. 133). He cites (pp. 134-136) an especially interesting example from *Henry VIII*, 3.2, where Norfolk describes the strange and distracted behaviour he and his companions have apparently witnessed Cardinal Wolsey performing before them on stage (see ll. 112-120). For Seltzer, 'Norfolk's catalogue of movements and gestures must be accurate, of course' (p. 136), and this is a perspective that has been regularly reiterated in editorial commentary on this passage (and see Bevington, *Action Is Eloquence*, p. 95). But however close it comes to describing Wolsey's visible behaviour, Norfolk's is not an innocent report. It is delivered by a figure who is palpably hostile to the Cardinal, and who can easily be imagined as wanting to present Wolsey in as bad a light as possible to the King. Report/description here is already loaded, embroiled in circumstance, invested with performative intent, and thus not so much (necessarily) a description of the way Wolsey should be behaving, but (in part at least) a reflection of how Norfolk wants Wolsey to be thought of as behaving.

139. Compare Stanley Cavell's comment regarding the ending of *The Winter's Tale*: 'we are bound, it seems to me, at some point to feel

that this theater is contesting the distinction between saying and showing' (*Disowning Knowledge In Six Plays of Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 204); and see also here Patricia Parker's brief comments in *Shakespeare from the Margins*, p. 296, note 8.

140. For some relevant analysis of this last example (where Dover Cliff itself, of course, even within the terms of the fiction, is never anything more than an absent presence), see again Jonathan Goldberg, 'Perspectives: Dover Cliff and the Conditions of Representation'; and also Stephen Orgel, 'Shakespeare Imagines a Theater', in *Shakespeare, Man of the Theater*, edited by Kenneth Muir, Jay L. Halio, and D. J. Palmer (East Brunswick, NJ, 1983), pp. 34-46 (pp. 40-43).

141. For some comment on Tamora's 'antithetical *ekphrases*' here (though I would want to take the argument quite a bit further), see Michael Pincombe, 'Classical and Contemporary Sources of the "Gloomy Woods" of *Titus Andronicus*: Ovid, Seneca, Spenser', in *Shakespearean Continuities: Essays in Honour of E. A. J. Honigmann*, edited by John Batchelor, Tom Cain, and Claire Lamont (Basingstoke and London, 1997), pp. 40-55 (p. 48).

142. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore and London, 1978), pp. 51 and 95 respectively; and see generally pp. 27-100, and also White's later volume, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore and London, 1987; reissued 1990), especially the opening essay, 'The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality', pp. 1-25. As so often, I am only just skimming the surface here of some highly complicated arguments and ideas. White's work is cited in a similar context, crucially from my own perspective, in Ivo Kamps, *Historiography and Ideology in Stuart Drama*, pp. 1-25. Kamps makes the point that White's position 'supports a view of history-writing as a fundamentally ideological practice' (p. 16). And as White himself observes, 'narrative is not merely a neutral discursive form that may or may not be used to represent real events in their aspect as developmental processes but rather entails ontological and epistemic choices with distinct ideological and even specifically political implications' (*The Content of the Form*, p. ix).

143. Francis Berry makes the point that insets, and especially those which he classifies as "voluntary", 'not required by the plot', are particularly open to being cut in performance (*The Shakespeare Inset*, p. 75; and see generally pp. 75-97).

144. Modern theatrical rhetoric regularly claims a special respect for the Shakespearian text in contemporary performance practice (not least in order to set up a distinction from earlier, widely criticized traditions of theatrical adaptation). But this argument, dubious in itself, tends automatically to exempt from its frame of reference those features of the printed texts that lie beyond the spoken word. There seems to be a widespread assumption that the telling of the story, the organization of the way material is presented, the relationship between the visual and the verbal, and various other elements of Shakespeare's

dramaturgy, are all incidentals, purely pragmatic considerations that can be conveyed almost "any old how", that are not worth gracing with "respect", and, unlike the areas of language and even characterization, do not come within the purview of Shakespeare's "classic" status.

145. See my comments above, and compare here McGuire's sense that a truly metadramatic approach will look to address itself to the way 'each performance of a play is an actualization, more or less full, of the range of possibilities for creative engagement inherent in the conjunction of the Shakespearean script with the talents of particular performers acting according to a certain set of conventions in the presence of an audience gathered in a building with specific physical features - with the whole ensemble reflecting, to some degree, the mores of the society and culture within which the performance occurs' ('Hamlet's "Judicious" Spectator', p. 35).

146. Not to mention the sheer difficulty of extrapolating visual and theatrical effects from written instructions in the first place, no matter how accurate or authoritative the directions concerned. The entire question of the text/performance relationship is particularly complex and problematic here. Though their contents are often a very distinctive element in the reading experience, especially in the late plays, stage directions obviously do not (in the usual run of things) form part of the spoken dialogue in performance, and actions seen on the stage, in turn, are never simply translatable "back" into any stage directions that might lie behind them. Added to all this, the modern theatre is happy to acknowledge openly that it regards stage directions in general (including authorial ones) as having no theatrical authority whatsoever. The standard late-twentieth-century position on the value/authority of stage directions (original or editorial), and their implications in relation to (actual or imagined) performance is encapsulated in Stanley Wells, *Re-Editing Shakespeare for the Modern Reader* (Oxford, 1984), pp. 57-78; for some more recent consideration of the issues involved here, see Margaret Jane Kidnie, 'Text, Performance, and the Editors: Staging Shakespeare's Drama', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 51 (2000), 456-473.

147. This applies especially in relation to such figures as Time, Gower, Cranmer, Cerimon, Belarius, Paulina, Prospero (most of all), and Theseus, and even to all the many anonymous lords and gentlemen who so often function as on-stage commentators in the late plays. I would add besides that none of these figures could have commanded absolute authority even if originally performed by Shakespeare himself (an idea I have seen or heard mooted at times in relation to Gower and Belarius, as well as Time and Prospero (see above, Chapter Two, note 150)).

148. For this well-known formula, and the equally-standard related critical principle of approaching dramatic texts with regard to their inbuilt possibilities for performance, rather than specific productions or performances, see such studies as: Stanley Wells, *Literature and Drama*, especially pp. 1-24; J. L. Styan, *The Shakespeare Revolution: Criticism and Performance in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, 1977); Anthony B.

Dawson, *Indirections: Shakespeare and the Art of Illusion* (Toronto, 1978); Jean E. Howard, *Shakespeare's Art of Orchestration: Stage Technique and Audience Response* (Urbana and Chicago, 1984); and, more generally, John Russell Brown, *Shakespeare's Plays in Performance* (London, 1966); and Marvin and Ruth Thompson, eds., *Shakespeare and the Sense of Performance* (Cranbury, NJ, 1989). Howard's book in particular strikes a chord with my own approach. The idea of a blueprint gives cause for a little caution, however; there are quite a few places in Shakespeare where the text is insufficiently detailed as a plan to give much sense at all of the precise nature of the intended action. And in similar terms, any suggestion of imagining a single ideal performance (in the "theatre of the mind") is seriously problematized by the way certain areas of the texts especially admit of all sorts of equally valid (or require equally makeshift) modes of performance.

149. I am making use throughout this paragraph of Harry Berger, Jr.'s arguments in *Imaginary Audition: Shakespeare on Stage and Page* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1989), particularly at this point his defence of the validity of a "decelerated reading" (see especially pp. 45-46). Berger is keen in this work (see pp. 25-42), amongst other things, to challenge some of the more tendentious "pro-performance" (anti-study) arguments of Gary Taylor's *Moment by Moment by Shakespeare* (London and Basingstoke, 1985).

150. I am drawing in part here, if very much to my own ends, on the reaction in recent performance theory against an essentialist model of the relationship between (Shakespearian) performance and text, and the rejection of the commonplace twentieth-century image of the stage, in the words of W. B. Worthen, as 'a site of interpretation, rather than a place of production, a place where "meanings" are found rather than made' ('Staging "Shakespeare": Acting, authority, and the rhetoric of performance', in Bulman, *Shakespeare, Theory, and Performance*, pp. 12-28 (p. 16); and see again generally here Bulman's Introduction to this volume, 'Shakespeare and performance theory'). As Worthen remarks elsewhere, 'what intervenes between texts and performances - and here we should regard *reading* as one way of producing the text, and of [sic] *stage performance* as another - is labor' (*Shakespeare and the authority of performance* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 21). Questions of staging space, performance medium, audience, and so on, further complicate the nature of the "authority" of modern performance, though similar factors apply just as much, of course, in relation to contemporary habits of reading and (especially) critical practices.

151. This is certainly the case now, and it is hard to envisage any version of the rehearsal process amongst the King's Men that did not involve some form of reading, whatever the material nature of the text(s) involved ("foul papers", transcripts, actors' parts, etc.). Moreover, in their own time, as Berger notes, Shakespeare's scripts would have been read by at least one other "audience" prior to their first performance, that is, the censor (see generally *Imaginary Audition*, pp. 18-24).

152. On the vexed question of the relationship between length of text and performance practice in the period, see Lukas Erne, "'The two hours' traffic of our stage": Performance criticism and the length of performance of Shakespeare's plays', *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 135 (1999), 66-76; and also Stephen Orgel, 'The Authentic Shakespeare', pp. 6-7, and 'Acting Scripts, Performing Texts', in *Crisis in Editing: Texts of the English Renaissance*, edited by Randall McLeod (New York, 1994), pp. 251-294. For Orgel, the unnecessary length of many of Shakespeare's texts is a reflection of the essential instability of the dramatic *script*, an inbuilt acknowledgement of the fluid, provisional nature of performance and the collaborative possibilities inherent in the theatrical process. But it is not too hard to feel that, if Shakespeare, at the end of his career, could come up with plays significantly too long to be performed conveniently by his own company, yet with the kind of complexity of verbal texture that is apparent throughout *all* sections of the text of *Cymbeline*, then the practicalities and possibilities of the stage were not necessarily uppermost in his mind here. On the idea of an interest on Shakespeare's part in the publication of his play-texts, see again Richard Dutton, 'The Birth of the Author', and my own comments above, at the end of Chapter Three. Going by the figures to be found in Spevack, *Cymbeline* is Shakespeare's third longest play, in terms of both words and lines. Adrian Noble's 1997 RSC production, according to the (never absolutely reliable) testimony of its programme ([p. 20]), cut around 1000 lines from the text in Nosworthy's Arden edition (not to mention certain spectacular actions), and still came in at around three hours and five minutes in length.

153. *Imaginary Audition*, pp. 29-30. Berger's tone in general has a tendency (possibly evident here) to suggest quite a disparaging view of performance, which I would not want to endorse. For a response to some of his arguments, see H. R. Coursen, *Shakespearean Performance as Interpretation* (Cranbury, NJ, 1992), pp. 39-48, though this seems to me to overstate the case in the other direction. Some sage and simple remarks of Bulman's perhaps sum up the situation here: 'the relationship between a dramatic text and its performance [. . .] is neither simple nor oppositional' ('Shakespeare and performance theory', p. 2).

154. For a good sense of the kind of criticisms "close reading" has been subjected to, particularly in relation to its institutional connections with New Criticism and (in this country) practical criticism, see Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, pp. 53-63 (especially p. 54); and compare too in this context Jean Howard and Marion O'Connor's attack on the common pedagogical treatment of "close reading" as 'a process by which attention to supposedly objective aspects of their construction allows the texts to speak for themselves, without meaning being coerced or distorted by the critic' (quoting from their editorial Introduction to *Shakespeare Reproduced*, p. 6). Part of the trouble in all this has to do with the essential ambiguity of the word "close", which can signify "detailed" or "careful" (who can argue against these?), but has very often served to imply "exclusive" or even "closed" (with the suggestion on top of

this of "definitive"), a focus on the text and the text alone. Despite plenty of assertions to the contrary, however, close reading itself has never really gone away (how could it?), with even the cultural materialist project, for example, acknowledging "textual analysis" (close reading in all but name) as one of its four principal elements (see Dollimore and Sinfield, *Political Shakespeare*, p. vii; and note in addition the comments in Erickson, *Rewriting Shakespeare*, p. 16). For some recent work on the theory and practice of close reading, and its continuing valuable possibilities, see Russ McDonald, ed., *Shakespeare Reread: The Texts in New Contexts* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1994), especially the Introduction by the editor, pp. 1-19.

155. *Rewriting Shakespeare*, p. 16; and see generally pp. 13-17. Erickson himself is drawing here on Harry Berger, Jr.'s arguments in *Revisionary Play: Studies in the Spenserian Dynamics* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1988), and particularly the dialogue that is played out in this volume between Berger's 'Afterword', pp. 453-473, and Louis Montrose's 'Introductory Essay', pp. 1-16 - see further below. Berger suggests that 'the uneasiness with reading that marks contemporary practice springs from the tendency to confuse close reading, formalism, and New Criticism' (p. 460), an argument which seems to me to capture the situation well. He also points to the crucial importance of close reading as a contemporary practice in the light of 'the textualization of cultural and institutional life' (p. 459).

156. 'Reading *The Tempest*', p. 27; and compare his view that, 'in *The Tempest*, as in late Shakespeare generally, the effect of the poetry is to promote uncertainty and to insist upon ambiguity, and attention to the verse makes one increasingly dubious about the bluntness of most political interpretation' (p. 18). McDonald's exploration of the play's dense verbal texture, as he himself acknowledges, builds on the work of Kott's 'The *Tempest*, or Repetition'. For some comparable insights into the construction of *The Winter's Tale*, see Richard Proudfoot's excellent essay, 'Directing the Romances 2. Verbal Reminiscence and the Two-Part Structure of *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 29 (1976), 67-78. I have commented on the detailed verbal and thematic patterning of *Cymbeline* in Chapter One. McDonald's declared interest in discovering 'uses for stylistic criticism that will reassert the value of textuality in a nontextual phase of criticism and that may contribute to the reconciliation of text and context, the aesthetic and the political' (p. 15), connects in many respects with my own concerns. The work of Kiernan Ryan is once again relevant here.

157. 'Shakespearean Defects and Shakespeareans' Defenses', p. 33; and see p. 32 (on the second idea here), and generally *New Readings vs. Old Plays: Recent Trends in the Reinterpretation of English Renaissance Drama* (Chicago and London, 1979). The latter work, embodying the core of Levin's position, directs much of its attention towards debunking "thematic" and "ironic" approaches to Shakespeare, elements from both of which are again very much a part of my own interpretative processes.

Levin does manage to satirize effectively the excesses of both types of reading, offering as he does so some telling observations on the dangers posed to responsible critical interpretation by the constant pressure towards novelty and originality within the Academy. But his resistance to new readings in general seems to me as problematic, poorly founded, and ill-conceived as his troubling opposition to political and ideological criticism, and is rooted, moreover, in a mid-twentieth-century aesthetic that carries no particular authority whatsoever when it comes to Shakespeare and Renaissance drama.

158. On the fine line between attempting to re-evaluate plays with a low standing in the canon and succumbing to bardolatry, see generally Charney, "*Bad*" *Shakespeare*; and for Levin's arguments in this area, 'Shakespearean Defects', and *New Readings vs. Old Plays*, especially pp. 125-136. "Bardolatry" itself is one of those terms that is always applied to somebody else - personally, I associate it with the kind of blanket praise that is rooted in superficial readings, unsubstantiated claims, and hyperbolic statements or platitudes regarding Shakespearian "universality". As Levin's own work attests, endeavours to defend or attribute greater levels of complexity to some of Shakespeare's earliest plays are particularly liable to provoke resistance or condemnation -and indeed, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* has served for some time now as the one play in the canon most Shakespearians are happy not to bother trying to speak up for (thereby protecting themselves from the charge of bardolatry?). There are significant parallels here with attitudes to the "authorially suspect" works amongst the late plays. And in this connection, it seems to me too that, just as in the case of spectacle and report, many of the self-referential elements of the dramaturgy of the late plays, their knowing use of conventional devices and strong metafictional tendencies, are already present and being explored within even very early Shakespeare (although not necessarily with quite the same degree of skill or sophistication). To quote Brian Gibbons on the subject of the *Two Gentlemen*, 'modern critics have dismissed the play as a failed attempt at romantic comedy, not being ready to suppose - indeed not even asking themselves whether - Shakespeare was using parody, burlesque and comedy to explore in controlled circumstances, subjects to which he was profoundly drawn, but for which he had yet to evolve fully expressive means' (*Shakespeare and Multiplicity*, pp. 206-207).

159. In the words of Harry Berger, 'when readers or playgoers respond to the text they respond to an interpretation: their own, the editor's, the critic's, the actors', or merely the interpretive force of the presuppositions that inform the context of any activity and shape expectations' (*Imaginary Audition*, p. 24); Berger's whole chapter here (pp. 9-24) provides a powerful dismantling of Levin's arguments on this subject.

160. As Annabel Patterson remarks, most critics from Coleridge to Eagleton, 'if they agree in nothing else, have converged in believing

that Shakespeare accepted without question contemporary social hierarchy and its self-justifications' (*Shakespeare and the Popular Voice* (Oxford, 1989), p. 5; and see generally pp. 1-12). So far as the late plays are concerned, this attitude is reflected especially in the multitude of topical readings allying these works with the policies of the King and Prince Henry, and the emphasis criticism has tended to place on the venues of the Court and the Blackfriars rather than the Globe. For a useful rejoinder to this standard "courtly" focus, see Palfrey, pp. 27-30. Here and below, I am returning to some of the central concerns of Chapter One.

161. On the history of attitudes to censorship here, see Richard Dutton, *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama* (Basingstoke and London, 1991), especially pp. 1-4. In Dutton's description of the situation, the 'basic picture of the Master of the Revels as the venal agent of an authoritarian regime (particularly in the Jacobean and Caroline periods) went substantially unchallenged through the mid-years of [the twentieth] century' (p. 4). It is a picture that exerted a major influence on "old" Historicism, and that has often been perpetuated in the all-new, advanced New Historicism. The idea that Shakespeare would have inevitably toed the state (and especially the Tudor) line is also, in my experience, very much a part of wider cultural perceptions of the dramatist.

162. *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice*, pp. 9-10. Along similar lines, Patterson is willing to attribute 'as much perspicaciousness to Shakespeare as is now assumed by his most sophisticated readers' (p. 9).

163. See *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison, WI, 1984), especially the essay, 'Prynne's Ears; or, The Hermeneutics of Censorship', pp. 44-119. As Patterson comments elsewhere, the process of '*reading between the lines*' that she advocates in relation to Renaissance literary texts is a response to a practice of '*writing between the lines*' brought about by censorship, and was already 'in the early modern period [. . .] clearly understood to be a political strategy with liberating consequences' (see *Reading between the Lines* (London, 1993), pp. 3-10 (p. 7)).

164. See generally *Mastering the Revels*, and also now *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 2000), particularly the Preface, 'Buggeswords and Analogical Reading', pp. ix-xx. I am obviously simplifying matters here quite considerably. And however accommodating the relationship between the Master of the Revels' office and the theatrical community, flashpoints, confrontations, and breakdowns in the system clearly did arise, occasioning specific acts of censorship, some of which undoubtedly have left their mark on the Shakespeare canon. For further discussion, see Janet Clare, 'Historicism and the Question of Censorship in the Renaissance', *English Literary Renaissance*, 27 (1997), 155-176. Censorship itself, of course, takes in issues other than those of state and politics - questions of obscenity, blasphemy and religion, personal satire, and so forth.

165. On the range (and varying sophistication) of self-referential techniques in the drama of the period, see again Braunmuller, 'The arts of the dramatist', pp. 81-89.

166. I have in mind here some remarks by Jonathan Culler (in *On Deconstruction*, pp. 196-205), forming part of an argument in which he sets up an opposition between a standard New Critical approach and a deconstructive perspective. According to Culler, whereas the former treats 'self-reflexivity' as a kind of 'self-knowledge, self-possession', the latter reveals a situation in which self-referentiality 'ultimately brings out the inability of any discourse to account for itself and the failure of performative and constative or doing and being to coincide' (p. 201). In other words, 'under exegetical pressure, self-reference demonstrates the impossibility of self-possession' (p. 202).

167. The last idea of the three is virtually a mantra of recent political criticism. For the concept of "metadiscursivity", see again Berger, *Revisionary Play*, pp. 462-473, Montrose's 'Introductory Essay' to that volume, and Erickson's discussion, *Rewriting Shakespeare*, pp. 13-17. On metadrama as simply one more level to the equation (reflecting the standard poststructuralist/postmodernist "suspicion of metanarratives"), see Malcolm Evans, 'Deconstructing Shakespeare's comedies', in Drakakis, pp. 67-94 (pp. 72-75).

168. Compare in this connection Montrose's complaint about the way Berger's approach is 'characterized by a methodological equivocation between his own powerfully appropriative acts of interpretation and the critically conservative representation of those acts as an exposition of authorial intention' ('Introductory Essay', p. 16) - though I am not sure exactly how "conservative" such a tactic is any more; and, in any case, a similar equivocation characterizes even "unpowerful" or consciously antagonistic readings that attribute a particular meaning to a text whilst occluding their own reliance on some form of (authorial or textual) intention. Another potential danger here is the creation of too close an identity between critic and author, an alignment of outlook that it is not always wise or desirable to maintain - see further Peter Erickson, 'Shakespeare and the "Author-Function"' (pp. 250-251). Acknowledging one's own embeddedness in ideology and the problems of "construction" does not in itself solve all the dilemmas of interpretative authority, or provide a way out of the hermeneutic circle. On the other hand, I agree entirely with Berger's sense of the continuing need - the absolute necessity - for producing "readings", his idea that there is actually 'something inherently wrong with not doing readings' (*Revisionary Play*, p. 459).

169. 'Shakespeare Imagines a Theater', p. 43. With regard to the late plays, Orgel cites specifically the key examples (which I discuss in Part Two) of the information the audience receives regarding the death of Hermione, and the 'egregiously (and pointlessly) inaccurate accounts' (but "pointlessly" by what criteria?) of their own behaviour provided by Iachimo and Pisanio in the final scene of *Cymbeline*.

170. 'Shakespeare Imagines a Theater', p. 44. Needless to say, I am pushing Orgel's argument here in my own direction. He himself goes on to observe: 'the parts of a Renaissance play do not fit together like architectural structures, but like rhetorical ones; that is, they fit together only in the mind, through the assent - the complicity, really - of the spectator, listener, reader'.

171. Oxford repunctuates: 'What now ensues, to th' judgement of your eye | I give, my cause who best can justify' (Sc.1. 41-42); and indeed, this couplet has been regularly repunctuated in the critical tradition (see the relevant note in *Companion*, p. 561). Meaning is not absolutely transparent here; and any appeal expressed is coming at least in part from Gower himself, as well as from "the play". Oxford's reading makes more precise grammatical sense than the quarto's, but the enjambement it produces, and the heavy caesura so early in the line (in what are essentially decasyllables) sound, to my ear, uncharacteristic of Gower's general style; and mixed constructions are hardly atypical of Shakespeare. The gloss to Oxford's text in the *Norton Shakespeare* treats 'th' judgement of your eye' as the antecedent of 'who' (p. 2720); the same could apply in the quarto reading, but in this version, 'who' can also refer to the audience in general, as an implied subject (and see the note in F. D. Hoeniger's Arden edition, p. 8). Another possibility, perhaps more far-fetched, but suiting well with my own argument, is to read 'justify' not as an infinitive but as an imperative, with a strong metrical stress on 'can': the ones who are best able to, let them justify the cause (in modern punctuation, "who best can, justify!") - a call for interpretative activity/struggle. And see further on these lines, the comments in Bruce Smith, 'Pageants into Play', pp. 239-240.

CHAPTER FIVE

1. I am writing in mind here, amongst other things, of Stephen Greenblatt's suspicion of what he refers to as 'the satisfying illusion of a "whole reading," the impression conveyed by powerful critics that had they but world enough and time, they could illuminate every corner of the text and knit together into a unified interpretive vision all of their discrete perceptions' (*Shakespearean Negotiations*, p. 4). At the same time, though, I am very much aware of the limitations of a fragmentary reading, and the interpretative distortion that can be produced through concentrating on only one or two aspects of a text. And it remains the case that some readings are less "partial" (though not necessarily less partisan) than others.

2. On the paradigmatic nature of the opening scenes, see Stephen Orgel, *The Tempest*, pp. 14-18. The heavy, undisguised exposition of 1.2 has often come in for criticism, or been treated as a merely makeshift effect; compare my comments above, Chapter Four, notes 29 and 115, and in Chapter Three, on John Dover Wilson's revision theory (see note 30).

3. *The Tempest*, p. 8. The effect of the text at this point, one of the very few places where Shakespeare deliberately sets out to deceive his audience, has, needless to say, not always been realized in performance, and productions have a tendency to ignore Shakespeare's careful structuring of the dramaturgy here, and let the audience in on the "real" situation. As Peter Holland comments in relation to Sam Mendes's 1993 RSC production, 'it is, though, a mistake to have Ariel visibly controlling the storm (with Prospero, too, visible through a scrim), for there are few effects in Shakespeare quite as thrilling as the realisation that the hyper-realism of the opening scene is really only a trick of the play's magician' (*English Shakespeares: Shakespeare on the English stage in the 1990s* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 172; and see too his essay, 'The Shapeliness of *The Tempest*', *Essays in Criticism*, 45 (1995), 208-229 (pp. 224-225)).

4. See such passages as 1.2. 489-495, 2.1. 204-224, 3.3. 1-52, and 5.1. 58-131, 232-243.

5. Out of a welter of commentary on the storm and the question of its original staging, I have drawn particularly on the discussions in Anne Barton, *The Tempest*, pp. 7-9, and "'Enter Mariners wet": realism in Shakespeare's last plays'; Andrew Gurr, 'The Tempest's Tempest at Blackfriars'; Holland, 'The Shapeliness of *The Tempest*'; John Jowett, 'New Created Creatures: Ralph Crane and the Stage Directions in *The*

Tempest; and Keith Sturgess's chapter, "A Quaint Device": *The Tempest* at the Blackfriars', in *Jacobean Private Theatre* (London and New York, 1987), pp. 73-96; and see also above, Chapter Four, note 119, and the briefer comments in Philip C. McGuire, *Shakespeare: The Jacobean Plays* (Basingstoke and London, 1994), pp. 175-177.

6. 'The *Tempest*'s *Tempest* at Blackfriars', p. 96. He continues: 'it is the verification of Prospero's magic and the declaration that it is all only a stage play' (p. 96). In similar terms, Gurr suggests that the realism of the storm 'sets up the ruling conceit for the whole play' (p. 95), since it is immediately 'proclaimed to be only stage magic, the art of illusion' (p. 96). That is to say, the emphasis on realism here goes hand in hand with a stress on the impressive power of Prospero's "art", and a fairly basic metadramatic focus (compare my comments above concerning the "revels" speech (Chapter Four, pp. 217-218)) on reality as a form of illusion. For a typical elaboration of these themes, see Alvin Kernan, *The Playwright as Magician*, pp. 129-145.

7. On the matter of nautical detail, see Orgel's commentary, *The Tempest*, pp. 97-100, and Alexander Frederick Falconer, *Shakespeare and the Sea* (London, 1964), pp. 36-40. Falconer is enthusiastic in his praise of Shakespeare's sea-knowledge here, and I have no reason to question his expert perspective, but his discussion is obviously tinged with an element of bardolatry. What he has to say, nevertheless, points to at least an attempt on Shakespeare's part at a fairly accurate representation of appropriate nautical practice.

8. On some of the problems of staging this scene and ensuring that the text can be heard, see Roger Warren, *Staging Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 158-161, and Holland, 'The Shapeliness of *The Tempest*', pp. 223-224. On the thematic importance of the dialogue, the way it introduces what will be recurring issues to do with rule and misrule, power structures and their disruption, see Orgel, *The Tempest*, pp. 14-15, and especially, David Norbrook, "'What Cares These Roarers for the Name of King?": Language and Utopia in *The Tempest*'.

9. Whether the remarks in question (ll. 27-32, 44-46, 61-64) are directed by Gonzalo to the audience, himself, or his fellow courtiers, is, in the end, primarily a performance decision - not least because entrances and exits in this scene are not fully marked in the Folio. It does seem, though, that Gonzalo is meant to be on his own on stage when he utters the closing lines. And in any case, whatever mode of delivery is adopted, his efforts at humour, and the time he finds to ruminate on the fate of the Boatswain, have little obviously to do with a realistic re-creation of a storm.

10. Something of the tension between realism and stylization here is reflected in the editorial and performance crux at TLN 70-73 in the Folio text, where the stage direction, 'A *confused noyse within*', is followed by the seemingly regular blank verse lines, 'Mercy on vs. | We split, we split, Farewell my wife, and children, | Farewell brother: we split, we split, we split'. To quote Oxford's note on this passage: 'the

unambiguous verse lineation in [the Folio] is in apparent conflict with the direction for "*confused noyse*", which suggests mixed and therefore non-metrical articulations. The entire scene is laced with verse rhythms, and a less realistic effect may be indicated. The "*confused noyse*" may be distinct from the cries, but we cannot be sure that the direction is Shakespeare's' (*Companion*, p. 613). A further complication stems from the fact that it is not absolutely clear that the lines quoted above are meant to be spoken "within", as is perhaps generally assumed. The mariners who enter wet not long before (and presumably it is mariners who are speaking at this point, despite the last (regular) speech prefix given being for Gonzalo) are not marked down as exiting in the Folio. Having these almost-chiastic, formalized lines spoken on stage could be a way of creating an even more stylized/artificial effect, though it seems doubtful that this is the intention.

11. In the words of Mimi Still Dixon, if a spectator 'responds to the shipwreck in the first scene of the first act as real, it is because he [sic] knows through dramatic experience how to construe the inadequate props before him' ('Tragicomic Recognitions: Medieval Miracles and Shakespearean Romance', p. 74).

12. Whether the atmosphere of the island is sweet or rotten, or how green/tawny the ground is, are questions that remain (certainly at this stage) undetermined in the text - indeed, the nature of the isle seems to change depending on who is describing it, or what sort of environment is required for the action taking place. The state of the court party's clothes is another matter. As Orgel remarks in relation to Antonio's comment at 1. 70, 'since Ariel has testified [1.2. 219-220] to the condition of the garments, Antonio is presumably being merely perverse'; as he then goes on to add, though, 'the line also contributes to a general sense that the quality of the island and of experience on it is perceived diversely and subjectively by the various characters' (*The Tempest*, p. 131, note to ll. 65-6). But there is also a metatheatrical dimension in place that makes it less easy to dismiss Antonio's position as purely and simply perverse. If the garments being worn in 2.1 look as good as new, the audience will know that this is either (a) because they were never *actually* wet or damaged in the first place, or (b) because the actors have had an opportunity to change costumes since the supposed storm. The first possibility fits in well with one probable aspect of Jacobean theatrical practice - it is, after all, just the mariners, in the cheap costumes, who are directed to enter "wet" in the first scene. However, if the clothes worn in 2.1 really do appear 'fresher than before' (1.2. 220), 'new-dyed' (2.1. 68), this can only be the result of some sort of off-stage activity (special treatment or costume-change). And if no attempt is made to represent Ariel and Gonzalo's claims of improved condition, subjectivity is again all that the audience has to go on. In either case, the meaning of theatrical convention is further complicated and destabilized, and the "true" nature of the fictional situation still challengingly difficult to read.

13. The processes of deception and revelation I have been making so much of only have their full effect, of course, in relation to the unknowing spectator. The logic of the situation here, however, applies even for those fully in the know. If performed according to the terms of the Folio text, nothing about the storm sequence would need to look any different, any more or less realistic, if it actually were intended as a representation of the "real" thing - an event as real at the level of the fiction, that is, as the storms in, say, *Pericles* or *King Lear*.

14. On the concatenation of themes and ideas involved here, see especially Orgel, *The Tempest*, pp. 20-25, 30-39, 43-50, and generally, *The Illusion of Power*; I have already touched on most of these issues above, in Chapters One and Four.

15. Another spectacle that seems in a sense to "misfire" (though the situation is complicated in this case by some textual uncertainty) is Ariel's sea-nymph disguise (1.2. 304-307, 377-411). Since Ariel is to be imagined as invisible as he sings to Ferdinand, this particular costume-change is, to quote Orgel, 'logically pointless' (*The Tempest*, p. 117; and see generally Orgel's commentary, pp. 117-118). Of course, Ariel's costume, as Orgel observes, does get seen by the audience, and in this respect it forms part of the overall "spectacle" of the play; but such an excuse/explanation for its existence seems to me only to raise additional questions about the nature of the on-stage spectacle, breaking down the expected divisions between the different "layers" of the theatrical representation.

16. On the crucial presence of the *Aeneid* in *The Tempest*, see such studies as J. M. Nosworthy, 'The Narrative Sources of *The Tempest*', Jan Kott's 1976 essay, 'The *Aeneid* and *The Tempest*', reprinted in Kott, *The Bottom Translation*, pp. 107-132; John Pitcher, 'A Theatre of the Future: *The Aeneid* and *The Tempest*', *Essays in Criticism*, 34 (1984), 193-215; Robert Wiltenburg, 'The *Aeneid* in *The Tempest*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 39 (1986), 159-168; Orgel, *The Tempest*, pp. 39-43; and Heather James, *Shakespeare's Troy*, pp. 189-221. The notorious "widow Dido" episode (2.1. 79-106) extends the interpretative uncertainties of 2.1 into the realms of history, gender, geography, and politics. Though it has its eccentricities, I find Kott's work in this area particularly valuable - not least for its emphasis on spectacle in *The Tempest* as a form of alienation/defamiliarization.

17. I have perhaps loaded my description of the hunt a little, but to quote Kott, 'this is one of the most frightening scenes in *The Tempest*, yet its theatrical cruelty was [sic] never shown onstage' ('*The Tempest*, or Repetition', p. 82); the force and cruelty of this sequence also seem to me to have received disappointingly little attention in recent critical work, including the flurry of "radical" studies produced during the 1980s and 90s. As Kott incisively suggests, even the names assigned to some of the hounds here ('Fury', 'Tyrant' (4.1. 255)) give a sense of the disturbing social and political undertones involved in this particular piece of spectacle. I would draw attention, too, to the

"dehumanizing" journey taken by the play's bit-part players, from their role in the first scene as mariners, condescendingly instructed by Alonso to 'play the men!' (1.1. 9), to (one presumes) their position as Prospero's spirits, supplying animal noises (1.2. 383-390), and ultimately having to appear in animal shape.

18. 'Late Romances: Magic, Majesty and Masque', p. 154; and see generally pp. 136-194; I have benefited particularly from Holderness's discussion here. The idea of Miranda as a surrogate audience has long roots in criticism, if perhaps more in relation to her role as on-stage recipient of Prospero's narrative, than in connection with the storm; see, for example, Morton Luce, ed., *The Tempest*, fourth edition, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1938), p. iii.

19. The text leaves plenty of scope for how to play Miranda's reaction(s) to her father here. Warren disparagingly observes, 'it is sometimes absurdly suggested that [Prospero's] narration is so tedious that Miranda's attention keeps wandering' (*Staging Shakespeare's Late Plays*, p. 162). Along similar lines, Orgel notes that 'Miranda makes it clear that her attention is in no danger of wandering', and argues from this that 'her father's violence is retrospective, the playing out of an old rage' (*The Tempest*, p. 16). I am not so sure, though, that Miranda's attentions need to be presented as entirely in tune with Prospero's desires, that it is not possible to play her interest as in some respect strained or distanced - in which case her comments to the contrary could simply be a way of covering her tracks, of feigning an interest which she knows she is expected to feel. She certainly seems to show herself in places, to quote Orgel again, 'conscious of playing a role, conscious of what her relation to her father requires her to say' (p. 17). The key point for me, however, is that this whole exchange is packed with potential tensions and subtext (to do with history, situation, personal relations, etc.), all of which suggest that there is a lot more going on here than mere exposition and the unproblematic imparting of information.

20. "'This thing of darkness I acknowledge mine": *The Tempest* and the discourse of colonialism', p. 59; and as he adds with regard to the action of 1.2 specifically, 'Prospero's narrative demands of its subjects that they should accede to *his* version of the past'. In the light of this, Miranda's ability to remember even anything at all from within (as the Folio-text puts it) 'the dark-backward and Abisme of Time' (TLN 140) might class as a threat to her father's project. On the gender tensions and anxieties that emerge from Prospero's narratives and exemplary presentations all the way through the play, see especially Stephen Orgel's 1984 essay, 'Prospero's Wife', reprinted in *Representing the English Renaissance*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1988), pp. 217-229.

21. A point particularly emphasized by Orgel (see *The Tempest*, p. 19, and p. 115, note to l. 261). Ariel's attitude is obviously much less directly confrontational than Caliban's, but his laconic denials (ll. 252,

257, 261) of Prospero's accusations register an opposition to both the latter's tone and his arguments. One or two of the spirit's responses seem rather to wrong-foot Prospero (e.g., l. 263); and in many ways, the entire exchange between them concerning Sycorax and the history of the island is an exercise in quiet resistance on Ariel's part to Prospero's take on the situation. Even Ariel's comment, 'yes, Caliban her son' (l. 286), which is ostensibly an expression of agreement, can be seen to qualify Prospero's claim that the isle was 'not honoured with | A human shape' after Sycorax's death, and the dismissive opinion of Caliban he expresses along with this (ll. 283-286).

22. Narrative re-workings of the storm/shipwreck and its after-effects begin with Miranda's brief comments at the start of 1.2, and are carried on through Ariel's revelation of his role in engineering events, Francisco's epic-style, noticeably distinct-in-tone description (2.1. 119-128) of Ferdinand swimming (on which, see Orgel's commentary, *The Tempest*, p. 133), the accounts from Stefano and Trinculo of their own experiences (2.2. 106-134), and so on, extending even as far as the final scene, and the little dialogue between Gonzalo and the Boatswain (5.1. 219-228). The contradictions and multiple perspectives created by all this are well captured by Luce in his edition, pp. xiv-xvi.

23. 'Late Romances: Magic, Majesty and Masque', p. 175. I would stress afresh that elusiveness and ambiguity in this context do not add up to quite the same thing as conventional interpretative "openness", but stand rather in opposition to ill-worked-out or insufficiently detailed lines of interpretation, as a sign of an interest in the complexities of interpretation, in all of its epistemological, ideological, and psychosocial dimensions, etc.; see further my section on 'Construction' in Chapter One (pp. 70-86).

24. Both in highly negative terms, in authorship work, primarily in relation to Acts 1 and 2, as a way of emphasizing the play's poor quality, and "hence" its disjointed authorship; and also, with a far more positive intent, in those "romance"-type approaches that see the play as a kind of "primitive", archetypal narrative, in which too much "art" or sophistication would only get in the way, serve to obscure the archetype (see above, Chapter Two, note 69). The first position is strongly challenged by Doreen DelVecchio and Antony Hammond in their recent New Cambridge edition, in terms that seek to demonstrate the coherent artistry of the play as a whole; the overall tenor of their actual interpretation, however, pretty much reinforces the second point of view, suggesting that *Pericles* requires a reading, a mode of response, which is itself essentially "artless".

25. For commentary on the language and imagery of *Pericles*, see above, Chapter Three, note 136. The thematic and structural parallels in the play (father-daughter relationships, journeys, riddles, names and naming, contrasting examples of government, and so on) are well known, and have received considerably fuller discussion. Two essays I have found particularly useful are Andrew Welsh's 'Heritage in *Pericles*', in

Tobias and Zolbrod, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 89-113; and Annette C. Flower's 'Disguise and Identity in *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 26 (1975), 30-41; and see generally here Wilson Knight, *The Crown of Life*, pp. 32-75, and DelVecchio and Hammond, pp. 36-78. The artistry and design of *Pericles* are also evinced in its recurring interest in music and the visual arts (emblems, iconography, etc.), for (varying and variable) comment on which, see the articles on the play by Debbie L. Barrett, Mary Judith Dunbar, Sara Hanna, William A. McIntosh, Patricia K. Meszaros, and William O. Scott, all included in the Bibliography. The unusual importance of repetition as a structural principle in this drama is emphasized by J. P. Brockbank in his 1971 essay, '*Pericles* and the Dream of Immortality', reprinted in *On Shakespeare*, pp. 283-302 (p. 297). Many of the more seemingly incidental repetitions in the text have often been explained/dismissed as evidence of memorial reconstruction (and are frequently "emended" away accordingly in Oxford), but I would see this as mainly just a reflection of a general critical insensitivity to the linguistic effects that *Pericles* has to offer.

26. 'The Shadow of Antioch: Sexuality in *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*', in *Parallel Lives: Spanish and English National Drama, 1580-1680*, edited by Louise and Peter Fothergill-Payne (Cranbury, NJ, 1991), pp. 167-179 (p. 169).

27. Recent work pursuing some of the play's more "unromantic" undercurrents in other areas includes Margaret Healy, '*Pericles* and the Pox', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 92-107; and some of the new essays in David Skeeel, ed., '*Pericles*': *Critical Essays* (New York, 2000), most provocatively, Michael Baird Saenger, '*Pericles* and the Burlesque of Romance', pp. 191-204.

28. As Richard Hillman puts it, Gower forms 'the most sustained literary allusion to be found in Shakespeare' ('Shakespeare's Gower and Gower's Shakespeare: The Larger Debt of *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 36 (1985), 427-437 (p. 428)). Having said that, though, the play itself nowhere explicitly identifies the *Confessio Amantis* as its own primary source; and indeed, through the fiction of what the Chorus has to say, implies that its actual sources long pre-date Gower. It is worth noting in this connection that Shakespeare's own immediate sources could well have involved (for certain details) versions of the Apollonius story other than those in Gower and Twine, not yet confirmed or identified, or no longer available to us; see again Bullough, VI, 349-374; and Elizabeth Archibald, *Apollonius of Tyre*, pp. 182-216.

29. To quote the Chorus's own words (ll. 5-9): 'It hath been sung at festivals, | On ember-eves and holy-ales [Q1: Holydayes], | And lords and ladies in their lives | Have read it for restoratives. | The purchase is to make men glorious' - though quite what Gower means by 'glorious' here has caused some editorial concern (compare the notes in F. D. Hoeniger's edition, p. 6, and DelVecchio and Hammond, p. 85). The term is clearly being used positively, but whether Gower's emphasis is social, psychological, or theological, is hard to say. What can be said,

however, is that the idea of "glory" is a recurring theme during the first two acts (see, for example, Scs.1. 120, 2. 76, 5. 14, 7. 37, 8. 6), and one that resonates in ways that cast at least a complicating light on this grand promise from the opening Chorus.

30. For the proverbial nature of Gower's Latin phrase, and the thought that it expresses, see Dent O38 (the parallel entry in Tilley is unhelpful). The imitation of medieval verse technique is of course further strengthened by all Gower's talk about sources and invocation of his own authors/authorities. The multiplying of perspectives and multiple efforts at archaism involved in all this are all part of the complex tone and dynamic of this opening chorus, the artistic/poetic power of which has tended rather to get ignored in authorship work or criticism that seeks to emphasize the primitive nature of the opening scenes.

31. See in particular here (albeit with one or two reservations), N. W. Gilroy-Scott, 'John Gower's Reputation: Literary Allusions from the Early Fifteenth Century to the Time of *Pericles*', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 1 (1971), 30-47. Chaucer's phrase, 'moral Gower' (*Troilus and Criseyde*, V, 1856), had long served as the standard description for the poet (see the note to ll. 1856-59 in the *Riverside Chaucer*, p. 1058). According to Gilroy-Scott, 'it is difficult to think of a comparable case of a single phrase being so influential and so damning' (p. 32).

32. This is reflected particularly in Gower's (conspiratorially co-optive) vocabulary of "we" and "our", that kicks in especially from the fourth chorus onwards (Sc.15. 1-52 - ll. 3, 6, 42, etc.). Whilst this first-person-plural method of speaking might be construed simply in terms of a collective reference to the company involved in the presentation of the drama, the nature of Gower's role, with its mode of perpetual direct address, means that its ambit can hardly fail to extend in places to take in the theatre audience as well. The new vocabulary is accompanied by an increasingly vigorous moral tone from the Chorus in the later stages of the play, most evident in the powerful condemnation he directs at Dioniza and Leonine, and both these elements can be seen to relate to a strongly paternalistic and protective attitude on Gower's part towards Marina.

33. The Quarto version of the passage referred to here reads (with punctuation that splits ll. 7b-9a across two separate sentences): '[. . .] I doe beseech you | To learne of me who stand with gappes | To teach you. | The stages of our storie [. . .]' (TLN 1745-1748). All the main modern editions re-line and re-punctuate, and even DelVecchio and Hammond accept (essentially) the standard emendation of 'with gappes' to 'i'th gaps' (see p. 163 of their edition).

34. Criticism has largely come to terms with the idea of the unreliable/partisan Chorus in *Henry V*, a figure whose judgements and interpretations are not necessarily at one with the perspective of the play as a whole. Attitudes to Gower, though, seem to have some way to go to catch up with such a possibility. I would attribute this in

part to the relative neglect of *Pericles*, and critical reluctance to invest too much meaning in a problematic, potentially collaborative text; and also, of course, to the dominant "Romance" model of reading, which admits little scope for scepticism regarding Gower's opinions. Steven Mullaney's influential reading of the Chorus as the intended embodiment of a 'timeless authority' (*The Place of the Stage*, p. 148) carries the same simplistic line of interpretation over into contemporary political criticism (see above, Chapter Four, note 19). For a very different understanding of Gower, offering a sense of alternative undercurrents within the critical mainstream, see Stephen Dickey, 'Language and Role in *Pericles*', *English Literary Renaissance*, 16 (1986), 550-566, and some of the material there cited.

35. On the conjunction of tone between the early choruses and the opening two acts, as an aesthetic feature rather than an indicator of authorship, see especially Hoeniger's essay, 'Gower and Shakespeare in *Pericles*' (pp. 467-474).

36. See, for example, Scs.10. 53-60, 20. 21-23, and 22. 19-20. This interest in the imagination of the audience has been widely commented on; it is emphasized especially by DelVecchio and Hammond (pp. 27-36). With the obvious parallels that it affords to *Henry V*, it has often been invoked in the effort to argue Shakespearian authorship of only the later choruses (as in Nancy C. Michael, 'The Usefulness of Narrative Sources and the Gower Choruses in Determining a Divided Authorship for *Pericles*', *The Upstart Crow*, 2 (1979), 34-50). That is to say, any increase in sophistication or change of perspective here has tended to be seen as arising from the intervention of Shakespeare himself, rather than as a characterizing gesture in relation to Gower.

37. *Pericles*, p. 35. DelVecchio and Hammond actually seek to set up a specific distinction between Gower and the *Henry V* Chorus at this point, arguing that 'the structural use of the Chorus in *Henry V* is clearly ironical and subversive, quite the reverse of the dramatic condition of Gower in *Pericles*'. The footnote they supply in support here (p. 35, note 2) ties itself up in knots in attempting to justify this dubious claim; and the difficulties of maintaining their position are further reflected in the use of the word "clearly" in the passage just quoted, which suggests that they can only sustain such an absolute distinction by suppressing one of the main interpretative controversies in the criticism of *Henry V*. For a similar perspective, however, see Richard Paul Knowles, '"Wishes Fall Out As They're Will'd": Artist, Audience, and *Pericles*'s Gower', *English Studies in Canada*, 9, no. 1 (March 1983), 14-24.

38. For a range of comment arguing the interpretative inadequacy of the Epilogue (Sc.22. 108-125), whether viewed as an aesthetic failing or a meaningful effect, see Dickey, pp. 565-566; R. P. Knowles, '"Wishes Fall Out As They're Will'd"', pp. 21-22; Walter Eggers, 'Shakespeare's Gower and the Role of the Authorial Presenter', pp. 440-441; Alexander Leggatt, *Shakespeare's Comedy of Love*, pp. 259-260; and Kristian Smidt,

Unconformities in Shakespeare's Later Comedies, pp. 114-116. My own position is close to the line taken by Eggers: if the moralizing of the Epilogue 'seems patently inadequate as a conclusion, then in this play the device of the authorial presenter has been made to work ironically, requiring an additional critical perspective in the audience' (p. 441). One reason for stressing this is that other critics have treated the Epilogue as embodying, unproblematically, 'an interpretive paradigm of romance' (Robert Uphaus, *Beyond Tragedy*, pp. 46-48 (p. 47)).

39. Current interpretative practice would probably prefer to see this omission by Gower as a broader form of suppression/repression, an indication of the play's failure to acknowledge the ambivalences at the heart of its own moral code, rather than as the kind of intentionally conspicuous silence I am arguing for. And it is true that the lack of any mention of Lysimachus in the Epilogue has gone largely unmentioned on in the criticism, has failed to prove particularly noticeable. But I would regard this as due mainly to the limitations of the "Romance" paradigm, and associated critical anxieties about Lysimachus and his encounter with Marina in the brothel - where, whatever the nature of the textual situation, it seems clear that the Governor of Mytilene is a well-known (and certainly identifiable) visitor/client, and that he later lies about (or at least dissembles) his intentions in being there (see TLN 1821-1935, and DelVecchio and Hammond, p. 170, note to ll. 96-107; this crucial sequence (Sc.19. 25-165) is of course massively re-written in Oxford, via Wilkins's *Painful Adventures*, in an activity I find hard to class as editing).

40. 'Heritage in *Pericles*', p. 112; and see too the comments in Bruce Smith, 'Pageants into Play: Shakespeare's Three Perspectives on Idea and Image', pp. 234-240; and Sara Hanna, 'Christian Vision and Iconography in *Pericles*', *The Upstart Crow*, 11 (1991), 92-116 (pp. 108-109). Welsh feels that the Latin tag of Gower's opening chorus provides an appropriate motto for the emblem that is the play; and he sees Gower himself in turn, in highly romantic terms, as transformed at the end into 'an emblem of the old tale, its many heritages, and its triumphs over time by the human imagination laboring in faith and hope and love to engender a future' (p. 112).

41. The play's main exploration of emblems and the relationship between word and picture is of course found in the presentation of the knights to Simonides and Thaisa in Scene 6. Oxford's text "tidies up" the Quarto considerably here, so that the identification of the origins of the knights, the description of their emblems, and the translation of their mottoes all conform to the same pattern. For a telling critique of this approach, see David Bevington, 'Determining the Indeterminate', pp. 504-505. The Quarto itself (TLN 729-788) leaves a number of the mottoes untranslated, and offers scope for some theatrical humour at the expense of the characters' lack of linguistic understanding (see DelVecchio and Hammond, pp. 194-195). In performance, the situation is further complicated by the question of whether the audience gets to see

the knights' emblems themselves, and what form (or quality) these might possess if they are shown; and see again Stephen Orgel, 'The Poetics of Incomprehensibility' (p. 437).

42. So whilst the first of these, he feels, can speak for itself ('What need speak I?' (Sc.5. 16)), when it comes to the second, he is reassuring the audience, 'What's dumb in show, I'll plain with speech' (Sc.10. 14), and by the time of the third, the problems involved seem to have grown even more intense: 'Like notes and shadows see them move a while; | Your ears unto your eyes I'll reconcile' (Sc.18. 21-22). In this last instance, moreover, Gower's comment immediately afterwards, 'See how belief may suffer by foul show' (l. 23), draws attention to the multiple layers of meaning and deception bound up in the various "shows"/"performances" going on at this point, factors that render still more complicated the relationship between word and picture; see in particular here the comments on this third of the play's dumb-shows in Phyllis Gorfain, 'Puzzle and Artifice: The Riddle as Metapoetry in *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 29 (1976), 11-20 (pp. 19-20).

43. That is to say, Gower's focus on the need for the audience to engage its imagination is not necessarily a locus of any profound Shakespearian insight. It might be taken instead, for example, as a sign of his own limited perspective, or of a low/patronizing opinion on his part concerning the capabilities and understanding of the Jacobean audience. Details in the choruses that can seem fairly tangential to the working out of the drama include Gower's interest in the figure of Aeschines and the latter's new-found status in the hierarchy of Tyre (Sc.18. 13-16, TLN 1752-1755); his reading out of Dioniza's epitaph for Marina (TLN 1778-1787, Oxford's 'Additional Passage', p. 1198); and his concern (if nothing else, potentially anticlimactic in its position in the epilogue) to fill the audience in on the eventual fate of Cleon and his family (Sc.22. 118-123). Information of this sort obviously helps to flesh out the fictional world, and to tie up any loose ends in the plot, but the timing and placing of its presentation seems to me designed (and to serve) to point to some of the differences, and the potential (functional) conflicts, between the play's narrative and dramatic modes.

44. For some useful comment on the characterization of Gower, see Dickey, who notes how the idiosyncrasies and touches of individuality given to the Chorus (and to *Pericles* too, for that matter) 'make any discussion of romance typology a drastic oversimplification' (p. 551). One might say that the standard models and types the play draws upon are themselves subjected to distancing, defamiliarized.

45. On theatrical parallels and antecedents to Gower, and the tradition of on-stage presenters to which he belongs, see especially Hoeniger, *Pericles*, pp. xix-xxiii, and Eggers, 'Shakespeare's Gower'. In the theatre, as modern performances have shown, the role can take on a very special relationship with the audience - though the desire to make that relationship as comfortable as possible often leads, in my experience, to an obscuring of the kind of tensions and undercurrents I have been

emphasizing. The search for some sort of acceptable contemporary correlative to the play's use of the choric convention (e.g., turning the learned, literary Gower into a representative of oral culture) tends to result in certain key aspects of the role being suppressed or simplified, whilst many of the more problematic details mentioned here are prone to being cut, or shifted to a more seemingly "logical" (less disjunctive) position in Gower's telling of the tale.

46. Characteristically, the Quarto includes no stage direction to indicate when (or that) '*a row of heads is revealed*' (to quote Oxford's interpolated direction, Sc.1. 39.1). There can be no doubt, though, from what both Gower and Antiochus say, that some such heads are meant to be visible. Oxford has the heads revealed just as or before Gower first alludes to them ('As yon grim looks do testify', l. 40), but they could equally be visible from the outset (as other editors have assumed). In any case, the presence of the heads makes for a vivid conjunction of narrative and spectacle from the very beginning. And the silent heads themselves are actually involved in the processes of telling in operation here (which perhaps somewhat vitiates Oxford's sense that they might 'distract from the spectacular effect of Gower's entrance' if in view from the start (*Companion*, p. 561, note to 1.39.1)). Thus alongside Gower's claim to the audience that they 'testify', Antiochus suggests to Pericles that, with their 'speachlesse tongues, and semblance pale', they 'tell' him of both their own (or their owners') and his potential fate (TLN 102; Oxford (l. 79) interestingly emends/modernizes 'semblance' to 'semblants' here, but also arbitrarily (and to my mind unbelievably, beyond the editorial pale! - it's not even an improvement) alters 'pale' to 'bloodless' (and see again *Companion*, p. 561, for the relevant textual notes)).

47. And see generally ll. 54-59, 89-105, 132-140; as it stands in the Quarto, the last of these passages also includes the comment from the Bawd, 'say what a parragon she is, and thou hast the haruest out of thine owne report' (TLN 1677-1678) - a phrase needlessly re-written in Oxford, without even the pretence of any warrant from Wilkins, on the basis that the construction lacks any parallel in Shakespeare, and "report" suspiciously repeats the previous sentence' (see *Companion*, p. 578). Actually though, the repetition here goes further than Oxford notices: compare Dioniza's earlier reference to Marina as 'our paragon to all reports' (Sc.15. 86).

48. The Quarto in this last passage reads 'like' (TLN 2239); the emendation to "life" goes back to Malone (see *Companion*, p. 589). Diana's speech (TLN 2234-2241), though evidently intended as verse, is printed as prose in the original, and editors have usually regarded it (on the basis of the rhyme-scheme) as also corrupt, missing something. Oxford supplies an entirely invented line and a half (ll. 228-229a), but provides a particularly thoughtful and illuminating note in support (albeit, of course, in the separate volume of *Companion* (p. 589, note to 21.228-9)).

49. In the first of these examples, Helicanus, on the verge of recounting Pericles's life-history to Lysimachus, is interrupted by the

arrival of Marina, whereupon he observes, in a gesture of metafictional self-consciousness, 'But see, I am prevented' (Sc.21. 53). Capping this, of course, in the final scene, as just mentioned, Pericles himself *does* give a brief résumé of the plot (Sc.22. 21-33/TLN 2277-2287). The second passage referred to, from Scene 7, typifies the kind of features critics have in mind when they complain about the inept dramaturgy of the first two acts; it is specifically condemned for its 'undramatic repetition' by Hoeniger (*Pericles*, p. 62 - though contrast his rather different view in 'Gower and Shakespeare in *Pericles*', p. 473). Oxford again engages in quite a bit of tidying up in this sequence, eliminating one of the smaller verbal parallels between the speeches through the omission of 'of him' in l. 69 (TLN 863; compare l. 74), and rather inefficaciously tinkering with the verse in places, including, for example, ll. 81-85 (TLN 876-878)). Interestingly enough, in this last instance (where there does seem to be some sort of definite problem with the original), Oxford's re-writing of Thaisa's speech is deliberately modelled on Pericles's previous reply to her (see *Companion*, p. 568) - i.e., the Oxford text at this point (further aided by its "emendations" to that reply itself (ll. 76-81, TLN 871-875)) actively adds to the amount of repetition present in the Quarto.

50. In the words of Ruth Nevo, 'we are sensitized by Gower's mediation to levels of consciousness, and to functions of the telling. Gower remembers, and recounts the story, Pericles reenacts it, and the reenacting itself, *en abyme*, is a compulsive repetition' (*Shakespeare's Other Language*, p. 42). The preponderance of narrative elements within the dramatic action has been widely commented on; see in particular Flower, and also the likes of John Arthos, '*Pericles, Prince of Tyre: A Study in the Dramatic Use of Romantic Narrative*'; Francis Berry, 'Word and Picture in the Final Plays'; M. C. Bradbrook, *The Living Monument*, pp. 184-194; and Elena Glazov-Corrigan, 'The New Function of Language in Shakespeare's *Pericles: Oath Versus "Holy Word"*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 43 (1990), 131-140. As Flower observes, the story is 'not only framed as Gower's tale, but dependent upon being "told" by its own characters' (p. 31).

51. I am treating Gower's phrase here, as Oxford does, as a self-contained statement (and see in addition Philip Edwards's version in his New Penguin edition, p. 50). On these terms, it would need to be accompanied by some sort of demonstrative gesture from the Chorus, designating the stage as its referent. This seems to me the best interpretation of the Quarto text, the punctuation of which (TLN 39-41) is certainly deficient. Other examples of editorial re-punctuation produce only limited grammatical sense (DelVecchio and Hammond, p. 86), or achieve grammatical precision at the expense of highly elaborate and unconvincing re-pointing (Hoeniger, *Pericles*, p. 6). Having said that, Oxford's own added apostrophe ('This', presumably implying "This is"?) seems unnecessarily fussy (and hardly communicable in performance).

52. On the 'formal naval protocol' enacted in this last example, see DelVecchio and Hammond, p. 175 (note to ll. 1-22), and Falconer,

pp. 20-21. The multiple entrances and exits at the start of both this scene and Scene 12, only partially marked in the Quarto, have always posed problems for editors, and benefit from a degree of clarification; Oxford's text also adapts quite radically the introductory dialogue in Scene 4 (TLN 410-467). Many of the play's expository sequences involve one-off characters and supernumeraries who were no doubt doubled on the Jacobean stage - perhaps in a way that called attention to the kind of connections/parallels/developments suggested here. One sequence I have not included in my list is the opening to Scene 2, which has often been suspected of especial corruption. The Quarto has Pericles enter 'with his Lords' (TLN 244), only for him to dismiss any company immediately (TLN 245; the lords are given no exit, but they re-enter later in the scene - 'Enter all the Lords to Pericles', TLN 278). Philip Edwards in particular has found this entry and rapid re-exit ridiculous ('An Approach to the Problem of *Pericles*', pp. 26-27; and compare too DelVecchio and Hammond, p. 95, note to 1.2.0); as it stands, though, the Quarto version can be seen to fit in more than adequately with the pattern I have adumbrated, providing a fairly awkward, purely visual means of establishing the new locale in Tyre (and compare the note in *Companion*, p. 562). As for those scenes not referred to here, the openings of these generally involve already established characters and situations, or follow on easily from earlier events.

53. Many of the issues involved in the self-conscious dramaturgy of the play come together in the figure of Marina, who, whilst probably the most vivid, lively, roundedly characterized creation in *Pericles*, is also, in various respects, the archetypal story-book princess, virgin-heroine, saintly paragon, fantasy-figure, exponent of the "womanly" arts, etc. - as well as, for that matter, the person around whom the plot ultimately achieves its realization and the processes of on-stage story-telling and report all tend to cohere, and in whom most of the play's strands of language and imagery find their "natural" resolution, via the operations of aesthetic artifice. For a range of comment on Marina, her role, characterization, and literary analogues, see Inga-Stina Ewbank, "'My Name is Marina": The Language of Recognition', in *Shakespeare's Styles: Essays in honour of Kenneth Muir*, edited by Philip Edwards, Inga-Stina Ewbank, and G. K. Hunter (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 111-130; Elizabeth Archibald, "'Deep clerks she dumbs": The Learned Heroine in *Apollonius of Tyre* and *Pericles*', *Comparative Drama*, 22 (1989-89), 289-303; Glazov-Corrigan, 'The New Function of Language in Shakespeare's *Pericles*'; Lorraine Helms, 'The Saint in the Brothel: Or, Eloquence Rewarded', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 41 (1990), 319-332; and Amanda Piesse, 'Space for the Self: Place, Persona and Self-Projection in *The Comedy of Errors* and *Pericles*', in *Renaissance Configurations: Voices/Bodies/Spaces, 1580-1690*, edited by Gordon McMullan (Basingstoke and London, 1998), pp. 151-170.

54. 5.2 is a scene that falls into two distinct sections, and I am largely concerned with the first of these here - though the second also has some interesting things to say in relation to testimony and report.

Autolycus provides the common denominator between the two parts, and his soliloquy in the middle of them (ll. 112-122) is itself another exercise in reported action.

55. The three gentlemen of 5.2 cannot all be said to be, in the strictest sense of the term, anonymous: the second is identified as one 'Rogero' (TLN 3031), and the third referred to as 'the Lady Paulina's steward' (l. 26), a role which presumably accounts for (makes plausible) his knowledge of Paulina's affairs with regard to the statue (ll. 93-102). In this respect, he could perhaps be the same (silent) gentleman who accompanies Paulina on her prison visit in 2.2.

56. See above, for example, Chapter Three, note 29. The two most common explanations put forward for the use of report in this scene - pressure of time in the composition, and the need not to undermine the impact of 5.3 - were already well in circulation by the end of the nineteenth century; see the comments reproduced in Horace Howard Furness, ed., *The Winter's Tale, A New Variorum Shakespeare* (Philadelphia, 1898), pp. 278-279. The attitude that seems to lie at the core of the negative reading here is made explicit by Northrop Frye when he writes, 'the fact that this conventional recognition scene is only reported indicates that Shakespeare is less interested in it than in the statue scene' ('Recognition in *The Winter's Tale*', p. 109). Alongside its generally low critical standing, as Dennis Bartholomeusz observes, 5.2 has also been 'particularly accident-prone' in the theatre (*The Winter's Tale in performance in England and America 1611-1976* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 235).

57. And compare, too, the Second Gentleman's previous suggestion that 'such a deal of wonder is broken out within this hour, that ballad-makers cannot be able to express it' (ll. 23-25) - an image which offers a particularly self-knowing reference back to the sequence involving ballads in 4.4 (ll. 257-311), where the audience has already been given a clear indication of the extraordinary "wonders" that ballad-makers are able to express.

58. 5.2 in fact plays a number of variations and offers a number of perspectives on the differences between showing and telling, seeing and hearing. Near the beginning, the First Gentleman (ll. 9-19) admits to some difficulty in describing what he has just seen, but suggests that the limitations of his report derive mainly from the nature of his status as a witness, that the meaning of the events concerned would have been inaccessible even to 'the wisest beholder, that knew no more but seeing' (ll. 16-17). Not long after, the Third Gentleman starts his account by roundly declaring, with regard to the testimony available to back up all the revelations he describes, 'that which you hear you'll swear you see, there is such unity in the proofs' (ll. 31-32). But such confidence in the efficacy of report becomes less apparent as he proceeds. It is, above all, it seems, the human interactions, and presumably the emotions they involve, that really beggar description here, with the meeting of Polixenes and Leontes also being described as

an encounter 'which lames report to follow it, and undoes description to do it' (ll. 57-58). Later on, in another highly self-referential (not to say extremely charged) comment on the lack of staging at this point, the First Gentleman claims that 'the dignity of this act was worth the audience of kings and princes, for by such was it acted' (ll. 79-80). His subsequent eagerness (ll. 108-111) to make sure that he gets to attend the events at Paulina's house is another implicit comment on the inadequacies of report.

59. Whether the gentlemen actually manage to gain access to the viewing of the statue is another matter - the play does not really deal in that kind of absolute realism. The entrance direction at the start of 5.3 makes provision for '*Lords, &c.*' (TLN 3185), but it is not clear that the gentlemen's presence would add very much in performance - in a sense, their place as observers is taken over by the theatre audience. It is worth noting too, in this context, that the Clown, Shepherd, and Autolycus, who also exit in 5.2 with the apparent intention of getting a look at 'the Queen's picture' (l. 172), are almost certainly excluded from the final scene (if only by the "law of re-entry") - a much more obvious absence than that of the three gentlemen.

60. The Second Gentleman's observation that Paulina has been visiting her house 'privately twice or thrice a day, ever since the death of Hermione' (ll. 104-105) is the remark that resonates most powerfully with hindsight, that offers the most scope for constructing an explanatory narrative. Other elements of the dialogue provide more straightforward cases of dramatic irony, such as the Third Gentleman's claim that 'who was most marble there changed colour' (l. 89). Similar resonances, of course, attach to much of the dialogue of 5.1 as well.

61. On the reference to Romano here, see above, Chapter Four, note 78. The only even remotely comparable disruption of the basic historical setting of Leontes's Sicilia that I can think of (setting aside, that is, its temporal co-existence with the play's historically- and geographically-challenged kingdom of Bohemia) is Hermione's unexpected revelation (and this is adapted closely from the source) that, as she puts it, 'The Emperor of Russia was my father' (3.2. 118).

62. See in particular here Leonard Barkan ("*Living Sculptures*": Ovid, Michelangelo, and *The Winter's Tale*'), who notes specifically that Shakespeare preserves a sense of ambiguity 'by never actually saying that Giulio Romano sculpted the statue', and makes the point too that the 'indefinite verbs' used to describe Romano's activity 'apply to both life and art, and moreover to both sculptural and theatrical art' (p. 657).

63. "*Living Sculptures*", p. 663; the ambiguities involved here are given a similar emphasis in William H. Matchett, 'Some Dramatic Techniques in *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 22 (1969), 93-107 (pp. 102-107). It is also possible, however, to envisage a performance situation in which the audience is even uncertain (if only fleetingly) as to whether the "statue" is actually an actor at all.

64. In addition to giving little away, Hermione's speech actually introduces a notable confusion of detail, since, as has often been pointed out, she was herself present at the reading of the oracle in 3.2, and thus had no need of Paulina's information on this score. This apparent inconsistency obviously gives some scope for revision theories, but I would see it more as a reflection of the nature of the moment here, with all its multiple perplexities, and part of the general emphasis on Paulina's activities in bringing about the final resolution, her role in the closing scene as emcee.

65. Studies attempting to get to grips with the ending of the play, what happens to Hermione, and the nature of the dramaturgy here (and representing the groundwork for later criticism) are particularly concentrated in and around the third quarter of the twentieth century. Relevant essays include: Adrien Bonjour, 'The Final Scene of *The Winter's Tale*', *English Studies*, 33 (1952), 193-208; Nevill Coghill, 'Six Points of Stage-Craft in *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 11 (1958), 31-41; Northrop Frye, 'Recognition in *The Winter's Tale*'; Matchett, 'Some Dramatic Techniques'; Kenneth Muir, 'The Conclusion of *The Winter's Tale*', in *The Morality of Art: Essays Presented to G. Wilson Knight*, edited by D. W. Jefferson (London, 1969), pp. 87-101; and David Bergeron, 'The Restoration of Hermione in *The Winter's Tale*'; and see too the discussions in A. D. Nuttall, *William Shakespeare: 'The Winter's Tale'* (London, 1966); and Fitzroy Pyle, *'The Winter's Tale': A Commentary on the Structure* (London, 1969). I have drawn also on the comments in Philip Edwards, '"Seeing is believing": action and narration in *The Old Wives Tale* and *The Winter's Tale*'; and B. J. Sokol, *Art and illusion in 'The Winter's Tale'*. Two influential works particularly to emphasize the notion of resurrection are S. L. Bethell's *'The Winter's Tale': A Study*, and Wilson Knight's chapter in *The Crown of Life*, pp. 76-128. For a recent essay capturing something of the ontological complexity of the play at this point, see Gareth Roberts, '"An art lawful as eating"? Magic in *The Tempest* and *The Winter's Tale*', in Richards and Knowles, pp. 126-142. What seems to me the general tenor of the critical debate may be, in part, a reflection of the fact that it is quite difficult to write about the play without speaking of Hermione's "still being alive" or Shakespeare's "withholding information" from his audience - attitudes which I regard as both highly problematic, nowhere directly warranted by the text.

66. Bonjour sets out the case for a sixteen-year seclusion, and argues that this represents a totally plausible, coherently-presented, and logically and psychologically realistic proceeding - not a position I find convincing. See further here Warren, *Staging Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 123-127, 143-154. Feminist critics especially have found a positive image in the idea of a plan on Paulina's part, and the shared female agency and hidden community that this implies (see, for example, Carol Thomas Neely, *Broken Nuptials in Shakespeare's Plays* (New Haven and London, 1985), pp. 166-209); but it remains the case that this whole narrative edifice is an extrapolation, a reading constructed entirely around the gaps in the text (what it pointedly refrains from saying).

67. Hermione's word, "issue", is, of course, in this context, significantly multivalent; and it is noticeable, too, that "preserved" is the same verb she uses in relation to Perdita's experience - which, as we know, has (once she is safely settled in Bohemia) nothing of the inexplicable or obviously supernatural about it. But whilst it points to a purely mundane explanation for Hermione's being alive, "preserved", on one level at least, brings its own complications with it, introduces an extra degree of confusion or obfuscation into the situation. Many of the available meanings cited in *OED* (12, 404-405, "preserve", verb, quoting from various senses) are of obvious relevance here: 'to keep safe from harm or injury', 'to keep alive, keep from perishing', even 'to keep [. . .] from decomposition'. What about, though, when it comes to, 'to keep from physical or chemical change', or 'keep from decay'? These might be thought to sit a little uneasily with Leontes's famous comment, 'Hermione was not so much wrinkled, nothing | So agèd as this seems' (ll. 28-29), and Paulina's reply to this (ll. 30-32). Are we supposed to understand that Hermione has "preserved" herself without "preserving" herself? Is this another of the play's attempts to destabilize the audience's awareness and sense of reality? And can (and should?) those wrinkles be represented in performance?

68. On the latter topic, Northrop Frye speaks for many when he states with confidence, 'it turns out that in fact no statue has been made of Hermione, and the entire reference to Romano seems pointless' ('Recognition in *The Winter's Tale*', p. 113); and it is true that, *in fact*, Giulio Romano never made a statue of Shakespeare's Hermione! But the logical pointlessness of the reference and the various conundrums it creates are surely, in themselves, a lot of the point. And can one say for certain that, at the level of the fiction, no statue has been made, or Hermione (to return to Barkan's actor/character distinction) has only been pretending? When it comes to the play's own "reality", nothing actually makes clear what (if anything) Giulio Romano has been doing, why such a story about him is circulating in the first place. Has he been visiting Paulina's house for the last sixteen years? (And what a story that could be!) The Third Gentleman's comments suggest that at least somebody along the line has seen, or claimed to have seen (or to have heard from someone who has seen, or claimed to have seen, etc.) Romano's statue: 'he so near to Hermione hath done Hermione that *they* say one would speak to her and stand in hope of answer' (5.2. 99-101; my emphasis). Of course, we are dealing here with two degrees of "unreality", a report of a report (and an indirect report, at that); and everything "they say" may be invention and gossip. Or indeed (and one might infer that this would have to be the case), the Third Gentleman himself, as Paulina's steward, could be in on the whole affair, spreading deliberate misinformation, helping to prepare the ground for Hermione's return. But if Hermione is not "really" a statue, just how long has she been standing ready in place as a statue in Paulina's gallery? At what stage in the proceedings do Paulina and Hermione manage to set up this situation, bearing in mind that Paulina's presence at the first reunion

is explicitly stated (5.2. 72-78)? Did she send someone on ahead to tell Hermione to assume her position? If so, it can hardly have been her Steward! Or is part of the purpose of the tour of the rest of her gallery that she takes the court party on (5.3. 9-18), to give her time to arrange matters appropriately? The problems/possibilities run on. Speculation is free - indeed, all that the play leaves us with; but it is such speculation, too, that is, in the end, the one really essentially pointless element here.

69. *Critical Practice*, p. 100; a further complicating element in the relationship of the audience to the events of the final scene is reflected in the fact that, as Belsey also observes here, 'no allusion to Hermione's resurrection is made by the oracle, which has been the reliable source of the audience's knowledge to this point'. It is this lack of allusion in the oracle - and the ease with which it could have been avoided - that particularly troubled Coleridge (see *Shakespearean Criticism*, I, 107).

70. Short of a blatant symbol like a severed head, or (possibly) an obviously mortal wound in combat, the death of a character generally *has* to be confirmed through words - and the presence of a body on stage does not necessarily serve to make matters any more certain. There are some useful comments on this subject in Cynthia Marshall, *Last Things and Last Plays*, pp. 38-60. Shakespeare's most conspicuous exploration of the ambiguities involved in "playing dead" is Falstaff's ("Sir John"'s) counterfeiting in *I Henry IV*, 5.4. *The Winter's Tale* rather seems to go out of its way to introduce or exploit potentially troublesome areas of representation - as well as this instance and the notable examples of the statue and the bear, one might mention Hermione's pregnancy, or the sequences involving the baby, its presence on stage at the same time as the bear in 3.3, the threats made to it in 2.3, and the stress Paulina places there on the family resemblance between such a mere prop and Leontes (ll. 96-108).

71. *The Winter's Tale*, p. 36. The reference to the burial and going to see the bodies need not have been introduced at all. To quote Orgel again, if Shakespeare 'had wanted to leave some question about Hermione's death, Leontes could easily have said nothing, or could have said that he could not bear to be confronted with the evidence of his crimes'. As things stand, however, it is hard to see any explanation at the level of the fiction that can get round this particular factor - unless one starts to posit some sort of (unmentioned and consequently totally "unauthorized" by the text) equivalent of the bed-trick or the mock-burials of earlier heroines.

72. I am thinking of such examples as Florizel's attempt to pass Perdita off as a princess of Libya in 5.1 (and indeed, much of what he says in this scene prior to the news of his father's arrival); or most of what Autolycus tells others about himself, not least in backing up his various disguises, and particularly during his initial cozening of the Clown in 4.3. Of course, performance choices can give an audience

specific cause to suspect that Paulina is or might be lying in 3.2 *even as she speaks*; but that is another matter. See further below.

73. This is to move into the territory of Howard Felperin's essay, "'Tongue-tied our queen?": the deconstruction of presence in *The Winter's Tale*', with its radical focus on the 'interpretive uncertainty' and 'linguistic indeterminacy' generated by the play (see especially p. 8). For a sense of the opposition and anxieties Felperin's study has provoked, see Kenneth C. Bennett, 'Reconstructing *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 46 (1993), 81-90; and Brian Vickers, *Appropriating Shakespeare: Contemporary Critical Quarrels* (New Haven and London, 1993), pp. 198-207. In an attempt to rebut Felperin's arguments, Bennett claims that the audience has 'no reason to disbelieve' the word of "neutral" characters and figures who are established for us as honest - that we accept what we are told unless given specific reason not to do so (pp. 84-85). But the example of Paulina's report (which Bennett simply glosses over, refuses to look into, argues that only 'the most perversely discerning' would want an explanation of (p. 85)) challenges this assumption head-on. This is a speech which ought to be (has to be) true, cannot be true, and yet is never said not to have been true. Indeed, in some respects, the text furnishes more reason to disbelieve Hermione's position than to question the validity of Paulina's report - the Queen's dialogue with Polixenes in 1.2, as Felperin in particular has stressed (pp. 8-10), is riddled with innuendo and possible *doubles entendres* that might easily arouse suspicion. This is, of course, *not* to imply that there is anything at all in Leontes's accusations - the oracle alone, within the terms of the play's fiction, is sufficient to guard against that possibility (and Bennett does get in some telling criticisms of Felperin's reading here (see pp. 83-84)). But whilst I see no reason to indulge in scepticism about the origin of the oracle or the reliability of its information, it does seem to me that we are meant to register the fact that the play is constructed in such a way (i.e., with a lack of soliloquy from either Hermione or Polixenes) that it *needs* the transcendental signifier of the oracle, with its 'pellucid prose' and 'plain-spoken and un-Delphic' style (Felperin, p. 6), to make the truth of the situation absolutely apparent.

74. *The Winter's Tale*, p. 153, note to ll. 15-6. For a recent exploration of this sequence in relation to the classifications of Renaissance dream theory, see David Ormerod, 'Antigonus's Dream' in *Shakespeare: Readers, Audiences, Players*, edited by R. S. White, Charles Edelman, and Christopher Wortham (Nedlands, Western Australia, 1998), pp. 248-259 (pp. 248-254). It is worth stressing, however, that it is not absolutely clear, even to Antigonus, whether what he is describing is actually a dream/hallucination, or a "real", external event.

75. On ghosts, visions, and apparitions in Shakespeare generally (though obviously without any comment on this example, given its status as a report), see Stanley Wells's two essays, 'Staging Shakespeare's Apparitions and Dream Visions', *The First Annual Shakespeare Globe*

Lecture (London, [1990]), and 'Staging Shakespeare's Ghosts', in Biggs and others, *The Arts of Performance*, pp. 50-69.

76. See, for example, Nuttall, p. 55, and Orgel's note on this passage, *The Winter's Tale*, pp. 153-154. For some alternative thoughts on the "living spirit" idea, compare the comments cited in Furness, *The Winter's Tale*, pp. 142-143. Against such arguments, all of which seem to me rather desperate, Ernest Schanzer claims, 'there is no precedent in Elizabethan drama for the spirit of a living person appearing to others either in dream or waking' (*The Winter's Tale*, p. 15). It is not an option considered by Antigonus.

77. Parallels for this description in Revelation are cited in Naseeb Shaheen, *Biblical References in Shakespeare's Plays* (Cranbury, NJ, 1999), p. 726; on other possible Biblical echoes and associations in Antigonus's speech, see J. H. P. Pafford, *The Winter's Tale*, p. 67, note to ll. 21-2. The image of a beatified Hermione ties in closely with the virtual cult of Hermione that seems to have developed by the time of 5.1. Any evocation of a Christian afterlife or saint here is at least complicated, however, by the overtly classical context (Antigonus refers specifically to the will of Apollo (l. 43)), and the figure's ghostly shriek on departing (ll. 35-36; and compare 5.1. 56-67). That is to say, the play, as usual, resists being pinned down to any one particular area of signification.

78. The Folio text lacks any directions for off-stage effects in this scene (which might also include halloos from the Clown - see ll. 74-78). The storm is predicted by the Mariner (ll. 2-6, 9-10), and its start specifically adverted to by Antigonus (l. 48; Oxford supplies a direction for 'thunder' at this point). The question as to whether 'a sound of dogs barking and hunting horns' should be heard as well is another matter (quoting from Orgel's bracketed stage direction, *The Winter's Tale*, p. 155, 3.3. 55a.1-2). Editors disagree (compare Orgel's commentary, note to l. 56, and Schanzer's argument, *The Winter's Tale*, p. 192); and there is so much going on here already, effects for a hunt might well be thought superfluous. Antigonus's own language (ll. 55-57) admits of different interpretations; but the Shepherd's comment, 'hark you now, would any but these boiled-brains of nineteen and two-and-twenty hunt this weather?' (ll. 62-64), sure sounds to me like an allusion to the noise of an off-stage hunt. The opening speech of the Shepherd, with its comic tone and mode of conspiratorial direct-address, is another element in the accumulation of techniques and conventions found in this sequence, and offers a notable contrast to Antigonus's (partly spoken to the baby, partly direct address) soliloquy. The ensuing dialogue of the Shepherd and the Clown (ll. 78-115) is itself a "virtuoso" exercise in report, interweaving the former's effort to relate his discovery with the latter's simultaneous descriptions, in competition with each other, of the shipwreck and the death of Antigonus. The bear and the sea-coast of Bohemia are of course the features in the scene that have received the most critical attention, frequently at the expense of the other effects on offer. For a survey of critical opinion in these areas, see Orgel's

edition, pp. 37-41, 153-156. The strangeness and experimentation of the dramaturgy in 3.3 carries over (though perhaps with an intervening act-break) into the extraordinary appearance of Time in 4.1.

79. See especially 3.2. 21-27, and also the Queen's exchange with Leontes in ll. 53-57; and compare too her earlier comments at 2.1. 109-114. Paulina's own attempt to confirm the particular truth of what she is saying by swearing to its veracity picks up on the dialogue at 1.1. 44-57, and is itself recalled (and problematized, recontextualized) just prior to the statue scene, through the discussion of the Shepherd and the Clown as to what they may or may not swear to now that they are "gentlemen born" (see 5.2. 125-170).

80. Warren, in a discussion comparing different performances of Paulina's report (*Staging Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 122-127), argues forcibly that Paulina must actually be consciously and deliberately lying here (and should be presented accordingly), that she is already putting into motion her plan for the rehabilitation of Leontes, in the full knowledge that 'Hermione is not in fact dead' (p. 124). Indeed, he goes so far as to claim that 'a Paulina who thinks Hermione dead and so pours out her grief is a much simpler character than one who knows that Hermione is alive and uses this knowledge to help Leontes to recover, initially by intensifying his agony' (p. 125). This may be so, but I fail to see what it has to do with Shakespeare. For me, such a comment exemplifies pretty much all that is wrong in current commentary on this sequence. Warren's valorization of complexity of characterization at this point is no more than a (disappointingly commonplace) reflection of modern theatrical biases and assumptions, and in a similar way, his whole discussion adheres to a realist aesthetic that is almost entirely irrelevant in this context, unsustainable on its own terms, and something that the play itself goes a long way towards subverting. This is not to say that there are not elements of exaggeration in Paulina's principal speech (ll. 174-201), language that can come across as, in Warren's word, 'overdone' (p. 123); and certainly, such language can distance the audience from what Paulina is saying, create uncertainty as to the truth-value and referentiality of her words. But the focus and import of all this is rhetorical and dramaturgical, not characterological. In other words, it operates within a general destabilization (discussed further below) of the realm of the off-stage world, a highlighting of the peculiar, under-represented nature of off-stage action, and of the conceptual issues and dramaturgical effects that arise from the manner of its treatment in the play. In this respect, the highly theatrical, even melodramatic, side to Paulina's remarks links in with certain aspects of the language of Antigonus's soliloquy in 3.3 and the conversation of the three gentlemen in 5.2. In both these other examples, there is a strongly gestural emphasis to the description of the reported scene, which again verges heavily towards the stagy and melodramatic, and introduces another layer of artifice, another complicating perspective, into the situation, presenting the off-stage ("unperformed") behaviour in terms of the vocabulary, tropes, and imagery of theatricality. On the

language of Paulina's speech, see further Anne Barton, 'Leontes and the spider: language and speaker in Shakespeare's last plays', pp. 170-171, and (especially) Russ McDonald, 'Poetry and Plot In *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 36 (1985), 315-329 (pp. 321-323); and on that of Antigonus's and the Gentlemen's reports, Bethell, '*The Winter's Tale*', pp. 62-64, and (although rather "Romance"-oriented) Carol Thomas Neely, '*The Winter's Tale: The Triumph of Speech*', *Studies in English Literature*, 15 (1975), 321-338 (pp. 333-335).

81. *Critical Practice*, p. 100. For Belsey, the effect of the statue scene and the discontinuities surrounding it is 'quite distinct from that of the improbable coincidences of the romance episodes' in the rest of the play. I would see any difference here more as a matter of degree than of kind, however; and it is clear, too, there are some serious problems with the notion of "classic realism" which Belsey uses as a touchstone in this discussion. It remains the case, though, that the statue sequence significantly disrupts the play's internal consistency, even at its most basic level of narrative realism, by requiring two mutually incompatible situations to have obtained.

82. *The Winter's Tale*, p. 36; and see also Orgel's footnote to this comment, along with his essay, 'Shakespeare Imagines a Theater', and my own discussion, drawing specifically on this earlier study, at the end of Chapter Four.

83. *Critical Practice*, p. 102. For further comment emphasizing the radically disjunctive, destabilizing nature of the statue scene and the events that surround it, see again William Morse, 'Metacriticism and Materiality: The Case of Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*'; and William Slights, 'Trusting Shakespeare's *Winter's Tale*: Metafiction in the Late Plays'; and also the editor's introduction in John J. Joughin, ed., *Philosophical Shakespeares* (London and New York, 2000), pp. 1-17 (p. 3). The effect of denying the audience a full account of all that has been going on is compounded in this case, in the closing lines, by the typical deferral of further explanations until after the play has finished (see 5.3. 152-156).

84. Again, I am not seeking to decry the power of the dramatic fiction or the appeal of its aesthetic structures. Nor do I find in the play's likening of its own action to that of an 'old tale' (5.3. 116-118) quite the 'contemptuous reference to fiction' which Belsey sees (*Critical Practice*, p. 101) - the tone at this point seems to me much more teasing, even (semi-)affectionate. On the other hand, I do feel that the end of the drama allows a lot more scope for "distance" than, say, Peter Erickson, for one, has suggested (*Patriarchal Structures in Shakespeare's Drama* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1985), pp. 148-172 (see especially pp. 168-170)). Aside from the play's self-reflexive experiments with dramatic and narrative form, I would draw attention in this connection to the games it can be seen to play with the *veritas filia temporis* motto, and even more crucially, to the resonances and particular (resurrection?) context of Paulina's 'it is required | You do awake your

faith' (5.3. 94-95). In this last respect, the play can of course seem to lend itself to specifically Christian readings (see again Bethell's work, or such studies as R. W. S. Mendl, *Revelation in Shakespeare* (London, 1964), pp. 195-200, and J. A. Bryant, Jr., *Hippolyta's View: Some Christian Aspects of Shakespeare's Plays* ([Lexington], KY, 1961), pp. 207-225). And indeed, my own emphasis might appear to lead rather in this direction. I would certainly claim that one of the main reasons why the idea of a sixteen-year seclusion has been so widely accepted as the definitive ("rational" and "realistic") explanation of what "happens" to Hermione is precisely because it gets away from any overt religious connotations or concerns. But for any Christian reading to be properly plausible or convincing here, it too would need to get to grips with the play's interrogative scepticism, "arealism", and thoroughgoing problematization of belief and plausibility. For some recent comment on the subjects of faith and religion in the play, and the implications of the final scene in this regard, see Walter S. H. Lim, 'Knowledge and Belief in *The Winter's Tale*', *Studies in English Literature*, 41 (2001), 317-334. And on questions of social and aesthetic expectations, hierarchy, and form, see Jennifer Richards, 'Social decorum in *The Winter's Tale*', in Richards and Knowles, pp. 75-91.

CHAPTER SIX

1. The omission at l. 55 covers only the half-line reaction from the King, 'thou speakest wonders', which in tone, meaning, and position in the dialogue corresponds interestingly with Cymbeline's interjection in response to the Soothsayer's interpretation of the prophetic label, 'this hath some seeming' (*Cymbeline*, 5.6. 454; see above, Chapter One). The presence of Henry's comment means that, strictly speaking, Cranmer actually has two speeches here, but I have tended to speak of these in the singular below, for the sake of convenience.

2. See again here Marjorie Garber, "'What's Past Is Prologue": Temporality and Prophecy in Shakespeare's History Plays', and my own comments above, pp. 49-52, 225-226.

3. A situation which in turn invests Cranmer's 'this' here with a certain self-referential, metadramatic dimension, since what the theatre audience "sees" as he is speaking is both the "this" of the on-stage moment of his prophecy, and the overall "this" of the play itself.

4. See generally the notes to this passage in R. A. Foakes, *King Henry VIII*, pp. 174-176; John Margeson, *King Henry VIII*, pp. 184-185; and Gordon McMullan, *King Henry VIII (All Is True)*, pp. 428-432, 438-440. On the particular Jacobean associations of the cedar and the language of peace, see above, p. 59; and on traditions of political prophecy in the period, see again Howard Dobin, *Merlin's Disciples*. For Biblical sources and analogues to Cranmer's prophecy, see too especially Naseeb Shaheen, *Biblical References in Shakespeare's History Plays* (Cranbury, NJ, 1989), pp. 213-215; and also R. W. S. Mendl, *Revelation in Shakespeare*, pp. 212-213; and G. K. Hunter, 'Shakespeare and the Church', in Mucciolo and others, *Shakespeare's Universe*, pp. 21-28 (pp. 21-22). The images of the flourishing cedar (ll. 52-54) and the vine as a symbol of peace and neighbourliness (ll. 33-35) are commonplaces of Old Testament thought. Aside from the obvious reference to the story of the Queen of Sheba (I Kings 10. 1-13, II Chronicles 9. 1-12), Biblical verses which Cranmer's words particularly echo or evoke include: Genesis 17. 1-8; I Kings 4. 25; II Kings 18. 31; Psalm 92. 12-13; Isaiah 65. 21-22; Ezekiel 17. 22-23, 31. 3-7; Micah 4. 1-5; Zechariah 3. 10; and also I Maccabees 14. 11-12; and see further below.

5. Biblical prophecies which emphasize a special birth, the hopes of a new generation, and/or images of heaven on earth, include: Psalm 72; Isaiah 2. 2-4, 7. 14, 9. 2-7, and 11. 1-9; Ezekiel 37. 24-27; Amos 9. 13-15; and Micah 5. 2. Whilst there is little in the way of direct verbal echoes

of any of these passages, Cranmer's vision is clearly modelled along Messianic and Millennialist lines - though as McMullan notes (*Henry VIII*, p. 440), there are no obvious references in all this to Revelation. The Biblical feel of Cranmer's language is actually pervasive, and extends, for me, into areas not generally noted. Thus 'children's children' is a phrase with strong Biblical associations (see, for example, Genesis 45. 10, Exodus 34. 7, Psalm 103. 17); the image of the vine, particularly in l. 49, is suggestive of John 15; the spreading branches of ll. 53-54, given the strongly Messianic context, are a little reminiscent of the image of the branch of David/Jesse or branch of the Lord (as in Isaiah 4. 2, 11. 1; Jeremiah 23. 5-6; Zechariah 6. 12); and James's 'star-like rise' seems to offer an echo of Balaam's fourth oracle (Numbers 24. 17), as well as being broadly redolent of the nativity of Jesus (Matthew 2. 1-12).

6. The Virgilian context for Cranmer's speech, and the Messianic aspects of his language in general, are particularly stressed by Wilson Knight; see *The Crown of Life*, p. 331; and especially *The Olive and the Sword*, pp. 69-85. Virgil's poem was apparently written to celebrate the marriage of Antony and Octavia, but with its reference to a virgin, vision of a renewed golden age, and emphasis on the figure of a child, and the resemblance of its pastoral imagery to the language of the Old Testament prophets, it was easily appropriated by early Christian interpreters such as Lactantius and Augustine for its supposed Messianic and Millennial significances. See Virgil, *The Eclogues*, edited and translated by Guy Lee, revised edition, Penguin Classics (Harmondsworth, 1984; reprinted 1987), pp. 55-59, 114-116; the tradition of Christian interpretation of the poem is also usefully discussed in Frances Yates, *Astraea*, pp. 3-4, 34-38.

7. For the relevant passages in these works, see *Metamorphoses*, I. 89-150, and ll. 4-10 especially of Virgil's poem; and on the place of Astraea in the representation/self-presentation of Elizabeth, the religious (and imperialist) implications of this depiction, and the significance of Ovid's and Virgil's texts to this whole symbolic network, see generally Yates, *Astraea*, and particularly the essay, 'Queen Elizabeth I as Astraea' (pp. 29-34). For an example of this imagery in operation, see Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, V. 1. 11, and also the Proem to this same book. In view of the Jacobean dimensions of Cranmer's speech, Virgil's "prophetic" evocation of an Augustan golden age in *Aeneid*, Book 6 (ll. 788-807) seems another relevant analogue.

8. This is such an obvious feature that it has been perhaps rather downplayed in recent work, as criticism has sought to emphasize the Jacobean contexts of Cranmer's speech, and its complimentary force in relation to the Queen's namesake, James's daughter (see below). Earlier critics, such as Dr Johnson, tended to assume composition in Elizabeth's reign, with later (makeshift) adaptation to incorporate the tribute to James. This, of course, was before the late date of the play became firmly established. See the comments in F. J. Furnivall, 'Another Fresh Confirmation'; Johnson's remarks, in a note from his 1765 edition (V, 490), are reprinted in *Johnson on Shakespeare*, VIII, 657.

9. A point made by Alexander Leggatt, who notes that 'the cult of Elizabeth in her lifetime took many forms, and one of them was the custom of ending plays with a tribute to the Queen, often in terms quite similar to those Cranmer uses here' ('Henry VIII and the Ideal England', *Shakespeare Survey*, 38 (1985), 131-143 (p. 131)). Leggatt cites examples which include *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune* (1582), Peele's *The Arraignment of Paris* (c.1581-1584), Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (c.1589-1592), and the original ending of Jonson's *Every Man out of his Humour* (1599); and see too on this topic, Barbara Hodgdon, *The End Crowns All*, pp. 212-234.

10. As a paradigm of rarity and excellence, possessing the power of self-replication, the phoenix was a standard figure for monarchy and royal succession in general, as well, of course, as having a particularly prominent position in the symbolism and iconography of Queen Elizabeth. In terms of the Shakespeare canon, the image of the 'maiden phoenix' connects most obviously to *The Phoenix and the Turtle*, and there is a useful discussion of the whole phoenix myth and the way it was utilized in classical, medieval, and Renaissance literature and culture in Richard Allan Underwood, *Shakespeare's 'The Phoenix and Turtle': A Survey of Scholarship* (Salzburg, 1974), pp. 303-317; see too William H. Matchett, 'The Phoenix and the Turtle': *Shakespeare's Poem and Chester's 'Loues Martyr'* (The Hague, 1965), pp. 17-32; and, for a typically emotive response to this line of imagery, G. Wilson Knight, *The Mutual Flame: on Shakespeare's 'Sonnets' and 'The Phoenix and the Turtle'* (London, 1955), especially pp. 196-198. On the association of the phoenix with Christ, see above, Chapter One, note 89; and with this overlap of imagery with *Cymbeline* in mind, see also here (up to a point) Rowena Davies, "'Alone th'Arabian Bird" - Imogen as Elizabeth I?', *Notes and Queries*, 224 (1979), 137-140. Matchett (p. 22) finds a 'comparative absence of the religious use of the phoenix' in the period, but see McMullan's note, *Henry VIII*, p. 439. On the conscious exploitation of the cult of the Virgin Mary in Elizabethan political image-making and the development and promulgation of the concept of the "Virgin Queen", see, for example, Roy Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth*, pp. 14-16, 117-128; and for some recent comment in relation to the play and Cranmer's speech, Ruth Vanita, 'Mariological Memory in *The Winter's Tale* and *Henry VIII*', *Studies in English Literature*, 40 (2000), 311-337.

11. For a description of the Princess's wedding and a survey of the occasional literature and dramatic entertainments which it inspired, see Peter Francis Corbin, 'A Death and a Marriage: An Examination of the Literature Occasioned by the Death of Henry Prince of Wales and the Marriage of his Sister Princess Elizabeth, 1612-13' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham, 1966); and on the play's relationship to this event, and to the general political background around this time, see especially Foakes, *Henry VIII*, pp. xxx-xxxv; Frances Yates, *Shakespeare's Last Plays*, pp. 15-37, 63-84; and David Bergeron, *Shakespeare's Romances and the Royal Family*, pp. 203-222. A notable depiction of the Princess as a phoenix is provided by Donne's Epithalamion for the occasion (see *The*

Complete English Poems of John Donne, edited by C. A. Patrides (London, 1985), pp. 192-197). Peter Rudnytsky makes the point ('*Henry VIII and the Deconstruction of History*', p. 55) that the connections between the dead Queen and Princess Elizabeth extended as well to their both being the daughter of a Queen Anne - a factor which perhaps complicates the overlapping context of praise here a little.

12. *Henry VIII*, p. xxxiii. Most importantly, Foakes reveals how the Biblical imagery Cranmer exploits, and some of the specific verses from Genesis 17 that he echoes (see above, note 4), received a prominent emphasis in sermons associated with the marriage. More tentatively, he also suggests (p. xxxii) a deliberate reminiscence of the ritual of the ceremony itself in the formal proclamation spoken by Garter King of Arms at the start of the christening scene (5.4.1-3). Links between Cranmer's prophecy and contemporary sermons and homilies in general are noted in Shaheen, *Biblical References in Shakespeare's History Plays*, pp. 213-214; and see too Bernard Harris, "'What's past is prologue": *Cymbeline and Henry VIII*', pp. 231-233.

13. Besides Foakes's work, see particularly Bullough, *Sources*, IV, 436-437; and Alvin Kernan, *Shakespeare, the King's Playwright*, pp. xix-xx, 152-156. Further back in the critical debate, James Spedding found in the idea of hurried composition in time for the wedding celebrations, the degree of contingency he needed to account for how divided authorship could have come about ('Shares', pp. 16*-17*). The fact that *Henry VIII* is not listed amongst the plays the King's Men were paid for performing at this time (see above, Chapter Two, note 147; Chapter Three, note 30) is very strong evidence that it did not form part of the celebrations at Court. Foakes's attempt to link it (*Henry VIII*, p. xxxiv) to a play that was due to be performed but then cancelled is mere desperation. Julia Gasper provides an especially forthright dismissal of the wedding-link theory (in a review of Fredson Bowers's edition, *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 45 (1994), 108-110); but whilst the nature of the play, for me, effectively precludes its having been written *in order* to celebrate the Princess's marriage, it is perhaps best not to follow Gasper too far in stressing its unsuitability for performance in a season that did manage to include *Othello* and *The Maid's Tragedy* (see Stephen Orgel, *The Tempest*, p. 2).

14. Other elements in the play with strong "Romance" associations include Katherine's vision in 4.2, the use of music in general (the dance of the masquers in 1.4, the song in 3.1, the singing choristers of the coronation procession in 4.1 (TLN 2424)), or, in the terminology of Wilson Knight, its "tempest" imagery (see *The Shakespearian Tempest*, pp. 241-246). For criticism treating *Henry VIII* in the context of the "Romances", see above, Chapter Two, note 42; and for individual "Romance" readings of the play, and further comment on the question of genre, see below.

15. Probably the most insightful example of this sort of reading is John D. Cox's essay, '*Henry VIII and the Masque*', *ELH*, 45 (1978), 390-409; and see too the comments in McMullan, *Henry VIII*, pp. 108-110. For

a more typical (more simplistic) approach to this aspect of the play's form, see Ralph Berry's chapter in *Shakespeare and the Awareness of the Audience*, pp. 128-141.

16. On the *de casibus* structure of the play (with the important influences of *The Mirror for Magistrates* and the motif of the Wheel of Fortune) and Cranmer's 'arrested fall', see particularly Frank Kermode, 'What is Shakespeare's *Henry VIII* About?', *Durham University Journal*, n.s. 9 (1947-48), 48-55 (p. 53). The Providential perspective that emerges here, with its strong Reformation context, obviously connects closely to the main source for the play's final act, Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* (or more formally: John Foxe, *Actes and Monuments of these latter and perillous dayes* (London, 1563; *STC* 11222), with many subsequent editions, the last prior to the probable date of the play (the sixth edition) entitled, *Actes and Monuments of Matters most speciall and memorable*, 2 vols (London, 1610; *STC* 11227)).

17. Quoting from Paul Bertram, *Shakespeare and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, p. 163; and see generally pp. 159-176; Bertram's ideas in this area are first expressed in 'Henry VIII: The Conscience of the King', in *In Defense of Reading*, edited by Reuben A. Brower and Richard Poirier (New York, 1962), pp. 153-173. Wilson Knight offers, if anything, an even more idealized reading of Henry; see *The Crown of Life*, pp. 256-336, and also his earlier essay, 'A Note on Henry VIII', *Criterion*, 15 (1935-36), 228-236. And see besides, for broadly related views from amongst a welter of criticism, Herbert Howarth, 'An old man looking at life: Henry VIII and the late plays'; S. C. Sen Gupta, *Shakespeare's Historical Plays* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 151-167; Peter Saccio, *Shakespeare's English Kings* (London and New York, 1977), pp. 209-228; Eckhard Auberlen, 'King Henry VIII - Shakespeare's Break with the "Bluff-King-Harry" Tradition', *Anglia*, 98 (1980), 319-347; and John Loftis, 'Henry VIII and Calderón's *La cisma de Inglaterra*', *Comparative Literature*, 34 (1982), 208-222 (re-worked in *Renaissance Drama in England & Spain* (Princeton, NJ, 1987), pp. 3-30). The ongoing influence of this line of approach is evinced by Jay Halio's recent edition, *King Henry VIII, or All is True*, pp. 35-38.

18. 'Henry VIII and the Deconstruction of History', p. 53; and for the development of his argument, see generally pp. 53-54 (material I draw on below). Where the specifics of "future" history are concerned, Cranmer's speech is actually a little lacking in details, but the kind of information that is "confirmed" by the course of events includes the long life and virgin/unmarried status of Elizabeth, the implied triumph of the Protestant Reformation, and her succession by a male heir who is not her son (though James himself remains decorously unnamed). Even such a seemingly conventional idea as 'all the world shall mourn her' ties in comfortably enough with the nature of the Queen's elaborate funeral and the general eulogistic outpouring of grief at the time of her death (see Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth*, pp. 14-15).

19. Cranmer was burnt at the stake as a heretic on 21 March 1556, during the persecutions of Mary I. For a detailed consideration

of the events leading up to his death, including his recantation and recanted recantation, see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven and London, 1996), pp. 554-605.

20. 'Henry VIII and the Ideal England', p. 141; and see also here Rudnytsky, pp. 54-55.

21. On the possibilities for playing this passage, the question of whether Gardiner has pointedly refrained from embracing the Archbishop earlier (see ll. 192-193), or whether Henry makes the two of them embrace twice, see McMullan, *Henry VIII*, p. 418, note to ll. 204-5. The Bishop of Winchester's 'cruel nature' (l. 163), enmity to Cranmer, and opposition to the Reformation are major features of Foxe's narrative of the period, and Gardiner was a familiar figure in the theatre as 'a scheming villain in play after play' (Margot Heinemann, 'Political drama', in Braunmuller and Hattaway, *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, pp. 161-205 (p. 196)). For a consideration of his life and career, see Glyn Redworth, *In Defence of the Church Catholic: The Life of Stephen Gardiner* (Oxford, 1990).

22. Cromwell's death (along with Cranmer's and Anne Boleyn's) is also evoked (indeed, specifically hoped for) by Gardiner at 5.1. 26-32. The ironic import of Wolsey's and Gardiner's comments is perhaps added to by Cromwell's eventual role in the downfalls of both Anne and Sir Thomas More (on whom, see below); see John Guy, *Tudor England* (Oxford, 1988; reprinted 1990), pp. 138-143.

23. More is such a peripheral presence in the play that it is hard to see much point in these lines other than for the sense of foreboding they introduce, and as a potentially problematizing example of political prediction/prophecy. Certainly, they do not seem to serve any real role in terms of characterization, even though, in theory, More ought to be the Lord Chancellor who appears later on in the play, in the coronation procession (TLN 2423) and, more significantly, the council scene. But whilst nothing is ever said to indicate More's loss of his position, the personal identity of this character is never specified, and historically speaking, More was already dead by the time of both these events. I assume, contrary to some editors, that the Lord Chancellor of 5.2 is not supposed to be More; and one might take the implied suggestion that he isn't as another (albeit hardly especially prominent) reminder of More's fate. See further below.

24. The effect here is compounded visually by the context of the execution procession in which the speaker is involved, with Buckingham entering 'from his Arraignment, Tipstaves before him, the Axe with the edge towards him, Halberds on each side' (TLN 889-891). This sequence also follows on closely, moreover, from Henry's initial encounter with Anne in the scene before (1.4).

25. And compare Gardiner's dialogue with Sir Thomas Lovell at 5.1. 16-32 (see above, note 22). The last lines just quoted here link back directly to some of Anne's words in 2.3 on the subject of royal

pomp, another passage suggestive of an association between beheading and divorce: 'Yet if that quarrel, fortune, do divorce | It from the bearer, 'tis a sufferance panging | As soul and bodies severing' (ll. 14-16; Oxford follows the punctuation of the Second Folio in l. 14 (see *Companion*, p. 620); in l. 16, many editors emend/modernize 'bodies' to "body's", which seems more appropriate to me (for the First Folio text, see TLN 1217-1219)).

26. This entire sequence, as is well recognized, is stuffed full with sexual innuendo, which reflects tellingly on the King's high-minded protestations about his pricking conscience (see below), but also seems to point forward to the sexual scandals/accusations that surrounded Anne's own downfall (see J. J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII*, new edition (New Haven and London, 1997), pp. 348-350; and for detailed considerations of Anne's final months, E. W. Ives, *Anne Boleyn* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 333-418, and, more provocatively, Retha M. Warnicke, *The Rise and Fall of Anne Boleyn* (Cambridge, 1989; reprinted 2000), pp. 191-233). The "queen"/"quean" wordplay in the first quotation here carries a particularly heavy irony in this respect (and see Juliet Dusinberre, *Shakespeare and the Nature of Women* (London and Basingstoke, 1975), p. 59).

27. And a passage which, in McMullan's words, 'would provide a particularly strong sense of irony for the audience, who would be well acquainted with the details of the reign of "Bloody Mary"' (*Henry VIII*, p. 385, note to l. 136).

28. On the absence of any authority in Holinshed for Anne's dangerous labour, see A. R. Humphreys, *King Henry the Eighth*, p. 251, note to l. 69; and compare the relevant note in McMullan's edition, p. 393 (though I would see the effect as more allusion or echo than mere 'displacement').

29. As most editors agree, there seems no reason to doubt that the 'Olde Lady' who enters at TLN 2961 is meant to be the same figure that accompanies Anne in 2.3, even though the Folio speech prefixes in the 5.1 sequence refer to her only as "Lady". Certainly, tone, attitude, and financial shrewdness all reflect a similar characterization.

30. Not necessarily specifically in terms of the birth of Elizabeth as such, but very definitely in the eventual unfulfilment of the 'promise' which the Old Lady asserts. Or rather, in its particularly unfortunate misfulfilment. On 29 January 1536 (or thereabouts), Anne miscarried a foetus that was confidently identified as a male, and may have been deformed. If this was not absolutely the final straw for Henry (contrast Ives, p. 343, and Warnicke, p. 191), it certainly helped provide the impetus used to bring about her fall. In any case, whatever the precise details relating to events where the available historical testimony is so propagandistic, "everyone knows" that Anne's "failure" (in Henry's terms) to bear a son and heir was just as significant for her own fate as was Katherine's. The Old Lady's attempt at prophecy is most spectacularly inaccurate.

31. Along with her sister, Mary, in the Second Act of Succession (1536); their legitimacy was only tacitly reasserted by their restoration to the line to the throne in the Third Act of Succession (1544). See Guy, pp. 142, 196; Barbara Kreps, 'When All is True: Law, History and Problems of Knowledge in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 52 (1999), 166-182 (pp. 169-171); and, more generally, Leah S. Marcus, 'Erasing the Stigma of Daughterhood: Mary I, Elizabeth I, and Henry VIII', in *Daughters and Fathers*, edited by Lynda E. Boose and Betty S. Flowers (Baltimore and London, 1989), pp. 400-417. Elizabeth and Mary were again officially bastardized during the reign of Edward VI, in letters patent issued on 21 June 1553 (Guy, p. 226).

32. On Henry's final will, its aims, legal validity, authenticity, and implications for the succession in later reigns, see especially Mortimer Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question, 1558-1568* (Stanford, CA, 1966), pp. 147-164; and also Scarisbrick, pp. 488-495; Guy, pp. 198-199; and Leonard Tennenhouse, *Power on Display*, pp. 75-76; there is some comment on its relevance to the play's events at this point in Kim H. Noling, 'Grubbing Up the Stock: Dramatizing Queens in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 39 (1988), 291-306 (p. 305, note 31); and see further below (note 34). Edward VI actually attempted to bypass both his sisters in favour of Jane Grey (whose short-lived reign is of course another episode missing from Cranmer's future history), but his death intervened before his 'Device for the Succession' could be ratified by Parliament (Guy, p. 226).

33. Most obviously in respect of the transition from Elizabeth to James, which in Cranmer's narrative becomes entirely straightforward, and suggests almost a new parentage for James in Elizabeth (thus also conveniently removing from the story James's own parents and another troubled history; see Noling, p. 305; and Orgel, *The Tempest*, pp. 37-39). But relevant again in this context is the Grey line, and its continuing role, through Jane's sister, Catherine, in the succession question during the early years of Elizabeth's reign (see generally Levine). This family continued, moreover, to pose a threat to the established succession even up to the time of the play, with the marriage in 1610 of James's cousin, Arbella Stuart (who had her own claim to the throne) to the heir to the Suffolk line, William Seymour. For a succinct summary of Arbella's story, see Kernan, *Shakespeare, the King's Playwright*, pp. 150-152; and for a particularly valuable discussion of Tudor and Jacobean succession issues and their relation to the play and Cranmer's speech, Ivo Kamps, *Historiography and Ideology in Stuart Drama*, pp. 122-137.

34. Which might seem to indicate that in this area, at least, the mystification of historical reality to fit in with a Jacobean agenda is part of the overall project of the play. This is certainly the view of Noling (see pp. 304-306), who stresses the extent to which Cranmer's prophecy (and Henry's response) presents a history that accords with the will of James, authorizing his place as true heir to both Elizabeth and Henry by suppressing precisely all the issues and anxieties of descent, gender,

or approval that might threaten to cloud that position in any way. But the difficulties of sustaining this monolithic perspective are reflected in Noling's own comments on the behaviour of the Old Lady in 5.1, which is supposed to cast an 'ironic light' on 'Cranmer's, and Shakespeare's, grander attempt to mythically transform Queen Elizabeth into King James' (p. 305). Who, though, is responsible for such an ironic juxtaposition (in what is a single-author approach to the play) if not Shakespeare?

35. A point made particularly forcefully by Rudnytsky (pp. 56-57). For a reading of the play's action as overshadowed in general by the death of the Prince (though he specifically excludes the final scene from the force of this influence), see Frederick O. Waage, Jr., 'Henry VIII and the Crisis of the English History Play', *Shakespeare Studies*, 8 (1975), 297-309.

36. The "presence" of the Prince is perhaps further evoked here too in the way the imperialist-colonialist aspects of these lines (including in this context the reference to 'new nations', with its suggestion of the Virginia settlement) seem to connect more to his particular concerns and policies than to his father's; and see McMullan, *Henry VIII*, pp. 63-80, and 'Shakespeare and the End of History', pp. 30-34. From another angle, the idea of 'new nations' also points to James's project of British Union, and so brings an additional (and again, not wholly untroubled) connection to *Cymbeline*.

37. See Corbin, who identifies nine particular funerary elegies to employ this comparison (pp. 56-57). There is always the possibility, of course, that the play was already in composition (and perhaps even, though this really does seem unlikely, fully composed) by the time of the Prince's death (see McMullan, *Henry VIII*, pp. 78-79); but the wedding and the Globe fire all confirm its original performance context as early-to-mid (and more mid than early) 1613.

38. And see generally ll. 183-193; Henry's word, 'aired', actively introduces the idea of the loss of royal heirs, even though he is talking about children who have hardly lived long enough actually to make it to that status. For the grim details of this family history, see Scarisbrick, pp. 149-150.

39. 'Henry VIII and the Ideal England', p. 131.

40. Whether, in the terms of this play, an appeal to "truth" is the most convincing way of deflecting potential criticism is another matter. I address the questions surrounding the play's wide-ranging exploration of truth - and its alternative title, *All Is True* - in the next section. One might just note here, though, as a sign of the complexity of its associations, the prominence of the idea of truth in Wolsey's comments on More and Cromwell quoted above.

41. A number of critics have drawn attention to this aspect of the Archbishop's speech (see, for example, Stuart Kurland, 'Henry VIII and James I: Shakespeare and Jacobean Politics', p. 214); and compare too in this connection the discussion of the play in relation to Renaissance

traditions of panegyric and the realm of epideictic rhetoric in Joanne Altieri, *The Theatre of Praise: The Panegyric Tradition in Seventeenth-Century English Drama* (Cranbury, NJ, 1986), pp. 60-73.

42. Cranmer's surprising intrusion of 'terror' at the end of his list of the monarchical virtues ('servants') transferred from Elizabeth to James has provoked strangely little comment from editors; none of the main modern editions offers a gloss. One assumes, obviously, that the Archbishop himself is talking in terms of a god-like fear and awe, 'the action or quality of causing dread; terrific quality, terribleness' (*OED*, XVII, 820, "terror" (noun), sense 2a); but other, darker associations were available in the period (not least, as *OED*'s citations show (senses 1 and 3), a particular Biblical association with death).

43. *Henry VIII*, p. 427, headnote to 5.4.

44. Most of the main proponents of sole Shakespearian authorship (Bertram, Wilson Knight, Foakes, Peter Alexander (*Shakespeare's Life and Art*, pp. 216-221)) offer the kind of interpretation referred to here (and see above, Chapter Three, note 63). It is probably fair to say that the second tactic described is partly a reflection of the desire of many critics to get away from the authorship question, with its often tedious technicalities, in their commentary on *Henry VIII*. But more antagonistic responses to the play's (which in such cases tends very specifically to mean Shakespeare's) politics often make use of this latter approach too; see the comments from Noling cited above, note 34.

45. 'Who Wrote Shakspeare's Henry VIII.?', p. 198. For Oxford's text of this poem, which I quote from below, see p. 887; and compare *Companion*, p. 459, and my own comments above, Chapter Two, note 125. Hickson acknowledges that he has encountered the verse concerned only in John Payne Collier's edition of Shakespeare, and he appears to have been unaware of its original source/context. He quotes it in a debased textual tradition, a fact that Spedding clearly enjoyed pointing out (as a response to the reprint of Hickson's essay in the 1874 *Transactions of the NSS*, p. 20*).

46. Oxford, p. 1343, remarks supplied by Stanley Wells.

47. On the relevance of James's literary publications and projects to his theories of monarchy, see above, Chapter One, note 109. Read against the background of the King's interests and policies, 'Upon the King' becomes effectively a statement of Divine Right.

48. 'Shares', pp. 2*-3*; and see also the following two paragraphs (pp. 3*-4*), which extend the list of complaints against the final act. The last sentence quoted resonates particularly interestingly in the light of McMullan's argument that the David and Bathsheba story stands as an implicit paradigm in the play's depiction of the King (see *Henry VIII*, pp. 88-93). Spedding's criticisms here form the bedrock of much of the later authorship debate, and they underlie, too, the extremely negative attitude to *Henry VIII* that was so common during the twentieth century (for one typical reflection of this broader influence, see A. A. Parker,

'Henry VIII in Shakespeare and Calderón: An Appreciation of *La Cisma de Ingalaterra*', *Modern Language Review*, 43 (1948), 327-352).

49. For this aspect of the play's performance history, and its influence on the critical tradition, see especially Iska Alter, "'To Reform and Make Fitt": *Henry VIII* and the Making of "Bad" Shakespeare'; and also the discussion in Arthur Colby Sprague, *Shakespeare's Histories: Plays for the Stage* (London, 1964), pp. 142-160. First published in 1850, Spedding's work pre-dates the great explosion of "archaeological" realism in performances during the second half of the nineteenth century, but both the situations mentioned here were already long established by the time of the essay's first appearance, not least through the productions of John Philip Kemble, and his partnership with his sister, Sarah Siddons (see McMullan, *Henry VIII*, pp. 26-31; Margeson, pp. 48-52).

50. Spedding is hardly unique in this. Political concerns and allusions have often been regarded by Shakespearians along the same lines as theatrical spectacle (see above, Chapter Four, note 98) - the greater their presence, the worse the writer, the less, the better (or best - Shakespeare!). There is an explicit manifestation of this position in the *NSS Transactions* for 1874, in responses to the work of Richard Simpson (discussed above, Chapter Three, note 79); see the comments by J. W. Hales, pp. 509-511, remarks that reflect the kind of atmosphere Spedding's work was being accepted into by the time of its reprinting.

51. In terms, that is, *both* of a division in authorial labour, and of a play internally divided against itself (through contingency, forced changes of plan, etc., and of course, in this reading, simply by dint of being collaborative). I do not want to pursue the question of the authorship of 5.4 in any detail here, other than to make my familiar point that the biases evident in Spedding's and Hickson's views on this scene, especially in conjunction with Hodgdon's valuable comments on its versification (see above, Chapter Three, note 131), call into question at least aspects of the validity of the 'attributional methods' that McMullan so confidently invokes. It is also worth mentioning that whereas the Shakespeare canon yields one or two reasonable parallels to Cranmer's vision (the prophetic label, the final speeches of *Richard III* and *King John* (whatever one makes of them), even the lines on Windsor Castle in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (5.5. 54-75)), the "Beaumont-and-Fletcher" canon seems to offer only parody (see McMullan, *Henry VIII*, p. 430, note to ll. 33-5, citing a passage from *Beggars' Bush*).

52. See generally, for example, the comments in J. C. Maxwell, *King Henry the Eighth*, pp. xxxi-xxxvii; Norman Rabkin, *Shakespeare and the Common Understanding*, pp. 230-231; Ralph Berry, *Shakespeare and the Awareness of the Audience*, p. 128; and on the supposed non-evocation of future events, Humphreys, pp. 12-15; and Howard Felperin, 'Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*: History as Myth', *Studies in English Literature*, 6 (1966), 225-246 (pp. 245-246). As Rudnytsky observes (pp. 44-45), this kind of attitude is central to the familiar generic manoeuvres of approaching the play in terms of romance or masque celebration (see further below).

53. *Shakespearean Criticism*, I, 214 (a description that comes from his 1819 attempt at a chronology of the canon); "patriotic" and "pageant" are words that regularly turn up in this context, too. For a range of readings along these lines, see S. Schoenbaum, *The Famous History of the Life of King Henry the Eighth*; Hardin Craig, *An Interpretation of Shakespeare* (New York, 1948), pp. 357-372; Irving Ribner, *The English History Play in the age of Shakespeare*, pp. 287-290; John Wasson, 'In Defense of *King Henry VIII*', *Research Studies*, 32 (1964), 261-276; Anne Shaver, 'Structure and Ceremony: A Case for Unity in *King Henry VIII*', *Selected Papers from the West Virginia Shakespeare and Renaissance Association*, 1, no. 2 (Spring 1977), 1-23; Larry S. Champion, *Perspective in Shakespeare's English Histories* (Athens, GA, 1980), pp. 166-184; and J. Madison Davis, 'The Problems of *Henry VIII*: History and National Pageant in the Tragicomic Mode'. On the strong tradition of propaganda and national celebration in performances of the play, see especially McMullan, *Henry VIII*, pp. 40-43, 438-439.

54. In views that achieve their most extreme expression in his now rightly notorious comments in Cecil Woolf and Jean Moorcroft Wilson, eds., *Authors take sides on the Falklands* (London, 1982), pp. 66-67; see Terence Hawkes, 'Swisser-Swatter: making a man of English letters', in Drakakis, *Alternative Shakespeares*, pp. 26-46 (pp. 43-44).

55. See again above, Chapter Two, note 42, and for Knight's own position on genre and terminology, Chapter Two, note 9; Foakes's edition provides probably the most influential expression of the "Romance" model of reading; and see below, note 70.

56. 'The Wheel of Fortune and the Maiden Phoenix of Shakespeare's *King Henry the Eighth*', *ELH*, 42 (1975), 1-25.

57. See Frank V. Cespedes, "'We are one in fortunes": The Sense of History in *Henry VIII*', *English Literary Renaissance*, 10 (1980), 413-438; and Judith H. Anderson, 'Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*: The Changing Relation of Truth to Fiction', in *Biographical Truth: The Representation of Historical Persons in Tudor-Stuart Writing* (New Haven and London, 1984), pp. 125-154. Between them, Bliss, Anderson, and Cespedes draw attention to many of the factors I have emphasized in the first part of this chapter. Egotism demands that one claim to have arrived at at least some of the ideas concerned independently. But my debts to the work of these three critics are far too many to list in full.

58. And coming in the wake, of course, of Oxford's unambiguous championing of this title. See especially here: Kreps; Annabel Patterson, "'All Is True": Negotiating the Past in *Henry VIII*', in Parker and Zitner, *Elizabethan Theater*, pp. 147-166; Anston Bosman, 'Seeing Tears: Truth and Sense in *All is True*'; and Thomas Healy, 'History and judgement in *Henry VIII*', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 158-175.

59. The Folio title quoted here is the head-title on the opening page of the text of the play (*Norton Facsimile*, p. 559); the Catalogue of

contents and the running-title both give the shorter form, 'The Life of King Henry the Eight' (*Norton Facsimile*, pp. 13, 560-586). The entry for the Folio in the Stationers' Register (8 November 1623) refers simply to 'Henry the eight' (reproduced in S. Schoenbaum, *William Shakespeare: Records and Images*, p. 221).

60. For the provenance of Bluett's and Wotton's comments, see above, Chapter Two, note 107, and Chapter Four, note 110, respectively. Matthew Page records the fire in an almanac entry for the relevant day (29 June), noting that 'they played All is true'; see H. R. Woudhuysen, 'King Henry VIII and "All Is True"', *Notes and Queries*, 229 (1984), 217-218. An additional reference to this title is apparently embodied in the surviving seventeenth-century ballad about the fire, with its refrain, 'Oh sorrow pittifull sorrow, and yett all this is true'; the authenticity of this ballad is confirmed in Peter Beal, 'The burning of the Globe', *TLS*, 20 June 1986, pp. 689-690; it was first printed in "Eu. Hood" [Joseph Haslewood], 'Of the London Theatres. - No. VIII', *Gentleman's Magazine*, 86, no. 1 (January-June 1816), 113-115; and see too Foakes, *Henry VIII*, pp. 181-183. The relevant original texts/documents for all four of these witnesses are reproduced in *Companion*, pp. 29-30. Internal evidence suggesting the appropriateness of *All Is True* as a title is furnished especially, of course, by the emphasis on truth in the play's Prologue; see further below.

61. Lorkin mentions the fire in a letter to Sir Thomas Puckering, dated 30 June 1613; the relevant section of this is transcribed in Foakes, *Henry VIII*, pp. 179-180; Howes's comment comes from his continuation 'vnto the ende of this present yeere 1614' of John Stow's *The Annales, or Generall Chronicle of England* (London, 1615), p. 926.

62. For Oxford's arguments, see again Stanley Wells's comments, p. 1343, and *Companion*, p. 28 (the latter forming part of Gary Taylor's 'General Introduction'). Wells and Taylor reaffirm their position in 'The Oxford Shakespeare Re-Viewed by the General Editors', *AEB*, n.s. 4 (1990), 6-20. In essence, their case for re-titling, as Taylor frames it (prefaced by the dubious claim that all the witnesses to the fire agree on this matter), is that 'the play being performed was called "All Is True" and was about "The Life of King Henry the Eight"'; but whilst the "of" of both Howes and Lorkin could simply mean "about", it need not do so, and might be intended to introduce what they regard as the actual title. In any case, the early references combine to suggest an interchangeability from the outset in the way in which the play was referred to.

63. A potential parallel for its use as a subtitle, which may at least give a hint of how the *All Is True* title came to be regarded, is provided by John Ford's late, great history play, *Perkin Warbeck* (1633), which carries the subtitle, *A Strange Truth*. This may well reflect a deliberate allusion, since Ford's Prologue, with its strong emphasis on truth, contains to my mind some very clear echoes of the Prologue to *Henry VIII*. I have used the edition of Ford's play by Peter Ure, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1968); see pp. 2, 11-12.

64. Cespedes (p. 417) makes a similar point. There is no reason to assume any particular authorial warrant for the precise form of the Folio title (or its shorter version); but the unique (for the Folio) use of "famous" is perhaps a good reason not to dismiss it too lightly. It is also a little ironic, in view of modern critical practices, that this is the only individual title in the volume to use the word "history", too.

65. See above, Chapter Two, note 90. Recent critical trends, and a growing appreciation of the qualities of the play, have done little as yet to disturb this familiar pattern. There is a chapter on *Henry VIII* in E. Pearlman, *William Shakespeare: The History Plays* (New York, 1992), but it is sidelined in the usual way in Graham Holderness, *Shakespeare: The Histories* (Basingstoke and London, 2000), and gets no mention at all in Ronald Knowles, *Shakespeare's Arguments with History* (Basingstoke, 2002). It is only really a marginal presence in Michael Hattaway, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays* (Cambridge, 2002), where it is covered just as one of 'Shakespeare's other historical plays' (in R. A. Foakes's essay of that name, pp. 214-228); and it is still also usually omitted from books oriented more towards the "general reader", such as John Julius Norwich, *Shakespeare's Kings* (Harmondsworth, 1999). It shares much of this fate, of course, with *King John*, but if anything, *Henry VIII* has been even more marginalized.

66. As a Jacobean rather than an Elizabethan work, for instance, its contemporary political associations and topical implications are rather different from those of the earlier English histories (compare Edna Zwick Boris, *Shakespeare's English Kings, the People, and the Law* (Cranbury, NJ, 1978), p. 17). But for many critics, temporal separation alone is excuse enough to exclude it from their studies of the histories as a group (and see the comments in Jonathan Hart, *Theater and World: The Problematics of Shakespeare's History* (Boston, MA, 1992), pp. 201-216).

67. Or, for that matter, *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Cymbeline*, *The Tempest*. For a sense of the play's place in this particular context, see Alexander Leggatt, *Shakespeare's Political Drama: The History Plays and the Roman Plays* (London and New York, 1988), one of the few studies along such lines to include a chapter on *Henry VIII*.

68. On the long-standing critical neglect of the Stuart history play, see especially Kamps, *Historiography and Ideology in Stuart Drama*; Ribner's study encodes the standard negative response (see his chapter, 'The History Play in Decline', in *The English History Play in the age of Shakespeare*, pp. 266-304). For relevant work addressing these later histories, including in particular here the so-called "Foxeian" or "Elect Nation" plays, see: Anne Barton's 1977 essay, "'He that plays the king": Ford's *Perkin Warbeck* and the Stuart history play', reprinted in *Essays, Mainly Shakespearean*, pp. 234-260; Judith Doolin Spikes, 'The Jacobean History Play and the Myth of the Elect Nation', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 8 (1977), 117-149; G. K. Hunter, 'Religious Nationalism in Later History Plays', in Newey and Thompson, *Literature and Nationalism*, pp. 88-97;

Margot Heinemann, "'God Help the Poor: The Rich can Shift": The World Upside-Down and the Popular Tradition in the Theatre', in McMullan and Hope, *The Politics of Tragicomedy*, pp. 151-165; and Julia Gasper, 'The Reformation plays on the public stage', in *Theatre and Government Under the Early Stuarts*, edited by J. R. Mulryne and Margaret Shewring (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 190-216.

69. McMullan offers a particularly full exploration of the play's varying generic elements and associations (*Henry VIII*, pp. 106-120, 137-143); he stresses especially its many close connections to *The Winter's Tale*; my own view, in contrast to his position (p. 116), is that it is even closer to *Cymbeline*.

70. For studies approaching the play specifically as a "Romance" or in relation to the "Romance" genre, out of an extensive field, and in addition to work already mentioned, see the likes of: Ronald Berman, 'King Henry the Eighth: History and Romance', *English Studies*, 48 (1967), 112-121; Stanley G. Eskin, 'Politics in Shakespeare's Plays', *Bucknell Review*, 15, no 3 ([Winter(?)] 1967), 47-64; H. M. Richmond, 'Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*: Romance Redeemed by History', *Shakespeare Studies*, 4 (1968), 334-349; Tom McBride, 'Henry VIII as Machiavellian Romance', *JEGP*, 76 (1977), 26-39; David Scott Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time*, pp. 133-141; Tennenhouse, *Power on Display*, pp. 96-101; and Maurice Hunt, 'Shakespeare's *King Henry VIII* and the Triumph of the Word', *English Studies*, 75 (1994), 225-245.

71. 'Henry VIII and the Deconstruction of History', p. 45. Of course, Rudnytsky's assessment here reflects a particular understanding of Shakespeare's histories - the kind of position I have already argued for strongly in Chapter One. Rudnytsky himself makes the crucial point that 'the simultaneous presence of conflicting perspectives precludes the plays from being in any simple sense "orthodox"' (p. 46).

72. See, for example, Paul Dean ('Dramatic Mode and Historical Vision in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 37 (1986), 175-189), who stresses the play's connections to what he calls the neglected form of 'romance history' (p. 175). For a sense of the wider generic context here, with its links back especially to non-Shakespearian Elizabethan history plays, see again Anne Barton, 'The king disguised: Shakespeare's *Henry V* and the comical history', and Larry Champion, 'The Noise of Threatening Drum'.

73. 'The Wheel of Fortune and the Maiden Phoenix', pp. 16, 23; and see generally pp. 20-23; and for related views, Judith Anderson, 'Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*', pp. 152-153; and Paul Dean, pp. 187-189.

74. McMullan provides the fullest exploration of the relevance of "truth" in all its forms (religious, iconographic, Reformation, historical, topical, apocalyptic, etc.) to the Archbishop's speech; see generally the Introduction to his edition, and his essays, 'Shakespeare and the End of History', and "'Swimming on bladders": the Dialogics of Reformation in Shakespeare & Fletcher's *Henry VIII*'.

75. For commentary exploring the play's engagement with political and theatrical spectacle, see particularly Edward I. Berry, 'Henry VIII and the Dynamics of Spectacle', *Shakespeare Studies*, 12 (1979), 229-246; Janet Clare, 'Beneath Pomp and Circumstance in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Studies* (Tokyo), 21 (1982-83), 65-81; F. Schreiber-McGee, "'The View of Earthly Glory": Visual Strategies and the Issue of Royal Prerogative in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 20 (1988), 191-200; and Bill Readings's essay, 'When Did the Renaissance Begin? The Henrician Court and the Shakespearean Stage', in *Rethinking the Henrician Era*, edited by Peter C. Herman (Urbana and Chicago, 1994), pp. 283-302.

76. *Letters of Sir Henry Wotton to Sir Edmund Bacon*, p. 30; and see above, pp. 219-220, for Wotton's whole paragraph here. The question has been raised lately as to whether the phrase 'in truth' is governed by 'sufficient', or is more a parenthetical aside, equivalent to "indeed" or "assuredly" (see Bosman, p. 460, and McMullan, "'Swimming on bladders'", pp. 213-214 - in McMullan's terms, 'whether it is the accuracy of the play or of Wotton's report of the play that is at issue' (p. 214)). The first reading seems much the more plausible to me, not least in view of the carefully composed/"constructed" nature of Wotton's account. But even with the second reading, it is still the play's 'many extraordinary circumstances' of realistic detail that lie behind his views on its possible impact. Whether Wotton's report is actually an eye-witness account of the play (or the fire) is another matter. One or two minor details in his description are not reflected in the Folio text of *Henry VIII*, but his knowledge of the action appears more than merely cursory.

77. And see again particularly Stephen Orgel, 'Making Greatness Familiar'. McMullan has questioned the precise force of 'familiar' here too ("Swimming on bladders", p. 214), but in this instance I feel both his alternative glosses miss the levelling, demystifying implications that seem to me unavoidable in the conjunction of 'familiar' with 'greatness' on the one side, and 'ridiculous' on the other.

78. *OED*, XVIII, 606, "true" (adjective), senses 1a and 2. I am grateful to my friend, Peter Snow, for drawing my attention to the importance of this (largely uncommented on) dimension of the *All Is True* title.

79. *Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, p. 30; this aspect of Wotton's account has often been picked up on. And indeed, for much of the twentieth century, *Henry VIII* was seen as little more than a simplistic succession of episodes, a loose agglomeration of unconnected spectacles strung together with a bit of padding in between. It is a view that still effectively persists, for example, in Readings, who is happy to speak of the action as a 'sterile succession of tableaux', lacking in 'organic resolution', and showing an 'indifference' to 'the passage of time between episodes' which 'appears as a failure to generate an organic temporality internal to the play' (p. 296). For all Readings's insights into the play, he seems to me here largely to end up perpetuating the standard sense of its episodic nature as a failure to achieve satisfactory aesthetic form.

"Organic" is a particularly loaded term in this context. Does *Henry VIII* need to conform to type and expectations to be successful? And if it comes across, with its episodic construction, as *sui generis*, does this mean that it is *necessarily* aesthetically inferior, inorganic?

80. The standard discussion of the cyclical aspects of the play's construction is found in Clifford Leech's essay, 'The Structure of the Last Plays'; and see too McMullan, *Henry VIII*, pp. 94-96. Paul Dean writes well about the 'restless undulating movement' to the drama's sense of time (p. 187), but he sees no scope for open-endedness given the conclusive nature of its final vision (see pp. 186-189). Yet even Cranmer's speech conveys an awareness of history as ongoing process, looking forward to the future of the future it describes. On the general questions of history, realism, and aesthetic form involved in all this, see Herbert Lindenberger, *Historical Drama: The Relation of Literature and Reality* (Chicago and London, 1975).

81. I have drawn especially in this paragraph on the discussions of the play's sources and its treatment of them in Foakes, *Henry VIII*, pp. xxxv-xxxix; Judith Anderson, 'Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*'; Patterson, "'All Is True'"; and McMullan, *Henry VIII*, pp. 161-180; with the inevitable additional reference to Bullough, *Sources*, IV, 435-451. The play's verbal closeness to its sources has been much discussed; see further below.

82. Judith Anderson's work in particular has pursued the play's engagement with the wider chronicle tradition beyond Holinshed, in the shape of the works of Edward Hall, John Speed, and John Stow, tracing in addition the influence, through Stow especially, of George Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey* ('Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*', pp. 135-142); and see further Patterson, "'All Is True'"; and Paul L. Wiley, 'Renaissance Exploitation of Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey*', *Studies in Philology*, 43 (1946), 121-146. The compendious nature of the chronicles and the multivocality of the individual works of Holinshed, Stow, etc., have of course been strongly emphasized by Patterson (and see again *Reading Holinshed's 'Chronicles'*). Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* is also something of a multivocal work, extended after his death, and re-conveying most importantly in the present context information from Cranmer's servant, Ralph Morice; see MacCulloch, pp. 297-322; and for some recent work on Foxe in general, David Loades, ed., *John Foxe and the English Reformation* (Aldershot and Brookfield, VT, 1997), and *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective* (Aldershot and Brookfield, 1999); and Christopher Highley and John N. King, eds., *John Foxe and his World* (Aldershot and Burlington, VT, 2002).

83. Katherine's reference in this latter instance to her gentleman usher, Griffith, as an 'honest chronicler', has received much comment; my attention was first drawn to the passage through R. L. Smallwood, 'Shakespeare's use of history', in Stanley Wells, *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, pp. 143-162 (pp. 159-160).

84. Another feature of the play that has been much discussed. A not dissimilar effect is provided by the masque in 1.4, which re-creates a notable precursor of the Jacobean masque form in a precursor of that

form's performance space, a banqueting room at Whitehall (or in the play's terms at this point, York Place); see especially Inga-Stina Ewbank, "'These pretty devices": A Study of Masques in Plays', in Spencer and Wells, pp. 405-448. On the history of the Blackfriars building, see again Irwin Smith, *Shakespeare's Blackfriars Playhouse*, especially pp. 3-30; and on the question of the play's performance in the Blackfriars Theatre, see McMullan, *Henry VIII*, p. 10, though given the resonances available in the full-scale re-staging of the trial in its original location, it seems peculiar to me to suggest that 'a proportion of the spectacle for which the play is known may well have been incorporated only after an initial run of performances at a theatre better suited to intimacy and irony than to pomp and sincerity'.

85. The connections and borrowings here are most easily pursued in the editions of Foakes and McMullan, who both reprint major extracts from Holinshed and Foxe, either in their commentary (McMullan) or as an appendix (Foakes, pp. 183-215); and see too McMullan, p. 167. The entry direction for the divorce trial lists 'two Scribes in the habite of Doctors' (TLN 1333-1334), who are presumably presented on stage as involved in taking down the court records. In the council scene, Cromwell sits at the 'lower end' of the table, 'as Secretary' (TLN 3041), and is clearly in charge of the agenda (5.2. 35-38). The association between secretaries and documents in general is also evident from 1.1. 114-119.

86. See the chronological tables provided in McMullan, *Henry VIII*, pp. 441-444, and C. Knox Pooler's edition, p. xxxv; there is an extended comparison of the play's events to recorded history in Cumberland Clark, *A Study of Shakespeare's 'Henry VIII'*, pp. 70-84. The treaty celebrations in France took place during June 1520, whilst Buckingham was executed in May 1521; the birth and christening of Elizabeth occurred in 1533, but Katherine did not die until 1536, and Cranmer was summoned before the council some time between 1543 and 1545. The precise date of this final occasion is not fully clear; McMullan opts for 1545 (p. 444), but modern biographers of the two leading participants seem to incline more to 1543; see MacCulloch, pp. 319-321; Redworth, pp. 177-207; and Jasper Ridley, *Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford, 1962), pp. 236-238.

87. During the historical period covered by the action, there were in fact two Dukes of Norfolk (Thomas Howard, father and son) and two Earls of Surrey, with the first of the latter becoming the second of the former. As this Thomas Howard (1473-1554) was Buckingham's son-in-law, he fits the play's Surrey, making his father, Thomas Howard (1443-1524), its Norfolk. To further confuse the generations of this family, the elder Thomas Howard was married to 'that old noble lady, Duchess of Norfolk' (4.1. 53) who appears in the coronation procession and the christening scene, though clearly not as the play's Norfolk's wife. The period 1521-1545 also saw three Lord Chamberlains and three Lord Chancellors (besides Wolsey). Sir Thomas Audley held the latter position by the time of Anne's coronation (having succeeded More), but by 1544 (though this date is possibly beyond the play's historical time-

frame - see the previous note), the office had passed to Sir Thomas Wriothesley. As regards the Lord Chamberlain, this position was filled by Charles Somerset, Earl of Worcester, until his death in 1526. The appointment was then awarded to Sir William Sands (or Sandys), the Lord Sands of the play, who held the office at the time of Wolsey's banquet, which in the play, of course, he attends in the company of the Lord Chamberlain! Since Sands died in 1540, he could not have been present at Cranmer's trial as Lord Chamberlain, but he did still retain the post at the time of Elizabeth's christening in 1533. What seems most apparent from all this is that the character of the Lord Chamberlain in the play has no real personal historical equivalent at all. For the information drawn on here, see McMullan, *Henry VIII*, pp. 204-207; J. D. Mackie, *The Earlier Tudors: 1485-1558* (Oxford, 1952), pp. 645-654; and the relevant entries in Thomson, *Characters*.

88. See especially Rudnytsky, p. 50. Holinshed does not name Anne as being present at Wolsey's banquet, which occurred in 1527, but is here transposed to before Buckingham's trial (1521). Critics tend to speak of the play's manipulation of time and early placement of Henry's first meeting with Anne as a subversion of the chronicle sources. It certainly works to undermine Henry's motives, within the play, and also, by extension, within actual history. But whilst Holinshed's *Chronicles* only first mentions Henry's interest in Anne after its description of the divorce proceedings, the actual dating of the beginnings of that interest is left slightly ambiguous (see Foakes, *Henry VIII*, pp. 204-206), an effect that is obviously not available within the chronologically linear form of Shakespearian drama.

89. Indeed, in the latter instance, the Duke of Norfolk (that is, the elder Thomas Howard) was not even in attendance in France (see 1.1. 1-2), but back in England, in charge of the kingdom during Henry's absence (Thomson, *Characters*, p. 222).

90. Though it has inevitably often been understood in precisely this way, or at least, as a sign of the play's concern (or the need for it) to stay as close to historical fact as possible. For a recent reading of the play's declared interest in truth along similar lines, see Hugh M. Richmond, 'Shakespeare's Last Experiment in *Versimo* [sic]: A Performance Approach to *All Is True*', *Theatre History Studies*, 13 (1993), 47-62.

91. The meaning of 'opinion' in 1. 20 has occasioned disagreement amongst editors. McMullan (p. 211), following in the tradition of Pooler, glosses as 'reputation'. Foakes, however, goes for "'state of mind", "ready intention"' (p. 5), and Margeson and Halio take a similar view, both suggesting 'conviction' (p. 65 and p. 74 respectively). I would lean towards this second position, though the context seems more to me to imply something like "declared intention".

92. Halio provides a particularly useful survey of events from the period covered by the play that are not included or referred to in the action (*Henry VIII*, pp. 11-16).

93. Though, as McMullan in particular has emphasized, that scene has been the most neglected, critically and theatrically, of any in the play (see *Henry VIII*, pp. 144-147). The fact that the Prologue ignores 'about half the play' and tells a 'plain untruth' about the absence of bawdy particularly bothered E. M. W. Tillyard ('Why did Shakespeare write *Henry VIII*?', *Critical Quarterly*, 3 (1961), 22-27 (p. 26)).

94. *Henry VIII*, p. 211, note to ll. 25-7. For work picking up on the latter implication, and pursuing the topicality of the play beyond the narrow question of its relation to the royal wedding, see again Kurland, 'Henry VIII and James I'; and also Donna Hamilton, *Shakespeare and the Politics of Protestant England*, pp. 163-190; and William M. Baillie, 'Henry VIII: A Jacobean History', *Shakespeare Studies*, 12 (1979), 247-266.

95. And then, of course, there are its particular resonances in relation to the juxtaposition of royal funeral and wedding in 1612-1613; see McMullan's note, *Henry VIII*, p. 211 (which also records some parallels for the Prologue's phrase, though it does not seem to have had quite the status of being proverbial); and Julia Briggs, 'Tears at the wedding: Shakespeare's last phase', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 210-227; and on the tone of the Prologue, see again Leggatt, 'Henry VIII and the Ideal England', p. 142. A lot obviously depends here on performance, not least the question of whether a particular character takes the part of the Prologue (Henry, the Lord Chamberlain, and the Old Lady have all been choices), an anonymous or formal figure, or even Herbert Beerbohm Tree's interesting idea of a Fool; see the discussion in Ralph Berry, "'My learned and well-beloved servant Cranmer": Guthrie's *Henry VIII*', in *Shakespearean Illuminations*, edited by Jay L. Halio and Hugh Richmond (Cranbury, NJ, 1998), pp. 309-316; and on Tree, Michael Booth, *Victorian Spectacular Theatre, 1850-1910*, p. 138.

96. 'Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*', p. 131.

97. See especially here Bullough, *Sources*, IV, 437-442; Auberlen; and McMullan, *Henry VIII*, pp. 77-80. *When You See Me, You Know Me* was first published in 1605 and probably written and first performed in 1604; it was reprinted, and possibly revived, in 1613; see the edition in the Malone Society Reprints, prepared by F. P. Wilson (Oxford, 1952), pp. v-xii.

98. Joseph Candido, 'Fashioning *Henry VIII*: What Shakespeare saw in *When You See Me, You Know Me*', *Cahiers Elisabéthains*, 23 (April 1983), 47-59.

99. See again especially here, Pierre Sahel, 'The Strangeness of a Dramatic Style: Rumour in *Henry VIII*', another key landmark essay in the criticism of the play, which I have benefited from enormously.

100. An interest on Shakespeare's part in the relationship between oral history, written record, and attitudes to and beliefs about historical "truth" is evinced especially by the dialogue in *Richard III* between Richard, the young Edward V, and that play's Duke of Buckingham, on the subject of Julius Caesar and the building of the Tower of London

(3.1. 61-94); see the comments on this passage in Antony Hammond, ed., *King Richard III*, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1981; reprinted 1988), p. 214; and Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History*, pp. 12-18; and see also Homer Nearing, Jr., 'Julius Caesar and the Tower of London', *Modern Language Notes*, 63 (1948), 228-233. I am drawing generally on Rackin's work here; and see again too Graham Holderness, *Shakespeare's History*, pp. 15-37. For the relevance of *Richard III* in this context, see further below.

101. I am looking for terminology here that can get beyond the "*graphia*" element in "historiography" (although modern English usage of the suffix, "-graphy", in general has obviously rather transcended this original association). Hence my "historification", which is not in *OED*, but which I am deriving from the listed verb, "historify", which comes with the meanings, 'to relate the history of; to record or celebrate in history', and 'to write history; to narrate, relate' (VII, 260, senses 1 and 2), the latter of these especially being able to encompass the range of significance I am after.

102. Katherine's identification of Griffith as an 'honest chronicler' comes in response to his verbal narrative of the life of Wolsey (4.2. 48-68), whilst Wolsey himself in 1.2 speaks of the 'ignorant tongues, which neither know | My faculties nor person yet will be | The chronicles of my doing' (ll. 73-75), thereby associating the process of chronicling with rumour and malicious gossip - though this comes in a scene where he himself is shown to be a master of spreading false information (ll. 105-108).

103. For some useful comments in this area, see A. R. Braunmuller, 'King John and Historiography', *ELH*, 55 (1988), 309-332.

104. See especially here John W. Velz, 'Sir Thomas More and the Shakespeare canon: two approaches', in Howard-Hill, *Shakespeare and 'Sir Thomas More'*, pp. 171-195; and also Margeson, pp. 14-15; and McMullan, *Henry VIII*, pp. 176-179. Whether Shakespeare was echoing himself at all in echoing *Sir Thomas More* is a question beyond my scope, but Velz's work suggests he knew the earlier play well. *Thomas, Lord Cromwell*, like *When You See Me, You Know Me*, was reprinted in 1613; see again in this connection, Waage, 'Henry VIII and the Crisis of the English History Play'. Two lost plays from 1601 on the life of Cardinal Wolsey are mentioned in Henslowe's papers, and may (or may not) have been another influence; for details, see Ribner, *The English History Play*, p. 209.

105. See again Hugh Richmond's essay, 'The Resurrection of an Expired Form: *Henry VIII* as Sequel to *Richard III*'. There are also one or two minor connections between the two plays involving characters. Thus the elder of the two Thomas Howards who could be *Henry VIII*'s Duke of Norfolk is the same figure as the Earl of Surrey who is twice referred to during *Richard III* (5.6. 3, 26), and actually appears in the Folio text of this work (see 5.3. 1-18, referring in this instance to Hammond's edition (Oxford follows the Quarto version here)); and Sir Thomas Lovell is mentioned in passing in *Richard III* as one of those

who are up in arms against the King (4.4. 449); see the relevant entries in Thomson, *Characters*.

106. Two lines at the start of 5.1 in *Richard III* deal briefly with that play's Buckingham being frustrated in an attempt to see Richard, but there is no suggestion at all of the plan the Surveyor refers to in 1.2 of *Henry VIII*; and even though the later Duke's language in 2.1 is similar to his father's at 5.1. 16-17 in the earlier play (and see also *Richard III*, 2.1. 32-39), in the dramatic context, the most trusted figure that the elder Buckingham is complaining about can only be Richard.

107. Paul Dean (pp. 182-184) comments interestingly on this aspect of these two passages, the characters' moralizing, quasi-Tillyardian use of history, and the distinctively theatrical metaphors in the Surveyor's language in 1.2. For the Surveyor, the earlier Buckingham is nothing but a would-be regicide; in the terms of the Duke, however, his father effectively initiated the founding of the Tudor dynasty by raising arms against a usurper.

108. For readings emphasizing this aspect of the play, which can translate as much into a Cranmer-like mysticism valorizing a particular "chosen" truth, as any form of intellectual despair, see Matthew H. Wikander, *The Play of Truth & State* (Baltimore, 1986), pp. 36-49; and Jonathan Hart, 'Henry VIII: The Play as History and Anti-History', *Aevum*, 65 (1991), 561-570.

109. 'History and judgement in *Henry VIII*', p. 160.

110. Bliss is the first critic really to identify the fundamental importance of the opening scene to establishing the insistently ironic tone of the play; see generally 'The Wheel of Fortune and the Maiden Phoenix'; and see again especially the essays by Cespedes and Judith Anderson; McMullan, *Henry VIII*, pp. 96-98; and for further comment on the pervasive irony of the play and its repeated undercutting of its public spectacles, F. W. Brownlow, *Two Shakespearean Sequences*, pp. 185-201; and Clare, 'Beneath Pomp and Circumstance'.

111. I stress the latter point because critics have often managed to dismiss the play's spectacle as thematically irrelevant, unconnected to the drama's main concerns. For a specific adoption of this position, see Kristian Smidt, *Unconformities in Shakespeare's History Plays* (London, 1982), pp. 145-158; but even among recent commentators on the play, its spectacle still seems to be something of a stumbling-block, not fully integrated into their sense of how the play's ironies work.

112. McMullan's edition in general conveys a good sense of the surveillance culture that dominates the play, and the pressures that bear on public discourse in this particular world. And see too, for some useful comment on the linguistic codes and structures that govern the dialogue, here and throughout, A. Lynne Magnusson, 'The Rhetoric of Politeness and *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 43 (1991), 391-409; and W. F. Bolton, *Shakespeare's English: Language in the History Plays* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 186-220.

113. For some useful discussion here, see Linda McJ. Micheli, "Sit By Us": Visual Imagery and the Two Queens in *Henry VIII*, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 38 (1987), 452-466.

114. On the treatment of the King's conscience, see above all Judith Anderson, 'Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*'; and for some more recent comment on the idea of conscience in the play generally, such studies as: Camille Wells Slight, 'The Politics of Conscience in *All Is True* (or *Henry VIII*)', *Shakespeare Survey*, 43 (1990), 59-68; and Susannah Brietz Monta, "'Thou fall'st a blessed martyr": Shakespeare's *Henry VIII* and the Polemics of Conscience', *English Literary Renaissance*, 30 (2000), 262-283.

115. And it is worth remarking how prophecy as a form of truth-telling is itself, rather like proverbial discourse, problematized in the action, from the moment of the fall of Buckingham onwards; see again here Howard Dobin, *Merlin's Disciples*, pp. 173-178.

116. McMullan has written well (both in his edition and in his essay, "'Thou hast made me now a man": reforming man(ner)liness in *Henry VIII*', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 40-56) about the gender anxieties that characterize Henry's behaviour and pronouncements, especially in his speech during the trial, and that reach a resolution in the remark just quoted. But he seems to me in the process to overidealize Cranmer's authority in the final scene.

CHAPTER SEVEN

1. Lois Potter writes particularly well about this aspect of the play in her edition, notably pp. 95-110; and see also, for an especially reflective critical response, Charles H. Frey, 'Grinning at the moon: Some Sadness in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 109-120.

2. Most of the connections involved here are self-evident, and I have mentioned many of them already. For an unusual view of the play's associations with *Timon*, see again F. W. Brownlow, *Two Shakespearean Sequences*; and for some suggestive thoughts on its relevance to the *Sonnets*, see W. H. Auden's Introduction to the edition by William Burto, *The Signet Classic Shakespeare* (New York, 1964), pp. xvii-xxxviii. Where *The Phoenix and the Turtle* is concerned, I am thinking particularly of the poem's imagery of two-in-oneness and its remote, idealizing tone; some of the language of the kinsmen in 2.2 (almost certainly a Fletcher scene of course) also calls this poem to mind for me; and see here, if mainly for the title, Philip J. Finkelppearl, 'Two Distincts, Division None: Shakespeare and Fletcher's *The Two Noble Kinsmen* of 1613', in Parker and Zitner, *Elizabethan Theater*, pp. 184-199.

3. Philip Edwards is the first critic really to draw attention to this aspect of the play ('On the Design of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*'); and see too especially Paula S. Berggren, "'For what we lack, / We laugh": Incompletion and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Modern Language Studies*, 14, no. 4 (Fall 1984), 3-17.

4. The morris dance is of course shared with (and probably borrowed from) Francis Beaumont's *Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn*, but whilst many critics treat the subplot of the countryfolk and the Schoolmaster simply as a vehicle for the morris dance, the one thing which the two works share, the dance, is in fact specifically absent from the Quarto text of *Kinsmen*, where the stage direction given reads '*Musicke Dance*', with the equally uninformative marginal direction, '*enter the dance*' (p. 46/3.5. 138). If nothing else, this suggests a concern in this part of the play with something more than merely re-using a successful piece of choreography.

5. On the performance history of the play, see above, Chapter Two, note 159.

6. See again here especially Lois Potter's essay, crucial in terms of my own perspective, whatever some of my disagreements with it, '*The Two Noble Kinsmen*: Spectacle and Politics'. For two contrasting views

on the language of the play, see A. Lynne Magnusson, 'The Collapse of Shakespeare's High Style in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *English Studies in Canada*, 13 (1987), 375-390; and, a particular aid to my understanding of the drama, Madelon Lief and Nicholas F. Radel, 'Linguistic Subversion and the Artifice of Rhetoric in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 38 (1987), 405-425.

7. For the play's use of pre-Chaucerian material, see Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 40-47. Statius's great poem is barely known these days; for comment, see David Vessey, *Statius and the 'Thebaid'* (Cambridge, 1973); the World's Classics translation by A. D. Melville (Oxford, 1992); and also E. M. W. Tillyard, *The English Epic and its Background* (London, 1954), pp. 99-104; and, on Boccaccio and Statius, David Anderson, *Before the Knight's Tale* (Philadelphia, 1988).

8. For discussions of Emilia's behaviour in this context, see, for example, Laurie Shannon, 'Emilia's Argument: Friendship and "Human" Title in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*'; and Dorothea Kehler, 'Shakespeare's Emilias and the Politics of Celibacy', in *In Another Country*, edited by Dorothea Kehler and Susan Baker (Metuchen, NJ and London, 1991), pp. 157-178.

9. This seems to me to add an alternative dimension to Potter's arguments for possible adaptation/alteration in this part of the play; see especially her 'Topicality or Politics? *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 1613-34'.

10. For something of the cultural background here, see Eugene M. Waith, *The Herculean Hero in Marlowe, Chapman, Shakespeare and Dryden* (London, 1962); and Reuben A. Brower, *Hero & Saint: Shakespeare and the Graeco-Roman Heroic Tradition* (Oxford, 1971). The descriptions of the knights derive most immediately from Chaucer, but that they echo wider traditions is obvious.

11. See again Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 46-51; and also Ann Thompson, 'Jailers' Daughters in *The Arcadia* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Notes and Queries*, 224 (1979), 140-141. Sidney's *The Lady of May* stands out most in this context.

12. In one respect, this is to ignore most of the main concerns of recent criticism, issues of desire and sexuality, the friendship tradition, and so on; in another, I hope, it is to focus attention on elements that reflect back on such issues. For recent work in the areas mentioned here, see the Bibliography.

13. This speech is lined as verse in the Quarto (p. 17), one of a number of passages to be mislined/mismetered. Most editors comment on this aspect of the text; see especially Richard Proudfoot, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. xxiv-xxvi; *Companion*, p. 627; Eugene Waith, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 218-221; and Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 119-123; and see too the discussion in Paul Bertram, *Shakespeare and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 21-34. I have not noted any further alterations in Oxford relating to lineation.

14. On the financial aspects of this discussion, and indeed, the play's financial imagery in general, see especially Richard Abrams, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen as Bourgeois Drama'.

15. The omission here covers a question from her father, 'do they so?' (l. 36), which could be given a variety of tones, but at least allows for a suggestion of the typical late Shakespearian scepticism on the part of someone hearing an unlikely or extremely idealized report.

16. Despite the explicit signal for a new scene ('Scæna 2') and the opening stage direction in the Quarto, 'Enter Palamon, and Arcite in prison' (p. 19/2.2. 0.1-2), there is a possibility that the scene remains continuous with 2.1, where the kinsmen are not given a separate exit (though there is a general 'exeunt' at the end) after their entry 'aboue' (p. 18/2.1. 47.1). Much depends on how the sequence (and 2.2 especially) was originally staged, but most modern editions maintain the Quarto scene division here; see the note in *Companion*, pp. 630-631, and Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 63-64. The very interest in distinguishing authorial shares is one reason why the division into two scenes has so often been preserved.

17. *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, p. 109, note to ll. 6-55; Waith's line-numbering here conforms with Oxford's.

18. *The Two Noble Kinsmen: Part I. Revised Text and Notes*, p. 132; and see also his discussion in *The Two Noble Kinsmen: Part II. General Introduction*, pp. 46*-48*.

19. It is noticeable in this connection that whereas Samuel Hickson, arguing for Shakespeare's authorship of 2.1, draws attention to the contradiction between what is said and what is shown in the two scenes, William Spalding, for whom the whole of the subplot, including 2.1, was by Fletcher, does not; see Hickson, 'The Shares of Shakspeare and Fletcher in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', p. 38*; and S[palding], *A Letter on Shakspeare's Authorship of 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, p. 36.

20. The Jailer remarks that the Duke and the two kinsmen 'came privately in the night' (2.1. 47-48), by which he presumably means the night just gone. Certainly, the Wooer seems to know nothing about the kinsmen, and the Jailer himself is not entirely sure what is going on. His instructions to the Daughter (ll. 19-20) on how to treat them and her fetching of 'stewings' for their chamber (l. 21) also seem indicative of a new situation within the prison.

21. To some extent, the Daughter's comments also create a discrepancy within the main plot, with Palamon seeming to spend longer in prison than Arcite does out of it; but the time-scheme within the kinsmen's story in the second and third acts generally doesn't bear much looking into. On one level, the action from 2.2 to 3.6 lasts no more than about four days, which hardly seems to correspond to the length of time implied for either Palamon's suffering in prison and on the run, or Arcite's period in service to Emilia.

22. This lack of connection is reflected in many respects in the way the criticism of the play has so often fragmented into discussions of only one or other of its two main story-lines (with the countryfolk scenes getting little attention at all). One might also note, though, that the Chaucerian material itself shows something of a similar disconnection, in its first half at least, not just in terms of the Theban framing story, but through Palamon and Arcite being almost as distanced from Emilia (with regard to her awareness and the image they have of her) as the Daughter is from Palamon.

23. Potter does comment on the "inconsistency" here (*The Two Noble Kinsmen*, p. 260, note to l. 4, and pp. 28-29), but it has not been widely picked up on by editors or critics. Part of the reason for this, it would seem, is that this particular discrepancy cannot be accounted for in terms of authorship, since the two scenes involved (3.6 and 4.1) are both usually given to Fletcher - though having said this, Potter does try to suggest that the effect may still be a result of the collaborative process, Fletcher being inconsistent with himself as the result of some change to the original plan of writing; and see further below.

24. The Court party does enter with a 'traine' in 3.6 (or 3.7 in the Quarto numbering; see p. 52/3.6. 131.2-3), but it is hard to see how any member of this would be able to leave the scene early, or indeed (on a plot level, if not necessarily a performance one), how or why the friends of the Jailer could be part of it. As so often, the lack of absolute realism and consistency here is not really an issue; but the act of reporting and re-reporting does seem to me to make a point out of it.

25. See again Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, p. 29; most editors have drawn attention to this particular duplication, usually accounting for it in terms of a collaborative inconsistency or as a sign of possible revision, but as Potter's commentary points out (p. 320), there are ways of explaining the two separate gift-givings at an ordinary plot level.

26. For some discussion of the names of the various countrymen and women involved in (or missing from) the morris-dance, see Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, p. 135, and her commentary to these two scenes. Most of the men's names given are distinctively Greek-sounding; the women's are not, which adds another dimension to the "profusion" of naming going on here. Apart from the cases of the schoolmaster and the taborer, none of the names mentioned particularly attaches to any of the individual characters (not on the page, at least), and most of the dancers end up with new "identities" in the morris anyway. The distinction between the two subplots, which can only be deliberate, even extends to their parallel authority figures, with the schoolmaster named as Gerrold, but the Doctor identified only by his profession.

27. On the reference to 'Giraldo', the question of whether this is meant to indicate Gerrold, and speculation about possible extradramatic significances here, see Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 354-355; the fact that the Daughter refers to this figure as "penning" songs (l. 11) is a detail that is perhaps not so hard to reconcile with the character in

3.5 (see l. 126, and Potter's commentary on this earlier passage, p. 239, note to l. 123).

28. For discussions of the figure of the Daughter and her place within the play, see especially Susan Green, "'A mad woman? We are made, boys!': The Jailer's Daughter in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*"; and Douglas Bruster, 'The Jailer's Daughter and the Politics of Madwomen's Language'; and also Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 47-53.

29. With the possible accompaniment of off-stage sound effects in places; see Frances Ann Shirley, *Shakespeare's Use of Off-Stage Sounds*, pp. 220-221.

30. Potter's edition comments in passing on the general lack of lines in the Wooer's part, noting especially that after this speech in 4.1, and the Daughter's entry that follows it, he has nothing more to say in this scene (*The Two Noble Kinsmen*, p. 266, note to l. 103). Indeed, as far as I can make out, prior to 5.4, when he starts addressing her in his semi-disguise as Palamon, the Wooer has only one line at all when the Daughter is on stage (other than entry announcements), and that merely confirms his isolation ('I never saw 'em' (2.1. 46)). This peculiarity in the treatment of "his" part/"voice" is further complicated by the way so much of his narrative here is made up of re-voicings of the Daughter's own words/songs, and by the intense intertextuality of the speech as a whole, not least its connections to that artful poem of framing and report, *A Lover's Complaint*. The Daughter's relationship to Ophelia has of course been widely commented on; for some specific comparison, see Carroll Camden, 'On Ophelia's Madness', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 15 (1964), 247-255; the links involved become particularly interesting in the light of Elaine Showalter's well-known essay, 'Representing Ophelia: women, madness, and the responsibilities of feminist criticism', in Parker and Hartman, *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, pp. 77-94.

31. For criticism discussing the imagery of the play, see above, Chapter Three, note 117.

32. I am assuming that the Prologue was an integral part of the play from its first performances, not a speech written for a revival, though there has been much debate on the issue (see above, Chapter Two, note 107). The parallels of language, structure, and theme that it offers to the rest of *Kinsmen*, and the way these are integrated into the overall form of the action, mean that for me it would require some very strong external evidence indeed even to begin to consider the idea that it was a later addition.

33. I have found particularly useful comment on the imagery of the Prologue here, and its extended opening metaphor, in Charles Frey, 'Collaborating with Shakespeare: After the Final Play'; Elizabeth Sacks, *Shakespeare's Images of Pregnancy*, pp. 100-101; and William C. Carroll, 'The Virgin Not: Language and Sexuality in Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Survey*, 46 (1994), 107-119.

34. See generally Malcolm A. Nelson, *The Robin Hood Tradition in the English Renaissance* (Salzburg, 1973); J. C. Holt, *Robin Hood* (London, 1982); and François Laroque, *Shakespeare's festive world*; and on the nature of the morris dance in the play, Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 356-359; and Waith, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 215-217.

35. On Chaucer's status as literary father-figure and his position in the Renaissance pantheon of English poetry, see Derek Brewer, ed., *Chaucer: The Critical Heritage*, 2 vols (London, 1978), I, 1-29; John H. Fisher, *The Importance of Chaucer* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL, 1992), pp. 141-169; and A. C. Spearing, *Medieval to Renaissance in English Poetry* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 59-120. And on Chaucer in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England more generally, see again Alice Miskimin, *The Renaissance Chaucer*; and Theresa M. Krier, ed., *Refiguring Chaucer in the Renaissance* (Gainesville, FL, 1998).

36. Lydgate's *Siege of Thebes*, written in conscious imitation of the *Knight's Tale*, stands at the head of this tradition. On Lydgate's and Spenser's practices in this regard, see the discussions in Brewer, I, 44-59, 114-116; and Spearing, *Medieval to Renaissance*, pp. 66-99, 327-332. *The Shepheardes Calender* offers multiple relevances to the issues I touch on below, though I have not followed up on any of these here.

37. Quoting again here from the text of *The Defence of Poesy* in *Sir Philip Sidney*, edited by Katherine Duncan-Jones, pp. 212-250 (p. 242). Sidney is using Chaucer primarily as a stick with which to beat his own contemporaries, but his dissatisfactions over aspects of Chaucer's art still emerge; and the same can be said in relation to similar works from the period by the likes of George Puttenham, Roger Ascham, William Webbe - views and comments that can be found collected in Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion, 1357-1900*, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1925).

38. Used by Chaucer himself, for instance, in a famous passage near the end of *Troilus and Criseyde*, Book V, 1786-1792, an example that in turn echoes the closing lines of Statius's *Thebaid*; and see again Miskimin, pp. 116-131.

39. For a few examples in the Chaucer canon, see the *General Prologue* to *The Canterbury Tales*, ll. 276-277, 404, 692-693.

40. Book V, pp. 1793-1798, following on from the passage referred to in note 38. Chaucer's anxieties here, of course, are an aspect in particular of a pre-print culture; and see too in this connection his little poem, 'Adam Sciveyn' (*Riverside Chaucer*, p. 650).

41. See Derek Pearsall, 'Thomas Speght (ca. 1550-?)', in *Editing Chaucer: The Great Tradition*, edited by Paul G. Ruggiers (Norman, OK, 1984), pp. 71-92 (pp. 81-82); for publishing details of Speght's volume, see the Bibliography.

42. These are all listed in the Bibliography; and on this aspect of the Chaucerian editorial history in general, see further Ruggiers, and

the essays in that volume by Anne Hudson (on John Stow) and James E. Blodgett (William Thynne).

43. On this and the wider use of Chaucerian material beyond the *Knight's Tale* (including the *Anelida*), see Potter, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, pp. 42-48. And on the mythography of Theseus and its more dubious elements, see D'Orsay W. Pearson, "'Unkinde" Theseus: A Study in Renaissance Mythography', *English Literary Renaissance*, 4 (1974), 276-298; and Peter Holland, 'Theseus' Shadows in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 47 (1994), 139-151.

44. *Truth and Textuality in Chaucer's Poetry*, p. 149.

45. See particularly here Richard Hillman, 'Shakespeare's Romantic Innocents and the Misappropriation of the Romance Past: The Case of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 43 (1990), 69-79; and see again, in relation to questions of authority generally, Michael Bristol, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen: Shakespeare and the Problem of Authority'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Listed below are all items cited in the text, Notes, and preliminary material, except for those few works, clearly signalled in the Notes, which I have only been able to quote from or refer to at second hand. Also included are a small number of other items (mainly authorship or textual studies and works of reference) which I have consulted but not had cause to mention directly. Entries are divided (with the minimum of cross-referencing) into three main sections, as follows:

- I: EDITIONS OF SHAKESPEARE
- II: OTHER LITERARY, DRAMATIC, AND HISTORICAL WORKS
- III: SCHOLARSHIP, CRITICISM, AND RELATED MATERIAL

The division of material between the separate sections is largely self-explanatory, but one or two points call for comment. For the sake of convenience, and as a reflection of the overall focus of the thesis, editions of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* are included in Section I, despite the fact that all the examples involved attribute the play explicitly to Shakespeare and Fletcher (or Fletcher and Shakespeare). The same applies to the recent Oxford and Arden 3 editions of *Henry VIII* by Jay L. Halio and Gordon McMullan respectively. Adaptations, performance-texts, and other "non-standard" versions of Shakespearian drama can be found in Section II. Multiple works by the same author(s) are listed in chronological order, by date of first publication of the edition or version used, earliest first (and then by original publication date or alphabetically, where necessary). Arrangement of the entries within the separate sections is explained in the individual headnotes, below.

SECTION I:

EDITIONS OF SHAKESPEARE

These are grouped under sub-headings, arranged as follows: A. Facsimile Editions; B. Complete Works; C. Individual Editions of Plays and Poems. The latter are sub-divided alphabetically by title. Entries within the groups and sub-groups are arranged alphabetically by editor(s).

A. Facsimile Editions

Allen, Michael J. B., and Kenneth Muir, eds., *Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto: A Facsimile Edition of Copies Primarily from the Henry E. Huntington Library* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1981)

Greg, W. W., ed., *Pericles 1609*, Shakespeare Quartos in Collotype Facsimile, 5 (London, 1940)

Hinman, Charlton, ed., *The Norton Facsimile: The First Folio of Shakespeare* (New York, 1968)

Mr William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories and Tragedies, Published According to the True Originall Copies: The Third Folio reproduced in facsimile, with an Introduction by Marvin Spevack, *The Shakespeare Folios* (Cambridge, 1985)

B. Complete Works

Alexander, Peter, ed., *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works* (London and Glasgow, 1951; reprinted 1988)

Barnet, Sylvan, general editor, *The Complete Signet Classic Shakespeare* (New York, 1972)

Bevington, David, ed., *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, third edition (Glenview, IL, 1980); updated fourth edition (New York, 1997)

Evans, G. Blakemore, textual editor, *The Riverside Shakespeare* (Boston, MA, 1974)

Evans, G. Blakemore, with J. J. M. Tobin, general editors, *The Riverside Shakespeare*, second edition (Boston, MA, 1997)

Greenblatt, Stephen, with Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus, eds., *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition* (New York, 1997)

Wells, Stanley, and Gary Taylor, with John Jowett and William Montgomery, eds., *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, *The Oxford Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1986)

—————, eds, *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works: Original-Spelling Edition*, *The Oxford Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1986)

—————, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*, *The Oxford Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1987); reprinted with corrections, *The Norton Shakespeare* (New York and London, 1997)

—————, eds., *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, *Compact Edition*, *The Oxford Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1988)

Wilson, John Dover, [general editor], *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare: The Cambridge Text*, with introductory material by Philip Brockbank, *Octopus Books edition* (London, 1980)

C. Individual Editions of Plays and Poems

All's Well That Ends Well:

Hunter, G. K., ed., *All's Well That Ends Well*, third edition, *The Arden Shakespeare* (London, 1959)

Snyder, Susan, *All's Well That Ends Well*, *The Oxford Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1993)

Antony and Cleopatra:

Bevington, David, ed., *Antony and Cleopatra*, The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1990)

Neill, Michael, ed., *Anthony and Cleopatra*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 1994)

Wilders, John, ed., *Antony and Cleopatra*, The Arden Shakespeare (London and New York, 1995)

The Comedy of Errors:

Wells, Stanley, ed., *The Comedy of Errors*, The New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1972)

Cymbeline:

Dowden, Edward, ed., *Cymbeline*, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1903)

Furness, Horace Howard, ed., *The Tragedie of Cymbeline*, A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, [18] (Philadelphia, 1913)

Hosley, Richard, ed., *Cymbeline*, The Signet Classic Shakespeare (New York, 1968; reissued in a combined edition with *Pericles* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, New York, 1986)

Maxwell, J. C., ed., *Cymbeline*, The New Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1960)

Nosworthy, J. M., ed., *Cymbeline*, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1955; reprinted 1986)

Warren, Roger, ed., *Cymbeline*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 1998)

Wyatt, Alfred J., ed., *Cymbeline*, The Warwick Shakespeare (London and Glasgow, [1897])

Hamlet:

Edwards, Philip, ed., *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1985)

Henry VI:

Hattaway, Michael, ed., *The Second Part of King Henry VI*, The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1991)

———, ed., *The Third Part of King Henry VI*, The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1993)

Henry VIII (All Is True):

Bowers, Fredson, ed., *Henry VIII*, in *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon* (see Section II), VII (1989), 1-144

Foakes, R. A., ed., *King Henry VIII*, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1957; reprinted 1984)

Halio, Jay L., ed., *King Henry VIII, or All is True*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 1999)

Humphreys, A. R., ed., *King Henry the Eighth*, The New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1971)

McMullan, Gordon, ed., *King Henry VIII (All Is True)*, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 2000)

Margeson, John, ed., *King Henry VIII*, The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1990)

Maxwell, J. C., ed., *King Henry the Eighth*, The New Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1962)

Pooler, C. Knox, ed., *The Famous History of the Life of King Henry VIII*, second edition, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1936; first edition, 1915)

Schoenbaum, S., ed., *The Famous History of the Life of King Henry the Eighth*, The Signet Classic Shakespeare (New York, 1967)

Macbeth:

Brooke, Nicholas, ed., *The Tragedy of Macbeth*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 1990)

A Midsummer Night's Dream:

Holland, Peter, ed., *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 1994)

Pericles:

Deighton, K., ed., *Pericles*, second edition, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1925; first edition, 1907)

DelVecchio, Doreen, and Antony Hammond, eds., *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1998)

Edwards, Philip, ed., *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, The New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1976)

Hoener, F. D., ed., *Pericles*, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1963; reprinted 1984)

Maxwell, J. C., ed., *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, The New Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1956)

Schanzer, Ernest, ed., *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, The Signet Classic Shakespeare (New York, 1965; reissued in a combined edition with *Cymbeline* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, New York, 1986)

Poems and Sonnets:

Burrow, Colin, ed., *The Complete Sonnets and Poems*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 2002)

Burto, William, ed., *The Sonnets*, The Signet Classic Shakespeare. with an Introduction by W. H. Auden (New York, 1964)

Duncan-Jones, Katherine, ed., *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, The Arden Shakespeare ([Walton-on-Thames], 1997)

Kerrigan, John, ed., *'The Sonnets' and 'A Lover's Complaint'*, The New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1986)

Roe, John, ed., *The Poems*, The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1992)

Rollins, Hyder Edward, ed., *The Poems*, A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare (Philadelphia and London, 1938)

Richard III:

Hammond, Antony, ed., *King Richard III*, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1981; reprinted 1988)

The Tempest:

Barton, Anne (as Anne Righter), ed., *The Tempest*, The New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1968)

Frye, Northrop, ed., *The Tempest*, The Pelican Shakespeare (Baltimore, 1959)

Furness, Horace Howard, ed., *The Tempest*, A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, 9 (Philadelphia, 1892)

Kermode, Frank, ed., *The Tempest*, sixth edition, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1958; reprinted 1988; fifth edition, 1954)

Langbaum, Robert, ed., *The Tempest*, The Signet Classic Shakespeare (New York, 1964)

Luce, Morton, ed., *The Tempest*, fourth edition, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1938; first edition, 1902)

Orgel, Stephen, ed., *The Tempest*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 1987)

Quiller-Couch, Arthur, and John Dover Wilson, eds., *The Tempest*, The New Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1921)

Righter, Anne; see under Anne Barton

The Tempest, Penguin Popular Classics (Harmondsworth, 1994)

Vaughan, Virginia Mason, and Alden T. Vaughan, eds., *The Tempest*, The Arden Shakespeare (Walton-on-Thames, 1999)

Titus Andronicus:

Bate, Jonathan, ed., *Titus Andronicus*, The Arden Shakespeare (London and New York, 1995)

The Two Noble Kinsmen:

Bawcutt, N. W., ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, The New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1977)

Bowers, Fredson, ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, in *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon* (see Section II), VII (1989), 145-298

Leech, Clifford, ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, The Signet Classic Shakespeare (New York, 1966; reissued in a combined edition with *Pericles* and *Cymbeline*, New York, 1986)

Littledale, Harold, ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen: Reprint of the Quarto, 1634*, Publications of The New Shakspeare Society, Series II, no. 7 (London, 1876)

———, ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen: Edited from the Quarto of 1634: Part I. Revised Text and Notes*, Publications of The New Shakspeare Society, Series II, no. 8 (London, 1876)

———, ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen: Edited from the Quarto of 1634: Part II. General Introduction and List of Words*, Publications of The New Shakspeare Society, Series II, no. 15 (London, 1885)

Potter, Lois, ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, The Arden Shakespeare (Walton-on-Thames, 1997)

Proudfoot, G. R., ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, Regents Renaissance Drama Series (Lincoln, NE and London, 1970)

Trussler, Simon, comp., *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, A programme/text with commentary, Swan Theatre Plays (London, 1986)

Waith, Eugene M., ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 1989)

The Winter's Tale:

Furness, Horace Howard, ed., *The Winter's Tale*, A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, 11 (Philadelphia, 1898)

Kermode, Frank, ed., *The Winter's Tale*, The Signet Classic Shakespeare (New York, 1963)

Moorman, F. W., ed., *The Winter's Tale*, second edition, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1922; first edition, 1912)

Orgel, Stephen, ed., *The Winter's Tale*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, 1996)

Pafford, J. H. P., ed., *The Winter's Tale*, The Arden Shakespeare (London, 1963; reprinted 1989)

Quiller-Couch, Arthur, and John Dover Wilson, eds., *The Winter's Tale*, The New Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1931)

Schanzer, Ernest, ed., *The Winter's Tale*, The New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1969)

SECTION II:

OTHER LITERARY, DRAMATIC, AND HISTORICAL WORKS

This section includes all non-Shakespearian dramatic and poetic texts used, Shakespearian adaptations and performance-texts, other works of fiction and literature, early historiographical texts, source material for the late plays, and any other early writings and early printed books. Entries are arranged alphabetically by author, with anonymous works listed by title at the appropriate point within the sequence. For the authorship of works from the "Beaumont and Fletcher" canon, it has seemed best here to follow the attributions of the editions cited. Where *STC* numbers are given, I have only been able to consult the work concerned in microfilm.

Apollonius of Tyre (Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri); see under Elizabeth Archibald, Section III

Aristotle, *The Poetics*, with an English translation by W. Hamilton Fyfe, published in a single volume with "Longinus", *On the Sublime*, and Demetrius, *On Style*, Loeb Classical Library, revised edition (London, 1932; first edition, 1927)

———, *Poetics*, translated by M. E. Hubbard, in Russell and Winterbottom, *Classical Literary Criticism* (see below), pp. 51-90

Auden, W. H., 'The Sea and the Mirror: A Commentary on Shakespeare's *The Tempest*' (1944), in *Collected Longer Poems* (London, 1968), pp. 199-252

Austen, Jane, *Mansfield Park*, edited by Tony Tanner, Penguin Classics (Harmondsworth, 1986; first printed 1966)

Beaumont, Francis, *Grammar Lecture*; see under Mark Eccles, Section III

———— (as "Francis Beaumont"), *The Masque of the Inner Temple and Grayes Inne: Grayes Inne and the Inner Temple, Presented Before his Maiestie, the Queenes Maiestie, the Prince, Count Palatine and the Lady Elizabeth their Highnesses, in the Banquetting house at Whitehall on Saturday the twentieth day of Februarie, 1612 [sic]* (London, [1613(?)]; STC 1663); also issued with cancel title page removing the authorial ascription (London, [1613(?)]; STC 1664)

————, *The Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn*, edited by Fredson Bowers, in *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon* (see below), I (1966), 111-144

————, *The Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn*, edited by Philip Edwards, in Spencer and Wells, *A Book of Masques* (see below), pp. 125-148

————, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, edited by Michael Hattaway, *The New Mermaids* (London, 1969; revised 1989)

Beaumont, Francis, and John Fletcher, *Comedies and Tragedies* (London, 1647)

————, *Fifty Comedies and Tragedies* (London, 1679)

————, *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, general editor Fredson Bowers, 10 vols (Cambridge, 1966-1996)

————, *Philaster; or, Love Lies a-Bleeding*, edited by Andrew Gurr, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1969)

Beckett, Samuel, *Texts for Nothing*, translated from the original French by the author, Signature Series, 21 (London, 1974); English version first published in *No's Knife: Collected Shorter Prose, 1945-1966* (London, 1967), pp. 69-136

The Bible; see under Carroll and Prickett, below

Boccaccio, Giovanni, *Teseida delle nozze di Emilia*, edited by Alberto Limentani, in *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, general editor Vittore Branca, I *Classici Mondadori* (Milan, 1964-), II (1964), 229-664

————, *Chaucer's Boccaccio: Sources of 'Troilus' and the 'Knight's' and 'Franklin's Tales'*, edited and translated by N. R. Havely, *Chaucer Studies*, 3 (Cambridge, 1980)

Bond, Edward, *Bingo: Scenes of money and death*, Methuen's Modern Plays (London, 1974)

Brooke, C. F. Tucker, ed., *The Shakespeare Apocrypha: Being A Collection of Fourteen Plays Which Have Been Ascribed to Shakespeare*, second impression (Oxford, 1918; first impression, 1908)

Caesarius of Arles, *Sermons*, Volume I (1-80), translated by Sister Mary Magdeleine Mueller, *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, 31 (Washington, DC, 1956; reprinted 1977)

——— (Césaire d'Arles), *Sermons au Peuple*, edited and translated into French by Marie-José Delage, 3 vols, *Sources Chrétiennes*, 175, 243, 330 (Paris, 1971-1986)

Carroll, Robert, and Stephen Prickett, eds., *The Bible: Authorized King James Version*, *The World's Classics* (Oxford, 1997)

Caxton, William, *The Game and Playe of the Chesse*, [translated from the French versions of Jean de Vignai and Jean Ferron, after the Latin of Jacobus de Cessolis] ([Bruges, c. 1475]; *STC* 4920); second edition ([Westminster, c. 1483]; *STC* 4921)

———, *Caxton's Game and Playe of the Chesse, 1474: A Verbatim Reprint of the First Edition*, edited by William E. A. Axon (London, 1883)

———, *The Golden Legende*, [translated from the French of Jean de Vignai, after the Latin of Jacobus de Voragine] (Westminster, 1483; *STC* 24873)

———, *The Golden Legend; or, Lives of the Saints, as Englished by William Caxton*, edited by F. S. Ellis, 7 vols, *The Temple Classics* (London, 1900)

Chaucer, Geoffrey, *The Workes of Geffray Chaucer newly printed, with dyuers workes whiche were neuer in print before*, [edited by William Thynne] (London, 1532; *STC* 5068)

———, *The Workes of Geffray Chaucer newlye printed, wyth dyuers workes whych were neuer in print before*, [edited by William Thynne], [second edition] (London, 1542; *STC* 5069, 5070)

———, *The Workes of Geffray Chaucer newly printed, with dyuers workes whiche were neuer in print before*, [edited by William Thynne], [third edition] ([London, 1550(?); *STC* 5071-5074)

———, *The Workes of Geffrey Chaucer, newli printed, with diuers addicions whiche were neuer in print before: With the Siege and Destruction of the worthy Citee of Thebes*, [edited by John Stow] ([London], 1561; *STC* 5075, 5076)

———, *The Workes of our Antient and lerned English Poet, Geffrey Chaucer, newly Printed*, [edited by Thomas Speght] (London, 1598; *STC* 5077-5079)

———, *The Workes of our Ancient and learned English Poet, Geffrey Chaucer, newly Printed*, [edited by Thomas Speght], [second edition] (London, 1602; *STC* 5080, 5081)

———, *The Riverside Chaucer*, third edition, general editor Larry D. Benson (New York, 1987, and Oxford, 1988; based on *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, edited by F. N. Robinson, second edition (Boston, MA, 1957; first edition 1933))

Cicero, *The Speeches*, with an English Translation by Lous E. Lord, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA and London, 1937)

Cowell, John, *The Interpreter; or, Booke Containing the Signification of Words: Wherein is set foorth the true meaning of all, or the most part of such Words and Termes, as are mentioned in the Lawe Writers, or Statutes of this victorious and renowned Kingdome, requiring any Exposition or Interpretation* (Cambridge, 1607; STC 5900)

de Lorris, Guillaume, and Jean de Meun, *Le roman de la rose*, edited by Daniel Poirion (Paris, 1974)

———, *The Romance of the Rose*, translated by Frances Horgan, The World's Classics (Oxford, 1994)

D'Avenant, William, *The Dramatic Works of Sir William D'Avenant, with Prefatory Memoir and Notes*, [edited by James Maidment and W. H. Logan], 5 vols (Edinburgh, 1872-1874; reissued New York, 1964)

———, *The Rivals: William Davenant 1668*, with an Introduction by Kenneth Muir, Cornmarket Press facsimile reprints, second series (London, 1970)

Donne, John, *The Complete English Poems of John Donne*, edited by C. A. Patrides, Everyman's Library (London, 1985)

Dryden, John, *The Poems of John Dryden: Volume I: 1649-1681*, edited by Paul Hammond, Longman Annotated English Poets (London and New York, 1995)

D'Urfey, Thomas, *The Injured Princess: 1682*, with an Introduction by T. P. Matheson, Cornmarket Press facsimile reprints, second series (London, 1970)

Early Greek Philosophy, translated and edited by Jonathan Barnes, Penguin Classics (Harmondsworth, 1987)

Eliot, T. S., 'Marina' (1930), in *The Complete Poems and Plays* (Fakenham, 1969), pp. 109-110

Fleay, F. G., ed., *The Strange and Worthy Accidents in The Birth and Life of Marina. By William Shakspeare, Transactions of the NSS, Series I, nos. 1-2* (1874), 209-241

Ford, John, *The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck: A Strange Truth*, edited by Peter Ure, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1968)

Foxe, John, *Actes and Monuments of Matters most speciall and memorable, happening in the Church, with an vniuersall historie of the same* [*The Book of Martyrs*], sixth edition, 2 vols (London, 1610; STC 11227); first published as *Actes and Monuments of these latter and perillous dayes, touching matters of the Church* (London, 1563; STC 11222)

Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, translated by Lewis Thorpe, *Penguin Classics* (Harmondsworth, 1966)

Greene, Robert, *The Scottish History of James the Fourth*, edited by Norman Sanders, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1970)

Harrison, Tony, *The Gaze of the Gorgon* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1992)

Herbert, Henry, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, 1623-1673*, edited by Joseph Quincy Adams, *Cornell Studies in English* (New Haven and London, 1917)

Holinshed, Raphael, [and others], *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, 6 vols (London, 1807-1808; reprinted from the second edition, London, 1587)

Isidore of Seville (Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi), *Etymologiarum sive Originum*, edited by W. M. Lindsay, 2 vols, *Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis* (Oxford, 1911; reissued 1971)

Jonson, Ben, *Ben Jonson*, edited by C. H. Herford, Percy Simpson, and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford, 1925-1952)

Kean, Charles, *King Henry VIII: Charles Kean 1855*, with an Introduction by Martin Wright, *Cornmarket Press facsimile series* (London, 1969); reprinted from *Shakespeare's Historical Play of King Henry the Eighth: Arranged for Representation at the Princess's Theatre by Charles Kean* (London, [1855(?)])

King James VI and I, *Political Writings*, edited by Johann P. Sommerville, *Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (Cambridge, 1994)

Lactantius (Lactance), *De opificio Dei (L'Ouvrage du Dieu Créateur)*, edited and translated into French by Michel Perrin, 2 vols, *Sources Chrésiennes*, 213-214 (Paris, 1974)

Lillo, George, *Marina: 1738*, *Cornmarket Press facsimile reprints* (London, 1969)

Lydgate, John, *Lydgate's 'Siege of Thebes': Part I. - The Text*, edited by Axel Erdmann, Early English Texts Society, Extra Series, 108 (London, 1911)

———, *Lydgate's 'Siege of Thebes': Part II. - Introduction, Notes, Rhyme-Lists, and a Glossary, with an Appendix*, edited by Axel Erdmann and Eilert Ekwall, Early English Texts Society, Extra Series, 125 (London, 1930)

Lyly, John, *The Plays of John Lyly*, edited by Carter A. Daniel (Cranbury, NJ, 1988)

MacNeice, Louis, *Collected Poems*, edited by E. R. Dodds, second edition (London, 1979)

Meres, Francis, *Francis Meres's Treatise 'Poetrie': A Critical Edition*, edited by Don Cameron Allen, University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, 16 (Urbana, IL, 1933)

The Mirror for Magistrates, edited by Lily B. Campbell (Cambridge, 1938)

———, *Parts Added to 'The Mirror for Magistrates' By John Higgins & Thomas Blennerhasset*, edited by Lily B. Campbell (Cambridge, 1946)

Montaigne, Michel de, *The Essayes; or, Morall, Politike and Millitarie Discourses of Lo: Michaell de Montaigne*, translated by John Florio (London, 1603); reprinted as *Michel de Montaigne: The Essays 1603*, A Scholar Press Facsimile (Menston, 1969)

———, *Les Essais*, edited by Pierre Villey (Paris, 1924; reprinted, with a Preface by V.-L. Saulnier, Paris, 1965)

———, *The Complete Essays*, translated and edited by M. A. Screech, Penguin Classics (Harmondsworth, 1993; first published, 1991)

Munday, Anthony, and others, *Sir Thomas More*, edited by Vittorio Gabrieli and Giorgio Melchiori, The Revels Plays (Manchester and New York, 1990)

North, Thomas, trans., *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes, Compared together by that graue learned Philosopher and Historiographer, Plutarke of Chaeronea* (London, 1579)

———, trans., *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romaines, Compared Together by that Grave Learned Philosopher and Historiographer, Plutarke of Chaeronea*, [fourth edition] (London, 1612)

Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong, *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court: Including the complete designs for productions at court for the most part in the collection of the Duke of Devonshire together with their texts and historical documentation*, 2 vols (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1973)

Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, with an English translation by Frank Justus Miller, Loeb Classical Library, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA and London, 1921-1922; first published 1916)

Owen, John (Ioanne Owen), *Epigrammatum Libri Tres* (London, 1606; STC 18984.5)

The Phoenix, edited by N. F. Blake, revised edition, Exeter Medieval English Texts and Studies (Exeter, 1990; first edition, Manchester, 1964)

Rowley, Samuel, *When You See Me, You Know Me (1605)*, prepared by F. P. Wilson, The Malone Society Reprints (Oxford, -1952)

Russell, D. A., and M. Winterbottom, eds., *Classical Literary Criticism*, The World's Classics (Oxford, 1989; revised edition of *Ancient Literary Criticism: The Principal Texts in New Translations* (Oxford, 1972))

Seneca, *Seneca's Tragedies*, with an English Translation by Frank Justus Miller, 2 vols, Loeb Classical Library (London and New York, 1917)

Shaw, George Bernard, *Fanny's First Play: An Easy Play for a Little Theatre*, in *The Bodley Head Bernard Shaw: Collected Plays with their Prefaces, Volume IV* (London, 1972), pp. 341-449; English text first published in *Misalliance, The Dark Lady of the Sonnets, and Fanny's First Play. With a Treatise on Parents and Children* (London, 1914), pp. 149-234

———, *Cymbeline Refinished: A Variation on Shakespear's Ending*, in *The Bodley Head Bernard Shaw, Volume VII* (London, 1974), pp. 177-199; first published as *Cymbeline Refinished: A Variation*, *The London Mercury*, 37 (1937-38), 373-389

Sidney, Philip, *Sir Philip Sidney*, edited by Katherine Duncan-Jones, The Oxford Authors (Oxford, 1989)

S[pencer], T. J. B., and S[tanley] W[ells], eds., *A Book of Masques: In Honour of Allardyce Nicoll* (Cambridge, 1967)

Spenser, Edmund, *Edmund Spenser: The Shepheardes Calender 1579*, A Scolar Press Fascimile (Menston, 1968)

———, *The Faerie Queene*, edited by Thomas P. Roche, Jr., with C. Patrick O'Donnell, Jr., Penguin Classics (Harmondsworth, 1987; first published, 1978)

Statius, [Works], with an English translation by J. H. Mozley, 2 vols, Loeb Classical Library (London, 1928; reprinted 1961)

———, *Thebaid*, translated by A. D. Melville, with an Introduction by D. W. T. Vessey, The World's Classics (Oxford, 1995)

Stephen, Henrie [Henri Estienne], *A World of Wonders; or, An Introduction to a Treatise touching the Conformitie of ancient and moderne wonders: or, A Preparatiue Treatise to the Apologie for Herodotus. The Argument whereof is taken from the Apologie for Herodotus written in Latine by Henrie Stephen, and continued here by the Author himselfe*, translated from the French by "R. C." (London, 1607; STC 10553)

Stow, John, *The Annales, or Generall Chronicle of England, begun first by Maister Ihon Stow, and after him continued and augmented with matters forreyne, and domestique, auncient and moderne, vnto the ende of this present yeere 1614 by Edmond Howes, gentleman* (London, 1615)

Theobald, Lewis, *Double Falshood: 1728*, with an introduction by Kenneth Muir, Cornmarket Press facsimile reprints, second series (London, 1970)

Twine, Laurence, *The Patterne of painefull Aduentures: Containing the most excellent, pleasant and variable Historie of the strange accidents that befell vnto Prince Apollonius, the Lady Lucina his wife, and Tharsia his daughter* (London, [c. 1594]; STC 709); reprinted attributed to T[homas] Twine (London, 1607; STC 710)

Virgil, *The Eclogues*, edited and translated by Guy Lee, revised edition, Penguin Classics (Harmondsworth, 1984, reprinted 1987; first published in Liverpool Latin Texts, Liverpool, 1980)

———, [Works], with an English translation by H. Rushton Fairclough, revised by G. P. Goold, The Loeb Classical Library, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA and London, 1999–2000; original edition first published 1916–1918)

Vita Aedwardi Regis qui apud Westmonasterium requiescit: The Life of King Edward who rests at Westminster, edited and translated by Frank Barlow, Medieval Texts (London, 1962)

Wellwood, S., ed., '*Marina*': *A Dramatic Romance by William Shakespeare: Being the Shakespearian Portion of the Tragedy of 'Pericles'* (London, 1902)

Wilkins, George, *The Painfull Aduentures of Pericles Prince of Tyre*, edited by Kenneth Muir, Liverpool Reprints, 8 (Liverpool, 1953)

Wotton, Henry, *Letters of Sir Henry Wotton to Sir Edmund Bacon* (London, 1661; Wing 3644)

A Yorkshire Tragedy, edited by A. C. Cawley and Barry Gaines, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1986)

SECTION III:

CRITICISM AND SCHOLARSHIP

Entries are arranged alphabetically by author, or where appropriate, by title or organization. Anonymous/unsigned works are listed under "unattributed".

Abartis, Caesarea, *The Tragicomic Construction of 'Cymbeline' and 'The Winter's Tale'*, *Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Jacobean Drama Studies*, 73 (Salzburg, 1977)

Abel, Lionel, *Metatheatre: A New View of Dramatic Form* (New York, 1963)

Abrams, Richard, 'Gender confusion and sexual politics in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Themes in Drama*, 7 (1985), 69-76

———, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen as Bourgeois Drama', in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 145-162

———, 'W[illiam] S[hakespeare]'s "Funeral Elegy" and the Turn from the Theatrical', *Studies in English Literature*, 36 (1996), 435-460

Adams, Robert M., *Shakespeare: The Four Romances* (New York and London, 1989)

Adelman, Janet, *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, 'Hamlet' to 'The Tempest'* (New York and London, 1992)

Alexander, Peter, 'Conjectural History, or Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*', *Essays and Studies*, 16 (1930), 85-120

———, *Shakespeare's Life and Art* (London, 1939)

Allen, Don Cameron, ed., *Studies in Honor of T. W. Baldwin* (Urbana, IL, 1958)

Allen, Percy, *Shakespeare, Jonson, and Wilkins as Borrowers: A Study in Elizabethan Dramatic Origins and Imitations* (Oxford, 1928)

Alter, Iska, "'To Reform and Make Fitt": *Henry VIII* and the Making of "Bad" Shakespeare', in Charney, *"Bad" Shakespeare*, pp. 176-186

Althusser, Louis, 'Marxism and Humanism', in *For Marx*, translated by Ben Brewster (London, 1969; reprinted 1971), pp. 219-247

- , *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays*, translated by Ben Brewster (London and New York, 1971)
- , 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)', in *Lenin and Philosophy*, pp. 127-186
- Altieri, Joanne, *The Theatre of Praise: The Panegyric Tradition in Seventeenth-Century English Drama* (Cranbury, NJ, 1986)
- Altman, Joel B., *The Tudor Play of Mind: Rhetorical Inquiry and the Development of Elizabethan Drama* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1978)
- Alulis, Joseph, and Vickie Sullivan, eds., *Shakespeare's Political Pageant: Essays in Literature and Politics* (Lanham, MD, 1996)
- Anderson, David, *Before the Knight's Tale: Imitation of Classical Epic in Boccaccio's 'Teseida'*, University of Pennsylvania Press Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia, 1988)
- Anderson, Judith H., 'Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*: The Changing Relation of Truth to Fiction', in *Biographical Truth: The Representation of Historical Persons in Tudor-Stuart Writing* (New Haven and London, 1984), pp. 125-154
- , *Words That Matter: Linguistic Perception in Renaissance England* (Stanford, CA, 1996)
- Andreas, James R., 'Remythologizing *The Knight's Tale*: A *Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Shakespeare Yearbook*, 2 (1991), 49-67
- Anglo, Sydney, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy*, second edition, Oxford-Warburg Studies (Oxford, 1997; first edition, 1969)
- Appleton, William W., *Beaumont and Fletcher: A Critical Study* (London, 1956)
- Archibald, Elizabeth, '"Deep clerks she dumbs": The Learned Heroine in *Apollonius of Tyre* and *Pericles*', *Comparative Drama*, 22 (1988-89), 289-303
- , *Apollonius of Tyre: Medieval and Renaissance Themes and Variations: Including the text of the 'Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri', with an English translation* (Cambridge, 1991)
- Armitage, David, 'The Dismemberment of Orpheus: Mythic Elements in Shakespeare's Romances', *Shakespeare Survey*, 39 (1986), 123-133
- Armstrong, Edward A., *Shakespeare's Imagination: A Study of the Psychology of Association and Inspiration* (London, 1946); second edition (Lincoln, NE and London, 1963; reissued 1982)

Arnold, Morris LeRoy, *The Soliloquies of Shakespeare: A Study in Technic* (Columbia, 1911; reissued New York, 1965)

Arthos, John, 'Pericles, Prince of Tyre: A Study in the Dramatic Use of Romantic Narrative', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 4 (1953), 257-270

Astington, John H., 'The Popularity of *Cupid's Revenge*', *Studies in English Literature*, 19 (1979), 215-227

Atkins, G. Douglas, and David M. Bergeron, eds., *Shakespeare and Deconstruction*, American University Studies, Series IV: English Language and Literature, 57 (New York, 1988)

Auberlen, Eckhard, 'King Henry VIII - Shakespeare's Break with the "Bluff-King-Harry" Tradition', *Anglia*, 98 (1980), 319-347

Auden, W. H., 'Introduction', in *The Sonnets*, edited by William Burto (see Section I), pp. xvii-xxxviii

Austin, J. L., *How to do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*, edited by J. O. Urmson (Oxford, 1962)

"B., C.", 'Shakspeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*', *Notes and Queries*, 3 (January-June 1851), 190-191

Baillie, W. M., 'Authorship attribution in Jacobean dramatic texts', in *Computers in the Humanities*, edited by J. L. Mitchell (Edinburgh, 1974), pp. 73-81

———, 'Henry VIII: A Jacobean History', *Shakespeare Studies*, 12 (1979), 247-266

Baldick, Chris, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (Oxford, 1990)

Baldwin, T. W., *William Shakspeare's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke*, 2 vols (Urbana, IL, 1944)

Bamber, Linda, *Comic Women, Tragic Men: A Study of Gender and Genre in Shakespeare* (Stanford, CA, 1982)

Barber, C. L., *Shakespeare's Festive Comedy: A Study of Dramatic Form and its Relation to Social Custom* (Princeton, NJ, 1959; reprinted 1972)

———, '"Thou that beget'st him that did thee beget": Transformation in *Pericles* and *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 22 (1969), 59-67

Barber, C. L., and Richard P. Wheeler, *The Whole Journey: Shakespeare's Power of Development* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1986)

Barish, Jonas, "'Soft, here follows prose": Shakespeare's Stage Documents', in Biggs and others, *The Arts of Performance*, pp. 32-49

Barkan, Leonard, "'Living Sculptures": Ovid, Michelangelo, and *The Winter's Tale*', *ELH*, 48 (1981), 639-667

—————, *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis & the Pursuit of Paganism* (New Haven and London, 1986)

Barker, Deborah, and Ivo Kamps, eds., *Shakespeare and Gender: A History* (London and New York, 1995)

—————, 'Shakespeare and Gender: An Introduction', in *Shakespeare and Gender*, pp. 1-21

Barker, Francis, *The Culture of Violence: Tragedy and history* (Manchester, 1993)

Barker, Francis, and Peter Hulme, 'Nymphs and reapers heavily vanish: the discursive con-texts of *The Tempest*', in Drakakis, *Alternative Shakespeares*, pp. 191-205

Barker, Francis, Peter Hulme, and Margaret Iversen, eds., *Uses of history: Marxism, postmodernism and the Renaissance*, The Essex Symposia (Manchester and New York, 1991)

—————, 'Introduction', in *Uses of history*, pp. 1-23

Barrett, Debbie L., 'Pericles, Social Redemption, and the Iconography of "Veritas Temporis Filia"', *Shakespeare Yearbook*, 2 (1991), 77-94

Barroll, J. Leeds, 'Shakespeare and Roman History', *Modern Language Review*, 53 (1958), 327-343

—————, 'The Chronology of Shakespeare's Jacobean Plays and the Dating of *Antony and Cleopatra*', in *Essays on Shakespeare*, edited by Gordon Ross Smith (University Park, PA and London, 1965), pp. 115-162

—————, *Politics, Plague, and Shakespeare's Theater: The Stuart Years* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1991; reprinted 1995)

—————, ed., 'Forum: A Funeral Elegy By W.S.', *Shakespeare Studies*, 25 (1997), 89-237

Barron, W. R. J., *English Medieval Romance*, Longman Literature in English Series (London and New York, 1987)

Barthes, Roland, *Mythologies*, selected and translated by Annette Lavers (St Albans, 1972; reprinted 1973; original French edition first published Paris, 1957; reprinted 1970)

—————, 'Myth Today', in *Mythologies*, pp. 107-159

———, 'The Death of the Author', in *Image Music Text*, edited and translated by Stephen Heath (London, 1977), pp. 142-148

Bartholomeusz, Dennis, *'The Winter's Tale' in performance in England and America 1611-1976* (Cambridge, 1982)

Barton, Anne (as Anne Righter), *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* (London, 1962)

Barton, Anne, *Essays, Mainly Shakespearean* (Cambridge, 1994)

———, 'The king disguised: Shakespeare's *Henry V* and the comical history', in *Essays, Mainly Shakespearean*, pp. 207-233; reprinted from *The Triple Bond: Plays, Mainly Shakespearean, in Performance*, edited by Joseph G. Price (University Park, PA and London, 1975), pp. 92-117

———, '"He that plays the king": Ford's *Perkin Warbeck* and the Stuart history play', in *Essays, Mainly Shakespearean*, pp. 234-260; reprinted from *English Drama: Forms and Developments: Essays in Honour of Muriel Clara Bradbrook*, edited by Marie Axton and Raymond Williams (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 69-93

———, 'Leontes and the spider: language and speaker in Shakespeare's last plays', in *Essays, Mainly Shakespearean*, pp. 161-181; reprinted from *Shakespeare's Styles: Essays in honour of Kenneth Muir*, edited by Philip Edwards, Inga-Stina Ewbank, and G. K. Hunter (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 131-150

———, '"Enter Mariners wet": realism in Shakespeare's last plays', in *Essays, Mainly Shakespearean*, pp. 182-203; reprinted from *Realism in European Literature: Essays in Honour of J. P. Stern*, edited by Nicholas Boyle and Martin Swales (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 28-49

———, '"Wrying but a little": marriage, law and sexuality in the plays of Shakespeare', in *Essays, Mainly Shakespearean*, pp. 3-30

Bate, Jonathan, *Shakespearean Constitutions: Politics, Theatre, Criticism 1730-1830* (Oxford, 1989)

———, ed., *The Romantics on Shakespeare*, New Penguin Shakespeare Library (Harmondsworth, 1992)

———, *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford, 1993)

———, *The Genius of Shakespeare* (London and Basingstoke, 1997)

Baxter, John, 'Cymbeline and the Measures of Chastity', *The Elizabethan Theatre*, 12 (1993), 135-155

Beal, Peter, 'The burning of the Globe', *TLS*, 20 June 1986, pp. 689-690

Bearman, Robert, *Shakespeare in the Stratford Records* (Stroud, 1994)

Becker, George J., *Shakespeare's Histories* (New York, 1977)

Beer, Gillian, *The Romance, The Critical Idiom*, 10 (London, 1970)

Behrens, Ralph, 'On Possible Inconsistencies in Two Character Portrayals in *Cymbeline*', *Notes and Queries*, 201 (1956), 379-380

Belsey, Catherine, *Critical Practice, New Accents* (London and New York, 1980)

———, *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and difference in Renaissance drama* (London and New York, 1985)

———, 'Literature, history, politics', in Lodge, *Modern Criticism and Theory*, pp. 400-410; reprinted from *Literature and History*, 9 (1983), 17-27

———, 'Making histories then and now: Shakespeare from *Richard II* to *Henry V*', in Barker, Hulme, and Iversen, *Uses of history*, pp. 24-46

Benjamin, Walter, *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt, translated by Harry Zohn (London, 1992; English translation first published New York, 1968)

Bennett, Kenneth C., 'Reconstructing *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 46 (1993), 81-90

Bentley, Gerald Eades, 'Shakespeare and the Blackfriars Theatre', *Shakespeare Survey*, 1 (1948), 38-50

———, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time, 1590-1642* (Princeton, NJ, 1971)

Benzie, William, *Dr. F. J. Furnivall: Victorian Scholar Adventurer* (Norman, OK, 1983)

Berger, Harry, Jr., 'Miraculous Harp: A Reading of Shakespeare's *Tempest*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 5 (1969), 253-283

———, *Revisionary Play: Studies in the Spenserian Dynamics*, with an Introductory Essay by Louis Montrose (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1988)

———, *Imaginary Audition: Shakespeare on Stage and Page* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1989)

Bergeron, David M., 'The Restoration of Hermione in *The Winter's Tale*', in Kay and Jacobs, *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*, pp. 125-133

———, 'Cymbeline: Shakespeare's Last Roman Play', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 31 (1980), 31-41

———, ed., *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater* (Athens, GA, 1985)

———, 'Introduction', in *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*, pp. 1-16

———, *Shakespeare's Romances and the Royal Family* (Lawrence, KS, 1985)

———, 'Reading and Writing in Shakespeare's Romances', *Criticism*, 33 (1991), 91-113; reprinted in revised form as 'Treacherous Reading and Writing in Shakespeare's Romances', in *Reading and Writing in Shakespeare*, edited by David M. Bergeron (Cranbury, NJ, 1996), pp. 160-177

———, 'The Beginnings of *Pericles*, *Henry VIII*, and [The] *Two Noble Kinsmen*', in *Entering the Maze: Shakespeare's Art of Beginning*, edited by Robert F. Willson, Jr., *Studies in Shakespeare*, 2 (New York, 1995), pp. 169-181

Berggren, Paula S., 'The Woman's Part: Female Sexuality as Power in Shakespeare's Plays', in Lenz, Greene, and Neely, *The Woman's Part*, pp. 17-34

———, '"For what we lack, / We laugh": Incompletion and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Modern Language Studies*, 14, no. 4 (Fall 1984), 3-17

Berman, Ronald, 'King Henry the Eighth: History and Romance', *English Studies*, 48 (1967), 112-121

Berry, Edward I., 'Henry VIII and the Dynamics of Spectacle', *Shakespeare Studies*, 12 (1979), 229-246

Berry, Francis, *The Shakespeare Inset: Word and Picture* (London, 1965)

———, 'Word and Picture in the Final Plays', in Brown and Harris, *Later Shakespeare*, pp. 81-101; also included in *The Shakespeare Inset*, pp. 144-165

Berry, Ralph, *Shakespeare and the Awareness of the Audience* (London and Basingstoke, 1985)

———, "'My learned and well-beloved servant Cranmer": Guthrie's *Henry VIII*, in *Shakespearean Illuminations: Essays in Honor of Marvin Rosenberg*, edited by Jay L. Halio and Hugh Richmond (Cranbury, NJ, 1998), pp. 309-316

Bertram, Paul, 'The Date of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 12 (1961), 21-32; reprinted in revised form as 'The Date of the Play', in *Shakespeare and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 283-296

———, 'Henry VIII: The Conscience of the King', in *In Defense of Reading: A Reader's Approach to Literary Criticism*, edited by Reuben Brower and Richard Poirier (New York, 1962), pp. 153-173

———, *Shakespeare and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1965)

Bethell, S. L., *Shakespeare & the Popular Dramatic Tradition* (London, 1944)

———, 'The Winter's Tale': A Study (London, [1947])

Bevington, David, *Action Is Eloquence: Shakespeare's Language of Gesture* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1984)

———, 'Determining the Indeterminate: The Oxford Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 38 (1987), 501-519

———, *Shakespeare*, Blackwell Introductions to Literature (Oxford, 2002)

Bevington, David, and Peter Holbrook, eds., *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque* (Cambridge, 1998)

Bicks, Caroline, 'Backsliding at Ephesus: Shakespeare's Diana and the Churching of Women', in Skeele, 'Pericles': *Critical Essays*, pp. 205-227

Bieman, Elizabeth, *William Shakespeare: The Romances*, Twayne's English Authors Series (Boston, MA, 1990)

Biggs, Murray, Philip Edwards, Inga-Stina Ewbank, and Eugene M. Waith, eds., *The Arts of Performance in Elizabethan and Early Stuart Drama: Essays for G. K. Hunter* (Edinburgh, 1991)

Birkett, Janet, 'Cymbeline in the Twentieth Century: A Study of Major British Productions' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham, 1983)

Birney, Earle, 'Is Chaucer's Irony A Modern Discovery?', *JEGP*, 41 (1942), 303-319; reprinted in Birney, *Essays on Chaucerian Irony*, edited by Beryl Rowland (Toronto, 1985), pp. 36-53

- Bishop, T. G., *Shakespeare and the theatre of wonder*, Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture, 9 (Cambridge, 1996)
- Bland, D. S., 'The Heroine and the Sea: An Aspect of Shakespeare's Last Plays', *Essays in Criticism*, 3 (1953), 39-44
- Blanpied, John W., *Time and the Artist in Shakespeare's English Histories* (Cranbury, NJ, 1983)
- Blayney, Peter W. M., 'The Publication of Playbooks', in Cox and Kastan, *A New History of Early English Drama*, pp. 383-422
- Blincoe, Noel R., 'The Analogous Qualities of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Masque of the Inner Temple and Grey's Inn*', *Notes and Queries*, 241 (1996), 168-171
- Bliss, Lee, 'The Wheel of Fortune and the Maiden Phoenix of Shakespeare's *King Henry the Eighth*', *ELH*, 42 (1975), 1-25
- , 'Tragicomic Romance for the King's Men, 1609-1611: Shakespeare, Beaumont, and Fletcher', in Braunmuller and Bulman, *Comedy from Shakespeare to Sheridan*, pp. 148-164
- , *Francis Beaumont*, Twayne's English Authors Series (Boston, MA, 1987)
- Blodgett, James E., 'William Thynne (d. 1546)', in Ruggiers, *Editing Chaucer*, pp. 35-52
- Boe, John, 'Cymbeline and Ezekiel', *Notes and Queries*, 240 (1995), 331-334
- Boitani, Piero, *Chaucer and Boccaccio*, Medium Aevum Monographs, n.s. 8 (Oxford, 1977)
- Boling, Ronald J., 'Anglo-Welsh Relations in *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 51 (2000), 33-66
- Bolton, W. F., *Shakespeare's English: Language in the History Plays*, The Language Library (Oxford, 1992)
- Bond, R. Warwick, 'The Puzzle of *Cymbeline*', in *Studia Otiosa: Some Attempts in Criticism* (London, 1938), pp. 9-74
- Bonjour, Adrien, 'The Final Scene of *The Winter's Tale*', *English Studies*, 33 (1952), 193-208
- Bono, Barbara J., *Literary Transvaluation: From Vergilian Epic to Shakespearean Tragicomedies* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1984)
- Booth, Michael R., *Victorian Spectacular Theatre, 1850-1910*, Theatre Production Series (London, 1981)

Booth, Stephen, 'Speculations on Doubling in Shakespeare's Plays', in *Shakespeare: The Theatrical Dimension*, edited by Philip C. McGuire and David A. Samuelson, AMS Studies in the Renaissance, 3 (New York, 1979), pp. 103-131

Boris, Edna Zwick, *Shakespeare's English Kings, the People, and the Law: A Study in the Relationship between the Tudor Constitution and the English History Plays* (Cranbury, NJ, 1978)

Bose, Tirthankar, 'Notes on *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in *Essays on Shakespeare*, edited by Bhabatosh Chatterjee, University of Burdwan Shakespeare Memorial Volume (Calcutta, 1965), pp. 160-168

Bosman, Anston, 'Seeing Tears: Truth and Sense in *All is True*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 50 (1999), 459-476

Bourdieu, Pierre, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, translated by Richard Nice, Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology, 16 (Cambridge, 1977)

Bourgy, Victor, 'About The Inset Spectacle In Shakespeare (Stance, Distance, Substance)', in Laroque, *The Show Within*, I, 1-20

Boyle, Robert, 'On Wilkins's Share in the Play called Shakspeare's *Pericles*', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 8-10 (1880-6), 323-340

———, 'On "Massinger and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*"', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 8-10 (1880-6), 371-399

———, '*Henry VIII*. An Investigation into the Origin and Authorship of the Play', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 8-10 (1880-6), 443-487

Bradbrook, M. C., 'Shakespeare and his Collaborators', in Leech and Margeson, *Shakespeare 1971*, pp. 21-36; reprinted in revised form as 'Shakespeare as Collaborator', in *The Living Monument*, pp. 227-241

———, *The Living Monument: Shakespeare and the Theatre of his Time* (Cambridge, 1976)

———, *Shakespeare: The poet in his world* (London, 1978)

Bradley, A. C., 'Scene-Endings in Shakespeare and in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in *A Miscellany* (London, 1929), pp. 218-224

Bradshaw, Graham, *Shakespeare's Scepticism* (Brighton, 1987)

———, *Misrepresentations: Shakespeare and the Materialists* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1993)

Braunmuller, A. R., 'King John and Historiography', *ELH*, 55 (1988), 309-332

———, 'The arts of the dramatist', in Braunmuller and Hattaway, *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, pp. 53-90

Braunmuller, A. R., and J. C. Bulman, eds., *Comedy from Shakespeare to Sheridan: Change and Continuity in the English and European Dramatic Tradition: Essays in Honor of Eugene M. Waith* (Cranbury, NJ, 1986)

Braunmuller, A. R., and Michael Hattaway, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge, 1990)

Brennan, Anthony, *Onstage and Offstage Worlds in Shakespeare's Plays* (London and New York, 1989)

Brewer, Derek, ed., *Chaucer: The Critical Heritage*, 2 vols (London, 1978)

Briggs, Julia, 'Tears at the wedding: Shakespeare's last phase', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 210-227

Brinkley, Roberta Florence, *Arthurian Legend in the Seventeenth Century*, Johns Hopkins Monographs in Literary History, 3 (Baltimore and London, 1932)

Brissenden, Alan, *Shakespeare and the Dance* (London and Basingstoke, 1981)

Bristol, Michael D., *Carnival and Theater: Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England* (New York and London, 1985)

———, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen: Shakespeare and the Problem of Authority', in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 78-92

———, 'Where Does Ideology Hang Out?', in Kamps, *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 31-43

———, 'How Good Does Evidence Have to Be?', in *Textual and Theatrical Shakespeare: Questions of Evidence*, edited by Edward Pechter, Studies in Theatre History and Culture (Iowa City, 1996), pp. 22-43

———, 'Recent Studies in Tudor and Stuart Drama', *Studies in English Literature*, 38 (1998), 363-409

Brockbank, Philip, *On Shakespeare: Jesus, Shakespeare and Karl Marx, and Other Essays* (Oxford, 1989)

———, 'History and Histrionics in *Cymbeline*', in *On Shakespeare*, pp. 272-282; reprinted from *Shakespeare Survey*, 11 (1958), 42-49

———, 'Pericles and the Dream of Immortality', in *On Shakespeare*, pp. 283-302; reprinted from *Shakespeare Survey*, 24 (1971), 105-116

Bromley, John C., *The Shakespearean Kings* (Boulder, CO, 1971)

Brower, Reuben A., *Hero & Saint: Shakespeare and the Graeco-Roman Heroic Tradition* (Oxford, 1971)

Brown, Ivor, *How Shakespeare Spent the Day* (London, 1963)

Brown, John Russell, *Shakespeare and his Comedies*, second edition (London, 1962)

———, 'Laughter in the Last Plays', in Brown and Harris, *Later Shakespeare*, pp. 103-125; reprinted in revised form as 'Playing for Laughs: the Last Plays', in *Shakespeare's Plays in Performance*, pp. 91-112

———, *Shakespeare's Plays in Performance* (London, 1966)

Brown, John Russell, and Bernard Harris, eds., *Later Shakespeare*, Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, 8 (London, 1966)

Brown, Paul, "'This thing of darkness I acknowledge mine": *The Tempest* and the discourse of colonialism', in Dollimore and Sinfield, *Political Shakespeare*, pp. 48-71

Brown, Sylvia, "'Over Her Dead Body": Feminism, Poststructuralism, and the Mother's Legacy', in *Discontinuities: New Essays on Renaissance Literature and Criticism*, edited by Viviana Comensoli and Paul Stevens, Theory/Culture (Toronto, 1998), pp. 3-26

Brownlow, F. W., *Two Shakespearean Sequences: 'Henry VI' to 'Richard II' and 'Pericles' to 'Timon of Athens'* (London and Basingstoke, 1977)

Brumble, H. David, *Classical Myths and Legends in the Middle Ages and Renaissance: A Dictionary of Allegorical Meanings* (Westport, CT, 1998)

Bruster, Douglas, 'Cymbeline and the Sudden Blow', *The Upstart Crow*, 10 (1990), 101-112

———, 'Female-Female Eroticism and the Early Modern Stage', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 24 (1993), 1-32

———, 'The Jailer's Daughter and the Politics of Madwomen's Language', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 46 (1995), 277-300

Bryant, J. A., Jr., *Hippolyta's View: Some Christian Aspects of Shakespeare's Plays* ([Lexington], KY, 1961)

Bullen, A. H., 'Publisher's Note', in Sykes, *Sidelights on Shakespeare*, pp. vi-xi

Bullough, Geoffrey, ed., *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, 8 vols (London and New York, 1957-1975)

———, 'Pericles and the Verse in Wilkins's *Painfull Adventures*', in *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, VI, *Other 'Classical' Plays* (1966), pp. 549-564; reprinted in revised form from *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasburg* (1965)

———, 'Pre-Conquest Historical Themes in Elizabethan Drama', in *Medieval Literature and Civilization: Studies in Memory of G. N. Garmonsway*, edited by D. A. Pearsall and R. A. Waldron (London, 1969), pp. 289-321

Bulman, James C., ed., *Shakespeare, Theory, and Performance* (London and New York, 1996)

———, 'Introduction: Shakespeare and performance theory', in *Shakespeare, Theory, and Performance*, pp. 1-11

Burgess, Glenn, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution: An Introduction to English Political Thought, 1603-1642* (Basingstoke and London, 1992)

———, *Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution* (New Haven and London, 1996)

———, 'Revisionist History and Shakespeare's Political Context', in *Shakespeare and History (Shakespeare Yearbook, 6 (1996))*, edited by Holger Klein and Rowland Wymer (Lewiston, NY and Lampeter, 1996), pp. 5-36

Burke, Seán, *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida* (Edinburgh, 1992)

Burrow, Colin, *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton* (Oxford, 1993)

Burrow, John, 'Poems Without Endings', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 13 (1991), 17-37

Byrne, Muriel St Clare, 'A Stratford Production: *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 3 (1950), 120-129

Cadwalader, John, 'Theobald's Alleged Shakespeare Manuscript', *Modern Language Notes*, 55 (1940), 108-109

Calderwood, James L., *Shakespearean Metadrama: The Argument of the Play in 'Titus Andronicus', 'Love's Labour's Lost', 'Romeo and Juliet', 'A Midsummer Night's Dream', and 'Richard II'* (Minneapolis, 1971)

———, *Metadrama in Shakespeare's Henriad: 'Richard II' to 'Henry V'* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1979)

Camden, Carroll, 'On Ophelia's Madness', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 15 (1964), 247-255

Campbell, Lily B., *Shakespeare's "Histories": Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy* (San Marino, CA, 1947)

Campbell, Oscar James, with Edward G. Quinn, eds., *A Shakespeare Encyclopaedia* (London, 1966; first published as *The Reader's Encyclopedia of Shakespeare* (New York, 1966))

Candido, Joseph, 'Fashioning *Henry VIII*: What Shakespeare saw in *When You See Me, You Know Me*', *Cahiers Elisabethains*, 23 (April 1983), 47-59

Cantor, Paul A., *Shakespeare's Rome: Republic and Empire* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1976)

Carney, Jo Eldridge, 'The Ambiguities of Love and War in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in *Sexuality and Politics in Renaissance Drama*, edited by Carole Levin and Karen Robertson, *Studies in Renaissance Literature*, 10 (Lewiston, NY and Lampeter, 1991), pp. 95-111

Carr, Joan, 'Cymbeline and the Validity of Myth', *Studies in Philology*, 75 (1978), 316-330

Carroll, William C., *The Metamorphoses of Shakespearean Comedy* (Princeton, NJ, 1985)

———, 'The Virgin Not: Language and Sexuality in Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Survey*, 46 (1993), 107-119

Cartelli, Thomas, 'Prospero in Africa: *The Tempest* as colonialist text and pretext', in Howard and O'Connor, *Shakespeare Reproduced*, pp. 99-115; reprinted in revised form in *Repositioning Shakespeare*, pp. 87-104

———, *Repositioning Shakespeare: National formations, postcolonial appropriations* (London and New York, 1999)

Cassell's Encyclopaedia of World Literature, general editor J. Buchanan-Brown, 3 vols (London, 1973; revised edition of *Cassell's Encyclopaedia of Literature*, edited by S. H. Steinberg, 2 vols (London, 1953))

Cavell, Stanley, *Disowning Knowledge In Six Plays of Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 1987)

Cespedes, Frank V., '"We are one in fortunes": The Sense of History in *Henry VIII*', *English Literary Renaissance*, 10 (1980), 413-438

Chambers, E. K., *Shakespeare: A Survey* (London, 1925)

———, *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1930)

———, *Shakespearean Gleanings* (Oxford, 1944)

———, 'The Disintegration of Shakespeare', in *Shakespearean Gleanings*, pp. 1-21; first published in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 11 (1924-25), 89-108

———, 'The Integrity of *The Tempest*', in *Shakespearean Gleanings*, pp. 76-97; reprinted from *Review of English Studies*, 1 (1925), 129-150

———, *The Elizabethan Stage*, corrected edition, 4 vols (Oxford, 1951; first edition, 1923)

Champion, Larry S., *The Evolution of Shakespeare's Comedy: A Study in Dramatic Perspective* (Cambridge, MA, 1970)

———, *Perspective in Shakespeare's English Histories* (Athens, GA, 1980)

———, *'The Noise of Threatening Drum': Dramatic Strategy and Political Ideology in Shakespeare and the English Chronicle Plays* (Cranbury, NJ, 1990)

Charlton, H. B., *Shakespearean Comedy*, second edition (London, 1938; first edition, 1938)

Charney, Maurice, *Shakespeare's Roman Plays: The Function of Imagery in the Drama* (Cambridge, MA, 1961; reissued 1963)

———, ed., *"Bad" Shakespeare: Revaluations of the Shakespeare Canon* (Cranbury, NJ, 1988)

———, 'Introduction', in *"Bad" Shakespeare*, pp. 9-18

Chartier, Roger, *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, translated by Lydia G. Cochrane (Cambridge, 1994)

Chedgzoy, Kate, 'Introduction: "Voice that is Mine"', in Chedgzoy, Hansen, and Trill, *Voicing Women*, pp. 1-10

Chedgzoy, Kate, Melanie Hansen, and Suzanne Trill, eds., *Voicing Women: Gender and sexuality in early modern writing*, Renaissance Texts and Studies (Keele, 1996)

Childress, Diana T., 'Are Shakespeare's Late Plays Really Romances?', in Tobias and Zolbrod, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 44-55

Clare, Janet, 'Beneath Pomp and Circumstance in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Studies* (Tokyo), 21 (1982-83), 65-81

———, 'Historicism and the Question of Censorship in the Renaissance', *English Literary Renaissance*, 27 (1997), 155-176

Clark, Cumberland, *A Study of Shakespeare's 'Henry VIII'* (London, [1931])

Clark, Glenn, 'The "Strange" Geographies of *Cymbeline*', in Gillies and Vaughan, *Playing the Globe*, pp. 230-259

Clark, Sandra, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher: Sexual Themes and Dramatic Representation* (Hemel Hempstead, 1994)

Clarke, Danielle, 'Cymbeline and Plutarch', *Notes and Queries*, 240 (1995), 329-331

Clayton, Thomas, 'Internal Evidence and Elizabethan Dramatic Authorship: An Essay in Literary History and Method: Review Article', *Shakespeare Studies*, 4 (1968), 350-376

Clemen, W. H., *The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery*, with a Preface by John Dover Wilson (London, 1951; revised translation of *Shakespeares Bilder* (Bonn, 1936))

———, 'Shakespeare's Use of the Messenger's Report', in *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art: Collected Essays* (London, 1972), pp. 96-123

———, *Shakespeare's Soliloquies*, translated by Charity Scott Stokes (London and New York, 1987)

Clogan, Paul M., 'Chaucer's Use of the *Thebaid*', *English Miscellany*, 18 (1967), 9-31

Clubb, Louise George, *Italian Drama in Shakespeare's Time* (New Haven and London, 1989)

Coghill, Nevill, 'Six Points of Stage-Craft in *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 11 (1958), 31-41

Cohen, Walter, 'Shakespeare and Calderón in an Age of Transition', in Greenblatt, *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance*, pp. 123-137

———, *Drama of a Nation: Public Theater in Renaissance England and Spain* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1985)

———, 'Political criticism of Shakespeare', in Howard and O'Connor, *Shakespeare Reproduced*, pp. 18-46

Cole, Maija Jansson, 'A New Account of the Burning of the Globe', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 32 (1981), 352

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, *Shakespearean Criticism*, edited by Thomas Middleton Raysor, second edition, 2 vols, Everyman's Library, 162, 183 (London, 1960; first edition, 1930)

Colie, Rosalie L., *Shakespeare's Living Art* (Princeton, NJ, 1974)

Colley, John Scott, 'Disguise and New Guise in *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 7 (1974), 233-252

Collini, Stefan, 'Introduction: Interpretation terminable and interminable', in Eco and others, *Interpretation and overinterpretation*, pp. 1-21

Cook, Carol, 'Straw Women and Whipping Girls: The (Sexual) Politics of Critical Self-Fashioning', in Kamps, *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 61-77

Cooper, Helen, 'Jacobean Chaucer: *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and Other Chaucerian Plays', in Krier, *Refiguring Chaucer in the Renaissance*, pp. 189-209

Cope, Jackson I., *The Theater and the Dream: From Metaphor to Form in Renaissance Drama* (Baltimore and London, 1973)

Corbin, Peter Francis, 'A Death and A Marriage: An Examination of the Literature Occasioned by the Death of Henry Prince of Wales and the Marriage of his Sister Princess Elizabeth, 1612-13' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham, 1966)

Corin, Fernand, 'A Note on the Dirge in *Cymbeline*', *English Studies*, 40 (1959), 173-179

Coursen, H. R., *Shakespearean Performance as Interpretation* (Cranbury, NJ, 1992)

Cox, John D., 'Henry VIII and the Masque', *ELH*, 45 (1978), 390-409

———, *Shakespeare and the Dramaturgy of Power* (Princeton, NJ, 1989)

Cox, John D., and David Scott Kastan, eds., *A New History of Early English Drama* (New York, 1997)

Craig, Hardin, *An Interpretation of Shakespeare* (New York, 1948)

———, 'Pericles and *The Painfull Adventures*', *Studies in Philology*, 45 (1948), 600-605

———, 'Shakespeare's Bad Poetry', *Shakespeare Survey*, 1 (1948), 51-56

———, *A New Look at Shakespeare's Quartos* (Stanford, CA, 1961)

Crawford, John W., 'Intuitive Knowledge in *Cymbeline*', *The Upstart Crow*, 1 (Fall 1978), 74-81

Crewe, Jonathan, *Trials of Authorship: Anterior Forms and Poetic Reconstruction from Wyatt to Shakespeare*, *The New Historicism: Studies in Cultural Poetics*, 9 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1990)

Crumley, J. Clinton, 'Questioning History in *Cymbeline*', *Studies in English Literature*, 41 (2001), 297-315

Cruttwell, Patrick, *The Shakespearean Moment and its Place in the Poetry of the 17th Century* (London, 1954)

Csengeri, Karen, 'William Shakespeare, Sole Author of *Pericles*', *English Studies*, 71 (1990), 230-243

Culler, Jonathan, *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism* (Ithaca, NY, 1982; reprinted London, 1994)

———, 'In defence of overinterpretation', in Eco and others, *Interpretation and overinterpretation*, pp. 109-123

Cummings, Hubertis M., *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio (A Review and Summary)*, *University of Cincinnati Studies*, 10 (Cincinnati, 1916; reissued New York, 1967)

Cunningham, Karen, 'Female Fidelities on Trial: Proof in the Howard Attainder and *Cymbeline*', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 25 (1994), 1-31

Curran, John E., Jr., 'Royalty Unlearned, Honor Untaught: British Savages and Historiographical Change in *Cymbeline*', *Comparative Drama*, 31 (1997), 277-303

Cust, Richard, and Ann Hughes, eds., *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603-1642* (London and New York, 1989)

Cutts, John P., 'Shakespeare's Song and Masque Hand in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 99 (1963), 184-195

———, 'Shakespeare's Song and Masque Hand in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *English Miscellany*, 18 (1967), 55-85

———, *Rich and Strange: A Study of Shakespeare's Last Plays* ([Pullman], WA, 1968)

Danby, John F., *Poets on Fortune's Hill: Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont & Fletcher* (London, 1952)

Danson, Lawrence, 'Twentieth-century Shakespeare criticism: the comedies', in Stanley Wells, *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, pp. 231-239

———, '“The Catastrophe is a Nuptial”: The Space of Masculine Desire in *Othello*, *Cymbeline*, and *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 46 (1993), 69-79

Davies, H. Neville, 'Pericles and the Sherley brothers', in Honigmann, *Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, pp. 94-113

Davies, Rowena, '"Alone th'Arabian Bird" - Imogen as Elizabeth I?', *Notes and Queries*, 224 (1979), 137-140

Davis, J. Madison, 'The Problems of *Henry VIII*: History and National Pageant in the Tragicomic Mode', *Selected Papers from the West Virginia Shakespeare and Renaissance Association*, 14 (1989-90), 44-62

Dawson, Anthony B., *Indirections: Shakespeare and the Art of Illusion* (Toronto, 1978)

———, 'Tempest in a Teapot: Critics, Evaluation, Ideology', in Charney, *"Bad" Shakespeare*, pp. 61-73

de Grazia, Margreta, 'Shakespeare in Quotation Marks', in Marsden, *The Appropriation of Shakespeare*, pp. 57-71

———, *Shakespeare Verbatim: The Reproduction of Authenticity and the 1790 Apparatus* (Oxford, 1991)

———, 'Imprints: Shakespeare, Gutenberg and Descartes', in Terence Hawkes, *Alternative Shakespeares*, Volume 2, pp. 63-94

de Grazia, Margreta, and Peter Stallybrass, 'The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 44 (1993), 255-283

de Man, Paul, *Allegories of Reading: Figural Language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke, and Proust* (New Haven and London, 1979)

———, 'The Resistance to Theory', in Lodge, *Modern Criticism and Theory*, pp. 354-371; reprinted from *Yale French Studies*, 63 (1982), 3-20

de Quincey, Thomas, 'Rhetoric', in *Literary Theory and Criticism*, edited by David Masson, *The Collected Writings of Thomas de Quincey*, X (London, 1897), pp. 81-133; first published as an unsigned review of Richard Whately, *Elements of Rhetoric*, *Blackwood's Magazine*, 24 (July-December 1828), 885-908

Dean, John, *Restless Wanderers: Shakespeare and the Pattern of Romance*, Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Elizabethan & Renaissance Studies, 86 (Salzburg, 1979)

Dean, Paul, 'Dramatic Mode and Historical Vision in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 37 (1986), 175-189

Delany, Sheila, *The Naked Text: Chaucer's 'Legend of Good Women'* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1994)

Delius, N., 'On Shakspeare's Use of Narration in his Dramas. Part I', translated by Eva Gordon, *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 3-4 (1875-6), 207-218

———, 'On Shakspeare's Use of Narration in his Dramas. Part II', translated by Eleanor Marx, *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 3-4 (1875-6), 332-345

Demaray, John G., *Shakespeare and the Spectacles of Strangeness: 'The Tempest' and the Transformation of Renaissance Theatrical Forms*, Medieval and Renaissance Literary Studies (Pittsburgh, 1998)

Dent, R. W., *Shakespeare's Proverbial Language: An Index* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1981)

Derrida, Jacques, *Writing and Difference*, translated by Alan Bass (London and Chicago, 1978)

———, 'Freud and the Scene of Writing', in *Writing and Difference*, pp. 196-231

———, 'Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences', in *Writing and Difference*, pp. 278-293

———, *Spectres of Marx: the state of the debt, the work of mourning, and the new international*, translated by Peggy Kamuf (New York and London, 1994)

———, *Politics of Friendship*, translated by George Collins, Phronesis (London and New York, 1997)

Dessen, Alan C., *Recovering Shakespeare's Theatrical Vocabulary* (Cambridge, 1995)

———, 'Stage Directions as Evidence: The Question of Provenance', in *Shakespeare: Text and Theater: Essays in Honor of Jay L. Halio*, edited by Lois Potter and Arthur F. Kinney (Cranbury, NJ, 1999), pp. 229-247

Dickey, Stephen, 'Language and Role in *Pericles*', *English Literary Renaissance*, 16 (1986), 550-566

The Dictionary of National Biography: From the Earliest Times to 1900, founded by George Smith, edited by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, 22 vols (London, 1937-1938; first printed 1885-1901)

Dixon, Mimi Still, 'Tragicomic Recognitions: Medieval Miracles and Shakespearean Romance', in Maguire, *Renaissance Tragicomedy*, pp. 56-79

Dobin, Howard, *Merlin's Disciples: Prophecy, Poetry, and Power in Renaissance England* (Stanford, CA, 1990)

Dobrée, Bonamy, 'The Last Plays', in *The Living Shakespeare*, edited by Robert Gittings (London, 1960), pp. 140-154

Dobson, Michael, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford, 1992)

Dollimore, Jonathan, *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Brighton, 1984)

———, 'Critical Developments: Cultural Materialism, Feminism and Gender Critique, and New Historicism', in Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare: A Bibliographical Guide*, pp. 405-428

Dollimore, Jonathan, and Alan Sinfield, eds., *Political Shakespeare: New essays in cultural materialism* (Manchester, 1985)

———, 'History and ideology: the instance of *Henry V*', in Drakakis, *Alternative Shakespeares*, pp. 206-227

Dominik, Mark, *Shakespeare-Middleton Collaborations* (Beaverton, OR, 1988)

———, *William Shakespeare and 'The Birth of Merlin'*, revised edition (Beaverton, OR, 1991; first edition, New York, 1985)

Donaldson, E. Talbot, *The Swan at the Well: Shakespeare Reading Chaucer* (New Haven and London, 1985)

Donawerth, Jane, *Shakespeare and the Sixteenth-Century Study of Language* (Urbana and Chicago, 1984)

Doran, Madeleine, *Endeavors of Art: A study of form in Elizabethan drama* (Madison, WI, 1954)

Dowden, Edward, *Shakspeare: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art* (London, 1875); third edition (London, 1877)

———, *Shakspeare*, Literature Primers (London, 1877)

Drabble, Margaret, ed., *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, fifth edition (Oxford, 1985)

Drakakis, John, ed., *Alternative Shakespeares*, New Accents (London and New York, 1985)

Dunbar, Mary Judith, "'To the Judgement of Your Eye": Iconography and the Theatrical Art of *Pericles*', in Muir, Halio, and Palmer, *Shakespeare, Man of the Theater*, pp. 86-97

Duncan-Jones, E. E., 'Queen Katherine's Vision and Queen Margaret's Dream', *Notes and Queries*, 206 (1961), 142-143

Duncan-Jones, Katherine, 'Was the 1609 *Shakespeare's Sonnets* really Unauthorized?', *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 34 (1983), 151-171

Dunn, Catherine M., 'The Function of Music in Shakespeare's Romances', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 20 (1969), 391-405

Dusinberre, Juliet, *Shakespeare and the Nature of Women* (London and Basingstoke, 1975)

Duthie, George Ian, *Shakespeare*, fifth impression (London, 1966; first impression, 1951)

Dutton, Richard, *William Shakespeare: A Literary Life*, Macmillan Literary Lives (Basingstoke and London, 1989)

———, *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama* (Basingstoke and London, 1991)

———, 'The Birth of the Author', in Parker and Zitner, *Elizabethan Theater*, pp. 71-92; reprinted in revised form as 'Shakespeare: the Birth of the Author', in *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern England*, pp. 90-113

———, *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern England: Buggeswords* (Basingstoke, 2000)

Eagleton, Terry, *William Shakespeare, Rereading Literature* (Oxford, 1986)

———, *The Ideology of the Aesthetic* (Oxford, 1990; reprinted 1996)

———, *Ideology: An Introduction* (London and New York, 1991)

———, ed., *Ideology*, Longman Critical Readers (London and New York, 1994)

———, *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, second edition (Oxford, 1996; first edition, 1983)

———, *The Illusions of Postmodernism* (Oxford, 1996)

Eccles, Mark, 'Francis Beaumont's *Grammar Lecture*', *Review of English Studies*, 16 (1940), 402-414

Eco, Umberto, 'Interpretation and history', in Eco and others, *Interpretation and overinterpretation*, pp. 23-43

———, 'Overinterpreting texts', in Eco and others, *Interpretation and overinterpretation*, pp. 45-66

———, 'Between author and text', in Eco and others, *Interpretation and overinterpretation*, pp. 67-88

Eco, Umberto, with others, *Interpretation and overinterpretation*, edited by Stefan Collini (Cambridge, 1992)

Edelman, Charles, *Brawl ridiculous: Swordfighting in Shakespeare's Plays*, The Revels Plays Companion Library (Manchester, 1992)

Edwards, Philip, 'An Approach to the Problem of *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 5 (1952), 25-49

———, 'Shakespeare's Romances: 1900-1957', *Shakespeare Survey*, 11 (1958), 1-18

———, 'On the Design of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *A Review of English Literature*, 5, no. 4 (October 1964), 89-105

———, *Shakespeare and the Confines of Art* (London, 1968)

———, 'The Late Comedies', in *Shakespeare: Select Bibliographical Guides*, edited by Stanley Wells (Oxford, 1973), pp. 113-133

———, *Threshold of a Nation: A study in English and Irish drama* (Cambridge, 1979)

———, '"Seeing is believing": action and narration in *The Old Wives Tale* and *The Winter's Tale*', in Honigmann, *Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, pp. 79-93

———, *Shakespeare: A Writer's Progress* (Oxford, 1986)

———, 'Wilson Knight and Shakespeare's Last Plays', in Mucciolo and others, *Shakespeare's Universe*, pp. 258-267

———, *Sea-Mark: The Metaphorical Voyage, Spenser to Milton*, Liverpool English Texts and Studies (Liverpool, 1997)

Egan, Robert, *Drama Within Drama: Shakespeare's Sense of His Art in 'King Lear', 'The Winter's Tale', and 'The Tempest'* (New York and London, 1975)

Eggers, Walter F., Jr., 'Shakespeare's Gower and the Role of the Authorial Presenter', *Philological Quarterly*, 54 (1975), 434-443

———, '"Bring Forth a Wonder": Presentation in Shakespeare's Romances', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 21 (1979), 455-477

Ellacombe, Henry N., *The Plant-Lore & Garden-Craft of Shakespeare* (Exeter, [1878])

Ellis, John M., *Against Deconstruction* (Princeton, NJ, 1989)

- Ellis, Steven G., 'Tudor state formation and the shaping of the British Isles', in Ellis and Barber, *Conquest and Union*, pp. 40-63
- Ellis, Steven G., and Sarah Barber, eds., *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725* (London and New York, 1995)
- Ellis-Fermor, Una, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen', in Ellis-Fermor, *Shakespeare the Dramatist and other papers*, edited by Kenneth Muir (London, 1961), pp. 177-186
- Elsky, Martin, *Authorizing Words: Speech, Writing, and Print in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1989)
- Elze, Karl, 'King Henry VIII', in *Essays on Shakespeare*, translated by L. Dora Schmitz (London, 1874), pp. 151-192
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 'Shakespeare, or the Poet' (1850), in *Representative Men: Seven Lectures*, edited by Wallace E. Williams and Douglas Emory Wilson, *The Collected Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, IV (Cambridge, MA and London, 1987), pp. 107-125
- Emslie, MacDonald, 'Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*, V, ii, 25-31', *The Explicator*, 17, no. 4 (January 1959), no. 29
- Erdman, David V., and Ephim G. Fogel, eds., *Evidence for Authorship: Essays on Problems of Attribution, with an Annotated Bibliography of Selected Readings* (Ithaca, NY, 1966)
- Erickson, Peter, *Patriarchal Structures in Shakespeare's Drama* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1985)
- , 'Shakespeare and the "Author-Function"', in *Shakespeare's "Rough Magic": Renaissance Essays in Honor of C. L. Barber*, edited by Peter Erickson and Coppélia Kahn (Cranbury, NJ, 1985), pp. 245-255
- , 'Rewriting the Renaissance, Rewriting Ourselves', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 38 (1987), 327-337
- , *Rewriting Shakespeare, Rewriting Ourselves* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1991)
- Erne, Lukas, "'The two hours' traffic of our stage": Performance criticism and the length of performance of Shakespeare's plays', *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 135 (1999), 66-76
- Eskin, Stanley G., 'Politics in Shakespeare's Plays', *Bucknell Review*, 15, no. 3 ([Winter(?)] 1967), 47-64
- Evans, Bertrand, *Shakespeare's Comedies* (Oxford, 1960)
- Evans, Gareth Lloyd, *Shakespeare V: 1606-1616, Writers and Critics* (Edinburgh, 1973)

Evans, Malcolm, *Signifying Nothing: Truth's True Contents in Shakespeare's Text* (Brighton, 1986)

———, 'Deconstructing Shakespeare's comedies', in Drakakis, *Alternative Shakespeares*, pp. 67-94

Evans, Willa McClung, 'Shakespeare's "Harke Harke Ye Larke"', *PMLA*, 60 (1945), 95-101

Ewbank, Inga-Stina, '"These pretty devices": A Study of Masques in Plays', in Spencer and Wells, *A Book of Masques* (see Section II), pp. 405-448

———, '"What words, what looks, what wonders?": Language and Spectacle in the Theatre of George Peele', *The Elizabethan Theatre*, 5 (1975), 124-154

———, '"Ny Name is Marina": The Language of Recognition', in *Shakespeare's Styles: Essays in honour of Kenneth Muir*, edited by Philip Edwards, Inga-Stina Ewbank, and G. K. Hunter (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 111-130

Falconer, Alexander Frederick, *Shakespeare and the Sea* (London, 1964)

Farnham, Willard Edward, 'Colloquial Contractions in Beaumont, Fletcher, Massinger, and Shakespeare as a Test of Authorship', *PMLA*, 31 (1916), 326-358

Fawcner, H. W., *Shakespeare's Miracle Plays: 'Pericles', 'Cymbeline', and 'The Winter's Tale'* (Cranbury, NJ, 1992)

Felperin, Howard, 'Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*: History as Myth', *Studies in English Literature*, 6 (1966), 225-246

———, 'Shakespeare's Miracle Play', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 18 (1967), 363-374

———, *Shakespearean Romance* (Princeton, NJ, 1972)

———, '"Tongue-tied our queen?": the deconstruction of presence in *The Winter's Tale*', in Parker and Hartman, *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, pp. 3-18; reprinted in revised form in *The Uses of the Canon*, pp. 35-55

———, *The Uses of the Canon: Elizabethan Literature and Contemporary Theory* (Oxford, 1990)

———, 'Romance and Romanticism', in *The Uses of the Canon*, pp. 16-34; reprinted in revised form from 'Romance and Romanticism: Some Reflections on *The Tempest* and *Heart of Darkness*, Or, When is Romance No Longer Romance?', in Kay and Jacobs, *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*, pp. 60-76

———, 'The *Tempest* in Our Time', in *The Uses of the Canon*, pp. 170-190

———, 'Bardolatry Then and Now', in Marsden, *The Appropriation of Shakespeare*, pp. 129-144

Ferguson, Arthur B., *Clio Unbound: Perception of the social and cultural past in Renaissance England*, Duke Monographs in Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2 (Durham, NC, 1979)

———, *The Chivalric Tradition in Renaissance England* (Cranbury, NJ, 1986)

———, *Utter Antiquity: Perceptions of Prehistory in Renaissance England*, Duke Monographs in Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 13 (Durham, NC and London, 1993)

Finkelpearl, Philip J., *Court and Country Politics in the Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (Princeton, NJ, 1990)

———, 'Two Distincts, Division None: Shakespeare and Fletcher's *The Two Noble Kinsmen* of 1613', in Parker and Zitner, *Elizabethan Theater*, pp. 184-199

Fisher, John H., *The Importance of Chaucer* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL, 1992)

Fleay, F. G., 'On Metrical Tests as Applied to Dramatic Poetry: Part I. Shakspeare', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874), 1-16

———, 'On the Play of *Pericles*', with a text of Fleay's "*Marina*" (see section II), *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874), 195-241

———, 'A Fresh Confirmation of Mr Spedding's Division and Date of the Play of *Henry VIII.*', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874), 23*

———, 'Mr Hickson's Division of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, Confirmed by Metrical Tests', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874), 61*-64*

———, *A Chronicle History of the Life and Work of William Shakespeare, Player, Poet, and Playmaker* (London, 1886)

Flower, Annette C., 'Disguise and Identity in *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 26 (1975), 30-41

Flynn, Vincent Joseph, 'The Grammatical Writings of William Lily, ?1468-?1523', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 37 (1943), 85-113

Foakes, R. A., 'On the First Folio Text of *Henry VIII*', *Studies in Bibliography*, 11 (1958), 55-60

———, 'Character and Dramatic Technique in *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale*', in *Studies in the Arts: Proceedings of the St. Peter's College Literary Society*, edited by Francis Warner (Oxford, 1968), pp. 116-130

———, *Shakespeare: the dark comedies to the last plays: from satire to celebration* (London, 1971)

———, 'Playhouses and players', in Braunmuller and Hattaway, *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, pp. 1-52

———, 'Shakespeare's other historical plays', in Hattaway, *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, pp. 214-228

Foster, Donald W., *'Elegy By W.S.': A Study in Attribution* (Cranbury, NJ, 1989)

———, 'A Funeral Elegy: W[illiam] S[hakespeare]'s "Best-Speaking Witnesses"', followed by a text of the poem, *PMLA*, 111 (1996), 1080-1105

Foster, Verna, 'Ford's Experiments in Tragicomedies: Shakespearean and Fletcherian Dramaturgies', in Maguire, *Renaissance Tragicomedies*, pp. 97-111

Foucault, Michel, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, [translated by Alan Sheridan], *World of Man: A Library of Theory and Research in the Human Sciences* (Tavistock, 1970; reprinted London, 1994; original French edition published as *Les mots et les choses* (Paris, 1966))

———, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, edited by Donald F. Bouchard, translated by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca, NY, 1977; reprinted 1996)

———, 'What Is an Author?', translated by Josué V. Harari, in Harari, *Textual Strategies*, pp. 141-160

———, 'The Order of Discourse', translated by Ian McLeod, in *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*, edited by Robert Young (Boston, MA and London, 1981), pp. 48-78

———, *Dits et écrits, 1954-1988*, edited by Daniel Defert and François Ewald, with Jacques Lagrange, 4 vols (Paris, 1994)

———, 'Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?', in *Dits et écrits*, I, 789-821; first published in its original form in *Bulletin de la Société française de philosophie*, 63, no. 3 (July-September 1969), 73-104

Foulkes, Richard, 'Herbert Beerbohm Tree's *King Henry VIII: Expenditure, Spectacle and Experiment*', *Theatre Research International*, n.s. 3 (1977-78), 23-32

Fowler, Alastair, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford, 1982)

Frank, Robert Worth, Jr., *Chaucer and 'The Legend of Good Women'* (Cambridge, MA, 1972)

Fraser, Russell, *Shakespeare The Later Years* (New York, 1992)

Frazier, Harriet C., *A Babble of Ancestral Voices: Shakespeare, Cervantes, and Theobald* (The Hague, 1974)

Freehafer, John, 'Cardenio, by Shakespeare and Fletcher', *PMLA*, 84 (1969), 501-513

Freud, Sigmund, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, translated by James Strachey, edited by Angela Richards, The Pelican Freud Library, IV (Harmondsworth, 1976; English translation first published in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, general editor James Strachey, vols IV-V (London, 1953))

Frey, Charles, 'The *Tempest* and the New World', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 30 (1979), 29-41

———, "'O sacred, shadowy, cold, and constant queen": Shakespeare's Imperiled and Chastening Daughters of Romance', in Lenz, Greene, and Neely, *The Woman's Part*, pp. 295-313

———, *Shakespeare's Vast Romance: A Study of 'The Winter's Tale'* (Columbia, MO and London, 1980)

———, ed., *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'* (Columbia, MO, 1989)

———, 'Introduction', in *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 1-5

———, 'Collaborating with Shakespeare: After the Final Play', in *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 31-44

———, 'Grinning at the Moon: Some Sadness in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 109-120

Frost, David L., "'Mouldy Tales": The Context of Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*', *Essays and Studies*, n.s. 39 (1986), 19-38

Frye, Northrop, 'The Argument of Comedy', in *English Institute Essays: 1948*, edited by D. A. Robertson, Jr. (New York, 1949), pp. 58-73

———, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton, NJ, 1957)

———, 'Recognition in *The Winter's Tale*', in *Fables of Identity: Studies in Poetic Mythology* (New York and London, 1963), pp. 107-118; reprinted from *Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama: In Honor of Hardin Craig*, edited by Richard Hosley (Columbia, MO, 1962), pp. 235-246

———, *A Natural Perspective: The Development of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance* (New York and London, 1965)

———, *Fools of Time: Studies in Shakespearean Tragedy* (Toronto, 1967)

———, *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1976)

———, 'Romance as Masque', in Kay and Jacobs, *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*, pp. 11-39

———, *The Myth of Deliverance: Reflections on Shakespeare's Problem Comedies*, second edition, with an Introduction by A. C. Hamilton (Toronto, 1993; first edition, 1983)

———, *Northrop Frye on Shakespeare*, edited by Robert Sandler (New Haven and London, 1986)

Frye, Roland Mushat, *Shakespeare: The Art of the Dramatist* (Boston, MA, 1970)

Furnivall, Frederick J., 'The New Shakspeare Society (The Founder's Prospectus Revised)', 28 March 1874, bound in at the front of *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 3-4 (1875-6)

———, 'Another Fresh Confirmation of Mr Spedding's Division and Date of the Play of *Henry VIII*', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874), 24*

———, 'Mr Hickson's Division of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, Confirmed by the Stopt-Line Test', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874), 64*-65*

———, 'Forewords', in Spalding, *A Letter on Shakspeare's Authorship of 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, new edition (1876), pp. v-xi

———, 'Introduction' (1874, revised 1877), in Gervinus, *Shakespeare Commentaries*, pp. xxi-lv

Fyler, John M., *Chaucer and Ovid* (New Haven and London, 1979)

Gajdusek, R. E., 'Death, Incest, and the Triple Bond in the Later Plays of Shakespeare', *American Imago*, 31 (1974), 109-158

Galloway, Bruce, *The Union of England and Scotland, 1603-1608* (Edinburgh, 1986)

Garber, Marjorie B., *Dream in Shakespeare: From Metaphor to Metamorphosis* (New Haven and London, 1974)

———, 'Cymbeline and the Languages of Myth', *Mosaic*, 10, no. 3 (Spring 1977), 105-115

———, "'What's Past Is Prologue": Temporality and Prophecy in Shakespeare's History Plays', in *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation*, edited by Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, Harvard English Studies, 14 (Cambridge, MA and London, 1986), pp. 301-331

———, *Shakespeare's Ghost Writers: Literature as uncanny causality* (New York and London, 1987)

Gasper, Julia, 'The Reformation plays on the public stage', in *Theatre and Government Under the Early Stuarts*, edited by J. R. Mulryne and Margaret Shewring (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 190-216

———, Review of *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, general editor Fredson Bowers, Vols VII-VIII; and *The Non-Dramatic Works of John Ford*, general editor L. E. Stock, *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 45 (1994), 108-110

Geller, Lila, 'Cymbeline and the Imagery of Covenant Theology', *Studies in English Literature*, 20 (1980), 241-255

Gervinus, G. G., *Shakespeare Commentaries*, translated by F. E. Bunnètt, with an Introduction by F. J. Furnivall, sixth edition (London, 1903; first edition, 1862)

Gesner, Carol, *Shakespeare & the Greek Romance: A Study of Origins* (Lexington, KY, 1970)

Gibbons, Brian, 'Romance and the heroic play', in Braunmuller and Hattaway, *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, pp. 207-236

———, *Shakespeare and Multiplicity* (Cambridge, 1993)

———, 'Fabled Cymbeline', in *Shakespeare and Multiplicity* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 18-47; reprinted in revised form from *Jahrbuch 1987*, 78-99

Gilbert, Miriam, "'This Wide Gap of Time": Storytelling and Audience Response in the Romances', *Iowa State Journal of Research*, 53 (1978-79), 235-241

Gillies, John, and Virginia Mason Vaughan, eds., *Playing the Globe: Genre and Geography in English Renaissance Drama* (Cranbury, NJ, 1998)

Gilroy-Scott, N. W., 'John Gower's Reputation: Literary Allusions from the Early Fifteenth Century to the Time of *Pericles*', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 1 (1971), 30-47

Glazov-Corrigan, Elena, 'The New Function of Language in Shakespeare's *Pericles*: Oath Versus "Holy Word"', *Shakespeare Survey*, 43 (1990), 131-140

———, 'Speech Acts, Generic Differences, and the Curious Case of *Cymbeline*', *Studies in English Literature*, 34 (1994), 379-399

Gless, Darryl J., 'Julius Caesar, Allan Bloom, and The Value of Pedagogical Pluralism', in Kamps, *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 185-203

Goddard, Harold C., *The Meaning of Shakespeare* (Chicago, 1951)

Goldberg, Jonathan, *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and Their Contemporaries* (Baltimore and London, 1983)

———, *Voice Terminal Echo: Postmodernism and English Renaissance texts* (New York and London, 1986)

———, 'Perspectives: Dover Cliff and the Conditions of Representation', in Atkins and Bergeron, *Shakespeare and Deconstruction*, pp. 245-265

———, *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities* (Stanford, CA, 1992)

———, *Desiring Women Writing: English Renaissance Examples* (Stanford, CA, 1997)

Gorfain, Phyllis, 'Puzzle and Artifice: The Riddle as Metapoetry in *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 29 (1976), 11-20

Grady, Hugh, 'Disintegration and its Reverberations', in Marsden, *The Appropriation of Shakespeare*, pp. 111-127

———, *The Modernist Shakespeare: Critical Texts in a Material World* (Oxford, 1991)

Graff, Gerald, 'Ordinary People and Academic Critics: A Response to Richard Levin', in Kamps, *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 99-113

Granville-Barker, Harley, *Prefaces to Shakespeare*, Second Series (London, 1930)

Gray, Henry David, 'Some Indications that *The Tempest* was Revised', *Studies in Philology*, 18 (1921), 129-140

———, 'Beaumont and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Philological Quarterly*, 2 (1923), 112-131

———, 'Heywood's *Pericles*, Revised by Shakespeare', *PMLA*, 40 (1925), 507-529

Gray, J. C., ed., *Mirror up to Shakespeare: Essays in Honour of G. R. Hibbard* (Toronto, 1984)

Green, Roger Lancelyn, 'The Phoenix and the Tree', *English*, 7 (1948-49), 11-15

Green, Susan, '"A mad woman? We are made, boys!": The Jailer's Daughter in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 121-132

Greenblatt, Stephen J., 'Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century', in *First Images of America: The Impact of the New World on the Old*, edited by Fredi Chiappelli, with Michael J. B. Allen and Robert L. Benson, 2 vols (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1976), pp. 561-580; reprinted in Greenblatt, *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture* (New York and London, 1990), pp. 16-39

———, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago and London, 1980)

———, ed., *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance* (Norman, OK, 1982)

———, *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* (Oxford, 1988)

Greene, Gayle, 'The Myth of Neutrality, Again?', in Kamps, *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 23-29

Greenman, David J., 'Women, Men, and Spirituality in Shakespearean Romance', *Thought*, 61 (1986), 360-369

Greenwood, John, *Shifting Perspectives and the Stylish Style: Mannerism in Shakespeare and his Jacobean Contemporaries* (Toronto, 1988)

Greg, W. W., *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*, 4 vols, The Bibliographical Society: Illustrated Monographs, 24 (London, 1939-1959; reprinted 1970)

———, *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare: A Survey of the Foundations of the Text*, third edition (Oxford, 1954; first edition, 1942)

———, *The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History* (Oxford, 1955)

———, 'The Bakings of Betsy', in Greg, *Collected Papers*, edited by J. C. Maxwell (Oxford, 1966), pp. 48-74; reprinted in revised form from *The Library*, Series III, vol 2 (1911), 225-259

Greene, David, *Reality and The Heroic Pattern: Last Plays of Ibsen, Shakespeare, and Sophocles* (Chicago and London, 1967)

Grudin, Robert, *Mighty Opposites: Shakespeare and Renaissance Contrariety* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1979)

Guillory, John, *Poetic Authority: Spenser, Milton, and Literary History* (New York, 1983)

Gurr, Andrew, 'The *Tempest's* Tempest at Blackfriars', *Shakespeare Survey*, 41 (1988), 91-102

———, *The Shakespearean Stage, 1574-1642*, third edition (Cambridge, 1992; first edition, 1970)

———, 'The Bare Island', *Shakespeare Survey*, 47 (1994), 29-43

———, *The Shakespearian Playing Companies* (Oxford, 1996)

Guy, John, *Tudor England* (Oxford, 1988; reprinted 1990)

Habicht, Werner, D. J. Palmer, and Roger Pringle, eds., *Images of Shakespeare: Proceedings of the Third Congress of the International Shakespeare Association, 1986* (Cranbury, NJ, 1988)

Hackett, Helen, "'Gracious be the issue": maternity and narrative in Shakespeare's late plays', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 25-39

Hadfield, Andrew, "'Hitherto she ne're could fancy him": Shakespeare's "British" Plays and the Exclusion of Ireland', in *Shakespeare and Ireland: History, Politics, Culture*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett and Ramona Wray (Basingstoke and London, 1997), pp. 47-67

Hadorn, Peter T., 'The Two Noble Kinsmen and the Problem of Chivalry', in *Medievalism in England (Studies in Medievalism, 4 (1992))*, edited by Leslie J. Workman (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 45-57

Halio, Jay L., 'The Late Plays as the Fulfillment of Shakespeare's Tragic Pattern', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 31-37

Halliday, F. E., *A Shakespeare Companion 1564-1964*, Penguin Reference Books (Harmondsworth, 1964; revised edition of *A Shakespeare Companion 1550-1950* (London, 1952))

Halstead, William P., *Shakespeare as Spoken: A Collation of 5000 Acting Editions and Promptbooks of Shakespeare*, Monograph Publishing on Demand Sponsor Series, 12 vols (Ann Arbor, 1977-1980)

- , *Statistical History of Acting Editions of Shakespeare*, 2 vols, *Shakespeare as Spoken Supplement*, vols XIII–XIV (Lanham, NY, 1983)
- Hamilton, A. C., *Northrop Frye: Anatomy of his Criticism* (Toronto, 1990)
- Hamilton, Charles, *William Shakespeare and John Fletcher: 'Cardenio; or The Second Maiden's Tragedy'* (Lakewood, CO, 1994)
- Hamilton, Donna B., *Virgil and 'The Tempest': The Politics of Imitation* (Columbus, OH, 1990)
- , *Shakespeare and the Politics of Protestant England* (Hemel Hempstead, 1992)
- , 'Shakespeare's Romances and Jacobean Political Discourse', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 64–71
- Hamilton, Paul, *Historicism, The New Critical Idiom* (London and New York, 1996)
- Hamlin, Will, 'A Select Bibliographical Guide to *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 186–216
- Hammond, Brean S., 'Theobald's *Double Falsehood*: An "Agreeable Cheat"?', *Notes and Queries*, 229 (1984), 2–3
- , 'The Performance History of a Pseudo-Shakespearean Play: Theobald's *Double Falsehood*', *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 7 (1984), 49–60
- Hanna, Sara, 'Christian Vision and Iconography in *Pericles*', *The Upstart Crow*, 11 (1991), 92–116
- , 'Shakespeare's Greek World: The Temptations of the Sea', in Gillies and Vaughan, *Playing the Globe*, pp. 107–128
- Harari, Josué V., ed., *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism* (Ithaca, NY, 1979)
- Harbage, Alfred, 'Elizabethan-Restoration Palimpsest', *Modern Language Review*, 35 (1940), 287–319; reprinted in *Shakespeare Without Words and Other Essays* (Cambridge, MA, 1972), pp. 170–218
- , *Annals of English Drama, 975–1700: An Analytical Record of all Plays, Extant or Lost, Chronologically Arranged and Indexed by Authors, Titles, Dramatic Companies &c.*, second edition, revised by S. Schoenbaum (London, 1964; first edition, 1940)

- Harding, D. W., 'Shakespeare's final view of women', *TLS*, 30 November 1979, pp. 59-61
- Hardy, Barbara, *Shakespeare's Storytellers: Dramatic Narration* (London, 1997)
- Harrier, Richard, 'Another Note on "Why the Sweets Melted"', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 18 (1967), 67
- Harris, Bernard, "'What's past is prologue": *Cymbeline* and *Henry VIII*', in Brown and Harris, *Later Shakespeare*, pp. 203-233
- Hart, Alfred, 'Shakespeare and the Vocabulary of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Review of English Studies*, 10 (1934), 274-287; reprinted in *Shakespeare and the Homilies, And Other Pieces of Research into the Elizabethan Drama* (Melbourne, 1934; reissued New York, 1977), pp. 242-256
- Hart, Jonathan, '*Henry VIII*: The Play as History and Anti-History', *Aevum*, 65 (1991), 561-570
- , *Theater and World: The Problematics of Shakespeare's History* (Boston, MA, 1992)
- Hart, Vaughan, *Art and Magic in the Court of the Stuarts* (London and New York, 1994)
- Harte, N. B., 'State Control of Dress and Social Change in Pre-Industrial England', in *Trade, Government and Economy in Pre-Industrial England: Essays presented to F. J. Fisher*, edited by D. C. Coleman and A. H. John (London, 1976), pp. 132-165
- Harting, James Edmund, *The Birds of Shakespeare: Critically Examined, Explained, and Illustrated* (London, 1871)
- Hartwig, Joan, *Shakespeare's Tragicomic Vision* (Baton Rouge, 1972)
- , 'Cloten, Autolycus, and Caliban: Bearers of Parodic Burdens', in Kay and Jacobs, *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*, pp 91-103
- Harvey, Elizabeth D., *Ventriloquized Voices: Feminist Theory and English Renaissance Texts* (London and New York, 1992)
- Hattaway, Michael, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, Cambridge Companions to Literature (Cambridge, 2002)
- Hattaway, Michael, Boika Sokolova, and Derek Roper, eds., *Shakespeare in the New Europe* (Sheffield, 1994)
- Hawkes, David, *Ideology, The New Critical Idiom* (London and New York, 1996)

- Hawkes, Terence, 'Swisser-Swatter: making a man of English letters', in Drakakis, *Alternative Shakespeares*, pp. 26-46; also included in *That Shakespeherian rag*, pp. 51-72
- , *That Shakespeherian rag: essays on a critical process* (London and New York, 1986)
- , *Meaning by Shakespeare* (London and New York, 1992)
- , ed., *Alternative Shakespeares*, Volume 2, *New Accents* (London and New York, 1996)
- Hawthorn, Jeremy, *A Concise Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory* (London, 1992)
- Hay, Malcolm, and Philip Roberts, *Edward Bond: A Companion to the Plays* (London, 1978)
- , *Bond: A Study of his Plays*, *Modern Theatre Profiles* (London, 1980)
- Hayles, Nancy K., 'Sexual Disguise in *Cymbeline*', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 41 (1980), 231-247
- Hazlitt, William, *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*, edited by Arthur Quiller-Couch, *The World's Classics* (Oxford, 1917)
- Healy, Margaret, 'Pericles and the Pox', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 92-107
- Healy, Thomas, 'History and judgement in *Henry VIII*', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 158-175
- Hedrick, Donald K., "'Be Rough With Me": The Collaborative Arenas of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 45-77
- Heinemann, Margot, 'How Brecht read Shakespeare', in Dollimore and Sinfield, *Political Shakespeare*, pp. 202-230
- , 'Political drama', in Braunmuller and Hattaway, *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, pp. 161-205
- , "'God Help the Poor: The Rich can Shift": The World Upside-Down and the Popular Tradition in the Theatre', in McMullan and Hope, *The Politics of Tragicomedy*, pp. 151-165
- Helgerson, Richard, *Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton and the Literary System* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1983)
- Helms, Lorraine, 'The Saint in the Brothel: Or, Eloquence Rewarded', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 41 (1990), 319-332

Henke, Robert, 'The Winter's Tale and Guarinian Dramaturgy', *Comparative Drama*, 27 (1993), 197-217

———, *Pastoral Transformations: Italian Tragicomedy and Shakespeare's Late Plays* (Cranbury, NJ, 1997)

Herrick, Marvin T., *Tragicomedy: Its Origin and Development in Italy, France, and England*, Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, 39 (Urbana, IL, 1955)

Hickman, Andrew, 'Bonduca's Two Ignoble Armies and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England*, 4 (1989), 143-171

H[ickson], S[amuel], '[*The Two Noble Kinsmen*]', Review of W[illiam] S[palding], *A Letter on Shakspeare's Authorship of 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, Charles Knight, ed., *The Pictorial Edition of Shakspeare*, and Alexander Dyce, ed., *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher, Westminster and Foreign Quarterly Review*, 47 (April-July 1847), 59-88; reprinted as S. Hickson, 'The Shares of Shakspeare and Fletcher in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*' (see below)

Hickson, Samuel, 'Who Wrote Shakspeare's Henry VIII.?', *Notes and Queries*, 2 (May-December 1850), 198; reprinted as 'A Confirmation of Mr Spedding's Paper on the Authorship of *Henry VIII.*', with a brief reply by James Spedding, *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874), 18*-20*

———, 'Authorship of *Henry VIII.*', *Notes and Queries*, 2 (May-December 1850), 401-403

———, 'Authorship of *Henry VIII.*', *Notes and Queries*, 3 (January-June 1851), 33-34

———, 'Shakspeare and Fletcher', *Notes and Queries*, 3 (January-June 1851), 318-319

———, 'The Shares of Shakspeare and Fletcher in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, no. 1 (1874), 25*-61*; reprinted from S[amuel] H[ickson], '[*The Two Noble Kinsmen*]' (see above)

Hieatt, A. Kent, 'Cymbeline and the Intrusion of Lyric into Romance Narrative: *Sonnets*, "A Lover's Complaint," Spenser's *Ruins of Rome*', in Logan and Teskey, *Unfolded Tales*, pp. 98-118

Hieatt, A. K., T. G. Bishop, and E. A. Nicholson, 'Shakespeare's Rare Words: "Lover's Complaint", *Cymbeline*, and *Sonnets*', *Notes and Queries*, 232 (1987), 219-224

Hieatt, A. Kent, Charles W. Hieatt, and Anne Lake Prescott, 'When Did Shakespeare Write *Sonnets* 1609?', *Studies in Philology*, 88 (1991), 69-109

Highley, Christopher, and John N. King, eds., *John Foxe and his World*, St Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Aldershot and Burlington, VT, 2002)

Hillman, Richard, 'Shakespeare's Gower and Gower's Shakespeare: The Larger Debt of *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 36 (1985), 427-437

———, 'Shakespeare's Romantic Innocents and the Misappropriation of the Romance Past: The Case of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 43 (1990), 69-79

———, *Intertextuality and Romance in Renaissance Drama: The Staging of Nostalgia* (Basingstoke, 1992)

Hirst, David L., *Tragicomedy, The Critical Idiom*, 43 (London and New York, 1984)

Hobday, C. H., 'Why The Sweets Melted: A Study In Shakespeare's Imagery', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 16 (1965), 3-17

Hodgdon, Barbara, *The End Crowns All: Closure and Contradiction in Shakespeare's History* (Princeton, NJ, 1991)

Hoener, F. D., 'How Significant are Textual Parallels? A New Author for *Pericles*?', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 11 (1960), 27-37

———, 'Irony and Romance in *Cymbeline*', *Studies in English Literature*, 2 (1962), 219-228

———, 'Shakespeare's Romances Since 1958: A Retrospect', *Shakespeare Survey*, 29 (1976), 1-10

———, 'Gower and Shakespeare in *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 33 (1982), 461-479

Hofling, Charles K., 'Notes on Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 1 (1965), 118-136

Hoge, James O., Jr., 'Tennyson on Shakespeare: His Talk about the Plays', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 18 (1976), 147-170

Holbrook, Peter, *Literature and Degree in Renaissance England: Nashe, Bourgeois Tragedy*, *Shakespeare* (Cranbury, NJ, 1994)

Holderness, Graham, *Shakespeare's History* (Dublin and New York, 1985)

———, ed., *The Shakespeare myth*, Cultural Politics (Manchester, 1988)

———, 'Prologue: "The Histories" and History', in Holderness, Potter, and Turner, *Shakespeare: The Play of History*, pp. 13-19

- , 'Late Romances: Magic, Majesty and Masque', in Holderness, Potter, and Turner, *Shakespeare: Out of Court*, pp. 127-235
- , *Shakespeare Recycled: The Making of Historical Drama* (Hemel Hempstead, 1992)
- , *Shakespeare: The Histories* (Basingstoke and London, 2000)
- Holderness, Graham, Bryan Loughrey, and Andrew Murphy, eds., *Shakespeare: The Roman Plays*, Longman Critical Readers (London and New York, 1996)
- Holderness, Graham, Nick Potter, and John Turner, *Shakespeare: The Play of History*, Contemporary Interpretations of Shakespeare (Basingstoke and London, 1988)
- , *Shakespeare: Out of Court: Dramatizations of Court Society*, Contemporary Interpretations of Shakespeare (Basingstoke and London, 1990)
- Holland, Peter, 'Theseus' Shadows in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 47 (1994), 139-151
- , 'The Shapeliness of *The Tempest*', *Essays in Criticism*, 45 (1995), 208-229
- , *English Shakespeares: Shakespeare on the English stage in the 1990s* (Cambridge, 1997)
- Holt, J. C., *Robin Hood* (London, 1982)
- Homan, Sidney R., 'The *Tempest* and Shakespeare's Last Plays: The Aesthetic Dimensions', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 24 (1973), 69-76
- , *When the Theater Turns to Itself: The Aesthetic Metaphor in Shakespeare* (Lewisburg, KY, 1981)
- Honigmann, E. A. J., 'Secondary Sources of *The Winter's Tale*', *Philological Quarterly*, 34 (1955), 27-38
- , *The Stability of Shakespeare's Text* (London, 1965)
- , *Shakespeare's Impact on his Contemporaries* (London and Basingstoke, 1982)
- , ed., *Shakespeare and his contemporaries: Essays in comparison*, The Revels Plays Companion Library (Manchester, 1986)
- , '"There Is a World Elsewhere": William Shakespeare, Businessman', in Habicht, Palmer, and Pringle, *Images of Shakespeare*, pp. 40-46

———, 'Shakespeare's Will and Testamentary Traditions', in *Shakespeare and Cultural Traditions: The Selected Proceedings of the International Shakespeare Association World Congress, Tokyo, 1991*, edited by Tetsuo Kishi, Roger Pringle, and Stanley Wells (Cranbury, NJ, 1994), pp. 127-137

Honigmann, E. A. J., and Susan Brock, *Playhouse wills, 1558-1642: An edition of wills by Shakespeare and his contemporaries in the London theatre*, The Revels Plays Companion Library (Manchester and New York, 1993)

"Hood, Eu." [Joseph Haslewood], 'Of the London Theatres. - No. VIII', *Gentleman's Magazine*, 86, no. 1 (January-June 1816), 113-115

Hooper, Wilfrid, 'The Tudor Sumptuary Laws', *English Historical Review*, 30 (1915), 433-449

Hope, Jonathan, *The authorship of Shakespeare's plays: A socio-linguistic study* (Cambridge, 1994)

Hopkins, Lisa, "'It is place which lessens and sets off": Perspective and Representation in *Cymbeline*', in Klein and Marrapodi, *Shakespeare and Italy*, pp. 253-268

———, "'The Shores of My Mortality": *Pericles*' Greece of the Mind', in Skeele, *'Pericles': Critical Essays*, pp. 228-237

Horton, Thomas B., 'Distinguishing Shakespeare from Fletcher through Function Words', *Shakespeare Studies*, 22 (1994), 314-335

Houston, John Porter, *Shakespearean Sentences: A Study in Style and Syntax* (Baton Rouge and London, 1988)

Howard, Jean E., *Shakespeare's Art of Orchestration: Stage Technique and Audience Response* (Urbana and Chicago, 1984)

———, 'The New Historicism in Renaissance Studies', *English Literary Renaissance*, 16 (1986), 13-43

———, *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England* (London and New York, 1994)

Howard, Jean E., and Marion F. O'Connor, eds., *Shakespeare Reproduced: The text in history and ideology* (New York and London, 1987)

———, 'Introduction', in *Shakespeare Reproduced*, pp. 1-17

Howard, Jean E., and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering A Nation: A feminist account of Shakespeare's English histories*, Feminist Readings of Shakespeare (London and New York, 1997)

Howard-Hill, T. H., ed., *Shakespeare and 'Sir Thomas More': Essays on the play and its Shakespearian interest*, New Cambridge Shakespeare Studies and Supplementary Texts (Cambridge, 1989)

Howarth, David, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485-1649* (Basingstoke and London, 1997)

Howarth, Herbert, 'An old man looking at life: *Henry VIII* and the late plays', in *Stratford papers on Shakespeare: 1961*, edited by B. W. Jackson (Toronto, 1962), pp. 177-194; reprinted in revised form as 'An Old Man's Methods: *Henry VIII* and the late plays', in Howarth, *The Tiger's Heart: Eight Essays on Shakespeare* (London, 1970), pp. 143-164

Hoy, Cyrus, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon (I)', *Studies in Bibliography*, 8 (1956), 129-146

———, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon (II)', *Studies in Bibliography*, 9 (1957), 143-162

———, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon (III)', *Studies in Bibliography*, 11 (1958), 85-106

———, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon (IV)', *Studies in Bibliography*, 12 (1959), 91-116

———, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon (V)', *Studies in Bibliography*, 13 (1960), 77-108

———, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon (VI)', *Studies in Bibliography*, 14 (1961), 45-67

———, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon (VII)', *Studies in Bibliography*, 15 (1962), 71-90

———, *The Hyacinth Room: An Investigation Into the Nature of Comedy, Tragedy, & Tragicomedy* (London, 1964)

———, Review of Paul Bertram, *Shakespeare and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, *Modern Philology*, 67 (1969-70), 83-88

———, 'Jacobean Tragedy and the Mannerist Style', *Shakespeare Survey*, 26 (1973), 49-67

———, 'Critical and Aesthetic Problems of Collaboration in Renaissance Drama', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama*, 19 (1976), 3-6

———, 'Fathers and Daughters in Shakespeare's Romances', in Kay and Jacobs, *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*, pp. 77-90

———, 'The Language of Fletcherian Tragicomedies', in J. C. Gray, *Mirror up to Shakespeare*, pp. 99-113

Hubbell, Lindley Williams, 'A Note on the Shakespeare Apocrypha', in *Studies in English Literature* (Kyoto, 1982), pp. 254-271

Hubert, Judd D., *Metatheater: The Example of Shakespeare* (Lincoln, NE and London, 1991)

Hudson, Anne, 'John Stow (1525?-1605)', in Ruggiers, *Editing Chaucer*, pp. 53-70

Hunt, Maurice, 'Shakespeare's Empirical Romance: *Cymbeline* and Modern Knowledge', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 22 (1980), 322-342

———, '"Stir" and Work in Shakespeare's Last Plays', *Studies in English Literature*, 22 (1982), 285-304

———, *Shakespeare's Romance of the Word* (Cranbury, NJ, 1990)

———, ed., *Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare's 'The Tempest' and Other Late Romances*, *Approaches to Teaching World Literature*, 41 (New York, 1992)

———, 'Shakespeare's *King Henry VIII* and the Triumph of the Word', *English Studies*, 75 (1994), 225-245

Hunter, G. K., 'Italian Tragicomedies on the English Stage', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 6 (1973), 123-148

———, 'Religious Nationalism in Later History Plays', in Newey and Thompson, *Literature and Nationalism*, pp. 88-97

———, 'Shakespeare and the Church', in Mucciolo and others, *Shakespeare's Universe*, pp. 21-28

Hunter, Robert Grams, *Shakespeare and the Comedy of Forgiveness* (New York and London, 1965)

Ingram, John K., 'On the "Weak Endings" of Shakspeare, with some Account of the History of the Verse-Tests in General', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874), 442-464

Ingram, R. W., 'Musical Pauses and the Vision Scenes in Shakespeare's Last Plays', in McNeir and Greenfield, *Pacific Coast Studies in Shakespeare*, pp. 234-247

Ioppolo, Grace, *Revising Shakespeare* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1991)

Iser, Wolfgang, *Staging Politics: The Lasting Impact of Shakespeare's Histories*, translated by David Henry Wilson (New York, 1993)

Ives, E. W., *Anne Boleyn* (Oxford, 1986)

Jackson, MacD. P., 'Affirmative Particles in *Henry VIII*', *Notes and Queries*, 207 (1962), 372-374

———, 'Shakespeare and *Edmund Ironside*', *Notes and Queries*, 208 (1963), 331-332

———, *Shakespeare's 'A Lover's Complaint': Its Date and Authenticity*, *Bulletin 72, English Series 13* (Auckland, 1965)

———, 'North's Plutarch and the Name "Escanes" in Shakespeare's *Pericles*', *Notes and Queries*, 220 (1975), 173-174

———, *Studies in Attribution: Middleton and Shakespeare*, *Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Jacobean Drama Studies*, 79 (Salzburg, 1979)

———, 'The transmission of Shakespeare's text' in Stanley Wells, *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, pp. 163-185

———, 'Compositors' Stints and the Spacing of Punctuation in the First Quarto (1609) of Shakespeare's *Pericles*', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 81 (1987), 17-23

———, '*Pericles*, Acts I and II: New Evidence for George Wilkins', *Notes and Queries*, 235 (1990), 192-196

———, 'George Wilkins and the First Two Acts of *Pericles*: New Evidence from Function Words', *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 6 (1991), 155-163

———, 'Rhyming in *Pericles*: More Evidence of Dual Authorship', *Studies in Bibliography*, 46 (1993), 239-249

———, 'The Authorship of *Pericles*: The Evidence of Infinitives', *Notes and Queries*, 238 (1993), 197-200

———, 'Phrase Lengths in *Henry VIII*: Shakespeare and Fletcher', *Notes and Queries*, 242 (1997), 75-80

Jacobs, Henry E., comp., *'Cymbeline': [An Annotated Bibliography]*, The Garland Shakespeare Bibliographies, 3 (New York, 1982)

Jacquot, Jean, 'The Last Plays and the Masque', in Leech and Margeson, *Shakespeare 1971*, pp. 156-173

Jaech, Sharon L. Jansen, 'Political Prophecy and Macbeth's "Sweet Bodements"', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 34 (1983), 290-297

James, D. G., *Scepticism and Poetry: An Essay on the Poetic Imagination* (London, 1937)

———, 'The Failure of the Ballad-Makers', in *Scepticism and Poetry*, pp. 205-241

———, *The Dream of Prospero* (Oxford, 1967)

James, Heather, *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, politics, and the translation of empire*, Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture, 22 (Cambridge, 1997)

Jameson, Fredric, 'Magical Narratives: Romance as Genre', *New Literary History*, 7 (1975-76), 135-163

———, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1981)

Jardine, Lisa, *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare* (Brighton, 1983)

Johnson, Samuel, *Johnson on Shakespeare*, edited by Arthur Sherbo, 2 vols, The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson, VII-VIII (New Haven and London, 1968)

Jones, Emrys, 'Stuart *Cymbeline*', Review of J. C. Maxwell, ed., *Cymbeline*, The New Shakespeare, *Essays in Criticism*, 11 (1961), 84-99

Jones, Robert C., *These Valiant Dead: Renewing the Past in Shakespeare's Histories* (Iowa City, 1991)

Jones, Terry, *Chaucer's Knight: The portrait of a medieval mercenary* (London, 1980)

Jones-Davies, M. T., ed., *Le Roman de Chevalerie au Temps de la Renaissance*, Centre de Recherches sur la Renaissance, 12 (Paris, 1987)

Jordan, Constance, 'Contract and Conscience in *Cymbeline*', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 25 (1994), 33-58

———, *Shakespeare's Monarchies: Ruler and Subject in the Romances* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1997)

Jorgensen, Paul A., *Shakespeare's Military World* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1956)

Joughin, John J., ed., *Philosophical Shakespeares, Accents on Shakespeare* (London and New York, 2000)

Jowett, John, 'New Created Creatures: Ralph Crane and the Stage Directions in *The Tempest*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 36 (1983), 107-120

———, reviewer, 'The Year's Contribution to Shakespeare Studies: 3. Editions and Textual Studies', *Shakespeare Survey*, 51 (1998), 302-337

Kahn, Coppélia, 'The Providential *Tempest* and the Shakespearean Family', in Schwartz and Kahn, *Representing Shakespeare*, pp. 217-243; also included in Kahn, *Man's Estate: Masculine Identity in Shakespeare* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1981), pp. 193-225

———, *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women, Feminist Readings of Shakespeare* (London and New York, 1997)

Kamps, Ivo, ed., *Shakespeare Left and Right* (New York and London, 1991)

———, 'Introduction: Ideology and its Discontents', in *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 1-12

———, ed., *Materialist Shakespeare: A History* (London and New York, 1995)

———, 'Materialist Shakespeare: An Introduction', in *Materialist Shakespeare*, pp. 1-19

———, *Historiography and Ideology in Stuart Drama* (Cambridge, 1996)

Kastan, David Scott, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time* (London and Basingstoke, 1982)

———, 'Proud Majesty Made a Subject: Shakespeare and the Spectacle of Rule', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 37 (1986), 459-475

———, 'Is There a Class in This (Shakespearean) Text?', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 24 (1993), 101-121

Kaufmann, R. J., 'Puzzling Epiphanies', Review of Frank Kermode, *Shakespeare: The Final Plays, Essays in Criticism*, 13 (1963), 392-403

Kaul, Mythili, 'References to Food and Feeding in *Pericles*', *Notes and Queries*, 227 (1982), 124-126

Kavanagh, James H., 'Shakespeare in ideology', in Drakakis, *Alternative Shakespeares*, pp. 144-165

- Kay, Carol McGinnis, and Henry E. Jacobs, eds., *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered* (Lincoln, NE and London, 1978)
- Keen, Maurice, *Chivalry* (New Haven and London, 1984)
- Kehler, Dorothea, 'Shakespeare's Emilias and the Politics of Celibacy', in *In Another Country: Feminist Perspectives on Renaissance Drama*, edited by Dorothea Kehler and Susan Baker (Metuchen, NJ and London, 1991), pp. 157-178
- , 'Teaching the Slandered Women of *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale*', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 80-86
- , 'Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*', *The Explicator*, 54 (1995-96), 70-72
- Kelly, Henry Ansgar, *Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeare's Histories* (Cambridge, MA, 1970)
- Kendrick, T. D., *British Antiquity* (London, 1950)
- Ker, W. P., *Epic and Romance: Essays on Medieval Literature* (London, 1897)
- Kermode, Frank, 'What is Shakespeare's *Henry VIII* About?', *Durham University Journal*, n.s. 9 (1947-48), 48-55
- , *William Shakespeare: The Final Plays, Writers and Their Work*, 155 (London, 1963)
- Kernan, Alvin B., *The Playwright as Magician: Shakespeare's Image of the Poet in the English Public Theater* (New Haven and London, 1979)
- , *Shakespeare, the King's Playwright: Theater in the Stuart Court, 1603-1613* (New Haven and London, 1995)
- Kerrigan, John, *Revenge Tragedy: Aeschylus to Armageddon* (Oxford, 1996)
- Kidnie, Margaret Jane, 'Text, Performance, and the Editors: Staging Shakespeare's Drama', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 51 (2000), 456-473
- Kiefer, Frederick, 'Art, Nature, and the Written Word in *Pericles*', *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 61 (1991-92), 207-225
- , *Writing on the Renaissance Stage: Written Words, Printed Pages, Metaphoric Books* (Cranbury, NJ, 1996)
- Kirsch, Arthur C., 'Cymbeline and Coterie Dramaturgy', *ELH*, 34 (1967), 285-306
- , 'Jacobean Theatrical Self-consciousness', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama*, 23 (1980), 9-13

- , *Shakespeare and the Experience of Love* (Cambridge, 1981)
- Kiser, Lisa J., *Truth and Textuality in Chaucer's Poetry* (Hanover, NH and London, 1991)
- Kishlansky, Mark, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*, The Penguin History of Britain, VI (Harmondsworth, 1997; first published, 1996)
- Klein, Holger, and Michele Marrapodi, eds., *Shakespeare and Italy* (*Shakespeare Yearbook*, 10 (1999)) (Lewiston, NY and Lampeter, 1999)
- Knight, G. Wilson, *The Shakespearian Tempest* (Oxford, 1932)
- , 'A Note on *Henry VIII*', *Criterion*, 15 (1935-36), 228-236
- , 'The Vision of Jupiter in *Cymbeline*', *TLS*, 21 November 1936, p. 958
- , *The Olive and The Sword: A Study of England's Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1944); reprinted in revised form as 'This Sceptred Isle: A Study of Shakespeare's Kings', in *The Sovereign Flower*, pp. 11-91
- , *The Crown of Life: Essays in Interpretation of Shakespeare's Final Plays*, second edition (London, 1948; first edition, Oxford, 1947); third impression (London, 1952); new impression (London, 1965)
- , 'Myth and Miracle', in *The Crown of Life*, pp. 9-31; first printed as *Myth and Miracle: An Essay on the Mystic Symbolism of Shakespeare* (London, 1929)
- , *The Mutual Flame: on Shakespeare's 'Sonnets' and 'The Phoenix and the Turtle'* (London, 1955)
- , *The Sovereign Flower: on Shakespeare as the Poet of Royalism together with related essays and indexes to earlier volumes*, second edition (London, 1966; first edition, 1958)
- Knowles, Christine, 'Caxton and his Two French Sources: The *Game and Playe of the Chesse* and the Composite Manuscripts of the Two French Translations of the *Ludus Scaccorum*', *Modern Language Review*, 49 (1954), 417-423
- Knowles, Richard Paul, '"The More Delay'd, Delighted": Theophanies in the Last Plays', *Shakespeare Studies*, 15 (1982), 269-280
- , '"Wishes Fall Out As They're Will'd": Artist, Audience, and *Pericles's* Gower', *English Studies in Canada*, 9, no. 1 (March 1983), 14-24

———, 'Autolycus, Cloten, Caliban & Co.: "Comic" Figures and Audience Response in Shakespeare's Last Plays', *The Upstart Crow*, 9 (1989), 77-95

Knowles, Ronald, *Shakespeare's Arguments with History* (Basingstoke, 2002)

Knutson, Roslyn Lander, *The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company, 1594-1613* (Fayetteville, AR, 1991)

Kott, Jan, *The Bottom Translation: Marlowe and Shakespeare and the Carnival Tradition*, translated by Daniela Miedzyrzecka and Lillian Vallee (Evanston, IL, 1987)

———, 'The *Aeneid* and *The Tempest*', in *The Bottom Translation*, pp. 107-132; reprinted from *Arion*, n.s. 3, no. 4 (1976), 424-451

———, 'The *Tempest*, or Repetition', in *The Bottom Translation*, pp. 69-106; reprinted in revised form from *Mosaic*, 10, no. 3 (Spring 1977), 9-36

Kreps, Barbara, 'When All is True: Law, History and Problems of Knowledge in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 52 (1999), 166-182

Krier, Theresa M., ed., *Refiguring Chaucer in the Renaissance* (Gainesville, FL, 1998)

Kukowski, Stephan, 'The Hand of John Fletcher in *Double Falsehood*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 43 (1990), 81-89

Kurland, Stuart M., 'Henry VIII and James I: Shakespeare and Jacobean Politics', *Shakespeare Studies*, 19 (1987), 203-217

———, '"The care . . . of subjects' good": *Pericles*, James I, and the Neglect of Government', *Comparative Drama*, 30 (1996-97), 220-244

Lake, D. J., 'Rhymes in *Pericles*', *Notes and Queries*, 214 (1969), 139-143

———, '"More" and "Mo(e)" in *Henry VIII*', *Notes and Queries*, 214 (1969), 143-144

———, 'Wilkins and *Pericles* - Vocabulary (I)', *Notes and Queries*, 214 (1969), 288-291

———, 'The *Pericles* Candidates - Heywood, Rowley, Wilkins', *Notes and Queries*, 215 (1970), 135-141

Lamb, Charles, *Specimens of English Dramatic Poets*, edited by William Macdonald, 2 vols, The Works of Charles Lamb, IX-X (London, 1903)

Landry, D. E., 'Dreams as History: The Strange Unity of *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 33 (1982), 68-79

Laroque, François, *Shakespeare's festive world: Elizabethan seasonal entertainment and the professional stage*, translated by Janet Lloyd, *European Studies in English Literature* (Cambridge, 1991; revised translation of *Shakespeare et la fête* (Paris, 1988))

———, ed., *The Show Within: Dramatic and Other Insets. English Renaissance Drama (1550-1642)*, Proceedings of the International Conference held in Montpellier, 22-25 November 1990, 2 vols, Collection Astraea, 4 (Montpellier, 1992)

Lavin, J. A., 'Shakespeare and the Second Blackfriars', *The Elizabethan Theatre*, 3 (1973), 66-81

Law, Robert Adger, 'Holinshed and *Henry the Eighth*', *Texas Studies in English*, 36 (1957), 3-11

———, 'The Double Authorship of *Henry VIII*', *Studies in Philology*, 56 (1959), 471-488

Lawrence, Judiana, 'Natural Bonds and Artistic Coherence in the Ending of *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 35 (1984), 440-460

Lawrence, William Witherle, *Shakespeare's Problem Comedies*, second edition (New York, 1960; first edition, 1931)

Lawry, J. S., '"Perishing Root and Increasing Vine" in *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 12 (1979), 179-193

Leavis, F. R., 'The Criticism of Shakespeare's Late Plays: A Caveat', *Scrutiny*, 10 (1941-42), 339-345

Ledger, Gerard, and Thomas Merriam, 'Shakespeare, Fletcher, and the Two Noble Kinsmen', *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 9 (1994), 235-248

Lee, Sidney, 'Shakespeare', in *The Dictionary of National Biography* (see above), 17, 1286-1335

———, *A Life of William Shakespeare*, revised edition (London, 1915; first edition, 1898)

Leech, Clifford, 'Timon and After', in *Shakespeare's Tragedies and Other Studies in Seventeenth Century Drama* (London, 1950), pp. 113-136

———, 'Shakespeare's Prologues and Epilogues', in Don Cameron Allen, *Studies in Honor of T. W. Baldwin*, pp. 150-164

———, 'The Structure of the Last Plays', *Shakespeare Survey*, 11 (1958), 19-30

- , *The John Fletcher Plays* (London, 1962)
- , 'Masking and Unmasking in the Last Plays', in Kay and Jacobs, *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*, pp. 40-59
- Leech, Clifford, and J. M. R. Margeson, eds., *Shakespeare 1971: Proceedings of the World Shakespeare Congress, Vancouver, August 1971* (Toronto, 1972)
- Leggatt, Alexander, *Shakespeare's Comedy of Love* (London, 1974)
- , 'The Island of Miracles: An Approach to *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 10 (1977), 191-209
- , 'Macbeth and the Last Plays', in J. C. Gray, *Mirror up to Shakespeare*, pp. 189-207
- , 'Henry VIII and the Ideal England', *Shakespeare Survey*, 38 (1985), 131-143
- , *Shakespeare's Political Drama: The History Plays and the Roman Plays* (London and New York, 1988)
- , 'The Shadow of Antioch: Sexuality in *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*', in *Parallel Lives: Spanish and English National Drama, 1580-1680*, edited by Louise and Peter Fothergill-Payne (Cranbury, NJ, 1991), pp. 167-179
- Leininger, Lorie Jerrell, 'The Miranda Trap: Sexism and Racism in Shakespeare's *Tempest*', in Lenz, Greene, and Neely, *The Woman's Part*, pp. 285-294
- Lemly, John, '"Make odde discoveries!": Disguises, Masques, and Jonsonian Romance', in Braunmuller and Bulman, *Comedy from Shakespeare to Sheridan*, pp. 131-147
- Lenz, Carolyn Ruth Swift, Gayle Greene, and Carol Thomas Neely, eds., *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare* (Urbana, IL, 1980)
- , 'Introduction', in *The Woman's Part*, pp. 3-16
- Levack, Brian P., *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union, 1603-1707* (Oxford, 1987)
- Levi, Peter, *A Private Commission: New Verses by Shakespeare* (London, 1988)
- Levin, Harry, *The Myth of the Golden Age in the Renaissance* (London, 1970)

Levin, Richard, *New Readings vs. Old Plays: Recent Trends in the Reinterpretation of English Renaissance Drama* (Chicago and London, 1979)

———, 'Shakespearean Defects and Shakespeareans' Defenses', in Charney, *"Bad" Shakespeare*, pp. 23-36

———, 'Ideological Criticism and Pluralism', in Kamps, *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 15-21

———, 'Reply to Michael Bristol and Gayle Greene', in Kamps, *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 47-60

———, 'The Cultural Materialist Attack on Artistic Unity, and the Problem of Ideological Criticism', in Merrix and Ranson, *Ideological Approaches to Shakespeare*, pp. 39-56

Levine, Mortimer, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question, 1558-1568* (Stanford, CA, 1966)

Levith, Murray J., *What's in Shakespeare's Names* (London, 1978)

Levy, F. J., *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA, 1967)

Lewis, Anthony J., '"I Feed on Mother's Flesh": Incest and Eating in *Pericles*', *Essays in Literature*, 15 (1988), 147-163

———, *The Love Story in Shakespearean Comedy* (Lexington, KY, 1992)

Lewis, Cynthia, '"With Simular Proof Enough": Modes of Misperception in *Cymbeline*', *Studies in English Literature*, 31 (1991), 343-364

Lief, Madelon, and Nicholas F. Radel, 'Linguistic Subversion and the Artifice of Rhetoric in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 38 (1987), 405-425

Lim, Walter S. H., 'Knowledge and Belief in *The Winter's Tale*', *Studies in English Literature*, 41 (2001), 317-334

Lindenberger, Herbert, *Historical Drama: The Relation of Literature and Reality* (Chicago and London, 1975)

Loades, David, ed., *John Foxe and the English Reformation*, St Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Aldershot and Brookfield, VT, 1997)

———, ed., *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective* (Aldershot and Brookfield, VT, 1999)

Lodge, David, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader* (London and New York, 1988)

Loftis, John, 'Henry VIII and Calderón's *La cisma de Inglaterra*', *Comparative Literature*, 34 (1982), 208-222

———, *Renaissance Drama in England & Spain: Topical Allusion and History Plays* (Princeton, NJ, 1987)

Logan, George M., and Gordon Teskey, eds., *Unfolded Tales: Essays on Renaissance Romance* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1989)

Lomax, Marion, *Stage images and traditions: Shakespeare to Ford* (Cambridge, 1987)

Long, John H., *Shakespeare's Use of Music: The Final Comedies* (Gainesville, FL, 1961)

Loomis, Dorothy Bethurum, 'Chaucer and Shakespeare', in *Chaucer's Mind and Art*, edited by A. C. Cawley (Edinburgh and London, 1969), pp. 166-190

Loughrey, Bryan, and Neil Taylor, 'Ferdinand and Miranda at Chess', *Shakespeare Survey*, 35 (1982), 113-118

Love, Harold, *Attributing Authorship: An Introduction* (Cambridge, 2002)

Lowe, David, and Robert Matthews, 'Shakespeare Vs. Fletcher: A Stylometric Analysis by Radial Basis Functions', *Computers and the Humanities*, 29 (1995), 449-461

Ludwigson, Kathryn R., *Edward Dowden*, Twayne's English Authors Series, 148 (New York, 1973)

Lynch, Stephen J., *Shakespearean Intertextuality: Studies in Selected Sources and Plays*, Contributions in Drama and Theatre Studies, 86 (Westport, CT and London, 1998)

McBride, Tom, 'Henry VIII as Machiavellian Romance', *JEGP*, 76 (1977), 26-39

MacCallum, M. W., *Shakespeare's Roman Plays and their Background*, reissued with a Foreword by T. J. B. Spencer (London, 1967; first edition, 1910)

McCoy, Richard C., *The Rites of Knighthood: The Literature and Politics of Elizabethan Chivalry*, The New Historicism: Studies in Cultural Poetics, 7 (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1989)

MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven and London, 1996)

McDonald, Russ, 'Poetry and Plot In *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 36 (1985), 315-329

———, *Shakespeare and Jonson / Jonson and Shakespeare* (Lincoln, NE and London, 1988)

———, 'Reading *The Tempest*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 43 (1990), 15-28

———, 'Late Shakespeare: Style and the Sexes', *Shakespeare Survey*, 46 (1993), 91-106

———, ed., *Shakespeare Reread: The Texts in New Contexts* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1994)

———, 'Introduction', in *Shakespeare Reread*, pp. 1-19

MacDougall, Hugh A., *Racial Myth in English History: Trojans, Teutons, and Anglo-Saxons* (Montreal, 1982)

McFarland, Thomas, *Shakespeare's Pastoral Comedy* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1972)

McGuire, Philip C., 'Hamlet's "Judicious" Spectator and The Metadramatic Critic', in *Shakespearean Metadrama*, 93rd MLA Convention, Special Session 206, 28 December 1978, discussion leader John W. Blanpied (Rochester, NY, [1978(?)]), pp. 28-49

———, *Speechless Dialect: Shakespeare's Open Silences* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1985)

———, *Shakespeare: The Jacobean Plays*, English Dramatists (Basingstoke and London, 1994)

McIntosh, William A., 'Musical Design in *Pericles*', *English Language Notes*, 11 (1973-74), 100-106

McJannet, Linda, 'Genre and Geography: The Eastern Mediterranean in *Pericles* and *The Comedy of Errors*', in Gillies and Vaughan, *Playing the Globe*, pp. 86-106

Mack, Maynard, 'Engagement and Detachment in Shakespeare's Plays', in *Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama: In Honor of Hardin Craig*, edited by Richard Hosley (Columbia, MO, 1962), pp. 275-296

Mackail, J. W., 'The Note of Shakespeare's Romances', in *Lectures on Poetry*, new impression (London, 1914; first impression, 1911), pp. 208-230

McKeithan, Daniel Morley, *The Debt to Shakespeare in the Beaumont-and-Fletcher Plays* (Austin, TX, 1938; reissued New York, 1970)

Mackie, J. D., *The Earlier Tudors: 1485-1558*, The Oxford History of England, VII (Oxford, 1952)

McKisack, May, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age* (Oxford, 1971)

Maclean, Ian, *Interpretation and Meaning in the Renaissance: The Case of Law, Ideas in Context*, 21 (Cambridge, 1992)

McManaway, James G., 'Recent Studies in Shakespeare's Chronology', *Shakespeare Survey*, 3 (1950), 22-33

McMullan, Gordon, *The Politics of Unease in the Plays of John Fletcher*, Massachusetts Studies in Early Modern Culture (Amherst, MA, 1994)

———, 'Shakespeare and the End of History', *Essays and Studies*, n.s. 48 (1995), 16-37

———, ed., *Renaissance Configurations: Voices/Bodies/Spaces, 1580-1690* (Basingstoke and London, 1998)

———, 'A Rose for Emilia: Collaborative Relations in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in McMullan, *Renaissance Configurations*, pp. 129-147

———, "'Swimming on bladders": the Dialogics of Reformation in Shakespeare & Fletcher's *Henry VIII*', in *Shakespeare and Carnival: After Bakhtin*, edited by Ronald Knowles, Early Modern Literature in History (Basingstoke and London, 1998), pp. 211-227

———, "'Thou hast made me now a man": reforming man(ner)liness in *Henry VIII*', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 40-56

McMullan, Gordon, and Jonathan Hope, eds., *The Politics of Tragicomedy: Shakespeare and After* (London and New York, 1992)

———, 'Introduction: The Politics of Tragicomedy, 1610-50', in *The Politics of Tragicomedy*, pp. 1-20

McNeir, Waldo F., and Thelma N. Greenfield, eds., *Pacific Coast Studies in Shakespeare* (Eugene, OR, 1966)

Magnusson, A. Lynne, 'The Collapse of Shakespeare's High Style in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *English Studies in Canada*, 13 (1987), 375-390

———, 'The Rhetoric of Politeness and *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 43 (1991), 391-409

Maguire, Laurie E., *Shakespearean suspect texts: The 'bad' quartos and their contexts* (Cambridge, 1996)

Maguire, Nancy Klein, ed., *Renaissance Tragicomedy: Explorations in Genre and Politics*, AMS Studies in the Renaissance, 20 (New York, 1987)

———, 'Introduction: Towards Understanding Tragicomedy', in *Renaissance Tragicomedy*, pp. 1-10

Maley, Willy, "'This sceptred isle": Shakespeare and the British problem', in *Shakespeare and national culture*, edited by John J. Joughin (Manchester and New York, 1997), pp. 83-108

———, 'Postcolonial Shakespeare: British identity formation and *Cymbeline*', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 145-157

Mallette, Richard, 'Same-Sex Erotic Friendship in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 26 (1995), 29-52

Maltby, Robert, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs, 25 (Leeds, 1991)

Manheim, Michael, *The Weak King Dilemma in the Shakespearean History Play* (Syracuse, NY, 1973)

Manley, Lawrence, *Literature and culture in early modern London* (Cambridge, 1995)

Maquerlot, Jean-Pierre, 'Playing within the play: Towards a Semiotics of Metadrama and Metatheatre', in Laroque, *The Show Within*, I, 39-49

———, *Shakespeare and the Mannerist Tradition: A Reading of Five Problem Plays* (Cambridge, 1995)

Maquerlot, Jean-Pierre, and Michele Willèms, eds., *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time* (Cambridge, 1996)

Marcus, Leah S., *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago and London, 1986)

———, 'Cymbeline and the Unease of Topicality', in *The Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture*, edited by Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier (Chicago and London, 1988), pp. 134-168

———, *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and Its Discontents*, *The New Historicism: Studies in Cultural Poetics*, 6 (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1988)

———, 'Erasing the Stigma of Daughterhood: Mary I, Elizabeth I, and Henry VIII', in *Daughters and Fathers*, edited by Lynda E. Boose and Betty S. Flowers (Baltimore and London, 1989), pp. 400-417

———, *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton* (London and New York, 1996)

Marsden, Jean I., ed., *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth* (Hemel Hempstead, 1991)

Marsh, Derick R. C., *The Recurring Miracle: A study of 'Cymbeline' and the last plays*, third edition (Sydney, 1980; first edition, Pietermaritzburg, 1962)

Marshall, Cynthia, *Last Things and Last Plays: Shakespearean Eschatology* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL, 1991)

Martin, Peter, *Edmond Malone, Shakespearean Scholar: A literary biography*, Cambridge Studies in Eighteenth-Century English Literature and Thought, 25 (Cambridge, 1995)

Martindale, Charles, and Michelle Martindale, *Shakespeare and the Uses of Antiquity: An Introductory Essay* (London and New York, 1990)

Marx, Steven, 'Shakespeare's Pacifism', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 45 (1992), 49-95

Masten, Jeffrey A., 'Beaumont and/or Fletcher: Collaboration and the Interpretation of Renaissance Drama', *ELH*, 59 (1992), 337-356

———, *Textual intercourse: Collaboration, authorship, and sexualities in Renaissance drama*, Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture, 14 (Cambridge, 1997)

———, 'Playwrighting: Authorship and Collaboration', in Cox and Kastan, *A New History of Early English Drama*, pp. 357-382

Matchett, William H., 'The Phoenix and the Turtle': Shakespeare's Poem and Chester's 'Loues Martyr', *Studies in English Literature*, 1 (The Hague, 1965)

———, 'Some Dramatic Techniques in *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 22 (1969), 93-107

Maxwell, Baldwin, *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger* (Durham, NC, 1939)

Maxwell, J. C., 'Virgilian Half-Lines in Shakespeare's "Heroic Narrative"', *Notes and Queries*, 198 (1953), 100

Mehl, Dieter, *The Elizabethan Dumb Show: The History of a Dramatic Convention* (London, 1965; revised translation of *Die Pantomime im Drama der Shakespearezeit* (Heidelberg, 1964))

Mendl, R. W. S., *Revelation in Shakespeare: A study of the Supernatural, religious and spiritual elements in his art* (London, 1964)

Merriam, T., 'Taylor's Statistics in *A Textual Companion*', *Notes and Queries*, 234 (1989), 341-342

—————, 'Pericles I-II Revisited and Considerations Concerning Literary Medium as a Systematic Factor in Stylometry', *Notes and Queries*, 237 (1992), 341-345

Merrix, Robert P., and Nicholas Ranson, eds., *Ideological Approaches to Shakespeare: The Practice of Theory* (Lewiston, NY and Lampeter, 1992)

Meszaros, Patricia K., 'Pericles: Shakespeare's Divine Musical Comedy', in *Shakespeare and the Arts: A Collection of Essays from the Ohio Shakespeare Conference, 1981 Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio*, edited by Cecile Williamson Cary and Henry S. Limouze (Washington, DC, 1982), pp. 3-20

Metz, G. Harold, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen on the Twentieth Century Stage', *Theatre History Studies*, 4 (1984), 63-69

—————, 'Disputed Shakespearean Texts and Stylometric Analysis', *TEXT*, 2 (1985), 149-171

—————, comp., *Four Plays Ascribed to Shakespeare: 'The Reign of King Edward III'; 'Sir Thomas More'; 'The History of Cardenio'; 'The Two Noble Kinsmen': An Annotated Bibliography*, The Garland Shakespeare Bibliographies, 2 (New York, 1982)

—————, ed., *Sources of Four Plays Ascribed to Shakespeare: 'The Reign of King Edward III', 'Sir Thomas More', 'The History of Cardenio', 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'* (Columbia, MO, 1989)

—————, "'Voice and credyt": the scholars and *Sir Thomas More*', in Howard-Hill, *Shakespeare and 'Sir Thomas More'*, pp. 11-44

Michael, Nancy C., 'The Relationship Between the 1609 Quarto of *Pericles* and Wilkins' *Painful Aduentures*', *Tulane Studies in English*, 22 (1977), 51-68

—————, 'The Usefulness of Narrative Sources and the Gower Choruses in Determining a Divided Authorship for *Pericles*', *The Upstart Crow*, 2 (1979), 34-50

—————, comp., *'Pericles': An Annotated Bibliography*, The Garland Shakespeare Bibliographies, 13 (New York, 1987)

Micheli, Linda McJ., "'Sit By Us": Visual Imagery and the Two Queens in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 38 (1987), 452-466

—————, *'Henry VIII': An Annotated Bibliography*, The Garland Shakespeare Bibliographies, 15 (New York, 1988)

Mikalachki, Jodi, 'The Masculine Romance of Roman Britain: *Cymbeline* and Early Modern English Nationalism', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 46 (1995), 301-322; reprinted in revised form in *The Legacy of Boadicea: Gender and Nation in Early Modern England* (London and New York, 1998), pp. 96-114

Miles, Geoffrey, *Shakespeare and the Constant Romans*, Oxford English Monographs (Oxford, 1996)

Miller, Jacqueline T., *Poetic License: Authority and Authorship in Medieval and Renaissance Contexts* (Oxford, 1986)

Mincoff, M., 'The Authorship of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *English Studies*, 33 (1952), 97-115

———, 'Henry VIII and Fletcher', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 12 (1961), 239-260

———, *Things Supernatural and Causeless: Shakespearean Romance*, revised edition, with an Introduction by Barbara A. Mowat (Cranbury, NJ, 1992; first edition, Sofia, 1987)

Minnis, A. J., *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic literary attitudes in the later Middle Ages*, second edition (Aldershot, 1988; first edition, 1984)

Miola, Robert S., *Shakespeare's Rome* (Cambridge, 1983)

———, *Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy: The Influence of Seneca* (Oxford, 1992)

Miskimin, Alice S., *The Renaissance Chaucer* (New Haven and London, 1975)

Moffet, Robin, 'Cymbeline and the Nativity', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 13 (1962), 207-218

Moi, Toril, *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory*, New Accents (London and New York, 1985; reprinted 1995)

Monta, Susannah Brietz, '"Thou fall'st a blessed martyr": Shakespeare's *Henry VIII* and the Polemics of Conscience', *English Literary Renaissance*, 30 (2000), 262-283

Montrose, Louis A., 'The Purpose of Playing: Reflections on a Shakespearean Anthropology', *Helios*, n.s. 7 (1980), 51-74

———, 'Renaissance Literary Studies and the Subject of History', *English Literary Renaissance*, 16 (1986), 5-12

———, 'Introductory Essay', in Berger, *Revisionary Play*, pp. 1-16

———, *The Purpose of Playing: Shakespeare and the Cultural Politics of the Elizabethan Theatre* (Chicago and London, 1996)

Mooney, Michael, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Transactions* (Durham, NC and London, 1990)

———, 'Defining the Dramaturgy of the Late Romances', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 49-56

Moretti, Franco, 'The Great Eclipse: Tragic Form as the Deconsecration of Sovereignty', in *Signs Taken for Wonders: Essays in the Sociology of Literary Forms*, translated by Susan Fischer, David Forgacs, and David Miller, revised edition, Verso Classics, 11 (London and New York, 1988; reprinted 1997; first edition, 1983), pp. 42-82

Morrill, John, 'The fashioning of Britain', in Ellis and Barber, *Conquest and Union*, pp. 8-39

Morse, William R., 'Metacriticism and Materiality: The Case of Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*', *ELH*, 58 (1991), 283-304

Moseley, C. W. R. D., *Shakespeare's History Plays: Richard II to Henry V: The Making of a King*, Penguin Critical Studies (Harmondsworth, 1988)

Mowat, Barbara A., *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances* (Athens, GA, 1976)

———, 'Shakespearean Tragicomedy', in Maguire, *Renaissance Tragicomedy*, pp. 80-96

———, 'Constructing the Author', in Parker and Zitner, *Elizabethan Theater*, pp. 93-110

———, 'The Theater and Literary Culture', in Cox and Kastan, *A New History of Early English Drama*, pp. 213-230

Mucciolo, John M., with Steven J. Doloff and Edward A. Rauchut, eds., *Shakespeare's Universe: Renaissance Ideas and Conventions: Essays in honour of W. R. Elton* (Aldershot, 1996)

Muir, Kenneth, 'The Problem of *Pericles*', *English Studies*, 30 (1949), 65-83

———, *Shakespeare as Collaborator* (London, 1960)

———, *Last Periods of Shakespeare, Racine, and Ibsen* (Liverpool, 1961)

———, 'The Conclusion of *The Winter's Tale*', in *The Morality of Art: Essays Presented to G. Wilson Knight by his Colleagues and Friends*, edited by D. W. Jefferson (London, 1969), pp. 87-101

- , 'A Trick of Style and Some Implications', *Shakespeare Studies*, 6 (1970), 305-310
- , 'Theophanies in the Last Plays', in Tobias and Zolbrod, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 32-43
- , ed., *Shakespeare Survey 29: Shakespeare's Last Plays* (Cambridge, 1976)
- , *The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays* (London, 1977)
- , *Shakespeare's Comic Sequence* (Liverpool, 1979)
- Muir, Kenneth, Jay L. Halio, and D. J. Palmer, eds., *Shakespeare, Man of the Theater: Proceedings of the Second Congress of the International Shakespeare Association, 1981* (East Brunswick, NJ, 1983)
- Mullaney, Steven, *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England* (Chicago and London, 1988)
- , 'After the new historicism', in Terence Hawkes, *Alternative Shakespeares*, Volume 2, pp. 17-37
- Mulryne, J. R., 'Shakespeare's *Knight's Tale*: [The] Two Noble Kinsmen and the Tradition of Chivalry', in Jones-Davies, *Le Roman de Chevalerie au Temps de la Renaissance*, pp. 75-106
- Murry, John Middleton, *Shakespeare* (London, 1936)
- Musgrove, S., 'The First Quarto of *Pericles* Reconsidered', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 29 (1978), 389-406
- Myers, Jeffrey Rayner, *Shakespeare's Mannerist Canon: 'Ut Picturae Poemata'*, *Literature and the Visual Arts: New Foundations*, 2 (New York, 1989)
- Nearing, Homer, Jr., 'Julius Caesar and the Tower of London', *Modern Language Notes*, 63 (1948), 228-233
- , 'The Legend of Julius Caesar's British Conquest', *PMLA*, 64 (1949), 889-929
- Neely, Carol Thomas, 'The *Winter's Tale*: The Triumph of Speech', *Studies in English Literature*, 15 (1975), 321-338
- , *Broken Nuptials in Shakespeare's Plays* (New Haven and London, 1985)
- Nelson, Malcolm A., *The Robin Hood Tradition in the English Renaissance*, *Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Elizabethan and Renaissance Studies*, 14 (Salzburg, 1973)

Nelson, Thomas Allen, *Shakespeare's Comic Theory: A Study of Art and Artifice in the Last Plays*, De Proprietatibus Litterarum: Series Practica, 57 (The Hague, 1972)

Nevo, Ruth, *Shakespeare's Other Language* (London and New York, 1987)

The New Shakspeare Society, 'First Report, July, 1875', bound in at the front of *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos.3-4 (1875-6)

—————; see also under Frederick J. Furnivall; *Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society*

Newey, Vincent, and Ann Thompson, eds., *Literature and Nationalism*, Liverpool English Texts and Studies, [17] (Liverpool, 1991)

Newton, K. M., *In Defence of Literary Interpretation: Theory and Practice* (Basingstoke and London, 1986)

—————, *Interpreting the Text: A Critical Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Literary Interpretation* (Hemel Hempstead, 1990)

Nicoll, Allardyce, 'Shakespeare and the Court Masque', *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 94 (1958), 51-62

—————, ed., *Shakespeare Survey 11: The Last Plays* (Cambridge, 1958)

Nicolson, Marjorie H., 'The Authorship of *Henry the Eighth*', *PMLA*, 37 (1922), 484-502

Noling, Kim H., 'Grubbing Up the Stock: Dramatizing Queens in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 39 (1988), 291-306

Norbrook, David, 'Macbeth and the Politics of Historiography', in *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1987), pp. 78-116

—————, "'What Cares These Roarers for the Name of King?': Language and Utopia in *The Tempest*", in McMullan and Hope, *The Politics of Tragicomedie*, pp. 21-54

—————, 'Rhetoric, Ideology and the Elizabethan World Picture', in *Renaissance Rhetoric*, edited by Peter Mack, Warwick Studies in the European Humanities (Basingstoke and London, 1994), pp. 140-164

Norris, Christopher, *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*, New Accents (London and New York, 1982)

Norwich, John Julius, *Shakespeare's Kings* (Harmondsworth, 1999)

- Nosworthy, J. M., 'The Narrative Sources of *The Tempest*', *Review of English Studies*, 24 (1948), 281-294
- , 'The Integrity of Shakespeare: Illustrated from *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 8 (1955), 52-56
- , 'Music and its Function in the Romances of Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Survey*, 11 (1958), 60-69
- Novy, Marianne, *Love's Argument: Gender Relations in Shakespeare* (Chapel Hill, NC and London, 1984)
- , 'Multiple Parenting in *Pericles*', in Skeele, 'Pericles': *Critical Essays*, pp. 238-248
- Nutt, Joe, *An Introduction to Shakespeare's Late Plays* (Basingstoke, 2002)
- Nuttall, A. D., *William Shakespeare: 'The Winter's Tale'*, *Studies in English Literature*, 26 (London, 1966)
- Olsen, Thomas G., 'Iachimo's "Drug-Damn'd Italy" and the Problem of British National Character in *Cymbeline*', in Klein and Marrapodi, *Shakespeare and Italy*, pp. 269-296
- Oras, Ants, '"Extra Monosyllables" in *Henry VIII* and the Problem of Authorship', *JEGP*, 52 (1953), 198-213
- Orgel, Stephen, *The Jonsonian Masque* (Cambridge, MA, 1965)
- , *The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1975)
- , 'Shakespeare and the Kinds of Drama', *Critical Inquiry*, 6 (1979-80), 107-123
- , 'What is a Text?', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama*, 24 (1981), 3-6
- , 'Making Greatness Familiar', in Greenblatt, *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance*, pp. 41-48
- , 'Shakespeare Imagines a Theater', in Muir, Halio, and Palmer, *Shakespeare, Man of the Theater*, pp. 34-46
- , 'Prospero's Wife', in *Representing the English Renaissance*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1988), pp. 217-229; reprinted from *Representations*, 8 (1984), 1-13
- , 'The Authentic Shakespeare', *Representations*, 21 (Winter 1988), 1-25
- , 'The Poetics of Incomprehensibility', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 42 (1991), 431-437

———, 'Acting Scripts, Performing Texts', in *Crisis in Editing: Texts of the English Renaissance*, Papers given at the twenty-fourth annual Conference on Editorial Problems, University of Toronto, 4-5 November 1988, edited by Randall McLeod (New York, 1994), pp. 251-294

———, *Impersonations: The performance of gender in Shakespeare's England* (Cambridge, 1996)

Ormerod, David, 'Antigonus's Dream', in *Shakespeare: Readers, Audiences, Players*, edited by R. S. White, Charles Edelman, and Christopher Wortham (Nedlands, Western Australia, 1998), pp. 248-259

Ornstein, Robert, *A Kingdom for a Stage: The Achievement of Shakespeare's History Plays* (Cambridge, MA, 1972)

———, *Shakespeare's Comedies: From Roman Force to Romantic Mystery* (Cranbury, NJ, 1986)

Overton, Bill, *The Winter's Tale*, The Critics Debate (Basingstoke and London, 1989)

The Oxford Classical Dictionary, third edition, edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth (Oxford and New York, 1996)

The Oxford English Dictionary, second edition, prepared by J. A. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner, 20 vols (Oxford, 1989)

Oxford Latin Dictionary, edited by P. G. W. Glare, 2 vols (Oxford, 1968-1976)

The Oxford Writers' Dictionary, compiled by R. E. Allen, Oxford Paperback Reference (Oxford, 1996; first published 1990)

Palfrey, Simon, *Late Shakespeare: A New World of Words* (Oxford, 1997)

Palmer, D. J., '"We Shall Know By This Fellow": Prologue and Chorus in Shakespeare', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 64 (1982), 501-521

Parker, A. A., 'Henry VIII in Shakespeare and Calderón: An Appreciation of *La Cisma de Ingalaterra*', *Modern Language Review*, 43 (1948), 327-352

Parker, Patricia A., *Inescapable Romance: Studies in the Poetics of a Mode* (Princeton, NJ, 1979)

———, 'Romance and Empire: Anachronistic *Cymbeline*', in Logan and Teskey, *Unfolded Tales*, pp. 189-207

———, *Shakespeare from the Margins: Language, Culture, Context* (Chicago and London, 1996)

- Parker, Patricia, and Geoffrey Hartman, eds., *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory* (New York and London, 1985)
- Parker, R. B., and S. P. Zitner, eds., *Elizabethan Theater: Essays in Honor of S. Schoenbaum* (Cranbury, NJ, 1996)
- Parrott, Thomas Marc, *Shakespearean Comedy* (New York, 1949)
- Parry, Graham, *The Golden Age restor'd: The culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Manchester, 1981)
- Partridge, A. C., *The Problem of 'Henry VIII' Reopened: Some Linguistic Criteria for the Two Styles apparent in the Play* (Cambridge, 1949)
- Partridge, Eric, *Shakespeare's Bawdy: A Literary & Psychological Essay and a Comprehensive Glossary* (London, 1947)
- Pask, Kevin, *The emergence of the English author: Scripting the life of the poet in early modern England*, Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture, 12 (Cambridge, 1996)
- Patterson, Annabel, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison, WI, 1984)
- , *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice* (Oxford, 1989)
- , *Reading between the Lines* (London, 1993)
- , *Reading Holinshed's 'Chronicles'* (Chicago and London, 1994)
- , "'All Is True": Negotiating the Past in *Henry VIII*", in Parker and Zitner, *Elizabethan Theater*, pp. 147-166
- Payne, Michael, *Irony in Shakespeare's Roman Plays*, Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Elizabethan and Renaissance Studies, 19 (Salzburg, 1974)
- Pearlman, E., *William Shakespeare: The History Plays*, Twayne's English Authors Series (New York, 1992)
- Pearsall, Derek, 'Thomas Speght (ca. 1550-?)', in Ruggiers, *Editing Chaucer*, pp. 71-92
- Pearson, D'Orsay W., "'Unkinde" Theseus: A Study in Renaissance Mythography', *English Literary Renaissance*, 4 (1974), 276-298
- Pechter, Edward, 'Against "Ideology"', in Kamps, *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 79-97
- Peck, Linda Levy, ed., *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 1991)

Perry, Curtis, *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the renegotiation of Elizabethan literary practice* (Cambridge, 1997)

Peterson, Douglas L., *Time, Tide, and Tempest: A Study of Shakespeare's Romances* (San Marino, CA, 1973)

Pettet, E. C., *Shakespeare and the Romance Tradition* (London, 1949)

Phillips, James Emerson, Jr., *The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays*, Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, 149 (New York, 1940)

Pierce, Robert B., *Shakespeare's History Plays: The Family and the State* ([Columbus], OH, 1971)

Piesse, Amanda, 'Space for the Self: Place, Persona and Self-Projection in *The Comedy of Errors* and *Pericles*', in McMullan, *Renaissance Configurations*, pp. 151-170

Pincombe, Michael, 'Classical and Contemporary Sources of the "Gloomy Woods" of *Titus Andronicus*: Ovid, Seneca, Spenser', in *Shakespearean Continuities: Essays in Honour of E. A. J. Honigmann*, edited by John Batchelor, Tom Cain, and Claire Lamont (Basingstoke and London, 1997), pp. 40-55

Pitcher, John, 'A Theatre of the Future: *The Aeneid* and *The Tempest*', *Essays in Criticism*, 34 (1984), 193-215

———, 'Names in *Cymbeline*', *Essays in Criticism*, 43 (1993), 1-16

———, 'Why Editors Should Write More Notes', *Shakespeare Studies*, 24 (1996), 55-62

Pittenger, Elizabeth, 'Dispatch Quickly: The Mechanical Reproduction of Pages', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 42 (1991), 381-408

Platt, Michael, *Rome and Romans According to Shakespeare*, Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Jacobean Drama Studies, 51 (Salzburg, 1976)

———, *Rome and Romans According to Shakespeare*, revised edition (Lanham, MD, 1983)

Platt, Peter G., *Reason Diminished: Shakespeare and the Marvelous* (Lincoln, NE and London, 1997)

Poel, William, 'The Authors of *King Henry the Eighth*', in *Shakespeare in the Theatre* (London, 1913; reissued New York, 1968), pp. 85-98; reprinted from *The New Age*, 15 September 1910

Pollard, Alfred W., *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos: A Study in the Bibliography of Shakespeare's Plays, 1594-1685* (London, 1909)

Pollard, A. W., and G. R. Redgrave, comps., *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640*, second edition, revised and enlarged by W. A. Jackson, F. S. Ferguson, and Katharine F. Pantzer, 3 vols (London, 1976-1991)

Pope, Alexander, 'The Preface of the Editor to *The Works of Shakespear* (1725)', in *The Prose Works of Alexander Pope, Volume II: The Major Works, 1725-1744*, edited by Rosemary Cowler (Oxford, 1986), pp. 1-40

Potter, Lois, 'Topicality or Politics? *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 1613-34', in McMullan and Hope, *The Politics of Tragicomedy*, pp. 77-91

———, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen: Spectacle and Narrative', in Laroque, *The Show Within*, II, 235-251

Potts, Abbie Findlay, *Shakespeare and 'The Faerie Queene'* (Ithaca, NY, 1958)

Powlick, Leonard, 'Cymbeline and the Comedy of Anticlimax', in Tobias and Zolbrod, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 131-141

Pratt, Robert A., 'Chaucer's Use of the *Teseida*', *PMLA*, 62 (1947), 598-621

Prior, Moody E., Review of J. M. Nosworthy, ed., *Cymbeline*, The Arden Shakespeare, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 7 (1956), 111-113

Prior, Roger, 'The Life of George Wilkins', *Shakespeare Survey*, 25 (1972), 137-152

———, 'George Wilkins and the Young Heir', *Shakespeare Survey*, 29 (1976), 33-39

Proudfoot, Richard, 'Shakespeare and the New Dramatists of the King's Men, 1606-1613', in Brown and Harris, *Later Shakespeare*, pp. 235-261

———, 'Directing the Romances 2. Verbal Reminiscence and the Two-Part Structure of *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 29 (1976), 67-78

———, 'Henry VIII (*All Is True*), *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and the Apocryphal Plays', in Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare: A Bibliographical Guide*, pp. 381-403

Pugliatti, Paola, *Shakespeare the Historian* (Basingstoke and London, 1996)

———, 'Shakespeare's Historicism: Visions and Revisions', in *Shakespeare and the Twentieth Century: The Selected Proceedings of the International Shakespeare Association World Congress, Los Angeles, 1996*, edited by Jonathan Bate, Jill L. Levenson, and Dieter Mehl (Cranbury, NJ, 1998), pp. 336-349

Pujante, A. Luis, 'Double Falsehood and the Verbal Parallels with Shelton's *Don Quixote*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 51 (1998), 95-105

Pye, Christopher, *The Regal Phantasm: Shakespeare and the Politics of Spectacle* (London and New York, 1990)

Pyle, Fitzroy, *'The Winter's Tale': A Commentary on the Structure* (London, 1969)

Quiller-Couch, Arthur, *Shakespeare's Workmanship*, third impression (London, 1919; first impression, 1918)

Rabkin, Norman, *Shakespeare and the Common Understanding* (New York and London, 1967)

———, 'Problems in the Study of Collaboration', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama*, 19 (1976), 7-13

———, *Shakespeare and the Problem of Meaning* (Chicago and London, 1981)

Rackin, Phyllis, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (London, 1991)

Rasmussen, Eric, 'Shakespeare's Hand in *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 40 (1989), 1-26

———, 'The Revision of Scripts', in Cox and Kastan, *A New History of Early English Drama*, pp. 441-460

Readings, Bill, 'When Did the Renaissance Begin? The Henrician Court and the Shakespearean Stage', in *Rethinking the Henrician Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contexts*, edited by Peter C. Herman (Urbana and Chicago, 1994), pp. 283-302

Rebhorn, Wayne A., 'After Frye: A Review-Article on the Interpretation of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 21 (1979), 553-582

Redmond, Michael J., "'My lord, I fear, has forgot Britain": Rome, Italy, and the (Re)Construction of British National Identity', in Klein and Marrapodi, *Shakespeare and Italy*, pp. 297-316

Redworth, Glyn, *In Defence of the Church Catholic: The Life of Stephen Gardiner* (Oxford, 1990)

Reed, Robert Rentoul, Jr., *Crime and God's Judgment in Shakespeare* (Lexington, KY, 1984)

Rees, Joan, *Shakespeare and the Story: Aspects of Creation* (London, 1978)

Reese, M. M., *The Cease of Majesty: A Study of Shakespeare's History Plays* (London, 1961)

Relihan, Constance C., 'Liminal Geography: *Pericles* and the Politics of Place', *Philological Quarterly*, 71 (1992), 281-299

Ribner, Irving, 'Shakespeare and Legendary History: *Lear* and *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 7 (1956), 47-52

———, *The English History Play in the age of Shakespeare*, revised edition (London, 1965; first edition, Princeton, NJ, 1957)

Richards, Jennifer, 'Social decorum in *The Winter's Tale*', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 75-91

Richards, Jennifer, and James Knowles, eds., *Shakespeare's Late Plays: New Readings* (Edinburgh, 1999)

———, 'Introduction: Shakespeare's Late Plays', in *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 1-21

Richman, David, *Laughter, Pain, and Wonder: Shakespeare's Comedies and the Audience in the Theater* (Cranbury, NJ, 1990)

Richmond, H. M., *Shakespeare's Political Plays* (New York, 1967; reissued Gloucester, MA, 1977)

———, 'Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*: Romance Redeemed by History', *Shakespeare Studies*, 4 (1968), 334-349

———, 'Shakespeare's Roman Trilogy: The Climax in *Cymbeline*', *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, 5 (1972), 129-139

———, 'Performance As Criticism: *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 163-185

———, 'Teaching *The Tempest* and the Late Plays by Performance', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 125-132

———, 'The Persistent *Kinsmen* of Shakespeare and Fletcher', *Notes and Queries*, 238 (1993), 232-234

———, 'Shakespeare's Last Experiment in *Versimo* [sic]: A Performance Approach to *All Is True*', *Theatre History Studies*, 13 (1993), 47-62

———, *King Henry VIII, Shakespeare in Performance* (Manchester and New York, 1994)

———, 'The Resurrection of an Expired Form: *Henry VIII* as Sequel to *Richard III*', in *Shakespeare's English Histories: A Quest for Form and Genre*, edited by John W. Velz, Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 133 (Binghamton, NY, 1996), pp. 205-228

Ridley, Jasper, *Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford, 1962)

Riemer, A. P., *Antic Fables: Patterns of Evasion in Shakespeare's Comedies* (Manchester, 1980)

Righter, Anne; see under Anne Barton

Roberts, Gareth, '"An art lawful as eating"? Magic in *The Tempest* and *The Winter's Tale*', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 126-142

Roberts, Jeanne Addison, 'Crises of Male Self-Definition in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 133-144

Roberts, Josephine A., 'The Phallacies of Authorship: Reconstructing the Texts of Early Modern Women Writers', in *Attending to Early Modern Women*, edited by Susan D. Amussen and Adele Seeff, with others, Center for Renaissance and Baroque Studies (Cranbury, NJ, 1998), pp. 38-57

Robertson, J. M., *The Genuine in Shakespeare: A Conspectus* (London, 1930)

Roderick, [Richard], 'On the Metre of *Henry VIII*.', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874), 66*-68*; reprinted from Thomas Edwards, *The Canons of Criticism and Glossary, being a Supplement to Mr Warburton's Edition of Shakespeare*, sixth edition (London, 1758)

Rogers, H. L., 'The Prophetic Label in *Cymbeline*', *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 11 (1960), 296-299

Rollins, Hyder E., 'A Note on Richard Edwards', *Review of English Studies*, 4 (1928), 204-206

Ronan, Clifford, '*Antike Roman*': *Power Symbology and the Roman Play in Early Modern England, 1585-1635* (Athens, GA and London, 1995)

Rose, Mary Beth, *The Expense of Spirit: Love and Sexuality in English Renaissance Drama* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1988)

Rossi, Joan Warchol, '*Cymbeline*'s Debt to Holinshed: The Richness of III.i', in Kay and Jacobs, *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*, pp. 104-112

Rossiter, A. P., 'Ambivalence: The Dialectic of the Histories', in Rossiter, *Angel with Horns and Other Shakespeare Lectures*, edited by Graham Storey (London, 1961), pp. 40-64; reprinted from *Talking of Shakespeare*, edited by John Garrett (London, 1954), pp. 149-171

Royal Shakespeare Company, Theatre Programme, *Cymbeline*, directed by Bill Alexander, first performance, Royal Shakespeare Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, 29 June 1989

———, Publicity Schedule for Stratford-upon-Avon theatres, 2 August 1993 - 29 January 1994

———, Publicity Schedule for Stratford-upon-Avon theatres, 29 March - 26 August 1995

———, Theatre Programme, *Cymbeline*, directed by Adrian Noble, first performance, Royal Shakespeare Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, 20 February 1997

Rubinstein, Frankie, *A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Sexual Puns and Their Significance* (London and Basingstoke, 1984)

Rudnytsky, Peter L., 'Henry VIII and the Deconstruction of History', *Shakespeare Survey*, 43 (1990), 43-57

Ruggiers, Paul G., ed., *Editing Chaucer: The Great Tradition* (Norman, OK, 1984)

Ryan, Kiernan, *Shakespeare*, second edition (Hemel Hempstead, 1995; first edition, 1989)

———, ed., *Shakespeare: The Last Plays*, Longman Critical Readers (London and New York, 1999)

Saccio, Peter, *Shakespeare's English Kings: History, Chronicle, and Drama* (London and New York, 1977)

Sacks, Elizabeth, *Shakespeare's Images of Pregnancy* (London and Basingstoke, 1980)

Saenger, Michael Baird, 'Pericles and the Burlesque of Romance', in Skeele, 'Pericles': *Critical Essays*, pp. 191-204

Sahel, Pierre, 'The Strangeness of a Dramatic Style: Rumour in Henry VIII', *Shakespeare Survey*, 38 (1985), 145-151

Said, Edward W., 'The Text, the World, the Critic', in Harari, *Textual Strategies*, pp. 161-188; reprinted in revised form as 'The World, the Text, and the Critic', in *The World, the Text, and the Critic*, pp. 31-53

- , *The World, the Text, and the Critic* (Cambridge, MA, 1983)
- Salingar, L. G., 'Time and Art in Shakespeare's Romances', *Renaissance Drama*, 9 (1966), 3-35
- , *Shakespeare and the Traditions of Comedy* (Cambridge, 1974)
- , 'Romance in *King Lear*', *English*, 27 (1978), 5-21
- , 'Shakespeare and the Italian concept of "art"', in *Dramatic Form in Shakespeare and the Jacobean* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 1-18; first printed in *Renaissance Drama Newsletter*, Supplement Three (Coventry, 1984)
- Salkeld, Duncan, *Madness and drama in the age of Shakespeare* (Manchester and New York, 1993)
- Salway, Peter, *A History of Roman Britain* (Oxford, 1997; first printed in *The Oxford Illustrated History of Roman Britain* (Oxford, 1993))
- Sams, Eric, 'The Painful Misadventures of *Pericles* Acts I-II', *Notes and Queries*, 236 (1991), 67-70
- Sanders, Norman, 'An Overview of Critical Approaches to the Romances', in Kay and Jacobs, *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*, pp. 1-10
- Sanford, Rhonda Lemke, 'A Room Not One's Own: Feminine Geography in *Cymbeline*', in Gillies and Vaughan, *Playing the Globe*, pp. 63-85
- Saunders, J. W. 'Vaulting the Rails', *Shakespeare Survey*, 7 (1954), 69-81
- Scarisbrick, J. J., *Henry VIII*, revised edition, Yale English Monarchs (New Haven and London, 1997; first edition, London, 1968)
- Schanzer, Ernest, 'Thomas Platter's Observations on the Elizabethan Stage', *Notes and Queries*, 201 (1956), 465-467
- Scheps, Walter, 'Chaucer's Theseus and the *Knight's Tale*', *Leeds Studies in English*, 9 (1976-77), 19-34
- Schiffhorst, Gerald J., 'The Imagery of *Pericles* and What It Tells Us', *Ball State University Forum*, 8, no. 3 (Summer 1967), 61-70
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich, *Hermeneutics and Criticism, And Other Writings*, translated and edited by Andrew Bowie, Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy (Cambridge, 1998)
- Schmidgall, Gary, *Shakespeare and the Courtly Aesthetic* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1981)

Schoenbaum, S., *Internal Evidence and Elizabethan Dramatic Authorship: An Essay in Literary History and Method* (London, 1966)

———, *Shakespeare's Lives* (Oxford, 1970)

———, *William Shakespeare: A Documentary Life* (Oxford, 1975)

———, *William Shakespeare: Records and Images* (London, 1981)

Schork, R. J., 'Allusion, Theme, and Characterization in *Cymbeline*', *Studies in Philology*, 69 (1972), 210-216

Schreiber-McGee, F., '"The View of Earthly Glory": Visual Strategies and the Issue of Royal Prerogative in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 20 (1988), 191-200

Schrickx, Willem, 'Pericles in a Book-List of 1619 from the English Jesuit Mission and Some of the Play's Special Problems', *Shakespeare Survey*, 29 (1976), 21-32

Schwartz, Murray M., 'Between Fantasy and Imagination: A Psychological Exploration of *Cymbeline*', in *Psychoanalysis and Literary Process*, edited by Frederick Crews (Cambridge, MA, 1970), pp. 219-283

Schwartz, Murray M., and Coppélia Kahn, eds., *Representing Shakespeare: New Psychoanalytic Essays* (Baltimore and London, 1980)

Scott, William O., 'Another "Heroical Devise" in *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 20 (1969), 91-95

———, *The God of Arts: Ruling Ideas in Shakespeare's Comedies*, University of Kansas Publications: Humanistic Studies, 48 (Lawrence, KS, 1977)

Scragg, Leah, *The Metamorphosis of Gallathea: A Study in Creative Adaptation* (Washington, DC, 1982)

———, *Shakespeare's Mouldy Tales: Recurrent Plot Motifs in Shakespearian Drama* (London and New York, 1992)

Scrimgeour, Gary J., 'The Messenger as a Dramatic Device in Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 19 (1968), 41-54

Seary, Peter, *Lewis Theobald and the Editing of Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1990)

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*, Gender and Culture (New York, 1985)

Seltzer, Daniel, 'The Staging of the Last Plays', in Brown and Harris, *Later Shakespeare*, pp. 127-165

Semon, Kenneth J., 'Fantasy and Wonder in Shakespeare's Last Plays', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 25 (1974), 89-102

Sen Gupta, S. C., *Shakespearian Comedy* (Calcutta, 1950)

———, *Shakespeare's Historical Plays* (Oxford, 1964)

Serpieri, Alessandro, 'Reading the signs: towards a semiotics of Shakespearean drama', translated by Keir Elam, in Drakakis, *Alternative Shakespeares*, pp. 119-143

Sexton, Joyce H., *The Slandered Woman in Shakespeare*, English Literary Studies Monograph Series, 12 (Victoria, BC, 1978)

Shaheen, Naseeb, 'The Use of Scripture in *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 4 (1968), 294-315

———, *Biblical References in Shakespeare's History Plays* (Cranbury, NJ, 1989)

———, 'Shakespeare's Knowledge of Italian', *Shakespeare Survey*, 47 (1994), 161-169

———, *Biblical References in Shakespeare's Plays* (Cranbury, NJ, 1999)

'Shakespeare: Annotated World Bibliography, 1990-1995', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 42-47 (1991-1996)

Shannon, Edgar Finley, *Chaucer and the Roman Poets*, Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, 7 (Cambridge, MA, 1929; reissued New York, 1964)

Shannon, Laurie J., 'Emilia's Argument: Friendship and "Human Title" in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *ELH*, 64 (1997), 657-682

Shapiro, Michael, 'Role-Playing, Reflexivity, and Metadrama in Recent Shakespearean Criticism', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 12 (1981), 145-161

———, 'Crossgender Disguise in *Cymbeline* And Its Sources', *Shakespeare Yearbook*, 2 (1991), 132-148

———, *Gender in Play on the Shakespearean Stage: Boy Heroines and Female Pages* (Ann Arbor, 1994)

Sharpe, Kevin, 'The King's Writ: Royal Authors and Royal Authority in Early Modern England', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, edited by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, Problems in Focus (Basingstoke and London, 1994), pp. 117-138

Shaver, Ann, 'Structure and Ceremony: A Case for Unity in *King Henry VIII*', *Selected Papers from the West Virginia Shakespeare and Renaissance Association*, 1, no. 2 (Spring 1977), 1-23

- Shaw, George Bernard, *Shaw on Shakespeare: An Anthology of Bernard Shaw's Writings on the Plays and Production of Shakespeare*, edited by Edwin Wilson (New York, 1961)
- Shawcross, John T., 'Tragicomedy as Genre, Past and Present', in Maguire, *Renaissance Tragicomedy*, pp. 13-32
- Sheen, Erica, "'The Agent for His Master": Political Service and Professional Liberty in *Cymbeline*', in McMullan and Hope, *The Politics of Tragicomedy*, pp. 55-76
- , 'The Pannonians and the Dalmatians: Reading for a European history in *Cymbeline*', in Hattaway, Sokolova, and Roper, *Shakespeare in the New Europe*, pp. 310-320
- Shepherd, Simon, *Amazons and Warrior Women: Varieties of Feminism in Seventeenth-Century Drama* (Brighton, 1981)
- Shewring, Margaret, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen Revived: Chivalric Romance and Modern Performance Images', in Jones-Davies, *Le Roman de Chevalerie au Temps de la Renaissance*, pp. 107-132
- Shirley, Frances Ann, *Shakespeare's Use of Off-Stage Sounds* (Lincoln, NE, 1963)
- , ed., 'King John' and 'Henry VIII': *Critical Essays*, Garland Shakespearean Criticism, 6 (New York and London, 1988)
- Shklovksy, Victor, 'Art as technique' (1917), in Lodge, *Modern Criticism and Theory*, pp. 15-30; reprinted from *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, edited and translated by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis (Lincoln, NE and London, 1965), pp. 5-24
- Showalter, Elaine, 'Representing Ophelia: women, madness, and the responsibilities of feminist criticism', in Parker and Hartman, *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, pp. 77-94
- Siegel, Paul N., *Shakespeare's English and Roman History Plays: A Marxist Approach* (Cranbury, NJ, 1986)
- Siemon, James Edward, 'Noble Virtue in *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 29 (1976), 51-61
- Siemon, James R., "'Perplex'd beyond self-explication": *Cymbeline* and Early Modern/Postmodern Europe', in Hattaway, Sokolova, and Roper, *Shakespeare in the New Europe*, pp. 294-309
- Simmons, J. L., *Shakespeare's Pagan World: The Roman Tragedies* (Hassocks, 1974)
- Simonds, Peggy Muñoz, *Myth, Emblem, and Music in Shakespeare's 'Cymbeline': An Iconographic Reconstruction* (Cranbury, NJ, 1992)

Simpson, Richard, 'The Political Use of the Stage in Shakspeare's Time', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874), 371-395

———, 'The Politics of Shakspeare's Historical Plays', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874), 396-441

Sinfield, Alan, *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading* (Oxford, 1992)

———, 'Macbeth: History, Ideology, and Intellectuals', in *Faultlines*, pp. 95-108; reprinted from *Futures for English*, edited by Colin MacCabe (Manchester, 1988), pp. 63-77

Singleton, S., 'Cymbeline, Act V. Sc. 5', *Notes and Queries*, Series II, vol 3 (January-June 1857), 163-164

Sisson, Charles J., 'Shakespeare Quartos as Prompt-Copies, with Some Account of Cholmeley's Players and a New Shakespeare Allusion', *Review of English Studies*, 18 (1942), 129-143

Skeele, David, *Thwarting the Wayward Seas: A Critical and Theatrical History of Shakespeare's 'Pericles' in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Cranbury, NJ, 1998)

———, ed., 'Pericles': *Critical Essays*, Garland Shakespeare Criticism, 23 (New York, 2000)

Skura, Meredith, 'Interpreting Posthumus' Dream from Above and Below: Families, Psychoanalysts, and Literary Critics', in Schwartz and Kahn, *Representing Shakespeare*, pp. 203-216

———, 'Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 40 (1989), 42-69

———, 'Is There a Shakespeare after the *New New Bibliography*?', in Parker and Zitner, *Elizabethan Theater*, pp. 169-183

Slater, Eliot, 'Shakespeare: Word Links Between Poems and Plays', *Notes and Queries*, 220 (1975), 157-163

———, 'Word Links with *All's Well That Ends Well*', *Notes and Queries*, 222 (1977), 109-112

Slights, Camille Wells, 'The Politics of Conscience in *All Is True* (or *Henry VIII*)', *Shakespeare Survey*, 43 (1990), 59-68

Slights, William W. E., 'Trusting Shakespeare's *Winter's Tale*: Metafiction in the Late Plays', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 103-108

Smallwood, R. L., 'Shakespeare's use of history', in Stanley Wells, *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, pp. 143-162

Smidt, Kristian, *Unconformities in Shakespeare's History Plays* (London, 1982)

———, *Unconformities in Shakespeare's Later Comedies* (Basingstoke and London, 1993)

Smith, Bruce R., 'Pageants into Play: Shakespeare's Three Perspectives on Idea and Image', in Bergeron, *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*, pp. 220-246

———, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics* (Chicago, 1991)

Smith, Hallett, 'Shakespeare's Romances', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 27 (1964), 279-287

———, 'Shakespeare's Last Plays: Facts and Problems', *Shakespearean Research Opportunities*, 3 (1967), 9-16

———, *Shakespeare's Romances: A Study of Some Ways of the Imagination* (San Marino, CA, 1972)

Smith, Irwin, *Shakespeare's Blackfriars Playhouse: Its History and Its Design* (New York, 1964)

———, 'Their Exits and Reentrances', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 18 (1967), 7-16

———, 'Ariel and the Masque in *The Tempest*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 21 (1970), 213-222

Smith, M. W. A., 'The Authorship of *Pericles*: An Initial Investigation', *The Bard*, 3 (1982), 143-176

———, 'The Authorship of *Pericles*: Collocations Investigated Again', *The Bard*, 4 (1983), 15-21

———, 'An Initial Investigation of the Authorship of *Pericles*: Statistics Support Scholars: Shakespeare did not write Acts I & II', *Shakespeare Newsletter*, 33 (1983), 32

———, 'The Authorship of *Pericles*: New Evidence for Wilkins', *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 2 (1987), 221-230

———, 'The Authorship of Acts I and II of *Pericles*: a New Approach Using First Words of Speeches', *Computers and the Humanities*, 22 (1988), 23-41

———, 'Function Words and the Authorship of *Pericles*', *Notes and Queries*, 234 (1989), 333-336

———, 'A Procedure to Determine Authorship using Pairs of Consecutive Words: More Evidence for Wilkins's Participation in *Pericles*', *Computers and the Humanities*, 23 (1989), 113-129

———, 'A Note on the Authorship of *Pericles*', *Computers and the Humanities*, 24 (1990), 295-300

———, 'Statistical Inference in A *Textual Companion* to The Oxford Shakespeare', *Notes and Queries*, 236 (1991), 73-78

———, 'The Problem of Acts I-II of *Pericles*', *Notes and Queries*, 237 (1992), 346-355

———, '*Sir Thomas More, Pericles* and Stylometry', *Notes and Queries*, 239 (1994), 55-58

Smith, Peter J., *Social Shakespeare: Aspects of Renaissance Dramaturgy and Contemporary Society* (Basingstoke and London, 1995)

Smith, Warren D., 'Cloten with Caius Lucius', *Studies in Philology*, 49 (1952), 185-194

———, *Shakespeare's Playhouse Practice: A Handbook* (Hanover, NH, 1975)

Smuts, R. Malcolm, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia, 1987)

Sokol, B. J., *Art and illusion in 'The Winter's Tale'* (Manchester and New York, 1994)

Sokolova, Boika, *Shakespeare's Romances as Interrogative Texts: Their Alienation Strategies and Ideology* (Lampeter and Lewiston, NY, 1992)

Solway, David, 'Intoxicated Words: Language in Shakespeare's Late Romances', *Sewanee Review*, 95 (1987), 619-625

Sommerville, J. P., *Politics and Ideology in England, 1603-1640* (London and New York, 1986)

———, 'Introduction', in King James VI and I, *Political Writings* (see Section II), pp. xv-xxviii

S[palding], W[illiam], *A Letter on Shakspeare's Authorship of 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'; A Drama Commonly Ascribed to John Fletcher* (Edinburgh, 1833); reprinted as below

Spalding, William, *A Letter on Shakspeare's Authorship of 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'; and on the Characteristics of Shakspeare's Style and the Secret of his Supremacy*, new edition, with 'Forewords' by F. J. Furnivall, Publications of The New Shakspeare Society, Series VIII, no. 1 (London, 1876)

Spearing, A. C., *Medieval Dream-Poetry* (Cambridge, 1976)

———, *Medieval to Renaissance in English Poetry* (Cambridge, 1985)

S[pedding], J[ames], 'Who Wrote Shakspeare's Henry VIII.?', *Gentleman's Magazine*, 187 (July-December 1850), 115-123; reprinted as James Spedding, 'On the Several Shares of Shakspeare and Fletcher in the Play of *Henry VIII.*' (see below)

Spedding, James, 'Who Wrote Shakspeare's Henry VIII.?', *Gentleman's Magazine*, 187 (July-December 1850), 381-382; partly reprinted as 'Mr Spedding's Letter', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874), 21*-22*

———, 'On the Several Shares of Shakspeare and Fletcher in the Play of *Henry VIII.*', *Transactions of the NSS*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874), 1*-18*; reprinted from J[ames] S[pedding], 'Who Wrote Shakspeare's Henry VIII.?' (see above)

Spence, Lewis, *Legendary London: Early London in Tradition and History* (London, 1937)

Spencer, Hazelton, *The Art and Life of William Shakespeare* (New York, 1940; reprinted London, 1947)

Spencer, T. J. B., *William Shakespeare: The Roman Plays: 'Titus Andronicus'. 'Julius Caesar'. 'Antony and Cleopatra'. 'Coriolanus'*, *Writers and their Work*, 157 (London, 1963)

Spencer, Theodore, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen', *Modern Philology*, 36 (1938-39), 255-276; reprinted in *Selected Essays*, pp. 220-241

———, 'Appearance and Reality in Shakespeare's Last Plays', *Modern Philology*, 39 (1941-42), 265-274; reprinted in *Selected Essays*, pp. 282-291

———, *Shakespeare and the Nature of Man*, second edition (New York, 1949; first edition, 1942)

———, *Selected Essays*, edited by Alan C. Purves (New Brunswick, NJ, 1966)

Spevack, Marvin, comp., *A Complete and Systematic Concordance to the Works of Shakespeare*, 9 vols (Hildesheim, 1968-1980)

———, 'Beyond Individualism: Names and Namelessness in Shakespeare', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 56 (1993), 383-398

———, 'Etymology in Shakespeare', in Mucciolo and others, *Shakespeare's Universe*, pp. 187-193

Spiker, Sina, 'George Wilkins and the Authorship of *Pericles*', *Studies in Philology*, 30 (1933), 551-570

Spikes, Judith Doolin, 'The Jacobean History Play and the Myth of the Elect Nation', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 8 (1977), 117-149

Sprague, Arthur Colby, *Shakespeare's Histories: Plays for the Stage*, The Society for Theatre Research (London, 1964)

Sprinker, Michael, 'Commentary: "You've Got a Lot of Nerve"', in Kamps, *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 115-128

Spurgeon, Caroline F. E., *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion, 1357-1900*, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1925)

———, *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us* (Cambridge, 1935)

Stallybrass, Peter, 'Shakespeare, the Individual, and the Text', in *Cultural Studies*, edited by Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula A. Treichler, with others (New York and London, 1992), pp. 593-612

———, 'Worn worlds: clothes and identity on the Renaissance stage', in *Subject and object in Renaissance culture*, edited by Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan, and Peter Stallybrass, *Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture*, 8 (Cambridge, 1996), pp 289-320

Stamm, Rudolf, 'George Bernard Shaw and Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*', in Don Cameron Allen, *Studies in Honor of T. W. Baldwin*, pp. 254-266

Stephenson, A. A., 'The Significance of *Cymbeline*', *Scrutiny*, 10 (1941-42), 329-338

Stevenson, Warren, 'Shakespeare's Hand in *The Spanish Tragedy 1602*', *Studies in English Literature*, 8 (1968), 307-321

Stewart, Alan, "'Near akin": the trials of friendship in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 57-71

Still, Colin, *Shakespeare's Mystery Play: A Study of 'The Tempest'* (London, 1921; later expanded as *The Timeless Theme* (London, 1936))

Stillinger, Jack, *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius* (Oxford, 1991)

———, 'Multiple Authorship and the Question of Authority', *TEXT*, 5 (1991), 283-293

Stoker, Bram, *Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving*, 2 vols (London, 1906)

Stone, George Winchester, Jr., 'A Century of *Cymbeline*; or Garrick's Magic Touch', *Philological Quarterly*, 54 (1975), 310-322

Strachey, Lytton, 'Shakespeare's Final Period', in *Books & Characters: French & English*, The Phoenix Library (London, 1928; first published 1922), pp. 39-56; first published in *Independent Review*, 3 (August 1904), 405-418

Strier, Richard, *Resistant Structures: Particularity, Radicalism, and Renaissance Texts*, The New Historicism: Studies in Cultural Poetics, 34 (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1995)

Strong, Roy, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London, 1977)

———, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London, 1986)

Sturgess, Keith, *Jacobean Private Theatre*, Theatre Production Series (London and New York, 1987)

Styan, J. L., *The Shakespeare Revolution: Criticism and Performance in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, 1977)

Sugden, Edward H., *A Topographical Dictionary to the Works of Shakespeare and his Fellow Dramatists*, Publications of the University of Manchester, 168 (Manchester, 1925)

Sundelson, David, 'So Rare a Wonder'd Father: Prospero's *Tempest*', in Schwartz and Kahn, *Representing Shakespeare*, pp. 33-53; reprinted in revised form as 'Shakespeare's Restorations of the Father', in Sundelson, *Shakespeare's Restorations of the Father* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1983), pp. 103-130

Sutherland, James, 'The Language of the Last Plays', in *More Talking of Shakespeare*, edited by John Garrett (London, 1959), pp. 144-158

Swander, Homer, 'Cymbeline and the "Blameless Hero"', *ELH*, 31 (1964), 259-270

———, 'Cymbeline: Religious Idea and Dramatic Design', in McNeir and Greenfield, *Pacific Coast Studies in Shakespeare*, pp. 248-262

Swayze, Margaret Isabel, 'A History of the Literary Criticism and Stage Production of *Henry VIII*' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham, 1973)

Swinburne, Algernon Charles, *A Study of Shakespeare* (London, 1880)

Sykes, H. Dugdale, *Sidelights on Shakespeare: Being studies of 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'. 'Henry VIII'. 'Arden of Feversham'. 'A Yorkshire Tragedy'. 'The Troublesome Reign of King John'. 'King Lear'. 'Pericles Prince of Tyre', with a 'Publisher's Note' by A. H. Bullen (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1919)*

Tarlinskaja, Marina, *Shakespeare's Verse: Iambic Pentameter and the Poet's Idiosyncrasies*, American University Studies, Series IV: English Language and Literature, 41 (New York, 1987)

Taylor, Edward William, *Nature and Art in Renaissance Literature* (New York and London, 1964)

Taylor, Gary, 'King Lear: The Date and Authorship of the Folio Version', in *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of 'King Lear'*, edited by Gary Taylor and Michael Warren, Oxford Shakespeare Studies (Oxford, 1983), pp. 351-468

———, *Moment by Moment by Shakespeare* (London and Basingstoke, 1985)

———, 'General Introduction', in Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, and others, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (see Section I), pp. 1-68

———, 'The Canon and Chronology of Shakespeare's Plays', in Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, and others, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (see Section I), pp. 69-144

———, 'The Transmission of *Pericles*', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 80 (1986), 193-217

———, 'The date and auspices of the additions to *Sir Thomas More*', in Howard-Hill, *Shakespeare and 'Sir Thomas More'*, pp. 101-129

———, *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present* (London, 1990)

———, 'What is an Author [not]?', *Critical Survey*, 7 (1995), 241-254

Taylor, Gary, and John Jowett, *Shakespeare Reshaped, 1606-1623*, Oxford Shakespeare Studies (Oxford, 1993)

Taylor, Michael, 'The Pastoral Reckoning in *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 36 (1983), 97-106

- , 'The Late Comedies', in Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare: A Bibliographical Guide*, pp. 159-179
- Teague, Frances, *Shakespeare's Speaking Properties* (Cranbury, NJ, 1991)
- Tennenhouse, Leonard, 'Strategies of State and political plays: *A Midsummer Night's Dream, Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VIII*', in Dollimore and Sinfield, *Political Shakespeare*, pp. 109-128
- , *Power on Display: The politics of Shakespeare's genres* (London and New York, 1986)
- Terry, F. C. Birkbeck, 'Cymbeline, V. v. 447, 448', *Notes and Queries*, Series VII, vol 4 (July-December 1887), 105
- Thomas, Brook, 'Cymbeline and the Perils of Interpretation', *New Orleans Review*, 10, nos. 2-3 (Summer-Fall 1983), 137-145
- Thomas, Sidney, 'The Problem of *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 34 (1983), 448-450
- Thomas, Vivian, *Shakespeare's Roman Worlds* (London and New York, 1989)
- Thompson, Ann, 'Philomel in *Titus Andronicus* and *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 31 (1978), 23-32
- , *Shakespeare's Chaucer: A Study in Literary Origins*, Liverpool English Texts and Studies, 16 (Liverpool, 1978)
- , 'Jailers' Daughters in *The Arcadia* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Notes and Queries*, 224 (1979), 140-141
- , 'Casting Sense between the Speech: Parentheses in the Oxford Shakespeare', *AEB*, n.s. 4 (1990), 72-90
- , 'Cymbeline's Other Endings', in Marsden, *The Appropriation of Shakespeare*, pp. 203-220
- , '"Miranda, Where's Your Sister?": Reading Shakespeare's *The Tempest*', in *Feminist Criticism: Theory and Practice*, edited by Susan Sellers (Hemel Hempstead, 1991), pp. 45-55
- , 'Person and Office: The Case of Imogen, Princess of Britain', in Newey and Thompson, *Literature and Nationalism*, pp. 76-87
- , 'Series Editor's Preface' (1996), Routledge Feminist Readings of Shakespeare Series (London and New York, 1997-)

———, "'Making Him Speak True English": Grammatical Emendation in Some Eighteenth-Century Editions of Shakespeare, with Particular Reference to *Cymbeline*', in *Reading Readings: Essays in Shakespeare Editing in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by Joanna Gondris (Cranbury, NJ, 1998), pp. 71-85

Thompson, Ann, and John O. Thompson, 'The Syntax of Metaphor in *Cymbeline*', in Habicht, Palmer, and Pringle, *Images of Shakespeare*, pp. 80-97

Thompson, Marvin, and Ruth Thompson, eds., *Shakespeare and the Sense of Performance: Essays in the Tradition of Performance Criticism in Honor of Bernard Beckerman* (Cranbury, NJ, 1989)

Thomson, J. A. K., *Shakespeare and the Classics* (London, 1952)

Thomson, W. H., *Shakespeare's Characters: A Historical Dictionary* (Altrincham, 1951)

Thorndike, Ashley H., *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspeare* (Worcester, MA, 1901; reissued New York, 1965)

Thorne, Alison, "'To write and read / Be henceforth treacherous": *Cymbeline* and the problem of interpretation', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 176-190

Thorne, W. B., 'The Cycle of Sin in Shakespeare's Late Plays', *The Upstart Crow*, 4 (Fall 1982), 86-93

———, 'Cymbeline: "Lopp'd Branches" and the Concept of Regeneration', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 20 (1969), 143-159

Thrall, William Flint, 'Cymbeline, Boccaccio, and the Wager Story in England', *Studies in Philology*, 28 (1931), 639-651

Tilley, Morris Palmer, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: A Collection of the Proverbs Found in English Literature and the Dictionaries of the Period* (Ann Arbor, 1950)

Tillyard, E. M. W., *Shakespeare's Last Plays* (London, 1938)

———, *The Elizabethan World Picture* (London, 1943)

———, *Shakespeare's History Plays* (London, 1944)

———, *The English Epic and its Background* (London, 1954)

———, 'Why did Shakespeare write *Henry VIII*?', *Critical Quarterly*, 3 (1961), 22-27

Tinkler, F. C., 'Cymbeline', *Scrutiny*, 7 (1938-39), 5-20

Tobias, Richard C., and Paul G. Zolbrod, eds., *Shakespeare's Late Plays: Essays in Honor of Charles Crow* (Athens, OH, 1974)

———, *Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society*, Series I, nos. 1-2 (1874)

———, Series I, nos. 3-4 (1875-6)

———, Series I, nos. 8-10 (1880-6)

Traub, Valerie, 'Desire and the Difference in Makes', in Wayne, *The Matter of Difference*, pp. 81-144

———, 'The (In)Significance of "Lesbian" Desire in Early Modern England', in *Queering the Renaissance*, edited by Jonathan Goldberg (Durham, NC and London, 1994), pp. 62-83

Traversi, Derek, *Shakespeare: The Last Phase*, second impression (London, 1965; first impression, 1954)

———, *An Approach to Shakespeare*, third edition, 2 vols (London, 1968-1969)

Turner, Robert K., Jr., 'The Two Noble Kinsmen and Speght's Chaucer', *Notes and Queries*, 225 (1980), 175-176

Turner, Robert Y., 'Slander in *Cymbeline* and Other Jacobean Tragicomedies', *English Literary Renaissance*, 13 (1983), 182-202

Uhlig, Claus, 'Shakespeare between Politics and Aesthetics', *Shakespearean International Yearbook*, 1 (1999), 26-44

unattributed, 'Further Notes on the Authorship of Shakspeare's Henry VIII.', *Notes and Queries*, 2 (May-December 1850), 306-307

Underwood, Richard Allan, *Shakespeare's 'The Phoenix and Turtle': A Survey of Scholarship*, Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Elizabethan and Renaissance Studies, 15 (Salzburg, 1974)

———, *Shakespeare on Love: The Poems and the Plays. Prolegomena to a Variorum Edition of 'A Lover's Complaint'*, Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Elizabethan & Renaissance Studies, 91 (Salzburg, 1985)

Uphaus, Robert W., *Beyond Tragedy: Structure & Experience in Shakespeare's Romances* (Lexington, KY, 1981)

Van Doren, Mark, *Shakespeare* (London, 1941; first published New York, 1939)

Van Laan, Thomas F., *Role-playing in Shakespeare* (Toronto, 1978)

Vanita, Ruth, 'Mariological Memory in *The Winter's Tale* and *Henry VIII*', *Studies in English Literature*, 40 (2000), 311-337

Vaughan, Alden T., and Virginia Mason Vaughan, *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History* (Cambridge, 1991)

Velie, Alan R., *Shakespeare's Repentance Plays: The Search for an Adequate Form* (Cranbury, NJ, 1972)

Velz, John W., 'The Ancient World in Shakespeare: Authenticity or Anachronism? A Retrospect', *Shakespeare Survey*, 31 (1978), 1-12

———, 'Sir Thomas More and the Shakespeare canon: two approaches', in Howard-Hill, *Shakespeare and 'Sir Thomas More'*, pp. 171-195

Venezky, Alice S., *Pageantry on the Shakespearean Stage* (New York, 1951)

Vessey, David, *Statius and the 'Thebaid'* (Cambridge, 1973)

Vickers, Brian, Review of Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, and others, eds., *The Oxford Shakespeare*, *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 40 (1989), 402-411

———, *Appropriating Shakespeare: Contemporary Critical Quarrels* (New Haven and London, 1993)

Vickers, Nancy, "'The blazon of sweet beauty's best": Shakespeare's *Lucrece*', in Parker and Hartman, *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, pp. 95-115

von Greyerz, Georg, *The Reported Scenes in Shakespeare's Plays*, Inauguraldissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Philosophisch-Historischen Fakultät der Universität Bern (Bern, 1965)

Vyvyan, John, *Shakespeare and the Rose of Love: A Study of the Early Plays in Relation to the Medieval Philosophy of Love* (London, 1960)

Waage, Frederick O., Jr., 'Henry VIII and the Crisis of the English History Play', *Shakespeare Studies*, 8 (1975), 297-309

———, 'Be Stone No More: Italian Cinquecento Art and Shakespeare's Last Plays', in *Shakespeare: Contemporary Critical Approaches* (*Bucknell Review*, 25, no. 1 (1980)), edited by Harry R. Garvin, with Michael D. Payne (East Brunswick, NJ, 1980), pp. 56-87

Waddington, Raymond B., 'Entertaining the Offered Phallacy: Male Bed Tricks in Shakespeare', in Mucciolo and others, *Shakespeare's Universe*, pp. 121-132

Waith, Eugene M., *The Pattern of Tragicomedie in Beaumont and Fletcher*, Yale Studies in English, 120 (New Haven, 1952)

———, *The Herculean Hero in Marlowe, Chapman, Shakespeare and Dryden* (London, 1962)

———, 'Shakespeare and the Ceremonies of Romance', in *Shakespeare's Craft: Eight Lectures*, edited by Philip H. Highfill, Jr. (Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL, 1982), pp. 113-137

———, 'Shakespeare and Fletcher on Love and Friendship', *Shakespeare Studies*, 18 (1986), 235-250

———, 'King John, Henry VIII, and the Arts of Performing Shakespeare's History Plays', in Biggs and others, *The Arts of Performance*, pp. 70-83

Wall, Wendy, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1993)

Waller, Frederick O., 'Printer's Copy for *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *Studies in Bibliography*, 11 (1958), 61-84

———, 'The use of Linguistic Criteria in Determining the Copy and Dates for Shakespeare's Plays', in McNeir and Greenfield, *Pacific Coast Studies in Shakespeare*, pp. 1-19

Waller, Gary, 'The Late Plays as Family Romance', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 57-63

Warnicke, Retha M., *The Rise and Fall of Anne Boleyn: Family politics at the court of Henry VIII* (Cambridge, 1989; reprinted 2000)

Warren, Roger, 'Theatrical Virtuosity and Poetic Complexity in *Cymbeline*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 29 (1976), 41-49

———, *Cymbeline, Shakespeare in Performance* (Manchester and New York, 1989)

———, *Staging Shakespeare's Late Plays* (Oxford, 1990)

Wasson, John, 'In Defense of *King Henry VIII*', *Research Studies*, 32 (1964), 261-276

Waswo, Richard, *Language and Meaning in the Renaissance* (Princeton, NJ, 1987)

Waters, D. Douglas, 'Shakespeare and the "Mistress-Missa" Tradition in *King Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 24 (1973), 459-462

Watkins, W. B. C., *Shakespeare and Spenser* (Princeton, NJ, 1950)

Waugh, Patricia, *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction*, New Accents (London and New York, 1984)

Wayne, Valerie, ed., *The Matter of Difference: Materialist Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare* (Hemel Hempstead, 1991)

———, 'Historical Differences: Misogyny and Othello', in *The Matter of Difference*, pp. 153-170

Webb, Henry J., 'A Reinterpretation of Chaucer's Theseus', *Review of English Studies*, 23 (1947), 289-296

Weimann, Robert, *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theater: Studies in the Social Dimension of Dramatic Form and Function*, edited by Robert Schwartz (Baltimore and London, 1978; revised translation of *Shakespeare und die Tradition des Volkstheaters: Soziologie, Dramaturgie, Gestaltung* (Berlin, 1967))

Weller, Barry, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen, the Friendship Tradition, and the Flight from Eros', in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 93-108

Wells, Charles, *The Wide Arch: Roman Values in Shakespeare* (New York, 1992)

Wells, Henry W., and H. H. Anniah Gowda, *Shakespeare Turned East: A Study in comparison of Shakespeare's Last Plays with some classical plays of India* (Mysore, 1976)

Wells, Robin Headlam, *Shakespeare, Politics and the State*, Context and Commentary (Basingstoke and London, 1986)

Wells, Stanley, 'Shakespeare and Romance', in Brown and Harris, *Later Shakespeare*, pp. 49-79

———, *Literature and Drama, with special reference to Shakespeare and his contemporaries*, Concepts of Literature (London, 1970)

———, *Shakespeare: An Illustrated Dictionary* (London, 1978)

———, *Re-Editing Shakespeare for the Modern Reader: Based on Lectures Given at the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, DC*, Oxford Shakespeare Studies (Oxford, 1984)

———, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare Studies* (Cambridge, 1986)

———, ed., *An Oxford Anthology of Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1987)

———, ed., *Shakespeare: A Bibliographical Guide*, new edition (Oxford, 1990)

- , 'Staging Shakespeare's Apparitions and Dream Visions', *The First Annual Shakespeare Globe Lecture* (London, [1990])
- , ed., *Shakespeare Survey 43: 'The Tempest' and After* (Cambridge, 1991)
- , 'Staging Shakespeare's Ghosts', in Biggs and others, *The Arts of Performance*, pp. 50-69
- , *Shakespeare: The Poet and his Plays* (London, 1997; revised edition of *Shakespeare: A Dramatic Life* (London, 1994))
- , 'The Two Noble Kinsmen at the Swan Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon', in *Shakespeare: Varied Perspectives*, edited by Vikram Chopra, New World Literature Series, 90 (Delhi, 1996), pp. 441-444
- Wells, Stanley, and Gary Taylor, 'The Oxford Shakespeare Re-Viewed by the General Editors', *AEB*, n.s. 4 (1990), 6-20
- Welsh, Andrew, 'Heritage in *Pericles*', in Tobias and Zolbrod, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 89-113
- Wendell, Barrett, *William Shakspeare: A Study in Elizabethan Literature* (London, 1894)
- Werstine, Paul, 'Compositor B of the Shakespeare First Folio', *AEB*, 2 (1978), 241-263
- , 'On the Compositors of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in Frey, *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, pp. 6-30
- West, E. J., 'Shaw, Shakespeare, and *Cymbeline*', *Theatre Annual*, 8 (1950), 7-24
- Wheeler, Richard P., *Shakespeare's Development and the Problem Comedies: Turn and Counter-Turn* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1981)
- White, Hayden, *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore and London, 1978)
- , *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore and London, 1987; reissued 1990)
- White, Howard B., *Copp'd Hills Towards Heaven: Shakespeare and the Classical Polity*, International Archives of the History of Ideas, 32 (The Hague, 1970)
- , *Antiquity Forgot: Essays on Shakespeare, Bacon and Rembrandt*, International Archive of the History of Ideas, 90 (The Hague, 1978)

White, R. S., *'Let wonder seem familiar': Endings in Shakespeare's romance vision* (London and Princeton, NJ, 1985; revised edition of *Shakespeare and the Romance Ending* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1981))

Wickham, Glynne, 'The Winter's Tale: A Comedy with Deaths', in *Shakespeare's Dramatic Heritage: Collected Studies in Mediaeval, Tudor and Shakespearean Drama* (London, 1969), pp. 249-265

———, 'From Tragedy to Tragi-Comedy: *King Lear* as Prologue', *Shakespeare Survey*, 26 (1973), 33-48

———, 'Romance and Emblem: A Study in the Dramatic Structure of *The Winter's Tale*', *The Elizabethan Theatre*, 3 (1973), 82-99

———, 'Masque and Anti-masque in *The Tempest*', *Essays and Studies*, n.s. 28 (1975), 1-14

———, 'Riddle and Emblem: A Study in the Dramatic Structure of *Cymbeline*', in *English Renaissance Studies: Presented to Dame Helen Gardner in honour of her Seventieth Birthday*, edited by John Carey (Oxford, 1980), pp. 94-113

———, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen or *A Midsummer Night's Dream, Part II?*', *The Elizabethan Theatre*, 7 (1980), 167-196

———, 'The Dramatic Structure of Shakespeare's *King Henry the Eighth: An Essay in Rehabilitation*', in *British Academy Shakespeare Lectures 1980-89*, with an Introduction by E. A. J. Honigmann (Oxford, 1993), pp. 117-136; reprinted in revised form from *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 70 (1984), 149-166

Wikander, Matthew H., *The Play of Truth & State: Historical Drama from Shakespeare to Brecht* (Baltimore, MD, 1986)

Wilcox, Helen, 'Gender and Genre in Shakespeare's Tragicomedies', in *Reclamations of Shakespeare*, edited by A. J. Hoenselaars, *Studies in Literature*, 15 (Amsterdam, 1994), pp. 129-138

———, '"If I prove honey-mouthed, let my tongue blister": Women's Language in Shakespeare's Tragicomedies', *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 134 (1998), 97-107

Wilders, John, *The Lost Garden: A View of Shakespeare's English and Roman History Plays* (London and Basingstoke, 1978)

Wiley, Paul L., 'Renaissance Exploitation of Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey*', *Studies in Philology*, 43 (1946), 121-146

Williams, Gwyn, 'The Loneliness of the Homosexual in Shakespeare', in *Person and Persona: Studies in Shakespeare* (Cardiff, 1981), pp. 131-141

Williams, Philip, Jr., 'New Approaches to Textual Problems in Shakespeare', *Studies in Bibliography*, 8 (1956), 3-14

Williamson, J. W., *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart: A Study of 17th Century Personation* (New York, 1978)

Williamson, Marilyn L., *The Patriarchy of Shakespeare's Comedies* (Detroit, 1986)

———, 'Violence and Gender Ideology In *Coriolanus* and *Macbeth*', in Kamps, *Shakespeare Left and Right*, pp. 147-166

Willson, Robert F., Jr., 'Enframing Style and the Father-Daughter Theme in Early Shakespearean Comedy and Late Romance', in Hunt, *Approaches to Teaching*, pp. 38-48

Wilson, Harold S., 'Nature and Art', in *Shakespeare: 'The Winter's Tale': A Casebook*, edited by Kenneth Muir, Casebook Series (London, 1968), pp. 151-158; reprinted from 'Nature and Art in *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, 18 (1943), 114-120

———, 'Philaster and *Cymbeline*', in *English Institute Essays: 1951*, edited by Alan S. Downer (New York, 1952), pp. 146-167

Wilson, J. Dover, 'The Copy used for *The Tempest*, 1623', in Quiller-Couch and Dover Wilson, eds., *The Tempest* (see Section I), pp. 79-85

———, *The Essential Shakespeare: A Biographical Adventure* (Cambridge, 1932; reprinted 1935)

———, 'Prefatory Note: With some Observations on the Vision in the Last Act', in J. C. Maxwell, ed., *Cymbeline* (see Section I), pp. vii-x

Wilson, Rawdon, *Shakespearean Narrative* (Cranbury, NJ, 1995)

Wilson, Richard, *Will Power: Essays on Shakespearean authority* (Hemel Hempstead, 1993)

———, 'Unseasonable laughter: the context of *Cardenio*', in Richards and Knowles, *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, pp. 193-209

Wilson, Robert H., 'Caxton's Chess Book', *Modern Language Notes*, 62 (1947), 93-102

Wilson, Scott, *Cultural Materialism: Theory and Practice* (Oxford, 1995)

Wiltenburg, Robert, 'The *Aeneid* in *The Tempest*', *Shakespeare Survey*, 39 (1986), 159-168

Wincor, Richard, 'Shakespeare's Festival Plays', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 1 (1950), 219-240

Wing, Donald, with others, comps., *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English Books printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700*, second edition, 3 vols (New York, 1972-1988)

Winy, James, *The Player King: A Theme of Shakespeare's Histories* (London, 1968)

Wise, Boyd Ashley, *The Influence of Statius upon Chaucer* (Baltimore, 1911; reprinted New York, 1967)

Wood, James O., 'The Running Image in *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 5 (1969), 240-252

———, 'Shakespeare and the Belching Whale', *English Language Notes*, 11 (1973-74), 40-44

———, 'Shakespeare's Hand in *Pericles*', *Notes and Queries*, 219 (1974), 132-133

———, 'The Shakespearean Language of *Pericles*', *English Language Notes*, 13 (1975-76), 98-103

———, 'Shakespeare, *Pericles*, and the Geneva Bible', *Pacific Coast Philology*, 12 (1977), 82-89

———, 'The Case of Shakespeare's *Pericles*', *San José Studies*, 6, no. 2 (May 1980), 39-58

Woolf, Cecil, and Jean Moorcroft Wilson, eds., *Authors take sides on the Falklands: Two questions on the Falklands conflict answered by more than a hundred mainly British authors* (London, 1982)

Woolf, D. R., *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto, 1990)

Wortham, Christopher, 'Shakespeare, James I and the Matter of Britain', *English*, 45 (1996), 97-122

Worthen, W. B., 'Staging "Shakespeare": Acting, authority, and the rhetoric of performance', in Bulman, *Shakespeare, Theory, and Performance*, pp. 12-28

———, *Shakespeare and the authority of performance* (Cambridge, 1997)

Woudhuysen, H. R., 'King Henry VIII and "All Is True"', *Notes and Queries*, 229 (1984), 217-218

Wright, Celeste Turner, 'The Amazons in Elizabethan Literature', *Studies in Philology*, 37 (1940), 433-456

Wright, W. Aldis, 'Shakspeare: *Cymbeline*, V. v. 447, 448', *Notes and Queries*, Series VII, vol 2 (July-December 1886), 85

Yates, Frances A., *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London and Boston, MA, 1975)

———, 'Queen Elizabeth I as Astraea', in *Astraea*, pp. 29-87; reprinted in revised form from 'Queen Elizabeth as Astraea', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 10 (1947), 27-82

———, *Shakespeare's Last Plays: A New Approach* (London, 1975)

Young, Alan R., 'A Note on the Tournament Impresas In *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 36 (1985), 453-456

Young, C. B., 'The Stage-History of *Pericles*', in J. C. Maxwell, ed., *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* (see Section I), pp. xxx-xl

———, 'The Stage-History of *Cymbeline*', in J. C. Maxwell, ed., *Cymbeline* (see Section I), pp. xliii-lv

———, 'The Stage-History of *Henry VIII*', in J. C. Maxwell, ed., *King Henry the Eighth* (see Section I), pp. xxxviii-l

Young, David, *The Heart's Forest: A Study of Shakespeare's Pastoral Plays* (New Haven and London, 1972)

Zuger, Harry, 'Shakespeare's Posthumus and the Wager: From Delusion to Enlightenment', *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 112 (1976), 133-142