



Shakespeare

ISSN: 1745-0918 (Print) 1745-0926 (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rshk20>

On Editing

Laurie Maguire & Emma Smith

To cite this article: Laurie Maguire & Emma Smith (2019): On Editing, Shakespeare, DOI: [10.1080/17450918.2019.1625434](https://doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2019.1625434)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2019.1625434>



Published online: 05 Jul 2019.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 12



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



On Editing

Laurie Maguire and Emma Smith

Magdalen College, Oxford University, Oxford, UK

ABSTRACT

Covering the changes in Shakespeare editorial theory and practice over the decades between the publication of the *Oxford Shakespeare* (1986) and the *New Oxford Shakespeare* (2016), this article surveys a range of modern texts with different rationales and aimed at different readerships. The article has three sections: the imagery associated with editorial activity, issues of authorship and collaboration, and the place of performance in editions. We trace the conceptual changes between the *Textual Companion* that accompanied the 1986 edition, and the *Authorship Companion* that is the equivalent for the 2016 edition, discussing the role of quantitative and qualitative approaches to questions of authorship and collaboration. We pay particular attention to the metaphors and tropes that shape editorial discourse, finding their echoes in early modern paratextual material. Pervasive anthropomorphic textual imagery tends implicitly to feminize texts (and masculinize editors), and we discuss the changing demands on editors and the continued dominance of male editors, particularly for Shakespeare's tragedies and histories. A final section discusses Arden editorial generations of *Hamlet* alongside the play's own telos of interrupted succession and its preoccupation with ghosts and the past.

KEYWORDS

Editorial theory; Hamlet; gender; hauntology; All's Well that Ends Well

Introduction

1598 saw the publication of Thomas Speight's edition of Geoffrey Chaucer, an edition "never in [his] mind that it should be published" because it was "done for ... private friends" (a2v).¹ In describing his preference for private circulation, Speight is referring to his editorial apparatus rather than Chaucer's works themselves, which were already in press. This editorial apparatus, as the title page advertises, comprises seven items: an account of Chaucer's influence, a biography, a summary of each work, glosses ("old and obscure words explained"), identification of sources, explanations of difficulties, and "Two books of his, never before Printed" (a1r). It is hard to imagine any modern editor engaging in such labour without publication plans but, this excepted, Speight's edition and its introduction have much in common with editions of the 20th and 21st centuries.

As every editor knows, *Ars longa, vita brevis*: Speight twice expresses his wish for more time and research (a2r, a2v). Francis Beaumont's prefatory epistle to Speight describes the editorial task in Lacanian fashion as one of endless desire: he recognizes his friend's editorial dissatisfaction with the finished work ("you have not made everything perfect to your owne mind") but reassures him that editing is about "open[ing] the way to others" (a3r). Fast forward to 1987 when Gary Taylor's introduction to the *Oxford Textual Companion* concluded by looking forward to its own obsolescence (62) or to 2017 and the general editors' preface to the *New Oxford Shakespeare Modern Critical Edition* which reminds us that the volume's 3,382 pages are only "an exploratory embodiment of research in progress" (iv).

Beaumont also characterizes editing as a work of magical re-remembering. Speight has done more for Chaucer than Medea did for Pelias because he has “restored us *Chaucer* both alive again and yong again” (a4r). John Heminges and Henry Condell would later develop this trope in their prefatory letter to the First Folio as they present Shakespeare’s works “cured and perfect of their limbs” (A3r).² Richard Proudfoot finds this image of the editor as body-magician reified at the end of a comic Restoration adaptation of *Dr Faustus* where, in the final stage direction, the doctor’s scattered “*Limbs come together. A Dance, a Song*” (Proudfoot 45, Mountfort E1v).³

Although editorial practice and textual procedures have changed enormously in 400 years, along with the technologies used to support them, the vocabulary associated with editing has not. In this article we review some of the developments in Shakespeare editing over the last thirty years, roughly between Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor’s *Oxford Shakespeare* (1986) and the *New Oxford Shakespeare* (ed. Taylor et al.) of 2017, with particular attention to its lexicon and tropes. Let us begin by looking at the role metaphor has played in textual scholarship.

“Marry, how? Tropicallly” (*Hamlet* 3.2.226)

The rhyme of “textual” with “sexual” exerted a strong gravitational pull on bibliographers, whether consciously or subliminally, even before Jerome McGann used the term “textual intercourse” to describe the social-material process in book production (3). Sample titles from three consecutive years in the 1980s highlight the association: Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse* (1987); Gary Taylor, “Textual and Sexual Criticism: A Crux in *Comedy of Errors*” (1988); and Janet E. Halley, “Textual Intercourse: Anne Donne, John Donne and the Sexual Poetics of Textual Exchange” (1989). Sometimes the association is developed (Leggo: “we need textual intercourse full of pleasure instead of this *coitus interruptus*”), sometimes it is reduced to innuendo. Steven Urkowitz compared Quarto/Folio characterizations of five of Shakespeare’s female characters in the provocatively titled “Five Women Eleven Ways” and the more queasily subtitled “An Invitation to the Pleasures of Textual/Sexual (Di)perversity” (Urkowitz, “Two Versions”); David Scott Kastan began an article on editing with a teasing update of Cole Porter: “Everybody seems to be doing it these days, or thinking about doing it, or most often – it is the 90s, after all – thinking about why he or she is not doing it. Editing, that is” (26). And variants of Roland Barthes’ “the pleasure of the text” abound. Perhaps this pervasively frisky language is an editorial overcompensation for the suspicion that, as A.D. Nuttall put it in his 2011 study, scholars are “dead from the waist down”. But the gender politics of editorial scholarship have more to do with the mundanely unequal experience of women – as editors and as texts – than with this reciprocal *jouissance*, as the field inherits and reproduces some long-held gendered assumptions.

Print was metaphorized as female and promiscuous from the moment Johannes Gutenberg invented movable type: “*est virgo hic penna, meretrix est stampificata*” (“the pen is a virgin, the printing press a whore”).⁴ Images of unruly women, scandalous circulation, and shameless exposure abound; texts peep out, offer themselves, present themselves wantonly (Wall 1–22, 169–226, Newman). Even when publication is seen as sexual violation rather than promiscuity, the text is female and the tone of discussion inescapably moral (Saenger 92ff). This sexual imagery is part of a larger physiological discourse. Early modern texts are anthropomorphized when they are described as lacking in some way: abused (orphaned, abandoned, mistreated, wounded, maimed) or nurtured (adopted, bandaged, bound up, re-remembered, patronized). The most gender-neutral term is “disfigured”. Abraham Fraunce’s dedicatory epistle to the corrected 1596 edition of *Amyntas* explains that his text was “so pitifully disfigured” that even Phyllis would not have recognized her Amyntas. The second edition of *Gorboduc* (Norton and Sackville, 1570) offers a lengthy simile to explain the corruption in the first edition. Here, the “disfigured” trope is extended sexually:

Even as if by meanes of a broker for hire, he [the man responsible for the textual quality of the first edition], should have enticed into his house a faire maide and done her villanie. And after[,] all to bescratched her face, torn her apparel, berayed and disfigured her, and then thrust her out of doors dishonested. (A2r)⁵

The vocabulary of virginity, allure and violence is present from the start (“enticed”, “maid”, “villainie”) with the swift anaphoric movement from “disfigured” to “dishonest” underlining the textual/sexual result. However, citing Irby Cauthen’s editorial observation that the first edition of *Gorboduc* was not so “disfigured” and “dishonested” that it could not serve as copy-text for the second, Michael Saenger points out that “the ‘facts’ of publishing are often distended to melodramatize the act of publication” and that these techniques “romanticize, dramatize and enrich the act of reading” (92). We agree with the middle of his three verbs: the image of female violation is a sensationalist trope. As Germaine Greer controversially wrote recently about contemporary crime drama and #MeToo politics, “female victimisation sells”.

This (melo)dramatic vocabulary has had a dispiriting longevity. In 1997 Ann Thompson registered her unease at the “clever” and “wellmeaning” sexual metaphors with which Gary Taylor represented the process of editing in his 1988 essay “Textual and Sexual Criticism”; this was published the year after the Oxford *Textual Companion* had characterized editors as “pimps of discourse” and had cited as a textual analogy Harold Pinter’s pimp in *The Homecoming* (Thompson 54–55, Wells and Taylor 60). We want to pursue the Pinter analogy a little further. *A Textual Companion* reads:

In a famous passage in Harold Pinter’s *The Homecoming*, Lenny the pimp memorably and at length describes his encounter with a woman who was “falling apart with the pox”. At the end of the story, the listener asks, “How did you know she was diseased?” Lenny answers, “I decided she was”. An editor, in emending, decides that a text is diseased; such decisions may be mistaken. But we know that every early printed edition of Shakespeare’s plays is more or less diseased: every compositor and every scribe commits errors.

This anecdote is so much more than just analogy. On the one hand it turns on Lenny’s unevincenced diagnosis by suggesting that “such decisions may be mistaken”. On the other it affirms its correctness, since every edition – and presumably by extension, therefore, every woman – is more or less diseased. The problematic gender politics of Pinter’s play make it a highly dubious metaphor for textual editing – or perhaps a rather appropriate one.

Modern editorial theories have often, like early modern paratexts, anthropomorphized the Shakespearean corpus. Stylometric tests aim to identify the “physiognomy” (Oras; cf Jackson, *Defining* 64–66) or the “stylistic fingerprint” of an author (Lerner and Mott, reporting on Segarra *et al.*; Keller).⁶ Harold Jenkins, dismissing the no-evidence objection to the theory of memorial reconstruction, remarked that “if you come upon a mutilated corpse you don’t deny a murder because nobody has reported one” (*Hamlet* 20). Forensic vocabulary has been a part of editorial vocabulary since the eighteenth century when Dr Johnson explained the editor’s role as detecting corruption; in the twentieth century editors “treat[ed] the text as if it were a crime scene and the author as an innocent victim of all those who had violated the text in various ways” (Cox 190–91). Jenkins’ corpse is gender-neutral but, like the diseased body, the mutilated textual corpse is most often female in textual rhetoric, turning editorial labour into a kind of erotic thriller in which the (male) editor-detective investigates the alluringly damaged body of the *femme fatale* text.

The *NOS Authorship Companion* has an unexpected interest in the female body as the compromised site of both criminal activity and agency. As in the analogy with *The Homecoming*, sometimes these parallels seem in excess of their illustrative role in the explanation of authorship validation procedures and take on an independent tropic significance. Michel Foucault’s foundational understanding of authorship as a penal category (“ownership has always been subsequent to what one might call penal appropriation. Texts, books and discourses really began to have authors [...] to the extent that authors became subject to punishment”; 108) is amplified into a specific framing device for Gabriel Egan. He begins the chapter “A History of Shakespearean Authorship Attribution” with the description of the murder of Dorothy Woods in Huddersfield in 1996, smothered by a pillow. The only clue was “the oily impression of a human ear” pressed against an entrance window, that was used to convict a local man, Mark Dallagher, of the murder. This case “contains several lessons for the study of authorship attribution” (27), and in particular cautions against “measurement of features that were wrongly thought to be distinctive”, “scholarly overestimation of the value of evidence” and “faulty

calculations of likelihood” (27–28). The anecdote about Dorothy Woods’ apparently neutral Harold–Jenkins style corpse (and Desdemona-style suffocation) is conflated with, and then erased by, that of the Shakespearean corpus: no one has ever been found guilty of her murder, but the anecdote is abandoned, having given its exemplary warning to would-be authorship attributionists. But after a survey of authorship attribution from Alexander Pope to Brian Vickers, Egan again returns to women and crime. This time it is the conviction of Sally Clark for infanticide after the death of her two children, apparently from Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (45). Here, as Egan points out, the relevant point is about statistically connected or independent phenomena; again, however, there is a sense that the underlying premise of editorial investigation is *cherchez la femme*. Women are underinvolved in – perhaps underinvested in – the often aggressive field of authorship attribution studies (Kesson), but instead of being scholarly participants, they seem here to be passive proxies for the text itself. This is not much of an advance on Beaumont’s dubiously complimentary image of the Chaucer editor as Medea figure: criminal enchantress. Whether women are figured as damaged text, analogy for methodologies of attribution, or magical editor, gender difference is instantiated at a deep tropical level.

This is not to say that masculine images do not appear in textual criticism, where they too are sexualized. George Gascoigne reflects on what it means to publish youthful, scurrilous poems unedited, eschewing the example of “wanton Ovid” in favour of Theodore Beza’s “*Poemata castrata*: So shall your reverend judgements behold in this second edition, my poems gelded from all filthy phrases” (¶3v). Sir Walter Scott, planning an edition of the works of John Dryden, wrote “I will not castrate John Dryden. I would as soon castrate my own father”, although he later conceded “it will be indispensable to circumcise him a little” (Lockhart 266). Textual criticism seems to invite sexual vocabulary (and women also use it); it is just that the masculine analogies have never assumed prominence. Some of this is explained by the heteronormative associations of the terminology of the printing press with its flat bed, its sheets, and its activity of pressing (De Grazia). When Mistress Ford and Mistress Page receive identical seduction letters in *Merry Wives of Windsor*, Mistress Page speculates that Falstaff has printed 100 such letters with blank spaces for women’s names because “he cares not what hee puts into the presse” (Folio 1623, TLN 621); in 1604 Anthony Scoloker explains that “a man in Print ... hath under-gone a Pressing (yet not like a Ladie)” (A2v, cited by Wall 1).

From textual vocabulary to editorial practice: women’s participation in this scholarly world has improved in the three decades since Gary Taylor observed that “women read Shakespeare but men edit him” (Taylor, “Textual” 195). He observed the “hostess” role that scholars like Anne Barton played in introducing T.J.B. Spencer’s *Hamlet* and noted the tendency to give women comedies to edit rather than tragedies, a generic distinction that has long been seen as hierarchized (we remember that *genre* and *gender* have the same etymological root). It is worth mentioning that in the *NOS Authorship Companion* John Burrows and Hugh Craig consistently refer, in an unacknowledged error, to Christopher Marlowe and Thomas Nashe’s *Dido, Queen of Carthage* as *Dido and Aeneas* (198, 210, 212). *Dido* is not allowed to be the heroine of her own play. Women can’t do tragedy on their own.⁷

No woman was part of the editorial team for the Oxford Shakespeare, although, by alphabet at least, Terri Bourus takes lead place for the NOS. The single-volume plays published by Oxford University Press in the *World’s Classics* series admit only two women editors across the entire canon (Jill Levenson for *Romeo and Juliet* and Susan Snyder for *All’s Well that Ends Well*). Things are slightly more balanced at Arden, where, although the overwhelming majority of tragedies and histories in the Third Series are edited by men, women do get a look in on the comedies and late plays; but they are still outnumbered (10:13). Perhaps this is the unwritten final chapter – “The Editors” – of Linda Bamber’s *Comic Women, Tragic Men*.⁸ Although Ann Thompson was properly proud to have co-edited the Arden 3 *Hamlet*, it still remains the generic exception (Thompson 66). The Arden 3 *Othello*, a text edited by E.A.J. Honigsmann in 1997 but reintroduced by Ayanna Thompson in 2016, exemplifies some of the uneasiness of scholarly priority – both gendered and racial – of

Taylor's observation about women's role introducing men's texts. But far from simply being the scholarly hostess smoothing over the social awkwardness of Honigmann's insensitivity to issues of homophobia and race ("Feed, and regard him not"?; *Macbeth*, 3.4.57), Thompson does a superb job of reclaiming the role of introducer as important. Her introduction "frames" Shakespeare's play and Honigmann's text. We take our verb from Thompson who explains that "the way we frame the story of *Othello* will impact the way the play will be understood and performed" (2). Her introduction raises and explores multiple framing possibilities (race; religion and ethnicity; jealousy; domestic tragedy within a military narrative, and/or its opposite; generic experiment; evil; the nature of man, or woman, or family in an increasing global world) and offers a sophisticated interrogative analysis of how meaning is made.

Thompson's introduction begins with a discussion about casting, contains three sections about *Othello* onstage, and a section about *Othello* "Restaged/Rewritten". The emergence of theatrical priorities in editions can be seen by comparing *Hamlet*'s opening lines in Arden 2 and 3: where Jenkins immediately pitches the reader to the back of the book for one of his "Longer Notes", Thompson and Taylor discuss original Globe staging of night scenes, Peter Brook's 2000 adaptation which ended with the play's opening question as "Qui est là?", and point out that "unfold yourself" is the first of a number of metaphors from clothing in the play. Let us take our cue from this interest in practical theatre and consider the role of performance in current editorial practice.

Enter the performance edition

As J.S. Bratton and Julie Hankey write in their Series Editors' Preface to the *Shakespeare in Production* texts: "It is no longer necessary to stress that the text of a play is only its starting-point, and that only in production is its potential realised" (Shakespeare, *The Taming* ix). Interpreting performance raises questions of how an editor should use performance or represent her thinking about performance. The commentary notes in Arden 2 and 3 include occasional observations about theatre. In *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Giorgio Melchiori explains the tone of Slender's "no matter" as "a clumsy dismissal" of his interlocutors' ironies or "as revealing how far [Slender] is intimidated – a decision left to the actor's general conception of the character he impersonates" (1.1.121, 123). For a long time, however, the primary (and logical) focus of performance enquiry, both theoretically and editorially, was stage directions. Theoretical thinking can be seen in essays from Honigmann in the 1970s to a recent collection of essays by Gillian Woods and Sarah Dustagheer.⁹ For changing editorial practice, we may consult any *Collected Works*. The Oxford *Complete Works* (1986) was the first to extend the Folio stage direction at *King John* 4.3: "Enter Arthur Duke of Brittainne on the walls, [disguised as a ship-boy]". Here the editors put the reader on the same footing as the viewer who has an immediate visual grasp of what the reader must otherwise wait four lines to discover: "this ship-boy's semblance hath disguised me quite" (4.3.4). In this example, editorial insertion is cued by information in dialogue.¹⁰ More questionable is the relationship between action and stage direction in *King Lear* during the blinding of Gloucester, where NOS reads "*Cornwall gouges out one of Gloucester's eyes and stamps on it*" (scene 14, 67.1). Is spelling out Cornwall's sadistic relish a job for an editor or a director?¹¹

One answer is in the Arden Performance Editions, which radically cut back interpretative commentary in order to produce a clean, informative text for actors which does not usurp their own performance expertise. Series editors Abigail Rokison-Woodall, Michael Dobson and Simon Russell Beale instead provide notes about pronunciation and verse-speaking, about mythological or classical or biblical references, but nothing about performance, historical or potential: "we hope these editions illuminate and explain Shakespeare's texts without imposing any specific ideas about how to inhabit, perform, read or enjoy them. Our aim throughout has been to set our actor-readers' imaginations free" (in Rokison-Woodall viii). The Arden Performance Editions direct themselves towards "actors in a rehearsal room and also students in the classroom seeking to bring the text from page to stage" (Rokison-Woodall vii) – but not all playreaders will have the same visual and choreographic abilities.

This is where editions and notes directly aimed at capturing or stimulating performance readings come into their own. Performance notes understand that reading forces us to attend to who is speaking, without the viewer's simultaneous ability to attend to silent onstage auditors; and that, depending on tone of delivery, a speech may say the opposite of its literal semantic content. How to convey this in print? Editors now offer the reader staging options, whether historical or potential – in Margaret Jane Kidnie's terminology, "real" or "virtual" performance ("Text" 465). The Cambridge *Shakespeare in Production* series (originally titled *Plays in Performance*) offers "a comprehensive dossier of materials" that enable readers to "become their own eye-witness". Here the focus is theatre history (as the retitling suggests) but, crucially, theatre history as literary criticism: "the history of a play in the theatre can often show where the energy and shape of it lie". There is probably no better example of this than Elizabeth Schafer's brilliant notes on Katherine's last speech in *Taming of the Shrew* (5.2.136ff).

The placing of the performance information in footnotes clearly allies these editions with conventional scholarly editions. Performance editions are thus a subcategory of Shakespeare editions. But recent Shakespeare editions of *Complete Works* have promoted this information from footnotes (where limitations of space inevitably made theatrical issues subordinate to lexical and textual concerns, and prevented any ability to read "from one stage direction to another"; Kidnie "Staging": 169) to visual prominence in the right-hand margin. They thus signal their kinship with promptbooks. Of course, it is less disruptive to look right to a note aligned with the text than it is to look downwards – which is presumably why promptbooks use the right-hand margin.

Kidnie was the first to experiment with the vertical axis of the printed page, offering performance options in a different font and typesize that necessarily severed any prescriptive link to a particular line in the adjacent text's different type.¹² The RSC edition edited by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen uses the right-hand margin for stage directions beyond the usual entrances and exits. The editors explain that the Folio text (on which their edition is based) rarely indicates stage business, asides or addressees; therefore, "we have sought to distinguish what could be described as directorial interventions ... from Folio-style directions by placing the former in the right margin in a different typeface" (59). These helpful directions tend to be brief: "Kneels", "shows letter", "servant spills water". The NOS uses the right margin more extensively, offering paragraph-length performance information that combines the general and the specific, the historical and the contemporary, with interpretive aperçus. Emilia's "say they strike us" in *Othello* 4.3.82 is "a moment in modern productions in which two abused wives half-pretend to each other that this is merely hypothetical". Paul Scofield's Othello "stammered 'not m-m-much moved'" (3.3.219). Othello's "Ha!" at 3.3.161 is "sometimes a turning point in the scene: Edmund Kean accompanied it with a 'sudden contraction of his body, as if he had been abruptly stabbed'. On the other hand, it can be dismissive, or even a laugh, as Othello starts to leave – prompting Iago to a desperate improvisation". Such a note offers possibilities and consequences relating to action, interpretation, subsequent speeches and character motivation.

Notes like these indicate that actors think about character, a category that, although outmoded in postmodern criticism, has never gone out of fashion in the theatre. It retains a hold, however, in editorial decisions and we might want to query this link between assumptions about character and textual interventions. In Folio *The Tempest* 1.2, Miranda hurls 12 lines of invective at Caliban, a speech which Dryden first reassigned to Prospero on the grounds of decorum. In returning the speech to its Folio speaker, the *New Oxford Shakespeare* follows recent practice (including Kermode for Arden 2, Orgel for World's Classics, and the Vaughans for Arden 3), and the performance note explains "the speech can represent an important aspect of [Miranda's] character" (1.2.351–62). This vague explanatory gesture towards Miranda's "character" has to be taken in conjunction with Prospero's preceding speech outlining Caliban's attempted rape, where the accompanying note suggests Miranda's wariness of her rapist and the physical production possibilities for Caliban to demonstrate ongoing lust and violence (1.2.347–49). Feminist criticism has rightly foregrounded the issues of rape and violence in this play, and the logic for returning the speech to Miranda is impeccable: she might well speak angrily when addressing an attempted rapist. For Arden 3, Virginia Mason Vaughan

and Alden T. Vaughan suggest that the speech is now considered “more consonant with [Miranda’s] character, which is more forceful and sexually aware than early editors seemed to prefer” (Arden 3 revised edition: 135). So this advance has not, as it happens, advanced textual criticism: the reasons for restoring the speech to Miranda are as character-based as the reasons for removing it.

Something similar happens in *Othello*. In the willow scene, the Folio text gives the line “This Lodovico is a proper man” to Desdemona. Both Arden 2 and 3 reassign the line to Emilia, and Arden 3 explains why: “for Desdemona to praise Lodovico at this point seems *out of character*” (Honigmann Arden 2, 291, our emphasis). Current practice restores the line to Desdemona who is elsewhere not averse to voicing sexual thoughts (she defends her right to accompany her husband to Cyprus in a line which may be confidently legal (“rights” of marriage) or boldly sexual (“rites” of marriage); 1.3.288). Here, however, we encounter a division in Arden 3b’s *Othello* where Thompson’s introduction discusses the troubling implications of reassigning this line (Thompson 46–47) yet the text retains Honigmann’s textual choice. Thompson’s collegial sense that “Honigmann’s editorial decisions remain both useful and admirable” and that it is only the “changed critical approaches” to *Othello* (5) that necessitate her new introduction here reveals its limitations: to edit a text is to undertake a series of acts of critical interpretation which are always limited by the perspective of the editor. Honigmann’s text was shaped by the same blindspots as his introduction.

Giving Desdemona back her Folio line about Lodovico is a character-based argument that is, at least, responsibly linked to her language elsewhere in the play. Ignoring inter-scene links reveals a troubling attitude to character in M.M. Mahood’s performance note in the casket scene of *The Merchant of Venice* for the New Cambridge Shakespeare. Bassanio ruminates on his choice of caskets while a song plays; the song’s first three lines rhyme with “lead”, a “coincidence” that, it has long been suggested, “is meant to guide Bassanio’s choice”. Mahood rejects this on the grounds that “it belittles Portia’s integrity” (3.2.63). It is possible, however, to draw a connecting line between Jessica’s defiance of her father (the gold Jessica steals from Shylock in the immediately preceding scene is thrown to Lorenzo with the words “Here catch this casket; it is worth the pains”; 2.6.34) and Portia’s attempt to assert her own authority against that of her father (in her first scene, Portia complains that she “may neither choose who I would nor refuse who I dislike, so is the will of a living daughter curbed by the will of a dead father”; 1.2.19–21). The property casket visibly links both defiant women, a prop all the more striking in the dialogue of both scenes given that it is not named as such on the title page of the 1600 quarto which advertises “The most excellent historie of the merchant of Venice With the extreame crueltie of Shyllocke the Iewe towards the sayd merchant, in cutting a iust pound of his flesh: and the obtayning of Portia by the choyse of three chests”.¹³ Here we see the difficulty of separating performance, text, and interpretation.

Intellectual segregation can result in missed opportunities. In *As You Like It*, 5.4.89.1 of the *NOS Modern Critical Edition*, the play’s coupling confusions are about to be cleared up as Rosalind and Celia enter for their weddings: notably, Phoebe will realize (why) she cannot marry Ganymede. The side note in the *NOS* reads: “some recent productions have had Orlando and Rosalind marry while both dressed as men”. This is a necessary response to the editors’ interpolation in the stage direction: “Enter Hymen, with Rosalind, and Celia [as themselves]”. But it is by no means clear that Rosalind and Celia enter “as themselves”. In the Folio text, Hymen explains to the Duke that he has come “That thou mightst ioyn his hand with his/Whose heart within his bosome is” (TLN 2689–90). Detecting one too many possessive masculine pronouns here, all editors emend the line – as *NOS* does here – to “join [her] hand with his”. As Maura Kuhn pointed out in 1977, this emendation was first introduced in the Third Folio (1664), an emendation that coincided with the introduction of female actresses on the English stage and finales characterized by sartorial finery. Unlike Orsino in *Twelfth Night*, Orlando is given no lines to indicate his lightbulb realization that the person in the forest who was discussing gender with him was none other than Rosalind. Kuhn suggests that costume achieves what dialogue does not: Rosalind remains, and is married, dressed as Ganymede. The practicalities of a quick change in days before zips and Velcro are relevant too; and the play’s gender fluidity continues into the epilogue. Text, interpretation and performance go hand-in-hand-in-hand

but it is striking that the permissiveness of the performance side note, quoting stage practice, is only made necessary by the editorial decision to emend the pronouns and interpose a stage direction about Rosalind's costume: it's the editors, not the play, that make this a heterosexual romance ending, and their emendations close down textual possibilities even as the performance note reopens them.

Thomas L. Berger wrote that "becoming a good, responsible performance critic entails ... becoming a literary critic and a textual critic". All three activities can "become so entwined as to be indistinguishable" (198, 206). In this sense, all editions are performance editions.

Authorship and collaboration

In 2017, Daniel Pollack-Pelzner wrote an article for the *New Yorker* about Christopher Marlowe's presence in the *New Oxford Shakespeare*, along with other identified co-authors such as Nashe, George Peele and Thomas Middleton. He surveyed the history of attempts to "quantify and tabulate Shakespeare's style", a survey that included Don Foster's 1990s claim that his Shaxicon database could identify Shakespeare as the author of *A Funeral Elegy*. Pollack-Pelzner concludes the saga: "Then a French scholar, using old-fashioned close reading, showed that the funeral elegy more closely resembled the style of another seventeenth-century writer, John Ford, and Foster conceded his mistake". Here Pollack-Pelzner is using the adjective "old-fashioned" as a compliment. The *Times Literary Supplement* (TLS) editorial used a distinctly negative version of this term – "long discredited methods" – when describing another attribution debate in 2012 ("This Week" 2).

In April of that year we had published an article in the *TLS* arguing for a second hand in *All's Well that Ends Well*, a hand that we suggested was Middleton's. In discussing the bifurcated nature of the Folio text of *All's Well*, we were not doing anything unorthodox. Every critic has noticed and tried to explain the text's unusual features – different systems of nomenclature for the duo later identified in the dialogue as the brothers Dumaine, different kinds of stage direction, a high percentage of rhyming couplets alongside blank verse and prose. All previous attempts to explain the textual anomalies invoked duality of some kind (Shakespeare was interrupted; he later revised the play; it was later adapted; it was marked up for revival). We simply suggested a different kind of duality: collaboration.

There are several features of *All's Well* that any convincing textual narrative needs to explain. For instance, the text contains an unusual stage direction, "Enter a gentle Astringer" (TLN 2601). Since the subsequent speech-prefixes are "Gent.", the prefix has to be an abbreviation of a noun (*Gentleman*) rather than of an adjective (*gentle*); we suggested (following the Third Folio, as had G.K. Hunter for *Arden 2*, and Susan Snyder for the *World's Classics*) that it was a misreading of "a gentleman, a stranger". Our contribution was to link it to Middleton's fondness for appositive explanations in his stage directions.¹⁴ Neither Isabella Wheeler's response, defending the character as one "of gentle birth, who administers astringents gently" (acknowledging it might be difficult to convey this precise role on stage), nor Macdonald P. Jackson's ("Astringer"), praising the power of a mysterious falconer on stage in a 1989 stage production, attempted to explain the speech prefix "Gent".

Our article contained its own form of duality: literary criticism alongside a quantitative approach. We made some statistical errors – we were inexperienced in doing that kind of work. But in retrospect it seems that the most challenging aspect of our contribution was not its potential findings but rather its "old-fashioned" method: none other than literary criticism (in which we are not inexperienced). Literary analysis was a substantial component of our article with which none of our interlocutors really engaged. We investigated the play's opening, the fake-language scene, the city comedy realism, the virginity dialogue, the shallow prodigal Bertram. The fact that *All's Well* is the only Shakespeare play to begin with a female character speaking – the Countess – seemed to us to merit attention. Suzanne Gossett and Helen Wilcox summarize our position (363): opening "with a speech by a woman [is] common enough for Middleton and other dramatists but not found elsewhere in Shakespeare unless one counts the witches in *Macbeth*".¹⁵ We further explored the Countess' role as marital go-between, a benevolent Middletonian bawd. Here the response to our

characterization was interestingly sentimental, showing how hard it is to let go of the Peggy Ashcroft/national treasure image. We were not suggesting that the Countess *is* a bawd but that she has a savviness associated with those kinds of female character in Middleton: the play reveals a different side when the Middleton angle becomes visible. The cost of this was too much for some: “To produce such unsympathetic readings of Shakespeare’s heroines is a high price to pay for the claim of co-authorship” (Vickers and Dahl). Alongside being unsympathetic towards Shakespeare’s heroines, we were judged not simply to have erred in suggesting that the King’s chronic fistula was anal (although his precise affliction is not named, this was a common form of the condition, and the word “notorious” is suggestive) but to have been “indelicate” in our suggestion. Both criticisms seem to have a particularly gendered quality: the unsympathetic and indelicate woman is a different creature from her male equivalent.

Our argument also attempted to date the play in 1607 or later. The *NOS* reinvestigates Shakespeare’s chronology, placing *All’s Well* between 1603 and 1605 with a later revision between 1620 and May 1622 (when an anal fistula has topical relevance). They both support and modify our argument (spoiler alert: they find Middleton’s hand as reviser rather than simultaneous collaborator¹⁶) but more crucially, they recognize the role literary criticism played in making it.

Recapping these old quarrels is not simply self-exculpation, nor is it our chance to bask in the somewhat refracted glory shed on our claim by the extensive investigation (five chapters) of Middleton’s presence in the *NOS Authorship Companion* (where we turn out to be wrongly right in almost everything we said). Rather, the quarrel over *All’s Well* raises two related questions for contemporary editorial investigation. What are the permitted methodologies that can be deployed to investigate questions of authorship, style, and textual transmission? (A subsidiary of this question is: how should disagreements be prosecuted? Partisan heat on this topic leads to a polemic that is not seen in other scholarly debates). And, relatedly, what skills does a contemporary Shakespeare editor need to carry out her role?

The claim we made for our literary critical method is the one element of our suggestion about the authorship of *All’s Well* that was beyond the *NOS*’s purview: the *Authorship Companion* has resolutely established authorship questions as quantitative rather than qualitative. When, in 1987 Oxford University Press published a textual volume to accompany its new edition of Shakespeare’s *Complete Works*, it was called *A Textual Companion*; in 2017 the equivalent volume is called an *Authorship Companion*. The difference in nomenclature is significant. The *Authorship Companion* is a formidably technical volume, full of charts and graphs, introducing us to Delta scores and Zeta tests, Discriminant Analysis and Random Forests. It is surprisingly readable (in small doses). And it is, as the above summary of the 2012 *All’s Well* controversy indicates, supremely necessary. Indeed, our 2012 article had concluded by acknowledging that “further work on ‘Middleton markers’ in *All’s Well* would benefit from additional analytical and stylometric tools”.

Nonetheless, we maintain that literary criticism has a role to play in attribution studies and in editorial work more generally. It is striking that a book such as John Bayley’s *Shakespeare and Tragedy* (1981), published before anyone had ever thought of associating Thomas Middleton with *Timon of Athens*, identifies two stylistic patterns in the play, two different streams of imagery – what textual critics now identify as two authorial hands. Shakespeare assumes that he will be identified by his poetic style: he wears “a noted weed, / That every word doth almost tell my name, / Showing their birth and where they did proceed?” (sonnet 76, lines 6–8). Of course, protocols were needed to regulate the impressionistic and unquantifiable identification of parallel phrases (Muriel St Clare Byrne attempted to set some groundrules in 1932). But the pendulum has perhaps swung too far in the other direction, the literary-critical baby now being thrown out with the computational bathwater. And therefore, we suggested, the skills needed in textual studies are as much literary and qualitative as they are mathematical and quantitative.

This is certainly evident in the choice of editors for the major publishing houses where one feature of recent decades has been the democratic dispersal of the scholarly category of editing. When New Bibliography reigned, scholarship was divided into textual critics (who created editions) and literary

critics (who interpreted them). Although textual critics published literary criticism, the reverse was unlikely. With the reappraisal of New Bibliographic shibboleths, textual criticism – and with it the authority of the editor – was stripped of its claims to mastery. As interpretative introductions to individual editions of the plays expanded in length, the editor became less an expert on cruxes and punctuation, and more a specialist in reception, performance, and literary criticism. Arden 3 Introductions dispensed with the standard dating and justification of copy text as the opening manoeuvre in their critical choreography, instead beginning with moments from the play's subsequent history. The purview of the editor has changed, and the balance has shifted from deducing what precedes the text (in terms of original performance, composition, and transmission) to tracing its afterlife.¹⁷ The tapas-style introductions to the *New Oxford Shakespeare* plays are perhaps the logical, commonplace reduction of those expansive critical essays: having expanded, they are now filleted back to their constituent reading.

The frequency with which Shakespeare plays are now re-edited means that the text cannot be made anew each time; hence, the logic of choosing editors for their critical relationship to a particular text's history or politics. Here, perhaps, we see our contemporary theatrical interest in who gets to play what role transposed to editing. In 1981 Anthony Hopkins played Othello for the BBC in black-face, a casting decision that is rightly unthinkable now. Can a non-Jew edit *Merchant of Venice*? Can a man edit *The Taming of the Shrew*? Probably, but not at this juncture – for reasons that Valerie Wayne articulated when she anticipated editions by “female and feminist editors, gay and lesbian editors, editors of different races and cultures, and other scholars willing to resist tradition”: we won't know what such editions might look like “until we have the pleasure of their texts” (“Sexual Politics” 187). Howard Jacobson's novelistic revision of *Merchant of Venice* offers an instructive analogy. “I wouldn't dare say only a non-Jew could have taken this play on — not least as it was a non-Jew who wrote the originating work — but I suspect only a Jew could have thought of taking it on the way I did”.

The question of what it means to revise a Shakespeare classic and update it to a new era is no longer limited to the sphere of creative writing (or theatre performance). Shakespeare editing is now an almost continuous, and accelerating, activity. Having failed to produce an edition in the early twentieth century (only McKerrow's orphaned *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare: A Study in Editorial Method* of 1939 survives of this attempt), Oxford University Press followed the 1986 *Oxford Shakespeare* with a second edition in 2005 and the *New Oxford Shakespeare* just over a decade later. To put the timescales differently, the first edition of *Hamlet* published by Arden in 1899 was in print for eighty-three years; Jenkins' Arden 2 (1982) had twenty-four years before Arden 3 was published, and the new Arden 4 series was announced before the Arden 3 had been completed. These speeding generations of the editorial family tree, with their different introductory emphases, mean that editions no longer replace their predecessors but sit alongside them;¹⁸ but it also gives Shakespeare editing a curiously disjointed teleology. Jacques Derrida's notion of Hauntology takes its cue from *Hamlet*, which “figures both a dead man who comes back and a ghost whose expected return repeats itself, again and again” (10). This impeded telos can be traced through recent editions of that play: in our final section we want to consider the relationship between Jenkins' Arden 2 *Hamlet* and Taylor and Thompson's Arden 3. Bringing our review full circle, we turn again to metaphors – this time, metaphors of editorial inheritance.

“Do not haunt me thus” (*A Midsummer Night's Dream* 2.2.91)

Hamlet's thwarted dynastic *telos* is echoed by its textual one: mapped onto the family romance of good brother Hamlet, bad brother Claudius, and confused son/nephew/son Hamlet we have the textual romance of “good” quarto (Q2 published in 1604–05), “bad” quarto (Q1 1603), and Folio text, published a generation later in 1623. Earlier editorial practice tended to endorse Prince Hamlet's view of the absolute moral difference between his uncle and his father – “no more like my father / Than I to Hercules” (1.2.152–53) – patrolling the precincts of the play to protect, *post hoc*,

the authoritative goodness of Q2 sleeping contentedly in the textual orchard against the usurping bad energies of Q1, stealing in with a vial of inky hebona.¹⁹ The play's own nagging doubts about this narrative have textual implications. That father and uncle may be troublingly interchangeable, and not just in his mother's bed, is Hamlet's own major pathology, and one shared by the bibliographic narratives around the play's textual transmission. Claudius conflates texts (uncle-father, aunt-mother, nephew-son); Hamlet collates texts ("Look here upon this picture, and on this": two brothers with the same *stemma*; 3.4.52), justifies his textual choice by exaggerating the properties of good and bad ("radiant angel" and "celestial bed" versus "mildewed ear" and "garbage"; 1.5.55, 56, 3.4.63, 1.5.57) and has fluctuating faith in his copytext (he worries that the ghost might be, quite literally, a *copy-text*). The anthropomorphizing tendencies of textual editing discussed at the beginning of this article implicate the plays' bibliographic and familial narratives, both horizontally – across the three texts of *Hamlet* – and vertically – backwards into the legacy of *Hamlet* editing. Inevitably, this play about impacted succession, interrupted inheritance, and patrilinear anxiety generates its own textual crises of legacy and legitimacy.

The anxiety of influence is particularly evident in recent editions of this play. Old *Hamlets* tend to keep stalking those battlements. Just as Hamlet himself keeps looking over his shoulder to an undead father with whom he, unlike his ancestors in Shakespeare's sources, is doomed to share a name, so Jenkins acknowledges an epic phalanx of the "illustrious dead" (ix) who have produced previous *Hamlets*, and Thompson and Taylor express themselves privileged to "take our place in the long line" of previous mediators (xix). After Sigmund Freud, though – or after Oedipus, or after *Hamlet* itself – this airbrushed fantasy of a happily linear succession never quite convinces: it's worth reminding ourselves of the insight from *The Interpretation of Dreams* that Hamlet himself, like *Hamlet*, cannot acknowledge his own murderous impulses towards his father.

The Arden 3 *Hamlet* tries hard not to be haunted by its forbears. Its patricidal impulses are properly sublimated. But perhaps the editors' pre-emptive admission in their first paragraph that "Jenkins did his job so well that we felt there was no need to do it again in the same way" (xix) – an admission implicit in all current editions, as we noted above – betrays something more anxious about the legacy of the past. Here, however, the textual father is to be killed by multiplication rather than substitution: following the notion of "unediting" first raised by Leah Marcus and Randall McLeod, the Arden 3 text of *Hamlet* edits all three early texts separately.

Perhaps a triple-decker *Hamlet* can regain the epistemological territory lost by the play to the duplicated *King Lear* in the late twentieth century, as textual selection, previously in the hands of editors, is devolved to readers. The charge that this attractive decision cannot entirely evade, however, is, inevitably, that it abdicates editorial and ethical responsibility. Editorial fealty is transferred, Polonius-like, from one textual sovereign to another – shifting from "good" to "bad" quarto without apparent scruple and substituting the neutral "1603", "1604–05", and "1623" for the morally freighted inheritance of the New Bibliographers. In refusing to adjudicate between the rival texts, that is to say, Thompson and Taylor refuse to acknowledge them *as* rivals: it's a principle of aggregation rather than selection, a ruling trinity rather than a dominant sovereign. (But even this illusion of editorial democracy is compromised by commercial imperatives: the second volume is priced for libraries and scholars rather than students, and the editors acknowledge that for the majority of readers, a single *Hamlet* is quite enough.)

The decision to present an unconflicted Q2 text as volume one is largely defended by the existence of the other texts in volume two, but this means that the single-volume *Hamlet* most readers will buy lacks an autonomous and robust editorial rationale, despite being presented as a stand-alone text. Although the editors claim that the "second volume is an entirely optional supplement: the present volume does not depend upon it in any way, and we imagine the majority of readers will be content with just one *Hamlet*" (xxii), in fact their text of Q2 offers fewer textual variants than other editions of *Hamlet*, presumably on the basis that these are properly to be found within the context of their respective texts. Thompson and Taylor have to argue both that the morass of contested textual evidence makes the three-text solution the most viable response *and* that Q2 is ultimately the most

authoritative text, probably based on what used to be called Shakespeare's "foul papers" (see Werstine 12–106). They pull off this double argument, just, by their ingenuous acknowledgement that the ideal is a will o' the wisp, that editing is as pragmatic and compromised as any other form of critical engagement, and that it is the job of an edition to stage questions rather than foreclose them. Their introduction ends with the confession that "we do not [...] have a new or sensational 'theory of *Hamlet*' to offer our readers", and this quietly meiotic triumph characterizes the modesty of their editorial voice. (But there *is* a sensational theory: it is that *Hamlet* can no longer be made into a singular play, and that therefore its compulsion to repeat can be read as a motor of textual transmission rather than inner psychology).

On textual matters, then, the editors' even-handedness is figured as agnosticism: in the absence of any compelling narrative of the provenance of the three early texts, the only logical consequence is to set them out separately and enable readers to assess their individual claims. Volume one gives us "the Arden *Hamlet*": Q2. Q2's authority has been little challenged – except by the *Oxford Shakespeare* – since Dover Wilson's textual work on the play in the 1930s: it provided Jenkins with his copy-text too.

The introduction to the second volume of Arden 3 is largely taken up with Q1, and, in particular, with its stage history. This returns us to the performance issues of our second section. That the quarto texts might give us particular access to the early performances of Shakespeare's plays has been an important aspect of their recent critical recuperation, and nothing, perhaps, dates Jenkins' edition more clearly than his dismissal of Q1's evocative stage direction "Enter Ofelia playing on a Lute and her haire downe singing". Preferring the unadorned "Enter Ophelia", Jenkins notes that "Q1 no doubt records some contemporary staging ... the lute, uncalled for in the text ... looks like an actor's embellishment". The interpretive framework is clear: props are viable only where the written text (which means the speeches of the characters, not the apparatus of the printed play) sanctions their use; we must discipline actors who, ever histrionic, will want to add their own frou-frou. Arden 3 locates interpretive authority differently, and professional and student productions of Q1 are the major element of its rehabilitation as an independent play. Q1's attractions for performers are clear: it is an ensemble piece rather than a star vehicle, quicker paced, and less full of quotations; reviews and interviews attest to Q1's narrative speed, political energy, and challenge to post-Romantic readings of Hamlet's interiority.

The one text that doesn't quite earn its keep in Arden 3 is the Folio. If Q1 and Q2 present radical alternatives – "Hyperion to a satyr" (the theatrical associations of "satyr" are suggestive in this context) – F has comparatively little new to offer readers. In showing allegiances to both of the previously printed texts, F's own genealogy is murky, and its claims to distinctive independence shaky. It is an advantage that Q2 and F are in separate volumes, since their divergences are largely incidentals and individual readings, best assessed by reading the two texts in parallel: but the argument for parallel texts still focuses critical attention on their interrelationship rather than on their supposed autonomy. The case for F seems to emerge as a consequence of the cases for an unconfated Q2 and a modernized Q1, and out of the need further to differentiate this edition from its predecessors. Collectively, the three texts offer a narrative of textual agon in which the belated, posthumous imprint of fraternal rivalry has none of the bad-boy allure of Q1 and can add only a handful of local passages to Q2. Like Prince Hamlet himself, then, son of a more authoritative textual father and nephew of a more charismatic textual uncle, F too is searching for a role.

And if most readers are indeed content with a single *Hamlet*, which *Hamlet* should that be? School students sitting A Level examinations on the play in 2018 were bewildered to see for commentary on the paper a speech they had not previously encountered in their intensive study of the text. Having worked solely from Bate and Rasmussen's Folio text of *Hamlet*, the soliloquy "How all occasions do inform against me" (*Oxford Shakespeare*, 717: this text includes the passage as an appendix) was entirely unfamiliar. The students' and teachers' sense of *Hamlet* and that of the exam board were crucially different. One *Hamlet* was not enough.

Conclusion

No one knew better than Thomas Speight that editing is a repetitive and collaborative art. William Thynne's edition of Chaucer had been published in 1532; it was revised by John Stow in 1561. Thynne's son Francis intended another iteration of his father's work but was anticipated by Speight's edition of 1598. The title page of the 1598 edition advertises its "Additions" to previous editions, and Speight's dedicatory epistle to Robert Cecil describes his work of "collect[ing] and correct[ing]" Chaucer (a2r). But just four years later Speight revised his own edition. The 1602 title page advertises six new items ranging from additions to Chaucer's biography and translations of his Latin and French to the inclusion of two new works. (The 1598 edition had itself included two books "*never before Printed*"; a1r).

In the 1602 prefatory epistles to Cecil and "To the Readers", Speight acknowledges the work of previous and current editors: the "praise-worthy labors" of William Thynne, and Francis Thynne's present intention to provide a Chaucer Commentary (a2v). This intention had initially deterred Speight from proceeding with his revision and he praises the editorial abilities of Thynne *filis* "being a Gentleman for that purpose inferior to none, both in regard of his own skill, as also of those helps left to him by his father". In fact Speight is persuaded – by Francis – to proceed. He "reform[s] the whole Worke" of William Thynne (a2r) and is encouraged by Francis who "kindly lent me his help and directions" (a2v). The result is the new revised edition of 1602, published just four years after Speight's first editorial labour.²⁰ Editing, then, has always been a process of renewal and revision, desire and deferral, a recursive rather than teleological activity, as the current vibrant market in scholarly publishing shows.

Notes

1. This is no mere modesty topos. Francis Beaumont (father of the playwright) writes a commendatory letter to Speight in which he acknowledges how much benefit he, Beaumont, has received from having had a private copy of Speight's work.
2. Both Ben Jonson and the publisher Edward Blount have been suggested as the authors of this letter (*NOS Critical Reference Edition* (II: xxxvii). In analysing Blount's literary career, Gary Taylor makes a good case for him as the more plausible candidate (*CRE* II: xxxviii–xlx). For more on ghost-writing, see our final section below.
3. Genevieve Love has recently extended Proudfoot's comment, looking at the vocabulary of disability in editorial discussions; she finds in the texts of *Dr Faustus*, and in their critics, an anxiety about bodily augmentation and bodily loss (Love 81–91).
4. The phrase comes from Filippo di Strata and is quoted by Wall 169.
5. The image is discussed by Wall 182–83, Saenger 92 and Atkin 89–92.
6. A headline in the *Observer* newspaper, advertising the Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC) edition of the *Apocrypha* (12 October 2013), read "Shakespeare's fingerprints found on three Elizabethan plays".
The frequency of the fingerprint image is perhaps inevitable given the history of the word "hand" to indicate authorial contribution: in the preface to *The English Traveller* Thomas Heywood said that he "had an entire hand, or at the least a maine finger" in 220 plays (1633, A3r).
7. In "A Supplementary Lexical Test" Macdonald P. Jackson correctly identifies it as *Dido, Queen of Carthage* (187).
8. Five essays in McMullan et al. do an excellent job of analysing and historicizing the role of female editors. See the essays by Valerie Wayne, Neil Taylor, H.R. Woudhuysen, John Lavagnino, and Suzanne Gossett. Woudhuysen praises the achievements of female editors of school editions (84–85) and although these are "lucrative commissions" ("the works [publishers] wanted to sell"; 85) there is inevitably a second-division feel to such commissions. A helpful census of women editors is provided at "Women Edit Shakespeare".
9. See Honigmann, Hammond, Kidnie ("Text, Performance" and "Staging"), Cox, Woods and Dustagheer.
10. Some early modern texts, such as the plays of Thomas Middleton, are sensitive to the need to align the reader's experience with the viewer's. See also "S.S.", *The Honest Lawyer* (1616): "Enter Curfew, Valentine as themselves, Vaster disguis'd" (H1v); Nathan Field, *Amends for Ladies* (1618): "Enter ... young BOULD like a waiting Gentle-woman" (B1v); "Enter MAIDE like an Irish foot-boy" (D1v); "Enter his Brother like a woman maskt" (D2v).
11. For discussions of editorial versus directorial remits see Williams, Dessen, Hammond 95, Kidnie "Staging" 175, and Cox 178–80. *NOS*'s imaginative insertion could be justified textually by analogy with other Elizabethan

plays. *Selimus* (1594, Q 1638) stages an enucleation where the verb used in the stage directions is “pull” not “gouge”: “Puls out his eyes” (F2v). Given that the 1986 *Oxford Complete Works* edition had used “pull” (“Cornwall pulls out one of Gloucester’s eyes and stamps on it”; 3.7.68.1), one could argue that this intervention has more textual support than “gouges”. Stamping also has some (slighter) analogous support. Stamping without an object occurs in several early modern stage directions to indicate anger (Chapman, *Widow’s Tears*: “*Lysander stamps and goes out vext with Cynthia*”; C4r; *King Lear*: “she reads the letter frowns and stamps”; E1r). But in Marlowe’s *1 Tamburlaine* we have a closer parallel to the NOS stage direction when the protagonist takes from his sword’s point the raw animal meat which Bajazeth has refused to eat and the stage direction reads: “He takes it and stamps upon it” (D7v).

12. She describes this and offers sample pages in “Staging” 169–76.
13. “Chests” is not replaced by “caskets” until the title page of the 1619 Pavier quarto. In the dialogue of the 1600 quarto, Nerissa refers to “these three chests of gold, silver, and lead” (1.2.25), but all subsequent references in the text are to “caskets”, as in Morocco’s request “lead me to the caskets/To try my fortune” (2.1.23).
14. For example: *Enter Lussurioso, and Infesto two Lords* (*Phoenix* I2r); *Enter Vindici and Hippolito, Vindici in disguise to attend L. Lussurioso the Dukes sonne* (*Revenger’s Tragedy* B2v); *Enter Mistres [sic] Katherine with Fitzgraua a Gentleman* (*Your Five Gallants* B2r).
15. Gossett and Gossett extend and contextualize our point:

Furthermore, the women who open *The Puritan Widow*, *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside* and *Women beware Women* are all mothers speaking with their adult children, and in two of three cases their lines focus on the same conjunction of birth, delivery and death that the Countess articulates in *All’s Well* (363).

16. The “?” after Middleton’s name in the Contents page – “*All’s Well that Ends Well*, by Shakespeare (adapted by Middleton (?))” – is somewhat misleading. The editors explain that “whenever this edition is the first to identify a collaborator or adapter, we treat the attribution more tentatively” (*Modern Critical Edition* 58).
17. A comparison of Arden 2 and 3 *Hamlet* is here instructive. Although both editions are, as it happens, edited by textual specialists, the energies of Arden 3’s introduction are turned resolutely forward. Where Jenkins in Arden 2 was preoccupied with sources, date, and the phantom of the *Ur-Hamlet*, Thompson and Taylor’s Arden 3 offers engaging accounts of the play’s theatrical and fictional metastases (Ambrose Thomas’s 1868 opera, the overweening Wopsle’s performance in *Great Expectations*, and Heiner Muller’s sharply political *Hamletmaschine* of 1977).
18. At least, this is true of single-text editions; it is not the case for *Complete Works* where a revised edition supersedes its predecessor. The different time scales for preparation are relevant here (a few years versus several decades).
19. The plays’ images of inscription have been noted by many. See Sibony, Maguire, Ferguson, Watson, Hawkes, Helgerson, and Pollard.
20. Even so, his collation of Chaucer with Chaucer’s sources is deliberately abandoned as it proves to be more substantive (“*it concerneth matter*”) than Speight’s lexical intentions allowed. He leaves this for a subsequent “*Commentor*” (a2v).

Works cited

- Anon. *King Lear*. STC 15343. London, 1605.
- Atkin, Tamara. *Reading Drama in Tudor England*. London: Routledge, 2018.
- Bamber, Linda. *Comic Women, Tragic Men*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1982.
- Bayley, John. *Shakespeare and Tragedy*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Berger, Thomas L. “The (Play)text’s the Thing: Teaching the Blinding of Gloucester in *King Lear*.” *Teaching Shakespeare through Performance*. Ed. Milla C. Riggio. New York: MLA, 1999. 196–219.
- Bratton, J.S. and Julie Hankey. *Series editors’ preface*. *Shakespeare in Production*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, ongoing.
- Burrows, John and Hugh Craig. “The Joker in the Pack.” Taylor and Egan 194–217.
- Byrne, Muriel St Clare. “Bibliographic Clues in Collaborate Plays.” *The Library* 4th series 13 (1932): 21–48.
- Chapman, George. *The Widow’s Tears*. STC 4994. London, 1612.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Works*. Ed. Thomas Speight. STC 5079. London, 1598.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Works*. Ed. Thomas Speight. STC 5080. London, 1602.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Works*. Ed. John Stow. STC 5075. London, 1551.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Works*. Ed. William Thynne. STC 5068. London, 1532.
- Cox, John D. “Open Stage, Open Page? Editing Stage Direction in Early Dramatic Texts.” Erne and Kidnie 178–93.
- De Grazia, Margreta. “Imprints: Shakespeare, Guttenberg, and Descartes.” In *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England*. Ed. Douglas A. Brooks. London: Ashgate, 2005, 29–58; republished Routledge, 2016, 29–58.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Specters of Marx*. Trans. Peggy Kamuf. London: Routledge, 1994.

- Dessen, Alan. *Rescripting Shakespeare: The Text, the Director, and Modern Productions*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002, 233–34.
- Dryden, John and William Davenant. *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island*. London: Henry Herringman, 1674.
- Erne, Lukas, and Margaret Jane Kidnie, eds. *Textual Performances*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.
- Ferguson, Margaret W. “Hamlet: Letters and Spirits.” Parker and Hartmann, 292–309.
- Field, Nathan. *Amends for Ladies*. STC 10851. London, 1618.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rabinow. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991.
- Fraunce, Abraham. *Amyntas*. STC 25118.8. London, 1596.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Transl. James Strachey, Alan Tyson, and Angela Richards. London: Penguin, 1991.
- Gascoigne, George. *Pleasantest Works*. STC 11639. London, 1587.
- Gossett, Suzanne. “Women Making Shakespeare – And Middleton and Jonson.” McMullan et al. 99–110.
- Greer, Germaine. “Shows Like The Bridge Repeatedly Depict Violence Against Women – So Why Are We Watching?” *Radio Times*. Online. 5 May 2018.
- Halley, Janet E. “Textual Intercourse: Anne Donne, John Donne and the Sexual Poetics of Textual Exchange.” *Seeking the Woman in Late Medieval and Renaissance Writing*. Eds. Sheila Fisher and Janet E. Halley. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1989, 187–206.
- Hammond, Anthony. “Encounters of the Third Kind in Stage-Directions in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama.” *Studies in Philology* 89 (1992): 71–99.
- Hawkes, Terence. “Telmah.” Parker and Hartmann 310–32.
- Helgerson, Richard. “What Hamlet Remembers.” *Shakespeare Studies* 10 (1977): 67–97.
- Heywood, Thomas. *The English Traveller*. STC 13315. London, 1633.
- Honigmann, E.A.J. “Re-enter the Stage Directions: Shakespeare and Some Contemporaries.” *Shakespeare Survey* 29 (1976): 117–26.
- Jackson, MacDonald P. *Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.
- Jackson, MacDonald P. “A Supplementary Lexical Test for *Arden of Faversham*.” Taylor and Egan. 182–93.
- Jackson, MacDonald P. “Astringer.” *The Times Literary Supplement* 11 May 2012: 6.
- Jacobson, Howard. Interviewed by Daniella Peled in *Haaretz*. 7 Mar. 2016.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.
- Kastan, David Scott. “The Mechanics of Culture: Editing Shakespeare Today.” *Shakespeare Studies* 24 (1996): 26–33.
- Keller, Stefan D. “Shakespeare’s Rhetorical Fingerprint. New Evidence on the Authorship of *Titus Andronicus*.” *English Studies* 84.2 (2003): 105–18.
- Kesson, Andy. “Authorship Studies: Where Have We Got and Where Are We Going?” *Before Shakespeare Online*. 2018.
- Kidnie, Margaret Jane. “Text, Performance and the Editors: Staging Shakespeare’s Drama.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51 (2000): 456–73.
- Kidnie, Margaret Jane. “The Staging of Shakespeare’s Drama in Print Editions.” Erne and Kidnie 158–77.
- Kuhn, Maura Slattery. “Much Virtue in ‘IF.’” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 28 (1977): 40–50.
- Lacan, Jacques. “Desire and the Interpretation of Desire in *Hamlet*.” *Yale French Studies* 55/56 (1977): 11–52.
- Lavagnino, John. “Bernice Kliman’s Enfolded *Hamlet*.” In McMullan et al. 89–98.
- Leggo, Carl. “Exclamation!” *Toasted Cheese: A Literary Journal*. Online, 1 March 2011.
- Lerner, Evan and Amanda Mott. “Penn Engineers’ Network Analysis Uncovers New Evidence of Collaboration in Shakespeare’s Plays.” *Penn Today*, 25 October 2016.
- Lockhart, John Gibson. *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott, Bart*. Vol. I. Edinburgh, 1837–38.
- Love, Genevieve. “Doctor Faustus’ Leg.” In *Christopher Marlowe, Theatrical Commerce, and the Book Trade*. Eds. Kirk Melnikoff and Roslyn L. Knutson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2018. 81–91.
- Maguire, Laurie. “‘Actions that a man might play’: Mourning, Memory, Editing.” *Performance Research* 7.1 (2002): 66–76.
- Maguire, Laurie and Emma Smith. “Many Hands: A New Shakespeare Collaboration.” *The Times Literary Supplement* 19 April 2012: 13–15.
- Marcus, Leah. *Unediting the Renaissance*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *Tamburlaine*. STC 17427. London, 1597.
- Masten, Jeffrey. *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.
- McGann, Jerome. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.
- McKerrow, R.B. *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare: A Study in Editorial Method*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1939.
- McLeod, Randall. “Un ‘Editing’ Shak-speare.” *SubStance* 10/11.33–34 (1981/1982): 26–55.
- McMullan, Gordon, Lena C. Orlin, and Virginia M. Vaughan, eds. *Women Making Shakespeare: Text, Reception, Performance*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Middleton, Thomas. *The Phoenix*. STC 17892. London, 1607.
- Middleton, Thomas. *The Revenger’s Tragedy*. STC 24149. London, 1607.

- Middleton, Thomas. *Your Five Gallants*. STC 17907. London, 1608.
- Mountfort, William. *The Life and Death of Doctor Faustus, Made into a Farce*. Wing M2974. London, 1688.
- Newman, Harry. "[P]rophanes filders': Medical Paratexts and Indecent Readers in Early Modern England." *Medical Paratexts from Medieval to Modern: Dissecting the Page*. Eds. Hanna C. Tweed and Diane G. Scott. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, 15–41.
- Norton, Thomas, and Thomas Sackville. *Gorboduc*. STC 18685. London, 1570.
- Nuttall, A.D. *Dead from the Waist Down: Scholars and Scholarship in Literature and the Popular Imagination*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2011.
- Oras, Ants. *Pause Patterns in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama: An Experiment in Prosody*. Gainesville: U of Florida P, 1960.
- Parker, Patricia, and Geoffrey Hartmann, eds. *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*. London: Methuen, 1985.
- Pollack-Pelzner, Daniel. "The Radical Argument of the New Oxford Shakespeare." *The New Yorker* 19 Feb. 2017.
- Pollard, David L. "Belatedness and *Hamlet*." *Hamlet Studies* 11 (1989): 49–59.
- Proudfoot, Richard. "Marlowe and the Editors." In *Constructing Christopher Marlowe*. Ed. J.A. Downie and J.T. Parnell. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000, 41–54.
- Rokison-Woodall, Abigail, ed. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2017.
- Saenger, Michael. *The Commodification of Textual Engagements in the English Renaissance*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Scoloker, Anthony. *Daiphantus*. STC 21853. London, 1604.
- Segarra, Santiago, Mark Eisen, Gabriel Egan, and Alejandro Ribeiro. "Attributing the Authorship of the Henry VI Plays by Word Adjacency." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 67 (2016): 232–56.
- Shakespeare, William. *All's Well that Ends Well*. Ed. Susan Snyder. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994.
- Shakespeare, William. *All's Well that Ends Well*. [Arden 2] Ed. G.K. Hunter. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2000.
- Shakespeare, William. *All's Well that Ends Well*. [Arden 3] Eds. Suzanne Gossett and Helen Wilcox. London: Bloomsbury, 2019.
- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Ed. John Dover Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1934, revised 1936.
- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. [Arden 2] Ed. Harold Jenkins. London: Methuen, 1982.
- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Eds. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet and Hamlet: the texts of 1603 and 1623*. [Arden 3] Eds. Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor. London: Thomson Learning, 2006.
- Shakespeare, William. *Othello*. [Arden 2] Ed. E.A.J. Honigmann. London: Thomas Nelson, 1999.
- Shakespeare, William. *Othello*. [Arden 3] Ed. E.A.J. Honigmann, intro. Ayanna Thompson. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- Shakespeare, William. *Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. Jill L. Levenson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works*. Eds. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor with John Jowett and William B. Montgomery. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works*. Eds. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor with John Jowett and William B. Montgomery. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005.
- Shakespeare, William. *The First Folio: The Norton Facsimile*. Ed. Charlton Hinman. 2nd ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 1996.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Merchant of Venice*. STC 22296. London, 1600.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Merchant of Venice*. STC 22297. London, "1600" i.e. 1619.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Merchant of Venice*. Ed. M.M. Mahood. Updated edition. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. [Arden 3] Ed. Giorgio Melchiori. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2000.
- Shakespeare, William. *The New Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works Modern Critical Edition*. Eds. Gary Taylor, John Jowett, Terri Bourus, and Gabriel Egan. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2016.
- Shakespeare, William. *The New Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works Critical Reference Edition*. Eds. Gary Taylor, John Jowett, Terri Bourus, and Gabriel Egan. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2017.
- Shakespeare, William. *The RSC Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. Eds. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Taming of the Shrew*. Ed. Elizabeth Schafer. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. [Arden 2] Ed. Frank Kermode. London: Methuen, 1952.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Ed. Stephen Orgel. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. [Arden 3 revised] Eds. Alden T. and Virginia M. Vaughan. London: Thomson Learning, 2011.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of Hamlet*. [Arden 1] Ed. Edward Dowden. London: Methuen, 1899.
- Sibony, Daniel. "Hamlet: A Writing-Effect." *Yale French Studies* 55/56 (1977): 53–93.
- "S.S." *The Honest Lawyer*. STC 21519a. London, 1616.
- Taylor, Gary. "Textual and Sexual Criticism: A Crux in *Comedy of Errors*." *Renaissance Drama* 19 (1988): 195–225.
- Taylor, Gary, and Gabriel Egan, eds. *The New Oxford Shakespeare Authorship Companion*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2017.

- Taylor, Neil. "To be acknowledged, madam, is o'erpaid": Women's Role in the Production of Scholarly Editions of Shakespeare." In McMullan et al. 69–78.
- "T.G." (tp). Attr. Robert Greene. *Selimus* STC 12310b. London, 1638.
- "This Week." *The Times Literary Supplement* 11 May 2012: 2.
- Thompson, Ann. "Feminist Theory and the Editing of Shakespeare: *The Taming of the Shrew Revisited*" (1997), reprinted in abridged form in *Shakespeare, Feminism and Gender*. Ed. Kate Chedgzoy. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001, 49–69.
- Urkowitz, Steven. "Five Women Eleven Ways: Changing Images of Shakespearean Characters in the Earliest Texts." *Images of Shakespeare: Proceedings of the Third Congress of the International Shakespeare Association of America 1986*. Eds. Werner Habicht, D.J. Palmer, and Roger Pringle. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1988. 292–304.
- Urkowitz, Steven. "Two Versions of *Romeo and Juliet* 2.6 and *Merry Wives of Windsor* 5.5.215-45: An Invitation to the Pleasures of Textual/Sexual (Di)perversity." In *Elizabethan Theater: Essays in Honor of Samuel Schoenbaum*. Ed. R.B. Parker and Sheldon P. Zitner. Newark: U of Delaware P. 222–38.
- Vickers, Brian, and Marcus Dahl. "What is Infirm." *The Times Literary Supplement* 11 May 2012: 14.
- Wall, Wendy. *The Imprint of Gender*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993.
- Watson, Robert N. "Giving up the Ghost in a World of Decay: *Hamlet*, Revenge, and Denial." *Renaissance Drama* new series 21 (1990): 199–223.
- Wayne, Valerie. "Remaking the Texts: Women Editors of Shakespeare, Past and Present." In McMullan et al. 57–68.
- Wayne, Valerie. "The Sexual Politics of Textual Transmission." *Textual Formations and Reformations*. Eds. Laurie E. Maguire and Thomas L. Berger. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1998. 179–210.
- Wells, Stanley, and Gary Taylor with John Jowett and William B. Montgomery. *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1987.
- Werstine, Paul. *Early Modern Playhouse Manuscripts and the Editing of Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013.
- Wheater, Isabella. "A gentle Astringer." *The Times Literary Supplement* 25 May 2012: 6.
- Williams, George Walton. "To Edit? To Direct? – Ay, There's the Rub." In *Arden: Editing Shakespeare*. Eds. Ann Thompson and Gordon McMullan. London: Bloomsbury, 2003. 111–24.
- "Women Edit Shakespeare". SHAKEDSETC: A Website Devoted to Historic Editions of Shakespeare, &c. Online. 2019.
- Woods, Gillian, and Sarah Dustagheer, eds. *Stage Direction and Shakespearean Theatre*. London: Bloomsbury, 2018.
- Woudhuysen, H.R. "Some Women Editors of Shakespeare: A Preliminary Sketch." In McMullan et al. 79–88.