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Reading one hundred and fifteen books on English Renaissance drama is uniquely exhausting, but it’s also a great privilege since it offers a rare opportunity to see the field whole. Although “whole” isn’t quite the right word since one is hardly left with the impression of unity or coherence. This variegation makes introducing and framing an essay of this sort difficult. There are a couple of general observations I can make from the outset though. First, it’s been driven home for me that a brilliant, paradigm-shifting book can be produced at any career stage. A number of the studies I found most impressive were first books. Second, there’s no one approach or subdiscipline leading our field. Among the books I expect to be particularly influential are studies dealing with book history, queer theory, and the history of ideas, and a number that don’t fit into any of our usual critical categories.

Of course, if our field is not dominated by one approach, it is dominated by one author. Some prefatory groans about the predominance of Shakespeare have become standard in this annual review, and I’m happy to join the chorus. But I also think Shakespeare has been an enabler of the diversity of critical perspectives that make our field exceptionally vital. The undeniable marketing benefits of the “Shakespeare” moniker can be especially important when it comes to securing the support of major presses for unorthodox or experimental work. There are plenty of reasons
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to be cynical about this sort of thing, but there are reasons to be thankful too. Both as a delivery mechanism for new critical ideas and as a site for public outreach, early modernists are fortunate to have Shakespeare in their corner. I think it’s important to acknowledge this even as we remain vigilant of the ways in which an overemphasis on Shakespeare distorts our sense of the history of theater and the culture of performance in the early modern period.

The following discussion considers this year’s books under themed subheadings. This is an inevitably reductive approach (it goes without saying that many books could be included in more than one category), but I hope it will make the essay easier for readers to navigate.

**TEXTS AND TRANSMISSION**

I received a number of books dealing with the texts, and textual cultures, of English Renaissance drama. Collectively, they demonstrate the range of critical uses to which book historical scholarship can be put.

Emma Smith has produced two studies of Shakespeare’s First Folio. The first, *The Making of Shakespeare’s First Folio*, explores the planning, printing, and publishing of Shakespeare’s 1623 collection with a final chapter on “Early Readers.” Pitched for general readership, the book nevertheless provides a storehouse of information that will be of interest to scholars. Central to the study is the assertion that the First Folio is a document of collaboration and sociality, of the interdependent relationships among playwrights, scribes, compositors, engravers, printers, and financial backers. This is a useful corrective to the more conventional view of the First Folio as a monument to Shakespeare himself and to a distinctly modern notion of authorial subjectivity.

Smith’s second book, *Shakespeare’s First Folio: Four Centuries of an Iconic Book*, picks up where *The Making of Shakespeare’s First Folio* leaves off, tracing different ways of interacting with the Folio—owning, reading, forging, acting, collecting, and studying—from the seventeenth century to our own time, and from Europe and America to Africa and Asia. Readers interested in Smith’s monographs will also want to consult her edited collection, *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare’s First Folio*, which features a solid lineup of essays covering the printing, publishing, reading, buying, and transmission of the 1623 collection.

Like Smith’s *The Making of Shakespeare’s First Folio*, Adam G. Hooks’s *Selling Shakespeare: Biography, Bibliography, and the*
Book Trade views Shakespeare’s authorial persona as a product of the collaborative practices of early modern print culture. However, Hooks’s project is more targeted than Smith’s. He considers how bibliographical work on the book trade can lay the foundation for a new kind of Shakespearean biography, a form of distributed and textually anchored life writing that he calls “bio-bibliography.” This shrewd argument gains momentum through a series of careful examinations of bookshops and printing houses. Here, we encounter long-forgotten individuals who contributed (financially and otherwise) to the creation of Shakespeare the Author. Bio-bibliography, Hooks shows us, isn’t about recovering through books a life that exists beyond them; it’s about understanding that the books themselves—material objects that move through complex social and economic environments—are constitutive of that life.

Many scholars will welcome the arrival of Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume’s monumental study, The Publication of Plays in London, 1660–1800: Playwrights, Publishers, and the Market, even if much of the material covered falls outside the date range in which most of us work. The opening chapter on “Play Publication before 1660” is too quick to dismiss deservedly influential work by Lukas Erne and Zachary Lesser, but the scholarship presented in subsequent chapters is nothing short of groundbreaking. Addressing basic questions about who published plays, how much they cost, and who bought them, this book provides the first exhaustive, fully analytic account of play publication in London between 1660 and 1800.

Two books that usefully shift the conversation from print to manuscript are James Purkis’s Shakespeare and Manuscript Drama: Canon, Collaboration, and Text and Laura Estill’s Dramatic Extracts in Seventeenth-Century English Manuscripts: Watching, Reading, Changing Plays. Like Hooks, Purkis wants to trade in simple models of authorial agency for a more nuanced understanding of the multiple figures involved in the production of dramatic documents. His third chapter on Thomas Middleton’s The Second Maiden’s Tragedy is particularly illuminating in this regard. He describes a manuscript that has undergone a complex series of revisions and features at least three distinct hands in addition to the original scribe’s. In this document, we find an embodiment of the way plays could evolve out of extended collaborative processes. Conventionally, a manuscript like this might be viewed as an opportunity to get closer to the author-at-work. But, as Purkis points out, it also calls into question the appropriateness of “the author” as an interpretive category.
What Purkis finally offers through his painstaking analyses is a persuasive argument about relevance of manuscript studies to a variety of scholarly debates, from textual editing and theater history to collaboration and attribution studies.

Estill’s *Dramatic Extracts in Seventeenth-Century English Manuscripts* turns to manuscript evidence not to assess where plays came from, but instead to understand where they went. In her detailed study, Estill traces how early modern playgoers and readers copied extracts of plays and masques into their notebooks. Together, these textual artifacts constitute an often-neglected archive of information about how the verbal component of performance was put to use, intellectually and politically, in seventeenth-century England. Estill shows how plays possessed a degree of assemblage-like volatility only partially accounted for in their lives as theatrical events and printed books. *Dramatic Extracts*, though certainly highly specialized, is not narrow in either conception or aim. Rather, the book zeroes in on a very specific cultural practice in order to offer an entirely new perspective on how plays make meaning.

This is in some ways opposite in spirit to Brian Vickers’s *The One “King Lear,”* which rather than confronting us with a new way of seeing things, asks instead that we accept an old way of seeing things. Arguing vigorously against the widely though not universally accepted position that the Quarto and Folio texts of Shakespeare’s *King Lear* constitute distinct and equally authoritative versions of the play, each from a different stage in the process of composition, Vickers insists on the validity of an older premise, that both texts are imperfect versions of a now-lost original: the “one King Lear” of the title, a complete masterpiece that no sensible playwright would consider revising. Vickers’s argument is stern, sometimes righteous, and he invokes both bibliographical and literary evidence to support his position. Not everyone will agree with the way he marshals this evidence. Indeed, reading *The One “King Lear,”* one often gets the impression that the idea of an original masterpiece has an imaginative, and emotional, purchase on Vickers that is much stronger than the textual record itself can bear out. Scholars working on the texts of *King Lear* will have to reckon with Vickers’s study, and they should, but I don’t foresee the book leading to a “new consensus” of the sort described in the conclusion.
ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Two books on the role of nature and ecology in Shakespeare’s writing illustrate some of the different ways in which an ecocritical perspective can be brought to bear on Renaissance drama. For Tom MacFaul in *Shakespeare and the Natural World*, Shakespeare’s engagement with nature derives primarily from religious habits of thought. MacFaul shows how representations of the natural world in Shakespeare’s plays contribute to religious and philosophical debates about the status of material life in the divine scheme. He demonstrates that in early modern England, nature could function as a site for unorthodox speculation about grace and free will. Shakespeare seems always to have connected nature to human creativity (as William Wordsworth would later), and yet he also found in nature a form of relationality that highlighted the limits of human agency. Tracing this paradox, both in Shakespeare’s drama and in Renaissance thought, is central to MacFaul’s project.

Randall Martin’s book, *Shakespeare and Ecology*, part of the Oxford Shakespeare Topics series edited by Peter Holland and Stanley Wells, takes a different approach to Shakespeare’s engagement with the natural world. For Martin, “ecology” is a term that denotes not only a way of understanding nature as a series of interlinked parts, but also a particular political orientation, one which is roughly similar to our present-day ecological consciousness. Indeed, Martin sees Shakespeare’s ecological sensibility as at once firmly embedded in its own historical moment and anticipatory of present-day environmental ethics. The transition from the former (historical context) to the latter (environmental ethics) sometimes feels a bit strained. I’m not fully convinced, for example, that “Mistress Quickly’s fuel choice ... would have resonated with Londoners weighing short-term costs and benefits against environmental damage” (p. 3) or that the end of *Cymbeline* is “suggestive of today’s need to merge regional and national interests with multilateral political action to avert global dangers such as rising sea levels and eroding biodiversity” (p. 115). Nevertheless, the work Martin has done reconstructing aspects of Renaissance deforestation, husbandry, and the relationship between militarization and the environment, among many other things, is truly impressive. His book should be consulted by anyone working on environment and ecology in the early modern period.
RELIGIOUS CONTEXTS

Three books on drama and religion stood out for me. David Scott Kastan’s *A Will to Believe: Shakespeare and Religion*, based on his Oxford Wells Shakespeare Lectures, does not offer any paradigm-shifting arguments, but it’s perhaps the best introduction to the general topic of Shakespeare and religion I’ve encountered so far. Aimed especially at an undergraduate audience, Kastan combines deep historical learning, careful close reading, and a fast-paced prose style. The book also contains a steady stream of critical wisdom that I think scholars at any level could benefit from. To give just one example, Kastan perceptively reminds us that “[e]ven as religion has been returned to our discussion of early modern drama, we often claim either too little or too much for it, especially when we shift from what characters say to what performance does” (p. 8). Comments like these are easy to pass through only half-noticed because Kastan drops them into the discussion without the stern gravitas typical of academic point making. But as with many of the book’s intuitions, it gets at something fundamental to the relationship between drama and religion, and to the critical practices we employ when discussing that relationship.

Brian Walsh’s *Unsettled Toleration: Religious Difference on the Shakespearean Stage* takes a fresh look at the well established notion that Renaissance plays tend to be religiously polyvocal rather than expressing a single theological or confessional stance. Walsh does this by correlating the intra-Christian conflict represented on stage in plays by Christopher Marlowe, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, William Rowley, and others to a specifically Renaissance, and specifically English, practice of toleration. Under this rubric, he shows how plays participate in what he terms, variously, “everyday ecumenicity” and “pragmatic pluralism.” I found Walsh to be at his strongest when he was analyzing complex cultural-historical contexts, more so than when he was reading the plays themselves. What makes his book important is the way it expands the critical vocabulary we use to talk about theater and religion.

Finally, *Staging Harmony: Music and Religious Change in Late Medieval and Early Modern English Drama* by Katherine Steele Brokaw is a meticulously researched, originally conceived study of theater and religion that bridges the disciplinary gap between music and drama and the historical gap between the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Brokaw shows that religious music on stage from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century shaped
cultural memory and linked the political and liturgical processes of Reformation to the embodied experiences of hearing and seeing. *Staging Harmony* expertly weaves together knowledge about theatrical practice, religious controversy, music history, and the history of sensation to make an argument that will be of interest to scholars working in all of these fields.

**THEATER AND KNOWLEDGE**

How did the Renaissance theater make, manage, and use different forms of knowledge? Several books I received address this question.

András Kiséry’s *Hamlet’s Moment: Drama and Political Knowledge in Early Modern England* is a painstakingly researched study of something that it’s incredibly hard to say something new about: Renaissance drama and politics. But Kiséry does it. And he does it, moreover, in a way that manages to be closely engaged with current scholarly debates without feeling either derivative or combative. Kiséry is not interested in attributing a certain kind of political orientation to the theater, nor is he interested in the representation of particular political positions or theories in individual plays. Rather, *Hamlet’s Moment* shows through a series of detailed case studies—all of which display a sophisticated knowledge of book history, intellectual history, and literary form—how Renaissance drama around 1600 familiarized English audiences with the emergent notion of politics as a profession. The commercial theater distributed a special form of cultural capital that Kiséry terms “political competence.”

Readers interested in theater and politics will also learn from Urszula Kizelbach’s *The Pragmatics of Early Modern Politics: Power and Kingship in Shakespeare’s History Plays*. The writing in this book is not always up to standard, but the author’s use of concepts from linguistic pragmatics can reveal unexpected things about the cultural effects of putting politics on stage. The book reminds us how useful the analytical tools of linguistics can be to the study of Renaissance drama. Such tools tend to be exploited far more in Continental European scholarship than in Anglo-American scholarship.

Over the last twenty years, a number of studies have shown how Renaissance plays drew on the language of economics. Brian Sheerin contributes to this body of work in *Desires of Credit in Early Modern Theory and Drama: Commerce, Poesy, and the Profitable Imagination*. His core argument, elegant in its simplicity, is
that economic theory, especially the concept of credit, shares with drama a desire to create something out of nothing—to tell a lie that everyone knows is a lie but decides to believe in anyways. From this suggestive starting point, Sheerin delivers five smart readings of plays by Marlowe, Shakespeare, Thomas Dekker, and Jonson.

Katherine Eggert’s *Disknowledge: Literature, Alchemy, and the End of Humanism in Renaissance England* explores the curious way in which early modern literature sometimes rejects established forms of knowledge in favor of more suspect epistemologies. Eggert’s term for this is “disknowledge.” She explains, “One sure sign that disknowledge is operating in a text is when bad ideas—or nutty ideas, or simply irrelevant ideas—start to look good” (p. 4). Alchemy serves as the prime example of this throughout the book. When writers like Spenser, John Donne, Shakespeare, Jonson, and Margaret Cavendish use alchemical tropes, they are practicing a kind of disknowledge, an active pushing-aside of one kind of knowing in favor of another. Locating her study at a cultural moment that falls after humanism’s heyday but before the emergence of the new science, Eggert shows how literary disknowledge establishes paradigms for epistemic choice that would eventually become central to the disciplinarity of the late seventeenth century and Enlightenment. Both deeply learned and impressively wide-ranging, *Disknowledge* will be required reading for anyone interested in the relationship between literature and the history of ideas in the early modern period.

**SHAKESPEAREAN AFTERLIVES**

If the books discussed in the previous section investigate the kind of thinking Renaissance drama makes possible in its own time, the books discussed in this section focus on the kind of thinking Renaissance drama makes possible in subsequent eras.

Michael Anderegg’s beautifully written book, *Lincoln and Shakespeare*, studies Abraham Lincoln’s intellectual devotion to the Bard with particular attention to how he incorporated lessons from the plays into his personal and professional life. Lisa Hopkins’s *Shakespearean Allusion in Crime Fiction: DCI Shakespeare* may sound too specialized to appeal to a broad audience of scholars, but in fact the book uncovers a large and diverse world of unexamined Shakespearean influence. Moving with ease between a variety of novels and films, Hopkins investigates the distinct ways in which crime fiction both invokes and ironizes Shakespearean cultural value. The book is written in agile, jargon-free prose and
will make a helpful addition to the library of any scholar interested in Shakespearean adaptation and appropriation.

Two superb studies of Shakespeare’s modern influence are Andreas Höfele’s *No Hamlets: German Shakespeare from Nietzsche to Carl Schmitt* and Theodore Leinwand’s *The Great William: Writers Reading Shakespeare*. Höfele explores the role of Shakespeare in the work of right-wing intellectuals from the late nineteenth century to the Cold War era. With chapters on Friedrich Nietzsche, Stefan George, Ernst Kantorowicz, Joseph Goebbels, Schmitt, and others, Höfele tells a remarkable story about the way Shakespeare provides imaginative resources for some of the most challenging and troubling thought of the modern era. The majority of Shakespeareans will be unfamiliar with the primary sources discussed in this book; Höfele spent long hours working in German archives. But *No Hamlets* is also very much engaged with current conversations in early modern studies, especially work on political theology and other strands of German theory that have become increasingly influential over the last fifteen to twenty years.

In *The Great William*, Leinwand is not interested in politics or philosophy, but rather in creative practice. The book includes lively and detailed discussions of seven writers’ career-long engagement with Shakespeare: Samuel Taylor Coleridge, John Keats, Virginia Woolf, Charles Olson, John Berryman, Allen Ginsberg, and Ted Hughes. Leinwand captures the intellectual and spiritual urgency with which these writers read Shakespeare, but he also shows that their reading was a profoundly embodied experience. Keats and Woolf, each in their own way, described being physically overwhelmed by Shakespeare’s verse, and Ginsberg was fascinated by what he thought of as a particularly Shakespearean mouthfeel. As this suggests, *The Great William* is not a study of how Shakespeare influences subsequent writers, but more accurately of “what Shakespeare ‘does’ to them” (p. 11). Leinwand’s interests are, at base, phenomenological. *The Great William* is also distinguished by something I can only describe as genuine respect for the material at hand. The way these modern writers combined the study of Shakespeare with creative work will seem odd, even wacky, by contemporary scholarly standards, but you won’t find any arch or snide remarks from Leinwand. He takes his subjects seriously as readers, writers, and thinkers. As he puts it simply, “When an Olson or Berryman or Hughes reads and comments on Shakespeare, the rules of scholarship obtain, but differently” (p. 7).
SHAKESPEARE: POLITICAL THEORIST AND PHILOSOPHER

In *Hamlet’s Moment*, which I commented on above, Kiséry insists that he does not view Shakespeare as a political thinker per se, but rather as a purveyor of a certain kind of political expertise. Other books I received insist on just the opposite, that Shakespeare can indeed be viewed as a unique kind of political thinker or philosopher.

In *Shakespeare and Democracy: The Self-Renewing Politics of a Global Playwright*, Gabriel Chanan writes intelligently about what Shakespeare has to teach a modern audience about participatory politics. For an academic reader, the book seems to veer sharply between scholarly commonplaces and methodologically rickety linkages (Chanan is a former teacher and social policy researcher, not an academic). However, for nonspecialists less concerned with the technicalities of scholarly argument, Chanan offers a satisfying way to pose big-ticket political questions through Shakespeare’s plays.

In a more historically grounded vein, Andrew Moore’s *Shakespeare between Machiavelli and Hobbes: Dead Body Politics* attempts to show how Shakespeare is part of a distinctly modern lineage of political thought. Moore places Shakespeare between Niccolò Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes not only in a historical sense, but also in a theoretical or political-doctrinal sense. For Moore, Shakespeare is a political thinker as much as a playwright, one who holds, and advances through his drama, specific political beliefs. While this kind of approach can be thought-provoking, it also feels critically unsophisticated at times, as do Moore’s prefatory comments on John Shakespeare’s political career, in which he remarks that thinking of “Shakespeare ... as the son of a career politician who grew up to be a brilliant political theorist” is “less jarring” than thinking of him as “the son of a Stratford glove-maker” who grew “up to be a famous London playwright,” which he finds “quite baffling” (p. xi).

Leon Harold Craig’s book, *The Philosopher’s English King: Shakespeare’s “Henriad” as Political Philosophy*, has similar issues, though it’s clear that Craig, a professor of political science, knows the plays intimately and has spent a great deal of time reflecting on them. Arguing that the second tetralogy articulates a sustained philosophy of political legitimacy, the book is full of smart, original readings and suggestive linkages. But the fact that Craig tries to subsume the plays’ various insights under the umbrella of one coherent philosophical master plan will feel
forced and unpersuasive to many scholars of Shakespeare. This is exacerbated by the fact that Craig makes his argument without reference to any of the influential work on Shakespeare and political philosophy by scholars such as Paul Kottman, Julia Lupton, and James Kuzner, to name just a few.

Thomas P. Anderson’s *Shakespeare’s Fugitive Politics*, by contrast, is closely engaged with recent work in this area. The book appears in my series Edinburgh Critical Studies in Shakespeare and Philosophy, so I can’t claim neutrality. That said, I do think *Shakespeare’s Fugitive Politics* makes a significant intervention by assembling a new critical vocabulary for talking about Shakespeare’s political imagination. Anderson rejects dialectically configured categories like “sovereign absolutism” and “republicanism,” which, he explains, probably have more to do with our knowledge of the way English history would play out than with Shakespeare’s own intellectual and artistic investments. Instead, Anderson argues that Shakespeare’s political imagination is characterized by *dissensus*, a term he borrows from Jacques Rancière. Dissensus, an active breaking down of centralized sovereign authority, is glimpsed frequently in the histories and Roman plays that form the core of Anderson’s study. Importantly, while Shakespearean dissensus is oriented toward democratic community, it is nevertheless very much prior to easily celebrated ideas like contract and consensus. Dissensus, in other words, marks an in-between space of political action, after sovereign absolutism but before republicanism or democracy.

*Worldly Shakespeare: The Theatre of Our Good Will* by Richard Wilson is a fascinating book about the way Shakespeare’s plays and poems model an agonistic cosmopolitanism that prepares us for the urgent problem of toleration in our own multicultural societies. Wilson distinguishes this vexed version of coexistence, which he calls “worldliness,” from the consensus-oriented “universalism” that comes down to us from Saint Paul. This is an excellent and potentially very influential argument. I do worry, though, about the programmatic way in which Wilson frames his project. Large and complex areas of critical debate are quickly swept aside: the turn to political theology is “inspired by a cult of the Catholic and Fascist jurist Carl Schmitt” and aims to “revive an old myth of Shakespeare as mystic monarchist” (p. 5); scholarship that views Shakespeare as a pluralist whose interest in religion is theatrical and imaginative rather than pointedly political is “bland Kantian critique” that idealizes “aesthetic closure and creative disinterest” (p. 7). The work that Wilson engages with must carefully (and most
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often) is his own. Still, Worldly Shakespeare is a bold and original work of literary criticism and anyone interested in Shakespeare, philosophy, and politics will do well to read it.

Kuzner’s Shakespeare as a Way of Life: Skeptical Practice and the Politics of Weakness is another intellectually ambitious book committed to delivering a far-reaching philosophical argument. The study is marked by a willingness to think alongside other critics and theorists while still staking out territory in which to make new claims. Kuzner shows us, in crystal-clear prose, how Shakespeare articulates a particular kind of skepticism—not one that questions knowledge or belief per se, but rather one that questions the capacity of the individual to engage successfully in the labor of knowledge acquisition all by themselves. Shakespeare, in other words, advances a kind of epistemological weakness, but he makes that weakness livable by representing knowledge as a form of social interaction. Shakespeare as a Way of Life is an intellectually invigorating study that takes the philosophical effects of the plays and poems seriously without losing sight of the fundamentally literary and dramatic mechanisms through which those effects are achieved.

RETHINKING BIOGRAPHY

I noted above that Hooks’s Selling Shakespeare proposes a compelling way to rethink the practice of Shakespearean biography. Other versions of this undertaking include The Shakespeare Circle: An Alternative Biography, edited by Paul Edmondson and Stanley Wells; Shakespeare and the Stuff of Life: Treasures from the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, edited by Delia Garratt and Tara Hamling; and The Year of Lear: Shakespeare in 1606, by James Shapiro.

Edmondson and Wells’s volume is premised on a rejection of the singularity and individualism that underpin conventional biography. A life is never a life apart. It’s always in and of the world. Accordingly, you won’t find a linear, birth-to-death narrative in The Shakespeare Circle. Instead, a group of twenty-six contributors discuss the many family members, friends, neighbors, colleagues, and patrons who cohabited Shakespeare’s personal and professional world, from his mother, father, and children, to his publisher, collaborators, patrons, and fellow actors. The volume features essays on John Shakespeare, Thomas Greene, Lady Elizabeth Barnard, the Mountjoys, the Burbages, John Fletcher, Middleton, and many others. Shakespeare exists in the spaces
in between. A similarly relational Shakespearean life emerges from Garratt and Hamling's *Shakespeare and the Stuff of Life*. In seven vividly illustrated chapters, which run from “Birth” and “Childhood” to “Professional Life” and “Older Age,” Shakespeare’s biography unfolds through a series of objects: books, chairs, beds, gloves, cloths, cauldrons, posset cups, and many other artifacts.

Shapiro’s *The Year of Lear* is an example of the microbiography that has become particularly popular over the last fifteen years. The book centers on 1606, a year in which Shakespeare worked on three major plays: *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*. It was a moment of creative transition for Shakespeare and cultural transition for Britain. Shapiro weaves those two stories together brilliantly. His careful political-historical research is sometimes supplemented with conjectural embellishments about Shakespeare’s life and temperament. But *The Year of Lear* never feels like scholarly fan fiction. Shapiro’s method seems to rest on a double-edged conviction that bringing a figure from the past to life requires imagination, but also that imagination should be firmly anchored to the archive. This is a tough balance to strike, but Shapiro accomplishes it.

Readers interested in Shakespearean biography will also enjoy Katherine Duncan-Jones’s beautifully illustrated *Portraits of Shakespeare*. Pitched for a broad readership, the book gives a thoroughly researched overview of what we know about the extant portraits of Shakespeare, including those that are currently disputed.

**THEATER HISTORIES: PEOPLE, PRACTICES, INSTITUTIONS**

The books addressed in this section consider material, institutional, and social aspects of playmaking and playgoing. Drawing on textual studies, book history, and the digital humanities, each of these studies practices an intellectually versatile theater history.

Richard Dutton’s much anticipated *Shakespeare, Court Dramatist* takes up one of the most basic and enduring questions in Shakespeare studies: why are there different versions of Shakespeare’s plays? There are a number of possible answers. Perhaps it’s because some texts were reconstructed from memory or patchy note taking. Perhaps it’s because some were pirated by unscrupulous publishers. Perhaps it’s because some represent shortened scripts used on tour outside of London. Or perhaps it’s because Shakespeare wrote longer, more literary versions of his plays in addition to those he wrote for performance. All of
these explanations have been offered over the years, but Dutton proposes something different: in a number of cases, he argues, Shakespeare’s plays were revised specifically for performance at Court. This argument runs counter not only to other textual schools of thought, but also, in a more general way, to a deeply entrenched desire, dating back at least to Alfred Harbage, to view Shakespeare primarily as a popular dramatist. Central to Dutton’s narrative is the figure of Edmund Tilney, Master of the Revels from 1579 to 1610, who was involved in establishing and coordinating “an élite group of court identified companies” (p. 21) for much of his working life. Dutton argues forcefully, and with careful attention to archival evidence, that Tilney was not just an administrator, but also a kind of theatrical impresario who had a hand in stage-managing and, in a sense, adapting Shakespeare’s plays for Court performance. No one knows more about the Master of the Revels than Dutton, but I predict that some scholars will query his boldest claims about the extent of Tilney’s influence on Shakespeare’s text. Of course, this is precisely the kind of debate a major book of this sort should trigger. Shakespeare, Court Dramatist is the work of a master scholar and merits careful attention from anyone interested in the history of English Renaissance drama.

In The Master of the Revels and Elizabeth I’s Court Theatre, W. R. Streitberger is interested in roughly the same concatenation of administration and creative forces that fascinate Dutton, but Streitberger’s book is less thesis driven than Dutton’s. Instead, he offers something closer to a narrative history of the Revels Office from Thomas Cawarden to Tilney, along with two very useful appendices that document Court entertainments and Revels officers. Throughout the book, Streitberger is locked into close conversation with E. K. Chambers whose still-influential account of the Revels Office and the offices of the Works and Wardrobe Streitberger sets out to revise point by point. This can make the book a bit laborious at times, but Streitberger’s work nevertheless represents a long-overdue historical intervention and one of the few up-to-date examinations of the pre-Tilney Revels Office we have.

In “Public” and “Private” Playhouses in Renaissance England: The Politics of Publication, Eoin Price considers why the term “private” suddenly starts being applied to a certain kind of commercial theater in the first decade of the seventeenth century, despite the fact that similar establishments existed in London since 1575. This is a simple but brilliant question (one that merits more than
the 95 pages of discussion afforded by the short-form Palgrave Pivot series in which the book appears). Price leads readers through a fascinating examination of printed plays and theater records to understand what changed in the economic and social landscape of early Jacobean drama to make “private” a potent term. Price’s slightly hectoring critique of “theoretical approaches,” which he oddly attributes primarily to Paul Yachnin, will grate on some readers. (The tone may be left over from a Ph.D. dissertation.) But it’s nevertheless clear from this short study that Price is an accomplished theater and book historian who asks probing questions and curates evidence elegantly. I very much look forward to reading more of his work.

Matthew Steggle has produced a remarkably original and informative book on ten Renaissance plays whose scripts have not survived: Digital Humanities and the Lost Drama of Early Modern England: Ten Case Studies. Steggle opens the book with two important reminders: first, all Renaissance plays are largely “lost” to the extent that we’re missing so much information pertaining to performance; and second, “lost plays” are not entirely lost, for we sometimes have their titles. With this established, Steggle turns to the titles of ten lost plays, and with the help of a variety of sophisticated digital resources, including chiefly EEBO-TCP, generates data that helps us surmise what those plays might have looked like, including how their plots unfolded and the kinds of characters they featured. The study is speculative, of course, but well informed and consistently methodologically self-aware. It’s an excellent example of how the digital humanities can dovetail in productive ways with traditional scholarly formats like the academic monograph, which in most institutions remains the primary currency for tenure and promotion bids.

Great Shakespeare Actors: Burbage to Branagh by Stanley Wells does exactly what it says on the tin. Aimed at a broad readership, the book offers short biographies of “great Shakespeare actors” from Shakespeare’s time to our own. Included among the chapters are figures we would expect to meet, such as Thomas Betterton, David Garrick, Sarah Siddons, Henry Irving, Ellen Terry, and Judi Dench, and others who might be less familiar to some readers, such as Dora Jordan and Donald Wolfit. Great Shakespeare Actors reads more like a series of encyclopedia entries than a monograph with a conceptual through-line. I don’t know if this is intentional, but in any case the book will very likely prove a helpful and entertaining resource for many.
It was a pleasure to see some work on private and occasional performance among this year’s books. Elizabeth Zeman Kolkovich’s *The Elizabethan Country House Entertainment: Print, Performance, and Gender* will establish itself as the authoritative study of this wonderfully peculiar performance practice. The three-legged thematic stool of print, performance, and gender situates Elizabethan country-house entertainments in an up-to-date critical frame and nicely counterpoints older studies that have tended to focus on mythography, sources, and Court micropolitics. Kolkovich’s analyses of the entertainments in print form, in my view, are the strongest sections of the book. With very little previous work done in this area, the new information Kolkovich presents about the functions and effects of printed entertainments—as collectables, as sources of rumor and gossip, as news—will be of interest to many early modernists.

Finally, theater historians—and other scholars of Renaissance drama, I’m sure—will get much use out of Richard Schoch’s impressive *Writing the History of the British Stage, 1660–1900*. Schoch’s book is the first study of English theater historiography from its origins in the 1660s to the twentieth century. Through careful discussions of a range of interesting texts and figures, he shows that before theater history was a modern academic discipline, with specialist training and empiricist methods, it was a largely amateur pursuit that included among its practitioners booksellers, bibliographers, antiquarians, journalists, and theater professionals. Early modernists will find especially helpful chapters on “Restoration Booksellers as Theatre Historians,” Edward Malone, and John Payne Collier.

**SPACE AND PLACE**

I received several books concerned in various ways with the importance of space and place to Renaissance drama.

Nina Levine’s *Practicing the City: Early Modern London on Stage* focuses on plays that represent boundary-crossing forms of urban sociality, instances of association and exchange that connect distinct neighborhoods, professions, and social milieus in London. These plays, Levine argues convincingly, model “new modes of urban belonging” (p. 2) for their diverse city audiences. In this respect, Levine’s book builds on excellent studies by scholars such as Jean Howard and Adam Zucker. She departs from this work by shifting attention away from specific institutions and locales to the social practices that work between them and
which contribute to the formation of an increasingly hybrid and complicated city.

In *This Orient Isle: Elizabethan England and the Islamic World*, Jerry Brotton situates Elizabethan drama within a global cultural imaginary. Queen Elizabeth’s 1570 excommunication by the Pope marked the beginning of a remarkable period of economic and political collaboration between England and the Islamic world. Brotton introduces readers to English merchants and adventurers who spent time in Persia, the Ottoman Empire, and the Moroccan Sultanate, and recounts a number of fascinating ambassadorial visits. The book is scholarly but accessibly written. It will appeal to both academic and nonacademic audiences.

Gavin Hollis’s *The Absence of America: The London Stage, 1576–1642* is a deft analysis of how London playing companies resisted the promotional zeal of the Virginia Company, either by marginalizing the New World or critiquing English colonial activities. Working with a range of plays and masques by Jonson, George Chapman, Philip Massinger, Shakespeare, Middleton, Dekker, and others, Hollis shows how playwrights interrogated the colonial project through ingenious spatial substitutions, frequently projecting elements of the New World into London itself. With close attention to the cultural and institutional geography of early modern London and an impressive command of the archive, *The Absence of America* stands out as one of the past year’s most critically sophisticated studies. This is the first title in the new Oxford University Press series Early Modern Literary Geographies, edited by Julie Sanders and Garrett A. Sullivan Jr. If Hollis’s book is any indication of what’s to come, the series will quickly establish itself as the home of our field’s most innovative scholarship on issues of space, place, and environment.

Finally, academics and nonacademics alike will be interested in Peter Whitfield’s lavishly illustrated *Mapping Shakespeare’s World*, which connects Shakespeare’s plays to various aspects of the early modern geographical imagination. The achievement of the book does not lie in its readings of the plays themselves (Whitfield doesn’t really attempt readings in the academic sense), but rather in the way the plays are juxtaposed with extraordinary archival documents, especially maps, that relate to the locales in which they are set (Greece, Rome, Venice, medieval Britain, and so on).
TIME, MEMORY, MEMORIALIZATION

Isabel Karremann’s new monograph, *The Drama of Memory in Shakespeare’s History Plays*, makes an original contribution to the study of memory and forgetting, a subject of scholarly interest since Frances Yates published *The Art of Memory* in 1966, but especially since the late ’90s and early 2000s when influential work on the topic appeared from Jonathan Baldo, Jonas Barish, Christopher Ivic and Grant Williams, and Garrett A. Sullivan Jr. Karremann shows how Shakespeare’s history plays contributed to the process of selective memorialization and strategic forgetting in the wake of the Reformation. One of the things that distinguishes Karremann’s book is her close engagement with performance studies, which allows her to link specific forms of memory to specific dramaturgical practices.

In *Monuments and Literary Posterity in Early Modern Drama*, Brian Chalk makes the simple but provocative assertion that playwrights wanted to be remembered. While much attention has been given to tropes of memorialization in lyric poetry, Chalk shows that playwrights like Marlowe, Jonson, John Webster, Shakespeare, and Fletcher also engaged with the objects and practices of cultural memory, revealing an abiding interest in the future of their plays.

J. K. Barret considers drama, poetry, and prose in her marvelous book, *Untold Futures: Time and Literary Culture in Renaissance England*. She argues that early modern literature “offers an important and largely unexamined archive for understanding the history of the future” (p. 4). The future meant many different things and operated at many different scales for early modern writers, but as Barret explains, it always ends up telling us something significant about how the present was viewed. Barret also explores the formal dimension of literary futurity, the way writing about what-comes-later requires, but also creates, certain grammatical, syntactical, and rhetorical structures. One of the many things that makes this book impressive is the fact that Barret is not just a skilled intellectual and literary historian, but also an expert close-reader. She manages to weave big ideas through the complex particularities of literary language without losing any of the latter’s nuance or energy.

LANGUAGE AND GESTURE ON STAGE

The first conclusion one will draw from John Kerrigan’s new book on “binding language” in Shakespeare is that there must
have been a lot of it. Clocking in at 622 pages, *Shakespeare’s Binding Language* addresses just about every oath, vow, promise, bond, gage, and contract in the canon. The book’s length won’t be easy on readers, but the significance of Kerrigan’s work—not just in terms of scale, but also in terms of depth of knowledge—can’t be denied. The study shows clearly that various forms of binding language not only connect Shakespeare’s plays to some of the most significant institutions, controversies, and events of the Renaissance, but also that such language is essential to understanding key structural elements of his dramaturgy.

Gary Watt’s *Shakespeare’s Acts of Will: Law, Testament, and Properties of Performance* shows how *will*—both the legal document and the volitional force—allows us to think about the conceptual and experiential links among theater, law, and public life. It’s a fiercely intelligent but nimbly written book that maintains a spirit of intellectual generosity throughout. Watt is interested both in the way words express will in Shakespeare’s late-Elizabethan plays (the period during which a last will and testament is often used as a plotting device) and in the way the performance of will on stage connects to cultural practices of witnessing outside the theater. Both onstage and off, testamentary language—the language that expresses volitional will and formalizes legal wills—is a primary concern for Watt. As he writes in his introduction, “In theater, the language of the play performs a sort of magic as it passes from the world of the stage to the world of the playgoers. In law, so-called ‘operative words’ (such as ‘I agree,’ ‘I declare,’ and ‘I swear’) have a comparable capacity to move people from one state of social being to another” (p. 5).

Farah Karim-Cooper’s *The Hand on the Shakespearean Stage: Gesture, Touch, and the Spectacle of Dismemberment* combines its author’s expert knowledge of early modern performance with new research on the cultural history of gesture to deliver a ground-breaking account of the emotional, psychological, and social work carried out by the hand on stage. I was especially struck by the thorough cultural-historical taxonomy of the hand in chapter 1, which will be of interest to anyone working on emotion, sensation, the history of the body, or historical phenomenology. I also found uniquely instructive the way Karim-Cooper cites the living, embodied evidence provided by performances at the reconstructed Globe Theatre and the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse. This will be a useful reminder to many readers of the special status these venues have as “research theaters,” and of the important work carried out by Globe Education where Karim-Cooper serves as Head of Higher Education and Research.
INWARDNESS AND PRIVACY

Ronald Huebert’s impressive book, *Privacy in the Age of Shakespeare*, offers a welcome counterweight to the many studies (recent and forthcoming) on various aspects of publicity, sociality, and material embeddedness in the Renaissance. Huebert builds on Katharine Eisaman Maus’s seminal study of inwardness in English Renaissance drama, but he distinguishes his project in two important ways. First, Huebert’s range of reference, both historical and generic, is notably broad and this will make his study of consequence for just about anyone working in early modern studies. What Huebert calls “the age of Shakespeare” actually stretches at least 150 years, from Thomas More to Milton, and he discusses drama, poetry, prose fiction, devotional work, commonplaces, and many other kinds of writing. Second, Huebert is careful to distinguish privacy from interiority, though he discusses the connections between the two when relevant. For Huebert, privacy refers to both a physical and a social state, one in which an individual has some degree of control over who does and who does not have access to their person. This concept, Huebert shows, was fully available to early modern men and women and designated an increasingly important category of experience.

Donald Beecher’s book, *Adapted Brains and Imaginary Worlds: Cognitive Science and the Literature of the Renaissance*, joins a well-respected body of work on cognition in our field. One of the things that makes Beecher’s study different is its investment in evolutionary psychology. Beecher argues that selfhood is an expression of a genetically hardwired neural system and that we should think of “the selves of literature in relation to the selves of reality,” as iterations of a “purpose-designed” brain as old as homo sapiens (p. 5). This will be a hard pill to swallow for many early modernists, both because it conflates literary characters and real human beings and because it largely disregards the cultural and material contexts that also shape both character and selfhood.

REASSESSING TRAGEDY

One of this year’s greatest scholarly achievements, in my view, is Blair Hoxby’s *What Was Tragedy?: Theory and the Early Modern Canon*. Combining literary and intellectual history, philosophy, and formal analysis, Hoxby recovers a largely lost early modern poetics of tragedy. As he explains, most of what we know of tragedy finds its origin in the work of German idealist philosophy
produced in the wake of the French Revolution and under the influence of Immanuel Kant. These writers—including Friedrich Schiller, Friedrich Schelling, and G. W. F. Hegel—have left an indelible mark on our notion of the tragic, even though their ideas developed comparatively late in the history of tragedy and under particular historical conditions. With an extraordinary range of reference—from antiquity to modernity and across Latin, Greek, French, German, Italian, and English literary and philosophical traditions—Hoxby invites us to reencounter early modern tragedy unencumbered by the distorting assumptions that we often don’t realize come down to us from German idealism. One reason A. C. Bradley and so many other scholars after him struggle with King Lear, for example, is because he reads “through the lens of Hegel” who didn’t appreciate the important philosophical role afforded to scenes of passive suffering in sixteenth-century theories of tragedy. For post-Kantian philosophers, as for Bradley, “mere suffering ... can never be tragic, no matter how painful it may be to watch. Early modern critics had no such compunction” (p. 10). What Was Tragedy? has many implications not just for how we understand tragedy in our period, but also for how we conceive of early modern selfhood, how we understand the history of emotions, and how we go about the business of literary periodization. It’s a major piece of scholarship.

Richard van Oort’s Shakespeare’s Big Men: Tragedy and the Problem of Resentment is a study that, like Beecher’s (discussed in the previous section), turns to unconventional material in order to find new ways to make sense of Renaissance literature. I think van Oort does so more successfully than Beecher and in a way that will engage a larger cross section of early modernists. Specifically, van Oort turns to generative anthropology’s theory of the origins of human society to find a more socially attuned language for discussing Shakespeare’s tragic heroes. Generative anthropology teaches that societies defer the resentment they feel for the “big men” who run things in order to (a) build a sense of community, and (b) use that community as a source of resistance once the “big men” are finally repudiated. What makes van Oort’s argument work is that he is not simply trying to fit Renaissance tragedy into a generative-anthropology shaped box. Instead, and much more instructively, he’s trying to use the concepts of generative anthropology to understand the social function of tragic form in the Renaissance.

Allyna E. Ward’s Women and Tudor Tragedy: Feminizing Counsel and Representing Gender traces the relationship between the
rhetoric of monarchy and the place of women in English society with a particular focus on the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Lots of groundbreaking work was produced on gender and politics in the 1980s, '90s, and early 2000s, frequently with Queen Elizabeth as the centerpiece. It would have been helpful if Ward had differentiated her project more clearly from this seminal body of scholarship. All the same, readers will find useful some of Ward's sustained readings of neglected Tudor plays, including a cogently argued chapter on early English translations of Senecan tragedies.

DRAMATIC SOURCES AND TRADITIONS

Charlotte Artese's *Shakespeare's Folktale Sources* is set to become the go-to study for anyone interested in how Shakespeare put folktales to use in his plays. Artese has done extensive research in English, French, and German archives many of us would not be very adept at navigating. The landscape of folk influence was complicated and uneven, with tales circulating in multiple versions and multiple languages, and being transmitted both textually and orally. Although Artese's study focuses on Shakespeare, she displays a solid knowledge of Renaissance drama more broadly. Each chapter concludes with a bibliography of different versions of the folktales under consideration, an especially valuable feature of the book that will establish a framework for future scholarship.

Charlotte Steenbrugge's *Staging Vice: A Study of Dramatic Traditions in Medieval and Sixteenth-Century England and the Low Countries* is part of a groundswell of work on Tudor drama this year. This includes Ward's *Women and Tudor Tragedy*, already discussed, and Greg Walker's *The Oxford Anthology of Tudor Drama*, about which I'll comment later. Steenbrugge's study takes a comparative approach, placing English Vice figures alongside the Dutch *sinneken*. We certainly need more comparative work in our field, but I wish a more compelling case had been made for the critical payoffs of looking at the English and Dutch traditions together. Steenbrugge does comment on the political and economic links between England and the Low Countries and suggests some literary influence at work in both directions, but more often than not the analyses of the two traditions are simply juxtaposed without any specifically comparativist claims being made. Nonetheless, Steenbrugge does a good job linking the respective vice traditions to aspects of cultural history and evolving theatrical practices.
Peter Mack’s *Reading and Rhetoric in Montaigne and Shakespeare*, another comparative study, does our field a great service by providing a concise and accessible description of how the two most famous authors of the European Renaissance brought their training in rhetoric to bear on the composition of plays and essays. Rhetoric is arguably the single most important intellectual context for understanding the practices associated with literary invention in the period. But it’s also the easiest to ignore since it can be discouragingly obscure and technical. Mack’s book will introduce Renaissance rhetoric to a new generation of undergraduate and graduate students in both English and French departments.

**NEW METHODS, NEW FORMS**

In this section, I consider several books that take up deliberately experimental or methodologically creative projects. This will also give me an opportunity to comment briefly on particular publishers and book series that are energizing our field.

Craig Dionne’s *Posthuman Lear: Reading Shakespeare in the Anthropocene* is published by Punctum Books, the brainchild of the indefatigable Eileen Joy. Punctum has been at the forefront of experimental criticism in medieval and Renaissance studies for the last several years and *Posthuman Lear* makes a worthy addition to its lists. “Part scholarship, part journalism, part ecological screed,” Dionne’s method is basically that he doesn’t have one. Instead he considers anything and everything whenever it seems suitable. He uses “examples from Japan, New Mexico, Finland, India, all the while jumping back to Shakespeare’s early modern England” (p. 15). In lesser hands, this would be a disaster. But Dionne pulls it off, mostly because he’s a good writer and has a uniquely capacious and disciplined intellect. He has also managed to find in *King Lear* a philosophy of what it means to be human that is both coherent and strange enough to anchor what would otherwise be scattered musings. The book is a testament to the critical payoffs of intellectual drift.

Something similar can be said of R. M. Christofides’ *Othello’s Secret: The Cyprus Problem*, which appears in the Shakespeare Now! series, edited by Ewan Fernie and Simon Palfrey. The book combines literary scholarship, political criticism, and personal memoir to re-present *Othello* as a play about Cyprus, not Venice. In particular, Christofides shows how *Othello* stages a form of political agonism that’s still at the heart of the island’s present-day struggles. The book is animated chiefly not by its literary-critical
intuitions, but rather by the way in which the author manages to tell a personal story through the imaginative raw materials of Shakespeare’s play.

Drawing new stories out of Shakespeare’s old ones is central to Fernie and Palfrey’s coauthored book, *Macbeth, Macbeth*, a novel that is both a sequel to and reflection on Shakespeare’s play. The novel occupies the imaginative world of *Macbeth*, but it also gives voice to its silences and form to its shadows. That is to say, *Macbeth, Macbeth* draws a new world out of the world Shakespeare presents to us and in doing so offers a distinctive way to reflect on the moral and emotional demands of the original play. I’m not sure who the audience for this book will be, but it’s certainly thrilling to read and it’s clearly the creation of two powerful intellects. *Macbeth, Macbeth* is the first volume in a new series titled Beyond Criticism, published by Bloomsbury, which promises to rethink critical practice at both a conceptual and formal level.

Gabriel Josipovici’s “*Hamlet*: Fold on Fold represents the best version of a kind of writing scholars rarely spend a lot of time with: learned but nonacademic, critical but nonmethodological. The book is neither historical nor theoretical, but rather than speaking to no one, it ends up speaking to everyone—or at least to anyone who has ever studied, taught, or performed *Hamlet*. Josipovici’s book takes the play one scene at a time (each scene gets a chapter) in order to gradually demonstrate the mismatch between *Hamlet* and our most basic critical instinct: the compulsion to interpret. Josipovici makes the case that *Hamlet*, by design, does not invite the reader or viewer in to pluck out the heart of its mystery. On the contrary, the play is committed to sustained uncertainty. It’s built to impart incremental knowledge and to encourage thinking rather than understanding. Josipovici writes from a decidedly modern perspective and with the sensibility of a practicing playwright and novelist. What he achieves—always in fluid, jargon-free prose—is a piece of criticism that transforms *Hamlet* from a problem to be solved into a process to be experienced.

Anyone in our field who values both creativity and academic rigor has probably drawn inspiration from Bruce R. Smith, a scholar whose critical practice has for decades been defined by the combination of inventiveness and exactitude. His new book, *Shakespeare Cut: Rethinking Cutwork in an Age of Distraction*, is very much in this vein. As always, Smith doesn’t contribute to subfields, he invents his own. In *Shakespeare Cut* he notes that in any of its several meanings, “cutting” always involves some
configuration of persons and objects moving through space and time. With this established, Smith wonders how the concept of “cutting” might, therefore, provide a new way to talk about the physics, psychology, and phenomenology of Shakespearean text and performance. Addressing cuts to Shakespeare’s texts (material that gets excised for performance), cuts in Shakespeare’s texts (the disposition of lines and scene breaks), cuts from Shakespeare’s texts (quotations and characters that enjoy a cultural life independent of the plays from which they’re drawn), and cuts with Shakespeare’s texts (the kind of creative collaboration that takes place between the Renaissance playwright and modern artists), Smith shows how cutting constitutes a new hermeneutic for describing the complex crossings of Shakespeare’s textual, performative, and cultural lives.

I conclude this section with one of the most anticipated books of the year: Jeffrey Masten’s *Queer Philologies: Sex, Language, and Affect in Shakespeare’s Time*. A large-format, wonderfully illustrated book that runs to almost 400 pages, this major study is the result of persistent intellectual risk-taking and careful thinking about the relations among queer theory, philology, historical linguistics, book history, and early modern literary studies. Masten calls for a renewed historical philology as a way to map out both the familiarity and alterity of early modern understandings of the bodies, acts, affects, and pleasures that comprise what we would now call sexual identity. This “philology of the queer” involves attending to the etymologies, transformations, and even orthographies of certain keywords—queue, tail, conversation, intercourse, fundament, foundation, mongrel, tup, bumbast, and many others—that structure the experience of sex, gender, and desire. Ranging from Foucauldian theory to textual editing and from Indo-European language families to Charles Hinman’s collator machine, *Queer Philologies* embodies two of the characteristics I have come to admire most in literary scholarship: a commitment to methodological pluralism and a capacity to be both creative and scholarly.

**ESSAY COLLECTIONS**

This section overviews the majority of edited collections I received, though a small number have been included in other sections. I begin with three large volumes from Oxford University Press, two from the Oxford Handbooks series and one from the Oxford Twenty-First Century Approaches to Literature series.
The Oxford Handbook of Shakespearean Tragedy, edited by Michael Neill and David Schalkwyk, is an enormous volume containing a whopping fifty-four essays and there’s hardly a weak link. What I particularly appreciate about this collection is the editors’ commitment to accommodating a range of approaches to tragedy. Within the volume’s pages, readers will find philosophical essays by Paul Kottman and Tzachi Zamir; essays on textual issues, including digital approaches, by Paul Werstine, Michael Witmore, Jonathan Hope, and Michael Gleicher; essays on performance by Tiffany Stern and Peter Holland; essays on screen adaptation by Sujata Iyengar and Katherine Rowe; and a variety of reflections on Shakespearean tragedy in a global context by Avraham Oz, Alexa Huang, and others.

Valerie Traub’s much-anticipated The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Embodiment: Gender, Sexuality, and Race is out as well. On first encounter, the volume may feel disorienting: the reader moves from a title which promises a focus on “embodiment,” to a table of contents that features a section on “The Lives of William Shakespeare,” to an introduction that opens by locating the collection’s origins in a request to edit “a feminist volume on gender” (p. 1). But as Traub’s erudite opening chapter makes clear, “embodiment” is a conceptual rubric under which the volume’s forty-three contributors can trace a feminism whose theoretical and historical concerns intersect with other identity-based critical approaches such as queer theory, critical race theory, disability studies, animal studies, and postcolonial studies, as well as historical phenomenology and the new materialism. As this suggests, the volume makes a particularly urgent and timely contribution to our field.

Early Modern Theatricality, edited by Henry S. Turner, serves not only as a nuanced state-of-the-field publication, but also—and more importantly—as a map of where we might go next if we’re willing to put the tools of theater history, performance studies, and critical theory into conversation. Turner chooses the term “theatricality” (rather than theater, drama, or performance) to capture more accurately the assemblage of material conditions, cognitive and sensory experiences, and spatial practices that together make the event of a play. Comprised of twenty-nine carefully curated keyword essays on topics such as “Scene,” “Skill,” “Off-Stage,” “Hospitality,” “Optics,” “Mobility,” and “Occasion,” Early Modern Theatricality advances a form of critical inquiry that is both historically meticulous and theoretically sophisticated.
Several edited collections I received challenge the Anglocentric focus of Shakespeare and Renaissance drama studies. *1616: Shakespeare and Tang Xianzu’s China*, edited by Tian Yuan Tan, Paul Edmondson, and Shih-pe Wang, considers the death of Shakespeare and the death of the famous Chinese playwright Tang Xianzu, both in 1616, as parallel literary-historical events. *Multilingualism in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, edited by Dirk Delabastita and Ton Hoenselaars, explores Renaissance drama’s obsession with foreign tongues, English dialects, and issues of translation. Employing a range of historical, linguistic, and semantic approaches, the volume’s international team of scholars has produced an admirably coherent set of essays that challenge conventional assumptions about the Englishness of English Renaissance theater. *Shakespeare in Cold War Europe: Conflict, Commemoration, Celebration*, edited by Erica Sheen and Karremann, is part of Alexa Huang’s Global Shakespeares series with Palgrave Pivot. It features eight short (10–15 page) essays that reflect on the challenge of talking about the cultural affordances of Shakespeare’s plays in political contexts where the very term “culture” is problematic. *Renaissance Shakespeare: Shakespeare Renaissances*, edited by Martin Procházka, Michael Dobson, Höfele, and Hanna Scolnicov, is a conference-proceedings volume that contains about forty contributions to the ninth World Shakespeare Congress that took place in Prague in 2011. It’s not thematically anchored—with sections on “Interpretations,” “Performance,” “Contexts,” “ Appropriations,” and “Adaptations” it covers just about everything—but it does give a useful snapshot of the state of Shakespeare studies across six continents.

Another volume that developed out of conference proceedings is *Shakespeare Expressed: Page, Stage, and Classroom in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, edited by Kathryn M. Moncrief, Kathryn R. McPherson, and Sarah Enloe, which draws on papers originally presented at the sixth Blackfriars Conference at the American Shakespeare Center in 2011. The volume is tightly focused and distinctive for the way it brings together teachers and theater practitioners to think about language and performance. It’s one of those rare volumes that will be of interest to actors and directors as well as academics. Another collection poised at the intersection of theatrical practice and historical scholarship is the Stanley Wells anthology, *Shakespeare on Page and Stage: Selected Essays*, edited by Edmondson. As Margreta de Grazia puts it in her afterword, “Has there ever been a textual scholar more enamored of the theatre than Stanley Wells?” (p. 449). The
essays in this collection exhibit Wells’s extraordinary critical range, as well as his characteristic clarity, wisdom, and wit.

Joseph Candido has edited a collection of essays in honor of Charles R. Forker called *The Text, the Play, and the Globe: Essays on Literary Influence in Shakespeare’s World and His Work*, which includes thirteen contributions by eminent scholars such as Rebecca Bushnell, S. P. Cerasano, Leeds Barroll, and Lois Potter. Many topics are covered, but the aim of the volume as a whole is to create a space of methodological overlap among theater-historical, textual, and cultural-historical approaches. Stephen Booth’s *Close Reading without Readings: Essays on Shakespeare and Others* falls somewhere between an edited collection and a monograph. Overseen by the Director of Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, Harry Keyishian, the volume contains thirteen essays on Renaissance drama and poetry, seven of which appear for the first time, the other six of which were published between 1969 and 2010. All the essays display Booth’s trademark (and almost always revelatory) approach to literary texts, which involves showing how poetry works rather than establishing what it means. I also received volume 29 of the annual journal *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, which maintains its high standard of scholarship with eight essays on matters ranging from dumb shows (Leslie Thomson), to friendship (Maurice A. Hunt), to slavery (Matthieu Chapman), and including readings of rare plays such as *The Laws of Candy* (Marina Tarlinskaja) and the lost play *Pythagoras* (Todd A. Borlik).

**SHAKESPEARE 400: COMMEMORATIONS, CELEBRATIONS, EXHIBITIONS**

A number of books I received were published to coincide with the 400th anniversary of the death of Shakespeare. These range from Margaret Willes’s *A Shakespearean Botanical*, which pairs sixteenth-century illustrations of plants with relevant lines from the plays; to a special issue of *Shakespeare Studies*, the journal of the Shakespeare Society of Japan; to a reissue of Oxford University Press’s 1916 *A Book of Homage to Shakespeare*, edited by Israel Gollancz, which was published to mark the tercentenary of Shakespeare’s death and which includes an intriguing collection of eulogies and commentaries by Thomas Hardy, Rudyard Kipling, Henri Bergson, Maurice Maeterlinck, and many others.

Two edited collections respond to the quatercentenary by considering the history of Shakespearean commemoration. *Celebrat-
ing Shakespeare: Commemoration and Cultural Memory, edited by Clara Calvo and Coppélia Kahn, includes fifteen essays that discuss a broad spectrum of events. We see how Shakespeare was celebrated in the context of the American Civil War, World War I, and the 1916 Easter Rising, in locales ranging from Australia to India and from Northwestern University to the Vatican. Shakespeare Jubilees: 1769–2014, edited by Christa Jansohn and Dieter Mehl, undertakes a similar, though more narrowly defined, project, focusing specifically on Shakespeare jubilees. There are a number of standout essays in this collection, including Katherine Scheil’s on Shakespeare clubs in America and John Cunningham’s on the music composed for the 1864 Stratford Tercentenary.

Other books I received celebrate Shakespeare’s legacy through critical reflections on his plays and poems. John O’Meara’s Remembering Shakespeare: The Scope of His Achievement from “Hamlet” through “The Tempest” is a somber and slightly misty-eyed meditation on Shakespearean genius. Shakespeare’s Creative Legacies: Artists, Writers, Performers, Readers, edited by Edmondson and Peter Holbrook, combines a series of short introductory essays on Shakespeare’s afterlives in film, poetry, fiction, music, and dance by scholars such as Tom Bishop, Penny Gay, and Sukanta Chaudhuri, with reflections on Shakespeare by practicing artists such as John Ashbery, Wendy Cope, Yuki Ninagawa, and Janet Suzman. The volume is an excellent example of the kind of insight, and pleasure, that can be generated when scholars and artists think together.

Shakespeare’s Dead, by Palfrey and Emma Smith, accompanies an exhibition of the same name that ran at the Bodleian Library in 2016. The book marks the death of Shakespeare by exploring what Palfrey and Smith describe as the extraordinary life in Shakespearean death. The book, aimed at a broad readership, is illustrated with high-quality images of texts, paintings, and artifacts connected to the early modern culture of death. Short chapters on topics such as plague, places of death, and death and sex are written in lively prose and balance carefully between cultural history and literary criticism.

EDITIONS OF PLAYS

I received eleven new editions, the majority of which are of plays by Shakespeare.
The Arden Shakespeare, third series, continues to produce carefully prepared and generously annotated and introduced critical editions. James C. Bulman’s edition of Shakespeare’s *King Henry IV, Part Two* includes an extremely informative introduction which breathes new life into this often-neglected play. Bulman expertly navigates the difficult textual terrain—neither the Quarto (which appeared in two issues) nor the Folio provides a fully authoritative copy text—explaining the rationale for his decisions in a detailed but accessible appendix. A revised edition of the Arden 3 *Othello*, edited by E. A. J. Honigmann, has been published with a new introduction by Ayanna Thompson. Scholars and students alike will appreciate Thompson’s reframing of the play in terms of the most current scholarly debates about genre, race, and sexuality, as well as her thorough and up-to-date account of the play’s stage history. Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor’s revised edition of *Hamlet* presents the text of the 1604–05 Second Quarto. (*Hamlet: The Texts of 1603 and 1623* was published as a separate volume in 2007.) The editors’ 168 pages of introduction and 103 pages worth of appendices provide an unprecedented level of contextualization on matters cultural, textual, and theatrical. Claire McEachern’s revised edition of *Much Ado about Nothing* updates the original introductory material with incisive discussions of gender dynamics, formal and structural characteristics, and stage history.

I also received four volumes from the New Kittredge Shakespeare series: *Cymbeline*, edited by Hannah C. Wojciechowski; *King John and Henry VIII*, edited by James H. Lake, Courteney Lehmann, and Jane Wells; *King Henry the Sixth: Parts I, II, and III*, edited by Annalisa Castaldo; and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, edited by Jane Wells. Aimed at middle-school and high-school readers, these volumes include class discussion topics and an annotated bibliography.

One of the great achievements in editing this year is Greg Walker’s *The Oxford Anthology of Tudor Drama*, a collection of sixteen freshly edited plays and entertainments, from the York Pageant of *The Fall of the Angels* and Henry Medwall’s *Fulgens and Lucrece*, to Nicholas Udall’s *Respublica* and Thomas Preston’s *Cambises*. It also includes examples of more familiar commercial drama by Marlowe, Thomas Kyd, and Shakespeare. Conceived as a companion to *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama*, which appeared in paperback in 2015, the *Anthology* emphasizes the extraordinary variety of Tudor performance culture and challenges received evolutionary narratives that move from old-fashioned to
modern or religious to secular. The collection makes a number of previously difficult-to-access plays readily available for scholars and will likely change the way we teach English Renaissance drama, too.

Richard Dutton and Steven K. Galbraith have published an edition of Thomas Drue’s *The Duchess of Suffolk*, an intriguing play performed in 1623/24 at the rebuilt Fortune Theater by the Palsgrave’s Men. Retelling the story of Katherine Willoughby (1519–80), who would become a Protestant martyr figure in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, the play is particularly interesting for its oblique commentary on religious-political events on the Continent in the early 1620s. This edition is the first title in a new Early Modern Drama Texts series published by Ohio State University Press and overseen by Dutton and Galbraith. The series will put scholarly editions of a range of lesser-known plays into circulation.

Finally, Matthew R. Martin has prepared a solid undergraduate-level edition of Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine the Great: Part One and Part Two* for Broadview Press. In addition to a comprehensive introduction, Martin provides appendices that include a selection of documents concerning early modern perceptions of Islam and the East.

**REFERENCE WORKS**

I received four new reference works (one older one now in paperback will be mentioned in a separate section). Three of these four books focus on Shakespeare.

Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin’s *Shakespeare’s Insults: A Pragmatic Dictionary*, part of the Arden Shakespeare Dictionaries series edited by Sandra Clark, is organized alphabetically and includes indexes of both works and characters. It’s thorough and easy to use. It’s also entertaining. *The Globe Guide to Shakespeare* by Andrew Dickson is an especially useful resource for theatergoers and for scholars and students interested in performance. While some of the contextual and biographical information it presents can easily be found in other places, the volume distinguishes itself by providing a detailed and globally aware stage and screen history for all thirty-nine plays. The second edition of *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*, edited by Michael Dobson and Stanley Wells, and revised by Will Sharpe and Erin Sullivan, is arranged a bit like a one-volume encyclopedia. The book begins with a 220-page section of alphabetically organized thematic entries on topics
ranging from the “Bible” and “Cockpit theatre” to “foreign words” and “Jan Kott.” This is followed by longer entries on individual plays and poems that include, among other things, a synopsis, textual information, information on sources, a critical history, and a stage history. The Companion is a neatly prepared one-stop shop for a wealth of basic information about Shakespeare’s works, then and now.

Frederick Kiefer has published an almost 1,000-page reference volume on *English Drama from “Everyman” to 1660: Performance and Print*. The book offers scholars of Renaissance drama ease of access to information that is usually spread across several different print and web-based resources, such as basic historical context, early texts, and first performances. The volume would stand to make a greater impact if it offered a clearer statement of what new information it was providing or what new research it was enabling. I also worry that in the absence of a searchable web-based component, or even an index, it won’t accommodate the kind of sophisticated cross-referencing that many book and theater historians have grown accustomed to.

GUIDES AND INTRODUCTIONS

The academic book market in our field is saturated with guides and introductions of various sorts, many published by Bloomsbury. Here I comment briefly on some key texts and series.

I received five volumes from Bloomsbury’s Arden Early Modern Drama Guides series, edited by Andrew Hiscock and Lisa Hopkins. These include “*Hamlet*: A Critical Reader”, edited by Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor; “*Romeo and Juliet*: A Critical Reader”, edited by Julia Reinhard Lupton; “*Julius Caesar*: A Critical Reader”, edited by Andrew James Hartley; “*The Spanish Tragedy*: A Critical Reader”, edited by Thomas Rist; and “*The Revenger’s Tragedy*: A Critical Reader”, edited by Brian Walsh. I’m very impressed with this series. I think its success lies in part in the general editors’ wise selection of volume editors who are both intellectually open-minded and capable of assembling strong, diverse teams of contributors. (Lupton’s volume on *Romeo and Juliet* is exemplary in this regard.) Each volume includes essays on the critical and performance history of the play under consideration, a “keynote essay” on current critical approaches, and a selection of new essays that put some of these approaches into practice. Volumes conclude with a survey of resources for teaching and research that are more useful than one might assume.
The “Resources” chapter in Thompson and Taylor’s volume on *Hamlet*, for example, includes a list of all modern editions of the play with a brief description of the copy text used and editorial approach taken.

Virginia Mason Vaughan’s “Antony and Cleopatra”: *Language and Writing* is a new volume in Bloomsbury’s Arden Student Skills: Language and Writing series, edited by Dympna Callaghan. Like the other books in the series, Vaughan’s is devoted to empowering undergraduate students to appreciate the distinctiveness of Shakespeare’s language. The volume closes with a very helpful chapter on how to research, plan, and write an essay on *Antony and Cleopatra*.

*Teaching Shakespeare with Purpose: A Student-Centred Approach*, by Ayanna Thompson and Laura Turchi, is the product of a unique collaboration between a major Shakespeare scholar (Thompson) and an education specialist (Turchi). Written especially for teachers of high-school students and college underclassmen, Thompson and Turchi describe techniques for moving us away from teacher-centered historical expertise toward a collaborative and participatory model of learning that puts Shakespearean language and performance at the center of the classroom experience. There’s a big difference between books on teaching by people who actually teach and those by pedagogues who haven’t been in a high school or college freshman classroom for twenty years. *Teaching Shakespeare with Purpose* is a particularly strong example of the first kind of book. It’s innovative, practical, and generous; I hope it will be read widely and put to use.

*Shakespeare and Early Modern Drama: Text and Performance*, by Pamela Bickley and Jenny Stevens, is another introductory volume aimed at undergraduates. It sets itself apart by pairing some of Shakespeare’s most frequently taught plays with plays by other Renaissance dramatists under themed chapter headings. For example, a chapter called “Defining the Self” has sections on *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Duchess of Malfi*; a chapter called “Money and the Modern City” has sections on *The Merchant of Venice* and *Volpone*. I’m not sure how a student would actually go about using this book, unless they were taking a course built very much on the themed model it offers. Nevertheless, I commend the authors for trying to return Shakespeare to the theatrical milieu in which he worked.

Finally, Bart van Es’s *Shakespeare’s Comedies: A Very Short Introduction* can be read in two or three sittings and still manages to be remarkably comprehensive. Aimed at a general readership,
the slim volume is nonetheless carefully researched and full of original ideas and connections.

NEW IN PAPERBACK

I received several books that are newly available in paperback editions. As most of these will have been addressed in previous “Recent Studies” essays, I offer only very brief comments here.

The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama, edited by Thomas Betteridge and Greg Walker and first published in 2012, provides an exhaustive overview of a period of Renaissance drama that many of us probably know less about than we’d care to admit. Covering the period from 1485 to 1603, the volume includes thirty-eight essays on religious drama; interludes and comedies; entertainments, masques, and royal entries; and histories and political dramas. Lynn Enterline’s Shakespeare’s Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion, first published in 2012, is an erudite study of how the linguistic, performative, and affective dimensions of Renaissance pedagogy shaped Shakespeare’s imagination. Nick Davis’s Early Modern Writing and the Privatization of Experience, first published in 2013, traces a shift from communal to individual experience in early modern literature and drama.

It’s great to have Stuart Gillespie’s Shakespeare’s Books: A Dictionary of Shakespeare Sources, first published in 2001, out in paperback. Shakespeare’s Books is a terrific resource not just for source study, but also for the broader study of Shakespeare’s intellectual contexts. The Cambridge History of British Theatre, Volume 1: Origins to 1660, edited by Jane Milling and Peter Thomson and first published in 2004, is, despite its title, heavily weighted toward the Renaissance. Essays by Martin Butler and Janet Clare, which address the less frequently examined period from 1642 to 1660, are especially valuable. The release of the paperback edition of Julia Thomas’s Shakespeare’s Shrine: The Bard’s Birthplace and the Invention of Stratford-upon-Avon, first published in 2012, is nicely timed to coincide with the publication of other books on Shakespearean commemoration linked with the quatercentenary (discussed earlier). Shakespeare’s Shrine tells the story of the nineteenth-century creation of Shakespeare’s Birthplace in Stratford-upon-Avon.

Finally, Zed Books has released in paperback two studies of Shakespeare by the British historian Victor Kiernan: Shakespeare: Poet and Citizen, first published in 1993, and Eight Tragedies of Shakespeare, first published in 1996. Like Christopher Hill, E.
P. Thompson, and Eric Hobsbawm, Victor Kiernan is a member of that highly influential generation of British historians who came to prominence in the 1960s and '70s. A committed Marxist, Kiernan writes with passion and precision on the social and economic contexts of Shakespeare’s plays.

CONCLUSION

My only concern when I agreed to do this essay was that I might come away from the experience feeling cynical about our field: too much derivative work, too much tedious positioning, too many exploitative presses producing $100 books they’ll never bother to get reviewed, too much Shakespeare.

I encountered all of this, but in the end it was overshadowed by all that is genuinely impressive about contemporary early modern studies: the rigor and detail with which the most serious historical criticism is practiced; the commitment to collaborative inquiry that informs the best essay collections; and the creativity and intellectual risk-taking that characterizes more and more of the books and book series devoted to English Renaissance drama. I was also heartened to see, at least among some of the strongest studies I received, a drift toward what I’d describe as critical nonpartisanship, or intellectual pluralism; a willingness, that is, to combine disparate methodologies, both historical and nonhistorical, in order to pose more complex questions and arrive at more nuanced insights. If nothing else, this means we belong to a community of scholars who are getting better and better at listening to one another. And in academia, as in the world beyond, that’s cause for optimism indeed.

Kevin Curran is Professor of Early Modern Literature at the University of Lausanne in Switzerland. He is the author of Shakespeare’s Legal Ecologies: Law and Distributed Selfhood (2017) and Marriage, Performance, and Politics at the Jacobean Court (2009), and the editor of Shakespeare and Judgment (2016). Curran edits the books series Edinburgh Critical Studies in Shakespeare and Philosophy and is founding director of the Lausanne Shakespeare Festival.
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