Preface to the second edition

Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist, first published by Cambridge University Press in 2003, argues that Shakespeare wrote his plays not only with performance but also with a readerly reception in mind.[1] It contends that Shakespeare and his company, around the turn of the seventeenth century, had a policy of having his plays published, that Shakespeare wrote long play texts of which he knew considerable portions would not be performed but would be available to his readers, and that those plays of which short and long versions are extant – notably *Hamlet*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Henry V* – reflect (in admittedly opaque ways) the two media for which Shakespeare conceived his plays, the stage and the page.

Appearing at a time when performance criticism had acquired importance in Shakespeare studies and when the view of Shakespeare as a "man of the theater" was prominent, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* offered a reconsideration of Shakespeare's authorial status. The monograph attracted attention, some of it positive and some of it skeptical or even hostile. Reviewers wrote that it "sets out probably the most exhilarating change in our image of Shakespeare as a writer for decades" (Peter Holland), "achieves nothing less than the complete undoing of our understanding of Shakespeare as author" (Dympna Callaghan), will "certainly change our future discourse about dramatic texts and about Shakespeare" (Richard Knowles), and is perhaps "one of those rare books that changes how Shakespeare is perceived and edited" (Colin Burrow).[2] No less significantly, others have passionately

[1] I am grateful to Patrick Cheney and Richard Waswo for their feedback to earlier versions of this Preface and to Leigh Mueller and Christina Sarigiannidou at Cambridge University Press for their help in preparing this second edition for publication.

[2] Holland, "Review," 5 (this review appeared in a Norwegian translation, and I am grateful to Peter Holland for sharing with me the English original, from which I quote); Callaghan, "Review," 406; Knowles, "Review," 551; Burrow, "Review," 324. Reviews of *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* are identified in this Preface by name of author and the short title "Review," the full reference being available in the Further reading list on pp. 22–25. Articles and books listed in Further reading are similarly identified by name and short title only.

disagreed with the book, claiming that its author and all those who agree with him suffer from a post-9/11 trauma or, as happened at the Blackfriars conference in Staunton, Virginia, in 2011, holding up a copy of the book and pantomiming machine-gunning it.[3] The *World Shakespeare Bibliography* records thirty-six reviews.[4] In 2004, a conference was organized by Richard Wilson at the University of Lancaster whose aim was to discuss the argument of *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*, which led to a collection of essays, *Shakespeare's Book*, edited by Richard Meek, Jane Rickard, and Wilson. Partly prompted by *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*, *Shakespeare Studies*, in 2008, featured a forum, edited by Patrick Cheney, devoted to "The Return of the Author." Other books and articles have similarly addressed or built on *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*. The chief aim of the Preface to this second edition is to contribute to the debate the book has stimulated in the decade since its original publication. The Further reading list at the end of the Preface gives publications that respond or add to *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* in significant ways. The aim of this second edition is not to rewrite the text of the first: no attempt has been made to revise throughout, although obvious errors have been corrected. Other than that, this second edition reprints the text of the first with whatever shortcomings or merits it may have.

Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist has been criticized for what I believe is a misreading of the title. The book, one reviewer writes, proposes the "refiguration of Shakespeare as a purely literary dramatist."[5] It "sets out to prove," another reviewer holds, "that Shakespeare wrote [his plays] primarily with readers – not theater audiences – in mind."[6] A third reviewer has even argued that "At the root of Erne's agenda is a deep vein of 'anti-theatrical prejudice.'"[7] Yet, while I argue that "some of the more dogmatic claims that have been made about the importance of performance for our understanding of Shakespeare's plays" need to be questioned, I recognize that "The greatest part of performance-oriented Shakespeare criticism has been salutary and beneficial" (p. 47).[8] As Hugh Grady has written, "Erne

[3] See Brooks, "Review," 235–36.

[4] Among those who sent me incisive feedback by private correspondence following the book's publication in 2003 and are thus not mentioned in the Acknowledgments to the first edition are Catherine Belsey, Keith Brown, Alan Dessen, Katherine Duncan-Jones, Richard Dutton, Philip Edwards, Ernst Honigmann, Jeffrey Knapp, Roslyn Knutson, Edward Pechter, Duncan Salkeld, Evert Sprinchorn, and Michael Steppat. I am grateful to them for their insights.

[5] Edmondson, "Review," 419. [6] Brooks, "Review," 222. [7] Rowland, "Review," 82.

[8] Unless otherwise indicated, parenthetical references are to the text of *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* below. I am sympathetic to William Worthen's argument for a performance criticism that does not treat performance as derivative of and secondary to the text (see "Intoxicating Rhythms"). As Worthen

has no quarrel with the view that Shakespeare was a man of the theatre who wrote to supply matter for a theatrical company from which he drew his livelihood."[9] I argue, however, that performance is not all Shakespeare had in mind. Rather, as another reviewer has written, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* "invite[s] us to think of a Shakespeare who wrote both to be read *and* to be performed. [Erne's] work suggests we should think of Shakespeare variously, concurrently, and perhaps confusedly, writing works that were too long for performance, revising them, sometimes alone and sometimes with others, sometimes for print, sometimes for performance, and amphibiously occupying the worlds of printed books and of the theater."[10]

The strong reactions the idea of Shakespeare as a literary dramatist have provoked in some quarters may be indicative of territorial anxieties in Shakespeare studies more generally. Whose Shakespeare? Does he belong to the theater or to the academy, is he of the stage or of the page, should we watch him or read him? These are false dichotomies, but the realization that they are false does not mean we can easily escape them, and surveying responses to *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* makes me realize that some have seen these dichotomies affirmed in it. I argue that the long play texts Shakespeare wrote for many of his tragedies and histories are significantly different from and longer than the play texts spoken by the actors on stage, and that Shakespeare knew so as he was writing them. To call the shorter version "theatrical" and the longer "literary," as I do in *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*, is right in that "theatrical" and "literary" refer to the two institutions in which Shakespeare saw his plays materialize, the public theater and the book trade. But it is true that the terms can be problematic, since they may suggest a dichotomy where none exists. For the comparatively short play texts that audiences would have heard in the theater certainly did not lack literary qualities (as the very short, intensely poetic but also startlingly stage-worthy text of *Macbeth* illustrates); nor would the passages which I argue were omitted before performance from a long play like *Hamlet* necessarily be unsuitable for the theater. Peter Holland has written that the portions I characterize as "literary" "are passages that [he has] heard work superbly on stage in a number of productions."[11] I agree. They were omitted in performance not because they necessarily lacked theatricality or stage-worthiness but because the full play texts were not "short anufe [enough] with out cutting" (p. 196), as one playwright put it.

points out, his article "tak[es] issue with the rhetorical framing of 'performance' [in *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*], not with the revisionist account of the process and cultural impact of dramatic publishing" (320).

[9] Grady, "Shakespeare Studies, 2005," 108. [10] Burrow, "Review," 325. [11] Holland, "Review," 6.

In other words, the literary and the theatrical were far more porous in Shakespeare's drama than some may have taken my study to suggest. Instead of having played out in separate spheres, the literary and the theatrical often overlapped: Shakespeare wrote long play texts with intricately poetic – or literary – material, of which he must have known that some would not reach the stage but also that some would, and would likely work very well when performed (by Richard Burbage, in particular, but also by others: think of Gaunt's "scepter'd isle" speech), material which may have been considered literary not only by readers but also by audiences. I suggest that we can occasionally observe in the gap between short and long versions of some of Shakespeare's plays the two media in which they materialized (see Chapter 9), but I do not argue that Shakespeare consistently had two separate modes of dramatic writing, the theatrical and the literary.

"Literary" is a convenient term for designating Shakespearean dramatic authorship, and one reason is the term's elasticity, its multiple resonances that contribute to my argument: Shakespeare was aware of and not indifferent to the readerly (or literary) reception of his plays (in print and, conceivably, manuscript); he and many of his contemporaries considered his printed plays as more than discardable ephemera, as literary texts of some prestige, and passages from them were included in commonplace books and anthologies, and even discussed in a scholarly treatise;[12] one of the ways in which his authorial aspirations as a dramatist manifest themselves is his over-long texts, which must have been stripped in preparation for performance of the material "*least prejudicial to the Plot or Sense*" (see p. 191), often made up of poetically intricate (or literary) language. While the elasticity of the term "literary" can be a virtue, it can also be a source of misunderstanding – all the more so as there is a sociology and politics to the term in today's academy. "Literary" does not mean "untheatrical," nor does the term save Shakespeare from the masses, "the smoky breath of the multitude," and claim him for the happy few. Nor, indeed, is "literary" synonymous with "print." The phrase "literary dramatist" encapsulates at once a style of writing, an anticipated readerly reception, a claim for generic respectability, and an authorial ambition. What it does not mean is that Shakespeare was not simultaneously a man of the theater.

***

[12] For the discussion of Shakespearean dramatic passages in William Scott's recently discovered treatise, *The Model of Poesy* (1601), see Stanley Wells, "A New Early Reader of Shakespeare," in *Shakespeare's Book*, eds. Meek, Rickard, and Wilson, 233–40.

Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist consists of two parts, "Publication" and "Texts." The two parts are closely connected, and the study's overall argument depends on both, but they are also distinct enough to have received largely separate responses, and here we might examine some of them. Part I examines the publication of Shakespeare's plays in the context of the legitimation of printed playbooks in Shakespeare's time (chapter 1). It argues that printed playbooks were more respectable publications than has often been assumed and that "Shakespeare" became a recognized author of published drama from 1598, when his plays started appearing with his name on the title page and Francis Meres, in *Palladis Tamia*, promoted Shakespeare to a place near the top of the English canon (chapter 2).[13] Chapter 3 is devoted to the publication of Shakespeare's plays in the late sixteenth century and offers a revisionist account of the agency leading to the appearance of Shakespeare's plays in print. Whereas it had often been assumed that Shakespeare was indifferent, and his company even opposed, to the publication of his plays, I argue that Shakespeare and his fellow players of the Lord Chamberlain's Men were in favor of it. What suggests a conscious decision to have Shakespeare's plays published is not only their massed appearance in print but also the fact that the same stationers can be shown to have been repeatedly involved in the publication of plays that seem based on authorial manuscripts (see pp. 111–13).

Several scholars have singled out this part of *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* in their response. While Peter Holland finds it "thoroughly convincing" and Lawrence Manley "a considerable strength," David Scott Kastan has disagreed.[14] In particular, Kastan denies a publication pattern, but fails to describe accurately the one I propose. The publication pattern for which I argue concerns explicitly "the twelve plays that may have been the first written by Shakespeare for the Lord Chamberlain's Men (whom Shakespeare joined in 1594)" (pp. 103–04), and not the plays Shakespeare wrote (or co-wrote) earlier, for other companies (see p. 117).[15] Kastan

[13] Note that MacD. P. Jackson has found suggestive connections between *Palladis Tamia* and Shakespeare's rival poet sonnets. He argues that "Shakespeare read Meres's 'Comparative Discourse' attentively" and that "The Rival Poet sonnets originated . . . in a general sense of rivalry fuelled by Francis Meres's glib inventory of England's top poets and playwrights" ("Francis Meres," 236, 243.). Jackson's article lends support to the view that Shakespeare was far from indifferent to seeing his name and works in print.

[14] Holland, "Review," 6; Manley, "Review," 31; Kastan, "'To think these trifles some-thing.'"

[15] More recently, James J. Marino has commented on the "impossibility of establishing Shakespeare [pre-1594] company affiliations. Nor is there any evidence to suggest," Marino continues, "that Shakespeare kept control of any play he had written, or had collaborated in writing, before joining the Chamberlain's Men" (*Owning William Shakespeare: The King's Men and Their Intellectual Property* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 30).

conflates the two groups of plays: "nearly one-half of the plays of Shakespeare that appeared in print by [1603] were not printed as part of a regular publication strategy by Shakespeare or his company, rendering it, therefore, something less than 'regular.'"[16] Having modified the sample within which I argue for a pattern, Kastan argues that I find regularity where I never claimed it existed.[17]

Kastan also contends that certain "bad" quartos contradict my argument that the Lord Chamberlain's Men sought publication for Shakespeare's plays.[18] This seems to assume that companies had total control over the publication of their plays, which Kastan elsewhere admits they did not.[19] If a stationer secured a manuscript of and the rights to a play before the Lord Chamberlain's Men offered a longer and better manuscript of the same play for publication, then what this means is that the publisher of the "bad" quarto got his foot in the door first, not that Shakespeare and his company were opposed to the play's publication. In the case of *Hamlet*, it even seems clear that the manuscript which underlies the "good" second quarto was sold to James Roberts before Nicholas Ling and John Trundell published the "bad" first quarto (see p. 105). The appearance of "bad" quartos offers no evidence to contradict the Lord Chamberlain's Men's desire to publish Shakespeare's plays.

Kastan's final objection centers on the famous "staying entry" of 4 August 1600 in the Stationers' Register according to which the printing of *As You Like It*, *2 Henry IV*, *Much Ado about Nothing*, and *Every Man in His Humour* was "to be staied." I suggest that even though some have believed that this entry reflects the Lord Chamberlain's Men's alleged reluctance to have Shakespeare's plays published (see p. 127), it does not, but may simply mean that the plays "lacked ecclesiastical authorization," as Peter Blayney and Cyndia Susan Clegg had argued earlier.[20] Kastan objects to this and

[16] Kastan, "'To think these trifles some-thing,'" 42.

[17] Kastan further argues that I disregard the evidence for the players' "opposition to unauthorized printing" (ibid., 41), even though I spend many pages investigating this evidence (see Chapter 5). In particular, Kastan claims that "Brome's 1635 contract with the Salisbury Court theater enjoining him from publishing without the sharers' permission is not considered" by me (41). In fact, I discuss it at some length and conclude that "what the company (like the Lord Chamberlain's Men) seems to have wanted to have a say about is the moment when – rather than the question whether – the play would be offered for publication" (p. 146).

[18] Kastan, "'To think these trifles some-thing,'" 41–42.

[19] Ibid., 44.

[20] See Cyndia Susan Clegg, "Liberty, License, and Authority: Press Censorship and Shakespeare," in *A Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. David Scott Kastan (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), pp. 478–79. This interpretation is supported by similar "to be staied" entries which were demonstrably occasioned by the lack of authority; for instance: "18 May, 1603. Henry Gosson. A booke called *a warninge peece to bribers* is to be staied and not entred to any but hym when he hathe aucthority for it" (Edward Arber, ed., *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers 1554–1640 AD*, 5 vols. (London, 1875–94),

believes that the plays mentioned in the "staying entry" "provide compelling evidence for the thesis that the company tried to prevent unauthorized printing of its plays."[21] Even if Kastan were right, the desire to prevent *unauthorized* publication would hardly mean that the company was opposed to publication *per se*. Independently of which position is correct, what strongly argues against the actors' alleged opposition to play publication is that three of the four plays were entered within less than three weeks and published the same or the next year in texts which appear to have been set up from authorial manuscripts. This does not suggest that the "staying entry" reflects a failed attempt by the Lord Chamberlain's Men to prevent publication (see p. 127). Contrary to Kastan, Richard Knowles writes: "I welcome Erne's demolition of the old argument that the company did not see publication as in their best interest."[22]

Based on the dates of composition and publication (or Stationers' Register entrance), I argue that, unless legal constraints or prior publication prevented them, the Lord Chamberlain's Men usually sold Shakespeare's manuscripts to stationers approximately two years after the plays first reached the stage (see pp. 110–11). Kastan claims that this part of the argument "depends on a highly conjectural dating of the plays."[23] My book acknowledges that the traditional dating of Shakespeare's plays is "necessarily conjectural" (p. 109) and that the two-year rule is no more than an approximation (see p. 111). All that is needed to understand the consistency – if not absolute regularity – with which Shakespeare's Lord Chamberlain's plays reached print is an approximate sense of chronology, and that is conveniently provided in the "Introduction" to the *Arden Shakespeare Complete Works*, by Richard Proudfoot, Ann Thompson, and Kastan himself:

Plays written for the new company at the Theatre in the five years from 1594 until the opening of the Globe in the autumn of 1599, in possible sequence of

111. 36). For the meaning of "authority," see Peter W. M. Blayney, "The Publication of Playbooks," in *A New History of Early English Drama*, eds. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 396–98.

[21] See Kastan, "'To think these trifles some-thing,'" 44.

[22] Knowles, "Review," 548. In an article which aims to make a contribution to the question of "How willing . . . the Lord Chamberlain's Company [were] to see their plays published," it has been argued that the "staying entry" was designed to prevent James Roberts, the playbill printer, from publishing the plays of Shakespeare's company (see Hirrel, "The Roberts Memoranda," 711). The argument that "Roberts regularly acquired and sought to publish the [Lord Chamberlain's Men's] play manuscripts without the company's own permission" (728) is unconvincing given that Roberts never published a single play (see Erne, *Shakespeare and the Book Trade*, 159–61). Nor is there any convincing evidence which relates the entry of 4 August 1600 to Roberts.

[23] Kastan, "'To think these trifles some-thing,'" 40.

compositions, are *Romeo and Juliet*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *King Richard II*, *King John*, *The Merchant of Venice*, the two parts of *King Henry IV*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and (at some date before summer 1598) the lost *Love's Labour's Won*. *As You Like It* and *King Henry V* may belong in this group, though both show signs of having been written with the Globe in mind.[24]

Of the twelve or thirteen plays here mentioned – depending on whether "Love's Labour's Won" really is a lost play or the alternative title of an extant one (see p. 106) – all but two appeared in print from 1597 to 1602. Of the remaining two, it appears that the company tried to have one published in 1600 but failed (*As You Like It*) and that the other one could not be published for legal reasons (*King John*), given that the similar *Troublesome Raigne of Iohn King of England* was already in print (see pp. 106–7). Kastan believes there is no evidence that the Lord Chamberlain's Men pursued a policy of publication and would like us to return to what Paul Menzer calls "the canard that Shakespeare took no interest in the publication of his plays,"[25] but a look at the publication pattern shows that Shakespeare and his fellows published as many of his first dozen Lord Chamberlain's Men's plays as they could.

Print publication some time after a play first reached the stage may have provided free publicity when it was revived (see pp. 114–15). There may be an additional reason for the time gap between first performance and publication which I did not investigate: publishers may have been reluctant to invest in a play until it had proven its popularity in the theater. Continued performance or occasional revivals of a play would likely help sales of the published playbook, just as print publication of a play would recommend it to theater-goers.[26] Alan B. Farmer and Zachary Lesser have shown that playbooks had an unusually high reprint rate, considerably higher than sermon-books and speculative books more generally, even though market shares of playbooks were modest compared to those of sermon-books.[27] The explanation may be that in the case of playbooks, publishers had unusually reliable indications of whether a play would sell

[24] Richard Proudfoot, Ann Thompson, and David Scott Kastan, gen. eds., *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works*, rev. edn (London: Methuen, 2011), 6.
[25] Menzer, *The Hamlets*, 37.
[26] See Tiffany Stern's insistence on "the extent to which [playhouse and printing house] shared interests" ("'On each Wall and Corner Poast': Playbills, Title-pages, and Advertising in Early Modern London," *English Literary Renaissance*, 36 (2006), 64).
[27] See Alan B. Farmer and Zachary Lesser, "The Popularity of Playbooks Revisited," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 56 (2005), 1–32.

well because of its popularity in the theater.[28] Once a play had had success in the theater, publishers had good reasons to invest in it, just as Shakespeare and his fellows must have encouraged publication because availability in another medium provided welcome publicity. A question that has repeatedly arisen is who exactly wanted Shakespeare's plays to be published: the stationers, the Lord Chamberlain's Men, or Shakespeare? At the turn of the seventeenth century, the answer, I suggest, is all three, though for different reasons: the stationers because Shakespeare's successful plays promised good sales in the book trade; the Lord Chamberlain's Men because print publication provided free publicity for the play in the playhouse; and Shakespeare because he was pleased to see his plays in print.[29]

After 1603, only three of Shakespeare's plays were newly published before the end of his lifetime, *King Lear* in 1608 and *Pericles* and *Troilus and Cressida* in 1609, although *Troilus and Cressida* had been entered in the Stationers' Register six years earlier. The evidence suggests that, while manuscripts of Shakespeare's plays were sold to stationers with some regularity up to 1603, this was no longer the case after that year. Chapter 4 attempts to outline the possible reasons for this breakdown: a temporary glut in the market for playbooks, the revival of children's companies, the change of patron (and reign), the frequent closure of the theaters due to plague, the publication of "bad" editions, the idea of a collected edition of Shakespeare's plays, and a change in publication strategy from print to manuscript presentation copies. I conclude that, after 1603, "print publication seems to have been postponed, possibly in lieu of manuscript presentation copies for influential patrons. Whatever other reasons there may have been for this postponement . . . the time may well have come when Shakespeare and his fellows projected a collected edition and therefore refrained from publishing in cheap quartos" (p. 138). One reviewer attributes to me the idea "that Shakespeare or his company may, as early as 1602–3, have been contemplating a complete Folio edition,"[30] but I consciously wrote no such thing and find the idea of a folio edition in 1602–3 implausible. The only collection consisting exclusively of plays that was published in the first years of the seventeenth century is William Alexander's *Monarchick Tragedies* (1604, with a "Newly enlarged"

[28] Tamsin Badcoe and I develop this idea in "Shakespeare and the Popularity of Poetry Books in Print, 1583–1622," *The Review of English Studies* (forthcoming).

[29] It is noteworthy that Shakespeare, after joining the Lord Chamberlain's Men, wrote plays with strong lyrical elements (what earlier critics called his "lyric phase"): in 1594, pondering whether to continue writing poetry or to return to writing plays, Shakespeare may well have consciously chosen to do both at once, writing plays with much poetry which, like his narrative poems, sold well in the book trade. I develop this idea in "Print and Manuscript," 64–69.

[30] Manley, "Review," 31.

edition in 1607), but that collection appeared in quarto. A folio collection may have become thinkable for Shakespeare once Jonson had started preparing his, late in Shakespeare's career. I agree with W. W. Greg, Stanley Wells, Katherine Duncan-Jones, and Ernst Honigmann that Shakespeare may have envisaged a folio collection of his plays (and even his works) before the end of his life, and, given that he is usually considered to have written plays until about 1613, it is possible that he started doing so before he ceased writing for the stage.[31] But I do not suggest that the publication pattern breaks down in 1603 because of plans for the First Folio.

Alan Dessen has written that he has "no better explanation than [Erne's] (a move to presentation copies) for Shakespeare and his colleagues' apparent indifference to publication" after *c.* 1603.[32] Richard Knowles has explored a different avenue:

> [Erne] dismisses the notion that the plague suddenly made publication unprofitable, arguing that plays from other companies continued to appear during this period. Still, other companies may have felt more need for publicity than did Shakespeare's men, who had reached the apex of success when chosen in 1603 to be the King's own players; and if Leeds Barroll is right that in the years 1603–8 the theaters were closed during 54 of 72 months, at a time when REED records show the company often on tour, advance publicity for uncertain London revivals might have seemed a poor investment of time and effort.[33]

Knowles may be right that, at a time when the company's new name lent it cachet and the plague made London revivals uncertain, the company decided that the publication of playbooks should wait until more propitious times. What Shakespeare made of the interruption of play publication after 1603 seems impossible to recover, but it is suggestive that he may have seriously reduced his presence amidst his company around this time. In his Shakespeare biography, *Soul of the Age*, Jonathan Bate has argued that Shakespeare "stopped acting around the time of the 1603–04 plague outbreak."[34] Bate notes that Shakespeare "is in the cast list of Ben Jonson's plays *Every Man in his Humour* (1598) and *Sejanus* (1603), but, unlike Richard Burbage, John Hemings, Henry Condell and the rest of his fellows in the King's Men, not those of *Volpone* (1605), *The Alchemist* (1610) and *Catiline* (1611)."[35] Nor, he adds, does Shakespeare's name appear in "a

[31] See below, pp. 136–37, and Honigmann, "How Happy Was Shakespeare with the Printed Versions of His Plays?"
[32] Alan Dessen, private correspondence, August 22, 2004.
[33] Knowles, "Review," 548–49.
[34] Jonathan Bate, *Soul of the Age: The Life, Mind and World of William Shakespeare* (New York: Viking, 2008), 355.
[35] Ibid., 355.