CONTINENTAL SHAKESPEARE

KAREN NEWMAN

Shakespearians are breathing a sigh of relief: there is *Shakespeare after Theory*. In his book of that name, David Kastan quotes Adorno's famous censure of Walter Benjamin for his 'wide-eyed presentation of mere facts' and declares himself firmly on the side of Benjamin. 'Only by turning to history from theory', he claims, and by 'recognizing that a play's materializations, in the printing house and in the playhouse, *are* the play's meanings', can we read Shakespeare today.[1] In a similar vein, Zachary Lesser urges us, in his *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication*, 'to stop thinking of plays simply as *texts*, and start thinking of them as *books*'.[2] He quotes D. F. McKenzie: 'every book tells a story quite apart from that recounted by its text'.[3] But this touted turn away from the linguistic turn, this swerve away from theory to book history, can only be 'theoretical', for the stories books tell are, after all, only available to us as texts, presented in a classroom or written up in a book or article – or, increasingly, posted online. Even numbers can't save us from hermeneutic obligation, for what are we to do with the facts: between 1576 and 1625, '30 percent of professional plays were reprinted within ten years'; in 1600, 'nine Stationers held Copy in nineteen Shakespearean titles'; in 1600, 'close to 31% of surviving retail titles were "literature and the arts"'; and, 'Whereas an early tragedy such as *Titus Andronicus* has only 1.3 percent prose, *Hamlet* features a full 27 percent'?[4] Even this quite useful 'new positivism' obliges us to read and interpret.

Lesser, in fact, begins his book with a textual reading, of an advertisement for *Troilus and Cressida* that appears as an anonymous preface on a cancel sheet the publishers Bonian and Walley inserted, as Lesser puts it, 'at some point during the press run', after the title page of the first edition in 1609 of Shakespeare's play.[5] The opening pages of Lesser's book in fact remind us that often the very material evidence evoked in the appeal to 'mere facts', or 'books', is in fact a 'text' that requires reading and interpretation. Such 'texts' may in turn be evidence of another's reading – in this case, as Lesser goes on to claim, of a publisher's reading that may well have led to publication in the first place. Lesser is suitably careful and expansive in defining 'reading' to include

> the publisher's understanding of a text based on its title, or its author's previous work, or its provenance – its acting company, theatre, patrons, or coterie – or its

[1] David Kastan, *Shakespeare after Theory* (New York, 1999), p. 13 (quoting from Adorno's *Aesthetics and Politics*) and pp. 34–5.

[2] Zachary Lesser, *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication: Readings in the English Book Trade* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 10.

[3] D. F. McKenzie, '"What's past is prologue": the Bibliographical Society and history of the book', in *Making Meaning: 'Printers of the Mind' and other Essays*, ed. Peter D. McDonald and Michael F. Suarez, SJ (Amherst, 2002), pp. 259–75, esp. p. 262.

[4] Marta Straznicky, 'What is a stationer?' in *Shakespeare's Stationers: Studies in Cultural Bibliography*, ed. Marta Straznicky (Philadelphia, 2013), pp. 1–16, esp. p. 5 (quoting from Zachary Lesser and Alan B. Farmer, 'The popularity of playbooks revisited', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 56 (2005), 1–32); Alexandra Halasz, 'The stationers' Shakespeare', in *Shakespeare's Stationers*, ed. Straznicky, pp. 17–27, esp. p. 23; Douglas Bruster, 'Shakespeare the stationer', in *Shakespeare's Stationers*, ed. Straznicky, pp. 112–31, esp. p. 121.

[5] Lesser, *Renaissance Drama*, p. 1.

generic conventions, or simply based on what friends or fellow stationers may have said about the text. All these judgments, many of which may be only partly conscious, are part of the publisher's reading of the text, for they form its 'horizon of expectations'.[6]

Lesser distinguishes his work both from that of the New Bibliographers (such as A. W. Pollard, W. W. Greg and R. B. McKerrow) – who remained wedded to 'authors', 'paradigmatically Shakespeare', and the notion that 'a single, authoritative work lay behind the multiple texts of a given play' – but also from some aspects of the so-called 'New Textualism' and its various practitioners – from the conflated-text crowd who remain within the authorial paradigm by arguing that the multiple texts of *Lear* represent authorial revision, to more recent work by Joseph Loewenstein, Leah Marcus, Jeffrey Masten and Kastan himself, which focuses instead on the 'author function' and 'systems of linguistic and bibliographical codings' that books display.[7]

Lesser places his work within this more recent paradigm, sometimes now dubbed 'cultural bibliography', and his focus is on publishers so as to understand, quoting Peter Blayney, 'why *that* play was published *then*'.[8] As he goes on to argue, 'publishers tended to specialize in order to appeal to their customers'.[9] The book trade had a shaping role in producing meaning, in shaping how books were marketed and sold. Lesser considers books as 'commodities', another stubbornly ambiguous word with meanings both material and theoretical. A publisher, he argues, 'does not merely bring a commodity to market but also imagines, and helps to construct, the purchasers of that commodity and their interpretations of it'.[10] In short, as Marta Straznicky argues succinctly in her introduction to the recent collection *Shakespeare's Stationers*: '"the materiality of the text" has become integral to historicist criticism, implicating as it does the physical form of print in every act of interpretation, past and present, whether this engages with the minutiae of orthography and punctuation, ideological work performed at the level of discourse, or the formation of the Shakespearean canon'.[11]

In turning to the Continental Shakespeare of my title, I want to consider another Shakespeare advertisement, one which appeared in advance of the publication of the First Folio in 1622 and which apparently offered it for sale on the Continental book market. Bear in mind the subtitle of Lesser's book, *Readings in the* English *Book Trade* (emphasis added). Since the publication of Richard Helgerson's *Forms of Nationhood* (1992), scholars in early modern English literary studies, and certainly of Shakespeare, have focused increasingly on the making of the English nation, the 'writing of England', and on the early printed book in English.[12] Yet, long before Shakespeare became the national poet whom the antiquarian Maurice Morgann famously celebrated 'as the patron spirit of world empire on which the sun will never set', before the current interest in transnational Shakespeare – before, in fact, the First Folio saw print in 1623 – booksellers were marketing their intellectual property in Shakespeare internationally.[13] From W. W. Greg's *The Shakespeare First Folio*, we learn that:

The principal centre of the European book-trade at the time was the fair held every spring and autumn at Frankfort-on-the-Main, in connexion with which there was published a half-yearly advertisement known as the *Mess-Katalog*. This did not include English books, though English booksellers frequented the market to buy stocks of foreign and classical works. There was, however, an English edition published by John Bill, the King's Printer, under the title *Catalogus uniuersalis pro*

[6] Lesser, *Renaissance Drama*, p. 9. 'Horizon of expectations' is taken from Hans Robert Jauss, 'Literary history as a challenge to literary theory', in *New Directions in Literary History*, ed. Ralph Cohen (Baltimore, 1974), pp. 11–42.

[7] Lesser, *Renaissance Drama*, pp. 14–15. It should be pointed out that Masten in particular demonstrates the collaborative character of early modern dramatic writing and production, not an important point for Lesser's argument.

[8] Lesser, *Renaissance Drama*, p. 10, quoting Peter Blayney, 'The publication of playbooks', in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York, 1997), pp. 383–422, esp. p. 391.

[9] Lesser, *Renaissance Drama*, p. 8.

[10] Lesser, *Renaissance Drama*, p. 17.

[11] *Shakespeare's Stationers*, ed. Straznicky, p. 3.

[12] Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago, 1992), p. 6.

[13] Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation and Authorship, 1660–1769* (Oxford, 1992), p. 228.

nundinis Francofurtensibus, which contained an appendix of English works. And to our surprise we find that 'A Catalogue of such Bookes as haue beene published, and (by authoritie) printed in English, since the last Vernall Mart, which was in Aprill 1622. till this present October 1622.' contains the entry: 'Playes, written by M. William Shakespeare, all in one volume, printed by Isaack Iaggard, in. fol.'[14]

'Our surprise', as Greg terms it, would seem to be prompted by two things: first, that the entry appears in 1622, before the First Folio actually appeared, in 1623;[15] and, second, that we find the entry in such an 'unexpected source', as he terms it, in a catalogue offering books for sale on the European market. Greg cites F. P. Wilson (*The Jaggards*, 1925), whose 'fortunate discovery', as Greg terms it, brought this early advertisement to light.[16] Wilson himself notes that it is 'perhaps the only contemporary advertisement of the First Folio now extant', though as recent commentators on the Folio have noted, its frontispiece, title page and front matter are, in fact, contemporary advertisements.

Both Greg and Wilson agreed that the advertisement 'does not add to our knowledge of the First Folio'.[17] Concerned with dating, they did not consider what it might mean that the First Folio was first offered for sale in a supplemental listing of *English* books to an English reprint of a *Latin* catalogue for a *German* book fair held in the city of Frankfurt. Over seventy-five years after Wilson first published his find, and almost fifty years after Greg's study of the Folio, Peter Blayney also considers this advance publicity for the Folio only in relation to dating in his 2003 catalogue for the Folger exhibition 'The First Folio of Shakespeare' (Figure 1).[18]

The mart at Frankfurt dates from at least the thirteenth century, but a market is attested there already in the eighth century; by the sixteenth, it had become a major European market where goods of all sorts were sold and exchanged – the famous French humanist printer Henri Estienne praised it in a Latin encomium as 'the sum of all the fairs of the whole world'.[19] Like many German cities, it was relatively small with some 12,000 inhabitants in 1555, and more than 20,000 by the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War in 1618. Located in the centre of Germany, it lay on major trade routes linking the cities of northern and southern Europe, Scandinavia and the Baltic.[20] Estienne's account details the many sorts of goods traded there, but the Frankfurt fair early became a centre of the Continental book trade. From all over Europe, and also from England, came not only printers, booksellers, typefounders, paper merchants and bookbinders, but also merchants, humanists, writers, travellers, players and more. The city authorities supported the development of commerce by controlling the prices charged for food and lodging, and keeping the tolls on the movement of goods light.[21] Estienne dubbed the book fair 'the Fair of the Muses', and that part of Frankfurt in which it was sited as 'Athens'.[22] So, to rephrase Peter Blayney's question, instead of asking 'why *that* play was published *then*', we might ask instead, why *that* advertisement *there* and *then*? What might thinking about this advertisement, 'reading' it in the largest sense, mean for our understanding of the development of Shakespearian cultural capital on the Continent?

The King's Printer, John Bill, to whom Greg attributes the catalogue in which this advertisement

[14] W. W. Greg, *The Shakespeare First Folio* (Oxford, 1955), p. 3.
[15] Printing of the First Folio was underway in 1622, at the time this advertisement appeared, but seems not to have been completed until late 1623.
[16] Greg, *The Shakespeare First Folio*, p. 3, n. 3.
[17] F. P. Wilson, 'The Jaggards and the First Folio of Shakespeare', *Times Literary Supplement*, 5 November 1925, 737.
[18] Peter Blayney, *The First Folio of Shakespeare* (Washington, D. C., 1991), p. 8.
[19] James Westfall Thompson, *The Frankfort Book Fair* (Chicago, 1911; repr. New York, 1968), p. 8. On the development of the fair at Frankfurt, see John L. Flood, '"Omnium totius orbis emporiorum compendium": the Frankfurt Fair in the early modern period', in *Fairs, Markets and the Itinerant Book Trade*, ed. Robin Myers, Michael Harris and Giles Mandelbrote (New Castle, DE, and London, 2007), pp. 1–42.
[20] Flood, 'Omnium totius', p. 2.
[21] Flood, 'Omnium totius', pp. 11–12.
[22] See Thompson, *The Frankfort Book Fair*.

(a)

A CATALOGVE OF SVCH BOOKES AS HAVE beene publiſhed, and (by authoritie) printed in *Engliſh, ſince the laſt Vernall Mart, which was in Aprill 1622. till this preſent October 1622.*

THe Hiſtory of the life and reigne of King *Henry* the ſeuenth, written by the Right Honourable *Francis* Lord Verulam Viſcount Saint Albons. The ſecond Edition. Printed for *Matthew Lownes* and *William Barret*, in fol.

The Imperiall hiſtory, Or a true relation of the liues and reignes of all the Roman Emperors, from the time of *Iulius Ceſar*, firſt founder of the Roman Empire and Monarchy, to *Ferdinand* the ſecond now reigning, printed for *Mat. Lownes* in fol.

A Diſcouery of Errors in *Yorkes* Catalogue of Nobilitie, publiſhed 1619. with a reuiew of his ſecond Edition thereof, together with the ſeuerall ſucceſſions and new creations, to this preſent yeere 1622. by *Auguſtine Vincent*, Rougecrom Purſiuant of Armes, printed by *William Iaggard* in fol.

A Defenſatiue againſt the poyſon of ſuppoſed prophecies, not hitherto confuted by the pen of any man, written by the Lord *Henry Howard* late Earle of Northampton, printed for *Matthew Lownes*, in fol.

King *Dauids* Vow, for reformation of himſelfe, his family, and his houſ-hold, deliuered in twelue ſermons before the Prince his Highneſſe, by *George Hakewill* Doctor in Diuinity, printed for *Matthew Lownes*, in 8.

The Art of Logicke, plainely taught in the Engliſh tongue, by Maſter *Blundeuill*, printed for *Matthew Lownes* in 4.

A

(b)

Playes, written by M. *William Shakeſpeare*, all in one volume, printed by *Iſaack Iaggard*, in fol.

The Theater of Honor and Knighthood, printed by *William Iaggard*, in fol.

1 a and b. *A Catalogue of such Bookes as have Beene published, and (by authority) printed in English* (1622). Ashm.1057(14), signature D4 recto (Fig. 1a) and verso (Fig. 1b). By permission of The Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford.

appeared, was an important player in the early English book trade between London and the Continent. Bill was apprenticed to the publisher John Norton in 1592 and was admitted a freeman of the Stationers in 1601. Between 1596 and 1603, he served as agent for Sir Thomas Bodley, who was then engaged in founding and stocking the Bodleian Library. Bodley bought books out of Norton's stock amassed from his biennial importations from the fair, and by sending Bill as his agent to buy books in Paris, Venice and elsewhere in Italy, frequently in Germany, and even in Spain.[23] Bill's involvement in the Continental book trade did not end with Bodley. In 1603, the Nortons and Bill became

> Copartners and Ioynt traders together in the art or trade of a Stacioner or Bookseller and in buying and bringing of bookes maps and other Stacionary wares & merchandises in and from ffrance Germany & other parts beyond the seas into England, & in selling the same again & in printinge of diuers bookes here in Englande and beyond the seas.[24]

As this document indicates, Bill's trade involved bringing stocks from the Continent to sell in England; subsequently, he also served as James I's agent, acquiring books for him from the Continent and regularly attending the Frankfurt book fair. Always on the look-out for the main chance, Bill began reprinting the half-yearly advertisement known as the *Mess-Katalog* in England, making various changes to its offerings to suit his market; later, he added an appendix of books published in England, or from his stock, for sale at the fair, a move Rees and Wakely, in their 2009 book *Publishing, Politics, & Culture*, dub a 'startling innovation'.[25] Bill not only purchased books, he and Norton also offered them for sale. We know, for example, that Bill printed a translation into French of Bacon's *Essays* in 1619 (STC 1152), no doubt for a French market in London, but also on the Continent where works by Bacon were highly sought after.[26] Bill thus had a demonstrated interest in circulating certain English materials among European readers. Bill's appendices, and changes he made to the catalogue, indicate that, in the second decade of the seventeenth century, he was particularly engaged in publishing, printing and selling polemical books and controversialist writing relating to post-Reformation, post-Tridentine debates. As the King's Printer, Bill, with Norton, published James's *Works* and a number of folio volumes concerned with the defence of a national church and rivalries with Rome.[27] Norton was interested as well in the market for French books, for he styled himself 'imprimeur ordinaire du Roy es langues estrangeres' in books dated 1609 and 1612.[28] As Rees and Wakely show, Norton and Bill 'acted in effect as a small-scale ministry of information'.[29] Norton maintained a shop at the Frankfurt fair from 1600 on, and, from 1603, with his more junior partner, Bill.

The *Mess-Katalog* was originally the sixteenth-century initiative of an Augsburg bookseller, but it was soon taken over by the Frankfurt city council, which continued to publish an official catalogue well into the eighteenth century. The catalogue was organized consistently according to the order of precedence of university faculties:[30] theology,

[23] Ian Philip, *The Bodleian Library in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Oxford, 1983), p. 9. Bodley famously excluded English books from his Library, not, as Philip points out, because he viewed them all as 'rifferaffes' and 'baggage books', as he did plays, but because he doubted if the English vernacular was 'the right language for the communication of scholarship' (p. 32). On Bodley, Norton and Bill, see John Barnard, 'Politics, profits, and idealism: John Norton, the Stationers' Company and Sir Thomas Bodley', *Bodleian Library Records* 17.5 (2002), 385–408.

[24] C3/334/73 (JB 111–13), cited in Graham Rees and Maria Wakely, *Publishing, Politics and Culture: The King's Printers in the Reign of James I and VI* (Oxford, 2009), p. 15.

[25] Rees and Wakely, *Publishing*, pp. 197–8. See their chapter 'John Norton, John Bill, and the Frankfurt catalogues', pp. 190–215.

[26] Rees and Wakely, *Publishing,* p. 42, n. 48.

[27] For a full account of the complicated legal battles surrounding patents, the print trade and the appointment of the King's Printer, see Rees and Wakely, *Publishing*.

[28] David J. Shaw, 'French-language publishing in London to 1900', in *Foreign-Language Printing in London, 1500–1900*, ed. Barry Taylor (Boston Spa and London, 2002), pp. 101–22, esp. p. 120.

[29] Rees and Wakely, *Publishing,* p. 194.

[30] Flood, 'Omnium totius', p. 16.

law, medicine, history, philosophy, poetry and mathematics, all in Latin, followed by German books, sometimes advertised in blackletter. The catalogues ended with 'Libri peregrini idiomatis', or books in the European vernaculars, and occasionally with a section announcing future offerings. Initially, Bill reprinted the catalogue revised to suit his market, but he quickly determined also to produce one of his own that would tout his and Norton's printed books. Between 1617 and 1621, Bill's reprinted catalogues included an appendix offering his and Norton's own recent publications: James's anti-papal works and those aimed at self-canonization, patristic writing, theological texts, and Protestant polemic and controversy, which was their specialty, but they soon began to act as agents for other British associates and firms, and, finally, 'as middlemen, agents or [even] backers or partners of continental colleagues'.[31] As Rees and Wakely put it,

> these were *joint-stock* businesses which means that Bill and Norton had interests [on the Continent] in a printing office or offices, and in a stock of books and other stationery wares which they presumably used in the same way that the partners used the stock in their London warehouses, i.e. as a flexible and indispensable trading resource, or indeed a form of currency.[32]

Norton died in 1612 and his cousin, Bonham Norton, took over his interests. Bill and Bonham Norton subsequently quarrelled and went to law, and in 1620, the firm sold their shares in the 'Latin stock' to the Stationers, so the appendix in which this early Shakespeare advertisement appears seems not to have been published by Bill, as Greg and Wilson believed, but on behalf of the Company itself.[33] In 1618, Bill had added to his printed catalogues a section entitled 'English Workes', an innovation taken up by the Stationers in their appendices printed between 1621 and 1628, when Bill again took over the publication of the catalogues until his death in 1630.[34] The Stationers' appendices continued to include books printed by Bill, but they also began, as might be expected, to offer a wider variety of English books under various imprints. Jaggard and Blount's First Folio was among them, advertised not only in the 1622 catalogue, while it was still in press, but also subsequently in the 1624 catalogue, after it had finally appeared, presumably, in November 1623.

Rees and Wakely assert that 'These works of course have nothing to do with the continental trade: entries of English-language titles were simply not meant for continental audiences.'[35] But things may not be quite so simple as Rees and Wakely aver. Why might the Stationers have included the First Folio among the English books advertised in the appendix to the Frankfurt book fair catalogue? No doubt both Bill, and subsequently the Stationers, used the reprinted catalogue with its English appendix to advertise and sell books for an English market, both English printed books and books imported from the Continent. But we know that Norton and Bill were selling books at the Frankfurt fair; why might there not be, among the 'great Variety of Readers' the First Folio syndicate sought to reach through such advertisements, Continental as well as English buyers? For, as Doug Bruster puts it succinctly in his essay 'Shakespeare the stationer', 'advertised goods are typically offered for sale'.[36]

To understand the appearance of the First Folio in the 1622 and 1624 appendices, we would do well also to take into account the considerable evidence documenting the presence and popularity of travelling players from England, the so-called *Englischer Comoedianten*, in what is now sometimes termed – in parallel with Braudel's 'Mediterranean World' – the 'North Sea World'.[37] Work by Jerzy Limon and Simon Williams, and more recently by Anston Bosman, Pavel Drábek, M. A. Katritzky

[31] Rees and Wakely, *Publishing*, p. 193.
[32] Rees and Wakely, *Publishing*, p. 190.
[33] Rees and Wakely, *Publishing*, p. 41. 'The Latin stock was set up in January 1616 by a group of 112 Stationers' and was never profitable (p. 41, n. 46); on the likely reasons for the sale, see pp. 40–4.
[34] Rees and Wakely, *Publishing,* p. 204.
[35] Rees and Wakely, *Publishing,* p. 212.
[36] Bruster, 'Shakespeare the stationer', p. 118.
[37] Anston Bosman, 'Northern Renaissance drama: a media ecology', manuscript.

and George Oppitz-Trotman, among others, drawing on both contemporary documents and nineteenth-century studies and early sources, has chronicled the visits of the travelling English actors who performed in various venues, both courts and urban centres: Paris and Fontainebleau, the Low Countries and Germany, reaching Vienna, Prague and even Gdansk, from the 1580s through the first half of the seventeenth century.[38] As Bosman observes, 'in the history of cultural relations between England and Europe, especially the Netherlands and Germany, the episode of the strolling players was an unexampled success'.[39] Yet, as he shows, commentators have typically 'deplored it as vulgarization', insisted on distinguishing between the so-called 'successful' players who remained at home, and the 'failures' who travelled abroad, and lauded the 'sophisticated London playgoers' over the putative '"somewhat rude audience" on the Continent'.[40] The very use of the term 'strolling' (to walk in a leisurely way as inclination directs, to ramble, saunter, wander) by scholars serves to undermine the focus and entrepreneurship of the troupes and their endeavours.[41]

The players were not only popular – their 'material', as has been shown, had a significant impact on the development of indigenous German drama.[42] But, as Bosman observes, the burgeoning scholarship on the English Comedians has remained a 'curiosity of literary history', focused on narrow empirical questions, rather than an illustrative example of cultural interchange. From occasional court performances, to more sustained sojourns at the courts of German princes, to a 'major presence in the theatre of several German cities', the number of troupes travelling and performing on the Continent increased in the first decades of the seventeenth century and seems only to have been slowed by the advent of the Thirty Years' War. The English Comedians 'created an awareness of theatre as an activity in its own right'; their impact was so substantial that, into the eighteenth century, troupes made up entirely of *German* actors continued to draw on this international brand by calling themselves 'English Comedians'.[43] Bosman notes that the often-observed scarcity of purpose-built playhouses in Northern Europe under-represents the dynamism and breadth of theatrical activity 'from London to Warsaw and from Copenhagen to Graz'.

From first-hand accounts of visitors to the city of Frankfurt and its book fair, and from other archival sources, we know that English troupes regularly performed at the Frankfurt fair. Fynes Moryson famously disparages the players out of England who

> played at Franckford in the tyme of the Mart, having neither a Complete number of Actours, nor any good Apparell, nor any ornament of the Stage, yet the Germans not understanding a worde they sayde, both men and women, flocked wonderfully to see theire gesture and Action, rather than heare them, speaking English which they understood not, and pronowncing peeces and Patches of English playes.[44]

[38] Jerzy Limon, *Gentlemen of a Company: English Players in Central and Eastern Europe, 1590–1660* (Cambridge, 1985); Simon Williams, *Shakespeare on the German Stage*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1990), vol. 1; Anston Bosman, 'Renaissance intertheatre and the staging of nobody', *ELH* 71.3 (2004), 559–85; George Oppitz-Trotman, '*Romeo and Juliet* in German, 1603–1604', *Notes and Queries* 62.1 (2015), 96–8; and Pavel Drábek and M. A. Katritzky, 'Shakespearean players in early modern Europe', in *The Cambridge Guide to the World of Shakespeare*, ed. Bruce R. Smith, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 2016), vol. 2, pp. 1527–33. For a brief survey of the English touring companies, see Peter Holland, 'Touring Shakespeare', in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Stage*, ed. Stanley Wells and Sarah Stanton (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 194–211.

[39] Bosman, 'Renaissance intertheatre', 559.

[40] Bosman, 'Renaissance intertheatre', 561.

[41] For an example of the pejorative impact of the modifier 'strolling' on judgements of the English players abroad, see Willi Flemming, quoted in Bosman, 'Renaissance intertheatre': 'the strolling actor lacks any connection with a cultural tradition', p. 561.

[42] See Gerhart Hoffmeister, 'The English Comedians in Germany', in *German Baroque Literature: The European Perspective*, ed. Hoffmeister (New York, 1983), pp. 142–58, esp. p. 146; Williams, *Shakespeare on the German Stage*; Albert Cohn's nineteenth-century study *Shakespeare in Germany in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Wiesbaden, 1865); and a host of other studies in both English and German that cannot be detailed here.

[43] Williams, *Shakespeare on the German Stage*, p. 29.

[44] *Shakespeare's Europe: A Survey of the Condition of Europe at the End of the 16th Century: Being Unpublished Chapters of Fynes*

Moryson's judgement of the English Comedians has endured. Albert Cohn, in his study of Shakespeare in Germany, writes of the 'weak ray from the sunlight of the Shakespearian drama' falling on Germany, but he provides a multitude of examples of such intertextual exchange.[45] 'Pronouncing pieces and patches of English playes' not only attracted enthusiastic audiences,[46] it also somehow managed to provoke the publication of a German 'translated' collection, *Engelische Comedien und Tragedien*, which purported to offer up material from the English players, including a 'version' of *Titus Andronicus*.[47] That collection appeared in octavo in 1620, hardly a format destined only for princely patrons or courtly fanciers of the English Comedians, but which some hard-headed printer/publisher/entrepreneur imagined would sell. Apparently it did, as the book was reissued in 1624 and additional volumes appeared subsequently. Bosman reminds us that the anonymous German Hamlet, *Der bestrafte Brudermord*, has never received the critical scrutiny it deserves.[48] Recently Russ Leo has demonstrated *Hamlet*'s importance on the Continent in his consideration of Geeraardt Brandt's *De Veinzende Torquatus*, which 'bears unmistakable traces of an encounter with Shakespeare's best-known tragedy'.[49] In Leo's estimation, we can trace 'the emergence of a theatre inflected by Shakespeare's work and English drama at large, but mediated by itinerant companies adapting this work for international audiences'.[50]

Moryson's recognition that gesture and action can be understood onstage even when words cannot also reminds us that travelling players who depended on 'gesture and action' scoured Europe in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries – Italian *commedia dell'arte* troupes, for example, toured as far away as England, the Low Countries and Spain, and in France even had their own theatre in Paris under the auspices of the French King.[51] Evidence points to a multi-lingual European theatre, in Bosman's terms, both nomadic and embodied, with ample 'action' including dance, acrobatics and other non-verbal forms.[52] In his account of the English players in Frankfurt, Moryson also observes that chief merchants at the Frankfurt fair, both Dutch and Flemish, regretted that their brisk business kept them from attending the English players' performances. We know that both Sidney and Sir Henry Wotton, among many others, visited the city of Frankfurt and its fair. From the Nuremberg chronicler Johann Christian Siebenkees's account of an English troupe's visit to the city in 1612, we learn that they 'attracted great crowds' of young and old, men and women, city fathers and 'educated professionals'.[53] Though concerned primarily with women and the English troupes in Germany,

Moryson's Itinerary (1617), ed. Charles Hughes (New York, 1903), p. 304.

[45] Cohn, *Shakespeare in Germany*, p. ix. See also Williams, *Shakespeare on the German Stage*, pp. 33–45. For thinking about such exchange more systemically and theoretically, see Robert Henke and Eric Nicholson's introduction to their important collection *Transnational Exchange in Early Modern Theatre*, ed. Robert Henke and Eric Nicholson (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 1–15.

[46] For an excellent survey of audiences' enthusiasm for the various English troupes, with emphasis on women, see M. A. Katritzky, 'English troupes in early modern Germany: the women', in *Transnational Exchange*, ed. Henke and Nicholson (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 35–48.

[47] See Maria Shmygol, '*Titus Andronicus* in seventeenth-century Germany', as delivered at the Shakespeare Association of America, Los Angeles, 28–31 March 2018; and *Early Modern German Shakespeare*: Titus Andronicus *and* The Taming of the Shrew: Tito Andronico *and* Kunst über alle Künste *in Translation*, ed. Maria Shmygol and Lukas Erne, under contract with Arden Shakespeare.

[48] Bosman, 'Renaissance intertheatre', 570. But see Tiffany Stern, '"If I could see the puppets dallying": *Der Bestrafte Brudermord* and Hamlet's encounters with the puppets', *Shakespeare Bulletin* 31.3 (2013), 337–52.

[49] Russ Leo, '*Hamlet*'s early international lives: Geeraardt Brandt's *De Veinzende Torquatus* and the performance of political realism', *Comparative Literature* 68.2 (2016), 155–80.

[50] Leo, '*Hamlet*'s early international lives', 156.

[51] For a discussion of what Moryson might mean by 'action', see Bosman, 'Renaissance intertheatre', 567. On the travels of the *commedia dell'arte* troupes, see Robert Henke, 'Border crossing in the commedia dell'arte', in *Transnational Exchange*, ed. Henke and Nicholson, pp. 19–34.

[52] Bosman, 'Renaissance intertheatre', 570. See William West, 'How chances if they travel? Expanding Shakespeare's Globe in early modern Germany', manuscript.

[53] Cited in Katritzky, 'English troupes', p. 39.

M. A. Katritzky offers an excellent survey of evidence of the varied audiences that attended their performances and their enthusiasm for the English players.[54]

The London actor Robert Browne, who travelled with various troupes on the Continent over some thirty years, inherited a share in the Globe in 1608, which he subsequently sold to Condell and Heminges. Thomas Sackville, a clown in his troupe who, as Bosman points out, apparently performed not only in English, but in Dutch and in German, ended his career a successful merchant in Frankfurt.[55] When playing at the fair, Browne's troupe seems to have stayed regularly at a particular inn in Frankfurt, the Sanduhr, whose proprietor undertook extensive, and expensive, building renovations in order to transform it into a suitable venue for performance, not a step likely to have been taken for irregular and infrequent visits.[56] In 1620, his widow outlined these investments in her ultimately successful appeal to the city authorities, who had initially denied the players' petition for permission to perform following her husband's death. *Pace* Moryson, Henslowe, entrepreneur and purveyor of costumes and stage properties to the London theatre, apparently numbered the Continental troupes among his clients.[57] The travelling players employed not only English actors, but foreign comedians as well, and thus fostered a theatre that was multilingual and what we might today term transnational.[58] In short, many studies have shown that the English actors' presence on the Continent was regular, recurrent, various, multiple and much more than a mere curiosity.

In 1621, we know that John Bill hosted at his home debates between Anglicans and Catholic scholars, and that Edward Blount, because of his 'neerenesse of freindship' to Bill, 'was allowed to come by myself and to bring 2. or 3. of my friends'.[59] Here we should remember Lesser's account of reading quoted earlier. Publishers chose to publish, to print and to advertise, based on myriad factors – perhaps, he says, even 'based on what friends or fellow stationers may have said about the text. All these judgments, many of which may be only partly conscious, are part of the publisher's reading of the text, for they form its "horizon of expectations"'.[60] Maybe the appearance of the First Folio advertisement among sermons and Protestant polemic is neither the 'surprise' Greg saw in it, nor the irrelevance Rees and Wakely claim. John Bill, a Frankfurt fair regular, and a savvy entrepreneur, might well have believed it made good business sense to offer for sale on the Continent 'Playes, written by M. William Shakespeare, all in one volume, printed by Isaack Iaggard, in. fol.' He, and the Folio syndicate, may have had a wider 'horizon of expectations' than our own Anglocentric blinders allow.

This assemblage of facts suggests that, even before there were modern nation-states; before the First Folio arrived at the Bodleian in 1624, despite Bodley's disparagement of such 'rifferaffes'; before the First Folio made its way into the libraries of such influential figures of the Dutch Golden Age as Joost van den Vondel, Constantijn Huygens and Johan Huydekooper van Maarseveen, the mayor of Amsterdam,[61] or of the Catholic college that educated English recusants at Saint-Omer; and some years before the Folio became a part of the libraries of Louis XIV and of his cultured finance minister, Fouquet; before the playwright was mentioned in passing in a 1682 German edition of comparative poetry – Shakespeare was always already multilingual and transnational, an incipient global cultural commodity.

[54] Katritzky, 'English troupes', p. 39.
[55] Bosman, 'Renaissance intertheatre', 564.
[56] See the Frankfurt Stadtarchiv, Ratssupplikationen 1619, cited in Katritzky, 'English troupes', p. 43.
[57] Katritzky, 'English troupes', p. 42.
[58] With regard to theatrical cultural exchange, both in early modern Europe and in response to classical models, which led to the generation of what Louise George Clubb terms 'theatregrams', see *Italian Drama in Shakespeare's Time* (New Haven, 1989), and her several articles preceding its publication. Bosman takes up this idea in a slightly different register, borrowing the term 'interlanguage' from applied linguistics, to describe these hybrid dramatic forms on the Continent as what he terms Renaissance 'intertheatre': 'Renaissance intertheatre', 565.
[59] Quoted in Rees and Wakely, *Publishing*, p. 241.
[60] Lesser, *Renaissance Drama*, p. 9.
[61] Leo, '*Hamlet*'s early international lives', 156.

THE STRANGER AT THE DOOR: BELONGING IN SHAKESPEARE'S EPHESUS

NANDINI DAS[1]

The shadows of two familiar texts loom behind Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors*: Plautus' *Menaechmi*, and St Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. *The Menaechmi* introduces the action about to unfold on stage with a casual, knowing nod towards the workings of the theatre, at once wondrous and banal. Walls and boundaries dissolve. As Plautus' Prologue explains:

> atque hoc poetae faciunt in comoediis:
> omnis res gestas esse Athenis autumant,
> quo illud uobis graecum uideatur magis;
>
> [This is what writers do in comedies: they claim that everything took place in Athens, intending that it should seem more Greek to you.][2]

If Plautus was a non-Roman Italian from Umbria, as some accounts suggest, he would have been particularly well positioned to understand that, in Rome's fictional world of *comoedia palliata* ('drama in a Greek cloak'), foreignness was interchangeable. It is not difficult, in a theatre, to take one city, one person, for another. One person's 'Athenish' ('atticissat', l. 12) could easily become another's 'Sicilish' ('sicilicissitat'). But theatre pushes the limits of that interchangeability further. It is a space in which inhabiting another's position, perspective and place – for better or for worse – is entirely possible:

> haec urbs Epidamnus est dum haec agitur fabula:
> quando alia agetur aliud fiet oppidum;
> sicut familiae quoque solent mutarier:
> modo hic habitat leno, modo adulescens, modo senex,
> pauper, mendicus, rex, parasitus, hariolus.
>
> [This city is Epidamnus as long as this play is being staged. When another is staged it'll become another town, just as households too always change. At one time a pimp lives here, at another a young man, at yet another an old one, a pauper, a beggar, a king, a hanger-on, a soothsayer.][3]

St Paul writes of the dissolution of walls and boundaries too, although his concerns are of a different order. Our readings of Paul's Epistle, when *The Comedy of Errors* is involved, hovers around descriptions of Ephesus as a city of 'curious arts' and magic (Acts 19.19), and Paul's advice on

[1] For the initial impetus to explore the subject of this article, I would like to thank Alan Stewart and the 'Languages of Tudor Englishness' seminar at the Shakespeare Association of America Conference (2018). Thanks also to Eoin Price for his invitation to deliver a keynote at the British Shakespeare Association Conference (2019), which inspired further work on the topic, and to Farah Karim-Cooper, Lucy Munro and Preti Taneja for their support and advice. Research for this publication was supported by the ERC-TIDE Project (www.tideproject.uk). This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 681884).

[2] Plautus, 'The two Menaechmuses', in *Casina. The Casket Comedy. Curculio. Epidicus. The Two Menaechmuses*, ed. and trans. Wolfgang de Melo, Loeb Classical Library 61 (Cambridge, MA, 2011), pp. 428–9, ll. 7–9.

[3] Plautus, 'The two Menaechmuses', pp. 428–9, ll. 72–6.