William Shakespeare. 2016. *The Comedy of Errors*. Edited by Kent Cartwright. The Arden Shakespeare. London: Bloomsbury

William Shakespeare. 2017. *Cymbeline*. Edited by Valerie Wayne. The Arden Shakespeare. London: Bloomsbury

Jesús Tronch Pérez
Universitat de València, Spain

In 2015, Bloomsbury, the publisher of the renowned Arden Shakespeare, announced preparations for a fourth sequence of editions while its Third Series, initiated in 1995, was nearing completion with nine plays in the pipeline (including *Edward III*). *Macbeth* appeared in 2015, *Henry IV Part Two* in 2016, and then the two editions under review. As for May 2018, *Midsummer Night's Dream* (2017), *Edward III* (2017), and *King John* (2018) have been published, so that *All Well's That Ends Well* (announced for December 2018) and *Measure for Measure* will crown the Third Series.

As Kent Cartwright states at the beginning of his preface, he assumed the editorship of Shakespeare's most Plautine comedy after the untimely death of its initial editor, Gareth Roberts.[1] Cartwright's Introduction and notes make readers appreciate the richness, complexity and depth of a comedy that has often been brushed off as a mechanical "imitation" of Plautus's farcical *Menaechmi*. After pointing out how *Errors* anticipates issues, motifs and devices present in later Shakespeare comedies, the first chapter of the

[1] Exact dating of Cartwright's edition of *Comedy of Errors* is somewhat problematic. The paperback copy I have received for review prints "Editorial matter © 2016 Kent Cartwright," and then "First published 2017" just below, in a way contradicting the publisher's website, which advertises the edition as published on 15 December 2016 for the hardback, paperback, PDF and EPUB formats. The online catalogue of the British Library registers 2016 as the creation date, but this is in an entry for the "online resource" type, while entries for the traditional "paper" book in university catalogues state 2017 as the creation date. Considering that what matters is the content and not the format, I have dated the edition 2016.

Introduction, "Error and Identity," examines how Shakespeare is concerned with the problem of human identity, the balance between inwardness and appearance (14), the possibility of losing and transforming one's sense of self, and how *Errors* parodies "as much as affirms […] the idea of oneself-as-another" (22). Cartwright admirably leads readers through this discussion by drawing attention to the way language and imagery flesh out issues and emotional responses. Such a formalist approach, with an incisiveness and pervasiveness uncommon in Arden critical introductions, is also carried out in "The Cultural World" chapter, the largest one, where Cartwright explores the motif of black magic, the marketplace, religion, time, and marriage. He explains how words have the uncanny power to call forth objects or actions (30), how the use of puns generates a "linguistic anarchy" that becomes a metaphor for the play's action (32), how religious language is politically charged with anti-Catholic overtones while at the same time allowing a Catholic-oriented reading, so that in the end "*Errors* does not align easily with one confessional position over another" (45). In a new chapter, entitled "Poetic geography, travel, Dark Ephesus," the play's geographical setting is revealed to be associated with mercantilism, sorcery and magic through its Pauline reminiscences.

The next chapter, "Genre and style," regales us with a detailed account of the play's generic shifts (from comedy, to farce, to romance, and even intimations of tragedy), uses of prose and verse (in its various stanzaic forms), and of devices such as repetition-with-variation. Cartwright's own style captivates us with illustrative images, as in "*Errors*'s fun comes partly from its different generic hats doffed or donned with a mime's ease" (58), or, on commenting on Shakespeare's eclectic resort to sources, "Shakespeare is like a juggler tossing up both footballs and teacups" (74). The "Sources and Influences" chapter shows that there is much more to *Errors* than Plautus's *Menaechmi*: the anti-Catholic satire recalls *Jack Juggler*'s parody of transubstantiation (91), and many allusions to contemporary London have analogues in contemporary pamphlets. Nonetheless, in Cartwright's comparison with the Latin comedy, I missed an elaboration of the ideological consequences of Shakespeare's variations.

Although Cartwright posits that the play offers "few staging problems and adapts easily to different imaginative settings" (93), he

devotes a chapter to this theatrical dimension, paying special attention to the staging of the "lock-out" episode in 3.1 (with reference to his article published in 2006). This seems to result from his decision to add three elements in his critical text: the stage direction "[*Exeunt with Dromio last*]" at the end of 2.2 (complemented by the commentary note "Dromio […] would exit last, or he might linger on stage, visible to the audience"); qualifying Adriana's entrance as "[*above, within the house*]" at 3.1.60; and the details for the exit stage direction at the end of 3.1 with Syracusan Dromio leaving the stage "*separately.*" The dilemma of doubling actors for the sets of twins is also dealt with in this chapter, preceding a section on the early performances, and then the conventional chapter on the play's "Afterlife." In the latter, Cartwright provides an enlightening discussion of the frontispiece in Nicholas Rowe's 1709 edition as realizing the play's "rich multivalence" (114), since it "holds diverse, potentially conflicting aspects, of the play in balance" (113), a balance that often modern productions do not manage to strike when they stress some dimensions "to the exclusion of others" (114). In his survey of stage productions, Cartwright points out that *Errors* is the "first Shakespeare play adapted for a musical in the American theatre" (121): *The Boys from Syracuse*, whose premiere in 1938 alluded to "political events in Nazi Europe" (122).

This 132-page introduction is comparatively lengthy, bearing in mind that *Errors* is not one of the "canonical" plays. Encompassing just 1,753 lines, it is Shakespeare's shortest play (Hart 1932, 21; Erne 2003, 165). One wonders if avoidance of a longer introduction led to placing the "Date of Composition" section in an appendix (only three previous Arden editions have done so). More usual in the series is to find "Longer Notes" (supplementing the commentary notes at the foot of the page) after the critical text, and the editor's textual analysis and statement of editorial procedures in appendices. Cartwright instructively explains the problems in lineation and in the positioning of stage directions that editors face because of the practices of the compositors of the First Folio text, the comedy's only substantive witness. As for the manuscript provenance of the printer's copy, he aptly brings into the analysis the contributions by William B. Long and Paul Werstine that question the possibility of identifying features that allow editors to distinguish "foul papers" from "promptbooks." For Cartwright, *Errors*'s compositors were probably reading "authorial papers that could have served as a

playbook for performance" (343). This performance took place "on the stage of a public playhouse" (346), Cartwright concludes by quoting Ichikawa (2007, 81), and this conclusion has been at the basis of his editorial decisions on stage directions (350). In the section on editorial procedures, he does not describe his editing principles with respect to a more or less emendatory treatment of the text, but focuses on explaining his intrusions (duly indicated in the collation notes with "*this edn*"), namely quotation marks in the dialogue to signal "when a speaker self-consciously repeats the words" of his or her interlocutor, and stage directions added to "mark certain actions, especially the passing of an object—a purse, a key, a chain—[...] or the striking of one character by another" (349). It is surprising that Cartwright does not refer to any use of the electronic resources *Early English Books Online-Text Creation Partnership* and *Lexicons of Early Modern English* (as, for instance, Valerie Wayne has done for her edition of *Cymbeline*; see below).

The resulting edited text can be deemed accurate, after comparing samples with Charlton Hinman's facsimile. Two new emendations in the dialogue comprise Cartwright's contribution (not a mean feat) to the play's long editorial history: the conjunction "and" replacing the Folio "or" in "Thou wouldst have changed thy place for a name, and thy name for an ass" (3.1.47), a decision justified in one of the Longer Notes; and the lineation of 4.4.125 as verse, in consonance with his minute attention to meter.

Finally, the commentary notes show the concern with performance issues that is customary in Arden Shakespeare, and, in line with Cartwright's formalist approach, display more attention to meter and rhetoric than in other Arden editions.

Cymbeline is, as Michael Dobson and Stanely Wells describe it, "at once one of the most puzzlingly uncertain in tone, and one of the most weirdly affecting, of Shakespeare's later plays" (2001, 103). Wayne's superb edition surely makes readers savor these features from the printed page. Her 136-page, richly informative introduction deals with genre, date, historical context (exploring issues of national identity, colonialism and empire), gender and sexuality, sources and intertexts, and afterlife of the play. As in a good number of other Arden 3 editions, discussion of the text and its editorial treatment is left to an appendix. Since the generic heterogeneity of the play is one of its notorious features (often equated with Polonius's hotchpotch-

like term "tragical-comical-historical-pastoral" in the Folio *Hamlet* [Bevington, TLN 1446]), it seems justified to position "A play of mixed genres" as the first chapter of the Introduction. Difficult as it is to pin it down to strict categories, Wayne persuades readers that "identifying *Cymbeline* as a tragical-comical-historical-pastoral dramatic romance may convey its play with generic form better than most" (24). Wayne discusses unexplored ramifications of the calumny plot, especially in the light of Helen Cooper's monograph on medieval romance (2004). As one of the play's "chief features," she highlights its innovative treatment of women within the play's overall misogynist discourse: Posthumus forgives and accepts his wife Innogen and regards "his own actions as even worse than hers" (13). Wayne concludes this chapter by emphasizing how the play recapitulates many themes and motifs Shakespeare used in his previous productions, which confers an appropriately valedictory character to the last play in the 1623 folio collection.

The "Date and Context" section (30–49) is richly detailed, citing historical events, performances and publications in 1610, with which Wayne associates issues, motifs, and topical concerns in the play. An important event is the investiture of Prince Henry as Prince of Wales, which Wayne relates to the play's interest in the name of Britain as part of King James's policy of being accepted as "King of Great Britain." The publication in 1610 of Galilei's *Sideri Nuncius* (*Starry Messenger* or *Message*), which confirmed the Copernican cosmological system, is possibly alluded to in Cymbeline's question "Does the world go round?" (5.5.232). Interestingly, in a footnote Wayne discards any relationship (posited by Chambers [1930, 1, 485], Bullough [1975, vol. 8, 12] and Warren [1989, 65]) between Innogen and Lady Arbella Stuart. For Wayne, if such association were possible, the play never would have been performed, especially at court (45). The accumulative evidence of these associations persuade Wayne that *Cymbeline* was written between March and November 1610 (50), in line with the recent appraisal of the chronology of Shakespeare's canon by Gary Taylor and Rory Loughnane (2017, 579–81).

In "Ancient Britain in Early Modern England," Wayne analyses how the play registers issues of the debate over James I's project of unifying the kingdoms of England and Scotland, but "without establishing a strongly partisan position in the controversy," as in

her view Shakespeare often has it (56). This ambivalence is also brought to light by Wayne in the play's gesturing toward the cultural prestige of ancient Rome in justifying England's incipient empire. Its critique portrays both contemporary court culture (in the positive portrayal of Guiderius and Arviragus) and the Italian Renaissance (impersonated in Iachimo) as "degenerate forms of imperial Rome" (66). In the "British identities" chapter, Wayne dissects the mixed affinities the play activates with British, Welsh, English and Scottish identities as well as with Roman, Briton and Celtic heritage (ultimately offered as worthy), and points out how *Cymbeline* resists easy, one-to-one correlations such Cymbeline-James I, or Guiderius-Prince Henry (80–81).

Wayne revisits issues she discussed in her essay "Gendered Text" (2016), such as Innogen's presumed virginity and the parallelisms between Posthumus and Cloten, and offers a generous examination of homoeroticism and fluidity of gender in Innogen's male disguise as Fidele and her/his attraction by her unknown brothers Guiderius and Arviragus (91–92) and in Cymbeline's remark "O what am I? | A mother to the birth of three?" (5.5.367–68) at the reunion and reconciliation/climax of the play (92–94). For Wayne, it is noteworthy that characters promoting discord are those that "dogmatically assert the claims of homogeneous femininity (Iachimo, Posthumus, Cloten) or manipulative femininity (the Queen)" (93), each being punished, reformed, or expelled; and she notes as well that Innogen's disguises do not empower her (unlike other Shakespearean cross-dressed heroines) and is in the end ideologically associated with what the patriarchy imposes on women: family and husband. In the chapter on "Sources and Intertexts," Wayne reviews previous scholarship on the various chronicles, romances, plays, and narratives with which *Cymbeline* can be connected, and pays special attention to possible influences by Cervantes's tale "The Curious Impertinent" (one of the Cardenio episodes), specifically in relation to references to Innogen as a diamond and to the use of metatextuality.

The introduction is capped by a section devoted to the play's "afterlives" on the stage, in translations, and in adaptations for radio, television, and film. This section, in which Wayne describes the dramatic, cultural, and ideological changes made by the "subsequent lives," makes clear that *Cymbeline* is not a forgotten play. Oddly

enough, Wayne mentions translations into Russian, German, Italian, Polish, Greek, Japanese, Chinese, and one twenty-first century Portuguese translation, but no Spanish rendering (!), when the SH·ES·TRA database of Shakespeare translations in Spain until 2000 registers nine, and Ángel-Luis Pujante published one in 2012 (I have not searched for translations in the Americas).

Cymbeline has comparatively few textual problems: its only substantive text is that printed in the First Folio, very likely from a transcript made by the professional scribe Ralph Crane, who also copied five other plays in the Folio (among them *The Tempest,* the first in the collection). I have checked random samples of Wayne's critical text against Hinman's facsimile of the First Folio and the results bespeak of an accurate text (barring details such as the modernization of "ought" at 5.4.33, which should be "aught"). Questionable as any critical text inherently is, points of disagreement may be confined to some of her added stage directions (mainly asides), and perhaps to her giving the name of Dorothy to the lady attending on Innogen (who enters at 2.3.76), the name appearing at 2.3.138 (a speech-prefix designation that is first adopted in this edition and that Wayne acknowledges to Martin Butler's suggestion). Unlike most editions (including Ann Thompson's for the Norton Shakespeare 3rd edition), Wayne corrects Folio's Imogen as Innogen (as did the Oxford 1986 and 2016 complete works editions); and keeps Iachimo (instead of modernizing it as Giacomo, as did Thompson and the Oxford editors). For Innogen, Wayne devotes nine pages in the appendix to justify her decision (391–98); for Iachimo, its corresponding commentary note in the List of roles.

Those enjoying learned and informative notes to Shakespeare's plays will be satisfied with Wayne's copious and judicious commentaries. She does not shrink from providing a long paraphrase when the glossed sentenced is obscure or elliptical (e.g. 1.4.19–23), or from describing about how a scene, a situation, or even a line has been staged (e.g. 1.2.7). If commentary notes usually signal when Shakespeare coined a word, as recorded in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the advent of *Early English Books Online-Text Creation Partnership* allowed scholars to question a number of claims to Shakespeare's lexical inventiveness in the OED. And since the EEBO-TCP project is still expanding, it is therefore reasonable that Wayne does not include this kind of claim in her commentary notes. The use

of this electronic resource has also been fundamental in Wayne's decision to keep Folio readings that the editorial tradition had been emending. One instance of these "restorations" is "solicity" (2.3.47), a word which previous editors believed it did not exist (and the OED continues to obviate, as for May 2018) when a search for the term in EEBO-TCP up to 1610 returns 21 hits in 16 records (again, as for May 2018, with the "variant spellings" option activated). (Incidentally, the textual note for "solicity" misplaces the siglum "F2" before the variant "solicits.")

In her analysis of the Folio text in "Appendix 1," Wayne adds more evidence to secure attribution of the printer's copy to Ralph Crane (387). She finds compelling Taylor and Jowett's proposal that Crane made his transcript from a manuscript copied by two different hands (390). She also provides reasons to support the possibility of revision by Shakespeare, a hypothesis which she tentatively connects to the two-hand character of the manuscript that Crane transcribed (401). At a time when Shakespeare's authorship has been revisited, especially by the New Oxford Shakespeare team of scholars (Taylor and Egan, 2017), it should be pointed out that Wayne summarily declines to open the question of the authorship of the apparently interpolated fourteeners voicing the dream vision in 5.4.30–62. Its Shakespearean attribution has not been questioned by Taylor and Loughnane (2017, 581). The textual appendix is followed by appendices on music and (a singular feature in the Arden Shakespeare series) on casting and doubling.

Thirty-seven pages of works cited denote the vast reading and research carried out by Wayne. But perhaps Wayne's inquiring spirit is best appreciated in the fact that she acknowledges the assistance of nineteen individuals through private communication, among them actors and scholars (such as Richard Proudfoot and Thompson, two of the general editors of the series). Wayne also includes online references by bloggers and composers.

To conclude, for their range of critical approaches and concerns and for their illuminating commentary notes that make readers appreciate the plays' complexities, the editions of Cartwright and Wayne are a pleasure to read, and both live up to the best Arden Shakespeare tradition, which will soon see its Third Series completed.

References

Bevington, David, ed. "*Hamlet* (Modern, Folio)." *Internet Shakespeare Editions*. University of Victoria. Accessed May 16, 2018. http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/doc/Ham_FM/complete/

Bullough, Geoffrey, ed. 1975. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. Vol. 8. 8 vols. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Butler, Martin, ed. 2005. *Cymbeline*, by William Shakespeare. The New Cambridge Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cartwright, Kent. 2006. "Staging the 'Lock-out' Scene in the Folio *Comedy of Errors*." *Studies in Bibliography* 24: 1–12.

Chambers, Edmund K. 1930. *William Shakespeare : A Study of Facts and Problems*. 2 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cooper, Helen. 2004. *The English Romance in Time: Transforming Motifs from Geoffrey of Monmouth to the Death of Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dobson, Michael, and Stanley Wells, eds. 2001. *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

EEBO-TCP: Early English Books Online-Text Creation Partnership. Accessed July 13, 2018. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebogroup/

Erne, Lukas. 2013. *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hart, Alfred. 1932. "The Number of Lines in Shakespeare's Plays." *The Review of English Studies* OS 8 (29): 19–28. doi:10.1093/res/os-VIII.29.19.

Hinman, Charlton, ed. 1968. *The First Folio of Shakespeare : Norton Facsimile*. New York, London: W W Norton / Hamlyn.

Ichikawa, Mariko. 2007. "The Staging of *The Comedy of Errors*, Act 3, Scene 1." *English Literary Renaissance* 15: 81–97.

Long, William B. 1985. "Stage Directions: A Misinterpreted Factor in Determining Textual Provenance." *Text* 2: 121–37.

Oxford English Dictionary Online. 2018. Oxford University Press. Accessed May 16, 2018. http://www.oed.com/

Pujante, Ángel-Luis, trans. 2012. "Cimbelino." In *William Shakespeare: Comedias & tragicomedias,* edited by Ángel-Luis Pujante, 1057–1160. Madrid: Espasa Libros, S. L. U.

Rowe, Nicholas, ed. 1709. *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear*. 6 Vols. London: Jacob Tonson.

SH·ES·TRA: Shakespeare en España en traducción. University of Murcia. Accessed May 16, 2018. https://www.um.es/shakespeare/shestra/index.php

Taylor, Gary, and Gabriel Egan, eds. 2017. *The New Oxford Shakespeare Authorship Companion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, Gary, and Rory Loughnane. 2017. "The Canon and Chronology of Shakespeare's Works." In *The New Oxford Shakespeare Authorship Companion,* edited by Gary Taylor and Gabriel Egan, 417–602. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, Gary, John Jowett, Terri Bourus, and Gabriel Egan, eds. 2016. *The New Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thompson, Ann, ed. 2016. "Cymbeline." In *The Norton Shakespeare*, third edition, volume 2, 1321–1415. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Warren, Roger. 1989. *Cymbeline*. Shakespeare in Performance. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Wayne, Valerie. 2015. "The First Folio's Arrangement and Its Finale." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 66 (4): 389–408.

Wayne, Valerie. 2016. "The Gendered Text and Its Labour." In *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Embodiment*, edited by Valerie Traub, 549–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wells, Stanley, Gary Taylor, John Jowett, and William Montgomery, eds. 1986. *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Werstine, Paul. 2013. *Early Modern Playhouse Manuscripts and the Editing of Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

How to cite this review:
Tronch Pérez, Jesús. Review of William Shakespeare, *The Comedy of Errors*, ed. Kent Cartwright (London: Bloomsbury, 2016) and William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*, ed. Valerie Wayne (London: Bloomsbury, 2017). *SEDERI* 28 (2018): 131–40.

Author's contact: tronch@uv.es

Postal address: Departament de Filologia Anglesa i Alemanya – Facultat de Filologia, Traducció i Comunicació – Avinguda Blasco Ibáñez, 32 – 46010 València, Spain