demonstrates that the recurring fonts form clear patterns, and concludes that the MS Bushell acquired and that Simmes printed was the authorial foul paper of Marlowe and his collaborator.

In 1602 Henslowe paid Rowley and Birde for 'additions' made to <i>Faustus</i>. It seems that the publisher, John Wright, had access, in c.1616, to a MS that both included the additions and responded to the 1606 <i>Acte to Restrayne Abuses of Players</i> by expurgating the names of God and Christ. From this material, plus the A3 Quarto, emerged the B1 Quarto.

An inconclusive chapter examines 'function words'—i.e. an author tends to use articles, adverbs, conjunctions, and prepositions with recognizable individuality over several, or all, of his or her works. The scenes often attributed to the collaborator (n. iv and iv. i) are tested against other works by the possible candidates—Dekker, Rowley, Nash, et al. —but Rasmussen favours a new candidate, Henry Porter, author of <i>Two Angry Women of Abington</i>, and Marlowe's Cambridge contemporary. 'Do you hear? ' appears eight times in the Wagner–Robin Act I, Scene iv, and this phrase is common in Porter's play. There is also a relatively high coincidence of function words. But Rasmussen does not claim that Porter's candidature is more than a possibility.

The final chapter examines B-text revisions of the A-text. This inevitably deals, <i>inter alia</i>, with the possible Calvinistic interpretation, which tends to focus on the will/can variation of A-text 'Neyer too late if Faustus can repent', and B-text '.... if Faustus will repent'. Michael Warren has rightly pointed out that the semantic difference between 'will' and 'shall' in this context is smudgy; and the Calvinistic case seems doubtful—and I would have thought dramatically disastrous as it removes the tension of Faustus's decision and its consequences.

This book is, as I have tried to show, an excellent survey and stimulating critical discussion of the textual problems in <i>Faustus</i>.

Pembroke College, Cambridge

COLIN WILCOCKSON

Edward II. By CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE. Edited by RICHARD ROWLAND.


It is pleasing to have a reasonable 'old-spelling' text of this play, with a good commentary and an exciting (if perhaps rather speculative) introduction.

I must confess to a preference for modernized texts, but this is not to say that I do not acknowledge the need for reprinted or edited versions of texts as they were produced during the Renaissance, whether in print or in manuscript. Indeed, we obviously need both kinds of editions. A modernized text makes a literary work accessible (and often surprisingly 'modern') to a much larger group of readers. Inevitably, during the process of modernization some things of value get lost, but this seems to me a price well worth paying. That applies with the more force if readers who are interested in seeing just what has been lost can turn to a scholarly presentation of a more 'authentic' text (which, however, may well have many imperfections of its own).

These days, with the number of modernized texts constantly on the increase and 'old-spelling' editions becoming more and more the province of the specialist, I find myself wondering whether the best way to produce an 'old-spelling' Edward II would not be to present a facsimile of the 1594 quarto. In saying this I am not implying criticism of the editor, but raising a matter of policy. An advantage of a facsimile (if that can be produced) is that obviously the editor is saved the enormous bother of trying to copy out a text that has so many variations in spelling and punctuation that editorial errors are very likely to occur (though I do not mean that I have found any). And if...
editor does not significantly alter the original text anyway, why not produce that in the most original form possible? Rowland’s treatment of the quarto on which his text is based is highly conservative, and it would have been quite possible to list his suggested emendations and additions as a separate entity from the text.

At this point I do have a few comparatively minor but not insignificant criticisms to offer. If the text is to be presented with editorial alterations, then I think the editor has a duty to do so in a consistent and helpful fashion. That has not always happened. In principle, Rowland recognizes the need for supplementary stage directions, as in scene 1, line 200.1: [Enter guard.]. But at times they are strangely absent, as in the following:

EDWARD. Lancaster.
LANCASTER. My Lorde.
GAVESTON. That Earle of Lancaster do I abhorre.

(scene 1, 11. 74-6)

This speech by Gaveston is an aside, as are the next three lines, before he reveals himself to Edward in line 130 after his enemies have left the stage. All these speeches, as they are printed in this edition, pose a problem to a reader who might—in the absence of directions to the contrary—conclude that Gaveston is participating in the dialogue. Yet the editor is himself aware that this is not so in his introduction (p. xix), which surely the reader cannot be supposed to remember when confronted with the text.

Difficulties of this kind are by no means uncommon. For example, it is sometimes quite hard to guess who is addressing whom, and one might expect the editor to have given more guidance. In the case of the punctuation, too, problems arise, though I admit that these are probably inevitable in any ‘old-spelling’ edition other than a facsimile. To an extent, the editor is aware of the need to supplement the pointing of the quarto. He is willing to incorporate marks from subsequent early quartos, although he feels that none of them has ‘authorial authority’ (p. xxxviii). If there is no such authority, there is really no good reason for excluding much needed other punctuation; or alternatively, if one's purpose is to produce Q1 as a text supposedly closer to the author than any modernized version could be, later punctuation—even from early quartos that have no special authority—should be avoided. Which takes me back to my earlier point that the best way to deal with all such matters is probably to produce a facsimile of the primary source, with editorial matter offered separately.

Editorial comment on textual matters is not always clear or convincing. Thus we have (as a note relating to scene 1):

71-2 majestie. I My lord.] Thus Q1 and Q2, Q3 and Q4 substitute a comma for the full stop after majestie'. Many editors, following Tucker Brooke, emend to ‘majestic, I My lord. Heere . . .’. But, although the idiom is unusual in the period, Q1's pointing makes sound theatrical sense: Gaveston gives a startled, enraptured exclamation at his first glimpse of Edward since returning from exile.

A more systematic method of collating the evidence would have been useful. Presumably the sense here is improved if we read a semi-colon after 'Q2'. If so, Tucker Brooke merely builds on what Q3 and Q4 have already initiated. And the return to Q1 and 2 is made the less persuasive by the very admission that the idiom there is ‘unusual in the period’.

Nevertheless, I have no reason for believing that the old-spelling text offered is not likely to be reasonable within its limits, i.e. as, for the most part, a transcript of Q1 with some editorial alterations and additions.

The commentary contains much that is valuable and illuminating, but here, too, I
found myself wishing for more. Not all readers will guess the connection between 'porpintine' (sc. 1, l. 40) and 'porcupine', despite a learned note on the nature of the beast. In sc. 2, l. 25 'slave' means 'rascal'. In sc. 22, l. 39, 'finely' has (among other senses) the important Elizabethan one of 'cleverly'/ 'cunningly' (with Marlowe allowing Lightborn self-praise which is at once partly undermined). Far too often the commentary does not explain who is meant when words like 'brother', 'earl', etc. are used in the text, and frequently the reader is left to guess at the modern equivalent of Elizabethan forms (as with T for modern 'ay', sc. 21, l. 25). Nevertheless, I generally found that where I needed a gloss the editor did provide it.

The explanations of contextual points are particularly good, and so is the contextualizing introduction. Too many critics these days are determined to find specific political allusions in plays which either cannot be argued to have them or range well beyond such preoccupations. Although Rowland may push his case a little too hard, he does establish a very interesting comparison between Edward and James, and especially with regard to the matter of homoeroticism. I found it difficult to dismiss the resemblances between the two kings as merely accidental; or if Marlowe did not intend us to see the similarities, it is still possible that he happened to give potent dramatic force to currents present and to come.

This is also a play which lends itself rather more than most to the attempt to see the world presented as one that is 'destabilized' or 'disoriented'. Still, I do not find Marlowe so lacking in positive moral and emotional conviction as Rowland appears to allow. For example, Kent is surely not merely a 'hapless dupe' (p. xxiv). And at the end the new king appears to re-establish some sort of order, although ambiguities remain in evidence. We can, moreover, respond to valuable things in characters not otherwise very deserving. A line like 'With haire that gilds the water as it glides', though spoken by Gaveston, has exactly the poetic resonance and superlative skill for which Marlowe himself is rightly renowned.

All in all, this edition is, with certain reservations, to be welcomed.

Footnote: since the above was written, the new (modernized) Revels edition, also published in 1994, and edited by Charles R. Forker, has come to my attention. As the two editors did their work independently, this does not influence my comments on Rowland's edition per se. No do I have the space here to compare the editions with each other. Suffice it to say that in my view admirers of Edward II will probably wish to own both Rowland's edition and Forker's volume, which at first sight strikes me as admirable.

The Flinders University of South Australia

Joost DAALDER


The theme of this volume is 'Playing Places for Shakespeare', and my review will concentrate on the articles that relate most directly to the central theme. John Orrell ('The Architecture of the Fortune Playhouse') has three points to make about the theatre. Though it occupied a smaller area than the Globe, its gallery-space was virtually identical; its middle gallery was proportioned in accordance with Renaissance architectural theory; and its posts were topped by terms in the form of satyrs, a feature with complicated symbolic implications. It does, however, seem strange that a theatre built on such sophisticated principles, and recognized by contemporary writers as a beautiful building, should so rapidly have become notorious for vulgarity and rowdiness.

Andrew Gurr ('The Bare Island') considers a number of problems about the...