**'The Occasion(s) of *As You Like It* and Editing the Play'**

Michael Hattaway

**SLIDE 1**

***Occasio* Take Occasion (Time) by the forelock, for she is bald behind (Tilley T311) from work published in Basel in 1523 . Emblem of the transient nature of *occasions*, both Renaissance and modern, with which we have to deal. Note also the *monde renversé* motif in border*,* enthroned child.**

**SLIDE 2**

Now edited 4 Shsp, 1 Jon. 1 Beaumont. All of these are volumes in which **spelling and punctuation are completely modernised**. Moderately happy with this reader-friendly approach, and have to say that I think old-spelling printed editions are obsolete in age of internet. (Internet still supplementary to print edition?) However, will share with you problems that arise with modernisation and regularisation, particularly, as it happens, words that derive from French.

New Cambridge Shsp likes to think of itself as being particularly open to performance, both **performance history and performance possibilities**: and have always thought that among my ideal readers directors planning productions. However, problems deciding which productions to discuss. Internet Shakespeare Editions now beginning to appear and these catalogue not only long lists of performances and some production photos. Have to confess, have chosen productions for which I have found reviews that offer some sort of opinion rather than mere evaluation, and tried to ‘catch’ occasions from the US and Europe. Is such a selection any more than a gesture?

Corollary: given that it is my conviction that Shakespearean productions may well be spectacular but should never be performed on illusionistic sets, I have chosen never to offer any **localisation** or history of localisation in headnotes to the scene. The answer to the qu. ‘Where does such and such a scene take place?’ is, it seems to me, ‘on the stage’. (Please don’t take this as an indication of being ‘anti-Erne’ – there is importance in being ernest).

Cambridge asked me to provide an *updated* version of my *AYLI*, which came out originally in 2000. That updated (in my case revised) now in production.

In 2006 Juliet **Dusinberre** brought out her Arden 3. A lot of what I have to say is generated by my contestation of her account of the play’s early performance history. I am inclined to contest most of it but, I hope no triumphalism.

Don’t think of myself as a front-line textual scholar, was not involved although possibly implicated in ‘the crisis in editing’. Have not developed a new paradigm, detected new categories, deployed a distinctive editorial technique, nor have I embarked on any sustained *quantitative* analyses, of textual elements, authorial idiosyncracies, or even company repertories.

I consider that whatever contributions I have made have been to locating plays within cultural fields of play – cultural and social history another focus of my interests -- and relating the results of my historical excavations to performance possibilities. So no real theoretical superstructure in what follows, but a couple of points grounded in the most traditional of all editorial practices, **lexical glossing**. Here the devil is indeed in the detail.

However, to return briefly to enumeration, in my experience, this often generates fairly open or tendentious results. Statistical tests on the text of *AYLI*, which variously date the play between 1596 and 1600, are summarized in Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, *Willia Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987), 121. They do not fix the occasion.

When working on *1H6* became convinced that Gary Taylor and co. may be guilty of exaggerating their deviance curves. Random statistical variation. Need a statistician.

Have to admit to anti-disintegrationist prejudice.

A brief digression towards *1 H6*,which fixes my position. I argued that Shsp probably wrote the play and wrote it before the other two parts. Maybe Shsp did not write much of *1H6*, although I have not read of any quantifier who has questioned the *termini a quo* and *ad quem* that I came up with, dates that make Shs’s authorship possible.

Perhaps it is just complacency that encourages me to remind myself that *1-3 H6* make great theatre, and to speculate that Shakespeare, unlike Ben Jonson a great listener, as Stanley Wells recently said, and, moreover, was probably a great ventriloquist who delighted in aping the styles of Marlowe, Peele, and whoever.

Thing about the **investigation of occasion** – or occasions – is that it is like structuralism: to invoke Saussure, there are no ‘positive terms’. Ascertaining provenance (theatrical venue) entails ascertaining occasion, entails ascertaining authorship entails ascertaining company … ascertaining provenance. So we see the creation of a classic hermeneutic circle.

I don’t really see my task as an editor being to abet the tasks of biographers. Attribution seems linked to biography rather than criticism, but have to admit that getting my head around the role that Middleton played in co-writing *Timon* led me to radical reappraisal of that play.

Since my *AYLI* appeared have been much stimulated by researches of **Tiffany Stern** and **Andrew Gurr**, and these have affected my most recent work. They have helped me place Dusinberre.

As you know, **Stern** has demonstrated the heterogeneity of the heaps of papers that served as ‘copy’ for compositors printing Shsp’s plays, the habit of ‘repatching’ the plays.[[1]](#footnote-1) She goes further in the direction taken by those textual scholars who, by study of different editions, have detected *authorial* *revision* (*Hamlet* and *King Lear* in particular) and also by those that pointed to variations, as a consequence of proof correction, between different copies of the same edition. Not only do we learn that *printed editions* offer different versions of ‘the text’ but the *copy* for those different editions seems often to have existed in different states.

In particular she has demonstrated that many parts of texts that previous generations had taken to be parts of organic, even sacred, wholes, are likely to have been inserts or appendages, created for particular performances which are often impossible to date. We find ourselves examining what Jowett calls ‘textual production rather than deformation’.[[2]](#footnote-2) The history of any text, therefore, is going to depend upon ‘**scattered occasions’**, and be unique to that text.

In the case of *AYLI* there are obvious examples:

First: ‘**It was a lover’** (5.3), Not even necessary to cover a boy’s change from his Ganymede into his Rosaline costume as it comes between two Ganymede scenes. Makes it less useful for dating.

Second: for **Hymen** ‘markedly inferior in style to the rest of the play’ (Chambers, 1, 404), (*I* bar confusion) and

Third: **Ros’s Epilogue**.

**Gurr** has recently published two single volume studies of Chamberlain’s/King’s Men and of Admiral’s Men. His work has perhaps made authorship ‘more of a social than a private activity’ (DF McKenzie). Company history can not only alert us to house styles and repertory patterns, but also, as we have seen, remind us of *multiplicity* of playing spaces. So we have to compound Stern’s ‘instability’ and Gurr’s ‘multiplicty’. We might also remember the work of SP Cerasano, who invites us to consider the ‘unfixity’ of theatre companies esp. Cerasano, S. P. (2005). 'Theatrical movements'. *SQ,* 56, iii-x.

Left mark on piece I have recently written on ***Timon***. Regression from Bailey Globe production to conviction that Blackfriars play. Started from Globe production. Created hypothetical narrative. Looked for evidence. Musical stage directions. Pageant. Whitefriars?

Maybe play satire not only on prodigality but on Timon as arriviste, a newly created ‘Lord’.

Putting the work of these scholars together we might generate a mantra:

**Instability of text / plurality of texts; multiplicity of occasions; dissolution of imputed link between the ‘original’ and the authentic.** There was often no one ‘original’, either text or performance, but a plurality.

Corollary of this: much of what we uncover is circumstantial and accordingly we must be aware not arrange the ‘facts’ we uncover into one narrative or story. (**Werstine** on dangers of ‘**narratives’** as opposed to ‘**knowledge’**.) Detailed scholarship combines with post-modernist theory to remind us of how much is unproven.Because of this need to write in the conditional because so much remains *unproven .* Much virtue in ‘if’, but it can be tedious. Moreover I think the desire to construct narratives or chains of causation programmed into us: doubtful whether unlinked ‘facts’ do constitute ‘knowledge’.

**I Theatrical Contexts**

Company history not new: Wheel has turned full circle. Harbage, Alfred (1952). *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions*. New York. Harbage balanced elite private playhouses against Globe and Fortune – theatres for a ‘nation’ Dangers of fixing on rival *playhouses*, rather than *companies* who were not necessarily ‘bound’ to them and who manifested a degree of mobility.

(a) Erne relates *AYLI’s* wait forpublishing to the success that the boys’ companies were enjoying about 1600. Did not appear until 1623. “Staying entry’ of 4 August, 1600: pre-emptive bid to prevent another stationer printing play, EITHER failure to obtain ‘ecclesiastical authorization’ (Clegg), OR uncommercial – out of fashion (Erne).

(b) I have become interested in not the little eyases but relations between Chamberlain’s Men and Admiral’s Men. Juliet Dusinberre argued our play was first performed at court in 1599, in fact at Richmond. Have to remember not just public and private *playhouses* but public and private *performances*. She even claims to have pinpointed the date – I think her case is at best unproven because she over-looked one word (‘amen) – but her contribution encouraged me to investigate the records court performances. If I am right, another reason for the staying entry might be that Chamberlain’s Men did not want the play available soon after court performance before reaping revenue from performances at the Globe. (Of course am starting a narrative with this conjecture)

Gurr’s theatre history enables us to perceive more clearly dialogue between Admiral’s and Chamberlain’s Men, each being paid large amounts for productions before Queen at Shrovetide and Christmas. (*Shakespeare in Love* misleading.) Revels at court -- occasional rather than ‘showbiz’ (Indira)

**Arguments for *AYLI* at Richmond**

1. Queen loved hunting.

2. Disguise game.

It seems that for about ten years the repertories of the Lord Admiral’s Men and the Lord Chamberlain’s Men were in a kind of dialogue one with the other – from the end of 1594 until the end of the Queen’s reign the rival companies played regularly at court at both Christmas and Shrovetide.[[3]](#endnote-1) Philip Henslowe, by that time associated with the Admiral’s Men, had lent Henry Chettle ten shillings on 25 November 1598 for ‘mending’ a Robin Hood play for court performance, probably at Whitehall at Christmas that year.[[4]](#endnote-2) This is likely to have been either *The Downfall of Robert Earl of Huntingdon* or *The Death of Robert Earl of Huntingdon*, both performed also at the Rose and for which Henslowe had lent Anthony Monday and Henry Chettle £5 each.[[5]](#endnote-3) *As You Like It* too may well have been performed at court: Bullough’s inference that ‘Shakespeare’s play was probably written for the sophisticated Essex circle to excel these crude works’, remains suggestive, although it must also remain hypothetical.[[6]](#endnote-4) It implies, however, that the phrase ‘As you like it’ may have been, if this play was indeed first performed by Shakespeare’s company, the Lord Chamberlain’s Men, at court, at Christmas 1598 or Shrovetide 1599, a knowingly loaded reference to royal taste, and may account for the Robin Hood motifs and references to hunting festivities that stud the text,[[7]](#endnote-5) as well as for the prominent device of disguising through cross-dressing.**[[8]](#endnote-6)** Disguise can be more than a plot device and become a means of characterisation or recreating identity, as Shapiro and, implicitly, Bloom point out.[[9]](#endnote-7) **Andrew Gurr has brought this last topic into historical focus by noting that, within the repertory of the Admiral’s Men, there is a significant cluster of plays that include this game of disguise, which was to be picked up by Shakespeare and inserted into his pastoral romance.** In addition to the Robin Hood plays already mentioned, this cluster includes Munday’s *John a Kent* or *The Wise Man of Westchester* (1594), Chapman’s *Blind Beggar of Alexandria* (1596), and the anonymous *Look About You* (1597-9?), imitated in Munday’s Robin Hood plays.[[10]](#endnote-8) This last is an intrigue of politics and passion at court, which also features Robin Hood (who disguises himself as a woman), along with a seeming hermit[[11]](#endnote-9) and a ruler in exile (Richard Coeur de Lion). These were followed in due time by Samuel Rowley’s *When You See Me You Know Me* (1604), and, within the genre of city comedy, Thomas Middleton’s *The Roaring Girl* (1611) and *No Wit, No Help like a Woman’s* (1611).[[12]](#endnote-10)Even if *As You Like It* was first performed at court, it was probably transferred to an amphitheatre playhouse fairly promptly. This had happened with other plays: *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (1597-8) was probably performed before the Queen at the royal palace of Windsor,[[13]](#endnote-11) and the title page of its first quarto (1602) advertises the text by noting that it had been ‘diverse times acted by the right honourable my Lord Chamberlain’s servants, both before Her Majesty and elsewhere’. The first surviving quarto of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (1598) reveals that it ‘was presented before Her Highness this last Christmas’, while the second quarto (1631) notes that it was ‘acted by His Majesty’s servants at the Blackfriars and the Globe’.[[14]](#endnote-12)

**3. Title dangerous compliment/ rebuff to Queen herself.**

Perhaps Shakespeare aware of possible dangers of performing before royal audience:

ROSALIND A jest's prosperity lies in the ear

Of him that hears it, never in the tongue

 Of him that makes it.

**That was possible provenance, now arguments for date**

In her Arden 3 edition of the play (2006), **Juliet Dusinberre** drew attention to a record of payment to Shakespeare’s company for what may well have been a significant performance of *As You Like It* (although not necessarily its first)**,** before the Queen and the court at Richmond on **Shrove Tuesday, 20 February, 1599**.[[15]](#endnote-13) Elizabeth herself liked to play a role in the deer-hunting – one of the play’s prominent themes – which had taken place in Sheen Chase, the former name of Richmond Park, since medieval times. In addition Dusinberre associated the poem’s mention of a dial with the great dial in the outer court at Richmond and also noted the mention of a dial in the text (2.7.20). (Although the palace dial had been repainted and repaired in 1599, it was not a new construction.[[16]](#endnote-14)) The payment is contained within a **warrant** of 2 October 1599 for three performances on the feasts of St Stephen (26 December, [1598]), New Year’s Day [1599], and Shrove Tuesday [1599]. It was augmented because the Queen had offered the traditional extra remuneration for a performance at which she was present:

**SLIDE 3**

To Iohn Heminges and Thomas Pope servant[es] vnto the Lorde Chamberleyne vppon the Councells warraunt dated at the Courte at Nonesuche s[ecun]do die Octobris 1599 for three Enterludes or playes played before her Matie vppon St Stephens daye at nighte Newyeares daye at nighte and shrove-tuesdaye at nighte laste paste xxli [£20] and to them more by waye of her Mats rewarde xli In all amounting to xxxli [[17]](#endnote-15)

**Dusinberre selects the last of these, Shrove Tuesday, because of Touchstone’s pancake joke – pancakes filled with minced meat were, she claims, were eaten on that day: ‘a certain knight … swore, by his honour, they were good pancakes, and swore, by his honour, the mustard was naught’ (1.2.50-3).** However, although Shrove Tuesday was indeed ‘Pancake Day’,[[18]](#endnote-16) pancakes were eaten throughout the year, and there is no known reference in the period to this sort of savoury fritter.[[19]](#endnote-17) The laborious jest does have the feel of a topical reference, but it might recall a well-known incident, of which we have no record, that had occurred several months before an early performance. Apart from that jest, however, which does not clinch the case (see 1.2.50-1n.), there is nothing to associate this play with that payment, or indeed with the payments for other Christmas and Shrovetide court performances by the Chamberlain’s Men in 1598 -1599. [[20]](#endnote-18) Another entry the next year when the court was again at Richmond **records a similar payment for performances by Shakespeare’s company at Christmas 1599 and Shrove Sunday (3 February, 1600):**

To Iohn Hemynge servaunt to the Lorde Chamberlaine vppon the Councells Warraunt dated at the Courte at Richmond xvijmo die Februarij 1599 [i.e. 1600] for three Enterludes or playes played before her Matie on St Stephens daye at nighte, Twelfth daye at night and Shroue sondaye [i.e. 3 February, 1600] at night laste paste xxxli [[21]](#endnote-19)

This suggests that, if indeed the first performance of *As You Like It* was at court, it could have been in late 1598, 1599, or 1600.

**Dial poem**

In 1972 news had been published of an unattributed poem, dated 1598 [-1599], but detached from any play. The poem was found in the commonplace book of Henry Stanford. Stanford was chaplain and tutor in the household of the Lord Chamberlain, George Carey, Lord Hunsdon, who, in 1603, was to leave him £40 in his will:[[22]](#endnote-20)

**SLIDE 4**

 ‘To the Queen, by the players, 1598’

As the *dial* hand tells o’er

The same hours it had before,

Still beginning in the ending,

*Circular* account still lending.

So, most almighty *Queen*, we pray,

Like the dial day by day,

You may lead the seasons on,

Making new when old are gone.

 That the babe which now is young

 And hath yet no use of tongue,

 Many a *Shrovetide* here may bow

 To that Empress I do now:

 That the children of these lords,

 Sitting at your *council* boards,

 May be, grave and agèd, seen

 Of her that was their father [*sic*] Queen.

 Once I wish this wish again:

 Heaven subscribe it with ‘*Amen’* (emphases added).

**SLIDE 5**

The anthology’s editors tentatively ascribed the poem to Shakespeare. [[23]](#endnote-21)

The poem invokes ‘Shrovetide’, a season when, as records show, Shakespeare’s company did perform before the court. As we have seen, Dusinberre related this hypothetical link between the poem and the 1599 Shrove Tuesday performance (proposed by Steven May) specifically to *As You Like It*.[[24]](#endnote-22) **However, there is also a warrant (of the same date) for a Shrovetide performance at Richmond by the Lord Admiral’s Men two days earlier on Shrove Sunday – as usual the two companies played before the Queen that Shrovetide.[[25]](#endnote-23)** The epilogue could be linked to either one of these 1599 Shrovetide performances, which performances cannot therefore be used for resolving the poem’s provenance.

Conversely, the argument for Shakespearean authorship cannot be reinforced by this kind of contextualizing. The poem’s trochaic metre and grammar could indeed be Shakespearean – although Shakespeare could conceivably have penned it for a play he did not write himself. Despite the fact that Shakespeare and Stanford were both associated with Lord Hunsdon – as was Morley[[26]](#endnote-24) – it may be significant that Stanford’s anthology contains nothing that is indubitably by Shakespeare, although there are many poems by the courtier poets of the age.

**Jonson seems to me to be a stronger candidate for authorship**. The trochaic tetrameters used by Jonson in, for example, the songs from Lord Haddington’s wedding masque, that were to be performed at Court on Shrove Tuesday at night in 1608, and the satyr songs in his *Oberon* of 1611 are very close in style to the dial poem and have roughly the same proportion of feminine endings. The forms ‘dial’ and ‘father’ are probably uninflected genitives, as in F1’s version of *AC*, 2.7.129 (‘father house’).[[27]](#endnote-25) However, this is not a Shakespearean idiosyncrasy: ‘father’ was both inflected and uninflected in Old English, although the *OED* claims, erroneously it would seem, that the uninflected form had disappeared in the fifteenth century. Jonson also occasionally uses the form.[[28]](#endnote-26) Moreover, the neo-platonic conceit of the ‘circular’ is more likely to be Jonsonian than Shakespearean.[[29]](#endnote-27) Jonson was a member of the Admiral’s Men in 1598, although his career had been lately jeopardised by his killing of Gabriel Spenser. So this poem could have been affixed to a court performance of one of his plays, perhaps *The Case is Altered*, sold earlier to Henslowe, or the tragedy, the plot of which he had supplied to Henslowe, which was revised by Chapman[[30]](#endnote-28)

However, the poem raises as many problems as it offers suggestions. First, the date: Henry Stanford dates only some of the entries in his anthology. There are many items of later dates that are entered *before* ‘As the dial hand tells o’er’. An example is item 93 of 1612, which was inserted after the publication in English of the works of Du Bartas in 1611.[[31]](#endnote-29) We cannot therefore be sure that the dial poem was copied as soon as Stanford received it, and its dating must be treated with caution. Given that it wishes the Queen another 50 or so years of life, excessive even by the hyperbolic standards of the day, it might have been *written* well before, perhaps soon after one or other of the attempts on the life of Elizabeth. Second, it may contain dangerous matter: ‘*En ma fin est mon commencement’* (‘In my end is my beginning’) was the motto of Mary Queen of Scots whom Elizabeth had had executed in 1587. Would it have been tactful to broadcast these words from the stage at any time after this? Third, there is no connection with any playing company. Fourth, and most significantly, it is obviously not primarily an *epilogue*. Yet its commentators have assumed that it is:

What is distinctive about this poem is that it compliments the Queen but does not invite her or the audience to think favourably of the play in the manner of most epilogues.[[32]](#endnote-30) **Most probably it was a *prayer* of the sort that was sometimes offered up at Court or private performances by the players (it does, after all, end with ‘Amen’),** perhaps to redeem themselves in the eyes of a society apt to regard them as vagabonds. In 1596 the Queen’s godson Sir John Harington wrote at the end of his *The Metamorphosis of Ajax*:

**SLIDE 6**

… I will neither end with sermon nor prayer, lest some wags like me to my Lord ( )’s Players who, when they have ended a bawdy comedy, as though that were a preparative to devotion, kneel down solemnly and pray all the company to pray with them for their good lord and master. [[33]](#endnote-31)

A quotation cited by Harington’s editor, Elizabeth Story Donno, reveals that the prayer for Queen and Council in the new poem was formulaic (see below) and should not be read as having a connection with the action of any particular play. Conceivably, it may not even imply composition for a performance before the Queen. Writing of Sir William Holles of Houghton, Nottinghamshire (1509-91), Gervase Holles (1547-1627) observed:

**SLIDE 7**

**he always kept a company of stage players of his own which presented him masques and plays at festival times and upon days of solemnity … always at the end of the play praying (as the custom then was) for the Queen’s majesty, the Council, and their right worshipful good master, Sir William Holles**.[[34]](#endnote-32)

**SLIDE 8**

**In Middleton’s *A Mad World, My Masters*, a Paul’s play of1606(?),Folly begs his grandfather for a blessing: ‘This shows much like kneeling after the play: I praying for my Lord Owemuch and his good countess, our honourable lady and mistress’.[[35]](#endnote-33)** Such a prayer could have been attached to any one of a handful of performances by the Admiral’s, or the Lord Chamberlain’s Men at Shrovetide. Although Henry Stanford was associated with the Carey family – George Carey, Lord Hunsdon was patron to the company generally known as the Chamberlain’s Men, and the Queen sometimes stayed in the Chamberlain’s residence in Blackfriars[[36]](#endnote-34) – his anthology contains a poem by Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange, later Earl of Derby.[[37]](#endnote-35) Its editor dates that entry around the end of 1588. Could Stanley, who, like Stanford, had Catholic connections and who had died suddenly in 1594, have written the prayer for his troupe who used it in 1599-1600 when they too were performing on Shrove Sunday at Richmond?[[38]](#endnote-36) Or could it perhaps be by Ferdinando’s brother William, sixth Earl of Derby, who wrote poems and plays himself, or by one of his large circle of literary associates?[[39]](#endnote-37)

The dialogue ‘Epilogue at Court’ to Dekker’s *Old Fortunatus* (probably performed at Court by the Admiral’s Men on 27 December, 1599), which doubles as a prayer, contains conceits so closely resembling those in ‘As the Dial Hand Tells O’er’ (the wish for a life so long for the Queen that she might see the locks of boys [boy players?] turn white and mathematical imagery) that Dekker may also be the author of the poem. Within his corpus, at least eight songs are written in trochaics.[[40]](#endnote-38) Ringler and May note that the only *dramatists* known to have used trochaics in the period were Shakespeare, Dekker, and Jonson,[[41]](#endnote-39) although they identified no fewer that 112 poems from the period with the same rhyme and metrical schemes as the dial poem.[[42]](#endnote-40)As we have seen, the Admiral’s Men, the company to which Jonson and Dekker belonged at the time, had performed at court earlier that year on Shrove Sunday 1599, two days before the performance by the Chamberlain’s Men, and, although we know no more about what they performed than we do about the offering of the Chamberlain’s Men, we must entertain the conjecture that the epilogue could have been for that performance.[[43]](#endnote-41) If the poem was indeed by Jonson or Shakespeare, Dekker could have borrowed from it for his *Old Fortunatus* epilogue. It is, of course, also the case that ‘Rosalind’s’ epilogue, which is customarily printed and performed at the end of *As You Like It*,could have been used at only one performance, and equally possible that a prayer was spoken after that.[[44]](#endnote-42)

**SLIDE 9**

II **Example of text: ‘What shall he have[[45]](#footnote-3)**. Seems simple enough.The scene fills a two hours interval (see 4.1.143) between wooing scenes and, with its cuckold jokes, sets off the wooing scenes that frame it. Don’t think it was inserted after earlier performances.

Easy to be attracted by readings that are ‘ideological’

1. With its **cuckoldry** jokes, it may sound a sceptical note about patriarchal marriage or,

2. Conversely, Peter Erickson may be right to argue that ‘the expected negative meaning of horns as the sign of a cuckold is transformed into a positive image of **phallic potency** that unites men’ Peter B. Erickson, *Patriarchal Structure in Shakespeare’s Drama*, 1985, p.23.

3. Alternatively may be about hunting. Seasonal masquerades performed by Mummers dressed in animal skins and antlers, perhaps associated with Robin Hood games, and **Laroque, p. 23**4 and the hunting scene in Chettle and Munday’s *Death of Robert Earl of Huntingdon* (1598) in which Friar Tuck enters dancing ‘carrying a stags head’ .

The song seems to imitate a folk mime of the sort in which players would have been clad in foliage with animal skins and antlers and performed burlesque and obscene actions that recalled ancient fertility rites (see Robert Weimann, ‘The folk-play and Shakespeare’ in his

SLIDE 10

***SCEANE. IIII.***

Winde hornes. Enter King, Queene, *Iohn, Fitzwater, Ely, Chester, Salsbury, Lester* , little *Iohn* , Frier *Tuck, Scarlet, Scathlocke* , and *Much* , Frier *Tuck* carrying a **Stags head**, dauncing.



That is so bad, that I think Shsp’s scene is far more likely to be pastiche than ideologically oriented.

**BACK TO SLIDE 9**

But the devil is in the detail: the hunters are designated as ‘foresters’. If the hunters are considered as **poachers**, it may celebrate a ritual of inverted social order that matches Rosalind’s usurpation of the man’s role in the wooing game.

Richard Wilson, coming from a counter-cultural position, speaks of a mocking game or ‘rough music’, which authorises the forest trespass and felony of poaching (p.74).

**But 0 SD FORESTERS** Either **officers in charge of the forest** or **natives of the forest** (*OED*  forester, 1 and 3); if the former, there may be a suggestion that the officers have joined the cause of those who appeared earlier as outlaws (2.7.0 SD). Alternatively, as Collier supposed (see collation) this may indicate something about the dress of Duke Senior’s courtiers as at 2.1.0SD.

However, ‘**leather skin**’ conceivably may mean that the protagonist of the song is to be imagined naked – as in *Edward III* (1596) ‘Since leathern Adam till this youngest hour’ (2.2.120).

**11 ‘The rest shall bear this burden’ This line does not appear in Hilton’s version of the song as a round for four voices (1652), and may, therefore, have been a direction to the players.**

**12 \*bourdon was my original meaning.** The word was in the period confused with ‘burden’ which generated a complex of puns: (1) the bass, ‘undersong’, or accompaniment(*OED*  bourdon2 1), or refrain (*OED*  burden *n* 10), (2) the cuckold’s horns, (3) the stage property of the slaughtered deer, (4) as is frequent in performance, one of the lords bearing horns carried on his fellows’ shoulders. **Is this substantive or accidental?**

**12 horn** (1) ornamental (helmet) **badge of honour** (*OED* sv *n* 16), (2) sign of a **cuckold** (see the proverb ‘He wears the horns’ (Tilley H625); for examples of ingenious sets of horns made for cuckolds, see D.E. Underdown, ‘The Taming of the Scold’, *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England*, ed. Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson, 1985, 116-36, at 128.

**16 lusty** (1) merry, pleasing, lustful (*OED* sv 1-4) with the implication, from the context, that the word celebrates woman’s sexuality, (2) massive (*OED* sv 9, although this meaning is recorded only from 1640).

**17 SD** The scene ends so abruptly that we may conjecture that lines (a comment by Jaques?) are missing.

This scene became key for bad Peter Hall production.

**II** Have to confess that once one has been commissioned to edit a text, one is tempted not only to present the thing itself as it really was (Arnold) but also, contrariwise, **to leave a mark**.

**What marks did I leave on *AYLI*?**

1. **New scene after O’s soliloquy,**
2. **Frenchifying play.**
3. Lexical discoveries

**SLIDE 11**

(a) **Taller**

John Dover Wilson argued for revision of an early version of 1593; see Arthur Quiller Couch and John Dover Wilson, eds., *As You Like It* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1926), 94–108.

**SLIDE 12**

**SLIDE 13**

(b) **Rake** for Armin

Some have doubted that Armin was “firmly” attached to the Chamberlain’s Men: he reported at Christmas 1600 that he was to “rake his journey” to Hackney with the “good lord, my master whom I serve”:[[46]](#endnote-43) this, however, suggests a quick excursion (see *OED* “rake” v1) from the City – the Lord Chamberlain lived in the Blackfriars – perhaps for a solo performance, and not that Armin had joined another company.[[47]](#endnote-44) Armin may equally have taken over the part of Touchstone only later: Kempe could well have first performed it both at court and at the Globe.[[48]](#endnote-45) Moreover, in *The Italian Taylor and his Boy* Armin wrote that in his time he had been “writ down for an ass”, indicating that, like Kempe, he had played Dogberry in *Much Ado about Nothing*,[[49]](#endnote-46) written about 1598. The fact that Armin took parts that have been traditionally associated with a “clown” like Kempe as well as those in which he shone as a “fool” (Feste in *Twelfth Night* and the Fool in *King Lear*, for example) indicates a lack of distinction between these two roles and that this evidence can have little validity for questions of dating.[[50]](#endnote-47)

**SLIDE 14**

(c) **Risqué references**. Does risqué demolish delightful? **SLIDE**

ROSALIND From henceforth I will, coz, and devise sports. Let me see, what think you of falling in love?

CELIA Marry, I prithee do, to make sport withal: but love no man in good earnest — nor no further in sport neither — than with safety of a pure blush thou mayst in honour come off again.

**23 come off** retire as from a field of combat; there is a possible reference to orgasm, although *OED*  records the usage only from 1650 (come *v* 17); see, however, 2.4.44-5n., Dekker, *1 Honest Whore* (1604), ‘a wench that will come with a wet finger’ (1.2.4), and Middleton and Dekker, *The Roaring Girl*, 1611, ed. Paul Mulholland, 1987, 2.1.192.

4, **Resistance to gay appropriation**. Too much of Ganymede as catamite (cf. Ophelia with Lute), too little of Chapman

**What not allowed**

**Ardennes**

Lees-J: Gardens that are both settings and symbols, that are (like Spenser’s Bower and Nonsuch’s Grove of Diana) erotic, moral, political, and, above all, **legible** spaces are also found in abundance in early modern drama, usually in ‘shorthand’ form. The ‘greenworld’ as a setting for love and romance, found, for example, in the Forest of Arden in *As You Like It* and the wood near Athens in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, build on many of the erotic associations of gardens in literature, as well as the idea of the forest as a place of transformation and adventure in the classical and medieval tradition.

**Delaune vs Branagh** **SLIDES 15, 16, AND 17**

1. Tiffany Stern, ‘Re-patching the play’, *From Script to Stage in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Holland and Stephen Orgel, (Basingstoke, 2004), 151-77. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. John Jowett, ‘Editing Shakespeare's Plays in the Twentieth Century’, *Shakespeare Survey* 59 (2006), 1-19 at 14. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Chambers, iv, 111-16; Andrew Gurr, ‘Intertextuality at Windsor’, *SQ* 38 (1987), 189-200 and *Playing Companies*, pp. 243-5. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
4. Henslowe, p. 102; Chambers, iv, 111; James Shapiro, *1599: A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare*, 2005, p. 36. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
5. Henslowe, pp. 86-7; Henslowe paid fourteen shillings to the Master of the Revels for licensing these on 28 March; his inventory of March 1598 lists various costumes and properties for the plays (pp. 317, 320, 322, 323). [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
6. Bullough, ii, 143; for elements of the devotional in the Robin Hood tradition, see Sean Field, ‘Devotion, discontent, and the Henrician Reformation: the evidence of the Robin Hood stories’, *Journal of British Studies* 41 (2002), 6-22, and for the way the play both laments a lost age of hospitality and also deflates its own nostalgia, see Indira Ghose, ‘"Better days: cultural memory in *As You Like It*’, *The Shakespearean International Yearbook*, ed. Graham Bradshaw and Tom Bishop, 2008, 8, 204-15. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
7. See 4.2 n.; Edward I. Berry, ‘Pastoral hunting’ in *As You Like It’*, in *Shakespeare and the Hunt,* 2001, pp. 159-89; Heather Dubrow, ‘Fringe benefits: Rosalind and the purlieux of the forest’, *NQ* 53 (2006), 67-9; Robert N. Watson, ‘As you liken it: simile in the forest’, *Back to Nature: The Green and the Real in the Late Renaissance*, 2006, pp. 77-107; Leah S. Marcus, ‘Shakespeare and festivity’, in Stuart Gillespie and Neil Rhodes (eds.), *Shakespeare and Elizabethan Popular Culture*, 2006, pp. 42-66. [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
8. See Scott McMillin, ‘The sharer and his boy: rehearsing Shakespeare’s women’, in Peter Holland and Stephen Orgel (eds.), *From Script to Stage in Early Modern England*, 2004, pp. 231-45; compare the excellent essay by Barbara Hodgdon, ‘Sexual disguise and the theatre of gender’, in Alexander Leggatt (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Comedy*, 2002, pp. 179-97. [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
9. See Susan Baker, ‘Personating persons: rethinking Shakespearean disguises’, *SQ* 43 (1992), 303-16. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
10. See Fred L Jones, ‘*Look about You* and the disguises’, *PMLA* 44 (1929), 835-41; Robert Leach, ‘*As You Like It* – a ‘Robin Hood’ play’, *English Studies* 82 (2001), 393-400. [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
11. Compare *AYLI,* 3.3.288-9; there is also a hermit in *John a Kent* and *The Blind Beggar of Alexandria*. [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
12. See Chapter 2 of Andrew Gurr, *Shakespeare’s Opposites: The Admiral’s Company 1594-1625*, 2009. [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
13. See, however, Wells and Taylor, *Textual Companion*, p. 120. [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
14. See Wells and Taylor, *Textual Companion*, pp. 117 and 270. [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
15. Dusinberre, pp. 36-46; cf. Juliet Dusinberre, ‘Pancakes and a date for *As You Like It*’, *SQ*, 54 (2003), 371-405. In the period, although New Year gifts were exchanged on 1 January, the calendar year began on Lady Day, 25 March so, in the period, that day (20 February) would have been dated 1598. The Queen and court had moved to Richmond on 10 February (John Chamberlain, *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. N. E. McClure, 2 vols, 1939, i, 68). She was at Nonesuch for the summer of that year. [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
16. Dusinberre, pp. 37-42. [↑](#endnote-ref-14)
17. David Cook and F. P. Wilson, (eds.), *Dramatic Records in the Declared Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber, 1558-1642*, Malone Society Collections 6, 1962, 55a, p. 30; the Lord Admiral’s Men were, as was customary, playing at court at the same time (John Astington, *English Court Theatre, 1558-1642,* 1999, pp. 235-6). [↑](#endnote-ref-15)
18. See Thomas Dekker, *The Shoemaker’s Holiday*, ed. R.L. Smallwood and Stanley Wells, (Manchester, 1979), xvii 53 and p. 218. [↑](#endnote-ref-16)
19. Knowles, p. 33 n. However, in Deloney’s *The Gentle Craft* (1597-8), there is a mention of a Shrovetide feast of ‘pudding-pies and pancakes’ (quoted in Smallwood and Wells (eds.), *Shoemaker’s Holiday*, p. 218), and see *OED*, ‘pudding-pie’ (generally contained meat). In John Taylor, *The Great Eater of Kent*, 1630, ‘pancakes’ are included in a list of sweetmeats not savories (p. 13). [↑](#endnote-ref-17)
20. Cook and Wilson, *Dramatic Records*, 39b and 57a, pp. 30-1. [↑](#endnote-ref-18)
21. Cook and Wilson, *Dramatic Records*, 57a, p. 31; Chambers, iv, 112. This is puzzling, because a subsequent payment is given to Derby’s Men for another evening performance on Shrove Sunday (3 February): ‘To Robert Browne servaunt to Therle of Darby vppon the Councells Warraunt dated at the Courte at Richmond xviijuo die Februarij 1599 [/1600] for one Enterlude or playe playde before her highnes on Shrove sondaye at nighte laste paste xli’ (Cook and Wilson, *Dramatic Records*, 57a, p. 31). However, the *Acts of the Privy Council* show that it was the Chamberlain’s Men who performed on Shrove Sunday and that Derby’s Men played on Shrove Tuesday (John Roche Dasent *et al.*, *Acts of the Privy Council of England 1542-1631,* 40 vols,1890-, 30.89 – Prof. Steven W. May gave me this reference.) [↑](#endnote-ref-19)
22. See Steven W. May’s Stanford entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. [↑](#endnote-ref-20)
23. Cambridge University Library, ms. Dd.5.75, f. 46; see William A. Ringler and Steven W. May, ‘An epilogue possibly by Shakespeare’, *MP*, 70 (1972), 138-9;Steven W. May and William A. Ringler, (eds.), *Elizabethan Poetry: A Bibliography and First-Line Index of English Verse, 1559-1603*, 3 vols, 2004, EV2916, iii, 363; Steven W. May, *Henry Stanford's anthology: an edition of Cambridge University Library manuscript Dd.5.75*, 1988, pp. xx, lxiii, 162 (item 228), and 373. In this later book May considers that the poem ‘could hardly be Shakespeare’s’ (p. xx). Brian Vickers, *Counterfeiting Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship and John Ford's Funerall Elegye*, 2002, pp. 428-9 reviews the evidence but does not endorse the attribution. However, in William Shakespeare, *Complete works*, ed. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen, 2007, p. 2433, it is accorded canonical status. [↑](#endnote-ref-21)
24. Ringler and May, ‘Epilogue’, p. 138; James Shapiro guesses that the poem was written not for the first performance of *As You Like It* but for a revival of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* at Shrovetide 1599, It was, he argues, a substitution for Puck’s epilogue, which matches it almost exactly in metre – the reason for Shapiro’s attribution (Shapiro, *1599*, pp. 84-6). [↑](#endnote-ref-22)
25. Cook and Wilson, *Dramatic Records*, 55b, p. 31. [↑](#endnote-ref-23)
26. May, *Anthology*, pp. xix and 313-14. [↑](#endnote-ref-24)
27. Some editors ascribe this to compositorial error: it could derive equally from author or copyists. [↑](#endnote-ref-25)
28. See A. C. Partridge, *The Accidence of Ben Jonson's Plays, Masques and Entertainments*, 1953, pp. 61 and 278-81 and N.F. Blake, *A Grammar of Shakespeare's Language*, 2002, pp. 38-9. [↑](#endnote-ref-26)
29. See Ben Jonson, ‘To … Sir Lucius Cary and Sir H. Morison’ and ‘The vision of Ben Jonson’, *Poems*, ed. Ian Donaldson, 1975, pp. 233 line 9 n. and 313 line 19; *Hymenaei*, 363-4; and *The New Inn*, ed. Michael Hattaway, 1984, 3.2.106 n., p. 146. [↑](#endnote-ref-27)
30. Carol Chillington Rutter, (ed.), *Documents of the Rose Playhouse*, 1984, p, 153; Gurr, *Playing Companies*, p. 241; for a link between Jonson and Stanford, see Katherine Duncan-Jones, ‘"They say a made a good end": Ben Jonson's Epitaph on Thomas Nashe’, *Ben Jonson Journal*, 3 (1996), 1-20. [↑](#endnote-ref-28)
31. May, *Anthology*, p. 261. [↑](#endnote-ref-29)
32. Tiffany Stern, *Making Shakespeare: From Stage to Page*, 2004, p. 120; Tiffany Stern, ‘"A small-beer health to his second day": playwrights, prologues, and first performances in the early modern theater’, *SP*, 101 (2004), 172-99. [↑](#endnote-ref-30)
33. Sir John Harington, *The Metamorphosis of Ajax*, ed. Elizabeth Story Donno, 1962, p. 185. Peter Roberts suggests privately that this could be a reference to Leicester’s Men. The Queen disapproved not only of the indelicate subject matter of Harington’s book but also of alleged slighting references to Leicester in the text. The Earl had died in 1588: Harrington’s jest, in the present tense, suggests ‘deliberate obfuscation to cloak a dig at the hypocrisy of the patron of puritans and players’. [↑](#endnote-ref-31)
34. Gervase Holles, *Memorials of the Holles family, 1493-1656*, ed. A. C. Wood, Vol. 5 of *Camden third series*, 1937, p. 42; see also Bernard Capp, ‘A lost Elizabethan actors' Company’, *NQ*, 242 (1997), 95-6; Peter Roberts, ‘Elizabethan players and minstrels and the legislation of 1572 against retainers and vagabonds’, in Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts (eds), *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain*, 1994, 29-55. [↑](#endnote-ref-32)
35. Thomas Middleton, *A Mad World, My Masters*, 1608, sig. H4v. Epilogues followed by prayers, or epilogues that incorporate prayers (often for King or Queen and Council), appear in Skelton’s *Magnificence* (1515), Rastell’s *Calisto and Melebea* (1527), Heywood’s *Witty and Witless* (1533) and *A Play of Love* (1534), Udall’s *Thersites* (1537), Bale’s *Three Laws of Nature* (1538), Redford’s *Wit and Science* (1539), Udall’s *Rafe Roister Doister* (1552), *Nice Wanton* (1560), *King Darius* (1565), Wager’s *The Trial of Treasure* (1567), *The History of Jacob and Esau* (1568), Preston’s *Cambises* (c. 1569), Garter’s *Susanna* (1569) Golding’s *Abraham’s Sacrifice* (1577), Fulwell’s *Like Will to Like* (1587), *The Pedlar’s Prophecy* (1595), and Greene and Lodge’s *A Looking-Glass for London and England* (1588). James Shapiro argues that the first part of the Epilogue to *2H4* was spoken by Shakespeare himself, at a court performance at Whitehall in the same season during which the Admiral’s Men were performing a Robin Hood play (*1599*, p. 39). In the quarto version of the play, this section ends, ‘And so I kneel down before you, but, indeed, to pray for the queen’ (Giorgio Melchiori (ed.), *2H4*, 1989, Epilogue, 12-13. The rest of the epilogue may combine two further epilogues (14-19 and 20-26), each composed for delivery before terminal jigs in amphitheatre performances. The actual words of that prayer, of course, are lost. Rastell’s *Of Gentleness and Nobility* (1527) has prayers at the end of each of its three parts. Terminal prayers may have been more common in the early Tudor period, but obviously still occurred. [↑](#endnote-ref-33)
36. May, pp. xiii-xiv; for Dudley Carleton’s cryptic reference to the Queen dining with Lord Hunsdon on 29 December 1601 when she saw a play, probably performed by the Chamberlain’s Men, in the Blackfriars, either in Hunsdon’s own great chamber or in the adjacent playhouse, see Chambers, *Shakespeare*, ii, 48. There is, however, no evidence that other performances of this nature in Blackfriars, for which *AYLI* may have been deemed suitable, had taken place earlier. (Peter Roberts supplied me with this reference.) [↑](#endnote-ref-34)
37. May, *Anthology*, item 165 (see pp. 304-5). [↑](#endnote-ref-35)
38. Cook and Wilson, *Dramatic Records*, 57a, p. 31; Astingdon, 236. [↑](#endnote-ref-36)
39. *Dictionary of National Biography*, 52, p. 249; the dial poem resembles many of the simile poems printed in John Bodenham, *et al*., *Bel-vedére or The garden of the Muses*, 1600. [↑](#endnote-ref-37)
40. *Old Fortunatus*, 1600, sigs A4r, L3r; *The Shoemaker’s Holiday*, 1600, sig. A4r; *Patient Grissil*, 1603, sigs A4v, H1v; *Troia Nova*, 1612, sig. C3v; The *Noble Spanish Soldier*, 1634, sig. B2r; *The Sun’s Darling*, 1656, sig G1r. Shakespeare used trochaics more than twenty times (Ringler and May, ‘Epilogue’, p. 139). [↑](#endnote-ref-38)
41. Ringler and May, ‘Epilogue’, p. 139. [↑](#endnote-ref-39)
42. May and Ringler, *Bibliography*, aa4troch, III, 2121; Campion devotes Chapter 6 of his *Observations in the Art of English Poesy* (1602) to the metre. [↑](#endnote-ref-40)
43. Gurr, *Playing Companies*, p. 254; Astingdon, *Court Theatre*, p. 236. [↑](#endnote-ref-41)
44. Tiffany Stern, ‘Re-patching the play’, *From Script to Stage in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Holland and Stephen Orgel, (Basingstoke, 2004), 151-77 at 161. [↑](#endnote-ref-42)
45. Seng, Peter J. (1959). 'The Foresters' Song in As You Like It'. *Shakespeare Quarterly,* 10(2), 246-249. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
46. Robert Armin, *Quips upon Question*, 1600, sig. Aiir [↑](#endnote-ref-43)
47. See Gurr, *Playing Companies*, 313; compare Knowles, 375-6. [↑](#endnote-ref-44)
48. James Nielson, “William Kemp at the Globe’” *SQ*, 44 (1993): 466-8; likewise Richard Dutton argues that Kempe remained in the company long enough to have played in *JC*, (*Licensing, Censorship, and Authorship in Early Modern England*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000) 34. [↑](#endnote-ref-45)
49. Robert Armin, *The Italian Tailor and his Boy*, (London, 1609), sig. A3r; Chambers, ii, 300; Wells and Taylor, *Textual Companion*, 120. [↑](#endnote-ref-46)
50. Touchstone is generally described in the text as a fool although he is named in the speech prefixes as “Clown”. [↑](#endnote-ref-47)