

# EMCO#6

From the Bergen Shakespeare and Drama Network Symposium  
Florence, October 2014

Early Modern Culture Online

Issue number 6, October 2015

“From the Bergen Shakespeare and Drama Network Symposium: Florence, October 2014”

EMCO is published by The University of Agder and the University of Bergen, Norway.

General Editors:

Professor Roy Eriksen, UiA

roy.eriksen@uia.no

Professor Stuart Sillars, UiB

stuart.sillars@uib.no

Managing Editor:

Associate Professor Sverre-Arve Myklebost, Volda University College, Norway

svenn-arve.myklebost@hivolda.no

ISSN: 1892-0888

EMCO is associated to The Bergen Shakespeare and Drama Network: [www.uib.no/en/rg/bsdn](http://www.uib.no/en/rg/bsdn)





## Table of Contents

<i>Another note on EMCO</i>	IV
Svonn-Arve Myklebost <i>Introduction: Florence Symposium on Editing</i>	V-VII
Helen Cooper <i>Editorial Anomalies and Stage Practice: A Midsummer Night's Dream 3.2-4.1</i>	1-10
C.W.R.D. Moseley <i>Shakespeare, The Spanish Armada and the Mississippi</i>	11-21
James Taabu Busimba <i>Re-language-ing Shakespeare for a Ugandan Readership: Potentials and Pitfalls of Translating King Lear in a Ugandan Language</i>	23-30
Perry McPartland <i>Painting the Plays</i>	31-40
Laura Saetveit Miles <i>Playing Editor: Inviting the Students Behind the Text</i>	41-47
Roy Eriksen <i>Editing and the Shadow of the Folio: On the Textual Integrity of The Taming of A Shrew (1594)</i>	49-70
Stuart Sillars <i>Afterword</i>	71-76
Contributors	77
Call for contributions	79

## Another note on EMCO

This is the second new-style issue of EMCO and it is slightly different from the first. We are still in the process of changing the journal, little by little, to introduce comment pieces, survey articles, notes and *en face* “encounters” or expositions of little-known works of early modern art, be they poems, sculpture, a badly painted *putto* off to the side of an otherwise well-known painting or what have you. For now, we are delighted to present to you a special issue of the journal based on last year’s meeting of the Bergen Shakespeare and Drama Network in Florence, more about which in the introduction.

We are confident that as the network of contributors, peer reviewers, readers, students and scholars somehow affiliated with EMCO and its related research milieux continue to grow, EMCO will flourish. We believe that in order to make its mark in the academe, a journal needs to do more than simply print articles. This is especially true in a time where more and more scholars self-publish, free of charge, on sites like *Academia*. It is vital, therefore, that EMCO remain not only *gratis*, but that it has something in it to attract readers to linger after reading the one article in which they had an interest. We hope, in the future, to expand EMCO’s place in the digital domain so it might become a hub for discussion and updates from the interdisciplinary field of Early Modern studies and its current state in the world’s universities. At the same time, EMCO will always have at its core a selection of peer-reviewed, scholarly articles, available to print on A4 paper and read in the comfort of your armchair, should you be less digitally inclined.

The interleaved images in this issue have generously been supplied by Perry McPartland.

**Introduction**  
*Florence Symposium on Editing*  
Svenn-Arve Myklebost

Anyone who owns bookshelves (and I assume the majority of our readers do), will have struggled with the pleasurable problem of how to organize them. I have a section for art/visual studies. At another location I have put all the Roland Barthes books I own. Should I move his *Camera Lucida* to the art/visual studies section? In some ways, I really ought to. And what about his *Image, Music, Text*? It would be infuriating to remove just one or two books by Barthes to another place in the shelves – it rubs me the wrong way – but *Camera Lucida* does in fact belong in the art/visual studies section, whether I like it or not. *Image, Music, Text*, however, only partly belongs. I cannot tear out the pages relevant to images and put them in the art/visual studies section. I mean, I could, but I don't want to. Neither of these problems have a satisfactory solution.

These are minor issues, however, when compared to the challenges represented by my various Shakespeare sections. Some of my shelves are for works *by* Shakespeare, others are for works *about* his plays and poems. The shelves containing works *by* Shakespeare however, are characterised by a great deal of co-authorship or co-creation. In many ways, they are as much *about* the works as they *are* them. Some because they are DVDs and Blu-rays containing feature film and filmed theatre versions of the plays; some because they are comic book and manga “adaptations” of the plays; some because they are translations; and all of them because they are in some way or other the result of editorship, from facsimiles of the Quartos and Folios to the most recent Arden editions. Virtually all modern editions of Shakespeare contain introductory

essays, annotation and a number of other paratexts that shape and influence the identity of the volume. In many respects, all the “editions,” the comics, the DVDs and even the ostensibly innocuous and merely representative *Collected Works*, are interpretations and configurations of the plays. Where does one draw the line, then, between editing a play and performing it, as it were? And how do these questions affect how I organise my bookshelves?



The topic of editing was the point of departure for the Bergen Shakespeare and Drama Network symposium in Florence in the autumn of 2014. Beyond the incontestably very important issue of my bookshelves, this topic birthed an impressive variety of papers and a wealth of interesting discussions relating to everything from forensic, incisive deliberations of specific textual cruxes to more general discussions of what it means to edit, what ideological and intellectual baggage editing brings with it, and the purposes and experiences of teaching Shakespeare's material, textual history in the classroom. In addition, or by extension, some papers also addressed the transmediation and translation of Shakespeare's works to other languages and media. Many of these perspectives are present in this issue of EMCO.

The Bergen Shakespeare and Drama Network was inaugurated by Professor Stuart Sillars at the University of Bergen in the mid-2000s and the first symposium took place in 2006. Since then, the BSDN has gathered a variety of scholars in a

number of pleasant locations around Europe to engage in informal yet serious presentations and discussions of topics relating to the cultural life of the Early Modern Period in general and the works of William Shakespeare in particular. The first issue of EMCO contained a collection of articles based on papers held at the 2009 symposium held in Montpellier. The relationship between EMCO and BSDN is firm and in the current instance, it has engendered a strong issue of the journal for your perusal.

EMCO#6 begins with Helen Cooper's "Editorial Anomalies and Stage Practice: A *Midsummer Night's Dream* 3.2-4.1," (1-10) in which she argues that the division between the third and fourth acts of *Dream* may be moved from its current position to some one hundred lines into the fourth act as it is currently demarcated. Cooper combines what we know about Elizabethan stage practices with the actual stage directions in the play (Q as well as F) to demonstrate that even though Act and Scene divisions were the inventions of later editors, there are grounds for claiming that they would have had a function on the Shakespearean stage and that this function may be relevant to the play's current aesthetic identity.

The aesthetic identity of Shakespeare's plays is the subject matter of the second article in this issue, Charles Moseley's "Shakespeare, The Spanish Armada and *Huckleberry Finn*" (11-21), wherein he explores how reconfigurations of *Hamlet* in Mark Twain's *Huckleberry Finn* and Richard Brinsley Sheridan's play *The Critic* make those works engage in an overarching, trans-historical interrogation and negotiation with their model. *The Critic's* parody of *Hamlet* is less a mockery of the model than of the countless plays which have imitated the Danish play in the interim between Shakespeare and Sheridan,

turning its devices into clichés. Moseley demonstrates how Sheridan's references to Shakespeare might drag *Hamlet* from the clutches of the unimaginative, lesser playwrights who had appropriated it up until that point. Twain, however, writing in a different time and – significantly – place, seems to betray a deeper unease with American literature's European heritage, albeit, like Sheridan, in a comedic mode.

Another way in which Shakespearean identity is interrogated and possibly reshaped (or, rather, extended) is through translation. James Busimba's "Re-language-ing Shakespeare for a Ugandan readership: Potentials and pitfalls of translating *King Lear* in a Ugandan language" (23-30) addresses the transcultural outcomes of translating *King Lear* into a Ugandan language, *Lusoga*. Cornelius Gulere Wambi's translation, which Busimba suggests is itself a kind of editing, utilises extant names, historical persons and myths from Ugandan folklore, (for example, Lear becomes *Mukama*, the mytho-historical progenitor of the Basoga ethnic community) thus placing *Lear* into a cultural framework which necessarily influences the identity of the translated text, while at the same time giving something back to Shakespeare, enriching the whole picture, as it were.

A wholly different way of engaging in the plays is through the medium of painting. Perry McPartland, in an article entitled "Painting the Plays" (31-40) explores the opportunities and challenges related to Shakespeare and contemporary art. How does one approach painting the plays in the 21<sup>st</sup> century? How does one avoid engaging in "mere" illustration? Looking at historical examples of Shakespeare painting and contrasting them with the contexts and epistemes of 20<sup>th</sup> century painters, McPartland, who is himself a contemporary artist, and whose

art is featured in this issue of EMCO, demonstrates how the ambitions and methods of artists in different time periods diverge in fundamental ways. It may just be that painting Shakespeare plays is impossible in the current artistic climate.

Many, perhaps most students who come to learn about medieval and early modern literature are unaware of what editing entails and the extent to which editions' material qualities, from the feel of the paper to the typography, shape the character of the texts. Laura Miles' article "Playing Editor: Inviting Students Behind the Text" (41-7) explores strategies that may be utilised to teach editing in the classroom. Miles predicts that for students, gaining deeper insight into early modern editing practices will inevitably create a greater understanding of what the plays say and do, in addition to highlighting their historicity. A useful way in, is to let students themselves play at being editors, as this makes it clearer to them what is at stake.

Roy Eriksen's article, "Editing and the Shadow of the Folio: On the Textual Integrity of *The Taming of A Shrew* (1594)" (49-70) very thoroughly debates the role structural patterning, i.e. literary rhetorical periods and scene distributions, plays in identifying authorial styles and for understanding the traditions to which a play such as *A Shrew* relates. This play, Eriksen argues, bears similarities to Marlowian and Italianate styles, difficult to discover, perhaps, if one considers *A Shrew* merely a derivation of *The Shrew*, as printed in the First Folio of 1623.

Rounding off the issue is Stuart Sillars' afterword (71-6), in which he explores some historical shifts in attitudes to Shakespeare editing, through looking at a series of examples from the Bell edition of 1733 to modern, digital editions like *The Quartos Project*, all the while thinking about what editing entails, philosophically, aesthetically, intellectually, for readers, directors and actors.



Perry McPartland *Shot from a Porn Movie, Scene 1, Underground Carpark, Car Window Rolled Down* 185x185cm. Oil on canvas. 2008.