SHAKESPEARE QUARTERLY

Winter 1976

VOLUME 27, NUMBER 1

Published by The Folger Shakespeare Library

Winter 1976

Cover illustration: Scene from *The Comedy of Errors* at the New York Shakespeare Festival, 1975. Photograph by George E. Joseph.

From the Editor

The "New" *Shakespeare Quarterly*

BY THE TIME seasoned readers of *Shakespeare Quarterly* begin perusing these prefatory remarks, they will undoubtedly have noticed several ways in which the present issue differs from its predecessors. The cover has been dressed up with a new logo accentuating the initial letters that have long been part of the *Quarterly*'s identity, and the Shakespeare coat of arms (which adorned *SQ* covers during the journal's earlier era under the aegis of the first Shakespeare Association of America) has been reinstated as a balancing component in the overall design. New type-faces and display motifs have been introduced on the pages between the covers, and the ratio between page height and page width has been reduced as one of several means of rendering the text on each page more readable and inviting. Biographical information about *Quarterly* authors has been relocated from a separate Contributor's page to a more accessible position at the base of the first page of each article and review. A few sections of the journal, including the book review section, have been redesigned to employ a more attractive and flexible double-column format. And several other details have been altered to provide greater visual diversity. Taken as a whole, the new look is intended to give the *Quarterly* a more contemporary address, while simultaneously preserving a number of key links with the journal's oldest traditions. I hope that readers will find the new combination pleasing.

The design, I should hasten to add, is not the only thing new about the Winter 1976 *Shakespeare Quarterly*. This number marks the first time that *SQ* has devoted a full issue to articles about producing Shakespeare's plays in the current theatre. Many of the articles, naturally, involve reviews of Shakespearean festivals in the season just concluded—with more festivals covered this year than in any previous production issue of the *Quarterly*—but a good number of them also include general observations about some of the theoretical problems involved in producing Shakespeare today. Moreover, there are several articles that differ from previous festival reviews in that they comment on productions not connected with any festival setting (see, for example, the essays by Robert Speaight, Bernard Beckerman, Barry Gaines, and Stephen Booth). Still other departures from the precedents set by past production issues are Helen Krich Chinoy's interview with director Jonathan Miller and Richard L. Coe's review article on the "Shakespeare Complex" in North America. What this issue presents, in fine, is a more comprehensive than usual treatment of Shakespeare in performance in the mid-1970s. In my view, it contains some excellent theatre criticism by a group of sensitive, well-informed reviewers, and it is organized in such a way as to provide, in its westward progression from England to Canada to New England to California, a sense of the pulse of Shakespearean theatre today.

For all its breadth, however, this issue does not—indeed *cannot*—do justice to the full range of Shakespearean performances available in one setting or another in our time. Several major festivals are not represented—not because they were considered unworthy of review, but merely because at this time the *Quarterly* was unable to afford sufficient space for inclusion of everything that merited attention—and the same holds true for a number of prominent theatrical centers apart from festival contexts, such as the McCarter Theatre in Princeton or the Guthrie Theatre in Minneapolis. Four events occurred during the year at the Folger that might have been discussed, for instance: there were superb dramatic readings on the Folger Theatre stage by Charlton Heston in November 1974 and Irene Worth in January 1975, and there were thought-provoking productions of two plays, *1 Henry IV* and *The Tempest*, by the Folger Theatre Group. These omissions are troubling, but just as troubling is the omission of any coverage of Shakespearean productions presented in 1975 on film and on television. While I am happy, then, that this issue provides an unprecedentedly generous sampling of the past season's most interesting Shakespeare performances, I am at the same time hopeful that the *Quarterly* will be able to offer fuller reporting in future issues on Shakespearean production.

HAVING THUS INVOKED THE FUTURE, I would now like to supplement these remarks by amplifying some comments I made in Winter 1975 about new directions for *Shakespeare Quarterly*.

Almost from the day I assumed the editorship of the journal in July 1974, I have been struggling to develop a clear conception of the kind of periodical *SQ* is best suited—by virtue of its varied traditions, present circumstances, and future possibilities—to become. To suggest that that struggle has now in any degree abated would be unthinkable: I cannot claim to have been granted any special insight into the "idea" of *Shakespeare Quarterly*, for of course there *is* no one integrating concept that will capture the essence of a journal with so rich and complex a history as *SQ*'s. All the same, however, a few provisional notions have surfaced, and perhaps they are worth sharing—and even repeating—if only for the purpose of eliciting thoughtful commentary from *Quarterly* readers.

One of these notions—the only one that can properly be accorded the lofty status of a given—is that whatever the *Quarterly* eventually becomes, it should never cease to be what it was at the outset: a periodical committed to setting and maintaining the highest standards in literary and dramatic scholarship and criticism. Among the most signal contributions of James McManaway's distinguished career has been the leadership he exercised by the example of his rigor and thoroughness as editor of *SQ* from 1951 to 1972. That example is, I think, the most important part of the *Quarterly*'s heritage, and it must be upheld without compromise no matter how markedly the journal evolves in other respects.

A second notion—and another that seems so self-evident as to be all but universally acceptable—is that a journal such as *Shakespeare Quarterly* should be responsive to obligations in three frames of reference: past, present, and future. Its obligation to the past—primarily, of course, to that portion of the past that is the journal's special province (the age of Shakespeare), but secondarily to all of the past that can be related in any manner to Shakespeare and his age—is that it present the past faithfully: that it endeavor, making use of all the resources available to modern scholarship, to promote the accurate representation of historical conditions, processes, events, ideas, persons, and works as these matters are brought to bear upon present-day interpretations of Shakespeare. Its obligation to the present is that, where appropriate, it endeavor to bring investigations of the past into fruitful relationship with needs and concerns of the present: without allowing either the past or the present to be distorted in the irresponsible pursuit of "timeliness," the journal should encourage the kind of comparative analysis by means of which the past and the present may be mutually illuminated. Finally, the journal's obligation to the future is that it endeavor to fulfill its obligations to the past and the present with enough intelligence and foresight to assure that a coherent and valuable body of scholarship and criticism will be transmitted from one generation of Shakespeareans to another.

A third notion—and one that is less self-evidently compelling than the first two—is that in order to meet all the obligations implicit in the second notion, *Shakespeare Quarterly* ought to reflect a full spectrum of Shakespearean interests, activities, and influences. Shakespeare is, after all, more than a noted poet and playwright. He is *sui generis*, a cultural phenomenon of the first order of importance—particularly in the English-speaking world, where his words and works supply a range of reference and allusion exceeded, perhaps, only by the King James Bible—and it is difficult to see why any important aspect of Shakespeare's general cultural significance should be considered inherently inappropriate for serious examination in the pages of this journal.

A fourth notion—one that derives quite readily from the third—is that *Shakespeare Quarterly* can best achieve its mission by working to develop and sustain the broadest audience compatible with the principles outlined under the first three headings. It is doubtful that John Heminge and Henry Condell could have anticipated how numerous would be the "great Variety of Readers," theatregoers, and other admirers who have been drawn to Shakespeare since the publication of the First Folio in 1623, or that even Ben Jonson could have realized how prophetically he spoke when he asserted that Shakespeare was "not of an age, but for all time." If Shakespeare is indeed for all time—if it is true that he has been in some sense contemporary with virtually every succeeding age and culture—it might be argued that one of the functions of a journal dedicated to his memory is to mirror enough facets of that contemporaneity to attract a wide and diverse readership. I am not suggesting that every person who attends a Joseph Papp production of Shakespeare in New York's Central Park is a potential *Quarterly* subscriber, or should be, although I imagine that most of Mr. Papp's audiences include at least a few individuals with a strong desire to learn more about the dramatist whose plays have so often enriched their lives. What I *am* suggesting is that there are several large categories of potential *SQ* readers (among them at least a small proportion of the thousands who regularly attend Shakespearean performances) who would find the journal more appealing if it contained a more ample representation of some of the faces of Shakespeare seldom seen in the study or the library or the classroom. It seems to me that a significantly augmented *Quarterly* audience is an objective worth pursuing—if for no other reason, simply because much of the writing for the journal might be rendered more lively and enduring were authors conscious of addressing a readership considerably more extensive than that comprised by their fellow specialists in the academy—and I am therefore prepared to entertain a number of possible new directions in emphasis, style, and even content if there is good reason to believe that they will expand the scope of the journal at no cost in rigor or integrity. *Shakespeare Quarterly* will, of course, continue to publish articles, notes, and reviews of the same kind as the finest material in previous volumes. At the same time, however, it is my hope that the journal will become progressively more receptive to original approaches and new features, in the expectation that fresh perspectives will cast unexpected light on important but hitherto unexplored aspects of Shakespeare's "infinite variety."

JOHN F. ANDREWS