

Murray links Ferdinand's incestuous passion to the myth of Narcissus, a welcome mythopoetic supplement to the study's largely medical context, and she suggests that the historical figures for the story may indeed have been twins. Tragicomedies often shifted poor behavior from the twins to their wives and mothers. In Webster's *The Devil's Law Case*, two siblings, Romelio and Jolenta, pretend that Jolenta is pregnant with twins in order to disguise the *gravidas* of Romelio's girlfriend, the nun Angiolella. William Ryder's *The Twins* explores the passion that Charmia feels for her husband's twin brother. The scenario is resolved by a bed trick in which the husband poses as his own twin, a clever rendition of an old conceit.

In comedy, twins trigger misrecognitions that produce funny situations, and they are perceived as blessings rather than curses to their parents, as in William Haughton's *Patient Grissil*. Shakespeare's twin plays go even further in defusing the fear of twins. Both *Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night* draw on the Plautine conceit of mistaken identity, but the earlier comedy doubles the trouble, while the later work features fraternal twins who become more like identical twins through cross-dressing. Viola and Sebastian, born from a violent cesarean section on the shores of Illyria, embody the twin mysteries of birth as division, separation, and trauma, and of gender as both riven and merged.

Although she notes literary sources, Murray's reliance on medical literature and broadsides occurs at the expense of detailed inquiry into myth, folklore, and anthropology. Where are Castor and Pollux, Romulus and Remus, and Jacob and Esau? Nonetheless, Murray has assembled a remarkable collection of texts unified around a single theme, and she has produced a thoughtful and coherent account of them as responses to the medical knowledge of the day. Meanwhile, my sister and I resemble Hermia and Helena's "double cherry—seeming parted / But yet an union in partition" (*Midsummer Night's Dream* 3.2.211–13), and I am blessed to share something with Cymbeline: "O what am I? / A mother to the birth of three? Ne'er mother / Rejoiced deliverance more" (5.6.369–71).

Julia Reinhard Lupton, *University of California, Irvine*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2018.114

The Shakespearean Forest. Anne Barton.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. xviii + 186 pp. \$99.99.

When Anne Barton died in late 2013, *The Shakespearean Forest* was not yet ready for publication. The subject of talks that Barton delivered in 1994 and in 2003, the second time as Trinity College's Clark Lecture series, the materials that would become *The Shakespearean Forest*—"electronic versions and . . . many printouts, some annotated" (xv)—were given, in 2014, to Hester Lees-Jeffries, who describes Barton as her "first

patron in Cambridge, in the best sense” (xvi). Lees-Jeffries edited these files for publication, and she discovered, presumably to her surprise, that Barton had already “completed the bulk of her work on *The Shakespearean Forest* by 2005” (xv). About the task she undertook, which included some re-sequencing of text in chapter 1, but not very much direct intervention otherwise, Lees-Jeffries observes, “The work I have done in preparing this book for the press is not a labour of love, but rather of profound gratitude—not simply for what Anne did for me, but for the work she has left us, and for her example as a scholar, critic, writer and teacher” (xvi). On behalf of scholars working in early modern drama, ecocriticism, and environmental literary history, I’d like to express profound gratitude to Lees-Jeffries for shepherding *The Shakespearean Forest* into print.

In a different world, *The Shakespearean Forest* would have been published about twelve years earlier, just as a generation of scholars, including myself, was beginning to examine early modern English literature and culture from ecocritical perspectives. There were precious few models for us to follow, and we would have undoubtedly benefited from consulting Barton’s elegant, erudite, and often witty book. Some moments in *The Shakespearean Forest* intimate that Barton would have welcomed such ecocritical engagement: near the end of chapter 6’s discussion of *As You Like It*’s Jaques, she writes, for example, “Hermits, solitary old religious men and such convertites to their way of life as the former Duke Frederick are likely to be less ecologically damaging” than the hunters and shepherds living in Arden (135). Wisely, Lees-Jeffries closes *The Shakespearean Forest* with a generous “bibliographical essay” that describes “the rise of eco-criticism and the new nature writing” in early modern English studies and so situates Barton’s book as a participant in this conversation (159).

Of her book’s broadest argument, Barton says in chapter 1, “It deals with forest symbolism, with ideas of the forest as a sentient being, capable of listening and even responding to some of the things humans do and say in it, and with the relationship, sometimes harmonious, more often troubled, between the forest and its neighbor and opposite, the city” (20). Five short chapters follow, each a distillation of archival research and wide reading. Chapter 2 concerns a matter close to my heart—the staging of “arboreal effects” (30)—and considers the problem posed by the performance of a play’s forest or tree in a range of theatrical venues. Chapters 3 and 4 explore the stage history of some of the drama’s non-arboreal figures: the wild man and Robin Hood, respectively. Chapter 3 usefully links Shakespeare’s *Timon of Athens* to a tradition of staging the wild man (63–66), while chapter 4, which is, to my eyes, a standout, charts characters in the drama and “real individuals who insist upon re-enacting specific parts or circumstances of the Robin Hood story” (78). For Barton, Robin Hood has a “featureless, almost anonymous, quality” in “the traditional stories,” which “made it easy” for him “to be absorbed” into other theatrical traditions and impersonated by a range of historical people (75). Chapter 5 takes up the relation between the forest and the city, and in it Barton provocatively suggests that the typical figuration of forests as female, which is evident in texts such as Michael Drayton’s *Poly-Olbion*, “may help to explain why, throughout the seventeenth

and eighteenth centuries, both in England and France, men trying to defend a particular forest against government legislation designed to exploit it and restrict its traditional common use often felt impelled to signal their identification with the place by disguising themselves, on their protest outings, as women” (112). Chapter 6 surveys forest plays, mainly Shakespearean, and concludes with a reading of *Macbeth*'s Birnam Wood, which she calls a “sentient forest” that proves “a punitive but also an autonomous, just and ultimately benevolent judge” (137).

The Shakespearean Forest features an afterword by Peter Holland. It's a detailed account of Barton's life and works, but it also rehearses a couple of injudicious observations about Barton's personal appearance and style. In light of how this volume has been framed, their inaptness raised this reader's eyebrows.

Vin Nardizzi, *University of British Columbia*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2018.115

Shakespeare's Pictures: Visual Culture in Drama. Keir Elam.
London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2017. xviii + 380 pp. \$108.

As the story goes, Protestantism's suspicion of iconography stunted the development of the visual arts in post-Reformation England, even as it laid the groundwork for the flourishing of its literary production. Of course, the period saw the rise of the theater, “England's lively pictorial culture” (Leonard Barkan, “Making Pictures Speak,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 48.2 [1995], 338). But drama repeatedly answered anti-theatricalist opprobrium by venerating the word and condemning the pictorial as the painted and the fake. As Hamlet famously says of Ophelia, in a moment often treated as symptomatic of the visual poverty of the age, “I have heard of your paintings too, well enough.”

Keir Elam's *Shakespeare's Pictures* joins a growing body of work challenging the oft-retold tale about the absence of visual culture in early modern England. Making use of the malleability of the word *picture* in the sixteenth century—it could mean both a painting and a description of a painting, refer to two- and three-dimensional objects (and hence both paintings and statuary), and connote both meanings of the word *counterfeit* (i.e., a perfect and a poor imitation)—Elam persuasively argues for a Shakespeare knowledgeable about visual objects and visual theory. Characters parrot and reframe classical and contemporary discourses on aesthetics in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and *Timon of Athens*. Courtesy of Falstaff we learn about the cost and merits of various types of household decor in *2 Henry IV*. Plays stage, or borrow from, other visual artforms—from *vanitas* and *memento mori*, miniatures, erotica, tapestries, painted cloth, heraldry, inn signs, and city views. The early modern theater, then, should be viewed as intermedial, enmeshed in and with other forms rather than set apart from them. By extension, *Shakespeare's Pictures* asks us to imagine a