



## Morgan, Oliver. Turn-taking in Shakespeare

Goran Stanivukovic

Volume 43, Number 3, Summer 2020

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1075324ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v43i3.35342>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (print)

2293-7374 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Stanivukovic, G. (2020). Review of [Morgan, Oliver. Turn-taking in Shakespeare]. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 43(3), 332–334. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v43i3.35342>

**Morgan, Oliver.**

*Turn-taking in Shakespeare.*

Oxford Textual Perspectives. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. Pp. xvi, 304. ISBN 978-0-19-8836353 (hardback) US\$71.50; ISBN 978-1-19-883636-0 (paperback) US\$27.50.

In their announcement for a new series, Oxford Textual Perspectives, the series' editors state that books published under this banner will be "informative and provocative studies" that explore the "technologies, cultures, and communities that produce, inform and receive [...] images, works, and artefacts" resulting from the interaction of cultural forces that shape communication. It is hard to think of a better volume to launch this series than Morgan's accessibly written, original, perceptive, and thoroughly well-argued book. His analytical skill is clear and precise, and his superb micro-analysis of words in isolation as well as in their immediate dramatic contexts is full of refreshing surprises. The strength of this book lies in its illuminating subtle micro-analyses. Morgan is excellent at hearing and seeing in the text what can easily pass unseen and unheard, yet what makes all the difference for understanding Shakespeare. He gets out of what he calls the "shape" of conversation—who speaks when, for how long, and to whom—an array of critical possibilities that show how carefully and cleverly, indeed provocatively, conversations and dialogues are composed. Morgan pushes the effect and meaning of "things that we are shown but not told" (2), that is, how dialogues as building blocks of drama flow and craft meaning on stage. He reveals new possibilities for formalist criticism, which has gathered force recently. Morgan pays critical attention to pattern, shapes, length, typography, and punctuation as components within the verbal architecture of a dialogue (3). He shows that in shaping dialogue, Shakespeare is highly sensitive to scenic situation, actor ability, and dramatic narrative; that the playwright "understands the mechanics of conversation" (9), or "a turn at talk" (3).

One thing that does not follow from Morgan's fine line of argument is that rhetorical analysis can account for everything that happens at the level of style and logical argumentation in a Shakespearean play, and that the variety of Shakespeare's styles is revealed in the interpretation of "the right level of detail" (16) in the shape of "turn talking." Morgan's method appears to be smart and simple. It shows that the literary-critical approach to prosody at times requires

no other tool but a pencil. His aim is to offer not a complete description but an “analytically useful description” (15), which one might also call re-description; he assembles meaning by disassembling the linguistic components of a dialogue. This method of gathering data from the plays is complemented by a “conversation analysis” (9), which is a branch of linguistic analysis used to explore the form and effect of conversation as set pieces. It is enhanced by intersectional linguistics used to analyze dialogue in conversation. Together, these two theoretical directions assist Morgan’s critically sophisticated analysis of the interactive quality of dramatic language (3).

The book is organized in two parts, each consisting of four chapters. It opens by defining turn-talking as a unit of dramatic text, illustrating it with a short dialogue from *Much Ado About Nothing*; next, Morgan explains his theoretical approach and establishes the grounds for his theoretical premise by using both early modern and post-early modern literary and critical texts. The author introduces the “turn-taking model by making a single, very reasonable, assumption” (43) about its form and function in Shakespeare. A great virtue of this book is its ability to develop many single reasonable assumptions into persuasive arguments. Morgan’s reasoning, analyses, conclusions, and critical language are like a fresh breeze blowing through a room. In the second chapter, he turns the introductory assumption into an examination of Shakespearean dialogue. He creates “a stable vocabulary for the description of dialogical form” (43), develops “a system of dialogical scansion” (43) with which concrete examples are abstracted, and turns to a range of plays to test his method, while his insights contrast generations of established critics and editors. *Richard II* is the subject of a chapter that shows how the analytical tool Morgan devised works at a deeper level of dialogic composition. As an instance of “conversational turn” (109) in dramatic speaking, “aside” is the subject of another ingeniously argued chapter.

As the book moves along and as further examples from more plays are the subject of analysis, so the theoretical grid expands. This is especially clear in a cogent response to the linguist Harvey Sacks, and in an interpretation of the methods of finishing (or not finishing) a dialogue, which is illustrated by an example from *Coriolanus*. The point that rhetoric is not the most effective analytical tool for explaining dialogue is well taken; rhetoric better addresses an “extended persuasive turn at talk” (167). The penultimate chapter in the second part examines a “typographical ambiguity” (191), involving either a comma

or a full stop at the end of a speech, in the only speech in Shakespeare that is believed to have been punctuated by the playwright (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, sig. G4r, 5.1.108–20), in relation to the semantic abundance of this speech. From a discussion of punctuation in print, the analysis moves to “the formal description of verse dialogue” (224), and to reflections on the blank spaces in dramatic verse.

This book was a joy to read because of the many colourful twists and turns of its critical language, because the author is a meticulous and imaginative close reader, and because the argument offers a very good model for stylistic micro-analysis as a mode in Shakespeare criticism. I hope that theatre practitioners, students in drama studio programs, and critics alike will find this book of use.

GORAN STANIVUKOVIC

Saint Mary's University, Halifax

<https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v43i3.35342>

**Munro, Lucy.**

*Shakespeare in the Theatre: The King's Men.*

London: Bloomsbury, 2020. Pp. 240. ISBN 978-1-4742-6261-3 (hardcover) US\$100.

Lucy Munro's book on the King's Men represents a substantial contribution to the historiography of early modern theatre and a major new study of this theatre company, whose activities spanned four decades of London's burgeoning theatre scene in the seventeenth century. At the heart of Munro's well researched and accessibly written book are the player, the playwright, and the theatrical community, as she puts it in the preliminary pages (xvi). Munro has struck an excellent balance between a macro-history of the material conditions of playing and textual analyses of individual plays by Shakespeare and his contemporaries that shaped the repertory of the King's Men. The six parts of the book—five chapters and an epilogue on *Hamlet*—are organized around case studies exploring one or several plays, focusing on themes and topics (e.g., magic and gender) as well as examining the staging conditions and playwriting practices illustrated by the plays on the repertory. Primarily, Munro interprets textual and contextual evidence that shows how plays evolved