

TIGHT RINGING BOOK

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_210579

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 822.33/67815

Accession No. 35615

Author Greg, W. W.

Title Shakespeare first folio 1963

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

THE SHAKESPEARE
FIRST FOLIO

THE SHAKESPEARE FIRST FOLIO

ITS BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND
TEXTUAL HISTORY

BY

W. W. GREG

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1955

Oxford University Press, Amen House, London E.C.4
GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON
BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS KARACHI CAPE TOWN IBADAN
Geoffrey Cumberlege, Publisher to the University



PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

Preface

THIS account of the Shakespeare First Folio was originally planned as an introduction to a facsimile of the volume. The scheme for a facsimile fell through, but the introduction got itself written in an extended form and now appears independently. This will explain if not excuse the rather awkward impersonality of the writing.

The work makes no pretence to originality. All I have tried to do is to set out the evidence and summarize on each point under discussion the view now generally held by scholars, or, if there is no commonly accepted opinion, the view that seems in best accord with the evidence. I am, of course, perfectly aware that this only means that I have expressed the views with which I personally agree; but I have endeavoured to be as objective as possible.

All references¹ to Shakespeare's plays are to the act, scene, and line numbering of the Globe edition (1891), though all quotations are from whatever original text may be in question. A difficulty arises in referring to those prints that depart widely from the received text, the so-called 'bad' quartos. My references are, in fact, to the corresponding passages in the Globe edition as indicated in the margins of the Griggs—Praetorius facsimiles and the more recent ones sponsored by the Shakespeare Association. References to and quotations from plays by other authors are to the Malone Society's reprints where such are available.

All quotations from printed books follow the originals exactly, except that I have not preserved differences of type unless they happened to be significant. In quoting documents and texts from manuscript I have followed the original spelling and usually the original punctuation (though not differences of script), but I have silently expanded contractions, except in the case of stage-directions and the like in manuscript plays, which are reproduced as closely as type permits. In all quotations square brackets enclose editorial additions: superfluous letters and punctuation marks are enclosed in parentheses; longer parentheses belong to the

original. In stage-directions an upright bar indicates a marked space or often a separate line. In references superior numerals indicate footnotes. I regret that in places the text is much congested with footnotes. For convenience of printing the longer notes have been placed at the end of the chapter or section to which they refer. All dates are calendar dates.

I owe more than I can easily express to the generous co-operation of three American friends. It is obvious that without Dr. E. E. Willoughby's permission to make what use I pleased of his monograph on the printing of the Folio, I could not have written the final chapter of this book. That chapter Dr. Willoughby has read, and since he has expressed no dissent, I hope I have not misrepresented his views or fallen into egregious error on the few occasions on which I have ventured to disagree with them. And I doubt whether I should have embarked on the work at all without the assurance of the kind assistance of Professor Fredson Bowers of the University of Virginia and Dr. James McManaway, like Dr. Willoughby of the Folger Shakespeare Library at Washington, who have patiently read the whole in typescript and have not only helped with their criticism but kept me posted regarding the latest work being done across the Atlantic. This was particularly important in a field in which research is active and in which opinion is constantly changing. For if the whole outlook of Shakespearian textual criticism has altered in the past fifty years, the rate of change has also been progressive and is now alarming. Indeed, I fear that despite our efforts some of that I have here written may be out of date before it gets into the reader's hands.

I also owe a debt to several scholars who have allowed me to consult either unpublished dissertations or articles ahead of publication. I have, I hope, made due acknowledgements in the proper place. But here I must particularly record the kindness of Dr. Alice Walker, who provided me with proofs of her recent book, which I was thus able to consult for a year before it appeared. To many others I have been indebted for help on particular points, among whom I must specially mention Professor D. Nichol Smith, who kept me straight over the puzzle of Steevens's part in the attribution to Ben Jonson of the prefatory address in the Shakespeare Folio.

I need hardly add that great as is my obligation to the friends who have helped me directly or whose works I have pillaged, as I have those of Sir Edmund Chambers and Professor Dover Wilson, responsibility for the many defects, and I fear errors, of the present work is mine alone.

W. W. G.

TANNERS KNAP, PETWORTH

October 1953

Postscript

Recent investigations into the printing of the Folio by John W. Shroeder, whose unpublished work I have been privileged to see, indicate that the irregularities are greater than Willoughby was aware and that some of his conclusions may need reconsideration.

W. W. G.

June 1954

Contents

CHAPTER I. PLANNING THE COLLECTION

page I

The initiative probably the players', 1. Date of inception: was Shakespeare interested? 2. Relation of Isaac Jaggard and Edward Blount, 4. Business relations of the publishing syndicate, 5. The Jaggards and their printing-house, 6. The choice of William Jaggard as printer, 8. His right to print play-bills, 10. The Collection of 1619, n. The Lord Chamberlain's protection of the King's men's plays, 15. The authorship of the dedicatory epistle and the address to the readers, 17.

CHAPTER II. QUESTIONS OF COPYRIGHT

28

Nature and origin of Elizabethan copyright, 28. Conditions of orderly publication: licence, warrant, and entrance, 29. Entrance obligatory, 31. Unprotected copies, 33. Books printed without entrance, 35. Assignment of unentered copies, 35. Copyright sometimes created by assignment, 36. The cases of *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Dr. Faustus*, 37. Pollard's theory of the relation of entrance to authorized publication, 39. Pollard's theory concerning copyright, 42. Wither's *Scholars' Purgatory*, 44. Stationers' liberty of printing sometimes overruled, 44. Misconceptions regarding the position of the printer, 47. Replacing 'bad' texts by 'good', 49. The interpretation of imprints and methods of distribution, 55. The entrance of plays for the First Folio, 58. Ownership of Shakespearian copies, and editions prior to 1623, 60.

CHAPTER III. EDITORIAL PROBLEMS—I

76

The canon, 76. The editors' task: who did the actual work? 77. Arrangement of the plays, 80. Nature of the texts: the editors' claims, 81. Misapprehension regarding these claims, 83. The revolt against pessimism, 88. Source of the quarto texts, 89. Nature of the quarto texts: Pollard's suggestion, 92. Weak points in Pollard's argument, 93. Soundness of Pollard's optimism: McKerrow's theory, 96.

CHAPTER IV. EDITORIAL PROBLEMS—2

105

Types of text at the editors' disposal, 105. Foul papers, 106. Duplications and textual tangles, no. Ghosts, mutes, and unmarked entrances, 112. Foul papers and prompt-books, 112. Irregular character designations, 113. Actors' names: two manners of occurrence, 114. Stage-directions, 121. Authors' use of theatrical language, 122. Varieties of stage-directions, 124. Divergent interests of author and book-keeper, 132. Directions typical of the author, 135. Directions typical of the book-keeper, 138. Summary of distinctive features of foul papers and prompt-books, 141. Act and scene divisions, 142. Cutting of plays, 145. Indications of auto-graph copy, 147. Censorship, 149. Private transcripts, 152. Memorially contaminated transcripts, 154. 'Assembled' texts, 156. Quartos used as copy, 159. Quartos used as prompt-books, 159.

CHAPTER V. EDITORIAL PROBLEMS—3

175

I-II. 2, 3 *Henry VI*, 176. III. I *Henry VI*, 185. Iv. *Richard III*, 190. V. *The Comedy of Errors*, 200. vr. *Titus Andronicus*, 203. vn. *The Taming of the Shrew*, 210. viii. *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, 217. ix. *Love's Labour's Lost*, 219. x. *Romeo and Juliet*, 225. xr. *Richard II*, 236. xir. *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, 240. xiii. *King John*, 248. xiv. *The Merchant of Venice*, 256. XV. i *Henry IV*, 262. xvi. 2 *Henry IV*, 266. xvii. *Much Ado about Nothing*, 277. xviii. *Henry V*, 282. xix. *Julius Caesar*, 289. xx. *As you Like it*, 293. xxi. *Twelfth Night or What you Will*, 296. xxii. *Hamlet*, 299. xxiii. *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 334. XXIV. *Troilus and Cressida*, 338. xxv. *All's Well that Ends Well*, 351. xxvi. *Measure for Measure*, 354. xxvii. *Othello*, 357. XXVIII. *King Lear*, 375. xxix. *Macbeth*, 389. xxx. *Antony and Cleopatra*, 398. xxxi. *Coriolanus*, 404. XXXII. *Timon of Athens*, 408. XXXIII. *Cymbeline*, 412. XXXIV. *The Winter's Tale*, 415. xxxv. *The Tempest*, 418. xxxvi. *Henry VIII*, 422. Summary, 426.

CHAPTER VI. THE PRINTING

433

Willoughby's researches, 433. Some typographical explanations, 433. Make-up and contents of the volume, 436. Interruptions and dislocations in the printing, 438. The printing of *Troilus and Cressida*, 447. The preliminaries, 449. Date of completion, 452. The published price, 454. Size of the edition, 455. The rate of printing, 456. Compositors of the Folio, 457. Time-table of printing, 461. Proof-reading, 461. Standard of accuracy, 464.

POSTSCRIPT

467

INDEX

469

References

The full titles of works to which only incidental reference is made are given at the time. Works more frequently consulted are referred to by short titles only, the expansion of which may be sought in the following list. A few other abbreviations used are as follows:

- DNB = Dictionary of National Biography.
SPD = State Papers, Domestic.
STC = A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475—1640. Compiled by A. W. Pollard & G. R. Redgrave. The Bibliographical Society, 1926.
MLR = *The Modern Language Review*.
RES = *The Review of English Studies*.
TLS = *The Times Literary Supplement*.
PMLA = *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*.

- ADAMS, *Herbert*.—The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, 1623—1673. By Joseph Quincy Adams. Yale University Press, 1917.
- ADAMS, *Timon*.—"Timon of Athens' and the Irregularities of the First Folio. By Joseph Quincy Adams. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 1908, vii. 53-63.
- ALEXANDER, *Henry VI*.—Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III. By Peter Alexander. Cambridge University Press, 1929.
- ARBER, *Transcript*.—A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554—1640 A.D. Edited by Edward Arber. London, privately printed. Vols. i, ii, 1875; iii, 1876; iv, 1877; v (Birmingham), 1894. Cited for incidental matter only: see *Stationers' Register*.
- BALD, *Evidence and Inference*.—Evidence and Inference in Bibliography. By R. C. Bald. In *English Institute Annual*, 1941, pp. 159-83. Columbia University Press, 1942.
- BENNETT, *Books and Readers*.—English Books & Readers, 1475 to 1557. Being a study in the history of the book trade from Caxton to the incorporation of the Stationers' Company. By H. S. Bennett. Cambridge University Press, 1952.
- BENTLEY, *Stage*.—The Jacobean and Caroline Stage: dramatic companies and players. By Gerald Eades Bentley. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1941.
- Bibliographical Society, Dictionaries of Printers*.—A Century of the English Book Trade, 1457 to 1557. By E. Gordon Duff.
A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland, and

- Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books, 15 57-1640. General Editor: R. B. McKerrow.
- A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at Work in England, Scotland, and Ireland from 1641 to 1667. By Henry R. Plomer. The Bibliographical Society, 1905, 1910, 1907.
- Bodleian Folio*.—The Original Bodleian Copy of the First Folio of Shakespeare (The Turbutt Shakespeare). By F. Madan, G. M. R. Turbutt, and S. Gibson. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1905.
- CAUTHEN, *Folio Lear*.—Compositor Determination in the First Folio 'King Lear'. By I. B. Cauthen, jr. *Studies in Bibliography*, 1952, v. 73-80.
- CHAMBERS, *Disintegration*.—The Disintegration of Shakespeare. By E. K. Chambers. British Academy Shakespeare Lecture, 1924. Reprinted in *Aspects of Shakespeare*, pp. 23—48. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1933.
- CHAMBERS, *E/iz. Stage*.—The Elizabethan Stage. By E. K. Chambers. 4 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1923.
- CHAMBERS, *IF. Shake*.—William Shakespeare: a study of facts and problems. By E. K. Chambers. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1930.
- Court-Books of the Stationers' Company*.—Court-Book B, see *Stationers' Records*. Court-Book C, quoted from the original: an edition is in preparation for the Bibliographical Society.
- References are by date of entry only.
- CROMPTON RHODES, *First Folio*.—Shakespeare's First Folio. A Study by R. Crompton Rhodes. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1923.
- An inaccurate and often misleading work, with occasional moments of insight.
- DAWSON, *Bibl. Problem*.—A Bibliographical Problem of the First Folio of Shakespeare. By Giles E. Dawson. *The Library*, June 1941, xxii. 25—33. The *Romeo-Troilus* dislocation.
- DAWSON, *Copyright*.—The Copyright of Shakespeare's Dramatic Works. By Giles E. Dawson. In *Studies in Honor of A. H. R. Fairchild*, University of Missouri, 1946, pp. 9-3 v
- DUTHIE, *Hamlet*.—The 'Bad' Quarto of *Camlet*. A critical study. By George Ian Duthie. Cambridge University Press, 1941.
- DUTHIE, *Shorthand*.—Elizabethan Shorthand and the First Quarto of 'King Lear'. By George Ian Duthie. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1949.
- EDWARDS, *Pericles*.—An Approach to the Problem of 'Pericles'. By Philip Edwards. *Shakespeare Survey*, 1952, v. 25—49.
- GERRITSEN, *Honest Man's Fortune*.—The Honest Mans Fortune. A critical edition of MS. Dyce 9 by Johan Gerritsen. Groningen, 1952.
- COLLANCZ, *Introduction*.—General Introduction. By Israel Gollancz. In *Studies in the First Folio written for the Shakespeare Association*, pp. ix—xxxiv. London, Humphrey Milford, 1924.
- GREG, *Alcazar and Orlando*.—Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: The Battle of Alcazar & Orlando Furioso: an essay in critical bibliography. By W. W. Greg. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1923.

- GREG, *Bibl. Drama*.—A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration. By W. W. Greg. Vol. i, 1939; vol. ii, 1951. The Bibliographical Society.
- GREG, *Bibl. First Folio*.—The Bibliographical History of the First Folio. By Walter W. Greg. *The Library*, July 1903, iv. 258-85.
- GREG, *Bonduca*.—Bonduca. By John Fletcher. Edited [from the British Museum MS. Add. 36758] by W. W. Greg. The Malone Society, 1951.
- GREG, *Capell Cat.*—Catalogue of the Books presented by Edward Capell to the Library of Trinity College in Cambridge. By W. W. Greg. Cambridge University Press, 1903.
- GREG, *Dram. Docs.*—Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses. Stage Plots: Actors' Parts: Prompt Books. By W. W. Greg. 2 vols.: Facsimiles, Commentary. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1931.
- GREG, *Editorial Problem*.—The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare: a survey of the foundations of the text. By W. W. Greg. The Clark Lectures, 1939. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1942. Second edition, revised, 1951.
- GREG, *Entrance &c.*—Entrance, Licence, and Publication. By W. W. Greg. *The Library*, June—Sept. 1944, xxv. 1—22.
- GREG, *False Dates*.—On Certain False Dates in Shakespearean Quartos. By W. W. Greg. *The Library*: I, Apr., II-III, Oct. 1908; ix. 113-31, 381-409.
- GREG, *Faustus*.—Marlowe's 'Doctor Faustus', 1604-1616. Parallel texts edited by W. W. Greg. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1950.
- GREG, *Pierce Penniless*.—Was the First Edition of 'Pierce Penniless' a Piracy? By W. W. Greg. *The Library*, June 1952, vii. 122-4.
- GREG, *Principles of Emendation*. Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare. By W. W. Greg. British Academy Shakespeare Lecture, 1928. Reprinted in *Aspects of Shakespeare*, pp. 128-201. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1933.
- GREG, *Pub. First Folio*.—The First Folio and its Publishers. By W. W. Greg. In *Studies in the First Folio written for the Shakespeare Association*, pp. 129-56. London, Humphrey Milford, 1924.
- GREG, *Spanish Tragedy*.—"The Spanish Tragedy"—a Leading Case? By W. W. Greg. *The Library*, June 1925, vi. 47-56.
- GREG, *Troilus*.—The Printing of Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida' in the First Folio. By W. W. Greg. *Publications of the Bibliographical Society of America*, Dec. 1951, xlv. 273-82.
- GREG, *Variants in Lear*.—The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear': a bibliographical and critical inquiry. By W. W. Greg. The Bibliographical Society, 1940.
- Henslowe's Diary*.—Henslowe's Diary. Edited by Walter W. Greg. 2 vols. London, A. H. Bullen, 1904, 1908.
- Entries are referred to by date only.
- Henslowe Papers*.—Henslowe Papers, being documents supplementary to

- Henslowe's Diary. Edited by Walter W. Greg. London, A. H. Bullen, 1907.
- HINMAN, *Headlines*.—New Uses for Headlines as Bibliographical Evidence. By Charlton Hinman. *English Institute Annual, 1941*, pp. 207-22. Columbia University Press, 1942.
- HINMAN, *New Light*.—Mark III: New Light on the Proof-Reading for the First Folio of Shakespeare. By Charlton Hinman. *Studies in Bibliography*, 1950, iii. 145-53.
- HINMAN, *Othello*.—The 'Copy' for the Second Quarto of 'Othello' (1630). By Charlton Hinman. In *Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies*, pp. 373-89. Washington, Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948.
- HINMAN, *Proof-sheet*.—A Proof-Sheet in the First Folio of Shakespeare. By Charlton Hinman. *The Library*, Sept.-Dec. 1942, xxiii. 101-7.
- HINMAN, *Romeo*.—The Proof-Reading of the First Folio Text of 'Romeo and Juliet'. By Charlton Hinman. *Studies in Bibliography*, 1953, vi. 61-70.
- HINMAN, *Variant Spellings*.—Principles Governing the Use of Variant Spellings as Evidence of Alternate Setting by Two Compositors. By Charlton Hinman. *The Library*, June 1940, xxi. 78-94.
- HOPPE, *Romeo and Juliet*.—The Bad Quarto of 'Romeo and Juliet': a bibliographical and textual study. By Harry R. Hoppe. Cornell University Press, 1948.
- LEE, *Additions*.—Notes & Additions to the Census of Copies of the Shakespeare First Folio. By Sidney Lee. (Reprinted from *The Library*, Apr. 1906, and revised to 24 May.) Oxford University Press, 1906.
- LEE, *Census*.—Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies (1623). A Census of Extant Copies. By Sidney Lee. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1902.
- LEE, *Introduction*.—Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Facsimile of the First Folio Edition, 1623. With introduction by Sidney Lee. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1902.
- LEE, *Surrey*.—A Survey of First Folios. By Sidney Lee. In *Studies in the First Folio written for the Shakespeare Association*, pp. 78—105. London, Humphrey Milford, 1924.
- MCKERROW, *Dram. MSS*.—The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts. By R. B. McKerrow. *The Library*, Dec. 1931, xii. 253-75.
- MCKERROW, *Henry 71*.—A Note on the 'Bad Quartos' of 2 and 3 'Henry V' and the Folio Text. By R. B. McKerrow. *RES*, Jan. 1937, xiii. 64-72.
- MCKERROW, *Introduction*.—An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students. By Ronald B. McKerrow. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1927. Second impression, corrected, 1928: reprinted 1948.
- MCKERROW, *S.'s MSS*.—A Suggestion regarding Shakespeare's Manuscripts. By R. B. McKerrow. *RES*, Oct. 1935, xi. 459-65.
- POLLARD, *Folios and Quartos*.—Shakespeare Folios and Quartos: a study in the bibliography of Shakespeare's plays, 1594-1685. By Alfred W. Pollard. London, Methuen, 1909.

- POLLARD, *Foundations*.—The Foundations of Shakespeare's Text. By Alfred W. Pollard. British Academy Shakespeare Lecture, 1923. Reprinted in *Aspects of Shakespeare*, pp. 1-22. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1933.
- POLLARD, *Richard II.*—A New Shakespeare Quarto. The Tragedy of King Richard II. Printed for the third time by Valentine Simmes in 1598. Reproduced in facsimile from the unique copy in the library of William Augustus White. With an introduction by Alfred W. Pollard. London, Bernard Quaritch, 1916.
Now in the Folger Library: another copy, imperfect, is in the Library of McGill University.
- POLLARD, *S's Fight*.—Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates and the Problems of the Transmission of his Text. By Alfred W. Pollard, *Sandars Reader in Bibliography*, 1915. Second Edition, revised. Cambridge University Press, 1920.
- POLLARD, *S's Text*.—Shakespeare's Text. By A. W. Pollard. In *A Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, edited by Harley Granville-Barker and G. B. Harrison, pp. 263-86. Cambridge University Press, 1934.
- SIMPSON, *Jonson*.—Ben Jonson. Edited by C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, n vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1925—52.
- SIMPSON, *Proof-reading*. Proof-reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries. By Percy Simpson. London, Humphrey Milford, 1935-
- Spanish Tragedy*.—The Spanish Tragedy (1592). Edited by W. W. Greg and D. Nichol Smith. The Malone Society, 1949.
- SPIELMANN, *Portraiture*.—Shakespeare's Portraiture. By M. H. Spielmann. In *Studies in the First Folio written for the Shakespeare Association*, pp. 1—52 (with 47 plates). London, Humphrey Milford, 1924.
Offprints of this article, with the addition of an index, were published the same year under the title 'The Title-Page of the First Folio of Shakespeare's Plays'.
Correction by Robert M. Smith, 'Fly-Specks and Folios', in *The Colophon*, new series, i. 25-32.
- Stationers' Records*.—Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company, 1576 to 1602, from Register B. Edited by W. W. Greg & Eleanore Boswell. The Bibliographical Society, 1930.
- Stationers' Register*.—The Stationers' Register or the Hall-Book of the Stationers' Company.
Entrances of copies are referred to by date only. Those of dramatic works are quoted from Greg, *Bibl. Drama*, all others from Arber, *Transcript* (qq.v.).
- Variorum* 1821.—The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, with the corrections and illustrations of various commentators. [Edited by James Boswell.] 21 vols. London, F. C. and J. Rivington &c., 1821.
- WALKER, *Textual Problems*.—Textual Problems of the First Folio: 'Richard

- IIP, 'King Lear', Troilus & Cressida', '2 Henry IV', 'Hamlet', 'Othello'.
By Alice Walker. Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- Portions of these studies had already appeared, sometimes in rather fuller form,
in the following articles:
- The Textual Problem of 'Troilus and Cressida'. *MLR*, Oct. 1950, xlv.
459-64.
- Quarto 'Copy' and the 1623 Folio: '2 Henry IV. *RES*, July 1951, 11.217-25.
- The Cancelled Lines in '2 Henry IV, IV. i. 93, 95. *The Library*, Sept. 1951,
vi. 115-16.
- The Textual Problem in 'Hamlet': a reconsideration. *RES*, Oct. 1951, ii.
328-38.
- 'King Lear'—the 1608 Quarto. *MLR*, July 1952, xlvii. 376-8.
- The 1622 Quarto and the First Folio texts of 'Othello'. *Shakespeare Survey*,
1952, v. 116-24.
- WALKER, I *Henry IV*.—The Folio Text of 'i Henry IV. By Alice Walker.
Studies in Bibliography, 1953, vi. 45-59.
- WILLIAMS, *Folio Lear*.—Two Problems in the Folio Text of 'King Lear'.
By Philip Williams. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Oct. 1953, iv. 451-60.
- WILLIAMS, *Quarto Lear*.—The Compositor of the 'Pied Bull' 'Lear'. By Philip
Williams. *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Virginia (Studies in
Bibliography)*, 1948, i. 59—68.
- WILLIAMS, *Troilus*.—Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida': the Relationship
of the Quarto and P'olio. By Philip Williams. *Studies in Bibliography*,
1950, iii. 131-43.
- WILLOUGHBY, *First Folio*.—The Printing of the First Folio of Shakespeare.
By Edwin Elliott Willoughby. The Bibliographical Society, 1932.
- WILSON, *Crane*.—Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players. By F. P.
Wilson. *The Library*, Sept. 1926, vii. 194—215.
- WILSON, *The Jaggards*.—The Jaggards and the First Folio of Shakespeare. By
F. P. Wilson. *TLS*, 5 Nov. 1925.
- Supplemented in
The First Folio Shakespeare. *Ibid.*, 12 Nov.
- WILSON, *MS. Hamlet*.—The Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet' and the
Problems of its Transmission. An essay in critical bibliography. By
J. Dover Wilson, Sanders Reader in Bibliography, 1932. 2 vols.
Cambridge University Press, 1934.

I. *Planning the Collection*

WHEN Shakespeare died in 1616, the year that saw the publication of the 'Works' of his friend Ben Jonson, many of those who had seen his plays acted or had read them in sixpenny pamphlets must have wondered whether and when these too would be collected in permanent form. In fact, seven years and more were to pass before 'Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies' appeared in a handsome volume containing thirty-six plays and running to over 900 double-columned pages. About the inception of the project we know little. Did it originate with the players who had been Shakespeare's fellows in the King's company, or was their co-operation sought by a publisher or group of publishers?

It was John Heminge¹ and Henry Condell, the two leading members of the company since the death of Richard Burbage in 1619, who signed the epistle dedicatory² and the address to the readers prefixed to the First Folio, and it is in these writings, if anywhere, that we may look to find some hint of the circumstances of publication. Here we read:

'It had bene a thing, we confesse, worthie to haue been wished, that the Author himselfe had liu'd to haue set forth, and ouerseen his owne writings; But since it hath bin ordain'd otherwise, and he by death departed from that right, we pray you do not envie his Friends, the office of their care, and paine, to haue collected & publish'd them . . . !'

¹ 'Heminges' is perhaps the more correct form of the name (which appears as 'Hemminges' in the actor-list among the preliminaries), but it is natural, in a work about the First Folio, to use the spelling he himself adopted in signing the dedication and address.

² This fact might be supposed to imply that it was the players who were primarily responsible for the publication, were it not that in the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1647 the epistle—to Philip, Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, the survivor of the two brothers to whom the Shakespeare Folio was dedicated—is similarly signed by ten members of what, before the closing of the theatres, had been the King's company, although it is plain from the bookseller's address that it was Moseley who was the moving spirit of an enterprise that preserved a further thirty-four pieces from the repertory of Shakespeare's company. That Heminge and Condell also signed the address is more suggestive.

Moving words: and although they might, no doubt, be the words of collaborators, of those, as they modestly say, 'who onely gather his works', they seem more appropriate to men who had taken an active and responsible part in the enterprise. And when, divesting ourselves of the wisdom of after-events, we remember that so large a venture in so unexplored a field was one that a cautious publisher would be more likely to fight shy of than actively to seek,¹ it may not appear unduly credulous to believe that in the great folio collection of plays that issued from Jaggard's press in 1623 we indeed have a monument raised by the piety of his old stage-mates 'onely to keepe the memory of so worthy a Friend, & Fellow alie, as was our Shakespeare'.²

If that was the case, when was the idea first entertained? We shall see in a moment that the collection must have been under way in 1620. How much earlier was the scheme mooted, and was the author himself interested in it? Jonson was preparing his works for the press about the time Shakespeare left London for Stratford,³ and Shakespeare must surely have known of it. It is foolish to suppose that Shakespeare was indifferent to the fate of his own works. The mere length of some of his plays, of *Hamlet*, of *Richard III*, of *Coriolanus* for example, must have made it difficult to produce them in their entirety on the stage, and suggests that he had an alternative mode of publication in view.⁴ In the quiet evening

¹ Willoughby, *First Folio*, pp. 3-4. The eagerness with which quartos of Shakespeare's plays had been read was doubtless an encouraging sign, but might prove deceptive to the adventurer, and he could not know that the Folio would need reprinting within nine years. The example of Jonson's *Works* was not altogether encouraging: we do not know how many copies were printed, but we do know that it was a quarter of a century almost before a second edition was called for.

² The anxiety over the financial aspect of the undertaking shown in the earlier part of the address—'read, and censure. Do so, but buy it first. I hat doth best commend a Booke, the Stationer saies . . . what eucr you do, Buy'—may be read to imply that the players were themselves interested in royalties or else that they were doing their best for the publishers whom they had persuaded to risk money in the undertaking. In the dedication they disclaim 'ambition either of selfe-profit, or fame'; but the phrase need not be pressed.

³ Simpson (ix. 14) thinks Jonson's copy went to press in 1612 or 1613—or rather began to go to press. The latest play in his collection is *Catiline* of 1611: the next, *Bartholmew Fair* of 1614, is not there. But the latest of the masques belongs to Jan. 1616.

⁴ Peter Alexander (*A Shakespeare Primer*, 1951, p. 161) suggests that *Coriolanus* and *Antony and Cleopatra* show signs of having been printed from manuscripts that Shakespeare had himself prepared for publication} but the special features of these

of his days at New Place, did Shakespeare ever discuss the possibility of printing with the cronies who visited him there? According to tradition, Ben Jonson himself was of their number; and Chambers sees 'no reason to reject this report'.¹ How far dare we press the wording of the preface? If 'the Author himselfe had liu'd', would he 'haue set forth, and ouerseen his owne writings'? Was he 'by death departed from that right' only, or from that purpose? We can but speculate. For in any case it was 'ordain'd otherwise': Shakespeare did not edit his own plays, and his fellows were left to tackle the task as best they could, for the words of the preface leave no doubt that they regarded themselves as at least formally responsible.²

One thing at least we know,³ namely, that the undertaking was in hand considerably earlier than used to be supposed, for example when Pollard was writing his important study of the *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos*. The information comes from a rather unexpected source. The principal centre of the European book-trade at the time was the fair held every spring and autumn at Frankfort-on-the-Main, in connexion with which there was published a half-yearly advertisement known as the *Mess-Kata/og*. This did not include English books, though English booksellers frequented the market to buy stocks of foreign and classical works. There was, however, an English edition published by John Bill, the King's Printer, under the title of *Catalogus uniuersalis fro nundinis FrancofurtensibuS*) which contained an appendix of English works. And to our surprise we find that 'A Catalogue of such Bookes as haue beene published, and (by authoritie) printed in English, since the last Vernall Mart, which was in Aprill 1622. till this present October 1622.' contains the entry: 'Playes, written by M. William Shakespeare, all in one

and some other late plays, especially elaborate directions more suited to production than prompting, are perhaps sufficiently explained on the supposition that Shakespeare was at this period less closely in touch with the theatre.

¹ W. Shake, i. 89.

² It is therefore justifiable as well as convenient to speak of Heminge and Condell as 'the editors', without, however, intending to imply that they did the detailed work themselves. The matter will claim closer consideration at the beginning of Chapter III.

³ Through a fortunate discovery published by F. P. Wilson in 1925; see his letter on *The Jaggards*.

volume, printed by Isaack Iaggard, in fol/ Again, in a similar list of books printed 'since the last Autumne Mart, which was in October 1623. till this present Aprill 1624.' we find the entry: 'Master William Shakesperes workes, printed for Edward Blount, in fol.' The First Folio was, therefore, expected to be on the market by October 1622, whereas we know that in fact it did not appear till near the end of 1623, and it follows that some considerable and unexpected delay must have occurred in its production. It will later appear¹ that printing was indeed interrupted in October 1621 and not resumed for some time, and it was doubtless during this interval that the rather optimistic announcement of 1622 was made: and further, since the Comedies section had been virtually completed before the interruption, printing must have begun in the course of the summer of 1621. And from this it is a safe inference that preparations for the collection started before the end of 1620, a couple of years or so earlier than was previously supposed.

There are two other conclusions that this new evidence forces upon us. One is that, since it was Isaac and not William Iaggard who inserted the advertisement in Bill's catalogue, we must suppose that, had there been no delay, Isaac would still have put his name on the title-page of the collection (as he eventually did) even though his father was still alive. He had in fact done so in the case of several earlier works.² The other is that Blount probably did not join in the undertaking till after the spring of 1622. Of course, the absence of Blount's name from the earlier advertisement does not prove that he then had no share in the scheme, any more than the absence of Iaggard's name from the later advertisement points to his having given up his interest in it; but it at least suggests the possibility, and Iaggard's high-handed action in holding up the printing for more than a year to suit his own convenience possibly implies that he was at the time in sole charge of the undertaking.

The imprint on the title-page of the Folio reads: 'London Printed by Isaac Iaggard, and Ed. Blount. 1623.' This is not strictly accurate, for Blount was not a printer.³ The formula

¹ See p. 422.

² See p. 7.

³ It was quite usual to speak of a stationer as having printed a book when what

sought to emphasize the fact that Jaggard was at once the printer and the joint publisher, a relationship that would have been more exactly expressed by saying 'Printed by Isaac Jaggard for himself and Ed. Blount', had such a precise formula been in keeping with the easy-going ways of London stationers at the time.¹ The important part taken by the printer in financing the undertaking is emphasized in the colophon, which reads, rather unusually, 'Printed at the Charges of W. Jaggard, Ed. Blount, I. Smithweeke, and W. Aspley, 1623.' This made it abundantly plain, and was no doubt intended to make plain, that the printer was not merely producing the work to the order of the real publishers, but was himself taking a leading part in the enterprise. From imprint and colophon together it is clear that the Jaggards and Blount were the main undertakers, and probably bore equal shares of the financial burden. John Smithweeke, or Smethwick as he was usually called, and William Aspley both possessed effective rights in plays of Shakespeare already published, which neither Blount nor the Jaggards did,³ and it

was meant was that he had employed another to print it for him. Thus in a Court minute of 18 Dec. 1592 (Court-Book B) Edward White is charged with 'havinge printed the Spanish tragedie belonging to Abell Ieffes', though White was a book-seller only and the edition in question was printed for him by Edward Allde. It is also true that some stationers were in the habit of representing themselves as having printed books which had in fact only been printed for them by others—Richard Jones (1564-1602), for example, made a regular practice of it (see p. 73, Note J). Such a combination as that found in the Folio imprint is nevertheless peculiar, though, as Willoughby points out (p. 8), it is not unique in works emanating from the Jaggard press, for Tom Coryate's *Greeting from the Court of the Great Mogul* purported to be printed in 1616 by William Jaggard and Henry Fetherstone, though the latter never owned a press.

¹ A somewhat similar formula does in fact appear in the Stationers' Register on 7 Nov. 1646, when 'Mrs. Mercie Meighen and Gabriell Beadell Entred for their Copies ... by consent of the said Mrs. Meighen' books that had belonged to her late husband. Occasionally in such a situation the printer was content to appear only as part-publisher. The editions of Sidney's *Arcadia* of 1633 and 1638, both 'Printed for Simon Waterson and R. Young', were almost certainly also printed by Young, whose device appears in them and who had been part-printer of the edition of 1627-9. A very peculiar case is that of *Seven Sermons* by Lancelot Andrewes, which came from the Jaggard press in 1627 but purport to be printed for Isaac Jaggard and Michael Sparke: STC (630) supposes it to have been at least completed by Dorothy Jaggard after her husband's death.

² In Latin works the term 'impensis' is quite usual to indicate the stationer who bore the cost of the publication, but in English the publisher was commonly designated simply by the word 'for'. See pp. 56 if.

³ See, however, pp. 60-61.

was doubtless for this reason that they appear as members of the syndicate. But whether they were invited to take part because of the rights they held, or whether they insisted on doing so in return for the use of their copies, is a question on which we can only speculate. In either case the wording of the colophon implies that they did put some capital into the venture; but the position of their names suggests that their participation was of a minor character, and it is significant that so was the part they played in producing the Second Folio nine years later.¹ There were several other holders of similar rights, one at least of importance, who took no part in the venture:² in most cases, we may suppose, they came to terms with the publishers of the Folio. There can then be little doubt that, in its inception at any rate, the moving spirit of the scheme on the publishing side was Isaac Jaggard.

The Jaggards' printing-house at the sign of the Half-Eagle and Key³ in Barbican had been founded in the early sixties by John Charlewood, who carried on an active business there for thirty years. Soon after his death early in 1593, his widow Alice married James Roberts, who had been a bookseller almost as long as Charlewood had been a printer, and who thus succeeded to the business.⁴ Some time between 1604 and 1606 Roberts sold it to William Jaggard.⁵ Jaggard, after serving his apprenticeship with Henry Denham, had taken up his freedom at the end of 1591 and from 1594 to 1608 was in business as a bookseller in Saint Dunstan's Churchyard, Fleet Street.⁶ Though he did not rise to eminence in

¹ In 1632 a special title-page was provided for each of the participants. According to the latest investigation (W. B. Todd, *Studies in Bibliography*, v. 1952) out of 163 extant copies with title-pages, 125 bear the name of Robert Allot (who had acquired Blount's interest and was clearly the chief venturer), 16 Smethwick's, and 7 Aspley's: Richard Hawkins and Richard Meighen, new-comers, account for 9 and 6 respectively. Jaggard's share had passed to the brothers Richard and Thomas Cotes, and enabled them to secure the printing (it is Thomas's name that appears), but they do not seem to have taken part in the publishing, unless, as is possible, they arranged with Allot to market and account for their copies.

² See pp. 68, 443, 445.

³ The arms of the city of Geneva.

⁴ Charlewood's copies were entered to Roberts by order of the Court on 31 May 1594.

⁵ See Note A on p. 21.

⁶ Lee (*Introduction*, p. xiv) states that Jaggard 'was established in business, first in Barbican, afterwards in Fleet Street at the East end of St. Dunstan's Church'. But this is a mistake, and his subsequent assertion (p. xv) that 'The main part of the First Folio was printed in Jaggard's printing-office near St. Dunstan's Church,

the Company and was never an Assistant or even, it would seem, of the Livery,¹ he was a man of substance and was appointed Printer to the City of London on 17 December 1610.² That he never held office may have been due to his infirmities, for he was a sick man and blind for the last ten years of his life.³ He still controlled the business, though he mostly printed books for other stationers, which was, indeed, the tendency of the time, and those that he printed for himself he employed booksellers to put on the market, which was natural enough. But in his affairs he was aided by his son Isaac, a young man of twenty-eight at the time of the publication of the First Folio, who appears to have been of a more adventurous disposition.⁴ Isaac was born in April 1595 and was admitted freeman of the Company *per patrimoniam* at the unusually early age of eighteen.^s We may reasonably surmise that his freedom was expedited that he might assist his father in his 'heauie visitation', and that he thenceforth took an increasingly large share in the work of the firm. He was evidently a man of literary interests and of some initiative. Before the production of the First Folio he had already put his own name on three books printed by the firm: Chapman's *Musaeus* in 1616; a reprint of Heywood's best-known play, *A Woman Killed with Kindness*[^] in 1617; and a translation of the *Decameron* in 1620. The exact significance of this is not known: he may have been in some way personally concerned in the publications, or William Jaggard may have preferred that such lighter literature should appear under his son's

but . . . probably some presses of Jaggard's friends were requisitioned for parts of the volume' is pure invention. The whole volume was printed by Jaggard, as Pollard was able to prove from evidence that he had actually placed at Lee's disposal (*Folios and Quartos*, pp. 132-3; cf. Chapter VI); and Saint Dunstan's Churchyard, like Saint Paul's, was the haunt of booksellers; there were no printing-houses in either at this time, though a few printers appear to have had their business in Saint Paul's Churchyard in the previous century.

¹ It was his brother John who was Under Warden in 1619-20: Pollard (*Folios and Quartos*, p. 100) tripped up here. A Mr. Jaggard was Renter Warden in 1610 and a Mr. Jaggard 'the yonger' in 1622 (Arber, *Transcript*, iii. 694, 692). The former was probably John Jaggard; the latter conceivably John Jaggard, jr., although he only became free on 4 July 1620 (iii. 685); obviously neither was William.

³ See Willoughby, p. 6¹, and Note B on p. 22.

⁴ It appears from his will that William also had a younger son Thomas, whom he had sent to the university.

^s 23 June 1613 (Arber, iii. 684). The usual age was twenty-four.

² Wilson, *The Jaggards*.

name rather than his own. The *Decameron* appeared in defiance of the Archbishop.¹ That Isaac was the leading spirit in the firm's Shakespearian venture can hardly be doubted.² Whether William lived to see the completion of the volume is, in fact, uncertain: it is certain that he did not see its publication.³ The exact date of his death is not known. He made his will on 28 March 1623 and it was proved on 17 November.⁴ He certainly died before 4 November, when Isaac was appointed City Printer 'in the place of ... his late Father deceased',⁵ and since there was no obvious urgency we may suppose some decent interval before the vacancy was filled. On the whole it seems likely that William died somewhere about the middle of October 1623.

Writers on the subject have sometimes expressed surprise that the players should have chosen Jaggard as the stationer to whom to entrust the publication of Shakespeare's plays,⁶ for twice already he had been concerned with Shakespearian copy of a sort, and in neither case had his dealings with it been particularly creditable. As early as 1598 or 1599 Jaggard had had printed for him a small collection of verse under the title of *The Passionate Pilgrim* and had put Shakespeare's name on the title-page.⁷ But only five out of the

¹ Hey wood's play had already been printed by William Jaggard in 1607 without entrance—one of the first books he printed. The other two works were entered by William, not Isaac. The *Decameron*, registered on 22 March 1620, was duly licensed by John Taverner, the Bishop of London's secretary, but a marginal note adds that it was 'recalled by my lord of Canterburyes comand'. The prohibition is undated, and may have come too late to stop the publication; but the first volume was reprinted in 1625.

² Isaac, it must be admitted, did not live up to his early promise. During the three years or so that he survived his father he published nothing of any interest—mostly small religious works. In 1625 his reprint of the first volume of the *Decameron* (under the title of *The Model of Wit*) was for Matthew Lownes; in 1626 Cockeram's dictionary was printed for Edmund Weaver. His health may have been failing.

³ See pp. 452-4.

⁴ Willoughby, p. 10.

⁵ Wilson, *The Jaggards*. The record appears both in the Repertories of the Court of Aldermen and the Letter Books.

⁶ We may safely dismiss any idea that Heminge and Condell negotiated with a syndicate of booksellers who chose Jaggard as their printer without reference to the players, for the syndicate appears to have come into existence only as the result of successful negotiations in which Jaggard was a moving spirit.

⁷ *The Passionate Pilgrime*. By W. Shakespeare. At London Printed for W. Jaggard, and are to be sold by W. Leake, at the Greyhound in Paules Churchyard. 1599. This is the title of the second edition; the first is known from a couple of sheets only and lacks the title-leaf. The unnamed printer was Thomas Judson,

twenty or twenty-one poems it contained were Shakespeare's—including two of the sugared sonnets that circulated among his private friends—the rest were by other writers. What Shakespeare thought of this we should not have known, had not Jaggard added to a third edition, which he printed himself in 1612, further material lifted from Thomas Heywood's *Troia Britannica*, printed by him three years before. This roused Heywood, and he exposed the theft in his *Apology for Actors*, at the same time recording Shakespeare's displeasure.¹ Jaggard at least had the decency to print a cancel title-leaf from which Shakespeare's name was removed.²

The other was a quite recent affair. The Folio of 1623 was not, in fact, the first attempt at a collection of Shakespeare's plays. Four years earlier Jaggard, though he kept his own name out of it, had acted as printer for a rather mysterious, rather shady, and, as it eventually proved, abortive scheme of his friend Thomas Pavier,³ that resulted in the reprinting of ten Shakespearian or pseudo-Shakespearian pieces. This 'Collection of 1619', as it is convenient to call it, is an affair of some importance, to which it will be worth while returning.⁴ At the moment let it suffice that since, as we have seen,⁵ the inception of the Folio scheme cannot be placed later than 1620, the two projects are very close in time, and it would be surprising if there were not some connexion between them. But whether Pavier's was an impudent attempt to forestall

who printed other books for Jaggard the same year (see *The Passionate Pilgrim*. By William Shakespeare. Reproduced in facsimile with an introduction by J. Q. Adams. Folger Shakespeare Library Publications. New York and London, Scribner, 1939, p. xxii). The copy was not registered.

¹ *An Apology for Actors*, 1612. In an epistle to his printer, Nicholas Okes, Heywood writes (sig. 04): 'Here likewise, I must necessarily insert a manifest iniury done me in that worke [*Britain's Troy*], by taking the two Epistles of Paris to Helen, and Helen to Paris, and printing them in a lesse volume [*The Passionate Pilgrim*], vnder the name of another [Shakespeare], which may put the world in opinion I might steale them from himj and hee to doe him selfe right, hath since published them in his owne name: but as I must acknowledge my lines not worthy his patronage, vnder whom he [Jaggard] hath publisht them; so the Author I know much offended with M. Jaggard (that altogether vnknowne to him) presumed to make so bold with his name.' A strangely worded and punctuated sentence, of the meaning of which, however, knowing the facts, we need be in no doubt.

² Both titles are preserved in Malone's copy in the Bodleian.

³ They must presumably have been fairly intimate, since in 1623 Jaggard appointed Pavier an overseer (assistant executor) of his will.

⁴ See pp. 11-17.

⁵ P- 4-

a more authoritative one already in contemplation, or whether it suggested to the players the desirability and possible profit of such an undertaking, or at least spurred them into action, is a question to which we are not very likely ever to know the answer.¹

If, therefore, the players looked a little unfavourably on Jaggard it was perhaps not altogether without cause. On the other hand it is easy to exaggerate the importance of both affairs. The *Passionate Pilgrim* quarrel, if there was one, was a personal affair going back a quarter of a century and most likely forgotten. The would-be collection was more recent, and there is reason to suppose that the players took a serious view of it.² But even if they were aware of Jaggard's participation, he could always explain, perhaps not quite ingenuously, that the project was Pavier's, and that he was merely printing for him in the ordinary way of business. Moreover, it will be suggested later³ that it may have been this very affair that led to an understanding between the King's men and the firm in Barbican.

It has often been suggested, as a reason for the players' choice of Jaggard as the printer of the Folio, that there already existed a personal link between him and the acting companies owing to his possessing the sole right of printing their play-bills or posters. The idea is of course speculative, and perhaps even fanciful, but the fact, though it has been questioned, appears to be established, and since it was a right which Jaggard evidently valued, it does suggest a connexion that it would be unreasonable to ignore.⁴ On the other hand it has been argued that it is unnecessary to look for any particular connexion. In view of the uncertain nature of the enterprise and the obvious risks involved, the players, if it was they who took the initiative, may have had some difficulty in finding a stationer prepared to venture upon it. They may have met with rebuffs, and Jaggard may not have been their first choice.⁵ For the sake of their own collection they could

¹ Pollard, in ignorance of the *Mess-Katalog* entries, naturally inclined to the latter alternative: 'When men are hesitating to take up a venture there is no greater spur to action than to see some one else trying to forestall them, and this spur, I think, the volume of 1619 supplied to the organizers of the Folio' (*Foundations*, p. 20).

² See p. 15.

³ p. 14

⁴ See Note C on p. 22.

⁵ This is Willoughby's view (pp. 4-5).

afford to overlook his part in what they no doubt regarded as Pavier's piratical attempt. Of this it may be desirable to give some fuller account.¹

The Collection of 1619' is not on the face of it a collection at all, nor does it ostensibly associate itself with any one year. Of the ten plays included only three have continuous signatures, the other seven are all bibliographically independent: of the nine title-pages² one is undated, three are dated 1619, three are dated 1600, and two are dated 1608; and the names of several different stationers appear in the imprints. Yet there is no question but that they were all printed at Jaggard's press within a few weeks of one another in 1619.³

The table on p. 12 gives the relevant bibliographical information respecting the ten plays in order of printing.

Two titles are typographically independent of the rest, those of *The Whole Contention* and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*. The latter has been placed last only for convenience: it may have been printed at any point in the series. *The Whole Contention* was evidently printed first since its signatures are continued through *Pericles*. After that the continuous signatures were abandoned, perhaps only to enable two plays to be set up at the same time. It will be noticed that in *Pericles* and *A Yorkshire Tragedy* the title was printed on the last

¹ The bibliographical facts relating to the enterprise, if a little complicated, are plain enough, and are now well known: their interpretation, on the other hand, involves some conjecture, and although it may be possible to cite evidence in favour of each point of the reconstruction attempted in the text, the story as a whole is perhaps best regarded as, be it hoped plausible, fiction.

² Two plays, called in the head-titles 'The first part of the Contention of the two Famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster, with the death of the good Duke Humfrey' and 'The Second Part. Containing the Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke, and the good King Henrie the Sixt', have a single joint title-page, 'The Whole Contention betweene the two Famous Houses, Lancaster and Yorke'.

³ Greg, *false Dates*, 1908. Pollard's masterly exposition of the evidence from types, devices, and watermarks in *Folios and Quartos* (pp. 81-107) appeared in 1909. In 1910 W. Neidig ('The Shakespeare Quartos of 1619', *Modern Philology*, Oct. 1910, viii. 145-63, with thirteen plates), by a brilliant application of laboratory methods of measurement, proved that seven of the nine title-pages were printed in part from the same setting of type, only the necessary alterations being made from play to play, and thereby established the order of printing. Quite recently Allan Stevenson's discovery of watermarks dated '1608' and '1617' or '1619' in plays ostensibly printed in 1600 and 1608 has furnished additional proof of the false dating ('Shakespearian dated Watermarks', *Studies in Bibliography*, 1951, iv. 159-64). See also E. K. Chambers, *W. Shake.*, i. 133-7, and Greg, *Pub. First Folio*, pp. 139-44-

leaf instead of the first, and was only later moved to the beginning: there would seem to have been some doubt at this point whether separate title-pages were to be provided or not. Now, if we suppose these two plays to have been printed simultaneously, the latter, which is an abnormally short piece, would of course have been finished first, and we find that the title-page of *A Yorkshire Tragedy* was in fact printed before that of *Pericles*.

1, 2	<i>The Whole Contention.</i>	'Printed at London, for T. P.'	A-Q4
3	<i>Pericles.</i>	'Printed for T. P. 1619.'	Tit., R-Aa4BbI
4	<i>A Yorkshire Tragedy.</i>	'Printed for T. P. 1619.'	Tit., A-C ⁴ DI-3
5	<i>The Merchant of Venice.</i>	'Printed by I. Roberts, 1600.'	A-K4
6	<i>The Merry Wives of Windsor.</i> ¹	'Printed for Arthur Iohn- son, 1619.'	A-G4
7	<i>King Lear.</i>	'Printed for Nathaniel But- ter, 1608.'	A-L4
8	<i>Henry V.</i>	'Printed for T. P. 1608.'	A-G4
9	<i>I Sir John Oldcastle.</i>	'London printed for T. P. 1600.'	A-K ⁴
10	<i>A Midsummer-Night's Dream.</i>	'Printed by Iames Roberts, 1600.'	A-H4

It is a curious and rather shabby collection. The components were, of course, all reprints of plays already published: there was no pretence of offering fresh material. Two pieces, *A Yorkshire Tragedy* and *i Sir John Oldcastle*, were not Shakespeare's at all, and the latter had indeed been acted by a rival company.² *Pericles* was at best only partly from his pen and was rejected by the editors of the First Folio. *The Whole Contention*, *The Merry Wives*, and *Henry V* were spurious texts of no authority (the first representing the pieces that figure as 2 and 3 *Henry VI* in the Folio). Only *The Merchant of Venice*, *King Lear*, and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* could make any claim to represent the plays as Shakespeare wrote them.

¹ The corrupt text found in the quartos of 1602 and 1619 is actually entitled *Sir John Falstaff and the Merry Wives of Windsor*.

² Nor, in the earlier edition printed by Simmes for Pavier in 1600, was *Oldcastle* ascribed to Shakespeare. It had in fact been written by Drayton, Hathway, Munday, and Wilson for the Admiral's (Nottingham's) men in 1599 (*Henslovoes Diary*, 16 Oct.) as a counterblast to Shakespeare's *Henry IV*.

Who was the responsible person behind the venture is not on the face of it very clear, and was probably not intended to be. Though Jaggard's name nowhere appeared, the whole group of plays came from his press; and in view of the diversity and sometimes misleading character of the imprints, some degree at least of responsibility would seem to rest with him. On the other hand, out of the nine title-pages five bear the initials T. P., which undoubtedly stand for Thomas Pavier, and this equally suggests responsibility on his part. While we can hardly hope to discover the exact circumstances behind the venture, it may not on the evidence be unfair to suppose a measure of collaboration between Pavier and young Isaac Jaggard. But in trying to imagine the story that lies behind this curious affair we shall do well to bear in mind that the Jaggards' was a reputable firm, accredited to the City of London, even though Isaac may have been of a more venturesome disposition than his father, and that though some of the copies in which Pavier dealt were not, from the literary point of view, of a very estimable character, he was a man of standing in the Company, who had been elected to the Livery only four years after his translation from the Drapers in 1600, and who became Under Warden in 1622. There is no ground for believing that the project, in its inception at all events, was anything but a straightforward and honest affair according to the notions of the time.

The continuous signatures running through the first three plays, in conjunction with the bare imprints on all the title-pages, suggest that the original plan was for a regular collection of uniform model provided with a general title-page on which fuller information respecting the printing and sale of the book would be provided.¹ Ten pieces would make a comfortable fat little volume—as indeed they do in the two copies that survive in their original bindings—and the rather unusual size of the paper chosen would give it a not unhandsome appearance. If successful it might even be followed by a further collection of the author's plays. The copies it contains were selected with some shrewdness from those immediately available. Pavier had a valid claim to the copyright² of

¹ The Jonson folio of 1616 provided a special title-page to each play.

² For a discussion of copyright see Chapter II,

the two *Contention* plays, *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, and i *Sir John Oldcastle*, and a more doubtful one to *Henry V. Pericles* had been irregularly published in the first instance, ten years before, and had once already been appropriated by another stationer: there were clearly no rights in the copy that need be considered. *The Merchant of Venice* and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* had both been regularly published by men who had acquired valid rights in them: but these men were both now dead, and the copies might be assumed to be derelict.¹ In the case of the two remaining plays, *The Merry Wives* and *King Lear* the original editions had been published, after regular entrance at Stationers' Hall, by Arthur Johnson and Nathaniel Butter respectively, who were both still alive and active (though Johnson seems to have migrated to Dublin about this time): it is likely that their consent to the use of their copies was obtained, and indeed their names appeared in the imprints to the new editions.²

A start then was made with *The Whole Contention* and *Pericles* and *A Yorkshire Tragedy*. All three title-pages bear Pavier's initials and the latter two the date 1619. At this point something must have happened to cause a change of plan. Pollard, assuming that Jaggard was in touch with the actors over the printing of play-bills,³ suggested that if in the course of business with the King's men he 'chanced to mention a project for printing' certain pieces 'with a collective titlepage as a volume of Shakespeare's plays, he may have heard enough plain-speaking to frighten him'.⁴ This is fanciful: Jaggard was not one to be so intimidated. But if such a meeting took

¹ This was a mistake as regards *The Merchant of Venice*. Thomas Heyes, the publisher of the original edition of 1600, had left a son Laurence, who made good his claim to the copy before the Court on 8 July 1619 (presumably soon after the appearance of the Jaggard-Pavier volume) and himself published an edition in 1637.

² This was the normal way of acknowledging permission to include a play in a collected edition. Thus in the Jonson folio of 1616 the names of John Smethwicke and Matthew Lownes appear in some copies on the title-pages of *Every Man out of his Humour* and *Poetaster* respectively, though the volume was printed by William Stansby for sale by Richard Meighen. In the present case, however, we shall see that the appearance of the names of the original publishers may have a different explanation.

³ See p. 10.

⁴ Pollard, *Folios and Quartos*, p. 101. Since William Jaggard was already blind, it is probable that any personal contact would be with Isaac.

place and if a project of the kind was mentioned, it may well have given the players food for thought. Supposing that they were already considering a collection of their own, it might occur to them that such a ramshackle collection as Pavier's, even if it did no great harm, was hardly the sort of advertisement to be desired: supposing that no such project had yet been mooted, they may well have thought that their dead friend and fellow deserved a worthier monument. Either way they would hardly be friendly disposed towards Pavier's proposed collection, and on consideration they may have thought it would be worth while offering Jaggard the printing of a possible complete collection in return for his dissuading Pavier from prosecuting his design. To Jaggard, on his side, such a suggestion may not have been unwelcome.¹ To assume financial responsibility would no doubt be a serious risk, but that might perhaps be shared: meanwhile he had to keep his eyes open for large works to occupy his press, and Isaac, if we know anything of his tastes, must have grown a little weary of printing ponderous tomes to the order of others. At the moment the press was presumably already engaged on a reprint for Walter Burre of Raleigh's *History of the World*, to replace Stansby's edition of 1617, but that would be finished by 1621, and a collection of Shakespeare's plays might make a suitable, if somewhat lighter, successor. It would not be straining probability to assume that Jaggard agreed.

Be this as it may, it can hardly be doubted that the King's men somehow got wind of Pavier's enterprise, for they invoked the protection of authority. On 3 May 1619 the Court of the Stationers' Company had before it for consideration a letter from the Lord Chamberlain, whereupon it was ordered that in future no plays belonging to the King's

¹ One might even suspect that the mention of Pavier's scheme had been made advisedly with the idea of bringing a little pressure to bear on the players. To suggest that the whole scheme was devised with a view to forcing their hand would doubtless be fantastic. But at least equally fantastic is the suggestion advanced by Crompton Rhodes (*First Folio*, p. 46) that the Stationers' Court may have compelled the players to give Jaggard the printing of the First Folio in compensation 'for the loss of his printing-rights of future impressions' of the Pavier collection. Jaggard had suffered no loss. If he merely printed the plays for Pavier he presumably got paid for his work: the idea that he thereby acquired a right to future printing is moonshine (see p. 48 and cf. Willoughby, p. 3').

men should be printed without their consent. There can be no reasonable doubt that the players were behind it.¹

Jaggard appears to have persuaded Pavier to give up the idea of a formal collection. The continuous signatures had already been abandoned, and so now, no doubt, was the proposed general title-page. The question was what could be done with the rest of the material in hand. After 3 May it was no longer safe to put the current date on the titles, for the order covered reprints as well as editions of hitherto unpublished plays. If the remaining six pieces were to be printed at all, it must be made to appear that they were old stock. Thus it was decided that the dates on the titles should be those of the editions that were being reprinted, so that if necessary the reprints could be passed off as copies of the same, or at any rate as twin editions of the same date.² In the case of *King Lear* and *Sir John Oldcastle* it is clear that a deliberate attempt was made to imitate the layout of the original titles, though of course the imprints differ except in the date. On the other hand, the title-pages of *The Merchant of Venice* and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* bear no resemblance to those of the original editions; but in these the imprints state that they were printed by James Roberts, who was safely dead.³ In carrying out this design Jaggard made a couple of mistakes that somewhat obscure the intention. On the title of *The Merry Wives* he inadvertently put the true date 1619 instead of copying that of the original edition of 1602; and, printing *Henry V* immediately after *King Lear*, he forgot to alter the date from 1608 to 1600 as he should have done.⁴

¹ See Note D on p. 24.

² It is even possible that an attempt was made to alter the dates on some of the titles already printed. In a copy of *A Yorkshire Tragedy* in the British Museum (C.i2.g.26) the figures '19' have been erased and '08' stamped in in their place; 1608 being the date of the original edition.

³ For centuries this helped to blacken his character by making him out a pirate.

⁴ *Henry V* is anomalous in another respect: it is the only play in the collection that does not bear Shakespeare's name on the title-page. The layout in *King Lear* had necessitated moving the author's name from its usual position to the head of the page: in altering this tide to fit *Henry V* the compositor had to distribute the type of the upper portion, and since the edition of *Henry V* he was reprinting (which, curiously enough, was that printed by Creede for Millington and Busby in 1600, not for Pavier in 1602) was anonymous, he omitted to insert Shakespeare's name above the device.

In this form the collection, which had indeed become a mere bundle of plays, was finally published. Doubtless the quartos were sold individually at Pavier's shop at the Cat and Parrot near the Royal Exchange—unless he deemed it prudent not to display them on his own counter—or by whatever booksellers could be induced to take a parcel; but also, as a few surviving copies attest, in sets, though it will be remarked with interest that in no two cases recorded are the plays in the same order, and that even *The Whole Contention* and *Pericles* never retain their relative positions. The character of a collection was intentionally disguised.

The First Folio is dedicated 'To the most noble and incomparable paire of brethren. William Earle of Pembroke . . . and Philip Earle of Montgomery'. They were the sons of Henry Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, who had maintained a company of actors in the early nineties with which Shakespeare may once have been associated, and William, as Lord Chamberlain, was the successor in office of the Lords Hunsdon who had been patrons of Shakespeare's company before the accession of King James. Some have supposed him to be the 'Mr. W. H.' of the dedication of Shakespeare's sonnets. The Lord Chamberlain was also responsible for the control of all theatrical matters, and through his subordinate, the Master of the Revels, for the licensing of plays and playhouses. Indeed, we have seen¹ how Earl William had himself lately intervened on behalf of the actors in their struggle against the unauthorized printing of their plays. No fitter patrons, at any rate from the actors' point of view, could have been found for the monument they were erecting to the memory of their dead friend, and it is but reasonable to surmise that the choice was that of Heminge and Condell themselves.

The dedicatory epistle and the address 'To the great Variety of Readers' may be confidently taken to express the views of those who signed them, but it has sometimes been doubted whether they were actually of their own writing. There may be no compelling reason to deny that Heminge and Condell were capable of their composition; at the same time there is a distinctly literary quality in the writing

¹ pp-15-16.

that suggests a practised hand. A sound critic, not given to indiscriminate praise, has called the second paragraph of the address 'a fine piece of Elizabethan prose with a lift right above the range of the ordinary writer'. It has been suggested¹ that the pieces may have been composed by Edward Blount, who was a man of some literary aspiration and had written several such trifles under his own name: he had been the friend of Marlowe and regarded himself as in some sense his literary executor.² The fact that he seems to have become associated with the First Folio only after a considerable portion of the volume was already printed, though it makes it unlikely that he acted as editor, would not prohibit his having had a directing hand in the preliminaries. No attempt, however, has been made to show any stylistic resemblance between the Folio dedication and address and Blount's acknowledged writings.³ The only candidate for authorship whose claims have been seriously argued is Ben Jonson. That Jonson was in some way connected with the publication appears, not so much from the noble tribute he paid in the only considerable commendatory poem the volume contains, but by his having apparently been commissioned to write the verses on the portrait.⁴ It was George Steevens who first suggested his authorship, and the view was later supported by a formidable array of parallels.⁵ Many of these have little

¹ For instance by Pollard, *Folios and Quartos*, p. 122.

² See his epistle to Sir Thomas Walsingham prefixed to the first edition of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* in 1598, and cf. Greg, 'The Copyright of "Hero and Leander"', *The Library*, Dec.-Mar. 1943-4, xxiv, 165-74.

³ Blount's style is, in fact, quite individual and quite different. There is no likeness of expression even when he is trying to say much the same thing. Compare, for example, in the early dedication of *Hero and Leander*, 'his determinations preuented by the stroke of death' with 'he by death departed from that right'; and in the much later address prefixed to Lyly's *Six Court Comedies* (1632), 'I haue gathered the scattered branches vp, and by a Charme (gotten from Apollo) made them greene again, and set them vp as Epitaphes to his Memory' with 'We haue but collected them, and done an office to the dead, to procure his Orphanes, Guardiansj without ambition either of self-profit, or fame: onely to keepe the memory of so worthy a Friend, & Fellow aliue, as was our Shakespeare'.

⁴ Just as Sir John Berkenhead was presumably invited to write the Latin verses engraved below the portrait of Fletcher in the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1647. Pollard's objection that the Droeshout portrait is so bad as to make us wonder whether Jonson, when he wrote the verses, had ever set eyes on it (*Folios and Quartos*, p. 122) is indeed rather in favour of their having been written to order.

⁵ See Note E on p. 26.

if any weight, but that there are points of resemblance is true enough. The most obvious parallel, often observed, is between the words of the address, 'His mind and hand went together: And what he thought, he vttered with that easinesse, that wee haue scarce receiued from him a blot [i.e. erasure] in his papers', and the passage in Jonson's *Discoveries*, 'I remember, the Players have often mentioned it as an honour to Shakespeare, that in his writing, (whatsoever he penn'd) hee never blotted out line. My answer hath beene, Would he had blotted a thousand/¹ There is sometimes a similarity of thought. 'Do so, but buy it first. That doth best commend a Booke, the Stationer saies': so the address. And Jonson writes 'To my Booke-seller', 'Thou, that mak'st gaine thy end, and wisely well, Call'st a booke good, or bad, as it doth sell'. Other passages show a distinct similarity of expression. With the phrases of the address, 'There you are number'd. We had rather you were weighd. ... Then, how odde [i.e. unequal] soeueyourbraines be, oryourwisdomes, make your licence the same, and spare not', compare 'Suffrages in Parliament are numbred, not weigh'd: nor can it bee otherwise . . . where nothing is so unequal!, as the equality: for there, how odde soever mens braines, or wisdomes are, their power is alwayes even, and the same'.³ The address continues, 'ludge your sixe-pen'orth, your shillings worth, your fiue shillings worth at a time, or higher, so you rise to the iust rates, and welcome. But, what euer you do, Buy.

¹ Ed. Simpson, ll. 647-50. This has usually been taken as a direct allusion to the address—Pollard (p. 122) speaks of 'the phrase which gave rise to it'—and to prove that Jonson could not have written the same. But Jonson speaks, not of what was written, but of what he had heard the players say, and of his answer, 'Which they thought a malevolent speech'. The two passages may very well be contemporary—indeed, they must be if the *Discoveries* are really notes for lectures at Gresham College (C. J. Sisson in *TLS*, 21 Sept. 1951; cf. Simpson, *Jonson*, xi. 582-5). In that case it could be argued that Jonson, writing on the players' behalf, repeated what they were in the habit of alleging as evidence of Shakespeare's ease of composition, while in his commonplace-book he recorded his private opinion of the same as it affected the propriety of Shakespeare's writing.

² Epigram III.

³ *Discoveries*, ll. 508-12. Jonson's 'discovery' is out of the younger Pliny, *Epistulae*, ir. xii. 5: 'Numerantur enim sententiae, non ponderantur; nee aliud in publico consilio potest fieri, in quo nihil est tarn inaequale quam aequalitas ipsa. Nam cum sit impar prudentia, par omnium ius est' (Simpson, *Jonson*, xi. 228). But this source does not fully account for the resemblance, even if we could believe that Heminge and Condell studied Pliny.

Censure will not driue a Trade': with this compare, from the Induction to *Eartholmew Fair*¹ 'It is further agreed that euery person here, haue his or their free-will of censure . . . the Author hauing now departed with his right:² It shall bee lawfull for any man to iudge his six pen'orth, his twelue pen'orth, so to his eighteene pence, 2. shillings, halfe a crowne, to the value of his place: Prouided alwaies his place get not aboue his wit.. .. Hee shall put in for Censures here'.³ Or take 'And though you be a Magistrate of wit, and sit on the Stage at Black-Friers, or the Cock-pit, to arraigne Playes dailie . . .'. Sitting in judgement on plays is almost an obsession with Jonson: for the phrasing compare *The Magnetic Lady* 'I shall have just occasion to beleeeve My wit is magisterial', and 'unlesse like a solemne Justice of wit, you will damne our Play, unheard',⁴ and the Ode on *The New Inn* 'Vsurpe the chaire of wit! Indicting, and arraigning euery day Something they call a Play'. Certainly no one can say that the rather hectoring vein of the earlier part of the address is not very Jonson, or that the touch of antiquarian learning in the dedication—'Country hands reach foorth milke, creame, fruites, or what they haue: and many Nations (we haue heard) that had not gummes & incense, obtained their requests with a leauened Cake'—does not recall many of the annotations with which Jonson encumbered his masques.⁵ And does it not look as though the parenthetical

¹ ll. 85-92.

² Compare 'and he by death departed from that right': but the expression was common at the time.

³ As was pointed out in 1821, the passage in *Bartholmew Fair* is good sense—each shall judge according to what he has paid for his seat—but what corresponding scale can there be in the case of a book sold at a fixed price? It looks as though the address were copying rather clumsily from the Induction. Still, Jonson was clearly inclined to harp on the idea, for he repeated it, rather less aptly perhaps, in *The Magnetic Lady* (n. chorus, 59-65): 'Dam\flay!. ... I see no reason, if I come here, and give my eighteene pence, or two shillings for my Seat, but I should take it out in censure, on the Stage. Boy. Your two shilling worth is allow'd you: but you will take your ten shilling worth, your twenty shilling worth, and more'. After all, there were no ten-shilling or twenty-shilling seats.

⁴ I. i. 12-13.

⁵ ' chorus, 40-41.

⁶ ll. 4-6; vi. 492.

⁷ There is even an actual parallel in the dedication of *The Alchemist*, which begins: 'In the age of sacrifices, the truth of religion was not in the greatnesse, & fat of the offrings, but in the deuotion, and zeale of the sacrificers: Else, what could a handfull of gummes haue done in the sight of a hecatombe?' It was pointed out by Briggs. However, as Malone noted (*Variorum*, 1821, ii. 661): 'This seems to

words had been slipped in to mitigate the unlikelihood of the ostensible writers indulging in such a conceit? The suggestion of authorship is no derogation to Jonson. If resemblances occur mainly in the earlier part of the address, it is in the later that the quality of the writing makes us wonder what sort of man he was that wrote it. One thing is certain: whoever wrote the address—and we may fairly assume that the epistle came from the same pen—if it was not Jonson himself, was a close student of his works. It is true that Heminge and Condell had acted in many of Jonson's earlier plays, down to *Catiline* in 1611, and they had every opportunity of studying (if they wished) the 'Works' published in 1616. But it is not from the early plays or from the printed works that the parallels mostly come. That the writer of the address knew *Bartholmew Fair* no one questions: but this play was acted in 1614 by the Lady Elizabeth's men and was not printed till 1631. And, however familiar with Jonson's published works the writer might be, it seems strange that in 1623, chaffing prospective buyers on their varying capacity as critics, he should use phrases that Jonson repeated in translating Pliny's remarks about parliamentary voting in a work not printed till 1641—unless, of course, we are to suppose that they were still ringing in his head after attending a lecture at Gresham College!

NOTE A (page 6)

The sale is usually said to have been in or 'about' 1608. Pollard, *Folios and Quartos*, p. 105, is curiously specific: 'In 1606 Roberts sold his printing plant to William Jaggard, the formal transfer of the business taking place two years later'. He cites no authority. The date 1608 comes from the notes made by Sir John Lambe, Dean of the Arches, in preparation, so it is supposed, for the Star-chamber Decree of 1637 (Arber, *Transcript*, iii. 702). But Lambe's information was often unreliable: he states, for example, that Roberts acquired the business from Charlewood's executors in 1589, whereas Charlewood did not die till 1593. We may therefore reject the date 1608 altogether. Pollard evidently knew that Jaggard was already printing in 1606. In fact Jaggard may

have been one of the common-places of dedication in Shakespeare's age. We find it in Morley's Dedication of a Book of Songs to Sir Robert Cecil, 1595: "I have presumed" (says he) "to make offer of these simple compositions of mine, imitating (right honourable) in this the customs of the old world, who wanting incense to offer up to their gods, made shift insteade thereof to honour them with milk."

have begun as early as 1604, though the first books of his of which we have certain knowledge are dated 1605. He was then already 'in Barbican'. But Roberts went on printing, also presumably in Barbican, till 1606. (G. Ellis, *The Lamentation of the Lost Sheep*, 'Printed by W. Jaggard dwelling in Barbican', and T. Savile, *The Prisoners' Conference*, 'Printed by William Jaggard dwelling in Barbican', both 1605: E. Dering, *Brief Instruction*, and J. Northbrooke, *Spiritus est uicarius Christi*, 'Printed by Iames Roberts', both 1606.) Thus for perhaps two years they overlap. After that Roberts disappears. He made his last entrance in the Stationers' Register on 10 July 1606. He may have carried on business for a while, but if he did it was as a retail bookseller only, for his name appears in no book after 1606 either as printer or in any other capacity. It is true that it was not till 29 Oct. 1615 that Jaggard entered certain copies 'which were heretofore entred to Iames Robertes': but there is nothing to show that Roberts was then alive: it may be a belated entrance of books that Jaggard had acquired nine or ten years before.

NOTE B (page 7)

There are allusions to Jaggard's affliction in the preliminaries of several books he printed. As early as 1613, in *The Treasury of Ancient and Modern Times*, vol. i, sig. Az, T. Miller, the compiler, writes 'To the Reader': 'But I am (at this time) forced to Write vnto thee, both on the behalfe of my selfe and the Printer: in regard of many Escapes, which vsually chanceth in Printing, by reason, that immediately after the Bookes beginning, sicknesse & other infirmities, did bereaue him of his sight.' Jaggard, therefore, we may suppose, became blind in 1612 or 1613. In A. Vincent's *Discovery of Errors*, 1622, is an address of 'The Printer' that begins (sig. If5): 'While I was Master of mine eyes, I read a story . . .' and ends (sig. 'Jy): 'howsoever it hath pleased God to make me, and him [R. Brooke] to style me a Blinde-Printer . . .'. In A. Favyn's *Theatre of Honour*, 1623, sig. A2, is an 'Epistle Dedicatorie' to Henry Montagu, Viscount Mandeville (later Earl of Manchester), which ends: 'Accept it Noble Lord, as I make no doubt but you will: And all my best abilities, while this poore old body of mine hath an houre to breath, is your Honors in all dutie, W. I.' More specific is a curious note in MS. Sloane 640 in the British Museum, a miscellaneous collection of medical recipes and cases: 'Jagger prynter being long subiect to Cathars and arthritik passions tandem lue affectus et virga valde exulcerata the humore by mercurial waters and vpically (?) dryven backe and thervpon receaving a diaphoretic became blynd' (fol. 192^a, repeated on fol. 266^b). At the head of fol. 275' is the date '1612. Maij 15°.' It has no relation to the notes, but these are likely to be earlier rather than later.

NOTE C (page 10)

It is discredited by Willoughby, who writes (pp. 2-3): 'It is by no means certain ... that Jaggard ever printed bills for any company other than the Earl of Worcester's or Queen Anne's. . . . Moreover, whatever rights Jaggard may have held, they were not undisputed. In October 1618 Thomas Symcock

applied for a patent—which he soon obtained—"for the sole printing of... all Billes for Playes [&c.]" ... it was not until 1629 that the patent was withdrawn'. Since Willoughby speaks with authority it will be well to set forth the evidence in detail. The story begins on 30 Oct. 1587 when John Charlewood had 'Lycenced to him by the whole consent of Thassistantes [i.e. of the Court of the Company], The onelye ympryntinge of all manner of Billes for players, prouided that yf any trouble aryse herebye then Charlwood to beare the charges', for which he paid the unusual fee of 2*s.* 6*d.* (On the same day 'the printing of Billes for pryces at fencinge' was licensed to Thomas Purfoot.) On Charlewood's death Jaggard applied for the right: 'Whereas William lagger hath made request to haue the printinge of the billes for players as lohn Charlwood had • yt is graunted: that if he can gett the said Charlwood his Wydowes consent hereunto or if shee die, or marry out of the company. That then the company will haue consideracion to prefer him in this sute before another' (Court-Book B, 23 Apr. 1593). Jaggard's reversion was frustrated by Alice Charlewood's marriage to James Roberts, and 'The billes for plaies' duly appear among the 'Copies whiche were lohn Charlwoodes' entered to Roberts on 31 May 1594. Eight years later, however, Jaggard appears to have got Worcester's men to appoint him to print their play-bills and renewed his application to the Court. This naturally brought up the question of Roberts's right, and the matter was discussed at a meeting on 13 Dec. 1602 (Court-Book C): 'M^r Robertes w^m lagger Vppon the hearinge of the clayme of william lagger to the printinge of the billes for the company of stage players apperteyninge to the right honorable the Erie of Worcester. Whiche is found to be the right of the said lames Robertes in the right of his wyfe. yt is ordered by the assent of the said parties And the said lames Robertes is content And dothe graunt for him and his wife, That the said William lagger shall haue the onely and sole ymprinting of the said billes for the said company of players nowe apperteyninge or hereafter to apperteyne to the said Erie of Worcester . . . The said William yeilding and payinge therefore to the said lames and his said wife or one of them monethely foure shillinges . . . And the said William lagger to meddle with the printing of no other billes for players, but these only . . . And the said William to be bound to the said lames in vli [£5] to perform this order for his parte'. (A further entry of 2 Apr. 1604 is merely a confirmation of the order upon Worcester's company being taken under the patronage of Queen Anne.) There is no need to suppose that this represents anything but the Court's consent to a friendly bargain between the parties, but the important point, which clearly emerges alike from the earlier entries and from the terms of the order itself, is that Roberts's right was to the printing of all play-bills and was not limited to those of any particular company. It is here that Willoughby went wrong. It follows that when Jaggard acquired Roberts's business about 1605, or at any rate when on 29 Oct. 1615 certain copies, including 'The players billes', 'heretofore entred to lames Robertes' were 'by Consent of a full Court' re-entered to William Jaggard, the latter's right ceased to be limited to one company and was extended to all. Moreover, it is clear that from William the right passed to Isaac Jaggard, since 'Bills for players' duly appear among the copies assigned with the Court's consent by Isaac's widow Dorothy to Thomas and Richard Cotes on 19 June 1627. As for

Symcock's patent. Willoughby admits that it 'was contested by the Stationers' Company and we do not know how rigidly the monopoly was enforced'. We know its terms from a broadside proclamation dated 30 Oct. 1620 (STC 8614), a copy of which is preserved in the collection of the Society of Antiquaries, and to which J. P. Collier drew attention in 1831 (*A History of English Dramatic Poetry*, iii. 383). This is 'An abstract of his Majestie's Letters Patents granted unto Roger Ward and Thomas Symcocke, for the sole printing of paper and parchment on the one side' including 'all Billes for Playes, Pastimes, Showes, Challenges, Prizes and Sportes whatsoever', at the end of which those interested are invited to repair 'to the Old Change, at the Golden Anchor, over against Carter Lane end, where they shall be reasonably dealt with for the same'. There is an imprint 'At London. Printed by Edward All-de, the Assigne of Roger Wood and Thomas Symcocke, 1620.', but the address given above is not known as his. From the Bibliographical Society's *Dictionary of Printers* it appears that, though granted, the patent was never enrolled, that the Company fought it by petition and in the courts, and that on 30 June 1629 it was finally cancelled by the Court of Chancery as having been surreptitiously and improperly obtained. It seems unlikely that Jaggard allowed it to interfere with the exercise of his rights. Willoughby further objects that the only surviving play-bill of the period, that of *England's Joy* in 1602, was printed by John Windet. But that pretended performance of Vennar's was a practical joke (see Chambers, *E/iz. Stage*, iii. 500) and the 'Plot', as it calls itself, cannot be regarded as typical or be cited as evidence of the normal practice.

NOTE D (page 16)

Court-Book C: 'Hen. Hemmings. vppon a letter from the right honorable the Lord Chamberleyne It is thought fitt & so ordered That no playes that his Maiestyes players do play shalbe printed without consent of somme of them'. If 'Hen.' is an error, as seems probable, it was John Heminge himself who took the letter to the Court. (Another letter, read on 3 Mar. 1623, only dealt with the licensing of plays by Sir John Astley (Chambers, *W. Shake.*, i. 130').) The Lord Chamberlain was William, Earl of Pembroke. The letter itself is not known, but it seems to be recapitulated in a subsequent letter of like tenor addressed to the Company on 10 June 1637 by Philip, Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, who had succeeded his brother in his title and office in 1630. (William and Philip were, of course, the 'incomparable paire' to whom the First Folio was dedicated.) A copy of the letter of 1637 is preserved among the Lord Chamberlain's papers in the Record Office (L.C. 5/134, pp. 178-9; Malone Society Collections, ii. 384-5) and runs (repunctuated):

'After my harty Commendacions: Wheras complaint was heertofore presented to my Deare brother & predecessor by his Maiestes servantes the Players, that some of the Company of Printers & Stationers had procured, published & printed diuerse of their bookes of Comaedyes, Tragedyes, Cronicle Historyes, and the like, which they had (for the speciall service of his Maiestye & for their owne vse) bought and provided at very Deare & high rates, By meanes wherof not onely they themselues had much prejudice, but the bookes much corruption to the iniury and disgrace of the Authors; And therupon the

Masters & Wardens of the company of printers & stationers were advised by my Brother to take notice therof & to take Order for the stay of any further Impression of any of the Playes or Interludes of his Maiestes servantes without their consentes; Which beeing a caution giuen with such respect & grounded on such weighty reasons, both for his Maiestes service & the particular interest of the Players, and soe agreeable to common iustice & that indifferent measure which euery man would looke for in his owne particular, it might haue been presumed that there would haue needed noe further Order or direction in the busines: Notwithstanding which I am informed that some Coppyes of Playes belonging to the King & Queenes servantes the Players, & purchased by them at Deare rates, haueing beene lately stollen or gotten from them by indirect meanes, are now attempted to bee printed, & that some of them are at the Presse & ready to bee printed; which if it should bee suffered would directly tend to their apparent Detriment & great preiudice, & to the disenabling of them to doe their Maiestes service; P'or prevention & redresse wherof it is desired that Order bee giuen & entred by the Master & Wardens of the Company of Printers & Stationers that if any Playes bee already entred, or shall heerafter bee brought vnto the Hall to bee entred for printing, that notice therof bee giuen to the Kinges & Queenes servantes the Players, & an inquiry made of them to whome they doe belong, And that none bee suffered to bee printed vntill the assent of their Maiestes sayd servantes bee made appeare to the Master & Wardens of the Company of Printers & Stationers by some Certificate in writeing vnder the handes of Iohn Lowen & Ioseph Taylor for the Kings servantes & of Christopher Bieston for the Kings and Queenes young Company, or of such other persons as shall from time to time haue the direction of those companies, which is a course that can bee hurtfull vnto none but such as goe about vniustly to prevayle themselues of others goodes without respect of Order or good gouernment, which I [am] confident you will bee carefull to auoyd; And therfore I commend it to your speciall care, & if you shall haue need of any further Authority or power either from his Maiestye or the counsell table the better to inable you in the execution therof, vpon notice giuen to mee either by your selues or by the Players I will endeauour to apply that further remedye therto which shall bee requisite. And soe I bidd you very hartily farewell, & rest

your very loueing friend,
P. and M.

Iune 10. 1637.

To the Master & Wardens of the company of Printers & Stationers.'

A confirmation of this letter, so far as it relates to the King's men and with a list of their plays attached, was issued on 7 Aug. 1641 by Robert, Earl of Essex, who had become Lord Chamberlain a few weeks before: a copy is in L.C. 5/135 (Malone Society Collections, ii. 398-9). In the letter of 1619 (as recited in 1637) the appearance of the old-fashioned term 'Cronicle Historyes' is striking: it may be explained by the inclusion in Pavier's collection of 'The Chronicle History of Henry the fift', while the phrase 'the booke[s] [had] much corruption to the iniury and disgrace of the Authors' is pointedly applicable to four pieces included in the same. Obviously it is here the players speaking: we hear them voicing their resentment at the circulation of garbled versions of

Shakespeare's plays. It should also be noticed that in the recapitulation the prohibition of 'any further Impression' of the King's men's plays is clearly intended to cover the reprinting of already printed pieces no less than the printing of new ones; whereas the order of 1637 itself appears to be directed only against the latter, a point that becomes even clearer in the confirmation of 1641 with its list of sixty unpublished plays. It was Crompton Rhodes (p. 44) who first drew attention to the significance, in respect of the events of 1619, of the recapitulation of 1637, although he was ignorant of the actual date afforded by the Court-Book.

Pavier's collection may not have been the only inducement the King's men had to seek protection, for the same year saw the publication of one of their plays, *A King and no King*, apparently from a private transcript that had got into the wrong hands (see p. 160).

There is also some reason to believe that the company, while still the Lord Chamberlain's men, had made interest with their patron in a like manner long before 1619. For we find in the Stationers' Hall Book (Register C, fly-leaf), notes of a couple of 'my lord chamberlens mens Plaies Entred' to James Roberts conditionally on his getting 'further Aucthoritie' on 27 and 29 May 1600, followed by a list dated 4 Aug. of four other pieces of theirs, *As you Like it*, *Henry V*, *Every Man in his Humour*, and *Much Ado about Nothing*, 'to be staied'. There can be little doubt that someone in authority had been making inquiries about plays that it was intended to print and had given a warning against trespassing upon the company's preserves.

NOTE E (page 18)

Steevens's suggestion first appeared after his death in 1800 in a note signed with his name in the 1803 *Variorum*, edited by Isaac Reed (i. 166), which begins with the quotation from *Bartholmew Fair* (as in the text) and ends, Perhaps Old Ben was author of the *Players' Preface*, and, in the instance before us, has borrowed from himself. This was repeated in the edition of 1813. It was only in the *Variorum* of 1821 that Boswell gave the evidence in full (ii. 663-75) in a long passage to which Steevens's name is again appended. But Boswell is not known to have had access to any manuscript material of Steevens's, whereas he had, of course, masses of Malone's, and it seems on the whole probable that only the last few lines of the passage (recording the later folios) are really from Steevens, and that Boswell inserted what precedes either on his own or from Malone's papers, and inadvertently omitted to make the necessary attribution. This 1821 passage (unlike Steevens's earlier suggestion) only attributes to Jonson the first paragraph of the address, though it admits that 'his revising hand may be traced' in the second as well. Later writers who have entertained the notion have, however, made no such distinction, and have even included the dedication as well; and in spite of some obvious differences of tone and intention there does not appear to be any reason why the whole should not have come from a single hand, whose-ever it may have been.

The theory of Jonson's authorship was revived by Maurice Castelain, the learned editor of the *Discoveries*, in 1907 (*Revue Germanique*, iii. 27), and by W. D. Briggs in *TLS*, 12 Nov. 1914, both in apparent ignorance of earlier

writings on the subject. The notion was brushed aside by Pollard (*Folios and Quartos*, p. 122) rather cavalierly it has been thought (Greg, *Pub. First Folio*, pp. 151-2). The arguments advanced in 1821 are fully and fairly summarized by Simpson (*Jonson*, xi. 140-4), though he ends by rejecting them. Chambers (*W. Shake.*, i. 142) thinks Jonson's claim better than Blount's.

II. Questions of Copyright

COPYRIGHT in the modern sense of the word, as implying the rights of an author in his own work, was unknown in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and indeed the word itself is not met with till after 1700.¹ It is true that the idea of rights in a 'copy' or work established itself at an early date, but the basis of that right is to be sought in the rules and customs of the London Stationers' Company, which controlled virtually the entire book trade and book production of the country,² and was essentially part of the domestic discipline that the Company exercised over its own members. Copyright, as the term would have been understood in Shakespeare's day, meant the exclusive right of a particular stationer to print or have printed for his use the copy in question.³ The notion seems to have grown out of that of 'privilege' or royal patent:⁴ at least this seems to be implied in a phrase used in a report to the Privy Council in 1583, in preparation for the Star-chamber Decree of 1586, recording that it is 'Not meet that sondrye men should print one booke, therefore her Maiestie not graunting priuiledge, the companie do order emongest them selves that he which bringeth a booke to be printed should vse yt as a priuiledge'.⁵ This apparently states the practice as it already existed in the Company, namely, that if a stationer brought to the Company (for registration) a book that he proposed to print, the Company (if it approved the copy) granted him the same exclusive rights in it as he would have enjoyed under a royal patent.⁶

In order to obtain such protection a book had, of course, to be printed in an 'orderly' fashion.⁷ What constituted

¹ See Note A on p. 69.

² Excepting only the Oxford and Cambridge presses authorized by the Universities.

³ See Note B on p. 69.

* See Note C on p. 70.

⁵ Arber, *Transcript*, ii. 784: 'bringeth a booke to be printed' evidently means more than merely 'printeth'.

⁶ See Note D on p. 70.

⁷ A clear account of the practice in regard to licensing and printing, at least in so far as it concerns dramatic works, will be found in Chambers, *Etiz. Stage*, iii. 158-77.

'orderly' printing appears from the frequent cases of 'disorderly' printing, which are defined as being 'without aucthority and entrance' or 'without aucthoritie lycence and entraunce'. The terms are not always used consistently, but we may conveniently identify 'lycence' with the official *imprimatur* and 'aucthority' with allowance by the Warden on behalf of the Company.¹ For orderly printing, therefore, three things were necessary. In the first place the copy had to receive the approval of the ecclesiastical or other official authorities.² We may call this 'licence'. Then the manuscript had to be submitted to a Warden, who, if satisfied that the licence was in order (or else that it could be dispensed with) and that the copy infringed no other man's rights, would grant his authority or allowance for its entrance.³ This may be called his 'warrant'. Lastly it had to be taken to the Clerk of the Company, who, satisfied by the Warden's warrant, would make the formal entry in the Hall Book, duly recording (as a rule) the 'hands' under which the licence and warrant were issued.⁴

For information respecting the nature of copyright and the manner in which it was obtained we should naturally look to the Ordinances of the Company.' Unfortunately, no early set of Ordinances has been preserved; the first we have are those of 1678, with supplements issued in 1682

¹ An early instance, of 13 Nov. 1576, states specifically that the work in question was 'Licensed by the Archbishop of Canterbury [Edmund Grindal] to be Translated into Englishe and so to be printed, and alowed by mr Seres [Master] and mr Gonnell [Upper Warden]'.

² See Note E on p. 71.

³ See Note F on p. 71.

⁴ Occasionally the Clerk acted on his own authority and recorded the fact: 7 Sept. 1580, 'Tollerated vnto [William Wright] but not vnder the wardens handes'; i July 1587, 'Receaued of [Edward White] for pryntinge a ballad... beinge broughte to enter by lohn woulf without the wardens handes to the cople'.

s Or, of course, to the Charter. The original Charter of 4 May, 3 & 4 Philip and Mary, 1557 (see Arber, *Transcript*, i, pp. xxviii-xxxii), contains nothing relevant, nor apparently does the Confirmation of 10 Nov., i Eliz., 1559 (*ibid*, i, p. xxxii). The original Charter perished in the fire of 1666, but its text is known from the Letters Patent in the Public Record Office (Patent Roll 3 & 4 Ph. & M., part 10, m. 10: Warrant 30 Apr., C. 82, bundle 98, pile 1027). However, an Exemplification of 36 Charles II (1684) is preserved at Stationers' Hall, and in it 'there is a clause to the effect that provided a book is entered in the Register the member of the Company [entering it] becomes proprietor either by gift of, or purchase from, the author, and he is given the sole right of printing the book' (*The Worshipful Company of Stationers and Newspaper Makers: notes on its origin and history*, by Sidney Hodgson: Stationers' Hall, 1953, p. 4).

and 1683.¹ The Ordinances of 1678 contain nothing to the purpose, but in the first supplement, dated 17 August 1681 and printed the following year. Order 5 provides that, 'whereas several Members of this Company have great part of their Estates in Copies; and by ancient Usage of this Company, when any Book or Copy is duly Entred in the Register Book of the Company, to any Member or Members of this Company, such Person to whom such Entry is made, is, and always hath been reputed and taken to be Proprietor of such Book or Copy, and ought to have the sole Printing thereof, in future any member violating this 'Privileg and Interest' 'shall forfeit . . . the sum of Twelve Pence' for every copy printed, sold, bound, or stitched contrary to the order.² The importance of entrance as evidence of rights in a copy was earlier emphasized by John Bill, the King's Printer, who, writing c. 1620 an account of William Fulke's Confutation of the Rhemish Testament' (STC 2888), records that George Bishop 'had the printing of that copie' granted ⁴to him and his Assignes. and this appeares by witnesses as also by the Registry of the Stationers hall where this was entred ... as all copies which are bought by Stationers are And this entry in the hall booke is the commun and strongest assurance that Stationers haue, for all their copies, which is the greatest parte of their Estates'.³ There was evidently then a close connexion between copyright and entrance; and entrance implied official licence and the Company's authorization. But the *imprimatur* was mainly an ecclesiastical matter and can have had nothing directly to do with copyright, which was essentially a domestic affair of the Company. It seems evident, therefore, that what really conferred copyright was the Company's recognition of a member's ownership of a particular copy, a recognition that in practice took the form of the Warden's authorization for entrance.⁴ This interpre-

¹ Arber, i. 3-26.

² Arber, i. 22-23.

³ Arber, iii. 39.

• This sufficiently explains the alleged fact that 'the Master and Wardens rarely if ever entered books during their tenure of office but did continue to publish during the same period' (L. Kirschbaum, *The Library*, 1945, xxvi. 195). Naturally, if a Warden published a book he might be taken to authorize its publication. But in fact Wardens did sometimes enter their books.

Of course, the body that really had authority to express the will of the Company was the Company's Court, known as the Court of Assistants; and not uncommonly, in what were presumably cases of doubt or controversy, the entrance was in fact

tation is borne out by such a conditional entrance as that of Samuel Rowley's play *When you See me you Know me*, granted to Nathaniel Butter on 12 February 1605: 'Yf he gett good allowance for the enterlude of .K. Henry the ,8th before he begyn to print it. and then procure the wardens handes to yt for the entrance of yt: He is to haue the same for his copy'.

Although, therefore, it may not be correct to say that it was entrance itself that conferred copyright, it was yet through entrance that copyright was normally established: it was, in fact, in Bill's words, the 'strongest assurance', and possibly the necessary evidence, of the right. Entrance was, in theory at least, obligatory. The Star-chamber Decree of ii July 1637 (par. ii) lays down 'That no person or persons whatsoever, shall at any time print or cause to be imprinted, any Booke or Pamphlet whatsoever, vnlesse the same . . . shall be first lawfully licenced and authorized . . . and shall be also first entred into the Registers Booke of the Company of Stationers; vpon paine that euery Printer offending therein, shall be for euer hereafter disabled to use or exercise the Art or Mysterie of Printing' and so forth;¹ the severe penalty being designed, we may suppose, for unlicensed printing rather than for mere neglect of entrance. And in the supplementary Ordinance of 6 December 1682, printed in 1683, we read that 'It hath been the Ancient Usage of the Members of this Company, for the Printer or Printers, Publisher or Publishers of all Books, Pamphlets, Ballads, and Papers, (except what are granted by Letters Patents under the Great Seal of England) to Enter [the same] into the Publick Register-Book of this Company, remaining with the Clerk of this Company for the time being, in his or their own Name or Names . . . before the same . . . is begun to be Printed. . . . It is therefore Ordained, That this shall be done 'before the Printing or reprinting of any Book,' &c. 'upon pain of forfeiting . . . Twenty pounds'.²

made by order of the Court. When, in ordinary cases, a Warden granted the warrant, it was, we may suppose, under some customary delegation of authority from the Court. Frequently copies were entered under the hands of both the Wardens, occasionally, but rarely, under the hand of the Master (see p. 29¹).

¹ Arber, iv. 529-30.

² Arber, i. 26. That reprints required licensing appears to have been a new

This is again a heavy penalty, and this time specifically for non-entrance. There is no doubt, moreover, that fines were imposed for non-entrance at a much earlier date. Thus on 2 April 1599 occurs the entry, 'Adam Islip. Receaued of him for printinge the Fountaine of fictions without entrance ij^s', and in the autumn, apparently, of 1602, 'Edward Aldee yt is ordered that he shall pay for A fine for printinge a booke without entrance Contrary to thorders vj^s viij^d', while on the same occasion Thomas Pavier, as the publisher, was fined 135. 4'. for causing the book to be printed, and Cuthbert Burby 35. 4'. for dealing in it.² It is true that these are the only instances recorded in which non-entrance alone is specified as the offence, but the phrase 'Contrary to thorders' leaves no doubt that entrance was compulsory under the Company Ordinances, and the same may be inferred from the many instances of fines inflicted for printing 'without auctoritie lycence and entrance' or the like. And, even though no fine were imposed, failure to enter a copy might still lead to its being confiscated to the use of the Company as a whole, as appears from a minute of 1 March 1602: 'Yt is ordered that all that betwene this and the next court day bringe not in their ballades to be entred accordinge to order, shall lose the same/ And that the seid ballades shalbe disposed accordinge to the discretion of the Master Wardens & Assistentes'.³ But the minute that most plainly sets out the position respecting non-entrance is one of 27 July 1639: 'M^r Benson desired leaue of the Court to print an Impression of the play called The Tragedy of Albouine made by M^r Davenant which was printed in Anno 1629. & neuer entred & therefore in the disposall of this Court. Vpon Consideracion thereof It was ordered that the said M^r Benson should haue leaue to print an Impression of 1500. paying to the Poore of this Company xl⁸.⁴ Here we have an explicit statement that without entrance there could be no copyright and

provision introduced in the Star-chamber Decree of 1637 (par. xviii): 'That no person or persons, do hereafter reprint, or cause to be reprinted, any booke or bookes whatsoever (though formerly printed with licence) without being reuiewed, and a new Licence obtained for the reprinting thereof (Arber, iv. 533). This was not ancient usage and it is doubtful whether the order was effective.

¹ Arber, ii. 829.

³ Court-Book B.

Arber, ii. 835.

⁴ Court-Book C; see Greg, *Bibl. Drama*, i. 51.

that an unentered copy automatically became the property of the Company.¹

The case of *Albovine* raises certain points that it may be convenient to consider immediately. The Court minute takes what may be called the legalistic view of the matter in stating that where no copyright existed in a printed work the same was the property of the Company and consequently at the disposal of the Court. Stationers in general, however, regarded such a book as anybody's game, and few troubled to obtain the Court's permission to reprint it. Why pay sixpence in the pound to the poor—the usual charge for printing one of the Company's copies—when it could be simply appropriated without sensible risk? A typical case is that of *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, printed for Sampson Clarke in 1591, reprinted with an attribution to 'W. Sh.' for John Helme in 1611, and again with Shakespeare's full name for Thomas Dewe in 1622, without once appearing in the Register. But it was not only through non-entrance that copies might become derelict. If a stationer died without heirs and without making an assignment of his copies, these again fell by custom into the hands of the Company, but again were liable to be appropriated by any enterprising publisher. A clear case of appropriation seems to be the printing by Jaggard for Pavier in 1619 of *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, originally entered and published by Thomas Fisher in 1600, and *The Merchant of Venice* registered and published by Thomas Hayes the same year, both of whom had died without making an assignment: the true character of his editions being revealed by their spurious imprints 'Printed by I(ames) Roberts, 1600', and by the fact that rights in the copy of *The Merchant* were established before the Court on 8 July 1619 by Lawrence Hayes, the son of the original owner, whose existence Pavier had apparently overlooked.²

¹ *Albovine* bore the somewhat reticent imprint: 'London, Printed for R. M. and are to bee sold in Saint Dunstanes Church-yard. 1629.' R. M. was presumably Richard Moore, who made his last entrance on 29 Apr. 1631. His widow assigned a copy to John Marnot on 27 June 1634, and others passed to his son John on 12 May 1641, but *Albovine* was not among them. The stock of the play did, however, somehow come into Marriot's hands and finally into those of Humphrey Moseley, who advertised the book in 1653-60. John Benson made no use of the order in his favour: he may have learnt of the unsold stock.

² See p. 65.

It is true that in cases of seemingly derelict copies being reprinted by stationers without apparent title, an element of uncertainty is introduced by the possibility that there had been an unregistered assignment. It cannot indeed be proved that assignments ever did escape registration altogether, but in view of the fact that in several instances an assignment remained unregistered for months, and in one instance for years, it seems extremely probable.¹ Unregistered assignments may explain some unlikely cases of apparent piracy of copies belonging to men still in active business:² but where a stationer printed, without traceable right to it, a copy that had belonged to one who had died or disappeared without known heir, it seems likely that he was simply treating the copy as derelict, and, in the absence of any indication to the contrary, that is the assumption made in the present work.

It has been necessary to insist at some length on the nature and source of copyright since there has been occasional misapprehension on the subject, and it is only fair to say that differences of opinion persist. Some critics have even gone so far as to maintain that copyright was secured by the mere fact of printing and publication.³ Such a view, however, leans too heavily on inferential evidence to the exclusion of direct testimony. It is supported in the main by observation of three facts: that many books were quite openly and regularly published without entrance; that such books were often assigned from one stationer to another as though the

¹ An entry of 17 Feb. 1623 records an assignment of 3 Feb., an entry of 16 Nov. 1630 one of 26 June, an entry of 6 Dec. 1630 one of 4 Oct. In these cases the delay was not long. But an entry of 29 May 1638 records an assignment of 5 June the previous year, and an entry of 4 July 1635 one of 10 June 1621, more than fourteen years before.

² It is probable that Nashe's *Pierce Penniless* twice changed hands without registration: see Greg, *Pierce Penniless*.

³ Thus to H. T. Price it is 'quite clear that the mere fact of publishing without entering the book gave the publisher copyright (that is, of course, if the book had been properly licensed)' ('Towards a Scientific Method of Textual Criticism for the Elizabethan Drama', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Apr. 1937, xxxvi. 164-5), and his pupil Leo Kirschbaum similarly maintains that 'copyright automatically came into being merely by the fact of publication' (*The Library*, Sept.-Dec. 1945, xxvi. 195). A like view is taken on much the same grounds by Hoppe (*Romeo and Juliet*, p. n). In reply see Greg, 'Entrance and Copyright', *The Library*, Mar. 1946, xxvi. 308-10.

rights in them were valid; and that on occasion the Court of Assistants did allow rights claimed in copies which had in fact never been entered.

According to the most detailed estimates available, estimates based on several converging lines of approach, the proportion of works published that were entered in the Registers, while it varied a good deal from year to year, appears to have been on the average about two-thirds.¹ Among the unentered were many works whose publication would seem to have been perfectly regular and which we must suppose had sought and obtained official licence. Some may even have received the Warden's authorization for entrance, though for some reason this had not in fact been acted on. Some were, of course, published under patents and did not require licence. Some were printed for private distribution and were not openly published at all, like the libretti of masques distributed on the occasion of performance. Many were ephemeral publications in which it was not considered worth while establishing copyright, for it is obvious that, unless there was some prospect of a continued demand, exclusive rights were delusory. It is noticeable, for example, how few mayoral pageants were entered, and we have already seen the Court trying to insist on the entrance of ballads, without, as it proved, much success. Nevertheless, when all allowances are made, it is still remarkable how many important and obviously authorized publications escaped entrance in the Register.²

The transfer of unregistered copies raises some rather nice questions. It will be agreed that a stationer could not validly transfer rights that he did not himself possess. But does the fact that the Court allowed the assignment of a particular copy to be registered imply that it guaranteed that the right assigned was valid? There seems no necessity to suppose it. As time went on it became customary to specify that what

¹ Greg, *Entrance Gfr.*, pp. 1-7.

² As Chambers (*Eliz., Stage*, iii. 176-7) observes, it does not appear to depend on the publisher: the case of Thomas Archer, who published six plays between 1607 and 1613 and entered none, is exceptional. He also remarks that 'many of the unentered plays went through more than one edition, including *Mucedorus*, a book of enduring popularity, and they do not appear to have been particularly subject to invasion by rival publishers'.

was assigned was (as, for instance, in an entry of 21 May 1639) 'All the Estate right title & interest' that a member had (or, we may infer, might have) in the copies specified, and it became increasingly common to add (as in the same entry) the saving clause 'saluo iure cuiuscunque'. It seems reasonable to suppose that in such instances as this the Court did no more than take cognizance of the transfer of copies from one member of the Company to another, and that this did not necessarily carry any implication that the original title to those copies was sound. This disposes of the suggestion that the assignment of unentered copies proves that copyright in them was recognized. But there remains the further question whether a duly registered transfer created a right in favour of the assignee. And here we must draw a distinction between two forms of transfer, a distinction that has not always been recognized.¹ In the case of a straightforward assignment the above argument still holds: no man can create a right he does not possess by transferring his claim to another. Such an assignment is that of 16 October 1609: 'M^r. welby Assigned over vnto hym by mistres Burby in full Court holden this daye & with the consent of the m^r. wardens & Assistantes here present in Court All her right in these copies folowinge vnder this condycion that yf there shalbe found any indirect Dealinge herein by any of the parties to the same Then these copies to be at the disposicion of the Company and this entrance to be void'.² But there is another form of transfer of which the following are examples: 26 June 1600, 'Io. Flasket Entred for his copies by consent of our Maister and M^r Man Warden these bookes . . . folowinge whiche were Paule Lynlayes . . .'; 22 January 1607, 'M^r Linge Entred for his copies by direccion of A Court, and with consent of M^r. Burby vnder his handwrytinge These .iiij copies . . .'.³ The effect of these entries is

¹ It is unfortunate that in the summaries of SR entries included among the play-entries in Greg, *Bibl. Drama*, the two forms are merged. They are, of course, duly distinguished in the SR extracts in i. 1-76.

² The wording of this entry well illustrates the point that all the Court is doing is to take notice of and give its consent to the transaction without taking any responsibility in respect of it, that it expresses no opinion regarding the rights professed, and that should those rights prove invalid the copies would become the property of the Company.

³ Another example is that of 28 Oct. 1600: 'Tho. haies Entred for his copie

that, the former owner having lost by death or else waiving whatever rights he may have had in the copies, the Court agrees to their entrance to another. No doubt a rival claim by another stationer might defeat the title (as is true of all entrances) but apart from that the entrance must be held, like any other entrance, to create a copyright, whether one was already in existence or not. Had any question arisen, we must suppose that the Court would have taken notice of the wording of the entry: at the same time it is not altogether certain how far a distinction was intended by the Clerk, since he sometimes made use of a mixed formula, 'Entred for his copies by assignment from . . .' (e.g. 13 August 1599, 23 October 1600, 18 January 1602, &c.).

The attitude of the Court to unentered copies is rather difficult to determine. It is stated unequivocally in the case of *Albovine* mentioned above, but on other occasions the Court took a less rigid view. If, however, its decisions appear at times inconsistent and even wayward, it must be remembered that, being itself the fountain-head of copyright, it could do as it pleased in any particular instance, and that we can never be certain that the Clerk's laconic minutes give us all the considerations upon which a decision was reached.¹ Perhaps the most illuminating are two cases decided on 18 December 1592,² both, curiously enough, involving a rather unruly member named Abel Jeffes. One concerned *The Spanish Tragedy*, of which Edward White had recently published an edition (printed by Edward Allde) 'Newly vnder the handes of the Wardens & by Consent of mr Robertes. A booke called the booke of the merchant of Venyce'. Of this play Roberts had made a conditional entrance on 22 July 1598, Trouided that yt bee not prynted . . . without lycence first had from the Right honorable the lord Chamberlen', and it was Roberts who printed for Hayes the edition of 1600. It has sometimes been supposed that this and certain other entrances of Roberts's were 'blocking entries', made, not with a view to publication, but to prevent unauthorized printing by anyone else; Roberts acting on these occasions merely as agent for the players. On this see Pollard, *Folios and Quartos* (pp. 66-67), but his interpretation has been challenged (Chambers, *W. Shake.*, i. 146) and it is not necessary to argue the matter here.

¹ The minutes of the Court illustrate the sort of dispute that came before it and the sort of compromise it effected. See Court-Book B (*Stationers' Records*), index under 'Copyright'. Particularly interesting are the decisions of 23 Oct. 1592 (p. 43), 5 Feb. 1593 (p. 45), i Mar. 1602 (p. 85), and 28 June 1602 (p. 88, and see Greg, 'The English Schoolmaster': Dexter *u.* Burby, 1602', *The Library*, Sept.-Dec. 1942, xxiii. 90-93).

² Court-Book B.

corrected and amended of such grosse faults as passed in the first impression'. No earlier edition is known, but one had presumably been printed by Jeffes, who entered the play on 6 October. Now Jeffes had been in trouble with the Company authorities as early as 22 July, and, having resisted search, was suppressed and committed to ward on 7 August: he did not make his submission till 18 December.¹ All the same the Court adjudged White to have offended 'in havinge printed the Spanish tragedie belonging to Abell leffes', ordered his edition to be confiscated, and only let him off imprisonment on the payment of a fine of *ios*.² At the same Court there came up for consideration the matter of *The Damnable Life and Deserved Death of Doctor John Faustus* of which Thomas Orwin had lately published an edition (to be sold by Edward White) 'Newly imprinted, and in convenient places imperfect matter amended', which claimed to have been duly 'Scene and allowed'. Jeffes challenged Orwin's right to the copy, and the decision of the Court is recorded as follows: 'Yt is ordered: that if the book of Doctor Faustus shall not be found in the hall book entred to Richard Oliff [from whom Orwin had presumably obtained the manuscript] before Abell leffes claymed the same which was about May last • That then the seid copie shall Remayne to the said Abell as his proper copie from the tyme of his first clayme which was about May Last as aforeseid'. No entrance had ever been made by any of the parties concerned, and the copy did 'Remayne' to Jeffes, for it was re-entered on 5 April 1596 to Edward White 'he havinge thinterest of abell leffes thereto'. We are not informed of the ground of Jeffes's 'clayme', but since the copy was not entered in the Register and we know that there was an edition before Orwin's, we must suppose that Jeffes had either printed that edition himself or acquired an interest in it from

¹ Therefore it might be argued, and in fact has been argued, that Jeffes's edition cannot have been printed later than July, and that the entrance in October was an afterthought prompted by a desire to obstruct the appearance of White's edition. But in fact this is a mistake, for we know that he 'was printing in the autumn of 1592 (Greg, *Pierce Penniless*, p. 124). It is significant that we are told that he refused to deliver up the bar of his press (as a guarantee of not printing) and we are not told that it was seized (Court-Book B, 7 Aug. 1592).

² See *Spanish Tragedy* (1592), Malone Society reprint, pp. vi-vii; Greg, *Spanish Tragedy*, pp. 48-52.

someone else.¹ In this case, therefore, the Court allowed a claim to copyright based on prior publication without entrance to defeat, as in the case of *The Spanish Tragedy*, that of an amended edition, though we must note that the claim would itself have been defeated by a prior entrance.²

The case of *The Spanish Tragedy* illustrates the importance attached to entrance, irrespective of the nature of the copy entered, and the obstacle it put in the way of the substitution of an authorized text. That of *Doctor Faustus* on the other hand, suggests that the fact of publication alone (without entrance) could nevertheless be made the basis of a claim that the Court might in certain circumstances take into consideration, and, if it chose, convert by its sanction into a copyright.

Owing to the position taken up by A. W. Pollard the question of entrance and copyright has become involved with that of the soundness or otherwise of the texts contained in the quarto editions of Shakespeare's plays published during his lifetime.³ Starting with the distinction between what he called the 'good' and the 'bad' quartos—a distinction of course long recognized by textual critics, but upon which he laid fresh and salutary stress⁴—he endeavoured to prove a general linking between good quartos and regular publication and between bad quartos and irregular publication. His thesis was that non-entrance points to some dishonesty in obtaining the copy, and that entrance indicates authorized publication. In his own persuasive manner he wrote: 'Finding, then, as we do, that quartos which have good texts and agree with the First Folio are entered regularly in the Stationers' Registers, and that quartos which have bad texts, not agreeing at all with the First Folio, are entered in the

¹ See Greg, *Faustus*, pp. 3-4.

² The use of the word 'Remayne' might be thought to imply that copyright already existed rather than that it was created by the order, but to assume such a precise use of terms would be risky.

³ His theory was fully stated in *Folios and Quartos* in 1909, but was in some respects amplified in the lectures he delivered as Sanders Reader in Bibliography at Cambridge in 1915. These were printed in *The Library* the following year, and reissued in 1917 in book form under the rather fanciful title of *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates*. (It has been objected that 'there were no pirates and Shakespeare didn't fight them'.) A second edition with a new introduction appeared in 1920.

⁴ See p. 88.

Stationers' Registers either irregularly or not at all, we are surely justified in arguing, by what used to be called in Logic the method of Agreement and Difference, that there is some causal relation at work which connects a good text with regular entry prior to publication in the Stationers' Register. Such a causal relation would compel us to protest against the common estimate of the members of the Stationers' Company as men so lost to any consideration of honesty or prudence that on payment of 6d. they could, as a matter of routine, reward the theft of an author's manuscript, or a transcript of it, with a perpetual copyright, so that the author himself would be unable to find anyone who would dare to print for him an edition of his own book.¹

Now the fact is that this alleged linking of good texts with entrance and bad texts with non-entrance is illusory. Pollard was misled on the one hand by the exceptional regularity with which Shakespearian texts as a whole were entered, and on the other by the imperfect analysis of the texts themselves that was available when he wrote. From a review of the publications of a number of the principal and most prolific authors of the time² it appears that Shakespeare, with 82 per cent of all his (separately published) works entered, almost heads the list. Only Bishop Hall with 83 per cent, Drayton with 86 per cent, and Shirley with a record of 96 per cent, stand above him. Of the works of Churchyard, Lodge, Middleton, and Munday, less than half were entered. Or confining our observation to plays, we may note many obviously authorized publications of which no entrance was made, such as Wilmot's version of *Tancred and Gismund*, 1591, Jonson's *Votryone*, 1607, and *Catiline*, 1611, Armin's *Two Maids of Moreclacke*, 1609, Fletcher's *Faithful Shepherdess*, 1610, Middleton and Dekker's *Roaring Girl*, 1611, Dekker's *If it be not Good the Devil is in it*, 1612, Webster's *White Devil*, 1612, and John Stephens's *Cynthia's Revenge*, 1613; and there are during the same period perhaps a dozen more unregistered plays, the editions of which, though not like the above guaranteed authoritative by the prefatory matter, yet contain what are clearly 'good' texts.

On the other hand, many notoriously bad texts were regu-

¹ *Folios and Quartos*, p. 65.

² Greg, *Entrance &c.*, p. 5.

larly entered. When Pollard wrote it was still customary to regard *The First Part of the Contention between Tork and Lancaster* and *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of Tork* as source plays of 2 and 3 *Henry VI* they are now accepted as merely 'bad' texts like any others, yet the former was quite regularly entered on 12 March 1594. Again, whatever may be the relation of *The Taming of a Shrew* to the Shakespearian play, there is no doubt that it is itself a 'bad' quarto, though it was registered on 2 May 1594. *Richard III* and *King Lear* were both regularly entered, but the texts printed in 1597 and 1608 respectively, though comparatively good, are now commonly regarded as being (like the bad quartos) either memorial reconstructions or surreptitious transcripts, and it is significant that they were only used as the basis of the Folio texts after drastic correction from an authoritative source. It has been suggested that both took shape in the company that owned them (when the prompt-book was temporarily unavailable) and it is just possible that the company may have given *Richard III* to the press in 1597; but it is hardly conceivable that *King Lear* should have come into the stationers' hands honestly as late as 1607, and we have every cause to entertain the suspicions that, as Pollard admits, the association of John Busby the elder with the procuring of the manuscript would naturally arouse.¹ And we are bound to observe that whatever doubts the simultaneous entrance and transfer of the copy for *The Merry Wives* may raise in our suspicious minds, the fact remains that the entrance was perfectly regular, which proves that no awkward questions were necessarily asked when a thoroughly disreputable text was presented to the Wardens for registration.² If we look beyond Shakespeare the evidence is startling.

¹ *Folios and Quartos*, p. 76. *King Lear*, though published by Nathaniel Butter alone, was registered as the joint copy of him and Busby on 26 Nov. 1607. Busby had been concerned in the 'bad' quarto of *Henry V* in 1600 and of *The Merry Wives* in 1602.

² The case that should above all have given Pollard pause is that of *Troilus and Cressida*. He can hardly have believed that the authorities of the Stationers' Company had any nice regard for textual purity in copies submitted for their approval; what he sought to credit them with was some concern as to how the copy had been obtained and with the interests of the real owners of the work. Now *Troilus and Cressida* was duly registered in 1609, but the quarto of that year, though it contains an admittedly 'good' text, goes out of its way, in a preface, which Pollard quotes

In 1938 Leo Kirschbaum published what he called 'A Census of Bad Quartos',¹ in which he enumerated eleven non-Shakespearian pieces that he considered should be included in the class: of these eight were regularly entered, only three were not. His list is not quite complete, but among 'bad' texts regularly entered are such well-known examples as Marlowe's *Massacre at Paris* n.d.,⁵ Greene's *Orlando Furioso*, 1594, Peele's *Old Wives Tale*, 1595, *The Famous factories of Henry V*, 1598, and Heywood's *If you Know not Meyou Know Nobody*, 1605—6.² It is clear that over the whole field we cannot say that there is even a tendency for 'bad' texts to escape entrance; the proportion of 'good' and 'bad' quartos registered is very much the same.

Pollard, in *Shakespeare's Folios and Quartos*, challenged two propositions with regard to copyright that Sidney Lee had maintained in his Introduction to the Oxford facsimile. One was enunciated by Lee as follows: 'In the absence of any statutory prohibition, [publishers] freely enjoyed the right of publishing any MS., whatever might be the channel through which it reached their hands, provided that they purchased a licence for its publication of the Stationers' Company.'³ This Pollard sought to modify rather than to deny. Lee's other proposition concerned the substitution of authorized for unauthorized texts. He wrote: 'It was also

at length, to proclaim that it has been printed against the wishes of 'the grand possessors'. Yet this, Pollard considers, does 'not greatly concern us' (*Folios and Quartos*, p. 76), and elsewhere (*S.'s Fight*, p. 54) he goes so far as to specify *Troilus* as one of the plays released by the players for publication!

¹ RES, Jan. 1938, xiv. 20—43.

² It is now perhaps safe to add the A-text of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, 1604, duly entered on 7 Jan. 1601.

³ *Introduction*, p. xi. As Pollard (p. 5) was quick to notice, there is a certain misapprehension apparent in the form of Lee's statement. The sixpence commonly paid on entrance was (in Shakespeare's time at any rate) no more than the fee for registering the right conferred by the Warden's sanction of the copy. There is no evidence that (at this time) the Company exacted any payment for what Lee calls its 'licence'. But Pollard went on to commit himself to the assertion that 'We have no record of any fee having to be paid for a licence', that is for the official *imprimatur*, either. Here he was wrong. We know that Sir Henry Herbert took money for licensing books for the press as well as plays for the stage—he received £1 in cash and books to the value of £1 4s. for licensing Lord Brooke's *Works* on 17 Oct. 1632, and IQS. for licensing Cowley's *Poetical Blossoms*, entered a week later (*Partorum*, 1821, iii. 231; Adams, *Herbert*, p. 41)—and it seems only reasonable to suppose that ecclesiastical licensors also received remuneration, perhaps proportionate to the size of the work submitted.

needful to conciliate and perhaps to compensate the piratical publisher, who was first in the field and had it in his power on an appeal to the Stationers' Company to prevent the substitution of a genuine version by a second publisher for his own corrupt but fully licensed property/¹ This Pollard characterized as an 'astounding assertion, for which I doubt strongly whether a shred of evidence can be produced'² and he added that 'it would be much nearer the truth to say that the publication of a surreptitious edition left an author free to do exactly what he liked. The existence of an edition already in print absolved him from the need of a licence, and we find him simply reprinting his own text without registration or any other formality/³

Pollard knew far more than Lee did about conditions of printing and publishing in Shakespeare's day, and he was less given to inventing the materials of history. But on this occasion, and as regards the main issue, Lee was right and Pollard was wrong. Whether or no Lee could himself have supported his contentions with any weight of authority or evidence, they can be so supported. Pollard was aware that the rigour of what may be called the legal or official doctrine was in practice mitigated and its outline blurred by all sorts of human considerations, and he allowed his sense of its limitations to lead him into denying the validity of the doctrine altogether. Moreover, it has to be admitted that, in an opposite direction and with more basis of fact, Pollard at times allowed his fancy to run away with him almost as much as Sidney Lee himself. There was this difference, that whereas Lee would use his fancy to furnish the ground of his thesis—evolving the ideal camel from his own inner

¹ *Introduction*, p. xiii.

² It is, however, exactly what we have seen that Jeffes did in the case of *The Spanish Tragedy* (pp. 37-38 above).

³ *Folios and Quartos*, p. 3. Pollard might not have written so confidently had he not had a particular instance in mind. He continued: 'This is what Nashe did when Richard Johnes took advantage of his absence to register and print his *Pierce Pennilesse*. Mr. Lee, if he will read Nashe's letter to his authorized publisher, J[ohn] B[usby], will hardly contend that Nashe had found it "necessary to conciliate" Johnes.' But here Pollard almost certainly misinterpreted the evidence regarding the publication of the pamphlet, for there can be little doubt that Nashe's letter prefixed to the second edition was addressed to Jones and not to Busby, and that he was in fact unaware that the copy had changed hands (see Greg, *Pierce Penniless*).

consciousness—Pollard used his mainly for purposes of embroidery—picturing himself charging the forts of folly on the animal's back.

Although he does not mention the work, Lee might have taken his statements about the attitude of the Stationers' Company towards copyright directly from a pamphlet by George Wither entitled 'The Schollers Purgatory, discovered in the Stationers Commonwealth', which was 'Imprinted for the Honest Stationers' about 1611.¹ It is a violent and at times virulent attack on the customs and dealings of the Company. The typical stationer, Wither writes, 'If he get any written Coppy into his powre, likely to be vendible, whether the Author be willing or no, he will publish it; And it shall be contrived and named alsoe, according to his owne pleasure: which is the reason, so many good Bookes come forth imperfect, and with foolish titles'.² He does not actually say that a bookseller who had obtained and published an imperfect copy of an author's work could prevent the author from replacing it by an authorized edition, but this seems to be implied in another passage: 'Yea, and by the lawes and Orders of their Corporation, they can and do settle vpon the particuler members thereof a p[er]petuall interest in such Bookes as are Registered by them at their Hall, in their several Names: and are secured in taking the full benefit of those books, better then any Author can be by virtue of the Kings Grant, notwithstanding their first Coppies were purloyned from the true owner, or imprinted without his leave'.³ If Wither's testimony is admitted, then Lee's position must be taken as established.⁴

But the rules and customs of the Stationers' Company were domestic affairs, whose currency was limited to its own

¹ It was, naturally enough, not entered, and is said not to have been licensed. Wither himself admitted that he had had 3,000 copies printed, partly by George Wood, a notoriously unruly stationer whose secret presses appear to have been finally seized and destroyed in 1624 (DNB quoting *Cal. S.P.D.*, 1623-5, p. 143). Long extracts printed by Arber (*Transcript*, iv. 14-20) are supplemented by Pollard (*S.'s Fight*, ? 33).

² Arber, iv. 18. The complaint about titles is borne out by what Nashe says in the letter prefixed in 1592 to the second edition of *Pierce Penniless*, in which the title-page of the first was pruned into sobriety: compare the two titles of *Troilus and Cressida* in 1609.

³ Pollard, *S.'s Fight*, p. 33.

⁴ See Note G on p. 71.

members, and they had sometimes to give way in the face of outside authority or influence.¹ Pollard knew² that the works of Sir Philip Sidney were jealously guarded during his life, and that after his death the influence of his family was brought to bear to prevent or suppress unauthorized publications. The letter is still extant in which Sidney's friend Sir Fulke Greville tells Sir Francis Walsingham that he had been warned by the stationer William Ponsonby that it was proposed to print the unrevised text of the *Arcadia* that circulated in manuscript, and had been advised to have recourse to Archbishop Whitgift or to his deputy. Dr. Richard Cosen, Dean of the Arches, to prevent the granting of a licence.³ Ponsonby was rewarded by being entrusted with the publication, first of the authorized text of the unfinished work (1590) and later of the whole as completed by the Countess of Pembroke herself (1593). He was also entrusted with the authorized texts of *The Defence of Poesie* (which he entered in 1594 and published the following year, defeating a piratical entrance and edition by Henry Olney in 1595) and of *Astrophel and Stella* (which he entered and appended to the *Arcadia* in 1598, superseding the unregistered text published by Thomas Newman, which had been suppressed at Burghley's instigation on 18 September 1591⁴). Pollard also knew the case of Bacon's *Essays*, These were entered on 24 January 1597 to Richard Sergier and on 5 February re-entered to Humphrey Hooper: two days

¹ Moreover, custom was concerned with what the Ordinances failed to regulate as well as what they did. Nothing was laid down respecting the relations of publisher and author. These were, no doubt, in most cases perfectly honourable; if they were not, there was nothing in the Ordinances that demanded the interference of the Court; at the same time there was nothing to prevent the Court taking cognizance of the matter if it saw reason to do so.

² *Folios and Quartos*, pp. 7-8.

³ 'Sir this day one ponsonby a bookebynder in poles church yard, came to me, and told me that ther was one in hand to print, sir philip sydneys old arcadia asking me yf it were done, with your honors con[sent] or any of his frendes, I told him to m[y] knowledge no, then he aduysed me to giue w[ar]ninge of it, ether to the archebishope or doctor Cosen, who haue as he says a copy of it to pervse to that end': autograph letter, endorsed 'November 1586' in SPD Eliz., vol. 195, art. 33. Walsingham was Sidney's father-in-law. Ponsonby registered the *Arcadia* on 23 Aug. 1588 under the Archbishop's own hand. But if recourse was had to the ecclesiastical authorities to withhold licence, that was, of course, a matter wholly outside the purview of the Stationers' Company.

⁴ See Arber, *Transcript*, i. 555.

later the original entrance was annulled, as appears from the note 'Cancellatur ista intratio/per curiam tentam 7 februarij'. An inscription in an extant copy¹ proves that the book was on the market that very day, and it must therefore have been already printing when Hooper made his entrance. That Bacon knew that an unauthorized edition was intended appears from the dedication to his brother Anthony, dated 30 January 1597, in which he speaks of gathering his 'fruit before it is ripe, to preuent stealing'. He proceeds: 'These fragments of my conceites were going to print; To labour the staie of them had bin troublesome, and subiect to interpretation; to let them passe had beene to aduenture the wrong they mought receiue by vntrue Coppies, or by some garnishment, which it mought please any that should set them forth to bestow vpon them.'² Therefore I helde it best discreation to publish them my selfe as they passed long agoe from my pen, without any further disgrace, then the weaknesse of the Author.' If we take Bacon *au pied de la lettre* we may suppose that he left it to Hooper, with the authentic manuscript in his hand, to 'labour the staie' of Sergier's edition by an application to the Court—which would bear out Pollard's thesis even better than to suppose Bacon's personal intervention—but seeing that Hooper's entrance was made under the 'hand' of the author himself (a most unusual procedure) as well as of two ecclesiastics, we may presume that he made his wishes known to the Company, and the wishes of a prominent lawyer and Member of Parliament would not be without weight. Lastly, Pollard guessed that the servants of the Lord Chamberlain (or of any great officer of state) would be in a favourable position to get a genuine grievance brought to the notice of the Court, though he was not at the time aware of the actual intervention of the Lord Chamberlain in 1619 and again in 1637.³

It must also be borne in mind that except in so far as they were incorporated in the Charter or depended upon Decrees

¹ Pollard, *Folios and Quartos*, p. n: 'Septimo die Februarii, 39 E.R. pretium xx^d. The copy was then in the British Museum, as Pollard says, but it was sold to Carl H. Pforzheimer in May 1938 (Pforzheimer Catalogue, 1940, i, pp. xxxvii-xli).

² In fact Sergier's entrance specified 'essayes. of M. F. B. with the prayers of his Sovereigne'.
³ See p. 24, Note D, and Note H on p. 72.

of the Star-chamber, the Ordinances of the Company originated in the same Court whose business it was to administer them, so that it would be no matter for surprise if on occasion the Court allowed itself some latitude in their interpretation in the interest of equity or perhaps even of mere partiality. Pollard realized that the behaviour of the Company authorities was sometimes at variance with a strict application of accepted rules of copyright, and he was also able to make out a good case for supposing that what he called 'piracy', namely the publication of a work contrary to the interest of the author or owner, was exceptional. But, misled by the accident that most of the worst Shakespearian texts were not registered, he evolved a theory that the Court and officers of the Company had a concern for the interests of authors and owners of manuscripts and were liable to ask inconvenient questions about the way in which copies had been obtained, and that they were prepared to assist, or at least not to allow their rules to impede, the substitution of an authorized for an unauthorized edition—a theory for which no sufficient evidence can be found. The only sense of 'piracy' that an Elizabethan stationer would have understood was the infringement of another stationer's privilege or copyright, and in discussing Elizabethan publishing conditions it is perhaps desirable to confine the word to that sense.

There is one other point that should be mentioned. Misapprehension has at times arisen through allowing too much importance to the part played by the printer in book-production of the time. It was only natural that bibliographers whose approach to the subject had been through study of the great master printers of early days, of Caxton, de Worde, Pynson, Berthelet, and of later men like Grafton and Day, should instinctively think of the printer as the commanding figure in the book-trade and be inclined to exalt his function at the expense of that of the mere bookseller. But, in fact, before the end of the sixteenth century, printers, though they continued to produce books on their own account, had become very largely trade-printers, the bulk of whose output was commissioned by other stationers who possessed no presses of their own. Jaggard was a typical printer of his day.¹

¹ See pp. 7 and 56.

Though differences remained,¹ the book-trade was organizing itself on modern lines. This preoccupation with the printer's role has occasionally led to confusion in discussing copyright, and even Pollard, dealing with the rights in Shakespearian texts, was inclined to trace a connexion through the printers of the quartos rather than, or alongside of, the stationers who had registered the copies, and the same may perhaps account for his unfounded belief that it was Jaggard rather than Pavier who was the moving spirit in the Collection of 1619.² Other less informed writers have been led to postulate what they call 'printing-rights'. In a sense, of course, all early copyright was a matter of printing-rights, since it was the exclusive right of a particular stationer to print, or have printed for him, a particular work. But this is not what is intended by those who use the phrase. What they appear to mean, for they are not very explicit, is a right on the part of a printer who had once been employed to print an edition of a book, to print, or to be employed to print, future editions of the same.³ It implies, in fact, a printing-right concomitant with copyright. For the existence of such a right there is no evidence whatever. All records go to show that the owner of a copy was at liberty to print it himself (if he was a master printer) or to employ whomsoever he pleased (being a master printer) to print not only the first but equally any subsequent edition of it. That the owner often employed the same printer to print a series of editions of a work was simply a matter of convenience. The only circumstances in which any printing-right (in the sense

¹ See p. 73, Note K.

² *Folios and Quartos*, chapter vi, especially the table on p. 115; and p. in.

³ This is how it appears to be used by Crompton Rhodes in the passage already cited, p. 15'. A blunder of Pollard's unfortunately gave countenance to the idea. In *Folios and Quartos*, p. 112, he asserted that in 1630 Blount 'was able to transfer to Robert Allot the sixteen plays of Shakespeare copyrighted in 1623 as if they had been his sole property', and he was therefore forced to argue that since 'we find that the Second Folio . . . was printed for Allot by Thomas Cotes, Isaac Jaggard's successor, it seems probable that the firm had some claim on the printing contract'. The fact is, as Pollard must have known but at the moment forgot, that what Blount assigned to Allot by a deed of 26 June 1630 (registered on 16 Nov.) was 'all his estate and right in the Copies', that is to say his share of the copyright, and that the Cotes brothers were then already in possession of Isaac Jaggard's share by assignment from his widow Dorothy of 'her parte in Shackspheere playes' on (or about) 19 June 1627.

contemplated) arose was when a printer, being the owner of a copy, assigned it to another stationer, being a bookseller, with the proviso that he should have the printing of it for the new owner. Such a stipulation was not uncommon, and we may suppose that the Court of the Company (and indeed common law) would have recognized his printing-rights in the book, but only as a matter of contract between parties, not as depending upon any practice of the Company.¹

Since it is largely through the replacing of 'bad' quartos by 'good'¹ ones that the question of copyright has got involved in textual problems, it will be well to take a glance at what actually happened in the case of Shakespeare's plays. When Pollard was writing in 1909 the quartos generally recognized as 'bad' were *Romeo and Juliet*, printed by John Danter without entrance in 1597; *Henry F*' printed, in spite of an order for 'staying', by Thomas Creede for Thomas Millington and John Busby (the elder) in 1600, and entered to Thomas Pavier as formerly printed and set over to him on 14 August the same year; *The Merry Wives of Windsor*' entered to John Busby (the elder) and immediately assigned to Arthur Johnson on 18 January 1602 and printed by T(homas) C(reede) for Johnson the same year; and *Hamlet*' entered to James Roberts on 26 July 1602 but printed (by Valentine Simmes) for N(icholas) L(ing) and John Trundle in 1603.² To these Pollard added a hypothetical 'bad' quarto

¹ Perhaps it was these cases that gave rise to the misleading conception of printing-rights in general, and the notion may have been fostered by a few instances in which a printer sought to jump a claim to a book he had printed, the rights in which he believed to be derelict. It seems likely that William White, who appears to have transferred his interest in *The Spanish Tragedy* to Thomas Pavier in 1600, and who printed editions for Pavier in 1602 and 1603, sought to print one on his own account in 1610, but that Pavier intervened, seized the stock, and had the unfinished edition completed at another press the following year (*The Spanish Tragedy*, 1602, Malone Society reprint, pp. vi, xii-xiii). There is a clearer case some years later. Bernard Alsop printed editions of *The Virgin Martyr* for the copy-holder Thomas Jones in 1622 and 1631. In 1633 Jones assigned the copy to Augustine Mathewes, and he in 1641 to William Sheares. Alsop probably did not know of the transfer, for he printed an edition for himself in 1651, while Sheares asserted his right in one of 1661. Booksellers, too, occasionally jumped claims in a like manner. John Danter entered *Titus Andronicus* in 1594 and the same year printed an edition 'to be sold by Edward White & Thomas Millington', and after his disgrace and death White got Roberts and Alldie to print editions for him in 1600 and 1611, while in 1602 Millington purported to assign the copy to Pavier.

² Pollard also included *Pericles*, but since this text was never superseded, and

of *Love's Labour's Lost*. Faced with what was to him the anomaly of a good quarto for which no entrance was to be found in the Register, his natural inclination was to explain it as having been published, like the similarly unregistered 'good' quartos of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*¹ to replace a 'bad' quarto, which in this case had not survived. And in confirmation of this conjecture he was able to point to the words 'Newly corrected and augmented'¹ on the title of 1598 that so aptly parallel the 'Newly corrected, augmented, and amended' on the 'good' *Romeo and Juliet* of 1599. Here, shaky as was his aim, Pollard would seem to have hit the mark, and his conclusion has been generally accepted.

More recent criticism has added to the list of 'bad' quartos. *The First Part of the Contention of York and Lancaster* and *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York* are now recognized as merely bad texts of 2 and 3 Henry 7: the former was entered to Thomas Millington on 12 March 1594, and the two printed for him in 1594 and 1595 respectively, and again in 1600, before being entered to Thomas Pavier by assignment from him in 1602, as V and '2' Henry VI. Both *Richard III* and *King Lear* are also now regarded as 'bad' quartos of a sort, though different from the rest: both were regularly entered and the former went through a long series of editions. To yet another class belong *The Taming of a Shrew* and *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, which, whatever may be their relation to *The Taming of the Shrew* and *King John*, were treated for purposes of publication as identical with the Shakespearian plays when the Folio entrance was made in 1623. *The Taming of a Shrew* was in 1594 entered to and printed by Peter Short, after whose death it passed

the play was rejected by the First Folio editors, it need not concern us. The irregular manner of its publication more or less forced Pollard to class it as a 'bad' quarto, and bad in some measure it undoubtedly is. See p. 98. Assessment is, of course, rendered difficult by the absence of any authorized text with which to compare the quarto and by the fact of its being only in part Shakespeare's.

¹ Actually, the words are 'Newly corrected and augmented By W. Shakespere', which of course can be, and have been, interpreted to mean that the play was revised by Shakespeare from some earlier piece. But little reliance can be placed on the punctuation or lack of punctuation on title-pages of the time. For example, the enlarged edition of Marston's *Malcontent* bore on its title the words: 'Augmented by Marston. With the Additions played by the Kings Maiesties servants. Written by Ihon Webster.'

to Nicholas Ling and from him to John Smethwick in 1607. *The Troublesome Reign* was not entered: it was printed in 1591 (by Thomas Orwin) for Sampson Clarke, in 1611 by Valentine Simmes for John Helme, and in 1622 by Augustine Mathewes for Thomas Dewe, but no sort of copyright was ever established in it. It was certainly passed off as Shakespeare's play, for the second edition purported to be 'Written by W. Sh.' and the third gave his name in full.

In five out of the eleven cases mentioned—*The Taming of a Shrew*, *The First Part of the Contention of Tork and Lancaster*, *Richard III*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *King Lear*—the quarto version was protected by an original entrance; in two others—*The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of Tork* and *Henry V*—there was a later entrance or assignment that would probably have been held to confer copyright upon the holder. In none of these seven cases was the quarto text superseded before the appearance of the Folio in 1623, when extensive negotiations with quarto-owners may be supposed to have taken place. In the four remaining cases—*The Troublesome Reign of King John*, *Lovers Labours Lost*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Hamlet*—the quarto version could claim no protection. In three of these cases, probably, a 'good' quarto was promptly substituted for the bad.

The circumstances in which *Romeo and Juliet* first appeared were discreditable. Not only did Danter fail to register the copy, but it would seem that his press was seized while he was in the act of printing it.¹ Though this was not quite the end of him,² he was soon in trouble again for disorderly printing and died some time before the end of 1599.³ There

¹ Only the first four sheets were printed by him, the book being finished by another printer, possibly Edward Allde. On the title the play is said to have been acted by Lord Hunsdon's men, which suggests that printing was begun before 17 Apr. when Hunsdon was appointed Lord Chamberlain; and we learn from a minute of 10 Apr. in Court Book B that Danter's presses had been seized and brought into the Hall 'in lent last', that is between 9 Feb. and 27 Apr. See Hoppe, *Romeo and Juliet*, pp. 32, 38-41. But this does not fix the date of printing as closely as Hoppe seems to have thought.

² He printed a cony-catching pamphlet called *Mihil Mumchance his Discovery of the Art of Cheating*, which was entered on 22 Aug. 1597.

³ He left a widow, who assigned certain of his copies to William White on 24 Dec. 1599 and 6 Oct. 1600, but nothing is heard of *Romeo and Juliet*. Some of Danter's printing material passed in 1599 to Simon Stafford, but no copyrights, though Stafford appears to have inherited the 'printing-right' in *Orlando Furioso*

was clearly nothing to interfere with the substitution of an authoritative text, and such a text the Chamberlain's men entrusted for publication to Cuthbert Burby, who employed Thomas Creede to print it for him in 1599.¹ Burby did not, indeed, seek to secure his title by registration: in view of the attitude taken by the Court towards the claims of Abel Jeffes in 1592,² he may have thought it politic not to call attention to the matter by attempting to enter an already published work.

With respect to *Love's Labour's Lost*, all we know for certain is that a good text was printed by W(illiam) W(hite) for Cuthbert Burby in 1598 without entrance, and it is assumed that this was to replace a 'bad' quarto. But the circumstances are so like those of *Romeo and Juliet* that we can hardly avoid the suspicion that the 'bad' quarto, if it ever existed, was also printed by Danter, perhaps shortly before *Romeo and Juliet*,

The case of *Hamlet* differs from the others in that the play had been entered to James Roberts on 26 July 1602 and that it was in defiance of this entrance that Ling and Trundle's edition was published the following year: the only 'bad' quarto that can be strictly called piratical. It describes the acting company as 'his Highnesse seruants' and must therefore have been printed after 19 May, the date of the Letters Patent appointing them the King's men. Late in 1604 (since part of the edition is dated 1605) the company decided to release the genuine text, and this was duly printed by Roberts for Ling. We can hardly suppose that Ling was the corn-

that Danter had reserved when he assigned the copy to Cuthbert Burby in 1594. That Danter's unassigned copies were regarded as derelict is confirmed by the case of *Titus Andronicus* (see p. 49').

¹ Hoppe believes that there was some close association between Danter and Burby and that in fact the rights which he supposes Danter to have had in *Romeo and Juliet* passed after his death to Burby (pp. 10-13). There appears to be insufficient evidence to support such a view. He even suggests (p. 14) that Burby was, or considered himself, the real publisher of Danter's *Romeo and Juliet* in 1597; which seems merely perverse. In any case it is unlikely that a respectable liveryman like Burby would have been in close association with a rascal like Danter, or that, if he were known to be, he would have been employed in the very search which led to Danter's final downfall (p. 34). If there were, after all, anything in Hoppe's belief that Burby was in some way Danter's representative, it would bring the case of *Romeo and Juliet* into line with that of *Hamlet*.

² See p. 38.

pany's choice: they presumably entrusted the manuscript to Roberts, from which we may conjecture that the entrance of 1602 had been made with their consent—possibly with a view to blocking the way to publication. There can be little doubt that had Roberts taken the case before the Court he could have got the Ling-Trundle edition condemned and suppressed: instead he evidently preferred to come to a friendly understanding with Ling, and allow him to publish the authorized text, only reserving the printing of it to himself. Trundle disappeared: it may be that the part played by this young stationer was that of procurer of the surreptitious text,¹ and that Ling had published it without knowing of Roberts's entry.

The case of *The Troublesome Reign of King John* stands on an altogether different footing. It purports to have been acted by the Queen's men; but we know comparatively little of the affairs of the companies at this early date, or with which, if any, Shakespeare was associated. We can therefore hardly guess what likelihood there would have been of replacing *The Troublesome Reign* by Shakespeare's version, even supposing that this was already in existence in 1591. By 1611, when Shakespeare's name was first associated with the printed piece, his genuine work was already old, and there would be little temptation to publish it, and in 1622, when the false ascription was formally made, the Folio was on the eve of publication.

It seems, therefore, that the players as a rule took steps to replace spurious versions of Shakespeare's plays by authoritative texts in those cases in which no entrance in the Register stood in the way. At the same time it would be unwise to lay any great stress on the distinction between registered and unregistered copies. If in 1604 Roberts came to terms with Ling, who must have pretended some title, however irregular, to *Hamlet* it is difficult to believe that the company could not have made arrangements to replace some of the registered 'bad' quartos had they been really anxious to do so. Neither they, nor anyone else at the time, would have thought the texts of *Richard III* and *King Lear*

¹ It reminds one somewhat of the part played by Daniel Frere in the case of Lambarde's *Archeion*: see p. 72, Note H.

sufficiently defective to be worth superseding.¹ But surely Cuthbert Burby, to whom they entrusted the authorized texts of *Love's Labour V Lost* and *Romeo and Juliet* would have been anxious enough to negotiate for Shakespeare's version of *The Taming of the Shrew*. Would Millington, and after him Pavier, have rejected advances in respect of *Henry V* and two parts of *Henry VI* or Johnson in respect of *The Merry Wives*? It may well have been thought more important that sound texts should be available of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* than of the *Shrew* and *Henry* plays: but why greater solicitude over *Love's Labour's Lost* than over *The Merry Wives*? In fact, it is very difficult to see why, in the matter of redemption, some were chosen and others left.

Pollard's two main works, *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos* and *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates* are intrinsically so important in the history of Shakespearian textual bibliography, and have had so wide an influence, that it has been necessary to devote considerable space to them here. In some respects the outlook has changed since he wrote, and if the view here taken is correct, he was mistaken over certain aspects of the case. But his central position, that it is only to a few admittedly 'bad' quartos that the terms stolen and surreptitious can be applied and that the great majority are on the contrary of very high textual authority, stands unshaken and is almost universally accepted today. To this all that now seems to us mistaken and occasionally perverse is incidental and ancillary, and it may even be fortunate that a certain lack of information and a certain restriction of view enabled him to put his case with a neatness and simplicity that we now recognize to be misleading, but which at the time undoubtedly helped to win it general acceptance. Moreover, Pollard's opinions did not stand still: 'Students of these matters must be prepared to live and learn, for they are not quite cleared up yet', he wrote, nearly twenty years after his Sandars lectures,² and with a confident optimism that after another twenty years we can only envy. Among his last

¹ It is one of the great merits of the Folio editors that they recognized the inferior nature of the printed texts of these plays and only used them as the basis of their own after they had been, thoroughly corrected by comparison with authoritative manuscripts (see pp. 192 ff.,¹ 34 ff.).

² S.'s Text, p. 286.

writings was the chapter on 'Shakespeare's Text' that he contributed in 1934 to *A Companion to Shakespeare Studies*. In this he recognized the pertinence of the case of *The Spanish Tragedy* and suggested that the registration of 2 *Henry VI* and *The Merry Wives* may have been the reason why these bad quartos were not superseded. Such admissions largely undermine his former position, and though this was never formally abandoned, he went so far as to admit that in his earlier works it 'was supported by some contentions of doubtful validity, and needed supplementing'.¹ It is pleasant to believe that had he lived to read these pages, he might not have found very much with which to disagree.²

There is one other matter on which something must be said, namely, the interpretation of imprints.³ These are, of course, intended to convey certain information respecting the production of the book in which they appear, but we must remember that this information was not designed to satisfy the curiosity of bibliographers; it was no more than what the stationer thought well to impart to a prospective purchaser. It may not reveal the whole facts respecting publication and what it does reveal may not always be the exact truth. Still, in the great majority of cases the information appears to be reasonably straightforward and complete, and, so far as we can check it, accurate.

Once the author has done his part, it needs the co-operation of three agents before a book can be placed in the hands of readers.⁴ First there is the capitalist who finds the money and directs the undertaking: he is the publisher.⁵ Next there is the craftsman, the printer, who manufactures the material book.⁶ Lastly there is the tradesman or bookseller who distributes it.⁷ These three functions may be kept distinct or they may be combined in various ways. In early times, of course, a printer produced his books at his own expense (unless he

¹ S.'s *Text*, p. 267.

² See Note I on p. 72.

³ The term must be taken to include colophons.

⁴ Greg, *Pub. First Folio*, pp. 130-4; *Entrance &c.*, pp. 14-22.

⁵ We are not here concerned with works subsidized from outside, whether by patron or by the author.

⁶ See Note J on p. 73.

⁷ See Note K on p. 73.

was helped by a patron) and sold them at his own house,¹ thus combining the functions of printer, publisher, and bookseller. But there soon arose a class of stationers who did not themselves own presses, but who made a living as booksellers, stocking and selling books printed by other men.² And if a printer was too busy, or his premises too cramped, to deal conveniently and to the best advantage with the retail trade, he might appoint such a stationer as his agent, to sell his books for him on commission, while he continued to finance the work himself. Or else a bookseller might come into possession of a manuscript of sufficient interest to tempt him to invest his own money in its publication. In that case he could pay a printer to produce an edition, for him to sell to his own profit. This seems to have proved a popular arrangement, and the later sixteenth century saw the rise of a regular class of capitalist publishers other than printers, and the early seventeenth the continued decline of the printer-publisher.³ Lastly, as trade grew in volume and complexity, it sometimes happened that a publisher would on the one hand employ a printer to produce a book for him, and on the other hand farm out the retailing to a bookseller, thus achieving complete functional differentiation.

It is these arrangements that are reflected in the imprints. The earliest and simplest form is 'printed by so-and-so', usually with the addition of an address. At the other extreme, and comparatively late, are imprints of the type, 'Printed (by A.B.) for C.D. to be sold by E.F.' Here there can be no question about the interpretation: A.B. is the printer, C.D. the publisher, and E.F. the bookseller. We shall therefore naturally interpret on similar lines two less explicit forms of imprint that are commonly met with. 'Printed by A.B. and sold by C.D.' will mean 'Printed by A.B. (for himself) and sold by C.D. (as his agent)'; A.B.

¹ See Note L on p. 73.

² See Note M on p. 74.

³ An early trade-printer was Nicholas Hill or Montanus or van de Berghe, who between 1546 and 1553 printed some two dozen books for no less than sixteen different stationers (Bennett, *Books and Readers*, pp. 235-6).

⁴ Where the printer is not also the publisher his name may not appear. The publisher always gives his name, or at any rate his initials, unless he has a reason for concealment; and the bookseller's name and address are naturally needed to tell the public where the book is on sale.

being the printer-publisher: Trinted (by A.B.) for C.D.' will mean Trinted by A.B. for (and to be sold by) C.D./; C.D. being the publishing bookseller.

The entrances in the Stationers' Register enable us to check these interpretations, for it is natural to suppose the publisher to be the owner of the copy. In the vast majority of cases we find that the evidence of the imprints is consistent with that of the entries. On the other hand, in a comparatively small but yet substantial number the expected identification of the publisher with the copyholder breaks down. In an important article¹ M. A. Shaaber discussed a great variety of cases and possibilities and came to the conclusion that the formulas 'printed for' and 'sold by' were sometimes used indifferently—from which it would of course follow that a strict interpretation of imprints is not always possible. At the same time, since there can be no ambiguity in the interpretation of the full type of imprint, it would be curious if the same phrases, when used in the shorter forms, bore a different meaning.

The trouble arises, of course, from the assumption that it was invariably the owner of the copy who financed the publication. And for this assumption, natural as it appears, there really seems to be no ground at all. That it was the common practice is proved by its being borne out by the great majority of examples. But between 1557 and 1640 we know of some 150 cases in which it is not.² In about two-thirds of these we find a printer printing his own copy 'for' someone else: in the remaining third a copy is printed only 'to be sold by' its owner. Now it is surely possible that when work was slack a printer might sometimes buy a likely copy with a view to keeping his press occupied, although for financial or other reasons he might not find it convenient to print it at his own expense. He would then look round for a bookseller willing to invest money in an edition and to employ him to print it, while he himself retained the copyright. Such an arrangement would account for two-thirds of the anomalous cases. On the other hand it is possible, though less likely, that a

¹ 'The Meaning of the Imprint in Early Printed Books', *The Library*, Dec.-Mar. 1943-4, xxiv. 120-41 (see particularly p. 130).

² Greg, *Entrance 6fr.*, p. 16.

bookseller, having purchased a copy, might for similar reasons find it inconvenient at the moment to pay for the printing of it himself, but that he might find a printer willing to bear the cost of an edition, while allowing him the benefit of distribution. Such an arrangement would account for most of the remaining cases. Happenings of this sort would probably not be frequent, but it would be surprising if they never occurred. That they did sometimes occur seems to be proved by a few anomalous cases of the full type of imprint, in which, as has already been said, there can be no doubt about the relation of the parties, the stationer 'for' whom the book was printed being necessarily the publisher. Yet in three instances we find that the copyright belonged, not to the man 'for' whom the book was printed, but to him by whom it was 'sold',¹ and it is plain that the copyholder, being unable to publish the book himself, found, not a printer, but another bookseller to bear the expense. In these cases it would be perverse to argue that 'printed for C.D. to be sold by E.F.' really meant 'printed for E.F. to be sold by C.D.'²

It is indeed possible, it is even probable, that terms were occasionally used loosely or erroneously, but it seems likely that in all but a very few exceptional cases imprints are to be interpreted strictly according to their wording, and they have been so interpreted in the present work. There are, no doubt, further subtleties of interpretation that may be discovered in regard, for example, to the presence or absence of addresses or the significance of obviously incomplete imprints, but they need not be considered here. Some may point to irregularities of publication; others have probably a perfectly innocent explanation.³

When the First Folio was on the point of publication⁴ the following entrance was made in the Hall Book of the Stationers' Company, the Register as it is commonly called:⁵

¹ Greg, *Entrance & c.*, p. 18. The cases are: 1607, STC 21507; 1611, STC 4705; 1625, STC 1687.

² See Note N on p. 74.

³ See Note O on p. 74.

⁴ See p. 453.

⁵ The importance of the entry suggests that it should be here reproduced in type-facsimile.

8°. Nouembris. 1623 Rs lac'. 21°. ...

M ^r . Blounte	Entred for their Copie vnder the hands	} vij ² ' .
Isaak laggard,	of M ^r . Do ^r . Worrall and M ^r . Cole	
	warden M ^r . William Shakspeers Comedye	
	Histories, & Tragedyes soe manie of t h	
	said Copies as are not formerly entred to	
	other men. viz ¹ _____.	

The Tempest

The two gentlemen of Verona

Measure for Measure

The Comedy of Errors

Comedyes. As you like it

All's well that ends well

Twelve night

The winters tale

Histories The thirde parte of Henry y^e sixt
Henry the eight

Coriolanus

Timon of Athens

Iulius Caesar

Traged.es. Mackbeth

Anthonie & Cleopatra

Cymbeline¹

The Dr. Worrall who granted the official licence was doubtless Thomas Worrall, at this time apparently an unbeneficed clergyman, chaplain to the Bishop of London, who had lately taken the degree of D.D.² and shortly (1624) became rector of Saint Botolph's, Bishopsgate, and later (1627) a prebendary of Saint Paul's.

The first thing to notice about the entry is that it contains several oversights. To begin with, the fee should have been not 75. but 85. for the sixteen plays named.³ Next, the implication that the plays included in the First Folio but not in the entrance had been 'formerly entred to other men' is misleading, for several had been printed without entrance.⁴

¹ The entry is on p. 69 of Register D. For facsimiles see Gollancz, *Introduction*, pp. xviii-xix, and Greg, *Bibl Drama*, i, frontispiece. The 'hands' under which the entrance was made are, of course, those of the ecclesiastical licenser (see p. 29) and of George Cole, who was Upper Warden for the year 1623-4 (see P- 29)«

² He first appears as 'Doctor' in the Register on 23 Sept.³ 1623: he is plain 'Master' on the 15th.

⁴ See Note P on p. 74.

¹ This fact might be cited as showing that the Clerk regarded printing as

Lastly, it was not the 'thirde part' but the First Part of Henry VI that was new.¹

Furthermore, we observe that for the purposes of copyright certain plays of the Folio were treated as identical with texts already in print. The Second and Third Parts of Henry VI had previously appeared as *The First Part of the Contention of Tork and Lancaster* and *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of Tork*; *The Merry Wives of Windsor* had appeared as *Sir John Falstaff and the Merry Wives*; and Henry V under the same title—however inferior the published texts might be. Not only so: from the same point of view Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew* was treated as identical with the *Taming of a Shrew* printed in 1594, and his *King John* with the *Troublesome Reign of King John* printed as early as 1591²—at least this seems to be the only explanation of the absence of these two plays from the new entrance.

Neither Blount nor Jaggard had hitherto published any Shakespearian play. Jaggard, it is true, had printed the Collection of 1619, but in so doing he had (on the face of it at any rate) merely been acting for Pavier. In regard to copyrights their previous position was rather uncertain. Jaggard had, through Roberts, possible though ill-defined claims to *Hamlet* and *Troilus and Cressida*. Blount's position was more interesting. On 20 May 1608 he had entered both *Pericles Prince of Tyre* and *Antony and Cleopatra* but had done nothing more about them.³ *Pericles* was in fact published the follow-

establishing as good a right to a copy as entrance: on the other hand, it might be argued that since Blount and Jaggard did not claim the rights of previously printed plays the Clerk assumed that they must all have been entered. In fact, of course, the phrasing is merely loose and no inference can be drawn from it.

¹ The slip was an easy one; all the more that *The First Part of the Contention of Tork and Lancaster* and *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of Tork* had already appeared in the Register on 19 Apr. 1602 as 'The first and Second parte of henry the vijth'.

² This fact must be borne in mind when considering whether the relationship between the two pairs is the same. But before using it as evidence of what that relationship is, we should want to know whether Blount and Jaggard would, from the point of view of copyright, have treated Shakespeare's *Richard III* and *King Lear* as identical with *The True Tragedy of Richard III* (1594) and *King Leir* (1605) had not the Shakespearian versions been previously published—when they were in fact entered as distinct plays.

³ The wording of the entrance of *Pericles*—'a booke called. The booke of Pericles Prynce of Tyre'—points to its having been the official prompt-book that he submitted for registration (see p. 100, Note B), and it might be argued that this

ing year, in contravention of Blount's entrance and in a distinctly dubious text, by Henry Gosson. *Antony and Cleopatra* had not been printed, and in 1623 Blount had either forgotten his former entrance or was in doubt of its validity after the lapse of fifteen years. Unlike Blount and Jaggard, the other two members of the Folio syndicate, John Smethwick and William Aspley, had each published and owned the copyright of certain plays of Shakespeare, and it was no doubt to this fact that they owed their share in the undertaking.

The bibliographical history of the plays printed in the First Folio but not included in the entry of 1623, in chronological order, is as follows.

King John

Treated as identical with

The Troublesome Reign of King John.

Not entered.

Printed (in two parts) (by Thomas Orwin) for Sampson Clarke, 1591.

Clarke is last heard of in 1598.

Printed by Valentine Simmes for John Helme, 1611, as 'by W. Sh.'

Helme died in 1616-17 leaving a widow, Anne, who on 3 December 1627 transferred his copies (not including the play) to William Washington.

Printed by Augustine Mathewes for Thomas Dewe, 1622, as 'by W. Shakespeare'.

Dewe died in 1625 and his copies (not including the play) somehow passed to Anne Helme and were included in the transfer of 1627.

No copyright was ever established in the play, which in 1623 was derelict.

Titus Andronicus

Entered to John Danter, 6 February 1594, together with a ballad of the same.

Printed by John Danter to be sold by Edward White and Thomas Millington, 1594.

Danter's press was confiscated in 1597 and he was dead by 7 July 1599.

Printed by J(ames) R(oberts) for Edward White, 1600.

White apparently acted on the strength of having been joint-bookseller of the edition of 1594.

Entered to Thomas Pavier by assignment from Thomas Millington, 19 April 1602, *saluo iure cuiuscunque*, but no valid rights existed.

suggests that the entrances were in, fact what have been called 'blocking entries' (made not with a view to publication, but on behalf of the acting company with a view to preventing unauthorized publication by another stationer) such as James Roberts is sometimes supposed to have made earlier. In 1608 Roberts had recently retired.

Millington's claim, like White's, was apparently based on having been joint-bookseller of the edition of 1594.

Printed (by Edward Allde) for Edward White, 1611.

All real copyright in the play lapsed on Danter's death. White was dead early in 1613 leaving a widow who is only heard of that year. The copy was derelict save for Pavier's very dubious claim.

2 *Henry VI*

The First Part of the Contention of York and Lancaster, entered to Thomas Millington, 12 March 1594.

Printed (in a 'bad' text) by Thomas Creede for Thomas Millington, 1594.

Printed by Valentine Simmes for Thomas Millington, 1600.

Entered to Thomas Pavier by assignment from Millington as the First Part of *Henry VI*, 19 April 1602, *saluo iure cuiuscunque*, but the title was perfectly good.

Printed as part of *The Whole Contention of Lancaster and York* (by William Jaggard) for T(homas) P(avier) in 1619.

Pavier's title to the printed version was perfectly sound.

The Taming of the Shrew

Treated as identical with

The Taming of a Shrew.

Entered to Peter Short, 2 May 1594.

Printed (in a 'bad' text) by Peter Short to be sold by Cuthbert Burby, 1594.

Printed by P(eter) S(hort) to be sold by Cuthbert Burby, 1596.

Short died in 1603 and was succeeded by his widow, Emma, who in 1604 married Humphrey Lownes; but no assignment of copies is recorded.

Entered to Nicholas Ling by order of a Court and with Burby's consent, 22 January 1607.

Burby surrendered whatever rights he might have in the plays mentioned in the entry: he had none in this particular copy, nor is it implied that he claimed any.

Printed by V(alentine) S(immes) for Nicholas Ling, 1607.

Entered to John Smethwick as a copy 'Whiche dyd belonge to Nicholas Lynge', 19 November 1607.

Ling would appear to have been already dead, though his will was not proved till 1610.

Ling's title to the copy was evidently valid, and so presumably was Smethwick's.

3 *Henry VI*

The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of Yorke. Not entered, but it may possibly have been thought to be covered by Millington's entrance of *The First Part of the Contention of York and Lancaster* in 1594.

Printed (in a 'bad' text) by P(eter) S(hort) for Thomas Millington, 1595 (8°).

Printed by W(illiam) W(hite) for Thomas Millington, 1600.

Entered to Thomas Pavier by assignment from Millington as the Second Part of *Henry VI*, 19 April 1602, *saluo iure cuiuscunque*, but the title would perhaps have been recognized.
Pavier's title to the printed version may be regarded as valid.

Richard II

Entered to Andrew Wise, 29 August 1597.
Printed by Valentine Simmes for Andrew Wise, 1597, 1598 (twice).
Entered to Matthew Law by consent of a Court as set over to him from Andrew Wise, 25 June 1603.
Wise is not heard of again and may have been dead.
Printed ('With new additions') by W(illiam) W(hite) for Matthew Law, 1608.
Printed (by Thomas Purfoot) for Matthew Law, 1615.
Both Wise's and Law's titles to the copy were obviously sound.

Richard III

{*The True Tragedy of Richard III* Entered to Thomas Creede, 19 June 1594.
Printed by Thomas Creede to be sold by William Barley, 1594.]
Richard III Entered to Andrew Wise, 20 October 1597.
Printed (in a doubtful text) by Valentine Simmes for Andrew Wise, 1597.
Printed by Thomas Creede for Andrew Wise, 1598, 1602.
Entered to Matthew Law by consent of a Court as set over to him from Andrew Wise, 25 June 1602 (cf. *Richard II*).
Printed by Thomas Creede to be sold by Matthew Law, 1605, 1612.
Printed by Thomas Purfoot to be sold by Matthew Law, 1622.
Both Wise's and Law's titles to the copy were obviously sound, though the latter apparently delegated his right of publication.

Romeo and Juliet

Not entered.
Printed (in a 'bad' text) by John Danter, 1597 (before 17 Mar.).
Danter's press was seized in the course of Lent while he was engaged on the play (which was completed by another printer) and he was dead by 7 July 1599.
Printed (in a 'good' text) by Thomas Creede for Cuthbert Burby, 1599.
Entered to Nicholas Ling by order of a Court and with Burby's consent, 22 January 1607.
Burby had no formal rights in the copy, though he had been entrusted with an authorized text to replace Danter's.
Entered to John Smethwick as a copy 'Whiche dyd belonge to Nicholas Lynge', 19 November 1607 (cf. *The Taming of the Shrew*).
Printed (by John Windet) for John Smethwick, 1609.
An undated edition also printed for Smethwick may be after 1623.
Ling's title was certainly sound, and so apparently was Smethwick's.

i *Henry IV*

Entered to Andrew Wise, 25 February 1598.

(A fragment only is known of the first edition, presumably printed by Short for Wise in 1598.)

Printed by P(eter) S(hort) for Andrew Wise, 1598.

Printed by S(imon) S(tafford) for Andrew Wise, 1599.

Entered to Matthew Law by consent of a Court as set over to him from Andrew Wise, 25 June 1603 (cf. *Richard II*).

Printed by Valentine Simmes for Matthew Law, 1604.

Printed (by John Windet) for Matthew Law, 1608.

Printed by W(illiam) W(hite) for Matthew Law, 1613.

Printed by T(homas) P(urfoot) to be sold by Matthew Law, 1622.

Both Wise's and Law's titles were obviously sound, though the latter ended by delegating his right of publication.

Love's Labour 's Lost

Not entered.

[From the words 'Newly corrected and augmented' on the title of the edition of 1598 it seems likely that this (like the edition of *Romeo and Juliet* 'Newly corrected, augmented, and amended' in 1599) was published to replace a lost edition containing a 'bad' text.]

Printed by W(illiam) W(hite) for Cuthbert Burby, 1598.

Entered to Nicholas Ling by order of a Court and with Burby's consent, 22 January 1607 (cf. *Romeo and Juliet*).

Entered to John Smethwick as a copy 'Whiche dyd belonge to Nicholas Lynge', 19 November 1607 (cf. *The Taming of the Shrew*). (Smethwick published an edition in 1631.)

Ling's title was certainly sound, and so apparently was Smethwick's.

Henry V

[*The Famous Victories of Henry V*. Entered to Thomas Creede, 14 May 1594. Printed by Thomas Creede, 1598.

In 1616 Creed took as partner Bernard Alsop, who succeeded him the following year.

Printed by Bernard Alsop (to be sold by Timothy Barlow), 1617.]

Henry V. Not entered: 'to be staied', 4 August 1600.

Printed (in a 'bad' text) by Thomas Creede for Thomas Millington and John Busby (the elder), 1600.

Entered to Thomas Pavier as 'formerlye printed & sett over', 14 August 1600.

Nothing is said of Millington's or Busby's consent, and the entrance was 'by direction of the Under Warden and not of a Court, but it was formally valid.

Printed by Thomas Creede for Thomas Pavier, 1602.

Printed (by William Jaggard) for T(homas) P(avier), with the date '1608' but actually in 1619.

Pavier's title, though shady, was doubtless recognized.

2 *Henry IF*

Entered to Andrew Wise and William Aspley, 23 August 1600.

Printed by V(alentine) S(immes) for Andrew Wise and William Aspley, 1600.

Wise is last heard of in 1603, and the play is not among his copies entered to Matthew Law on 25 June.

Aspley's title by survivorship was sound.

Much Ado about Nothing

'to be staied', 4 August 1600.

For the rest the history is the same as that of 2 *Henry 17*.

Aspley's title was good.

A Midsummer-Night's Dream

Entered to Thomas Fisher, 8 October 1600.

Printed (by Richard Bradock?) for Thomas Fisher, 1600.

Nothing is heard of Fisher after the autumn of 1601; he made no assignment and apparently left no heir.

Printed 'by Iames Roberts, 1600.', but actually by William Jaggard for Thomas Pavier in 1619.

Derelict.

The Merchant of Venice

Entered to James Roberts, 22 July 1598, 'Prouided that yt bee not prynted by the said Iames Robertes; or anye other whatsoeuer without lycence first had from the Right honorable the lord Chamberlen', meaning, no doubt, without leave of the Chamberlain's company.

Entered to Thomas Hayes, by Roberts's consent, 28 October 1600.

Printed by J(ames) R(oberts) for Thomas Hayes, 1600.

Printed 'by I. Roberts, 1600.', but actually by William Jaggard for Thomas Pavier in 1619.

Entered to Lawrence Hayes by consent of a Court as a copy of his father's,

Thomas Hayes, 8 July 1619. (Lawrence Hayes published an edition in 1637.)

Thomas Hayes's title was sound, and so was his son's.

The Merry Wives of Windsor

*Sir John Fahtaff and the Merry Wives of Windsor**, entered to John Busby (the elder), and immediately re-entered, by assignment from Busby, to Arthur Johnson, 18 January 1602.

Printed (in a 'bad' text) by T(homas) C(reede) for Arthur Johnson, 1602.

Printed 'for Arthur Johnson', but actually by William Jaggard for Thomas Pavier, 1619.

Probably printed with Johnson's consent.

Johnson's title to the printed version was sound.

Hamlet

Entered to James Roberts, 26 July 1602.

Printed (in a 'bad' text) (by Valentine Simmes) for N(icholas) L(ing) and John Trundell, 1603 (after 19 May).

Printed (in a 'good' text) by J(ames) R(oberts) for N(icholas) L(ing), 1604-5. Trundle, who may be supposed to have procured the 'bad' text, vanishes (like Busby in the case of *King Lear*).

Entered to John Smethwick as a copy 'Whiche dyd belonge to Nicholas Lyng', 19 November 1607 (cf. *The Taming of the Shrezw*).

Evidently Roberts consented to Ling's edition of the 'good' text (in which Ling ignored his former partner) and, since in 1607 the Wardens recognized the copy as Ling's, there may have been a private assignment from Roberts, who is not heard of after 1606, and may have been already dead. In the absence of any such understanding it would appear that Smethwick's title might have been challenged by William Jaggard as Roberts's successor.

Printed (by Valentine Simmes?) for John Smethwick, 1611.

An undated edition, also for Smethwick, may be after 1623.

Smethwick's title, if not necessarily valid, was evidently recognized.

"King Lear

[*King Letr*. Entered to Edward White (replacing Adam Islip), 14 May 1594.

Entered to Simon Stafford, and immediately re-entered to John Wright (Stafford to have the printing), 8 May 1605.

Printed by Simon Stafford for John Wright, 1605.]

King Lear. Entered to Nathaniel Butter and John Busby (the elder), 26 November 1607.

Printed (in a doubtful text) (by Nicholas Okes) for Nathaniel Butter, 1608.

Busby, who may be supposed to have procured the copy, vanishes (as Trundle does in the case of *Hamlet*).

Printed 'for Nathaniel Butter, 1608.', but actually by William Jaggard for Thomas Pavier in 1619.

Probably printed with Butter's consent.

Butter's title to the printed text was sound.

Troilus and Cressida

Entered to James Roberts in full Court 'to print when he hath gotten sufficient authority for yt', 7 February 1603.

Entered to Richard Bonian and Henry Walley, 28 January 1609.

Printed by G. Eld for Richard Bonian and Henry Walley, 1609.

The original title-page, which stated that the play 'was acted by the Kings Maiesties seruants at the Globe', was cancelled and a preface was added claiming that it was 'neuer stal'd with the Stage, neuer clapper-clawd with the palmes of the vulger', nor 'sullied, with the smoaky breath of the multitude', which implies that the piece, if acted at all, had not appeared on the public stage. The writer adds: 'thanke fortune for the scape it hath made amongst you. Since by the grand possessors wills I beleeeue you

should haue prayd for them rather then beene prayd', implying that the publication was without the consent of the King's men. (Cf. p. 445.)

Bonian is last heard of on 19 February 1611.

Walley's title by survivorship was sound except for a possible claim under Roberts's original entrance.

Othello

Entered to Thomas Walkley, 6 October 1621.

Printed by N(icholas) O(kes) for Thomas Walkley, 1622.

At this date the play can hardly have been published except by leave of the King's company, and since the Folio was already in preparation they presumably reserved the right of inclusion.

[As you Like it]

'to be staied', 4 August 1600. Entered in 1623.]

\Antony and Cleopatra

Entered to Edward Blount, 20 May 1608. Re-entered in 1623.]

[Pericles]

Not included in the Folio.

Entered to Edward Blount, 20 May 1608.

Printed (in a 'bad' text) (by William White) for Henry Gosson, 1609 (twice).

Printed by S(imon) S(tafford), 1611.

Printed (by William Jaggard) for T(homas) P(avier), 1619.

The first edition contravened the entrance, and clearly no copyright was recognized. The copy was derelict.]

The position of the aforementioned plays with regard to copyright may be summarized as follows.

Three copies were derelict, namely *King John* (represented by *The Troublesome Reign\ Titus Andronicus* (subject to a very dubious claim by Pavier), and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*. So was *Pericles'* and it cannot, therefore, have been difficulties over copyright that caused its exclusion from the Folio. In the cases of *The Troublesome Reign* and *Pericles* no rights had ever been established: in those of *Titus Andronicus* and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* perfectly valid titles had lapsed on the death of the owner without heir or assignee. In these cases the right had technically fallen to the Company, to be granted at the discretion of the Court; but save in exceptional cases such copies were treated as anyone's property.

Members of the syndicate held the title to six plays.

Smethwick owned four: *The Taming of the Shrew* (represented by *A Shrew*), *Romeo and Juliet*, *Love's Labour's Lost* and *Hamlet*. In each case a technical flaw could be found in the title, but all were no doubt recognized. Aspley owned 2 *Henry IF* and *Much Ado about Nothing* with identical histories.

Outside the syndicate the most important owners were Law and Pavier.

Law had sound title to *Richard II*, *Richard III* (a doubtful text), and i *Henry IV*, all derived from Wise. These were popular pieces, but there is some suggestion that he was either uninterested or embarrassed, for in several cases he preferred to act as bookseller rather than publish them himself; which may explain his absence from the syndicate. He did not, however, relinquish his title. He must, one supposes, have been compensated, but negotiations appear to have been difficult, though matters were in the end composed.¹

Pavier had three copyrights of varying validity but probably recognized, and he may have had some vague pretension to the derelict *Titus Andronicus*. His title to 2 *Henry VI* (through *The First Part of the Contention*) was sound. That to 3 *Henry VI* (through *The True Tragedy*) was similar, except that the original publisher had failed to enter the copy (perhaps thinking it covered by that of the former play). Pavier had printed *Henry V* in pursuance of a rather vague and irregular entrance, but this may perhaps have been regarded as conferring a title. All three were 'bad' texts, but they might have given him an entry into the syndicate but for his attempted collection of 1619. As it was he probably received some compensation, at least for the *Henry VI* copies, especially as he was a personal friend of Jaggard.²

No other stationer held rights in more than a single play. Lawrence Hayes had established his title to *The Merchant of Venice* in 1619. Johnson controlled *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (through the 'bad' text of *Sir John Falstaff*). Butter had a valid title to the rather doubtful text of *King Lear*. *Troilus and Cressida* belonged in effect by survivorship to Walley, in spite of an earlier entrance by Roberts. Lastly,

i See pp. 443-4.

2 See p. 93.

Othello was Walkley's, but the right of inclusion in the Folio had probably been reserved.

With most of these men negotiations were presumably opened, and were sooner or later satisfactorily concluded, except in the case of Walley who, it seems, proved obstructive and was probably in the end ignored.¹

NOTE A (page 28)

See Dawson, *Copyright*. An author's rights in his works were first recognized by the Act of 8 Anne, c. 19 (1709), which gave him protection for fourteen years. By a curious irony it was later decided by the House of Lords that there had always existed such a right in perpetuity at common law, but that this had been abrogated by the statute (see Pollard, *S.'s Fight*, pp. 4—5, quoting A. Birrell, *Seven Lectures on the Law and History of Copyright in Books*, 1899). But no one seems to have suspected the right till after it had ceased to exist. No doubt there was a vague feeling abroad that an author, or at any rate the possessor, of a work had an equitable right to the same, a feeling that finds expression in certain phrases (clearly emanating from the players) in the Lord Chamberlain's letter to the Stationers in 1637 (see p. 24, note D), in which such a claim is argued to be 'agreeable to common justice & that indifferent measure which euery man would looke for in his owne particular', though it is recognized that it might require the intervention of the King in Council to enforce it.

NOTE B (page 28)

This of course benefited the author indirectly, for, as Pollard has well observed, 'although the ordinances of the Stationers' Company took no account whatever of the rights of authors, [the protection they afforded] was a gain to these as well as to printers and publishers. Next to being able to secure perpetual copyright in his writings for himself, the best thing that could happen to an author was to be able to sell his books to someone else who could do so. The copyright which the Stationers' Company conferred on the publisher who entered a book in its register, by increasing his prospect of profit made it possible to increase also the remuneration of the author, nor was there such a total absence of competition between rival publishers as to oblige an author to accept whatever he was offered' (*S.'s Fight*, pp. 23—24). Regarding the remuneration of authors at this period Pollard has some interesting remarks, but though 'an author's property in his literary work had become a tangible asset', the evidence hardly justifies his conclusion that 'it is difficult to believe that printers and publishers could appropriate it at pleasure by surreptitiously obtaining a copy of the manuscript' (*Folios and Quartos*, pp. 5-6). It was the incorporation of the Stationers' Company in 1557 that made possible the regulations underlying Elizabethan copyright. Before that, stationers and authors alike were keenly aware of the uncertainty of their position. John

i See pp. 447-9.

QUESTIONS OF COPYRIGHT

Mychel of Canterbury in his *Breviat Chronicle*, 1551, argues with his 'frendes and brothers of the occupacion of printing to suffer me quietlye to enioye the benefite of these myne owne labours, and to haue the aduantage of myne owne inuencion, as I shall gladly suffer euery of them to enioye the commodities of his, and then we shal brotherhke liue in Concorde, one by another'. Again, Thomas Lanquet's *Epitome of Chronicles of England* was printed with a continuation by Thomas Cooper in 1549 by Berthelet, and ten years later was reprinted by Seres and Marsh: in 1560 Cooper issued another edition, from Berthelet's house, in which he complained that 'certaine persons, for lukers sake, contrarie to honestie, had caused my chronicle to be prynted without my knowlage'. (Bennett, *Books and Readers*, pp. 129—32.)

NOTE C (page 28)

Patents were often granted for classes of books, such as almanacs and psalters, but also, and perhaps originally, for individual works. When Pynson printed Bishop Tunstall's *In laudem matrimonii oratio*, delivered on the occasion of Princess Mary's betrothal to the Dauphin, 15 Oct. 1518, he added to the colophon, dated 13 Nov., the words, 'cum priuilegio a rege indulto / ne quis hanc orationem intra biennium in regno anglia? imprimat: aut alibi impressam / et importatam in eodem regno Anglias vendat'. A later example appears to have been Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* (see Court-Book B, 16 Jan, 1589 and subsequently). Even as late as 5 Dec. 1727 Lewis Theobald obtained from George II a fourteen-year privilege for *Double Falsehood*, but this was because he was representing the play as Shakespeare's; had he published it as his own he would have received the same protection under the Act of 1709. From the first, privileges might be obtained by authors as well as stationers. A patent granted to an author did no more than establish that natural right which the House of Lords decided in 1774 had always existed: one granted to a stationer for an important work he had commissioned or purchased was equally reasonable. Those for classes of books, though sometimes perhaps justifiable, are more difficult to defend, and the practice of granting them was open to abuse and was certainly sometimes abused.

NOTE D (page 28)

How closely associated were the ideas of privilege and copyright in the minds of writers of the time is apparent in several documents concerned with the controversy over patents that arose in the eighties. In 1582 one writes, after enumerating certain patents, 'Otherwise we finde none to haue priuilege, but generally as... all... printers haue, which is to haue the sole printinge of such bookes as any learned man shall make at their charge or geue vnto them' (Arber, *Transcript*, ii. 776), and in 1586 the patentees themselves argue ('with the same confusion between privileges and copyright', as Pollard observes) that 'if priuileges be revoked no bookes at all shoulde be prynted, within shorte tyme, for comonlie the first prynter is at charge for the Authors paynes. .. where an other that will print it after hym, commeth to the Copie gratis, and so maie he sell better cheaper then the first prynter, and then the first prynter shall never vtter his bookes' (Arber, *Transcript*, ii. 805; cf. Pollard, *Folios and Quartos*,

p. 6). No doubt, copyright may be called a privilege, though we generally associate the term with one granted under Letters Patent; but the patentees were evidently out to confuse the issue.

NOTE E (page 29)

In early days this was often dispensed with, the Wardens allowing the entrance of obviously innocent copies and only referring doubtful cases to some outside authority, but after the Star-chamber Decree of 1586 had regularized and made more reasonable the procedure of licence, this practice became less common, though to judge by the entries in the Stationers' Register it was never wholly abandoned. For thirty years from 1607 dramatic copies were usually, though never always, licensed for printing by the Master of the Revels, but this practice, even if it had ecclesiastical sanction (Chambers, *Eliz. Stage*, iii. 169—70), was of doubtful 'legality', and a later Decree of 1637 put an end to it. In connexion with entrances 'vnder the hand' of the Master of the Revels a warning should be added. It has been suggested that in these cases, or some of them, the Wardens accepted, as sufficient warrant for entrance, the Master's licence for acting (see Crompton Rhodes, *First Folio*, pp. 27-31; Chambers, *W. Shake.*, i. 100, 129-30; Greg, *Editorial Problem* (first edition), p. 107). In such cases it would follow that the copy presented for entrance was the official prompt-book, and that the publication was authorized by the owners. But the suggestion is in fact mistaken (Greg, *Entrance &c.*, pp. 11-14, and *Editorial Problem* (second edition), pp. [f—g]).

NOTE F (page 29)

The usual phrase, entered 'under the hand' of the Warden, would lead us to suppose that he added his authorization to the licence of the official reader at the end of the manuscript. This is indeed explicitly stated in an entry of 20 Feb. 1585, which was made 'by commaundement from m^r warden newbery vnder his own handwrytinge on the backside of the wrytten copie'. It is a curious fact, however, that while many official licences got printed in the works to which they were appended, no instance of a Warden's warrant seems to have survived in print, and apparently the only instance recorded in a manuscript is that at the end of the First Book of Milton's *Paradise Lost*. 'Imprimatur Tho. Tomkyns R^{mo} in Christo Patri ac Domino Dno Gilberto divina Providentia Archi-episcopo Cantuariensi & Sacris domesticis. Richard Royston Int' p Geo: Tokefeilde Cl.'. Comparison with the Register entry of 20 Aug. 1667 shows that Royston was the Warden who authorized the entrance, and Tokefield was of course the Clerk who made it. Perhaps the warrant usually took the form of a note to the Clerk.

NOTE G (page 44)

Wither was a man with a grievance and his evidence is certainly open to cross-examination. On 17 Jan. 1623 he obtained a patent for his *Hymnes and Songs of the Church* that not only gave him the sole right of printing (which was fair enough) but further provided that it should be bound up and sold with all

copies of the Psalms in Metre (which Pollard not unfairly called 'iniquitous'). The Stationers' Company opposed the grant, the bookbinders petitioned Parliament against it, and Wither seems to have been unable to enforce the objectionable clause of his privilege. Doubtless his testimony is prejudiced, and Pollard was perhaps within his right in describing him as 'a bad witness'. But we must discriminate. His assertion that registration was a greater protection than a patent is in general quite untrue, and can only reflect chagrin at his personal failure. On the other hand, it would have been bad polemics to bring against the Company's Ordinances and practice charges that were contrary to common knowledge, and his general statement of the case must be accepted. Indeed we can hardly suppose that Pollard would have seriously argued that according to the laws and customs of the Company, the rights of a stationer in a copy he had printed after due registration would have been invalidated by the fact that it had been published without the author's consent.

NOTE H (page 46)

We know from the Stationers' Register that authorized texts were sometimes substituted for unauthorized through a friendly arrangement between the publishers concerned. A case in point is that of William Lambarde's *Archeion*. The work was written in 1591, and the author died in 1601, and copies must have circulated in manuscript among antiquarian lawyers for close on half a century. At length one of these copies found its way into the hands of Daniel Frere, who on 27 Mar. 1635 'Entred for his Copie vnder the hands of M^r. Morgan lones, M^r. weekes, and M^r. Rothwell warden a booke called Archion or the high Courtes of lustice in England &c', and followed this up with an edition, which, however, proved to be seriously incorrect. A more authoritative manuscript was entrusted by the author's grandson, Thomas Lambarde, to Henry Seyle, and on 1 July we find him and Frere making a joint entrance: 'Entred for their Copie vnder the hands of M^r. Morgan lones, M^r. Weekes and M^r. Rothwell warden a booke called Archeion or the high Courts of lustice in England, being the true originall Copie from the Authors executor. The former Entry of this booke to Daniel Frere being hereby made void'. In making this entrance it is clear that the publishers relied on, and the Clerk accepted, the original licence by the legal and ecclesiastical assessors and the Warden's authority for registration. But Frere, having maintained his claim to the copy, gracefully retired, and the 'newly corrected' edition of 1635 was printed by E(lizabeth) P(urslowe) for Henry Seyle alone. This case bears out Lee's theory of conciliation and compensation.

NOTE I (page 55)

The origin of the 'bad' quartos has been much disputed. In 1934 Pollard (ignoring his own earlier speculations) recorded a theory that placed 'The discredit of their production ... on unscrupulous booksellers, supposed to have sent shorthand writers to the theatre to take down what they could of a play, their notes being afterwards patched together by a hack editor' (*S.'s Text*, p. 267). Such proceedings might be described as piracy. The shorthand hypothesis has had a great vogue in Germany and America—Curt Dewischeit and

Max Forster, H. T. Price and J. Q. Adams have been prominent exponents—but it has been less popular with English scholars (Greg, *Editorial Problem*, pp. 57-59), who may be said to have now abandoned it altogether. The last nail was perhaps knocked into its coffin in 1949 when G. I. Duthie published his book on *Elizabethan Shorthand*. Instead, the bad texts are now generally admitted to be memorial reconstructions, vamped up, for performance by provincial companies, by actors who had taken part in the plays on the London stage, though the circumstances no doubt varied a good deal from case to case. If a company in financial difficulties offered such a secondary prompt-book of a popular play to a stationer, he could hardly be blamed for printing it, and the term 'pirate' would be hardly applicable.

NOTE J (page 55)

Occasionally the person whose name appears as printer was only a contractor who farmed out the work. For example, although Richard Jones (i 564-1602) was returned as having one press in 1583 and r 586 (Arber, *Transcript*, i. 248, v. lii), most, if not all, of the books purporting to be printed by him can be traced to the presses of other men. Anthony Kitson (1549-76) is an earlier instance. But these anomalous cases are of no importance. More pertinent is the warning that the person named as printer on the title-page may only have been responsible for part of the book—indeed, occasionally he printed no more than the title itself.

NOTE K (page 55)

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the bookseller played a somewhat different and more important part from what he does now. Today a publisher distributes his books through any booksellers who will stock or order them. Then, although any popular work could doubtless be picked up on the booksellers' stalls that cumbered St. Paul's Churchyard in the east and St. Dunstan's in the west, a publisher often employed a particular bookseller to distribute a book, and it was through him, presumably, that the minor retailers obtained their supplies. It is not till the second half of the seventeenth century that we find publishers like Francis Kirkman advertising their wares as 'sold by most booksellers'.

NOTE L (page 56)

Unless, as was sometimes the case, he kept a shop separate from his printing-house. Thus Wynkyn de Worde, who from 1500 printed at the sign of the Sun in Fleet Street, also had a shop in Paul's Churchyard at the sign of Our Lady of Pity; and Julian Notary in the Latin imprint to his edition of Herolt's *Sermones de tempore et sanctis*, 1510, announced they were 'to be sold (where they have been printed) at London in the suburb of Temple Bar near the porch of St. Clement's . . . under the sign of the Three Kings. And they will also be found for sale in St. Paul's Churchyard in the . . . little shop [*ce/lula*] from which also hangs the same sign of the Three Kings' (Bennett, *Books and Readers*, p. 180). Later in 1565-7 William Griffith, whose printing-office was in Fleet Street, also had a 'shop in the west' in St. Dunstan's Churchyard where he doubtless sold his books.

NOTE M (page 56)

The distinct trade of bookselling most likely originated through the importation of foreign books, sometimes specially printed for the English market and even for particular stationers. For example, an edition of Garlandia's *Synonytna* was printed in 1494 by Wolfgang Hopyl at Paris 'to be sold by Nicholas Lecomte, at the sign of St. Nicholas, in Paul's Churchyard'. Another early bookseller was Walter Lynne, also of St. Paul's Churchyard, who between 1547 and 1550 published some two dozen books from the presses of London printers. Lecomte and Lynne were both foreigners, the one a Frenchman, the other from the Low Countries. (Bennett, *Books and Readers*, p. 235.)

NOTE N (page 58)

Twice we find a colophon correcting an anomalous imprint. In 1595 Peek's *Old Wives Tale* was entered to Ralph Hancock. In the edition printed by Danter the same year the imprint (printed first) states that the book was 'to be sold by' Hancock and John Hardy, but the colophon (printed last) that it was printed 'for' the same. Again in 1607 Wilkins's *Miseries of Enforced Marriage* was entered to George Vincent, who published editions in 1607 and 1611: in the edition of 1629, however, the imprint runs, quite anomalously, 'Printed by Aug. Mathewes for Richard Thrale', whereas the colophon (added for the first time) runs, 'Printed by Aug. Mathewes for George Vincent . . . to be sold by Richard Thrale'. The earlier case has, of course, been cited as evidence that 'sold by' and 'printed for' mean the same thing, but no such explanation can be made to fit the second.

NOTE O (page 58)

It may be worth while instancing certain irregular imprints connected with John Hodgets. That of Dekker and Webster's *Westward Ho*, 'Printed at London, and are to be sold by Iohn Hodgets dwelling in Paules Churchyard. 1607.' is certainly suspicious. The copy had been entered conditionally to Henry Rockett, but the entry was cancelled. The print bears a device that was presumably in the possession of William Jaggard, though he never used it in his acknowledged work. Still more suspicious are the imprints of Day's *Isle of Gulls* (unentered), 'Printed for Iohn Trundle, and are to be sold by Iohn Hodgets . . . 1606.', and of *The Woman Hater* (entered to E. Edgar and R. Jackson), 'Printed by R[obert]. Rfaworth]. and are to be sold by Iohn Hodgets . . . 1607.', from the first of which the publisher's name, and from the second the printer's initials, were removed in the course of printing. It looks very much as though Hodgets were being used either as a cat's-paw or as a stalking-horse.

NOTE P (page 59)

The regular fee at this date was 6d. for each copy entered, and when a number of pieces were entered together the fee paid usually corresponds exactly. But there was a good deal of uncertainty over what constituted a 'copy'. The plays in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647 were individually entered and paid for; but they formed part of a larger entrance. In the case of the Jonson

folio of 1616 the plays had all been previously published and were not re-entered, but the eight unpublished 'Masques at Court' were entered as a single copy. Sir William Alexander's *Monarchic Tragedies* were entered as a single copy in 1604, though the issue of that date contained two and the re-issue of 1607 contained four plays; and his *Recreations with the Muses* were entered as a single copy in 1637, though they contained four plays besides other works. In 1648 Cartwright's works were entered as a single copy, though three plays besides poems were specified.

TIL *Editorial Troblems.* I

INT the course of their 'Epistle Dedicatorie' and their address 'To the great Variety of Readers' Heminge and Condell thrice assert that it is they who have collected the pieces contained in the volume: it is doubtful whether, personally, they "claim any more.¹ But at least they make themselves responsible for the canon. And to this no one, apart from the author, could speak with greater authority. They were in the best position to know what was Shakespeare's and what was not, and if they included a play in the collection we may take it that it was essentially his—whether his alone may be considered in a moment. First we should note a limit to their authority. So far as the plays written for the Chamberlain's—King's company are concerned they must be supposed to have been fully acquainted with the facts of authorship; but that company was first formed in 1594, and although opinions differ rather widely over the date at which Shakespeare began writing for the stage, it is generally agreed that some of his extant work must have been produced at least two years earlier. Of the circumstances in which these prentice plays were composed Heminge and Condell may have been less perfectly informed, and even supposing that their intention was to include no play that was not wholly Shakespeare's, all that we can legitimately assume is that the earliest works they admitted passed in the company as his, not that they were known to be his unaided production. And on the whole this agrees with critical surmise, for even among those least fond of finding traces of alien hands in the Folio, there can be few who would stake their reputation on the Shakespearian integrity of, say, I *Henry VI* or *The Taming of the Shrew* or even *Titus Andronicus*.²

At the other end of the series we encounter the problem

¹ Dedication, 'We haue but collected them': address, 'haue collected & publish'd them' and 'who onely gather his works'. For what more may be implied see below, pp.₂ 77 ff.

² What may be called a 'fundamentalist' position has, however, been recently taken by some critics, for example by E. M. W. Tillyard in *Shakespeare's Historical Plays* (1949) and by H. T. Price in *Construction in Shakespeare* (1951).

of collaboration in a different form. A consensus of critical opinion today, though there are, of course, dissidents, finds Shakespeare's hand in parts, but in parts only, of *Henry VIII* *Pericles*, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. The first of these was admitted to the Folio, the other two were not. For this, it would seem, there can be only one explanation, namely, that while the editors' design was to exclude any play they knew not to be substantially Shakespeare's, they made an exception of *Henry VIII* in order to round off the series of Histories.¹ If that is so, it follows that, in the belief of those best able to judge at the time, the other plays in the collection were all, subject only to reservations already indicated, Shakespeare's unaided work.

But selection was only the first step in editing the collection. Of this Heminge and Condell must have been aware, but it is perhaps natural that they should say little about their more detailed duties of editorship. However, in the dedication they speak of Shakespeare's plays 'out-liuing him, and he not hauing the fate, common with some, to be exequutor to his own writings',² which implies the need of someone to do the office for him, and they follow it up with the profession that 'it hath bin the height of our care, who are the Presenters, to make the present worthy of your H.H. [highnesses] by the perfection', which could only be attained by some close supervision. And in the address to the readers they follow up the parallel allusion to the author's being 'by death departed from that right' of overseeing his own works by the well-known claim (of which more later) to have substituted good texts for bad and now to offer them 'cur'd, and perfect of their limbes'. But while in no way disclaiming responsibility, they say nothing to make us believe that they personally performed the arduous duty of detailed supervision; and it is unlikely that two busy actors, with the management of a large company and two theatres on their hands, would have found leisure for the task. For, as will become increasingly evident as we proceed, the task cannot have been a light one. Indeed, it might not be too much to say that, apart from works seen through the press by their

¹ Greg, *Editorial Problem*, pp. 19-21. The same desire might account for the inclusion of i *Henry VI*. See Note A on p. 98.

² An allusion, presumably, to the happier fate of Jonson's.

authors, no book of the time had greater care and labour bestowed on its editing than did the First Folio of Shakespeare's plays.¹ That this fell short, sometimes perhaps lamentably short, of the standard we should like to have seen maintained, and that it may even on occasion have been misguided, is true; but that should not blind us to the facts, and no one who has carefully studied these and has himself some experience of the difficult labour of editing will question the onerous nature of the task undertaken or the devotion with which it was carried through.

That somebody must have been in charge, under the general direction of Heminge and Condell, is evident. Who it was we can only guess, and speculation there has been. Pollard tentatively suggested Edward Blount, who had indeed some literary pretensions.² But if, as seems likely, Blount did not come into the venture till after most of the Comedies had been printed,³ he is ruled out. Moreover, it is, on *a priori* grounds, more likely that the editing was in the hands of the players rather than the stationers, for it was they who had access to the material and were in a position to estimate its value. Perhaps the most likely person to have devilled for Heminge and Condell is the book-keeper of the King's company.⁴ He would have all the relevant documents under his care and probably possessed a more intimate knowledge of their nature and quality than anyone else. We know that ten years later the company's book-keeper was a man named Knight,⁵ evidently the Edward Knight who is named first among 'Musitions and other necessary attendantes' of the King's company in a protection against arrest dated 27 December 1624,⁶ and it was he who wrote

¹ In this it contrasts strikingly with the posthumous (third) volume of Jonson's works, nominally edited by Sir Kenelm Digby.

² *Fohos and Quartos*, p. 112: 'Edward Blount . . . may have had a further importance as probably possessed of more literary feeling than the other partners, and thus not impossibly the editor of the volume.' Lee (*Introduction*, p. xiv) had asserted, with his habitual blend of vagueness and confidence, that 'One or other of [the publishers] prepared and arranged the plays for press, and corrected the proofs'.

³ See p. 4.

⁴ See Note B on p. 100.

⁵ On 21 Oct. 1633 Sir Henry Herbert wrote: 'This was subscribed to their [sc. the King's men's] play of The Tamer Tamd, and directed to Knight, their book-keeper' (*Variorum*, 1821, iii. 210; Adams, *Herbert*, p. 21).

⁶ British Museum MS. Add. 19256, fol. 44; Adams, *Herbert*, pp. 74-75.

or prepared for the stage several of their prompt-books, the earliest of which is that of *The Honest Man's Fortune*, licensed for acting on 8 February 1625.¹ It is therefore possible that he already occupied the position of book-keeper when the Folio was in preparation and acted as its virtual editor. In that case Edward Knight would be a person of hitherto unsuspected importance in the history of English literature.²

If for any reason we were to rule out the book-keeper as editor, we should be left, it would seem, with nobody but Isaac Jaggard to fill the post. That he may, for anything we know, have had the ability and inclination for the task need not be denied, and he would seem to have been a man of some literary interests. But he must have been kept fairly busy superintending the printing of the Folio and other works, and his activities would necessarily have been limited to such material as Heminge and Condell chose to hand over. He is unlikely to have had direct access to the company's archives, and there may have been considerations (such as the necessity to preserve the Master of the Revels' licence) that would make the players reluctant to see some of their manuscripts leave the theatre. One function, however, we may reasonably allow him. As printer it would be his duty to provide for the proof-reading of the sheets as they went through the press. It may be, of course, that this task was undertaken by the editor in addition to his other labours. But that would have involved daily attendance at the printing-house,³ and if the editorial work was going on at the theatre such attendance would have been likely to prove burdensome and consequently irregular. Since there could be no question here of authorial afterthoughts, it seems more probable that the editor was content to hand over his prepared copy to the printer and rely on him to see that it was correctly translated into type. The serious study of variants between different copies of the First Folio, which is almost our only source of knowledge respecting the proof-reading it underwent, has as yet hardly begun, but so far nothing has emerged to suggest reading by anyone outside the printing-house, and indeed very little that would imply reference to the copy at

¹ See Greg, *Bonduca*, pp. v-vi, and Note C on p. 100.

² See Note D on p. 100.

³ See p. 4605.

all.¹ For the moment, then, we may assume that Isaac Jaggard made himself responsible for seeing that the printed sheets followed the copy with such moderate fidelity as custom dictated and circumstances allowed, though how far he read them himself and how far he left the drudgery to another we can hardly guess.²

One thing that the editors must have determined at the outset is the arrangement of the plays. The threefold division into Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies would naturally suggest itself, and has nothing to do with convenience of printing as Sidney Lee supposed.³ The chronological order in the Histories is again the obvious one: that of the Comedies and Tragedies is less clear. Lee, anxious as ever to prove the incompetence of all concerned, represented the plays as printed anyhow as the copy dribbled in.³ It was left to Pollard to make the plausible suggestion that in their arrangement the editors followed the businesslike principle of displaying their most attractive wares in the most prominent positions.⁴ Thus the section of Comedies both begins and ends with a series of five plays that had either never been printed before or had only appeared in very inferior versions,⁵ and the four of which sound texts were already available are tucked away between. It is, of course, an accident that the Histories both begin and end with a hitherto unprinted play.⁶ In the Tragedies the disposition is less evident, and is disturbed by the anomalously placed *Troilus and Cressida*, which must be left out of account.⁷ True, the section does or was designed to begin with one and end with two hitherto unprinted plays.⁸ But it also shows traces of a different arrangement.

¹ Concerning proof-reading in general see pp. 460 ff.

² In three out of four corrected proofs of the Folio that survive (see pp. 462 ff.) all the corrections appear to be in the same hand, which points to one person having been, in the main, responsible, and the fact that they were read a page at a time suggests that they did not leave the printing-house.

³ *Introduction*, p. xxv.

⁴ *Folios and Quartos*, p. 123.

⁵ The position of the unprinted *Winter's Tale* at the end is, however, accidental: see pp. 439, 443-

⁶ Unless the desire to close with something new was a factor in determining the admission of *Henry VIII* (see p. 77).

⁷ See pp. 447-9.

⁸ The last of them, *Cymbeline*, is not in fact a tragedy at all and should have accompanied *The Winter's Tale* in the first section. If for some reason delivery of

As it stands, of the first six plays five are classical, and of the last six five are modern or legendary. This is not likely to be fortuitous, though the presence of *Romeo and Juliet* among the classical plays and of *Antony and Cleopatra* among the non-classical raises a doubt how much weight should be attached to the arrangement, or rather whether something did not occur to upset it. But when all is said, the discernible principles of arrangement do not carry us very far, and in detail the order of the plays would appear to be largely accidental, governed presumably by casual preference or the convenience of the moment—which means a partial return to Lee's position.

In approaching the all-important question of the nature and authority of the texts printed in the First Folio, we naturally start with the claims made in the volume itself. These are high. On the title-page we are assured that the plays are 'Published according to the True Originall Copies', and in the curious head-title above the list of principal actors they are represented as 'Truely set forth, according to their first Originair. The phrases are presumably Jaggard's; he had, however, received his material from the players and the claim may reasonably be taken to have their authority behind it. But the claim must be reasonably interpreted. For long critics perversely argued that the words implied that all the plays in the volume had been printed direct from Shakespeare's autograph manuscripts, and because this was manifestly not the case—several being reprints of earlier editions—they dismissed the claim as dishonest. But all that the phrases can legitimately be taken to mean, and all, we may suppose, they were intended to mean, is that the Folio was printed from sources that correctly represented the plays as performed in the theatre; and we shall find that it was in fact mostly printed from authoritative sources, and that in the few cases in which less satisfactory prints were used, considerable pains were taken to bring them into conformity with what were regarded as the true originals.¹

But the crucial and much-discussed passage is, of course,

the manuscript was delayed, this may have been what the editors intended, and it may have been through a misunderstanding that Jaggard placed it at the end of the volume instead of the section.

^x See Note E on p. 101.

that in the address 'To the great Variety of Readers', which must once again be transcribed in full:

'It had bene a thing, we confesse, worthie to haue bene wished, that the Author himselfe had liu'd to haue set forth, and ouerseen his owne writings; But since it hath bin ordain'd otherwise, and he by death departed from that right, we pray you do not envie his Friends, the office of their care, and paine, to haue collected & published them; and so to haue published them, as where (before) you were abus'd with diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of iniurious impostors, that expos'd them: euen those, are now offer'd to your view cur'd, and perfect of their limbes; and all the rest, absolute in their numbers, as he conceiued them. Who, as he was a happie imitator of Nature, was a most gentle expresser of it. His mind and hand went together: And what he thought, he vttered with that easinesse, that wee haue scarce receiued from him a blot in his papers/

It must be admitted that fine as this is as a piece of English composition, it is not as precise as could be wished. Among the great variety of readers have been some, and critically not the least influential, who have assumed—and how far they may have been meant to assume is a matter of curious speculation¹—that the words, 'where (before) you were abus'd with diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of iniurious impostors, that expos'd them', implied that all texts hitherto published (all the quartos, that is) were unauthorized and corrupt. And since critics soon discovered that several of the Folio texts had been printed without material alteration from these earlier quartos, they immediately concluded the editors to be themselves impostors', willing for the sake of advertisement to decry the very texts they were using for their own

¹ Pollard thought that 'with the sale of the First Folio in view [the passage] was doubtless intended to be interpreted' in the sense in which it has been commonly taken (*Folios and Quartos*, p. 2). But if Heminge and Condell really intended this *suggest w falst*, it matters little whether their words were literally true or not, and Pollard's endeavour to represent Shakespeare's friends as honest men is a failure. There is the further possibility that the phrases used may not have been their own (see pp. 17 ff.). The information they gave the actual writer may have been more explicit, and ambiguity may have resulted from the attempt to mould it into literary form. If so, Heminge and Condell should be given the benefit of the doubt.

edition. Only here and there was found a critic clear-sighted and unprejudiced enough to see that the editors had intended nothing of the sort, that all that their words, strictly interpreted, affirmed was that among previous editions of individual plays were 'diuerse' (that is, some or certain) texts that had been issued without authority and were in fact grossly corrupt—a fact that nobody questioned—and that none of these had been reprinted in the Folio.¹

Directly or indirectly based on this mistaken interpretation of what Heminge and Condell had said, there grew up a tradition of textual pessimism in respect of Shakespeare's plays that lasted a couple of hundred years. The Folio editors had denounced the quartos generally as stolen and surreptitious, their texts as maimed and deformed—this was accepted as gospel. But they had themselves reprinted these same quartos unaltered while representing them as cured and perfect of their limbs, thereby branding themselves as frauds and liars, whose profession to have preserved the rest of the plays perfect in their numbers was unworthy a moment's consideration. And so we enter the jungle of disbelief. How Pope treated the text, relegating passage after passage to a marginal limbo of spuriousness, is well known. Samuel Johnson, in his 'Proposals' for an edition, dated 1 June 1756, let loose his imagination in a famous flight of rhetoric, of the ironic overtones of which he was clearly unconscious:

'To have a text corrupt in many places, and in many doubtful, is, among the authours that have written since the use of types, almost peculiar to Shakespeare. Most writers, by publishing their own works, prevent all various readings, and preclude all conjectural criticism. . . .

'But of the works of Shakespeare the condition has been far different: he sold them, not to be printed, but to be played. They were immediately copied for the actors, and multiplied by transcript after transcript, vitiated by the blunders of the penman, or changed by the affectation of the

¹ The antithesis is between the 'diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies' and 'all the rest'. To those who take the former to mean all quartos the 'rest' are of course the plays first printed in 1623: those who confine the 'diuerse stolne . . . copies' to the notoriously 'bad' quartos interpret the 'rest' as meaning all the others, whether printed from 'good' quartos (which are thereby acknowledged as authentic 'originals') or from manuscript.

player; perhaps enlarged to introduce a jest, or mutilated to shorten the representation; and printed at last without the concurrence of the authour, without the consent of the proprietor, from compilations made by chance or by stealth out of the separate parts written for the theatre: and thus thrust into the world surreptitiously and hastily, they suffered another depravation from the ignorance and negligence of the printers, as every man who knows the state of the press in that age will readily conceive.

'It is not easy for invention to bring together so many causes concurring to vitiate a text. No other authour ever gave up his works to fortune and time with so little care . . . no other editions were made from fragments so minutely broken, and so fortuitously reunited; and in no other age was the art of printing in such unskilful hands.'¹

The allusion to the plays being printed 'without the consent of the proprietor' shows that in penning this Vigorous rhetoric' Johnson had in mind the quartos rather than the Folio, though curiously enough he said nothing to limit the scope of his damnation. Even so, it justifies Pollard's remark that 'it may be questioned whether for once in his life the great Doctor did not descend in this passage to writing sheer nonsense'.² But, to quote Pollard again: 'It is only fair to Dr Johnson to remember that he wrote this Prospectus before he edited his author, and that in his Introduction after nine years'³ experience he writes nothing in this vein, though it seems clear that he pinned his faith with much too absolute confidence to the First Folio.' He never, indeed, recanted his opinion, but if challenged he might well have replied, as on another occasion, 'Ignorance, pure ignorance'.

Theobald, even after editing the plays, took a view not very unlike Johnson's, for in the preface to his second edition (1740) he wrote of Shakespeare:

¹ 'Proposals for Printing, by Subscription, the Dramatick Works of William Shakespeare, corrected and illustrated by Samuel Johnson', 1756, pp. 3-4. The proposals were reprinted *in extenso* in Malone's preface to his edition of 1790 (see *Variorum*, 1821, i. 195-201), and Chambers (*W. Shake.*, i. 144) introduced some confusion by quoting a passage thence as if it were by Malone.

² *S.'s Fight*, p. 97. See further Note F on p. 101.

³ In the 'Proposals' the edition was promised within nineteen months. Such is the vanity of human wishes.

'We are to consider him as a writer, of whom no authentick manuscript was left extant; as a writer, whose pieces were dispersedly performed on the several stages then in being. And it was the custom of those days for the poets to take a price of the players for the pieces they from time to time furnished; and thereupon it was supposed they had no farther right to print them without the consent of the players. As it was the interest of the companies to keep their plays unpublished . . . many pieces were taken down in short-hand, and imperfectly copied by ear from a representation; others were printed from piecemeal parts surreptitiously obtained from the theatres, uncorrect, and without the poet's knowledge.'¹ Capell, it is true, was of a different opinion, and amid much extravagant speculation expressed his belief that 'these quarto's are the poet's own copies, however they were come by; hastily written at first, and issuing from presses most of them as corrupt and licentious as can any where be produc'd, and not overseen by himself, nor by any of his friends . . . it may be true that they were "stoln;" but stoln from the author's copies, by transcribers who found means to get at them: [a note admitting that perhaps 'they were fairly come by: which is, in truth, the editor's opinion, at least of some of them'] and "maim'd" they must needs be, in respect of their many alterations after the first performance'.² We may suspect that this was partly prompted by a desire to differ from previous editors, and it was certainly disregarded by subsequent ones.

To Johnson's verdict Edmond Malone in part demurred,³ but he himself persisted in the misinterpretation of Heminge and Condell's words, and though his own work had taught him the value of the quartos as a whole, he continued to regard them as unauthorized:

'Fifteen of Shakespeare's plays were printed in quarto

¹ Reprinted in the 1821 *Variorum*, i. 32-33.

² 1768: reprinted in the 1821 *Variorum*, i. 127.

³ In the preface to his edition of 1790, reprinted in the 1821 *Variorum*, i. 201: 'It is not true that the plays of this author were more incorrectly printed than those of any of his contemporaries . . . It is not true that the art of printing was in no other age in so unskilful hands. Nor is it true, in the latitude in which it is stated, that "these plays were printed from compilations made by chance or by stealth out of the separate parts written for the theatre": two only of all his dramas . . . appear to have been thus thrust into the world'.

antecedent to the first complete collection of his works . . . The players, when they mention these copies, represent them all as mutilated and imperfect; but this was merely thrown out to give an additional value to their own edition, and is not strictly true of any but two of the whole number; *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *King Henry V.*¹—With respect to the other thirteen copies, though undoubtedly they were all surreptitious, that is, stolen from the playhouse, and printed without the consent of the author or the proprietors, they *in general* are preferable to the exhibition of the same plays in the folio; for this plain reason, because, instead of printing these plays from a manuscript, the editors of the folio, to save labour, or from some other motive, printed the greater part of them from the very copies which they represented as maimed and imperfect, and frequently from a late, instead of the earliest, edition; in some instances with additions and alterations of their own/²

Subsequent writers have at times shown less than Malone's discrimination, while obstinately persisting in the same misunderstanding. Sidney Lee in 1902, though his admissions betray some uneasiness, emulated Johnson himself in confidence and prejudice, and even echoed his language:

⁴It is not easy to exaggerate the narrowness of policy which actuated the Elizabethan publisher's treatment of plays. In his crass endeavour to satisfy the new-born taste for the published drama, he ignored not merely the material interest of author or manager, but the intelligent interest of the reader. If he cared little about the manner in which he acquired a copy of a play, he cared not at all whether or no it correctly presented the author's text. Both the author's manuscript and the authentic transcript which was in the hands of the theatrical manager frequently lay beyond the publisher's reach. Often he printed a crude draft of a piece which had been taken down, whether in shorthand or in longhand, by an enterprising visitor to the playhouse, from the actors' lips in course of the performance. Incoherence and confusing omissions commonly characterized the result. It is thus that

¹ He apparently excluded the 'bad' *Romeo and Juliet* of 1597, which, of course, he knew, because it had been replaced by the 'good' text of 1599: the 'bad' *Hamlet* of 1603 was not discovered till 1823.

² *Variorum*, 1821, i. 203.

may best be accounted for the strange defects and perversities of the original editions, printed in Shakespeare's lifetime, of his "Henry V" (by Thomas Millington) in 1600, of his "Merry Wives" (by Arthur Johnson) in 1602, and of the first quarto of "Hamlet" (by Nicholas Ling and John Trundell) in 1603. More frequently the publisher would bribe a scrivener, or perhaps an actor, into procuring for him a rough copy of the play which had been carelessly transcribed for some subordinate purpose of the playhouse. Such a transcript seldom proved faithful to the author's intention. In most instances it was unsparingly abridged, or it was defaced by actors' interpolations, and by ignorant errors of the copyist which the printer's reader made little effort to amend.

"The greater number of the quarto editions of Shakespeare's plays which were published in his lifetime seem to have been printed from more or less imperfect and unauthorized playhouse transcripts which were obtained by publishers more or less dishonestly. The quartos of "Richard III" and "Second Part of Henry IV," with the second quarto of "Hamlet" (although its defects are small compared with those of the first), present versions that were unsatisfactorily abridged. The original impressions of "Troilus," "Othello," and "Lear" abound in proofs of copyist's carelessness and printer's incapacity. Comparatively few faults are visible in "Love's Labour's Lost," "Much Ado," "Midsummer Night's Dream," "Merchant of Venice," "Richard II," "First Part of Henry IV," "Titus," and the 1599 quarto of "Romeo and Juliet,"¹ and in these cases the authorized playhouse transcript or "prompt-copy" may have been at the publisher's disposal, but none give absolutely convincing evidence at all points of complete authenticity.² How easy it is to paint a

¹ It is plain that Lee's sole criterion of accuracy in a quarto text is agreement with the Folio, but since the last eight plays enumerated were all printed in the Folio from copies of the quartos, the test of agreement is of little value. Few critics today would be so naive as to assume that the Folio texts of *Hamlet* and *Troilus* are on the whole superior to the quartos. It may be added that Lee's arithmetic is peculiar, for he enumerates eight quartos in which he finds 'comparatively few faults' and yet asserts that the 'greater number' of the fifteen published in Shakespeare's lifetime (p. xi) contained 'imperfect' texts.

² *Introduction*, pp. xii-xiii. Pollard (*Folios and Quartos*, p. 2) politely ridiculed this magisterial nonsense. He challenged Lee to quote 'at least one case in which a scrivener or actor is known thus to have betrayed his employers' and to indicate

graphic picture of the past unhampered by a knowledge of the facts!

Lee's pronouncement represents, if in an exaggerated form, the view taken by most Shakespearian critics half a century ago, a view based ultimately on the misunderstanding of the words of Heminge and Condell fostered by the great authority of Malone. The true meaning of what they wrote was pointed out as early as 1859 by Tycho Mommsen in the introduction to his parallel-text edition of *Romeo and Juliet*, and again by J. O. Halliwell in his *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare* published in 1887, but was ignored by most critics. It was not till in 1909 Pollard raised the banner of revolt against two centuries of pessimism, and linked the correct interpretation of the passage in the address with a fresh insistence on and definition of the distinction between what he named the 'good' and the 'bad' quartos, that serious attention became focused upon this important issue. As we saw,¹ Pollard further linked this distinction with certain views on the subject of copyright that have not stood the test of recent criticism, but this, when first propounded, only helped to advance his main thesis, which it is safe to say no serious critic now disputes.

According to this, what Heminge and Condell wrote, or allowed to be written for them, may be not only explained, but completely explained, on the assumption that by the 'diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies' they meant only what Pollard called the 'bad' quartos: the editors of the Folio are thereby cleared of the imputation of fraud, and the basis of pessimism in respect to the quartos as a whole is removed. But more than this: the fact that the Folio editors made no use of the recognized 'bad' quartos,² and used others, of the

'what "subordinate purpose of the playhouse" a rough copy of the play . . . would be likely to serve'. He further observed respecting Lee's final flourish that 'Even a statement in Shakespeare's autograph that he had corrected the proofs would hardly justify all these adjectives without a certificate of his competence as a proof-reader'. Lee remained impervious to criticism and was still repeating substantially the same views as late as 1925 in what, before the appearance of Chambers's authoritative work, passed in this country as the standard life of Shakespeare. pp. 39 ff.

² If there is any qualification to be made to this statement it is trivial: see in Chapter V the discussion of 2 and 3 *Henry VI* (possible use of 'bad' quartos to supply defects in authoritative manuscripts) and *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet* (use of a 'bad' quarto in the preparation of the 'good' quarto upon which the editors relied).

text of which they were suspicious, only after careful collation with an authoritative manuscript, justifies our believing that those quartos that they reprinted without material alteration contained texts that they knew to be in at least substantial agreement with the originals; and if they showed this discrimination in their use of the quartos, it is only reasonable to suppose that they were equally careful in their selection of the manuscripts from which a majority of the plays in the Folio were printed. It is true that when they spoke, or let Jaggard speak, of 'Originalls', they may have had in mind the plays as current in the playhouse rather than as they came from the pen of the author, and that these stage versions may have suffered from omissions—indeed, we may be certain that in some cases they did—and that they may even have contained additions that were none of Shakespeare's writing—in some cases this is at least probable. But, subject to the limitation of their outlook and to some imperfections no doubt in the materials at their command, the editors of the Folio strove honestly to provide readers with an authentic text, and in fact did provide one of very considerable, if not always of the very highest, authority; though we must not forget that where they reprinted earlier editions substantially unaltered it is a secondary authority. Their methods were not ours or what we should wholly approve, but they saw the main problems, and in their endeavour to solve them they themselves took the first steps in the critical study of Shakespeare's text. We should not exaggerate the merits of their edition, but neither should we yield to the once fashionable belief that it is in any profound manner corrupt or misrepresentative of what Shakespeare really wrote or intended his public to hear. 'Whoever thinks so is, to use a nice old-fashioned phrase, *sinning his mercies*' is Pollard's memorable verdict.¹

But although we have good warrant of an inferential sort for believing in the substantial authenticity of the texts of the 'good' quartos, there remains something to be said regarding their probable provenance. Whence were the manuscripts behind them derived? The theory of wholesale pilfering from the playhouses is obviously unsatisfactory;

¹ *Foundations*, p. 16.

that of the wide dissemination of private transcripts has mainly late evidence in its support and is inherently improbable.¹ The natural inference is that, contrary to their general policy,² the company at times saw fit to release plays to the press. That they did so in order to replace the 'bad' quartos of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet* and probably *Love's Labour's Lost* can hardly be doubted.³ May they not have done the same on other occasions too? Pollard argued the case as follows:⁴

'It may surely be taken for granted that no one save the players themselves could sell plays in batches, and if we find plays appearing in print in such batches, and at the very times when it would obviously be to the convenience of the players to sell them, then we have a very strong argument that it was from the players that they were obtained/ He then points out that 'in the eight years 1585—92' the number of plays 'entered for publication on the Stationers' Register'⁵ is no more than 10 (+4). 'In the last of these years, 1592, the theatres were closed, owing first to riots and subsequently to the plague, from' 23 June to 28 December;⁶ 'but the players doubtless hoped for better times, and only three plays were entered. In 1593, however, plague again broke out, and the theatres were closed for an even longer time, viz., from' 2 February to 26 December? 'It is, therefore, very significant that' between 6 July 1593 and 20 July 1594 'no fewer than' 25 (+6) 'plays were entered on the Register, suggesting the inference that they had been sold by the players during the time that the theatres were closed and were now being regis-

¹ See pp. 152

ff.

² See Note G on p. 102.

³ See pp. 49 ff.

⁴ *Folios and Quartos*, pp. 9-10.

⁵ Pollard's mistaken belief that entrance in the Register offered some guarantee that the copy had been regularly obtained led him to attach greater weight to his figures than they in fact possess (see pp. 39 ff.). In what follows the number of plays printed in each period without entrance has been added in parentheses. Perhaps editions known to be 'bad' quartos should be eliminated, but since many of the plays entered are not extant, the correction would be no more than apparent. It seems better to let the crude figures stand for what they are worth. Unfortunately Pollard's dates and figures are so curiously inaccurate, and his periods at times so arbitrary, that it has been necessary partly to recast his argument, though so far as possible his own words have been retained. Only plays believed to have been acted on the popular stage have been included: academic pieces, closet dramas, shows, and the like have been disregarded. Each 'part' of a play has been counted separately.

⁶ In the case of the Rose, the only theatre for which, thanks to Henslowe's diary, we have precise information.

⁷ Pollard says 'April to December 22', but gives no authority.

tered as they were got ready for publication. After July, 1594, there is a pause of some months, and then between April, 1595? and January, 1596, nine (+i) plays are entered/ The rest of 1596 and the first half of 1597 is a blank; then between August 1597 and August 1598 five (+5 ?) plays appear. Nothing more happens for a year, and then between August 1599 and the end of 1600 'the number again rises suddenly to' 26 (+5 ?). There was no closing of the theatres at this time and Pollard could only put forward an explanation that he candidly admitted was 'not as strong as in 1593'. He continued: 'but, putting coincidences altogether out of the question, such an outpouring of plays as we find between' July 1593 and July 1594 and again between August 1599 and December 1600 'points strongly to the publishers having obtained them in those years from the only source where they could exist in quantities, that is from the companies of players. . . . When we find' 25 (+6) and 26 (+5 ?) plays appearing in 'these two periods' of thirteen and seventeen months respectively and only 24 (+10?) in the rest of the last sixteen years of the sixteenth century, 'surely we have strong *prima fade* evidence that the sale to publishers of plays afterwards duly entered in the Stationers' Register was regulated by their lawful owners'. It fell to Chambers to suggest more particular and convincing explanations for the sudden wholesale release of plays in the two periods mentioned.¹ 'In 1594 the companies were reforming themselves after a long and disastrous spell of plague; and in particular the Queen's, Pembroke's, and Sussex's men were all ruined, and their books were thrown in bulk upon the market.' In 1599—1600, when 'many of the plays published belonged to . . . the Chamberlain's and the Admiral's' companies, a 'reason might be found in the call for ready money involved by the building of the Globe in 1599 and the Fortune in 1600'. Another peak of 17 (+5) plays in 1607 is mainly accounted for by 'the closing of Paul's and the sale of the plays acted there'.²

¹ *Eliz. Stage*, iii. 184.

² Writing later (*S's Text*, pp. 269-70) Pollard welcomed Chambers's explanations as 'neater' than his own. He also took the occasion to revise his figures, but they are still far from reliable.

In Pollard's argument if the arithmetic is shaky the logic is sound, and although some considerable deduction must be made for the entrance of a good many certainly bad texts, especially in the earlier period,¹ and of some good texts that were probably not released by their owners, the reasoning is on the whole convincing and has met with general acceptance. But granting that good texts were in most cases sold by their owners for publication, it still remains to inquire what their actual origin was and to what degree they can be considered authoritative. The great stimulus to research afforded by Pollard's work, releasing students as it did from the quagmire of nineteenth-century despondency, has resulted, during the last forty years, in much investigation into the nature of particular texts, which is in the end the only way in which we can hope to answer the question. But Pollard himself, ranging over the field of quartos and Folio alike, put forward some significant speculations which have profoundly influenced subsequent opinion.

He began by pointing out that Heminge and Condell were familiar with Shakespeare's autographs: 'His mind and hand went together: And what he thought, he vttered with that easinesse, that wee haue scarce receiued from him a blot in his papers.'² Moreover, what they had from him must have been his original drafts, not fair copies, else their remarks have no meaning. Next he argued that alike on the score of economy and to avoid unnecessary risk of piracy it is likely that the intervention of an outside scrivener would be generally avoided. The playwright turned in his autograph copy: if this was sufficiently clean it would itself become the prompt-book, if not it would probably be transcribed in the theatre. We know that one at least of Henslowe's hacks provided him with a fair copy of his plays that the company could presumably use as a prompt-book.³ Then Pollard

¹ See p. 42.

² This piece of piety should not be pressed to mean more than that the drafts were reasonably free from alterations and erasures. Shakespeare doubtless composed fluently and seldom went back over what he had written. The unblotted papers became a literary tradition and reappear in what Moseley wrote of Fletcher in 1646 (see pp. 109-10). Like many traditions it may have been interwoven with fiction. For evidence of what authors' foul papers were really like see pp. 108 ff.

³ Robert Daborne wrote to Henslowe on 13 Nov. 1613 about one of his plays (probably *The Arraignment of London* rather than *Machiawel and the Devil* as

claimed that we possess at least three manuscript prompt-books that are known to be in the hands of their authors. *Sir Thomas More*' *Believe as you List*' and *The Launching of the Mary*.¹ Lastly he saw in the survival, both in 'good' quartos and in Folio texts, of what look like prompter's directions and of the names of actors taking certain minor parts, such as we frequently find in extant prompt-books, evidence that several of Shakespeare's plays had indeed been printed in the first instance from theatrical prompt-copies. The inference, of course, is that *some* of the first editions of Shakespeare's plays were *probably* printed from his own autograph manuscripts. Pollard put the claim no higher. He wrote: 'The argument is that in the absence of evidence making it impossible, we are not entitled to assume that what *did* happen in the case of some plays by other playwrights did *not* happen to some plays by Shakespeare. In the case of some plays by other playwrights we find that it was the author's autograph manuscript which was first submitted to the censor and then used as a prompt copy and equipped with the notes and stage-directions necessary for this purpose. From the notes and stage-directions which occur in some of the printed quartos, there is a high probability that these were printed from prompt copies, and if what happened with other plays by other playwrights is any guide to what happened to Shakespeare's, some of these prompt copies were probably in his autograph. Some of them, also, were probably *not* but it may be claimed that at every stage in the passage of a play from Shakespeare's study the balance of probabilities is in favour of optimism.'²

Before, however, we accept Pollard's conclusions we shall do well to examine somewhat more closely the premisses on which his argument is based. It is likely enough that when

Pollard supposed: *S.'s Fight*, p. 56): 'Mr Hinchlow you accuse me with the breach of promise, trew it is I promysd to bring you the last scean which that you may see finished I send you the foule sheet [*sc.* the rough copy] & the fayr I was wrighting as your man can testify which if great busines had not prevented I had this night fynished ... I will not fayle to write this fayr and pcrfit the book which shall not ly on your hands' (*Henslowe Papers*, p. 78).

¹ These and other dramatic manuscripts mentioned in the text are discussed by Greg, *Dram. Docs.*, pp. 237-369: see also pp. 162-3.

² *Foundations*, pp. 6-7: cf. *S.'s Fight* (chap. iii), 'The Manuscripts of Shakespeare's Plays'.

Henslowe contracted with his needy crew for plays, he stipulated that the manuscripts should be delivered in such shape that they could be used for prompt-books and so avoid the expense of transcription. It is less likely that this was so in the case of Shakespeare, at any rate from 1594 onwards, or generally of the men who wrote for the Chamberlain's and King's company. Indeed, Pollard himself points out that what Shakespeare handed over were his original drafts—what Daborne called the foul sheets—and although the players commented on the absence of erasures, it would be rash to conclude that they were in a fit state to serve the prompter—at any rate without supporting evidence. This Pollard thought he had found in three autograph prompt-books that survive, although in order to provide relevant evidence it would have to be shown that they were not merely autograph but foul papers, which cannot be suggested of more than one of them. Besides, none of them can be taken as typical. In the form in which we have it the original manuscript of *Sir Thomas More* has been supplemented by additions and revisions by various writers—Chettle, Dekker, and probably Shakespeare—in several different hands, and presents a motley and amorphous appearance: it was almost certainly never acted,¹ and had it been it must assuredly have been transcribed. The most that can be said is that when the manuscript, in its original state, was enclosed in a wrapper inscribed 'The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore', it must have been intended as a prompt-book, and as such was submitted for licence to the Master of the Revels, who demanded such drastic alterations as led in the end to its being abandoned. The original manuscript is in the hand of Anthony Munday, who is generally supposed to have been the main author, but Pollard admits that the piece probably contains the work of other writers as well, in which case it must be a fair copy, and it is only an accident that the scribe who prepared it was himself part author. No inference, it would seem, can be drawn from this case.² *Believe as you List* is unquestionably a prompt-book, and is unquestionably autograph, but it is certainly not

¹ The contrary was confidently asserted by W. J. Lawrence in an article in *TLS*, 1 July 1920, but his arguments are unconvincing.

² See Note H on p. 102

an original draft, and the circumstances in which the manuscript was produced were exceptional.¹ It is the only one of the three that is known to have belonged to the King's company. *The Launching of the Mary* is also apparently a prompt-copy and is autograph: it may be an original draft, though it seems to have been partly rewritten to meet the censor's objections, but it too is anomalous.² Thus the three examples that Pollard selected do very little to support his case, and though other autograph prompt-books may exist, they are not really any more relevant.

Again, in regard to the inference that certain Shakespearian texts were printed from prompt-books caution is necessary. As we shall see when we come to examine the evidence more closely, the appearance of actors' names in a text by no means proves that it was printed from a prompt-copy, for an author may write a part with a particular actor in mind, and many stage-directions that have been commonly cited as typical of the prompter may equally well have been written by an author in close touch with the stage. Cases need to be distinguished more carefully than Pollard attempted to do.³

The truth is that Pollard's argument, at any rate in the form in which he presented it, affords little ground for supposing that any of Shakespeare's plays were printed from manuscripts in his own handwriting. We know, from the fact that his ease of composition could be inferred from them, that the manuscripts he habitually handed over to the company were his original drafts, and there is no certainty that he ever handed over anything else. But, with the possible exception of the wholly exceptional *Launching of the Mary*, acted by some unidentified company, no instance survives of an original draft being used as a prompt-book.⁴ What Pollard's argument lacks is a connecting link: either evidence that Shakespeare sometimes made fair copies of his plays or that foul papers normally became prompt-books. Without it Pollard's case fails: but that is far from disposing of the possibility that some of Shakespeare's plays may have been printed from autograph copy.⁵

¹ See Note I on p. 103. ² See Note J on p. 103. ³ See pp. 114 ff., 121 ff.

⁴ Concerning *The Captives* see pp. 108-9, and for *Troilus and Cressida* see p. 348.

⁵ See Note K on p. 103.

But it was mainly the form of Pollard's argument that was at fault: where he went wrong was in supposing that in order to vindicate the authenticity of Shakespearian texts it was necessary to show that they were printed from prompt-copies. Moreover, it was partly an *a priori* argument, designed to establish a possibility rather than demonstrate a fact. Such demonstration, if possible at all, must rest on a close analysis of the texts themselves. In 1923 Pollard hoped that 'Ten years hence . . . we may know more than we do now as to what these manuscripts were' that lay behind the printed editions,¹ and his own optimistic approach has borne fruit. If not within ten years, yet now, thirty years later, we may claim to know a good deal more about Shakespeare's manuscripts than we did. And if what we have learnt has shaken some of Pollard's arguments, it has at the same time vindicated his optimism, for the position as we now see it is in a way more favourable to his underlying thesis than that which he himself envisaged. In place of texts printed from autograph prompt-books more or less sophisticated by the book-keeper, present-day criticism is inclined to see texts printed from Shakespeare's unadulterated drafts. And this shift of view Pollard himself in some measure anticipated when in 1934 he wrote: 'if there was no playhouse transcript [made to serve the prompter] then Shakespeare's autograph had no competitor, while if a fair copy had been made in the playhouse, this would certainly have been regarded as the better manuscript to keep; and thus again the autograph [always supposing it had been preserved!] becomes the probable source of the good quarto.'²

But it was R. B. McKerrow who in 1931, in what has been described as 'One of the most illuminating bibliographical papers ever written',³ first brought the author's draft into the forefront of the critical picture. Modestly entitled 'The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts', it poses the question why the printed texts of plays contain as a rule so many

¹ *Foundations*, p. 21.

² *S.'s Text*, pp. 270—1. Already in 1916 he had written of *Richard II* (pp. 96-97) that 'the clean copy made by the scrivener would have been considered better worth keeping than the author's draft, and . . . thus . . . it was probably the one in Shakespeare's handwriting which . . . reached the printer'.

³ Bald, *Evidence and Inference*, p. 165.

more corrupt and unintelligible passages than do the non-dramatic texts of the time. In general, non-dramatic works, whether in verse or prose, are printed with substantial accuracy and present few cruxes, showing that the Elizabethan or Jacobean compositor, if supplied with straightforward copy, was able to make a quite competent job of it.¹ It follows that the manuscripts of many of the plays sent to the printer must have presented greater difficulties than those of most non-dramatic works.² But one would suppose that prompt-books, which have sometimes been suggested as the main source of 'good' dramatic texts, must of all manuscripts have been clean and straightforward if they were to fulfil their purpose, and this assumption is on the whole borne out by an examination of the copies that have survived. There seemed to McKerrow to be only one conclusion, namely that when the players decided to release one of their plays to the press, the manuscript they handed to the printer was not the prompt-copy, which in any case, since it usually bore the Master of the Revels' licence, there was very good reason for not letting out of their hands, but the author's original draft,³ with its deletions and alterations and loose ends, possibly already scrawled over by the prompter preliminary to the preparation of the official 'book'. There were, of course, some obvious objections that could be brought against so novel a theory, objections that McKerrow met with great skill and marked success. What they were, and what the answers are, will, however, be more conveniently discussed in considering the characteristics of the various categories of dramatic manuscripts that will occupy our attention in the next chapter.

¹ See Note L on p. 104.

² Here we have the 'bibliographical' principle, which is characteristic of modern criticism and distinguishes it so sharply from that of forty years ago, namely that, apart from ordinary typographical errors, the corruptions and abnormalities in the print should be traced to peculiarities in the copy rather than blamed on the assumed incompetence of the printer. The principle, however, has its limitations, regarding which see p. 333, Note K.

³ McKerrow is again modern in that he does not even allude to the fanciful hypotheses by which Dr. Johnson and Sidney Lee sought to account for the relative corruption of dramatic prints.

NOTE A (page 77)

Henry Fill and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* are generally held to be the outcome of collaboration between Shakespeare and John Fletcher about 1613. In the case of *Pericles* Shakespeare is thought to have contributed or revised, about 1608, the last three acts of a play begun or originally written by an unknown author.

Pericles Prince of Tyre, which was originally printed as Shakespeare's in a 'bad' quarto in 1609, though excluded from the First Folio, today finds a place in the canon. It was one of seven plays added in 1664 to the second issue of the Third Folio, which reproduced the quarto text as it stood. These additional plays were retained in the Fourth Folio in 1685 and by Nicholas Rowe in his editions of 1709. They were excluded by Pope in 1725; but in 1790 *Pericles* was readmitted by Malone at the instigation of Richard Farmer, who recognized Shakespeare's hand in it. Its position is quite anomalous, and it is curious that it and not *The Two Noble Kinsmen* should be thought to belong to the canon. In the Third Folio *Pericles* has signatures and pagination distinct from the other additional plays, and this has been thought to imply that the publisher, Philip Chetwind, originally intended to add *Pericles* only: it may be so, but the fact would lend no greater authority to the inclusion,

In a recent article Philip Edwards has propounded a most interesting theory respecting the play. According to him the extant text of *Pericles* is the work of two reporters, one of whom rewrote in flat verse what he could remember of Acts I and II, and the other strung together what he could remember of Acts III to V, with little attempt to make it verse at all and not much more attempt at coherence. Although Edwards does not go so far as to maintain that the original play was Shakespeare's throughout, he sees clearly that such is the logical conclusion of his argument, for the manifest difference of style between the earlier and later portions of the play would be fully explained by the difference in the method of reporting, and to suppose that the difference of reporter happened to coincide with a difference of authorship would be to invoke a gratuitous coincidence. (No doubt an explanation could be invented, but there is no sense in piling hypothesis on hypothesis.) If *Pericles* was indeed wholly Shakespeare's, we should be forced to suppose that its exclusion from the First Folio was due to the editors' inability to replace the 'bad' text by a good one. The play-book may have gone astray after the performance at Whitehall in 1619, like that of the slightly later *Winter's Tale*, and have never been recovered.

The Two Noble Kinsmen was published in 1634 as 'Written by the memorable Worthies of their time; M^r. Iohn Fletcher, and M^r. William Shakespeare. Gent.' in a quarto evidently printed from a prompt-copy written or at least annotated by Edward Knight, book-keeper in the King's company (see pp. 78-79).

To the collaboration-plays should perhaps be added *Cardenio*, a dramatization, presumably, of the story of Cardenio and Luscinda from *Don Quixote* (available in Shelton's translation of the first part in 1612). This play was acted at court in the winter of 1612-13 (as 'Cardenno') and again on 8 June

(as 'Cardenna'), and a manuscript of 'The History of Cardenio' was registered for publication by Humphrey Moseley on 9 September 1653 as by Fletcher and Shakespeare. Moseley's attributions, though most likely derived from the manuscripts, do not always carry weight. However, Cervantes's tale, with altered names, supplies the plot of a play called *Double Falsehood, or the Distressed Lovers*, printed in 1728 as 'Written Originally by W. Shakespeare; and now Revised and Adapted to the Stage by Mr. Theobald, the Author of Shakespeare Restor'd'. In spite of some improbabilities in Lewis Theobald's account, there seems no sufficient reason to doubt that he based his version on an early manuscript, perhaps bearing an ascription to Shakespeare, or to believe that he was perpetrating 'so agreeable a Cheat' as that of which, even at the time, he was accused. His indignant repudiation of the suggestion that the original might have been by Fletcher precludes our supposing that he had somehow acquired Moseley's manuscript or even knew of his entrance.

A word may be added on other possible work of Shakespeare's outside the canon. Most English students now accept the Shakespearian authorship of the three additional pages and possibly a few other lines in *Sir Thomas More*. The case for the attribution was fully argued in *Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More* by A. W. Pollard and others (Cambridge University Press, 1923); see also Chambers, *W. Shake.*, i. 514, and (on the palaeographical evidence) Greg in *TLS*, 24 Nov. and i Dec. 1927. The attribution has, indeed, been strongly contested. Repeated attacks on the palaeographical side by S. A. Tannenbaum are too wayward and prejudiced to carry weight. More general criticisms by L. L. Schucking in *RES*, Jan. 1925, i. 40—59, have been lately repeated in the *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, May 1952, xxxiii. 225—8: suffice it that the writer asserts that it is 'Thomas Heywood, an den m. E. sicher zuerst als den Verfasser der Morus-Szene zu denken ist'. A careful inquiry into sources by Marie Schutt in *Englische Studien*, 1933-4, lxxviii. 209-26, produces some curious results but is admittedly inconclusive as to date. On the other side the masterly statement of the case by R. W. Chambers in his essay on 'Shakespeare and the Play of More' in *Man's Unconquerable Mind* (1939), 1952, pp. 204—49, comes as near to formal proof as its nature allows, and is likely to be held conclusive by anyone capable of judging evidence. The latest review of the case, by R. C. Bald in *Shakespeare Survey*, 1949, ii. 44-65, ends *et tu Shakespeare an diabolus*. In the present discussion it will be assumed that the three pages are in Shakespeare's autograph.

A play entitled 'The Raigne of King Edward the third' (Q 1596) was ascribed to Shakespeare by Edward Capell, who printed it in his *Prolusions* (1759-60). Opinion has varied, but most modern critics consider the Countess of Salisbury episode (i. ii. 94 to n. ii. 211 in Tucker Brooke, *Shakespeare Apocrypha*, 1908) to be by a different hand from the rest, and Chambers (*W. Shake.*, i. 516) agrees with Tennyson that this may be Shakespeare's. Uncertainty regarding the date of the play and the company to which it belonged hampers judgement. No other of the many attributions to Shakespeare are worth considering, though Swinburne, who differed from Tennyson over *Edward III*, was convinced of the Shakespearian authorship of *Arden of Feversham*.

NOTE B (page 78)

The book-keeper in an Elizabethan playhouse was, as his name implies, the person who had charge of the prompt-books. He is generally, and plausibly, assumed to have been identical with the prompter, or 'book-holder' as he was called. If so, it was doubtless he who annotated and on occasion transcribed copies for the stage. 'Book' was the regular term for the prompt-copy of a play, and two are so inscribed: it even survives here and there in the Stationers' Register when a prompt-book was presented for entrance, as for instance on 28 Oct. 1600, 'Abooke called the booke of the merchant of Venyce', implying that the manuscript presented, like those of *John a Kent* and *Sir Thomas More*, was inscribed 'The Booke of—'. Indeed, the phrase 'to hold the book', meaning to prompt, is current among actors today, as it was when Nashe made Will Summer say, 'I pray you holde the booke well, we be not *non plus* in the latter end of the play' (*Summer's Last Will and Testament*, ed. McKerrow, 1. 1820). The book-keeper was, on the other hand, distinct from the stage-keepers, menials who swept the stage and probably set properties, and who occasionally walked on as supers, which the prompter, of course, could not do.

NOTE C (page 79)

That Knight the company's book-keeper was the Edward Knight of the protection and the scribe of the play, long assumed, has now been proved by J. Gerritsen's discovery (pp. xxi ff.) that the hand of an 'Edw: Knight' who signed as witness to an agreement of 20 Mar. 1616 (*Henslowe Papers*, p. 90) is identical with that of the prompt-books. There is nothing in this document to show what Knight's position may have been at the time. Knight had evidently at least annotated the prompt-copy from which *The Two Noble Kinsmen* was printed in 1634 (see Note A), and if we knew that he had done so for the original performance it would carry his activities back to about 1613; but the inclusion in the directions of the abbreviated names of two actors, Curtis Greville and Thomas Tuckfield, points to a revival probably about 1625, and it may have been for this that Knight revised the book.

NOTE D (page 79)

It is true that nowhere in the Folio do we find trace of Knight's very distinctive stage-directions, familiar to us from several manuscripts and also to be found in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. Another scribe connected with the King's men was Ralph Crane, who wrote the prompt-book of *Sir John van Olden Earnavelt* as early as 1619. He very likely had a hand in preparing the copy for the Folio (see pp. 217, 335, 356, 415, 418), and if, for example, he transcribed *The Tempest* for the collection, he may have done some work on the text that could be called editorial. But there is no reason to suppose that he was ever officially connected with the company, and he is less likely than the book-keeper to have been in a position of editorial responsibility. His work was first identified and his career traced by F. P. Wilson in 1926. His peculiarities as a scribe have been discussed by Greg in *The Library*, Mar. 1942,

xxii. 208-22, by Greg and Wilson in the introduction to *The Witch* (pp. xiv-xv), and by M. McL. Cook and Wilson in that to *Demetrius and Enanthe* (pp. ix-xi), both in the Malone Society's editions, 1950-1.

NOTE E (page 81)

Chambers pertinently observes that "This term "original" is of common use in the records of the medieval stage, and there it seems to represent the authoritative copy of a play by which the performances were governed, and to replace the earlier *Qrdo* of the liturgical drama. It often appears in some such form as "regenall", and it is difficult to resist the conviction that in the mind of medieval writers it was connected with *regere*' (W. Shake., I. 97). This would apply well to the prompt-book. But Humphrey Moseley, prefacing the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1647, appears to give the word a more precise meaning. After remarking that on the stage, and consequently in private transcripts of stage versions, 'some Scenes and Passages' were omitted, he claims that 'now you have both All that was Acted, and all that was not; even the perfect full Originalls without the least mutilation'. However, as Chambers points out (i. 98), 'although Moseley may have restored "cut" passages, it is clear from his texts that apart from these he was often printing from "books" which had undergone [some stage] adaptation'. Thus by 'Originalls'¹ he seems to have meant full texts, but not necessarily texts exactly as the authors had written them. If we assume that it was in the same sense that the word is used in the Shakespeare Folio, it is probably generally but not literally true of all the plays: the Folio texts of *Hamlet* and *Lear* can hardly be supposed to contain all that Shakespeare wrote, and Heminge and Condell may well have considered that it was the 'book' that afforded the most authoritative text. In any case their words must not be pressed as if they had a legal meaning.

NOTE F (page 84)

Pollard adds: 'The theory that the plays must have been "multiplied by transcript after transcript" ... has not one shred of evidence to support it... The statement that the plays were "fragments minutely broken, fortuitously reunited" ... is on no higher level. . . . That the plays might have been "compilations made by *stealth* out of the separate parts written for the theatre" is conceivable, though there is no evidence to support it; but that these compilations could have been made by *chance*, that fragmentary "parts" could have been "*fortuitously reunited*" is surely not even conceivable'. Pollard later (*Foundations*, pp. 9-10) saw fit to modify his criticism somewhat in view of suggestions that fragments of actors' parts may have been used in vamping up the texts of the bad quartos and, more important, that 'there are three plays first printed in the Folio, the *Two Gentlemen of verona*, *Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *Winters Tale*, which, it has been plausibly maintained, were mainly or entirely put together from the Actor's [*sic*] parts reunited (*not fortuitously*) by means of the "Plot" or list of the entrances of the various actors in each scene' (see pp. 163-4). Some may doubt whether the modification was really called for.

NOTE G (page 90)

See Chambers, *Eliz. Stage*, iii. 183-4: 'It is generally supposed, and I think with justice, that the acting companies did not find it altogether to their advantage to have their plays printed. . . . Presumably the danger was not so much that readers would not become spectators, as that other companies might buy the plays and act them', though admittedly the risk of this seems to have been small so far as the London stage was concerned. Chambers refers to Heywood, who wrote in the epistle prefixed to his *English Traveller* (1633): 'Others of [my plays] are still retained in the hands of some Actors, who thinke it against their peculiar profit to haue them come in Print'. Chambers adds: 'We find the King's Revels syndicate in 1608 entering into a formal agreement debarring its members from putting any of the play-books jointly owned by them into print' (cf. ii. 65), but this was only natural and implies nothing in regard to the policy of the syndicate as a whole.

NOTE H (page 94)

See Greg, *Dram. Docs.*, p. 200. The make-up of the manuscript of *Sir Thomas More* and over-emphasis on the claims of economy and the fear of piracy became the basis of what Chambers has dubbed the theory of 'continuous copy', according to which an author's original draft, after receiving the licence of the Master of the Revels, became the official prompt-book, was annotated by the book-keeper, was cut or expanded according to the demands of circumstance, and during a long theatrical career was freely revised and rewritten, sometimes in the margin, sometimes by means of inserted or substituted slips or leaves; and might in the end be sent to press for the luckless printer to make of it what he could. This theory has been mainly developed in relation to Shakespeare by Dover Wilson. (It may be added that in his recent edition of 3 *Henry 7*, p. 118, he protests that it is 'a doctrine which the said Wilson long since abandoned, without, to the best of his recollection, ever consciously holding it'. But it would seem that the denial is only intended to apply to the *Henry VI* plays.) Pollard was a good deal attracted by it about 1919-20 at a time when he and Wilson were working in close touch with one another. Later Pollard seems to have had misgivings, for already in 1923 he remarked that 'in most of the plays, if we look closely enough into them, we shall find enough discrepancies, enough evidence of what seems imperfect revision, enough diversity of style, to tempt us to believe that Shakespeare wrote all his plays in the years of his dramatic apprenticeship and spent the rest of his working life in constantly rewriting them'. He rather spoilt the effect by adding: 'That theory is not much more untenable than its opposite which envisages each play as the result of a continuous effort throughout so many weeks and then finished and done with' (*Foundations*, p. 15). We may freely admit the possibility of revision or collaboration in a few plays; but the fact remains that those who begin by accounting for everything that seems to them unexpected by the postulate of rewriting and recasting end by seeing each play as the outcome of a long process of rehandling of earlier material by the same or by some other band. The theory might never have been pushed to the length it has but for *Sir Thomas More*, which has proved an unfortunate red herring in Shake-

spearian textual criticism. On the whole question of revision see Chambers, *Disintegration*, and concerning 'continuous copy' *W. Shake.*, i. 151-2.

NOTE I (pageys)

Greg, *Dram. Docs.*, pp. 198-9. Massinger had been rash enough to write a play on the deposing of Sebastian of Portugal by Philip II, which the Master of the Revels refused to license 'ther being a peace sworn twixt the kings of England and Spayne'. Massinger thereupon recast and adapted it to a classical story, and in this shape it was duly licensed (*Variorum*, 1821, iii. 229-31, 230; Adams, *Herbert*, pp. 19, 33). Although little or no structural alteration was needed, the substitution of classical for modern names and setting necessitated more alteration than could conveniently be done on the existing copy. Rewriting by the author was inevitable, but he had no difficulty in producing a perfectly clean manuscript for use in the theatre. This, at least, is the most likely origin of Massinger's one autograph prompt-book. Two other prompt-copies survive of plays in which he is supposed to have had a share, *Sir John van Olden Barnavelte* and *The Parliament of Love*, the first a King's men's play, and they are both in the hands of scribes.

NOTE J (page 95)

See Greg, *Dram. Docs.*, p. 201. It is impossible to believe that Walter Mountfort's amateurish piece can have achieved more than one or two performances sponsored and probably paid for by the East India Company. (Subsidized performances were not unknown: Essex's supporters paid the Chamberlain's men 40^s. to act *Richard II* on the eve of the rising. See Chambers, *W. Shake.*, ii. 325.) For these performances shift would if possible be made with the manuscript as the author delivered it, however rough—and it is in fact in a very untidy state. Although the Master of the Revels licensed it, he demanded that he should in future be supplied with 'fairer Copy' to read. (There has been some misunderstanding over this. It has been said (Malone Society edition, p. xi; Greg, *Dram. Docs.*, p. 200, and *Editorial Problem*, pp. 33, 43) that Herbert, after licensing it, asked to be supplied with a fair copy of the play. This is on the face of it unlikely. Adams (*Herbert*, p. 35) and the Malone Society's edition both render Herbert's note, 'I commande your Bookeeper to present mee with a faire Copy hereafter'; but though the ink has faded, the reading is almost certainly 'a fairer Copy' (as given in Greg, *Dram. Docs.*, p. 301), in which case 'hereafter' must be taken to mean 'in future'.)

NOTE K (page 95)

Under Pollard's immediate influence Chambers wrote, with less than his usual caution: 'Mr. Pollard has dealt luminously with the question of the nature of the "book", and has disposed of the assumption that it was normally a copy made by a "play-house" scrivener of the author's manuscript. For this assumption there is no evidence whatever. There is, indeed, little direct evidence one way or the other; but what there is points to the conclusion that the "original" or standard copy of a play kept in the play-house was the author's autograph

manuscript, endorsed with the licence of the Master of the Revels for performance, and marked by the book-keeper or for his use with the indications of cuts and the like, and with stage-directions for exits and entrances and the disposition of properties, supplementary to those which the author had furnished' (*Eliz. Stage*, iii. 193). Actually, of fifteen manuscripts that can reasonably be regarded as prompt-books not more than five (including *Believe as you List* and *The Launching of the Mary*) seem likely to be autograph.

NOTE L (page 97)

In illustration McKerrow takes three texts at random. In the 5,391 lines of Book IV of *The Faery Queen* the Oxford Press editor finds less than two dozen errors, mostly trifling, and only two passages in which there could be any doubt of the correct reading, both open to easy emendation. In *Greene's News from Heaven and Hell*, a pamphlet of 62 pages, there is again the usual sprinkling of misprints, but 'not, I think, a single error which could cause a moment's difficulty in reading'. And in ten folio pages of *The Treasury of Ancient and Modern Times*, printed by Jaggard in 1619, 'I noted eighteen errors, of which only one is at all serious'. Why then does the Folio text of *Coriolanus* 'in some 3,400 lines contain, apart from many errors or irregularities in punctuation and line arrangement, at least twenty-one passages in which conservative modern editors have had either to emend the text or admit their inability to do so? Why does the second quarto of *Hamlet*... contain at least a dozen passages of similar incorrectness?'

IV. *Editorial 'Problems.* 2

THE problem that faced the editors of the First Folio, assuming a desire on their part to give readers as authoritative a text as possible of Shakespeare's plays, was what texts they should select for the printer in those cases in which there was more than one to choose from. To critics who were content to assume, and disposed to assert, that Heminge and Condell took whatever first came to hand or left it to Jaggard to pick whatever he pleased from among existing copies, no problem, of course, presented itself. But with the closer scrutiny of individual texts and the sort of general discussion that Pollard initiated, the question has been recognized as one that is certainly pertinent and to which an answer may even be possible. Gradually it has become apparent that the Folio editors must have bestowed some care upon their choice of text and went to some trouble to fulfil the promises they held out in their preliminary discourses. The modern critic and the modern editor have therefore a problem of their own: to ascertain the way in which the first editors set about their task, and to detect, if possible, in each individual instance the source of the text they chose and the nature of the authority that lay behind it. It is no use pretending that this is easy or that certainty is always, if ever, possible. The question whether a particular Folio text was set up from a manuscript or from an earlier print is one which sufficiently patient and minute examination should be able to answer definitely, although in a few cases critics are not yet agreed. But when we probe beyond this comparatively superficial problem, and ask what sort of manuscript was handed to the Folio printer or lay behind the printed edition supplied, or in some cases what sort of manuscript it was by comparison with which that edition was corrected before being used as copy for the Folio, we enter an altogether different field of criticism, a misty mid region of Weir, a land of shadowy shapes and melting outlines, where not even the most patient inquiry and the most penetrating analysis can hope to arrive at any but tentative and proximate conclusions.

But if what song the Sirens sang is a question not beyond all conjecture, we may at least hope to form an idea of the manuscripts behind the transmitted texts of Shakespeare's plays that can claim to be reasonable and to possess a measure of plausibility. We shall be wise to pitch our expectation no higher.¹

But before proceeding to discuss individual plays it will be necessary to say something about the various types of written or printed copy that we know or may suppose to have been at the editors' command. The types, it must be admitted, are in a sense ideals that we construct in our imagination, but we are fortunate in being able at many points to check conjecture by comparison with actually surviving manuscripts or prints as the case may be.²

Obviously the type of manuscript that first presents itself for consideration is the author's rough draft of his play, the 'foul sheets' mentioned by Daborne, the 'foul papers' we shall find Edward Knight transcribing. By a rough draft is not to be understood a first sketch but a copy representing the play more or less as the author intended it to stand, but not itself clear or tidy enough to serve as a prompt-book. Whether behind it lay a yet rougher draft we can hardly tell. In some cases it is probable enough; but an experienced dramatist would doubtless be able to produce at once a sufficiently coherent text. He would be working, we may suppose, on a fairly detailed scenario.³ How completely the text of the original draft was reduced to final form would probably depend on circumstances. If the author was going to prepare the fair copy himself, as we have seen Daborne doing,⁴ he might leave some details to be determined in the process: if the fair copy was to be made by a scribe, the draft would have to incorporate the author's final touches. Yet even in this case some reservation is perhaps necessary, for the author would know that his text was likely to undergo further alteration to meet the demands of the censor and the

¹ On the limits of legitimate inference in such matters see the cautionary paper by Madeleine Doran entitled 'An Evaluation of Evidence in Shakespearean Textual Criticism' in the *English Institute Annual*, 1941 (Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. 95-114).

² See Note A on p. 162.

³ See Note B on p. 164.

⁴ See p. 923.

exigencies of the stage, and unless he were more meticulous than we should naturally suppose Shakespeare to have been, he might leave occasional tangles and loose ends to be dealt with by the book-keeper or settled in rehearsal. The piety of Heminge and Condell allowed them to say that so fluent was Shakespeare's pen that they had 'scarse receiued from him a blot in his papers'. How literally this can be taken a closer examination of the texts must decide, but it is also conceivable that some of the lack of blotting may have been due to the easy ways of the author, who failed to tidy up his foul papers, and that the scribe charged with the preparation of the prompt-book may sometimes have wished, like Jonson, that Shakespeare had done a little more 'blotting' of his own.

Perhaps the most revolutionary part of McKerrow's theory that plays were generally printed from the authors' original drafts¹ was the tacit assumption that these would be preserved in the playhouse after the prompt-copy had been prepared. We are fortunate in being able to point to an instance in which this was so, even if it is a solitary one. When, probably sometime between 1625 and 1635, Edward Knight prepared for a private patron a transcript of Fletcher's tragedy of *Bonduca*² originally acted fifteen or twenty years before, he omitted two or three scenes at the beginning of the last act, and added a note explaining that 'the occasion, why these are wanting here, [is that] the booke where by it was first Acted from [*sc.* the prompt-book] is lost: and this hath beene transcrib'd from the [evidently imperfect] fowle papers of the Authors w^{ch} were found'. He does not indeed say that they were found in the playhouse,² but if it is true that any considerable number of plays were printed from similar manuscripts, it is obvious that the theatres are the only places in which they can have been preserved. Nor is it, on the face of it, at all unlikely that after an author's draft had been transcribed for

¹ See pp. 96-97.

² The point must not, of course, be lost sight of. As Chambers says: 'Unfortunately, he does not say whether the "fowle papers" were preserved at the theatre or in the hands of the author or his representatives' (*W. Shake.*, i. 125), and recently A. K. McIlwraith has detected in the phrase 'wch were found' a suggestion that such preservation was unusual (*RES*, July 1953, iv. 284). The chief reason for entertaining the hypothesis is the pragmatic one that it accounts for much in extant texts that is otherwise difficult of explanation.

the prompter it should have been stowed away in case of accident to the prompt-book or of its becoming illegible through much handling.¹ It is conceivable that even when the author prepared his own fair copy the company found it prudent to insist on the rough draft being handed over at the same time as a safeguard against double dealing.²

It is, perhaps, hardly surprising that among the waifs and strays of theatrical manuscripts that have come down to us, there is not much that we can confidently claim as foul papers. Most of the additions in the manuscript of *Sir Thomas More* may be reasonably regarded as such.³ There exists a manuscript of part of a scene from Marlowe's *Massacre at Paris* which contains a text fuller than and superior to that of the very corrupt print of c. 1594: it can never have formed part of a prompt-book and looks like an author's draft: it may be the solitary fragment of Marlowe's autograph that we possess.⁴ These do not take us very far. But there is reason to believe that we have the original draft of Thomas Heywood's play *The Captives*. This autograph manuscript does not, it is true, show much alteration, and since it has been elaborately annotated for stage use, it might naturally be supposed to be a prompt-copy. On the other hand, such a fluent writer as Heywood must have been⁵ could doubtless have produced foul papers no more blotted than these, and there are three considerations that between them make it impossible to regard it as an official 'book'. In the first place, although the play was licensed by the Master of the Revels for the Cock-

¹ We have already seen (p. 92) that the manuscripts of Shakespeare's plays whose unblotted state is recorded by Heminge and Condell must have been his original drafts, and it will be noticed that they speak of them as though they were manuscripts still in their possession rather than as ephemeral papers that had once passed through their hands.

² See Note C on p. 164.

³ One of the revisional hands is that of the book-keeper fitting together the work of other men; another revises an already written scene. But the three pages by Shakespeare are obviously free composition and may be used as evidence of the author's manner of writing.

⁴ In the Folger Shakespeare Library: printed, with facsimile, by J. Q. Adams, *The Library*, March 1934? xiv. 447-69. The supposed signature of 'Christofer Marley' published by Bakeless in his study of Marlowe (1942, i. 208) does nothing either to confirm or to confute the attribution.

⁵ In 1633 he claimed to have written or had a main hand in over two hundred plays (epistle to *The English Traveller*).

pit company (the Lady Elizabeth's men) on 3 September 1624,¹ there is no inscription to that effect on the blank page at the end.² Next, the manuscript is written in a vile hand that must, one would suppose, have made it useless to the prompter.³ Last, and most conclusive, the book-keeper's notes are written in a hand almost as bad as the text, from which no attempt is made to distinguish them. The inference is that in this case the book-keeper did his work of stage-adaptation on the author's foul papers with a view to having a transcript made for the prompter presumably by another hand. That would be the natural procedure unless the book-keeper were himself, like Knight, something of a calligrapher, which the annotator of *The Captives* clearly was not. Such a transcript would have resembled *The Welsh Ambassador*' a manuscript probably prepared about the same time for the same company, in which the text and the prompt-directions are in the same hand and are hardly distinguished in style. Clearly foul papers annotated by the book-keeper are one of the types of manuscript we shall have to take into account.

The Shakespearian pages in *Sir Thomas More* and Heywood's *Captives* alike prove that an author's foul papers may be reasonably free from alteration. Supposing the former to be in this respect a fair sample of the manuscripts that Shakespeare handed over to the players, while it may be a matter of opinion whether Heminge and Condell were justified in describing these as containing scarcely a blot, there can be no doubting that they prove the author's ease of composition. This fluency was, we may readily believe, common to other writers of the time, and the unblotted papers became a literary tradition. At the end of the address of 'The Stationer to the Readers' in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647 Humphrey Moseley wrote: 'What ever I have scene of Mr.

¹ G. Chalmers, *Supplemental Apology*, 1799, p. 218; Adams, *Herbert*, p. 29.

² Not in itself a very weighty objection: out of fifteen supposed prompt-books at least four appear not to have borne a licence.

³ Heywood was aware how badly he wrote: at the end of *The Exemplary Lives of Nine Worthy Women*, 1640, he excuses the compositor for errors in reading 'a difficult and unacquainted hand'.

⁴ If the inference here made is correct, the important conclusion follows that a printed text that shows distinctive marks of the prompter may yet have been printed from foul papers.

Fletchers owne hand, is free from interlining; and his friends affirme he never writ any one thing twice: it seemes he had that rare felicity to prepare and perfect all first in his owne braine; to shape and attire his Notions, to adde or loppe off, before he committed one word to writing, and never touched pen till all was to stand as firme and immutable as if ingraven in Brasse or Marble/ This may have been true to much the same extent as what Heminge and Condell said of Shakespeare. But a comparison of Knight's copy of the foul papers of *Bonduca*¹ with the folio text (apparently printed from the prompt-copy) suggests that they contained a considerable amount of not very clear alteration.

In general, and *a priori*⁷, we should expect an author's foul papers to show quite a lot of deletion, alteration, interlining, false starts, and the like, and the thoroughness and clearness with which corrections were made would be likely to vary much with the care and patience of the writer. Moreover, what was sufficiently clear for the book-keeper, familiar with dramatic writing and the ways of playwrights—able too, in the case of Shakespeare, to consult the author at need²—might be anything but clear to the average compositor, if the foul papers happened to come his way. One of the most interesting texts in this respect is the 'good' quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* of 1599. From this it appears that the first four lines of the Friar's opening speech in n. iii were first written as part of Romeo's speech at the end of the preceding scene, for they are printed in both positions. Again, in Romeo's soliloquy at the tomb, the four lines

Depart againe, come lye thou in my arme,
 Heer's to thy health, where ere thou tumblest in.
 O true Apothecarie!
 Thy drugs are quicke. Thus with a kisse I die

are plainly a not very happy first draft of the ensuing thirteen (v. iii. 108—20). And there are several minor duplications, such as 'I will beleeeue, Shall I beleeeue that vnsubstantiall

¹ See p. 107.

² According to Dover Wilson (*MS. Hamlet*, i. 170-4) the prompt-copy of *Hamlet* must have been prepared and the play produced in complete independence of Shakespeare. But the circumstances may have been exceptional.

death is amorous' (v. iii. 102-3), and what P. A. Daniel called the 'admirable confusion' at in. iii. 40—43.¹

Besides alterations, whether carefully or carelessly made, foul papers may very well contain passages that should have been altered but were not. If an author gets embrangled in a speech, he may impatiently pass on in the heat of composition, intending perhaps to go back to it, or perhaps content to leave it to the copyist to disentangle. In Shakespeare's draft of More's great speech to the rebels there is one passage where, in his haste, he got into difficulties, attempted an alteration that scarcely mended matters, and finally left it to the book-keeper to tidy up as best he could.² In the Queen Mab speech in *Romeo and Juliet* three lines appear to be out of place and the repetition of the Courtier may be an oversight.³ The same phenomenon appears in *Richard II*, parts of which, it seemed to Pollard, 'Shakespeare wrote ... at top speed, the words often coming to him as fast as he could set them down, and . . . some passages he could hardly have troubled himself to read over'.⁴ He mentioned as 'The worst instance of this . . . the confusing double reference to Peace in i. iii. 132 and 137, which seems to have led to five lines being cut out in despair of mending it'.⁵ We find similar hesitation in other authors. Fletcher, when he began writing *Bonduca*, was uncertain even of the number and relationship of some of his principal characters: in the first scene he gave the British queen a son and a daughter; later he introduced a second daughter and turned the son into a nephew. And at the end of the play he left one strand of the plot in the air, to be tucked in perhaps by a different hand.⁶

¹ For further details see p. 233, Note C, and also Note D on p. 165.

² See Greg, *Editorial Problem*, pp. 103-4. Commenting on the alteration, Pollard remarked (*S.'s Text*, p. 275) that 'The passage suggests that the bookkeeper in Shakespeare's theatre may have done considerably more harm to the text of the plays than editors have guessed!' It depends what you mean by harm. That he sometimes interfered is likely enough, and he may occasionally have sacrificed some lines of Shakespeare; that his interference was unwarranted we have less reason to believe. After all, Shakespeare was there to protest if the book-keeper proved too high-handed.

³ See p. 232, Note B (end).

⁴ Pollard, *Richard II*, p. 98.

⁵ There is clearly something wrong with the passage as it stands in the first quarto. The Folio omitted ll. 129-33; Capell, perhaps with better judgement, cut out ll. 134-8.

⁶ See Greg, *Bonduca*, pp. xii-xiii.

Another possible mark of foul papers is the appearance of 'ghost' characters. At the beginning of a scene an author will sometimes write down a list of the characters he is likely to require, but when it comes to the point he may not provide speeches for them all. Or he may find that he does not need a character till later, and may provide a separate entrance for him while still leaving his name standing at the head of the scene. If the dumb characters have parts elsewhere and are minor members of a group, this does not matter much, though it is theatrically extravagant and may prove dramatically clumsy. If, on the other hand, they appear nowhere else, or are inappropriate to the scene as developed, or are too important to be allowed to appear as supers, the book-keeper is likely to eliminate them from the prompt-copy. Contrariwise, the author may, of course, write a speech for a character for whose presence he has not provided, in which case the book-keeper will certainly need to add the name to the initial direction and, further, to make sure that it gets into the 'plot'.¹ It is not easy to point to indubitable examples of 'ghosts', but Chambers notes that 'Juliet is unexpectedly dumb on her first appearance in *Measure for Measure*', i. ii. 120,² and that 'Leonato is accompanied by "Innogen his wife" at the beginning of *Much Ado About Nothing*. She recurs [unnamed] in one later scene [n. i. i], but has not a word throughout the play', and so important a character as the heroine's mother, if she appears at all, 'ought not to be a mute'.³ Petruchio in *Romeo and Juliet* (in. i. 36) is probably meant to be present though he does not speak.

The worst oversights that an author leaves in his foul papers we may look to find corrected in the prompt-book, as we do those of Fletcher mentioned above, and this affords one criterion that should help to distinguish the two types of manuscript. We shall, indeed, find that so much of what

¹ See Note E on p. 166.

² She is unquestionably meant to be present (see l. 119) and in the circumstances her silence is perhaps natural, but it is at the same time dramatically awkward, and in fact it looks as though Shakespeare had forgotten her. In *Airs Well* (in. v. i) Chambers (*H. Shake.*, i. 450) supposes Violenta to be a mute, but the name may be an error for Diana.

³ *W. Shake.*, i. 231. He admits that 'Abridgement is a possible explanation', and ghost characters have, indeed, been thought to be evidence of revision.

follows turns on this distinction that it will not be possible to keep the discussion of the two apart. Foul papers and prompt-books call for simultaneous treatment.

The features we have been considering are of a kind that, if we are concerned at all for the reputation of the author as a conscientious artist, we shall hope and expect to meet with only occasionally in his manuscripts. But we shall naturally look for other, lesser, and more frequent stigmas by which foul papers may be recognized. Here again McKerrow pointed the way. In an important paper published in 1935, which he merely called 'A Suggestion regarding Shakespeare's Manuscripts', he drew attention to the curiously erratic manner in which characters are designated, alike as speakers and in stage-directions, in the original editions of some plays, in contrast with the almost complete regularity prevailing in others.¹ Such irregularity would be natural enough in the work of an author composing freely, who may vary the descriptions of his characters much as a novelist does. He may, indeed, at first be doubtful what to call or how to distinguish them. At the beginning of *The Comedy of Errors* there is great confusion in the way the Antipholuses and Dromios are distinguished, and it is only in the fourth act that a consistent method emerges. Or a character may be indicated by his function even after he has been given a proper name. In the same play Angelo first appears as such, later he is simply Goldsmith'. In *Love's Labour's Lost* the King of Navarre is indifferently 'Ferdinand', 'Nauar', or 'King'; Armado is also 'Braggart', Holophernes 'the Pedant', and Nathaniel 'the Curat'. Costard is also 'Clowne', and so is Peter in *Romeo and Juliet* and Bottom in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* and Launcelot in *The Merchant of Venice*. In *All's Well that Ends Well* 'Bertram, Count of Rossillion', as he is duly named in the initial direction, is afterwards sometimes Bertram and sometimes Rossillion, the Countess is

¹ He instanced on the one hand *The Comedy of Errors* and *All's Well that Ends Well* in the Folio and the quartos of *Romeo and Juliet* (1599), *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* (1600), *Love's Labour's Lost* (1598), *The Merchant of Venice* (1600), and *Titus Andronicus* (1'94)—but the feature is less marked in the last two—and on the other *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Measure for Measure*, *Twelfth Night*, *King John*, and *Macbeth*, all Folio plays—but we must except the Induction to *The Shrew*, and *King John* is at best a doubtful case.

also 'Old Countess', 'Lady', 'Old Lady', and 'Mother', and Lafeu is also 'Old Lafeu' and 'Old Lord', but the last may be a wrong expansion. Or it may be the relation of a character to others on the stage that is uppermost in the author's mind. In *Romeo and Juliet* Capulet becomes 'Father' when talking to his daughter, and Lady Capulet rings the changes on 'Lady of the house', 'Old Lady', 'Lady', 'Wife', 'Capu. Wi.', and 'Mother' (Mo., 'M.'). Uncertainty of this sort would be inconvenient, and, if frequent, intolerable, in a prompt-book, and it would be the business of the scribe to remove it. Occasional instances might remain, either through carelessness or because, like 'Clowne', they did not matter, but we may assume that in a manuscript prepared for the prompter the designations of the characters will be reasonably clear and consistent. As McKerrow said, 'A prompter of a repertory theatre could hardly be expected to remember that Bertram was the same person as Rossillion, or Armado the same as Braggart'.¹

In foul papers ambiguity may also arise through the omission of, or the use of inadequate, speech-prefixes. In his crowded scene in *Sir Thomas More* Shakespeare assigned a series of interruptions simply to an 'other' ('oth', 'o') speaker, and later assigned two consecutive speeches to 'all', leaving it to the book-keeper to distribute them among the particular persons present, which he dutifully did. In the original portion of the play there is a marginal addition of five speeches in another hand (11. 647—58): it is plain that they belong to the Clown and the Sheriff, but the only prefix is a 'clo' at the beginning. Had a fresh transcript been made, the speeches with their necessary prefixes would no doubt have been incorporated in the text.

The appearance of actors' names in a text has commonly been taken to be characteristic of the prompt-book. But here we need to distinguish two quite different ways in which they occur. An actor's name may appear in place of a proper name or of a description in the case of a particular incidental charac-

¹ S.'s MSS., p. 464. Inconsistency in the designation of characters has sometimes been treated, particularly by Dover Wilson, as evidence of revision. But such an explanation is obviously inapplicable, for instance, in the case of *Romeo and Juliet*, whereas McKerrow's theory covers all cases.

ter. Or an actor's name may appear as duplicating and as a gloss on the name or description of a character. Now, as McKerrow pointed out,¹ an author in close touch with the theatre—and no one was in closer touch with his fellow actors than Shakespeare—when he writes a minor 'character' part, or one calling for some particular physical trait, will obviously do so with a particular actor in mind, and nothing would be more likely than that, instead of giving a name (or other designation) to the part, he should simply put down the name of the actor he intended should play it, or even that, having first given a name to the part, he should later forget or cease to trouble about it, and substitute the much more important name of the actor. This will explain the occasional appearance of actors' names, in a particular manner, in foul papers, and consequently in texts printed from them. Such appearances are less likely to persist in prompt-books, for they will, of course, be actors in the original production, and if the play continues to be performed the names are unlikely to be left standing when, in the course of time, the parts come to be taken by other performers.

This use of actors' names by the author is not, of course, likely to be frequent, but there is evidence that Shakespeare quite naturally fell into it on occasion. In 2 *Henry IV* he introduces a Beadle, who is described as an 'Atomy' or 'Anatomy', and who in the quarto (1600) is given the name of Sincklo both in the direction and the speech-headings (v. iv. i, 4, 33). (The name disappears in the Folio.) Clearly Shakespeare must have had a living skeleton in mind, and there is other evidence both that the actor John Sincklo was of peculiar appearance and that the company included at least one abnormally lean man.² Sincklo also has a speech as one of the Players in the Induction to *The Taming of the*

¹ *Dram. MSS.*, pp. 269, 274-5. His suggestion was originally made in ignorance of two important papers by Allison Gaw, 'Actors' Names in Basic Shakespearean Texts', *PMLA*, 1925, xl. 530, and 'John Sincklo as one of Shakespeare's Actors', *Anglia*, 1926, xlix. 289. But both had been anticipated by Crompton Rhodes, *First Folio*, 1923, p. 57.

² Greg, *Editorial Problem*, pp. 73¹, 1163. We have in 2 *Henry IV* not only the skeleton Beadle but Justice Shallow, whose 'dimensions to any thick sight were invisible' (nr. ii. 336), and the recruit Shadow, who was like 'the edge of a pen-knife' (III. ii. 286). The Beadle could double with the latter but not with the former.

ShreW) and as this alludes to a particular impersonation of his, the introduction of the name must again be due to the author.¹ In *Much Ado about Nothing* when Dogberry and Verges first make their appearance (in. iii) they do so more or less consistently under their own names, but these Shakespeare soon discarded, for two scenes later they are Constable and Headborough, though as a prefix 'Const. Dog/' remains. On their next appearance (iv. ii) there is a good deal of confusion: the names do not appear, and after a while the characters settle down as Kemp and Cowley, both well-known members of the company. At the end (v. i) they are merely 'Const.' and ⁴'Con. 2.' It is clear that from the first Shakespeare was writing the parts for a particular pair of comedians, and he sometimes used their names in place of those he had invented for the parts. In this instance the Folio reproduces the inconsistencies of the quarto (1600), but they must surely have been tidied up in the prompt-book. In *Romeo and Juliet* the 'good' quarto (1599: iv. v. 102) has 'Enter Will Kemp' where the prefix is Peter, who is, of course, the clown, and how uncertain Shakespeare was over the name of the character appears later (v. iii. 22) from his confusing him with Balthasar. The first, but not the second, passage was corrected in the Folio, both, presumably, in the prompt-book.²

To this theory it has been objected that in the manuscripts that have come down to us actors' names occur exclusively as additions by the book-keeper, and Chambers considers this decisive.³ It is, however, sufficient to point out in reply that in any case the authorial use of actors' names would be exceptional, that they would very likely not survive beyond the foul papers, and that our extant playhouse manuscripts are mostly prompt-books. Moreover, in the extant manu-

¹ Sincklo also acted a Keeper in 3 *Henry VI* (see below, p. 119) and appeared in his own person with other members of the company in Webster's *Induction to Marston's Malcontent* (1604).

² Thomas Towne, one of Prince Henry's men, appears in a stage-direction, 'Enter Towne like a sweeper', and as a speaker in Dekker's *Honest Whore* (part i, 1604, sig. 13). It is evidently a clown's part, and the quarto is supposed to have been printed from the author's manuscript.

³ W. Shake., i. 237. He adds: 'The case is perhaps not so simple where, as in *Much Ado About Nothing*, the actor-names run through a series of speech-prefixes. But probably Shakespeare wrote inadequate prefixes, in the form of mere numerals, and the book-keeper glossed them.'

scripts actors' names occur, not in the way an author might use them but in the second manner distinguished above.

When the book-keeper introduces actors' names¹ into a manuscript it is as glosses upon the names of characters or the description of supers; he wishes to remind himself of the particular actor he has to be on the look-out for, and his addition usually leads to duplication.² As a rule, but not invariably, it is only the actors of minor parts that are noted. Exceptional are the two instances in *The second 'Maiden's Tragedy*. Here we find, 1. 1723, 'Enter m^r Goughe', referring to an inserted speech that lacks a prefix but almost certainly belongs to Memphonius, a quite important character. Later, 1. 1928, where 'the Toombstone flies open' and the spirit of the Lady, the nameless heroine of the play, appears, is the marginal direction 'Enter Ladye Rich Robinson'. In *Barnavel* too the names of the actors of a few fairly prominent parts have been preserved, including those of the three chief female characters.

The following are normal examples of actors' names added by the book-keeper. In some cases the names or initials have been added to the author's (or scribe's) direction (as regularly in *Barnavel*) in others the book-keeper has repeated the author's direction with additions (as often in *Believe*). *Barna-*

¹ For the names mentioned here see, down to 1616, Chambers, *Eliz.. Stage*, i. f. 295-350, and from 1616 to 1640, Bentley, *Stage*, ii. 343-628.

² Not necessarily always: in writing an original direction he may find it convenient to name the actor rather than the character. For example, *Believe*, 661 'M^r Hobs: calld vp', 829 'Ent: Flaminus: [played by John Lowin] m^r Hobs: Rowland: F[r]jan Balls', evidently his attendants, whom Massinger had omitted; 1116 'Rowland: wth the booke of records', 1825 'Gascoine: & Hubert below: ready to open the Trap doore for M^r Taylor', 1968 'Harry: Willson: & Boy ready for the song at ye Arras', 2716 'Ent: R: Baxt: wth Swords', 2722 'Ent: Rowland wth swords'. Most of these are supers or stage-hands, one is a musician who remains 'within'; but Taylor played the hero, Antiochus, and is not elsewhere named. The calling up of 'M^r Hobs' is obscure; he enters with others at 830. Again the book-keeper, when he furnishes the name of an actor, may cross out that of the character he represents. Thus at *Believe*, 1. 1185, Massinger wrote 'Ent: flaminivs. Calistus. Demetrivs' and Knight deleted the last two names when he added 'M^r Hobs: & Rowland'. This, in a print, would cause no duplication and the case would resemble one of authorial origin, except that there is no dramatic significance in the actors mentioned. It may be that this is how the direction 'Enter Will Kemp', which contradicts the speech-prefixes, got into *Romeo and Juliet*, supposing the book-keeper to have annotated the foul papers, or perhaps it is more likely that Shakespeare forgot to supply an entrance, and that the book-keeper, with his mind on the casting, wrote in the name of the obvious actor for the part instead of the character-name.

velt: 864 'Enter, I. Captaine: lo: Ri: & Soldiers.—migh', 919 'Enter Messeng^r. R:T:', 936 'Enter Holderus. T.P.', 1313 'Enter Captaine m^r Rice', 1404 'Enter 2. Captaines. m^r Rob: mighell:', 1924 'Enter Daughter G: lowen', 1970 'Enter wife nich.', 2523 'Enter Prouosts Wife T: Hole:', 2784 'Enter 2. Captaines: & y^{eir} Soldiers, severally m^r Rob: m^r Rice'. *Believe*: 575 'Ent: flaminivs. & Calistus: R: Bax', 607 'Ent: Demetrius—W^m Pattrick', 733 'Ent:... officers, [deleted] Rowland: W^m Mago: Nick:', 1223 'Ent: Lentulus: m^r Rob: wth a letter', 1257 'Ent: Titus:—R. Baxt:', 1915 'Ent: Iaylor:W^m penn wth poniard & halter', 2187 'Ent: Iaylor: & others Rowl:', 2367 'Ent:... 2.&3marchant:W^m Pen: Curt: & Attend^{ts}: Rowland: m^r Balls: Nick:'. *Two Noble Ladies*: 256 'Anth: Gibs:' opposite 'Enter 3. Souldiers', 400 'Guard Tay: Stage k[eeper]:', 768 'Ent. Anth Brew:' opposite 'Enter a Lord of Babilon', 900 'Tay. Gib: Stage k:' three lines before soldiers are called for, 1078 'Ent Spirrit Geo Stut', 1171 'Tritons m: Bond Stutf.', 1240 'Enter . . . noblemen, and souldiers. Tay: Gibs:'. *Captives*: 295 'Enter An abbot wth his Covent off Fryars, amongst them Fryar Ihon, and Fryar Richard. lack: Gibson', possibly as Friars, but more likely to set a 'Chaire' that the book-keeper calls for here, 1492 'Gib: Stage[keeper]: Taylo^l' apparently for 'A tumult wth in', 2606 'fact[or]: Gibson', 2805 'Stage-keepers as a guard'. *Woodstock*: 133 'G[r]ad' added before the prefix 'Mayre', 1405 'George' added three lines above 'Enter, a seruant', 2088 'Toby:' added after 'Enter seruants'. *Honest Mans Fortune*: i. i. 313 'Ent: y^e Creditors G: Ver: I: Rho:', i. ii. 94 'Ent: 2: Seruants G: Rick:'. *Ironsides*: 643 'm: Grad: Stutf:' opposite 'Enter . . . the Two Pledges', 735 'H. Gibs:' opposite 'Enter a messenger runinge' (anticipated overleaf by 'Ent Mess[e]nger H Gi[bs]on'), 872 'm^r gradell' opposite 'The Herrold departeth', 882 'may' added below speaker 'i Balife', 914 'Enter H: Gibs:' anticipating 'Enter a Messenger' overleaf. *John of Bordeaux*: 466 'lohn holand w^h a letter' required five lines below, 678 '[E]nter lohn holland' apparently as the devil Asteroth disguised.

As already remarked, notes of this kind will tend to produce duplication in prints based on prompt-copies, though circumstances may interfere to prevent it. There do not, in

fact, appear to be any cases of duplication in the Folio itself,¹ though we can point to a few actors' names that seem to owe their presence to the book-keeper. Thus in 2 *Henry T*⁷, where two rebels enter at iv. ii. i we have the direction 'Enter Beuis, and Iohn Holland' (with 'Beuis' and 'Hoi/' as prefixes). Since Holland is known as an actor, we may presume that Beuis was another. (In the 'bad' quarto of 1594 the direction is 'Enter two of the Rebels with long staues' and the prefixes are 'George' and 'Nicke', names which are taken from the text.) Again in 3 *Henry VI* at i. ii. 48 the Folio has 'Enter Gabriel' (with 'Gabriel' as prefix) for a messenger (as he is designated in the 'bad' octavo, 1595) and at in. i. I 'Enter Sinklo, and Humfrey, with Crosse-bowes in their hands' (prefixes 'Sink.' and 'Hum.') for keepers (as the octavo calls them). Sincklo we have met already; 'Gabriel' is supposed to be Gabriel Spenser and 'Humfrey' Humphrey Jeffes. These names, substituted for descriptions and persisting in the speech-prefixes, would point to the author if there were anything in the text to suggest that particular actors were in contemplation, which there is not. The direction in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, v. i. 128 'Tawyer with a Trumpet before them', one of several directions introduced by the prompter in the Folio, preserves the name of a stage-hand who was buried as 'William Tawier, M^r Heminges man' in 1625. In *Much Ado* the servant Balthasar, who enters 'with musicke' in the quarto, is replaced in a Folio direction at ii. iii. 38 (but not in the speech-headings) by 'lacke Wilson', a known musician.

Outside the canon duplications are not uncommon. In *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (1634) we have iv. ii. 74 'Enter Messengers. Curtis' and v. iii. i 'Enter ... some Attendants, T. Tucke: Curtis'. These are evidently Curtis Greville and Thomas Tuckfield: the former joined the King's men between 1622 and 1626, the latter is only recorded in 1624, and they must, therefore, belong to a revival of the play. In Marston's *Antonio and Me Hid a* (1602), iv. i (l. 1278), is the

¹ There may be a disguised instance in *The Taming of the Shrew* if, as has been suggested, the erroneous prefix 'Par.' at iv. ii. 71 is properly a prompter's gloss on 'Enter a Pedant' immediately below. There was an actor William Parr who might conceivably fit the bill. See Dover Wilson's edition, p. 115.

direction 'Enter Andrugio, Lucio, Cole, and Norwod', which must preserve the names of two actors otherwise unrecorded; and in Beaumont and Fletcher's *Mad Lover* (F 1647) n. ii. 20 'Enter Stremon and his Boy Ed, Hor.', i.e. Edward Horton, and iv. i. i 'Enter a Servant and R. Bax, and Stremon at the doore', i.e. the Richard Baxter of *Believe*; and in *The Wild-Goose Chase* (1653), in. i. i 'Enter . . . Leuerduce, alias Lugier, Mr. Illiard', viz. Swanston.¹ In Daborne's *Poor Man's Comfort* (1655), 1. 186, we have 'Enter 2 Lords, Sands, Ellis', possibly Gregory Sanderson and Ellis Worth; and in Day's *Blind Beggar of Bednal Green* (1659), Act IV, 1.2177 'Enter old Playnsey, old Strowd, and Captain Westford, Sill Clark', but of Clark nothing is known.² Attempts have sometimes been made to find the names of actors in those given to servants and other minor characters in the text, but there is hardly enough substance in such speculations to call for discussion.³

These, then, are the two ways in which actors' names may find their way into dramatic manuscripts and so occasionally into print. An author, writing a part for a particular actor, may substitute his name for that of the character (supposing that he has one) both in stage-directions and in speech-headings; but this presupposes that the actor has a particular quality or distinction that leads the author to select him for the part, and also, of course, that the author is writing for a particular company, whose members are personally known to him. Or else the book-keeper, preparing the prompt-book for use in performance (or adapting it for a revival) and knowing the casting of the piece, may insert an actor's name as a gloss on the name or description of a character, usually a subsidiary character, or possibly substitute it for the same, in order to remind the prompter of the particular actor who is to come on.⁴ The two modes of occurrence should as a rule

¹ McKerrow, *Dram. MSS.*, p. 272.

² Chambers, *Eliz. Stage*, iii. 271, 285.

³ See Note F on p. 166.

⁴ This is likely to be done in close connexion with the preparation of the 'plot', in which the actor taking a part is usually named on his first appearance. If actors' names are introduced in preparing the prompt-book for the original performance, they are likely to be altered on the occasion of a revival, and in fact we sometimes find, as in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, that the actors mentioned belong to a period long after the first production of the play. Thus the appearance in a print of the names of

be easy to distinguish, though in certain cases their nature may be obscured: the one is of course characteristic of foul papers and the other of prompt-copy.

Sidney Lee, at his most camelty, declared that the characteristic marks of the prompt-book, 'the finished playhouse transcript' as he called it, were 'complete divisions of a play into acts and scenes, stage directions, indications of "the scene,"⁰ and lists of *dramatis personae*'.¹ It need hardly be said that *dramatis personae* and scene-locations are purely literary features virtually unknown in theatrical manuscripts; act and scene divisions were only gradually introduced, and there is great variety in the fullness and character of stage-directions in the prompt-books that have survived. It is true that it is upon the analysis of stage-directions that critics have largely relied, and are bound to rely, in attempting to distinguish the types of manuscript that lie behind the printed texts. But, as has already been hinted, critics have not always been sufficiently discriminating in the use they have made of them. They have been all too ready to argue that a prompter will write curt orders to the actors and property men, whereas an author's directions will take a more descriptive and literary form. This *a priori* distinction is only partly borne out by examination of the manuscripts and may on occasion prove misleading.

Stage-directions, as Chambers remarks, 'are clearly in the main the work of the authors'. It is they who supply the foundation; the book-keeper, however much he is concerned with them, does no more than modify and supplement. This is what we should expect. Chambers continues: 'The author has a double purpose to serve by his stage-directions. They are not all strictly necessary for the conduct of an actual performance. They are in part designed to explain the structure of his play to the company and to make clear the way in which he wishes it to be staged.'² This is borne out by what we know of foul papers. The additions to *More*, written for the book-keeper to fit into the original text, are, as we should expect, not very lavish of directions. Shakespeare has nothing

dead actors might be used as evidence that there had been no recent revival, though it would not be wise to rely very heavily upon it.

¹ *Introduction*, p. xix.

² *W. Shake.*, i. 118-19.

but 'Enter the L maier Surrey Shrewsbury'—it is the book-keeper who supplies the initial entrance and adds 'Enter' before the prefix 'Seriant'—but other contributors write '[En]ter At on dore S^r Thomas moore and Lord maire: Att an other doore S^r lohn Munday Hurt', 'Enter S^r Thomas moore and his man Atired like him', 'Enter The Shreiuw wth Fawkner a ruffin and officers': it is, however, the book-keeper who supplies 'Enter Moore wth attendaunts w^t Purss & mace'. The *Massacre* fragment has 'Enter A souldier w^{fc} a mvskett', 'Enter minion', 'He Kills him', 'Enter guise', 'Exit', and 'Exeunt'. *The Captives*, if accepted as foul papers, proves that the author wrote a full set of fairly elaborate directions,¹ and the same appears to have been the case in *Bonduca*, though here we cannot be certain that Knight may not have made additions of his own when copying Fletcher's original.

In considering the language in which directions are couched, we must remember that most dramatists were men familiar with the theatre—and Shakespeare, more than most, was of it—and, whatever the vision before their eyes, in giving it shape they tended to use the language of the stage.² They write 'within' for what to the audience is without,³ their characters enter at several 'doors', though they may be meeting in a forest,⁴ or 'above' or 'aloft', that is, on the balcony, whether they appear at a window, on the walls of a town, or on a crag or hill. And authors no less than producers demand music and noises off. In *Believe* it is Mas-

¹ Heywood's other manuscript play, *The Escapes of Jupiter*, also contains full descriptions of the action. The manuscript bears no indication of stage use, and might pass as a literary production, were it not for the direction 'A songe If you will' (fol. 77^a), which clearly envisages performance.

² In the case of a practical dramatist the free play of imagination is always curbed by awareness of the limitations of the theatre, and the instinctive use of stage terminology is a natural reflection of the fact.

³ Quite exceptional is the direction, *Tempest*, V. i. 256 'Enter Ariell, driuing in Caliban', where 'in' means onto not off the stage, and *King Lear* (Q), v. iii. 238 'The bodies of Gonorill and Regan are brought in', where F has 'out'.

⁴ *Midsummer-Night's Dream*, II. i. i 'Enter a Fairie at one doore, and Robin goodfellow at another': cf. *Coriolanus*, I. viii. i 'Enter Martius and Auffidius at seuerall doores' in the middle of a battle: so *John a Kent*, 406 'Enter at one doore lohn a Kent... at anoth[er] enter the Countesse', and *Captives*, 1496 'enter att one, doore, godfrey wth Coontry Fellowes ... at the other Mildewe', both in the open country.

singer who calls for 'musiccp & a songe' (2026), and in *Woodstock* 'sound A Senett' (350), 'wind Homes wthin' (584), 'Trumpetts sound' (627)⁵ and 'a florish' (914) are all original directions, not additions by the prompter. In *Dick* it was probably the author who provided for 'A noyse wthin of, Diablo Englese' (fol. 47^b). It need not, therefore, surprise us if in 3 *Henry VI*, iv. iii. 27 it was Shakespeare who wrote 'Richard and Hastings flyes ouer the Stage', in *Romeo and Juliet*, i. v. i 'They march about the Stage' (to indicate a change of locality), in *Macbeth*, I. vii. I 'Enter a Sewer, and diuers Seruants with Dishes and Seruice ouer the Stage', and in *Antony and Cleopatra*, III. x. I 'Camidius Marcheth with his Land Army one way ouer the stage', in *Coriolanus*, v. v. i 'Enter two Senators, with Ladies, passing ouer the Stage', and in *Hamlet* (Q2), iv. iv. i 'Enter Fortinbrasse with his Army ouer the stage'.¹ He goes farther than this, for when in *The Tempest*, i. ii. 375 and in. ii. 48, he writes 'Enter Ariell inuisible' and at III. iii. 17 'Prosper on the top (inuisible:)' he is actually appealing to a technical convention, for the Admiral's men we know had 'a robe for to goo invisibell';² and 'the top' on which Prospero appeared, or didn't, was presumably some structure above the balcony, as in i *Henry VI*, m. ii. 26 'Enter Pucell on the top, thrusting out a Torch burning'. Similarly in Thomas Nabbes's *Covent Garden*, published in 1638 with an epistle by the author and presumably from his own manuscript, we find minute directions for the entrance and exit of characters 'by the right Scoene', 'by the middle Scoene', 'by the left Scoene', and even 'Enter ... in the Balcone'. The fact is that there is hardly a stage-direction that has been cited as characteristic of the prompter that cannot be paralleled from texts for which the author was probably alone responsible. It follows that when Pollard finds 'characteristic prompter's notes' in 'Enter Romeo and Iuliet aloft', 'Play Musicke', and 'Whistle Boy' in one play, and the mention of 'doors' and the reminder 'Ly doune' in another (*Midsummer-Night's Dream*), and infers that the printed quartos therefore have prompt-copies behind them,³ we must

¹ Cf. *John a Kent*, 780 'From one end of the Stage enter an antique', 819 'From vnder the Stage the third Antique'.

² *Henslowe Papers*, p. 123.

³ *S.'s Fight*, p. 64.

protest with McKerrow¹ that he has mistaken the evidence and that he is clinging to the old superstition that the author writes directions in the indicative and the prompter in the imperative mood.²

From a study of the stage-directions that may reasonably be supposed to have originated in the authors' own manuscripts it appears that they commonly wrote many that could be of no immediate help to the prompter, but which describe a scene as they imagined it while writing, and which could at best, as Chambers remarks, serve the company in the production of the play. In their evocative quality many of the directions have, indeed, a literary appeal, as though they were written for the reader rather than the actor. This too is natural enough, for a play was, as a rule, read to the company and had to secure approval before it was accepted, and the more readily and vividly it could be followed the better its chances would be.³

Several varieties of descriptive directions can be distinguished.⁴ Characters are described on their first appearance, and their status and relationships may be defined: *Captives*, 2 'Enter M^r Raphael a yonge Marchaunt M^r Treadway his companion and Frend', 456 'Enter . . . m^r. Ashburne, an Englishe Marchant, and his man godffrey', 2605 'Enter Thomas Ashburne the yonger brother to Ihon A Marchant wth one off his factors'; *Eonduca*, 2 'Enter Bonduca: (hir Daughter) Hengo: (hir Sonne)'; *Ironsides*, 461 'Enter Edricke a poore man'; *Two Noble Ladies*, 67 'Enter Barebones (a poore Scholler)'; and similarly 2 *Henry VI*, I. iii. I 'Enter three or four Petitioners, the Armorers Man being one' (this is the first mention of the Armourer), v. i. i 'Enter Yorke, and his Army of Irish'; 3 *Henry VI*, Iv. ii. I 'Enter Warwicke and Oxford in England, with French Souldiours'; *Comedy of Errors*, II. i. I 'Enter Adriana, wife to Antipholis Sereptus,

¹ *Dram. MSS.*, pp. 272-3.

² See Note G on p. 166.

³ See Note H on p. 167.

⁴ The following represents a skimming of the more significant directions drawn from playhouse manuscripts, with others taken for comparison from printed texts, generally of plays by Shakespeare. It would, of course, be easy to fill many pages with similar examples. Further directions from manuscripts and from Shakespearean quartos may be sought respectively in Greg, *Dram. Docs.*, pp. 239-369, and *Editorial Problem*, pp. 158-81.

with Luciana her Sister', III. i.I 'Enter Antipholus of Ephesus, his man Dromio, Angelo the Goldsmith, and Balthaser the Merchant', iv. iv. 44 'Enter ... a Schoolemaster call'd Pinch'; *The Shrew*, I. i. 48 'Enter Baptista with his two daughters, Katerina & Bianca, Gremio a Pantelowne, Hortensio sister [read suitor] to Bianca'; *Merchant*, I. ii. I 'Enter Portia with her wayting woman Nerrissa'; *Twelfth Night*, I. i.I 'Enter Orsino Duke of Illyria'; *Much Ado* (Q 1600), I. i. I 'Enter Leonato gouvernour of Messina, Innogen his wife, Hero his daughter, and Beatrice his neece, with a messenger', I. ii.I 'Enter Leonato and an old man brother to Leonato', III. iii.I 'Enter Dogbery and his compartner with the Watch'; *Timon*, I. ii. I 'Enter Lord Timon . . . Ventigius which Timon redeem'd from prison'; *Coriolanus*, i. iii. i 'Enter Volumnia and Virgilia, mother and wife to Martius'; and *The Mad Lover* (F 1647), I. 'Enter Astorax King of Paphos, his Sister Calis, traine, and Cleanthe, Lucippe, Gentlewomen at one doore; At the other Eumenes a Souldier'; cf. also 3 *Henry 7*, n. v. 55 'Enter a Sonne that hath kill'd his Father, at one doore: and a Father that hath kill'd his Sonne at another doore'.

The reason or occasion of their appearance may be explained: *Captives*, 1496 'enter . . . godffrey wth Coountry Fellowes For their reskewe'; *Bonduca*, 1653 'Enter ... & Soldiers: vpon the chase'; so 2 *Henry 7*, III. i.I 'Enter King ... to the Parliament'; 3 *Henry 7*, Iv. iii. I 'Enter three Watchmen to guard the Kings Tent'; *Coriolanus*, I. ix. 11 'Enter Titus with his Power, from the Pursuit'; *Timon*, v. iii.I 'Enter a Souldier in the Woods, seeking Timon'.

Often the grouping of the characters is indicated, particularly in entries from opposite directions: *Captives*, 2984 'Enter at one doore Isabel Palestra Scribonia at the other Raphael Treadway: Ihon Ashb: & the Clowne alooffe'; *Bonduca*, 1666 'Enter Caratacke: (at their backs:)'; so i *Henry VI*, Iiv.iii. Ii 'Enter a Messenger that meets Yorke. Enter Yorke with Trumpet, and many Souldiers'; 2 *Henry 7*, I. i. I 'Enter King ... on the one side. The Queene... on the other'; 3 *Henry VI*, III. iii. 111 'They stand aloofe', Iv. I. 9 'Enter King Edward, Lady Grey, Pembroke, Stafford, Hastings: foure stand on one side, and foure on the other'; *Taming*

of the *Shrew*, i. i. 48 'Lucen. Tranio, stand by', v. i. i 'Enter Biondello, Lucentio, and Bianca, Gremio is out before'; *Comedy of Errors*, v. i. 330 'All gather to see them'; *Midsummer-Night's Dream*, n. i. 188 'Enter Demetrius, Helena following him', iv. i. i 'Enter Queene of Faeries, and Clowne, and Fairies: and the king behind them'; *Hamlet*, v. i. 62 (F) 'Enter Hamlet and Horatio a farre off'; *Henry VIII*) iv. i. i 'Enter two Gentlemen, meeting one another'; *Timon*, I. ii. I 'Then comes dropping after all Apemantus discontentedly like himselfe'.

Habits and disguises and the like are noted: *John a Kent*, 214 'Enter lohn a Kent like an aged Hermit', 368 'Enter . . . one drest lik a Moore', 406 'Enter . . . lohn a Kent, hermit lyke, as before', 582 'to them Oswen [and] Amery making them selues ready', 595 'Heere enter Amery & Oswen vnbraste', 780 'enter an antique queintly disguysde', 1032 'Enter lohn a Cumber in his owne habit'; *More*, 410 'Enter Lincolne . . . and other armed, doll in a shirt of Maile, a head piece, sword and Buckler', 954 'Enters . . . the Lady Maioresse in Scarlet'; *Woodstock*, 350 'Enter . . . Woodstock very braue', 1424 'Enter a spruce courtier a horsebacke'; *Welsh Ambassador*, 1068 'Enter . . . Eldred as a Welsh seruuingman'; *SMT*, 1877 'Enter Gouianus in black'; *Dick*, fol. 46^b 'Ent: 2. Drums; Teniente, divers musketts, fernando wth Pike (wthout band, an Iron about his necke, 2 Chaines manacling his wrists; a great Chaine at his heeles) Iaylo^r, 3. or 4 Halberts, A Barre sett out'; *Captives*, 2464 'Enter the knight, halff vnredy'; *Bonduca*, 867 'Enter . . . ludas: wth his Soldiers: (halters about their Necks:)'; *Honest Man's Fortune*, Iv. i. I 'Enter Montaigne: in meane habit', v. iv. I 'Enter . . . Charlott drest as A Bride'; *Believe*, 2 'Antiochus stoiccpin philosophers habits'; *Two Noble Ladies*, 1081 'Enter a Spirit, Like a souldier in armour on his breast a sable sheild written on with Golden letters', 1101 'Enter an Angell shaped like a patriarch vpon his breast a blew table full of silver letters, in his right hand a red crossierstaffe, on his shoulders large wings', 1970 'Enter . . . Miranda . . . in her Owne Amazonian attire, an helmet on and the beavor down'; and so *Edward III* (Q 1596), v. I. 8 'Enter sixe Citizens in their Shirts, barefoote, with halters about their necks'; 2 *Henry FI*,

II. iv. I 'Enter Duke Humfrey and his Men in Mourning Cloakes', 17 'Enter the Duchesse in a white sheet, and a Taper burning in her hand'; *Titus*, v. ii. I 'Enter Tamora and her two sonnes disguised'; *Loves Labour's Lost* (Q 1598), v. ii. 158 'Enter Black-moores with musicke, the Boy with a speech and the rest of the Lordes disguysed', 592 'Enter Pedant for Iudas, and the Boy for Hercules'; *Romeo and Juliet* (Q 1599) 5 I. i. 82 'Enter old Capulet in his gowne, and his wife'; *King John*, v. ii. I 'Enter (in Armes) Dolphin . . . Soldiers'; *Merchant of Venice*, Iv. i. 166 'Enter Portia for Balthazer'; *As you Like it*, II. ii. I 'Enter . . . two or three Lords like Forresters', iv. i 'Enter Rosaline for Ganimed, Celia for Aliena, and Clowne, alias Touchstone', vii. i 'Enter Duke sen. & Lord, like Out-lawes'; *Twelfth Night*, I. iv. I 'Enter . . . Viola in mans attire'; *Coriolanus*, I. ix. I 'Enter . . . Martius, with his Arme in a Scarfe', I. i. 179 'Enter ... Coriolanus, crown'd with an Oaken Garland', II. iii. 44 'Enter Coriolanus in a gowne of Humility', iv. Iv. I 'Enter Coriolanus in meane Apparrell, Disguisd, and muffled'; *Tempest*, i. ii. 316 'Enter Ariel like a water Nymph', iv. i. 139 'Enter certaine Reapers (properly habited:)', v. i. i 'Enter Prospero (in his Magicke robes)'; the favourite night-gown, recorded by the reporter in *Hamlet*, in. iv. 103 'Enter the ghost in his night gowne', appears in 2 *Henry IV* (Q 1600), in. i. i 'Enter the King in his night-gowne alone' (it is removed in the Folio), *Othello*, i. i. 161 (Q) 'Enter Brabantio in his night gowne', *Julius Caesar*, II. ii. I 'Enter Iulius Caesar in his Night-gowne', *John a Kent*, 581 'the Bridegroomes come foorth in their nightgownes and kerchers on their heades', 604 'Enter the Earle of Chester in his night gowne', and in *Escapes*, fol. 82^b 'Enter Iupiter and Danae in her night-gowne'.

Properties required are recorded: *John a Kent*, 369 'Enter . . . one . . . wth a Tun painted with yellow oker, another with a Porrenger full of water an[d] a pen in it'; *More*, 15 'Enter Caueler with a paire of dooues', 954 'Enters Lord Maior . . . with . . . Seruants carying lighted Torches', 1174 'Enter S^r. Thomas Moore, with Pursse and Mace borne before him'; *Woodstock*, 2 'Enter hastily at seuerall doores: Duke of Lancaster [and others] wth Napkins on ther armes &

kniues in ther hands: & s^r. Thomas Chaeney, wth others beareing torches, & some wth clookes & Rapiers'; *Captives*, 1251 'Enter The Lady de Auerne wth a letter in her hand readinge'; *Escapes*, fol. 86^b 'Thonder and lightninng lupiter discends In his Maiesty his thonder-bolt burning in his hande', fol. 81^b 'Enter the Beldams Drawinge out Danaes bed shee In it they place Power Tapers att the Power Corners' (cf. 2 *Henry* '(F)', III. ii. 146 'Bed put forth'); *Bonduca*, 963 'Enter: wth wine & Meate', 2259 'Enter one wth Swords: & A great Cup'; *Two Noble Ladies*, 559 'Enter Barebones with a satchell of meate, and a bottle of Wine', 1752 'Iustina is discovered in a chaire asleep, in her hands a prayer book, diuells about her'; so *Titus*, Iv. ii. I 'Enter ... another with a bundle of weapons, with verses writ vpon them', iii. I 'Enter ... Titus beares the arrowes with letters on the ends of them'; *John, IIIA*. I 'Enter Bastard with Austria's head'; *Tempest*, iv. i, 193 'Enter Ariell, loaden with glistering apparell, &c.'

Action accompanying or following entrance is described: *John a Kent*, 1393 'Enter Shrimpe leading Oswen and Amery about the tree'; *Woodstock*, 1706 'Enter one whisling'; *Dick*, fol. 35^a 'Alarum, as y^e soft musicke begins, a peale of Ordnance goes off; then Cornetts sound a Battaile, w^{ch} ended; Ent: . . . wth musketts', fol. 46' 'Ent: fernando bareheaded, talking wth y^e Duke of Macador'; *Bonduca*, 1206 'Enter the Druides (Singing) The Daughters: (strowing flowers)', 2108 'Enter: Drusus: Regulus: (stopping the Soldiers, at the Doore.)', 2189 'Enter: petillius: talkes wth y^e Generall', 2564 'Enter: petillius: lunius: climbing the rock: fight'; *The Two Noble Ladies*, 616 'Enter Lysander and Cyprian conferring', 1453 'Enter Bloud & Caro embracing'; so 2 *Henry* 71, II. i. I 'Enter the King ... with Faulknors hallowing', Iv. vi. I 'Enter lacke Cade and the rest, and strikes his staffe on London stone'; 3 *Henry* VI, Iv. iii. 27 'Enter Warwicke, Somerset, and the rest, bringing the King out in his Gowne, sitting in a Chaire'; *Titus*, in. i. I 'Enter the ludges and Senatours with Titus two sonnes bound, passing on the Stage to the place of execution, and Titus going before pleading . . . (i i) Andronicus lieth downe, and the ludges passe by him', v. ii. 9 'They knocke and Titus opens his studie doore'; i *Henry* IV, in. iii. 102 (Q) 'Enter the prince marching, and

Falstaffe meetes him playing vpon his trunchion like a fife'; *Coriolanus*, i. iii. i 'Enter Volumnia and Virgilia . . . They set them downe on two lowe stooles and sowe'; *Tempest*, in. iii. 20 'Enter seuerall strange shapes, bringing in a Banket; and dance about it with gentle actions of salutations, and inuiting the King, &c. to eate, they depart' (but this is a dumb-show, and these are necessarily described in detail, even in the 'plots'), v. i. 172 'Here Prospero discouers Ferdinand and Miranda, playing at Chesse'. We may even be informed of previous action, as in 2 *Henry VI*, in. ii. i 'Enter . . . from the Murther of Duke Humfrey', and *Coriolanus*, i. vii. i 'Titus Lartius, hauing set a guard vpon Carioles, going with Drum and Trumpet toward Cominius, and Caius Martius, Enters with a Lieutenant'.

Independent action is, of course, also described: *John a Kent*, 299 'he pulles his beard', 412 'Sydanen & h[e] conferre', 551 'round in his eare', 848 'exit Into the Castell, & makes fast the dore', 1124 'they look about'; *More*, 1068 'florishing his dagger', 1342 'daughters kneele', 1551 'kneeling and weeping', 1920 'As he is going vp the stayres, enters the Earles'; *SMT*, 1339 'Runs at her and falles by the way in a Sound'; *Dick*, fol. 47^b 'Exit, biting his thumbs, y^e soldiers stampe'; *Escapes*, fol. 86^b 'As hee aprocheth the bedd Itt Fyerer and lupiter From thenc takes an abortiue Inffant'; *Bonduca*, 2129 'the Soldiers kneele about & weepe', 2502 'ludas steales nere him and shootes him: & startes back', 2508 'flings and tumbles him ouer: pulls him vp againe', 2587 'they come of the rocke'; *Two Noble Ladies*, 98 'Hides him vnder the table', 948 'Cantharides claws Caro', 1170 'The Tritons dragge them in sounding their trumpets', that is, off the stage, 1796 'She looks in her booke, and the Spirits fly from her', 1860 'The Devills sinck roaring; a flame of fier riseth after them'; so 2 *Henry 7*, i. i. 170 'He stamper with his foot, and the Souldiers shew themselues', iii. 42 'Teare the Supplication', 141 'She giues theDuchesse a box on the eare'; 3 *Henry 7*, Iv. iii. 57 'They leade him out forcibly'; *Coriolanus*, I. vi. 75 'They all shout and waue their swords, take him vp in their Armes, and cast vp their Caps', 11. i. 106 'Bru. and Scic. Aside', that is, they retire, III. i. 185 'They all bustle about Coriolanus'.

When characters enter their appearance is described: *Captives*, 456 ⁴'Enter After a greate Tempestuous storme m^r. Ashburne', doubtless he looked it, as later, 653 'Enter palestra, all well [*read wett*] as newly shipwracke and escapt the Fury off the Seas' (cf. *Tempest*, I. i. 54 'Enter Mariners wet'); *Dick*, fol. 39 'Ent: . . . Pike, (wth his face wounded,); *Honest Man's Fortune*, in. i. 145 'Ent: Montagne: fainting'; *Two Noble Ladies*, 222 'Enter lustina supporting Doron deadly wounded'; so *Edward III*, Iv. viii. I 'Enter Audley wounded, & rescued by two squirs'; *Titus Andronicus*, II. v. I 'Enter . . . Lauinia, her hands cut off and her tongue cut out, and rauisht'; *Taming of the Shrew*, n. i. 143 'Enter Hortensio with his head broke'; *Coriolanus*, i. iv. 52 'Enter Martius bleeding, assaulted by the Enemy'.

So are their attitudes and gestures: *John a Kent*, 1050 'En[ter] lohn a K[en]t listning'; *More*, 1080 'Enter Lady Vanitie singing, and beckning with her hand'; *Bonduca*, 1046 'Enter: younger Daughter . . . she shewes her selfe but at y^e Doore' (cf. *Honest Mans Fortune*, III. iii. 92 'Lamyra shewes hir Selfe at the Arras'), 1850 'Enter ludas . . . (peeping at the Doore:)', this at any rate is in the open country: and, of course, not only on entry: *John a Kent*, 792 'a ducking curtesy', 1145 'The boy trips round about Oswen and Amery, sing[ing a] chyme, and they the one after the other, lay them [down] vsing very sluggish gestures, the Ladyes amazed S[tare?] about them'; *More*, 238 'shrugging gladly', 1237 'with great reuerenc[e]', 1532 'kinde salutations' *Ironside*, 219 'Leofricke pulls Turkillus by the sleeve, as hee is goeing and stayes him', 512 'hee shewes his tongue'; *Captives*, 880 'the Fryars make a Lane wth ducks and obey-sance', which Heywood himself emphasizes with a marginal 'Musicke and vayles'; *Launching*, 1233 'stands amazed', 2129 'Rreades [*sic*] to her selfe. starts as if afrighted, shakes with feare. & speakes'; *Two Noble Ladies*, 976 'Enter Barebones stands beholding Caro'; and so i *Henry VI*, v. iii. 8 ff. 'Enter Fiends. . . . They walke, and speake not. . . . They hang their heads. . . . They shake their heads. . . . They depart'; 2 *Henry VI*, Iv. iii. 23 'Enter Warwicke . . . and . . . Souldiers, silent all'; *Titus*, II. i. 26 'Enter Chiron and Demetrius brauing', i.e. quarrelling; in *Coriolanus*, v. iii. 182, the

pregnant 'Holds her by the hand silent'; *Tempest*, v. i. 58 'Alonzo with a franticke gesture'; and *Mad Lover* (F 1647), i. ii. 36 'Mem. walks aside full of strange gestures'.

So, even, are their expressions and mental conditions: *More*, 1575 'pondering to him selfe'; *SMT*, 819 'Enter Votarius sadly', 1655 'Enter Tirant wondrous discontedly [*sic*]', 1891 'Gouianus kneeles at the Toomb wrondrous [*sic*] passionatly'; *Two Noble Ladies*, 480 'The guard stands fixed, their eys rowling from the King to Cyprian, and so too & fro', 497 'Kneeles with a fearfull countenance and is so fixed'; so *Coriolanus*, i. i. 255 'Citizens steale away'; *Henry VIII*, in. ii. 372 'Enter Cromwell, standing amazed'; *Mad Lover*, i. i. 108 'He kneeles amaz'd. and forgets to speake'; *The White Devil*, v. iii. 127 'Brachiano seemes heare neare hisend'.

Noises of all sorts are called for: *John a Kent*, 918 'why the musique playes, enters . . .'; *More*, 954 'The waytes playes. Enters . . .'; *Captives*, 869 'The bell ringes to mattens', 879 'The quire and musick', 1030 'Knocke', 1496 'Atmult[SIC]wth in and suddenenoyse enter...'; *Bonduca*, 644 'Drums beate A March- wthin', 2149 'Exeunt: Drums beating a Dead March'; so *Edward III*, v. i. 176 'After a flourish sounded within, enter an herald' (printed as part of the text); and *Hamlet* (Q2), i. iv. 6 'A florish of trumpets and 2. peeces goes of', III. ii. 95 'Enter Trumpets and Kettle Drummes, King [&c.]'.

Asides are often, but far from always, marked; rarely there is a note of the person addressed: *Two Noble Ladies*, 453 'asside to Lysander', 456 'asside to the Souldan', 461 'asside to Colactus'; also *John a Kent*, 1212 'to Mooreton'; *Two Noble Ladies*, 1037 'to Blood', 1039 'to Sinew' (cf. 3 *Henry* 71, III. iii. 59, 131, 163, 165, 166); and so, exceptionally, *Richard III* (F), I. iii. 318 'Speakes to himselfe', and *Merchant of Venice* (Q), III. ii. 60 'Bassanio comments on the caskets to himself'.

Locations are sometimes recorded: they may be merely theatrical, as in *John a Kent*, 1187 'Enter lohn a Kent . . . foorth of the Castell'; *More*, 104 'An Arras is drawne, and behinde it (as in Sessions) sit the L. Maior [&c.]'; *Barnavel*, 1883 'Enter Barnauelt (in his studdy)'; and so 2 *Henry VI*,

Iv. ix. I 'Enter King ... on the Tarras', which really means no more than 'aloft'; *Julius Caesar*, II. i. I 'Enter Brutus in his Orchard'; and *Timon*, Iv. iii. I 'Enter Timon in the woods': or, more rarely, an actual place may be named, as in *More*, 1411 'Enter S^r. Thomas Moore ... as in his house at Chelsey', and 1728 'Enter Sir Thomas Moore ... in his chamber in the Tower'; *Dick*, fol. 31^b 'Ent: Two Devonshire Merchants, as being in Sherryes'; and so i *Henry 7*, Iv. ii. I 'Enter Talbot with Trumpe and Drumme, before Burdeaux' (cf. 2 *Henry VI* ('bad' Q 1594), v. ii. 66 'Alarms to the battaile, then enter the Duke of Somerset and Richard fighting, and Richard kils him vnder the signe of the Castle in saint Albones'); 3 *Henry W(F)*, Iv. ii. I 'Enter Warwicke and Oxford in England, with French Souldiers'; *Richard III* (F), III. iii. I 'Enter Sir Richard Ratcliffe, with Halberds, carrying the Nobles to death at Pomfret'; *Titus*, I. i. 63 'They goe vp into the Senate house'; *King John*, II. i. I 'Enter before Angiers'; 2 *Henry IV* (Q 1600), iv. i. I 'Enter the Archbishop [and others] within the forrest of Gaultree' (this, which comes from the text, disappears in the Folio); *Henry V* (F), III. i. I 'Enter the King . . . Alarum: Scaling Ladders at Harflew', iii. I 'Enter the King and all his Traine before the Gates', 58 'Flourish, and enter the Towne'; *Coriolanus*, I. iv. I 'Enter Martius ... as before the City Corialus', II. ii. I 'Enter two Officers, to lay Cushions, as it were, in the Capitoll'.

Not all these directions were necessarily written by the author, but there is no doubt that the great majority were, and they follow a common pattern. Many would be of no service to the prompter, and some could not conceivably be the work of the book-keeper. But on the whole directions remain unaltered in the prompt-book; even those least useful, one would suppose, in performance are usually allowed to stand. So long as they do not actually interfere with the use of the book, the book-keeper lets them alone. Doubtless there was more than mere indifference or carelessness in this, for In a repertory company, with the possibility of revivals, a book would need to preserve its usefulness for production as well as for prompting. The extent to which directions were left standing may have depended to some extent upon the

history of the manuscript. If the book-keeper himself transcribed the foul papers to serve the purpose of a prompt-copy, he might not trouble himself much over what was irrelevant to his immediate purpose. *The Honest Man's Fortune* is perhaps an instance in point, and in fact the manuscript contains little that would not have practical value on the stage. On the other hand, if the author prepared his own fair copy, as in *Believe as you List* or if it was prepared by an independent scribe, the original directions would remain intact unless the book-keeper, in preparing the manuscript for prompting, troubled to delete them or substituted others of his own. In this respect *Believe* is, of course, of peculiar interest, for author and book-keeper alike showed conspicuous care, and we can watch Knight at work on Massinger's directions. His concern is mostly to repeat, in heavier script and in the left margin, those that are important for his purpose, sometimes with significant abbreviation or expansion. Once he writes 'Ent: Metellus ... (Aboue)' (1960), but here he is merely repeating Massinger. He supplies 'Ent: Garde (agen)' (2885): specification of re-entry is exceptional in early texts. He provides for a 'Florish' (1336, 1361, &c.). Massinger writes 'Enter . . . Antiochus (Habited like a kinge)' (881), 'they beare of the Queene' (1766), 'offers to kisse hym' (2118), and Knight neither emphasizes nor deletes. Massinger's elaborate 'Enter officers leadinge in Antiochus. his head shaude in the habit of a slaue' (2322) does not interest him; he is content to repeat 'Ent: Antiochus: & Card'. However, where Massinger writes 'enter laylor. with a poniard & halter' (1915) he repeats the whole on the left and adds the name of the actor; and so he does with 'enter laylor with others' (2194), though he allows only one actor for the 'others', and he crosses out the original direction as standing, in his opinion, too late. In repeating Massinger's picturesque 'Enter laylor. with browne bread, & a wooden dishe of water' (1987) he reduces it to 'Ent: laylor (wth bread & water)'; it is the properties that interest him. Occasionally, however, it is Knight who is the more specific: 'musiccp & a songe' (2025) becomes 'the Lute . strikes & then the Songe', and when Massinger orders 'the recordes brought in' (1118) Knight not only specifies 'Ent: Rowland : wth the booke of

records', but in an earlier warning, 'the great booke: of Accomptes ready' (982), explains that the company's ledger is to do duty for the chronicles of Carthage. He is particularly concerned about portable properties that will be needed later in the scene, and makes the necessary additions to Massinger's directions: Chrysalus is to enter 'wth a writing Pen' (2), Berecinthius Wth .3- papers' (301), Flaminius 'wth -2- letters' (1185), Lentulus and Marcellus each 'Wth a letter' (1224, 2367); at the end he adds a list of the writings needed. We find much the same elsewhere. In *More*, opposite an elaborate descriptive direction of Munday's, the book-keeper inserts in the margin the condensed version 'Enter Lincolne betts Williamson Doll' (410), he draws lines round 'Ent. Shrew.' (523) to make it more prominent, repeats 'Enter Crofts' on the left (553)⁵ and where Munday writes 'The waytes playes' before the entry of the Lord Mayor, he repeats 'waites play here' in the margin (954). In *Woodstock* an original direction 'sound a florish' (2095) is specified by the prompter as 'Florish Cornetts'; in *The Captives* Heywood writes 'The bell ringes to mattens' (869) but all the prompter needs is 'Bell Rung'; in *The Two Noble Ladies* the book-keeper translates 'A drum far off' (1664) into 'Low March. w^{thin}' (though in *Woodstock* it is the book-keeper himself who writes, 2152 'A Drome afare of'); in *Barnavelt*, to the original direction 'Enter Prouost Sold^r. & ExecuTM', the book-keeper adds 'wth a Coffin & a Gibbett' (2809); in *The Parliament of Love* we find a brief 'Ent' Beaupre' on the left duplicating the fuller 'Ent' Beaupre like a More' on the right (102), but this book is all in one hand: rather surprisingly it is the book-keeper who adds 'assayle the walls' in *Ironsides* (914) and 'here they wright in their Tables' in *John of Bordeaux* (1028), but the relevance of the latter is obscure. It is perhaps significant that in *The Honest Man's Fortune* where the manuscript reads 'Ent: Viramour' (Iv. i. 22), the folio has 'Enter Vera-mour with Counters', these being later required to do duty for coins. Presumably the addition was made by the book-keeper.

It will by now be evident that what with the author's addiction to stage terminology and the book-keeper's tolerance of literary and picturesque language, the great mass of stage-

directions are of very little assistance in distinguishing between foul papers and prompt-copy. It remains to inquire whether there are any forms of direction that are peculiar to the author and that the book-keeper, if he is alert and knows his business, is unlikely to put up with, and on the other hand whether there are any types which can only have arisen in the theatre.¹

An author shows his hand most clearly in indefinite directions and in what may be called permissive or petitory directions, neither of which could originate with or commend themselves to the book-keeper. One form of vagueness shows itself in the mention of unspecified groups: *John a Kent*, 334 'Enter Turnop wth his crewe of Clownes', 554 'Enter Turnop [and others] wth their Consort', 581 'the Bridegroomes come foorth', 648 'Enter Llwellen, his trayne, and lohn a Cumber'; *More*, 410 'Enter Lincolne ... a crewe attending'; *Woodstock*, 2300 'Exitt nimble & the re[st]'; *Welsh Embassador*, 1069 'wincheste[r] and his faction kiss the Kings hand'; *Ironsides*, 104 'Enter a Companye of cuntrymen makeinge a noyse'; *SMT*, 1655 'Enter Tirant . . . Nobles a farr of'; *Bonduca*, 950 'Exeunt ladyes', and again at 1575, where the folio has 'Exeunt Daughters'; *Captives*, 295 'Enter An abbot wth his Covent off Fryars'; *Believe*, 487 'ex flaminivs cum suis'; and similarly 2 *Henry VI* (F), Iv.iii. I 'Enter Cade and the rest', Iv.viii. I 'Enter againe Cade, and all his rabblement'; *Richard III* (F), III. iii. I 'Enter Sir Richard Ratcliffe... carrying the Nobles to death'; *Coriolanus*, III. i. 181 'Enter a rabble of Plebeians with the -Ediles', Iv,i. I 'Enter Coriolanus .., with the yong Nobility of Rome', vi. 128 'Enter a Troope of Citizens', v. vi. 61 'Enter the Lords of the City'. Where groups have been previously defined or are obvious from the action, such indefinite directions are, of course, sufficient. In other cases the exact composition of the groups would doubtless be settled in production and presumably noted in the 'plot', as all 'attendants' must have been; anyhow, the book-keeper very seldom interfered with them. It is perhaps more curious how seldom he took notice of indefinite numbers in the author's directions: *More*, 453 'Enter [tjhree or foure Prentices of trades'; *Launching*, 1216

¹ See Note I on p. 167.

'Enter Lo. Ad: wth '2- or -3- attendantes' (but at 142, where the author wrote 'Enter • gouer: deputie, & 2. or 3 Comittees', i.e. committeemen, he did alter it to '1.2. Committee'): and so we find *Comedy of Errors*, iv. iv. 109 'Enter three or foure, and offer to binde him: Hee striues'; *Romeo and Juliet* (Q '599)5 I• i- 'o 'Enter three or foure Citizens with Clubs or partysons', iv. i 'Enter Romeo, Mercutio, Benuolio, with fiue or sixe other Maskers, torchbearers'; *Merchant*, II. ii. 121 'Enter Bassanio with a follower or two'; *Coriolanus*, v. vi. 9 'Enter 3 or 4 Conspirators of Auffidius Faction'; and *Two Noble Kinsmen* (Q 1634), III. v. I 'Enter a Schoole master. 4. Countrymen: and Baum. [?read Bavian] 2. or 3. wenches, with a Taborer' (which Knight did not alter); and the vague extravagance of 2 *Henry VI* (F), Iv. ii. 33 'Enter Cade . . . with infinite numbers', and iv. 9 'Enter Multitudes with Halters about their Neckes'. The acme of vagueness seems to be reached in the directions in *Love's Labour's Lost* (Q 1598), v. ii. 900 'Enter all', and *Tour Five Gallants*, II. i.52 'Enter All', iii. I 'Enter all at once'.

More important critically is the other type of direction peculiar to the author, that which merely contemplates the possibility of some action or stage effect. It may merely leave an alternative to be determined in production, or suggest the possibility of some elaboration, or ask for something particular, such as 'A boy the lest that can play'.¹ Examples are: *John a Kent*, 836 'The fourth [sc. Antique] out of a tree, if possible it may be', 1098 'Enter Shrimp playing on some instrument', which is left to the book-keeper to determine; *More*, 954 'Enters ... so many Aldermen as may'; *Capfives*, 1251 'Enter The Lady de Auerne . . . wth her, mayde or page' (but the author crossed out the last two words), 2432 'Eather strykes him wth a staffe or Casts a stone' (but later, 3187, '! hitt him with a stone'); *Escapes*, fol. 77^a 'A songe Iff you will'; *Launching*, 1154, 'where yt must be the least man wth a long beard', 2677 'there must appeare aloft, as many gallants & ladies as the roome [sc. the balcony] Canne well hold'. Some of these are similar to the indefinite numbers already considered, and as before the book-keeper neglects them: but other questions would need

¹ On the tide-page of John Hey wood's *Play of the Weather*, 1533.

specific answers.¹ These permissive directions are not uncommon in printed texts: *Three Lords of London* (1590), sig. Ci 'Here Simp, sings first, and Wit after, dialoguewise, both to musicke if ye will'; *Edward I* (1593), 50 'Enter after them Glocester ... & others as many as may be'; *Titus Andronicus* (Q 1594) 5 i. i. 70 'then enter . . . and others as many as can be'; *Locrine* (1595), 4 'presently let there come forth a Lion running after a Beare or any other beast'; *James IV* (1598), 1548 'enter certaine Huntsmen, if you please, singing', 2051 'enter from the widdowes house a seruice, musical songs of marriages, or a maske, or what prettie triumph you list'; *Alphonsus of Aragon* (1599), 2109 'Exit Venus. Or if you can conueniently, let a chaire come downe from the top of the stage, and draw her vp'; *Death of Robert Earl of Huntington* (1601), III. ii 'Enter or above [Herbert, Chester]', that is, either on the main or upper stage; *What you Will* (ifo'i\ v. 193 'Enter as many Pages with torches as you can'; *Hoffman* (1631), 1682 'Enter as many as may be spar'd, with lights, and make a lane kneeling while Martha the Dutchesse like a mourner with her traine passeth through'. In the Folio we have, among others, 2 *Henry VI*, I. iv. 25 'Here doe the Ceremonies, and make the Circle, Bullingbrooke or Southwell reades, Coniuro te, &c.'; *Comedy of Errors*, Iv. iv. 149—50 'Runne all out... as fast as may be, frightened'; *The Shrew*, v. i. 114 'Exit Biondello, Tranio and Pedant as fast as may be'. It is true that we cannot be certain how many of these texts had passed through the hands of the book-keeper, but so far as the evidence goes it suggests some lack of care on his part. It is little use arguing that indefinite and optional directions must have been cleared up in the prompt-book when we have reason to suppose that in fact they were often left standing.²

We are perhaps on rather firmer ground in dealing with

¹ We should have expected the book-keeper to decide whether the tree was practicable in *John a Kent*, and whether staff or stone was to be used in *Captives*. When the book-keeper annotated the latter he had evidently not made up his mind by the time the book was prepared the point may have been settled.

² A case of careful revision of an author's directions by the book-keeper may be seen in *The Humorous Lieutenant* in the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1647. See p. 172, Note Q, and observe how the book-keeper is uninterested in whom the ambassadors come from, and cares nothing what the prince has been doing, only in what he carries.

directions that can only have been introduced by the book-keeper, though even here we have to remember, before inferring an origin in prompt-copy, that we have reason to suspect that the book-keeper sometimes made preliminary notes on the author's foul papers.¹

It has usually been held that one characteristic of the book-keeper is that he tends to mark entries a few lines earlier than required by the text. The evidence is rather conflicting. In *The Honest Mans Fortune* a manuscript written by the book-keeper Edward Knight himself, marginal entries are sometimes, but by no means always, marked from one to eight lines earlier than in the folio, but in cases where the discrepancy is greatest the manuscript arrangement seems preferable. In *Believe*, Knight, when duplicating Massinger's marginal entries, places them from one to four lines earlier (though once two lines later); but this is partly conditioned by the need to find room for them without interfering with Massinger's unabbreviated speakers' names, a consideration that accounts for two anticipations of as much as six lines. The object of the book-keeper's entries in the left margin is to catch the prompter's eye and so warn him of what is to come; they will naturally be made early rather than late, but their exact position seems largely a matter of chance.² That the operating factor is the prompter's need to glance ahead is shown by the practice of repeating at the foot of a recto page a direction occurring near the head of the following verso. There are two instances of this in *Ironsides* (733, 914) and one each in *John of Bordeaux* (I 120) and *The Two Noble Ladies* (1449),³ and at one point in *Believe* (2022) a direction and a speech are so transferred that the prompter may turn the leaf at leisure during a song.

Some of the incursions by the book-keeper that we have been considering would tend to duplication in print, and in general it may be said that repetition of stage-directions points to prompt-copy, just as textual repetition usually points to foul papers. Actually the duplication of directions

¹ See p. 109.

² The reasons usually given for the alleged practice are not very satisfactory: see Greg, *Editorial Problem*, p. 38.

³ There is even an instance in *The Captives* see p. 141.

is, perhaps naturally, rare in printed texts; but it seems on the whole likely that the persistent placing of directions a few lines too early does indicate the use of prompt-copy, though the inference may not be a very strong one.

It is obvious that anticipatory directions of this kind would afford no time to call an actor if he were not already at his post. Quite distinct are the warnings for actors to be ready which appear in some manuscripts, and which provide perhaps the best evidence of all of the intervention of the book-keeper. Warnings are frequent among Knight's additions in *Believe as you List* for actors and supers alike: 661 'M^r Hobs: calld vp' (sc. Flaminius, who enters with his attendants at 830), 1825 'Gascoine: & Hubert below: ready to open the Trap doore for M^r Taylor' (sc. for 'Antiochus ready: vnder the stage' at 1877, though he does not speak, still 'belowe', till 1931), 1968 'Harry:: Willson: & Boy ready for the song at y^e Arras' (at 2022), 2824 'Be ready: y^e .2. Marchants: wth Pen: Curtis: & Garde' (for entry at 2862); and similarly for properties, 654 'Table ready: & -6' chaires to sett out' (needed at 732), 982 'the great booke: of Accompts ready' (for 1115 'Ent: Rowland: wth the booke of records'), 2378 'All the swords ready' (which are not brought in till 2717 and 2722). In *The Welsh Ambassador* almost every entry has a warning from ten to thirty lines before: thus 12 'bee redy Penda' (34 'Enter Penda like a Comon soldier'), 80 'bee redy Edmond & Eldred' (for entry at 110), 796 'bee redy Penda and Voltimar aboue' (820 Carintha 'shews Penda wth a Leading staff voltimar at his back: his sword in him'), 1156 'bee redy Carintha at a Table' (I 183 'Enter Carintha at a Table readinge', a discovery, of course); also 1934 'sett out a Table' (for the discovery at 1962 'Enter Clowne in his study writinge'). In *The Lady Mother* they are also frequent, but much rougher, consisting of the mere repetition of a name a dozen lines or more before an entry, with which it is usually connected by a line drawn down the margin: for example, fol. 188^b 'Maudlin' fifteen lines before 'Ent' Magdalen', fol. 189^a 'Thoro' fourteen lines before 'Ent' Thoroughood', fol. 203^a 'Grimes' twenty lines before 'Ent' Grimes', and 'Lady' thirteen lines before 'Ent' Lady', fol. 204^a 'Alexander y: Marloue' fourteen lines before 'Ent' Alexander

& yo: Marloue'. In *Woodstock* they are less frequent, but 2208 'Shrevs Ready' (for entry at 2221) is a clear case, and properties are often noted beforehand: 789 'Petitions: Mace' (for 800 and 901 respectively), 858 Taper' (for 863), 1136 'Blankes' (sc. the 'blanke charters' produced at 1142), 2377 'A bed for Woodstock' (discovered at 2432), 2741 and 2749 'Dromes' (which 'sounds [withjin' at 2754). There is one instance in *Dick of Devonshire* (fol. 46^a), 'A table out, sword & papers' anticipating by five lines only Iv. iii 'Ent:... 2 gent': one wth Pikes sword. w^{ch} is laid on a Table, Teniente, Clarke wth papers': this is in the same hand as the text.¹

Warnings are sometimes found in printed texts. Thus, for example, *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (Q 1634), i. iii. 68 '2. Hearses ready with Palamon: and Arcite: the 3. Queenes. Theseus: and his Lordes ready' (anticipating i. iv by forty lines), iv. 30 '3. Hearses ready' (anticipating I. v by twenty lines), in. v. 67 'Chaire and stooles out' (for 105 'Ladies sit downe'). They appear in several plays of the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647: particularly in *The Spanish Curate*, III. ii. 132 'The Bar & Book ready on a Table' (anticipating by fifty lines iii. I 'A Bar. Table-booke, 2 chairs, & papers standish set out'), iii. 145 'Chess-board and men set ready' (anticipating by a hundred lines iv. 28 'Enter Moore with Chesse-board'), Iv. v. 6 'Diego ready in Bed wine cup' (anticipating 40 'Enter Diego (in a bed)' and 42 'Bed thrust out', and 61 ('Give me a cup of wine'), vi. 4 'Pewter ready for noyse' (anticipating by forty lines vii. 22 'A great noyse within'), v. i. 26 'A Table ready covered with Cloath Napkins Salt Trenchers and Bread' (anticipating by 130 lines v. ii. i 'The Table set out and stooles'); also *The Chances*, iv. ii 'Bawd ready above' (anticipating by fifty lines 'Enter Bawd (above)' in iv. iii); and in *Love's Pilgrimage*, iv. i 'loh. Bacon ready to shoot off a Pistol' (anticipating by sixty lines 'a shot') incidentally preserves the name of a stage-hand who is also known from a ticket of privilege of 12 January 1637.2 So again in *Bussy D'Ambois* (Q2, 1641 only), i. i. 153

¹ Warnings are said to occur in a manuscript of *Twelfth Night* (probably copied from the Folio text) which appears to have been prepared for use in performance: Chambers, *W. Shake.*, i. 112.

² Malone Society's Collections, ii. 380.

'Table Chesbord & Tapers behind the Arras' (ready for I. ii, sixty lines later).¹

One would have supposed that warnings would only be found in actual prompt-books, but in fact there are a number in *The Captives*, which the book-keeper seems to have annotated exactly as though he were dealing with a prompt-book and not merely marking foul papers preparatory to transcription. He repeats at the foot of fol. 61^a a direction at the head of the following verso as though the transcript were certain to follow the original page for page.² Near the foot of fol. 56' we find in the margin 'Ent: Scribonia' anticipating her entry on the verso, but here the intervening twenty-nine lines are marked for omission; and on 62' is 'Raph: Tred: Clow: to them' anticipating 'Enter mr Raphael mr Treadway and the clowne' on the verso, and again the intervening fifteen lines are cancelled. But on fol. 59' we have 'Ent: Myldew & Sarlaboyes to her' anticipating n. iii 'Enter the Bawde Mildewe and Sarlaboyse', only twenty-eight of the intervening thirty-six lines being cut, and on fol. 61^b 'Fellowes ready, palestra: Scribonia. mildew. wth Godfry. Sarly:' anticipating their entry by thirty-two lines of which nineteen are cut, and there is another clear warning on fol. 60^b 'Ink: paper ready' anticipating 'Enter Dennis wth pen Inke & paper' twenty lines later. On fol. 68^a 'Dennis' is added to an entry, though he only speaks 'wthin' twenty-five lines later.³ It is plain that even warnings are no infallible criterion of prompt-copy.

It may be convenient to sum up the results of this discussion

¹ McKerrow, with his usual insight, noted as a 'mark of genuine prompter's copies' what is in effect a form of warning, namely 'the mention, at the time of the entry of a character, of properties which he will require later in the scene, but either must not or need not exhibit to the audience at the time of entry' (*Dram. MSS.*, p. 271). An author would be unlikely to show such foresight: it would be essential that the prompter should make provision. He pointed out two examples in Beaumont and Fletcher plays: *The Spanish Curate* (F), II. i. I 'Enter Leandro (with a letter writ out)' (ready for 113 'I have a Letter to your worship'), and *Cupid's Revenge* (Q 1615), v. iv. I 'Enter Leucippus, Vrania: Leucippus with a bloody Handkerchief (needed presumably sixty lines later when Urania is wounded).

² Cf. p. 138.

³ Thus the inclusion of a character in an initial direction who in fact does not enter till later, which on p. 112 we found characteristic of the author, may also happen through the intervention of the book-keeper.

as they affect the distinction between foul papers and prompt-copy. Characteristic of foul papers are, first of all, loose ends and false starts and unresolved confusions in the text, which sometimes reveal themselves as duplications in print: next, inconsistency in the designation of characters in directions and prefixes alike, and occasionally the substitution of the name of an actor, when the part is written with a particular performer in view: lastly, the appearance of indefinite and permissive stage-directions, and occasionally of explanatory glosses on the text. It must, however, be recognized that owing to the casual ways of book-keepers these characteristics may persist, to some extent at least, in the prompt-book; but in general the ordering of the text seems to have received more attention than that of the directions, which was perhaps only natural. Characteristic of prompt-copy are the appearance of actors' names duplicating those of (usually minor) characters, possibly the general appearance of directions a few lines too early, and warnings for actors or properties to be in readiness. At the same time these features may be introduced by the book-keeper into the foul papers if he annotates them with a view to transcription. The possibility may not be a very serious one, but it should none the less be borne in mind. It may be added, however, that whatever deductions have to be made from the weight of these criteria, the presence of any of them in a print argues a close dependence on a playhouse manuscript of some sort, which carries with it a high degree of authority.¹

Before we leave foul papers and prompt-books there are a few subsidiary points to be considered. One is the attitude of authors and book-keepers to the division of a play into acts and scenes. Here we have to observe an important distinction. According to the custom of the Elizabethan stage, division into scenes is structural and follows directly from the action: a new scene begins whenever the stage is clear and the action is not continuous; whenever, that is, a change of locality is possible.² So long, therefore, as the directions

¹ See Note J on p. 168.

² There is, however, an element of uncertainty here. When one set of characters goes out on the approach of another set a new scene is usually marked on the ground that the stage is clear, whereas modern editors continue the scene on the ground that the action is continuous. On the other hand, in battle scenes, where combatants are

are clear, the division into scenes follows automatically and there is the less need for any formal division or numbering in the manuscript.¹ On the other hand, the division into acts is merely conventional. An author may write without any such division in mind: if he intends a division, and wishes it to be in any way recognized on the stage, it is essential that he should indicate it in his manuscript.²

Most playhouse manuscripts show some sort of division. Of nineteen that we need take account of, only *More* and *John of Bordeaux* are wholly undivided, but in the case of *Woodstock* (in which originally only the first and second scenes were marked) and of *Ironsides* the present division into acts is a later importation. All four are early. The only other sixteenth-century manuscript, *John a Kent*, has an original division into acts only. Of manuscripts that can be probably assigned to the next quarter of a century, seven are divided into acts only, *Charlemagne*, *SMT*, *Welsh Ambassador*, *Parliament of Love*, *Escapes*, *Honest Man's Fortune* (and so the 1647 folio), and *Faithful Friends* (in which, however, the first act is divided into scenes). Only three are divided into both acts and scenes, *Barnavelte*, *Two Noble Ladies*, and *Captives*, and the earliest of these belongs to 1619. There remain four manuscripts of the thirties. *Believe* has Massinger's careful division into acts and scenes. Knight crosses out most of the scene-headings, but he emphasizes the division into acts. At the head of the second and fourth

constantly in and out, old texts seldom trouble to break up the scene: it is modern editors who are constantly imagining 'Another part of the Field'.

¹ In the theatrical 'plot', however, scenes are basic, since they determine continuous sections of the action, and they are always indicated by a line across the column. It was probably with a view to the construction of the 'plot' that the book-keeper, when marking the manuscript of *The Captives*, wrote 'clere' in the margin whenever the stage was empty. 'Clear' also occurs sixteen times among the jottings in a quarto of *A Looting-Glass for London and England* that has been prepared for use in performance (Malone Society reprint, pp. xxx-xxxii), and 'Exeunt cleere' appears twice in the second quarto of *A King and no King*, which was printed from a copy of the first that had done duty on the stage (see p. 160).

² Act-division is not usually recognized in the 'plots'. In *The Dead Man's Fortune* (c. 1590) there are rows of crosses on four of the scene-lines, and since in each case there is a note of 'Musique' in the margin, they presumably indicate a division into acts. The plots of 2 *The Seven Deadly Sins* (c. 1590), *The Battle of Alcazar* (1598-9 ?), and i *Tamar Cam* (1602) have appearances of dumb-shows, a presenter, or a chorus that show a five-act structure in each, but there is no formal division. Acts II and IV only are marked in the quarto of *The Battle of Alcazar*, 1594.

acts he adds 'Long', referring doubtless to the interval.¹ *The Soddered Citizen* has Clavell's original division into acts and scenes: Knight alters the act-division, making Act IV include the original v. i, but in this case he respects the scene-division, carefully altering the numbering in Act V. *Launching* has an original division into acts and a very imperfect one into scenes: the book-keeper provided for music in the intervals. *Lady Mother* has an original division into acts only, which was altered by the scribe himself, making Act III begin a scene earlier, though the original heading was left standing. *Bonduca* is divided into acts only: the 1647 folio adds a division into scenes, which suggests a playhouse addition, unless it was introduced at the time of printing. It would seem from this that authors were little interested in the numbering of scenes, and the book-keeper even less; indeed, one gets the impression that it may have been mainly a literary convention.² As regards acts, although what is probably our earliest manuscript, *John a Kent*, is divided, the recognition of them seems to be on the whole a later development, due possibly to the growing use of music in the theatre.³ Certainly the opening in 1609 of the Blackfriars house, with its greater opportunities in this respect, must have made a difference to the King's company,⁴ but we have no manuscript of theirs before SMT in 1611.

Act-division was evidently recognized in the Lord Admiral's company before the end of the sixteenth century, for

¹ As in *Midsummer-Night's Dream* (F), end of Act III, 'They sleepe all the Act'. A similar indication is found in Heywood's *Fair Maid of the West*, Part I (1631), 'Exeunt. Act long. Explicit Actus quartus'.

² All Crane's private transcripts, as well as *Barnavelt*, are divided into both acts and scenes. A curiosity is Dekker's *Honest Whore* (part i, 1604), in which, after an initial ⁴Actus Primus. Scaena Prima', the only divisions are in quires E-H, where scenes vii to xi and xiii are marked, the remains apparently of a continuous, division into scenes. This may somehow be the result of collaboration, for Middleton is supposed, on Henslowe's authority, to have had a hand in the play.

³ We have just seen the connexion between music and act division as early as c. 1590 in the 'plot' of *The Dead Mans Fortune*. The habitual use of music between the acts seems to be implied in a direction in *Tour Five Gallants* (1608), Iv. i. I 'In the midst of the musick, enter . . .', and we find in *Dick of Devonshire* (1626 ?), fol. 35^a 'Act. 2. Sc. i. Alarum, as y^e soft musicke begins, a peale of Ordnance goes off'.

⁴ In 1604 the King's men spoke of 'the not received custome of musicke in our Theatre', sc. the Globe (*The Malcontent*, Induction).

⁵ See Note K on p. 168.

on 23 October 1598 Henslowe paid money 'vnto m^r Chapmane on his playe booke & ij jects of a tragedie of bengemens plotte'. A plot by Jonson was sure to be carefully divided. At a later date it was no less recognized in the Lady Elizabeth's company. In his correspondence with Henslowe in 1613—14 Daborne writes 'one Fryday night I will deliver in the 3 acts fayr written', and again 'I have . . . given Cyrill Tourneur an act of the Arreignment of london to write', and 'I have took extraordinary payns with the end & altered one other scean in the third act', and 'one Friday night I will bring you papers to the valew of three acts'. It will be noticed that Daborne also speaks of a 'scean', and he elsewhere writes 'your man was with me whoe found me wrighting the last scean' and 'trew it is I promysd to bring you the last scean'; but though he is probably using the term in its technical sense, it does not, of course, follow that the scenes were numbered.¹

Something should be said about the book-keeper's habit of cutting plays for production. Most prompt-books have been more or less heavily cut, though they differ a good deal both in the extent and in the manner of the cutting, even if we leave censorship out of account.² There is none in *Believe as you List*: probably all that was needed was done on the earlier version. Nor is there any in the late *Two Noble Ladies*, a short play of only just over 2,100 lines; and in two short pieces of earlier date, *John a Kent* (about 1,700 lines) and *John of Bordeaux* (about 1,350 lines), it is negligible. In others the approximate figures are: *Woodstock* a play of 3,000 lines probably, has 8 cuts totalling 95 lines; *Ironsides* (2,050 lines) 38 cuts totalling 170 lines; *Charlemagne* (nearly 2,800 lines) 18 cuts totalling 155 lines; *The second 'Maiden's Tragedy'* (2,500 lines) 13 cuts totalling 135 lines; *The Soddered Citizen* (over 2,900 lines) 9 cuts totalling 170 lines; *The Launching of the Mary* (over 3,000 lines) 5 cuts totalling nearly 200 lines. How differently the book-keeper worked may be seen by comparing *Ironsides* in which the average cut is only four and a half lines, with *The second 'Maiden's*

¹ The phrases quoted will be found in *Henslowe's Diary*, fol. 51^b, and *Henslowe Papers*, pp. 69, 72, 73, 78, 81.

² This will be considered later, pp. 149 ff.

Tragedy', in which it is ten and a half: in the late *Soddered Citizen* and *Launching of the Mary* the cuts are even fewer and longer. In all these plays, except perhaps the last, the book-keeper was working on a fair copy, and there is no reason to suppose that he had either read or marked the foul papers. In the foul papers of *The Captives*, which run to some 3,000 lines, there are 27 cuts totalling 255 lines. A prompt-book prepared from this manuscript should have been clean. And such are the two books in which text and annotations are in the same hand, pointing to their having been transcribed from fully prepared foul papers: of these *The Welsh Ambassador* (2,300 lines) has no cuts at all, and *The Parliament of Love* (2,500 lines) has only 4 cuts totalling 20 lines, all on a single opening, which had perhaps received insufficient attention in the first place. The natural inference, and one agreeable to common sense, is that if the book-keeper were presented with foul papers he might mark the cuts in them before the prompt-copy was prepared, in which case the passages in question would not appear in the prompt-book at all; whereas if he were presented with a fair copy suitable for the prompter's use he would, of course, have to make his cuts in it, and the passages would remain, albeit marked for omission.¹ Except in the early *Ironsides* and the late *Captives*, each of which is shortened by about a twelfth, the cuts make no great impression on the length of the play and appear to have been usually made on what may be called local grounds, to remove offence or obscurity, to lighten over-long speeches, or for other mainly literary reasons. There is little indication of a desire to reduce plays to a standard length. It may be true that, Shakespeare and Jonson apart, the average length of plays of the period was about 2,400 lines and the usual length of performance some two hours. But there are allusions to plays lasting two and a half and even three hours,² and the prompt-book of *Believe as you List* was not cut though it runs to over 3,000 lines: *Ironsides*, which is not much over 2,000 lines, is more heavily

¹ Practice may, however, have varied. There is some indication that occasionally passages marked for omission in the foul papers were nevertheless preserved (similarly marked) in the prompt-copy, possibly in order that they should be available if required on some future occasion.

² See Chambers, *Eliz. Stage*, ii. 543'.

cut than *Woodstock*' which is about 3,000. On the evidence we are bound to believe that plays differed considerably in length and performances in duration.

There are two criteria of printing from autograph that critics have sometimes sought to apply, and which therefore deserve some consideration, namely the persistence in printed texts of spellings characteristic of the author, and the presence of misprints that can be explained by known peculiarities in his handwriting. During Shakespeare's life, and for some time after, English spelling was being gradually reduced to rule. This was in the main the work of compositors, though professional and other practised scribes no doubt shared in the movement. Thus, with the exception of some scholarly writers who were themselves interested in the process, the spelling of authors tended to be more erratic and old-fashioned than that of the prints in which their works appeared. This would be particularly true of a man like Shakespeare, educated in a provincial grammar school, and the inference one might draw from the variations in his signature is borne out by an examination of his contribution to *More*. As a rule the eccentric spellings of an author's manuscript would, of course, be eliminated by the compositor; but exceptionally, as when he had difficulty in deciphering the original, or in the case of unfamiliar words or proper names, he would be liable to follow his copy exactly. In *Macbeth* Banquo's name is regularly so spelt except on its first occurrence (i. ii. 34) when it appears as 'Banquoh'. That this is no mere misprint seems probable from the spelling 'Banquho', which is regular in Holinshed. It follows that, whatever the actual manuscript from which the Folio text was set up, we may feel assured that it was in Shakespeare's autograph that the exceptional form originated.¹ The best-known and most remarkable example, however, is the word 'silence' which appears in *More* in the very individual form 'scilens'.² Of course, no compositor would normally reproduce such a spelling, but in *2 Henry IV* Silence is the name of a character and in the

¹ As noted by Richard Flatter, ' "The True Originall Copies" of Shakespeare's Plays', *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical Society*, July 1952, vii. 36.

² The spelling with 'sc' is in fact not uncommon, V for 'ce' is more unusual; the combination is, so far as is known, unparalleled outside Shakespeare.

quarto of 1600 (but not in the Folio) it is spelt 'Scilens' eighteen times.¹ There can be no reasonable doubt that the form comes from Shakespeare's own pen. It has been objected that such spellings are not necessarily peculiar to Shakespeare, and further that if they sometimes persist in print they may also persist in a transcript. The first objection is irrelevant.² We are bound to believe that the foul papers of a Shakespearian play were in Shakespeare's hand: all we assume is that eccentric spellings were not introduced by a compositor or an experienced scribe. The second objection contains, of course, an obvious truth. But supposing that there is a one-in-ten chance of a peculiar spelling being reproduced by a scribe or a compositor, the chance of its surviving in a print set up from a transcript is only one in a hundred. Thus, though nothing can, of course, be inferred from a single instance, if we find any considerable number of eccentric or archaic spellings in a print, the likelihood is great that it was set up from the author's own manuscript and not from a scribal copy.

In the matter of handwriting everything depends on our knowing the author's, and on its exhibiting some marked individual peculiarities. The hand in which the copy is written will naturally affect the sort of mistakes—what are called 'graphic errors'—that the compositor will make through misreading it.³ For example, to judge from his addition to *More*, Shakespeare sometimes wrote a peculiar, but not uncommon, form of V in which the round is separated by a slight cross-stroke from the rest of the letter. Such an V is, of course, liable to be misread as 'oi' or 'or', and in fact we

¹ See J. Dover Wilson in *Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More* (chap. 4, 'Bibliographical Links between the Three Pages and the Good Quartos'), Cambridge University Press, 1923, p. 129; and also Note L on p. 169.

² An attempt to prove authorship from the appearance of particular spellings is another matter. In a paper on 'Anthony Munday's Spelling as a Literary Clue' (*The Library*, June 1923, iv. 9-23) Muriel St. C. Byrne argued plausibly enough that his characteristic doubling of the o in words like *love*, *done*, *forth*, <word, and so on, might, under conditions, be used as evidence of authorship. There is an even more individual spelling of Thomas Heywood's. The ordinary Elizabethan form of *aye* was T, but Heywood spelt it 'ey' (as noted by F. G. Fleay, *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, 1891, i. 293), and the spelling persists in several of his printed plays.

³ This subject too has been mainly investigated by Dover Wilson, who treats it along with Shakespeare's spelling: see note i above.

do find these particular misprints occasionally in the plays. Again, many misprints in the plays are what are known as 'minim errors',¹ and a glance at the *More* addition will show how easily these could arise. But errors of this kind afford little help, since the peculiarities from which they spring are common to many hands of the time. It is not often that an author's hand exhibits features that are strictly personal. Thomas Heywood had the peculiarity of writing 'quartus' and 'quintus', not as '4⁹' and '5⁹' as was usual, but as '45' and '55', and since he sometimes used a final form of V which is very like a '6', the contractions became indistinguishable from '46' and '56'. When, therefore, we find that in *The Wise Woman of Hogsdon* printed as Heywood's in 1638, the last two acts are headed 'Actus 46.' and 'Actus 56.', it is as good a proof as we could wish that the play was set up from autograph copy, for the peculiarity is a personal one, and no scribe used to copying dramatic manuscripts would conceivably make such an absurd mistake. But this is quite exceptional. As a rule the most we can say is that, since we may expect prompt-copies to be more carefully and clearly written than foul papers, a large number of errors in a print that can be explained by known features of the author's handwriting, even if they are not particularly individual features, points to its having been printed from the latter rather than the former, unless, of course, there is reason to suppose that the author prepared his own fair copy.

One last point should be mentioned before we leave the subject of foul papers and prompt-books. It has often been argued, especially by Chambers, that a printed text from which the oaths have been more or less consistently removed must have been printed from an original that had been used for performance after the Act of 1606 prohibited profanity on the stage.² We lack evidence, however, to show how far

¹ A minim is a single short down-stroke, and minim errors arise through miscounting or misinterpreting a series of these. The second element in an 'a' is a minim, and in many Elizabethan hands V and v are minim-letters.

² 3 James I, c. 21 (27 May), providing that any person who 'shall in any Stage play, Interlude, Shewe, Maygame, or Pageant jestingly or prophanely speake or use the holy Name of God or of Christ Jesus, or of the Holy Ghoste or of the Trinitie . . . shall forfeite for everie such Offence. . . Tenne Pounds' (printed by Chambers, *Elix. Stage*, iv. 338-9).

the provisions of the Act were enforced.¹ It would, no doubt, be part of the duty of the Master of the Revels² to prevent abuses. But Tilney and Buc appear to have been mainly concerned with possible political allusions and with impertinence towards persons of rank. In *More*, which was of course written long before the Act, Tilney sought to take the sting out of a scene of popular discontent by altering 'English' to 'man' (352) and 'straunger' and 'Frencheman' to the remoter 'Lombard' (364, 368): in *SMT Buc* comes to the defence of the nobility when he insists that it shall be 'some' rather than 'great' men who fear death (1.1354); of 'your ladies', striking out the jibe that 'theile sooner kill them selues with lust, then for it' (1. 1426) and making it not 'most' but only 'many' who will sacrifice honour before life (1. 1841)—a nice point this!—and of majesty itself when he will have the Tyrant say 'I am poisoned' and not 'your kinges poisond' (1. 2403): he does also strike out an occasional 'heart', 'life', and 'Bi'th masse', but elsewhere leaves 'masse', 'faith', and 'troth' standing. In *Barnavelt* Buc altered or cancelled two or three phrases of possible political import and entered a general protest concerning the treatment of the Prince of Orange—which appears to have been ignored. There is no purging: indeed there is little that could be counted profane beyond '6 the devill', 'a devill take it', 'Hell take'; an occasional 'faith' and 'troth' is allowed to pass. On the other hand, Herbert's strictness is notorious, and his difference with his sovereign as to whether 'faith', 'death', and 'slight' were oaths or asseverations has passed into literary history.³ We may feel sure that the books that came under his review were carefully relieved of 'oaths, prophaness, and publique ribaldry' and that little of the sort was allowed to pass on the stage.⁴ 'The players ought not to study their parts till I have allowed of the booke', he noted, and ordered the book-keeper

¹ Prosecution was to be upon information laid, and since playgoers evidently did not object to profanity, and the Puritans, who objected to profanity, did not frequent plays, the Act may well have been a dead letter except for action by professional promoters.

² See Note M on p. 169.

³ *Variorum*, 1821, iii. 235; Adams, *Herbert*, p. 22. 'If the king had been a better etymologist, he would have realized that, while "Faith" was an asseveration, "Death" and "Slight" were, at least in origin, oaths' (Chambers, *W. Shake.*, i. 239).

⁴ See Note N on p. 171.

to 'Purge ther parts, as I have the booke'. At the same time he recorded that 'All ould plays ought to bee brought to the Master of the Revells, and have his allowance to them for which he should have his fee, since they may be full of offensive things against church and state; the rather that in former time the poetts tooke greater liberty than is allowed them by mee'.¹ This was in 1633. He was clearly dissatisfied with the milder censorship of his predecessors.² It may be that the purging of profanity did not become effective till Herbert took office seventeen years after the original Act. By that time the First Folio was nearing completion.³

Chambers's treatment of the subject is judicious and cautious, but does not pretend to be the last word on the subject:⁴ 'whatever degrees of profanity the Act covered, it clearly only related to words spoken on the stage, and not to words put into print. One does not see, then, why the publishers of the First Folio should have gone to the pains of expurgation. . . . On the whole it looks as if the expurgation of Shakespeare must date from stage revivals of 1606 or later. Whatever its genesis, it is nowhere complete and in most plays quite perfunctory.' He recognizes that, with *Henry IV*, *Othello* is one of the most thoroughly purged plays in the Folio, and elsewhere suggests⁵ that the lack of expurgation in the quarto of 1622 proves that the transcript of the prompt-book from which he believes it to have been printed must have been prepared before 1606, within two years or so of production. But *Othello* cannot be dissociated from a group of Beaumont and Fletcher plays that the King's men released about the same time.⁶ They are *The Maid's Tragedy*, 1619 (revised edition, 1625), *A King and no King*, 1619,

¹ There had been trouble over a revival of Beaumont and Fletcher's play *The Woman s Prize, or The Tamer Tamed*; of which Herbert forbade a performance on 18 Oct. 1633 'upon complaints of foule and offensive matters conteyned therein'. The following month, 23 Nov., 'The Kings players sent me an ould booke of Fletchers called The Loyal Subject, formerly allowed by Sir George Bucke 16 Novemb. 1618, which ... I did peruse, and with some reformations allowed of.

² For references see *Variorum*, 1821, iii. 209-10, 232-5; Adams, *Herbert*, pp. 19, 21, 22.

³ See Note O on p. 171.

⁴ W. *Shake.*, i. 237-42.

⁵ *Ibid.* i. 460.

⁶ Attention was called to these by K. W. Cameron, 'Othello', *Quarto i*, *Reconsidered*, *PMLA*, Sept. 1932, xlvii. 671-83. But the article is unreliable, and the evidence on which the writer concludes that the quartos were printed from prompt-copy would not satisfy criticism today. This rather invalidates his thesis.

Philaster, 1620 (revised edition, 1622), and *Thierry and Theodoret* 1621. All these have a full complement of profanity, and all were presumably written after 1606. They may, of course, have been printed from foul papers, or from transcripts that had not suffered from stage purgation. One might indeed ask: 'Why did Beaumont and Fletcher continue to insert profanity in their plays, if excision was a prerequisite to allowance of the manuscript?' Possibly they could not help it. The real interest of these plays lies elsewhere. First we must note that, as will appear,¹ the second edition of *A King and no King* 1625, was printed from a copy of the first that had undoubtedly been used as a prompt-book on the stage, yet no attempt whatever had been made to remove the oaths. Secondly, later editions of all the plays except *Thierry* were printed for Richard Hawkins between 1628 and 1630, and these editions *are* expurgated, although there is no hint of any new contact with the stage. Hawkins also published the second edition of *Othello* in 1630, and it is worth noting that this, like the Folio, is expurgated, though not always in the same manner.² There can, therefore, be little question that there existed, some time before 1628, a purely literary tradition of expurgation, and it is not inconceivable that this may to some extent have affected the Folio, though published as early as 1623. Chambers himself remarks³ that the expurgation that appears in the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1647^{was} carried a stage farther in that of 1679, which again suggests that it was a matter of literary taste, in this case perhaps the taste of the 'ingenious and worthy Gentleman' the use of whose copy of the earlier folio the editors of the later gratefully acknowledged. It follows, therefore, that the presence or absence of profanity cannot be regarded as affording altogether reliable evidence respecting the nature and date of the manuscript that served as copy for a printed text.

Sidney Lee, when he failed to find in the Folio texts the features that he imagined to be characteristic of the prompt-

¹ p. 160.

² Fredson Bowers points out (privately) that of *The Shoemakers' Holiday*, originally printed in 1600, both the third and fourth editions, 1618 and 1624, show occasional expurgation.

³ W. *Shake.*, i. 239.

book, concluded that they must have been mostly printed from private transcripts.¹ His attention was, of course, directed to this type of manuscript through an incidental remark by Humphrey Moseley in his preface to the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1647,^a a quarter of a century later: 'When these Comedies and Tragedies were presented on the Stage, the Actours omitted some Scenes and Passages (with the Author's consent) as occasion led them; and when private friends desir'd a Copy, they then (and justly too) transcribed what they Acted. But now you have both All that was Acted, and all that was not; even the perfect full Originalls without the least mutilation'. Moseley here disclaims the use of private transcripts in his collection,² but his words are evidence of their existence, which is confirmed by Knight's transcript of *Bonduca* and Crane's of Fletcher's *Demetrius and Enanthe* (*The Humorous Lieutenant*) and Middleton's *Game at Chess* and *The Witch*. It is, however, uncertain how early the custom of making private transcripts prevailed, whether in the King's company or elsewhere. None of the extant examples can be dated before 1624,² when the scandal over *A Game at Chess* caused a sudden demand and perhaps set a fashion: *Demetrius* is dated 27 November 1625; of *The Witch* all we can say is that it was presumably copied before Middleton's death in 1627. Since publication was contrary to the general policy of the King's men they are not very likely to have favoured circulation in manuscript; still, after receiving the Lord Chamberlain's protection against unauthorized publication in 1619, it is possible that their attitude relaxed. Indeed, we know of one instance that would seem to be even earlier than this, for 1619 is the

¹ *Introduction*, p. xix; cf. above, p. 121.

² We know that such a manuscript of *The Mad Lover* was in the hands of Sir Aston Cokayne before the publication of the 1647 folio, and it seems to be implied that it was available to Moseley. However, the presence of actors' names in the folio text of this play shows that it was actually printed from the prompt-book. (See Greg, *Bibl. Drama*, iii. 1017.)

³ Some manuscripts of Jonson's masques, including presentation copies written by Jonson himself and by Crane, are earlier but irrelevant. Presentation copies of Cartwright's *Royal Slave* (B.M. MS. Add. 41616, art. i) and Suckling's *Aglaure* (B.M. MS. Royal 18 C. xxv) probably date from 1636 and 1638 respectively. As will later appear, a presentation copy has been conjectured to have been the source of the quarto of *Troilus and Cressida* in 1609, and a private transcript of that of *Othello* in 1622.

date of the first quarto of *A King and no King*, and the epistle in which Thomas Walkley dedicated it to Sir Henry Neville implies that it was from him that the publisher obtained the copy and that it was printed by his wish.¹ It is possible, therefore, that at the time the copy for the First Folio was being got together a few private transcripts were already abroad to make Sidney Lee's assumption theoretically possible.

Respecting the sort of text that a private transcript would be likely to exhibit the evidence is rather uncertain. Crane's copies (other than those of *A Game at Chess*' all manuscripts of which present peculiar features) contain reasonably good texts. Middleton's dedication of *The Witch*—'recovered into my hands (though not without much difficultie)'—seems to hint that the manuscript of this unsuccessful play was retrieved from the theatre and may therefore have been a prompt-copy, an inference consistent on the whole with the character of the text.² On the other hand a comparison of *Demetrius* with the folio version (*Humorous Lieutenant*) shows that it was copied from foul papers.³ Knight's *Eonduca* was avowedly transcribed from the same, but only, it would appear, because the prompt-copy had gone astray.⁴ Moseley, on the contrary, reporting, we may suppose, what the actors had told him, distinctly states that the custom was to make private copies from books that had been cut for the stage. It is the features of the prompt-book, therefore, that we should as a rule expect to find in this class of manuscript, but cases varied, and there is also always the possibility that original characteristics may have been edited away in a copy prepared for literary use.

Another type of manuscript that may have to be taken into account is the memorially contaminated transcript. The idea is that in copying out a play the scribe, if he is familiar

¹ 'I present, or rather returne vnto your view, that which formerly hath beene receiued from you, hereby effecting what you did desire.' It is possible that the King's men sought to prevent the publication, for the entrance in the Stationers' Register on 7 Aug. 1618 is in the name not of Walkley but of Edward Blount, who made the abortive entries of *Pericles* and *Antony and Cleopatra* ten years earlier. However, when the quarto appeared the company was not above making use of it as a prompt-book: see p. 160.

² See Note P on p. 172.

³ See Note Q on p. 172.

⁴ See Note R on p. 172.

with the piece as acted, may unconsciously, or even consciously, substitute what he has heard on the stage for what actually stands in his copy.¹ The existence of such transcripts has been postulated to explain the textual features of certain plays: by Dover Wilson in the case of the Folio *Hamlet* by Chambers in that of the quarto *Richard III* (1597), and by Alice Walker in that of the quarto *Lear* (1608). There is no doubt that such memorial contamination is a possibility, in some circumstances probably an actuality, of textual transmission. There is no reason at all why it should not have occurred in dramatic works, which possibly offered conditions particularly favourable to this form of corruption. Bad lighting has been suggested as a contributory cause.² But there are limits that it is reasonable to set both to the degree of corruption that is likely to have established itself on the stage in such a way as to impress itself on the memory of an actor or auditor—especially if, as is sometimes assumed, that auditor was the prompter, who would have his eye on the correct text—and no less to the amount of nonsense or inferior stuff that a scribe may be supposed to have set down rather than consult the text before him. We may, for example, ask those who postulate such a method of transcription to consider carefully the likelihood that in *Richard III* (iv. iv. 523 ff.) a scribe would write,

The Brittainie nauie is disperst, Richmond in Dorshire
Sent out a boate to aske them on the shore,
If they were his assistants yea, or no:

if the manuscript before him read,

The Brittainie Nauie is dispersed by Tempest.
Richmond in Dorsetshire sent out a Boat
Vnto the shore, to aske those on the Banks,
If they were his Assistants, yea, or no ?

¹ This possibility is considered in connexion with play-abridgement by Greg, *Alçazar and Orlando*, pp. 254-5.

² That windows were often small with inferior glazing and that tapers must often have given a poor light is true enough, but the fact remains that bad conditions did not in general interfere with competent work. If, however, the work of transcription was done surreptitiously and in haste the liability to contamination would no doubt be increased.

or whether in *King Lear* (L. i. 84 ff.) he would be content with

but now our ioy,

Although the last, not least in our deere loue,
if before him he had the correct version,

Now our loy,

Although our last and least; to whose yong loue,
The Vines of France, and Milke of Burgundie,
Striue to be interest.¹

One other class of manuscripts has been postulated by some critics. These are copies reconstructed from actors' parts, to which, appropriately enough, the name of 'assembled texts' has been given. The chief sponsors of the assembly theory are Crompton Rhodes and Dover Wilson,² who evolved it to explain the peculiarities of certain Folio texts. These, which appear most clearly in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and less so in *The Winter's Tale*, are the massing of the names of all the characters appearing in a scene in the initial direction, more or less in the order of their appearance but irrespective of whether they enter at the beginning or later on, and the all but complete absence of later entrances or other stage-directions. The suggestion is that the initial directions were copied from the theatrical 'plot' of the play and the text either pieced together or transcribed from the actors' 'parts'.³ That in the absence of foul papers, prompt-book, or transcript, a text of sorts could be put together in this laborious manner need not be denied; but it is less easy to imagine an Elizabethan scribe performing the task without leaving manifest traces of the process. So long as there were only two speakers all would no doubt go smoothly enough, but when a number took part in the discussion considerable confusion would be likely to result. As Chambers, who gives a fair but

¹ The corruptions attributed by Dover Wilson to the transcriber involved in the Folio text of *Hamlet* are, on the contrary, well within the bounds of reason.

² Rhodes, *First Folio*, pp. 96 ff.; Wilson, 'The Task of Heminge and Condell' in *Studies in the First Folio written for the Shakespeare Association* (London, Humphrey Milford, 1924), pp. 72 ff., and editions of the several plays.

³ Dover Wilson, for various not very convincing reasons, extends the theory to *Measure for Measure*, *As you Like it*, *The Comedy of Errors*, and *The Merchant of Venice*.

critical account of the theory, remarks,¹ we should expect to find two particular kinds of error, which in fact we do not find: mistakes in the order of speeches, and the occasional inclusion in them of cues from elsewhere. Nor is there, in the massed entries, any trace of the phrase 'to them' that is characteristic of the 'plots'.² Indeed, this phrase makes it quite clear which characters enter at the beginning and which later, and any scribe who had the skill and patience to assemble a text in this manner would have had little difficulty in introducing the characters at the proper time.³ Nor can the general absence of stage-directions, apart from the massed entries,⁴ be admitted to point to the use of 'plots' and 'parts', for the extant examples of these are by no means devoid of stage-directions and similar descriptions of action, even if we disregard the sometimes elaborate dumb-shows.⁵ There are also other objections of an *a priori* nature. The theory necessarily presupposes the loss of other possible texts, and the Globe fire in 1613 has naturally been invoked to account for the fact, though there is no reason to believe that any play-house manuscripts perished on that occasion.⁶ In any case the probability is that the prompt-book, 'plot', and 'parts' needed for the performance of a play would be kept together⁷ and the foul papers stored elsewhere, so that the chance of the prompt-book and the foul papers being destroyed and the 'plot' and the 'parts' surviving seems rather remote.

The massing of entries and the general absence of stage-directions are features not confined to plays in the First Folio. They are found, for example, in Webster's *Duchess of Malfy*, a King's men's play of 1613—14, printed in 1623. Since it was then published by the author it is unlikely to be

¹ W. Shah., i. 153-4.

² See Note S on p. 173.

³ Dover Wilson would doubtless retort that this is exactly what the scribe attempted unsuccessfully to do in *The Winter's Tale*, in which there are massed entries in all but two scenes, but some individual entries are repeated later on. *The Winter's Tale* was, of course, printed, and probably prepared for press, later than *The Two Gentlemen* and the *Merry Wives*.

⁴ See Note T on p. 173.

⁵ See Note U on p. 173.

⁶ We hear that when the Fortune was burnt in 1621 the actors lost 'all their apparell & play-booke', but at the Globe 'nothing did perish but wood and straw, and a few forsaken cloaks': Chambers, *Eliz. Stage*, ii. 442, 420.

⁷ We know for a fact that in one instance at least the prompt-book was kept inside the folded 'plot', for on the outside of the latter was written 'The Booke and Platt of the second part of The 7- deadly sinns'.

an assembled text, and since the massed entries are both defective and redundant they cannot well be derived from the 'plot'.¹ They rather suggest foul papers,² an origin that is borne out by certain notes in the text³ and by the claim of the quarto to represent 'The perfect and exact Coppy, with diuerse things Printed, that the length of the Play would not beare in the Presentment', which in any case would rule out assembling from actors' 'parts'. Equally significant is the fact that one of the manuscripts of *A Game at Chess* in the hand of Ralph Crane⁴ exhibits the same features, for, since other copies of the play made by Crane and Middleton⁵ are normal in this respect, there must, it would appear, have been an original available, and therefore no need to resort to the laborious process of assembling.⁶ Since it has been suspected that some of the manuscripts from which plays in the First Folio were printed were written by Crane, it seems possible that the massing of entries was an occasional eccentricity of his. He may have been imitating Ben Jonson, who, following the neo-classical method of scene-division, naturally headed each scene with a simple list of the characters appearing in it.⁷ Certainly Crane follows Jonson in omitting 'Enter' at the beginning of initial directions (in MS. Malone 25), and so does Webster in *The Duchess of Malfy*: the Folio plays usually have the normal 'Enter', but this may have been added by the printer, since it is occasionally absent (*Two Gentlemen*, i. i, v. iii; *Merry Wives*, III. ii).⁸

¹ As duly noted by W. J. Lawrence in *TLS*, 12 Jan. 1922.

² See p. 112.

³ See p. 167, Note I (end).

⁴ Bodleian MS. Malone 25.

⁵ British Museum MS. Lansdowne 690, and Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. O. 2. 66.

⁶ MS. Malone 25 contains a condensed version of the play, and Dover Wilson seems to think that this somehow suggests assembling. But the actors' parts would be of the full version, and to combine abbreviation with assembling would add greatly to the difficulties of an already difficult task. It shows how hard put to it Wilson is to defend a theory to which he nevertheless protests he is 'not in the least wedded'. See *The Library*, June 1930, xi. 113-16, and R. C. Bald's reply, Sept. 1931, xii. 243-8.

⁷ If so, he was not, of course, being very intelligent, since there is no real analogy between the two cases.

⁸ Dover Wilson's reply to the objections raised against the theory of assembled texts will be found in the Note on the Copy in his edition of *The Winter's Tale*, 1931, pp. 119-27. As usual he makes his points shrewdly, but they are not wholly convincing. He counters the plausible objection that in the theatre 'parts' and 'book'

Of the thirty-six plays in the First Folio fourteen had previously appeared in what are generally reputed 'good' quartos,¹ and for the majority of these a quarto was used, with more or less correction, as copy for the Folio.² And in most cases the particular edition used as copy was what may be assumed to have been the latest available at the time of preparation, though in some cases one edition only had appeared, and that many years before.³ The amount of correction—or of alteration, to use a more non-committal word—varies greatly. In some cases—as in *Richard III* and *King Lear*, and to a lesser extent in *Troilus and Cressida*—it amounts to a pretty thorough revision of the text; in certain others there is hardly any. Almost all, however, show some elaboration of the stage-directions, though it may be slight. This has occasionally led critics, particularly Pollard, to believe that in some cases at least Folio texts were set up from copies of the quartos that had been used in the play-house and annotated by the prompter.⁴ Others⁵ prefer to suppose that when the quartos were compared with the play-house manuscripts to see whether they were sufficiently accurate to serve as copy for the Folio, a few directions and an occasional variant in the text were rather casually added to the quarto before it was delivered to the printer. The procedure may not have been the same in all cases. In some texts the amount of textual correction required would have rendered the quarto unusable by the prompter: in others the amount of annotation actually effected would appear to have been altogether inadequate to serve his purpose.⁶ The most

would be kept together and probably share in any accidental destruction by suggesting that Herbert may have lost the 'book' when it was submitted to him, which, applied to half a dozen plays, is anything but plausible.

¹ A further two or four or six, according to variant opinion, had appeared in 'bad' quartos, but of these the Folio editors made no appreciable use: see p. 88.

² In eleven cases, certainly: over 2 *Henry IV* and *Othello* opinion is still divided; *Hamlet* is generally believed to have been printed from a manuscript, but even this has recently been questioned. It would make a neater pattern if in all cases quartos had been used.

³ See Note V on p. 174.

⁴ See Note W on p. 174.

⁵ Or, at any rate, Greg, *Editorial Problem*, pp. 15, 120-2, 124, 126, 128. Chambers, *W. Shake.*, i. 165, is non-committal. Many early interludes were, of course, printed expressly for acting, but they belong to a different theatrical world.

⁶ Advocates of the quarto-prompt-book theory would doubtless argue that the

likely case is *Titus Andronicus*, a possible one is *Richard II*.¹ The possibility at least must be admitted, for there can be no doubt that in 1625 the second edition of Beaumont and Fletcher's play *A King and no King* was printed from a copy of the first (1619) that had done duty as a prompt-book in the theatre.² The text had been to some extent revised, and at one point three lines inserted, but what is more significant is that the directions were amplified and defined, once an actor's name was introduced, 'Enter Seruant. Will. Adkinson',³ and twice there was added the note 'Exeunt cleere', which last at any rate can have originated nowhere but in the playhouse.⁴ This being so, the subject calls for a few words of general discussion.

It is by no means certain that the prompter would have found a quarto convenient. No doubt a printed text would have some advantage of clearness over a manuscript, but it would offer less room for annotation, and the prompter, used to a 'book' with from fifty to eighty lines to a page, might feel less at home with a quarto half the size, which would entail more turning of the leaves and restrict his freedom to look ahead. There is thus no reason to suppose, with Pollard, that the company would have been anxious to substitute a printed prompt-book for their manuscript one. But if their prompt-book were accidentally destroyed or lost, or if it merely became worn with use, they would be likely enough to substitute a printed edition if one was available.⁵

admitted carelessness with which the book-keeper prepared manuscripts for the stage may be invoked to account for the inadequate preparation of printed prompt-books. They could not be refuted in logic. But we may claim the right to prefer probabilities to possibilities and to hope that the people concerned usually performed their tasks in a more or less reasonable fashion.

¹ Pollard (*S.'s Fight*, p. 66) found what he called 'clear evidence' that the Folio texts of *Much Ado* and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* were set up from copies of the quartos that had been 'used in the theatre as prompt-copies'. But more recent criticism takes a very different view of the evidence adduced, and Pollard's conclusion must be rejected (see pp. 245-6, 280-1).

² See 'The Second Quarto of "A King and no King", 1625', by Bertha Sturman, *Studies in Bibliography*, 1951, iv. 166-70.

³ Act V, sig. K4^v: he is not otherwise known.

⁴ See Greg, *Dram. Docs.*, p. 212¹, citing W. J. Lawrence. Another case may be that of the second quarto of *Bussy D'Ambois*, 1641: see pp. 140-1.

⁵ If the prompt-book were only damaged or worn it would doubtless be preserved, even if it could not be used, for the sake of the licence. If it were lost or destroyed the play would need relicensing, as in the case of *The Winter's Tale* and

A King and no King was a popular play, to judge from the number of editions it went through, and since it was staged as early as 1611 there would have been time for the original prompt-book to become a good deal thumb'd before 1625. There have also survived a few copies of printed editions that have evidently been prepared for use as prompt-books. The most interesting of these is one of an otherwise unknown edition of *The Looking Glass for London and England* (between 1602 and 1617?) preserved at Chicago.¹ This seems, from the mention of Gilbert Reason as an actor, to have belonged to Prince Charles's men between 1610 and 1625, and since Reason is known to have led a section of the company on tour in 1613, it may have been for provincial representation that it was prepared. Other examples may have had a like origin, for we know that provincial companies sometimes at least depended on printed texts for their repertory. Middleton tells us as much in *The Mayor of Queenborough* (v. i, Q 1661, sig. 13, but the reference is difficult to date) when he says that a gang of 'professed Cheaters . . . only take the name of Country-Comedians To abuse simple people with a printed play or two, Which they bought at Canterbury for six pence'. Moreover, about Christmas 1609 a Yorkshire company acted a play of *Saint Christopher* from 'a printed booke', as well as 'the three shirleyes' (*The Travels of the Three English Brothers*, printed 1607), Terocles prince of Tire' (*Pericles*, 1609), and 'Kinge Lere' (probably Shakespeare's *King Lear*, 1608).²

This appears to exhaust the possible types of copy that we may suppose to have been at the disposal of the Folio editors, and to conclude what need be said by way of preface to the discussion of the individual plays.

The Honest Mans Fortune. Of the former it may possibly have been the printed sheets from the Folio that Herbert re-allowed; of the latter no print was available, and Knight had to prepare a fresh manuscript for submission.

¹ See the Malone Society reprint, pp. xxviii-xxxiii.

² See C. J. Sisson, 'Shakespeare Quartos as Prompt-Copies', *RES*, Apr. 1942, xviii. 135-40.

There exists a copy of William Cartwright's *Comedies, Tragicomedies, with other Poems*, 1651, in which two of the pieces have not only been prepared for stage use but bear Sir Henry Herbert's autograph licences for performance dated 15 Jan. and 9 Mar. 1671/2, but these, being post-Restoration, are hardly relevant to our problem (*Cartwright*, ed. G. B. Evans, Madison, 1951).

NOTE A (page 106)

The student may be referred to the admirable summaries by Chambers, *Eliz. Stage*, iii. 193-200, and W. Shake., i. 92-125. See also Greg, *Editorial Problem*, pp. 22-48, and, for an account of the extant manuscripts, *Dram. Docs.*, pp. 189-376. For convenience of reference a list is here added of the manuscripts cited in the discussion that follows.

- Barnavelt. Sirjohnvan Olden Barnavelt.* B.M. MS. Add. 18653. Prompt-book by Crane. Censored by Buc. King's company, 1619. Ed. W. P. Frijlinck (Amsterdam) 1922.
- Believe as you List.* B.M. MS. Egerton 2828. Prompt-book: Massinger's autograph, annotated by Knight. Licence by Herbert. King's company, 1631. Ed. C. J. Sisson (Malone Society) 1927 (1928).
- Bonduca.* B.M. MS. Add. 36758. Private transcript by Knight of Fletcher's foul papers, c. 1625-35. Ed. W. W. Greg (Malone Society) 1951.
- Captives, The.* B.M. MS. Egerton 1994, art. 3. Heywood's foul papers annotated by book-keeper for transcription as prompt-book. Cockpit company (Lady Elizabeth's), 1624. Ed. Arthur Brown (Malone Society) '953-
- Charlemagne.* B.M. MS. Egerton 1994, art. 6. Prompt-book: autograph (?), annotated by book-keeper. Censored by Buc. Company unknown, c. 1605? Ed. J. H. Walter (Malone Society) 1937 (1938).
- Demetrius and Enanthe (The Humorous Lieutenant).* Brogyntyn MS. Private transcript by Crane, 1625. King's company. Ed. M. McL. Cook and F. P. Wilson (Malone Society) 1950 (1951).
- Dick of Devonshire.* B.M. MS. Egerton 1994, art. 2. A fair copy, possibly the author's, designed for use as prompt-book. Company unknown. 1626? Ed. A. H. Bullen, *Old Plays* (ii. I-99), 1883. (Malone Society edition in contemplation.)
- Escapes of Jupiter, The.* B.M. MS. Egerton 1994, art. 4. Consists of a revised version of certain scenes from Heywood's *Golden Age* (pr. 1611) and *Silver Age* (pr. 1613). Autograph manuscript by Heywood, showing no sign of stage use or indication of date. *The Golden Age* at least belonged to the Queen's men.
- Faithful Friends, The.* Dyce MS. 10. Scribal copy with one scene supplied apparently in autograph, c. 1625? King's company.
- Game at Chess, A.* Bodleian MS. Malone 25. Private transcript by Crane with Middleton's autograph dedication, 1624. King's company. (There are at least five other manuscripts, one autograph and two by Crane.)
- Honest Man's Fortune, The.* Dyce MS. 9. Prompt-book by Knight (substitute). Licence by Herbert. King's company, 1625 (originally Lady Elizabeth's, 1613?). Ed. J. Gerritsen (Groningen) 1952 (a critical edition, but closely based on the manuscript).
- Ironside. Edmond Ironside.* B.M. MS. Egerton 1994, art. 5. Prompt-book, scribal. Company unknown, 1590-1600? Ed. E. Boswell (Malone Society) 1927 (1928).
- John a Kent and John a Cumber.* Huntington Library MS. Prompt-book: Munday's autograph annotated by the same book-keeper as *More*.

- Admiral's company? c. 1590. Ed. M. St. C. Byrne (Malone Society) 1923.
- John of Bordeaux*. Am wick Castle MS. Scribal prompt-book (?) of a play by Greene (?), annotated by book-keeper, and with one speech supplied in Chettle's autograph. Strange's company? c. 1590-1600. Ed. W. L. Renwick (Malone Society) 1935 (1936).
- La fly Mother, The*. B.M. MS. Egerton 1994, art. 9. Prompt-book: scribal (?). Licence by Blagrave (Herbert's deputy). King's Revels company, 1635-
Launching of The Mary) *The*. B.M. MS. Egerton 1994, art. 15. Prompt-book: Mountfort's autograph (foul papers?). Licence by Herbert. Company unknown, 1633. Ed. J. H. Walter (Malone Society) 1932 (1933).
- More. Sir Thomas More*. B.M. MS. Harley 7368. Intended prompt-book in Munday's autograph, with autograph additions by Chettle, Dekker, and Shakespeare, and by the book-keeper. Censored by Tilney. Admiral's company (?), c. 1593 (?). Ed. W. W. Greg (Malone Society) 1911.
- Parliament of Love, The*. Dyce MS. 39. Prompt-book: by the same scribe as *The Welsh Ambassador*. Licence by Herbert (cut out). Cockpit company (Lady Elizabeth's), 1624. Ed. K. M. Lea (Malone Society) 1928 (1929).
- SMT. The second'Maiden's Tragedy'*. B.M. MS. Lansdowne 807, art. 2. Prompt-book, scribal. Licence by Buc. King's company, 1611. Ed. W. W. Greg (Malone Society) 1909 (1910).
- Soddered Citizen, The*. MS. in private hands. Prompt-book: scribal, with Clavell's autograph corrections, annotated by Knight. King's company, 1631 (?). Ed. J. H. P. PafFord (Malone Society) 1935 (1936).
- Two Noble Ladies, The*. B.M. MS. Egerton 1994, art. n. Prompt-book: autograph. Revels' company, c. 1622? Ed. R. G. Rhoads (Malone Society) 1930.
- Welsh Ambassador, The*. Cardiff Public Library MS. Prompt-book: by the same scribe as *The Parliament of Love*. Lady Elizabeth's company (?), c. 1623. Ed. H. Littledale and W. W. Greg (Malone Society) 1920 (1921).
- Witch, The*. Bodleian MS. Malone 12. Private transcript by Crane. King's company, c. 1625 ? Ed. W. W. Greg and F. P. Wilson (Malone Society) 1948 (1950).
- Woodstock. The First Part of the Reign of Richard II, or Thomas of Woodstock*. B.M. MS. Egerton 1994, art. 8. Prompt-copy: scribal (?). Censored by Buc (?). Chamberlain's company (?), c. 1592-5? Ed. W. P. Frijlinck (Malone Society) 1929.

Besides play-manuscripts there are two other classes of documents to which allusion will be made in this chapter, theatrical 'plots' and actors' 'parts'. 'Plots', which are peculiar to the Elizabethan stage, are skeleton outlines of plays, consisting mainly of the entrances and exits of characters. The name of the actor of each part is usually mentioned on his first appearance. There are occasional notes of the action and of the properties and noises required, and

fairly full descriptions of dumb-shows and the like. Several such plots, some fragmentary, have survived and are reproduced and described in Greg, *Dram. Docs.*, pp. 1-171. They are *The Dead Marts Fortune*, c. 1590; 2 *The Seven Deadly Sins*, c. 1590; *Frederick and Basilea*, c. 3 June 1597; 2 *Fortune's Tennis* (?), c. 1597-8; *Trot/us and Cressida* (?), c. May 1599; *The Battle of Alcazar*, c. 1598-9 (?); and i *Tamar Cam*, c. 2 Oct. 1602. Only one actor's 'part' has come down to us from the period, that of the hero in Greene's *Orlando Furioso*. The role was played by Edward Alleyn, and the part is corrected in his own hand. It too is reproduced and described in *Dram. Docs.*, pp. 173-87. The plots and the part were earlier printed in *Henslowe Papers*, pp. 127-71.

NOTE B (page 106)

We hear of Jonson submitting a 'plotte' for the approval of the Admiral's company and Chapman writing a tragedy on it, and 'The Plott of a Scene of mirth to conclude this fourth Acte' survives along with the text of the scene in question in *The Faithful Friends*. Drawing up the plot of a play was a serious matter. John Day writes to Henslowe, 'I have occasion to be absent about the plott of the Indydes therfore pray delyver to will hauton sadler'; and Nathan Field, 'M^r. Dawborne and I, have spent a great deale of time in conference about this plott, which will make as beneficiall a play as hath Come these seauen yeares'. (See *Henslowe's Diary*, fol. 43^b, 3 Dec. 1597, and fol. 51^b, 23 Oct. 1598; *Henslowe Papers*, p. 57, 4 June 1601 (?), and p. 84, June 1613; Greg, *Dram. Docs.*, pp. 1^r, 2^r, 326, and *Editorial Problem*, p. 26.) An unfinished plot of the second quarter of the seventeenth century is in the Folger Library and was printed by J. Q. Adams (*The Library*, June 1945, xxvi. 17-27). The fact that the scenes are divided on the neo-classic model suggests that it may have been a closet drama that was in contemplation rather than one for the popular stage. The manuscript includes a list of personae and notes on the geography of Thrace and Macedon, apparently for use in supplying local colour.

It looks as though a note from the author's plot had found its way into a stage-direction of *Airs Well that Ends Well* at II. iii. 190, 'Parolles and Lafew stay behind, commenting of this wedding'. And similarly in *Timon*, I. i. 94 'Enter Lord Timon, addressing himselfe curteously to euery Sutor'; and cf. *Corio/anus*, i. iv. 30, 'Enter Martius Cursing', which he proceeds to do. This sort of plot is, of course, quite distinct from the theatrical document so called used in representation and mentioned at the end of Note A.

NOTE C (page 108)

The anonymous author of *The Defence of Cony-catching* (1592, sig. 03) accused Robert Greene of selling his play *Orlando Furioso* to the Queen's men for twenty nobles, and when they were in the country selling it to the Admiral's for as much more. (It has been suggested that this was a joke, and that the *Defence* was written by Greene himself: J. C. Jordan, *Robert Greene*, Columbia University Press, 1915, pp. 96-107; cf. Rene Pruvost, *Robert Greene et ses romans*, Paris, 1938, pp. 443-53, and E. H. Miller in the *Huntington Library Quarterly*, May 1952, xv. 280. The arguments advanced by Jordan are not

very convincing, but the writer's hostility to Greene may have been more assumed than real, and perhaps no great weight should be attached to the accusation.) Later, Thomas Heywood complained that some playwrights made a double sale of their work, first to the actors and then to the printers (*The Rape of Lucrece*, 1608, address 'To the Reader'). This would, ofcourse, account for some 'good' quartos having been printed without leave of their owners, but the practice can hardly have been widespread. As regards the handing over of rough copy it must be admitted that the only hint of this in Henslowe's correspondence is when Daborne sent him a foul sheet in proof of his good intention, as previously mentioned (p. 92³).

No doubt some authors published their plays with the consent of the company. Jonson is a case in point, and Marston and Dekker appear to be others. Presumably they either retained their foul papers, supplying the company with fair copies, or else recovered them after the prompt-book had been prepared.

NOTE D (page III)

There may be a special reason for such duplications in certain printed texts. Foul papers would very likely be marked with cuts preparatory to being transcribed for the prompt-book, and if they were handed to the printer he might be told to disregard the deletions. But, unless he were unusually alert, he would probably not always distinguish between those made by the book-keeper and the author's own, and thus restore lines that had never been intended to form part of the finished text.

Of quite different origin are the duplications to which Dover Wilson once gave the name of 'repetition-brackets'. It occasionally happens that a line or part of a line occurs twice over some way apart in a scene, and that its first appearance is a patent error. There are, for example, two cases in the folio text (1647) of the first scene of *The Honest Man's Fortune*, where the words 'How proceeds my suit?' appear at 1. 219 and again at 1. 238, and 'have an eye upon him' at 1. 295 and again at 1. 313. Such repetitions may come about in either of two ways. If an addition is to be made in a text it will be written either in the margin or on a separate slip, and the writer may add at the end of the addition, as a sort of catchword, the next few words of the original text that are to follow. An example is in *SMT*, 249, where the original line 'I do beseech your maiestie, looke cheerfull' reappears as 'I do beseech your grace look cheerfullie &c.' at the foot of the slip bearing the insertion. If, therefore, the position of the insertion were not clearly marked and a printer entered it a line too low, we should get just such a duplication as we are considering. On the other hand if a passage is cancelled, the scribe may repeat at the head of the deletion the words at which the text is to be resumed. Then if, in printing, the cut is restored, we shall again get a repetition-bracket. That this is the explanation in *The Honest Man's Fortune* is suggested by the fact that there are no repetitions in the manuscript, and that in the first instance the intervening lines are actually marked for omission. Another instance, also probably indicating a cut, is in *The Womarfs Prize*, u. iv, where 'Thou hast heard I am sure of Esculapius' appears twice over some dozen lines apart (R. C. Bald, *Beaumont and Fletcher Folio*, 1938, p. 68). Thus the brackets may theoretically indicate

either addition or omission; but normally, we may suppose, the latter, since in this case no misplacement need be assumed. See Greg, 'A Question of Plus or Minus', *RES*, July 1930, vi. 300-4.

NOTE E (Page 112)

For example in the quarto of 2 *Henry IF* (1600), a text certainly printed from foul papers, we find at in. i. 32 'Enter Warwicke Surry, and sir lohn Blunt', though neither the Earl of Surrey nor Blunt speaks anywhere in the play; Blunt is brought on again at v. ii. 42, and he is addressed at Iv. iii. 81, though here he has no entrance: Fauconbridge enters at i. iii. i and Kent at iv. iv. i, but neither has a part. All these mutes are removed in F except Surrey, the presence of a second 'lord' being implied at 1. 33. Further, Lord Bardolph, who has a part in i. i, iii, enters as a mute at iv. i. i, and Westmorland, who has a part in Iv. i—iv, enters as a mute at v. ii. i: these mute entries also disappear in F. On the other hand, a number of characters speak for whom entrances are first marked in F: a Porter at i. i. i, a Servant of the Lord Chief Justice at i. ii. 62, the recruits Mouldy, Shadow, Wart, Feeble, and Bullcalf at III. ii. 109 (rather than 1. i), Sir John Coleville at iv. iii. i, Warwick (re-entry) at Iv. v. 226, Davy at v. i. 9 (rather than 1. I), and Mistress Quickly and Doll Tearsheet at v. iv. i. Particularly characteristic of the author's manner of composition is the direction 'Enter Warwicke, duke Humphrey, L. chiefe Justice, Thomas Clarence, Prince(,) lohnf,] Westmorland' at v. ii. i, followed at 1. 14 by the repetition 'Enter lohn, Thomas, and Humphrey', when the time comes to use these characters: this too F tidies up.

NOTE F (page 120)

According to F. G. Fleay (*Life of Shakespeare*, 1886, p. 265), 'it is certain that in very early plays up to the end of the sixteenth century it was frequently the case that the actors in plays are designated by their proper Christian names', meaning, of course, that some characters were given the Christian names of the actors that played the parts; and Dover Wilson indulges in some elaborate conjectures on these lines (ed. *The Taming of the Shrew*, p. 118). But there is nothing to support Fleay's 'certainty', and as Chambers remarks, 'The book-keeper could have no occasion to trouble about textual names, and the author, writing in advance of casting, would certainly not know to whom such small parts would be given' (*W. Shake.*, i. 237). As regards Wilson's identifications of certain names in the Folio text of *The Shrew*, one may point out that if some of the names of Petruchio's servants, like Gabriel and Curtis, suggest actors (though Gabriel Spencer was killed by Ben Jonson in 1598 and Curtis Greville is first mentioned as an actor in 1622) most of them, like Nathaniel, Joseph, Philip, Walter, and Sugersop, do not.

NOTE G (page 124)

Of directions in general Chambers remarks (*W. Shake.*, i. 118): 'Unless they are mere substantival, participial, or adverbial *marginalia*, they are generally couched in the indicative mood. Very rarely they are in the imperative. I do not think one need regard the imperative as a special note of the book-keeper.'

As imperatives he only instances '*John a Kent*, 736 'look in his glasse', and '*Ironsides*, 955 'Sound Drum wthin'. This may give the impression that imperative directions are rarer than in fact they are, but they cannot be held distinctive of either the author or the prompter. We have just seen imperative, indicative, and absolute directions occurring indifferently in '*Woodstock*', in '*John a Kent* 'giue him somewha[t]' (231) and 'he sees their handes' (244) are consecutive original directions, and both forms occur throughout; in '*Launching*, 1141 'Here bringe a little table', and 1144 'answeare wthin' are the author's; in '*Antony and Cleopatra*, II. v. 64 'She hailes him vp and downe', is followed by 73 'Draw a knife'; and in '*Edward III* (1596), 111.v. 64 'kneelee and kisse his fathers hand', and 90 'his Sword borne by a Soldier' appear on the same page (G2^r); and of the directions added by Knight in '*Believe* only one is imperative, 2824 'Be ready: y^e .2. Marchantes', all the rest are participial and the like. Imperative and indicative combine in a single direction in 2 *Henry VI* (F), i. iv. 24 'Here doe the Ceremonies belonging, and make the Circle, Bullingbrooke or Southwell reades', where the permissive alternative points clearly to the author. Actually 'Enter', at any rate for a single character, is imperative: 'Enters' is found, but rarely (it seems characteristic of Munday). And 'Exit', though indicative, was evidently felt as an imperative, and so was often substituted for 'Exeunt': 'Exeat' is very uncommon.

NOTE H (page 124)

On 8 Nov. 1599 Robert Shaa, one of the Admiral's men, wrote to Henslowe respecting 2 *Henry Richmond*, a play by Robert Wilson and others, 'we haue heard their booke and lyke yt their pryce is eight poundes, which I pray pay now to m^r wilson', and on 4 Apr. 1600 another member of the company, Samuel Rowley, wrote: 'M^r hinchloe I haue harde fyue shetes of a playe of the Conqueste of the Indes [by John Day and William Haughton] & I doe not doute but It wyll be a verye good playe therefore I praye ye delyuer them fortye shyllinges in earneste of It & take the papers Into your one hands.' Some years later, on 16 May 1613, we find Robert Daborne writing to the same, 'one Tuesday night if you will appoynt I will meet you & m^r Allin & read some [of a new play] for I am vnwilling to read to the generall company till all be finisht', and again on 11 Mar. 1614, 'Sir if you do not like this play when it is read you shall hav the other which shall be finished with all expedition' (*Henslowe Papers*, pp. 49, 56, 70, 82).

NOTE I (page 135)

There is one curious use that seems almost peculiar to Anthony Munday. At times his directions shrink to what are in effect mere notes or reminders. When More invites his wife to 'sit good Madame, vppon an humble seate' (1413) Munday adds in the margin the words 'lowe stooles', and when More says to his executioner 'Heers thy fee' (1947) he adds the words 'his pursse'. (So in '*Launching*, 905, opposite 'I prythee take yt', Mountfort noted 'his purse', but crossed it out and wrote 'giues his purse'.) These may be regarded as notes of properties required. Again, when the pickpocket explains to the Justice, 'This fellow Sir, perhaps will meete ye thus, Or thus, or thus' (236), Munday writes 'action' in the margin as a reminder to suit the action to the words, though it

can hardly be called a stage-direction. The habit would not deserve notice did it go no farther: but when again More says to the executioner, 'I come hether only to be let blood, my doctor heere telles me it is good for the head ache' (1940), in the margin stands the explanation 'by the hangman' (deleted, presumably by the book-keeper when he marked a cut a little below); and similarly in *John a Kent*, opposite the words 'lie deliuer them' (1471) stands the explanation 'the Ladyes'. These are remote from the stage, and even remoter is another example. This is in one of the additions to *More* (IV, 1.150), but since it is in the hand of the book-keeper it may again be Munday's. Here, in the scene in which More plays his joke of disguise on his learned visitor, we find the marginal jotting 'et tu Erasmus an Diabolus'. It is surprising that the book-keeper should have copied this in. The closest parallel to these explanatory notes seems to be in *The Two Noble Ladies*, where, opposite the words of the converted Conjuror, 'This sacred trueth alone shall be my studdy' (1902), is the gloss 'The Angells booke', but this may be meant as a direction to take it up, since he has just consigned his magical works to the flames. Another possible case is in Webster's *Duchess of Malfy* (Q 1623), Iv. ii. 165 'a Coffin, Cords, and a Bell', which again might be a prompter's note for properties, but is more likely an author's explanatory gloss on the line 'Here is a present from your Princely brothers', since there is certainly such a gloss in III. iv, 'The Author disclaims this Ditty to be his' (R. C. Bald, *The Library*, Sept. 1931, xii. 245). Such annotations could originate with none but the author, and would only confuse the prompter, but they are too exceptional to possess any critical importance.

NOTE J (page 142)

Alice Walker (*Textual Problems*, pp. 109 ff.) has recently invited us to envisage a type of manuscript intermediate between foul papers and prompt-book. She finds certain printed texts free from the characteristics of foul papers, yet equally free from the stigmas of the prompt-book. A careful transcript of the foul papers made by ascribe with production in view, but not yet annotated by the book-keeper, might exhibit these features. But the *a priori* improbability of such a manuscript (or a copy of it) having got into the printer's hands makes it difficult to accept the hypothesis. Besides, there is no need to suppose that foul papers, whether Shakespeare's or another's, always exhibited false starts and irregular speech-prefixes, and it is certain that not all prompt-copies bear unequivocal marks of the book-keeper's hand; alternatively, we can imagine a literary scribe, when making a copy for a private collector, either tidying up the author's rough copy or removing the marks of stage adaptation from the prompt-book. (See Postscript, p. 467.)

NOTE K (page 144)

The assignment of *Woodstock* to the Chamberlain's men some fifteen years earlier is purely conjectural, based on its close relation to *Richard II* (Chambers, *Eliz. Stage*, iv. 43). Of the original quartos of Shakespeare's plays only *Othello* (1622), the latest, is divided into acts, and there is evidence in the Folio that some plays originally undivided had an act-division thrust on to them at some later date. In *Titus Andronicus* Act II begins in the middle of what in

the quarto is a continuous scene, and the stage-directions have been altered accordingly. The same may be the case with Act V of *The Comedy of Errors*. In *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* the direction 'They sleepe all the Act' (that is, during the interval) underlines the awkwardness of breaking the quarto continuity of Acts III and IV. The erroneous divisions in *Henry V*, on the contrary, seem to be editorial. The following table shows the divisions as they appear in the Folio.

COMEDIES	HISTORIES	TRAGEDIES
<i>Tempest</i> , A & S	king John, A & S	<i>Troilus</i> , none
<i>Two Gent.</i> , A & S	(irregular)	<i>Coriolanus</i> , Acts
<i>Merry Wives</i> , A & S	<i>Richard II</i> , A & S	T//IW, Acts
<i>Measure</i> , A & S	I Henry IV, A & S	<i>Romeo</i> , none
<i>Errors</i> , Acts	2 Henry IV, A & S	<i>Timon</i> , none
<i>Much Ado</i> , Acts	Henry V, Acts	<i>Julius Caesar</i> , none
<i>Love's L's L.</i> , Acts	(irregular)	<i>Macbeth</i> , A & S
<i>M.-N. Dream</i> , Acts	I Henry VI, A & S	<i>Hamlet</i> , A & S
<i>Merchant</i> , Acts	(irregular)	(very imperfect)
<i>As you Like it</i> , A & S	2 Henry VI, none	King Lear, A & S
<i>Taming</i> , Acts	3 Henry VI, none	Othello, A & S
(imperfect)	<i>Richard III</i> , A. & S	Antony, none
<i>All's Well</i> , Acts	Henry VIII, A & S	<i>Cymbeline</i> , A & S
<i>Tw, Night</i> , A & S		
<i>Winters Tale</i> , A & S		

It will be noticed that all the Comedies are divided at least into acts. Probably those previously undivided had a division introduced at the time of printing. Less attention in this respect was paid to the Histories, and less still to the Tragedies. For a summary of act-division in printed plays generally from 1591 to 1610 see Greg, 'Act Divisions in Shakespeare', *RES*, Apr. 1928, iv. 152-8.

NOTE L (page 148)

Wilson (pp. 125—6) cites another amusing example. As an instance of a spelling 'normal in manuscript but abnormal in print, we may take "theise" (— these)', yet it occurs in the Folio in *Henry V*, in. ii. 122. 'Why does it occur here? The answer is that Jamy, a dialect speaker, holds the stage, and that when dealing with dialect a compositor with a conscience will follow his copy *literatim*. Yet there is no dialect significance of any kind in "theise," a spelling which may be found in almost any manuscript of the period. It is simply a piece of Shakespearian orthography, which the compositor, hypnotised by the surrounding dialect, has transferred to his stick. And the hypnosis did not cease there, for the spelling persists to-day in all modern editions.' Wilson, who is our chief authority on this subject, has further considered it in an article on 'Spellings and Misprints in the Second Quarto of "Hamlet",' in *Essays and Studies*, x. 36-60 (English Association, 1924), and in *MS. Hamlet*, i. 102-17.

NOTE M (page 150)

There were four Masters of the Revels during the period with which we are concerned. Edmund Tilney, the earliest, under whom it would seem the practice

of licensing plays for public performance began, was a connexion of Lord Howard of Effingham, and probably owed his appointment to his influence. Tilney's patent as Master is dated 24 July 1579 (printed by Chambers, *E/iz. Stage*, i. 88) and he held the post till his death on 20 Aug. 1610. But from early in the reign of James I the duties of the office were discharged by his nephew George Buc. Buc and John Lyly, the dramatist, had both been esquires of the body to Elizabeth, and had both, it seems, been led to expect the reversion of the Mastership, though in fact Elizabeth did nothing about it. It was on 23 June 1603 that the reversion was at last granted to Buc, and a commission as acting Master was issued in his favour the same day. He was knighted the following month. At one time he employed as deputy a 'm^r Segar' (Stationers' Register, 4 Oct. 1608 to 10 Mar. 1609), who, one is naturally inclined to suppose, was a relation of Sir William Segar, Garter King of Arms. During BUC'S lifetime reversions were granted to Sir John Astley or Ashley on 3 Apr. 1612 and to Ben Jonson on 5 Oct. 1621. By 30 Mar. 1622 Buc was reported to be insane, and on 16 May he was required to surrender his office. He died on 20 Sept. 1623. A warrant to swear in Sir John Astley was issued as early as 29 Mar. 1622, but on 20 July 1623 he leased the office for £150 a year to Henry Herbert, who acted thenceforth technically as his deputy. Herbert had been sworn a servant to King James as gentleman in ordinary of the privy chamber on 20 Mar. 1622, and on 7 Aug. 1623 he was knighted and received as Master of the Revels by the King at Wilton. He employed as deputies, first William Blagrove (from 1624 to 1636), who also ran a theatrical company at Salisbury Court and whom one naturally suspects of being descended from the Thomas Blagrove who was once acting Master of the Revels under Elizabeth, and after him Thomas Herbert (Stationers' Register, 24 Mar. to 26 Apr. 1637), presumably a connexion of Sir Henry, possibly the Thomas Herbert, groom of the bedchamber to Charles I, to whom the king gave his copy of the Second Folio Shakespeare, now in the royal collection at Windsor Castle. Sir Henry acquired the reversion of the Mastership, jointly with a certain Simon Thelwall, in 1629, and, having outlived Ben Jonson, succeeded as (joint) Master on Astley's death in 1641. He retained the post when the office was revived after the Restoration and held it till his death on 27 Apr. 1673. It is to his Office-Book that we owe most of our knowledge of the censoring and licensing of plays of the time. The book itself is no longer extant, or at any rate traceable, but Malone and Chalmers made extensive, though far from complete, extracts from it, and a few other scattered entries have been preserved. Malone's extracts were printed in his edition of Shakespeare in 1790, and reprinted in the 1821 *Variorum*; Chalmers's appeared in *A Supplemental Apology for the Believers in the Shakespeare-Papers* [sc. the Ireland forgeries], 1799. (These extracts have been conveniently collected and edited, along with other documents, by J. Q. Adams, *Herbert*, 1917.) It is probable that for the years 1622 to 1641 the extant extracts represent little more than half the plays actually licensed (Bentley, *Stage*, i. 101). We know of seven plays recorded in the Office-Book between 10 May and 24 Oct. 1622, that is, before Herbert's lease of the office: these entries must have been made by Astley—they differ in form from Herbert's, the earliest of which is dated 27 July 1623.

NOTE N (page 150)

It is plain that while authors could not always be persuaded to restrain their profanity—like Shirley, whose *Young Admiral* Herbert commended in this respect (3 July 1633, *Variorum*, 1821, iii. 232-3, Adams, *Herbert*, pp. 19-20)—a good deal of purging was done in the playhouse before plays were submitted to licence. On 21 Oct. 1633 Herbert wrote: 'Mr. Knight, In many things you have saved mee labour; yet wher your judgment or penn fayld you, I have made boulde to use mine' (*Variorum*, iii. 210, Adams, p. 21). Moreover, Herbert expected that this would be done. He had earlier, on 18 Nov. 1632, complained of another play of Shirley's, *The Ball*, in which 'ther were diuers personated so naturally, both of lords and others of the court, that I took it ill, and would have forbidden the play, but that Biston [Christopher Beeston] promiste many things which I found faulte withall should be left out, and that he would not suffer it to be done by the poett any more, who deserves to be punisht: and the first that offends in this kind, of poets or players, shall be sure of publique punishment' (*Variorum*, iii. 231—2, Adams, p. 19). And the activity of the book-keeper is evident from the plays themselves. In this respect Knight's own manuscript of *The Honest Marfs Fortune* in 1625 is particularly interesting. Both it and the print in the folio of 1647 have been purged, but differently. At v. iv. 94 Knight himself altered 'pray god' to 'I wish' (F 'Pray Heaven') and at 149 deleted 'troth'. Herbert does not seem to have touched the manuscript when he appended his licence, and it retains several expletives where there are dashes in the folio text: I. i. 154 'my troth', II. ii. 220 'by my blood' (a queer expression this, for the common oath 'blood' or 'sblood' stands, of course, for 'God's blood'), Iv. ii. 136 'by my soule [altered to 'blood' ?] & what it hopes for', 140 'before my god', v. i. 60 'by my troth'. On the other hand, the manuscript has 'heaven' three times and once 'the fates' where the folio has 'God'. *The Parliament of Love*, 1624, shows no sign of censorship: there is no more than an occasional 'troth' and 'faith'. Nor, as from its history we should expect, was there much left to censor in *Believe as you List*, 1631: Herbert altered one passage, but mutilation has left the reason obscure. On the other hand, in *The Launching of the Mary*, 1633, the autograph has been heavily purged: Herbert struck out 'fayth' or 'yfayth' or 'good fayth' at least seventeen times, 'Troth', 'S'life', and 'the lord' each once, as well as the line 'next to the sole redeemer of my soule' (657); but he left 'by gisse' and 'In gods name' standing, probably by oversight. In *The Lady Mother*, licensed by Blagrave in 1635, a couple of oaths are deleted near the beginning, but the few there seem to be later on are untouched. Of course Herbert was equally alive to political matters and personalities, as is evident from his insisting on the complete rewriting of *Believe* and the partial rewriting of *Launching*, and in the latter he disallowed all allusion to the massacre at Amboyna (98, in, 120); we have seen above his resentment at Shirley's want of respect for persons at court.

NOTE O (page 151)

Alice Walker (*RES*, July 1951, ii. 225) takes a similar view. She writes: 'Broadly, the dividing line between plays from which profanity was not

expurgated and those from which it was lies between the Comedies and the Histories. This corresponds [approximately] with the break in the printing of the Folio on which work was begun in 1621 and resumed with *Richard II* in the spring of 1623. [The interruption lasted more likely from Oct. 1621 to Nov. 1622.] In this interval Buc had resigned his office as Master of the Revels and it looks as if whoever prepared the copy for Jaggard anticipated a more rigorous attitude towards profanity in plays from Buc's successor.' And in *Textual Problems* (p. 31) she gives it as her opinion that 'The removal of profanity from the Folio plays was . . . editorial in inspiration'.

NOTE P (page 154)

Directions in *The Witch* are generally bare but adequate. Some exits (45, 882, 1029, 1203, 1300, 1546, 1560, 1669, 1827) and a few entrances (382, 934, 1800, 1817) are omitted: Crane may have overlooked them. Several directions evidently survive from the author's manuscript: 181 'Enter Heccat: & other witches: (with Properties, and Habbits fitting.)', the 'other witches' should of course have been specified; 437 'she Coniures: And Enter a Catt (playing on a Fidle,) and Spiritts (wth Meate)'; 945 'Enter Duchesse, leading Almachildes (blindfold)'; 1345 'A Spirit like a Cat descends'; 1357 'Hec. going vp'; 1633 'Enter Francisca, in her Chamber'. At 2022, 'here they Daunce y^e witches Dance & Ex¹.' may very well be a playhouse addition, referring to a particular dance borrowed from a contemporary masque.

NOTE Q (page 154)

Demetrius contains passages cut in the folio: small omissions may be due to Crane. Directions are suggestive: 32, MS 'Enter diuers Cittizens, & their wives', F 'Enter 2. Citizens, and Wives'; 46, MS 'Enter Celia (in poore attire)', F 'Enter Celia'; 120, MS 'Enter King Antigonus: and his Traine', F 'Enter King(.) Antigonous, Tymon, Charinthus, Menippus'; 128, MS 'Enter y^e Embassado^{rs}. from Seleucus, Lysimachus, & Ptolomey', F 'Ent. 3 Embassadors'; 186, MS 'Enter Prince Demetrius from hunting: attended wth yong Gentlemen', F 'Enter Demetrius with a Javelin, and Gentlemen'.

NOTE R (page 154)

There are two other manuscripts of plays in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647, which have not been printed but are described by R. C. Bald in his monograph on the collection (Bibliographical Society, 1938). Both are in the 'Lambarde' volume, now in the Folger Shakespeare Library. The manuscript of *The Woman's Prize*, according to Bald (p. 60), 'gives the play as cut for acting before Herbert's time; the folio gives a fuller version of the play, but observes the cuts that were made by Herbert in 1633' (see above, p. 151^x). Presumably, therefore, the manuscript was copied from the prompt-book. *Beggars' Busk* (pp. 61 ff.), which is said to be in the same hand as Suckling's *Aglaura* (see p. 151³), contains, as appears from Bald's quotations, some apparently playhouse directions that reveal Knight's peculiar punctuation, whereas those in the folio seem to show that of Massinger. This again suggests prompt-copy.

NOTE S (page 157)

The phrase 'to them' is rarely found in either manuscript or printed plays. Munday uses it, *John a Kent*, 368 'to them this crew marching', 582 'to them Oswen [and] Amery'; so does Heywood, *Escapes*, fol. 93 'To whom at another doore Enter Ganimed'. In *Captives*, 2850, it is the book-keeper who adds 'to him' to 'Enter gripus the Fisherman', 2861 'to them' to 'Enter godffrey', and 2915 'to 'em' to 'Enter Ashburne [&c.]'. Here 'to them' is the correlative to 'clere' (see p. 143)- In *Henry Fill* we find, II. ii. 12 'Enter to the Lord Chamberlaine', and III. ii. 228 'Enter to Woolsey', and in *Coriolanus*, I. iv. I 'Enter Martius, Titus Lartius ... to them a Messenger'; in *James 7* (1598), 2053 'to them, Ateukin and Gnato'.

NOTE T (page 157)

In *The Two Gentlemen* there are no directions at all beyond the initial entries, but exits are regularly marked. So they are in *The Merry Wives*, and there is a single direction, 'Enter Fairies', at v. v. 41, their appearance not being provided for at the beginning. In *The Winter's Tale* the entrances of iv. iii and v. ii are not massed, and in some others the massing is imperfect. We find n. iii. 26 'Enter Paulina' (a repetition), 192 'Enter a Seruant', in. iii. 80 'Enter Clowne' (a repetition), Iv. iv. 181 'Enter Seruant' (a repetition), 220 'Enter Autolicus singing' (a repetition), 606 'Enter Autolicus' (a re-entry), 699 'Enter Clowne and Shepheard' (a re-entry), v. i. 85 'Enter a Seruant' (a repetition), 178 'Enter a Lord'; we also find, III. ii. I 'Enter . . . Hermione (as to her Triall)', iii. 58 'Exit pursued by a Beare', Iv. iv. 165 'Heere a Daunce of Shepheards and Shepheardesses', 352 'Heere a Dance of twelue Satyres'.

NOTE U (page 157)

2 *Seven Deadly Sins*, 'A tent being plast one the stage for Henry the sixt • he in it A sleepe', 'The Three put back the foure', 'Then Enuy passeth ouer the stag', 'The fight ferrex is slayn', 'The Ladies fly', 'Mercury Comes and all Vanish'; *Dead Man's Fortune*, 'Enter ... cuttynge of ruffles', 'whiles he speakes validore passeth ore the stage disguisde', 'here the laydes speake in prysoun', 'satires plainge on ther Instruments', 'after that the musicke plaies', 'the cheste or truncke to be broughte forth'; *Frederick and Easilea*, 'To them Pedro Basilea vpon the walls . come doune'; *Battle of Alcazar* (mutilated), action only in dumb-shows, as 'Furies bringing in the Scales', but many notes for noises, as 'sound sennett', and properties, as 'Chai^{ts} b[o]xes for Presents'; *Troilus and Cressida* (fragmentary), 'they on the wall descend to them,' and noises, as '3. seuerall tucketts'; *Fortune's Tennis* (fragmentary), 'ladies following mute', 'A Table brought in'; i *Tamar Cam*, 'To her the orracle speakes', and many noises, including 'Thunder', 'Wind home', 'Drum a far of. In the *Orlando* part: 'dragges him in', 'enters wth a mans legg', 'solus', 'here he harkens', 'he walketh vp & downe', 'he singes', 'he whistles for him', 'he beates. A.', 'A. begins to weepe', 'exit', 'currut', 'Inchaut', 'decubit', 'exit', 'pugnat N. victus', 'Oliuer victus', 'pugnat', 'O victus'. It is clear that texts compiled from sources such as these would not necessarily lack stage-directions.

NOTE V(page 159)

The only certain exceptions are *The Merchant of Venice* and *King Lear*, printed from the genuine first editions of 1600 and 1608 respectively and not from Jaggard's falsely dated reprints of 1619. For *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, on the other hand, the reprint was used. The 'good' quartos available when the Folio was printed are as follows (doubtful cases are queried in parentheses): those known to have been used are in heavy type.

Much Ado, 1600.

Love's Labour's Lost, 1598.

Midsummer-Nighfs Dream, 1600, [1619].

Merchant of Venice, 1600, [1619].

Richard II, 1597, 1598^a, 1598^b, 1608, 1615.

1 *Henry IV*, 1598, 1599, '04, 1608, 1613, 1622.

2 *Henry IV*, 1600.

Richard III, 1597, 1598, 1602, 1605, 1612, 1622.

Trot/us and Cressida, 1609.

Titus Andronicus, 1594, 1600, 1611.

Romeo and Juliet, 1599, 1609, (n.d.?).

Hamlet, 1604-5, 1611, (n.d.?).

King Lear, 1608, [1619].

Othello, 1622.

NOTE W(page 159)

Pollard wrote, for example, of *Richard II* (p. 98): 'As soon as the First Quarto was printed its greater handiness and legibility would give it great advantage over any written text for the purposes of a prompt-copy, and if any written text then existed in the theatre there is every probability that it was destroyed.' But since he believed that the Folio text was set up from a corrected copy of the quarto of 1615, he was forced to argue that in this case at least the quarto prompt-book was not itself given to the printer but only used for correction of the quarto that actually served as copy. And since the correction could equally have been made from a manuscript prompt-book, there seems, on his assumption, no ground for postulating the use of a quarto as prompt-book at all. (See, however, p. 238.) In general, however, his idea seems to have been that whenever the company sold a play to the press they handed over the prompt-book, content to receive a printed copy in return—regardless of the fact that they thereby surrendered the evidence of their licence—and that it was these actual copies, annotated by the prompter to serve as prompt-books, that were in some cases used for printing the Folio text. But why, if the quartos had been printed in the first instance from prompt-books, should they later have needed annotation to make them serve as such? Pollard's theory seems to lack coherence; but he was, of course, writing at a time before foul papers had been brought into the critical picture.

V. Editorial Problems. 3

WE are at length in a position to tackle the individual plays and to make some guess at the sort of manuscripts that lie behind the printed texts. After what has been said in the previous chapter it will be realized that plausible guessing is about all we can hope for: in view of the frequent ambiguity of the evidence we can expect no certainty in our conclusions. So long, however, as we are content with what are admittedly no more than probabilities, we may yet reach conclusions of some interest. If we find distinctive evidence of authorial copy, and no corresponding evidence of the book-keeper's hand, we shall diagnose foul papers, ignoring the possibility of supineness on the part of the book-keeper; and on the other hand, if we find distinctive evidence of the activity of the book-keeper and none characteristic of the author, we shall diagnose prompt-copy, ignoring the possibility that the book-keeper may have edited the original draft. This must be taken as a general qualification of the more dogmatic statements that the interests of brevity and clarity impose on the detailed discussions that follow, and it must be remembered that foul papers and prompt-books do not exhaust the possibilities regarding the copy from which the texts were printed. The plays are discussed in their chronological order as arranged by Chambers. The dates are also from Chambers, and are, of course, often conjectural and approximate. Those in parentheses indicate possible earlier versions or later revisions. Unspecified references to Chambers are to his accounts of the individual plays in question in *William Shakespeare*, i. 277-498. Similar references to Dover Wilson are to the notes on the copy and other places in his editions of the plays. Wilson and Chambers are the only writers who have dealt systematically with the bibliographical sources of the text.

I-II. 2, 3 *HENRY THE SIXTH*. 1591 (1594)

'*Bad*' Quarto (i 594) and Octavo (i 595).—These respectively bear the titles of 'The first part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster . . . with the notable Rebellion of lacke Cade: and the Duke of Yorkes first claime vnto the Crowne' and 'The true Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke, and the death of good King Henrie the Sixt, with the whole [*sc.* the conclusion of the] contention betweene the two Houses Lancaster and Yorke, as it was sundrie times acted by the Right Honourable the Earle of Pembroke his Seruants'. The parts are too closely connected to have different histories, and we must assume that both were acted (though not necessarily first acted) by Pembroke's men; and they seem to have been then known as the two parts of *The Contention between the Houses of Tork and Lancaster*. Their relation to 2 and 3 *Henry VI* has been a standing problem of Shakespearian criticism. Although they were recognized as derivative by Johnson, common opinion generally followed Malone in regarding them as source plays until Peter Alexander demonstrated their likeness to other 'bad' quartos, a view that is now widely accepted.¹ They appear to be reports of deliberately shortened versions that differed in some respects from those preserved in F. Chambers notes that at two points in Part II, at the beginning of the incantation scene (i. iv) and of the murder of Duke Humphrey (III. ii), 'a different staging appears to be contemplated in Q and F'—and it is not clear which is original—and that there are other signs of alteration.² If the plays reached the Chamberlain's men from another company (see below) some refashioning would not be unlikely. The reporter's hand shows itself clearly in York's confused claim to the crown (in 2 II. ii), in the inclusion of gags, and in the transference of lines from one part of the play to

¹ Alexander propounded his theory, in which he followed the lead of J. S. Smart, in *TLS* 9 Oct. and 13 Nov. 1924, and developed it in his study of *Henry VI* in 1929. It was at once endorsed by Chambers and McKerrow, and it is unhesitatingly accepted by Dover Wilson (whose careful editions, 1952, are of the greatest value) although he differs emphatically from Alexander on the question of authorship.

² See Note A on p. 184.

another and even from other plays. At any rate there are borrowings from *Edward II*,³ and, as Chambers says, 'if a play known to us has been drawn upon, other comparatively striking Q lines may belong to plays not known'. Alexander finds some 'parts' better reported than others and suspects that one actor who played Warwick and another who doubled Suffolk and young Clifford were responsible for the report. Chambers is inclined to blame the book-keeper, who would be more likely to have access to the 'plot', the use of which seems necessary to account for the similarity and occasional identity of some Q and F stage-directions in Part II (see below).⁴ To account for passages almost identical in F and Q or O, Alexander conjectured that the reporter was able to use fragments of the genuine text, but this is less likely than that, as McKerrow suggested, the printer of F had recourse to Q and O where the manuscripts he habitually followed were illegible.⁵

Q and O were both reprinted in 1600 and again in 1619 (from the original editions). The 1619 prints contain many alterations, which in a few cases anticipate F. They may have been printed from copies that had been 'corrected' by someone with rather inaccurate recollections of a performance.

Folio.—It was not till the two parts of the Pembroke company's *Contention* came into the hands of the Chamberlain's men in 1594 that they were linked up with Strange's *Henry VI* (see i *Henry VI*) and became the second and third parts of a trilogy.⁶ Contradictions, whether of construction or style, are less in evidence than in Part I, but Dover Wilson sees proof of revision in Part II in 'the confusion between Dame Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester, and her mortal enemy Queen Margaret' and in Part III in uncertainty of the kinship of the Marquess of Montague. The former is, of course,

³ A few close parallels between F and *The Massacre at Paris* must be due to like borrowings on the part of the reporter of Marlowe's play.

⁴ Unless F borrowed these directions from Q, which is conceivable but unlikely. It is possible that one or two other directions in Q, not resembling those in F, may also be derived from the 'plot', e.g. those at I. iv. I and Iv. i. I, but the majority appear to be descriptions of action witnessed on the stage.

⁵ See Note B on p. 184.

⁶ They had clearly assumed their new titles by 1602, when they appeared in the Stationers' Register (incorrectly) as 'The first and Second parte of henry the vj t' (see pp. 62-63).

a confusion of names, not of persons. It is true that in 2 III ii Margaret is addressed by the King as 'Nell' (1. 26) and in the course of one long speech speaks of herself as 'Eleanore' (11. 100, 120) and even as 'Dame Eleanore' (1. 79). (None of the lines in question are in Q.) But, as Chambers remarks, it is not certain that these strange aberrations would be more likely to occur in the work of a reviser than of an original author. The scene is that of Gloucester's murder, and this may have tricked the writer into unconsciously substituting the name of his Duchess, who has been prominent in the earlier scenes, for that of the Queen. The Marquess of Montague is properly the brother of Warwick, and when first introduced in 3 i. i it is indeed in Warwick's company that he appears, but his two brief speeches link him not with Warwick but with the Yorks, and it is the Duke of York whom he calls brother; and in the next scene he enters in company with Edward and Richard as if one of the family. He does not reappear till n. i, and then and thenceforth he is consistently and correctly Warwick's brother.⁷ The grouping in i. i—ii looks less like revision than an original misreading of the chronicles, later corrected. (In O he remains York's 'brother' in i. i, but becomes his 'Cosen' in i. ii. This suggests misgiving on the part of the reporter rather than correction on the stage.)

There are, of course, differences of style, which may be explained by differences of authorship or of date: either theory presupposes collaboration or revision. For example, young Clifford's speech, 2 v. ii. 31—65, with its 'terrible oath of vengeance', Wilson finds 'palpably Shakespearian' in contrast to others: Chambers thinks it 'clearly of later style than the rest', even of other admittedly Shakespearian portions. It might have been added on the occasion of the revival clearly implied in the epilogue to *Henry 7m* 1599 (1. 13). On the whole, differences of style seem less noticeable in Part III than in Part II.

There is no division into acts and scenes. The stage-directions are clearly authorial and are similar in the two

⁷ He gives trouble again later, for when Warwick goes over to Henry's side, Montagu remains true to Edward (iv. i. 143), yet he appears with his brother supporting Henry at IV. viii. 14. But that is another matter.

parts, which proves that those of Part II are not derived from Q (see above). The more important (with notes of particular agreements and disagreements in Q and O) are as follows. Part II: I i. I 'Flourish of Trumpets: Then Hoboyes. | The King, Duke Humfrey, Salisbury, Warwicke, and Beauford on the one side. | The Queene, Suffolke, Yorke, Somerset, and Buckingham, on the other'; iii. i 'Enter three or foure Petitioners, the Armorers Man being one' [Q 'Enter two Petitioners, and Peter the Armourers man']; 42 'Teare the Supplication'; 141 'She giues the Duchesse a box on the eare'; iv. i 'Enter the Witch, the two Priests, and Bullingbrooke' [Q 'Enter Elnor, with sir Iohn Hum, Koger *[sic]* Bullenbrooke a Coniurer, and Margery Iourdaine a Witch', Southwell, the second priest, has no part in either text and may have been omitted]; 16 'Enter Elianor aloft' [Q 'She goes vp to the Tower']; 24 'Here doe the Ceremonies belonging, and make the Circle, Bullingbrooke or Southwell reades, *Coniuro te, &c.* It Thunders and Lightens terribly: then the Spirit riseth' [Q 'She [the Witch] lies downe vpon her face. | Bullenbrooke makes a Circle [and invokes Askalon]. ... It thunders and lightens, and then the spirit riseth vp']; II. i. I 'Enter the King, Queene, Protector, Cardinal!, and Suffolke, with Faulknors hallowing' [Q 'Enter the King and Queene with her Hawke on her fist, and Duke Humphrey and Suffolke, and the Cardinall, as if they came from hawking']; 59 'Enter one crying a Miracle' [Q 'Enter one crying, A miracle, a miracle']; 68 'Enter the Maior of Saint Albones, and his Brethren, bearing the man betweene two in a Chayre' [Q '. . . with Musicke, bearing the man that had bene blind . . .']; 152 'After the Beadle hath hit him once, he leapes ouer the Stoole, and runnes away: and they follow, and cry, A Miracle' [Q '. . . hit him one girke, . . . they run after him, crying, A miracle, a miracle']; iii. I 'Sound Trumpets. Enter the King and State, with Guard, to banish the Duchesse'; 59 'Enter at one Doore the Armorer and his Neighbors, drinking to him so much, that hee is drunke; and he enters with a Drumme before him, and his Staffe, with a Sand-bagge fastened to it: and at the other Doore his Man, with a Drumme and Sand-bagge, and Prentices drinking to him' [so Q except 'drunken']; iv, I 'Enter Duke Humfrey and his

Men in Mourning Cloakes' [so **Q**]; 17 'Enter the Duchesse in a white Sheet, and a Taper burning in her hand, with the Sherife and Officers' [Q 'Enter Dame Elnor Cobham barefoote, and a white sheete about her, with a waxe candle in her hand, and verses written on her backe and pind on, and accompanied with the Sheriffes of London, and Sir Iohn Standly, and Officers, with billes and holbards']; in. i. i 'Sound a Senet. Enter King ... to a Parliament' [Q 'Enter to the Parliament. | Enter two Heralds before, then . . . and then the King and the Queene . . .']; ii. I 'Enter two or three running ouer the Stage, from the Murther of Duke Humfrey' [Q 'Then the Curtaines being drawne, Duke Humphrey is discovered in his bed, and two men lying on his brest and smothering him in his bed. And then enter the Duke of Suffolke to them']; 32 'King sounds' [Q 'The King falles in a sound']; 122 'Noyse within. Enter Warwicke, and many Commons'; 146 'Bed put forth' [Q 'Warwicke drawes the curtaines and shoves Duke Humphrey in his bed']; iii. I 'Enter the King, Salisbury, and Warwicke, to the Cardinal in bed' [Q 'Enter King and Salsbury, and then the Curtaines be drawne, and the Cardinall is discovered in his bed, rauing and staring as if he were madde']; Iv. i. I 'Alarum. Fight at Sea. Ordnance goes off. | Enter Lieutenant, Suffolke, and others' [Q 'Alarmes within, and the chambers be discharged, like as it were a fight at sea. And then enter the Captaine of the ship and the Maister, and the Maisters Mate, & the Duke of Suffolke disguised, and others with him, and Water Whickmore']; ii. 33 'Drumme. Enter Cade, Dicke Butcher, Smith the Weauer, and a Sawyer, with infinite numbers'; vii. i 'Alarums. Mathew Goffe is slain, and all the rest. Then enter lacke Cade, with his Company' [Q 'Alarms and then . . . rest with him. . . . Cade again, and ...']; viii. I 'Alarum, and Retreat. Enter againe Cade, and all his rabblement'; ix. i 'Sound Trumpets. Enter King, Queene, and Somerset on the Tarras'; 10 'Enter Multitudes with Halters about their Neckes'; v. i. I 'Enter Yorke, and his Army of Irish, with Drum and Colours'; ii. 66 'Enter Richard, and Somerset to fight' [Q, omitting 1-65, 'Alarmes to the battaile, and then enter the Duke of Somerset and Richard fighting, and Richard kils him vnder the signe of the Castle in saint

Albones']; 77 'Alarum a farre off'. Part III: I. i. I 'Alarum. | Enter Plantagenet . . . and Souldiers' [to a fuller direction O adds 'with white Roses in their hats']; 32 'They goe vp'; 50 'Flourish. Enter King Henry . . . and the rest' [to a fuller direction O adds 'with red Roses in their hats']; 169 'He stampe with his foot, and the Souldiers shew themselues'; ii. 69 'A March a farre off'; iv. 21 'A short Alarum within'; II. i. I 'A March. Enter Edward, Richard, and their power'; [25 O 'Three sunnes appeare in the aire'] 43 'Enter one blowing' [cf. in. iii. 160]; iv. II 'They Fight, Warwicke comes, Clifford flies'; v. 55 'Alarum. | Enter a Sonne that hath kill'd his Father, at one doore: and a Father that hath kill'd his Sonne at another doore'; 73 'Enter Father, bearing of his Sonne'; vi. 31 'Alarum & Retreat. Enter Edward, Warwicke, Richard, and Soldiers, Montague, & Clarence'; 41 'Clifford grones'; III. iii. I 'Flourish. T Enter Lewis the French King, his Sister Bona, his Admiral!, call'd Bourbon: Prince Edward, Queene Margaret, and the Earle of Oxford. Lewis sits, and riseth vp againe'; 16 'Seats her by him'; 46 'Hee descends. Sheeariseth'; 59 'Speaking to Bona'; III 'They stand aloofe'; 160 'Post blowing a home Within'; 166 'They all reade their Letters'; 250 'He giues his hand to Warw.'; iv. i. i 'Enter Richard, Clarence, Somerset, and Mountague'; 9 'Flourish. | Enter King Edward, Lady Grey, Penbrooke, Stafford, Hastings: foure stand on one side, and foure on the other'; ii. 27 'They all cry, Henry'; iii. i 'Enter three Watchmen to guard the Kings Tent'; 23 'Enter Warwicke ... and French Souldiers, silent all', 27 'Warwicke and the rest cry all, Warwicke, Warwicke, and set vpon the Guard, who flye, crying, Arme, Arme, Warwicke and the rest following them. | The Drumme playing, and Trumpet sounding. | Enter Warwicke, Somerset, and the rest, bringing the King out in his Gowne, sitting in a Chaire: Richard and Hastings flyes ouer the Stage'; 48 'Takes off his Crowne'; 57 'They leade him out forcibly'; vi. 68 'Layes his Hand on his Head'; vii. 17 'Enter on the Walls, the Maior of Yorke, and his Brethren'; 37 'Takes his Keyes'; 53 'The Drumme begins to march'; 75 'Throwes downe his Gauntlet'; viii. 30 'Shout within, A Lancaster, A Lancaster'; v. i. i 'Enter Warwicke, the Maior of Couentry, two Messengers, and

others vpon the Walls'; ii. i 'Alarum, and Excursions. Enter Edward bringing forth Warwicke wounded'; 50 'Here they beare away the Body. | Exeunt'; iii. I 'Flourish. Enter King Edward in triumph, with Richard, Clarence, and the rest'; v. 38 '[Edw.] Stabs him'; 39 'Rich, stabs him'; 40 'Clar. stabs him'; 42 '[Rich.] Offers to kill her'; vi. I 'Enter Henry the sixth, and Richard, with the Lieutenant on the Walls'; 57 'Stabbes him' [O 'He stabs him']; 60 'Dyes' [O 'He dies']; 67 'Stabs him againe' [O 'Stab him againe'].

There is much here that suggests foul papers. Some directions are indefinite: the author is indifferent whether Bolingbroke or Southwell shall perform the incantation in 2 I. iv, and only the opening words of the formula are given—no doubt they were read from a scroll. There is some uncertainty of designation. Gloucester is usually 'Duke Humfrey', but appears as 'Trotector' at 2 n. i. i: the Bishop of Winchester is 'Beauford' at 2 I. i. I, but usually 'the Cardinall': the Duke of York is 'Plantagenet' at 3 I. i. I. There are a couple of summary entrances: at 2 II. iii. I the King's 'State' and 'Guard' have to cover a whole bevy of courtiers and delinquents, and the 'Fight at Sea' at 2 Iv. i. I involves among 'others' the Master and Mate of the ship, one Walter Whitmore, and two Gentlemen prisoners. And there are other more specific omissions: in Part II Somerset enters at I. iii. 104, Simcock's wife at II. i. 68, and Stanley at II. Iv. 17, though no provision is made for them. In Part III at II. vi. 31 Montague and Clarence have been added as an afterthought.⁸ But there is also plenty of evidence of the hand of the book-keeper. The very full provision of noises in these boisterous plays may seemingly be ascribed to him, and so may the duplication at 3 II. v. 73, the author having amalgamated two distinct entrances at 1. 55. These might, at a stretch, be regarded as annotations on foul papers. It is less easy so to regard the introduction of actors' names. In Part II Cade's rebellion is heralded by the entry of two apprentices [Q 'Enter two of the Rebels with long staues'] for which F has the direction 'Enter Beuis, and Iohn Holland' (Iv. ii. I), and the same names appear as speakers' prefixes. Holland is

⁸ They are not in the direction in O, though Clarence (George) speaks in both texts. Montague has no part in either.

known as an actor and Bevis was presumably another.⁹ The rebels 'Michael' (Iv. ii. 107, in direction and as prefix) and 'George' (iv. vii. 20, in direction only) may also have acquired actors' names. None of these occur in the F dialogue (Q has other names, which are mostly taken from the dialogue of that version). In Part III two keepers (as they are called in O) enter at in. i. I and F has the direction 'Enter Sinklo, and Humfrey, with Crosse-bowes in their hands', and these names also supply the prefixes; and at i. ii. 47 a messenger 'Gabriel' enters and speaks. John Sincklo, Humphrey Jeffes, and Gabriel Spencer are well-known actors. In no case is it of the least consequence who took these minor parts and their assignment cannot possibly be attributed to the author.¹⁰ Nor is it in the least likely that when the book-keeper read through the script, casting had proceeded far enough for him to know what actors would be available for particular subordinate parts. There seems, therefore, no escape from the conclusion that the manuscript behind F had at some time been used as a prompt-book. Nor is it altogether easy to believe that at this early date the Chamberlain's men should have obtained from Pembroke's foul papers in addition to or in place of the prompt-book and that these should have survived for another thirty years. Perhaps the deficiencies in the F copy are not, after all, so serious, provided that certain additions were made in the 'plot'. On the whole the most reasonable supposition seems to be that authorial fair copy, which still left something to be desired, was in the first instance used by the prompter with a minimum of editing for the stage, that after the manuscript reached the Chamberlain's men it was worked over and partly rewritten, that a new prompt-copy was then prepared, and the old manuscript ultimately handed to the printer. Of the new prompt-book we know nothing: we may suppose that in its preparation errors and confusions of the original were corrected, but this, it must be admitted, is rather a pious belief than a confident conviction.

9 Chambers makes the ingenious and plausible suggestion that Bevis also played the Armourer, Horner, for Q preserves what looks like a bit of gag added to his part at II. iii. 93: 'as Beuys of South-hampton fell vpon Askapart.'

¹⁰ Wilson's contention to the contrary cannot be allowed: he seems to have misunderstood McKerrow's argument (see pp. 114—15).

NOTE A (page 176)

Minor points that suggest possible revision between Q or O and F are the substitution in F at 2 iv. i. 108 of 'Bargulus the strong Illyrian Pyrate' (mentioned by Cicero) for the even more obscure 'mightie Abradas, The great Masadonian Pyrate' (known only from Greene); at 3 in. ii. 193 of 'the murtherous Macheuill' for 'the aspiring Catalin' (i.e. Catiline), which may not be beyond the invention of a reporter; and at 3 II. i. 177—81, in the estimate of the opposing forces, of 30,000 and 25,000 for 50,000 and 48,000 respectively, which latter are closer to the 60,000 and 48,650 of the source—but it is possible that the reporter had some knowledge of the chronicles (cf. Note B).

Lucille King, writing on the sources of *Henry 71* in *PMLA*, 1936 (li. 702-18), found fifty-two instances in which F was closer to Hall and Holinshed than Q and O, and nine of the reverse. These, however, will not all bear examination. The chroniclers report that according to some Gloucester was smothered, according to others strangled. Q, 2 in. ii, represents him being smothered; F neither represents nor describes his death, but only depicts the corpse as 'Staring full ghastly, like a strangled man' (l. 170); there is no contradiction here. The discrepancy over Cade's sword and staff at 2 iv. vi. I is due to tampering by the compositor of F (see Note B). The chronicles report that Clifford was killed with an arrow in the throat; F (3 n. vi. i) merely describes him as wounded, but O as 'wounded, with an arrow in his necke': but since this is only a stage-direction, describing no doubt what was represented on the stage, it need raise no difficulty. This is insufficient evidence on which to base a theory that Q—O are not derived from the version represented by F but only from a common original. It is simpler to suppose some direct influence of Holinshed on Q and O, of which, indeed, Wilson finds other indications.

NOTE B (page 177)

See McKerrow, *Henry VI*. The passages in question are 2 iv. v and vi. 1-7 and 3 iv. ii. 1-18. But the compositor seems to have used his imagination over the stage-directions. In the second passage he expanded one and supplied another implicit in the text; in the first, Q's 'three or foure Citizens' became 'two or three Citizens' and Cade's 'sword' became 'his staffe', which is an error, for it is his sword in the source (cf. Note A). McKerrow's theory could also be made to account for 2 i. i. 236-59, lines identical in the two texts except for two small corrections and one small error in F—note particularly the common errors at 240 'the Neuils parts' and 247 'humors fits'. But in this case it is possible that on the stage ll. 236-59 were substituted for ll. 214-35, of which there is no trace in Q and which, with the forced pirate-simile and the far-fetched 'brand Althaea burnt', could well be spared. In that case ll. 236-59 would not have stood in the manuscript, and supposing the printer to have compared his copy with Q, he may have been tempted to supply the lines from that source. (Lines 214 and 236, which are almost identical, do not, however, form a 'repetition bracket' (see p. 165, Note D), for 214 is guaranteed original by 216.)

III. I *HENRY THE SIXTH*. 1592 (1594)

Folio.¹—It is now usually conceded that Part I of *Henry VI* is substantially later than Parts II and III.² Indeed, it seems that whoever wrote the latter had no knowledge of the former. Apparently conclusive is the fact, to which Wilson draws attention, that Talbot, the hero of Part I, is wholly ignored in Parts II and III: not only does Gloucester not mention him when giving 'a list of those who had shed their blood in France' (2 I. i. 78—87), but he does mention Salisbury and 'brave York', the 'factious traitors' who in Part I are 'responsible for Talbot's death'. But if Parts II and III are ignorant of Part I, Part I, as we have it, undoubtedly looks forward to the others, for it is out of the soil of the Temple Garden that the Wars of the Roses grow. The only doubt is whether Part I was originally written as an introduction to Parts II and III, as Wilson maintains, or whether, as Chambers seems to imagine, an originally independent play on the French wars was adapted for the purpose. Wilson, arguing that Part II cannot have been written as a sequel to Part I, observes that in Part I, which opens with the funeral of Henry V, his son Henry VI is a youth of an age to love, whereas Parts II and III repeatedly insist that he was only nine months old at the time. But this is equally an argument against Part I having been originally written to lead up to Part II, and points rather to adaptation. Striking, too, is the contrast between Gloucester, the 'common Brawler' and 'roaring-boy' of Part I, and the 'noble gentleman' the 'good Duke Humphrey' of Part II—a contrast hardly to be explained away by assuming a writer 'incapable of appreciating . . . finer points'—while the anticipatory allusion (i. i. 39) to Gloucester's wife, who is prominent in Part II, may be part of the adaptation. Besides, assuming Wilson's history of the plays, we may wonder what motive one company could have in staging a prologue to plays belonging to a rival.

¹ The text has been lately and minutely explored by Dover Wilson in his edition of 1952. Whether his views regarding the authorship prove acceptable or not his careful analysis of the evidence will have permanent value.

² See Note A on p. 189.

Unless different portions of the play be assigned to appreciably different dates their very disparate styles can only be ascribed to difference of authorship. It is true that the recognizably Shakespearian portions, such as n. iv, which all critics allow to be his, may have been written later than the rest. If, on the testimony of the 'bad' octavo of 1595, we allow the two *Contention* plays to have belonged to Pembroke's company, and connect the 'harry the vj', new to Strange's on 3 March 1592, with the present play, it is conceivable that Shakespeare was only concerned in this after the three pieces had somehow, as we know, come into the hands of the Chamberlain's men on their formation in June 1594, and that it was then that they became the three parts of *Henry VI* Performance by a different company (which may not even have acquired the original actors' 'parts') would remove the *a priori* improbability of literary revision. But disparity of style is not the only ground for suspecting diversity of authorship. Besides differences in the spelling of proper names, which are in some cases startling but not always easy to link up with differences of style, there are certain marked contradictions of treatment. For example, the author of v. i, in which Winchester has, it appears, only lately become Cardinal, can hardly have read, still less have written, i. iii, in which he already appears in full canonicals.

The text is divided into acts and scenes, but the division is too imperfect and erratic to have been introduced for literary purposes; it must represent an original division that has been disturbed by later rehandling. But it is only in the last two acts that it becomes impossible and has forced modern editors to introduce an arrangement of their own, which, in fact, is satisfactory for the play as it stands. In F the heading 'Actus Quartus, Scena Prima' correctly corresponds to iv. i, but the next divisions marked, 'Scena secunda' and 'Scoena Tertia', correspond to the modern v. i and ii, and 'Actus Quintus' heads the final v. v, which contains only 108 lines. It is not hard to guess what happened. Acts I (six scenes), II (five scenes), and IV (seven scenes) were undivided, while Act III was correctly divided into four scenes. Act V had originally six scenes, of which, however, only the first three were marked; and of these the first was lost in revision,

carrying with it the heading for Act V. Thus to the printer v. ii and iii (= modern v. i and ii) naturally became iv. ii and in, and he carried on till he came to the last (unmarked) scene, which he was then forced to treat as 'Actus Quintus'.

In the case of a play of this early date and originally produced by another company, one would hardly expect the foul papers to have reached the Chamberlain's men. If Parts II and III represent author's fair copy, annotated by the book-keeper and used by the prompter, and later revised and discarded, something of the same origin may be conjectured for Part I. The stage-directions are fuller and more descriptive in some parts than others, but do not otherwise differ noticeably in character. They are obviously, in the main, author's directions :³¹ i. i 'Dead March. | Enter the Funerall of King Henry the Fift, attended on by the Duke of Bedford, Regent of France; the Duke of Gloster, Protector; the Duke of Exeter[,] Warwicke, the Bishop of Winchester, and the Duke of Somerset'; ii. i 'Sound a Flourish. | Enter Charles, Alanson, and Reigneir, marching with Drum and Souldiers'; 21 'Exeunt. | Here Alarum, they are beaten back by the English, with great losse. | Enter Charles, Alanson, and Reigneir'; iii. 14 'Glosters men rush at the Tower Gates, and Wooduile the Lieutenant speakes within'; 24 'Enter to the Protector at the Tower Gates, Winchester and his men in Tawney Coates'; 56 'Here Glosters men beat out the Cardinalls men, and enter in the hurly-burly the Maior of London, and his Officers'; 69 'Here they skirmish againe'; iv. 23 'Enter Salisbury and Talbot on the Turrets, with others'; v. I 'Here an Alarum againe, and Talbot pursueth the Dolphin, and driueth him: Then enter loane de Puzel, driuing Englishmen before her'; vi. i 'Alarum, Retreat, Flourish. | Enter on the Walls, Puzel . . . and Souldiers'; II. i. 8 'Enter Talbot, Bedford, and Burgundy, with scaling Ladders: Their Drummers beating a Dead March'; 38 'Cry, S. George, A Talbot. | The French leape ore the walles in their shirts. Enter seuerall wayes, Bastard, Alanson, Reignier, halfe

³¹ Chambers notes that in Act I many directions (not as a rule entrances) begin with 'Here': there are in fact nine instances. The use is uncommon, though not unknown, elsewhere in the canon (cf. Part II, i. iv. 24, and *Henry IV*, and see Greg, *Editorial Problem*, index). Wilson, who assigns Act I to Nashe, points to the similar use of 'Here'—also nine instances—in *Summer's Last Will and Testament*.

ready, and halfe vnready'; III. i. I 'Flourish. Enter King . . . Gloster offers to put vp a Bill: Winchester snatches it, teares it'; 86 'Enter in skirmish with bloody Pates'; ii. 26 'Enter Pucell on the top, thrusting out a Torch burning'; 36 'An Alarum. Talbot in an Excursion'; 41 'Bedford brought in sicke in a Chayre'; 59 'They whisper together in counsell'; Iv. ii. I 'Enter Talbot with Trumpe and Drumme, before Burdeaux'; vi. I 'Alarum: Excursions, wherein Talbots Sonne is hemm'd about, and Talbot rescues him'; v. iii. 45 'Alarum. Enter Suffolke with Margaret in his hand. . . . Gazes on her'; v. I 'Enter Suffolke in conference with the King, Glocester, and Exeter'. Some of these are mistaken. Wilson points out that the drums at ii. i. 8 are absurd in a surprise attack, and doubtless belong to II. ii, where the same three, Talbot, Bedford, and Burgundy, solemnly bring in Salisbury's corpse. Another point he makes is that the 'Flourish' that marks the departure of York and others at Iv. i. 181 would more fittingly mark the King's at 1. 173. In these he sees jottings misplaced by the book-keeper when he read through the script. That many of the noises were added by him is very probable, though some appear to be part of the original directions. But a book-keeper, reading through the text, would be very unlikely to misplace his annotations, and would, moreover, simply write 'Dead March' rather than 'Their Drums beating a Dead March'. If, however, as most critics believe, the play was originally the work of more than one author, somebody must have been responsible for fitting the several parts together, and it is possible that in doing so he added a few directions: such a process would appear to offer greater chances of misplacement than the mere act of reading. Of course, we should expect such errors, affecting the formal conduct of the play, to be ultimately noticed, and the misleading division of the last two acts would hardly have been left standing in a properly prepared prompt-book. This confirms our earlier suspicion that a new prompt-book was prepared after the play came into the possession of, and had been revised for, the Chamberlain's company, though the old manuscript was preserved, for the same reason as foul papers were, and was in the end handed to the printer.

NOTE A (page 187)

Alexander, who believes in the Shakespearian authorship of the play, denies this (see 2, 3 *Henry VI*, note i: pp. 187-92). On the contrary he maintains that Part I was the first written and that echoes of it are found in the reported version of Part II. For example, in York's claim to the crown in 2 II. ii, where in F he says (11. 4-5),

In crauing your opinion of my Title,
Which is infallible, to Englands Crowne

in Q he speaks of

The right and title of the house of Yorke,
To Englands Crowne by liniall descent

which seems reminiscent of i *Henry VI*, III. i. 165-6,

That doth belong vnto the House of Yorke,
From whence you spring, by Lineall Descent.

Again where, in i. i, the King receives his bride at the hands of Suffolk, he speaks (1. 22) of

A world of earthly blessings to my soule

which in Q becomes

A world of pleasures to my perplexed soule.

It is argued that here 'perplexed' is inappropriate and is borrowed from the 'perplexed' of i *Henry VI*, v. v. 95, a passage of similar context in which the King is torn between the two brides proposed for him.

These instances are not without weight, though by themselves they do not, as Alexander recognizes, carry complete conviction. G. Blakemore Evans (reviewing Wilson's edition in *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Jan. 1953, iv. 84-92) finds fifteen instances, but since he does not specify them it is not possible to tell whether they carry more or less weight than those mentioned above. If Alexander's contention holds, i *Henry VI* can hardly be the 'harry the vj' of Mar. 1592, since the Pembroke's men's reporters would be unlikely to be influenced by a new play belonging to another company.

Alexander finds another argument in favour of an early date for i *Henry VI* in its relation to *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, which he describes as a 'tissue of borrowed and only half-assimilated phrases from *Henry VI*, *Richard III*, as well as *King John* itself (*Shakespeare's Life and Art* 1939, p. 85). He gives no details and it is therefore not possible to assess the evidence, but Evans again agrees and holds *The Troublesome Reign* to be the debtor. Since this play was printed in 1591 it would follow that all the Shakespearian pieces in question would have to be dated considerably earlier than is usually done. (Cf. the discussion of *King John*, Note B.) While Alexander's case cannot at present be taken as proved, it clearly deserves further investigation.

IV. RICHARD THE THIRD. 1592-3

The quarto and Folio texts differ considerably—much in the same way as those of *King Lear*, more than those of 2 *Henry IV Troilus and Cressida*, and *Othello*. Theories of literary revision, inherently improbable, are discredited by differing over which is the revised version. Recent criticism recognizes that the Folio offers, as a whole, not only the better but the more original text.

Quarto (1597).—The copy for *Richard II* that Andrew Wise entered on 29 August must have reached him from the playhouse, and it would be surprising if the copy for *Richard III* that he entered on 20 October came from a different source. It was, however, a very different type of manuscript. In the case of an old play that must have come to the Chamberlain's men from some other company it is quite possible that the author's original had either not been preserved or had itself been used as the prompt-book. In either case if the players decided to release the play for publication and were at the same time unwilling to part with their official copy it would be necessary to make a transcript. Such a copy Chambers believes to underlie Q, in which he recognizes that 'some of the textual features—omissions, paraphrases, substitution of equivalent words, incorporation of actor's [*sic*] "connectives"—are such as appear in "reported" plays'. To account for these he supposes the transcript to have been made by the book-keeper, who allowed his recollection of what he had heard on the stage to contaminate the text he was copying, 'thus vulgarizing the style, and producing in a minor degree the features of a reported text'. The explanation would be acceptable if we could believe in sufficient corruption of the text so establishing itself in representation as to impress itself upon the book-keeper's memory, in his capacity as prompter, or in a sufficient indifference on his part, in his capacity as scribe, to the manifestly superior text that lay before him.¹ A different explanation is offered by D. L. Patrick, who was the first to subject the texts to a

¹ This question is discussed on pp. 152 ff.

thorough critical analysis, an analysis that convinced him, and is likely to convince others, that Q is indeed none other than a report of an abridged acting version of the play.² Q omits some 200 lines of F scattered through some fifty passages, the longest of fifty-five lines. Some are cut to eliminate minor characters or to facilitate the doubling of parts, some lighten long speeches; but most of the omissions appear to be accidental, and it is significant that a recollection of an omitted passage has occasionally contaminated another that is retained. The other features enumerated by Chambers, together with transposition, assimilation, and anticipation, are fully illustrated and discussed by Patrick.³ The few lines peculiar to Q are capable of explanation.⁴ But if Q is a report, it is a report on a very different level of accuracy from the recognized 'bad' quartos. Patrick did no more than hint at its origin. There is, however, no doubt that a report at least as good could have been produced by a common effort of the company under the guidance of the book-keeper. The nature of the abridgement points to its having been made for stage use, very likely in the country, where the absence of some of the hired men and shorter acting-time would account for the cutting—though in fact this makes little impression on the

¹ *The Textual History of Richard III*, by David Lyall Patrick. Stanford University Press (London; Oxford University Press), 1936. There is nothing new in the suggestion, for several earlier critics, including Alexander Schmidt writing in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* for 1880, had maintained Q to be a report, though an unusually good one; but they mostly relied on the hypothesis of shorthand and had none of them considered the evidence in detail. Both McKerrow and Greg had independently arrived at the same conclusion as Patrick but had published nothing on the subject.

² The evidence both for abridgement and reporting is summarized by Greg, *Editorial Problem*, pp. 80-85.

³ There are twenty single lines or parts of lines in Q that do not appear in F, and one continuous passage of thirteen. The removal of profanity is responsible for the loss of two lines from F. Six others may reasonably be supposed accidental omissions, leaving twelve to be accounted for as actors' insertions in Q. The one substantial passage, IV. ii. 107-19, in which Richard snubs Buckingham when he begs for the earldom of Hereford, may well have been cut out as politically injudicious at the time that F was being prepared for press. The importunity of the Duke of Buckingham was a little too suggestive of the rapacity of another Buckingham—still only Marquess when the play was printed, but Duke before it appeared—nor might it have been thought altogether tactful to remind the superstitious James of sinister prophecies concerning a castle of Richmond, when it was at the royal palace of Richmond that his predecessor had died (see W. J. Griffin and R. B. McKerrow in *RES*, 1937, xiii. 329-32).

length of a long play. In that case reporting and shortening formed a single process. An occasion is suggested by a known provincial tour by the Chamberlain's men in the summer of 1597, supposing them to have needed to produce a play the prompt-book of which had remained in London. They are likely to have been back early in October, and would then have no further use for their makeshift copy. If they wished to release the play for press, they may have thought the manuscript good enough for the purpose. And so it proved, for it went through a number of editions and has imposed on many editors. The directions are on the whole scanty and rather bare. Presumably they were inserted by the book-keeper, and he may have retained some recollection of those in the prompt-book. But his reproduction is haphazard: he gets only 'Shee spitteth at him. . . . Here she lets fall the sword' in place of F 'Spits at him. . . . She lookes scornfully at him. . . . He layes his brest open, she offers at with his sword. . . , She fals the Sword' (1. ii. 144, 171, 179, 183).⁵ he has 'Enter Executioners' (1. iii. 339) because they are so described in the text, where F has 'Enter two murtherers'. A curious literary feature is the headings 'His oration to his souldiers' and 'His Oration to his army' before Richmond's and Richard's speeches at v. iii. 237 and 314. They may have been added by the printer. F omits the second, no doubt by accident.⁵

Folio.—This was printed mainly from a copy of Q6, 1622,⁶ that had been corrected by collation with a full and authoritative manuscript. Two passages, however, the first 164 lines or so of Act III and the last 357! lines of Act V (beginning with v. iii. 48^b), were printed from Q3, 1602,⁷ almost un-

⁵ See Note A on p. 197.

⁶ As demonstrated by P. A. Daniel in his introduction to the Griggs facsimile of the first quarto in 1883. That the quarto actually served as copy, and was not merely consulted where the manuscript was obscure, is shown by IV. iv. 364, which is correctly placed in Q1, is omitted in Q6, and is misplaced after 1. 365 in F, showing that it had been carelessly inserted in the copy.

⁷ As early as 1864 the Cambridge editors noted some dependence of F on Q3, and so did certain later critics. It appears to have been Schmidt who in 1880 first pointed to specific passages. He was followed by Fleay (*Life of Shakespeare*, 1886, p. 277) and by McKerrow (*RES*, 1937, xiii. 69, where '1605' is a slip for '1602'), but they only mention the subject incidentally. Daniel declared that he could 'find no proof of any such connection' (p. v), and Chambers ignores it. The dependence of the two passages upon some quarto after Q2 and before Q6 is, however, beyond

altered apart from a little tinkering at the stage-directions. Apparently two leaves had at some time been lost from the middle and four or five from the end of the manuscript and been replaced by leaves from Q3, and when the manuscript was collated with Q6 these printed leaves were abstracted and incorporated in the copy for F.

The question arises, what exactly was the manuscript that was used in the preparation of F. The simplest and most obvious thing to suppose would be that it was the prompt-book itself that had become damaged between 1602 and 1605 and made good with leaves from the current edition of the play.⁸ But Alice Walker,⁹ who has recently tackled the problem, finds serious grounds for doubting whether the manuscript can have been a prompt-copy. Unquestionably the stage-directions preserved in F are essentially the author's. Only the poet who wrote 'Tomorrow in the battell think on me. And fall thy edgeless Sword' (v. iii. 134—5) can have been responsible for the unusual transitive use of 'fals' already quoted from a stage-direction. Typical directions are the following (to which, in some cases, those of Q are added for comparison): I. i. I 'Enter Richard Duke of Gloster, solus' [so Q except 'Glocester']; 42 'Enter Clarence, and Brakenbury, guarded' [Q 'Enter Clarence with a gard of men']; ii. I 'Enter the Coarse of Henrie the sixt with Halberds to guard it, Lady Anne being the Mourner' [Q 'Enter Lady Anne with the hearse of Harry the 6.']; 225 'Exit two with Anne' [Q 'Exit']; 227 'Exit Coarse' [Q 'Exeunt, manet Gl.']; iii. 318 'Speakes to himselfe'; II. i. i 'Flourish. | Enter the King sicke . . .'; 28 'Embrace'; 79 'They all start'; 133 'Exeunt some with K. & Qneen [sic]'; ii. 34 'Enter the Queene with her haire about her ears, Riuers & Dorset after her'; iii. I 'Enter one Citizen at one doore, and another at the other'; III. ii. I 'Enter a Messenger to the Doore of Hastings' [Q '. . . to Lo: Hastings']; 96 'Enter a Pursuiuant' [Q 'Enter Hastin. a Purssuant']; 108 'Throwes him his Purse' [Q 'He giues him . . .']; iii. I 'Enter Sir Richard Ratcliffe, with Halberds, carrying the Nobles to death at Pomfret' [Q

question, and the duplication of 'as' in nr. i. 123, which is a misprint peculiar to Q3 and is certainly conscious in F, limits the choice to Q3.

⁸ See Greg, *Editorial Problem*, p. 87.

⁹ *Textual Problems*, pp. 18 ff.

'Enter Sir Rickard [*sic*] Ratcliffe, with the Lo: Riuers, Gray, and Vaughan, prisoners'; iv. i 'Enter Buckingham, Darby, Hastings, Bishop of Ely, Norfolke, Ratcliffe, Louell, with others, at a Table' [Q 'Enter the Lords to Councell']; v. I 'Enter Richard, and Buckingham, in rotten Armour, maruelous ill-fauoured' [Q 'Enter Duke of Glocester... in armour'] vii. i 'Enter Richard and Buckingham at seuerall Doores' [Q 'Enter Glocester at one doore, Buckingham at another']; 95 'Enter Richard aloft, betweene two Bishops' [Q 'Enter Rich, with two bishops a loste [*sic*]']; 227 'Enter Buckingham, and the rest' [not in Q]; iv. ii. i 'Sound a Sennet. Enter Richard in pompe . . .' [Q 'The Trumpets sound, Enter Richard crownd ...']; 2 'Sound' [Q 'Here he ascendeth the throne']; iv. 136 'Enter King Richard, and his Traine' [Q 'Enter K. Richard marching with Drummes and Trumpets']; 509 'He striketh him' [so Q]; v. i. i 'Enter Buckingham with Halberds, led to Execution' [Q 'Enter Buckingham to execution']; iii. 19 'Enter Richmond, Sir William Brandon, Oxford, and Dorset' [Q 'Enter Richmond with the Lordes, &c.']; 46 'They withdraw into the Tent'; 79 'Enter Derby to Richmond in his Tent' [so Q except 'Darby'].

No doubt author's directions may find their way into a prompt-book, but it is impossible to believe that even if an author's fair copy had been used as a prompt-book some of the directions quoted above would not have been supplemented by the book-keeper, for several are manifestly inadequate for performance, for example 'carrying the Nobles to death', 'Enter Buckingham and the rest', 'Enter Buckingham with Halberds, led to Execution'. Moreover, the entrances are both defective and redundant. As Miss Walker points out, 'Hastings and Dorset are omitted from the entry at i. iii. 41, Scales at n. i,¹⁰ Catesby at in. vii. 95 and iv. iv. 432, Clarence's daughter at iv. i, the Page at iv. ii, and the Sheriff [Ratclif in Q] from v. i.¹¹ On the other hand . . . supernumeraries are included: Catesby at ii. i, Ratcliff and

¹⁰ See Note B on p. 197.

¹¹ It is remarkable that all these omissions are in Q likewise, yet absence of the names in F can hardly be due to imperfect collation, since in no case has the direction been taken over unaltered from Q.

Derby at 11. ii. 101; Norfolk at in. iv, Ratcliff and Lovel at iv. ii and Dorset at v. iii. 19.' The appearance of ghosts and mutes is, of course, common in foul papers; at the same time, since there seems no particular reason why the characters mentioned should not be present in the scenes in question, their names may have appeared in the prompt-book. In no case, however, do they appear in Q. There is also confusion of prefixes in a few cases. In I. iii we have 'Enter the Queene Mother'¹² and her speeches have the prefix 'Qu.'; but at 1. 110 'Enter old Queene Margaret', whose speeches have at first the prefix 'Margaret' ('Mar.'), but later 'Q. M.', which might stand for 'Queene Mother'. The prefix 'Q. M.' may, however, be due to faulty collation, since it occurs also in Q.¹³ In II. ii 'Enter . . . the two children of Clarence': the son is at first 'Edw.' but later 'Boy', and 'Boy' is the prefix throughout in Q: the girl, however, is 'Daugh.' and together they are 'Chil.', whereas in Q the corresponding prefixes are 'Gerl' and 'Ambo', which are less suggestive of imperfect collation. At iv. i, where the girl reappears as a mute (ignored in the direction), the Duchess of York calls her 'My Neece Plantagenet': this is the same in Q. At i. iii. 339 'Enter two murderers' but the only prefix is 'Vil[lain].', though in the next scene we find 'i. (2.) Mur.': this can owe nothing to Q. On the other hand considerable inconsistency in the designation of the hero can be explained by the occasional failure to alter the designations of Q.¹⁴

Considering the evidence as a whole, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that behind F there lies not a prompt-book but foul papers; and it may be worth observing that the loss of leaves would be more likely in the case of foul papers than a regular prompt-book. If this be admitted, any theory designed to account for the textual facts will necessarily be more complicated. Miss Walker conjectures that what happened was this. The copy for *Richard III* (F) was prepared

¹² That is, Queen Elizabeth, but since at this point Edward IV is still alive, the description is inaccurate. In Q she is merely 'Queene' here; Q calls her 'Quee. mother', correctly, at iv. i. i, where F has 'the Queene'.

" The prefix 'Q. M.' occurs for the first time in F at 1. 134, and this is also the line at which in Q 'Qu. Mar.' is first shortened to 'Qu. Ma.': 'Qu. M.' is first found in Q at 1. 155, and 'Q. M.' first at 1. 216.

¹⁴ See Note C on p. 198.

in 1621. The foul papers it was proposed to use were found to be defective and were supplemented by leaves from a printed copy in the playhouse library. This happened to belong to the edition of 1602, not to the more recent one of 1605—which would be likely enough. But before the play actually came to be printed in the spring of 1623, probably during the months when printing was suspended, October 1621 to November 1622,¹⁵ it was decided, perhaps at Jaggard's suggestion, to supply the compositor with printed copy. Accordingly a copy of Q6 (1622) was procured and corrected by comparison with the manuscript, the leaves of Q3 that had been incorporated in the latter being substituted for the corresponding leaves of Q6 for the sake of certain annotations they contained. If the manuscript be thought to have included some directions emanating from the book-keeper, this need cause no surprise, since he is likely enough to have annotated the foul papers;¹⁶ it is less easy to account for prompter's notes in the passages printed from Q3.¹⁷ We shall have to suppose that when leaves from Q3 were Incorporated in the manuscript, the stage-directions were at least roughly compared with those in the prompt-book, though no attempt was made to correct the text. Of course, some prompter's directions may at the same time have been transferred from the prompt-copy to the foul papers (cf. note 15), but if any comparison took place it is surprising that nothing was done to make more specific the many vague directions of the author. It should be added that the preparation of Q6 to serve as copy for F appears to have involved not only collation with the manuscript but some editorial interference of a rather ignorant nature. Thus at two points (n. ii. 142, 154) 'Ludlow', correctly reported in Q, was erroneously altered to 'London', and at III. ii. 98 ff. the name of the pursuivant Hastings was eliminated both from the direction and the text, presumably under the impression that there had been some confusion with Lord Hastings, though in fact the name has the warrant of the chronicler.

¹⁵ See p. 461.

¹⁶ At I. i. 42 the misplaced 'guarded' looks like an addition. Some notes for stage noises may also be from the hand of the book-keeper: ii. i. i 'Flourish', IV. ii. i 'Sound a Sennet', 2 'Sound'.

" See Note D on p. 198.

It must be admitted that the above is a rather untidy hypothesis, but in the present state of our knowledge it would appear to be the only one that takes account of the textual evidence as a whole.¹⁸

We may dismiss any idea of F having been printed from a quarto that had been used as a prompt-book, since not only are the characteristics of F, as we have seen, less those of a prompt-book than of foul papers, but the amount of correction involved, though it would not render it impossible as printer's copy, would certainly have made it useless for the prompter. F introduces an imperfect division into acts and scenes. In Act III Scenes v-vii are not marked: in Act IV Scene iii is not marked, and Scenes iv and v are in consequence misnumbered: in Act V Scenes iii-v are not marked. The division was most likely introduced at the time of printing.

NOTE A (page 192)

Admittedly Q would be a very defective prompt-book. A number of important entrances are overlooked, as those of Hastings and Dorset in i. iii, who speak at ll. 183 and 186 and, if editors are right, should come on with Gloucester at l. 41. Several directions are of the summary type characteristic of the author, for instance III. iv. I 'Enter the Lords to CouncelP, v. i. I 'Enter Buckingham to execution', iii. 19 'Enter Richmond with the Lordes, &c.' These could not have come from a normal prompt-book. But the book-keeper, writing from dictation, would not necessarily remember at the beginning of a scene what characters took part in it—that would only appear as the reconstruction proceeded—and he might jot down a provisional direction and later forget to make it specific. An emergency prompt-book would not be expected to be perfect. On other occasions he was better prepared, for instance in. iii. i 'Enter Sir Rickard [*sic*] Ratliffe, with the Lo: Riuers, Gray, and Vaughan, prisoners', iv. i. I 'Enter Quee. mother, Duchesse of Yorke, Marques Dorset, at one doore, Duchesse of Glocest. at another doore.'⁷

NOTE B (page 194)

ii. i. 67 'Of you Lord Wooduile, and Lord Scales of you.' Historically Woodville and Scales are both identical with Rivers (Anthony Woodville), but Shakespeare evidently did not realize this, since he included both Rivers and Woodville in the direction at II. i. I. Similarly Stanley and Derby are the same. In this case it is not quite certain whether Shakespeare was aware of the identity, but in iv. v Derby is recognized as the father of George Stanley. Perhaps the confusion was removed in the prompt-book, for in Q Thomas Stanley is Derby throughout, though this is in fact inaccurate since it was Henry VII who raised Thomas Lord Stanley to the Earldom of Derby.

¹⁸ See Note E on p. 198.

NOTE C (*page 195*)

In Q he is Gloucester throughout the first three acts, that is, before his coronation, except at in. i. 150 and vii. 95 ('Rich.'), and without exception speaks as 'Glo.' In the last two acts he is Richard or King Richard and always speaks as 'King'. There is therefore virtually no inconsistency. In F he is generally Richard (later King Richard) throughout, except at II. i. 46, III. i. i, and in. iv. 22, where he is Gloucester (in several spellings). His speeches have the prefix 'Rich.' except in in. i. 63-154, where we find 'Glo.', and in v. iii where 'King' ('K.') occurs spasmodically. All these aberrations are, of course, reversions to Q; but the occasional retention of 'King' may have been due to a feeling that Richard was becoming confused with Richmond, whose prefix was properly 'Richm.' but was often reduced to 'Rich.'

NOTE D (*page 196*)

III. i. 150, F adds 'A Senet' at the beginning and 'and Catesby' at the end; v. iii. 57, F adds 'Exit' for Norfolk, and 107 'Manet Richmond'; 222-3, Q3 'Exeunt. | Enter the Lords to Richmond', F 'Exeunt Richard & Ratcliffe, | Enter the Lords to Richmond sitting in his Tent'; 271, Q3 'Rat. &c.', F 'Ratcliffe, and Catesby'; 302, £3 'He sheweth him a paper', F omits; 313, £3 'His Oration to his Armie', F omits; F adds, 337 'Drum afarre off', 342 'Enter a Messenger', and iv. 6 'Alarums'; v. I, Q3 'then retrait being sounded, . . . other Lords', F 'Retreat, and Flourish. . . diuers other Lords'; 13-14 erroneously printed as a stage-direction in £3, correctly as a speech by Derby in F; 41, F adds 'Exeunt'.

NOTE E (*page 197*)

Miss Walker adds some interesting remarks regarding the probable amount of corruption in the Folio text, the peculiar circumstances of printing permitting certain numerical calculations to be made. The bulk of F was printed from Q6, and we know the number of errors that had accumulated in Q6 in the course of successive reprintings after Q1, and also the percentage of these errors that were corrected in F. (Where F failed to correct an error of this sort we can of course confidently substitute the reading of Q1.) But Qr must also have contained errors, and we know the number of cases in which F altered a reading of Q1 (disregarding evident misprints in F). Presumably the percentage of Q1 errors that F corrected was the same as that of the accumulated errors in Q6 that it eliminated. We are therefore in a position to calculate the probable number of Q1 errors that F overlooked. Miss Walker reckons these to be about 150. Then there are the errors of Q3, which F made no attempt to correct. When printing from Q6, F altered a reading in every three or four lines; therefore in the 500 lines or so it printed from Q\$ it should have made perhaps another 150 alterations. Miss Walker concludes that, after we have corrected F by comparison with Q1, there may remain something like 300 errors uncorrected. (The argument with regard to Q3 does not appear altogether valid, for (a) Q3 is of course less corrupt than Q6 and contains fewer errors to correct, (6) in printing from Q6 F should have made more

corrections than it did, and (c) the total includes errors of £'3 that can be corrected by comparison with **Qi**. But the figures are, of course, in any case only approximate.) This clearly allows an editor considerable latitude in the way of emendation, though it is safe to say that the majority of the errors uncorrected in F, since they make sense, must always remain undetected.

Miss Walker also distinguishes the work of the two compositors who set up the play in the Folio (see p. 457) and has some pertinent remarks concerning their respective characteristics and comparative accuracy.

V. THE COMEDT OF ERRORS. 1592-3

Folio.—The directions are remarkable for certain indications they contain: Iv. i. 14 'Enter . . . from the Courtizans', 85 'Enter . . . from the Bay', v. i. 37 'Exeunt to the Priorie', 281 'Exit one to the Abbesse', which suggest a set stage with three houses—in the centre Antipholus's, the Phoenix, on one side the Courtesan's, the Porpentine, and on the other the Abbess's, the Priory—and between them streets leading to the harbour and into the city: the central space is spoken of as the Mart.¹ The balcony is used for a window of Antipholus's house, but no use is made of the inner stage. It seems doubtful, therefore, whether the play was designed for the regular theatre, and in fact the earliest performance on record was at Gray's Inn on 28 December 1594.² There is nothing to show that this was the original performance, any more than there is anything to connect the piece with a Paul's court play 'The historic of Error', 1577, or a Sussex's court play 'A Historic of Ferrar', 1583 (more likely a story of Ferrara), or Strange's 'gelyous comedy', new on 5 January 1593; but the jest about France 'arm'd and reuerted, making warre against her heire' (III. ii. 126) would have had no point except between the summer of 1589 and that of 1593, when Henri IV was at war with the League.

Other directions, on the whole rather sparse, but occasionally indefinite or petitory, are characteristic of the author: II. i. I 'Enter Adriana, wife to Antipholus Sereptus, with Luciana her Sister'; III. i. I 'Enter Antipholus of Ephesus, his man Dromio, Angelo the Goldsmith, and Balthaser the Merchant'; ii. 170 'Enter Angelo with the Chaine'; Iv. iv. 8 'Enter Dromio Eph. with a ropes end'; 44 'Enter Adriana

¹ Doubtless there is some latitude of imagination. When the action is connected with one of the houses the others may be thought of as at a distance, and characters may even leave the stage in order to reach them. Dover Wilson's edition (1922) has a detailed analysis of the localities.

² When 'upon Innocents-Day at Night... a Comedy of Errors (like to Plautus his Menechmus) was played by the Players', who are caustically but no doubt jestingly described as 'a Company of base and common Fellows' (*Gesta Grayorum*, 1688, pp. 20, 22, 23).

. . . and a Schoolemaster, call'd Pinch'; 47 'Beats Dro.'; 109 'Enter three or foure, and offer to binde him: Hee striues'; 147 'Enter Antipholus Siracusia with his Rapier drawne, and Dromio Sirac.'; v. i. 130 'Enter , . . the Merchant of Siracuse bare head'; 183 'Cry within'; 330 'All gather to see them'. But there also seem to be a few notes by the prompter; the clearest is at iv. iv. 149-50, 'Runne all out. . . . Exeunt omnes, as fast as may be, frighted', in which 'Exeunt omnes' was doubtless added (incorrectly) on the left, duplicating the author's original direction on the right; and it is possible that the similar 'Exeunt omnes' at v. i. 407 was also an addition by the book-keeper. A duplication at v. i. 190, 'Enter Antipholus, and E. Dromio of Ephesus', may also be due to him, and Chambers thinks he may have added the words 'call'd Pinch' at iv. iv. 44, though why he does not explain. These notes may have been made on the foul papers. The extraordinary confusion and inconsistency of the character names and prefixes that persist through most of the play were analysed by McKerrow, who referred them to the author's manuscript.³ Even at the end of the play we have (v. 1.407) 'Manet the two Dromio's and two Brothers'. There are some discrepancies: the kitchen wench is called Luce at in. i. 48—60, but Nell at ii. 111 (for the sake of a pun), and at III. ii. I an attempt seems to have been made to change the name of Luciana to Juliana (S.D. 'Iuliana', prefix 'Iulia.', but 'Luc.' again from 1. 53) if this is anything more than a printer's blunder. There are a few other contradictions, due doubtless to oversights of the author: some short lines and textual difficulties may point to small cuts or accidental omissions. Otherwise the text is a clean one. An unoriginal division into acts only has been introduced, perhaps at the time of printing, since the unusual direction at v. i. 10, 'Enter Antipholus and Dromio againe', after their exit at the end of Act IV, shows that the action was meant to be continuous.

In the case of an early play that must have come to the Chamberlain's men from some other company it is, of course, particularly dangerous to dogmatize, but the manuscript behind F was clearly the author's, and since it is difficult to

believe that the confusion in the character names and prefixes would have been tolerated in a prompt-book, it would seem that the manuscript was most likely foul papers.⁴

⁴ Cf. p. 185. Fredson Bowers suggests (privately) that if the *original* performance was a private one the foul papers are perhaps more likely to have remained in the author's hands than would be the case if the play had been written for the regular repertory of a company.

VI. *TITUS ANDRONICUS*. (1590?) 1594

Quarto (1594).—The descriptive directions, often elaborate (e.g. Iv. i. I 'Enter Lucius sonne and Lauinia running after him, and the Boy flies from her with his Bookes vnder his Arme') and sometimes indefinite (e.g. i. i. 70 'and others as many as can be'), are normal for an author familiar with the theatre (thus 'aloft', 'at one doore ... at the other doore', 'passing on the Stage'): there is also some uncertainty in the speakers' prefixes. In the absence, then, of any definite indication of prompter's notes, we may assume that the copy was foul papers. There are signs of alteration in the text. On sig. 12^r nine lines appear to have been removed in proof and four speakers' names centred and leaded in compensation. The error may, of course, have had nothing to do with the copy. But in what became the first act there seems to be clear evidence of expansion.¹ At I. i. 36 we are told how Titus has returned victorious

and at this day,
To the Monument of that \read the] Andronic
Done sacrifice of expiation,
And slaine the Noblest prisoner of the Gothes

and agreeably with this the direction at 1. 70 brings on 'Tamora the Queene of Gothes and her two sonnes Chiron and Demetrius' only. It would therefore appear that the presence of her eldest son Alarbus and his sacrifice as the noblest of the Goths, which occupies ll. 96-149, must be an addition to the scene as originally planned and at least partially written.² And, as Wilson points out, the speech by Marcus at 1. 391, which makes so abrupt a transition as to suggest a new scene, can be linked up with L 340 if the intervening passage be regarded as an insertion. Later, the

¹ Dover Wilson in his recent edition (1948) finds evidence of the sort throughout and infers an originally much shorter play written for touring purposes. But the evidence of expansion is less certain in the later acts, and while there is abundant evidence of the shortening of plays, presumably for acting in the country, there is no known instance of a play being originally written for that purpose and later expanded for the London stage.

² For possible qualification to this inference see Greg, 'Alteration in Act I of "Titus Andronicus"', in *MLR*, Oct. 1953' xlviii. 439-40.

typographical arrangement at Iv. iii. 89-90 suggests that this unquestionably Shakespearian sally was a marginal addition to the Clown's speech as first written: and in the same scene the virtual duplication in ll. 98-99 and 107 suggests, to Wilson at least, that ll. 102-8 were an afterthought. It should be added that if we are right in supposing Q to have been printed from foul papers, the alterations we have been considering are best regarded as part of the original composition,

In 1600 a second quarto was printed from a copy of the first that had suffered injury at the foot of the last three leaves, with the result that six passages, including the final lines of the play, had to be supplied by conjecture.³ This called for some editorial skill, and the editor did not stop here. He removed the three and a half lines in the first scene that, as we have seen, contradict the later action (though he left the equally contradictory stage-direction as it stood) and he also made several intelligent emendations in the text.⁴ A reprint of Q2 appeared in 1611.

Folio.—This was printed from Q3, with a division into acts only. The most important difference is the introduction of a new scene at the end of Act III. This runs to eighty-five lines and would conveniently fill a single leaf of foolscap. It has the unusual heading: 'A Bnaket [*read* Banket]. | Enter Andronicus, Marcus, Lauinia, and the Boy'. In no similar direction is Titus called Andronicus,⁵ in no other scene have his speeches the prefix 'An.', and nowhere else is Tamora called Tamira as she is here. This argues at least a different scribal origin from Qi. Some have seen in it the work of a different and later hand.⁶ The scene was presumably already

³ The explanation of the variation between Qi and Qz in these passages was arrived at independently by J. S. C. Bolton (*PMLA*, 1929, xlv. 776-80) and R. B. McKerrow (*The Library*, 1934, xv. 49-53). The fullest discussion is that by J. Q. Adams in his introduction to the facsimile of the unique copy of Qi in the Folger Library (1936), pp. 24-28. J. C. Maxwell in his recent edition of the play (*Arden Shakespeare*, 1953, p. xvii) has detected a similar origin for variants in V. ii. 71 and 106, the first lines on 14 recto and verso respectively.

⁴ See Note A on p. 208.

⁵ He is 'Andronicus' at II. iii. 259 and III. i. 11 when Marcus is not present, but whoever wrote the heading to the inserted scene can hardly have realized that Marcus had an equal right to the name. In the text he is, of course, often referred to or addressed as 'Andronicus' even by his brother.

⁶ For example Chambers, who suspects the hand of Webster in at least part of it. H. T. Price is 'certain that [the scene] is not a later addition' (*Adams Memorial*

there when the play was divided into acts, for without it Act III would consist of only one scene of 300 lines, but the division is certainly not original,⁷ and may have been introduced at the time of printing.

The directions have been sometimes edited and occasionally supplemented in F, but they differ chiefly in the addition of a number of prompter's notes: I. i. i 'Flourish' and 'Drum & Colours' [for 'Drums and Trumpets']; 18 'Enter . . . aloft . . .'; 223 'A long Flourish till they come downe'; II. ii. 10 'Winde Homes' [evidently a marginal duplication of 'and wind homes in a peale']: characteristic are the changes at i. i. 70 'Sound Drums and Trumpets, and [F Trumpets. And] then enter two of Titus sonnes, and then [F Sonnes; After them,] two men bearing a Coffin couered with black, then two other sonnes, then [F Sonnes. After them,] Titus Andronicus, and then Tamora the Queene of Gothes and her two sonnes Chiron and Demetrius, with Aron the More, and others as many as can be, then [F bee: They] set downe the Coffin, and Titus speakes', and at v. iii. 26 'Trumpets sounding, [F Hoboyes. | A Table brought in. |] Enter Titus like a Cooke, placing the dishes [Q2, F the meate on the table], and Lauinia with a vaile ouer her face'.⁸ This indicates some dependence on a playhouse text, and some normalization of speakers' names points in the same direction, though the tendency is already observable in £2. The only instance of purging is the substitution of 'Out' for 'Zounds' at Iv. ii. 71. One would normally infer collation with the prompt-book. But any independent manuscript must have contained the original text of the six passages conjecturally reconstructed in Q2, and no collator could have overlooked such a

Studies, 1948, p. 102), but his arguments are not conclusive. Wilson is content to accept it as Shakespeare's and of a piece with what he takes to be the rest of his revision: so is Maxwell. A leaf might, of course, have been lost from the foul papers after the prompt-book had been prepared and before Q was printed from them.

⁷ At one point F makes a division where the action is continuous, altering the Q direction 'Exeunt, sound trumpets, manet Moore' to 'Exeunt. | Actus Secunda. [*sic*] | Flourish. | Enter Aaron alone', which clumsily makes the trumpets herald Aaron's entry instead of the Emperor's exit.

⁸ It is curious that, whereas both Q and F have the direction 'He [Titus] stabs the Emperesse' at v. iii. 63, no text has any direction for Saturninus to kill Titus at 1. 64 or for Lucius to kill Saturninus at 1. 66. The action is, of course, plain from the text.

discrepancy, for instance, as the addition of four lines at the end of the play. The most plausible inference is that the company did not possess the original prompt-book but had been using an annotated quarto for the purpose.⁹

The difficulty about this solution is that there is some evidence of F having received correction from an independent source. This includes the addition of two lines, namely i. i. 398 'Yes, and will Nobly him remunerate',¹⁰ and 'What booke?' inserted after iv. i. 36, two major alterations, and a few verbal changes. On closer examination, however, it appears by no means certain that any of these additions and alterations do in fact imply access to an independent source. The inclusion of the words 'What booke?', which are anticipated from 1. 41, is certainly an error, and is as likely to have had its source in a quarto prompt-book as in a manuscript one.¹¹ One of the cruxes of the play is at v. iii. 73, where, just after Marcus has begun 'Oh let me teach you . . .', Q makes a 'Romane Lord' butt in with a long speech beginning 'Let Rome her selfe bee bane vnto her selfe'. F, apparently thinking this an impious sentiment in the mouth of a Roman, transferred the speech to a 'Goth', regardless of the fact that the speaker later refers to Aeneas as 'our Ancestor'! There is little doubt that Capell was right in continuing the speech to Marcus and reading 'Lest' in place of 'Let', though how the Roman Lord crept in is unexplained. In any case no one defends the reading of F, and there is therefore no reason to suppose that it had any authority behind it. The most interesting of the alterations in F is the reconstruction at in. i. 33-37. The passage stands thus in the several texts:

QI if they did heare
 They would not marke me, if they did marke,
 They would not pittie me, yet pleade I must,
 And bootlesse vnto them.
 Therefore I tell my sorrowes to the stones . . .

⁹ See Note B on p. 208.

¹⁰ See Note C on p. 209.

¹¹ Wilson's suggestion that the words are 'the relic of a partially deleted passage' in the prompt-book has since been (privately) withdrawn. They might have been intended as a sort of catchword to connect with 1. 41, if someone had the sense to cancel the forced and rather fatuous lines that intervene (see p. 209, Note D, end).

Q2 reads the same except for the insertion of 'or' before 'if' in 1. 34.

Q3

if they did heare

They would not marke me, or if they did marke,
All bootlesse vnto them.

Therefore I tell my sorrowes booties to the stones . . .

if they did heare

They would not marke me: oh if they did heare
They would not pittie me.

Therefore I tell my sorrowes booties to the stones.¹²

Here it is obvious that F had recourse to some authority besides Q3 since it restored the half-line 'They would not pittie me', though it certainly made a very poor job of emendation. The prompt-book could, of course, have supplied the half-line, had it been available; but we have already seen that that is unlikely, and in the present instance there is a trifle of evidence to indicate that the prompt-book was not the source on which F relied. For the prompt-book presumably agreed with Qi, both being derived from the foul papers, and in that case it lacked the 'or' in 1. 34.¹³ Yet this 'or', misprinted 'oh', appears in F, which should therefore depend on Q2. This can only mean one thing: namely that the company had been using as its prompt-book an annotated copy of Q2, and that, unwilling to part with this, they commissioned a scribe to correct a copy of Q3 in accordance with it for the use of the printer.¹⁴ The train of evidence may be slender, but it is at least clear, and the conclusion to which it points is a perfectly reasonable one. None of the minor verbal variants in F conflict with it in anyway.¹⁵ There remains then only i. i. 398 as

¹² The short line and the imperfect connexion in Qi suggest error. Wilson, who calls it 'a typical Sh. tangle', solves it satisfactorily by simply omitting the short 1. 36, but he does not discuss the implication of the curiously variant texts. Qz sought to make 1. 34 smoother by its small insertion. Q3 omitted 1. 35 owing to its repeating 1. 34, and then made the very feeble emendation of 'All' for 'And': it also accidentally repeated 'booties' in 1. 37. F accidentally repeated 'heare' in place of 'marke' and retained the unmetrical 'booties'.

¹³ The 'or' might of course have been accidentally omitted in Qi, but it is at least not open to Wilson to argue so, since he omits it himself.

" Presumably the manuscript insertion, ur. ii, was transcribed at the same time.

¹⁵ See Note D on p. 209.

evidence that F had access to a manuscript authority. It cannot be altogether disregarded, but the line is inessential and detachable, and it is not impossible that it should have been concocted in the theatre to make clearer the implication of Titus' rhetorical question and emphasize his simple-minded reliance on the favour of the Queen whose eldest son he had just slaughtered! The conclusion remains, therefore, that there is no reason to suppose that in 1623 the company possessed any other prompt-book than a printed quarto in which one scene had been inserted in manuscript.¹⁶

NOTE A (*page 204*)

Most of the variants in Qz are the usual errors, small corrections, and accidental changes by the compositor. But a few must be deliberate and argue the hand of an editor. The most important is the obviously correct transfer of iv. iii. 77 from the Clown to Titus. At II. iii. 222 the senseless 'bereaud in blood' was corrected in manuscript in the only surviving copy of *Qi* to 'heere reav'd of lyfe': Qz reads 'embrewed heere': Wilson plausibly conjectures 'berayed' for 'bereaud'. A possible improvement is made at v. ii. 142, where the past tense 'knew . . . supposd' is changed to the present 'know . . . suppose'; but the alteration is not strictly necessary, and Wilson follows *Qi*. Three emendations that argue at least 'some classical learning in the corrector', as Wilson admits, are I. i. 226 'Tytans' for 'Tytus', II. iii. 231 'Piramus' for 'Priamus', and Iv. ii. 95 'Alcides' for 'Alciades'.

NOTE B (*page 206*)

The early history of the play is obscure. According to Henslowe's Diary it was performed (as 'titus & ondronicus') by the Earl of Sussex's men on 23 Jan. 1594, and was then a new play, to that company at any rate. According to the 1594 title-page it had already been 'Plaide by the Right Honourable the Earle of Darbie [earlier Lord Strange], Earle of Pembroke, and Earle of Sussex their Seruants'. All this was before the formation of the Lord Chamberlain's company. We know that the latter company never owned the foul papers since these had been used for Q in Feb. 1594; nor can we be certain that they ever acquired the prompt-copy, for the addition of . ii in F would only be evidence of the fact if the scene were original, which is in question. But whether they once possessed a manuscript prompt-book, or whether from the first they used a copy of *Qi* for the purpose, they must have lost it, since in 1623 they were unable to restore the original conclusion of the play. The loss presumably occurred between 1600 and 1611, for, as we shall see (p. 207), it was a copy of Qz rather than Q3 that they annotated and used as a prompt-book. Of course, 'loss' must be interpreted to cover destruction through constant use, which would be likely enough in the case of a manuscript that had been through the hands of four different companies.

¹⁶ See Note E on p. 209.

NOTE C (page 206)

Wilson, who, since he takes in. ii to be original, is bound to assume a manuscript prompt-book, conjectures that Q\$ was only roughly compared with it in order to incorporate the prompter's annotations, as was done in several other plays, and that since i. i. 398 comes immediately before an important direction, which had moreover received the prompter's attention, the editor happened to notice its absence in '3. This explanation, however, cannot be maintained. For one thing, the first of the mutilations in the copy of Qi from which Qz was printed involved the direction at v. iii. 26, a direction which the prompter later altered and expanded. These alterations F incorporated, yet it retained the spurious reading introduced by the editor of Q2, namely 'the meate on the table' in place of simply 'the dishes'. For another thing Wilson assumes the other line, 'What booke?' to have been also taken over from the prompt-book, though there is nothing in the way of a neighbouring stage-direction that can have directed the editor's attention to it. Nor is there in the case of III. i. 33-37 (see p. 206), which, on Wilson's theory, must also have been altered by comparison with the prompt-book.

NOTE D (page 207)

The most striking are perhaps the three following, II. iv. 41, Qi 'Cosen hast thou met', F 'hast thou met withall': 'withall' is a compositor's emendation designed to restore the verse after Q3 had accidentally omitted 'Cosen'. v. ii. 18, Qi 'Wanting a hand to giue that accord', F 'Wanting a hand to giue it action': Q may be right (at any rate with Pope's emendation 'giue it that') but the compositor did not understand and therefore altered it: 'accord' is what accords with his talk, appropriate gesture; Wilson compares *Hamlet*, in. ii. 19-20, 'suit the action to the word', v. iii. 199, Qi 'Her life was beastlie and deuouide of pittie', which F improves by reading 'Beast-like': this at least cannot have come from the original prompt-book, for it is in the line preceding the spurious ending.

NOTE E (page 208)

It will of course be noticed that the above account proceeds on the assumption that if, in the course of preparing the copy for F, the editor had become aware of the unoriginal nature of the passages reconstructed in £)2, he would have altered them. This assumption may be challenged. The editor of Qz did his work skilfully and his reconstruction is in no obvious way inferior to the original. Particularly at the end it might be thought that lines had been deliberately added to provide for Aaron. It is, therefore, not certain that an editor might not have preferred the readings of £)2 to those of Qi. At the same time, from our study of other plays it would appear that if a scribe were directed to bring a quarto into conformity with a manuscript he usually worked in a mechanical manner and took little heed of the intrinsic merit of the readings. The matter cannot be regarded as finally settled.

VII. THE TAMING OF THE SHREW (1592) 1594

A Shrew:¹ *Quarto* (1594).—The title runs: 'A Pleasant Conceited Historic, called The taming of a Shrew. As it was sundry times acted by the Right honorable the Earle of Pernbrook his seruants.' It was registered on 2 May. On 11 June following, according to Henslowe's Diary, 'the tamyng of A shrowe' was performed at the old Newington Butts theatre where the newly formed Admiral's and Chamberlain's companies were acting. It is not marked as a new play and the takings were small:² there is nothing to prove which version it was, but it was evidently in, or passed into, the possession of the Chamberlain's men.

The quarto exhibits some of the features of a reported text. It is less than 1550 lines long. Some of it is written in Marlowesque style and it pilfers freely, in snatches up to four lines at a time, from *Tamburlaine* and *Faustus*.³ Where the texts are parallel, that of *A Shrew* is sometimes only intelligible, or so it is alleged, by reference to *The Shrew*, and it misses the point of a joke.⁴ Comparison with Ariosto's *Suppositi* or Gascoigne's *Supposes*—the use of either the original or the translation being evident in both versions—shows that in plot and scene and characters *The Shrew* is closer to the source than is *A Shrew*. All the same *A Shrew* is not a 'bad' quarto of the usual type. Its points of verbal contact with *The Shrew* are comparatively rare, and it is for the most part

¹ It is of course convenient to distinguish the two plays, or the two versions, whichever one pleases to call them, as *A Shrew* and *The Shrew*, but there does not appear to have been any intentional distinction between the titles. The two pieces were regarded as identical for purposes of copyright and the Stationers' Register is consistent in the use of the indefinite article even as late as 1642. The same form also crops up occasionally in the headlines of all the folios after the first.

² 9.T.: none of the takings at this theatre were high and they declined during the brief season often days: 'hamlet' brought in only 8/., 'andronicus' js,

³ The borrowings are listed by F. S. Boas in his edition of *A Shrew*, 1908.

⁴ As first pointed out by Samuel Hickson more than a hundred years ago (*Notes and Queries*, 1850, i. 194, 226-7, 345-7). The seven passages in question (with references to Praetorius's facsimile of Q, 1886) are: II. i. 174 = sc. xv. 38; IV. iii. 69-72 — xi. 47-49; 123-6 = xiii. 35-39; 136-9 = xiii. 28-30; 171-3 = xiii. 56-58; V. ii. 176-9 = xvii. 140-3; 184-5 = xvii. 154-5. The evidence for the derivative character of *A Shrew* is convincingly marshalled by Duthie (as in note 10), pp. 338-46.

freely written in regular but flat and unpoetical blank verse. In fact, although here and there it shows unmistakable signs of memorization, it would need to be regarded, not so much as a reconstruction of an original on the lines of *The Shrew* as an imitation based on recollection of it.

Broadly speaking, three views have been taken of the relation between the two plays. These are to some extent bound up with questions of authorship. There is general agreement that in *The Shrew* the Christopher Sly framework and the Petruchio—Kate scenes are Shakespeare's, but in respect of the sub-plot of Bianca and her lovers opinion is more divided, (i) Originally, of course, *A Shrew* was regarded as the source play upon which *The Shrew* was based. This view is still held by Chambers, who assigns the sub-plot to a collaborator, whom he supposes to have made a fresh study of the *Suppositi* when he rewrote it. But such a view takes insufficient account of the derivative character of *A Shrew*, (ii) Impressed by this, some critics have taken *A Shrew* to be nothing but a 'bad' quarto of *The Shrew*, albeit of a rather unusual type.⁵ This view, originally advanced by Creizenach,⁶ was later ably defended by Peter Alexander⁷ and is endorsed by Dover Wilson in his edition of *The Shrew* (1928). But it too fails to take into account the whole of the evidence, (iii) Lastly, some have believed *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* to be independently derived from a common source. This was the position taken up as early as 1878 by ten Brink,⁸ but he gave no reason for his opinion, and it was left to two recent critics to develop the thesis independently—R. A. Houk⁹ and G. I. Duthie.¹⁰ Duthie's is a particularly lucid exposition of an intricate case. He first shows that the evidence for the derivative nature of *A Shrew* is confined to the main plot and

s In some 'bad' quartos, at least in *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*, there are passages of free but un-Shakespearian verse, where, as we suppose, the reporter's verbal recollection failed him altogether and he was reduced to rendering the general sense of the scene in his own pedestrian terms. If such conditions prevailed throughout we might, so it is suggested, get something like the text of *A Shrew*.

⁶ *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, iv (1909), 686-98.

⁷ *TLS*, 16 Sept. 1926.

⁸ *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, xiii. 94.

⁹ 'The Evolution of "The Taming of the Shrew"', *PMLA*, Dec. 1942, Ivii. 1009-38.

¹⁰ "'The Taming of a Shrew' and 'The Taming of the Shrew'", *RES*, Oct. 1943, xix. 337-56.

argues that it is, in respect of this, conclusive. On the other hand there are, in the sub-plot of *The Shrew* certain contradictions that can, it is claimed, be best accounted for on the assumption of a reworking of the material in *A Shrew*. The inference is that *A Shrew* is a 'bad' quarto of an earlier *Shrew* play from which *The Shrew* is also derived.¹¹ From this it follows that the Shakespearian main plot of *The Shrew* may have stood substantially in its present form in the original play (which probably dated from before the plague and may have been written for Pembroke's men) but that the sub-plot was refashioned at a later date. That the sub-plot was originally Shakespeare's there is nothing to suggest. Duthie speaks of Shakespeare 're-working' it and at the same time cutting out the Sly framework from the latter part of the play, but it is not clear whether this is a considered judgement. One would like to suppose that the loss of the conclusion of Sly's adventure was accidental.¹² If the poor success of the play at Newington Butts be held to imply that it was the original piece that was performed there, the revision may only have been undertaken after the Chamberlain's men had settled down at the Theatre.

The Shrew: Folio.—The rather full stage-directions, occasionally indefinite or petitory, are normal for the author: Ind. i. 15 'Falles asleepe'; ii. i 'Enter aloft the drunkard with attendants, some with apparel, Bason and Ewer, & other appurtenances, & Lord'; I. i. 48 'Enter Baptista with his two daughters, Katerina & Bianca, Gremio a Pantelowne, Hortensio sister [read suitor] to Bianca. Lucen. Tranio, stand by'; 150 'Exeunt ambo. Manet Tranio and Lucentio'; 253 'The Presenters aboue speakes'; 259 'They sit and marke'; ii. 17 'He rings him by the eares'; 141 'Enter Gremio and Lucentio disgu[i]sed'; 219 'Enter Tranio braue, and Biondello'; II. i. 22 'Strikes her'; 29 'Flies after Bianca'; 40 'Enter Gremio, Lucentio, in the habit of a meane man,

¹¹ Duthie, like Chambers, assumes that whoever rewrote the sub-plot made fresh use of the *Suppositi*. This may be thought unlikely. But it is only if we reject it as impossible that we are forced to accept Alexander's view. It may also be remarked that, though there seems no doubt that the author of the sub-plot in the original play did know the *Suppositi*, the use he made of it may not have been great, for there is some suggestion that he had other versions of the story in mind (see Duthie, p. 352).

¹² See Note A on p. 215.

Petruchio with Tranio, with his boy bearing a Lute and Bookes'; 143 'Enter Hortensio with his head broke'; 222 'she strikes him'; Iv. i. 109 'Enter foure or fiue seruingmen'; 153 'Enter one with water'; ii. 72 'Enter a Pedant'; iii. 31 'Beats him'; iv. I 'Enter Tranio, and the Pedant drest like Vincentio'; 19 'Enter Baptista and Lucentio: Pedant booted and bare headed' (some confusion here, for the disguised Pedant is on already); v. i. i 'Enter Biondello, Lucentio and Bianca, Gremio is out before' (i.e. Gremio comes on first and the others enter to him); 15 'Pedant lookes out of the window'; 114 'Exit Biondello, Tranio and Pedant as fast as may be'; 115 'Kneele'; ii. i 'Enter Baptista . . . The Seruingmen with Tranio bringing in a Banquet'; 37 'Drinkes to Hortensio'.¹³ But there are also notes that may have been added by the book-keeper: Ind. i. i 'Enter Beggar and Hostes, Christophero Sly' (the name, an obvious afterthought, comes from the text: his speeches are headed 'Beg.' throughout); 16 'Winde homes. Enter a Lord from hunting'; 73 'Sound trumpets'; ii. 37 'Musick'; i. i. i 'Flourish. Enter Lucentio, and his man Tranio' (the flourish marks the beginning of the main play); III. ii. I 'Enter Baptista . . . and others, attendants' (presumably a gloss on 'others'); Iv. i. 186 'Enter Curtis a seruant' (this is a re-entry and the gloss is obviously misplaced). There is one certain actor's name, 'Sincklo', which heads a speech by one of the Players in the Induction (i. 98). The Lord recognizes him as having played a part that was 'aptly fitted', and he replies 'I thinke 'twas Soto that your honor meanes'. There would be no point in this unless it were an actual part played by an actor whose appearance was likely to be remembered, and we know that Sincklo's appearance was striking and that there actually was such a part.¹⁴ His introduction is therefore deliberate and his name due to the author. There are several other possible actors' names, the introduction of which would have

13 The phrases 'bare headed' and 'as fast as may be' are also found in *The Comedy of Errors*, from which Dover Wilson concludes that the directions in the two plays were written by the same hand. No doubt they were—by Shakespeare's.

¹⁴ See p. 115, and discussion of 'Henry IV. For the part (presumably in a play later revised by Fletcher as *Women Pleased*) see Wilson's note. The 'Soto' of the *Narcissus* merriment is, of course, nothing but 'sot' modified for a rime. The same association may underlie the character-name.

to be put down to the book-keeper. The most interesting is the mysterious 'Par.' at iv. ii. 71, who may have acted the Pedant.¹⁵ Then there is the no less mysterious 'Peter' who enters to no purpose at iv. iv. 69. This looks like an error. There is also a 'Nicke' who speaks as a 'Messenger' at in. i. 82 and a Tel.' who speaks for the Haberdasher at iv. iii. 63. If these are actors' names they should not be identified with the servants Peter and Nick elsewhere, for those named in the text cannot be actors.¹⁶ The seeming additions by the book-keeper might point to prompt-copy that had retained many of the author's directions unaltered, or they might be notes made on the foul papers during the process of reading and casting. The latter is the more likely in view of the author's confusion over the dress of the Pedant at iv. iv. i, 19, and the book-keeper's over the standing of Curtis at iv. i. 186, and the unexplained Peter of iv. iv. 69.¹⁷ And there is one piece of evidence that seems decisive in this direction. At in. i. 46-60 and iv. ii. i—8 there is utter confusion among the speakers Hortensio, Luciano, and Bianca. Now Hortensio is here disguised as 'Licio', and Dover Wilson makes the very plausible suggestion that the confusion is due to the use of the inadequate prefixes *//.*, */u.*, and *bi*. These could only have appeared in foul papers; in the prompt-book the speeches must have been properly assigned.¹⁸

Moreover the entrances and exits and the designation of characters are not what we should expect to find in any manuscript that had been properly prepared for use on the stage. At ii. i. 39 Hortensio is omitted and Biondello appears merely as Tranio's 'boy'. At in. ii. i Lucentio should have been specified as among the 'others'. Grumio is missing at in. ii. 186, Lucentio at iv. ii. 6, and Petruchio at v. ii. 1; an Officer should enter at v. i. 95, though he does not speak. Lucentio is made to enter along with Biondello at Iv. iv. 73 when he is apparently already present. Many exits are unmarked. Sly is introduced as 'Beggar' and always speaks as such, but he is described as 'the drunkard' at Ind. ii. I. He

¹⁵ See p.

119¹.

¹⁶ See p. 166, Note F.

¹⁷ Wilson sees in the first two cases evidence of insertion in the course of revision: Peter he believes to be a servant who enters without speaking.

¹⁸ See Note B on p. 216.

and the others 'aboue' are called 'The Presenters' at i. i. 254. The Shrew is Katerina, Katherina, Katherine, and Kate indifferently.

But, granting that F was printed from a manuscript that had been annotated for the stage but not itself used in performance, there still remains some uncertainty respecting its nature. Since the play was probably an old Pembroke's piece refashioned for the Chamberlain's men, it is difficult to tell how much of the actual papers was old and how much new. The sub-plot must have been completely recast. There is no evidence that the Shakespearian main plot was, but it too may have been rewritten for anything we can tell. The simplest thing is to suppose that fresh foul papers of the whole were produced in 1594. But any history of the play we reconstruct is bound to be more than usually speculative.¹⁹

There is a clumsy division into acts only. The two scenes of the Induction are included in Act I, the second act is not marked, Acts III, IV, and V run to 680, 541, and 159 lines respectively. Modern editors have made their own division, separating the Induction and making Act IV begin two scenes and Act V one scene earlier. There is nothing absolutely impossible about the F division, but it is obviously a makeshift and is more likely to have originated in the printing-house than on the stage.

NOTE A (page 212)

After the two scenes of the Induction, common to both versions, *The Shrew* has only one short Sly interlude, at the end of the first scene. A *Shrew* has no interlude at this point, but instead it has four later interludes that are not in *The Shrew* (scs. v. 216-23, xi. 78-79, xvi. 45-54, 127-33, the last providing for the removal of Sly before the final scene) besides the conclusion. We can understand the omission of some at least of these interludes if the action of the play called for the use of the balcony, from which, according to F, Sly views the proceedings. (In Q Sly appears to have been accommodated on the stage, which would doubtless be necessary if the version was to serve a touring company.) But it is difficult to believe that after his elaborate induction Shakespeare would have willingly left the matter in the air and have not provided

¹⁹ If ten Brink's thesis is accepted, the case of *The Shrew* is in a measure parallel to that of *Richard III*, in which Shakespeare appears to have borrowed something from an earlier play that is only known from a 'bad' quarto: see Dover Wilson, "Shakespeare's 'Richard III' and 'The True Tragedy of Richard III', 1594", *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Oct. 1952, iii. 299-306.

for Sly's removal and awakening. There is, it is true, nothing discernibly Shakespearian in the versions of the Sly scenes preserved in *A Shrew*, which show the hand of the imitator of Marlowe, though some have detected in Sly's 'oh Lord sirra, I haue had The brauest dreame to night, that euer thou Hardest in all thy life' an embryonic anticipation of the dream that had no bottom (*A Midsummer-NightV Dream*, iv. i. 210 ff.).

NOTE B (page 214)

Wilson infers the intervention of an 'editor' guilty of misinterpreting the prefixes. But it is not clear that we need invoke the presence of anyone not normally concerned in preparing the copy. There must always have been matters to attend to before the copy was handed to the printer, if only making sure that the papers were complete and in order, and unless unreasonable reliance was placed in Jaggard's discretion, somebody in the theatre must have at least glanced through the manuscripts. Of course, the book-keeper should have known better than to make such a blunder as this, but if he were careless or pressed, he may have thought he could interpret the prefixes without troubling to read the passage attentively.

VIII. THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA

1594

Folio.—The text, like that of *The Merry Wives*, its successor in the *Folio*, is remarkable for the fact that it contains no stage-directions beyond entrances for the characters massed at the head of each scene, generally in the order of appearance but irrespective of when they appear, and exits usually but not invariably at the end. This has been thought to point to copy 'assembled' from actors' 'parts', but it may have been a peculiarity of the scribe Ralph Crane,¹ who, there is some reason to suppose, transcribed for press not only *The Two Gentlemen* and *The Merry Wives* but also *The Tempest* and *Measure for Measure*, that is, the first four Comedies in the *Folio*. At least in the present case the lavish use of parentheses and hyphens goes far to betray his hand. Transcript there must have been, for no playhouse manuscript could have exhibited the features mentioned. What sort of manuscript, however, lay behind the transcript it is difficult to say in the absence of the main source of evidence upon which we are wont to rely. The mere fact that a transcript was made might be supposed to imply that no foul papers were available, were it not that transcription appears to have been the editorial policy at the outset of the undertaking. More significant, in the circumstances, is the 'Finis' at the end of the first act, which may be compared with the 'Finis, Actus primus' &c. of *Twelfth Night* and suggests that, of the act and scene division, the former at least was not introduced at the time of printing.² The division is unlikely to be original, but it is more likely to have been introduced at some later date into the prompt-book than into foul papers. Indeed, foul papers are a very unlikely source in view of the facts that in their own peculiar fashion the directions provide for the presence of all necessary characters (not, however, for re-entries, though

¹ See pp. 156-8.

² Suspicion might fall on Crane, since the formula 'Finis Actus prii' &c. occurs regularly in his transcript of Middleton's *Witch*. But in this he was probably following his copy, for the formula is also found in Middleton's autograph manuscript of *A Game at Chess*, whereas it is not found in Crane's transcript of Fletcher's *Demetrius and Enanthe*.

exits are sometimes marked) and that there is no irregularity in their designation.

There is much confusion of time and locality and some of action, besides occasionally apparent corruption, in the text. In his edition in 1921 Dover Wilson argued that the play, which runs to no more than 2,300 lines, was cut and partly rewritten by another, inferior, hand, and hinted that it may not always have belonged to the Chamberlain's company. Chambers, on the contrary, while admitting the possibility of some omissions, considers that 'the badness is not necessarily un-Shakespearean' and for the rest finds nothing that may not be accounted for by carelessness on the part of the author, suggesting that 'early in the career of the Chamberlain's men was a not unlikely time for hasty composition'.

IX. LOVE'S LABOUR 'S LOST. (1593?) 1595

A king of Navarre, albeit called Ferdinand,¹ who has a Berowne and a Longaville among his intimates, can hardly fail to suggest Henry of Navarre with his chief supporters Marechal Biron and the Due de Longueville. It has also been pointed out that the meeting of the King with 'a Princess of France, the gaiety and masques attending the meeting, the business of Aquitaine and the "hundred thousand crowns" ' find a parallel in the meeting at Nerac between Henry and his estranged wife Marguerite de Valois, also a Princess of France, at which questions of dowry involving Aquitaine were discussed, and that even the story told of Katharine's sister at v. ii. 13—18 seems to allude to an incident narrated by Marguerite in her *Memoires*—though how Shakespeare came to be possessed of these details is not apparent.² Such adumbration of contemporary characters, particularly in an amiable light, is not exactly what we should expect after Henri IV had forfeited English sympathy by turning Catholic in the summer of 1593, and there are references in the play that point to a date later than this. It is possible, therefore, that Shakespeare worked on the basis of an earlier 'French comedy'³ that drew upon sources not generally available; but even if that was the case, there is no necessity to suppose that he took from it more than the general situation together with a few names and incidental allusions.

Hypothetical 'bad' quarto (1596?).—The title-page of the quarto of 1598, which was printed without entrance in the Stationers' Register, runs: 'A Pleasant Conceited Comedie called, Loues labors lost. As it was presented before her Highnes this last Christmas. Newly corrected and augmented[.] By W. Shakespere. Imprinted at London by W. W. for Cutbert Burby.' Analogy with *Romeo and Juliet*, also unregistered, the 'good' quarto of which, 'Newly

¹ In directions and speech-prefixes only, never in the text.

² See Dover Wilson's edition (1923) citing Abel Lefranc, *Sous le masque de William Shakespeare* (1919). None of the sources were yet available in print.

³ According to Henslowe's Diary a 'frenche Comodey' was performed as a new play on ii Feb. 1595, but this is too late for our purpose, and it belonged to the Admiral's men.

corrected, augmented, and amended', was published by the same Cuthbert Burby the following year, suggests that in this case too there had been an earlier 'bad' quarto, now lost, possibly also from the press of John Danter. This view, originally advanced by Pollard in 1909, is now generally accepted.⁴ Danter's press was seized while in the act of printing *Romeo and Juliet* in 1597, so that, if he also printed a 'bad' quarto of *Love's Labour's Lost* this is likely to have been the earlier of the two, an order also suggested by the fact that the 'bad' quarto of *Love's Labour's Lost* was superseded by an authorized edition a year earlier than that of *Romeo and Juliet*.

'Good' quarto (1598).—If the statement on the title-page about a court performance 'this last Christmas' was reprinted from the 'bad' quarto, the season referred to would probably be that of 1595-6; if, as seems more likely, the statement was new, it referred, of course, to the season of 1597—8. The records do not help us, for the Chamberlain's men gave several performances at court on each of these occasions, but on neither are any titles mentioned.

The quarto is badly printed, the work, it would seem, of an inexperienced compositor, and it abounds in typographical errors besides more serious corruptions. It also abounds in erratic and archaic spellings, of which Dover Wilson furnishes a list. Some may be aberrations of the compositor, but some can be paralleled in other Shakespearian texts and are doubtless referable to the author. There is also great irregularity in the names and designations of characters and speakers,⁵ an irregularity that recalls *Romeo and Juliet* and which is here occasionally aggravated by the misreading of abbreviated prefixes. So do two clear instances of false starts:⁶ Iv. iii. 296—3177 is duplicated in what immediately follows and an expanded version of v. ii. 827-32 appears in 11. 847-64.

¹ See pp. 49-50. Whether 'corrected and augmented' is intended to imply that the play itself had been revised is uncertain. The Cuckoo song (v. ii. 904 ff.) at any rate cannot be earlier than 1597, for the lady-smocks come from Gerard's *Herbal*, entered on 6 June that year (J. W. Lever in *RES*, Apr. 1952, iii. 117-20).

³ See pp. 113 ff. and Note A on p. 224.

⁶ See p. no.

⁷ There is a short line, 'With our selues' (l. 316+), for which Wilson has an ingenious explanation. He supposes Shakespeare to have marked the passage for deletion with a marginal bracket, which he closed a line too soon, and the lower arm

Throughout what in F became the first three acts the stage-directions are confined to entrances and exits; later they become more frequent and descriptive. Everywhere they illustrate the author's uncertainty how to describe his characters and, particularly in the last act, his vague definition of groups: I. i. I 'Enter Ferdinand K. of Nauar, Berowne, Longauill, and Dumaine'; 182 'Enter a Constable with Costard with a letter'; ii. I 'Enter Armado and Moth his page'; 132 'Enter Clowne, Constable, and Wench'; II. i. I 'Enter the Princesse of France, with three attending Ladies and three Lordes'; III. i. I 'Enter Braggart and his Boy'; 71 'Enter Page and Clowne'; Iv. i. I 'Enter the Princesse, a Forrester, her Ladyes, and her Lordes'; 150 'Exeunt. Shoot [i.e. Shout] within'; ii. I 'Enter Dull, Holofernes, the Pedant and Nathaniel'; 84 'Enter Jaquenetta and the Clowne'; iii. I 'Enter Berowne with a paper in his hand, alone'; 21 'He standes a side. The King entreth'; 45 'Enter Longauill. The King steps a side'; 59 'He reades the Sonnet'; 100 'Dumaine reades his Sonnet'; 195 'He reades the letter'; v. i. 17 'Draw-out his Table-booke'; ii. I 'Enter the Ladies'; 158 'Enter Black-moores with musicke, the Boy with a speach and the rest of the Lordes disguysed'; 310 'Enter the King and the rest'; 337 'Enter the Ladies'; 565 'Enter Curate for Alexander'; 592 'Enter Pedant for ludas, and the Boy for Hercules'; 671 'Berowne steps foorth'; 678 'The partie is gone' (a fragment of text printed as a direction); 723 'Enter a Messenger Mounsier Marcade'; 901 'Enter all'. Note that the Constable is Dull, the Clowne is Costard, the Wench is Jaquenetta, the 'three attending Ladies' are Rosaline, Katharine, and Maria, but later 'the Ladies' include the Princess, the 'three Lordes' attendant include Boyet, the Braggart is Armado, the Boy or Page is Moth, the Pedant is Holofernes, and the Curate is Nathaniel. The duplications at Iv. ii. I and v. ii. 723 need not imply annotation by the book-keeper. One could hardly have more typical author-directions.

That, as Chambers says, something has gone wrong in

of which partly cancelled one line. But, as Chambers says, the words look like an attempt to alter 1. 316 before deciding to delete it. The words make no sense, and nothing is needed between 11. 316 and 317.

ii. i is evident, for the relation of the Lords and the Ladies makes no sense. For this old puzzle Dover Wilson, developing earlier views of Capell and H. B. Charlton,⁸ has produced a plausible and possibly correct solution on the assumption that when Shakespeare introduced the mistaken-identity motive into v. ii he intended to remove it from II. i, but carelessly bungled the necessary alterations. What is needed to put matters right is the deletion of ll. 114—28 and 180—93 and the substitution of 'KathenV for 'Rosalin' at l. 195 and 'Rosalin' for 'Katherin' at l. 210.⁹

In all this Dover Wilson sees evidence of revision of the play on the occasion of a performance at court at Christmas 1597, but the alterations in question might have been made quite as easily, and much more probably, during the original process of composition. Everything points to Q having been printed from foul papers.¹⁰

Q ends with the mysterious subscription in large type: 'The wordes of Mercuric, are harsh after the songes of Apollo/ To Chambers the addition 'looks like the beginning of an epilogue or a presenter's speech for a following mask'. He is probably right, assuming that such a speech was in prose. But had it been designed for the original production we should expect to find the whole. It may have been an afterthought, possibly for the court performance; but in that case it is not obvious why a note of it should have been made in the foul papers. There was a later revival at court early in January 1605 and a private performance was arranged soon

⁸ *The Library*, Oct. 1917, viii. 355.

⁹ Chambers discredits Wilson's explanation and suggests that confusion may have arisen through an attempt, such as that which some critics assume to have been made in *Romeo and Juliet*, to use a corrected copy of the 'bad' quarto to print from. An endeavour to explain the textual peculiarities of Q on this basis was first made by Van Dam in *English Studies* in Aug. 1925, and later by Crete Hjort (Greta Hort) in *MLR* in Apr. 1926 (xxi. 140-6), but it is not clear that the supposed use made of the 'bad' quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* ltd. to irregularities similar to those found in *Love's Labour 'j* Lost.

¹⁰ Wilson assumes that Shakespeare's much-altered fair copy was used as a prompt-book. This is, perhaps, not impossible—if we allow that such inconsistency in speakers' names would have been tolerated by the prompter—for the book-keeper would recognize Shakespeare's deletions and would not misinterpret his prefixes as the compositor seems to have done. But there is little to suggest a fair copy at all, and the assumption is unsupported by evidence. It was presumably made because anyhow else at the time could Wilson account for Shakespeare's autograph having survived.

afterwards, perhaps at the Earl of Southampton's, The title of a late quarto in 1631 implies that the play held the stage at the Blackfriars.

Folio.—There is no doubt that F was set up from Q with the usual printing-house corrections and corruptions. Copies of Q are known to differ, and a few F variants, both corrections and corruptions, may be Q readings that have not otherwise survived. That the text received some editorial attention appears from a rather unsuccessful attempt to reduce speakers' names to order, and there may have been some emendation. There is nothing that would be beyond the scope of an intelligent press reader, but there is elsewhere little to justify the assumption of the presence of such a person in Jaggard's office. A single substitution of 'loue' for 'God' (v. ii. 316) is slender evidence for any connexion with the stage. The directions are virtually unaltered. The addition of 'Song' at III. i. I follows indications in the text. At the end we have:

Brag. The Words of Mercuric,
Are harsh after the songs of Apollo:
You that way; we this way.

Exeunt omnes

—the editor's desperate attempt to fit the final words of Q into the structure of the play.¹¹ Once again *Love's Labour's Lost* resembles *Romeo and Juliet* in that F was printed from Q without reference to any playhouse authority.¹² F introduces a division into acts only (misprinting the fifth 'Actus Quartus') of monstrously disproportionate lengths—509, 257, 207, 710, and 1104 lines respectively. Probably it was made at the time of printing, for in this case the note 'Finis Actus Primus' (cf. *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*) looks as though it had been added merely to fill up space at the foot of a column.

¹¹ On the strength of this Wilson makes the surprising suggestion that F was printed from a copy of Q that had been used as a prompt-book: it is, of course, inconceivable.

¹² This is rather surprising. We can only suppose that the editors, knowing that the 'bad' quartos had been replaced by others printed from Shakespeare's own manuscripts, were content to leave it at that without looking farther into the texts.

NOTE A (*page* 220)

In this Wilson is, as usual, inclined to see evidence of revision, and to some extent this may be so, though the revision need not be of later date. But, as Chambers observes, it is not clear that this offers more than a partial explanation. Different in character from other irregularities is the occasional appearance in the text of Duke for King (I.i. 182, ii. 38, 132, II. i. 38) and of Queen for Princess (II. i. 8, iv. ii. 134, 143, iii. 41: also as prefix at ii. i. 13 and throughout Iv. i and v. ii, though it is only near the end of the last scene that the Princess learns of her father's death). They may conceivably have survived from an earlier play. After all, Marguerite de Valois was 'Reine Margot', and there was plenty in the lives of her and her husband to supply matter for a rather scandalous chronicle. Would it be altogether fanciful to recall that before marrying Henry she had been the mistress of the Due de Guise? Monsieur Marcade, who appears at v. ii. 723 in place of the usually anonymous messenger, must certainly have had an earlier history.

X. ROMEO AND JULIET. 1595

Resemblances in the textual history of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Love's Labour 's Lost* have already been noted in considering the latter. The two are also akin in lyrical tone and the use of rime in elaborate metrical patterns.

'*Bad*' quarto (1597).—The title-page reads: 'An excellent conceited Tragedie of Romeo and Iuliet. As it hath been often (with great applause) plaid publicquely, by the right Honourable the L. of Hunsdon his Seruants. London, Printed by Iohn Danter'. Shakespeare's company was known by this title only between 22 July 1596, when George Carey succeeded his father, the Lord Chamberlain, in the title and in the patronage of the players, and 17 April 1597, when he was in turn appointed to his father's office.¹ The title-leaf formed part of the first sheet to come off the press, and Danter must, therefore, have begun printing the play before, or at any rate soon after, 17 April. In fact it must have been some little time before, since a minute of 10 April in Court-Book B of the Stationers' Company records that during the preceding Lent (9 February to 26 March inclusive) Danter had been found printing a papistical book and that in consequence two presses belonging to him (and he is unlikely to have had more than two) were to be 'defaced and made vn-serviceable for pryntinge'. This must have put an end to his activities, at least for the time being, and in fact we find that only the first four sheets (A—D) of *Romeo and Juliet* came from his press: the later sheets (E—K) are printed in a different type and style and are clearly the work of a different, if unidentified, printer.

It is generally agreed that Q₁ is a memorial reconstruction, of which it shows all the usual stigmas. The report varies greatly in quality, degenerating as it proceeds. In some of the earlier scenes the text is very close to Q₂, whereas most of the ending is little more than a summary paraphrase. There are several passages of un-Shakespearian verse that render the same situation as Q₂ with little or no direct verbal resemblance, but which yet on examination prove to

¹ See Note A on p. 232.

be a mosaic of words and phrases from different parts of the genuine text. Sometimes a displaced passage is correctly reproduced, whereas in its proper context it is only paraphrased. There is a garbled version of the sonnet-prologue, but the chorus that in Q2 separates the (modern) first and second acts is absent. Occasionally in scenes of action dialogue is replaced by description (e.g. I. i. 70). There are borrowings or echoes from other Shakespearian plays. The text has been most closely studied by H. R. Hoppe,² who advances the plausible theory that the report was of a somewhat shortened version of the play by actors who had earlier taken part in a full performance and who endeavoured to expand the abridged text by a rather hazy recollection of the full one.³ He finds the parts of Romeo and Paris better reported than others and concludes that the text was put together by the actors of these roles, though some of their speeches are admittedly inferior and they share in the general breakdown at the end.⁴ A rather perplexing bibliographical feature of Qi is that on 64 recto and verso, corresponding to i. iii, and on C3 verso and C4 recto, corresponding to i. v. 113-46, the speeches of the Nurse are set in italic type.⁵ The most obvious explanation is that here the reporter was able to make use of an actor's 'part' and that this happened to be written in Italian script. At the same time, except in the first thirty-six lines of i. iii (of which more later), the speeches in question do not agree particularly closely with Q2, and it seems therefore more likely that the actor wrote out his part from memory than that he supplied the reporter with the original scroll.

The stage-directions in Qi are consistent with the assumed origin of the text (those starred in the following list have nothing corresponding in Qs): I. i. I 'Enter 2. Seruing-men of the Capolets'; 42 'Enter two Seruingmen of the Moun-tagues'; 70 'They draw, to them enters Tybalt, they fight, to

² 'The First Quarto Version of "Romeo and Juliet", II. vi and iv. v. 43 ff.', *RES*, July 1938, xiv. 271-84; *The Ead Quarto of 'Romeo and Juliet': a bibliographical and textual study*, Cornell University Press, 1948. His main conclusions are endorsed by G. I. Duthie, *MLR*, July 1950, xlv. 375-7; and see p. 234, Note E.

³ See Note B on p. 232.

⁴ His attempt to identify the actors of these parts is less convincing than other portions of his thesis.

⁵ So is a speech of Peter's at the head of CI recto, I. iii. 100-4, but this is doubtless due to a blunder by the compositor.

them the Prince, old Mountague, and his wife, old Capulet and his wife, and other Citizens and part them'; iii. I 'Enter Capulets wife and Nurce'; v. 17 'Enter old Capulet with the Ladies'; 124 'They whisper in his eare'; II. iv. 140 'He walkes by them, and sings'; 161 'She turnes to Peter her man'; vi. 16 'Enter Iuliet somewhat fast, and embraceth Romeo'; III. i. 93 'Tibalt vnder Romeos arme thrusts Mercutio(.) in[,] and flyes'; 136 'Fight, Tibalt falles'; ii. 32 'Enter Nurse wringing her hands, with the ladder of cordes in her lap'; iii. 118 'He offers to stab himselfe, and the Nurse snatches the dagger away'; 162 'Nurse offers to goe in and turnes againe'; iv. II 'Paris offers to goe In, and Capolet calls him againe'; v. i 'Enter Romeo and Iuliet at the window'; 42 'He goeth downe'; 64 'She goeth downe from the windowe'; 160 'She kneeles downe'; 234 'She lookes after Nurse'; Iv. iii. 58 'She fals vpon her bed within the Curtaines'; iv. I 'Enter Nurse with hearbs, Mother'; 3 'Enter Oldeman'; 15 'Enter Seruingman with Logs & Coales'; v. 22 'Enter Oldeman'; 50 'A11 at once cry out and wring their hands'; 95 'They all but the Nurse goe foorth, casting Rosemary on her and shutting the Curtens'; v. i. 12 'Enter Balthasar his man booted'; iii. I 'Enter Countie Paris and his Page with flowers and sweete water'; 11 'Paris strewes the Tomb with flowers'; 17 'Boy whistles and calls. *My Lord.* \ Enter Romeo and Balthasar, with a torch a[nd] a mattocke, and a crow of yron'; 121 'Enter Fryer with a Lanthorne'; 139 'Fryer stoops and lookes on the blood and weapons'; 147 'Iuliet rises'; 170 'She stabs herselfe and falles'. Most of these directions might no doubt have been written by the author picturing the scene, but they might even better record the impressions of a spectator: 'somewhat fast' (II. vi. 16) suggests the latter, so does 'at the window' (III. v. I) where Q2 has the technical 'aloft'. Many actions described are what actors would naturally supply without prompting (in. v. 234, v. iii. 139), and it is noticeable how many are derived from the text. Thus 'vnder Romeos arme' (in. i. 93) reflects 'I was hurt vnder your arme'; the 'cordes' carried by the Nurse (in. ii. 32) are mentioned in the text, but the ladder' betrays a knowledge of what they are to be used for; of the servingman's 'Logs & Coales' (iv.

iv. 15) the 'Logs' come from the text, and 'Coals' is a poor repetition in place of the 'spits' of Q2. Sometimes it is only the text of Q2 that supplies the clue, and the Qi direction may rest on recollection of performance. Juliet 'kneeles downe' (III. v. 160) because she says 'Good Father, I beseech you on my knees', words which are not in Qi: that the Nurse enters 'with hearbs' (IV. iv. I) is plain from Q2, in which Lady Capulet bids her 'fetch more spices', though there is no hint of this in Qi. But occasionally Qi has a direction that cannot be based on visual memory and proves a knowledge of words preserved only in Q2. Thus Paris enters 'with flowers and sweete water' (v. iii. I): 'with flowers I strew thy Bridale bed' is in the Qi text, but 'thy Canopie . . . Which with sweet water nightly I will dewe' is peculiar to Q2. More complex is the example at v. iii. 22, where Romeo enters 'with a torch, a[n]d a mattocke, and a crow of yron'. This comes substantially from the text, 'Giue mee this mattocke, and this wrenching Iron', but in Q2 it is Friar Laurence who actually carries a 'Crowe' (l. 121), and that this is original is proved by his bidding Friar John 'Get me an Iron Crow, and bring it straight Vnto my Cell' (v. ii. 21—22). Instead of this the Friar in Qi calls for 'A spade and mattocke', which must be an anticipation of v. iii. 185, where the Watch explains, 'We tooke this Mattocke and this Spade from him', though here Qi only mentions 'toolles about him, Fitte to ope a tombe'. While there is no direct evidence, the care for portable properties suggests that the report may have been prepared with a view to performance, in which case the action described would serve to recall how things had been regulated on the London stage.⁶ They are certainly informative. For example, from Q2 we should naturally suppose that it was the Friar's remonstrances that arrested Romeo's attempt to kill himself at in. iii. 108, and this may have been Shakespeare's intention; on the other hand Qi tells us that, at any rate according to the rather hazy recollection of the reporter,⁷ it was the Nurse who snatched the dagger from his hand.

⁶ Alternatively, it might be argued that the directions are literary and designed to help a reader to visualize the action.

⁷ The scene in question is one of those in un-Shakespearian verse, which appears not to have been in the abridged version with which the reporter was more recently acquainted.

'Good' quarto (1599).—This quarto 'Printed by Thomas Creede, for Cuthbert Burby' two years after Banter's, announces itself as 'Newly corrected, augmented, and amended', and naturally describes the acting company as 'the right Honourable the Lord Chamberlaine his Seruants', but, unlike the corresponding quarto of *Love's Labour's Losf*, it does not name the author. It has characteristic author's directions: i. i. i 'Enter Sampson and Gregorie, with Swords and Bucklers, of the house of Capulet'; 40 'Enter two other seruing men' (of whom the only one who speaks is called 'Abram'); 70 'They fight'; 73 'Enter Tibalt'; 80 'Enter three or foure Citizens with Clubs or partysons' (but the only speech is headed 'Offi. '); 82 'Enter old Capulet in his gowne, and his wife'; 86 'Enter old Mountague and his wife'; 88 'Enter Prince Eskales, with his traine' (he is not otherwise named—evidently della Scala); iii. I 'Enter Capulets Wife and Nurse'; iv. i 'Enter Romeo, Mercutio, Benuolio, with fiue or sixe other Maskers, torchbearers'; v. I 'They march about the Stage, and Seruingmen come forth with Napkins. | Enter Romeo' (wrongly); 17 'Enter all the guests and gentlewomen to the Maskers'; 27 'Musick playes and they dance'; 145 'One cals within *lulief*' II. iii. I 'Enter Frier alone with a basket'; vi. 16 'Enter luliet'; III. i. I 'Enter Mercutio, Benuolio, and men'; 36 'Enter Tybalt, Petruchio, and others'; 93 'Away Tybalt'; 136 'They Fight. Tibalt falles'; 146 'Enter Prince, olde Mountague, Capulet, their wives and all'; ii. 32 'Enter Nurse with cords'; iii. 71 'Enter Nurse and knock' (within); 79 'Enter Nurse'; Iv. ii. I 'Enter Father Capulet, Mother, Nurse, and Seruingmen, two or three'; iv. I 'Enter Lady of the house and Nurse'; 3 'Enter old Capulet'; 15 'Enter three or foure with spits and logs, and Baskets'; v. 95 'Fxeunt manet [sic]'; 101 'Exit omnes' (wrongly); 102 'Enter Will Kemp'; v. i. 12 'Enter Romeos man'; iii. i 'Enter Paris and his Page'; 17 'Whistle Boy'; 22 'Enter Romeo and Peter' (error for Balthasar); 121 'Entrer [sic\ Frier with Lanthorne, Crowe, and Spade'; 190 'Enter Capels' (i.e. Capulets); 202 'Enter Capulet and his wife' (should be at 190). At v. iii. 71 are the words 'O Lord they fight, I will go call the Watch', printed in italic like a stage-direction. They are spoken by Paris's Page, and were

presumably added in the margin without a prefix, as were the Nurse's cries of 'Madam' at n. II. 149, 151. At III. v. 37 the direction 'Enter Madame and Nurse' is certainly an error, for Lady Capulet is never 'Madame' in directions, and she enters as 'Mother' at 1. 65. It probably stands for 'Enter Nurse, calling *Madame*' which was then duplicated in the text as 'Nur. Madam'. The Petruchio who accompanies Tybalt at in. i. 36 is a mute, unless he speaks the words 'Away Tybalt', printed as a stage-direction at 1. 93: he is, however, mentioned in the text at i. v. 133. The appearance of Will Kemp at iv. v. 102 may be due to Shakespeare, who was, of course, writing the meagre part of Peter for him; but since his speeches are headed 'Peter', it is perhaps more likely that the book-keeper substituted the actor's name for that of the character when reading through the author's draft. Similarly the confusion at v. iii. 22 may have arisen through the book-keeper making a marginal note that the part of Balthasar could be doubled with Peter's: in that case, however, the prefixes 'Pet.' must be due to the compositor.⁸

That behind Q2 were the author's foul papers is clear from duplications and confusions in the text⁹ and is confirmed by the inconsistency of the often 'functional' character-designations and speech-prefixes.¹⁰ In both respects Q2 is typical.

It has, however, been long recognized that Q2 was not printed throughout from manuscript. The fact that, as in Q1j some of the Nurse's speeches are in italic points to a close bibliographical connexion between the texts.¹¹ Of the extent and nature of the connexion different views have been held. But a recent investigation by Sidney Thomas¹² has

⁸ Chambers thinks that the many properties mentioned may also point to the hand of the book-keeper. The inference is plausible, but not necessary. Had the book-keeper enough imagination to think of spits at IV. iv. 15?

⁹ See Note C on p. 233.

¹⁰ See pp. 113-14 and Note D on p. 234.

¹¹ The common italic is confined to I. iii. 1-78 (on sig. 64 of both quartos). Q2 does not follow Q1 in this respect in I. v. That the italic is not due to common origin but that here Q2 was actually printed from Q1 is plain from the prose lines 4 and 14-15—'Wheres this Girle ? what luliet' and 'How long is it now to Lammas-tide ?'—each of which necessarily begins a fresh line in Q1 because the immediately preceding line is full, but also begins a fresh line in Q2 though the preceding line is not full.

¹² 'The Bibliographical Links between the First Two Quartos of "Romeo and Juliet"', *RES*, Apr. 1949, xxv. 110-14.

established that the close similarity between the two texts extends only from I. ii. 46 S.D. to iii. 35 inclusive.¹³ This enables the case to be brought within the terms of McKerrow's explanation of the similar phenomenon in 2 and 3 *Henry VI*,¹⁴ namely, that here Q2 was printed from Qi because there was a defect in the manuscript copy.¹⁵ But though this passage affords the most extensive and most striking instance of agreement between Qi and Q2, there are others in which Qi was at least consulted by the printer of Q2, presumably owing to the occasional obscurity of the manuscript. This, for example, is the only possible explanation of the common error 'Young Abraham: Cupid' at II. i. 13. There are also at least two passages in which identity of capitals, italics, and colons suggests a bibliographical connexion between the texts.¹⁶ Lastly, an occasional glance at Qi may account for some otherwise unexplained resemblances in the stage-directions of Q2.¹⁷

Besides the sonnet-prologue there is a sonnet headed 'Chorus' at the point where modern editors begin Act II. This may indicate an original intention on Shakespeare's part to divide the play into acts, but he apparently wrote no more choruses, and the absence of the one he did write from **Qi**, which nevertheless retains the prologue, perhaps means that it was omitted from the prompt-book. None of the texts is formally divided.

Folio.—Q2 was reprinted in 1609 and from this third

¹³ Qi, sig. 63 recto, 1. 6 to 64 verso, 1. 3 (. . . yeare:); Qz, sig. 63 recto, 1. 15 to 64 recto, 1. 33 (. . . yeares.). Qz carries on the italics for the Nurse's part to the end of sheet B, but that is not surprising. The change of copy is shown not only by textual variation but by the speech-headings. In Qi Lady Capulet is 'Wife' throughout I. iii: in Qz she is 'Wife' as far as 1. 15, but 'Old Lady' from 1. 49 onwards.

¹⁴ q.v., Note B. McKerrow himself applied the theory to *Romeo and Juliet* likewise.

¹⁵ See Note E on p. 234.

¹⁶ II. iv. 38-48 and III. v. 26-36. In each, however, Q2 presents textual variants presumably derived from the manuscript. It is possible that here and there the manuscript, though at least partially legible, was damaged or tender, and that an editor, going through it for the printer, substituted a corrected fragment of Qi. McKerrow (as in note 14) suggested a like origin for II.ii. 16-22, III. iii. 1'-36, 47-71, 82-98, IV. i. 1-16, 34-41, 'etc.'; but it is not clear that these are anything but rather well-reported passages. On the other hand, there is evidence, communicated privately by Alice Walker, that II. ii. 38 ff. were set up from a corrected copy of Qi in which the position of the insertions was misunderstood.

¹⁷ For instance at in. i. 136 and v. iii. 121: the identical direction at I. iii. I belongs to the section of Q2 printed from Qi.

quarto F was set up without material alteration. There is no evidence that the copy was ever compared with a playhouse manuscript; indeed it certainly was not, for any such comparison must have left apparent traces. Nor can the quarto have been conceivably used as a prompt-book. The prologue was omitted: perhaps the leaf was absent from the copy of Q₃ used to print from. Italic for the Nurse's part was finally discarded. The stage-directions were slightly revised, sometimes intelligently, sometimes not; there is nothing to suggest that this was done anywhere but in the printing-house.¹⁸

NOTE A (page 225)

There has been some confusion over the date, for which Chambers is responsible. Malone gave it as 1yApr., correctly (*Variorum*, 1821, ii. 346). But DNB gives 'March 1596-7' without specifying the day or its authority, and Chambers gives 17 March (*Eliz. Stage*, ii. 195). This rests on his account of 'The Elizabethan Lords Chamberlain' in the Malone Society's Collections (1908, i. 39), in which unfortunately he seriously misquotes his source in the *Sydney Papers* (*Letters and Memorials of State written by Sir Henry Sydney, Sir Philip Sydney, &c.*, edited by Arthur Collins, 2 vols., 17 f6). He explains, quite correctly, that 'William Brooke, Lord Cobham . . . died on March 5, 1597, and almost immediately afterwards' it was rumoured 'that George Carey, second Lord Hunsdon, was likely to succeed to the place which his father had held before him'. What then follows should run: 'On April 13 Rowland Whyte wrote, "My Lord of Hunsdon waits, and doeth all Things appertaining to the Place, but hath not yet the whyte Stalf" (*S.P.*, ii. 38), and in a later letter of Tuesday 19 April, "Vpon Sonday in the After Noone, my Lord Hunsdon had the Whyte StafFe giuen hym, and therby [became] Lord Chamberlain" (*S.P.* ii. 41).' Chambers misdates the letter of 13 Apr. 'March 13', omits the date of the 'later letter', and after 'Sonday' inserts '(March 17)', which in fact was a Thursday.

NOTE B (page 226)

The un-Shakespearian verse in which these scenes are reconstructed is often pedestrian, but includes some lines of superior quality, such as 'So light of foote nere hurts the troden flower' in II. vi and 'The perfect modell of eternitie' in v. iii, which have led Sidney Thomas (*RES*, Jan. 1950, i. 8-16) to conjecture that the passages were at least touched up by a real poet, whom he would identify as Henry Chettle. There is no doubt that Chettle had been, and may still have been, closely associated with the printer John Danter, but the internal evidence to connect him with these passages is not impressive. Duthie (as in Note E, p. 20), while noting the variant quality, rejects this view on the ground that these passages, like others, contain reminiscences of the genuine text.

¹⁸ See Note F on p. 235.

NOTE C (page 230)

Several instances have already been mentioned at pp. 110-11. The confused passage at III. iii. 34 ff. runs:

More honourable state, more courtship lues	
In carrion flies, then Romeo: they may seaze	
On the white wonder of deare luliets hand . . .	
This may flies do, when I from this must	flie, <i>a</i>
And sayest thou yet, that exile is not death?	<i>b</i>
But Romeo may not, he is banished.	<i>c</i>
Flies may do this, but I from this must	flie: <i>d</i>
They are freemen, but I am banished.	<i>e</i>

There is obviously something wrong here. P. A. Daniel, on the assumption that Qi was an imperfect version of an early draft subsequently revised, proposed to omit line *d* and rearrange the others in the order *c*, *a*, *e*, *b* (parallel-text edition, New Shakspeare Society, 1874, p. vii). The Globe editors make the simpler alteration of omitting lines *a* and *b*. Another duplication is at iv. i. 109 ff.:

Then as the manner of our countrie is,
Is [*read In*] thy best robes vncovered on the Beere,
Be borne to buriall in thy kindreds graue:
Thou shall be borne to that same auncient vault,
Where all the kindred of the Capulets [*? read Capels*] lie ...

Here it is plain that the last two lines are intended to replace the third. Among minor duplications, besides that at v. iii. 102-3 (see pp. 110-II), is II. ii. 10-11 'It is my Lady, 6 it is my loue, 6 that she knew she wer'. A like origin may be suspected for other hypermetrical lines: III. i. 152 'O Prince, O *Cozen*, husband, O the bloud is spild', III. ii. 9 'And by their owne bewties, or if loue be blind', and 76 'Rauenous douefathered rauen, woluishrauening lamb'. At iv. v. 128-30 Shakespeare, quoting from a popular song, was content to jot down the first and last lines he wanted, leaving it to the book-keeper to supply the gap in the prompt-copy, which he obediently did, as we know from Qi.

As regards the Queen Mab speech, I. iv. 53-95, it was again Daniel who observed that ll. 67-69 should come before 1. 59. In the same speech Dover Wilson has (privately) sought an explanation of the curious fact that the thirty-eight lines, 54-91, which stand at the foot of sig. C2^r, are printed as twenty-six lines of prose. It is fairly obvious that when the page was first set up a dozen lines must have been omitted, possibly because they were written in the margin or on a separate slip, and that when the error was discovered an attempt was made to crowd them in after the pages had been imposed. The lines most easily detached from the context are 59-66 and 77-81 (these indeed total thirteen, but it is conceivable that one line originally set was in the end discarded). If these were the lines later inserted it would account for certain peculiar features of the speech. The addition of ll. 59-66 had, it seems, been so clumsily effected in the foul papers that in Q2 they were, as we have seen, misplaced; whereas in the prompt-book they were erroneously substituted for ll. 67-69 which are absent from the report offered by the 'bad'

QI. Lines 77-81 are responsible for the unexpected repetition of the Courtier, and since they themselves contain the rather awkward repetition of 'nose', it is possible that they are in effect a first draft, later discarded in favour of 11. 82 ff., and that the compositor was in the first instance quite right in omitting them.

NOTE D (page 230)

A tendency to 'functional' designation is already apparent in the 'bad' Qi. Where characters have no proper names of their own it is natural that a reporter, no less than an author, should fall into the use of descriptive labels, and should not always use them consistently. Thus in the directions of QI Lady Capulet is Capulet's wife when she appears with her husband, as at I. i. 65-88, III. i. 146, IV. ii. I, and v. iii. 190, but she is Mother when with Juliet as at III. v. 65, IV. iii. 6, and iv. I. As a speaker she is more consistently Mother than in £2, e.g. III in. i ('M.', 'Mo.') and v. iii ('Moth.'). Perhaps the most curious designation is 'Enter Oldeman' for Capulet twice, in iv. iv. 3 and v. 22. This is unexpected if the report was intended to serve as a prompt-book, but such piratical copies would naturally tend to be rough.

NOTE E (page 231)

The passage in question runs to 96 lines in the Globe edition, that is, something over 100 lines of writing probably, including directions and allowing for divided lines of verse. This would reasonably fill one leaf of foul papers. In these the passage may have been a little longer than in Qi, though the text appears to be well, if demonstrably not perfectly, reported.

Possibly the leaf was not entirely missing, for it is noticeable that of half a dozen or more variants in the lines in question, four, and these the only significant ones, appear in the first dozen lines (48 Qi 'backward' (an obvious error), £2 'giddie'; 53 Q2 adds 'I pray thee'; 47, 48 Qi 'with', £2 'by'). These corrections, as they appear to be, may have come from a fragment of the leaf that remained. It is curious that immediately after the texts have begun to differ again at i. iii. 36 there is what looks like a common error, Qi 'high lone', Qa 'hylone'. But the latter is a misprint for 'by lone' (Q3 'a lone'), so that the logical inference would be that Qi was printed from Q2 ! Actually the resemblance must be accidental.

G. I. Duthie, in an elaborate article on "The Text of Shakespeare's 'Romeo and Juliet' ", *Studies in Bibliography*, 1951, iv. 3-29, while agreeing that here Q2 is printed from Qi, puts forward, albeit tentatively, a different explanation. This, however, involves the intervention of an editor who transcribed the foul papers, which seems an unnecessary complication, and has in fact been since (privately) withdrawn.

There is some difference of opinion in respect to the exact point at which dependence on Qi begins. In specifying i. ii. 46 Thomas follows Robert Gericke, who was the first to detect the influence of Qi on Qz (*Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 1879, xiv. 270-3). Duthie would make dependence begin a few lines later and so exclude the four variants mentioned above. But the general resemblance of the texts from 1. 46 onwards is striking, and a leaf of foul papers would be very likely to begin with an important entrance.

NOTE F (page 232)

At Iv. v. 103 'Enter Will Kemp' is replaced by 'Enter Peter' in accordance with the prefixes, v. iii. 71 is recognized as a speech and given to Peter, in accordance with the direction at 1. 22, but there Peter is an error for Balthasar, and in fact the speaker is Paris's Page. Prefixes ('Nurse') are given to the marginal calls of 'Madam' at II. ii. 149 and 151, and the muddled prefix 'Watch boy' at v. iii. 171 is corrected to 'Boy'. Otherwise, apart from purely formal alterations, such as the addition of 'Exeunt omnes' at the end, the only differences appear to be as follows: I. i. 80, F omits 'or partysons'; v. i, the erroneous 'Enter Romeo' is replaced by the equally erroneous 'Enter Seruant'; II. ii. 136, F adds 'Cals within'; Iv. 150, for 'Exeunt' F has 'Exit. Mercutio, Benuolio'; 232, for 'Exit' F has 'Exit Nurse and Peter', but Romeo goes out too; III. i. 93, F alters the irregular 'Away Tybalt' (possibly a speech) to 'Exit Tybalt' and adds 'Enter Tybalt' at 1. 126; iii, 75, for the unintelligible 'Sludknock' F has 'Knocke' (at v. 37 the erroneous 'Enter Madam and Nurse' remains); Iv. ii. 37, for 'Exeunt' F has 'Exeunt luliet and Nurse' and at 1. 47 for 'Exit' it has 'Exeunt Father and Mother'; v. 17, F adds 'Enter Mother'; at 1. 95 F omits 'manet' unnecessarily, but at 1. 101 rightly removes 'Exit omnes'; v. i. 32, for 'Exit' F has 'Exit man' and at 1. 57 it supplies 'Enter Appothecarie'; lastly F clears up the muddle at iii. 190, 202, removing the direction at 202 and substituting it for that at 190.

XL RICHARD THE SECOND. 1595

We owe our knowledge of the texts mainly to Pollard's careful analysis in 1916.

Quarto (1597).—The copy, which was entered to Andrew Wise on 29 August, must have been obtained from the playhouse, since all the evidence points to its having been none other than Shakespeare's foul papers. The graphic and informal directions—e.g. 'He pluckes it out of his bosome and reads it' (v. ii. 71), 'The murderers rush in. ... Here Exton strikes him downe' (v. v. 105', 107)—are clearly the author's; but they are not very elaborate, and they would be insufficient for production. There is some inconsistency in the designation of characters: Bolingbroke is also Hereford and (later) King, Mowbray is also Norfolk. Pollard found passages that need revision (e.g. I. iii. 129—38, cf. p. 111) and Chambers pointed out another (II. ii. 98-122) that seems little more than a sketch for a speech and in which repetition suggests false starts: Dover Wilson too complains of 'textual tangles'. Pollard believed that he could trace Shakespeare's hand in a punctuation carefully dramatic in some set speeches and haphazard elsewhere.

In 1608 Q4 for the first time printed the passage in the Parliament scene (iv. i. 154—318) dealing with Richard's abdication, which had evidently been cut out for political reasons when the play was first printed: the gap remained obvious in spite of some adjustment of the surrounding text. The 1608 version of the passage is very inaccurate and apparently represents a report.

Folio.—This was printed from one of the later quartos, but with the abdication supplied from an authentic manuscript, presumably the prompt-book: it is not certain that the abdication was ever omitted from the acting version. That the quarto used as copy for F had been collated with some independent and presumably playhouse authority is proved by revision at two points in the light of historical knowledge;¹

¹ The substitution of 'Glousters' for 'Woodstockes' in I. ii. I to avoid a solitary and confusing use of the latter title, and that of 'Salsbury, Spencer' for 'Oxford, Salisbury' in v. vi. 8, since it was Thomas Despencer and not Aubrey de Vere who was involved in the rising against Henry.

by a large number of variants that in many cases restore, and in a few correct, the readings of Qi; by eight cuts totalling fifty lines—though of these four one-line omissions may be accidental—and by a thorough revision of the stage-directions. The last are supplemented by many necessary entrances, superfluities are pruned, numbers defined, and inconsistent designations in part removed: those quoted above appear in the form 'Snatches it', 'Enter Exton and Seruants. . . . Exton strikes him down'. But the collation was superficial, for over half the errors introduced by Qi and Q3 (to say nothing of original errors of Q1) remained unconnected: and it is strange that, except for one rather clumsy cut, the prompt-book appears to have done little to tidy up the text. There is some purging of 'profanity', and a division into acts and scenes was introduced, but there is nothing to show whether this was in the prompt-book or was added at the time of printing: it overlooks v. iv.

Which particular quarto served as copy for F has been in debate. Pollard drew attention to the surely significant fact that of 158 errors introduced by Q2 and Qj (both 1598) just over half reappear in F, whereas of fifty-three errors (in passages retained in F) introduced by Q4 and Q5 (1608, 1615) only five reappear, and that of these, three are found in a bunch near the end. This led him to entertain the idea that F was printed from an imperfect copy of Qj in which the final leaves had been supplied from Q'; but he eventually rejected it in favour of a tame acceptance of the current belief that the sole copy for F was Q'.² Pollard's discarded conjecture has recently been revived by Richard Hasker,³ who seeks to show that F was printed from a copy of Q3 in which the loss of the last two leaves (sigs. 13-4, containing v. v. 19 to the end) had been made good from Q5. The proof that, for the bulk of the text at any rate, the copy for F was Q3 is virtually conclusive:⁴ the case for the use of Q' in the last 151 lines of the play is also a strong one, if less compelling.⁵

The prompt-book with which the copy for F was collated

² This was the logical inference until the discovery of Q3 proved that the errors introduced by Q4 were only 18 and not 53 as had been supposed.

³ 'The Copy for the first Folio "Richard II" ', *Studies in Bibliography*, 1952, v. 53-72.

¹ See Note A on p. 238.

⁵ See Note B on p. 239.

may have been the original transcript of the foul papers made before these were handed to the printer in 1597. Pollard's fanciful assumption that this was replaced by a copy of Qi as soon as printed need not be seriously considered.⁶ But it would be very strange if a copy made up of leaves of Q3 and Q5 had been originally prepared for the printer of the Folio. If, therefore, the copy used was indeed such a made-up exemplar, it is more likely to have been one that had itself done duty as a prompt-book. The play had been popular, and though the company represented it as old and out of use when asked to play it on the eve of Essex's rebellion in 1601,⁷ there were later revivals. The original prompt-book may well have shown signs of wear before 1608 and have been replaced, after collation, by a copy of Q3.⁸ There must have been a performance of the play, including the abdication, to account for the reported supplement of 1608 and this performance may have been itself the occasion of the reprint: such a performance would, of course, on Chambers's view, account for the substitution of 'Heaven' for 'God' in F.

NOTE A (page 237)

The weighty numerical evidence, so strangely set aside by Pollard, is supported by the retention in F of the curious spelling Vnpruind' for Vnprund' (in. iv. 45, perhaps influenced by the neighbouring 'ruind') which is peculiar to E3, and by the reading 'mine' (iv. i. 70) as in Q2, 3, where Q1, 4, 5 have 'my'. Against Q3 are the misprints 'formerly' for 'formally' (I. iii. 29) and 'Impresse' for 'impreese' (III. i. 25) and the spelling 'percullist' for 'portcullist' (I. iii. 167) that F shares with Q5. But the first of these is a frequent error that may easily have occurred independently; 'impreese', i.e. imprese or impres, is an unusual spelling that may have been altered twice under the influence of the distinct 'impress' (this later became a recognized spelling of imprese); and 'percullis' seems to have been a favourite spelling of 'portcullis' early in the seventeenth century. Hasker finds definite support for Q3 in the punctuation of F despite the difficulty of evaluating this class of evidence.

⁶ See p. 174, Note W. With it, of course, goes his belief that a copy of Q5 was collated with this copy of Qi to serve as copy for F. Dover Wilson, in his edition of 1939, agrees in rejecting Pollard's view.

⁷ See Chambers, *W. Shake.*, ii. 325.

⁸ We should, of course, have to suppose that this quarto prompt-book in turn got worn or damaged at the end, and that the last two leaves were replaced, some time between 1615 and 1621, by others from Q5, these being again collated either with the discarded leaves or with the worn-out manuscript. However tattered the latter might be it would be kept for the sake of the licence.

NOTE B (*page 237*)

The three readings in which F follows Q5 against Q3 are 'euer' for 'neuer' (v. v. 70), 'wer't' for 'art' (99), and 'thine' for 'thy' (107). It is true that these might be regarded as normalizations that could occur independently. The first removes a double negative; in the second the past tense is perhaps more natural than the present; the third is a change that happens frequently before a vowel. But they are supported by the spelling 'tels' for 'tells' (in an uncrowded line, v. v. 55) found only in Q4, 5, and F. Punctuation throws no light on this portion of the text.

XII. A MIDSUMMER-NIGHT'S DREAM 1595-6

Quarto (1600).—The stage-directions, which are neither particularly frequent nor particularly elaborate, have many of the characteristics of the author: I. i. I 'Enter Theseus, Hippolita, with others'; 20 'Enter Egeus and his daughter Hermia, and Lysander and Helena, and Demetrius' (but Helena does not enter till) 180 'Enter Helena'; i. ii. I 'Enter Quince, the Carpenter; and Snugge, the loyner; and Bottom, the Weauer; and Flute, the Bellowes mender; & Snout, the Tinker; and Starueling, the Tayler'; II. i. I 'Enter a Fairie at one doore, and Robin goodfellow at another'; 60 'Enter the King of Fairies, at one doore, with his traine; and the Queene, at another, with hers'; 188 'Enter Demetrius, Helena following him'; ii. I 'Enter Tytania Queene of Fairies, with her traine'; 27 'Enter Oberon'; 65 'Enter Pucke'; 84 'Enter Demetrius and Helena running'; in. i. I 'Enter the Clownes'; 166 'Enter foure Fairyes'; ii. I 'Enter King of Fairies, and Robin goodfellow' (the latter at 1. 4); 87 'Ly doune'; 436 'Sleepe'; iv. i. I 'Enter Queene of Fairies, and Clowne, and Fairies: and the king behinde them'; 108 'Enter Theseus and all his traine. Winde home'; 143 'Shoute within: they all start vp. Winde homes'; ii. I 'Enter Quince, Flute, Thisby and the rabble', but 15 'Enter Snug, the loyner', and 25 'Enter Bottom' (in this scene Shakespeare had forgotten that Flute and Thisbe are one); v. i. I 'Enter Theseus, Hyppolita, and Philostrate'; 29 'Enter Louers; Lysander, Demetrius, Hermia and Helena'; 152 'Exit Lyon, Thysby, and Mooneshine'; 378 'Enter Pucke'; 398 'Enter King and Queene of Fairies, with all their traine'; 430 (speaker's name) 'Robin'. It will be noticed that grouping is in evidence: after carefully naming the 'rude mechanicals' in i. ii, the author later contents himself with the description 'the Clownes' (III. i) or 'the rabble' (iv. ii); the young couples, having been named in i. i, become simply 'Louers' at v. i. 29, for here the names are a palpable addition; the fairies are quite indefinite, except for the 'foure' at III. i. 166, who are named in the text. There is also a tendency to mass characters

at the beginning of a scene: Helena is named at i. i. i, but her entrance is separately marked at 1. 180; at Iv. ii. i 'the rabble' implies all the Clowns, but Snug enters separately at 1. 15 and Bottom at 1. 25; Pucke is made to enter with Oberon at m. ii. i, though in fact he only does so at 1. 4. There is some uncertainty in designating characters: Oberon is King of Fairies (or simply King) or Oberon indifferently; Titania is of course named in the text, but in directions appears only at II. ii. i on her second entry, and may here be an addition; Bottom, on his most important appearance (iv. i. i) is merely 'Clowne'; Theseus and Hippolyta, after long appearing by name, become as a rule Duke and Duchess after the play begins in Act V; lastly Robin (Goodfellow) and the generic Puck alternate throughout, and since the names are used indifferently in the text and in the prefixes of a single scene (III. ii), we do not need to follow Fleay in the belief that they indicate different periods of composition rather than the habitual inconsistency of the author. At the same time there seem to be some clear marks of interference by the book-keeper. The addition of the lovers' names at v. i. 29 must surely be his; he may have added 'Tyrania' (or else 'Queene of Fairies') at III. ii. i. There is evident duplication at iv. i. 143, 'Shoute within: they all start vp. Winde homes', where it looks as if 'Winde homes' were the addition, though it is this that is warranted by the text. In that case 'Winde home' at 1. 108 may also be due to the book-keeper, and so may the notes 'Ly downe' (III. ii. 87) and 'Sleepe' (436). In view, however, of the absence of some necessary entrances and exits, and of the persistence of irregularities noted above, we are bound to conclude that the book-keeper's notes, if such they are, were desultory jottings on the foul papers; for, in spite of the general cleanness of the text, we can hardly imagine that Q represents a finished prompt-book.

Dover Wilson, whose edition appeared in 1924, finds a few abnormal spellings that are more likely to have originated with the author than the compositor. A brilliant contribution was his demonstration of revision at the beginning of Act V. Here in the first 84 lines there are eight passages of varying length in which the line-division is disturbed. Omit

these passages and a perfectly consecutive text remains. There is no escaping the conclusion that in this we have the original writing, which was supplemented by fresh lines crowded into the margin so that their metrical structure was obscured.¹ But it is otherwise with Wilson's further inference that the additions were made at an appreciably later date. They are, no doubt, as a whole more poetical and lively than the original speech, which they serve to brighten up, but to deny that Shakespeare may have introduced them for this very purpose on reading over the scene soon after it was written is to rely perhaps too confidently on personal impressions of style. So, at least, Chambers maintains, in spite of his earlier suspicion, based on metrical grounds, 'that the opening of Act 5 shows some traces of later work'. There may have been other alterations. Chambers agrees with Wilson (who follows Fleay) that at the very end the fairy masque (ll. 378-429) and the epilogue (ll. 430-45) 'look very much like alternative endings to the play, the one for a private performance, the other for the public stage'. There would be nothing surprising in finding both in the foul papers, and we should expect to find them there in the order in which they were written. What Chambers calls the 'hymeneal character' of the play itself suggests that it was written for a wedding (whose, has been much debated) and if it was, it might very likely be later adapted for the theatre. Wilson (from whom Chambers here parts company) assumes the opposite. He observes that the epilogue, a rather pedestrian affair, is headed 'Robin' (though he speaks of himself as 'the Puck') whereas the masque, in which the writing is more touched with imagination, is introduced by 'Tuck'; and using these designations as tests, he distinguishes two layers of composition, marked by different poetic styles, in which an earlier Robin corresponds to a later Puck. Undoubtedly the writing varies; but it need hardly surprise us to find Shakespeare writing in a flatter and more conventional and seemingly earlier manner about his rather tiresome lovers, or that his verse should sometimes come to life and catch fire in touching on themes that appealed more to

¹ The validity of the inference has been disputed by Leo Kirschbaum (*Modern Language Notes*, Jan. 1946, lxi. 44-49), but his arguments lack cogency.

his imagination. However that may be, from these and other clues Wilson builds up an elaborate theory of twofold revision, an original piece of 1592 being rewritten in 1594 and further adapted in 1598. It is all very ingenious: the difficulty is to believe that this refashioning would not have left plainer bibliographical traces than are now apparent, for the text as a whole is markedly clean; and it serves to make only the more incredible Wilson's view that 'The Fisher Quarto [Qi] was beyond doubt printed from a theatrical prompt-book'—an opinion that its author would perhaps no longer so confidently maintain.

Folio.—Q was reprinted in 1619 with the original date and the false claim to be 'Printed by Iames Roberts',² and without significant variation.³ This in turn supplied the copy for F, but in this case the differences, though not extensive, are certainly significant, particularly in the stage-directions. In the text there are no more than half a dozen or so alterations that according to Wilson 'are unlikely to be due to the compositors'.⁴

There are two striking differences. One is that in the ending Egeus has been substituted for Philostrate as master of the ceremonies. This is puzzling. There has been little so far to suggest that Egeus belonged to the court, and there can have been no confusion due to doubling of parts, for Philostrate and Egeus appear together in i. i. The most likely explanation is that the actor who played Philostrate in i. i had been required for another part (either Oberon or one of the 'mechanicals') which prevented his being available in Act V, and that the book-keeper was therefore driven to transfer his part there to Egeus, a transference that involved a textual alteration that rendered 1. 38 unmetrical. The other difference is the introduction of a division into acts. This was clearly not original, for one of the divisions has been made at a point where the lovers are asleep on the stage, necessitating the direction 'They sleepe all the Act', that is, throughout the interval. This presumably means both that the division was made in the theatre and not merely for printing,

² See p. 12.

³ There is a feeble attempt to correct the lining at the beginning of Act V, and a few obvious exits are added.

⁴ See Note A on p. 246.

and that the intervals were of some duration, probably with music. We may reasonably surmise that in this case, and possibly in others, the division was introduced on the occasion of a performance at the Blackfriars house.⁵

The stage-directions have been revised rather elaborately; but the revision was evidently spasmodic, and the superficiality of the work appears clearly in a single example at in. i. 166:

Q1: That thou shalt, like an ayery spirit, goe.
Pease-blossome, Cobweb, Moth, and Mustard-seede?
Enter foure Fairyes.

Q2: That thou shalt like an ayry spirit go.
Pease-blossome, Cobweb, Moth, and Mustard-seed.
Enter foure Fairies.

F: That thou shalt like an airie spirit go.
Enter Pease-blossome, Cobweb, Moth, Mustard-seede, and four Fairies.

Here a line of text, slightly misprinted in Q2, has in F been converted into part of a stage-direction, presumably by the same hand that was responsible for the other alterations. Nevertheless, that some theatrical authority was available for consultation is proved by the direction 'Tawyer with a trumpet before them' at v. i. 128,⁶ and doubtless a number of other additions come from the same source. But even here the clumsiness of the editor, already manifest over the fairies, shows itself in placing the direction before instead of after the entry of the mummers, and similar incompetence appears throughout. Wherever it comes from, the direction 'Enter Pucke' at III. i. 56 incorrectly duplicates the entry of Robin at 1. 79;⁷ the famous 'Enter Piramus with the Asse head', which undoubtedly had its origin in the playhouse, is inserted at in. i. 115, whereas it belongs to 1. 106; the direction 'Enter Oberon and Pucke' at III. ii. 345 is wrong since they are on the stage already, and so is the addition 'and Oberon' at iv. i. 51 for the same reason; the addition of 'Exit all but Wall' has been introduced at v. i. 152, doubtless from the

⁵ See p. 144.

⁶ See p. 119.

⁷ Wilson explains it as a prompter's warning; but why an isolated example?

prompt-book, without noticing that it merely duplicates the exit of Lion, Thisbe, and Moonshine three lines below. At iv. i. 32 the queer direction 'Musicke Tongs, Rurall Musicke', which anyhow looks like a duplication, seems, as Capell pointed out, to be contrary to the author's intention, since Titania hastily puts her foot down on the suggestion: it may have come from the prompt-book, or it may have been at least in part concocted by the editor on the suggestion of the text—'Lets haue the tongs, and the bones'. The editor certainly did not mend matters by elaborating the direction at iv. i. 143 to 'Homes and they wake. | Shout within, they all start vp'. Other awkward points in the quarto directions are left untouched. At Iv. ii. I the unintended duplication 'Flute, Thisbie' remains, though Flute is removed as a speaker (see Note A), so does that of the 'Louers' at v. i. 29, though 'Tytania' is removed at II. ii. I. At iv. i. I the unspecified 'Clowne' still stands for Bottom; at l. 205 is the addition 'Bottome wakes', but the prefix 'Clo.' is unaltered; at v. i. 208 'Exit Clow.' refers to Wall. The omission of in. ii. 344 along with its 'Exeunt' is of course the fault of the compositor, not the editor. On the other hand, the occasional massing of entries is duly corrected, as it doubtless was in the prompt-book: at I. i. 20 'Helena' disappears; at in. ii. i the direction is 'Enter King of Pharies, solus' and at l. 4 'Enter Pucke'; at Iv. ii. I 'and the rabble' is replaced by 'Snout, and Starueling'. Many alterations are merely formal, adding exits or making them more precise, and so on, but many describe the action and either come from the prompt-book or witness to some editorial care: II. ii. 26 'Shee sleepest'; 64 'They sleepest'; III. i. 198 'The Clownes all Exit'; ii. 135 'Awa.', i.e. Demetrius awakes; 418 'lye downe'; 441 'Enter Hermia'; iv. i. 88 'Musick still', i.e. soft music; 191 'Exit Duke and Lords', but the prefix is 'Thes.'; v. i. 107 'Flor. Trum.' for the entry of the Prologue; 170 'Enter Pyramus'; 269 'The Lion roares, Thisby runs off'; 321 'Enter Thisby'. It was clearly the prompt-book that supplied 'Sleepers Lye still' at iv. i. 107, a warning to wait for the second 'Winde homes' before stirring, and no doubt also 'Quince' opposite 'Enter the Prologue' at v. i. 108.

Wilson is obviously right in assuming that the copy of Q2

used for F had either been compared rather closely with the prompt-book, or had else been itself annotated to serve as one. And naturally, since he sent the original prompt-book to press in 1600, he inclines to the second alternative.⁸ But this appears improbable in view of the many uncorrected abnormalities that remain, the clumsiness of the alterations themselves, and especially, for example, the two fragments of dialogue, 'Stand forth Demetrius' and 'Stand forth Lisander', that Qi printed as stage-directions at I, i. 14 and 16, and that still appear as such in F. It is difficult to believe either in a prompt-manuscript or in a prompt-quarto which allowed an error like this to go uncorrected. Everything indeed points to Q having been printed from foul papers that had received some slight attention from the book-keeper, and F from a copy of Q2 that had been compared with the prompt-book by a rather fussy but incompetent editor, meticulous in introducing manuscript readings whenever he noticed them, but liable to overlook as many as caught his attention.

NOTE A (*page 243*)

These appear to be conjectural emendations with no authority behind them. Only one, 'our' for 'or' at v. i. 34, is certainly correct, and this is fairly obvious and well within the compass of a compositor. Of the other six, one or two are plausible and one is certainly wrong. But beyond these half-dozen verbal changes there are a few alterations of greater importance that must have come from the prompt-book. Two correct oversights of Shakespeare's: the change of 'Flute' to 'Snowt'⁷ (as the impersonator of Wall) at v. i. 157, and the transfer of the second speech in iv. ii from Flute to Starveling (the author having written consecutive speeches for Flute and Thisbe, forgetting that they were the same). Wilson finds significance in the resurrection of Bottom at v. i. 358 to speak a speech originally assigned to Lion, but this is speculative.

NOTE B (*page 246*)

At III. ii. 416 F adds in the margin the note 'shifting places'. Hereabouts Puck is playing hide-and-seek with Demetrius and Lysander, and it is evidently to this that the direction refers; but it has no particular relevance to the line opposite which it stands. Wilson, observing that this line is half-way down a page in Qz, infers that the note is a generalized direction inserted in a copy of Q used by the prompter. This is, as usual, ingenious, but we do not know that it did not occupy a similar central position on a page in the manuscript. And it might be argued that the addition of the Christian name in the direction

'Enter Peter Quince' at *HI. i. 121* proves just the opposite. For while we can easily imagine the scribe who prepared the prompt-book writing the fuller form where the foul papers had the shorter, and also an editor, engaged on bringing a copy of *Qz* into agreement with the prompt-book, automatically making the addition, it is much more difficult to believe that the book-keeper, annotating a copy of *Q* for use in performance, would of his own accord make so futile an addition.

XIII. KING JOHN. 1596-7

The Troublesome Reign: Quarto (1591).—The title of this two-part play runs: 'The Troublesome Raigne of Iohn King of England, with the discouerie of King Richard Cordelions Base sonne (vulgarly named. The Bastard Fawconbridge): also the death of King Iohn at Swinstead Abbey. As it was (sundry times) publikey acted by the Queenes Maiesties Players, in the honourable Citie of London' The action of the play, which runs to barely 3,000 lines,¹ is continuous,² and the division into two parts is probably no more than a literary device designed to impart to the play some of the dignity of *Tamburlaine*' comparison with which is explicitly invited in the verses 'To the Gentlemen Readers' prefixed like prologues to the two parts but making no pretence to any but literary origin. That some close relation was recognized between *The Troublesome Reign* and Shakespeare's *King John*—as there was between *A Shrew* and *The Shrew*—is evident from the fact that in each case the two pieces appear to have been treated as for copyright purposes identical,³ so that it was deemed unnecessary to enter in the Stationers' Register the plays actually printed in the Folio. The relation in question, in the present instance, a consensus of critical opinion has decided to be that of source to finished product, though a few, like Pope, have suspected *The Troublesome Reign* itself of being at least in part by Shakespeare. If, then, common opinion is right, the case of *King John* is in a manner parallel to that of *King Lear*, although the relation is a great deal closer in the case of the history than of the tragedy. For in *King John* Shakespeare followed the earlier play for the most part scene by scene and incident by incident, and even, as Chambers notes, in 'the logical run of many of the dialogues'. Of course he rewrote throughout; but at least

¹ 2,968 lines of text (including the prefatory verses to each part, n and 15 lines respectively) according to the numbering in the Praetorius facsimile of 1888. Dover Wilson, in his edition of *King John*, 1936, reckons it at 'roughly about 2,800 lines'.

² The Second Part begins in the middle of Prince Arthur's tragedy with a scene corresponding to IV. iii of *King John*.

³ All the more naturally that the later reprints of *The Troublesome Reign* were attributed to Shakespeare on the title-page.

two lines are identical, another half-dozen are substantially the same, and the number of scattered phrases in Shakespeare's play that can be paralleled in the source runs to between one and two hundred.⁴ Eight scenes (four in each part) are wholly omitted (including the anti-clerical clowning) and three new scenes are introduced (one of which is represented by a stage-direction in the original). The balance is very different: the 1,743 lines of Part I Shakespeare expands to 1,890, the 1,199 of Part II he reduces to 680. This takes no account of the prefatory verses, of which he made no use. In 1611 a second edition bore on the title the words 'Written by W. Sh.' and a third in 1622 'Written by W. Shakespeare'.⁵

King John: Folio.—The most striking formal feature of F is the anomalous act and scene division in the earlier part of the play. Act I consists of two scenes of 276 and 598 lines respectively; Act II of a single scene of 74 lines only: in the last three acts (of 539, 559? and 521 lines) the division is normal, but the heading 'Actus Quintus' is misprinted 'Actus Quartus'. Critics have endeavoured to explain the anomaly by supposing that alterations were made in the text after the division had been introduced.⁶ Chambers suggests that an original second scene to Act II may have been omitted. But there is nothing in the source that could supply material for such a scene; moreover, as we shall see, II. i is certainly continuous With III. i. Wilson comes to Chambers's assistance by suggesting a scene that might have filled the place, but his only excuse for the conjecture is to explain a supposed difficulty later on.⁷ Wilson also believes that the present Act II was an afterthought, added by way of introduction to in. i. But Act II in fact corresponds to Part I, iv. 190-234 of *The Troublesome Reign* and there is nothing

⁴ See Note A on p. 253.

⁵ See Note B on p. 254.

⁶ Any such explanation has to meet the initial objection that, in the plays hitherto considered, division seems to be a late feature, that there is no record of any Jacobean production of *King John*, and no likelihood of structural alterations in the play at so late a date. Wilson believes that the play was originally written for a company other than the Chamberlain's, one which, unlike the Chamberlain's, divided its plays into acts. But he does not indicate what company, if any, had this habit.

⁷ At III. iii. 19-24, in which John alludes to services rendered by Hubert of which neither the earlier scenes nor the source make mention. But it is surely not unlike Shakespeare to give solidity to a character by casual allusions to supposed happenings beyond the scope of the action as known to the spectator.

whatever to suggest that it was not originally present. It will be noticed, moreover, that Wilson's two conjectures cancel one another so far as any explanation of the anomalous short second act is concerned.

If we abandon speculation on these lines the true explanation should be fairly obvious. It will be noticed that I. ii is appreciably longer than any of the last three acts, and should almost certainly form an act by itself. All we need suppose is that in the manuscript handed to the printer the second act was accidentally headed 'Scaena Secunda' instead of 'Actus Secundus'. The printer would naturally reproduce this incorrect heading, and would next find himself confronted with 'Actus Tertius'. All he could do would be to convert this into 'Actus Secundus', and then alter in. ii to III. i and so on.⁸ If this is what happened, the anomalous division sprang from a simple blunder, there is no reason to suppose that the division was not introduced with a view to printing, and no reason to suppose that the play underwent any revision at all.⁹

But we have not yet done with F's 'Actus Secundus'. There is no doubt that it belongs to Act III and little doubt that it originally formed the first scene of that act. Modern editors, however, amalgamate it with F in. i (originally in. ii) to form a single scene. Chambers truly complains that this makes the 'juncture' at 1. 75 'Very abrupt'.¹⁰ Salisbury, in pursuance of an order given at ii. i. 553—5, has been sent to bring Constance to the wedding of the Dauphin with Lady Blanch, the bribe for the French betrayal of her cause. Constance indignantly refuses to attend and, seating herself on the ground, as upon a throne, declares that the kings may attend upon her there if they choose. After this it would be equally absurd for the ceremony to be brought to her, or for her to change her mind and seek the scene of the ceremony.

⁸ This is apparently the assumption on which editors have generally proceeded in making F I. ii into Act II and relegating F II to Act III. Later they have unnecessarily made the battle episodes of F III. ii into separate scenes, in. ii, iii.

⁹ Wilson indeed suspects extensive revision—as usual—but the only other addition to which he is able to point is III. iv. 21-67, and this, if it is an addition, may just as well have been added in the course of composition as later.

¹⁰ He also complains of the shortness of the first act in modern editions—only 276 lines. But this for the most part deals with and exhausts a single theme, Philip's bastardy, and need not raise any suspicion.

Yet she is later present at it, and our rigid stage conventions raise a dilemma. To make the scenes continuous involves the first absurdity, to make them separate the second. But the difficulty was less on the Elizabethan stage. There place, like time, was fluid: one locality might as it were overflow and engulf another. The scene of Salisbury's mission would be played on the front stage: at the end of it Constance seats herself apart. Then the traverse is drawn open and the royal trains advance from the inner stage: the whole stage becomes the scene of the ceremonies, wherever that may be, embracing Constance, though she has never left her seat. This is recognized by the absence of any exit at the end of F's 'Actus Secundus'. Yet there is, in fact, a change of place, which justifies the marking of a new scene. The freedom of Elizabethan staging enables the playwright to slip between the horns of the dilemma.¹¹

The stage-directions are on the whole bare and rather non-committal: i. i. i 'Enter King Iohn, Queene Elinor, Pembroke, Essex, and Salisbury, with the Chattyllion of France'; 44 'Enter a Sheriffe';¹² 181 'Exeunt all but bastard'; II. i. I 'Enter before Angiers, Philip King of France, Lewis(,) Dauphin, Austria, Constance, Arthur'; 75 'Drum beats'; 84 'Enter K. of England . . . and others'; 201 'Trumpet sounds. | Enter a Citizen vpon the walles'; 300 'Heere after excursions, Enter the Herald of France with Trumpets to the gates'; 334 'Enter the two Kings with their powers, at seuerall doores'; 503 'Whispers with Blanch'; III. ii. I 'Allarums, Excursions: Enter Bastard with Austria's head'; iii. i 'Alarums, excursions, Retreat. Enter Iohn . . . Lords'; iv. iii. I 'Enter Arthur on the walks'; v. ii. i 'Enter (in Armes) Dolphin ... Souldiers'; v. i 'Enter Dolphin, and his Traine'; vi. I 'Enter Bastard and Hubert, seuerally'; vii. 28 'Iohn brought in'. These doubtless originated with the author: the balcony is twice 'the walles', yet armies enter 'at seuerall doores'. But there is nothing that may not have

¹¹ See Note C on p. 254.

¹² The Sheriff, who is mute, is a relic from *The Troublesome Reign*. There he first 'whispers the Earle of Sals[.] in the eare', but, having obtained audience, himself, as 'Thomas Nidigate Shrieue of Northamptonshire', formally introduces the disputants. In *King John* he probably 'whispers' Essex, but a more considered staging would perhaps have made Essex enter with him instead of at the beginning.

stood in the prompt-book, though nothing that implies the book-keeper's hand unless it be the alarms and excursions.

There is much confusion among the characters, sometimes over their names, sometimes their relationship, and most of it is real confusion in the author's mind, not mere inconsistency of designation. Shakespeare may be supposed to have known, even if he cared little, that John succeeded his eldest brother Richard, and that Arthur was the son of his second brother Geoffrey. Yet in the first scene Chatillon's words are at least open to the interpretation that John had succeeded Geoffrey, and in the second both Philip and Arthur himself imply that the latter was Richard's son. This is no great matter. Nor does it matter much that the Bastard is sometimes Philip and sometimes Richard. He is, of course, introduced as Philip Faulconbridge, but, having persuaded the King that he is Cœur-de-lion's son, he is knighted as 'Sir Richard, and Plantagenet' (I. i. 162) and passes thenceforth indifferently by either name—Philip at i. i. 231, III. ii. 4, 5, Richard at i. i. 168, 178, 185, iv. iii. 41, v. iii. 12. The origin of this is in *The Troublesome Reign* in which, too, Philip is knighted as 'Sir Richard Plantagenet' (Part I, i. 301). More confusing is it that the French king, Philip, sometimes takes the name of his son the Dauphin, Lewis. He is correctly 'Philip of France' at I. i. 7, but in n. i he is addressed as 'King Lewis' at 1. 149 and replies in a speech headed 'Lew.'; moreover it is clearly he and not the Dauphin who speaks two speeches headed 'Lewis' at the opening of the scene (11. i, 18), though the characters are correctly distinguished in the direction immediately above.

Besides this there is the usual kind of inconsistency in the designation of speakers.¹³ King Philip, when not confused with the Dauphin, speaks first as 'King' and after John's entry as 'France'. Philip Faulconbridge is naturally 'Philip' when he first appears, but as soon as he has made his choice of parentage he becomes 'Bastard' (at i. i. 138), and so he generally remains: yet he reverts to 'Philip' at III. i. 75 S.D., 131, 133. Similarly the Queen Mother, who is Elinor (or 'Elea.') throughout i. i, has her speeches headed 'Queen',

¹³ See p. 113. McKerrow was hasty, to say the least, in classing *King John* among the plays with regular speech-prefixes.

'Qu. Mo.' or 'Old Qu.' in II. ii, but is Elinor again in in. iii. Most curious is the Citizen of Angiers in II. i, whose speeches are headed 'Cit.' before the skirmish at 1. 300, but who, as soon as the Heralds enter, becomes 'Hubert' (or 'Hub.') and remains so to the end of the scene. The presumption is that a note by the book-keeper, half-way through the scene, to the effect that the part of the Citizen was to be doubled with that of Hubert, who first appears in Act III, was misunderstood and his speeches given the prefix of the other character.

All this, however, does not amount to very much. The textual confusions would very likely pass unnoticed—some of them have escaped the vigilance of most editors. The Citizen—Hubert muddle may have originated in F. For the rest the book-keeper, carefully preparing the prompt-book, might have been expected to tidy them up: but if an author's fair copy was being used for the purpose, or if a transcript was made by an inexperienced scribe who copied mechanically what was before him, it is perhaps unlikely that any one would have troubled to remove the inconsistencies. The view we take will very likely depend upon the date we assign to the play. If Chambers is right in placing it in the middle nineties, when the Chamberlain's was a well-established company with settled habits, we may regard the source of F as most likely foul papers whose directions were for some reason less characteristic than usual and upon which the book-keeper had made a few notes. If, on the other hand, we agree with Wilson in dating the play some six or eight years earlier, we may also agree with him in attributing to F a prompt-book origin.¹⁴

NOTE A (page 249)

Shakespeare must not only have had *The Troublesome Reign* before him as he wrote, but must have been intimately familiar with it, for he sometimes echoes its wording in a different context. Indeed, the direction of the borrowing is not always evident. Wilson compares Part I, xiii. 218-22 with Iv. iii. 35-50, passages that are both concerned with Arthur's death but are drawn from different parts of the action, and shows how they are linked by the occurrence in each of the words 'beauty', 'deed', 'revenge', 'rage', and of the rhetorical questions 'Was euer heard?' in the one and 'haue you read or heard?' in the other. These are the sort of links that Duthie, for instance, has elsewhere used to maintain the theory of reporting.

NOTE B (page 249)

A doubtful murmur respecting the relation of the plays has occasionally made itself heard. Wilson, who would put the original composition of *King John* before 1590, played with the notion that *The Troublesome Reign* might be the derivative, only to reject it and to argue forcibly in favour of the generally accepted relation. But it appears that the orthodox view is now to be challenged. In his recent *Shakespeare Primer* (1951, pp. 155-6, 164) Peter Alexander treats *The Troublesome Reign* as a 'bad' quarto of the Shakespearian play, a view he had already adumbrated in *Shakespeare's Life and Art* (1939, p. 85). Since Alexander regards *A Shrew* as simply a 'bad' quarto of *The Shrew*, he would naturally be tempted to extend the theory to the parallel case of *King John*. In doing so he relies on the conclusions of a student, Ernst Honigmann, in whose unpublished B.Litt. thesis (Oxford) the theory forms part of a revolutionary attempt to place the beginning of Shakespeare's dramatic writing several years earlier than is generally allowed. A first perusal, through the courtesy of the author, failed to carry conviction, but it would be unfair to pronounce on the subject until Honigmann's promised edition of *King John* in the new Arden Shakespeare is available.

NOTE C (page 251)

Though there is no exit marked, Constance's name appears among those entering with the royal trains since she has to speak in the new scene. Neither Arthur nor Salisbury takes part in it: they just fade away, probably remaining somewhere in the background. Wilson's ingenious stage-directions achieve essentially the same effect as the fluid technique of the Elizabethan stage. The whole is a case of what has been called dramatic *enjambement*, by which characters pass from one scene and locality to another without leaving the stage. (For the rationale of the convention see Greg, 'Webster's "White Devil"', Part II, 'Division into Scenes', *The Modern Language Quarterly*, Dec. 1900, iii. 120—2.) A more explicit case is in *Romeo and Juliet*, I. iv-v, where, at the end of the Queen Mab scene at the front, the masquers walk about the stage till they arrive at Capulet's house and mingle with the servants preparing the banquet upon the inner stage.

NOTE D (page 253)

Wilson is able to point to one remarkable piece of evidence in favour of an early date. In *The Troublesome Reign* Austria appears wearing the skin of the lion slain by King Richard (Part I, iii. i: 'The Bastard chaseth Lymoges the Austrich Duke, and maketh him leaue the Lyons skinne'), but it has nothing resembling the lines in *King John* (II. i. 137—8):

You are the Hare of whom the Prouerb goes
Whose valour plucks dead Lyons by the beard

—Shakespeare being doubtless familiar with the proverb 'Mortuo leoni et

lepores insulstant' in the *Adagia* of Erasmus. When, therefore, in *The Spanish Tragedy* we find the lines (277-9):

He hunted well that was the Lyons death,
Not he that in a garment wore his skin:
So Hares may pull dead Lyons by the beard

they seem to be a clear echo of the words and situation in *King John*—and *The Spanish Tragedy* is usually dated 1589 and the earliest extant edition almost certainly appeared in the autumn of 1592. Wilson is therefore fully justified in arguing that *King John* was probably written before 1590, even if, as he admits, this is not the only possible interpretation of the evidence.

XIV. *THE MERCHANT OF VENICE*. 1596

Quarto (1600).—The play, 'a booke of the Marchaunt of Venyce or otherwise called the lewe of Venyce', was conditionally entered Vnder the handes of bothe the wardens' to James Roberts on 22 July 1598, 'Prouided that yt bee not prynted by⁷ him 'or anye other whatsoeuer without lycence first had from the Right honorable the lord Chamberlen'. The unusual form of the entry and the fact that for over two years Roberts failed to act upon it have suggested to some critics that its object was to hinder rather than to promote publication and that it was made at the instigation of the players. However that may be, the play was re-entered on 28 October 1600 to Thomas Haies: 'Entred for his copie vnder the handes of the Wardens & by Consent of m^r Robertes. A booke called the booke of the merchant of Venyce/ That this was by a friendly arrangement with Roberts is confirmed by the fact that it was he who printed the ensuing quarto for Haies the same year; and that the publication had the sanction, if not of the Lord Chamberlain, at least of his servants, is implicit in the wording of the entry, since 'A booke called the booke' almost certainly means that the manuscript presented for registration was none other than the official prompt-book of the company.¹ It should not, however, be hastily assumed that this was the copy actually sent to the printer. The production of the prompt-book would satisfy the Wardens that the publication was authorized by the owners; moreover, it would bear the acting allowance of the Master of the Revels, and the Wardens might be content to accept this in place of an ecclesiastical licence to print. Having thus served a double purpose the prompt-book may have been replaced by some less valued manuscript for use at press.

The stage-directions are not, for the most part, elaborate:
i. ii. i 'Enter Portia with her wayting woman Nerrissa';
iii. i 'Enter Bassanio with Shylocke the lew'; II. i. I 'Enter Morochus a tawnie Moore all in white, and three or foure followers accordingly, with Portia, Nerrissa, and their traine';

¹ See p. 100, Note B.

ii. i 'Enter the Clowne alone'; 34 'Enter old Gobbo with a basket'; 121 'Enter Bassanio with a follower or two'; iv. 9 'Enter Launcelet'; v. i 'Enter lewe and his man that was the Clowne'; vi. I 'Enter the maskers, Gratiano and Salerio'; 26 'lessica aboue'; vii. i 'Enter Portia with Morrocho and both theyr traines'; ix. i 'Enter Nerrissa and a Seruiture' (i.e. servitor); 4 'Enter Arrogon, his trayne, and Portia'; in. i. 77 'Enter a man from Anthonio'; 80 'Enter Tuball' (repeated at 82); 81 'Exeunt Gentlemen'; ii. i 'Enter Bassanio, Portia, Gratiano, and all their traynes'; 60 'A Song the whilst Bassanio comments on the caskets to himselfe'; 223 'Enter Lorenzo, lessica, and Salerio a messenger from Venice'; 239 'open the letter'; iv. I 'Enter Portia . . . and a man of Portias' (sc. Balthasar); Iv. i. I 'Enter the Duke, the Magnificoes, Anthonio, Bassanio, and Gratiano'; 119 'Enter Nerrissa'; 166 'Enter Portia for Balthazer'; ii. I 'Enter Nerrissa'; v. i. 68 'play Musique'. These directions, with their indefinite numbers and their persistent groups, are undoubtedly the author's, but they appear to contain some notes by the book-keeper. The clearest instance is at ii. v. I, where 'the Clowne' is a gloss on 'his man that was', i.e. his former servant—Launcelot had left the Jew's service. Then there is Tubal's double entrance in in. i, once when he is seen approaching, and again when he is addressed: one or other must be an addition. If so, the imperative notes at in. ii. 239 and v. i. 68 may be from the same hand. An entrance for Portia as well as for Nerissa is needed at iv. ii. I, and one for Salerio along with the rest at iv. i. i, and several exits are unmarked: at Iv. i. 119 Shakespeare forgot to mention that Nerissa is in male attire.

There is some inconsistency in designating characters. 'Shylocke' and 'lew', 'Launcelot' and 'Clowne' are used indifferently both in directions and speech-headings, sometimes within a scene.² Much worse is the confusion between what Wilson has nicknamed 'the three Sallies': Solanio (sometimes misprinted 'Salarino'), Salarino, and Salerio. Salerio is the only one who appears in the dialogue: he is named four times, and must be accepted. But Salarino is called 'Salerino' at II. vi. I and a speech of his is headed 'Saleri.' at III. i. 79;

² See Note A on p. 260.

and Salarino is merely a diminutive of Salerio. Wilson suggests that Salarino is a ghost, a doublet of Salerio: Shakespeare, it would seem, was just uncertain of the name.³ Chambers finds some abnormal spellings that suggest an autograph source, and Wilson agrees that 'Gondylo' for gondola (n. viii. 8) may be Shakespeare's, though he is certain that the 1600 copy 'contained not a line of Shakespeare's handwriting'. Chambers, on the contrary, sees 'no clear reason why the copy . . . should not have been in Shakespeare's hand', and the evidence seems indeed to point in that direction. But the text is generally a clean one, and the question arises whether such confusions as it contains are of a kind to make it unlikely that an author's fair copy was used as a prompt-book and later used by the printer of Q, as the entry in the Register suggests. At Iv. i. 398 a speech, probably by Gratiano, is falsely ascribed to Shylock, but this may be a mere misprint. The Jew and Clown prefixes are immaterial; a careful book-keeper might have avoided them in writing, but no one would have troubled to alter them. There may have been one or two insertions, but there is no saying whether they are of later date.⁴ It is more difficult to believe in a prompt-book that did not know how many characters of rather similar names there were in the play. On the whole foul papers with some playhouse annotation seem perhaps most likely, but it is not possible to pronounce with any confidence.

In 1619 a reprint of **Qi** appeared, as part of a pretended collection of Shakespeare's plays, with the original date and a false assertion that it was 'Printed by I. Roberts'.⁵ Like certain of its fellows in the collection,⁶ this piratical edition underwent some revision both in text and stage-directions, though the alterations made were plainly without authority. Several exits are noted for the first time, including 'Exit one

³ That there were only two 'Sallies' in the play is confirmed by the list of personae in a late quarto of 1637, but there it is Salerio who is omitted. However, as Chambers observes, we do not know whether this had any authority behind it.

⁴ Wilson, availing himself of a suggestion by Greg, takes v. i. 34-48 to be 'a theatrical interpolation in the interests of the clown', and Chambers agrees. But Greg's elaborate conjecture respecting an inserted slip with a misunderstood catchword is not really necessary; the facts can be more simply explained by supposing that a speaker's name was written rather too low, so that Lorenzo's 'sweete soule' got tacked on to the Clown's speech. ⁵ See p. 12. ⁶ Cf. 2 and 3 *Henry VI* (p. 177).

of his men' at II. ii. 125. At II. v. i the direction becomes 'Enter the lew and Lancelet'. In III. i the second entrance for Tubal is omitted (this is the only direction in which an alteration in Q2 anticipates F). Imperative directions become indicative: in. ii. 239 'He opens the Letter', and v. i. 68 'Musicke playes'. In the text Shylock's speech at Iv. i. 398 is transferred to Gratiano (anticipating F; but the correction is an obvious one). The most important change is at i. iii. 65-665 where 'is hee yet possest How much ye would?' is altered to 'are you resolu'd, How much he would haue?' to bring it into line with Shylock's reply. But it is less likely that the change of address proved awkward on the stage, as Wilson suggests, than that the reviser simply did not 'catch on' to it. Several other alterations prove his lack of intelligence. He made a superficial attempt to disentangle the 'Sallies', but only succeeded in corrupting Solanio to 'Salanio' throughout.⁷

Folio.—This, like Q2, was printed from Qi, but from a copy that had received some playhouse annotation. That is evident from the stage-directions, which pay special attention to noises. We find 'Flo(r). Cornets' added three times to ceremonial scenes at Belmont.⁸ At III. ii. 60 'Here Musicke' is prefixed to the direction for a song, at v. i. 109 is added 'Musicke ceases', and at 121 'A Tucket sounds'. At ii. iv. 9 Launcelot enters 'with a Letter'. At Iv. ii. I the direction is corrected to 'Enter Portia and Nerrissa' (though there is still no entrance for Salerio at iv. i. i). At III. ii. 223 'a messenger from Venice', as a description of Salerio, is removed from the direction. The second 'Enter Tuball' disappears from in. i, as it does in Q2. As in Q2, again some attempt is made to tidy up the 'Sallies': for example at in. iii. i the 'Salerio' of Qi becomes 'Salarino' in Q2 and 'Solanio' in F. At II. vi. i 'Salerino' (Q2 'Salarino') is misprinted 'Salino', and so again at 1. 20, thus making a fourth 'Sally'. The alterations may be conjectural. The speech misassigned to Shylock

⁷ See Note B on p. 261.

⁸ Once, indeed, it appears after the direction at II. viii. i, but it certainly belongs to the previous scene in which Morocco makes his choice of the caskets. It may have been intended to mark his departure, but more likely it should have heralded his entrance at vii. i (as it does at i. i) and has been inserted at the head of the wrong scene. Cf. I *Henry VI* (p. 188), and *Macbeth* (p. 394).

at iv. i. 398 is transferred to Gratiano (as in Qs). Two instances of profanity have been removed (at i. ii. 121 'I pray God graunt' becomes 'I wish' and at v. i. 157 'no Gods my ludge' becomes 'but wel I know') and, more significant, so has a dig at the Scots (at i. ii. 83, where 'the other Lord' replaces 'the Scottish Lorde'): a revival at court is recorded on Shrove Sunday, 10 February 1605, a year before the Act against profanity.

There is no doubt that some of the alterations in F come from the playhouse. According to Wilson it is 'the long-standing verdict of scholars' that F 'was reprinted from a copy of Qi 'which had been used as a prompt-book in the theatre or, at the least, had been collated with such a prompt-book', and Chambers states, a little ambiguously, that 'the Qi used for F probably represented prompt-copy'. There is, however, much the same difficulty in supposing that a copy of Qi was itself used as prompt-copy as there is in supposing that Qi was printed from a prompt-book. One feels bound to assume that in the prompt-book the identity of the 'Sallies' was made apparent—else how could they play their parts on the stage?—yet it would seem that neither Q I nor F (let alone Q2) had any authoritative guidance in the matter.⁹ At the same time, if they *were* reduced to order in the prompt-book, it is difficult to imagine how the editor, who took so many details from that source, failed to clear up this difficulty at the same time. There seems no escape from the dilemma. The only other relevant point to observe is that if the direction 'Flo. Cornets' at ii. viii. i was really inserted at the head of the wrong scene (see Note B), the accident would perhaps have been more likely to happen in transferring annotations from the prompt-book to a copy of Qi destined for the printer than in preparing a copy of Qi to be itself used as a prompt-book, and in the latter case would surely have been corrected.

A normal division into acts only was introduced in F.

NOTE A (page 257)

Launcelot's other name appears to be Gobbo, but this form never appears in the text and is otherwise only used to indicate his father, 'old Gobbo'. In II.

9 See Note C on p. 261.

ii. i-io, the only passage in which the name appears in the text itself, it is spelled 'lobbe', which presumably represents the Italian *Giobbe*, Job: *Gobbo* means hunchback, and as such was applied by Francis Davison to Robert Cecil in a letter of 27 Oct. 1596. This discrepancy is the most substantial of the reasons on which Dover Wilson, in his edition of 1926, bases his theory of multiple origin for the text. But it is difficult to see where it leads.

NOTE B (page 259)

Trivialities apart, Wilson notes five other changes in which Q2 anticipates F. Three are accepted as genuine corrections: II. viii. 39 'Slubber' for 'Slumber', III. v. 24 'e'ne' (i.e. e'en) for 'in', IV. i. 30 'his state' for 'this states'. Only the first is significant; the others are fairly obvious conjectures. The reviser may have known the play on the stage. Two are mistaken alterations: III. i. 7 'gossips report' for the correct 'gossip report', and v. i. 148, 151 'poesie' (twice) for 'posie'. The first is just such an alteration as a meddlesome editor or compositor would be likely to make; the second is a misprint perhaps due to the intervening 'poetry'. Both are within the bounds of coincidence. Greg's 'tentative suggestion' (*apud* Wilson) that the marked copy of Q1 from which Q2 was printed in 1619 may have remained in Jaggard's office and have been used again, after further revision, as copy for F, must be rejected. For one thing, only a small proportion of the Q2 variants reappear in F; for another, as Alice Walker was quick to point out, Q2 and F cannot have been printed from the same copy of Q1, for copies of Q1 differ among themselves in an important reading on sig. 04, and Q2 was printed from a copy with the correct, and F from a copy with the incorrect, reading at this point.

NOTE C (page 260)

If we allow that Salerio and Salarino were accepted as merely variant forms of the same name and designated a single character, and if we further dismiss Wilson's plausible conjecture that it was Solanio and not Salerio who figured in the trial scene, and lastly make the compositor of F responsible for a number of ambiguous abbreviations and misprints, then there need not have been anything essentially wrong with the appearances of the characters and the distribution of their speeches in the text, whatever it was, that lies behind F. It is certainly to F's credit that it substitutes Solanio for Salerio in in. iii. At the same time F's ambiguities in I. i are serious and the prefix 'Salar.' at l. 15 a palpable error, and 'Salarino' (II. iv. 1) and 'Salino' (II. vi. 1 and 20) are wanton misprints for 'Salarino'. It must be confessed that the assumptions needed to habilitate the source of F are considerable.

XV. i HENRY THE FOURTH. 1597

Quarto (1598).—The play was entered at Stationers' Hall on 25 February 1598, probably within a few months of its production; a desire to advertise the substitution of Falstaff for Oldcastle (see below) may account for its early publication. What passes for Qi was printed the same year; but the binding of an Italian grammar has yielded a single sheet (sig. C) of an earlier impression.¹ Comparison with this shows that the compositor of Qi was economizing space and sometimes ran speeches together, a fact that, as Dover Wilson points out in his edition of 1946, may account for a misplaced prefix that might else invite a different explanation.²

The epilogue to Part II as good as confesses that Falstaff was originally called Oldcastle, and the earlier name has not only left traces in the text³ but continued to be the traditional title of the play.⁴ The change is supposed to have been made out of deference to, or at the command of, Lord Cobham,⁵ an ancestress of whom married Sir John Oldcastle, the Lollard leader and 'martyr'. Chambers points out that this was probably not the only alteration made. At I. ii. 181 Prince Hal's thieving companions are named as Talstalf, Haruey, Rossill, and Gadshil', and the prefix 'Ross.' survives at n. iv. 193, 195, 199; further, Part II has the direction 'Enter the Prince, Poynes, sir Iohn Russel, with other' at ii. ii. i. The references to Russell have been partially and clumsily removed in F, evidently by a corrector who did not

¹ Once in Halliwell's possession, now in the Folger Shakespeare Library.

² I. i. 76-77:

A gallant prize ? Ha coosen, is it not ? In faith it is.

West. A conquest for a Prince to boast of.

Cf. Greg, *Editorial Problem*, pp. 128-9.

³ See Part II, Epilogue, ll. 31-34, and I. ii. 37 (Q), prefix 'Old': Part I, I. ii. 47, 'my old lad of the castle'.

⁴ See a letter of 8 Mar. 1600, Field's *Amends for Ladies*, 1618, and the Lord Chamberlain's accounts for 1638-9 (Chambers, *W. Shake.*, ii. 322, i. 382, ii. 352).

⁵ No doubt, if Chambers's dating is correct, Henry, eighth Baron Cobham, rather than his father William, the Lord Chamberlain, who died on 5 Mar. 1597. On the other hand, Dover Wilson argues strongly in favour of the more puritanical William (*The Library*, June 1945, xxvi. 12-16). This he is able to do since he believes a verse play of 1596 was rewritten largely in prose the following year. But his arguments are not altogether convincing (cf. *As you Like it*).

understand that what had happened was that Russell had been replaced by Peto and Harvey by Bardolph. The fact that 'Both Russell and Harvey were familiar names at the Elizabethan court' suggests the motive.

The stage-directions are normal for an author, though not on the whole particularly distinctive: II. i. i 'Enter a Carrier with a lanterne in his hand'; ii. 30 'They whistle'; 97 'Here they rob them and bind them'; 104 'Enter the theeues againe'; 108 'As they are sharing the Prince & Poinis set vpon them, they all runne away, and Falstalffe after a blow or two runs away too, leauing the bootie behind them'; iii. I 'Enter Hotspur solus reading a letter'; iv. 88 'Here they both cal him, the Drawer stands amazed not knowing which way to go'; 133 'he drinketh' (and again at 172); 528 'Enter Bardoll running'; 580 'He searcheth his pocket, and findeth certaine papers'; III. i. 197 'Glendower speakes to her in Welsh, and she answeres him in the same'; 232 'Themusicke playes'; 249 'Here the Ladie sings a welsh song'; iii. 102 'Enter the prince marching, and Falstalffe meetes him playing vpon his trunchion like a fife'; Iv. i. 12 'Enter one with letters'; iii. 29 'The trumpet sounds a parley'; v. i. 8 'The trumpet sounds'; 108 'Exeunt: manent Prince, Falst.'; iii. I 'Here they embrace, the trumpets sound, the king enters with his power, alarme to the battel, then enter Douglas, and sir Walter Blunt'; 56 'The Prince drawes it out, and finds it to be a bottle of Sacke'; 57 'He throwes the bottle at him'; iv. 39 'They fight, the king being in danger, Enter Prince of Wales'; 78 'Enter Douglas, he fighteth with Falstalffe, he fals down as if he were dead, the Prince killeth Percy'; 101 'He spieth Falstalffe on the ground'; in 'Falstalffe riseth vp'; 132 'He takes vp Hotspur on his backe'; 162 'A retraite is founded [j/V]'.⁶ Sometimes the directions are deficient. The exit and entrance that should separate what in F became Acts III and IV are wanting, and the direction separating v. ii from v. iii lacks the essential exit, which is enough of

⁶ It will be noticed that four of the above directions (none of them entrances) are introduced by the word 'Here', which in discussing i *Henry VI* (note 3) we found to be characteristic of Nashe. It is therefore worth noting that Dover Wilson finds a number of parallels with Nashe's works in i *Henry IV* a fact for which, however, he has no explanation to offer (see his edition, pp. 191-6, and *The Library*, June 1945, xxvi. 11-12).

itself to show, as Wilson observes, that it cannot derive from prompt-copy. Everything points to Q having been printed from foul papers, and there is no need to suppose that these had even been annotated by the book-keeper.

Folio.—This was printed from Q5 (1613), although Q6 (1622) was presumably by then available,⁷ which suggests that the copy had been prepared some time before. A division into acts and scenes was introduced. The directions were pruned and touched up: that at iv. i. I, demanded by the new division, was supplied; but that at v. ii. 102 was left as it stood, and it remained for later editors to mark a new scene, which proves that the divisions can have had no playhouse authority. Indeed the whole editing appears to have been literary,⁸ which is significant in view of the very thorough purging of profanity. F follows Q5 in omitting one speech, v. v. 32-33, presumably because in the context the second line makes no apparent sense. Of the many alterations in the text some correct known errors of Q5 and a few suspected errors of **Qi**. Among them are probably some editorial alterations, such as that of 'present' to 'President', i.e. precedent, example, at II. iv. 37; and a few of the changes in the stage-directions may have a similar origin. Otherwise the variants, even when plausible, are probably due to the compositors; and the most we need assume is some recollection of a performance, which would equally account for a few attractive readings in the Bering manuscript.¹⁰ At no point is it necessary to assume recourse to the prompt-book.¹¹

NOTE A

An important article by Alice Walker on "The Folio Text of "i Henry IV" ' (*Studies in Bibliography*, 1953, vi. 45—59), analysing the work of the two compositors involved, throws considerable light on the editing that the copy for F may have received before being sent to press. She concludes that while the great majority of the F variants are due to the compositors, it is probable that a few had been marked in the quarto by someone who knew the play but

⁷ See p. 461.

⁸ See Note A.

⁹ See pp. 149 ff. There remains 'lesu' (Q 'jesus') at n. ii. 86.

¹⁰ A condensed and amalgamated version of the two plays, transcribed from Q5 of Part I and Qi of Part II and prepared for acting in the first quarter of the seventeenth century. It is now in the Folger Shakespeare Library.

¹¹ See Note B on p. 265.

is unlikely to have had access to any written authority. Miss Walker's article is further considered on p. 466, Note E.

The editing seems to have been in some respects careful, if not always informed (cf. the character-changes mentioned above), and to have extended to the occasional restoration of colloquial contractions that Wilson plausibly suspects the pedantry of the Q compositor of having removed. In this connexion Alice Walker (*Textual Problems*, pp. 109 ff.) draws attention to the curious similarity between the Q i *Henry 7*' and the F 2 *Henry IF*' in respect of the quite unnatural absence of colloquial forms in the speech of the humorous characters, and concludes that Q Part I was printed from and that behind F Part II lay a transcript intermediate between foul papers and prompt-copy, prepared by the same scribe of pedantic literary habits. This explanation has the advantage of neatness and simplicity, but there are considerable difficulties in the way of believing in such transcripts as she postulates (see p. 166 Note J).

NOTE B (page 264)

Wilson conjectures that the reviser, as the easiest way to effect the purgation of the oaths, consulted a prompt-copy that had been in use after 1606, and that in the course of doing so he introduced some half-dozen haphazard corrections into the copy of Q5 from which F was printed. But there is nothing to force us to this conclusion. The strongest suggestion of the use of the prompt-book is the introduction of colloquial contractions (see Note A), but this would assume a closer collation than seems likely.

XVI. 2 *HENRY THE FOURTH*. 1598

Quarto (1600).—As originally printed the quarto lacked what in F is in. i. When the defect was discovered, after about half the edition had been sold, two leaves, £3—4, were cancelled and replaced by a complete sheet of four leaves incorporating the missing matter. The scene runs to 108 lines of verse and would conveniently cover the two sides of a folio leaf, which may have been accidentally mislaid or overlooked. Such an accident would obviously be more likely in the case of foul papers than of a prompt-book, and other evidence points in the same direction. Indeed, Q may be taken as the typical example of a text set up from the author's original draft. Traces survive of the earlier names of Falstaff and Peto (see I *Henry IV*) and in I. i Lord Bardolf has been imperfectly substituted for Sir John Umfreville. There are ghosts and mutes, and entrances and exits are often unmarked.¹ There are inconsistent and generic designations of characters.² The minor part of a Beadle in v. iv is assigned to the actor John Sincklo both in the direction and prefixes. There was no need to depict him as abnormally lean, and the emphasis laid on this characteristic proves that Shakespeare was exploiting the remarkable appearance of a particular actor and was writing the part expressly for him.³ There is the repeated Shakespearian spelling 'Scilens' for Silence.⁴ The epilogue has had two paragraphs added after the prayer for the Queen. There appears to be an unresolved textual tangle at i. iii. 78—80⁵ and a false start at III. i. 53—56.⁶ Two lines were actually removed in the course of printing and do not appear in F: they are iv. i. 93, 95, of which the first is superfluous and the second obscure (but see Note I). The directions are clearly the author's and are often indefinite: Indue, i 'Enter Rumour painted full of Tongues'; I. ii. I 'Enter sir Iohn alone, with his page bearing his sword and buckler'; II. i. I 'Enter Hostesse of the Tauerne, and an Officer or two'; 65 'Enter Lord chiefe iustice and his

¹ See p. 166, Note E.

² See Note A on p. 272.

⁴ See pp. 147—8.

⁶ See Note D on p. 273.

³ See p. 115 and Note B on p. 272.

⁵ See Note C on p. 273.

men'; ii. I 'Enter the Prince . . . with other'; iv. I 'Enter a Drawer or two' (but there are at least two); III. i. I 'Enter the King in his night-gowne alone'; ii. 62 'Enter Bardolfe, and one with him'; Iv. i. I 'Enter . . . within the forrest of Gaultree'; ii. i (really continuous) 'Enter Prince Iohn and his armie' (two lines early); iii. 27 'Enter Iohn[,] Westmerland, and the rest'; v. iv. I 'Enter Sincklo and three or foure officers'; v. i 'Enter strewers of rushes'; 6 'Trumpets sound, and the King, and his traine passe ouer the stage: after them enter Falstaffe . . .'; and, most characteristic of all, v. ii. i 'Enter Warwicke, duke Humphrey, L. chiefe lustice, Thomas Clarence, Prince(.) Iohn[,] Westmerland' followed by 14 'Enter Iohn, Thomas, and Humphrey', whom Shakespeare decided he did not need for the opening exchanges between Warwick and the Lord Chief Justice (Westmorland he did not use at all). A few notes may have been added by the book-keeper when he read the script.⁷

Q wants eight passages, totalling 156' lines, that appear in F.⁸ That they are cuts is evident, for they sometimes leave the transition harsh and the metre defective. They do little to shorten the play as a whole, but, though occasionally clumsy, they lighten individual speeches and, by relieving tedious discussion, quicken the pace. But if the cuts were marked by the book-keeper when he read through the foul papers no notice appears to have been paid to his directions in preparing the prompt-book, for it must have been from the prompt-book that the passages found their way into F.⁹

Folio.—This clearly has the prompt-book behind it. The cuts are restored; the Epilogue rearranged; directions are drastically pruned, made explicit, and generally tidied up;¹⁰ ghosts and mutes disappear, and many entrances and exits are added; character-designations and speech-prefixes are largely normalized and made consistent; Sincklo becomes

⁷ This at least is suggested by the arrangement of the directions at IV. iii. i:

Alarum *Enter Falstaffe* *excursions*

⁸ Namely I. i. 166-79, 189-209, iii. 21-24, 36-55, 85^b-io8, II. iii. 23-45% IV. i. 55-79, io3^b-39.

⁹ See Note E on p. 273.

¹⁰ For example the directions at v. ii. i and 14 now take the form 'Enter the Earle of Warwicke, and the Lord Chiefe lustice' and 'Enter Iohn of Lancaster, Gloucester, and Clarence'.

one of the Beadles with the prefix 'Officer'. There are a number of small omissions amounting to some 40 lines in all: no doubt the reasons for these differ. Some may be accidental; some remove profanity, not necessarily through official censorship; some remove indelicacy, though worse remains; some may be classed as emendations (see Note D); and a few remain unexplained, for to see anti-patriotic sentiment in I. ii. 240—7 is surely as fanciful as to see un-Christian sentiment in in. i. 53-56. There are also many variant readings: here too some are doubtless accidental, some errors and some corrections; a few suggest that the text may have undergone revision when the prompt-book was prepared, though these tend to fade out on closer scrutiny (see, however, Note G).¹¹

F introduces a division into acts and scenes, which, except for counting the Induction as i. i, seems reasonable enough:¹² it is not clear, however, that its origin is theatrical rather than literary. The same is true of the altered staging of the last scene. In Q the King's procession first passes over the stage on its way to the coronation; then Falstaff and his crew enter and take their places; and it is only on the return of the procession from the Abbey that they break in on the decorum of the occasion. F omits the first procession, though, as Wilson points out, it seems to be implied in the conversation of the rush-strewers. Later on, according to Q, the procession moves off after the interruption, and the Lord Chief Justice and Prince John re-enter to consign Falstaff and his followers to the Fleet, and themselves conclude the scene. In F they apparently stay behind when the procession passes on, a less decorous procedure, which might, however, be thought more strictly in accordance with the King's command. There can be no question but that Q's is the more effective arrangement, and it is less likely that F represents that adopted in the prompt-book than that it is due to the

¹¹ At IV. iv. 104 the substitution of

But write her faire words still in foulest Letters ?

for Q's unintelligible

But wet her faire words stil in foulest termes ?

is manifest botching.

¹² Modern editors correct this error but introduce worse ones later on: their division at IV. ii is wrong, that at IV. iii unnecessary, and that at iv. v absurd.

interference of a literary editor who did not properly understand the requirements of stage-production.

There are other indications that F cannot be immediately derived from the prompt-book. While in some ways the treatment of the directions is consistent with prompt-book custom, the revision is more drastic than we usually find, and the general removal of stage noises and effects that would be needed by the prompter points rather to the hand of a literary editor. The revision is also curiously inconsistent: at I. ii. 62 F supplies the Servant who waits on the Chief Justice, but at II. i. 68 it removes the men who undoubtedly accompany him; apparently it is only concerned with speakers, again a literary rather than a theatrical criterion. Noticeable too is the persistent removal in F of contracted and colloquial forms and spellings. Since in I *Henry IV* the tendency is for F to restore colloquialisms that had been presumably removed by the Q compositor, their removal in the present case is unlikely to be due either to the scribe of the prompt-book or the compositor of F. Again we seem to see the hand of a literary reviser.¹³

But though it is usually agreed that the prompt-book lies somewhere behind F, the question whether F was itself printed from the prompt-book or a transcript of it, or from a copy of Q that had been elaborately 'corrected' by comparison with such a manuscript, remains in dispute. It seems on general grounds unlikely that a manuscript would have been given to the printer, still more unlikely that a manuscript would have been specially prepared for the printer, when there was to hand a perfectly good quarto, the cuts in which could easily be restored and the text of which needed less correction than was in fact carried out in *Richard III* and *King Lear*. In view, therefore, of the fact that there are undoubted errors common to Q and F, critical opinion was till lately generally content to assume that it was Q that served as copy for F. But in 1940 appeared the new Variorum edition by M. A. Shaaber, who argued strongly in the opposite direction, pronouncing the evidence in favour of F's derivation from Q to be largely illusory and finding signs of F having been printed from a manuscript written by Ralph

¹³ For a different interpretation see i *Henry IV*, Note A (end).

Crane, or at least by a scribe who shared some of his peculiarities. Shaaber's view deserves careful consideration; nevertheless it was perhaps too hastily endorsed by Dover Wilson in his own edition of 1946. The attempt to deny weight to the evidence in favour of a direct relation between the two texts is not altogether successful. The most serious argument is the editor's own impression, after five years' work on the text, that there are not the 'similarities of spelling, punctuation, and typographical style' one would expect to find if F were in fact printed from Q.¹⁴ Other negative arguments are not free from the appearance of special pleading. Most editors believe some speeches to be misassigned in both texts: this Shaaber flatly denies. Some thirty common errors have been alleged by one editor or another, though not all, to be sure, need to be taken seriously. Shaaber rejects most of them on the ground that not all critics are agreed that they are errors. This is true; but critics can usually be found to defend any nonsense and see in it proof of the subtlety of the author's thought. In the end only three trifling twin-errors are admitted, and these, as Shaaber rightly observes, can easily be ascribed to coincidence in texts that must go back, however indirectly, to one original manuscript. Dover Wilson shows a bolder and more truly critical spirit in recognizing a minimum of ten common errors, which he traces to original mistakes or ambiguities in Shakespeare's manuscript surviving or being similarly misinterpreted in Q on the one hand and, through the prompt-book and Crane's transcript, in F on the other. This is, up to a point, a critically possible explanation: still, however careless Shakespeare's treatment of minims, it is difficult to believe that the perfectly obvious reading 'inuisible' at III. ii. 337 should have been twice misread as 'inuinsible' and this twice misinterpreted as 'inuincible', which, *pace* the critics, makes no sense at all.¹⁵ Another

¹⁴ Some similarities of spelling there certainly are. Alice Walker *Textual Problems*, p. 103) points out that both texts have 'Welch' at I. iii. 79 but 'Welsh' at 1. 83, 'sawcines' at II. i. 124 but 'sawcinesse' at 1. 135, 'breuitie' at II. ii. 135 but 'breuity' in the next line, 'thin' at v. iv. 20 but 'thinne' at 1. 34. At IV. v. 32-33 'downy' and 'down' are spelled 'down(e)y' and 'dowlne' in both texts. At II. i. 119 Q has the quite exceptional spelling 'maner' in order to get the word in at the end of a line, and so has F, though here the word occurs at the beginning of an uncrowded line: this is the only time the short spelling is found without reason in the Folio out of more than 130 instances.

¹⁵ See Note F on p. 275.

reason that Shaaber gives for doubting the dependence of F on Q is that the King's speech at Iv. v. 60-80 'is mislined differently in the two texts'. There are, it is true, several mislinings in each; but these, properly considered, point, in fact, to dependence rather than the reverse. Q's first error is simply to tack a short line (62) on to the one before: F combines it with what follows and so upsets the next three lines. This could easily happen as the result of a clumsy correction made in a copy of Q. Q's next error is to make 1. 69 instead of 1. 70 a short line: and here F follows Q exactly. The rest of Q is correct, but F has a further error due to an alteration in the text involving the introduction of another short line. This again could easily arise from an insertion in Q.¹⁶

Shaaber is on much firmer ground in arguing positively that F was printed from a manuscript, and a manuscript which, though dependent on the prompt-book, can only have been a literary transcript of it. Although, as we saw (note 10), F resolves the massed entry in Q, it introduces several of its own. Thus II. ii. I 'Enter Prince Henry, Pointz, Bardolfe, and Page' followed by 78 'Enter Bardolfe'; Iv. i. I 'Enter the Arch-bishop, Mowbray, Hastings, Westmerland, Coleuile' followed by 25 'Enter Westmerland' (there is no evidence of Coleville being present, but he is on and speaks in the continuous iv. iii where F, but not Q, gives him a fresh entrance); v. iii. i 'Enter Falstaffe, Shallow, Silence, Bardolfe, Page, and Pistoll' followed by 86 'Enter Pistoll'. These are far less striking examples than those found in other texts commonly connected with Crane, for instance *Measure for Measure*; still, they do suggest some half-hearted inclination in the same direction. Again, F has, of course, been entirely repunctuated, and the heavy style and rather lavish use of hyphens and parentheses are somewhat in Crane's manner, though they are by no means peculiar to him.¹⁷ Against Crane is the removal of colloquialisms already noticed, which is not at all in his manner, any more than it is in that of the book-keeper or the F compositors.

The evidence, then, points unmistakably to another hand intervening between the prompt-book and F. At the same time, being somewhat equivocal, it hardly justifies the

¹⁶ See Note G on p. 275.

w See Note H on p. 275.

assumption of a transcript, the *a priori* improbability of which has already been emphasized, or of the intervention of Crane himself. Indeed, the personal identification, originally advanced by J. Q. Adams, has been doubted by careful observers. As a compromise it might be suggested that the comparison of Q with the prompt-book and its preparation to serve as copy for F were entrusted, not to the book-keeper or other official of conservative habits, as seems usually to have been the case, but to some more independent and adventurous scribe, who shared some of Crane's prepossessions and mannerisms, but whose literary taste refused to countenance the colloquial usages that abound in Q.

Unlike Dover Wilson, Alice Walker refuses to surrender to Shaaber's persuasions and stoutly maintains the old arguments in favour of regarding F as a modified reprint of Q.¹⁸ And so the dispute continues without any certain conclusion in sight. It may be that a careful examination of the formal peculiarities of the texts, such as enabled Williams to settle the similar problem in *Troilus and Cressida* would provide conclusive evidence one way or another. It is to be hoped that before long some competent investigator with no preconceived ideas may be found to undertake the rather arduous task.

NOTE A (page 266)

Northumberland's speeches have the prefix 'Earle' in I. i but later 'North.'; Mowbray, described as 'Earle Marshall' in the stage-direction, is 'Marsh.' in i. iii but 'Mowbray' in Iv. i: in II. iii Northumberland 'his wife' is 'Wife', but 'the wife to Harry Percie' is 'Kate': one of Justice Shallow's speeches is headed 'lust.' (III. ii. 90): in directions Quickly is 'Hostesse of the Tauerne' at II. i. I but 'mistris Quickly' at II. iv. 24; her speeches, however, are all assigned to 'Hostesse' except at II. iv. 24, 34: Doll Tearsheet is 'Doll', 'Dorothy', or 'Tere.' in II. iv but 'Whoore' in v. iv—we cannot doubt her identity. In i. ii Falstaff is 'lohn', 'sir lohn', or 'Falst.' (besides 'Old'), his boy is 'Boy' or 'Page', and the Lord Chief Justice is 'Justice' or 'Lord'. Prince Henry is 'Prince', but so is Prince John, who is also 'lohn' (like Falstaff).

NOTE B (page 266)

The term 'Atomy' (F 'Anatomy', skeleton) applied to the officer is supported by 'Nut-hooke', 'tripe visagde rascall', 'paper-facde villaine', 'thin man', 'famished correctioner', 'starude blood-hound', 'Goodman death, goodman bones', 'thinne thing'.

¹⁸ See *Textual Problems*, pp. 94-120, and Note I on p. 276.

It is just possible that another actor's name is preserved in the mysterious direction 'Enter Will' at II. iv. 21. The most obvious explanation, indeed, is that the direction is misplaced and that Will is the name of a third drawer, who calls on the others to hurry up at 1. 14. (Both speech and direction disappear in F.) But it recalls the direction 'Enter Will Kemp' in *Romeo and Juliet* (Q2, IV. v. 101) and Dover Wilson interprets it to mean that Falstaff here leaves the ladies in the inner room and crosses the stage for a purpose explained at 1. 37. If Kemp was the creator of Falstaff on the boards Shakespeare of course knew his man and may have referred to him by name. Kemp was the company's chief comic actor, and a sharer and householder, till 1599, and if he played Falstaff his departure would explain why 'the fat rogue' had to be killed off in *Henry V*.

NOTE C (page 266)

Hast. If he should do so, French and Welch he leaues his
back vnarmde, they baying him at the heeles neuer fear that.

F straightens it out:

Hast. If he should do so,
He leaues his backe vnarm'd, the French, and Welch
Baying him at the heeles: neuer feare that.

NOTE D (page 266)

how chances mockes,
And changes fill the cup of alteration,
With diuers liquors! O if this were scene,
The happiest youth viewing his progresse through,
What perills past, what crosses to ensue?
Would shut the booke and sit him downe and die:
Tis not ten yeeres gone,
Since Richard and Northumberland great friends . . .

Three and a half lines were presumably cancelled and did not appear in the prompt-book, for F joins the loose ends in the perfectly satisfactory reading

With diuers Liquors. 'Tis not tenne yeeres gone . . .

And some maintain that the 'profane and sceptical' lines were cut on the score of 'un-Christian pessimism'!

NOTE E (page 267)

This has naturally raised a suspicion that the passages were censored in Q at the time of printing. Dover Wilson, following L. L. Schucking (*TLS*, 25 Sept. 1930) and A. Hart (*Shakespeare and the Homilies*, 1934, pp. 179 ff.), points out that Q was published during the period of tension that followed Essex's return from Ireland, and Elizabeth is known to have been sensitive to any mention of the fate of Richard II. The abdication scene had been discreetly omitted from Shakespeare's play on its publication in 1597, and early in 1599 Sir John Hayward's *First Part of the Reign of Henry the Fourth*—a perfectly innocent historical essay, notable chiefly for its euphuistic speeches, but rendered

suspect by an injudicious dedication to Essex—had been suppressed, its author imprisoned, and the Bishop of London's chaplain, Samuel Harsnett, who had licensed it, summoned to defend his action. When therefore, so goes the argument, 2 *Henry IV* was submitted to the ecclesiastical corrector, 'who may even have been Harsnett himself, he is likely enough to have cut out any allusions to the dangerous topic of Richard's deposition and death. To meet the objection that the inserted scene III. i is particularly full of references to Richard it is suggested that, owing to the mislaying of the loose leaf, the matter it contained was never seen by the censor and was printed without his authority, that when this came to the notice of the authorities they forbade the reprinting of the play, and that this explains why only one edition of this doubtless popular piece appeared. All this is ingenious and in a manner plausible enough; but at the same time there are certain difficulties that must not be lost sight of. In the first place, only half the cuts mention Richard, and then only incidentally and in a manner that would hardly necessitate extensive deletion; and if there are a few dangerous lines in the other cuts they too are only incidental. Some of the excised passages appear to be quite innocent, such as the cautious speeches by Morton and Lord Bardolph and Lady Percy's praise of her dead husband (the first, third, and sixth of the cuts). It is true that all the cuts occur in scenes in the rebels' camp, and that they include all references to Richard and Bolingbroke so far as the original issue of the play is concerned; but the rebels' deliberations are unquestionably long-winded, and it is only natural that they, rather than the King's party, should make play with Richard's name. Next, it is by no means certain that the copy ever was submitted to the ecclesiastical authorities for licence. There existed, of course, a regular panel of correctors, to whom works for publication were supposed to be referred, and the Stationers' Register often records the name of the corrector by whom a particular copy was licensed. But in other instances no name is mentioned, and the probability is that in these the Wardens took it on themselves to allow the entrance without referring the copy to any outside authority (see p. 71, Note E). This appears to have been the case with 2 *Henry IV* and *Much Ado*, which were entered together on 23 Aug. 1600 under the hands of the Wardens only. The evidence is not, of course, conclusive—the Clerk may have been careless—but for what it is worth it suggests not only that 2 *Henry IV* was never submitted to ecclesiastical censorship at all but that it never occurred to the Wardens that there could be anything dangerous in it. Again, had the cuts been made by the censor for the reasons alleged, the printer would presumably have known of it, and it is very unlikely that he would have gone to considerable trouble and some expense to insert a scene that the censor would *ex hypothesi* have disallowed. Lastly, had the authorities discovered that the play contained objectionable matter that had been inserted after licence, they would certainly have tried to suppress it rather than be content to forbid reprinting. (The edition may, indeed, have been sold out before they discovered what had happened, but that would hardly have saved those responsible from action by the Star-chamber.) That they did not suppress it is clear, for it is today the commonest of all Shakespeare first quartos. And had they forbidden reprinting, it is unlikely that the prohibition would have been observed or enforced once the accession of James had removed all political

anxiety: after all, I *Henry IV*, with its equally frequent allusions to Richard and Bolingbroke, went on being reprinted, and so did *Richard II* itself, with the abdication scene restored. The result of the ban on Hayward's book was that at least three reprints appeared (though it is true that they masqueraded as originals) and the copy was quite normally assigned to a new publisher on 14. Apr. 1603, within three weeks of Elizabeth's death. The censorship theory looks very like a mare's-nest.

NOTE F (page 270)

This is one of the common errors that Shaaber refuses to acknowledge because 'Most of the editors' have not accepted Rowe's emendation. One trifling but possibly significant twin-error appears in the direction at II. iii. I: Q reads 'Enter Northumberland his wife' and F 'Enter Northumberland his Ladie'; but the Earl as well as the Countess is present. Alice Walker (*Textual Problems*, p. 100) cites several other common errors of punctuation. In fact there are probably more errors common to Q and F than have been generally recognized. For example, at II. iv. 91 Q reads '& your ancient swaggrer comes not in my doores' and F 'your ancient Swaggerer comes not in my doores', but there can be no reasonable doubt that J. C. Maxwell's emendation, 'and [= if] your ancient swagger, a comes not in my doores', is correct (*MLR*, Oct. 1947, xlii. 485; Walker, p. 116).

NOTE G (page 271)

- Q: When like the bee toling from euery flower,
Our thigh, packt with waxe our mouthes with hony . . .
- F: When, like the Bee, culling from euery flower
The vertuous Sweetes, our Thighes packt with Wax,
Our Mouthes with Honey . . .

Wilson comments: 'I conj. that Sh. wrote "coling" (an old sp.) and that the Q. compositor both misread it "toling", and overlooked "the virtuous sweets"'. But here Q is perfectly satisfactory as it stands—'toling' is 'tolling', taking toll of—and 'cole' for 'cull' is a fourteenth-century, not an Elizabethan spelling. When 'tolling' was replaced by the transitive 'culling' an object had to be supplied. This may have been mere misunderstanding and interference on the part of an editor, or it may be an instance of revision in the prompt-book: 'Vertuous Sweetes' may pass for Shakespeare.

NOTE H (page 271)

Alice Walker (*Textual Problems*, p. 108) points out that of some 260 parentheses in F, 39 were already in Q, and that in any case the F compositors were inclined to introduce them. Thus in reprinting *Richard III* compositor B added 57 and compositor A added 7 to the 13 in Q6 (concerning the compositors see pp. 457 ff.). In *The Winter's Tale*, usually supposed to have been printed from Crane's manuscript, there are approximately 360. There is no trace of Crane's favourite spelling 'ha's' for 'has' or the Jacobean colloquial contraction 'em' for 'them', which are both features of *The Winter's Tale*.

NOTE I (page 272)

Miss Walker indeed makes one original suggestion that, if correct, would be decisive. It is to the effect that the cut at Iv. i. 103-39 was meant to begin two and a half lines earlier and to include the 'impolitic' close of Mowbray's speech:

And suffer the condition of these times(.)
To lay a heauy and vnequall hand
Vpon our honors.

(The contention finds some support in the fact that in Q the necessary question-mark appears at the end of 1. 100 instead of in its proper place, after 'honors' in 1. 103, as in F.) The error was discovered while the sheet was on the press and the compositor was instructed to remove 1l. 101-2 (and presumably 103'), but by mistake he took out 1l. 93 and 95, which happened to begin with the same words, and F perpetuated the error. It is an attractive, if perhaps rather fanciful, suggestion: the difficulty is to assign a meaning to 1. 95. (See 'The Cancelled Lines in "2 Henry IV" ' in *The Library*, Sept. 1951, vi. 115-16.)

An instance of the apparent dependence of F on Q has been detected (and privately communicated) by Fredson Bowers, The prose lines v. i. 58-62 run in Q:

Shal. Go to I say, he shal haue no wrong, look about Dauy:
where are you sir lohn? come, come, come, off with your boots,
giue me your hand master Bardolfe.

F tries to convert this into verse, but preserves the line-division of Q:

Shal Go too,
I say he shall haue no wrong: Looke about *Dauy*.
Where are you Sir lohn? Come, off with your Boots.
Giue me your hand M. Bardolfe.

But this is not beyond the bounds of coincidence.

XVII. *MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING* 1598-9

Quarto (1606).—The stage-directions, if mostly rather colourless, present some peculiar features: I i. I 'Enter Leonato gouvernour of Messina, Innogen his wife, Hero his daughter, and Beatrice his neece, with a messenger'; 96 'Enter don Pedro, Claudio, Benedicke, Balthasar and Iohn the bastard'; 161 'Exeunt. Manent Benedicke & Claudio'; ii. I 'Enter Leonato and an old man brother to Leonato'; iii. I 'Enter sir Iohn the bastard, and Conrade his companion'; II. i. I 'Enter Leonato, his brother, his wife, Hero his daughter, and Beatrice his neece, and a kinsman'; 90 'Enter prince(.) Pedro, Claudio, and Benedicke, and Balthaser, or dumb Iohn';¹ 160 'Dance | exeunt'; 219 'Enter the Prince, Hero, Leonato, Iohn and Borachio, and Conrade'; 270 'Enter Claudio and Beatrice'; iii. 39 'Enter prince, Leonato, Claudio, Musicke'; 45 'Enter Balthaser with musicke'; III. i. I 'Enter Hero and two Gentlewomen, Margaret, and Vrsley'; iii. I 'Enter Dogbery and his compartner with the Watch'; iv. I 'Enter Hero, and Margaret, and Vrsula'; v. I 'Enter Leonato, and the Constable, and the Headborough'; Iv. ii. I 'Enter the Constables, Borachio, and the Towne clearke in gownes'; v. i. 268 'Enter Leonato, his brother, and the Sexton'; iii. I 'Enter Claudio, Prince, and three or foure with tapers'; iv. i 'Enter Leonato . . . old man, Frier, Hero'; 16 'Exeunt Ladies'; 34 'Enter Prince, and Claudio, and two or three other'; 52 'Enter brother, Hero . . .'; 130 'dance'. These directions, with their indefinite numbers and vague descriptions, are clearly the author's; but it is equally clear that they do not all remain as Shakespeare wrote them. That at i. ii. I cannot be original: presumably 'brother to Leonato' is a gloss. It is unlike Shakespeare to repeat at II. i. I the details already given in a previous scene. The form of III. i. I suggests a first appearance, but Margaret and Ursula have already been on in ii. i, though their entrance there is not

¹ The last five words, perhaps an addition, are evidently misprinted, but exactly how is disputed: 'or' may be a relic of 'Borachio'; for 'dumb Iohn' cf. 'Dun Iohn' at III. iii. 115. 'Pedro' may also have been added.

NOTE I (page 272)

Miss Walker indeed makes one original suggestion that, if correct, would be decisive. It is to the effect that the cut at Iv. i. 103-39 was meant to begin two and a half lines earlier and to include the 'impolitic' close of Mowbray's speech:

And suffer the condition of these times(.)
To lay a heauy and vnequall hand
Vpon our honors.

(The contention finds some support in the fact that in Q the necessary question-mark appears at the end of l. 100 instead of in its proper place, after 'honors' in l. 103, as in F.) The error was discovered while the sheet was on the press and the compositor was instructed to remove 11.101-2 (and presumably 103'), but by mistake he took out ll. 93 and 95, which happened to begin with the same words, and F perpetuated the error. It is an attractive, if perhaps rather fanciful, suggestion: the difficulty is to assign a meaning to l. 95. (See 'The Cancelled Lines in "2 Henry IV"' in *The Library*, Sept. 1951, vi. 115-16.)

An instance of the apparent dependence of F on Q has been detected (and privately communicated) by Fredson Bowers. The prose lines v. i. 58-62 run in Q=

Shal. Go to I say, he shal haue no wrong, look about Dauy:
where are you sir lohn? come, come, come, off with your boots,
giue me your hand master Bardolfe.

F tries to convert this into verse, but preserves the line-division of Q:

Shal. Go too,
I say he shall haue no wrong: Looke about *Dauy*.
Where are you Sir lohn? Come, off with your Boots.
Giue me your hand M. Bardolfe.

But this is not beyond the bounds of coincidence.

XVII. *MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING* 1598-9

Quarto (1600).—The stage-directions, if mostly rather colourless, present some peculiar features: I. i. I 'Enter Leonato gouvernour of Messina, Innogen his wife, Hero his daughter, and Beatrice his neece, with a messenger'; 96 'Enter don Pedro, Claudio, Benedicke, Balthasar and lohn the bastard'; 161 'Exeunt. Manent Benedicke & Claudio'I ii. i 'Enter Leonato and an old man brother to Leonato'; iii. I 'Enter sir lohn the bastard, and Conrade his companion'; II i. i 'Enter Leonato, his brother, his wife, Hero his daughter, and Beatrice his neece, and a kinsman'; 90 'Enter princeQ Pedro, Claudio, and Benedicke, and Balthaser, or dumb lohn';¹ 160'Dance | exeunt'; 219 'Enter the Prince, Hero, Leonato, lohn and Borachio, and Conrade'; 270 'Enter Claudio and Beatrice'; iii. 39 'Enter prince, Leonato, Claudio, Musicke'; 45 'Enter Balthaser with musicke'; III. i. I 'Enter Hero and two Gentlewomen, Margaret, and Vrsley'; iii. i 'Enter Dogbery and his compartner with the Watch'; iv. I 'Enter Hero, and Margaret, and Vrsula';v. I 'Enter Leonato, and the Constable, and the Headborough'; Iv. ii. I 'Enter the Constables, Borachio, and the Towne clearke in gownes'; v. i. 268 'Enter Leonato, his brother, and the Sexton'; iii. I 'Enter Claudio, Prince, and three or foure with tapers'; iv. i 'Enter Leonato . . . old man, Frier, Hero'; 16 'Exeunt Ladies'; 34 'Enter Prince, and Claudio, and two or three other'; 52 'Enter brother, Hero . . .'; 130 'dance'. These directions, with their indefinite numbers and vague descriptions, are clearly the author's; but it is equally clear that they do not all remain as Shakespeare wrote them. That at i. ii. I cannot be original: presumably 'brother to Leonato' is a gloss. It is unlike Shakespeare to repeat at ii. i. i the details already given in a previous scene. The form of III. i. I suggests a first appearance, but Margaret and Ursula have already been on in II. i, though their entrance there is not

¹ The last five words, perhaps an addition, are evidently misprinted, but exactly how is disputed: 'or' may be a relic of 'Borachio'; for 'dumb lohn' cf. 'Dun lohn' at III. iii. 115. 'Pedro' may also have been added.

provided for and we are not told who they are. The direction at II. iii. 45 duplicates the 'Musicke' at I. 39. In all this, and in the mixture of verse and prose, Dover Wilson sees evidence of extensive revision.² It is not accepted as such by Chambers, nor is it clear that we have to do with anything more than foul papers that have undergone some annotation and possible alteration. Some anomalous spellings and the light punctuation point to autograph copy, which, of course, Wilson admits.³ Leonato's wife (I. i. I, II. i. I) is a ghost, who has no part and no business in the play.⁴ Balthasar is a mute in i. i (96) and perhaps in II. i (90), and Don John at I. i. 206, and Leonato's unidentified 'kinsman' in II. i (he may be the 'cosin' who is addressed at I. ii. 28):⁵ so are Don John, Borachio, and Conrade at II. i. 219, who, if they are present at all, must keep very much in the background. On the other hand, characters speak whose presence has not been provided for: Borachio certainly enters with the rest at II. i. 90, and, as already said, Margaret and Ursula are present in the same scene; Conrade as well as Borachio speaks in Iv. ii and so do two of the Watch. In in. v there is no entry for the Messenger, and Leonato's exit is marked several lines too early: there may have been an insertion.

The designation of characters, both in directions and speech-headings, is often inadequate and inconsistent and would render Q or its source equally useless as a prompt-book. Aragon is sometimes 'Prince' and sometimes '(Don)

² He discusses the form of the directions at length in his edition of 1923. Thus, he thinks that III. iv. I with its double conjunction indicates revision, 'and Vrsula' being 'a later addition'. But Ursula is addressed in the first speech, and seems always to have been present. Wilson appears to have overlooked the similar form of III. v. I, and he had not yet come across *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* (Q), I. ii. I, where six characters are all linked by 'and'.

³ He also admits that the 'anomalies' of the text 'would certainly have been cleaned up in a theatrical fair-copy', but at the same time maintains, without being conscious of any contradiction, that 'there can be no doubt at all that the "copy" used for Q 'was the manuscript theatrical prompt-book'. Nothing could better illustrate the confusion into which a generation ago some of the acutest critics were led by the belief that the manuscript of *Sir Thomas More* in its present form was a normal prompt-book.

⁴ See p. 112.

⁵ According to Chambers 'the singer Balthasar is also Anthonio's son and Leonato's "cousin" [sc. nephew] and kinsman': the direction at I. i. 96, where he 'enters, properly enough, as a mute', implies indeed that he has arrived along with Don Pedro, but there is no reason why he should not. However, unexplained relationships of this sort would rather support Wilson's theory of revision.

Pedro': his brother Don John is also sometimes 'Bastard'. Leonato's brother is several times named in the text (II. i. 116 'Anthonio', v. i. 92 'Anthony', 100 'Anthonie') but in directions and prefixes he is 'old man' ('Old') or 'brother', except three times in n. i, just after Ursula has addressed him as 'signior Anthonio'. The 'Towne clearke' of Iv. ii. I is apparently the Sexton, who speaks in that scene and who is marked as entering at v. i. 268 though he has no part. But the wildest confusion is over Dogberry and Verges, who not only appear in numerous disguises but also take on the names of their impersonators Kemp and Cowley. Since Shakespeare was evidently writing the parts specially for these actors, it is only natural that he should sometimes use their names when he could not trouble to remember those that he had invented for the characters.⁶ Besides this, prefixes were sometimes miswritten or misprinted: for example, at II. i. 104-15 the speeches headed 'Bene.' and 'Balth.' are evidently all spoken by the same character, whether he be Balthasar, as the old Cambridge editors (followed by Chambers) believed, or Borachio, as the new will have it. Some passages may have been altered or deleted (as perhaps at v. i. 106—8) and have left ragged edges; but as usual this may as well indicate alteration in the course of composition as later revision. Crowding at the foot of sig. Gi recto (iv. i. 158-60) suggests that something was added in proof, but it does not follow that the addition was a mistake, as Wilson believes. If ever there was a text printed from foul papers that still needed a good deal of correction to fit them for use in the theatre it is Q.

Folio.—This was printed from Q without material change. Wilson has shown that, so far as the text is concerned, what

⁶ See p. 116. They figure in four scenes and are described as follows, III iii: direction, 'Dogberry and his compartner'; prefixes, 'Dogbery', 'Dog.', and 'Verges'. in. v: direction, 'the Constable, and the Headborough'; prefixes, 'Const. Dog.', 'Con. Do.', 'Constable', 'Dogbery', 'Dogb.' and 'Headb.', 'Head.', 'Verges', iv. indirection, 'the Constables'; prefixes, (for Dogberry) 'Keeper', 'Andrew', 'Kemp', 'Kern.', 'Ke.', 'Constable', and (for Verges) 'Cowley', 'Const.' V. i. 205: direction, 'Constables'; prefixes, 'Const.' and 'Con. 2'. In Iv. ii 'Keeper' may have originated in 'Kep' being misread 'Kep' and misinterpreted as 'Kep': 'Andrew' is supposed to stand for 'merry-andrew', which was (at any rate later) a recognized term for a clown: once 'Couley' appears by error for 'Conrade', evidently through the misreading of an abbreviation: Constable, it will be observed, is used indifferently.

alterations there are possess no authority. Some revision of speech-headings is conjectural and not always correct. Changes in the stage-directions, though of no great importance, reveal a playhouse origin. In that at II. iii. 35 'Musicke' is replaced by 'and lacke Wilson', the name of a known musician,⁷ and the duplication at 1. 45 is removed. To the direction at n. i. 90 is added 'Maskers with a drum' and at 1. 160 'Dance | exeunt' becomes misleadingly 'Exeunt. | Musicke for the dance'. At 1. 219 the direction is merely 'Enter the Prince', Don John, Borachio, and Conrade being left out altogether, and the entrance of Hero and Leonato being postponed to 1. 270. From v. i. 268 'his brother, and the Sexton' are omitted as though they took no part in the scene; but Antonio speaks at 1. 338, and the Sexton may also be present. At v. iv. 34 'and two or three other' is replaced by 'with attendants'. At I. i. 161 'Manent' is changed to the incorrect but more customary 'Manet'. At III. i. 1 'Gentlewomen' is misprinted 'Gentlemen' and 'Vrsley' is replaced by the otherwise usual 'Vrsula'. In the text one passage (iv. ii. 19-22) playing too familiarly with the name of God is removed, and so is a jibe at German and Spanish fashions in dress (III. ii. 34-37): the play was revived at court in 1612-13 in connexion with the marriage of Princess Elizabeth and the Palsgrave. A normal division into acts only is introduced.

The copy of Q from which F was printed must, says Chambers, 'have been used as, or corrected by, a prompt-copy': according to Wilson 'all scholars are now agreed' that 'a copy of the Quarto was used as a prompt-book . . . and finally this prompt-book, or another copy of the Quarto collated with it, was delivered to the printers . . . for the production of the Folio'. Whatever scholars may have believed in 1923, no such opinion can be entertained today. The reasons that make it inconceivable that it was the prompt-book that served as a copy for Q make it equally impossible that a copy of Q should ever have been used as a prompt-book without far more correction than F indicates. Moreover, F retains

⁷ Probably the John son of Nicholas Wilson, christened at St. Bartholomew the Less in Apr. 1585 and still residing in the parish in 1624, rather than the famous lutanist and Professor of Music at Oxford, 1595-1674.

the names of Kemp and Cowley: Kemp left the company in 1599, and though Cowley did not die till 1619, it is unlikely that their names survived in a prompt-copy. We may safely assume that it was with a manuscript prompt-book that a copy of Q was compared before being handed to the printer, but the comparison can have been no more than superficial, since only a few of the alterations needed in the directions were actually made, most of the irregularities and incongruities of Q being passed over without notice.

XVIII. HENRY THE FIFTH. 1599

'*Bad*' quarto (1600).—Dover Wilson, whose edition of the play appeared in 1947,¹ rejecting earlier speculations,² concurs in the 'fairly general agreement' that Q is a reported text. It is certainly an abridgement, in which, for example, the whole of I. i and many later passages are suppressed, but whether it is a report purposely shortened for provincial acting, or a report of such a shortened version, is not immediately apparent. The former seems on general grounds the more likely hypothesis, and might be regarded as certain if the mysterious 'Gebon' ('Ge.') who enters and speaks twice, apparently as a French lord (III. vii. I, 98, IV. v. I), could be identified as an actor. Through most of the play what remains of the verse is fairly close to F, whereas much of the prose (which, however, is also printed as verse) is either a mosaic of phrases or else paraphrase in which only fragments of the original are embedded. But in the long final scene, which is partly verse and partly prose, Q breaks down altogether, omitting much and reproducing only isolated bits of the rest. It is noticeable that there is nowhere any attempt to reconstruct the substance of a scene or passage in un-Shakespearian verse, such as we find in the 'bad' quartos *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*. Two short scenes (iv. iv and v) are reversed, and passages are transposed, often within a scene, but also sometimes from one scene to another: the last lines of iv. ii appear at the end of in. vii. Among the omissions is the episode of the English, Scotch, Irish, and Welsh captains (III. ii. 69-153), which, with Jamy's comic speech, must surely have been cut when the play was acted before James I in 1605, and may have been suppressed earlier in deference to protests known to have been made

¹ In this he was assisted by, and acknowledges the help of, G. I. Duthie, with whom some of the conjectures it contains appear to have originated.

² His reference (p. 113) to 'Alfred Pollard, who was at the time [1919] with me trying out ideas, later abandoned, on the origin of the "bad" Shakespearian quartos', apparently implies that he no longer entertains his former elaborate theories, involving abridgements of early versions subsequently expanded by recollections of partially revised texts, and no notice has, therefore, been taken of them in the present work.

respecting 'scorn' of the Scottish king on the part of London actors.³ There may have been some other departures from the F text in the representation reported in Q. The suggestion that Q exhibits certain historical corrections is dismissed by Chambers as illusory; but either there had been some alteration of the French dialogue, or else the reporter had himself a knowledge of French. Some speeches are differently assigned, but this may be chiefly due to difficulty in sorting out the French nobles, 'the foure French Lords' as Q calls them (iv. v. I).

In some verse speeches the texts agree closely and it is likely that one or two actors were concerned in the reporting, though the evidence is not very clear. More doubtful is the suggestion that similarity of punctuation in the short speech by the Governor of Harfleur (III. iii. 44—50) points to some bibliographical link between the texts. Three notes of action appear in both texts at the same point, but such action is implicit in the text and no reference to a 'plot' need be assumed. Nor is there any really significant resemblance between the elaborate directions at v. ii. I. Otherwise the directions in Q are meagre and suggest the bare notes needed for production rather than the descriptions of a spectator. A few are recorded below along with those of F.

A second quarto was printed from Q₁ in 1602, and a third, also printed from Q₁, appeared in 1619 but dated '1608'.⁴ Q₃ presents a number of variants, a few of which anticipate F. These may be corrections introduced from recollection of a performance.⁵

Folio.—The text is divided into five normal but rather unequal acts by the presence of choruses that appear to belong to the original composition of the play.⁶ On this division is superimposed an obviously incorrect numbering, in which

³ See Chambers, *Eliz. Stage*, i. 3232.

⁴ See p. 12.

⁵ Cf. 2 and 3 Henry VI and *The Merchant of Venice*.

⁶ Ignoring the prologue, epilogue, and choruses, the acts run to 408, 538, 729, 986, and 496 lines respectively. The chorus before the last act contains allusions to the Earl of Essex that can only have been made after his departure for Ireland on 27 Mar. 1599 and before his ignominious return on 28 Sept. following—probably not later than June, by which time the failure of the expedition seems to have been generally recognized. This passage at least must have been cut in later performances, and it is possible that the choruses as a whole were omitted since there is no trace of them in Q.

the first two acts are run together and the long fourth act divided into two; but this only makes the distribution more unequal, and the numbering was probably first introduced in or for printing. But even the original division presents a difficulty at one point. The chorus between the first two acts details the conspiracy against Henry's life, and is explicit about the scene, which, it says,

Is now transported (Gentles) to Southampton . . .
And thence to France . . .

Yet in II. i we are back in Eastcheap, and then after the embarkation at Southampton we return again to London, where Bardolph, Pistol, Nym, and the Boy still linger over the death of Falstaff. To gloss over this manifest contradiction two lame and probably un-Shakespearian lines have been added after the closing couplet of the chorus:

But till the King come forth, and not till then,
Vnto Southampton do we shift our Scene.

Chambers conjectures that the chorus should properly have been placed after II. i, and that the 'Folio editor'⁷ supplied the lines to cover up the mistake.⁷ But this overlooks II. iii, which still intervenes between Southampton and France. It is much more likely that Dover Wilson and Duthie are right in contending that n. i and II. iii are insertions, and that when the play was begun it was still intended that Falstaff should take part in the expedition, as promised in the epilogue to 2 *Henry IV*. At the same time it is only on the slenderest grounds that Wilson argues that the play as written did take Falstaff to France, and that when Kemp left the company Falstaff's part had to be removed, what could be salvaged being transferred to Pistol.⁹ There is, indeed, every reason to believe that it was the defection of Kemp that was the death

⁷ Chambers goes on to suggest that the lines 'probably replaced an act-heading already set up' and thus led to the later misnumbering. This assumes that the column of type was already made up, and that the heading was removed to make room for the two lines. But a normal act-heading occupies the space of about six lines, so that if what Chambers imagines had happened the column should be four lines short.

⁸ If II. i, iii are insertions they probably replaced something else, for without them Act II would run to only 339 lines. But the original scenes must have been either at Southampton or in France. Parts of II. i are unlocalized and might be salvage from such a scene. An earlier scene may, of course, have been cut out of the short first act.

⁹ See Note A on p. 287.

of Falstaff, but had the part of Falstaff been already written into the play, we may suppose that rather than cut it out the company would have entrusted it, *faute de mieux* to Robert Armin⁵ who is believed to have succeeded Kemp in the course of 1599-¹⁰

Wilson's edition of the play is comparatively recent (i 947) and it is encouraging to find that he recognizes F as having been printed from Shakespeare's foul papers. There are 'Characteristic spellings', and misprints that 'can readily be explained as mis-readings of Shakespearian script'. At the same time the text is reasonably clean and the punctuation 'quite surprisingly good'. There is some uncertainty in the designation of characters. 'King' naturally stands indifferently for Henry or for Charles of France, except when they appear together in v. ii, where there is considerable confusion. In the initial direction 'the King' is Charles, but at 1. 98 Henry: the first prefix 'King' refers to Henry, after which the two are distinguished as 'France' and 'England' to 1. 97, but from there on 'King' is Henry even after Charles's return except just near the end when we find 'French King', 'France', and 'England' again. That Katherine's gentlewoman is 'Alice' in III. iv and 'Lady' in v. ii both in Q and F is explained by her being addressed by name in the former but not in the latter scene: it is, of course, only an inference that the same person is intended. Henry's youngest brother is introduced as 'Humfrey' in I. ii (he does not speak) but appears as 'Gloucester' or 'Gloster' later on. In the scene of the four Captains (III. ii. 79—153) only Gower retains his name, Fluellen becomes 'Welch' and Macmorris and Jamy are 'Irish' and 'Scot.' throughout. Mistress Quickly is introduced by name at II. i. 28, but is later always called 'Hostesse': her speeches are headed 'Hostesse' or 'Host.' except at II. iii. 35, where the prefix in F is 'Woman'.

The impression of foul papers is generally borne out by the stage-directions: i. ii. I 'Enter the King, Humfrey, Bedford, Clarence, Warwick, Westmerland, and Exeter' [Q 'Enter King Henry, Exeter, 2. Bishops, Clarence, and other Attendants']; 7 'Enter two Bishops', i.e. Canterbury and

¹⁰ It is true that the dates are not altogether certain, and for anything we know there may have been an interregnum in the office of clown to the company.

Ely (as in I. i. I); n. i. 28 'Enter Pistoll, & Quickly' [Q 'Enter Pistoll and Hostes Quickly, his wife', 66 'They drawe']; 103 'Draw' [Q 'They draw']; ii. 12 'Sound Trumpets. | Enter the King, Scroope, Cambridge, and Gray' [Q 'Enter the King and three Lords'; Scroop is called 'Masham' as in the text]; iv. I 'Flourish. | Enter the French King, the Dolphin, the Dukes of Berry and Britaine'; III. i. I 'Enter the King, Exeter, Bedford, and Gloucester. Alarum: Scaling Ladders at Harflew'; 34 'Alarum, and Chambers goe off'; ii. 148 'A Parley'; iii. I 'Enter the King and all his Traine before the Gates'; 58 'Flourish, and enter the Towne'; v. I 'Enter the King of France, the Dolphin, the Constable of France, and others'; vi. i 'Enter Capitaines, English and Welch, Gower and Fluellen'; 92 'Drum and Colours. Enter the King and his poore Souldiers'; 121 'Tucket. Enter Mountioy'; vii. i 'Enter the Constable of France . . . with others'; Iv. i. 63 'Manet King'; 87 'Enter three Souldiers, Iohn Bates, Alexander Court, and Michael Williams'; ii. I 'Enter the Dolphin, Orleance, Rambures, and Beaumont'; iii. I 'Enter Gloucester . . . with all his Hoast: Salisbury, and Westmerland'; 79 'Tucket. Enter Montioy'; iv. I 'Alarum. Excursions. | Enter Pistoll, French Souldier [Q 'the French man'], Boy'; vi. I 'Alarum. Enter the King and his trayne, with Prisoners'; vii. 58 'Alarum. Enter King Harry and Burbon, with prisoners. Flourish'; viii. 9 'Strikes him' [Q 'He strikes him']; v. i. 30 'Strikes him' [Q 'He strikes him']; ii. I 'Enter at one doore, King Henry, Exeter . . . and other Lords. At another, Queene Isabel, the King, the Duke of Bourgongne, and other French' [Q 'Enter at one doore, the King of England and his Lords. And at the other doore, the King of France, Queene[,] Katherine, the Duke of Burbon, and others']; 98 'Exeunt omnes. | Manet King and Katherine' [Q 'Exit King and the Lords. Manet, Hrry [*sic*], Katherine, and the Gentlewoman']; 307 'Enter the French Power, and the English Lords' [Q 'Enter the King of France, and the Lordes']; 385 'Flourish'; 402 'Senet. | Exeunt'. There is nothing here that might not have been written by the author. All the same the frequent notes for noises and the like naturally suggest the book-keeper: 'Flourish' added to two of the choruses (II and III) and also at II. iv. I, III. iii. 58,

Iv. vii. 585 and v. ii. 385; 'Sound Trumpets' at II, ii. 12; 'Drum and Colours' at III. vi. 92; Mountjoy's 'Tucket' at III. vi. 121 and Iv. iii. 79; 'Alarum: Scaling Ladders' (probably) at III. i. I; 'Alarum, and Chambers goe off' at III. i. 34, 'Alarum. Excursions' at Iv. iv. I; 'A Parley' (from the text) at III. ii. 148; and lastly 'Senet' at v. ii. 402. He may also be responsible for the duplication at III. vi. I. We are familiar with the book-keeper's habit of annotating foul papers, but here the notes are so frequent as to make us wonder whether he is not preparing the manuscript for use as a prompt-book. This, however, seems unlikely in view of the deficiencies that remain. The author made things easy for himself by the use of group-phrases: at III. v. I 'others' covers 'Britaine', at v. ii. I 'other Lords' covers Gloucester and Westmorland and 'other French' covers Katherine and Alice. These would have had to be specified in a prompt-book. There are also definite omissions: at ii. iv. I the Constable is not mentioned as entering although he speaks, nor at in. iii. I is the Governor; at III. vi. 92 Gloucester, at iv. vii. 58 Warwick, Gloucester, and Exeter, and at v. ii. 98 Alice are omitted: at Iv. iii. I Salisbury and Westmorland seem to have been added as an afterthought. On the other hand, at iv. ii. I 'Beaumont' is a ghost, who is mute here and appears nowhere else. In i. ii the King's brothers, Gloucester, Bedford, and Clarence, as well as Warwick, are mutes, though it is only fitting that they should be present on a ceremonial occasion. It is, indeed, Clarence's only appearance, and editors have therefore removed him; yet he undoubtedly appeared, for he is the only one named in Q—though how Q came to know his name is a puzzle. All things considered, there seems no doubt that it was from foul papers and not from a prompt-book that F was printed.

NOTE A (page 284)

As usual the argument is ingenious, namely that at v. i. 86 Pistol speaks of Falstaff's punk as '*my Doll*¹': 'Newes haue I that my Doll is dead i'th Spittle of a malady of France'. That editors have acted without warrant in altering 'Doll' to 'Nell', i.e. Pistol's wife Nell Quickly, is proved by the reading of Q, 'newes haue I certainly That Doll is sicke [of] mallydie of France', and by Pistol's earlier taunting of Nym at II. i. 78-81: 'to the spittle goe, and from the Poudring tub of infamy, fetch forth the Lazar Kite of Cressids kinde, Doll

Teare-sheete, she by name, and her espouse.' What is fatal to Wilson's argument is that the speech in v. i is authentic Pistol and cannot conceivably have been written for Falstaff. It is just another of Shakespeare's inadvertences. Of course, if Falstaff was cut out of the later acts something must have been put in to take the place of the excised matter, and Wilson does indeed find signs of padding. He suggests, for example, that iv. i. 31-32 are intended to lead up to Henry's prayer at ll. 306-22, and that ll. 35-305 are therefore an insertion, and further that the Macmorris-Jamy episode (III. ii. 69-153) 'is dramatically self-contained' and ignores the Duke of Gloucester's urgent summons (ll. 58-60)—but this summons Fluellen has already refused. None of this is altogether convincing. A similar view was taken by J. H. Walter ('With Sir John in it', *MLR*, July 1926, xli. 237—45) whose detailed arguments go some way towards establishing a case for extensive revision throughout, though his eagerness to do so led him into a curious misinterpretation of the 'foure or fiue most vile and ragged foyles' of Iv. Prol. 50. (His edition of the play in the new Arden Shakespeare appeared after this book was in type. It is difficult to believe, as he alleges, that Falstaff was removed by the censor at the instigation of Lord Cobham.)

XIX. JULIUS CAESAR. 1599

Folio.—It seems to be the common opinion of editors that *Julius Caesar* is the best-printed play in the collection. The text is unusually clean¹ and the stage-directions present few abnormalities. It used to be inferred from this that it was printed from 'the original manuscript of the author'. Recent critics, who believe they know more about Shakespeare's autographs, are inclined to account for the tidiness of the text by supposing that behind it lies a carefully prepared prompt-book. There is an absence of Shakespearian spellings. Dover Wilson, whose edition appeared in 1949, argues that a transcript was specially made for the printer; and if the company was unwilling to part with the prompt-book and no foul papers were available, this is likely enough. The evidence, however, is not very compelling. Strongest is the spelling 'Antony' in place of the usual 'Anthony'.² Wilson finds a dozen verbal errors in the text, but we have no reason to suppose that the prompt-book was immaculate. A speaker's name is wanting at v. iv. 7: it may have puzzled the transcriber, but so it may the compositor, and the fact that the line is partially indented perhaps suggests that the latter was responsible. A late literary alteration may have been made at in. i. 47,³ but the matter is too speculative to base much on it.

Most editors believe that in iv. iii the double announcement of Portia's death is due to alteration, but Chambers observes, and Wilson apparently agrees, that this is 'not necessarily more than an afterthought at the time of composition'. Presumably ll. 181—95 contain the original version,

¹ This may be partly due to the fact noted by Chambers, who claims the concurrence of Bradley, that 'Shakespeare is deliberately experimenting in a classical manner, and with an extreme simplicity both of vocabulary and phrasing'.

² There is no doubt that 'Anthony' was Shakespeare's spelling and there seems no reason why the book-keeper or the compositor should have altered it in this play alone. At the same time the Italian forms 'Antonio' and 'Octauio' (the former in the text, the latter in text and directions alike) may also be Shakespeare's: 'Anthonio' appears in *Antony and Cleopatra*, II. ii. 7.

³ See Dover Wilson, 'Ben Jonson and "Julius Caesar"', *Shakespeare Survey*, 1949, ii. 36-43.

which was inadequately deleted when 11. 143—58 were inserted.⁴

The stage-directions, though not on the whole lavish, are characteristic enough: I. i. I 'Enter Flavius, Murellus, and certaine Commoners ouer the Stage'; ii. I 'Enter Caesar, Antony for the Course... a Soothsayer: after them Murellus and Flavius'; 25 'Sennet. | Exeunt. Manet Brut. & Cass.'; 78 'Flourish, and Shout'; 131 'Shout. | Flourish'; 182 'Enter Caesar and his Traine'; iii. I 'Thunder, and Lightning. Enter Caska, and Cicero'; 100 'Thunder still'; II. i. I 'Enter Brutus in his Orchard'; 38 'Giues him the Letter'; 45 'Opens the Letter, and reades'; 59 'Knocke within'; 86 'Enter the Conspirators, Cassius [&c.]'; 100 'They whisper'; 191 'Clocke strikes'; 303 'Knocke'; 334 'Thunder'; ii. I 'Thunder & Lightning. | Enter Iulius Caesar in his Night-gowne'; III. i. 76 'They stab Caesar'; 77 'Dies'; ii. I 'Enter Brutus and goes into the Pulpit, and Cassius, with the Plebeians'; 45 'Enter Mark Antony, with Caesars body'; iii. I 'Enter Cinna the Poet, and after him the Plebeians'; 43 'Exeunt all the Plebeians'; Iv. ii. I 'Drum. Enter Brutus, Lucillius, and the Army. Titinius and Pindarus meete them'; 30 'Low March within'; iii. I 'Exeunt. | Manet Brutus and Cassius'; 129 'Enter a Poet'; 158 'Enter Boy with Wine, and Tapers'; 159 'Drinkes'; 239 'Enter Lucius with the Gowne'; 266 'Musicke, and a Song'; 275 'Enter the Ghost of Caesar'; v. i. 68 'Lucillius and Messala stand forth'; ii. I 'Alarum. Enter Brutus and Messala'; 2 'Loud Alarum'; iv. I 'Alarum. Enter Brutus . . . and Flavius'; 7 'Enter Souldiers, and fight'; v. 23 'Low Alarums'; 24 'Alarum. Cry within, Flye, flye, flye'. There can be no doubt of the author's hand in these. But there is also a very full provision of stage noises and some apparent duplication: the 'Thunder' at II. i. 334 is probably a marginal note for the 'Thunder & Lightning' of n. ii. i and the 'Loud Alarum' of v. ii. 2 a like note for the 'Alarum' at 1. i. Also at II. ii. i the 'Iulius Caesar' is unexpected: perhaps Shakespeare wrote 'Iulius' for a change, and the book-keeper glossed it in the interest of uniformity. At in. ii. I 'and goes into the Pulpit' is obviously an inser-

⁴ Note the repetition of the call for wine in 11. 142 and 158, which, however, does not constitute a 'repetition bracket' as defined in p. 165, Note D.

tion, but it may be Shakespeare's. All this might, of course, mean annotation of foul papers, but in view of other indications it seems more likely that it derives from the prompt-book. There is little of the uncertainty usually associated with an author's manuscript. In v. iv Messala and Flavius are mute, but there is no reason why they should not be present. Brutus' boy Lucius is exceptionally 'Boy' at Iv. iii. 158, but this is in the passage that we have seen to be probably an insertion. A little earlier, at 1. 129, the direction 'Enter a Poet' should include Lucilius, Titinius, and Lucius. It is possible that the insertion was more extensive than has been supposed, and if it was made in the prompt-book and not in the foul papers—as is likely in view of the retention of the deleted passage later—the whole episode may have escaped revision by the book-keeper. According to Wilson the direction at iv. ii. i 'cannot be derived from Shakespeare's MS/ He explains that Brutus comes from his tent to meet Lucilius and his army, with which is Pindarus, and that Titinius should enter with Cassius at 1. 31. But if this is the intention, it is just as surprising that the book-keeper should have passed it as that Shakespeare should have written it, nor is there any likelihood of the otherwise careful transcriber having bungled this particular direction. Whatever the intention, the responsibility for the direction is likely to be Shakespeare's. The anticipatory entry of a character can be paralleled in several plays apparently printed from his foul papers. For the rest there may have been some confused alteration that misled the book-keeper. Spectators would be less disturbed than an editor by the question who should be meeting whom.

There is one difficulty in supposing that F was printed from a normal prompt-book, namely that we should hardly expect the book-keeper in preparing it to have transcribed the sometimes redundant directions of the author, or to have repeated in the margin directions he had already written elsewhere.⁵ Possibly the author for some reason submitted a fair copy of the play—which would also help to account for the cleanness of the text—and that this was used, with some

⁵ It is true that Edward Knight occasionally did so in preparing the prompt-book of *Believe asyou List*.

further annotation, as the prompt-book. This would further account for the apparent absence of foul papers in 1623 and the necessity of making a transcript for the printer.

There is a normal division into acts only. Editors have of course added one into scenes. But it is a question whether they have any business to begin a fresh scene at iv. iii. The direction in F explicitly states that Brutus and Cassius merely remain behind when the rest go out, and it is a principle of the Elizabethan stage that chief characters do not exit and immediately re-enter for a fresh scene. No doubt iv. ii is before Brutus's tent and Iv. iii inside it, but that would present no difficulty to Elizabethan staging.

XX. AS YOU LIKE IT. 1599

Folio.—Apart from a few difficulties the text is a clean one. No Shakespearian spellings or the like have been detected. There are, it is true, inconsistencies as to which of the girls is the taller (I. ii. 284, iii. 117, Iv. iii. 88), which Duke is Frederick (i. ii. 87, 247, v. iv. 160), and how long the elder Duke has been banished (I. i. 120, iii. 73, II. i. 2). Chambers thinks the last 'too Shakespearean to need explanation': the other two he ascribes to misprints, but in them, too, carelessness may have played a part (as over the name of the French king in *King John*) and a maladjusted change of cast may have confused the question of height. There is clumsiness in the presence of two Jaques's. At I. i. 5 Shakespeare gave the name to the second son of Sir Rowland de Boys, and this he had doubtless forgotten when he so named the melancholy lord of Arden. When at the end Jaques de Boys is introduced in person (v. iv. 157) it is as 'Second Brother' only.

The stage-directions are even barer and less informative than in *Julius Caesar*: I. ii. 158 'Flourish. Enter Duke, Lords, Orlando, Charles, and Attendants'; 224 'Wrestle'; 227 'Shout'; iii. 43 'Enter Duke with Lords'; II. i. i 'Enter Duke Senior: Amyens, and two or three Lords like Forresters'; ii. I 'Enter Duke, with Lords'; iv. i 'Enter Rosaline for Ganimed, Celia for Aliena, and Clowne, alias Touchstone'; v. 40 'Song. | Altogether heere'; vii. I 'Enter Duke Sen. & Lords, like Out-lawes'; III. ii. 131 'Enter Celia with a writing'; iv. ii. i 'Enter laques and Lords, Forresters'; v. iv. 114 'Enter Hymen, Rosalind, and Celia. | Still Musicke'. No doubt some of this derives from the author. We may see his hand in the 'two or three Lords like Forresters' (n. i. i), echoed later in 'Forresters' (iv. ii. I) and 'like Out-lawes' (ii. vii. i), which means the same: and again in 'Enter Rosaline for Ganimed, Celia for Aliena, and Clowne, alias Touchstone' (II. iv. i),¹ where symmetry will account for the

¹ The use of 'for' where we should say 'as' (i.e. in the guise of) can be paralleled in *The Merchant of Venice*, IV. i. 169 'Enter Portia for Balthazer', and in a rather different sense (in the role of) in *Love's Labour's Lost*, V. ii. 565 'Enter Curate for Alexander' and 592 'Enter Pedant for ludas, and the Boy for Hercules'. The latter directions at least are the author's.

naming of the Clown. But there is some annotation that suggests the book-keeper: 'Flourish', 'Wrastle', 'Shout', 'Still Musicke'. At II. v. 40 'Altogether heere' must be a marginal note printed six lines too soon: it refers to the refrain 'Heere shall he see. &c.' The usurper and his brother, who have three entries each, are distinguished as 'Duke' and 'Duke Senior' not only in the directions but in every speech-heading with a meticulous care that we do not naturally associate with Shakespeare. It is further noticeable that characters are recorded as entering when they first come in view of those on the stage, though it may be some while before they join them: thus it is seven lines before Le Beau is addressed at I. ii. 105 and five before William speaks at v. i. 13. On the other hand, some inconsistency and uncertainty persists. Celia enters 'with a writing' at III. ii. 131, but nothing is said about Rosalind's verses at 1. 93. The generic 'Lords' are a little vague. Those attending the usurper are mute except in II. ii, which has speeches headed 'i. Lo.' and '2. Lo.' Similarly there are speeches by 'i. Lord' and '2. Lord' in II. i, where the Duke Senior enters, and here Amiens is specified in addition to the other 'two or three Lords'. But at ii. vii. I the 'Lord' who speaks as 'i. Lord' is apparently Amiens, who is addressed by the Duke as 'good Cozen' and sings a song at the end of the scene. Here 'Lord' is probably a misprint for 'Lords'. Amiens is also among the 'Lords' in iv. ii for a song: he is mainly a singing Lord. This would cause no difficulty on the stage: Jaques apart, the Lords are probably a constant group. On the whole the evidence points to F having been printed from a prompt-book that retained a few features of the author's papers but had in other respects been carefully prepared. If the company was reluctant to risk their prompt-copy, a transcript may have been made for the printer: a few errors might be blamed on it, but it does not appear to have left any other trace of its existence. There is a regular division into acts and scenes.

Many editors have thought the writing in the Hymen episode, v. iv. 114-56, inferior to that of the rest of the play, and have held the passage to be a later insertion by another hand. If so, it was naturally made in the prompt-book and not the foul papers. Chambers observes that while there is

no textual disturbance to prove insertion, 'the scene would run well enough without' the lines in question. But surely Rosalind and Celia must appear 'in their proper habits'—though where to find them might be a problem—and openly reveal their identity. If, therefore, Hymen is an intruder for the sake of spectacle, he is likely to have displaced something of more literary merit.

Dover Wilson, whose edition appeared in 1926, has, as usual, ingenious theories of his own. For him *As you Like it* is a play of 1593, mostly in verse, revised, largely in prose, in 1599. He makes play, naturally enough, with the inconsistencies already mentioned, and with supposed allusions that would point to an early date, but which not all critics are willing to admit. But the foundation of his theory of revision is the traces of verse that he finds embedded in scenes conjectured to have been rewritten in prose. For example in i. ii. 139-209 many passages can, with what he calls 'a little innocent faking', be arranged as verse. But so, Chambers maintains, can other prose passages that Wilson admits to have been first written in 1599.² But apart from this, the sufficient answer is that the speeches in question are excellent prose but at best very indifferent verse.³ And the theory involves its author in other difficulties: for example it forces him to argue that Shakespeare, rewriting the opening scene, introduced Jaques de Boys, having forgotten that another Jaques was already one of the principal characters in the play!

² e.g. I. ii. 133-40: see *The Tears Work in English Studies*, 1926 (1928, vii. 125-6). According to Chambers verse rhythms in prose 'come thickest in Shakespeare at about the time of *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night*, but thickly also in *Coriolanus* and *Winters Tale*'.

³ Another Verse fossil', this time dug up by A. W. Pollard, is V. ii. 8-18, and in this case Wilson is able to point, not without justifiable triumph, to the fact that F actually prints one speech as verse:

Orl. You haue my consent.
Let your Wedding be to morrow: thither will I
Inuite the Duke, and all's contented followers:
Go you, and prepare Alienaj for looke you,
Heere comes my Rosalinde.

But this is no better verse than the other supposed relics. Presumably the compositor was misled by the fact that the lines will scan, after a fashion, and possibly by some accidental division in the manuscript.

XXI. TWELFTH NIGHT OR WHAT YOU WILL. 1600-1 (or 1602?)

Folio.—Another unusually clean text. Dover Wilson, whose edition appeared in 1930, finds 'a certain number of spellings and abbreviated forms ... which might be called Shakespearian', but attaches no importance to them. The punctuation and stage-directions he describes as 'on the whole both adequate and competent/ The latter are even barer than in *As you Like it*: i. i. i 'Enter Orsino Duke of Illyria, Curio, and other Lords'; iv. I 'Enter Valentine, and Viola in mans attire'; v. 157 'Enter Violenta' (error for Viola); II. ii. i 'Enter Viola and Maluolio, at seuerall doores'; iii. 40 'Clowne sings'; 75 'Catchsung'; iv. 14 'Musicke playes'; 51 'Musicke'; III. i. 140 'Clocke strikes'; iv. ii. 23 'Maluolio within'; v. i. 398 'Clowne sings'. There is little here to go upon, but all things considered it seems most likely that it was the prompt-book (or a transcript of it) that served as copy for F.¹ There is a division into acts and scenes (which, however, overlooks the clear stage at III. iv. 300) an unusual feature of which is the appearance of notes 'Finis, Actus primus (secundus, Quartus)' duplicating the regular headings. Since this is found in only one other play,² it is unlikely that the division was made for the purpose of printing, and it may therefore be original, or have been introduced on the occasion of some revival. The Violenta of I. v. 157 might be an accidental survival of an original form of the name later shortened to Viola.³ Chambers observes that 'The mildness of Sir Toby Belch's profanity may be due to Jacobean expurgation', of

¹ Wilson infers as much from the phrases 'at seuerall doores' and 'within', but these are in fact ambiguous (see pp. 122-5). He also notes 'some natural confusion between the speech-headings *Fab.* and *Tob.*', but this is doubtless due to the transcriber (if there was one) or to the compositor.

² *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, q.v.; but cf. *Love's Labour's Lost*.

³ But curiously enough it is also found as a ghost-name in *All 's Well*, q.v. Wilson thinks that Viola in *Twelfth Night* and Diana in *All V Well* may have been played by the same boy and that a transcriber 'inadvertently employed the name of a character he took in some non-Shakespearian play'—a more than usually extravagant conjecture. Besides, it is unlikely that the boy who played the heroine in 1602 would have taken such a minor part the following year—unless, indeed, his voice was breaking.

which there is other evidence. The usual substitute for 'God' was 'heaven', but in this play 'loue' seems to have been preferred, and the humour of the puritan Malvolio invoking the heathen deity (II. v. 187, 194, III. iv. 83, 91) is unlikely to be accidental.⁴ It is almost certain from the insistence on Viola's musical accomplishments at I. ii. 57-58 that she was meant to be a singer, and from the awkward opening of ii. iv that the song 'Come away, come away death' has been transferred from her to Feste. We must therefore suppose that when the play was originally produced the company had a singing boy who was no longer available on the occasion of some revival. This again would point to the prompt-book having provided the copy for F. With this origin Chambers agrees, and so does Wilson; but then it must be remembered that when Wilson was editing the Comedies he was inclined to see a prompt-book origin in many cases that are rejected by more recent criticism.

The earliest record we have of *Twelfth Night* is a performance witnessed by John Manningham at the Middle Temple on 2 February 1602. It was evidently then new to him, and it is admittedly only on stylistic grounds that Chambers dates it a year or two earlier. Wilson is content with 1602, but contends that the play has not come down to us in its original form. We have seen that the transference of a song from Viola to Feste is probable and some rewriting has evidently been necessary to bring Olivia's fool to Orsino's court. Wilson argues that all allusions to Feste's truancy are therefore revisional. There is some force in the argument that Feste's closing song, 'When that I was and a little tiner boy', and its echo in *King Lear*, III. ii. 74-77, are likely to be close in date, and it has even been argued that the snatch in *King Lear* was the germ out of which the song in *Twelfth Night* grew, probably under the fostering care of Robert Armin, who is supposed to have played the fool in both plays. There may also be more force than Chambers is willing to allow in some curiously particular if recondite and uncertain allusions to the doctrine of equivocation, which link up with that in *Macbeth*, II. iii. 9-12—a doctrine that must have been

⁴ Cf. 2 *Henry VI*, IV. x. 62, where 'loue' is equally inappropriate in the mouth of Jack Cade, though this is less likely to be designed.

commonly discussed in London at the time of Father Garnett's trial in 1606 for complicity in the Gunpowder Plot.⁵ Since some alteration is admitted it is difficult to set precise limits to it—though care for the actors' parts would keep it within bounds—and 1606 is as likely as any other date.⁶ In that case it is even possible to see in Malvolio's incongruous Joviality Shakespeare himself poking fun at the recent statute against profanity.

⁵ See Dover Wilson in *TLS*, 13 June 1929.

⁶ The only recorded revivals were on Easter Monday (6 Apr.) 1618, and at Candlemas (2 Feb.) 1623. If C. J. Sisson's identification of 'The Lady of the Strachy' (II. v. 44-45) ^{can} 'substantiated the text contains an allusion as late as 1616 (*J. Q. Adams Memorial Studies*, Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948, p. 739).

XXII. HAMLET. 1600

A play of 'hamlet' was acted, probably on 11 June 1594,¹ at Newington Butts when the Admiral's and Chamberlain's companies were occupying the playhouse for a short while under Henslowe's management, and Nashe's well-known gibe about 'English Seneca' affording 'whole Hamlets . . . of Tragicall speeches' proves that a 'Senecan' drama of the name was current as early as the summer of 1589.² In the same passage Nashe drags in an allusion to 'the Kid in 'Esop'. in which he probably glances at Thomas Kyd: this comes short of implying that Kyd was the author of the early *Hamlet*, though the attribution is in itself likely enough. An allusion by Lodge in 1596 proves that the play continued to be performed at the Theatre, presumably by the Lord Chamberlain's men, and later references in 1601 and 1620 suggest that it was still remembered, if not acted, after Shakespeare's play had been produced, which was almost certainly before February 1601. We may suppose that it was upon this early play, perhaps with some fresh reference to Belleforest's tale,³ that Shakespeare based his tragedy, but whether closely, as in the case of *King John*, or remotely, as in that of *King Lear*, there is no certain evidence to show.

No other play in the canon has been preserved in such a variety of independent but related texts, and of no other have the bibliographical and textual features of the texts been so minutely studied. It is therefore inevitable that the following summary should be somewhat lengthy, but the peculiar interest of the case justifies a more extended treatment than usual.

'*Bad' quarto* (i 603).—All, or almost all, that can relevantly be said about this earliest edition of the play has been well

¹ Henslowe entered the date as 9 June, but that was a Sunday, when no performances were allowed.

² Preface to Greene's *Menaphon*, entered in the Stationers' Register on 23 Aug., ed. McKerrow, iii. 315-16.

³ In the fifth volume of his *Histoires tragiques*, 1570, drawing upon the Danish history of the twelfth-century Saxo Grammaticus. A translation of Belleforest, *The History of Hamlet*, exists in an apparently unique copy dated 1608. This need not be the first edition, but it seems to contain distinct reminiscences of Shakespeare's play.

said by G. I. Duthie.⁴ There is now very general agreement that Q1 is a reported text and represents a version of the play acted by a company touring in the country. The stage-directions are for the most part bare and rather inadequate, with a few of a more descriptive type such as a reporter might be expected to write: i. v. 149 'The Cost vnder the stage'; III. ii. 146 'Enter a Dumble Shew, the King and the Queene, he sits downe in an Arbor, she leaues him: Then enters Lucianus⁵ with poyson in a Viall,⁶ and powres it in his eares, and goes away: Then the Queene commeth and findes him dead: and goes away with the other' (but later they are Duke and Duchess); iv. 103 'Enter the ghost in his night gowne'; 217 'Exit Hamlet with the dead body'; Iv. v. 20 'Enter Ofelia playing on a Lute, and her haire downe singing'; v. i. 104 'he throwes vp a shouel'; 273 'Leartes leapes into the graue'; 276 'Hamlet leapes in after Leartes'; ii. 313 'They catch one anothers Rapiers, and both are wounded, Leartes falles downe, the Queene falles downe and dies'; 373 'Enter Valtemar and the Ambassadors from England, enter Fortenbrasse with his traine' (but Valtemar has no business here: at 1. 291 a fragment of text, 'a hit', is printed as a direction, but this is a compositor's error). The text runs to only 2,154 lines as against 3,799 of the full version.⁷ Names are much corrupted throughout,⁸ and two are, for some reason that has never been fully explained, altered, Polonius and his servant Reynaldo being replaced by Corambis and Montano.⁹

Duthie's thesis is that Q1 is derived almost entirely from the full Shakespearian version that lies behind both Q2 and F. He finds in Q1 two categories or types of text. The more prevalent follows, or attempts to follow, the original fairly closely, being at its best an almost verbal reproduction, at its worst a string of phrases that makes little or no pretence to

⁴ In his doctoral dissertation published in 1941.

⁵ The name comes from the text at 1. 254.

⁶ The 'Vial!' is a recollection of I. v. 62, a line duly reported in Q1.

⁷ The figures are those of the Cambridge edition of 1892 and exclude stage-directions. The reprint of Q1 follows the original line for line, and the full text is therefore not strictly comparable, though probably rather more so than that of the Globe edition with 3,930 lines,

⁸ See Note A on p. 330.

⁹ See Note B on p. 330.

metre or even to consecutive sense. The best is well exemplified in the first scene from 1. 15 onwards, allowing for what may be deliberate cuts; the worst may be seen in the 'To be, or not to be' soliloquy (III. i. 56-88); intermediate is the earlier 'solid flesh' soliloquy (I. ii. 129-59). All this is manifest reporting of different degrees of fidelity. The other category consists of passages of usually correct but uniformly flat and evidently un-Shakespearian verse that render the general sense of the original, or at least occupy a corresponding position, but show little or no verbal similarity. These passages have sometimes been supposed to be relics of the early *Hamlet* as yet unrevised by Shakespeare. Duthie, however, is able to show that they are largely a mosaic of words and phrases recollected from other parts of the existing play, or even from other Shakespearian or non-Shakespearian plays, and strung together after the fashion of the hooked atoms that dance along the road to Xanadu.¹⁰ Another theory has been that the passages are the work of a hack-poet called in to fill gaps left by the reporter; but it is now evident that they were written by someone whose mind was steeped in the language of the play, as the reporter's must have been, and there seems no reason why the reporter should not have been capable of writing them once his mind was freed from shackles of verbal reproduction. So long as the reporter imagined that he could in any way recover Shakespeare's own words he toiled painfully and conscientiously along the broken paths of memory, but when all that memory retained was the general significance of a scene he was free to reconstruct it in his own pedestrian fashion, and the words and phrases of the original that he wove into his verse rose unbidden from subconscious depths. Thus Duthie concludes that, except at a few points to be considered later, a single agency working on the final text of the play will account for all that we find in **QI**.¹¹

¹⁰ Without in any way impugning Duthie's conclusion or questioning the relevance of many of his examples, it may be suggested that some of the parallels adduced are rather remote, and the reader is at times tempted to wonder how the given idea could have been expressed without to some degree echoing something in the original.

¹¹ Duthie finds reason to suppose that alterations were made in the report after it had been written, but he admits in a postscript that even so they may have been made by the original reporter.

The accuracy of some of the reporting has naturally led to the suspicion that the reporter was, or rather had once been, an actor in the play. Now one of the most striking features of Qi is the way in which the text of the first scene comes into sudden agreement with the genuine versions upon the entrance of Horatio and Marcellus. We know from subsequent scenes that the reporter cannot have been Horatio, and the inference is therefore that he was the actor who took the part of Marcellus, an inference borne out on the whole by other scenes in which Marcellus is present. This 'Marcellus theory', originally propounded by H. D. Gray as long ago as 1915,¹² has been widely accepted.¹³ Marcellus does not appear after the first act, but the actor who played the part presumably took other roles later on. One was probably Lucianus in the Gonzago play, whose one short speech (III. ii. 266—70) is word perfect, and others have been suggested. The long and involved speech of the ambassador Voltemand (II. ii. 60-80) is also remarkably accurate; but in this case there are similarities in the punctuation of Qi and F that have led some to the belief that the reporter had access to the actor's 'part' or a copy of it. This would be all the likelier if the 'part' were his own.¹⁴

Actor's gag has apparently found its way into the text. By a nice irony of chance the most obvious example is a dozen lines added, at in. ii. 50, to the speech in which Hamlet expresses his opinion of the clown who speaks more than his part, lines to which there is nothing corresponding in the genuine texts.

There are four outstanding differences between Qi and the genuine texts. One is the position of the Nunnery scene. In Q2 and F Polonius plans to 'loose' his daughter to the Prince at II. ii. 162, but the meeting does not take place till in. i. 88. In Qi the meeting follows immediately upon its planning. The change is deliberate, for the dialogue has

¹²The First Quarto of "Hamlet" ', *MLR*, Apr., x. 171-80.

¹³It is, however, not free from difficulties. Marcellus is on the stage in I. \b and I. iv, and we should therefore have expected him to know the beginning and end of I. iii rather than the middle; yet it is the middle portion, between Polonius and Laertes, that is well reported, whereas the opening and closing portions, between Laertes and Ophelia and between Ophelia and Polonius, are little more than paraphrase.

been carefully adjusted to the new sequence. The object may have been to simplify the action of the play—perhaps also to avoid the characteristic Shakespearian oversight whereby at ii. i. 101 and 117 Polonius bids Ophelia accompany him to the King and yet arrives alone at II. ii. 40. The change has, however, produced some awkwardness of its own, for Ophelia is condemned to stand by, ignored by all, for close on a hundred lines, and, moreover, is allowed no opportunity to provide herself with the tokens and remembrances she is to return to Hamlet.¹⁵ In the *Erudermord* (see p. 307) the sequence is essentially the same as in Qi.

Another difference is the introduction of a scene which is different from anything in Q2 and F. In these Horatio receives a letter from Hamlet (v. vi) and later Hamlet himself tells him of the adventures that befell on his voyage to England (v. ii. 1—74). There is nothing corresponding to the latter in Qi: in place of the former, and occupying the same position, Qi has a scene between Horatio and the Queen, in which he tells her of Hamlet's return and the manner of his escape. Here again the action is somewhat simplified, and the change obviates the awkwardness of delaying the account of Hamlet's adventures till after the Graveyard scene.¹⁶

A third difference is in the view taken of the Queen's character. In Q2 and F Gertrude, although she is manifestly free of complicity in her former husband's death and unsuspecting of the manner of it, never actually asserts her innocence and, even while repenting her o'erhasty marriage, gives no hint of siding with her son, of whose intentions indeed she appears to have no inkling. In Qi, on the contrary, at the end of the Closet scene (in. iv) she formally avows her innocence—'I sweare by heauen, I neuer knew of this most horride murder'—and enters into a solemn compact with Hamlet—'I vow ... I will conceale, consent, and doe my

¹⁵ They may, of course, have been trinkets that she habitually carried about her. There is nothing in any text to suggest the casket in which she is usually represented as keeping them. According to the direction in Dover Wilson's edition 'she takes jewels from her bosom'.

¹⁶ So improbable does Hamlet's delay in giving an account of himself seem to some critics that it has been maintained that the whole Graveyard scene was an after-thought: see L. L. Schiicking in *RES*, Apr. 1935, xi. 129-38.

best, 'What stratagem soe're thou shalt devise'—and in the new scene with Horatio (iv. vi) she makes arrangements to forward it by lulling the King's suspicions—'But I will soothe and please him for a time'. It is, however, only at these two points that we catch a glimpse of this different conception of the Queen; elsewhere Qi follows the other texts. It may be mentioned that in this Qi comes in some ways closer to the story as told by Belleforest, in which the Queen, while she does not pretend to be ignorant of the murder, yet shows sympathy with her son's plans for revenge by her advice and desire for its success. Thus it is at least possible that in the early *Hamlet* she played a more active part than in the play we know, the part of a sort of penitent Lady Macbeth. Chambers makes the interesting suggestion that the reporter may as a boy have played the Queen in the early *Hamlet* and may at these two points have contaminated his report by recollections of it; and Duthie, though he does not mention this possibility, agrees in seeing in these passages of Qi relics of the original play. Whether this actually contained such a scene between the Queen and Horatio as we find in Qi we do not know, though it is possible.¹⁷ The extant scene, however, shares the character of the un-Shakespearian verse in Qi, being in the main a mosaic of phrases and ideas borrowed from other portions of the text. It should be added that there is no trace of such a scene in the *Erudermord* which on the contrary places the narrative of Hamlet's escape in a conversation between him and Horatio, as in the genuine texts.

The fourth and last difference is in the manner of Hamlet's escape on the England voyage. The account given in the genuine texts is perfectly coherent and straightforward. So, up to a point—for there is a serious gap in the story—is that in the *Erudermord* but it is entirely different. In Qi, so it is alleged, the account that Horatio gives the Queen in the scene already discussed is defective and confused, but

¹⁷ There is even in Qz at iv. v. I, where we find Horatio in unexpected attendance on Gertrude, a possible hint that their relations were once closer than they now appear. If we are right in seeing in the Queen of Qi some traits borrowed from the pre-Shakespearian play, the debt may be more than general, for the words in which she promises Hamlet her assistance (quoted above) are either a recollection of the source or else are imitated from *The Spanish Tragedy* (1592, 11. 240-2): 'I will consent, conceale, And ought that may effect for thine auale, loyne with thee'.

has points of contact with both the other versions. From this Duthie infers that whoever compiled the provincial version represented by Qi knew an account of Hamlet's escape different from that in the Shakespearian play, and that this was in fact the account preserved in the *Brudermord*. The only source from which this alternative account can reasonably be supposed to have been drawn is the early *Hamlet*. But the *Brudermord* not only makes Hamlet relate his escape to Horatio, but in an earlier scene actually represents it upon the stage. Such repetition is absurd. The presence of the narrative may be accounted for by the fact that a like narrative appears at the corresponding point in Shakespeare's play, and the inference is drawn that the scene of the escape appeared in the early *Hamlet*.

Such in essence is Duthie's theory respecting the divergent accounts of Hamlet's adventure, but his argument at this point is less convincing than elsewhere. In the first place he seems to misrepresent Qi through treating it as though it were meant to give a complete account of the affair. This it makes no pretence of doing, for Horatio tells the Queen that Hamlet

at his next conuersion [*sic*] with your grace,
He will relate the circumstance at full.

All that Qr tells us is that Hamlet discovered the Tacket' containing the warrant for his death, substituted another sealed with 'his fathers Scale', and was 'set ashore'¹⁸ while Rosencranz and Guildenstern 'went for England'; and all this is consistent with the Q2—F version. Of the manner of Hamlet's return nothing is said. The only detail in which Qi agrees exclusively with the *Brudermord* is the phrase 'Being crossed by the contention of the windes', with which compare 'Nun begab es sich, dass wir eines Tages contrairen Wind hatten' (v. ii), and this the *Brudermord* may well have borrowed from the provincial version while going elsewhere for its main narrative. There seems, therefore, no reason to suppose that here Qi had any other ultimate source than the Shakespearian text, a view the possibility of which Duthie now (privately) concedes.

¹⁸ This does not afford a link with the *Brudermord* since Shakespeare has Hamlet set ashore by the pirates.

Once this is realized, Duthie's argument loses its force. The *Brudermord* is deprived of the alleged support of Qi; there is no longer any question of a common source or any reason to suppose that at this point the *Brudermord* owes anything to the early *Hamlet*. We may imagine that the compiler of the *Brudermord* desiring a more sensational performance, decided that Hamlet's adventures should be represented on the stage. It was a sound theatrical instinct, for the absence of the hero for most of the fourth act has often been regarded as a weakness in the construction of the play. But the altering of the commission offered no scope for sensation, and a sea-fight was beyond the capacity of his stage. He consequently resorted to the comic melodrama of the two ruffians tricked into shooting one another, a device surely more in keeping with the Ophelia—Phantasma (Osric) harlequinade than with the more dignified horrors of Senecan tragedy. Moreover, a point that Duthie admits, Shakespeare's account is in general agreement with Belleforest's, so that if here the *Brudermord* preserved the action of the old play we should have to suppose that Shakespeare, in departing from it, reverted to its source. Duthie holds that 'This is quite possible'; but it is less likely and is unnecessary.¹⁹

There remains the question whether Qi represents correctly a report of the genuine text obtained for acting in the country by a company that had no right to it, or whether it represents a report of an authorized touring version belonging to the Chamberlain's men, in which case it was more likely obtained with a view to publication. Duthie poses the question, but finds no positive evidence either way, though he expresses a personal preference for the former alternative. However, the question is not really in doubt. We know of no certain case of a play being reported for publication, and it is incredible that anyone should have reported a provincial performance when the play was being acted in London. On the other hand, there are plenty of instances of plays being reported apparently with a view to unauthorized production by touring companies. Nor does the internal evidence really leave any doubt on the matter. That both Qi and the *Brudermord* place the Nunnery scene earlier than Q2 and F is not of

19 See Note D on p. 331.

much significance, since the altered sequence might quite well have been adopted in an authorized stage adaptation. It is less likely that such an adaptation would have reverted—if it was a case of reversion—to the earlier names of Polonius and Reynaldo. Moreover, Duthie himself points out that although 'The *Erudermord* is not directly based upon the Qi text ... it contains echoes of passages in it which, . . . owe their form or their very existence to the reporter and to no one else'. Since these 'echoes' can only be from the provincial version, it follows that this was itself a report. It might be thought that the opposite fact that the *Erudermord* often agrees with Q2 and F against Qi indicated that in these cases Qi departed from the provincial version and was therefore itself an inaccurate report of that version, but, as we shall see, the composite derivation of the *Erudermord* forbids our drawing any such inference.²⁰

Lastly, it may be observed that the title of Qi runs: 'The Tragical Historic of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke[.] By William Shake-speare. As it hath beenediuerse times acted by his Highnesse seruants in the Cittie of London: as also in the two Vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxford, and elsewhere'. This means that by the time the quarto was printed the company had become the King's men, and their warrant as such is dated 19 May. The emphasis on provincial acting may be significant, and so may the vagueness about the London performances. That Shakespeare's play had been acted in 'the Cittie of London' cannot be literally true: the only performances were presumably at the Globe, which was in Southwark.

*Der bestrafte Erudermord oder Prinz Hamlet aus Ddnemark.*²¹—This German version is only known from a

20 Were we to suppose that the *Erudermord* was indeed indebted to the early *Hamlet* for its account of Hamlet's escape, as Duthie maintained, and moreover that it received that account by way of the provincial version of the play, then indeed we should have to believe that Qi was a corrupt report of that version. But Duthie nowhere makes the second assertion and does not apparently assume it. Instead he leaves the reader to draw the very unlikely conclusion that the *Erudermord* derived its account directly from the early *Hamlet* and that Qi was independently influenced by the same source. This affords an additional reason for rejecting the view that Qi owes anything to the early *Hamlet* at this point.

²¹ Quotations from the *Erudermord* are from W. Creizenach's *Schauspiele der englischen Komodianten*, n.d., pp. 147-86. It is also printed together with an English translation in A. Cohn's *Shakespeare in Germany*, 1865, pp. 236-303. A different translation is in H. H. Furness's *Variorum* edition, ii. 121-42.

manuscript, now lost, dated 27 October 1710, which was printed in 1781. 'There is not the slightest doubt', writes Duthie, 'that *Der Eestrafte Brudermord* represents an English play, carried over to Germany by English travelling actors about the end of the sixteenth or the beginning of the seventeenth century/ A *Hamlet* was played at Dresden in 1626 by a company led by John Greene. A good deal has already been said about the text. This was doubtless much altered and debased in the course of a century and more of performance in Germany, but it remains recognizably the same piece and is full of verbal echoes of Shakespeare's play. Most of these are phrases that occur in all the English versions, but at times the parallels are with the genuine texts only, and at others only with Qi. Of the former Duthie lists thirty-six of varying weight, including one with a passage found in Q2 but neither in F nor Qi: n. ix 'von dieser Stund an will ich darnach trachten, wo ich den Konig allein finde, ihm das Leben zu nehmen'; cf. Iv. iv. 65—66 'from this time forth' My thoughts be bloody, or be nothing worth'. The passages occur at different points in the play, but the contexts are similar. Of parallels with Qi, where Q2 and F differ, Duthie lists twenty-one, and in some instances the phrase in Qi is certainly of the reporter's coining. The most significant occurs where the King, about to send Hamlet to England, says (III. x), 'Wir aber aus vdtlicher Vorsorge haben ein Mittel erfunden . . .': Qi alone at this point, corresponding to Iv. iii. 42, has 'we in care of you: but specially in tender preservation of your health . . .', a phrase not dependent on any genuine text of *Hamlet*, but borrowed from *Henry V* 11.ii. 58 'in their deere care And tender preseruacion of our person . . .'. It may be remarked that the exclusive links with the genuine texts are not only more numerous, but on the average of greater individual weight, than the exclusive links with Qi.

Now, had the continental company had access to Q2 or even to Qi, there would have been no need to vamp up a memorial reconstruction such as the *Brudermord* appears to be, and there would have been none of this cross-linking. The *Brudermord* in its original form must, then, have had birth between 1600 and the spring of 1603. Further, it is clear that whoever concocted the German play, or rather the

English continental version of which the *Brudermord* presumably started life as a translation, knew and sought to reproduce the genuine Shakespearian *Hamlet*, but knew also the English provincial version and at times allowed memories of the latter to contaminate his reconstruction of the former. As a working hypothesis Duthie supposes that a company starting on a continental tour in 1601—2 engaged one or more minor actors who had taken part in the London performances of Shakespeare's play and also some of the provincial company, and that by pooling their memories these succeeded in concocting a text with the general features of the *Brudermord*.

Duthie, however, finds yet another strain in the composition of the *Brudermord*) namely reminiscence of the early *Hamlet*. By far the most important is the representation and report of Hamlet's escape on the English voyage. This has been sufficiently considered already, and reasons have been given for supposing Duthie's interpretation of the evidence to be mistaken. There is also Corambus, whose name seems to be preserved in a slightly more correct form than in Qi. Besides this there are a few points in which the *Brudermord* appears to be closer to Belleforest than are the other extant texts. Since we may dismiss the idea of the reporters having read the French story, the most likely hypothesis is that these passages represent reminiscences of the early play. They do not, in fact, amount to much, but are perhaps unlikely to be due to coincidence. The most economical conjecture is that among the concoctors of the *Brudermord* was the provincial actor whom we have already supposed to have once appeared in the old play and to have introduced recollections of it into the Qi version.

'Good' quarto (1604-5).—The authoritative texts of *Hamlet*, Q2 and F, are analysed in Dover Wilson's exhaustive monograph, based on his Sandars lectures of 1932.²²

The title-page of Q2, some copies of which are dated 1604 and some 1605, runs: 'The Tragicall Historic of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke. By William Shakespeare. Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much againe as it was, according to the true and perfect Coppie.' Thus the edition

²² This was printed in 1934. His edition of the play appeared the same year.

claims to have been printed from a genuine manuscript, which the earlier print, though it bore the device of the same publisher, Nicholas Ling, by implication was not; but this should not be interpreted to mean that the manuscript was necessarily Shakespeare's own. All the same the evidence as a whole points in that direction. In contrast to Qi the stage-directions bear the stamp of the author: i. i. 126 'Enter Ghost'; 127 'It \? He] spreads his armes'; 139 'The cocke Crowes'; ii. i 'Florish. Enter Claudius, King of Denmarke, Gertrad the Queene, Counsaile: as [*? read* Counsailors,] Polonius, and his Sonne Laertes, Hamlet, Cum Alijs'; iv. 6 'A florish of trumpets and 2. peeces goes of; 38 'Enter Ghost'; 57 'Beckins'; v. 149 'Ghost cries vnder the Stage'; ii. i. i 'Enter old Polonius, with his man or two' (prefix 'Rey[naldo].'); III, ii. I 'Enter Hamlet, and three of the Players'; 56 'Exeunt they two' (text 'you two', sc. Guildenstern and Rosencranz); 95 'Enter Trumpets and Kettle Drummes, King, Queene, Polonius, Ophelia'; 148 (omissions supplied from F, and some variants) 'The Trumpets sounds. [*F* Hoboyes play.] Dumbe show followes. [*F* The dumbe shew enters.] | Enter a King and a Queene, [*very louingly;*] the Queene embracing him, *and he her*, [*F omits*] [*She kneeles, and makes shew of Protestation vnto him.*] he takes her vp, and declines his head vpon her necke, he lyes [*F Layes*] him downe vppon a bancke of flowers, she seeing him asleepe, leaues him: anon come in an other man [*F comes in a Fellow*], takes off his crowne, kisses it, [*and*] pours poyson in the sleepers [*F Kings*] eares, and leaues him [*F Exits*]: the Queene returnes, finds the King dead, [*and*] makes passionate action, the poysner with some three or foure come [*F two or three Mutes comes*] in againe, seeme to condole [*F seeming to lament*] with her, the dead body is carried away, the poysner wooes the Queene with gifts, shee seemes harsh [*F loath and vnwilling*] awhile, but in the end accepts [*his*] loue. [| Exeunt]' (they remain King and Queen in the text); 357 'Enter the Players with Recorders'; iv. iii. i 'Enter King, and two or three'; 12 'Enter Rosencraus and all the rest'; 16 'They enter' (as bidden); iv. i 'Enter Fortinbrasse with his Army ouer the stage'; 10 'Enter Hamlet, Rosencraus, &c.'; v. 112 'Enter Laertes with others'; vi. I

'Enter Horatio and others'; v. i. I 'Enter two Clownes' (i.e. the Gravediggers; prefixes 'Clowne' and 'Other'); 240 'Enter K. Q. Laertes and the corse'; ii. 237 'A table prepar'd, Trumpets, Drums and officers with Cushions, King, Queene, and all the state, Foiles, daggers, and Laertes'; 289 'Trumpets the while'; 291 'Drum, trumpets and shot. Florish, a peece goes off'. At one or two points we may see the hand of the book-keeper making notes. He is doubtless responsible for the duplication at v. ii. 292, the original direction being simply 'Florish, a peece goes off' as at I. iv. 6: he may possibly have added 'Cum Alijs' at i. ii. i (Shakespeare having forgotten to provide for the ambassadors) since the same phrase appears in F at ii. ii. i. There is some uncertainty regarding characters present: 'his man or two' at n. i. i (but this looks as though it had been tampered with: there is certainly only Reynaldo), and 'two or three' at Iv. iii. I; at v. i. 240 the priest or 'Doctor' is ignored, and there must of course have been bearers, but the bareness of the direction reflects the bareness of the 'Ceremonie'; at in. ii. 95 Shakespeare is content to name those who speak, but when the King enters with trumpets and drums we may assume that the whole court is present; on the other hand at in. ii. I 'three of the Players' is curiously precise—only three have speaking parts in the Gonzago play, and it is to them alone that Hamlet's advice is addressed. The elaborate direction for the dumb-show was clearly edited in F, which breaks it up into a number of separate sentences and removes several touches of the author—'sleeper', ⁴'condole', 'harsh'—but there are omissions in each text: as we shall see, omission is a disease from which Q2 suffers throughout, and F is not free from it. Near the beginning there are a few possible links with Q1: I. i. I 'Enter Barnardo, and Francisco, two Centinels' recalls the 'Enter two Centinels' of Q1; ii. 128 'Exeunt all but Hamlet' is the same in the two texts and recurs in Q1 at II. ii. 574 instead of the commoner phrase 'manet' (as in F); at I. v. 149 Q2 merely adds 'cries' to the Q1 direction. We shall see later on that the influence of Q1 can also be traced in the dialogue of the early scenes of Q2.

Q2 is badly printed. Wilson finds it 'one of the worst

printed of all the original Shakespearian texts' and concludes that the compositor was inexperienced and careless and was constantly hurried in spelling out what was at least to him a difficult manuscript, so that he not only frequently misread or guessed at the words before him, but riddled his text with omissions of all sorts, letters, words, phrases, whole lines, and even longer passages.²³

The longer omissions are five in number and total 83 lines. They are: n. ii. 244(Let me question . . .)—76 and 352—79 in the first talk between Hamlet and his former acquaintances from Wittenberg (the first leaves consecutive sentences to begin with 'But', the second renders even abrupt an already abrupt transition); Iv. v. 161—3 in Laertes's speech when confronted by the mad Ophelia (these lines are anyhow obscure and are no loss); v. i. 39-42 in the Gravedigger scene (which is necessary to explain the joke to the second clown); and v. ii. 68—80, the end of Hamlet's talk with Horatio before the entrance of Osric, cutting Hamlet short in the middle of an important speech, of which moreover the full drift is preserved in **Qi**. If we could believe that the compositor was attending to the sense of what he set up, we might understand his cutting the third passage: of the other omissions there seems no explanation.²⁴

There are, of course, many errors besides omissions. The compositor misread words or guessed at them from the first few letters. Some of the misreadings can be explained, as can those in other 'good' quartos, by peculiarities of Shakespeare's writing, such as 'the King' for 'checking' (iv. vii. 63) and 'vnfold' for 'vnsele' (i.e. unseal, v. ii. 17), the latter helped no doubt by 'bold' in the line before. He also printed 'fearefull' for (F) 'fretfull' (I. v. 20), 'expectation' for 'expectancie' (in. i. 160), 'Considerat' for 'Confederate' (in.

²³ See Note E on p. 331.

" In the first Hamlet likens Denmark to a prison and in the second he glances rather critically at the activities of the Chapel children. By 1604 a Danish princess shared the English throne and had taken the said children under her protection, and it has been suggested that the passages were excised in deference to her. But the terms applied to the children are not really derogatory, and in any case the children had served Elizabeth before they served Anne; and to call Denmark a prison was almost polite compared with the reflections on the drunkenness of the Danish court (i. iv. 17-38) which are retained in Qz but were in fact cut in F, though probably for another reason (see Note G).

ii. 267)⁵ 'criminal!' for 'crimefull' (iv. vii. 7), and 'wisedome' for 'wisenesse' (v. i. 286). His naive errors would have mattered less had they been left alone. But unfortunately the sheets were overseen by a press corrector, who made a number of alterations by guess-work rather than by reference to copy. We know this from the variants found in different exemplars of the original. Eighteen variants have so far been discovered in the six known copies of Q2. The press reader rightly corrected 'braues' to 'braines' (F 'Braine', n. ii. 617) and 'reponsiue' to 'responsiue' (v. ii. 159); but he also altered 'pair' (v. ii. 9) and 'yaw' (v. ii. 120), which were perfectly correct, to 'fall' and 'raw'; and he changed 'thirtie' to 'thereby' (v. i. 321) when it should have been 'shortlie', and 'Vnice' to 'Onixe' (v. ii. 283) when it should have been 'Vnion'. These are known instances, but most of the reader's activity is doubtless hidden from us, and the fact must be taken into account whenever Q2 preserves a reading apparently inferior to that of F.²⁴

Error and inconsistency extend to the names of the characters. Some variation of spelling may be the author's, but most of it should probably be debited to the compositor. Interchange of 'Barnardo' and 'Bernardo' and of 'Fortinbrasse' and 'Fortenbrasse' might be due to either; the consistent 'Rosencraus' (F 'Rosencranz') and the occasional 'Guyldersterne' (in II. ii) in place of 'Guyldensterne' are obvious misreadings, and so is 'Ostricke' for 'Osricke' (in sig. N but not in sig. O).²⁶ The Queen is 'Gertrad' at i. ii. I but consistently 'Gertrard' in the direction at III. iv. I, in the text of iv. i, and in both text and directions of Iv. v: the former would be an easy misreading of 'Gertrud', the latter less so, and the uniform absence of a final *e* makes it uncertain whether Gertrude (as in F) is what Shakespeare really intended: she is Gertred in Qi, Geruth in Belleforest.

Q2 swarms with abnormal spellings. Some may be those of an ignorant and unpractised compositor, but if he was

²⁵ Correction and miscorrection by a press reader are not, of course, features peculiar to *Hamlet*. The classic example is the first quarto of *King Lear*, 1608, in which a dozen copies have yielded 148 substantive alterations. But in that case the reader does seem to have sometimes consulted the copy.

²⁶ Wilson's fantastic explanation is uncalled for: *s* and *st* before a small letter are often indistinguishable in secretary hands.

unable to read his copy fluently he doubtless transferred many spellings to his stick as they stood, and a number can be paralleled in other Shakespearian quartos. The evidence, however, carries less weight than in better-printed texts. The punctuation is light and may also reproduce that of the copy fairly closely. There is not much variation in speakers' prefixes, though they do not always tally with the names used in directions: the Queen is 'Queene' or 'Gertrard' indifferently in both. Osric (or Osricke) is not named on his first appearance, and it is only from the anonymous 'Lord' (v. ii. 204) that we know that he is identical with the 'Courtier' of v. ii. 81. After that he is Osric in the prefixes (277, 292, 312, 314, 316, 361) and enters by name at 1. 361 though his previous exit is not marked.

What appears to be a double false start survives at III. ii.
177-8,

For women feare too much, euen as they loue,
And womens feare and loue hold quantitie,
Eyther none, in neither ought, or in extremitie,²⁷

which F corrects to

For womens Feare and Loue, holds quantitie,
In neither ought, or in extremity . . .

There may be other errors and tangles of Shakespeare's, straightened out in F, which it is impossible clearly to distinguish from blunders of the Q2 compositor.

Q2 presents us with a number of readings that would pass as acceptable and even excellent had we not the more excellent readings in F with which to compare them. Good examples are: I. i. 73 'dayly cost of brazon Cannon' (F 'Cast'), I. v. 20 'fearefull Porpentine' (F 'fretfull'), and i. v. 33 'rootes it selfe in ease' (F 'rots'). To account for these it has been suggested that the Q2 readings were what Shakespeare first wrote and the F readings second thoughts substituted for them when he glanced through the prompt-book, and since in some cases it is the F reading that is supported by Qi (as in the second quoted above) and sometimes the Q2 reading (as in the other two) it was further argued

²⁷ A line closely paralleled by *Romeo and Juliet*, V. iii. 102-3 (Q2), 'I will beleeeue, Shall I beleeeue that vnsubstantiall death is amorous'.

that he glanced through it twice, once before the actors' 'parts' were prepared and again at some later date.²⁸ This theory was exploded by Wilson when he pointed out that the graphic outline of the two readings is habitually alike, for it is absurd to suppose that Shakespeare, when dissatisfied with a word in his text, commonly replaced it by another of generally similar appearance.²⁹ For the Q2 readings, however plausible in themselves, the compositor must therefore be held responsible. How comes it, then, that in a round dozen instances Qz is supported by Qi in its departure from what must be supposed the correct reading of F? The answer is that in most of them the Q2 reading was borrowed from Q1.

For, while it may not be possible to prove that any part of Q2 was actually set up from a corrected copy of Qi, as happened in the case of *Romeo and Juliet* there can be very little doubt that, if it was not, the compositor at least had Qi beside him and was influenced by it in the earlier part of the play, corresponding roughly to the first act—and it is to the first act that all but two of the agreements between Qi and Q2 mentioned above belong. The following are the most notable of the errors and abnormal spellings that the compositor of Q2 seems to have taken over from Q1: I. i. 44 'horrowes' (F 'harrowes', Qi 'horrors'), 63 'smot the sleaded pollax', 75 'ship-writes' (F 'Ship-wrights'), ii. 129 'sallied' (supposed by Wilson to be an error for 'sullied', F 'solid'), 177 'studient' (F 'Student'), 200 'Capapea' (F 'Cap a Pe') v. 55 'Angle' (F 'Angell'), 89 'Gloworme' (Qi 'Glo-worme', F 'Glow-worm'). There can be no reasonable doubt that these common readings are due either to Q2 being in part set up from an imperfectly corrected copy of Q1, or to the compositor of Q2 consulting Qi when puzzled by the manuscript before him.³¹ It may be mentioned that both Qi and

²⁸ See Greg, *Principles of Emendation*, pp. 183-5, 191-3.

²⁹ Wilson himself allows Shakespeare one afterthought in the prompt-book, namely 'tristfull visage' for 'heated visage' at III. iv. 50. This, it is true, is not open to the above objection, but Wilson's argument is not wholly convincing; indeed his interpretation of this difficult passage is one of his less happy fantasies.

³⁰ See pp. 230—1 and Note F on p. 331.

³¹ Since there is no question of Qi having served as copy for Qz beyond the first act, if at all, the agreements in four-fifths of the play will anyhow have to be accounted for by consultation. They are, however, far more numerous in the first

Q2 occasionally use quotation marks at the beginning of lines to mark sententious phrases, though they do so at different points. The usage is sufficiently uncommon in the popular drama to suggest that it was a case of imitation. The typographical layout of the title-page of Q2 is unquestionably imitated from that of Q1.³²

The theory that it was Shakespeare's original manuscript that was handed to the printer has perhaps been more widely accepted in the case of the second quarto of *Hamlet* than in that of any other edition of a play of the canon, and seeing that the print can hardly have been in any way derived from the prompt-book, it can claim a high degree of inherent probability. At the same time it must be admitted that it is supported by a lesser body of material evidence than in the case of some other quartos.

Folio.—If Q2 was printed from Shakespeare's foul papers and F was not printed from Q2, it would seem likely that F was printed from, or at least had behind it, the official prompt-book, and this view has indeed been widely accepted, though the evidence in its favour is not altogether clear.

F omits some 230 lines that are found in Q2, nearly three-quarters of them in the part of *Hamlet*. Omissions of all sorts are a disease of F as well as of Q2, and some lines are doubtless missing through accident. For example, of Polonius's words in Q2 (i. ii. 58-60),

[He] Hath my Lord wrong from me my slowe leaue
By laboursome petition, and at last
Vpon his will I seald my hard consent,

only 'He hath my Lord' remain in F, and we might suppose that we were dealing with a deliberate cut were it not that the Q1 rendering, 'He hath, my lord, wrung from me a forced graunt', proves that part at least of the matter omitted in F stood in the prompt-book.³³ Correction accounts for the omission of a line and a half at in. ii. 177—8, as we have already

act than later. Greg, *Principles of Emendation*, p. 187, finds 55 instances distributed among the several acts as follows: 37, 6, 7, 1, 4. Wilson's minuter collation, which no doubt includes many accidental agreements, yields a total of 176, of which 92 are in the first act and 84 in the rest of the play.

³² It need hardly be said that from the editorial point of view this contamination of Qz by Qi materially lessens the authority of its readings.

³³ Another omission of which a trace remains in Qi is IV. iii. 27-30.

noticed.³⁴ It is not always easy to distinguish between accident and design, but Wilson classes 225 lines as deliberate cuts.³⁵ Of these the more important are the rather irrelevant passages that lead up to the appearances of the Ghost at i. i. 126 and I. iv. 38^b;³⁶ twenty-seven lines cut in the Closet scene (in. iv); most of iv. iv; twenty-five lines of the plot between Claudius and Laertes (in iv. vii); and fifty-four lines in the first part of the last scene, including a good deal of Osric and the whole of the Lord who so superfluously repeats his message. These cuts are all skilful, especially those in Hamlet's talk with his mother, concerning which Wilson remarks that 'Shakespeare himself could hardly have pruned his own verse more tenderly'. But the omission of 225 lines out of nearly 4,000 is not very much and does not suggest any serious attempt to shorten the play. The cuts lighten individual speeches and remove some obscurities and redundancies, but apart from a possible wish to relieve the principal part, they appear to be generally dictated by local convenience. The longest, consisting of the whole of Iv. iv after the exit of Fortinbras and including Hamlet's talk with the Norwegian Captain and his soliloquy 'How all occasions doe informe against me', stands apart from the others as perhaps the least expected³⁷ and as being apparently of later date, since the omitted lines have left traces both in Qi and in the *Brudermord*. The scene, therefore, must presumably have once stood in the prompt-book, and there is no need to suppose that Shakespeare had anything to do with its omission; but

³⁴ See p. 314.

³⁵ They are: I. i. 108-25, IV-17-38a, 75-78', III. ii. 181-2, 228-9, iv. 71^b-76^a, 78-81, 161-5^a, 167^b-70^a, 180^a, 202-10, IV. i. 40'^a44a, iv. 9-66, vii. 69^b-82^a, 101^b 3^a, 115-24, V. ii. 110^b-42, 145-50, 203-18. The cuts iv. vii. 69^b-82^a and v. ii. no^b-42 involve some slight adjustment of the text.

³⁶ See Note G on p. 332.

³⁷ The most surprising thing about it, however, is that it did not include the whole scene, for there seems no point whatever in retaining the eight lines of Fortinbras's rather otiose speech. Perhaps it was thought necessary that the audience should at least be on bowing acquaintance with him before his appearance at the end of the play.

³⁸ Qi, like F, ends the scene before Hamlet's entrance, but in rendering 1. 2 it uses the phrase 'Fortenbrasse nephew to old Norway', and it uses the same phrase at I. ii. 28, where the genuine texts have 'Norway Vncle to young Fortenbrasse'. Now the only place in which the actual words 'The Nephew to old Norway, Fortenbrasse' are found in Q2 is at IV. iv. 14 in the omitted portion of the scene. The echo of the closing lines of Hamlet's soliloquy (ll. 65-66) in the *Erudermord* has already been noted, p. 308.

as regards the other cuts we have some reason to believe that they were made by his own hand and marked in the foul papers. If so, we may suppose that in preparing the prompt-copy the book-keeper left out the marked passages, though fortunately the compositor of Q2 ignored the directions in his copy.³⁹ It is, indeed, on general grounds probable that the passages in question never figured in the prompt-book. For it is hard to believe that a play of 3,700 lines—the approximate length of *Hamlet* in F—was habitually acted in its entirety. It is likely that many more cuts were marked in the prompt-book, and if all the cutting had been done in it, why should the printer have observed some cuts and not others?

Wilson prints a comparative table of stage-directions in the several texts which is often illuminating. The relation of Q2 and F in this respect is peculiar. Many directions are reproduced either exactly or with such slight editing as we noticed in the Dumb-show, for example: i. i. i 'Enter Barnardo and Francisco two Centinels'; ii. 128 'Exeunt | Manet Hamlet' (cf. Q2); iv. 57 'Ghost beckens Hamlet' (cf. Q2); v. 149 'Ghost cries vnder the Stage'; II. ii. 108 'The Letter'; III. ii. 145 (see Q2); Iv. iv. I 'Enter Fortinbras with an Armie' (cf. Q2); v. i. I 'Enter two Clownes'; 240 'Enter King, Queene, Laertes, and a Coffin, with Lords attendant' (cf. Q2, neither provides for the Priest); ii. 294 'Trumpets sound, and shot goes off' (condensed from Q2); 360 'March afarre off, and shout within' (Q2 'A march a farre off'). This is normal so far as it goes, since the prompt-book would naturally reproduce directions from the foul papers: what is remarkable is that F repeats exactly the two directions, at i. i. i and I. v. 149, in which Q2 appears to be indebted to Q1, and which are therefore unlikely to have stood just so in Shakespeare's manuscript. It looks as though we should have to allow for some influence of Q2 upon F.

F sometimes adds directions, or adds particulars to directions, that are not found in Q2, and these additions are often of a kind typical rather of the author than the book-keeper:⁴⁰

³⁹ See Note H on p. 332.

⁴⁰ Alice Walker (as in note 49), p. 135, hints that F may have been edited with the reader in view. This would account for most of the additions, and also for the omission at Iv. iv. I (see above), but hardly for the indefinite numbers at II. ii. 440 and III. ii. I.

II. ii. 167 'Enter Hamlet reading on a Booke'; 385 'Flourish for the Players'; 440 'Enter foure or fiue Players'; III. ii. I 'Enter Hamlet, and two or three of the Players' (cf. Shakespeare's definite 'three'); 237 'Sleepes'; 271 'Towres the poyson in his cares'; iv. 24 'Killes Polonius', 217 'Exit Hamlet tugging in Polonius' (one could swear that this was Shakespeare's); Iv. v. 20 'Enter Ophelia distracted'; v. i. 62 'Enter Hamlet and Horatio a farre off' (perhaps unique); 273 'Leaps in the graue' (but not at 281); ii. 276 'Prepare to play'; 291 'They play'; 311 'Play' (but not at 296); 313 'In scuffling they change Rapiers'; 330 'Hurts the King'; 338 'King Dies'; 342 '[Laertes] Dies'. Since we know that omissions are frequent in Q2 we may assume with some confidence that most of these directions stood in the foul papers. Indeed the only one that cannot have been there is the 'two or three of the Players' of III. ii. This, which is in any case a quite improper direction for a book-keeper to write, can only be explained by the general urge to reduce the number of supers that is evident throughout. Thus Polonius's 'man or two' (assuming that this is not a blunder) is replaced by 'Reynaldo' at II. ii. I; there is only 'one with a Recorder' at III. ii. 357, which just suffices for the action, instead of Shakespeare's 'Players with Recorders', as plainly envisaged in the text (II. 303, 360); at iv. iii. I the 'two or three' discreet attendants who enter with the King disappear—unregretted by those who think that Claudius is communing with his secret thoughts rather than with unspecified 'councillors of state' as Wilson supposes—and so at Iv. v, I does the anonymous 'Gentleman' who brings news of Ophelia's distraction, his speeches being transferred to Horatio, and also the anonymous 'Lord' who so pointlessly follows Osric at v. ii. 203; lastly at v. ii. 373 the cast was thought insufficient to supply more than one English Ambassador (though Q1 suggests that at least two were eventually forthcoming). But if F adds some directions it omits others, as at I. i. 127, 138, iv. 6, v. ii. 289; it has no special notes for Ophelia's songs in Iv. v, though it has for the Gravedigger's in v. i. It identifies the anonymous 'Courtier' at v. ii. 80 as 'young Osricke', and it correctly gives the off-stage cries at iv. v. 152:

*A noise within. Let her come in.
Enter Ophelia.*

Laer. How now? what noise is that?
which the compositor of Q2 had bungled:

*. A noyse within.
Enter Ophelia.*

Laer. Let her come in.
How now, what noyse is that?

A few directions, half a dozen perhaps, have undergone more drastic alteration. At the end of the play it is only a matter of necessary stage-elaboration :v.ii. 372 'Enter Fortinbras and English Ambassador, with Drumme, Colours, and Attendants' is harmless, and so at 1. 414 is 'Exeunt Marching: after the which, a Peale of Ordenance are shot off', which merely formulates the indications in the text. Again, the entry of the court to witness the players' play clearly called for ceremony: F, disregarding the trumpets and kettle-drums of Q2, preserves its 'Enter King, Queene, Polonius, Ophelia', but adds 'Rosincrance, Guildensterne, and other Lords attendants, with his Guard carrying Torches. Danish March. Sound a Flourish'. A 'Danish March' (which in any case looks like an addition intended to replace 'Flourish') is no doubt appropriate, if unexpected,⁴¹ and it is unlikely that it would have meant anything either to the players or to the audience before Anne of Denmark came to London. The addition can hardly be earlier than 1603. Another and much more important alteration, in the last scene, was presumably made in the original production, or in any case before that reported in **Q1**. Wilson has explained how when Shakespeare wrote the play he evidently intended the fencing-match—a spectacle that would mean more to an Elizabethan audience than it does to us—to be fought with the old-fashioned rapier and dagger. This is explicitly stated by Osric at v. ii. 152 and confirmed by the Q2 direction at 1. 235, which provides for 'Foiles' and 'daggers'. But times were changing and the

⁴¹ In *I Henry VI*, nr. iii. 30, 'Here sound an English March' announces Talbot's approach and 'French March' two lines later announces that of the Duke of Burgundy; but the cases are hardly parallel.

single-rapier play was coming into fashion. So F, although it still allows Osric to speak of 'Rapier and dagger' as Laertes's 'weapon\ provides differently in its stage-direction 'Enter King, Queene, Laertes and Lords, with other Attendants with Foyles, and Gauntlets, a Table and Flagons of Wine on it', the significance of the gauntlets being plain from the Q1 direction 'They catch one anothers Rapiers, and both are wounded' at 1. 308.

At two points the staging implied in Q2 is deliberately altered. There the second scene of Act IV begins:

Enter Hamlet, Rosencraus, and others.

Ham. Safely stowd, but soft, what noyse, who calls on Hamlet?

O heere they come.

Ros. What haue you doone my Lord with the dead body?

This is muddled: Shakespeare, as he often did, noted down the characters he needed, careless of when they were to appear. In tidying it up the book-keeper amplified the dialogue:

Enter Hamlet.

Ham. Safely stowed.

Gentlemen within. Hamlet, Lord Hamlet.⁴²

Ham. What noise? Who cals on Hamlet?

Oh heere they come. *Enter Ros. and Guildensterne.*

Ro. What haue you done my Lord with the dead body?

This is deftly done and needful. The opening of the previous scene is more drastically reconstructed and less successfully. Hamlet has just dragged the body of Polonius off the stage, and Q2 opens a fresh scene thus:

*Eenter [sic] King, and Queene' with Rosencraus
and Guyldensterne.*

King. There's matter in these sighes . . .
Where is your sonne?

Ger. Bestow this place on vs a little while. [*Ex. R. & G.*]
Ah mine owne Lord, what haue I scene to night?

⁴² Q2 may, of course, have omitted this speech, but the fact that in F it replaces the words 'but soft' points rather to a deliberate alteration.

Instead, F continues the same scene thus:

Enter King.

King. There's matters in these sighes. . . .

Where is your Sonne ?

Qu. Ah my good Lord, what haue I scene to night ?

Here Shakespeare knew what he was doing. It is unusual for a principal character to go out and return again immediately in a new scene, and Shakespeare was therefore anxious to make it clear that a new scene was actually here intended. To this end he represents the King as already in company with the courtiers when the Queen joins them. She is agitated, and wants to speak to her husband alone, so she politely dismisses the two attendants for the moment. What more natural?⁴³ The alternative afforded by F is unsatisfactory and can hardly represent Shakespeare's intention. It is surely unlikely that he meant the King to enter the Queen's apartment pat upon Hamlet's leaving it (he had no call to intrude since he supposed Polonius to be eavesdropping) while Rosen-cranz and Guildenstern hung about within call: moreover, the King speaks of 'his mothers closet' (1.35) as though it were somewhere else. F took advantage of the Queen's being already on the stage to simplify the theatrical arrangement at the expense of the dramatic action.⁴⁴

There remains the direction at the beginning of I. ii. It would be ungracious to question Wilson's interpretation of the scene as representing a formal meeting of council, the first of the new reign. There is the King's speech from the throne on his accession and marriage, the discussion of foreign affairs and the dispatch of the ambassadors, the hearing of Laertes's petition for leave of absence, and finally the recognition of Hamlet as heir to the crown and the request or command that he shall remain at court. All this is reflected in the Q2 direction (as emended by Wilson) with its provision of the entrance in state of the King and Queen, followed by the Councillors including Polonius, the petitioner Laertes, and last and aloof the dispossessed heir. Since there is no separate entry for the ambassadors, they must be included among the rest, being more likely covered by the phrase

43 See Note I on p. 332.

44

See Note J on p. 333.

'Cum Alijs' than included among the Councillors as Wilson suggests. In F the direction runs: 'Enter Claudius King of Denmark, Gertrude the Queene, Hamlet, Polonius, Laertes, and his Sister Ophelia, Lords Attendant', and at 1. 25 'Enter Voltemand and Cornelius'.⁴⁵ The opening formula is copied from Q2, but otherwise F goes its own way: the Councillors disappear, the characters come on in order of precedence, and to crown all 'his Sister Ophelia' is dragged in (from Q2 I. iii. I 'Ophelia his Sister') although she has no part in the scene and certainly no place at the council table. We can only wonder what the book-keeper (or was it the Folio editor ?) was thinking of.⁴⁶

On the whole it seems to be a rather queer prompt-book, if prompt-book it is, that lies behind F. The editing is at times competent and even adroit, at times bungled and ineffective. Except where we can check them by Qi, changes may have been made, for anything we can tell, at any time down to 1623. A missing exit is occasionally supplied, occasionally one marked in Q2 is omitted: altogether almost a score are missing, but for this the compositor may, of course, be at least partly responsible. The only missing entrance is that for the Priest at v. i. 240, whom F and Q2 alike ignore, though Qi observes him. It is perhaps worth noting that in this scene F and Qi both speak of a 'Coffin' where Shakespeare speaks of the 'corse'.⁴⁷ It must in any case have been an open coffin, since Laertes proposes to take the body in his arms (1. 273).

The book-keeper is also prepared to redistribute speeches and to adjust the text in doing so. In iv. iii after the King's speech Shakespeare writes vaguely:

Enter Rosencraus and all the rest.

King. How now . . . Bring him before vs.

Ros. How, bring in the Lord.

They enter.

⁴⁵ There is a theatrical explanation of their belated appearance (see Note C) and it has no dramatic significance. In Qi 'the two Ambassadors' enter with the others, but then Qi begins the scene at the point where their mission comes in question.

⁴⁶ Ophelia was probably a sheer blunder on somebody's part: she does not appear in Qi, which otherwise reproduces in general the order of F.

⁴⁷ Cf. *Richard III*, I. ii. I, Q 'Enter the Coarse of Henrie the sixt', F 'Enter . . the hearse of Harry the 6'.

F tidies this up as follows:

[*King.*'] , . .

Enter Rosincrane.

How now? . . . Bring him before vs.

Rosin. Hoa, Guildensterne? Bring in my Lord.

Enter Hamlet and Guildensterne.

Here the book-keeper is only expanding slightly and keeping well within the bounds of his duty. But confidence is shaken by an earlier instance at i. v. 113 ff.:

Enter Horatio', and Marcellus.

Hora. My Lord, my Lord.

Mar. Lord Hamlet.

Hora. Heauens secure him.

Ham. So be it.

Mar. Illo, ho, ho, my Lord.

Ham. Hillo, ho, ho ...

Here F prints:

Hor. & Mar. within. My Lord, my Lord.

Enter Horatio and Marcellus.

Mar. Lord Hamlet.

Hor. Heauen secure him.

Mar. So be it.

Hor. Illo, ho, ho, my Lord.

Ham. Hillo, ho, ho ...

Again, at the beginning, the book-keeper is exercising his legitimate function, but his later alterations, if they are anything more than slips, show him up as a meddlesome bungler. Other adjustments, mostly indifferent, are: in. ii. 56, Q2 '*Ros.* I my Lord', F '*Both.* We will my Lord'; 281, Q2 '*Pol.* Lights, lights, lights' (given in F to '*All.*'); 332, Q2 '*Ros.* What my Lord' (given in F to Guildensterne—a very natural alteration, but probably mistaken); iii. 26, Q2 '*Ros.* We will hast vs' (given in F to '*Both.*'); v. i. 288, Q2 '*All.* Gentlemen. *Hora.* Good my Lord be quiet', F '*Gen.* Good my Lord be quiet'. At III. iv. 51-52 F corrects an obvious blunder in Q2 :

Quee. Ay me, what act?

Ham. That roares so low'd, and thunders in the Index,
Looke heere vpon this Picture, and on this,

but the foul papers were doubtless correct and it was the compositor who set the prefix for Hamlet's speech a line too soon. A more complex and more doubtful case is at in. ii. 400—5, where the order of the words as well as their assignment is affected. There is difference again near the beginning of III. iv, where Q2 reads:

[*Polonius*] . . . Pray you be round.

Enter Hamlet.

Ger. He wait \read warnt] you, feare me not,
With-drawe, I heare him comming.

Ham. Now mother, what's the matter?

and F:

[*Polonius*']. . . Pray you be round with him.

Ham. within. Mother, mother, mother.

Qu. He warrant you, feare me not.

Withdraw, I heare him comming.

Enter Hamlet.

Ham. Now Mother, what's the matter?

Here it is difficult to say how much is corruption on the one side and how much legitimate editing on the other.

Besides alterations in the stage-directions and adjustments, judicious and otherwise, in the dialogue, F substitutes a number of readings, generally synonymous or corresponding expressions, that are either manifestly erroneous or at least inferior to those of Q2. Some are doubtless unconscious changes made by the compositor. A common mistake in printing is the repetition of an earlier word or phrase in place of another, or even the anticipation of one from a neighbouring context. Examples occur, for instance, in Q2: I. i. 45" '*Bar.* It would be spoke to. *Mar.* Speake to it Horatio', where F is doubtless correct in printing Question it', and i. ii. 67 'Not so much my Lord, I am too much in the sonne', where the first 'much', not found in F, is obviously intrusive. Now this type of error is particularly common in F: for example II. ii. 52 'My Newes shall be the Newes to that great Feast' (Q2 'the fruite'), and II. ii. 467 'One cheefe Speech in it, I cheefely lou'd' (Q2 'one speech'). Wilson counts fifteen cases of repetition and eleven cases of anticipation from the same or the

following line. This is a formidable list, and though Wilson is perhaps too ready to brush aside the possible responsibility of the compositor, there is no doubt that such errors would more readily occur in the work of a copyist who was already familiar with the text. And only on this assumption, it would seem, can we reasonably account for anticipations from a more distant context, of which there are some half-dozen examples. Here are the first two:

- I. i. 150, Q2 The Cock that is the trumpet of the morne
 F The Cocke that is the Trumpet of the
 day . . .
 152 Awake the God of Day
- I. i. 161, Q2 And then they say no spirit dare sturre
 abroade
 F And then (they say) no Spirit can walke
 abroad . . .
 167 Walkes o're the dew

Moreover, once we recognize that what Wilson calls 'an active memory' has been at work in the transmission of F, it becomes easy to detect the source of other errors and substitutions in it. Thus at II. ii. 198 F has the inapposite collocation 'Satyricall slaue' in place of Q2's 'satericall rogue', perhaps because the words 'rogue' and 'slaue' were linked in the scribe's mind through 1. 576, 'O what a rogue and pesant slaue am I'; and at III. i. 149, where Q2 reads 'God hath giuen you one face', F's error 'one pace' may be due to the scribe having already in mind the 'gig & amble' a line later. Some of the associations that Wilson observes may seem far-fetched, but the workings of a scribe's mind are often queer. It is, of course, conceivable that when the book-keeper prepared the prompt-copy he had already some acquaintance with the play, but his mind is hardly likely to have been steeped in it as our hypothetical transcriber's seems to have been. Nor is it likely that these errors would have been allowed to remain uncorrected in the prompt-book, for several of them make manifest nonsense, like 'Newes' mentioned above or v. ii. 191-2 'there are no tongues else for's tongue' (Q2 'for's turne'). Moreover, in several cases we know that the errors in question were not in

the prompt-book, for when Q1 is available for comparison it almost invariably supports the correct reading—as, for example, at I. i. 150 and II. ii. 467 quoted above.⁴⁸ Wilson is therefore led to infer that between the prompt-book and F there stood a transcript made by someone who knew the play well and whose subconscious memory at times betrayed him into writing words other than those before him. Some of the errors may even be variants that had established themselves on the stage. This memorial contamination suggests haste, and haste will also account for the frequent omissions. As we have just seen, Q1 sometimes enables us to distinguish between the errors of the book-keeper and those of the transcriber.

Wilson's theory that F was printed not from the prompt-book itself but from a copy of it made for the purpose, is plausible enough if the company, as it is only reasonable to assume, was unwilling to part with the original. What is much more difficult to understand is why the editors should have gone to the trouble of having a transcript made from the prompt-book rather than follow their habitual policy of printing from a 'good' quarto. If they were content to reprint the 'good' second quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* (or rather its descendant of 1609) as it stood, with all the stigmas of foul papers upon it, why did they reject the 'good' second quarto of *Hamlet*? It was, it is true, badly printed and was disfigured by many errors; but it contained a far more authoritative text and less serious corruption than, for example, the quartos of *Richard III* and *King Lear* and if the editors were prepared to undertake the quite considerable labour of correcting these quartos to serve as copy for the printer, how was it that they declined the lesser task of correcting Q2 of *Hamlet*?

This problem is taken up by Alice Walker in her recent discussion of the play.⁴⁹ She accepts the substance of Wilson's findings, including the transcript of the original prompt-copy; on the other hand, she believes this transcript to have been made for the theatre to replace a worn-out prompt-book, and F to have been printed from a copy of Q2 that had been

⁴⁸ Q1 supports the correct reading in nine instances. Twice it supports the error. One of these is trifling and rather uncertain (i. iv. 14). But at I. i. 161 (cited above) Q1 reads 'dare walke', and this (not F's 'can walke') must have stood in the prompt-book. The error is an easy one, and it may have been made by the book-keeper even without the influence of 1. 167.

" *Textual Problems*, pp. 121-37.

altered and corrected by comparison with it. But she ascribes to the F compositors (especially to compositor 5, who was responsible for two-thirds of the play) much of the corruption that Wilson attributes to the transcriber.⁵⁰ For example, in the case of III. i. 149, where Wilson offers the ingenious explanation of the substitution of 'pace' for 'face' already mentioned, she points out that in the line before F has 'pratlings' for 'paintings' and in the line after 'gidge' for 'gig', so that 'pace' is likely enough to be a simple misprint.

The evidence in favour of F having been printed from Q2 is much the same as that for Q2 having been in part printed from Q1, namely their agreement in a number of unusual forms and spellings and some misprints. Miss Walker makes it clear that F's affinities are with Q2 rather than with Q3 (1611) or Q4 (n.d.), but one could wish that she had set out the positive evidence in favour of Q2 rather more fully. However, we have, common to Q2 and F: I. i. 63 'smot. . . pollax', 73 'brazon', v. 115-16 'Illo . . . Hillo', II. i. 3 'maruiles' (F 'maruels', adv.), 99. 'out adoores' (F 'out adores'), ii. 566 'dosen', 578 'fixion' (fiction), Iv. v. 100 'impitious' (F 'impittious', impetuous), v. ii. 322 'how' (F 'How?' ho!). The list is not without weight, even allowing for possible coincidence, and while there would be nothing surprising in abnormal spellings of the foul papers being reproduced by the compositor of Q2, it could not with much plausibility be argued that the same spellings were faithfully reproduced by two transcribers and the compositor of F.⁵¹ It might, of course, be suggested that the compositor of F sometimes consulted Q2 when his manuscript was obscure, but against this is the appearance occasionally of what might be called typographical links as well: I. i. 18 'Exit Fran.' (where 'Exit' would suffice), III. iii. 26 'Exeunt Gent.' (where 'Exeunt' would suffice, and where 'Gent.' stands for Rosencranz and Guildenstern), and Iv. i. 32 'Enter Ros. & Guild.' (crowded into the right margin). It will have been noticed that at i. i. 63 'smot... pollax' is among the readings

so See Note K on p. 333.

⁵¹ Miss Walker adds four readings which, in company with many other critics, she takes to be misprints in Qz repeated in F: II. ii. 397 'hand saw', III. ii. 262 'mistake' (Q1 'must take'), 269 'ban' (Q1 'bane'), 295 'paiock'.

that were previously cited as evidence that Q2 was itself dependent on Qi,⁵² and that it is therefore highly unlikely to have been found in either the foul papers or the prompt-book, and when it is remembered that we earlier found in F two stage-directions that also appear to owe their form to Qi,⁵³ it must be admitted that the evidence for F having been printed from Q2 amounts to something not far short of proof.⁵⁴

There is a very superficial purging of profanity in F, which may have been done in the prompt-book in 1606 or later, or else in the course of printing. According to a table drawn up by Wilson, 'God' is variously altered on seven occasions and retained on eight.

F has a very imperfect division into acts and scenes, omitting i. iv and v and extending no farther than II. ii. Further division into acts was first introduced in the quarto of 1676 and has been followed by later editors, who have further divided the acts into scenes. But this division is very unsatisfactory, since, as already remarked (Note J), it makes Act IV begin in the midst of a continuous action, and indeed in the middle of what F, even if mistakenly, makes a single scene. The 1676 quarto may represent the practice of the Restoration stage and reflect the instinct of actors to pause after the tension of the Closet scene, but its influence has been most unfortunate. A better distribution might be achieved by including the Nunnery scene (now in. i) in Act II (as II. iii), and so bring it into closer association with n. ii, in which the meeting is planned, and by transferring iv i-iii to Act III, thus making it begin with the Play scene and end with Hamlet's dispatch to England, which forms a single continuous action. The redistribution would somewhat increase the disparity of the acts, which in the Globe edition now contain 831, 753, 928, 662, and 736 lines respectively (total 3,930), for it would make the numbers 851, 949, 880, 514, and 736: but the fourth is in any case the shortest, and whether it consists of 662 lines or 514 seems a minor consideration beside that of correctly interpreting the dramatic structure of the play.

52 Seep. 315.

53 See p. 318.

54 This conclusion, if accepted, has, of course, like the partial and occasional dependence of Qz on Qi, important editorial implications. See Note L on p. 333.

NOTE A (page 300)

The only names correctly preserved are Hamlet, Horatio, Marcellus, Fortinbrass, and Ophelia (Ofelia). Gertrude becomes Gertred; Laertes, Leartes; Rosencranz and Guildenstern, Rosencraft and Gilderstone; Cornelius is Cornelia the only time he is named, and Voltemand is Voltemar, but this may be an attempted correction, for the name intended must be Valdemar. Claudius, who is nowhere named in the text, becomes simply 'King'. Barnardo and Francisco become anonymous 'Centinels' and Osric 'a Bragart Gentleman'—not a very apt description. The names in the players' play are peculiar: Baptista and Lucianus are correctly reported, but Gonzago becomes Albertus and the scene, Vienna, is given as 'guyana'.

NOTE B (page 300)

In the *Brudermord* (see p. 307) the former name is Corambus, and since this is the form it takes in *All's Well* (IV.iii. 185) it is probably correct and Corambus one of Qi's habitual corruptions. Reynaldo does not figure in the *Brudermord*. The most plausible suggestion respecting the change of names, though it is not altogether satisfactory, is that Corambus and Montano were those borne by the characters in the early *Hamlet* and that they were there, or had at least become on the stage, recognizable caricatures of Lord Burghley and one of his followers; that Shakespeare, rewriting the play soon after Burghley's death in 1598, thought it more decent to alter them to Polonius and Reynaldo; but that the reporter reverted to the traditional names as more generally familiar. Of course, the reporter might easily have forgotten the name Reynaldo, which occurs only twice in the text, but in that case one would have expected him to leave the character anonymous, as he did Barnardo and Francisco and Osric. Polonius was probably so named in memory of the great Polish statesman and writer Laurentius Grimaldus Goslicius, whose book entitled *The Counsellor* appeared in an English translation the year of Burghley's death.

NOTE C (page 302)

According to Duthie the reporter cannot himself have played Voltemand because (a) he would have known his own name and (b) he would have known that he had no business at v. ii. 373. The answer to (a) is that he did know his name (see Note A); to (b) that if, as is likely, Qi was printed from the prompt-book of a touring company, someone may have written his name in the margin as a reminder that the actor who played a Danish ambassador in i. ii and II. ii was here available to play an English one. The wording of the stage-direction rather suggests that 'Voltemar' is an insertion, and the prefix is 'Ambass.' In fact, it is almost certain that the parts of Marcellus and Voltemand were doubled in the performances upon a recollection of which the reporter relied, for Qi omits the beginning of I. ii down to the point at which the latter enters in F. Shakespeare seems to have intended Voltemand and Cornelius to be present from the beginning of the scene, for they have no separate entry in Q2; but the book-keeper had to consider the resources of the company, and the twenty-five lines before Voltemand is required would have given Marcellus time for a quick change of costume.

NOTE D (page 306)

The suggestion that the *Erudermord* version of Hamlet's escape, or something like it, figured in the early *Hamlet* was made by Fredson Bowers as long ago as 1933 (*Modern Language Notes*, Feb., xlviii. 101-8), when he argued that the episode was imitated in *Alphonsus Emperor of Germany*, a play printed in 1654 but written, he believes, between 1597 and 1599. *Alphonsus* and *Hamlet* belong, of course, to the same class of Senecan revenge-plays, and it is quite possible that the former owed something to the early form of the latter, or even, if dates permit, to the Shakespearian version. In *Alphonsus* Richard of Cornwall, disguised as a clown, tricks two 'Dutch Bowers', who have been sent to murder him, by shamming dead, and after they have quarrelled and one has killed the other, himself gets up and dispatches the survivor. This is rather remote from the device used by Hamlet in the *Erudermord*, and hardly needs a prototype. If there is any connexion between the two, the scene in *Alphonsus* may have afforded a hint to the compiler of the *Erudermord*.

NOTE E (page 312)

Fredson Bowers ('A Definitive Text of Shakespeare: Problems and Methods', *Studies in Shakespeare*, University of Miami Press, 1952, p. 19) writes: 'Wilson's theory of the harried and driven workman does not appear to coincide with the picture given by bibliographical analysis of the physical facts of the printing.¹ The pattern of the skeleton formes is that 'customarily adopted when the compositor was comfortably ahead of the press', and there is even a suspicion that two presses were engaged on the work, which would point to two compositors also being involved. At the same time the relation between composition and press-work would depend on many considerations of printing-house economy of which we can know nothing; and the compositor would be expected to set a given amount of copy, or at any rate a given number of type-pages, in a given time. It is, however, significant that a spelling analysis of Q2 by Alice Walker (privately communicated) appears to reveal the presence of two compositors. If that is so, the source of the peculiarities of Q2 may have to be sought in the copy, and some of the assumed omissions of £)2 may be compositors' additions in F.

NOTE F (page 315)

All the same there is some evidence that at any rate in the first scene a corrected copy of Q1 served as copy for Q2. The first thirteen lines of Qz differ widely from the briefer dialogue of Qi and would have had to be largely rewritten, and they offer no general typographical resemblance. After the entry of Horatio and Marcellus, however, the texts become closely parallel, and at once a typographical correspondence is observable likewise. Qi, continuing the practice with which it started, prints speakers' names and text level on the left as far as Horatio's speech at 1. 30, where for the first time it indents the speaker. Q2, on the other hand, begins by indenting the text (setting the speakers full out) but after the entrance of Horatio and Marcellus it switches into agreement with Qi, printing 1l. 24—29 level with the speakers, and then from 1. 30 indents the speakers, again as in Qi. (It is true that Qz is sometimes

inconsistent in the matter of indentation later on, e.g. on sigs. F2^v3^r.) Moreover, Q2 ends two speeches erroneously with commas, 1. 6 'houre,' and 1. 15 'Dane/. The first is one of the few lines before the entry that is closely rendered by Qi, and in Qi it also ends with an erroneous comma, 'watch,': in Qi 1. 15 correctly ends with a comma, because the speech is continued. It is difficult to believe that these agreements are accidental or that they can have resulted from a merely casual consultation of Qi. Alice Walker, *Textual Problems*, p. 121, believes that 'Q2 was printed ... from Q1 ... throughout what became in the Folio Act I'.

NOTE G (page 317)

These passages appear to be designed to lower the strain and distract the spectators' attention in order that the appearance of the Ghost may come with the greater shock. Either this intention was not understood or the device proved ineffective or was not deemed worth the delay in the action. The second passage contains reflections on the drunkenness of the Danish court, and it has been suggested that it was cut in deference to Anne of Denmark after James I's accession. Indeed, the intemperance of James's own court, if we are to believe Sir John Harington, may well have made it sensitive to such criticism. None the less the suggestion must be rejected. What is cut is only the talk of 'heauy headed reueale', which is leniently treated as no more than a 'dram of eale' in the 'noble substance'; what remains is the King's 'rowse' and 'wassell' and 'the swaggring vp-spring reeles', which, whatever Shakespeare may have meant by it, could only too easily suggest the swaggering of an insolent upstart and be supposed to apply to the new monarch. Besides, the absence of anything corresponding in Qi suggests that the cut was made before the play was produced.

NOTE H (page 318)

The sharp eye of Dover Wilson has detected a small but significant indication that the cuts were actually made in the foul papers. In iv. i F omits 11.40^b44^a; but 40^b is absent from Q2 likewise—we owe the acceptable reconstruction 'so likewise slander' to the ingenuity of Theobald and Capell. Now the recognized manner of indicating a cut—as may be seen in almost any dramatic manuscript—was by a bracket in the left margin, a line being drawn down opposite the lines to be omitted with horizontal arms marking the beginning and the end. In the present case the upper arm would have to extend below 40^a but above 40^b, and if carelessly drawn might easily run through 40^b, rendering it illegible and so causing its omission in Q2.

NOTE I (page 322)

No text marks an exit for the Queen at the end of in. iv, and since they all mark one for Hamlet the omission is perhaps no accident. Most likely the Queen is meant to pass from one scene to the other without leaving the stage by what has been called dramatic *enjambement* (see p. 254, Note C). The Closet scene would end with Hamlet on the back stage dragging off the body and the Queen in front watching him. Then with the drawing of the traverse

—the curtain that screened the alcove—the scene would cease to be the Queen's 'closet'; she would be thought of as coming out of her room and meeting the King in a hall or corridor.

NOTE J (page 322)

The alteration in F may be of later date since Q1 opens the new scene with the direction 'Enter the King and Lords'. Wilson finds the entrance and dismissal of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern awkward and favours the arrangement in F, and in his edition makes the scene run on without a break, though he has not sufficiently the courage of his conviction to dispense with the courtiers. Indeed, so persuaded is he that the arrangement in Q2 cannot be intended that to account for it he postulates the loss of a scene that originally intervened between in. v and Iv. i. This is inconceivable where the action is so rapid and continuous. It is a disaster that editors have followed a late quarto in choosing this of all points at which to begin a new act (see p. 329).

NOTE K (page 328)

It is not altogether clear that on Miss Walker's theory the postulate of a transcriber is necessary, though it remains the most convenient explanation of errors of anticipation. Concerning the compositors see pp. 457 if. The difference of view here is important. Wilson has rendered a valuable service to criticism by throughout insisting on tracing to the copy features that earlier editors had blamed indiscriminately on the printer. But, as is the way with innovators, he is inclined to work his theory too hard. We now know more than we did about the work of Jaggard's compositors and their liability to error, and it is becoming clear that textual criticism will in future have to take serious account of their several characteristics.

NOTE L (page 329)

In an unpublished article Harold Jenkins, while recognizing the influence of Q2 on F, advances strong reasons for supposing that it cannot have served as copy. Indeed, the absence of any general typographical resemblance between the Q and F texts is a difficulty in the way of Miss Walker's thoroughgoing theories in the case of other plays besides *Hamlet* (see Postscript on p. 467).

XXIII. THE MERRT WIVES OF WINDSOR 1600-1 (?)

'Bad' *quarto* (I602).¹—This is clearly a reported text, apparently a memorial reconstruction of a version closely allied to, if not substantially identical with, F: it is also a deliberately shortened text. It is not, however, it would seem, a report of an abridged version, since whoever prepared it evidently knew the full text. For example, of Falstaff's speech at Iv. v. 95-105 only the beginning and the end appear, almost verbatim, at the corresponding point in Q, but a garbled version of the six omitted lines found its way into v. v, between ll. 135 and 136, where there is nothing corresponding in F. The abridgement, therefore, appears to have been done in the course of preparing the report, whence we may conclude that this was intended for acting, presumably in the country, and only later and incidentally found its way to press. An outstanding feature of the report is the habitual fullness and accuracy of the Host's part and the way in which the text in general improves when he is on or near the stage. The same is true, if less noticeably, of Falstaff's. In neither case, however, is the quality of the reporting uniform, and it seems less likely that Q was vamped up by the two actors themselves than that an independent reporter was able to draw on the recollection of each. The last act is much confused. The omission of the first four scenes is, no doubt, like that of i. i, deliberate, but the denouement itself in v. v is woefully inadequate and bears little resemblance to the corresponding scene in F.² The Host takes no part in it in either

¹ The relation of the texts was examined in detail in the introduction to Greg's reprint of Q (Clarendon Press, 1910), which made use of earlier work by P. A. Daniel (introduction to the Griggs facsimiles of 1881 and 1888) and H. C. Hart (Arden edition, 1904). Views then expressed were somewhat modified in *Editorial Problem*, pp. 70-72, and have been re-examined by J. W. R. Meadowcroft in an unpublished Master's thesis at McGill University, which the author has kindly communicated.

² So different is it that it has been conjectured to go back to a different original. One curious feature of v. v in F is that Evans drops his dialect, and yet Falstaff is able to recognize him by his speech: 'Heauens defend me from that Welsh Fairy' (l. 85). Perhaps, writing hastily, Shakespeare did not trouble to supply the dialect, leaving it to the actor to make good his negligence. If so the actor failed him, for

text, and it is clear that, in spite of the presence of Falstaff, the reporter was unable to recover more than the barest outline, and that he rewrote part of the scene in doggerel verse, incorporating in it what appears to be a fragment of a London ballad. It may be significant that the part of Falstaff was perhaps played by William Kemp (cf. *Henry V*, p. 284), the comic actor who left the Chamberlain's men some time in 1599 to travel abroad. He was back by September 1601 and possibly rejoined the company for a while before becoming a member of the Earl of Worcester's in the course of 1602.

The only importance of Q, textually, is the possibility of using it to emend or supplement F. Some editors have borrowed from it more than was perhaps judicious. But at in. i. 108 Q preserves the words 'Giue me thy hand terestiall', and at Iv. v. 105 'to say my prayers', which have undoubtedly been accidentally lost in F. These phrases there is no difficulty in inserting as they stand. But there are other phrases peculiar to Q that have a Shakespearian flavour but are less easy to accommodate. At II. ii. 2-3, instead of F's 'Why then the world's mine Oyster, which I, with sword will open', Q has the equally characteristic 'I will retort the sum in equipage'. This phrase can only be worked into F on the assumption of partly overlapping omissions in both texts. Such coincidence may be thought unlikely, but the alternative is to suppose that the text underwent some no less improbable literary revision before the printing of F.

Folio.—The text has the peculiarity that each scene is headed by an entrance for all the characters that appear in it, irrespective of whether they enter at the beginning or later on, that similarly the only exits are at the ends of scenes, and that there are no other stage-directions. The only exception is 'Enter Fairies' at v. v. 41, the initial direction not having provided for them. This peculiarity it shares with some other plays,³ and it may point to the text having been set up from a transcript by Ralph Crane, a supposition consistent with the lavish use of parentheses which is a feature of his known manuscripts. If the copy for F was of this nature it makes it

the indications of Welsh pronunciation in Q are of the slightest ('Teane', 'Pead' [F 'Bede'], 'plew'). But the trouble goes deeper than this: Evans's speeches are quite out of character.

3 See pp. 156-8.

harder to conjecture whether it was foul papers or the prompt-book that lay behind it, and the absence of stage-directions deprives us of what is usually our chief ground of judgement. There are undoubtedly confusions in the text that must have originated with the author, but it is not equally certain that they would have been removed in preparing the play for production. Again, the very fact that a transcript was made for printing might be supposed to indicate that there were no foul papers available, but the inference is discounted by the further fact that the first four comedies in the collection all appear to have been printed from transcripts specially prepared for press, and this would therefore seem to have been the policy when work on the Folio was begun. Possibly some light may be thrown on the point by another line of argument.

A minor thread in the plot concerns the stealing of the Host's horses, and this is connected with a supposed 'Duke de Iamanie' (Iv. v. 88—89) and his servants 'three Cozen-lermans' (79), or 'three sorts of cosen garmombles' as they are called in Q, who are also described as 'three Germane-diuels; three Doctor Faustasses' (70—71). It is usual to see in this an allusion to Frederick, Count of Mompelgart, later Duke of Wiirttemberg, who was entertained at court in 1592, when among other places he visited Windsor and Reading. Elizabeth appears to have promised him the Order of the Garter, and after his return to Germany he sent several letters and missions to remind her of it. His importunity seems to have roused some resentment at court and possibly some amusement in wider circles. He was eventually elected in 1597, but in spite of two further embassies failed to obtain the insignia till after the Queen's death. Now, in view of the rather mysterious allusions to Falstaff pawning his horses to the Host (n. i. 99—100) and to the Host's horses being stolen, it is curious how persistently horses and horse-dealing crop up in the Mompelgart story. There is, indeed, no hint of shady dealing on the part of the Count or his agents—rather the reverse—but we can easily imagine that among other gossip some scandalous tales became current. The horse-stealing episode is curiously fragmentary and is indeed hardly intelligible in either version as it stands. It may

be that it played a more important part in the play as originally written and that it was thought advisable to cut the more obviously libellous passages on the stage. Bad reporting of the Host's part hereabouts suggests that the text may have been altered subsequent to the original production. If so, the 'garmombles' allusion, which must in any case be a bit of actor's gag that got into the report, may be a sly reference to the forbidden topic.⁴ If cutting of this sort occurred, it would seem that F must go back to the prompt-book in which it was effected. But this is conjectural. The only certain revision in F, apart from some purging of oaths no doubt subsequent to the Act of 1606, is the substitution of Broome for the original Brooke (in Q) as the alias adopted by Ford. Since Brooke was the family name of Lord Cobham, in deference to whose susceptibilities Falstaff is supposed to have replaced Oldcastle in *Henry IV*⁵ it is reasonable to suppose the same influence here, although, there being no trace of Oldcastle in *The Merry Wives*,⁵ the two changes were probably made at different times. This again suggests the prompt-book as the source of F, though it is possible, of course, that the transcriber would have observed the alteration even if he were copying from foul papers.

The date of the play is rather uncertain. Chambers argues that because Q borrows a line from *Hamlet* (v. i. 312, 'What is the reason that you vse me thus?' inserted in Iv. ii. 124), 'and at the same time must rest on a report of some of the earliest performances, since Brooke could hardly have survived the special review of the play by the Revels officers for the court', the play must have been written later than *Hamlet*. But in fact we do not know when, if ever, the play was acted at court before the Jacobean performance of 4 November 1604, and are therefore unable to date the change of name with any precision. All the borrowing from *Hamlet* proves is that Q was not put together before 1600—i. It would be much more natural to suppose that *The Merry Wives* was written immediately after *Henry V* in 1599.

⁴ No doubt 'garmomble' is the same as the dialect 'girmumble', 'jurmungle', or 'jurmumple', which seems to mean a slight hurt or else confusion, and, as a verb, to bamboozle: the form may have been intentionally modified for the sake of a pun on Mompelgart.

⁵ Greg (as in note i) did find some traces, but they are disposed of by Chambers.

XXIV. *TROILUS AND CRESSIDA*. 1602

Quarto (1609).—*Troilus and Cressida* is a play of puzzles, in respect of its textual history no less than its interpretation, and any attempt to solve them cannot be other than speculative. In the first place there is a double entrance in the Stationers' Register. On 7 February 1603 James Roberts 'Entered for his copie in Full Court holden this day. to print when he hath gotten sufficient aucthority for yt. The booke of Troilus and Cresseda as yt is acted by my lord Chamberlins Men'. The formality of entrance by order of the Court of Assistants is sufficiently unusual to attract attention, and so is the conditional nature of the entrance, which allowed Roberts the rights in the copy but gave him no immediate permission to print it. Since no 'licence' is specified it would be natural to assume that the 'aucthority' required was the usual ecclesiastical sanction, were it not that comparison with *The Merchant of Venice*¹ in conjunction with the staying order of 4 August 1600,¹ suggests the alternative possibility that the permission sought was that of the Lord Chamberlain's company. This has led some critics to suspect that the object of the entrance was not so much to secure the copyright to Roberts as to prevent unauthorized publication by another and that it was made at the instigation of the players.² However that may be, Roberts did nothing further in the matter, and the one definite piece of information the entry affords is that early in 1603 the play was in existence and had already been performed.³ Almost six years later, on 28 January 1609, two young stationers who were just starting business together, Richard Bonian and Henry Walley, 'Entred for their Copy vnder thandes of m^r Segar deputy to Sir Geo. Bucke

¹ See p. 24, Note D (end).

² The wording of the entry, though ambiguous, is worth attention. The formula 'a book called . . .' is common and not significant: 'a book called the book of. . .' implies that the copy submitted for registration was none other than the prompt-book (cf. again *The Merchant of Venice*, and see p. 100, Note B). The inference to be drawn in the present case, where the entry speaks of 'The booke of...', is less certain, but if it was indeed the company's prompt-copy that Roberts took to Stationers' Hall, it would increase the likelihood that he was acting on the players' behalf.

³ The phrase 'as yt is acted' would seem to suggest habitual performance: but the wording must not be pressed; it may mean no more than 'as it hath been acted'.

and m^r warden Lownes a booke called. The history of Troylus and Cressida', and this they followed up within the year with a quarto printed for them by George Eld. This is found in two states. As originally designed it bore an authoritative-seeming title: 'The Historic of Troylus and Cresseida. As it was acted by the Kings Maiesties seruants at the Globe. Written by William Shakespeare.' This bore out Roberts's assertion that the play had been acted by the former Chamberlain's men.⁴ But while printing was in progress it was decided to withdraw this title and to substitute for it a fold of two leaves,⁵ the first bearing a new title (printed in part from the same setting of the type⁶), 'The Famous Historic of Troylus and Cresseid. Excellently expressing the beginning of their loues, with the conceited wooing of Pandarus Prince of Licia. Written by William Shakespeare', and the second the rare distinction of an 'Epistle'. This, headed 'A neuer writer, to an euer reader. Newes' and with the bare subscription 'Vale', describes the piece as 'a new play, neuer stal'd with the Stage, neuer clapper-clawd⁷ with the palmes of the vulger, and yet passing full of the palme comicall; for it is a birth of your [read that] braine, that neuer vnder-tooke any thing commicall vainely . . . refuse not, nor like this the lesse, for not being sullied, with the smoaky breath of the multitude; but thanke fortune for the scape it hath made amongst you. Since by the grand possessors wills I beleuee you should haue prayd for them rather then beene prayd.' This pointedly contradicts the earlier title, and it has generally been taken to contradict Roberts's entry likewise. 'We are bound', says Chambers, 'to assume that Bonian and Walley

¹ The wording, however, is different, the past tense 'was' implying that it was known not to be in the current repertory.

⁵ Philip Williams (*Studies in Bibliography*, 1949, ii. 25-30) has shown that we should not distinguish two issues of the book, as had previously been done, but only two states, the cancel having been almost certainly printed as part of the last sheet (sig. M). The difference between copies depends merely on whether the cancel has ten effected, or the cancellans lost: one copy is alleged to contain both the original title and the substituted fold.

⁶ It was customary to print extra copies of the title-page of a book to paste up as advertisements on posts about the city (McKerrow, *Introduction*, pp. 90-91) and for this purpose the type of the title was often kept standing after the rest had been distributed.

⁷ The phrase is borrowed from the play itself, V. iv. I: 'Now they are clapper-clawing one another'. It appears to have been a dialect or canting term to which Nashe and Shakespeare gave literary currency.

had come to this belief that the play was unacted: he adds that 'It does not follow that they were right'. But we can hardly brush aside such repeated and emphatic statements deliberately made in correction of an earlier claim. Moreover, the statements are not in fact unreconcilable. All that Roberts said was that the play had been acted by the Chamberlain's men: the epistle is, in fact, careful not to deny this; all it implies is that the play had not been acted before the vulgar multitude. The inference is that the company had given a private performance. And this is indeed what, on internal grounds, we might expect. It would be rash in the extreme to dogmatize upon what Shakespeare would or would not have been likely to offer his public at the Globe; but one cannot help suspecting that *Troilus and Cressida* would have been caviare to the generality of playgoers at the end of Elizabeth's reign. We may also reject any idea that it was written, as gossip reports *The Merry Wives* to have been, for the Queen's court: the whole tone of the play, let alone the epilogue, is against such an assumption. But there is one audience that we may readily believe would have understood both the high seriousness of the doctrine of 'degree' and the impassioned poetry of love, and have at the same time savoured the salacious seasoning of bitter wit and found no incongruity between these opposites, but on the contrary have appreciated the cynical twist that turned passion and heroics to dust and ashes. That audience was the termers of the Inns of Court, and if the play was written by Shakespeare and performed by the Chamberlain's men for, say, the habitual All Saints or Candlemas festivities of the Inner Temple, it would explain some of the peculiarities of the piece and give us a hint respecting its history, though it must be frankly admitted that there is no shred of external evidence with which the conjecture can be supported.⁸

⁸ The theory was advanced by Peter Alexander in an article in *The Library* in Dec. 1928 (ix. 267-86), a serious and partially successful attempt to solve the problems of the play, though his suggestions (p. 285) that Shakespeare was himself responsible for its publication and that its altered position in the Folio was due to difficulty of classification should not be taken seriously. Concerning the character of shows staged at the Inns of Court he pertinently refers to 'the wittily obscene speeches' in the Gray's Inn revels of 1594, a contemporary account of which was printed as *Gesta Grayorum* in 1668, and to an order by the Benchers of the Inner Temple in 1611 forbidding the usual festivities 'For that great disorder and scurrility

The stage-directions, which are generally meagre, bear on the whole the impress of the author rather than the theatre: I. i. 91 'Sound alarum'; 108 'Alarum[.] Enter 'Eneas'; ii. I 'Enter Cressid and her man'; 189 'Sound a retreat'; iii. I 'Enter Agamemnon . . . with others'; 259 'Sound trumpet'; II. ii. 97 'Enter Cassandra rauing'; iii. I 'Enter Thersites solus'; III. iii. 38 'Achilles and Patro[.] stand in their tent'; Iv. i. I 'Enter at one doore 'Eneas, at another Paris, Deiphobus, Autemor [sic], Diomed the Grecian with torches'; ii. 41 'Knock'; v. I 'Enter Ajax armed . . . &c.'; 63 'Flowrish enter all of Troy'; 112 'Alarum'; 116 'trumpets cease'; v. i. 74 'Enter Agam: . . . with lights'; iv. I 'Enter Thersites: excursions'; vi. 27 'Enter one in armour'; vii. i 'Enter Achilles with Myrmidons'; 8 'Enter Thersi: Mene: Paris'; 14 'Enter Bastard'; viii. 14 'Retreat'; ix. I 'Enter Agam:... and the rest marching'. A feature of the directions is the frequent abbreviation of names where there is no need to save space: another is that the entrance of a single character is several times marked at the beginning of a line and serves as speech-heading as well (iv. i. 80, v. v. 42, vi. I, 2, 137). Noises are frequent, but often required by the text, as at i. i. 91 where 'Sound alarum' is needed to explain Troilus's exclamation 'Peace you vngracious clamors', and I. iii. 259 where 'Sound trumpet' is the executive order following 'Eneas's 'Trumpet blowe alowd' three lines before. The curiously worded entry at III. iii. 38 depends directly on the text, where Ulysses calls attention to their presence: 'Achilles stands ith entrance of his tent'. But the directions are inadequate for performance. Some thirty entrances and a like number of exits are wanting. In I. iii Diomedes is a mute, but there is no reason why he should not be present, nor is there any reason why Calchas should not enter at II. iii. 75, though he does not speak; on the other hand, the inclusion of the latter at iv. v. i is a mistake, for Diomedes proposes to escort Cressida to him at 1. 53.

is brought into this House by lewd and lascivious plays'. If it is true, as has been asserted, that the titles assumed by the Lord of Misrule at Gray's Inn contain 'allusions to nearly all the famous places of ill-repute about London', it would help to explain the epilogue to *Troilus and Cressida*, addressed as it ostensibly is to an audience of 'traiders in the flesh'; but it must be added that nothing to be found in Stow's *Survey* bears out the allegation.

In all this there is some suggestion of foul papers, and whatever touching up there may have been appears literary rather than theatrical. But other indications of foul papers are to seek. There is little or no uncertainty in the designation of characters, beyond the variant forms Cress(e)ida and Cress(e)id, Diomedes and Diomed, Pandarus and Pandar, Priamus and Priam (which are really metrical variants though they mostly occur in directions as well), and the indefinite 'all of Troy' at Iv. v. 63. Margarelon is simply 'Bastard' the only time he appears (v. vii. 14) and is not named in the text. Cressida is accompanied by 'her man' on her first appearance (i. ii. I) and Pandarus addresses him as Alexander at 1. 45. 'If we accept the peculiarities of spelling described by Professor Dover Wilson as Shakespeare's, the copy for [the quarto of] *Troilus and Cressida* was written by him/ So Alexander (p. 279), but Chambers objects that the spellings, in so far as they are significant, 'might show through a transcript as well as a print'.⁹ Alexander also finds the punctuation Shakespearian, particularly the use of a period to emphasize the preceding word in the middle of a sentence. But not all his examples are convincing, and some Chambers dismisses as 'palpable errors'.¹⁰ On the whole, however, an impression of autograph copy remains. Without comparison with the Folio text the most one can say is that a fair copy by the author would satisfy what evidence there is, and that if the play were written for a particular occasion and a particular audience it is not impossible that such a copy should have been prepared for presentation.

Folio.—In this *Troilus and Cressida* was originally intended to follow *Romeo and Juliet*—a juxtaposition of the romantic and the cynical, the fine flavour of which, could we believe it designed, would somewhat alter our view of the editorial methods of Heminge and Condell—and three pages were set up before circumstances caused the play to be removed to its present position.¹¹ These pages are a close reprint of Q, and it is clear that had the play been completed forthwith the relation of the texts would have been the same as in

⁹ See, however, p. 148.

¹⁰ The punctuation of the stage-directions does not induce confidence: e.g. Ill. ii. i 'Enter. Pandarus Troylus, man' where F has 'Enter Pandarus and Troylus Man'.

¹¹ See pp. 445-7-

Romeo and Juliet' however different their ultimate source might be. With the fourth page of text, however, marked differences appear, and we become conscious that behind F there lies either a different manuscript or else the same manuscript in a different stage of both literary and theatrical evolution. What is curious is that whereas the directions are more adequate in F than in Q, most critics, though admittedly not all, agree that the textual readings of Q are on the whole superior to those of F. It was long supposed that F was printed directly from the manuscript, and those who observed the many resemblances of detail between F and Q referred them to a common source. But some doubts made themselves heard,¹² and when in 1928 Alexander (as in note 8) first devoted serious attention to the matter, he was able to muster sufficient evidence of F's having been printed from Q to make a definite impact on critical opinion,¹³ and it appears that before 1930 Chambers had come independently and by another path to the same conclusion. Nevertheless, the question remained undecided till in 1950 Philip Williams produced full bibliographical proof. It is, of course, clear that the copy of Q from which F was printed must have been extensively altered by comparison with a manuscript, which incidentally supplied the prologue, and it is the relation of this manuscript to the one from which Q was itself printed that is now the main textual problem of the play.

F reproduces, with few and presumably accidental exceptions, the stage-directions of Q, but it sometimes modifies them, and it adds a considerable number of its own. The principal additions and alterations are as follows: I. iii. 212-13 'Tucket . . . Enter 'Eneas'; 259 'The Trumpets sound' [Q 'Sound trumpet'], 309 'Exeunt. | Manet Vlysses, and Nestor'; II. ii. 97 'Enter Cassandra with her haire about her cares' [Q '. . . railing']; iii. 277 'Musicke sounds within' (belongs properly to the next scene); III. iii. 38 'Enter Achilles and Patroclus in their Tent' [cf. Q]; IV. i. I 'Enter . . . ~~Eneas~~ with a Torch . . .'; iv. 50 'Enter ./Eneus' (sic, but 51 'Eneas within' and he does not appear); 109 'Enter the Greekes' (in fact, 'Eneas, Paris, Antenor, Deiphobus, and

¹² See Greg, *Principles of Emendation*, p. 139.

¹³ See Greg, *Editorial Problem*, p. III.

Diomedes, of whom only the last is a Greek); 142 'Sound Trumpet' (as required by 'Harke, Hectors Trumpet'); 145 'Exeunt' (as in Q, but Diomedes and 'Eneas remain'), V.63 'Exeunt, [wrongly] | Enter all of Troy, [as in Q] Hector, Paris, 'Eneas, Helenus and Attendants. Flourish'; 159 'Enter Agamemnon and the rest' (misled by 'Great Agamemnon comes to meete vs here': they have not left the stage); v. i. 73 'Enter Hector, Ajax, Agamemnon . . .' (but Troilus and Menelaus are still missing); iii. 112 'A Larum', iv. I 'Enter Thersites in excursion'¹ [cf. Q]; viii. 22 'Sound Retreat. Shout' (belongs properly to the next scene); x. 34 'Exeunt' [Q ', . . all but Pandarus', correctly]; 57 'Exeunt' (but Pandarus is alone). The common base with Q is obvious, and no less obvious is the revision there has been for the stage. At II. ii. 97 the phrase 'with her haire about her eares', which F substitutes for Q's 'rauing', is almost a technical term.¹⁴ Many, but by no means all, necessary entrances and exits have been supplied, but that at III. iv. 109 is misleading, and there are other signs of carelessness. Additional noises are provided. Some of the defects that remain may be due to imperfect collation, some may be oversights of the compositor. The additional notes might have been made on the foul papers, but they are frequent enough to suggest an intention to provide complete directions for performance.

Each text contains lines and passages absent from the other: these are five times as extensive in F as in Q.¹⁵ Mostly they are due to omission and most of the omissions appear to be accidental; in some instances the compositor's eye evidently skipped from one occurrence of a word or phrase to another. Merit might be found in the absence of some of Thersites's medical unpleasantness in each text, but whereas Q most likely omitted II. iii. 80^b—82 (and this was probably accidental), the more important passage v. i. 23-27 ('rawe eyes . . . tetter'), in place of which F has 'and the like', may be regarded as either a suppression in F or an expansion in Q. As regards omissions in Q Chambers attempts to

" It occurs in *Richard III* (F), II. ii. 34, and cf. 'her haire downe' in *Hamlet* (Qi), IV. v. 21, and 'Enter mistrisse Maybery her haire loose' in *Northward Ho* (1607), v. i.

" According to the markings in the Griggs facsimile of Q edited by H. P. Stokes in 1886, 20 passages totalling 43 lines appear in F only, and 6 passages totalling 8½ lines in Q only. But, as we shall see, 3 ½ F lines have no business there.

distinguish between accident and design, with only moderate success.¹⁶ Three passages indeed may very well have been omitted deliberately, namely I. iii. 354-6, III. iii. 161-3, and IV, v. 165-70, in the first of which there has been some consequential adjustment.¹⁷ Chambers calls them 'deliberate excisions of, or bungling attempts to emend, passages found unintelligible in a manuscript'. But 'bungling' really begs the question, for a good case could be made out for regarding the excisions as removing lines in which the thought was obscure or needlessly involved.

There are also many verbal variants, in respect of which critics have held divergent views. Certainly not all would agree with the emphasis of Chambers's remark that 'F has many better readings though some worse'. He is content to distribute responsibility between the respective compositors, 'the usual sophisticating editor' of F, and in Q 'a scribe less expert at reading manuscript and more inclined to ... emend what he did not understand than a printer'. In so arguing he is concerned to refute the theory that in F we have a revision of the text, but it would tell equally, of course, against revision in Q.¹⁸ Few now would argue in favour of revision in F, but a case can be made out, on a basis of the score or so most evidently intentional variants, of something of the sort having taken place in Q. Sometimes a flat and commonplace reading in F appears to have been replaced by one with more flavour in it; sometimes a forced and obscure expression gives place to simpler and directer manner of speech; sometimes we can detect other good reasons for the change. In judging so the critic is of course relying mainly on his own intuition: but the following examples merit consideration:

III. iii. 100: F 'As when his vertues *shining* vpon others';
Q '*ayming*' (more pointed);

¹⁶ See Note A on p. 349.

¹⁷ According to Chambers both the earlier passages 'are accompanied by corruption of the neighbouring text'. But it is not plain that in the first 'Corruption' is the right word, and in the second it amounts to no more than an obvious misprint—'him, most' for 'hindmost'—unrelated to the omission. Chambers hardly preserves his usual open mind where Q is concerned.

¹⁸ In general Chambers's scepticism in respect of literary revision, as evinced in his Academy lecture (*Disintegration*, pp. 45-47), is undoubtedly well founded, but, as we shall see, there are some circumstances in which his objections do not hold.

- IV. v. 187: F '*And seene thee scorning forfeits and subduments*'; Q '*Despising many* (avoids repetition from 183-5 'I haue . . . seene thee ort . . . and I haue seene thee');¹⁹
- III. iii. 158 : F '*Or hedge aside from the direct forth right*' (image obscure: to hug the side of the road instead of keeping to the middle?); Q '*turne*' ;
- III. iii. 198: F '*prouidence . . . Knowes almost euey graine of Plutoes gold*' (far-fetched and irrelevant—by association, no doubt, with *Plutus*)\ Q '*thing* (leaving a short line).²⁰

The most striking difference between the texts is connected with the lines v. x. 32—34 (F):

Pand. But heare you ? heare you ?

Troy. Hence broker, lackie, ignomy, and shame

Pursue thy life, and Hue aye with thy name

which are found here in both texts, but which, in F only, also appear at the end of v. iii. There can be little doubt that the earlier was their original position and that they were intended to mark Pandarus's dismissal from the play. But later, when Shakespeare decided to have him speak the epilogue, and for that purpose brought him somewhat incongruously on to the field of battle, the lines were made to do duty and transferred to a later point in the text. If that is so F must somehow represent the foul papers in which the alteration was imperfectly made. And if it be suggested that the change may have been made and the epilogue added in the prompt-book, we may point to an unquestionable false start at iv. v. 97 in

¹⁹ There is another clear instance of revision six lines later: F 'When that a ring of Greekes have *henm' d thee in*'; Q '*shrupd*'. Q's is obviously meant to be a more forcible reading, but there is no such word as *shrupd*, which must therefore be a misprint. One might conjecture *shrubdy* the image being that of entangling undergrowth, but it would be difficult to produce any authority for the expression.

²⁰ The most interesting and perhaps the crucial case is at I. iii. 92: F '*Corrects the ill Aspects of Planets euill*'; Q '*Corrects the influence of euill Planets*'. The former is much the more colourful reading and has naturally appealed to editors. But it is open to criticism in respect of style and sense alike. There is the jingle '*Corrects . . . Aspects*' and the tautology '*ill . . . euill*'. Besides, the malevolent influence of planets is not so much inherent as the result of unfavourable aspects. This is more exactly expressed by Q, which recognizes the influence of planets when hurtful (through ominous conjunction).

Ulysses' noble characterization of Troilus. The passage begins and ends in Q:

The yongest sonne of Priam, a true knight,
 Not yet mature, yet matchlesse[,] firme of word . . .
 They call him Troylus, and on him erect,
 A second hope as fairely built as Hector . . .

F ends the same, but begins:

The yongest Sonne of Priam;
 A true Knight; they call him Troylus;
 Not yet mature, yet matchlesse, firme of word . . .

Shakespeare must have written:

The yongest sonne of Priam, a true knight,
 They call him Troylus

crossed out the last four words (inadequately), reserving the phrase till later, when it comes in with enhanced effect. That Q duly omits the cancelled words proves that it was printed from a properly edited manuscript.

It is evident in what direction the evidence is leading us, and while we cannot hope to extract from it any formal proof of the history of the texts, we may, with the help of a little imagination, reconstruct at least a plausible outline.²¹ In 1602 Shakespeare was commissioned to write a play for the Christmas festivities of one of the Inns of Court. He gave them *Troilus and Cressida*²² - a piece whose political and romantic themes alike were worthy of a critical audience, but were also alike spiced to the mood and licence of the occasion. His foul papers, with sundry alterations and corrections marked in them, he handed to the Chamberlain's men for rehearsal. But it was necessary to provide a copy for the society that had commissioned the play: it had perhaps to be approved by the Benchers. This copy Shakespeare wrote from the foul papers himself, observing of course his alterations, but making inevitably many small changes in the text. Whenever he was dissatisfied with an expression he doubtless altered it if on

²¹ See Note B on p. 350.

²² Chettle and Dekker had written a *Troilus and Cressida* for the Admiral's men in Apr.-May 1599, which may, of course, have given Shakespeare the idea. But the extant fragmentary 'plot' of the earlier play (Greg, *Henslowe Papers*, p. 142, *Dram. Docs.*, pp. 138-40) does not suggest any structural likeness with Shakespeare's beyond what is implicit in the common subject.

the spur of the moment he could devise a better; but most of the changes were probably unconscious, and he may even have made occasional errors and omissions. Meanwhile the company, considering the play not suited to their own repertory, decided to dispense with a formal prompt-copy and make do, for a single performance, with the foul papers.²³ They would, of course, understand Shakespeare's markings, and his inadequate directions could be supplemented. So the play was produced. It may be that the company, knowing that another manuscript was abroad, sought to protect their interest by getting Roberts to make a provisional entrance in the Stationers' Register. If so, it served its purpose for six years. After that somebody into whose hands the presentation manuscript had come traded it to a couple of young adventurers, who were specializing in good-class dramatic copy,²⁴ and these duly entered it at Stationers' Hall, apparently in ignorance of Roberts's entrance of 1603. They appear at first not to have known that there was anything peculiar about the copy, since they gave it a perfectly normal title-page advertising its performance by the King's men at the Globe. Someone must have told them that this was not correct, and they must have either learnt or surmised that the players looked on the publication with disfavour,²⁵ for they withdrew the title-page and added an epistle denying that the play had ever been publicly performed and twitting 'the grand possessors' with a desire to deprive the public of the enjoyment of it.²⁶ For these alterations they were of course responsible, but the style and wording make it very unlikely that either the new title or the epistle was of their own composition. As Fredson Bowers has (privately) suggested, they

²³ As thirty years later another company is believed to have done in the case of Mountfort's *Launching of the Mary* (see p. 103, Note J). For a private performance it would probably not be necessary to submit the play to the Master of the Revels. Segar's licence was for printing.

²⁴ Bonian had published Middleton's *Five Gallants* in 1608, and he and Walley together published Jonson's *Masque of Queens* in 1609 and Fletcher's *Faithful Shepherdess* in 1609 or 1610. These were all, it seems, authorized publications. They also entered the more questionable *Case is Altered* in 1609, but this they appear to have made over to Sutton, who published it as Jonson's without their participation. Bonian is not heard of after Feb. 1611, but Walley lived to become Master of the Stationers' Company in 1655.

²⁵ See Note C on p. 350.

²⁶ See Note D on p. 350.

are much more likely to have sought the help of whoever sold them the manuscript. It required at least some familiarity with Homer to make Pandarus a prince of Lycia: the epistle is just what a young wit of the Inns of Court might be expected to throw off, and who else would be as likely to write of 'the vaine names of commedies changde for the titles of Commodities, or of Playes for Pleas'? Later, when *Troilus and Cressida* came to be printed in the Folio, the editors at first proposed to reprint the text of the quarto as it stood, but afterwards decided to have it collated with the foul papers, which turned up among the playhouse manuscripts. The collator was no doubt instructed to disregard any cuts he might find marked in them; and he carried out his instructions only too literally, restoring some passages that Shakespeare had struck out, and so incidentally producing duplications in the text. He also doubtless overlooked corrections that he ought have made. On the whole, collation with the foul papers was a mistake and resulted in an inferior text: it was, however, prompted by considerations of policy,²⁷ and had the merit of rescuing the prologue, which we may suppose to have been added at the last moment, after the presentation copy had been prepared, and which did not, in consequence, appear in the quarto.

There is no division into acts and scenes, which is what we should expect in the case of a play that had not been acted since Elizabethan days and had not been specially edited for printing.

NOTE A (page 345)

Among the obviously accidental omissions Chambers overlooks an instructive example at Iv. v. 94. F, evidently correct, reads:

Halfe stints their strife, before their strokes begin.

Fits. They are oppos'd already.

Aga. What Troian is that same that lookes so heauy?

Vlis. The yongest Sonne of Priam . . .

Q incorrectly:

Halfe stints their strife, before their strokes begin.

Flisses: what Troyan is that same that lookes so heauy?

Vlis. The yongest sonne of Priam . . .

The compositor apparently set the prefix for Ulysses but inadvertently omitted

²⁷ See pp. 448-9.

his one-line speech, continuing with that of Agamemnon, and the press reader, finding two consecutive speeches assigned to Ulysses, worked the first prefix into the text as a vocative. The hand of the reader can also be plausibly seen at I. iii. 36, where the compositor of Q, having before him the reading 'Vpon her patient brest' (as in F), seems to have accidentally omitted the 'p' of 'patient', leaving an impossible reading that the reader converted into 'ancient'.

NOTE B (page 347)

The history of the play outlined in the tentative account in the text agrees substantially with the conclusions reached by Philip Williams in an unpublished article privately communicated. Alice Walker (*Textual Problems*, pp. 68-93) also gives a generally similar account, except that she denies that the transcript from which Q was printed can have been by Shakespeare, a point on which her arguments, though not conclusive, deserve consideration. This forces her to account for what she admits to be the general inferiority of the F readings by supposing considerable corruption by compositor B (see pp. 457 ff.).

NOTE C (page 348)

The King's company did not authorize the printing of any play of Shakespeare's between the *Hamlet* of 1604-5 and *Othello* in 1622. However, if *Troilus and Cressida* was not in their repertory, they would have no strong reason to object, and in fact there is nothing to show that either they or Roberts did anything about what was technically an infringement of copyright. (See Note D.) There is no record (apart from Roberts's entry) of the play having ever been performed: an alleged mention of it in connexion with the Cockpit riot of 1617 is probably one of Collier's forgeries (Chambers, *W. Shake.*, ii. 386).

NOTE D (page 348)

The epistle, though lively and shrewd enough in its way, is not a model of lucidity. At the close, after speaking of the individual play and 'the scape it hath made amongst you', the writer, when he turns to the policy of 'the grand possessors', lapses into the plural, 'you should have prayed for *them*' having evidently in mind Shakespeare's plays generally, of which earlier he had written, 'And beleue this, that when hee is gone, and his Commedies out of sale, you will scramble for them, and set vp a new English Inquisition'. The point of attack seems to be the habitual reluctance of the King's men to see their plays in print rather than their opposition to the printing of *Troilus and Cressida* in particular.

XXV. *ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL*
1602-3

Folio.—Critics have naturally differed over the history of *All's Well* and they have mostly shown uneasiness in tackling the problems of an admittedly difficult and unsatisfactory play. The stage-directions, though described by Chambers as 'mainly normal', present some unusual features; they are bare apart from entrances: I. i. I 'Enter yong Bertram Count of Rossillion, his Mother, and Helena, Lord Lafew, all in blacke'; ii. I 'Flourish Cornets. | Enter the King of France with Letters, and diuers Attendants'; II. i. I 'Enter the King with diuers yong Lords, taking leaue for the Florentine warre: Count, Rosse, [*read* Count Rossillion,] and Parrolles. Florish Cornets'; iii. 58 'Enter 3 or 4 Lords'; 69 'She addresses her to a Lord'; 190 'Exeunt[.] | Parolles and Lafew stay behind, commenting of this wedding'; III. i. I 'Flourish. Enter the Duke of Floreuce [*sic*], the two Frenchmen, with a troope of Souldiers'; iii. I 'Flourish. Enter the Duke of Florence, Rossillion, drum and trumpets, soldiers, Parrolles'; v. I 'A Tucket afarre off. | Enter old Widdow of Florence, her daughter, Violenta and Mariana, with other Citizens'; 41 'A marche afarre'; 77 'Drumme and Colours. | Enter Count Rossillion, Parrolles, and the whole Armie'; vi. I 'Enter Count Rossillion and the Frenchmen, as at first'; Iv. i. I 'Enter one of the Frenchmen, with fiue or sixe other souldiers in ambush'; 70 'Alarum within'; 98 'A short Alarum within'; ii. I 'Enter Bertram, and the Maide called Diana'; iii. I 'Enter the two French Captaines, and some two or three Souldiours'; 134 'Enter Parolles with his Interpreter'; v. i. I 'Enter Hellen, Widdow, and Diana, with two Attendants'; 7 'Enter a gentle Astringer'; iii. I 'Flourish. Enter King, old Lady, Lafew, the two French Lords, with attendants'; 168 'Enter Widdow, Diana, and Parrolles'; 231 'Enter Parolles'; 334 'Flourish'. The directions are not wholly adequate, a couple of entrances and a score of exits are unmarked. Parolles is wrongly added to the entrance at v. iii. 168, he enters separately at 1. 231, as duly marked. This is too common in Shakespeare to be a sign of revision.

There is some confusion at in. v. i: the Widow's daughter, we know, is Diana (who gives her surname as Capilet at v. iii. 147, 159) and Violenta is not otherwise named. If the punctuation is right, Violenta is a ghost, as Chambers supposes (though she is retained as a mute by most editors): but if the comma is misplaced she is identical with Diana, as Wilson thinks (ed. 1929)—unless she 'was a character in the play at some earlier stage'. If they are the same there has been a change or at least a confusion of names, and this might account for the queer wording at iv. ii. I. There can be no doubt that the directions are in general the author's, but some specific noises such as 'Flourish Cornets' (twice) and 'A short Alarum within' suggest the hand of the book-keeper. Wilson thinks that 'Parolles and Lafew stay behind, commenting of this wedding' may be Shakespeare's direction to a collaborator how to continue: it might equally well be a note for his own future guidance. But it has more the appearance of a phrase from an author's plot or scenario that has been accidentally preserved, and 'diuers yong Lords, taking leaue for the Florentine warre' might conceivably be another. The confusion of the character-designations and speech-headings was remarked by McKerrow:¹ Chambers thinks that it was probably the book-keeper who 'added the letters G. and E. to the i. and 2. by which the author discriminated the brothers Dumain [named only in the text of iv. iii], who are indifferently described [I. ii, II. i, III. i, vi, iv. i, iii, v. i] as Lords, Captains, or Frenchmen, and are apparently also the Gentlemen of [III. ii]. The letters may indicate the names of actors; Gough and Ecclestone have been guessed at.' The 'gentle Astringer' of v. i. 7 is a puzzle. An 'astringer', or more commonly 'ostreger', is a keeper of goshawks, and is out of place here. Wilson supposes him a relic of an earlier play—an always convenient explanation—Chambers would see in him a corruption of a gentleman usher, and it seems that Wilson later admitted this possibility. Some of the names of minor characters are curiously reminiscent of earlier plays: Capilet (v. iii. 147, 159) of *Romeo and*

¹ See p. 113. An illuminating instance is the 'I. Sol[dier].' in Iv. I, who volunteers to act as 'th'Interpreter', and so becomes "Inter." or **Int.** later in the scene and remains so in iv. iii.

Juliet Dumaine (Iv. iii. 200, &c.) of *Loves Labour 's Lost*, Corambus and Jaques (Iv. iii. 185) of *Hamlet* and *As you Like it*, Sebastian (Iv. iii. 184) and Violenta (III. v. I) of *Twelfth Night*.

There can, of course, be no doubt that behind F lie the author's foul papers, but it is uncertain whether they were in their original state. Some long dashes in the printed text and some broken lines suggest cuts or alterations, and in occasional inconsequences and contradictions and in imperfectly assimilated chunks of prose it is easy to find evidence of botching. No Shakespearian spellings have been noted and the text is in worse form than we should expect from Jaggard's compositors working on an autograph manuscript. It has been conjectured that the foul papers had been transcribed by a rather incompetent literary scribe—anyone connected with the theatre must have done more to tidy them up—and if so it might be possible to blame him for some sententious fustian. But what such a transcript could have been doing among the playhouse manuscripts is unexplained.

There is a division into acts only, perhaps introduced by the transcriber and based on a late performance. There is, however, no record of a revival.

XXVI. *MEASURE FOR MEASURE*. 1604

Folio.—In his edition of 1922 Dover Wilson stresses the likeness between *Measure for Measure* and *AlVs Well'* not only in tone but in certain features of the text, and it is in fact not unlikely that the history of the two plays was somewhat similar. The stage-directions are even barer: i. i. I 'Enter Duke, Escalus, Lords'; ii. I 'Enter Lucio, and two other Gentlemen'; 45 'Enter Bawde'; 86 'Enter Clowne'; 120 'Enter Prouost, Claudio, Iuliet, Officers, Lucio, & 2. Gent/; iii. I 'Enter Duke and Frier Thomas'; iv. I 'Enter Isabell and Francisca a Nun'; 6 'Lucio within'; II. i. I 'Enter Angelo, Escalus, and seruants, lustice'; 32 'Enter Prouost'; Iv. i. I 'Enter Mariana, and Boy singing'; iii. 26 'Barnardine within'; 41 'Enter Barnardine'; no 'Isabell within'; 115 'Enter Isabella'; v. I 'Enter Duke and Friar Peter'; II 'Enter Varrius'; vi. 10 'Enter Peter'; v. i. I 'Enter Duke, Varrius, Lords, Angelo, Esculus [sic], Lucio, Citizens at seuerall doores'; 19 'Enter Peter and Isabella'; 168 'Enter Mariana'; 404 'Enter Angelo, Maria[na], Peter, Prouost'. There are one or two unimportant entrances unmarked and about a dozen exits, but only a few of these are of any consequence. The absence of noises is noteworthy: it is true that the play makes little demand of the kind; still, at v. i. I one would expect at least a 'Flourish' of the 'Trumpets' the Duke had expressly ordered at iv. v. 9. Centred directions of so-and-so 'within', followed by an entrance, are unusual and perhaps confined to this play. There is no uncertainty of designation—Isabella and Isabell, Julietta and Juliet are of course metrical variants—Mistress Overdone and Pompey are 'Bawde' and 'Clowne' consistently, though they are named in the text. There is, however, considerable uncertainty who some of the characters are, and several of them have remarkably small parts and little significance. It is not apparent why there should be two Friars playing similar roles, and in fact Thomas (I. iii—not named in the text) and Peter (iv. iii, v, vi; v. i) are probably the same, as Dr. Johnson long ago suggested, the author having merely forgotten the name. A 'gentle Varrius' is addressed in iv. v and is

present but mute in v. i: he appears to be in the Duke's confidence, but we hear no more of him. Also in iv. v a Flavius is sent for but does not appear, and a Valencius, a Rowland, and a Crassus are mentioned. The object, of course, is to give a background. A Justice, who is distinct from the Provost and seems to be a later addition in II. i, is hardly more substantial, though he does speak a few words at the end. The nun Francisca (not named in the text) speaks only nine lines in i. iv, but her presence is justified. In I. ii (120—97) Juliet is certainly present (see 1. 119) but does not speak. This in the circumstances may be modesty, but her presence is curiously ignored by the other characters.¹ All this may point to cutting or revision, or it may point to a hasty disregard of economy that more careful construction would have avoided. At the end F adds one of its rare lists of personae. This gives 'Mist'ris Over-don, a Bawd', but only 'Clowne' for Pompey; it distinguishes Thomas and Peter as '2. Friers'; it omits the Justice and Varrius; but it gives the Duke's name as Vincentio, though it appears nowhere in the text.² From this Wilson concludes that 'the F. list, whencesoever derived, relates to a form of the play different from that which has come down to us'. This is an attractive fancy, but for what purpose could such a list have been prepared? Besides, there are also lists for *The Tempest* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* that is, for three out of the first four plays in the Folio, which makes it likely that they were specially drawn up by the editor when preparing the copy for the collection.³

The text is fully divided into acts and scenes. Whether this was the work of the transcriber it is not possible to say, but it follows the conventions of the Elizabethan stage. At

¹ Claudio's 'You know the Lady, she is fast my wife' (1. 151) is more like a reference to someone absent than an introduction.

² Unless the scribe omitted this name from the direction at I. i. i he apparently invented it for the list. If he did, he may also have invented the names of Thomas and Francisca in the directions. It would be much more like Shakespeare to call for a Friar and a Nun in the directions and then give them names in the text than vice versa.

³ The only other lists in the Folio are those for *The Winter's Tale*, 'Henry IV, Timon, and Othello'. The second and third are printed in large type on pages by themselves and were obviously supplied as padding when it was found that the plays would not fill the space allotted to them. Without the list the last page of *Othello* would have been very bare (as indeed would that of *Measure for Measure*) and the same is true in lesser degree of *The Winter's Tale* (and *The Two Gentlemen*).

two points it differs from the division adopted by modern editors. They are complementary. F marks a new scene at i. ii. 120 because there is a clear stage. But in the previous line Pompey announces the approach of the Provost and his prisoners, who now enter, so that there can be no change of locality and the action is continuous, and modern editors continue the scene. Contrariwise F marks no new scene at in. ii, for the Duke remains on the stage in view of the audience. No doubt Scene i is within the prison and Scene ii without, and modern editors, familiar with the picture-stage, have felt constrained to mark a fresh scene, giving the Duke an exit and immediate re-entry contrary to Elizabethan custom. On Shakespeare's stage with the drawing of the traverse the prison gates closed, leaving the Duke outside, another instance of dramatic *enjambement*.

The rather lavish use of parentheses, for various purposes, suggests the hand of Ralph Crane, which has also been traced in other early plays in the Folio, and a few unusual uses of the hyphen and some apostrophes where nothing is elided likewise recall peculiarities of his. Wilson remarks that in the complete absence of directions for action within the scenes *Measure for Measure* resembles *The Merry Wives* (its predecessor in the Folio) and infers assembly from 'parts', but this peculiarity too is suggestive of Crane's work. On the other hand, since in ii. i the Justice is distinct from the Provost, there is no suggestion of the massing of entries at the beginning of the scene.

We may fairly assume that the copy for F was an edited transcript, possibly by Crane, but of what is less clear, since the scribe seems to have edited away most indications of origin. If, however, we suppose, and it is a fair guess, that in the prompt-book something was done either to remove or to lend substance to the various shadowy characters, it would seem likely that what the scribe had before him were foul papers that had been left in a rather rough state.

XXVII. *OTHELLO*. 1604 (?)

Quarto (i 622).—This is the latest of the Shakespeare quartos, having been registered on 6 October 1621. At this date it is unlikely to have been published without the sanction of the King's company,² and they doubtless reserved the right of reprinting, since the Folio was already in hand. It does not, however, necessarily follow that they provided the copy. It is also the only Shakespeare quarto that is divided into acts, albeit imperfectly.³ Such a division, if it originated in the playhouse, is unlikely to be earlier than 1609,⁴ but it may be literary in origin. Chambers thinks that because Q retains the oaths (which are rather thoroughly expurgated in F) it must have been printed from a manuscript of 1606 or earlier, but this does not follow;⁵ moreover, the frequent spellings 'em' and 'ha' (for 'haue' in place of the earlier V) point to late Jacobean original.⁶ Chambers also believes that Q and F 'clearly rest substantially upon the same' manuscript, a feature of which was 'the occasional writing of lines of verse ... as two separate half-lines'. These usually occur at different points in the text but occasionally coincide, as at i. i. 35, 53, 54. If, however, as will be suggested later, F was printed from a doctored copy of Q, some concurrence would be natural, and the instances that occur in F alone appear to be due to its constant habit of splitting long lines to fit the narrow measure. The problem is, therefore, to account for their presence in Q. But here lines tend to be not only divided but misdivided, as in i. i. 49-52. This would be most likely to result in printing or copying from foul papers that had been obscured by alteration or marginal addition.

¹ See Note A on p. 371.

² See pp. 15-16.

³ See Note B on p. 372.

⁴ See p. 144.

⁵ See pp. 151-2. It must not be supposed that all the oaths in Q1 are necessarily original: some may be stage vulgarizations that were introduced into the text by a transcriber, whose presence will become evident later.

⁶ Fredson Bowers queries (privately) whether these forms may not be compositorial and points out that in *Westward Ho* (1607) the spelling changes from 'em' to 'hem' when a fresh compositor takes over. But the forms 'em' and 'ha' are certainly not characteristic of any of the habitual Folio compositors, and while a compositor might please his fancy whether to print 'em' or 'hem', he would be less likely to substitute the contraction for the full form.

The variation of the texts recalls to some extent that found in *Troilus and Cressida*, but in the present case it is generally agreed that the readings of F are on the whole the more authentic. The most notable difference is that Q lacks 160 lines that appear in F.⁷ There is little to lead us to suppose that any of these are later additions in F, and most are unquestionably omissions in Q. Obviously the omission of 160 lines out of over 3,300 does nothing appreciable to shorten the play, and if there are any deliberate cuts the reason for them must be sought in the immediate context. In fact nearly all the shorter omissions appear to be accidental.⁸ Of longer omissions the most important is the Willow song, Iv. iii. 31^b—53^a and 55—57, which is proved intentional by the omission of a reference to it in v. ii. 246^b—8. Presumably it was cut on the occasion of a revival when there was no singing boy available for the part of Desdemona.⁹ Certainly intentional too is the omission of i. ii. 72—77, elaborating Brabantio's charge of witchcraft against Othello, since there has been adaptation in what follows. Other passages are self-contained and not strictly necessary to the context, though it may not always be easy to define the reason for their omission.¹⁰ The cuts are on the whole skilful, and adjustment, where needed, is neat. But the accidental omission of a score of passages comprising nearly thirty lines is serious. It might, no doubt, be due to the compositor alone, but it would be easier to believe that he shared the responsibility with a rather careless transcriber. The possibility will need further consideration when the variants between the two texts come in question.

⁷ Apart from passages in which the texts are divergent, Q has only some five half-lines that are not in F. One (I. iii. 201) is a half-line necessary to the sense; thrice the omission results in a short line (II. i. 82^a, III. i. 32^a IV. ii. 33^a) and in the third instance again leaves the sense defective. Another is again a short line (I. i. 15), but in this case it is not needed by the sense, and is, indeed, rather unexpected: it is just possible that it is the accidentally preserved end of a cancelled passage. F also omits Q's 'Des. O Lord, Lord, Lord' after v. ii. 83, but this is of very doubtful authenticity.

⁸ See Note C on p. 372.

⁹ In that case it cannot have been cut in the foul papers, but a transcriber may have known that it was not sung in the current stage version and have omitted it on that account. The words are not necessarily Shakespeare's. One object of the song is to suggest the theme of adultery (I. 57) and its omission leaves the introduction theme at I. 61 decidedly abrupt. The further omission of II. 60-63 leaves what follows unintelligible, and must therefore, unlike that of the song itself, be accidental (see Note C).

¹⁰ See Note D on p. 372.

The stage-directions in Q and F, though they often differ, have a common basis. They are fuller in Q and it will be convenient to exhibit them here in a single list (brackets enclose F variants; stars indicate directions peculiar to Q): I. i. I 'Enter Iago and Roderigo' [F 'Enter Rodorigo, and Iago']; 82 'Brabantio at a window' [F 'Bra. Aboue' as prefix only]; 161 'Enter Brabantio in his night gowne, and seruants with Torches' [F 'Enter Brabantio, with Seruants and Torches']; ii. I 'Enter Othello, Iago, and attendants with Torches' [F omits 'and']; 28 'Enter Cassio with lights, Officers, and torches' [F 'Enter Cassio, with Torches']; 56 'Enters Brabantio, Roderigo, and others with lights and weapons' [F 'Enter. .. with Officers, and Torches']; iii. I 'Enter Duke and Senators, set at a Table with lights and Attendants' [F 'Enter Duke, Senators, and Officers']; 12 'Enter a Messenger' [F 'Enter Saylor' a line later]; 32 'Enter a 2. Messenger' [F omits '2.']; 47 'Enter Brabantio, Othello, Roderigo, Iago, Cassio, Desdemona, and Officers' [F '. . . Cassio, Iago, Rodorigo, and Officers']; 120 "Exit two or three"; 171 'Enter Desdemona, Iago, and the rest' [F '. . . Iago, Attendants']; 301 'Exit Moore and Desdemona' [F 'Exit']; II. i. I 'Enter Montanio, Gouvernor of Cypres, with two other Gentlemen' [F 'Enter Montano, and two Gentlemen']; 20 'Enter a third Gentleman' [F omits 'third']; 51 "Enter a Messenger" (to whom is given 'A saile . . .' and 53-54) [F has 'Within. A Saile . . .' and gives 53-54 to 'Gent.']; 56 "A shot"; 91 ['within.] A saile, a saile' [F as speech after 93]; 180 "Trumpets within"; 200 "they kisse"; 214 'Exit' [F 'Exit Othello and Desdemona']; ii. I 'Enter a Gentleman reading a Proclamation' [F 'Enter Othello'sQ Herald[,] with a Proclamation'], iii. 11 'Exit Othello and Desdemona' [F 'Exit']; 62 'Enter Montanio, Cassio, and others' [F 'Enter Cassio, Montano, and Gentlemen']; 148 "Helpe, helpe, within"; 150 'Enter Cassio, driuing in Roderigo' [F '. . . pursuing Rodorigo']; 156 "they fight"; 157 "A bell rung"; 163 'Enter Othello, and Gentlemen with weapons' [F '. . . and Attendants']; 250 'Enter Desdemona, with others' [F '. . . attended']; III. i. I 'Enter Cassio, with Musitians and the Clowne' [F omits 'with' and 'the']; iii. 89 'Exit Desd. and Em.' [F 'Exit']; 290 'Ex. Oth.

and Desd.' [F 'Exit' after 288]; 450 'he kneeles'; 464 'Iago kneeles'; iv. i. I 'Enter Iago and Othello' [F 'Enter Othello, and Iago']; 37 'He fals downe' [F 'Falls in a Traunce']; 226 'A Trumpet'; v. i. 46 'Enter Iago with a light' [F 'Enter Iago']; ii. I 'Enter Othello with a light' [F 'Enter Othello, and Desdemona in her bed']; 18 'He kisses her'; 83 'he stifles her. | Emillia calls within' [F 'Smothers her. | Emilia at the doore']; 125 'she dies'; 198 'Oth. fals on the bed'; 234 'The Moore runnes at Iago. Iago kills his wife'; 251 'she dies'; 283 'Enter Lodouico, Montano, Iago, and Officers[:] Cassio in a Chaire' [F '. . . Cassio, Montano, and Iago, with Officers']; 356 'He stabs himselfe'; 359 'He dies' [F 'Dyes']; 371 'Exeunt omnes' [F 'Exeunt'].

The Q directions might all have been written by the author. At i. iii. 171 'and the rest' can only be his; the erroneous inclusion of Desdemona at 1. 47 has many parallels; at II. i. I the 'Gouernor of Cypres' is quite in Shakespeare's manner, and so are the 'two or three' at I. iii. 120. On the other hand, several directions peculiar to Q have a literary flavour, and some definitely point to a transcriber. 'Brabantio at a window' (I. i. 82, where F has 'Aboue'), the Senate 'set at a Table' (I. iii. I), 'a third Gentleman' (II. i. 20), the 'Gentleman reading a Proclamation' (II. ii. I), and 'The Moore runnes at Iago' (v. ii. 234) might be helps to the reader added by someone who had seen the play performed and was preparing a copy for a private patron. Such a person could be the book-keeper. But there are other indications that seem to make his participation unlikely. The Sailor who enters at I. iii. 13 (rather than 12) is called a 'Messenger' because he is so described in the text, though the prefix 'Sailor' remains at 1. 14 and has apparently been erroneously substituted for 'Officer' (as in F) at 1. 13. Similarly at II. i. 51 'Enter a Messenger' is a pure invention, for there can be no doubt that F is correct in making 'A saile, a saile, a saile' a cry 'Within' and giving 11. 53—54 to one of the Gentlemen. The book-keeper would hardly have introduced an imaginary character.¹¹

That the transcript was made from foul papers seems

¹¹ We can at least be certain that the transcriber was not Edward Knight (see pp. 78-79), whose work is unmistakable.

likely, though the evidence is not altogether clear. A cut text more usually goes back to prompt-copy, but the cuts (except the Willow Song) may have been marked in the foul papers, and if we believe Moseley, it was customary to observe them in private transcripts.¹² The book-keeper would probably have found the prompt-copy most accessible and convenient to copy, but if the transcript was made by an outsider the company may have been reluctant to trust its official copy in his hands. There is practically no variation in the designation of characters, such as sometimes marks foul papers. The hero is of course Othello or the Moor indifferently in the text,¹³ but as a speaker he is always Othello, and so in the F directions. In Q he appears three times as the Moor: i. iii. 302 'Exit Moore and Desdemona', II. iii. 259 'Exit Moore, Desdemona, and attendants', v. ii. 234 'The Moore runnes at lago'. F omits the third and reduces the other two to 'Exit', incorrectly. Most likely all three are due to the transcriber.¹⁴ In neither text are the entrances and exits fully given. Q omits the entrance of Desdemona (in bed) at v. ii. i. F omits the entrance of Emilia at v. i. no. Both omit Othello's re-entrance at i. ii. 53, but so they do his exit at 1. 49: this is not unusual. Q omits four exits that appear in F, and F four that appear in Q: five exits are omitted in both, and five times F has 'Exit' where Q has 'Exeunt' or specifies more than one character, and there is one instance of the reverse. Much or all of this may be the fault of the transcriber and compositors.¹⁵ It will be noticed that in otherwise similar directions the order of the names is often varied, but neither text seems to follow any principle. Sometimes Q gives the names in order of precedence and F in order of speaking, sometimes the other way about.

" Seep. 153.

13 In the source (Cintio's *Ecatommiti*, ill. 7) he is simply 'il Moro': where Shakespeare found the name Othello is not known (see Chambers, *W. Shake.*, ii. 380).

14 There is some variation of spelling. According to Chambers 'Q regularly spells Emillia, Roderigo, Montanio, for the 'Emilia, Rodorigo, and Montano of F'. But these forms are not quite consistent. Q has Montano in Act V, and F once has Emillia, and Emilia repeatedly when the compositor ran short of the digraph. The transcriber and the printers may be responsible.

¹⁵ The use of 'Exit' before two or more names is, of course, common enough. But the error may also arise from the contraction 'Exe' or 'Ext' being mistaken for 'Exit'.

All that can be said at this point is that Q appears to have been printed from a transcript, perhaps of the foul papers, perhaps not by the book-keeper. The date of the transcript is unlikely to have been earlier than 1620, but whether it was made expressly for Walkley's edition, or whether a private transcript came into his hands, there is nothing to show. In his address 'to the Reader' he says nothing about having obtained the copy from a private collector as he does in the dedication of *A King and no King* in 1619.¹⁶

A second quarto appeared in 1630. It was printed from the first but with some reference to F, as appears from common sophistication (see Note F) and from the purging of profanity, which though less extensive is usually similar. The omissions were restored,¹⁷ and it was at one time supposed that for this purpose a manuscript was consulted, which conferred upon Q2 occasional independent authority. This, however, came later to be questioned and recent research has established that they were printed from F.¹⁸

Folio.—It has been usual to assume that Q and F were independently printed from the same or perhaps closely related manuscripts. Quite recently, however, Alice Walker has argued that F was actually set up from a doctored copy of Q.¹⁹ For such a novel view one expects, of course, cogent evidence. Until we know more exactly than we do at present what was the relation of the manuscripts behind Q and F, it would be risky to attach much importance to such points of resemblance as the printing of i. iii. 172-3 as one line or the antiquated 'This present warres' at 1. 235 (altered to 'warre' both in Q2 and F2), to such common spellings as 'timerous' (I. i. 75), 'lushious' (i. iii. 354) or 'pudled' (III. iv.

¹⁶ See p. 154¹. *Othello* was the last of several King's men's plays that Walkley published about this time. Besides *A King and no King* in 1619 he published *Thierry and Theodoret* in 1621, and between them *Philaster* in 1620. The last was partly a 'bad' text, but he was able to replace it by a 'good' text in 1622. Similar in this respect is *The Maid's Tragedy* (1619, 1622), but that was published by Constable and Higgenbotham. (See pp. 151-2.)

¹⁷ All the major omissions, that is, except IV. i. 185-7, where instead Q2 omits the second prefix. The restoration of minor omissions in prose is imperfect. Where Q1 and F diverge, Q2 sometimes conflates the versions, e.g. at i. iii. 261-2, 388, V. ii. 220. Q2 adds one stage-direction of its own, viz. 'Thrusts him in' (i.e. stabs him) at v. i. 61.

¹⁸ See Note E on p. 373.

u' *Textual Problems*, pp. 138-61.

143)5 or even to the opposed agreements of 'Warriour' (n. i. 184) and 'Warrior' (in. iv. 151), since they might, theoretically at least, have been inherited from a common source. It is otherwise. Miss Walker insists, with the past tense and past participle of certain weak verbs, since it is clear that here neither text followed copy except accidentally. In early Shakespeare quartos a phonetic spelling in *-/* is prevalent, and this was doubtless Shakespeare's own. But in the course of time these spellings gave place more and more to those in *-ed* or *-V*. Both Q and F normalize in this respect, but not to the same extent. There are 25 instances in which both have the modern spelling, and 24 in which both have the old. That is only natural. But if the Q and F compositors were working independently, we should expect each to modernize in some cases in which the other did not. What we find is that in 23 cases Q retains the *-/* spelling where F modernizes, and not one case of the reverse. This can only mean that the change was progressive: apparently Q, printing from manuscript, modernized in about a third of the cases, and F, printing from Q, modernized in about half. The evidence seems conclusive.

Of course, if this was so, a copy of Q must have been extensively corrected by comparison with a manuscript before F was printed from it. The collator must have been instructed to bring the readings and directions of Q into exact agreement with this manuscript, and in particular to restore all cuts and omissions. How literally he carried out his instructions may be seen by his excision of many of the directions of Q and his niggling alteration of others in a manner that often resulted in obscurity or actual error. No doubt carelessness on the part of the F compositor may have contributed. But after every allowance has been made it seems that the directions in the manuscript collated must have been for the most part singularly bare.²⁰ They may just have served the necessities of a prompt-copy; they must have been altogether different from those in any Shakespearian foul papers of which we have evidence.

This has a bearing upon what remains the crucial problem of the play, namely the nature of the manuscript used for

²⁰ An exception is the demand for lights and torches in the first act.

collation and its relation to the one from which Q was originally printed. This question can only be answered, if at all, by a detailed comparison of the texts.²¹

To account for the differences between the texts Alice Walker (see note 19) has proposed the following theory. Q was printed from a transcript of the prompt-book made, rather carelessly, by the book-keeper, who, being familiar with the play, sometimes contaminated the text before him by what he remembered, or thought he remembered, to have heard on the stage (thus introducing some actors' errors and vulgarizations) and even occasionally ventured on deviations of his own.²² F was printed from a copy of Q that had been corrected by collation with an authoritative fair copy.²³ These suppositions deserve close attention.

We have already found some reason to suspect the presence of a transcriber, and that the theory postulates one need not trouble us. And some memorial contamination by a transcriber, such for instance as has been detected in the Folio text of *Hamlet*, would also be by no means surprising.²⁴ At the same time we have found some indication that the transcriber is less likely to have been the book-keeper than someone with a less professional knowledge of the play. It remains to be seen whether the memorial contamination that can be proved is such as to show a knowledge of the play of the kind that only the book-keeper would be likely to possess.

We may start by examining some representative instances of minor variants, those involving only a single word or a short phrase. Sometimes the readings are indifferent, as in I. ii. 91, Q 'To beare me to him', F 'To bring me to him', and v. ii. 28, Q 'Alas my Lord', F 'Alacke, my Lord'. But in the great majority of cases there can be no doubt that F has

²¹ If we could be certain that I. i. 122-38 (see Note D) was not a theatrical cut but a cancelled false start (erroneously restored along with other deletions) it would follow that the manuscript from which it was restored could be none other than the foul papers. But this interpretation is by no means certain.

²² See Note F on p. 373.

²³ By 'fair copy' it is to be supposed that Miss Walker means one of those normalized transcripts, not yet annotated for stage use, that she believes to have sometimes intervened between foul papers and prompt-book (see p. 168, Note J). She raises, but does not discuss, the question whether the fair copy was autograph.

²⁴ Miss Walker thinks that it may be no 'wild surmise' that the same transcriber was involved in the two cases.

preserved the more Shakespearian reading. At the same time, since we know that the transcriber was on occasion capable of editing his text (see Note F), we may reasonably suspect that some of the Q readings are deliberate alterations of the original. When at v. ii. 209 he wrote 'reprobation' instead of 'reprobance' he may be forgiven if he doubted whether the latter was an English word at all, for it has been found nowhere else in the language; and when at I. i. 147 he altered 'producted' to 'produced' he was smoothing the metre.²⁵ Other changes were no doubt less conscious, some quite unconscious, such as I. i. 33 'Worships' for 'Moorships', iv. ii. 225 'command' for 'Commission', v. ii. 10 'put out thine' for 'put out thy light'.²⁶ But none of these, it will be noticed, imply any general acquaintance with the play.²⁷ They are, so far as they are unconscious, the very kind of substitutions, often vulgarizations, that compositors and transcribers commonly make when they attempt to carry too many words in their heads at once. F has similar though much rarer examples.²⁸ It will be noticed, incidentally, that in the case of many of the variants Q's reading might very well be the original one, later superseded by the better reading of F, supposing that the text at some time underwent revision.²⁹ However, before we entertain any such speculations it will be well to remind ourselves that there can be no question of any revision of the text between the making of the transcript for Q and the collating of Q to serve as copy for F.

If, then, we are to find evidence of any intimate knowledge

²⁵ See Note G on p. 373.

²⁶ Other examples are: I. iii. 82 'set phrase' for 'soft phrase', 252 'Vtmost pleasure' for 'Very quality', 275 'reputation' for 'Estimation', Iv. ii. 43 'occasion' for 'motive', 207 'time' for 'instant', 210 'conception' for 'exception', v. ii. 95 'what's the best' for 'what's best to do', 288 'Wring' for 'Wrench', 351 'medicinall' for 'medicinable', 363 'lodging' for 'Loading'.

²⁷ Except possibly v. i. 7 'sword' for 'stand', where 'sword' may be anticipated from 1. 10.

²⁸ Thus I. i. 100, Q 'brauery' (swaggering), F 'knauerie', iii. 159, Q 'sighes', F 'kisses', 355, Q 'acerbe', F 'bitter'. At I. ii. 21, Q 'provulgate' has been usually taken to be an error for 'promulgate' as in F, but it is a perfectly good word and most unlikely to have been introduced by the transcriber. An interesting error is at v. i. 114, where Q reads 'Hee's almost slaine, and Roderigo dead', and F inserts 'quite' before 'dead'. The collator must have written 'quite' in the margin, intending it to be substituted for 'dead', whereas the compositor added it instead.

²⁹ It is perhaps the variants at I. iii. 252 and v. ii. 10 that most suggest this origin, but it would be possible in many others.

of the play on the part of the transcriber, it will have to be in those more extensive variations between the texts which produce in Q the impression of spasmodic memorial reconstruction. No doubt these can be accounted for on Miss Walker's hypothesis. But it must be clearly understood that what we are asked to suppose is that certain rather extensive corruptions had established themselves so firmly on the stage that they came naturally to the mind of the transcriber and were preferred by him to the text he was copying.³⁰ How else should we account, for example, for his going to the trouble of elaborately recasting the grammatical construction of a passage and writing (I. iii. 106-9),

To youth [*read vouch*] this is no prooffe,
Without more certaine and more ouert test,
These are thin habits, and poore likelihoods,
Of moderne seemings, you preferre against him

when what was before him ran,

To vouch this, is no prooffe,
Without more wider, and more ouer[t] Test
Then these thin habits, and poore likely-hoods
Of moderne seeming, do prefer against him.

It will be worth while to examine a few of these recast passages and to inquire whether the hypothesis of a contaminating transcriber is the only possible, or even the most plausible, explanation. Three instances must suffice.

At I. iii. 276 ff. the two texts run as follows: Q

Du. Be it, as you shall priuately determine,
Either for stay or going, the affaires cry hast,
And speede must answer, you must hence to night,

³⁰ If the transcriber was without critical sense, and was transcribing from foul papers, he may have supposed that what he remembered hearing on the stage correctly represented the prompt-book and that this contained a text that had been revised after the foul papers were written. In that case he cannot have been the book-keeper, who, used to following performances in the prompt-book, can have been under no illusion regarding the perversions that actors introduced into their parts. No doubt *Othello* was a popular play and a number of revivals are recorded, but in fact we know of none between 1613 and 1629, and although there may of course have been some, it is a little risky to assume that there had been one sufficiently recent in 1620 to have rendered the text intimately familiar to the book-keeper or to anyone else.

Desd. To night my Lord ?

Du. This night.

Oth. With all my heart.

and F

Duke. Be it as you shall priuately determine.

Either for her stay, or going: th'Affaire cries hast:

And speed must answer it.

Sen. You must away to night.

Oth. With all my heart.

F is the more rapid and dramatic, but it leaves a short line, which Q does not. The impression is of deliberate revision in F rather than of corruption in Q.³¹

At I. iii. 384 ff. the textual situation is different. Q reads:

Iag. Go to, farewell:—doe you heare Roderigo ?

Rod. what say you ?

Iag. No more of drowning, do you heare ?

Rod. I am changed.

Exit Roderigo.

Iag. Goe to, farewell, put money enough in your purse:

Thus doe I euer make my foole my purse:

and F:

Iago. Go too, farewell. Do you heare Rodorigo?

Rod. He sell all my Land.

Exit,

Iago. Thus do I euer make my Foole, my purse . . .

Here F is very abrupt, and it is difficult to avoid the suspicion that there has been an omission, perhaps somehow related to Iago's repeated phrase, while there can be little doubt that Roderigo's resolution to sell his land, and so provide money in his purse, has been accidentally lost in Q. If so, Q2 may have been right in adding the words 'He goe sell all my land' after Roderigo's 'I am chang'd'. At the same time the repetition of 'purse' in the last two lines of Q is clumsy, and the relation of the texts could be more easily explained if there had been some alteration in the foul papers. Be that as it may, it is surely more likely that there has been omission in both

³¹ Miss Walker feels Desdemona's reply to the Duke, forestalling Othello's, to be out of tone for the spartan 'warrior', and judges it part of the transcriber's 'Vulgarization . . . persistent throughout the quaito'. But a young woman who sees her lover snatched from her arms on her wedding night might be betrayed into an exclamation of surprise—not even necessarily of protest—however modest and restrained.

texts than that the transcriber, with the F version before him, should have omitted an essential part of it and so greatly expanded the rest.

Again, take the lines v. ii. 219-20: in Q

Em. 'Twill out, 'twill [out]: I hold my peace sir, no,
I'll be in speaking, liberall as the ayre,

and F

Emil. 'Twill out, 'twill out. I peace?

No, I will speak as liberall as the North . . .

A whole essay might be written on these two lines, but what strikes one most is the Shakespearian quality of both versions, and it is by no means easy to decide which is preferable. In Q the first line (as emended in Q2) is a regular decasyllabic. F is terser, and an attempt has apparently been made to compress it into a half-line completing the half-line before.³² With regard to the second line in F it might be objected that the wind does not in fact speak. Q might therefore be preferred, since what it says is in effect 'My speech shall be free as air', or, if 'North' be substituted for 'ayre', 'My speech shall be as unbridled as the storm'.³³ At the same time, there is perhaps a touch of pedantry about 'Tie be in speaking' from which F is free. And the reading 'North' itself may seem a rather violent ellipsis unless prepared for by the 'ayre' of Q. Everything therefore points to F's version having been reached by way of Q's, rather than Q's being a corruption of F's.

Two other passages are worth glancing at before we try to draw a conclusion, I. ii. 18-21 runs in Q (a phrase from F supplied in brackets):

My seruices which I haue done the Seigniorie,
Shall out tongue his complaints, tis yet to know,

³² What goes before reads in Q (F is purged, but scans the same):

My father gave my mother.

Em. O God, O heauenly God.

lag. Zouns, hold your peace.

Here the two short speeches combine into one perfectly good line, whereas the first will not combine comfortably with the half-line before. It was the less judicious to try to combine the second speech with what followed, as in F.

³³ Qz seems to have felt this when it retained the line as in Q1 but with the emendation 'north' from F.

[Which when I know,] That boasting is an honour,
I shall provulgate . . .

Neither version will do. It would appear that the 'tis yet to know' was a false start immediately replaced by 'Which when I know', but inadequately deleted. Hence the appearance of both phrases in F, while Q left out the wrong one.³⁴ The other is the familiar lines I. iii, 144 ff., which run in Q,

The Anthropophagie, and men whose heads
Doe grow beneath their shoulders: this to heare,
Would Desdemona seriously incline;

but of which F gives the second line as

Grew beneath their shoulders. These things to heare . . . This is, as it stands, impossible and editors have perforce followed Q. But as a reference to the narrative that precedes, F's 'These things' is preferable to Q's 'This'.³⁵ It looks as though Shakespeare wrote the overweighted line

Do grow beneath their shoulders. These things to hear and that Q and F each sought to lighten it in a different fashion.

It will have become evident whither all this is tending. In place of a contaminating transcriber we get a picture of two different scribes struggling with, and at times variously interpreting, much and carelessly altered foul papers—perhaps even of alterations made by the author or with his authority after his draft had been officially copied. That one scribe was the book-keeper and that he was preparing the prompt-copy there seems no reason to doubt; but that the two scribes were the same is unlikely, nor indeed is there anything to suggest that the Q transcriber was the book-keeper once we realize that there is no need to credit him with an intimate knowledge of the play. Whether or no the collator who corrected

34 Possibly the compositor misunderstood a direction by the collator, making an addition of what should have been a substitution (cf. note 28, end). The passage is closely parallel to others, already quoted, from *Romeo and Juliet*, v. iii. 102-3 (Q2),

Why art thou yet so faire ? I will beleuee,
Shall I beleuee that vnsubstantiall death is amorous,

and *Hamlet*, III. ii. 177 (Q2),

For women feare too much, euen as they loue,
And womens feare and loue hold quantitie . . .

35 As Q2 felt when it printed 'these', and Pope when he emended it to 'All these'.

a copy of Q by comparison with the prompt-book was the book-keeper must remain uncertain: probably not, in view of the slavish way he worked.

We have slipped into thinking of the manuscript that lies at the back of F as the prompt-book, and on the theory here suggested the conclusion seems inevitable. It is, of course, contrary to our experience elsewhere that the cut text should derive from foul papers and the full text from the prompt-book; however, it is likely enough that the cuts would be marked in the foul papers, and if they were it is still conceivable that the passages should have been transcribed in preparing the prompt-copy. The textual indications that it is with prompt-copy that we have to do in F are supported by a study of the stage-directions. It is incredible that any Shakespearean foul papers should have been as bare of directions as F. Moreover, as already remarked, such a phrase as 'and the rest' (Q, I. iii. 171) can only have originated in foul papers, and though it might conceivably have persisted in a carelessly prepared prompt-book, we know that in fact it did not, for it was altered to 'Attendants'⁷ in the manuscript used in the preparation of F, and it would be extravagant to suppose that if this was not foul papers it was anything but prompt-copy.³⁶ Similarly the foul papers' 'Exit two or three' was dropped, though nothing was put in its place in F: this was probably an oversight of either the collator or the compositor.

When all is said it has to be admitted that the evidence for the textual history of *Othello* remains contradictory and ambiguous. In the present state of our knowledge perhaps the following outline seems the most likely. Somewhere about 1620, probably, a transcript was made from the foul papers by a scribe of rather careless habits. He found a good deal of difficulty in interpreting the author's intention in a rather

³⁶ Alice Walker does, indeed, make just this assumption. In an endeavour to reconcile the uncut text of F with the stark directions and the absence of the usual stigmas of prompt-copy, she postulates a transcript intermediate between the foul papers and the prompt-book, and even hints that it may have been made by Shakespeare himself. If it were, that would account neatly enough for the apparent textual revision we have observed (just as a private autograph transcript has been assumed to account for apparent revision in the *quarto* of *Troilus and Cressida*) but the postulate is uneconomical and not strictly necessary: besides, neither Shakespeare nor any ordinary scribe would have stripped bare the directions in this fashion.

heavily corrected manuscript, and was not always happy in his selection of alternative possibilities. That he had some familiarity with the play on the stage is possible, but uncertain. He was occasionally high-handed and indulged in a certain amount of editing in a literary rather than a theatrical direction. From this transcript Walkley printed his edition early in 1622—it was registered in October the previous year. The text of *Othello* was printed in the Folio about August or September 1623, but the copy had doubtless been prepared some while before. The editors decided to use Q to print from, but they seem to have mistrusted the text—which would be natural if it had been printed from a private transcript not made under their own supervision—for they insisted on its being first collated with the prompt-book. This had, of course, been prepared many years before, presumably by the book-keeper of the time, whom we may assume to have been more successful than the later transcriber in interpreting the author's intention, and who may even have had his assistance in the task. The collation generally resulted, therefore, in a considerable improvement of the text, but at the same time in some not very fortunate reduction of the stage-directions. There was a little superficial editing, as generally in the Folio. As in all similar cases the collation was doubtless to some extent imperfect, and some errors of Q probably remained unconnected, though the evidence does not suggest that they were either very serious or very frequent, and is itself not always conclusive.³⁷

NOTE A (page 357)

Chambers dates *Othello* 1604 on the ground of a court performance on 1 Nov., which need not of course have been the earliest; and a date in 1604 would, he remarks, allow of a possible allusion to it in *The Honest Whore* (i. i. 37), since Henslowe's payment to Dekker and Middleton for this piece in the spring of 1604 was only 'in earnest', and it may not have been completed till shortly before its registration on 9 Nov. But Alfred Hart (*TLS*, 10 Oct. 1935) has pointed out some apparent borrowings from *Othello* in the 1603 *Hamlet*, and since plague closed the theatres from the spring of 1603 to that of 1604, any play there quoted must have been on the boards early in 1603. Of course, Hart's argument that *Othello* must be earlier than Roberts's registration of *Hamlet* on 26 July 1602 would only be valid if it was the Qi version he was registering, which there is no reason to suppose.

³⁷ See Greg, *Principles of Emendation*, pp. 161-3.

NOTE B (*page 357*)

There is no heading to the first act nor to the third, which is perhaps against the division having been introduced at the time of printing. The initial direction for what became iv. iii is misplaced, two lines before the exit for iv. ii, which does not suggest any very close connexion with the playhouse. The divisions were, however, sufficiently satisfactory to be followed in F, which added a division into scenes. This agrees with that of modern editions except that n. ii (the proclamation, entirely unlocalized) is not divided from II. iii. The scene-division may very likely have been introduced when the play was prepared for press (F), though there is nothing to prove this.

NOTE C (*page 358*)

The reasons for assuming accident are various. Several lines are necessary to the sense: I. iii. 118, 124, in. iv. 8—10, 195^b—6^a, iv. iii. 60—63; and so is I. iii. 195, whose omission is due to homoeoteleuton, which also accounts for that of iv. ii. 73—76. Similarly II. i. 158 is needed for the rime. The omission of iv. i. 185—7 leaves consecutive speeches by the same speaker. Twice parentheses seem to have been mistaken for marks of deletion, i. ii. 65, iii. 63. The reason for supposing the omission of i. iii. 16, 370^b, II. iii. 280^b—2, III. i. 58^b, iii. 325, iv. ii. 101, and v. i. 82—83 to be accidental is merely the lack of any discernible reason for it. Perhaps we should add II. i. 39—40^a and v. ii. 82^b, but these may have been thought obscure. There is also a good deal of minor omission, apparently the result of carelessness, in the longer prose passages, e.g. at II. i. 244-70, iv. i. 124, 207, ii. 188.

NOTE D (*page 358*)

Two passages, iv. i. 38-44 and v. ii. 266-72, contain repetitions that might conceivably have led to accidental omission, but it seems more likely that the one was cut as obscure and the other as redundant: the second leaves an abrupt transition, and the clumsiness of the last line suggests that there may be something wrong with the text. The lines v. ii. 151-4 might be thought repetitive, they might even be in danger of raising a laugh. Emilia's curious outburst of sententious verse, iv. iii. 87—104, was an obvious passage to cut if the scene needed lightening: indeed, so little do the lines accord with their prose setting that here if anywhere we might suspect a later addition. Other apparent cuts are in. iii. 383-90 (which leaves a short line), 453^b-60 (as fine a poetical image as any in the play, but all the more dangerous to dramatic tension), vi. ii. 151^b-64 (also diffusive and again leaving a short line), and v. ii. 185-93. Perhaps the most interesting is i. i. 122-38 in Roderigo's baiting of Brabantio, since it might be argued that this is not a cut at all but a first draft cancelled in favour of the shorter alternative that follows (139-41^a). There seems to be some contradiction between the two. The earlier passage makes no question that Desdemona has run away with her lover, and even describes the manner of it, whereas the later admits the possibility that she is still in her room. There is also repetition in that each offers a conditional apology, and they are inconsistent. First, Roderigo says in effect, 'If it is with your approval that your

daughter has given herself to the Moor, we have been indiscreet to interfere'; later, 'If, after all, she has not run away, we are to blame for playing a joke on you'. It is true that the rather obscure line 138 makes a sort of connexion, albeit inadequate, between the two alternatives.

NOTE E (page 362)

Clark and Wright wrote in 1866: 'Of this [second] Quarto . . . Mr Collier says: "It was unquestionably printed from a manuscript different from that used for the Quarto of 1622, or for the Folio of 1623." But after a minute comparison of the two it appears to us clear that [Q2] must have been printed from a copy of [Qi] which had received additions and corrections in manuscript. . . . These additions and corrections, though agreeing for the most part with the first Folio . . . were derived from an independent source' (Cambridge Shakespeare, 1866, viii. xvii; 1892, viii. xii-xiii). The first part of this statement is, of course, true: regarding the second part Chambers (*IV. Shake.*, i. 461) and Greg (*Editorial Problem*, p. in) were sceptical, and the dependence of Q'2, as regards the additions, on F alone has been lately proved by C. Hinman (*Othello*, 1948).

NOTE F (page 364)

There can be little doubt that Q has been to some extent edited, at least metrically. In i. iii. 202—19 we have an exchange of sententious couplets between the Duke and Brabantio, after which they turn to the urgent business in hand, and the Duke opens proceedings with a speech in prose (221—9). The transition is made in a single line by Brabantio, which in F runs 'I humbly beseech you proceed to th'Affaires of State', the sudden change to prose admirably emphasizing his brushing aside of personal considerations. This effect is weakened in Q, in which the line is reduced to verse: 'Beseech you now, to the affaires of the state.' On the other hand, F reveals the usual sophisticating hand of its editor. At the top of the same page of Q we find the line (189, divided between two speakers) 'Due to the Moore my Lord.—God bu'y, I ha done', which F ruins by pedantically printing 'God be with you: I haue done'. Or take the lines v. ii. 317-18 which run in Q, 'But that belike, lago, in the nicke Came in, and satisfied him'. For the pointed colloquialism 'nicke' F substitutes (unmetrically) 'interim', a rather favourite word with Shakespeare, but here comparatively vapid. (Q2 and the old Cambridge editors follow F!) With this compare *Hamlet*, I. i. 65 (Q2) 'Thus twice before, and iump at this dead houre' (cf. *Othello*, n. iii. 392 'And bring him iumpe, when he may Cassio finde') where for 'iump' F reads 'iust'. F, of course, often sophisticates in minor ways, altering 'em' to 'them', 'ha' to 'haue', 'an' to 'if', and so forth.

NOTE G (page 365)

We may suppose that at i. ii. 22 he changed 'Siege' to 'height' because he did not understand its sense of seat or rank (and indeed the figurative use seems to be unique), at iii. 271 'offic'd' to 'actiue' because he found it obscure, at iv. ii. 18 'their Wiues' to 'her Sex' because there was nothing for 'their' to refer to, at v. i. 34 'vnblest fate highs' to 'fate hies apace' because he thought 'hie

by itself not sufficiently emphatic. When at v. ii. no he changed 'more nearer earth' to 'more neere the earth' he may have thought he was correcting Shakespeare's grammar. At v. ii. 342 he altered 'me as I am' to 'them as they are' supposing the reference to be to 'these vnluckie deeds' in the line above, whereas it properly anticipates the 'one' of ll. 344, &c. At v. ii. 70 the root of the corruption in '—vds death' for 'vs'd thee' was probably a graphic confusion between 'vsd' and 'vds'.

XXVIII. *KING LEAR*. 1605

Quarto (1608).—For approximately 400 lines of the play we depend upon a single text, for 300 on Q and for 100 on F. The explanation of the deficiencies need not be the same in all cases, but for the most part omission can be assumed.¹ That there are accidental omissions in F can hardly be doubted, but neither can we doubt that it has been cut for representation.² It has sometimes been assumed that Q has also been cut, though differently: but that any play should have been twice and differently cut for representation is hard to believe. As Miss Walker (as in note 18) caustically remarks, 'What lies behind the notion of alternative cutting and two acting versions of *Lear* seems on a par with the supposition that, after a play had been written and performed, its author continued to tinker with the dialogue'. The objection, of course, is to alternative cutting as distinguished from progressive cutting. In fact much of the omission in Q is certainly accidental, and it may all be, as Chambers saw, though it would no doubt imply gross carelessness on somebody's part. At one point in in. i, where the texts are divergent, there has clearly been omission in each, and since the join at 1. 30 is harsh, it is possible that the omissions overlapped and that some lines are altogether lost.

The stage-directions in Q are fairly full and clearly visualized (those of F are here added for comparison; those peculiar to Q are starred): I. i. I 'Enter Kent, Gloster, and Bastard' [F ' . . Gloucester, and Edmond']; 35 'Sound a Sennet, Enter one bearing a Coronet, then Lear, then the Dukes of Albany, and Cornwell, next Gonorill, Regan, Cordelia, with followers' [F 'Sennet. Enter King Lear, Cornwall, Albany, Gonerill, Regan, Cordelia, and attendants']; 191 'Enter France and Burgundie with Gloster' [F 'Flourish. Enter Gloster with France, and Burgundy, Attendants'] -,269 'Exit

¹ Chambers agrees with the majority in taking the *FooFs* Merlin prophecy, nr. ii. 79-95' to be 'an incongruous theatrical interpolation' in F. Of IV. iii, which is only in Q, Granville-Barker remarked, 'I could better believe that Shakespeare cut it than wrote it' (*Prefaces to Shakespeare*, First Series, 1927, p. 228), but the likelihood of spurious additions in Q depends upon the origin of that text, which is still in debate.

² See Note A on p. 386.

Lear and Burgundie' [F 'Flourish. Exeunt']; 286 'Exit France & Cord' [F 'Exit France and Cor/']; ii. I 'Enter Bastard Solus' [F 'Enter Bastard']; 47 'A Letter'; iii. I 'Enter Gonorill and Gentleman' [F 'Enter Gonerill, and Steward']; iv. 9 'Enter Lear' [F 'Homes within. Enter Lear and Attendants']; 280 'Enter Duke' [F 'Enter Albany']; v. i 'Enter Lear' [F 'Enter Lear, Kent, Gentleman, and Foole']; II. i. I 'Enter Bast, and Curan meeting' [F 'Enter Bastard, and Curan, seuerally']; 39 'Enter Glost.' [F 'Enter Gloster, and Seruants with Torches', 79 'Tucket within']; 88 'Enter the Duke of Cornwall' [F 'Enter Cornwall, Regan, and Attendants']; 131 'Exeunt' [F 'Exeunt. Flourish']; ii. i 'Enter Kent, and Steward' [F 'Enter Kent, aad [*sic*] Steward seuerally']; 46 'Enter Edmund with his rapier drawne, Gloster[,] the Duke and Dutchesse' [F 'Enter Bastard, Cornwall, Regan, Gloster, Seruants', 144 'Stocks brought out']; 181 'sleepes'; iv. I 'Enter King' [F 'Enter Lear, Foole, and Gentleman']; 129 'Enter Duke and Regan' [F 'Enter Cornwall, Regan, Gloster, Seruants.... Kent here set at liberty', 184 'Tucket within', 286 'Storme and Tempest']; 289 'Exeunt Lear, Leister [*read* Gloster], Kent, and Foole' [F 'Exeunt']; III. i. i 'Enter Kent and a Gentleman at seuerall doores' [F 'Storme still. Enter Kent, and a Gentleman, seuerally', ii. i 'Storme still']; iii. I 'Enter Gloster and the Bastard with lights' [F 'Enter Gloster, and Edmund', iv. 3, 64, 104, 167 'Storme still']; iv. 120 'Enter Gloster' [F (115) 'Enter Gloucester, with a Torch']; v. i 'Enter Cornwall and Bastard' [F 'Enter Cornwall, and Edmund']; vi. i 'Enter Gloster and Lear, Kent, Foole, and Tom' [F 'Enter Kent, and Gloucester', 7 'Enter Lear, Edgar, and Foole']; vii. i 'Enter Cornwall, and Regan, and Gonorill, and Bastard' [F 'Enter Cornwall, Regan, Gonerill, Bastard, and Seruants']; 29 'Enter Gloster brought in by two or three' [F 'Enter Gloucester, and Seruants']; 78 'draw and fight'; 80 'Shee takes a sword and runs at him behind' [F 'Killes him', 94 'Exit [a servant] with Gloucester']; iv. i. 12 'Enter Gloster led by an old man' [F (10) 'Enter Gloucester, and an Oldman']; ii. 69 'Enter a Gentleman' [F 'Enter a Messenger']; iv. I 'Enter Cordelia, Doctor and others' [F 'Enter with Drum and Colours, Cordelia, Gentlemen, and Souldiours']; vi. 34

"He kneeles"; 41 "He fals"; 83 'Enter Lear mad' [F (88) 'Enter Lear']; 192 'Enter three Gentlemen' [F 'Enter a Gentleman']; 208 'Exit King running' [F 'Exit']; 249 "they fight"; 256 "He dies"; 266 'A letter' [F 'Reads the Letter']; 291 'A drum a farre off' [F (289) 'Drum afarre off']; vii. I 'Enter Cordelia, Kent and Doctor' [F '. . . Kent, and Gentleman', 21 'Enter Lear in a chaire carried by Seruants']; 84 'Exeunt. Manet Kent and Gent.' [F 'Exeunt', 11. 85-99 omitted]; v. i. I 'Enter Edmund, Regan, and their powers' [F 'Enter with Drumme and Colours, Edmund, Regan. Gentleman, and Souldiers']; 18 'Enter Albany and Gonorill with troupes' [F 'Enter with Drum and Colours, Albany, Gonerill, Soldiers']; 38 'Exeunt' [F (36) 'Exeunt both the Armies']; ii. I 'Alarum. Enter the powers of France ouer the stage, Cordelia with her father in her hand' [F 'Alarum within. Enter with Drumme and Colours, Lear, Cordelia, and Souldiers, ouer the Stage, and Exeunt']; 4 'Alarum and retreat' [F adds 'within']; iii. 3 'Enter Edmund, with Lear and Cordelia prisoners' [F 'Enter in conquest with Drum and Colours, Edmund, Lear, and Cordelia, as prisoners, Souldiers, Captaine']; 40 'Enter Duke, the two Ladies, and others' [F 'Flourish. Enter Albany, Gonerill, Regan, Soldiers', 101 'Enter a Herald', 109 'A Trumpet sounds' (replacing 'Cap. Sound trumpet'), 'Herald reads']; 118 'Enter Edgar at the third sound, a trumpet before him' [F 'i Trumpet. . . 2 Trumpet. . . 3 Trumpet. Trumpet answers within. Enter Edgar armed', 151 'Alarums. Fights']; 222 'Enter one with a bloudie knife' [F 'Enter a Gentleman']; 238 'The bodies of Gonorill and Regan are brought in' [F 'Gonerill and Regans bodiesbrought [*sic*] out']; 257 'Enter Lear with Cordelia in his armes' [F the same]; 294 'Enter Captaine' [F 'Enter a Messenger', 311 'He dies', 326 'Exeunt with a dead March']. The directions in Q have all the appearance of normal author's directions: at the same time they would not be impossible as the descriptions of a reporter, though less likely if the report had been intended to serve as a prompt-book.

A like reservation applies to the descriptions of characters, in which there is a good deal of inconsistency and some ambiguity. The worst is over the two dukes. Cornwall is

often **Duke** both in directions and speech-headings, and so is Albany, both before and after Cornwall's death. Otherwise inconsistency is no more than sporadic and does not lead to uncertainty. Regan is once Duchess in a direction, but always speaks under her own name. Lear is occasionally King in directions but never as a speaker. Edgar in disguise is once Tom in a direction, but still speaks as Edgar. Edmund is always Bastard except in the directions of the fifth act and once in the second. Oswald is Steward in directions, except on his first appearance (in i. iii) when he is a Gentleman ('Gent.'), but since here the identification depends on F it may be the result of economy: he speaks twice as Oswald in i. iv just after he has been called by name.

The record of entrances and exits is very defective: some sixteen entrances and twice that number of exits are unmarked. The most noticeable are at i. i. 269, 'Exit Lear and Burgundie', where at least Cornwall, Albany, and Gloucester also leave the stage, though not in company with the King; at i. v. i, 'Enter Lear', though Kent, the Fool, and a Servant are with him; and at II. ii. 158, where there is no exit for Cornwall, Regan, and Edmund. In every respect the quarto text is unsuited to representation.

If this were the whole of the evidence one would not hesitate to conclude that Q had been printed from foul papers. But further scrutiny of the text, and especially a comparison of its readings with those of F, reveals a very different state of affairs. The text of Q has always been recognized as unsatisfactory, even by those editors who have relied most heavily on it in detail. It is true that there are a good many speeches and exchanges of dialogue in which variations from F are few and unimportant. But on the other hand Q contains many obviously corrupt and unintelligible passages; it misassigns speeches and adapts them to wrong speakers;³ it shows grotesque mishearings.⁴ It also prints much prose as

³ As, for instance, at v. iii. 81, correctly printed in F as

Reg. Let the Drum strike, and proue my title thine

(that is, 'do thou prove'), which appears absurdly perverted and misassigned in Q as

Bast. Let the drum strike, and proue my title good.

⁴ Such as 'in sight' for 'incite' (Iv. iv. 27), 'a dogge, so bade in office' for 'a dog's obeyed in office' (iv. vi. 163), and 'ought' for 'oft' with punctuation adapted (i. iv.

verse and more verse as prose, and when it does print verse as verse it often misdivides it: its punctuation is helpless; there are seldom any stops within speeches but commas, and these are frequently omitted or misplaced.⁵ It is also clear that the copy was very badly written and often baffled the compositor altogether, and that this peculiarity persisted throughout.⁶

Critics have sought to account for the more striking differences between Q and F in a variety of ways. Revision has naturally been suggested. In a detailed study Madeleine Doran⁷ argued that Q was printed from Shakespeare's foul papers, which were already confused and illegible through much correction and alteration, and which underwent further revision in the course of preparing the prompt-book, the source of F. But besides a certain improbability in such extensive literary revision, especially after the foul papers had been handed over, the theory had to meet the difficulty of believing that Shakespeare, and that at the height of his powers, could ever have written the clumsy and fumbling lines we find in Q, or that these could in general represent a stage in the development of F. More extravagant is the position taken up by Van Dam,⁸ namely that Q is 'far superior to the Folio version', being printed from an early prompt-book, closer to Shakespeare's original than the revised version that was ultimately printed in F. To this theory apply in full force the objections to supposing any literary revision once a play has taken final form in the prompt-book.⁹

Others have seen in Q a reported text. Of modern critics¹⁰ Chambers appears to have been the first to give explicit expression to this view when he wrote in 1930: 'I think that the characteristics of Q point to a reported text. . . . Possibly it

⁵ See Note B on p. 387.

⁶ See Note C on p. 387.

⁷ *The Text of King Lear*, Stanford University Publications, 1931.

⁸ *The Text of Shakespeare's "Lear"*, by B. A. P. Van Dam (Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama), Louvain, 1935. He had the temerity to put on his title-page the words *Magna est veritas et praevalebit*.

⁹ See Chambers, *Disintegration*.

¹⁰ The idea was not new. As long ago as 1879 Alexander Schmidt, writing 'Zur Textkritik des "King Lear"' (*Anglia*, 1880, iii. I, reprinting a 'Programm' of the previous year) maintained the view, but this was as part of the thesis that all the Shakespearian quartos were of this origin. For fifty years after Schmidt critics generally, whatever their particular beliefs, failed to distinguish between the textual character of *Lear* (and *Richard III*) and that of the majority of other quartos, and this no doubt tended to blacken the character of the quartos in general.

was produced by shorthand and not memorization.' Of course it is a text on the whole much superior to those of the recognized 'bad' quartos, resembling rather that of *Richard III*, though some of its features appear to be different.¹¹ Once the suggestion had been made, further analysis of the text produced evidence in abundance. All the stigmas of reporting from stage-representation are there: actors' connectives and expansions, perversions and vulgarizations, anticipations and recollections and assimilations, breakdowns and improvisations.¹² There is no ignoring this evidence, and its significance is now generally admitted. Different opinions, however, have been held respecting the manner of reporting. Following Chambers's hint, shorthand has been suggested, opinion favouring now Timothy Bright's system of Character,¹³ now John Willis's Stenography.¹⁴ However, all speculation on these lines has been scotched by Duthie's recent investigations¹⁵ and is not likely to be revived. A different explanation is favoured by Kirschbaum (as in note 12), who maintains that Q, in spite of its superior quality, is a memorial reconstruction like any other 'bad' quarto. But that the text we have in Q can be the result of reporting by one or two actors is flatly and plausibly denied by Duthie, who in his recent edition (see note 12) falls back on the theory proposed by Patrick in the case of *Richard III*, namely that the text was reconstructed by an effort of communal memory on the part of the cast at a time when the company was temporarily deprived of its prompt-copy, presumably during a tour in the country. This explanation has been rather reluctantly accepted for want of a better, and is now probably that most widely current.¹⁶

¹¹ For example, in *Richard III* Q is shorter than F by some 200 lines, in *Lear* it is longer by a like amount.

¹² For the evidence see Greg, 'The Function of Bibliography in Literary Criticism illustrated in a study of the Text of "King Lear"', *Neophilologus*, 1933, xviii. 250-62, and *Editorial Problem*, pp. 88-101; Leo Kirschbaum, *The True Text of King Lear*, Johns Hopkins Press, 1945 and especially G. I. Duthie's critical edition of the play, Oxford, Blackwell, 1949.

¹³ See J. Q. Adams in *Modern Philology*, 1933, xxxi. 135-63.

¹⁴ See Greg, as in note 12.

¹⁵ *Elizabethan Shorthand and the First Quarto of King Lear*, by G. I. Duthie, Oxford, Blackwell, 1949 (1950).

¹⁶ The circumstances in which such a reconstruction could occur are peculiar and unlikely to have been repeated. For provisional acceptance see Greg's review of

Nevertheless, any theory that Q is essentially a report of a stage performance, however obtained, has to meet objections as formidable in their way as the theory of revision. For, once we have rejected, as we have done, the idea of texts variously cut to suit different occasions and recognized that the omissions in Q are probably accidental, we are forced to assume a performance of the complete play as written, and seeing that we have (in F) a cut stage version, possibly censored, which there is no reason to doubt was prepared for the original production, the performance on the stage of an unabridged version becomes wellnigh incredible. Had there been a report of a stage performance it would almost certainly have given us a garbled version of F rather than anything resembling Q.¹⁷

There are further serious difficulties in the way of any theory, such as Duthie's, that would regard Q as a text somehow procured with a view to acting, for we have already observed that the record of entrances and exits is altogether inadequate for the regulation of a performance, and also that the loose indication of characters would in some cases lead to confusion on the stage. Granted an unabridged or an alternatively cut performance, the hypothesis of a shorthand report made with a view to publication seemed to offer an escape from this difficulty, but once stenography is ruled out it would appear that the theory of reporting in any ordinary sense must be abandoned. The truth is that critics have been speculating without proper regard to the probabilities of the case.

We seem to be left with nothing but the always tricky and unconvincing hypothesis of an abnormally careless transcript of foul papers contaminated by recollections of performance, and it is not surprising that speculation should have turned to explore the possibility of such a solution. Thus Alice Walker has lately advanced a theory that has at least the merit of ingenuity as well as freshness.¹⁸ Analysis of the texts has convinced her that memorial contamination in Q is Duthie (*MLR*, July 1949, xlv. 397-400) and the latest edition of the play by Kenneth Muir (new Arden edition, 1952).

¹⁷ For difficulties in the way of ascribing certain individual corruptions to memorial reconstruction see a review of Kirschbaum (as in note 12) in *RES*, July 1946, xxii. 230-4.

¹⁸ *Textual Problems*, pp. 37-67.

confined to certain portions of the text, those namely in which Goneril and Regan appear,¹⁹ and that when neither is on the stage corruption is no more than can be attributed to a careless and unpractised scribe writing from dictation. Further, and this is a subtle point, in the contaminated scenes she finds the parts of the two sisters less corrupt than those of the other characters, and lines directly addressed to them less corrupt than others. On the basis of these findings Miss Walker postulates a surreptitious transcript of the foul papers by two boy actors, 'Goneril' dictating to 'Regan', who in their haste contaminated the written text by recollections of what they were accustomed to speak and hear on the stage. Naturally they would know their own parts better than those of other characters on the stage with them, and they would retain words addressed to them better than exchanges in which they had no part. On the other hand, of scenes in which neither of them appeared they would have little or no knowledge, so that they would be forced to rely on the written text, and these scenes would consequently be free from contamination.

This theory will go a considerable way towards accounting for the peculiarities of the quarto text. But before embracing it we shall do well to remind ourselves of what exactly it involves. We must, to begin with, be confident that we can clearly distinguish between memorial contamination and other forms of corruption, and of this it may be easier to convince ourselves than others. It seems, in the next place, a trifle unlikely that a couple of boys should have been able to get hold of the foul papers, still more that they should have found an opportunity to transcribe them in the playhouse, and if they were able to convey them to some more private and convenient place, there would be less need for haste and therefore less temptation to rely on memory.²⁰ On

¹⁹ She finds contamination heaviest in I. i and v. iii, rather less so in II. iv: it is more in evidence where Goneril appears alone (e.g. I. iii) than where Regan appears alone (e.g. in. vii).

One might be tempted to suppose that defective foul papers had been supplemented by memorial reconstruction, but Miss Walker rejects this idea since it would not account for the evidence of transcription throughout. Besides, the papers are unlikely to have become damaged at so early a date.

²⁰ We must remember that once the prompt-book had been prepared there would

the present hypothesis there is perhaps less than the usual improbability about a severely contaminated transcript, but even so some of the perversions in Q seem rather improbable.²¹ Moreover, in scenes in which contamination is not assumed there is still much corruption which it is difficult to account for through any process of dictation and writing so long as F is assumed to be approximately correct. The latter, however, Miss Walker denies, and she distributes the corruption more or less evenly between the Q transcriber and the compositor of F, holding that the true text can only be recovered by a process of dovetailing and conflation of the two. This task she accomplishes on occasion with much ingenuity. It is, however, a disturbing thought that the Folio compositor should have been guilty of the amount of corruption postulated, and though Miss Walker is able to point to her illuminating analysis of his errors in I *Henry IV*, it is not altogether clear that even that amount of inaccuracy will suffice in the present instance.²² It is to be feared that a consideration of the various theories so far advanced can only lead to the conclusion that it remains as true today as it was twenty-five years ago that *King Lear* still offers a problem for investigation,²³

Q is notorious for the frequency of variation between copies. Of the twelve now known only two pairs agree

be no further immediate use for the foul papers, which would be preserved only as a precaution against accident: they would presumably be locked away in a place of safety where they would be difficult of access, but from which on the other hand it is unlikely that they would be missed.

²¹ Consider, for example, I. i. 84-87, in F:

Now our loy,
Although our last and leastj to whose yong loue,
The Vines of France, and Milke of Burgundie,
Striue to be interest.

In Q instead:

but now our ioy,
Although the last, not least in our deere loue . . .

Are we to suppose that Burbage habitually perverted these lovely lines upon the stage? If not, 'GoneriF' must have gone to some trouble to reconstruct them from a very imperfect memory rather than glance at the manuscript.

²² Miss Walker agrees with Cauthen (*Folio Lear*) that the compositor throughout *Lear* is the one known as B: see pp. 457 ff., where (Note E) a summary analysis of i *Henry W* will also be found. On the other hand Williams (*Folio Lear*) contends that both compositors A and B, if not others, are involved.

²³ See Greg, *Principles of Emendation*, p. 140.

throughout. Out of the ten sheets that make up the book (apart from the title-fold) seven at least were corrected in the course of printing, the press reader having made nearly 150 substantive alterations. Some of these were correct, some were not: for some it is clear that he consulted the copy, some are obviously guess-work.²⁴

Folio.—That F was printed from Q, as originally observed by P. A. Daniel,²⁵ can easily be proved thanks to the alterations made in the readings of Q while it was passing through the press. For in addition to what Chambers describes as 'a continuance of errors and a general orthographic resemblance', we find in F readings that can only have been reproduced either from an uncorrected or from a corrected sheet of Q—readings that are original errors of the compositor later corrected by the press reader, or else erroneous guesses that the reader substituted for the original misprints.²⁶

The copy of Q from which F was printed had of course been collated with and corrected by a manuscript. The collator had evidently been instructed as usual to bring the print into exact accord with the manuscript, and since this had been cut for the stage he excised a number of passages that appeared in Q as well as supplying a number that had been accidentally omitted. The fact that the manuscript had been cut suggests that it was the prompt-book, and this is fully borne out by other evidence.

A glance at the stage-directions collected above will show that most of the graphic touches that give them life in Q have disappeared. This is consonant with the comparative austerity of a prompt-book, in which directions are pruned to what is needed on the stage (see for example III. vii. 80). The state entrance at i. i. 35 is typical.²⁷ On the other hand

²⁴ See Greg, *Variants in Lear*.

²⁵ In his introduction to the Praetorius facsimile of Qi, 1885.

²⁶ See Note D on p. 387.

²⁷ Noticeable is the disappearance of the 'one bearing a Coronet'. It is not, perhaps, characteristic of Shakespeare to look so far ahead in his directions, for the coronet is not called for till 1. 141. However, it is evident that he has clearly visualized the scene, and there is subtlety in the provision he makes. When Lear says to his 'Belov'd Sonnes' Cornwall and Albany 'This *Coronet* part betweene you', he is bidding them share the executive office only; he retains on his own head the *crown* as symbol of 'The name, and all th'addition to a King'. This touch is lost in F, in which, since

the book-keeper is solicitous about stage noises (e.g. i. iv. 9, II. i. 79, II. iv. 2863 *and passim*) and properties (n. ii. 144, iv. vii. 21—the loss of 'lights' at III. iii. i may be accidental), occasionally about action (n. iv. 129) and ceremonial (v. iii. 101), and generally about such supers as he can afford. At the same time, while as a rule the directions in F owe nothing of their form to Q, the book-keeper was now and then influenced by the wording of the foul papers (e.g. I. i. 286, iv. vi. 291, v. iii. I, where ambiguity in F arises from its habitual overpunctuation, and v. iii. 238). On the contrary the direction at v. iii. 257, which one would expect the book-keeper to rewrite, is reproduced from Q *literatim*, doubtless because the collator overlooked it.

The entrances and exits in F are almost complete, only one entrance and six exits being unmarked, and of these all but two exits are defects of Q that the collator failed to remedy. The remaining pair may be oversights of the compositor.

Character indications too have for the most part been made consistent and explicit. The confusion between the Dukes is removed. Oswald is always Steward, even at i. iv. 358. The only exception is as regards Edmund, and in his case the inconsistency is worse than before, though in fact it matters little. There is a half-hearted attempt to substitute his name for Bastard, but it is not carried through. Possibly the collator realized the danger of confusion between the prefixes 'Edm.' and 'Edg.'; if so it may account for the substitution of Bastard at II. ii. 47, where Q has Edmund. We could believe that he was consistently Edmund in the prompt-book, and this seems to be borne out by the fact that in I. ii F follows Q in using the prefix 'Bast.' down to a point (1.181) where it has to supply a speech from the manuscript and from there on has 'Edm.' There are some differences of spelling. Q has 'Gonoriir' throughout, F 'Goneriir'. Since 'Gonoriir' is the form in the source-play of *King Leir*, this may have been Shakespeare's spelling, the change being made in the prompt-book.²⁸ Even the spelling 'Leir' persists

no provision is made, we must suppose that Lear takes the coronet from his own head to part between the Dukes.

²⁸ The name is spelt 'Gonorille' in Holinshed, 'Gonoriir' in Spenser, 'Gonerill' in *The Mirror for Magistrates*.

occasionally in Q, where it is more likely to be due to Shakespeare than to the compositor.

Apart from the instances noted, the collator's work on the directions and the prefixes seems to have been pretty thorough. How far it was so in the text is more difficult to judge. No doubt there are common errors of reading—'*Historica passio*' for '*hysterica passio*' at n. iv. 56 is perhaps the most striking—and there are several survivals of mispunctuation, as at i. i. 129 and n. iv. 293. But on the whole the collator did his work well.²⁹ Someone also tampered with the text of F, though whether it was the book-keeper in preparing the prompt-copy, or the collator in correcting Q, or the Folio compositor, is uncertain. Anyhow, in Gloucester's speech at in. vii. 56-66 Q's 'rash' and 'dearne' are unquestionably Shakespeare's, and were altered to 'sticke' and 'sterne' because they were not understood. There may be another instance at in. iv. 122. Here F reads 'squints'. But the corrected state of Q has 'squemes', which is probably intended for 'squines', and the original state has 'queues', which is perhaps a misprint for 'squences'. Both *squiny* and *squene* are recorded as dialectal forms of *squint*"

F introduces a full division into acts and scenes which mainly agrees with that of modern editors except early in the second act, where it makes Scenes ii-iv continuous. This is a perfectly possible arrangement if we suppose the stocks, which are brought on to the stage at 11. ii. 144, to remain in view at the back, with Kent asleep in them, while Edgar delivers his soliloquy in front. It is, however, rather unlikely that Edgar would return to Gloucester's castle, and the staging assumed in F would therefore be unexpected on a stage duly provided with an alcove and traverse.³¹

NOTE A (page 375)

This is borne out by the removal of a few minor characters: one servant is saved in in. vii and two gentlemen at iv. vi. 192; the part of the Doctor in

²⁹ His worst errors were overlooking the omission at V. iii. 47 and mis-emending I. iv. 366, as recorded in Note D. He also failed to correct 'Justices' to 'lusticers' at IV. ii. 79, which the press reader of Q had put right.

³⁰ They are both used by Robert Armin in pamphlets printed in 1608 and 1609, and Armin played the Fool in the original production of *Lear*.

³¹ See Note E on page 388.

iv. iv and vii is combined with that of a Gentleman, not without awkwardness, and a trumpeter is dispensed with at v. iii. 118.

It has been suggested that some of the cuts in F may have been made by the censor. This is uncertain; but comparison with BÜG'S work on *The second 'Maiden's Tragedy'* suggests that phrases in some of the omitted passages may have incurred, or have been thought likely to incur, the disapproval of the Master of the Revels: for example i. ii. 157^b-66^a ('diuisions in state, menaces and maledictions against king and nobles'), I. iv. 154-69 ('Lords and great men will not let me, if I had a monopolie out, they would haue part an't, and Ladies too'), III. i. 30-42 (neglect of port defences), and III. vi. 19-59 (ridicule of 'False lusticers'). On the other hand, Iv. vi. 169^b-74^a (with 'Place [read Plate] sinnes with Gold, and the strong Lance of Justice, hurtlesse breakes') is in F though absent from Q, and in any case objection to particular phrases need not have involved extended omissions.

NOTE B (page 379)

A characteristic if extreme example is at I. i. 127-30:

So be my graue my peace as here I giue,
Her fathers heart from her, call France, who stirres?
Call Burgundy, Cornwell, and Albany,
With my two daughters dower digest this third . . .

This is almost correct verbally (F reads 'Dowers' and 'the' in the last line) but needs full stops after 'her' and 'France' and 'Burgundy'. It looks as though the copy for Q had been written continuously, without line-division, and without punctuation, and that it had been left to the compositor to punctuate the text and identify and divide the verse as best he could. To account for varying success in the matter of verse lineation it has been suggested that there were two compositors of different ability, but this would appear to be a mistake (see Williams, *Quarto Lear*).

NOTE C (page 379)

The press reader occasionally succeeded where the compositor failed. At in. iv. 126 the compositor printed 'anellthu night more'; it was the reader who corrected it to 'he met the night mare' ('he' was of course a sophistication). But when at 1. 6 in the same scene the compositor misprinted 'contentious' (F) as 'crulentious', the reader could only guess 'tempestious', and when at Iv. ii. 57 he printed 'thy slayer begin threats', the best the reader could do was 'thy state begins thereat', where the correct reading was not 'thereat' but probably 'to threat'.

NOTE D (page 384)

The most noticeable instance of the first is to be found at v. iii. 46-47, where the compositor originally omitted three words and printed the rest as a single line of verse. The reader repaired the omission but not the mislining. F prints the passage exactly as it stands in the uncorrected state of Q. For the second case see i. iv. 366. Here the compositor set up the meaningless word 'alapt', which on recognized graphic principles must be a misreading of 'ataxt' (i.e.

taxed, blamed). The reader, however, guessing at the sense, altered it to 'attaskt' (i.e. taken to task). When, therefore, the F compositor printed 'at task' (which really means nothing at all) he was emending a ghost word. The copy of Q used for F doubtless contained, as do all extant copies, a mixture of corrected and uncorrected sheets, and the above readings prove that in it sheet D was in the corrected and sheet K was in the uncorrected state. Other readings show that sheet H and possibly sheet E were in the uncorrected state.

NOTE E (*page* 386)

There is also divergence in Act IV, since modern editors of course introduce iv. iii from Q. Thus F's 'Scena Tertia' becomes Iv. iv, 'Scena Quarta' becomes iv. v, and 'Scena Quinta' becomes Iv. vi. The modern Iv. vii, however, is headed 'Scaena Septima' in F. This suggests that the division was not in the prompt-book, but was introduced by the collator when preparing the copy for F. He apparently began by dividing Act IV in Q correctly into seven scenes, then deleted Scene iii since it was not in the prompt-book, and corrected the numbering of iv-vi to agree, but overlooked Scene vii.

XXIX. *MACBETH*. 1606

Folio.—*Macbeth*, with 2,108 lines, is one of the shortest plays in the canon, and much the shortest of the Tragedies.¹ It has 28 scenes,² with an average of barely more than 75 lines. This multiplicity of scenes must be a deliberate dramatic device to give an impression of rapid and bustling action, as in *Antony and Cleopatra*;³ but whether the briefness of the scenes, the longest of which is 240 lines, is due to the play having been originally written as a short piece, perhaps to form part of a court entertainment, or whether it is mainly or wholly the result of adaptation for such an occasion, is less clear. Belonging most likely to 1606 and being obviously designed to flatter King James,⁴ it is only natural to suspect—though there is no evidence to support the suspicion—that *Macbeth* may have been one of the three plays presented by the King's men at Greenwich and Hampton Court in July and August as part of James's entertainment of his brother-in-law Christian IV of Denmark, an occasion on which a short play may have been acceptable. On the other hand it is almost certain that the text as we have it has undergone at least some cutting. It has, for instance, many short lines; and while some of these may be, and probably are, original, others, either by their own awkwardness or by concomitant obscurity, suggest interference with the text, as for example at i. ii. 20, 51, III. ii. 32, iv. 4, Iv. iii. 28, 44.. There are also some inconsistencies in the action which suggest that we have not got the whole story. One concerns Cawdor's treachery. At I. ii. 50 Ross reports that

Norway himselfe, with terrible numbers,
Assisted by that most disloyall Traytor,
The Thane of Cawdor, began a dismall Conflict,

¹ Only *The Comedy of Errors*, 1,777 lines, and *The Tempest*, 2,062 lines, are shorter. *Julius Caesar*, 2,477 lines, is the only other Tragedy with less than 3,000.

² In the Globe edition, but see pp. 395-6.

³ A play of 3,064 lines and 43 scenes, giving an average of no more than 73 lines, in spite of a fifth act of two scenes only, one of which runs to 369 lines. The shortest scenes in *Macbeth* have 12 and 10 lines: *Antony and Cleopatra* has two scenes of 4 lines only.

⁴ See Note A on p. 396.

yet at I. iii. 72 Macbeth, fresh from the battle, knows nothing of Cawdor's defection: 'the Thane of Cawdor Hues A prosperous Gentleman'. It is evident that the understanding between Cawdor and Norway was a secret one and had only come to light after Macbeth left the field, and presumably some explanation of the circumstances has been lost.⁵ There seems also to have been some alteration in the staging of the final battle at Dunsinane and the presentation of Macbeth's death.⁶ In these cases, it is true, the cutting or revision may not have been extensive. More serious are the contradictions that appear to gather round the plot to kill Duncan. In the lines that begin 'What Beast was't then That made you breake this enterprize to me?' (I. vii. 47-54) Lady Macbeth clearly implies that it was her husband who first suggested the murder: yet the first we hear of it is in I. v, where the plot is clearly the Lady's, and as the play now stands no earlier consultation was possible.⁷ Moreover, in I. v it is clearly Lady Macbeth who proposes to do the killing,⁸ and this is borne out by her subsequent excuse (II. ii. 12-13), 'Had he not resembled My Father as he slept, I had don't': yet it appears from Macbeth's soliloquy while he is waiting for her signal (II. i. 33-64) that responsibility for the actual deed is to be his own. There has clearly been some change of purpose, and perhaps even of presentation, here; but how far the original plan was developed and subsequently modified, and how far Shakespeare was content to play the dramatic game of hinting at a background of plotting that he never troubled to work out, is more difficult to determine. Whatever we may suspect, there is no proof that *Macbeth* was ever anything but a short play.⁹

It has often been suspected that *Macbeth* suffers from interpolation as well as cutting. There are two songs in the later witch-scenes of which only the opening words are given: in. v. 33 'Come away, come away, &c.' and Iv. i. 43 'Blacke

⁵ See Note B on p. 396.

⁶ See p. 394.

⁷ See Note C on p. 396.

⁸ That she bids her husband 'put This Nights great Businesse into my dispatch' (II. 68-69) and 'Leaue all the rest to me' (I. 74) might mean no more than that she undertook to make the necessary preparations—as she in fact did in the drugging of the guards—but her prayer 'That my keene Knife see not the Wound it makes' (I. 53) proves that it was her own hand that was to wield the weapon.

⁹ See Note D on p. 397.

Spirites, &c.' Songs beginning thus are preserved in a play by Thomas Middleton called *The Witch* which has come down to us in manuscript, where they appear to be original.¹⁰ When he wrote his play Middleton knew and echoed *Macbeth*: in view of the borrowing of the songs it is not unlikely that *Macbeth* may be reciprocally indebted to Middleton in other ways as well. Chambers, who is followed by Wilson, maintains that 'interpolation' is 'confined to three passages in the witch-scenes', namely III. v and IV. i. 39-43 and 125-32, 'which can be distinguished from the genuine text by the introduction of Hecate, by the use of an iambic instead of a trochaic metre, and by prettinesses of lyrical fancy alien to the main conception of the witches'. The change of tone is evident: whether it implies a difference of authorship each reader must judge for himself.¹¹ Wilson, who suspects, though he does not claim, that Middleton's insertions may be more extensive than Chambers allows, believes that they necessitated abbreviation elsewhere in order to maintain the balance of *Macbeth* as a short play, and makes Middleton responsible for the clumsy cutting of the doubtless originally Shakespearian second scene, which has left it in what is generally admitted to be its present unsatisfactory state. The speech of the 'bleeding Captaine'¹² especially is rough in metre and has several short lines, which F and modern editions dispose somewhat differently. He is, of course, wounded and complains of faintness at the end, but there is nothing in the character of his deliberately rhetorical speech¹³ to lead one to suppose that its occasional incoherence is due

¹⁰ Malone MS. 12 in the Bodleian, a scribal copy by Ralph Crane. The latest edition is that for the Malone Society, 1950, in which the songs will be found at ll. 1331 and 1999. There is no doubt that these are the songs intended, for versions of them were included, doubtless from some stage source, in Davenant's adaptation of *Macbeth* in 1672-3 (printed 1674) and thence no doubt in the 1673 quarto of Shakespeare's play.

¹¹ See Note E on p. 397.

¹² See Note F on p. 397.

" Wilson finds a similarity of style between it and the 'Pyrrhus' speech in *Hamlet*, and points out that l. 22, 'Till he vnseam'd him from the Naue toth' Chops', and *Hamlet*, II. ii. 495-6, 'But with the whiffe and winde of his fell sword, ThVnnerued father fals', derive from consecutive lines in the Marlowe—Nashe *Dido* (II. i. 253—6):

Which he disdainig whiskt his sword about,
And with the wound [*conj.* wind] thereof the King fell downe:
Then from the nauell to the throat at once,
He ript old Priam . . .

to the speaker's condition rather than to textual accidents. Moreover, similar irregularities occur throughout the scene.

The date of Middleton's *Witch* is uncertain. If, as seems to be implied in the manuscript, it was first acted at the Blackfriars house, it cannot be earlier than 1609; and if, as some suppose, it made use of the witches from the anti-masque of Jonson's *Masque of Queens* it is unlikely to be much later: 1610-11 is as probable a date as any. The only recorded performance of *Macbeth* was that witnessed by Simon Forman at the Globe on Saturday 20 April 1611 (not 1610 as he wrote in error) but from his confused account it is, of course, impossible to tell exactly what version was then on the boards. One would imagine that a performance at the Globe would be of a full-length play. But if a short play was desired as part of a court entertainment, the company may well have been tempted to revive *Macbeth* and to salvage some of the witch-spectacle from Middleton's unsuccessful piece.¹⁴ An occasion of the sort may have presented itself at the time of the marriage of Princess Elizabeth to the Elector Palatine on 14 February 1613.¹⁵ By then Shakespeare had retired from the stage and revision of his work by another hand would have been more likely than earlier.

The stage-directions show evidence of more than one origin and hint at occasional confusion or alteration: I. i. I 'Thunder and Lightning. Enter three Witches'; ii. i 'Alarum within. Enter King[,] Malcolme, Donalbaine, Lenox, with attendants, meeting a bleeding Captaine'; iii. 21 'Drum within'; 78 'Witches vanish'; iv. I 'Flourish. Enter King...'; 58 'Flourish. | Exeunt'; v. i 'Enter Macbeths Wife alone with a Letter'; vi. I 'Hoboyes, and Torches. Enter King...'; vii. i 'Ho-boyes. | Torches. | Enter a Sewer, and diuers Seruants with Dishes and Seruice ouer the Stage. Then enter Macbeth'; II. i. I 'Enter Banquo, and Fleance, with a Torch

¹⁴ Compare *Macbeth*, Iv. i. 132, 'Musicke. The Witches Dance, and vanish', with *The Witch*, 1. 2022, 'here they Daunce y^e witches Dance & Ex'.

¹⁵ The King's men presented an unidentified play at Whitehall on 16 Feb., which was either in addition to or in place of a masque, but this is likely to have been one of the fourteen named pieces performed in connexion with the wedding festivities for which they were paid by warrant of 10 May following (Chambers, *Eliz. Stage*, iv. 127, *W. Shake.*, ii. 342-3).

before him'; 9 'Enter Macbeth, and a Seruant with a Torch'; 61 'A Bell rings'; ii. 57 'Knocke within' (and 'Knocke' at 65, 69, 73); iii. i 'Enter a Porter. | Knocking within' (and 'Knocke' at 3, 7, 13, 17, 22); 85 'Ring the Bell, [printed as part of the text] | Bell rings. Enter Lady'; iv. I 'Enter Rosse, with an Old man'; III. i. II 'Senit sounded. Enter Macbeth as King, Lady[,] Lenox, Rosse, Lords, and Attendants'; 44 'Exeunt Lords'; 73 'Enter Seruant, and two Murtherers', iii. I 'Enter three Murtherers'; iv. I 'Banquet prepar'd. Enter Macbeth . . .'; 40 'Enter the Ghost of Banquo, and sits in Macbeths place'; v. I 'Thunder. Enter the three Witches, meeting Hecat'; vi. I 'Enter Lenox, and another Lord'; Iv. i. I 'Thunder. Enter the three Witches'; 39 'Enter Hecat, and the other three Witches'; 69 'Thunder. | i. Apparition, an Armed Head'; 72 'He Descends'; 76 'Thunder. | 2 Apparition, a Bloody Childe'; 81 'Descends'; 86 'Thunder[.] | 3 Apparition, a Childe Crowned, with a Tree in his hand'; 94 'Descends'; 106 'Hoboyes'; 112 'A shew of eight Kings, and Banquo last, with a glasse in his hand';¹⁶ ii. 85 'Exit crying Murther'; iii. 140 'Enter a Doctor'; v. i. I 'Enter a [different] Doctor of Physicke, and aWayting Gentlewoman'; 22 'Enter Lady, with a Taper'; ii. i 'Drum and Colours. Enter . . .'; 31 'Exeunt marching'; iv. i 'Drum and Colours. Enter Malcolme . . . and Soldiers Marching'; 21 'Exeunt marching'; v. I 'Enter Macbeth, Seyton, & Souldiers, with Drum and Colours'; 7 'A Cry within of Women'; vi. i 'Drum and Colours. Enter . . . and their Army, with Boughes'; 10 'Exeunt[.] ' Alarums continued'; vii. ii 'Fight, and young Seyward slaine'; viii. 34 'Exeunt fighting. Alarums. [Enter Fighting, and Macbeth slaine. | Retreat, and Flourish. Enter with Drumme and Colours...'; 54 'Enter Macduffe; with Macbeths head'; 59 'Flourish'; 75 'Flourish. | Exeunt Omnes'.

There are plenty of descriptive touches here to suggest the author: 'meeting a bleeding Captaine', 'alone with a letter', 'diuers Seruants with Dishes and Service ouer the Stage', 'Banquet prepar'd', 'A Cry within of Women', 'their Army, with Boughes'; and some rather vague descriptions:

¹⁶ This is in error: it is the last of the kings, not Banquo, who carries the mirror, as appears from 1. 119. But it may be only the punctuation that is at fault.

'Rosse, with an Old man', 'Lenox, and another Lord', 'a Doctor of Physicke, and a Wayting Gentlewoman', 'Exeunt [*or Exit*] Lords'. But the ample provision of lights and noises points to the hand of the book-keeper: 'Senit sounded', 'Ho-boyes. Torches', 'Drum and Colours'; and so does the careful specification of Attendants. There is a duplication at ii. iii. 85 that is clearly his; 'Ring the Bell' being an executive order for the author's 'Bell rings'. Duplication in the battle scene points to a change in the staging: at v. viii. 34 'Exeunt fighting' is consistent with 54 'Enter Macduflfe; with Macbeths head', but hardly with the intervening 'Enter Fighting, and Macbeth slaine'. Apparently it was decided that a display of swordsmanship was desirable and that Macbeth's death should take place on the stage, and the directions were inadequately adjusted.¹⁷ There is an error at I. vi. I, where 'Hoboyes, and Torches' has been attached to the head of the wrong scene: it is repeated correctly at the beginning of i. vii.¹⁸

The author's directions derive doubtless from his foul papers, but there is nothing in them that might not reasonably survive in a prompt-book, though a few might have been made more specific. Contrariwise, the book-keeper's additions might for the most part be notes made on the foul papers, though they are rather more elaborate than one would expect;¹⁹ but the duplication at n. iii. 85 looks more like a note made in the prompt-book, and if there was a change in the staging of the battle-scene, it was more likely made when the play was at least in rehearsal, and the record would naturally find its way into the prompt-book and not into

¹⁷ Of course the directions will not do as they stand. In spite of what Wilson says, it would be pointless for the combatants to go off fighting and immediately return to conclude the battle. The Elizabethan producer had to be wary of the 'brawle ridiculous'.

¹⁸ Editors have long recognized that "Torches" are inappropriate in 'the one sunlit scene in the play'. (The suggestion that they point to an indoor performance at the Blackfriars or elsewhere is manifestly absurd.) But so are the 'Hoboyes'. Duncan is not making a ceremonial entry but approaching the castle informally, as the casual conversation indicates. Lady Macbeth catches sight of him and hastens out at 1. 10. A formal entry would call for a flourish of trumpets: oboes are indoor instruments, appropriate accompaniment to the banquet.

¹⁹ The misplacing of the torches and music at I. vi. i would perhaps happen more easily in annotating foul papers than in preparing the prompt-copy, and in a play so full of lights and noises the direction might easily be copied in thoughtlessly.

the foul papers. Chambers states that '*Macbeth* is doubtless printed from a prompt-copy', and this too is Wilson's opinion, though he adds that if there was much abridgement it may have involved a transcript of the stage-copy, and that this may account for a good deal of mislining in the earlier part of the play.²⁰

That behind F there lies a prompt-book of some sort is placed beyond reasonable doubt by two further considerations. One is that the record of entrances and exits is almost complete, such deficiencies as there are being, if necessary, attributable to scribe and compositor.²¹ The other is that there is practically no inconsistency, much less ambiguity, in the designation of the characters.²² It is difficult to believe that any text printed from Shakespeare's foul papers could show such regularity.

One cannot help wondering why copy such as that behind *Macbeth* should have been chosen for the Folio—always supposing that something fuller once existed and had survived. But at the time the Folio was printed James was still on the throne, and for a play so essentially his the editors may have thought it good policy to print a version prepared for court presentation. It may be that to this bit of snobbery we owe the loss of the authentic text.

The play is divided into acts and scenes and it is likely that these were already marked in the manuscript used to print from. Everything is regular except in the last act, in which the battle-scene is confused. F makes this continuous

²⁰ One author-spelling survives at I. ii. 34, 'Banquoh' (Holinshed 'Banquho'): see p. 147. But that might happen even in a transcript.

²¹ At II. i. 30 there should be an exit for Fleance as well as Banquo. There should be exits for the Ghost at III. iv. 72 and for a Servant at v. iii. 19. At IV. i. 132 Hecate must be included in the Witches' exit. There should be an exit and re-entry for Seyton at v. v. 8 and 15, but such brief absences, implied in the text, are often not marked any more than other obvious 'business'. At v. iv. I modern editors add Lennox and Ross, but their presence is not necessary. On the other hand some omit Angus at I. ii. 45, since he is mute, but, as Wilson points out, I. iii. 100 seems to make his presence likely.

²² Duncan is invariably 'King' both in directions and speech-headings. Macbeth appears 'as King' at III. i. II but is never called so, nor is Lady Macbeth ever Queen. (This is the more striking in that Macbeth had a claim to the throne through his wife. But Shakespeare deliberately refuses to allow any excuse for the usurper.) She is introduced as 'Macbeths Wife' (I. v. I) and at III. ii. i is 'Macbeths Lady': otherwise she is simply 'Lady' throughout. The only irregularity is the Captain-Sergeant confusion already mentioned (Note F).

(sc. vii): modern editors, following Pope, begin a fresh scene (viii) after 1. 29. But there is no necessary change of locality, and the stage is equally clear before vii. 14 and 24 and viii. 35, and at this last point Wilson (again following Pope) actually proposes another new scene (ix).

NOTE A (page 389)

The Weird Sisters are, of course, in Holinshed, who has a picture of them, but it is worth recording that during James's visit to Oxford, on 27 Aug. 1605, he was greeted by 'tres quasi Sibyllae' with speeches alluding to Duncan and Banquo, which were printed at the end of Matthew Gwynne's *Fertumnus* in 1607. In the Folio they are called Witches in the directions: in the text they are always the Weird Sisters (except to the 'rumpe-fed Ronyon' of I. iii. 6). The word is spelt 'weyward' or 'weyard' in F and is usually two syllables: in Holinshed it is 'weird'. They bear with them a distant suggestion of the Parcae, but it would be too much to call them ministers of fate.

NOTE B : (page 390)

The secret nature of Cawdor's treason is later made quite plain, and it is clear that the discovery, however it was made, came as a shock and a surprise (see i. ii. 65-66, iii. 111-16, iv. 5, 11-14). But these belated allusions do not obliterate the earlier contradiction. However, Ross's speech in I. ii is itself plainly defective. In F 11. 50 ff. run:

. . . And fanne our people cold.
Norway himselfe, with terrible numbers,
Assisted by that most disloyall Traytor . . .

The Globe edition, for the sake of the metre, prints:

. . . And fan our people cold. Norway himself,
With terrible numbers,
Assisted by that most disloyal traitor . . .

All would be well if we were to complete the clumsy half-line with some such words as 'and, as now is known,' or 'and in secrecy'. But the defect is probably more considerable.

NOTE C (page 390)

That Macbeth was already meditating murder and shrinking from the act is true. His hesitation between passively awaiting the fulfilment of the Witches' prophecy and actively promoting it is the theme of i. iii. 130-42, and i. iv. 49-53 show him embracing the latter course. It is also true that he hints at his ambition in his letter to his wife, i. v. 1-15—'what Greatnesse is promis'd thee. Lay it to thy heart'—but the only unequivocal phrases—'the fatall entrance of Duncan Vnder my Battlements', 'O neuer, Shall Sunne that Morrow see', 'He that's comming, Must be provided for'—are the Lady's: Macbeth says no more than 'We will speake further'. None of this would justify Lady Macbeth's words 'Nor time, nor place Did then adhere, and yet

you would make both' (i. vii. 51-52). As soon as Duncan decided to visit Macbeth time and place did adhere, and his coming is announced in I. v.

NOTE D (page 390)

The difficulties of the extant text are well analysed by Dover Wilson in the introduction to his edition of 1947. Naturally he builds round them an elaborate textual history. *Macbeth*, as a full-length play, was originally written by Shakespeare for James VI in 1599, at a time when one Lawrence Fletcher was leading a section of the Chamberlain's men on a tour in Scotland; later it was abridged by the author for the entertainment of Christian IV in 1606; and again in 1610-11 interpolated, with compensatory cutting, by Middleton. It may be remarked that though Fletcher's name heads the list in the patent of the King's men in 1603, there is no evidence that he was ever associated with the Chamberlain's, or that any members of that company were ever in Scotland.

NOTE E (page 391)

Hecate is in Middleton's play, but only as 'y^e cheif Witch', whereas in *Macbeth* she appears to retain her character as the underworld goddess who was the recognized sovereign of witches. At in. v. I her name is disyllabic, and so it is in Middleton: but this is also the recognized Shakespearian pronunciation (*Midsummer-Night's Dream*, v. i. 391, *Macbeth*, II. i. 53, III. ii. 41, *Hamlet*, in. ii. 269, *Lear*, I. i. 112) except where the name is applied in the sense of witch to the Pucelle in the dubious I *Henry VI* (III. ii. 62). There does not appear to be any particular resemblance between the alleged interpolations and Middleton's work: indeed, if 'prettinesses of lyrical fancy' are alien to Shakespeare's treatment of the witches, they are still farther removed from Middleton's coarse and caustic presentation. At Iv. i. 39 Hecate enters with 'the other three Witches', which brings the number up to six; and it has been maintained that there are six witches in Middleton's play—but this belief rests on a misreading of the manuscript (Malone Society edition, p. vi¹).

NOTE F (page 391)

He is Captain in the direction and speech-headings, but is spoken of in the text (1. 3) as 'Serieant', which may point to revision. It appears that sergeant was once a higher rank than now, and Wilson would have him a sergeant-major, who was a commissioned officer—but that would still not make him a captain. No doubt it could be argued that he was a sergeant when he rescued the king's son and that he had been promoted for his valour, but such an intention would be futile unless made explicit—as, of course, it may have been in a fuller version.

XXX. ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA. 1607

Folio.—On 20 May 1608 Edward Blount, who was later to be one of the chief promoters of the Shakespeare *Folio*, entered in the Stationers' Register *Pericles Prince of Tyre* and *Antony and Cleopatra*. The wording of the entry suggests that in the case of *Pericles* it was the prompt-copy that was produced, and the same may have been true of *Antony and Cleopatra*. This, together with the fact that Blount made no attempt at the time to print either play, has raised a suspicion that it may have been a blocking entry intended to prevent unauthorized publication. If so, it failed, for *Pericles* was pirated the following year. *Antony and Cleopatra* however, remained unprinted till the *Folio* appeared, by which time the original entrance seems to have been forgotten since the play was re-registered in 1623.

Chambers observes that 'The stage-directions are not markedly full, but there are occasional notes for action or for the grouping and attitude of personages'. A few directions are detailed, but on the whole their elaboration may sometimes have been overstressed.¹ At the same time they show perhaps sufficient development of technique to justify the opinion that behind the *Folio* lies 'a very carefully written copy, elaborately prepared by the author for the stage with directions respecting the manner of production. There is no sign of its having been used as a prompt-book, and the directions are not of a kind that would be convenient in actual performance. In fact it is a producer's copy, not a prompter's.' This has led to the conjecture that 'Shakespeare may have been already contemplating retirement, or was at least temporarily loosening his connexion with the stage', though the actual break is supposed not to have happened for another three years.²

The most noteworthy stage-directions are these: I. i. 10 'Flourish. Enter Anthony, Cleopatra[,] her Ladies, the Traine, with Eunuchs fanning her'; ii. I 'Enter Enobarbus, Lamprius, a Southsayer, Rannius, Lucillius, Charmian, Iras,

¹ Greg, *Editorial Problem*, pp. 147-8, followed by Wilson in his edition of 1950.

² *Ibid.*, p. 148, quoted by Wilson.

Mardian the Eunuch, and Alexas'; 91 'Enter Anthony, with a Messenger'; 116 'Exit Messenger' (error, 118 'I. Mes. '); 117 'Enter another Messenger' (119 '2. Mes. '); 121 'Enter another Messenger with a Letter' (122 '3. Mes. '); iv. I 'Enter Octavius reading a Letter, Lepidus, and their Trainee'; v. 34 'Enter Alexas from Caesar'; II. i. I 'Enter Pompey, Menecrates, and Menas, in warlike manner'; ii. 173 'Flourish. Exit omnes. | Manet Enobarbus, Agrippa, Mecnas'; iii. I 'Enter Anthony, Caesar, Octavia betweene them'; v. 61 'Strikes him downe'; 62 'Strikes him'; 64 'She hailes him vp and downe'; 73 'Draw a knife'; 84 'Enter the Messenger againe'; vi. I 'Flourish. Enter Pompey, at one doore with Drum and Trumpet: at another Caesar, Lepidus, Anthony, Enobarbus, Mecnas, Agrippa, Menas with Souldiers Marching'; 83 'Exeunt. | Manet Enob. & Menas'; vii. I 'Musicke playes. | Enter two or three Seruants with a Banket'; 20 'A Sennit sounded. | Enter Caesar ... with other Captaines'; 44 'Whispers in's Eare'; 120 'Musicke Playes. | Enobarbus places them hand in hand. | The Song'; 140 'Sound a Flourish with Drummes' (required by text); III. i. I 'Enter Ventidius as it were in triumph, the dead body of Pacorus borne before him'; ii. i 'Enter Agrippa at one doore, Enobarbus at another'; 66 'Kisses Octavia. | Trumpets sound. | Exeunt'; iii. 2 'Enter the Messenger as before'; viii. i 'Enter Caesar with his Army, marching'; x. i 'Camidius Marcheth with his Land Army one way ouer the stage, and Towrus the Lieutenant of Caesar the other way: After their going in, is heard the noise of a Sea fight. Alarum. Enter Enobarbus and Scarus'; 4 'Enter Scarrus'; xi. 24 'Sits downe'; 25 'Enter Cleopatra led by Charmian and Eros'; xii. 6 'Enter Ambassador from Anthony'; xiii. 13 'Enter the Ambassador, with Anthony'; Iv. i. I 'Enter Caesar, Agrippa, & Mecnas with his Army, Caesar reading a Letter'; ii. 10 'Enter 3 or 4 Senators'; iii. i 'Enter a Company of Soldiours'; 7 'They meete other Soldiers'; 9 'They place themselues in euery corner of the Stage'; 12 'Musicke of the Hoboyes is vnder the Stage'; 19 'Speak together'; iv. 18 'Enter an Armed Soldier'; 23 'Showt. | Trumpets Flourish. | Enter Captaines, and Souldiers'; vi. 20 'Enter a Soldier of Caesars'; vii. 4 'Alarums. | Enter Anthony, and Scarrus wounded'; 6 'Far

off' (retreat at 8 ?); viii. I 'Alarum. Enter Anthony againe in a March. Scarrus, with others'; ix. I 'Enter a Centerie, and his Company, Enobarbus followes'; xii. i 'Alarum afarre off, as at a Sea-fight. | Enter Anthony, and Scarrus'; xiv. 93 'Killes himselfe' (belongs at 95); 131 'Enter 4. or 5. of the Guard of Anthony'; 140 'Exit bearing Anthony'; xv. I 'Enter Cleopatra, and her Maides aloft, with Charmian & Iras'; 37 They heaue Anthony aloft to Cleopatra'; 91 'Exeunt, bearing of Anthonies body'; v. i. I 'Enter Caesar . . . with his Counsell of Warre'; ii. 34 (direction missing), 112 'Cleo. kneeles'; 232 'A noise within'; 316 'Dyes'; 323 'Enter the Guard rustling in, and Dolabella'; 331 'Charmian dyes'; 332 'Enter Dolabella'; 337 'Enter Caesar and all his Traine, marching'.

In the multiplicity and bustle of the battle scenes³ Shakespeare disregards the convention of not allowing characters to go off and re-enter immediately (iv. vii-viii). There are occasional oversights. In I. ii. 91 ff. there is certainly some confusion over the Messengers, and modern editors are pleased to distribute the parts between messengers and attendants: in iv. xii the alarum that F places at the beginning Wilson would have at 1. 3, Steevens and others at 1. 9. As a rule action is fully provided for, and it is a little surprising that there are no directions for Antony's attempted suicide at iv. xiv. 103 or Cleopatra's play with the asps at v. ii. 306 and 315, but the text is of course sufficiently explicit. Much more important and surprising is the absence of the direction that should inform us of the manner of Cleopatra's capture in the monument at v. ii. 34, where, moreover, consecutive speeches are assigned to Proculeius. Wilson apparently assumes a cut that has carried away the direction with it. But if Shakespeare had not made up his mind respecting the mechanics of the action, or if he thought it best to leave them to the actors to work out on the stage, he would naturally leave a blank for the direction and repeat the speaker's name. Editors have amused themselves devising ingenious ways of working the trick,⁴ and, obsessed by Shake-

³ Cf. *Macbeth*, note 2.

⁴ The mechanics of the scene are discussed from the producer's point of view by Bernard Jenkin in *RES*, Jan. 1945, xxi. 1-14.

speare's dependence on Plutarch, have brought in Gallus to take part in it and have even assigned him Proculeius's second speech. This is clearly not what Shakespeare intended.⁵

This omission would itself suffice to show that we are not dealing with prompt-copy. Wilson finds many Shakespearian spellings and characteristic misprints, and Chambers agrees that F may have been printed from his manuscript. It seems to have been carefully prepared. There is, it is true, a good deal of mislining that probably derives from the copy, but this appears to be mainly due to Shakespeare's running on half-lines to save space. Wilson finds that speeches of one and a half to two and a half lines account for nearly all of it. A few cases occur at the beginning or end of longer speeches; and Chambers thinks that Shakespeare sometimes split a line in the middle of a speech to indicate a pause. In Shakespeare's later plays lining is occasionally rendered uncertain by the liberties taken with the normal scansion of blank verse.

Entrances are on the whole adequate, but there are a few oversights. At III. i. I Silius should have been added, at III. viii. I Taurus, at III. xii. I Thidias; at IV. iv. I Charmian should have been distinguished from 'others'; v. i. I wants Proculeius, who speaks, and Gallus, who is addressed; Selucus should enter at v. ii. 111. On the other hand, there is much redundancy. In I. ii Lamprius, Rannius, Lucillius, and Mardan are mutes, and of the first three we hear no more.⁶ Shakespeare has evidently jotted down the names of characters, mostly from Plutarch, that he thought he might use and did not. They give a certain background, and it is doubtful whether editors do well to remove them: Mardan

⁵ It is quite true that Gallus ought to be present. At v. i. 69 Caesar bids Gallus assist Proculeius, and at ii. III he enters along with Proculeius in Caesar's train. But these are casual mentions, and it is clear that in writing the scene of the capture Shakespeare had simply forgotten about him. This is not the only occasion on which editors have displayed their knowledge of Plutarch in fussy elaboration of the simplicity of Shakespeare. We learn from Plutarch that the emissary sent to Caesar at iii. xii. 6 was one Euphronius, who was tutor to Antony and Cleopatra's children. Capell and other editors therefore call the envoy Euphronius: Wilson will have him 'Schoolmaster'. Of course, Shakespeare knew this, and mentions it at 1. 2, but when the man begins to expatiate on his humble station Caesar cuts him short, and Shakespeare is content to call him simply 'Ambassador'.

⁶ Lamprius might be the name of the Soothsayer, but more likely stands for Lamprias, Plutarch's grandfather and his source of information about Antony. Lucillius survives from *Julius Caesar*. Of Rannius nothing is known.

at least has every right to be present, and he is again a mute in v. ii. Agrippa is mute in II. vi and III. xii, Dolabella in Iv. vi, and both he and Menas in v. I.⁷ In most cases there is no reason why the characters should not be present and no reason to remove them: but at v. i. I Dolabella is a mistake, for his absence is the subject of remark at 11. 69-71.⁸ A few exits are missing, for instance at I. ii (end), xii. 25, III. xiii. 28. There are traces, too, of massing. In I. ii Enobarbus, mentioned at 1. i, may not enter till 1. 11; in III. x Scarus enters at 1. i and again at 1. 5; Dolabella enters at v. ii. 322 and again at 1. 332: the same is implied in 'Enobarbus followes' at iv. ix. i. We should naturally suppose that in a copy made for the stage some at least of the defects of the stage-directions must have been repaired.

There is little or no uncertainty in the designation of characters, but a good deal in the spelling of their names. Cleopatra is never Queen; Octavius is always Caesar: Cleopatra's 'Ladies', distinguished from 'the Traine' at i. i. 10, are Charmian and Iras. Canidius is always misspelt 'Camidius', 'Camidias', or 'Camindius': Shakespeare calls Caesar's envoy in III. xii and xiii Thidias consistently, and there is no excuse for following Theobald in giving him the name 'Thyreus', which, according to Wilson at least, is itself an error for Plutarch's Thyrsus. When the evidence is clear we must allow Shakespeare to name his characters as he will.

That F was printed from Shakespeare's foul papers is confirmed by one remarkable passage. Wilson, while of course agreeing as regards the origin, remarks that 'a couple of small repetitions in the first Monument scene [iv. xv] may be traces of the prompter's hand'. Following up an observation by Bernard Jenkin (as in note 4) he points out that in Cleopatra's speech

Oh Sunne,
Burne the great Sphere thou mou'st in, darkling stand
The varrying shore o'th'world.O Antony, Antony, Antony
Helpe Charmian, helpe Iras helpe: helpe Friends
Below, let's draw him hither

⁷ According to editors Menas appears in the wrong camp in n. vi: probably he was an afterthought; he does not speak till left alone with Enobarbus at 1. 84.

⁸ His movements generally are mysterious: see Wilson's note on v. i. i.

the last lines (11^b-13^a 'O Antony... hither') are redundant. Antony at 13' replies directly to 11^a, and the intervening lines not only make futile 11. 21-23, where it is apparently a question of opening the door of the monument, but anticipate and duplicate 11. 29^b-31^a,

but come, come Anthony,
 Helpe me my women, we must draw thee vp:
 Assist good Friends.

There is also the duplication of Antony's memorable cry, 'I am dying Egypt, dying', at 11. 18 and 41. From this Wilson concludes that 11. 13^b-31^a, 'Teace . . . Assist good Friends' were intended to be cut and were so marked by the prompter or perhaps by Shakespeare himself, and that whoever made the cut rescued Antony's words from 1. 18 and worked them into 1. 41.⁹ But there are other possible explanations, which do not involve the book-keeper and seem intrinsically more probable. One is that 11. 11^b-13^a, 'O Antony . . . hither', are merely a false start (imperfectly) deleted by Shakespeare before he went on with Antony's reply, and worked in with modification later. This, however, would leave an awkward join metrically between 11. 11^b and 13^a and would not account for the second duplication. More likely, therefore, is the conjecture that when Shakespeare got to 1. 29^a 'Demuring vpon me', he became dissatisfied with what he had written—as well he might, with its contradiction, its obscure allusion to opening the door, and its irrelevant elaboration of 'th'Imperious shew' (1. 23) that tends to dissipate the tension—cancelled all after 1. 11^a and continued with 1. 29^b, and later at 1. 41 retrieved Antony's 'I am dying Egypt, dying'.

In view of the undoubted source of F in foul papers it is significant that there is no division of the play into acts and scenes.

⁹ Wilson's explanation is not very clear, and on the face of it does not account for the major duplication. However, his allusion to this forming 'a kind of bracket' (see p. 165, Note D, end) suggests that what he had in mind was that the book-keeper cut 11. 13^b-31^a, as he says, and then wrote in 11. 11^b-13^a to take their place: he speaks of him jotting down 'a couple of notes'. (In confirmation of this he might have pointed to the spelling 'Antony' in 1. 11^b, in place of the usual 'Anthony'.) But such substitution would have been quite unnecessary, since 11. 29^b-31^a, 'but come . . . good Friends', could have been perfectly well fitted on to 1. 11^a, 'The varying shore o'th'world'.

XXXI. CORIOLANUS. 1608

Folio.—The textual conditions in *Coriolanus* appear to be very like those in *Antony and Cleopatra*. There are the same spellings and misprints and mislinings, the last due, it would seem, to the same cause. The stage-directions show a further development towards graphic elaboration and are clearly designed for the producer: i. i. I 'Enter a Company of Mutinous Citizens, with Staues, Clubs, and other weapons'; 47 'Showts within' (text 'What showts are these?'); 227 'Enter a Messenger hastily'; 255 'Citizens steale away. Manet Sicin. & Brutus'; iii. I 'Enter Volumnia and Virgilia, mother and wife of Martius: They set them downe on two lowe stooles and sowe'; iv. I 'Enter Martius, Titus Lartius, with Drumme and Colours, with Captaines and Souldiers, as before the City Corialus: to them a Messenger'; 13 'They Sound a Parley [text 'Come, blow thy blast']: Enter two Senators with others on the Walles of Corialus'; 30 'Alarum, the Romans are beat back to their Trenches[.] Enter Martius Cursing'; 42 'Another Alarum, and Martius followes them to [the] gates, and is shut in'; 45 'Enter the Gati [*read*Gates]'; 61 'Enter Martius bleeding, assaulted by the Enemy'; 62 'They fight, and all enter the City'; v. 4 'Alarum continues still a-farre off'; vi. I 'Enter Cominius as it were in retire, with soldiers'; 75 'They all shout and waue their swords, take him vp in their Armes, and cast vp their Caps'; vii. i 'Titus Lartius, hauing set a guardvpon Carioles, going with Drum and Trumpet toward Cominius, and Caius Martius, Enters with a Lieutenant, other Souldiours, and a Scout'; 7 'Alarum, as in Battaile' (belongs to viii. i); viii. 13 'Heere they fight, and certain Voices come in the ayde of Auffi. Martius fights til they be driuen in breathles'; ix. i 'Flourish. Alarum. A Retreat is sounded. Enter at one Doore Cominius, with the Romanes: At another Doore Martius, with his Arme in a Scarfe'; 11 'Enter Titus with his Power, from the Pursuit'; 40 'A long flourish. They all cry, Martius, Martius, cast vp their Caps and Launces: Cominius and Lartius stand bare'; x. i 'A flourish. Cornets. Enter Tullus Auffidius bloudie, with two or three Souldiors'; II. i. 106

'Bru. and Scic, | Aside' (i.e. they retire; but 1. 221 'Enter Brutus and Scicinius'); 179 'A Sennet, | Trumpets sound. | Enter Cominius the Generall, and Titus Latius: betweene them Coriolanus, crown'd with an Oaken Garland, with Captaimes and Souldiers, and a Herauld'; 220 'Flourish. Cornets. | Exeunt in State, as before'; ii. i 'Enter two Officers, to lay Cushions, as it were, in the Capitoll'; 41 'A Sennet. Enter the Patricians, and the Tribunes of the People, Lictors before them: Coriolanus, Menenius, Cominius the Consul: Scicinius and Brutus take their places by themselues: Coriolanus stands'; 70 'Coriolanus rises, and offers to goe away'; iii. I 'Enter seuen or eight Citizens'; 44 'Enter Coriolanus in a gowne of Humility, with Menenius'; 66 'Enter three of the Citizens'; 91 'Enter two other Citizens'; 132 'Enter three Citizens more'; III. i. 181 'Enter a rabble of Plebeians with the JEdiles'; 185 'They all bustle about Coriolanus'; 203 'Corio. drawes his Sword'; 229 'Exeunt. | In this Mutinie, the Tribunes, the JEdiles, and the People are beat in'; iii. 135 'Exeunt Coriolanus, Cominius, with Cumalijs. | They all shout, and throw vp their Caps'; iv. i. I 'Enter Coriolanus ... with theyong Nobility of Rome'; iv. I 'Enter Coriolanus in meane Apparrell, Disguisd, and muffled'; v. i 'Musicke plays. Enter a Seruingman'; 3 'Enter another Seruingman'; 7 'Enter the first Seruingman'; 12 'Enter second Seruant'; 20 'Enter 3 Seruingman, the i meets him'; 36 'Pushes him away from him'; 54 'Beats him away'; vi. 20 'Enter three or foure Citizens'; 128 'Enter a Troope of Citizens'; v. ii. I 'Enter Menenius to the Watch or Guard'; iii. 182 'Holds her by the hand silent'; iv. 51 'Trumpets, Hoboyes, Drums beate, altogether'; v. i 'Enter two Senators, with Ladies, passing ouer the Stage, with other Lords'; vi. 9 'Enter 3 or 4 Conspirators of Auffidius Faction'; 49 'Drummes and Trumpets sounds, with great showts of the people'; 61 'Enter the Lords of the City'; 71 'Enter Coriolanus marching with Drumme, and Colours. The Commoners being with him'; 132 'Draw both the Conspirators, and kils Martius, who falles, Auffidius stands on him'; 156 'Exeunt bearing the Body of Martius. A dead March Sounded'.

These directions may include a few notes by the book-keeper: 'Cornets' separated from 'flourish' at i. x. I and n. i.

220 looks suspicious. Obvious instructions to the producer are 'They set them downe on two lowe stooles and sowe' (I. iii. I) and 'Holds her by the hand silent' (v. iii. 182): such business is normally left to the actors in rehearsal. But there are other directions that have nothing to do with performance at all, and look more like information supplied for the reader: 'Titus Lartius, hauing set a guard vpon Carioles, going . . . toward Cominius' (I. vii. I) is really a summary of what he says in this short scene. It might well have been copied in from the author's plot or scenario, and 'Enter Martius Cursing' (i. iv. 30)⁵ which he proceeds to do, might come from the same source. On the whole the directions become rather less elaborate as the play proceeds, as though the author were growing impatient of the unwonted task. Sometimes he gets a little involved. At i. iv. 42 Martius is said to get 'shut in' at Corioles, though he continues his speech and only enters the gate at 1. 45; and at in. i. 229 the direction is simply an expansion or explanation of the 'Exeunt', which it makes superfluous. We may reasonably hold the compositor responsible for the absurdity at HI. iii. 135, where 'Cum alijs' seems to have been mistaken for a personal name.

Entrances appear to be complete throughout and there is no noticeable redundancy. If a few exits are missing they are insignificant. At n. i. 221 the Tribunes 'Enter', though in fact they had only gone 'Aside' (at 1. 106); but this is not unusual (cf. *Troilus and Cressida*, p. 344).

There is no ambiguity in the designation of characters, though some uncertainty of spelling and at least one apparent error. At i. i. 231 'Sicinius Velutus' should properly be Sicinius Bellutus (he is always called Sicinius, but this is often spelt Scicinius); 'Annius Brutus' (always Brutus) is identified by editors with L. Junius Brutus: this also is a possible misreading. Other characters too are introduced under fuller names than are afterwards usual. The hero appears as Caius Martius, and is regularly Martius until his triumph, when of course he becomes Coriolanus:¹ at the very end he reverts to Martius in the directions, but not as a speaker, after Aufidius has refused to recognize his title at v. vi. 88-90. His son is 'yong Martius' at v. iii. 22, but his

¹ He is hailed at I. ix. 65 and 67 as 'Marcus Caius Coriolanus'.

one speech is headed 'Boy'. The only character over whom there is serious confusion is Titus Lartius,² The Volscian capital, Corioli, is usually called Corbies, but also 'Coriolus', 'Carioles', 'Cariolus', and 'Corialus'.³

There can be no doubt that behind F lies a very carefully prepared author's manuscript. So carefully prepared is it that it might have been used as a prompt-copy, but there is no evidence that it was, and the fact that it was given to the printer suggests that it was not the only manuscript the company possessed.

There is a division into acts only. Since *Corio/anus* was originally intended to open the section of Tragedies, this may well have been introduced at the time of printing.

² He is introduced at I. i. 231 as Titus Lartius and his speeches have the prefix 'Tit.': in I. iv and vii he is the same, but his prefix is 'Lar.' or 'Lart.': in I. v he is Titus, but his prefix is 'Lar.': in I. ix he is again Titus, but his speeches are headed 'Titus Lartius' or 'Lartius'. On the other hand, in II. i (in which he is a mute) he appears as 'Titus Latius', and so he does in III. i, where his prefix is 'Latius'—though in the intervening II. ii he is mentioned as Titus Lartius. Elsewhere in the text he is always called Lartius or Titus Lartius, except at I. i. 243 where he is 'Titus Lucius'—presumably a misprint for 'Latius'. It seems that he is Latius in Plutarch, but this is said to be an error.

³ On the scansion of Corioles and Coriolanus see H. Granville-Barker, *Prefaces to Shakespeare*, fifth series, 1947, pp. 192-5.

XXXII. *TIMON OF ATHENS*. 1608

Folio.—*Timon* has always presented a problem to editors and has been the subject of much speculation. Its peculiarities are thus characterized by Chambers: 'There is much mislineation in the text. Lines are irregularly divided; prose speeches are printed as verse, and verse speeches as prose. The passages affected are mostly short. Many lines are split, and the splitting is often not explicable as due to considerations of space or a desire to indicate major pauses. It is very likely that there were frequent marginal insertions in the copy. . . . And there are several scenes in which the verse at least cannot be the complete and jointed work of Shakespeare. This is particularly noticeable in the longer speeches. These contain Shakespearean ideas, sometimes inchoate, and scattered Shakespearean phrases. But they are not constructed as articulated paragraphs at all. They consist of juxtaposed sentences, now in blank verse, now in rhyme, now in wording which can most easily be read as prose. . . . It must be added that the structure of *Timon* as a whole is incoherent.' Multiple authorship has been the most favoured explanation: either revision by Shakespeare of the work of others, or completion of an unfinished Shakespearean play by other hands. 'None of the theories seems to me convincing in detail, and their very multiplicity suggests that their exponents are on the wrong tack. Moreover, most of these are compelled to admit that the revision, by whomsoever accomplished, was itself blundering and incomplete. . . . I do not doubt that [the play] was left unfinished by Shakespeare, and I believe that the real solution of its "problem", indicated long ago by Ulrici and others, is that it is unfinished still.¹ The passages of chaotic verse, in particular, look very much like rough notes, hastily jotted down to be worked up later. . . . Shakespeare seems to have worked chiefly on the beginning and end of the play, and to have left the middle acts in a very imperfect state. *Timon*, as it stands, is of course very short, and it may be that some scenes are lacking altogether. . . . I do

¹ [This view has been well worked out by Una Ellis-Fermor in an article in *RES*, July 1942, xviii, 270-83.]

not suggest that *Timon* throws much light upon Shakespeare's normal methods of working.' The most disconnected scene, but at the same time one of the most textually finished, is III. v, in which Alcibiades pleads before the Senate on behalf of some friend condemned on a charge of manslaughter. But who the friend is or what are the circumstances we are not told. It might be Timon himself, but there is no hint elsewhere of his crime. Indeed, there is no clear link between the story of Timon and that of Alcibiades, who seems cast for the part of Coriolanus. They might almost belong to different plays.

The stage-directions to some extent resemble those in *Coriolanus*' but the more elaborate are confined to the earlier part of the play; later they are barer, though they present some unusual features: I. i. I 'Enter Poet, Painter, leweller, Merchant, and Mercer, at seuerall doores'; 39 'Enter certaine Senators' (merely passing over the stage); 94 'Trumpets sound. | Enter Lord Timon, addressing himselfe curteously to euery Sutor', 256 'Enter Alcibiades with the rest'; ii. I 'Hoboyes Playing lowd Musicke. | A great Banquet seru'd in: and then, Enter Lord Timon, the States, the Athenian Lords, Ventigius which Timon redeemed from prison. Then comes dropping after all Apemantus discontentedly like himselfe'; 120 'Sound Tucket. Enter the Maskers of Amazons, with Lutes in their hands, dauncing and playing'; 128 'Enter Cupid with the Maske of Ladies'; 150 'The Lords rise from Table, with much adoring of Timon, and to shew their loues, each single out an Amazon, and all Dance, men with women, a loftie straine or two to the Hoboyes, and cease'; II. ii. I 'Enter Steward, with many billes in his hand'; III. i. I 'Flaminius waiting to speake with a Lord from his Master, enters a seruant to him'; iii. I 'Enter a third seruant with Sempronius, another of Timons Friends'; iv. I 'Enter Varro's man, meeting others. All Timons Creditors to wait for his comming out. Then enter Lucius and Hortensius'; 80 'Enter Timon in a rage'; v. I 'Enter three Senators at one doore, Alcibiades meeting them, with Attendants'; vi. i 'Enter diuers Friends at seuerall doores'; 44 'The Banket brought in'; iv. ii. i 'Enter Steward with two or three Seruants'; 29 'Embrace and part seuerall wayes'; iii. i 'Enter Timon in

the woods'; 44 'March afarre off'; 48 'Enter Alcibiades with Drumme and Fife in warlike manner, and Phrynia and Timandra'; 399 'Enter the Bandetti'; 463 'Exit Theeues. | Enter the Steward to Timon'; v. i. 32 'Enter Timon from his Caue'; 134 'Enter Timon out of his Caue'; iii. I 'Enter a Souldier in the Woods, seeking Timon'; iv. I 'Trumpets sound. Enter Alcibiades with his Powers before Athens'; 2 'Sounds a Parley, [text 'Sound to this . , . Towne'] | The Senators appeare vpon the wals'; 70 'Alcibiades reades the Epitaph'.

It is not surprising that some of these directions are reminiscent of what may have been jottings in the author's original plot; where the drama has only half disengaged itself from the matrix of thought, it is natural that the directions should not have been fully adapted to the needs of the stage: 'Lord Timon, addressing himself curteously to euery Sutor', 'Ventigius which Timon redeem'd from prison', 'Flaminus waiting to speake with a Lord from his Master', 'All Timons Creditors to wait for his comming out', are hardly even notes for a producer. Some stand curiously apart from the text. The direction for the masque has got tacked on to the 'Tucket' that announces its approach at I. ii. 120, and the entry of the ladies is repeated at 1. 128: in fact it is only the 'fore-runner' that, as Cupid, enters at 1. 128 to 'Haile' Timon, who grants the troop 'kind admittance'; they actually enter, it seems, at 1. 137. Later in in. vi the 'Banket' that is 'brought in' at 1. 44 should properly appear in response to Timon's 'Come bring in all together' at 1. 53. There is also a looseness of expression: we have 'a third seruant' (III. iii. I) and 'two other Senators' (v. ii. i) at the beginning of scenes, as though the author were unmindful of the articulation of his play. At in. iii. I 'Enter . . . Sempronius, another of Timons Friends', who has already appeared, suggests haphazard composition. Some of the prefixes are equally unspecified: we have 'Some speake' and 'Some other' at III. vi. 96 and 97. It is interesting to note the frequent directions for noises, which in this case cannot be supposed additions by the book-keeper, and which therefore suggest that in other plays his intervention may have been too readily assumed.

Entrances are altogether inadequately marked. Character designations are not as a rule indefinite or inconsistent, but many of the characters are themselves unspecified and hard to place. This shows itself in the difficulties encountered by whoever drew up the list of personae to fill up a blank page at the end. There we find 'Certaine Senatours', 'Certaine Maskers', 'Certaine Theeues' along with the unnamed Poet, Painter, Jeweller, and Merchant of the opening scene, contrasting with half a dozen named characters of little importance bracketed as 'Seuerall Seruants to Vsurers'¹, The forms 'Ventidius' (i. i), 'Ventigius' (i. ii), Tentiddius' (n. ii), and Tentidgius' (III. iii) illustrate the uncertainty of Shakespeare's spelling.²

There is, of course, no doubt that F was printed from foul papers that had never been reduced to anything like order. Significantly there is no division into acts and scenes. There is no record of the play's having been acted, and it is most unlikely that it ever was. It is all the more remarkable that the foul papers should have been at the disposal of the editors. It must be borne in mind that *Timon* was inserted at the last moment in the place long reserved for *Troilus and Cressida*? and it is quite possible that the editors did not in the first place intend to print it at all, and only decided to do so when something was needed to fill the gap. In 1678 an alteration appeared as *The History of Timon of Athens, the Man-Hater_____Made into a Play. By Tho. Shadwell*'. Whatever the laureate's temerity, his criticism was sound, for Shakespeare's *Timon* is no finished play but an *elauche*.

¹ Editors have not mended matters by following Rowe in calling Timon's Steward Tlavius'. This name seems to occur only once, at II. ii, 194, where it is almost certainly an error for Flaminius, as editors themselves allow.

³ See p. 446.

XXXIII. *CYMBELINE*. 1609-10

Folio.—The text, apart from some textual errors, is clean, and the lining is correct. The stage-directions are on the whole bare and suited to the stage, except those for battle scenes and spectacles, which appear to have been taken over as they stood from an author's manuscript prepared in the same manner as *Coriolanus*: i. iv. I 'Enter Philario, Iachimo: a Frenchman, a Dutchman, and a Spaniard'; II. ii. i 'Enter Imogen, in her Bed, and a Lady', 10 'Sleepes. | Iachimo from the Truncke'; 50 'Clocke strikes'; iii. 80 'Knocks'; III. i. I 'Enter in State, Cymbeline, Queene, Clotten, and Lords at one doore, and at another, CaiusQ Lucius, and Attendants'; ii. i 'Enter Pisanio reading of a Letter'; v. 41 'Enter a Messenger'; vi. I 'Enter Imogen alone'; vii. I 'Enter two Roman Senators, and Tribunes'; iv. ii. I 'Enter Belarius, Guiderius, Aruiragus, and Imogen from the Caue'; 100 'Fight and Exeunt'; 183 'Enter Guidereus'; 186 'Solemn Musick'; 197 'Enter Aruiragus, with Imogen dead, bearing her in his Armes'; 282 'Enter Belarius with the body of Cloten'; 291 'Imogen awakes'; v. ii. I 'Enter Lucius, Iachimo, and the Romane Army at one doore: and the Britaine Army at another: Leonatus Posthumus following like a poore Souldier. They march ouer, and goe out. Then enter againe in Skirmish Iachimo and Posthumus: he vanquisheth and disarmeth Iachimo, and then leaues him'; 10 'The Battaile continues, the Britaines fly, Cymbeline is taken: Then enter to his rescue, Bellarius, Guiderius, and Aruiragus'; 14 'Enter Posthumus, and seconds the Britaines. They Rescue Cymbeline, and Exeunt. | Then enter Lucius, Iachimo, and Imogen'; iii. I 'Enter Posthumus, and a Britaine Lord'; 84 'Enter two Captaines, and Soldiers'; 94 'Enter Cymbeline . . . and Romane Captiues. The Captaines present Posthumus to Cymbeline, who deliuers him ouer to a Gaoler. [Exeunt.]; iv. i 'Enter Posthumus, and Gaoler'; 30 'Solemn Musicke. Enter (as in an Apparition) Sicillius Leonatus, Father to Posthumus, an old man, attyred like a warriour, leading in his hand an ancient Matron (his wife, & Mother to Posthumus) with Musicke before them. Then, after other

Musicke, followes the two young Leonati (Brothers to Posthumus) with wounds as they died in the warrs. They circle Posthumus round as he lies sleeping'; 93 'Iupiter descends in Thunder and Lightning, sitting vppon an Eagle: hee throwes a Thunder-bolt. The Ghostes fall on their knees'; 113 'Ascends'; 119 'Vanish'; v. 69 'Enter Lucius, Iachimo, and other Roman prisoners, Leonatus behind, and Imogen'. There is little here that needs comment. Some directions have been overpared: at in. vi. I Imogen enters as a boy, and at iv. ii. 113 Guiderius carries Cloten's head. The 'Messenger' of in. v. 41 is in fact merely the attendant whom Cymbeline had sent to fetch Imogen at 1. 35. At v. iv. I there are properly two Gaolers: this may be no more than a misprint (Capell and some later editors have brought in two at 1. 152 likewise, but without warrant).

The entrances and exits are virtually complete. The only entrance lacking is that for a Messenger at 11. iii. 59, and here the prefix, if made emphatic, may have served as an entrance as well. Half a dozen unimportant exits are unmarked. Nor is there any inconsistency to speak of in character designations. Posthumus Leonatus is often Leonatus in the text, but in the directions only at v. v. 69, where his speeches continue to carry the prefix 'Post.' There is, as usual, some divergence of spelling; thus Cloten is spelt with two /s in the earlier part of the play and with one in the later, consistently in text and directions alike, except that in in. v he has one and in iv. i two. Curiously enough the form 'Imogen' seems to be due to the printer. Simon Forman, who saw the play in April 1611, has 'Innogen' twice, and this is the form Shakespeare used in *Much Ado*. In Geoffrey of Monmouth Innogen is the wife of Brutus, and so in Holinshed. In *Lochrine* (Q 1595) the name is misprinted 'lunoger' a. 240).

Most critics regard the vision in v. iv (11. 30-126? — the later limit is disputed) as what Chambers, who agrees, calls 'a spectacular theatrical interpolation'.¹ If this is so, and if

¹ To the vision belongs, of course, its interpretation in v. v. 425-59. This passage is less evidently un-Shakespearian than the vision itself, and makes use of the Soothsayer — here addressed as Philamonus — who is already a character in the play (iv. ii. 346-52). Possibly the play as originally written contained a vision in dumb-show only. But the fact that Posthumus is led out in custody at the end of v. iii and

the interpolation is of later date, the manuscript containing it can hardly have been Shakespeare's foul papers, and we must see behind F the company's prompt-book as it stood in the early twenties. This is in accord with the rest of the evidence. The actual copy may, of course, have been an *ad hoc* transcript. *Cymbeline* was revived at court as late as 1 January 1634. If the receipt of the copy was delayed, as was that of *The Winter's Tale*, it might account for this tragicomedy having been misplaced in the Folio at the end of the section of Tragedies.²

There is a full division into acts and scenes, which would probably be normal in a prompt-copy at this date. It differs at three points from that adopted by modern editors. F begins a new scene i. i. 70 since the stage is clear, whereas editors run it on since the place is the same and the action continuous, the approach of the Queen and Princess being announced in ll. 68-69. F runs on II- v and vi, evidently in error, for they are not necessarily connected. Lastly, F begins a new scene at III. vi. 21, again because the stage is clear. And here editors have less excuse for continuing the action, for though there is no change of locality there may very well be an interval of time. The same, however, holds good at iv. ii. 101, where neither F nor editors mark a fresh scene.

immediately re-enters in jail at the beginning of v. iv suggests that there has been some disturbance hereabouts.

² See p. 80⁸.

XXXIV. THE WINTER'S TALE. 1611

The play seems to have been popular. Simon Forman saw a performance at the Globe on 15 May 1611; it was acted at court on 5 November, and was one of fourteen plays given by the King's men in connexion with the marriage of Princess Elizabeth the following winter: it was revived at court on 7 April 1618, possibly again in 1619, and certainly on 18 January 1624, when it was presented 'To the Duchess of Richmond, in the king's absence', and on 16 January 1634. On 19 August 1623 Herbert noted in his Office Book: Tor the king's players. An olde playe called Winter's Tale, formerly allowed of by Sir George Bucke, and likewyse by mee on Mr. Hemmings his worde that there was nothing profane added or reformed, thogh the allowed booke was missinge; and therefore I returned it without a fee.¹ *The Winter's Tale* was a late-comer in the Folio, but it was most likely printed in November 1622,² nine months before Herbert relicensed the piece, which was therefore not in preparation for printing but presumably for the performance of January 1624.

Folio.—The text is fully and regularly divided into acts and scenes and is remarkably clean, with careful punctuation; it is also characterized by a lavish use of parentheses, apostrophes, and hyphens. These are recognized features of the work of Ralph Crane, the scribe who is usually supposed to have provided the copy for the earliest printed Comedies also.³ There is another marked peculiarity that *The Winter's Tale* shares with some of the earliest plays, namely the massing of entrances and the general absence of other stage-directions, which we have already found characteristic of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. The practice, however, is not uniform. Except at two points the names of all the characters appearing in a scene are given

¹ *Variorum*, 1821, iii. 229; Adams, *Herbert*, pp. 18, 25.

^a See p. 461.

³ Were it not that we know that *The Winter's Tale* was an afterthought in the Folio, we might naturally conclude that Crane had been commissioned to prepare the first and last plays of the section, on Pollard's principle that the editors placed their best-finished wares in the most prominent positions.

at the beginning, irrespective of when they enter, but in order of entry, and sometimes divided by colons into groups; in a few cases individual entrances are repeated at their proper place, but usually not; few exits are marked except at the ends of scenes. The massed entrances might, of course, as Chambers notes, have been copied from a 'plot', and this might perhaps have supplied the few elaborations found in the directions. The following are the only directions other than bare entrances and exits: in. ii. I 'Enter Leontes, Lords, Officers: Hermione (as to her Triall) Ladies: Cleomenes, Dion'; 10 'Silence' (but Rowe recognized this as spoken by the Officer); iii. 58 'Exit pursued by a Beare'; Iv. i. I 'Enter Time, the Chorus'; iii. I (and iv. 222) 'Enter Autolicus singing'; iv. 165 'Heere a Daunce of Shepheards and Shephearddresses'; 352 'Heere a Dance of twelue Satyres'; v. iii. I 'Enter Leontes ... Paulina: Hermione (like a Statue:) Lords, &c.' The presence of all characters is duly provided for, except for three oversights: at ii. iii. 26 it should have been specified that Paulina is carrying the baby (cf. III. iii. I 'Enter Antigonus, a Marriner, Babe . . .'); in III. ii Paulina is present, she speaks at l. 149 and later; in the same scene a Servant enters at l. 143.

The character of the stage-directions has of course led to the suggestion that F is a text assembled from actors' 'parts',⁴ and the fact that the prompt-copy was reported missing in 1623 lends the theory a plausibility it does not in all cases possess. There are, however, reasons to suppose that the massing of entrances may have been an eccentricity of Ralph Crane's work, and the actors' parts may not have been the only source from which a new 'book' could be constructed. The prompt-copy must have been in existence at the time of the court performances of 1618 and 1619, but may possibly have gone astray on the latter occasion. That would normally, on the view here taken throughout, have left the company in possession of the foul papers, which they might have been expected to hand over to the printer, as they appear to have done in so many other cases. But if this was the only manuscript of the play they possessed they may have hesitated to part

4 See Crompton Rhodes, *First Folio*, p. 99, elaborated by Dover Wilson in his edition of 1931. For the 'assembly' theory see pp. 156-8.

with it and have preferred to commission Crane to prepare a transcript on literary lines for use in the Folio. Hence perhaps the delay in producing the copy. That transcript, however, even if the printer returned it, would have been of no use on the stage, and when the players were required to give another court performance they presumably had their book-keeper prepare a fresh prompt-copy from the foul papers and persuaded Herbert to license it in the summer of 1623.⁵

Wilson, with his usual passion for disintegration, would deny the Time-Chorus (iv. i) to Shakespeare. It is, of course, no essential or integral part of the play, and such a link might easily have been provided in the playhouse if the author had omitted to make sufficiently plain the lapse of sixteen years. It is no great achievement, and Wilson is not alone in his suspicions: but not all readers will agree with his denigration of the style or refuse to find in it some Shakespearian turns of phrase.

It is remarkable that the survival of Hermione plays no part in Greene's romance of *Pandosto* which the play follows closely through the first four acts, and that Simon Forman, in his account of the performance at the Globe in 1611, is equally silent about the striking catastrophe. There are also some hints in Acts III and IV both that Hermione is really dead and that the climax of the play was to be the recognition of Perdita, which in the extant version is curiously slurred over. It has therefore been suggested with some plausibility that the last act as we have it is not the original conclusion of the play.⁶ Since, however, the present Act V is undoubtedly Shakespeare's, it cannot have been written much later than the rest of the play, and the most likely occasion for the alteration would be the performance in connexion with Princess Elizabeth's marriage festivities in the winter of 1612-13.

⁵ E. E. Willoughby suggests (*apud* Wilson's edition, p. 113, note) that what Herbert licensed on 19 August was not a manuscript but the sheets of the Folio containing the play. These were certainly printed by that date, but they would have needed a lot of editing and have provided very little room for it.

⁶ In a letter by J. E. Bullard and W. M. Fox in *TLS*, 14 Mar. 1952.

XXXV. THE TEMPEST. 1611

Folio.—*The Tempest* was acted at court on I November 1611 and repeated in 1612-13 during the festivities for the marriage of the Lady Elizabeth. Although probably the last of Shakespeare's unassisted plays, it opens the section of Comedies in the Folio and therefore the whole collection. It is fully divided into acts and scenes, as at this date we should expect.¹ The text is a clean one, carefully punctuated, and in view of the lavish use of parentheses and other scribal characteristics of Ralph Crane, it is now usually allowed to have been printed (like the three following pieces) from a transcript in his hand, which may have been prepared specially to serve as a model for the collection. It is significant that the list of characters at the end is the only such list in the Folio certainly printed because it was in the copy and not specially supplied to fill up space.² The stage-directions are ample throughout, and in the case of spectacles elaborate: I. i. I 'A tempestuous noise of Thunder and Lightning heard: Enter a Ship-master, and a Boteswaine'; 54 'Enter Mariners wet'; 63 'A confused noyse within'; ii. 317 'Enter Ariel like a water Nymph'; 375 'Enter Ferdinand & Ariel, inuisible playing & singing'; 381 'Burthen dispersedly'; 466 'He drawes, and is charmed from mouing'; II. i. 185 'Enter Ariell playing solemne Musicke'; 297 'Enter Ariell with Musicke and Song'; 300 'Sings in Gonzaloes eare'; ii. I 'Enter Caliban, with a burthen of Wood (a noyse of Thunder heard.)'; 44 'Enter Stephano singing'; 47 'Drinkes'; 57 'drinks'; 182 'Caliban Sings drunkenly'; III. i. I 'Enter Ferdinand (bearing a Log.)'; ii. 48 'Enter Ariell inuisible'; 133 'Ariell plaies the tune on a Tabor and Pipe'; iii. 17 'Solemne and strange Musicke: and Prosper on the top (inuisible:) Enter seuerall strange shapes, bringing in a Ban-

¹ Prospero and Ariel leave the stage at the end of Act IV and enter again at the beginning of Act V, which is not evidence that an intervening scene has been omitted, as Dover Wilson contends, but that the act division is original. Wilson's edition, the first of the series, appeared in 1921, and it must not be supposed that his judgement is so constant that it has stood still these thirty years and more. Indeed, he now agrees that the copy for F was a transcript by Crane and not Shakespeare's autograph as he once supposed.

² See p. 355³.

ket; and dance about it with gentle actions of salutations, and inuiting the King, &c. to eate, they depart'; 53 'Thunder and Lightning. Enter Ariell (like a Harpey) claps his wings vpon the Table, and with a queint deuite the Banquet vanishes'; 82 'He vanishes in Thunder: then (to soft Musicke.) Enter the shapes againe, and daunce (with mockes and mowes) and carrying out the Table'; Iv. i. 58 'Soft musicke. I Enter Iris'; 72 'Iuno descends'; 123 'Iuno and Ceres whisper, and send Iris on employment'; 134 'Enter Certaine Nimphes'; 138 'Enter certaine Reapers (properly habited:) they ioyne with the Nimphes, in a gracefull dance, towards the end whereof, Prospero starts sodainly and speakes, after which to a strange hollow and confused noyse, they heauily vanish'; 193 'Enter Ariell, loaden with glistering apparell, &c. Enter Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo, all wet'; 257 'A noyse of Hunters heard. Enter diuers Spirits in shape of Dogs and Hounds, hunting them about: Prospero and Ariel setting them on'; v. i. I 'Enter Prospero (in his Magicke robes) and Ariel'; 58 'Solemne musicke. | Heere enters Ariel before: Then Alonso with a franticke gesture, attended by Gonzalo. Sebastian and Anthonio in like manner attended by Adrian and Francisco: They all enter the circle which Prospero had made, and there stand charm'd: which Prospero obseruing, speakes'; 88 'Ariell sings, and helps to attire him' -, 172 'Here Prospero discouers Ferdinand and Miranda, playing at Chesse'; 216 'Enter Ariell, with the Master and Boatswaine amazedly following'; 256 'Enter Ariell, driuing in Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo in their stolne Apparell'.

There can be no doubt that these directions are fundamentally the author's: they are almost throughout what we have come to expect of Shakespeare in his later plays when he was writing instructions for the producer. But we have not got them, it would seem, exactly as they were written. No author writing with only the prompter or the producer in view would use such an expression as 'with a queint deuite the Banquet vanishes' (III. iii. 53). It is the language of a spectator recording with appreciation the ingenuity of the staging,³ and there

³ Such language is familiar to us from the descriptions of many masques, in which the author (or recorder) makes his bow to the machinist, as Jonson sometimes did to

is no reason why Crane should not have seen *The Tern-pest*. The direction at Iv. i. 138, with its 'properly habited' and 'strange hollow and confused noyse', may also have been edited, and thunder 'heard' (I. i. I, II. ii. i) suggests the literary touch. Juno's car apparently comes in view of Iris, and presumably of the audience, at iv. i. 72—'her(e) Peacocks flye amaine'—but she herself does not enter, on foot, till 1.100, where editors therefore place the direction. All entrances are duly provided for, and all but two minor exits of Ariel: no doubt Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo are meant to slink away at v. i. 299, though there is no direction to that effect. There is no uncertainty and virtually no variation in the character designations. The metrical variant Prosper occurs once in a direction (in. iii. 17) as well as in the text: the extended form Ferdinando is only found on his first appearance at i. i, 10. It may be noted that 'the Duke of Millaine [Antonio] And his braue sonne' were in the wreck (i. ii. 438): that we hear no more of the latter is evidence rather of Shakespeare's carelessness than of revision. Adrian and still more Francisco are rather shadowy characters, but are needed to provide attendants for Sebastian and Antonio (v. i. 58).

Crane's transcript was clearly made from the author's original. This must have been carefully prepared and might have served as a prompt-copy. But if the book-keeper annotated it to any extent for the stage, Crane edited away all traces of his handiwork.

The Tempest is a very short play, 2,062 lines in the Globe edition, but that does not necessarily mean that it has been abridged. Its markedly hymeneal character—if the masque is original—suggests that it was written for a marriage, when it may have formed part of a longer entertainment. Wilson reads in (or into) the text an elaborate story of abridgement, expansion, and revision, and finds in three long expositions of pre-history (i. ii. 1-186, 187-320, II. i. 1-190) evidence that 'At some stage of its evolution *The Tempest* was in all likelihood a loosely constructed drama, like *The Winter's Tale*

Jones before they quarrelled: cf. *The Masque of Blackness*, "The Masquers were placed in a great concaue shell, like mother of pearle, curiously made to moue on those waters, and rise with the billow' (folio 1616, sig. 4F3^v). We know that Crane transcribed at least one masque of Jonson's (F. P. Wilson in *TLS*, 8 Nov. 1941).

and *Pericles* in which the pre-history was represented on the stage. Chambers accounts for this peculiarity more simply as 'due to an attempt, unusual with Shakespeare, to secure unity of time'.⁴ Wilson rejects the masque (and some other passages) as un-Shakespearian, and so do certain other critics, though they cannot make up their minds whether the intruder is Beaumont, Chapman, or Heywood. Perhaps Chambers is right in supposing the admitted difference of style to be a deliberate attempt to distinguish the masque from the rest of the piece, such as is evident in the players' play in *Hamlet*. But even Chambers confesses to doubts respecting the authenticity of I. ii. 298-304, 317, n. i. 297-305, and iv. i. 106-17, lines of which, indeed, anyone would be glad to see Shakespeare relieved.

⁴ It would not be surprising if Shakespeare had tired of the sprawling structure of such plays as *The Winter's Tale* and *Pericles* and, with a belated regard for Sidney's well-known strictures in *The Defence of Poesy* (*Arcadia*, 1598, p. 514), had set out to show how a chronicle history could be presented in an action confined to a few hours and to one small island.

XXXVI. HENRY THE EIGHTH. 1613

On Tuesday 29 June 1613, during an early, but not necessarily the first, performance at the Globe of *Henry VIII* or *Allis True* as it seems also to have been called, the wad from one of the chambers discharged on the stage (see i. iv. 49) lodged in the thatched roof of the galleries, and the theatre was burnt to the ground in an hour or two, though of the contents nothing perished, we are told, but a few forsaken cloaks.

Folio.—Despite strong dissent in some quarters, most critics follow Spedding (1850) in dividing *Henry VIII* between Shakespeare and Fletcher, and are even agreed on the whole upon their respective shares.¹ In a spectacular play there are bound to be long descriptive stage-directions, and the most important of these are derived more or less directly from Holinshed: from whom incidentally comes knowledge of the 'two great Siluer Fillers' borne before the Cardinals at the trial (n. iv. i).² 'The Order of the Coronation' of Anne Bulleyn (iv. i. 36) is less a direction than a programme of the procession that continues to pass over the stage during the ensuing conversation between spectators. The direction for the trial occupies 18 lines in F, for the coronation 25 lines, for Katherine's vision (iv. ii. 82, not, of course, from Holinshed) 14 lines, for the council (v. iii. i) 7 lines, for the christening (v. v. i) 10 lines. These are not particularly characteristic; but the remaining directions are also full and conform to what we have come to expect of the late Shakespeare. How far, in a collaborated play, they are actually his must of course remain uncertain, but many of them might well be. It is possible that Shakespeare provided an unusually elaborate synopsis on which he and Fletcher worked, and that this already contained the more important directions—Chambers

¹ A recent contribution to the discussion is that by A. C. Partridge, *The Problem of Henry VIII Reopened* (Cambridge, Bowes and Bowes, 1949), in which a study of certain linguistic forms is shown to indicate dual authorship and to support in general Spedding's division.

² Not, in fact, from the account of the trial, but from a description of Wolsey's 'order in going to Westminster hall daillie in the tearme'. It appears to have been Wolsey who substituted silver-gilt columns for the traditional mace.

remarks that 'Shakespeare starts most of the themes' and leaves them to Fletcher to work out—or it is possible—if Chambers is right in thinking that 'Some kind of collaboration, even if Shakespeare was at a distance, is more plausible than revision'—that when the several scenes had been written they were entrusted to Shakespeare to fit together and that he then supplied the bulk of the directions to suit his own notions of production. Apart from the long spectacular descriptions the more significant directions are these: i. i. i 'Enter the Duke of Norfolke at one doore. At the other, the Duke of Buckingham, and the Lord Aburgauenny'; 115 'Enter Cardinall Wolsey, the Purse borne before him, certaine of the Guard, and two Secretaries with Papers: The Cardinall in his passage, fixeth his eye on Buck[ing]ham, and Buckingham on him, both full of disdaine'; 198 'Enter Brandon, a Sergeant at Armes before him, and two or three of the Guard'; ii. I 'Cornets. Enter King Henry, leaning on the Cardinals shoulder, the Nobles, and Sir Thomas Louell: the Cardinall places himselfe vnder the Kings feete on his right side'; 9 'A noyse within crying roome for the Queene, vsher'd by the Duke of Norfolke. Enter the Queene, Norfolke and Suffblke: she kneels. King riseth from his State, takes her vp, kisses and placeth her by him'; iv, i 'Hoboies. A small Table vnder a State for the Cardinall, a longer Table for the Guests. Then Enter Anne Bullen, and diuers other Ladies, & Gentlemen, as Guests at one Doore; at an other Doore enter Sir Henry Guilford'; 35 'Hoboyes. Enter Cardinall Wolsey, and takes his State'; 49 'Drum and Trumpet, Chambers dischargd'; 60 'All rise, and Tables remou'd'; 64 'Hoboyes. Enter King and others as Maskers, habited like Shepheards, vsher'd by the Lord Chamberlaine. They passe directly before the Cardinall, and gracefully salute him'; 74 'Choose Ladies, King and An. Bullen'; 76 'Musicke, Dance'; 81 'Whisper'; 108 'Exeunt with Trumpets'; n. i. 55 'Enter Buckingham from his Arraignment, Tipstaues before him, the Axe with the edge towards him, Halberds on each side, accompanied with Sir Thomas Louell, Sir Nicholas Vaux, Sir Walter Sands, and common people, &c.'; ii. i 'Enter Lord Chamberlaine, reading this Letter'; 13 'Enter to the Lord Chamberlaine . . .'; 62 'Exit Lord Chamberlaine, and

the King drawes the Curtaine and sits reading pensiuely'; 74 'Enter Wolsey and Campeius with a Commission'; 121 'Walkes and whispers'; iv. 12 'The Queene makes no answer, rises out of her Chaire, goes about the Court, comes to the King, and kneeles at his Feete. Then speakes'; 121 'She Curtsies to the King, and offers to depart'; 241 'Exeunt, in manner as they enter'd'; in. i. I 'Enter Queene and her Women as at worke'; 23 'Enter the two Cardinalls, Wolsey & Campian [sic]'; ii. 106 'Enter King, reading of a Scedule'; 135 'King takes his Seat, whispers Louell, who goes to the Cardinal!'; 203 'Exit King, frowning vpon the Cardinall, the Nobles throng after him smiling, and whispering'; 228 'Enter to Woolsey . . .'; 349 'Exeunt all but Wolsey'; 372 'Enter Cromwell, standing amazed'; Iv. i. I 'Enter two Gentlemen, meeting one another'; 56 'Enter a third Gentleman'; ii. i 'Enter Katherine Dowager, sicke, lead betweene Griffith, her Gentleman Vsher, and Patience her Woman'; 80 'Sad and solemne Musicke'; 82 (end) 'The Musicke continues'; 95 'Musicke ceases'; 173 'Exeunt leading Katherine'; v. i. i 'Enter Gardiner Bishop of Winchester, a Page with a Torch before him, met by Sir Thomas Louell'; 86 'Louel seemes to stay'; ii. 20 'Enter the King, and Buts, at a Windowe aboue'; iii. 8 'Cranmer approaches the Councell Table'; 114 'Enter King frowning on them, takes his Seate'; iv. I 'Noyse and Tumult within: Enter Porter and his man'; v. i (end) 'The Troope passe once about the Stage, and Garter speakes'.

Entrances and exits are virtually complete. In i. ii Wolsey is of course accompanied by his Secretaries (one of whom he addresses at 1. 102) as at i. i. 115, though they are not mentioned, and Lovel's re-entry with the Old Lady at v. i. 153 is unmarked. Momentary absences of the Lord Chamberlain at i. iv. 60 and of Sir Anthony Denny at v. i. 83 are ignored. (It may be observed that editors persist in making a character exit and re-enter with another when all he does is to go to the door and admit him.) Nor is there ever any irregularity in the designation of characters. Henry is 'King Henry' on his first appearance, then always 'King', very seldom 'the King'. Wolsey is 'Cardinall Wolsey', seldom plain 'Wolsey' (once 'Woolsey'), or 'the Cardinall' (and always 'Car/ or 'Card.' as speaker), Cardinal Campeius (misprinted 'Cam-

pion' at III. i. 23) being always distinguished by name. Katharine is regularly 'Queene' till after the divorce, when (iv. ii. i) she becomes 'Katherine Dowager' (with the prefix 'Kath.'). Anne does not appear after her marriage.

The copy for F was clearly a carefully prepared manuscript, in whose hand or hands there is no evidence to show. It could have been used as a prompt-book, but there is no indication that it was. There is naturally a full division into acts and scenes. Modern editors make two scenes of what in F is the continuous v. ii. According to the direction it is not even a case of dramatic *enjambement* by means of the traverse: 'A Councell Table brought in with Chayres and Stooles, and placed vnder the State'. Then 'Enter Lord Chancellour' and other members of the council. The characters already on the stage join them without exit. Why this clumsy procedure should be indicated is hard to say: one would suppose that at the Globe there must have been a 'discovery'.³

3 Compare 2 *Henry VI*, III. ii. 146, where the authoritative text (F) has 'Bed put forth', whereas the report (Q) indicates a discovery.

SUMMARY

It may be of interest to glance back over the conclusions reached in the present chapter. It must not, of course, be forgotten that while all the results are conjectural, some are more conjectural than others; nevertheless, put dogmatically and stripped of qualifications and dubieties previously expressed, the following statements may be accepted as in the main representing current critical opinion.

2, 3 *Henry VI.*—Q and O, reports: F from author's (or authors') fair copies originally used as prompt-books and later revised, defects being made good from Q and O.

i *Henry VI.*—F from a similar manuscript.

Richard III.—Q, communal reconstruction for provincial prompt-book: F from Q3 and Q6 collated with foul papers.

The Comedy of Errors.—F from foul papers.

Titus Andronicus.—Q from foul papers: F from a quarto that had been supplemented in manuscript and used as a prompt-book.

The Taming of the Shrew.—F from foul papers.

The Two Gentlemen of Verona.—F from a transcript (by Crane) of the prompt-book.

Love's Labour's Lost.—Q from foul papers: F from Q.

Romeo and Juliet.—Qi, report: Q2 from foul papers with some use of Qi: F from Q3.

Richard II.—Q from foul papers: F from Q3 and Q5 either used as a prompt-book or collated with it.

A Midsummer-Night's Dream.—Q from foul papers: F from Q2 with some reference to the prompt-book.

King John.—F from author's copy that had perhaps served as the prompt-book.

The Merchant of Venice.—Q from foul papers: F from Q with some reference to the prompt-book.

1 *Henry IV.*—Q from foul papers: F from Q5 with some literary editing.

2 *Henry IV.*—Q from foul papers: F from Q collated with the prompt-book.

- Much Ado about Nothing*.—Q from foul papers: F from Q with some reference to the prompt-book.
- Henry F.*—Q, report: F from foul papers.
- Julius Caesar*.—F from transcript of the prompt-book (which may have been the author's fair copy).
- As you Like it*.—F from the prompt-book (or a transcript of it).
- Twelfth Night*.—F from the prompt-book (or a transcript of it).
- Hamlet*.—Qi, report (influenced by earlier play): Qz from foul papers with some use of Q1: F from Q2 collated with the prompt-book (or a transcript of it).
- The Merry Wives of Windsor*.—Q, report: F from a transcript (by Crane) of the prompt-book.
- Troilus and Cressida*.—Q from a private transcript by the author: F from Q collated with foul papers.
- All's Well that Ends Well*.—F from foul papers.
- Measure for Measure*.—F from a transcript (by Crane) of foul papers.
- Othello*.—Q from a private transcript of foul papers: F from Q collated with the prompt-book.
- King Lear*.—Q from a careless transcript of foul papers memorially contaminated: F from Q collated with the prompt-book.
- Macbeth*.—F from the prompt-book, which may have undergone alteration (or a transcript of it).
- Antony and Cleopatra*.—F from foul papers carefully prepared for production.
- Coriolanus*.—F from foul papers carefully prepared for production.
- Timon of Athens*.—F from foul papers left unfinished.
- Cymbeline*.—F from the prompt-book, which retained a good deal from foul papers (or a transcript of it).
- The Winter's Tale*.—F from a transcript (by Crane) of foul papers.
- The Tempest*.—F from an edited transcript (by Crane) of foul papers carefully prepared for production.
- Henry VIII*.—F from foul papers carefully prepared for production (or a transcript of them).

Take the quartos first. There exist six recognized 'bad' quartos: 2 *Henry FI*, 3 *Henry VI* (actually an octavo), *Romeo*

and Juliet Qi, *Henry 7*, *The Merry Wives*, and *Hamlet Qi*. All these are reports, that is to say, memorial reconstructions of stage performances. There was probably also a 'bad' quarto of *Love's Labour's Lost*, but no copy is now known. Of these texts a minimum of use was made in the Folio. A few defects in the manuscripts of 2 and 3 *Henry VI* were made good from the quarto and octavo: also the 'good' quartos of *Romeo and Juliet* (Q2) and *Hamlet* (Q2), on which F relied in the one case completely and in the other partially, owed something to their 'bad' predecessors, though of this the Folio editors were doubtless unaware. The 'good' quarto of *Love's Labour's Lost*, closely reprinted in F, may also have been partly dependent on the 'bad' one.

Among the fourteen quartos generally classed as 'good', two stand apart as containing texts markedly divergent from and inferior to F: these are *Richard III* and *King Lear*. The former is in fact a reported text, but since it was reconstructed from memory by the company of players as a whole when in need of a provincial prompt-book, it is very different from the recognized 'bad' quartos. *King Lear* was printed from a very careless and contaminated transcript of foul papers, which we may suppose to have been surreptitiously obtained for publication. (It was probably the only case of the sort, the texts of the 'bad' quartos having been originally obtained for provincial acting and having only later found their way to press.) Of the rest, two were printed from private transcripts of foul papers: in the case of *Troilus and Cressida* the transcript was made by the author himself (and contained some alteration), in that of *Othello* by a scribe unconnected with the theatre. The remaining ten quartos, *Titus Andronicus*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Romeo and Juliet* Q2, *Richard II*, *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, *The Merchant of Venice*-, i and 2 *Henry IV*, *Much Ado*, and *Hamlet* Q2, were all printed from foul papers, but in *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*, and possibly in *Love's Labour's Lost*, some use was made of the previous 'bad' quarto.

Turning to the Folio we note that in every case in which a 'good' quarto of the play had already appeared, a quarto, not always the earliest, was probably used as copy, though this is more obvious in some cases than in others and some

difference of opinion remains respecting 2 *Henry IV*' *Othello*' and *Hamlet*. The quartos of *Love's Labour 's Lost* and *Romeo and Juliet* were reprinted almost as they stood; i *Henry IV* received some literary editing; in the case of *Much Ado*' *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, and *The Merchant of Venice* some reference was made to the prompt-book in the matter of stage-directions, and 2 *Henry IV*' *Hamlet*' and *Othello* were fully collated with it; so also was *Richard II* unless it was printed from a quarto that had itself done duty as such; *Troilus and Cressida* was, rather unfortunately and for a special reason, collated with foul papers; the unsatisfactory quartos of *Richard III* and *King Lear* were thoroughly revised, the former by comparison with foul papers, the latter with the prompt-book; *Titus Andronicus* was printed from a quarto that had been used as a prompt-book (and had been supplemented in manuscript) and so possibly was *Richard II*.

Lastly, we come to plays that appeared for the first time in the Folio. Five, the first four and the last of the Comedies as they stand in the collection, were printed from transcripts made by Ralph Crane, *The Two Gentlemen* and *The Merry Wives* of the prompt-book, *Measure for Measure*' *The Winter's Tale*' and *The Tern-pest* of foul papers. Ignoring the question of intervening transcripts (which in the case of prompt-copies are perhaps always to be assumed) we find that seven Folio texts have the official prompt-book behind them, namely *The Two Gentlemen*' *The Merry Wives*' *As you Like it*, *Twelfth Night*, *Julius Caesar*', *Macbeth*, and *Cymbeline*: in the last the prompt-book retained more than usual of the features of the foul papers; that of *Macbeth* may have undergone considerable alteration; that of *Julius Caesar* may have been the author's fair copy. Such too seems to have been the copy from which *King John* was printed, but it is less certain that it had been used as a prompt-book. Author's or authors' fair copy that had once served as prompt-books probably also lies behind the three parts of *Henry VI*; these, however, were not the current prompt-books but old ones that had been used as the basis of revision.

Eleven Folio texts were printed from foul papers (or in some cases transcripts of them), namely *The Comedy of Errors*' *The Taming of the Shrew*' *Henry V*' *All's Well*' *Measure for*

Measure, *Timon*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus*, *The Winter's Tale*, *The Tempest*, and *Henry VIII* those of *Timon* were unfinished; those of *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus*, *The Tempest*, and *Henry VIII* had been elaborately prepared for production. All foul papers, whether used for quartos or for the Folio, were liable to contain annotations by the book-keeper.

Summarizing still further we find that foul papers lie behind thirteen 'good' quartos (and therefore ultimately behind the Folio texts), namely *Titus Andronicus*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Romeo and Juliet* Q2, *Richard II*, *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, *The Merchant of Venice*, i and 2 *Henry IV*, *Much Ado*, *Hamlet* Q2, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Othello* (the last two through private transcripts), and *King Lear* (through a contaminated transcript); and also directly behind a further eleven Folio texts, namely *The Comedy of Errors*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Henry V*, *All's Well*, *Measure for Measure*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus*, *Timon*, *The Winter's Tale*, *The Tempest*, and *Henry VIII*. Foul papers were also used for collation with quartos of *Richard III* and *Troilus and Cressida*. A prompt-book of some sort lies behind one quarto, *Richard III* (provincial), and twelve Folio texts, namely I, 2, and 3 *Henry VI* (subsequently revised), *Titus Andronicus* (in the shape of a quarto), *The Two Gentlemen*, *King John*, *Julius Caesar*, *As you Like it*, *Twelfth Night*, *The Merry Wives*, *Macbeth* (altered), and *Cymbeline*. Prompt-copy was also used to collate quartos of *Richard II* (unless the quarto was itself a prompt-book), 2 *Henry IV*, *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, and *Othello*, and some reference was made to it in connexion with *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *Much Ado*. Thus foul papers come somehow into the picture in the case of twenty-five plays, and a prompt-book in the case of twenty-one. Private transcripts appear in the history of *Troilus and Cressida* and *Othello*, and a printed quarto was used as a prompt-book in the case of *Titus Andronicus* and perhaps of *Richard II*.

Of the thirty-six plays in the Folio, twenty-two were printed there for the first time, at any rate in a reputable text, and in each instance from a playhouse manuscript. Fourteen plays had previously appeared in what commonly

pass for 'good' quartos, and all these probably were used as copy for the Folio. But only ten of them had been printed from regular playhouse manuscripts. Two, *Troilus and Cressida* and *Othello* had been printed from private transcripts, but while that of *Troilus* had been made, with some correction, by the author himself and was in consequence of particularly high authority, that of *Othello* was less trustworthy. The quartos of *Richard III* and *King Lear*, whatever their precise origin, contained manifestly corrupt texts. Of these facts the editors were fully aware, and they only allowed these four quartos to be used after they had been diligently compared with manuscripts in the theatre. Even some of the other quartos they only approved after similar comparison had been made. While, therefore, it is certain that many errors of one sort and another found their way into the Folio, no less certain is the general authority of the sources on which it drew. In eight cases the text was probably printed direct from Shakespeare's autograph copy, in another eleven cases from a quarto that had in its turn been so printed.

One cannot help being impressed by the variety of textual history revealed. The Folio editors appear to have had a considerable amount of material at their disposal and to have given some thought to their choice, and when they were in any way doubtful about the authenticity of the particular copy chosen, they endeavoured to remedy its defects. No doubt their choice was sometimes determined by considerations of convenience rather than textual merit, and their editorial activities may occasionally have been mistaken, but on the whole they performed their task in a reasonably conscientious manner and at times went to considerable trouble to provide their readers with what they believed to be an authentic text. Their worst critical errors were tampering with the text of *Troilus and Cressida* (and for this there may have been a special reason) and selecting an unoriginal manuscript of *Macbeth* supposing them to have had another at their disposal. No doubt, had they printed throughout directly from manuscripts in their possession instead of sometimes relying on quartos and transcripts, the Folio would have had an authority even greater than it now possesses; and had they surrendered their prompt-books to the printer in place of

foul papers, the text would have presented fewer difficulties to the reader, though it might have been less authentic and to the textual detective less interesting. They had, however, to consider to some extent the convenience of the printer on the one hand and on the other their responsibility as trustees of the company's play-books, and it would be presumptuous as well as ungrateful on our part to blame them for acting as they did.

VI. *The Printing*

WE owe our knowledge of the strange eventful history of the printing of the First Folio mainly to the acute and patient investigation of E. E. Willoughby, whose exhaustive monograph on the subject, published by the Bibliographical Society some twenty years ago, is a remarkable example of pioneer work that for much of the field it covers seems likely to prove definitive. The present chapter does little more than summarize Willoughby's conclusions.¹

Before proceeding, however, it will be well to explain a few points of typographical technique that may be unfamiliar to non-bibliographical readers but a knowledge of which is essential for the understanding of the problems involved and the methods by which they have been solved.²

In the earlier seventeenth century all printing was done on a wooden hand-press and on hand-made paper. The paper was manufactured in separate sheets of several sizes and qualities, and the printing of each side of the sheet was a separate operation. The type needed for one side, one 'forme' as it is called, was locked in an iron frame or 'chase' and placed on the press where the impression was taken. This was the first operation of printing. If only one press was in use, the sheets as they came off it would be stacked or hung up to dry. If two presses were available, each sheet as it was 'printed' on the first might at once be transferred to the second, on which the other forme of type had been laid, and so printed on the other side, or 'perfected' as it is called.³ The term 'forme' is applied alike to the blocks of type and to the impressions made from them, and the two formes required for the completely printed sheet are known as the 'outer' and 'inner' respectively.⁴

¹ See Note A on p. 464 and postscript to the Preface on p. vii.

² For more detailed information on technical points the reader should consult McKerrow's *Introduction to Bibliography*, particularly chapter ii.

³ It is here assumed that a sheet could be perfected immediately after printing. It has sometimes been thought, for example by McKerrow (p. 21), that the sheets had to be dried between the two operations, but this is a mistake (Bald, *Evidence and Inference*, pp. 178-81), as McKerrow himself came to recognize.

* The outer forme is the one that includes the first page of the sheet, the inner the

Between seventeenth-century and modern printing the operational difference that has the most notable bibliographical results is probably the fact that in early times type was not as a rule kept standing. Most printers possessed only a limited stock. The usual method in setting up the matter for a sheet or for a gathering (if there was more than one sheet in the quire) was to make up the type into pages and impose it in formes as composition proceeded, and to start printing immediately with the first forme to be completed. Press-work would then go on while the other formes were being prepared, and as soon as the required number of impressions of a forme had been taken, the type in it would be distributed in preparation for further composition. In the case of a folio in sixes, that is, one in which three sheets are sewn together, making a quire or gathering of six leaves or twelve pages,¹ printing can begin as soon as the seventh page, completing the inner forme of the inner sheet, has been imposed. As soon as the eighth page is ready the inner sheet can be perfected by printing the outer forme, and so on from the middle of the quire outwards. Thus in printing each gathering the normal procedure was to begin with the inner sheet, and in each sheet for the printing of the inner forme to precede that of the outer.²

So much for general considerations of seventeenth-century printing. But it is certain details more intimately connected with the typography of the First Folio that have enabled bibliographers, and Willoughby in particular, to unravel its history.³ The text of the plays in this volume is printed in double columns, and the columns are surrounded by rules, which are double at the top of the page, enclosing

one that includes the second page. Thus in a folio the outer contains pages i and 4, the inner pages 2 and 3; in a quarto the outer contains pages i, 4, 5, 8, the inner 2, 3, 6, 7; and so on.

¹ The quire of six leaves is clearly the basis of the Shakespeare First Folio, and is indeed the most usual. It occurs regularly throughout the collection of Jonson's *Works* of 1616. On the other hand, in the Beaumont and Fletcher *Comedies and Tragedies* of 1647 the normal gathering is of four leaves. The later Shakespeare folios of 1632, 1663-4, and 1685 are all predominantly in sixes.

² It should be said at once that this order was not always followed in the First Folio: Jaggard must have had sufficient type to afford on occasions a less economical method of working. (Willoughby, p. 45¹; Hinman, *Proof-sheet*, pp. 105-6.)

³ They are fully explained by Willoughby, chapter ii.

the headline consisting of the running-title and the pagination. These rules were printed from thin strips of brass, which easily got broken or bent with use, but might also be straightened again. Now in making up the pages of text the compositor did not take a fresh set of strips for each forme or sheet or quire but left the old ones standing as they were, merely fitting them round fresh blocks of type. He also left the running-titles standing and used them over and over again in the several quires of the same play. And he did more than this. The running-titles of successive plays were often partly the same—for instance those of the tragedies mostly begin with the words '*The Tragedie of*—and when this was so the compositor left as much as he could of the headline standing. Furthermore, the act and scene headings that run across both columns at the beginning of each play could, and often were, kept standing and were merely shifted from one to another;¹ and even the lesser act and scene headings confined to one column were sometimes moved unaltered from place to place. For a pair of pages the box rules and running-titles together constitute what may be called a 'skeleton forme', which often persists from quire to quire, surrounding different blocks of type.² Thus when printing proceeded smoothly we find the skeleton formes repeating themselves in orderly fashion from quire to quire; and when this orderly repetition is broken, and fresh rules are introduced and running-titles are reset, we may infer that there was some disturbance or interruption in the work. It must, however, be remembered that continuous, if slight, changes occurred in the skeleton as it was shifted from forme to forme, so that its appearance at the end of a run was sensibly different from

¹ There are only six variant forms of the heading in the volume, and these represent only four completely different settings (Willoughby, pp. 15-16):

A. <i>Actus primus, Scena prima.</i>	In <i>Tempest</i> to <i>Much Ado</i> .
A', <i>crctus primus.</i>	In <i>L.L.L.</i> to <i>M. of V.</i>
A". <i>eActus primus. Sczna Trima.</i>	In <i>A.y.L.i.</i> to <i>AWs Well</i> .
B. <i>Actus "Primus, Scana Trima.</i>	In <i>Twelfth N.</i> , <i>K. John</i> , <i>Rich. II.</i>
C. <i>'Actus 'Primus. Scaena Trima.</i>	In <i>Winters Tale</i> , <i>i Hen. IV</i> to <i>Hen. VIII</i> , <i>Coriolanus</i> to <i>Cymbeline</i> .
D. <i>Actus "Primus. Scæna Prima.</i>	In <i>Troilus</i> .

² In some quires there is only one skeleton forme, which is repeated six times; in others there are more than one. The columns of type are also separated by a rule, but this forms no part of the skeleton forme, being removed along with the type.

what it had been at the beginning. It follows that if, say, three sections of the volume were printed without break, it is nevertheless possible to determine unambiguously the order in which they were printed, though this may not be the order in which they now stand.

Lastly, a word must be said about ornaments. These were for the most part wood-blocks, and in the course of use they naturally sometimes got damaged, so that cracks or worm-holes or small breaks may show in the impressions. And since the damaged state is of course later than the perfect state, we are often able, from a study of the ornaments, to say that one book must have been printed before, or after, another, or to determine the order in which different parts of a book passed through the press. The evidence needs, it is true, to be used with circumspection, for an apparent break may be due to imperfect inking, and on the other hand heavy inking and pressure may disguise a real defect in the block; moreover, small cracks tend to open and close with the degree of dampness and the tightness of the locking-up.¹ Nevertheless, if a sufficient number of impressions are compared in a sufficient number of copies, the evidence may be accepted as reliable.

Bearing these considerations in mind we can tackle the history of the printing of the First Folio as it has been disentangled by a process of bibliographical detection.

The collation, or register of signatures, which describes the bibliographical make-up of the Folio, is as follows:

A⁶(AI + I) [B]²; A-Bb⁶ Cc²; a-g⁶ gg⁸ h-v⁶ x⁴; [I, 2]
 ¶⁶ ¶¶⁶ ¶¶¶⁶ i aa-ff⁶ gg² Gg⁶ hh⁶ kk-bbb^{6,2}

¹ For an actual instance in which evidence of the sort proved misleading see Greg, *False Dates*, pp. 384-5, and Pollard, *Folios and Quartos*, p. 105.

² An unsigned leaf is inserted after A i in the preliminaries. The second preliminary quire (one sheet only) is actually unsigned, and so are the two detached leaves before the arbitrary signatures in the last section. In the gathering Gg in the same section the first leaf is signed 'Gg', the second and third 'gg'; the former has here been assumed to be correct and the latter misprints in order that the quire may be distinguished from its neighbour and from another anomalous quire 'gg' in the previous section. There are several other misprints in the signatures. That on Vi (normally simply 'V') is in some copies misprinted 'Vv', a3 is misprinted 'Aa3', m3 is sometimes misprinted 'l3', bb2 is misprinted 'Bb2', nni-2 are misprinted 'Nn' and 'Nnz', ooi is misprinted 'Oo', 002 is left unsigned, tt2 is misprinted 'tt3', xx is throughout misprinted 'x', yy2-3 are misprinted 'yz' and 'y3'. After the unpagged preliminaries each section has a distinct pagination: these begin on Ai (1-303), ai (1-232), and

After the preliminaries the register falls into three sections, divided above by semicolons, containing the Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies respectively.

In detail the contents of the volume are:

PRELIMINARIES:

sigs. A⁶ [B²] with one leaf inserted after Ai, unpagcd.

COMEDIES:

The Tempest, sigs. Ai^r-B4^r, pp. 1-19.

The Two Gentlemen of Verona, sigs. 647—Di^v, pp. 20—38.

The Merry Wives of Windsor, sigs. D2^r-E6^v, pp. 39-60.

Measure for Measure, sigs. Fi^r-G6^v, pp. 61—84.

The Comedy of Errors, sigs. Hi^r-I2^v, pp. 85-100.

Much Ado about Nothing, sigs. I3^r-Lr, pp. 101-21.

Love's Labour's Lost, sigs. Li^v-M6^v, pp. 122-44.

A Midsummer Night's Dream, sigs. Ni^r-C'3^v, pp. 145—62.

The Merchant of Venice, sigs. O4^r-Q2^v, pp. 163-84.

As you Like it, sigs. Q3^r-S2^r, pp. 185-207.

The Taming of the Shrew, sigs. S2^v-Vi^r, pp. 208—29.

All's Well that Ends Well, sigs. Vi^v-Yi^v, pp. 230-54.

Twelfth Night or Whatyou Will, sigs. Y2^r-Z6^r (Z6^v blank),

PP-²55-75-

The Winter's Tale, sigs. Aai^r-Cc2^r (Cc2^v blank), pp. 277-303-

HISTORIES:

King John, sigs. ai^r-b5^v, pp. 1—22.

Richard II, sigs. b6^r-d5^r, pp. 23-45.

1 *Henry IV*, sigs. d5^v-f6^r, pp. 46-73 (omitting 47-48).

2 *Henry IV*, sigs. f6^v-g6^v, ggi^r-8^v, pp. 74-100 (+ two unnumbered).

Henry V, sigs. hi^r-k2^r, pp. 69-95.

1 *Henry VI*, sigs. k2^v-m2^r, pp. 96—119.

2 *Henry VI*, sigs. rri2^v-o3^v, PP- 120-46.

3 *Henry VI*, sigs. 04^r-q4^v, pp. 147~7²-

aai (1-399, but jumping from 156 to 257): the arbitrarily signed quires at the beginning of the last section are unpagcd, except for the numbers 79 and 80 on the second leaf. But there are many misprints and irregularities in the numbering, and these often differ in different copies: the last page is always numbered 993 by mistake for

Richard III) sigs. q5^r-t2^v, pp. 173-204.

Henry VIII, sigs. t3^r-X4^v, pp. 205-32.

TRAGEDIES:

Troilus and Cressida, 2 leaves unsigned, sigs., ¶i^r-6^v, ¶ ¶ i^r-6^v, imfi^r (TOi^v blank), unpagged (except 79-80 on the second unsigned leaf).

Coriolanus, sigs. aai^r-cc3^v, pp. 1-30.

Titus Andronicus, sigs. cc4^r-ee2^v, pp. 31-52.

Romeo and Juliet, sigs. ee3^r-gg2^v, Ggi^r, pp. 53-79.

Timon of Athens, sigs. Ggi^v-6^v, hhi^r-6^r (hh6^v blank), pp. 80-98 (+ one unnumbered).

Julius Caesar, sigs. kki^r-ll5^v, pp. 109-30.

Macbeth, sigs. 116^r-nn4^r, pp. 131-51.

Hamlet, sigs. nn4^v-qqi^v, pp. 152-282 (misprinted 280, omitting 157-256).

King Lear, sigs. qq2^r-ss3^r, pp. 283-309.

Othello, sigs. ss3^v-w6^r, pp. 310-39.

Antony and Cleopatra, sigs. w6^v-zz2^v, pp. 340-68.

Cymbeline, sigs. zz3^r-bbb6^r (bbb6^v blank), pp. 369-399 (misprinted 993).

Most of the breaks in the printing have left obvious traces in the dislocation of the regular sequence of signatures, though not, as we shall see in a moment, the most important interruption of all.

The first irregularity to attract notice is at the end of the Comedies. *Twelfth Night* happened to end on Z6, and *The Winter's Tale* therefore naturally began a second alphabet on Aai. This was the normal sequence of signatures. But *Twelfth Night* did not quite fill quire Z: it ended on Z6^r, and the verso was left blank. This is not normal in the Folio.¹ *The Tempest*, *Much Ado*, *As you Like it*, and *The Taming of the Shrew* all end on recto pages, and in each case the next play begins on the verso.² It was clearly the intention of the

¹ On the other hand, in the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1647 every play begins on a recto page, and there are consequently a number of blank versos. This enabled the volume to be split up into its component parts, and indeed we find some of the plays advertised separately for sale.

² The same is true of the other sections. The only blank pages (except at the close of sections) are those at the end of *Troilus* and *Timon*, both connected with manifest dislocations.

printer to avoid leaving blanks. The inference is that when quire Z was printed off the section was believed to be complete, and that the addition of *The Winter's Tale* was an afterthought, or at any rate that the play was not at the moment available. We have confirmation of this in a break of continuity in the skeleton formes and in the state of the ornament at the end of the play, which shows it to have been printed at an appreciably later date. This is a matter to which we shall have to return in a moment.¹

Continuity of the skeleton formes and other criteria show that after *Twelfth Night* work proceeded immediately with *King John* and *Richard II*. But at the end of quire b, with only two pages of the latter play printed, an interruption occurred. There is a break-up of the skeleton formes, and running-titles and act and scene headings are reset. The page numbers, which up to this point are of an unusually large fount (the same, in point of fact, as that used for the dates in the 1619 collection),² are henceforth smaller; and, most significant of all, experts are able to detect a difference in the appearance of the type,³ which henceforth shows more signs of wear, proving that some considerable time must have elapsed before the resumption of work, during which it had been used for printing other books. Clearer, however, to the eye of the uninitiated is the evidence of the tail-ornament that figures at the end of many plays throughout the volume.⁴

This, which may be called the satyr ornament from the grotesque figure that occupies a central place in the design, appears at the end of twenty-four out of the thirty-six plays in the First Folio—wherever, indeed, there was convenient

¹ Willoughby, p. 12. We know that in the summer of 1623 the prompt-book of *The Winter's Tale* was lost, for on 19 Aug. Herbert licensed 'An olde playe called Winter's Tale, formerly allowed of by Sir George Bucke ... on Mr. Hemmings his worde that there was nothing profane added . . . though the allowed booke was missinge' (*Variorum* 1821, iii. 229; Adams, *Herbert*, pp. 18, 25). This, however, seems to have been probably a couple of years after the printing of the rest of the Comedies and eight months or more after the addition of *The Winter's Tale* (see p. 461): the relevance of Herbert's record is therefore doubtful.

² See pp. n ff.

³ Regarding the type, a fount of Dutch origin, see Horace Hart's memorandum in Lee's *Introduction* (pp. xxii-xxiv) and Pollard, *Folios and Quartos* (p. 132).

⁴ The ornaments and ornamental initials in the First Folio are fully listed by Pollard, *Folios and Quartos*, pp. 132-3, but this is the only one of any bibliographical interest.

room for it. Now at the end of the book this ornament shows two imperfections: both are in the top line, one a break about half an inch from the right-hand end, the other a small dent immediately above the left-hand cornucopia.¹ The first of these is found in every impression of the block throughout the volume,² and is therefore of no interest. But the other appears in some impressions only, being the result of an accident that happened to the block in the course of the printing, and its absence or presence distinguishes what may be called state 2 and state 3 of the ornament, to distinguish them from the original undamaged state i. State 2 appears six times in the Comedies (the last at the end of *Twelfth Night*) and also at the end of *King John*, the first of the Histories. State 3 is found at the end of *The Winter's Tale*, next at the end of i *Henry T*⁷, and thenceforth throughout the volume, seventeen times in all. It follows that the accident happened between the printing of *King John* and that of the later plays, among which is to be reckoned *The Winter's Tale*.

Both states 2 and 3 of the ornament likewise appear in two other books upon which Jaggard was at work at the same time, and which were advertised in the same issue of Bill's *Catalogus uniuersalis* that contains the earliest mention of the First Folio, that, namely, of books to be published between April and October 1622.³ These are Augustine Vincent's *Discovery of Errors in the First Edition of the Catalogue of Nobility by Ralph Brooke* and Andre Favyn's *Theatre of Honour and Knighthood*: of these, Vincent's duly appeared with the date 1622; Favyn's is dated 1623 and must therefore have been delayed, like Shakespeare's. Vincent's book has two examples of the ornament, state 2 on sig. Nnnn3^v, and state 3 on sig. Xxxx3^r: Favyn's has state 2 at the end of

¹ That is, the right and left of a person looking at an impression of the block.

² This statement may need qualifying. In its earliest appearances, at the end of *Measure for Measure* and *The Comedy of Errors*, the block shows only very slight sign of damage (J. P. P. Pafford reports, privately, that in the copy of the Folio in the Library of the University of London it is hardly perceptible, though according to the Oxford facsimile it is distinct in the Chatsworth copy). It is possible, therefore, that injury first occurred during the early pulls of the outer forme of the outer sheet of sig. G. The block was undamaged when Jaggard used it in the first edition of Ralph Brooke's *Catalogue and Succession of Kings &c.* in 1619.

³ See p. 3.

the list of contents¹ and of Book i, and state 3 at the end of Books 2, 5, 7, and 10. It follows that the second accident to the block most likely occurred during the interruption we have detected in the printing of *Richard II* (at the end of quire b), and that the plays showing state 2, together with the first Book of *The Theatre of Honour*, must have been printed before the later portion of *A Discovery of Errors*, in spite of the fact that this work is dated a year earlier than the other two.²

The explanation of these facts may best be given in Willoughby's own words (pp. 36-38),³

'In order to understand this strange procedure [in interrupting the printing of the Shakespeare Folio] we must consider Jaggard's relations with one of his clients. In 1619 he printed and published Ralph Brooke's *Catalogue and Succession of the Kings, Princes, Marquesses, Earls, and Viscounts of this Realm*. Jaggard evidently found Brooke a rather disagreeable person to deal with, for among other things he insisted on Jaggard's including two pages headed "Faults escaped in Printing, to be Corrected thus", which might seem to saddle the printer with errors clearly due to the author. Moreover, no sooner had the book appeared than it was discovered to contain, despite its claims to accuracy and authority, very serious shortcomings. Brooke's irascible temper had made him many enemies among his colleagues in the College of Heralds, who were eager to point out his errors and magnify the importance of certain misstatements concerning the family of the Earl Marshal.⁴ Irritated and perhaps alarmed by these criticisms, Brooke determined to issue at his own expense a second edition of his *Catalogue and Succession* [to

¹ Proving that the preliminaries were printed before the bulk of the book, which, indeed, there was nothing to prevent.

² Willoughby, pp. 35-36.

³ Willoughby first announced his theory in an article on 'An Interruption in the Printing of the First Folio' in *The Library*, Dec. 1928, ix. 262-6.

⁴ [Brooke had rendered himself vulnerable by acrimonious attacks on others. According to DNB it was after Camden's appointment as Clarenceux King of Arms in 1597 that Brooke issued, without date or stationer's name, 'A Discouerie of certaine Errours published in print in the much commended Britannia, 1594. Very preiudiciall to the discentes and successions of the auncient Nobility of this Realme. By Yorke Herault. *Quam quisque norit artem, in hac se exerceat*'. It started a bitter quarrel in the Heralds' Office.]

be printed by William Stansby], in which the errors of the first edition would be corrected and the blame for them laid on the printer. Jaggard was no doubt angry when he heard of Brooke's intention, for not only was his skill as a printer unjustly called in question, but of the five hundred copies which formed the first edition two hundred still remained "rotting by the walles" and would of course be unsaleable.

'Meanwhile the young Rouge Croix Pursuivant of Arms, Augustine Vincent, aided by other members of the College of Heralds, had prepared a lengthy set of notes upon the errors in the first edition of the *Catalogue and Succession*. In these he not only took Brooke severely to task, but proved that he and not the printer was to blame for the errors. Jaggard agreed to reprint Brooke's work along with Vincent's caustic commentary. The book was licensed by the Earl Marshal and was entered in the Stationers' Register on 29 October 1621. There is reason to believe that Jaggard desired to publish Vincent's *Discovery* before Stansby could finish the second edition of Brooke's *Catalogue*, but he was unable to carry out his intention. Brooke must have been alarmed at Jaggard's move, for, according to Jaggard [in a letter prefixed to Vincent's work], "hee poasted in such hast, night and day, but especially by night, to re-print at his owne charge, and the Printers perill, that vnauthorized Edition".

'If Brooke considered it necessary to "poast in such hast" to forestall the publication of Vincent's *Discovery* of his errors, we may be fairly confident that after 29 October 1621 Jaggard was pushing his book to completion with all possible speed. But, besides speed, accuracy was needful. Jaggard could not refute the accusation which appeared on the title-page of the second edition of Brooke's *Catalogue*, that the mistakes of the first edition were "fauts, committed by the Printer, in the time of the Authors sicknesse", by publishing a book which itself teemed with errors. The readiest way to attain both speed and accuracy would be to interrupt the work upon other books in hand—Favyn's *Theatre of Honour* and the First Folio—and devote himself and his staff to the completion of Vincent's controversial volume.'

This accounts neatly enough for the interruption of work on the Shakespeare Folio after quire b of the Histories, and

the registration of Vincent's *Discovery of Errors* on 29 October 1621 may be accepted as supplying a date for the interruption near enough for our purpose.¹ By that time 23 quires of the Comedies and 2 of the Histories had been completed; 25 quires in all, or 75 sheets.

Once work on the Shakespeare Folio was interrupted, Jaggard seems to have been in no great hurry to go on with it, for he printed at least two other substantial books in 1622, and it may not have been much before the end of that year that he again took the Folio in hand.²

On starting afresh Jaggard naturally resumed work on quire c of the unfinished *Richard II*, but he appears to have at once encountered fresh difficulties. For only one quire later there is again a break in continuity, and the skeleton formes, instead of being carried over from quire c to quire d, are found used in *The Winter's Tale* on quires Aa to Cc, and from that play are carried over to *Henry 7*, which begins on quire h—the remainder of *Richard II* and the two parts of *Henry IV* being left for future attention.

To account for this irregularity it has been pointed out that the rights in *Richard II* and i *Henry IV* were owned by Matthew Law, an important copy-holder who had not joined the Folio syndicate;³ and it has been suggested that he now raised objections to the inclusion of his plays in the collection.⁴ If so, Jaggard had no choice but to hold up the work pending a settlement. He therefore turned to *The Winters Tale*, a manuscript of which we may suppose had now become

¹ In the circumstances it is likely that Vincent obtained the allowance of 'the Earle of Arondell, Earle Marshall of England' to his work before handing the manuscript to Jaggard, and that Jaggard registered the copy as soon as received and began printing it forthwith.

² Willoughby (p. 39) thinks that it may have been 'irritation at Jaggard's decision to interrupt the printing of the Folio' that led the King's men to allow Thomas Walkley to print the first quarto of *Othello* in 1622. It is an attractive surmise; but *Othello* was entered at Stationers' Hall on 6 Oct. 1621, more than three weeks before Vincent's *Discovery*, and this seems a little early for the players to have known of Jaggard's intention.

³ See p. 68.

⁴ His absence from the syndicate is not altogether surprising, for there is reason to suspect that he was either short of capital or else not particularly interested in his Shakespearian copies, since in several instances he appears to have allowed the printer to bear the risk of an edition and contented himself with the subsidiary role of book-seller (see pp. 57-58). If he was uninterested it is perhaps curious that he should have raised objections: if on the other hand he was hard up he may have been tempted to stand out for better terms than the syndicate was willing to concede.

available, hoping that things would soon right themselves. When, however, this play was finished, Law still proved obdurate. Jaggard could not proceed with *Richard II* or i *Henry IV*' and he hesitated to start on 2 *Henry IV* so long as the fate of Part I was uncertain. (Law's other copy, *Richard III*, was still a comfortable way ahead.) The only thing to do was to calculate the amount of space needed for the three plays the printing of which was postponed and to proceed at once with *Henry V*' and this, as we have seen, is what Jaggard did.¹

After *Henry V* printing continued normally through the three parts of *Henry VI* as far as the end of quire o, after which a change in skeleton formes again indicates an interruption. It would seem that at this point differences with Law were composed, for instead of continuing with the remaining twenty pages of 3 *Henry VI*' Jaggard returned, as the continuity of the skeleton formes shows, to quire d of *Richard II* and went on to complete that play and to print the two parts of *Henry IV*.

What inducement Jaggard or the players offered Law to make him withdraw his opposition we do not know, and indeed we might even wonder whether this was the real cause of the interruption, were it not that, as we shall shortly see, something of the same sort appears to have happened in the Tragedies, over *Troilus and Cressida*' where it caused an even worse dislocation. As it is, the proposed explanation is the only plausible one that has been suggested, and as such it may be accepted with tolerable confidence.²

It now appeared, however, that Jaggard, perhaps because he based his calculation on the abnormally short play of *King John*, had seriously underestimated the space required for the relegated plays when he began *Henry V* on hi; for when he came to the end of quire g he still had more than half of 2 *Henry IV* in hand. His only course was to interpolate a quire of eight leaves, which he signed 'gg'. Of this the text of the play filled only fourteen pages, but Jaggard

¹ Willoughby, pp. 41-44.

² Willoughby (p. 41') has no difficulty in disposing of the suggestion that the trouble was over the inclusion of the deposition passage in Act IV of *Richard II* (which comes on dz).

was able to occupy the remaining two by printing the epilogue in large type on the recto and a list of characters on the verso of ggS.¹

Again there is continuity in the skeleton formes between the end of 2 *Henry IV* on gg and the resumed printing of 3 *Henry VI* on quire p. Work then continued normally through the two remaining Histories, *Richard III* and *Henry VIII* and (skipping *Troilus and Cressida*) through the first two Tragedies, *Coriolanus* and *Titus Andronicus* and on to near the end of the third, *Romeo and Juliet*. At this point, however, comes an obvious dislocation, for there is an anomalous one-sheet quire, gg², near the end of the play, which actually concludes on the recto of the first leaf of a quire Gg, the verso of which carries the first page of *Timon of Athens*. We are here helped by the survival of a cancelled leaf 'gg3' bearing on the recto a different setting of the last page of *Romeo and Juliet* and on the verso the first page of the text not of *Timon* but of *Troilus and Cressida* also in a different setting from that usually found.² It is therefore evident that, according to the original plan, it was *Troilus and Cressida* that was to have followed *Romeo and Juliet* in the section of Tragedies, but that for some reason this sequence had to be altered. Now *Troilus and Cressida* had been published in 1609 by Richard Bonian and Henry Walley, after entrance in the Stationers' Register,³ but in defiance, so it was claimed, of the King's players,³ and there can be little doubt that in 1623 the surviving partner, Walley, followed Law's lead by refusing Jaggard permission to reprint his copy. Jaggard acted as in the former case: pending a settlement he laid *Troilus* aside, estimated the space needed to complete the play, and went

¹ Willoughby, pp. 44-45. This interpolation of sixteen pages led, of course, to duplication in the pagination. But the duplication is more serious than it should have been owing to the fact that the printer not only miscalculated the space required for the relegated plays but also miscounted the pages, placing on hi' the number 69, whereas this page should properly have been 85. Thus, actually the numbers 69 to 100 appear twice over. The last two pages of 2 *Henry IV* are unnumbered.

² This leaf occurs, either in place of or in addition to the habitual cancellans, in the Toovey copy in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, and in the Burdett-Coutts and three other copies in the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington. Since the last page of *Romeo* and the first of *Troilus* usually found are mere reprints of the cancelled pages, the latter afford the substantive Folio text, and should be taken as copy in any critical edition based thereon. In each case, however, the true substantive text is a quarto.

³ See p. 339.

on with the printing of its successor, *Julius Caesar*, on quire kk. The continuity of printing is vouched for by the typographical carry-over from gg to kk, and thenceforth printing continued uninterrupted to the end of the volume. By the time this was reached Jaggard had despaired of coming to terms with Walley and had decided to replace *Troilus* by *Timon* (which may have been a late-comer like *The Winter's Tale*) and he therefore printed the colophon at the end of *Cymbeline*—a tragi-comedy that had somehow strayed into the section of Tragedies.¹

When Jaggard suspended work on *Troilus and Cressida* four leaves of a projected three-sheet gathering gg had been set up (containing the last five pages of *Romeo* and the first three of the text of *Troilus*) and the inner sheet (gg3, gg4, containing the last page of *Romeo* and the first three of *Troilus*) had been already printed off. Rather than keep type standing, Jaggard now printed offgg1 and gg2 (with their four pages of *Romeo*) as a single-sheet quire, gg². When it was decided that *Romeo* should be followed not by *Troilus* but by *Timon*, the original gg3 (with the end of *Romeo* and beginning of *Troilus*) of course became useless. The last page of *Romeo* was reprinted on the recto of the first leaf of a new quire, Gg⁶, and *Timon* was begun on the verso of the same leaf. The continuity of printing between the last quire of *Cymbeline*, bbb, and Gg is once more established by the persistence of the skeleton formes.²

But *Timon of Athens* is a much shorter play than *Troilus and Cressida* and it failed to fill the space that had been allotted for the latter. The text ended on hh5^v and the quire was completed by printing a list of characters on hh6^r, leaving the verso blank. Since *Julius Caesar* already began with quire kk there was nothing for it but to omit signature ii altogether and to leave a gap in the pagination between 98 and 109.

After he had disposed of *Timon* Jaggard, we may suppose, turned his attention to the preliminaries. These present some peculiar problems that will claim our attention later.³ Suffice it for the moment to notice that when they were printed all

¹ Willoughby, pp. 46-47; cf. also above, p. 80⁸.

² See Note B on p. 464.

3 pp. 449 ff.

hope of including *Troilus and Cressida* appears to have been abandoned, for the title does not appear in the catalogue of plays.

And then, at the eleventh hour, *Troilus* after all became available. The original sheet (gg3, gg4) had been preserved: of its two leaves the second, containing the second and third pages of text, could be utilized; this leaf bore, of course, no signature,¹ but the original pagination, 79—80, remained: the first, signed <gg3, which bore on its recto the end of *Romeo and Juliet*² had naturally to be scrapped, and, as we have seen, only survives by accident. To replace this a fresh leaf was printed bearing on the recto, in large type, a hitherto unprinted prologue to *Troilus* and on the verso a reprint of the original first page of the text. This accounts for the two unsigned and non-conjugate leaves at the beginning of the play. The printing then proceeded normally through ¶¶⁶ and ¶¶⁶, ending on the recto of ¶¶¶I, the verso of which was left blank.² The play, thus printed, was inserted at the head of the Tragedies: it was the only possible place for it seeing that it had always been assigned to this section and that the colophon had already been placed at the end of *Cymbeline*³

It has usually been assumed⁴ that at the last moment Walley for some reason relented and withdrew his opposition,

¹ In the Folio normally only the leaves of the first half of each quire are signed. A better practice was to sign the first leaf of the second half as well, which placed the make-up of the quire beyond doubt.

² The point does not appear to have been discussed by bibliographers, but it seems probable that ¶¶¶I and the unsigned first leaf were printed together as one sheet, in which case this unsigned leaf was not one of the first but one of the last of the play to come off the press.

The play was set up by compositors '17 pages, and B, 8 pages (see p. 447). The first setting of the first page of text was by B, the reprint by A. But through most of the play the work of both was hasty. (See Alice Walker, *Textual Problems*, pp. 86 ff.)

³ Willoughby, p. 50. When the first three pages of *Troilus* were originally set up, the head-tide and running-tide both read 'The Tragedie of Troylus and Cressida'. When the first page was reprinted this head-title was retained, but in the newly printed leaves the running-title appears simply as 'Troylus and Cressida'. This change and the position the play now occupies have sometimes been thought to imply a not unnatural doubt on the printer's part whether it was a tragedy at all (e.g. by Crompton Rhodes, *First Folio*, p. 27, and Alexander, see above, p. 340⁸). There can, however, be no doubt that, rightly or wrongly, the play was always intended to appear in the section of Tragedies, and whoever was responsible for including *Cymbeline* in that section is unlikely to have had any qualms over *Troilus*. The quarto of 1609 calls it a 'Historic' and the preface treats it as a comedy.

⁴ As by Willoughby, p. 50.

though in view of his long intransigence this seems on the face of it a little unlikely. But a re-examination of the evidence in the light of recent investigation suggests a different and much more interesting possibility. We have seen¹ that Walley claimed the copyright of *Troilus and Cressida* by virtue of the edition that he and Bonian had published in 1609 after a regular entrance in the Stationers' Register; and further that the text of the play in the Folio was printed from that quarto modified by comparison with a manuscript.² But when Bonian and Walley made their entrance of the play on 28 January 1609, there already stood in the Register an earlier entrance allowed by the Court on 7 February 1603 to James Roberts.³ Further, we now know that although in most of the Folio text the use of a manuscript source is evident, no such use can be traced in the three pages set up along with the end of *Romeo and Juliet* (or in the reprint of the first of them) so that we are entitled to believe that, had the printing proceeded as originally planned, the Folio would have presented us with a mere reprint of the quarto without admixture from any other source, just as it had done in *Romeo and Juliet*'

What, in the circumstances, was Jaggard's position with respect to the copyright of the play? He could have argued before the Court of the Company, and not, one would imagine, without some prospect of success, that as Roberts's representative he had inherited the rights conferred by the Court itself in 1603,⁵ that Bonian and Walley's edition not only flouted the interests of the players but contravened the regulations of the Company, and that the entrance of 1609 ought never, in fact, to have been allowed. If his argument were admitted, it would follow that Jaggard would have a perfect right to print the play from manuscript: at the same time there is reason to doubt whether it would give him the right to appropriate Bonian and Walley's text by reprinting

¹ p. 445.

² See pp. 342-3.

³ See p. 66.

⁴ See Walker, *Troilus*, pp. 462-4; *Textual Problems*, p. 72; Greg, *Troilus*, pp. 278-9.

⁵ True, the copy had been entered to Roberts conditionally upon his obtaining 'sufficient authority for yt'. But in so far as this may have meant the assent of the Lord Chamberlain's men, as in the case of *The Merchant of Venice*, Jaggard had that of their successors, the King's men; and in so far as it may have meant official sanction, this had been granted in 1609, and the licence of the deputy Master of the Revels would be valid irrespective of who had entered the copy.

their edition.¹ So long, therefore, as there was no manuscript at his disposal, Jaggard was unable to include *Troilus and Cressida* in the collection. What happened, we are to suppose, was that at the last moment a manuscript turned up, and that Jaggard then felt in a position to snap his fingers at Walley. It is true that what he actually did was not to print the play directly from the manuscript but to transfer variant manuscript readings to a copy of the quarto and to hand this amended copy to the compositor.² But this was not obvious on the face of it, and indeed the fact, though long suspected, has only lately been proved.³ If challenged Jaggard could have instanced the many passages in which his text differed from Walley's and the many lines it contained that were not in the quarto, and have pointed triumphantly to the hitherto unprinted prologue that appeared in all the dignity of large type on the first page in the Folio.

It remains to consider the preliminaries, which, as we saw,⁴ must have been already printed off when the manuscript of *Troilus* came to hand. There are nine leaves. The signatures 'A2' and '3', on the leaves containing the dedication and the address, show that the basis, as planned, was a quire of three sheets, as elsewhere in the volume.⁵ A3 is conjugate with the leaf carrying the verses signed 'Ben: lonson', which is therefore A4; and A2 is conjugate with the leaf carrying the verses by Holland, which is therefore A5. Further, the catalogue leaf (A6) is conjugate with that bearing on its verso the lines signed 'B. I.' (Ai), which are obviously intended to face the portrait on the title-page. It follows that the title-leaf is an insertion, as is only natural, seeing that the engraved portrait would require separate printing on a special press.⁶

¹ For details see Greg, *Troilus*, pp. 276-7, where two cases are cited in which an amended text was held to infringe the copyright of an imperfect one previously published, but it was only through an agreement between the contending parties that the superior text was reprinted under cover of the original rights. The cases are *The Spanish Tragedy* (see Greg, *Spanish Tragedy*, p. 52; *Spanish Tragedy* (1592), Malone Society reprint, p. xiii) and *The Damnable Life and Deserved Death of Doctor Faustus* (see Greg, *Faustus*, pp. 3-4).

² It was not, in fact, a very good manuscript, and not all the readings borrowed from it have found favour with critics. But it was of course politic on Jaggard's part to adopt the text it offered.

³ See p. 343.

⁴ pp. 446-7.

⁵ See pp. 434', 4471.

⁶ Leaves carrying engravings (as distinct, of course, from wood-cuts) were often printed separately from the quires in which they were included. It was so with the

The leaves carrying the verses signed 'L. Digges' and 'I. M.' and the list of actors are also conjugate and form one unsigned sheet. This was apparently an afterthought, and its position is indeterminate and varies in different copies. Had it been intended to be placed in the middle of quire A (as in the Chatsworth copy, which, however, has been re-bound) the first leaf should have borne the signature 'A': had it been intended to follow quire A (as in the Grenville copy, re-bound but said to be otherwise in the original state, and in the Capell, re-backed but showing no signs of tampering) it should have been signed 'B'. Neither of these arrangements is satisfactory since both involve an interruption in the commendatory poems.¹ A logical arrangement can be achieved by placing the additional sheet after A5 (so that the verses by Digges follow those by Holland and the list of actors precedes the catalogue of plays, as in Booth's reprint), but although in this position the fold could be pasted on to the counterfoil of the title-leaf, thus avoiding duplicate sewing within the quire, it is not very likely to have been intended.² The fact is that the sheet was printed, no doubt after the others, without any clear idea of the position it was to occupy, and that no position can, therefore, be claimed as more correct than another.³ It is best therefore kept apart

portrait of Fletcher in the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1647. On the other hand, the engraved title to the 1616 folio of Jonson's Works forms part of the quire, and in the Shakespeare Second Folio the title with its portrait is conjugate with the leaf bearing Milton's (unsigned) verses headed 'An Epitaph'. For further examples see Pollard, *Folios and Quartos*, p. 138¹.

¹ If the sheet were folded the other way, so that the list of actors preceded the verses, and were then inserted in the middle of A, all the commendatory verses would come together, though the insignificant tributes by Digges and I. M. would precede Jonson's (McKerrow, *Introduction*, p. 26z²). This is ingenious and, since the leaves are neither signed nor numbered, possible: at the same time there can be no doubt that the sheet was issued folded in the manner in which it is usually found.

² In the original Bodleian copy the sheet is placed after A4, an arrangement that combines all disadvantages and can only be an aberration of the binder, William Wildgoose. (It may have been accidentally slipped into that position when the sheets were dispatched. There is no reason to suppose that the Bodleian's was a specially prepared or 'standard' copy, as Falconer Madan (*Bodleian Folio*, p. 6) maintained.) More authority would attach to the copy that the printer presented to Augustine Vincent (Lee, *Census*, LXXXVII), now in the Folger collection, but this, though in its original binding, has unfortunately lost several of the preliminary leaves and had others substituted, so that no inference regarding the original order is possible.

³ The possible arrangements of the preliminaries are well discussed by Madan (*Bodleian Folio*, 1905, pp. 10-12) except for a serious error over the identity of the

from quire A, and has in the register given above been assigned the inferential signature '[B]'. Its contents are hardly less anomalous than its position is indeterminate. The copies of verses signed 'L. Digges' and 'I. M.'¹ doubtless came in too late to be printed on A5^v as would otherwise have been natural. The list of principal actors may have been in Jaggard's hands for some time, since it appears to have been compiled in 1621,² but if so it would seem to have been mislaid. Above it is printed a sort of head-title, a most unusual feature in a collection and particularly inappropriate in this position. One may suspect that it was originally set up for the catalogue of plays, displaced in favour of the present heading, and used above the actor-list merely to fill up space if no large head-piece was handy.

The portrait on the title-page was engraved, as the subscription tells us, by Martin (or Marten) Droeshout, a twenty-two-year-old³ member of a family of Flemish artists settled in London. It is not pleasing and has little technical merit. Several impressions are known of an early state of the plate,⁴ in which the moustache and eyebrows are light and the absence of any shadow on the collar gives the head a rather detached appearance. This defect was later remedied, the eyebrows were extended, the moustache made heavier, and the line of the hair somewhat altered. The general effect, however, was certainly not improved. A few copies of the First Folio are said to show certain other trifling alterations that are usually held to be distinctive of the

inserted leaf in quire A, which had been determined two years before (Greg, *Bibl. First Folio* p. 264, and *Capell Cat.* p. 116). Pollard (*Folios and Quartos*, pp. 137-8) gives a full and correct account of the matter.

¹ The initials 'I. M.' most likely stand for James Mabbe, the translator, who was closely associated both with Leonard Digges and with Blount. (The case for the identification has been fully argued by A. W. Secord, 'I. M. of the First Folio Shakespeare and other Mabbe problems', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Oct. 1948, xlvii. 374-81.) They can hardly stand either for the fifteen-year-old John Milton or the nineteen-year-old Jasper Mayne, one of whom certainly and the other probably contributed verses to the Second Folio. No one now ascribes the lines to John Marston, who had taken orders and become a country parson the year of Shakespeare's death. The verses on the portrait, signed 'B. I.', are generally accepted as Jonson's (*Jonson*, ed. Simpson, viii. 390).

² Chambers, *W. Shake.*, ii. 78.

³ In 1623, that is. The actual date of the engraving is not known.

⁴ See Note C on p. 465.

Second, but they do not affect the general appearance of the engraving.¹

The volume was now complete. The printing done after the interruption late in October 1621 was 152' sheets, or practically 51 quires. An entrance respecting the volume was made in the Stationers' Register on 8 November 1623,² but whether the printing was then complete, or whether, as is quite possible, the entrance was made immediately after the printing of *Cymbeline* and *Timon*, and the preliminaries and *Troilus* not printed till later, cannot be certainly determined.

It is important, however, that we should be as particular as we can about the date of completion of the Folio. The appearance of William Jaggard's name in the colophon may reasonably be taken to imply that he was still alive when *Cymbeline* was printed.³ True, the book might still be said to have been printed at his charges even though he were recently dead: but if Isaac had already succeeded to the firm in Barbican it seems probable that he would have named himself as its representative on the syndicate. It would be convenient if we could similarly argue that the appearance of Isaac Jaggard's name on the title-page should be taken to imply that this was printed after his father's death, but to do so would be misleading: not only had Isaac put his name in the imprints of several works printed by the firm from 1616 onwards,⁴ but since it was under his own name that he advertised the book in 1622⁵ there is no doubt that he regarded it as his own personal concern, and would have put his name on the title whether his father were dead or not.

William Jaggard we know was dead by 4 November 1623, when Isaac was appointed City Printer in his place: how long he had been dead we cannot tell for certain, but on the whole it seems likely that he died some while before the end

¹ The engraving has been fully discussed and illustrated by M. H. Spielmann, *Portraiture*, pp. 25-43.

² See p. 59.

³ Chambers, *W. Shake.*, i. 138-9. Willoughby (p. 10²) concurs, while pointing out that G. Carleton's *Madness of Astrologers*, printed by William Jaggard for W. Turner of Oxford, is actually dated 1624. But this work had been registered as early as July 1623 and the date 1624 was of course put on it by anticipation. Since it was to be published away from London, delivery may have been expected to take some time, and the date may have been anticipated as early as October.

⁴ See p. 7.

⁵ See pp. 3-4.

of October.¹ Very roughly then we may say that *Cymbeline* with the colophon was probably printed by the middle of that month. There then remained the printing of *Timon*' of the preliminaries, and of *Troilus*, before the volume was ready for publication: whether these or any of them were printed in William's lifetime is uncertain.

There is, indeed, one piece of evidence that suggests that the book was ready for issue before William Jaggard's death. For in his copy of the First Folio, a complete copy with his arms upon the binding, Jaggard's friend Augustine Vincent of the College of Arms wrote 'Ex dono Wiffi Jaggard Typographi. a°. 1623.'² On the face of it this is conclusive: at the same time it might, if necessary, be argued that when Vincent received the volume late in 1623 he wrote the words in recollection of a promise made by the afflicted printer before his death, even though he knew that his sufferings were at an end.

The reason for caution over Vincent's evidence is connected with the registration of the new plays in the Folio at Stationers' Hall on 8 November. By then William Jaggard was of course dead, and the entrance is in the names of Isaac Jaggard and Edward Blount—it was actually the only entrance Isaac ever made. By then not only had the volume been concluded with the printing of *Cymbeline*' but *Timon of Athens* must also have been inserted, since it required licence and is named in the entry. But it affords no evidence that either the preliminaries or *Troilus and Cressida*—an old play that in any case needed no licence—were yet in print. The official licence was granted by Dr. Worrall,³ but it is unlikely that he had before him the manuscripts of the newly printed plays. Rather we may suppose that he was supplied with advance sheets of the volume upon the last page of which was written a list of the pieces for which licence was sought—the list in fact preserved in the Register entry—and that it was to this list that he subscribed his hand. Since entrance was being made in anticipation of publication, and not of printing as was the more usual course, any delay would

¹ See p. 8.

² See p. 450³. Facsimile of the inscription in Gollancz, *Introduction*, p. xxiv.

³ See p. 59.

presumably be avoided, and we should naturally suppose that the advance copy was prepared immediately after the addition of *Timon* and before the printing of *Troilus* and the preliminaries. Printing before licence no doubt involved a risk, since the censor might take exception to some of the contents; but we may perhaps suppose that Jaggard took the precaution of approaching him in advance, and had ascertained that the *imprimatur* would be forthcoming on his own assurance that nothing had been altered from the versions approved for acting by the Master of the Revels. In that case it should not have taken more than a few days to secure the official licence, and in the meantime the printing of *Troilus and Cressida* would be going ahead. If then the whole volume was in print before the death of William Jaggard, that is, by, say, the middle of October, it would seem likely that licence was sought about the beginning of that month, and we are left with a seemingly inexplicable interval before registration followed.

It is safer to confess that we cannot be certain, within a month or so, of the date when the printing of the Folio was completed. It cannot, we may assume, have been published before 8 November: if at the time of registration *Troilus* still remained to be printed, it cannot have been issued much before the end of the month. Had it not been intended to appear by then, custom would have suggested dating it the following year. All we know for certain is that a copy reached the Bodleian Library at Oxford in time to be sent for binding on 17 February 1624.'

Before he began printing the Folio Jaggard must have considered and decided two related questions, the size of the edition and the price at which copies were to be sold. It was George Steevens who first speculated about the price, and it is to him that we owe the only external evidence we possess. Giving a list of the early editions of Shakespeare's plays in his own edition of 1793 he wrote: 'An ancient quarto was sold for six-pence; and the folios of 1623 and 1632, when first printed, could not have been rated higher than at ten shillings each.'² But when this passage was reprinted in the first 'Variorum' edition in 1803 Steevens added the note:

¹ Bodleian Folio, p. 5 and plate in.

² i. 449.

'I have since discovered, from an ancient MS. note in a copy of the folio of 1623, belonging to Messieurs White, book-sellers in Fleet Street, that the original price of this volume was—one found'¹ Such inscriptions should no doubt be accepted with caution, but in the particular case there is sufficient supporting evidence to justify credence. The traditional price of a quarto play was sixpence, as Steevens said: at the same rate the thirty-six plays of the Folio would have cost i8j., and the Folio was better printed and had an engraved portrait. It is usual to estimate the cost of books in the earlier seventeenth century as in the neighbourhood of *id.* a sheet, at which price the 227 sheets of the Folio work out at about \<s.² The price of a pound may have included a plain calf binding.³

As to the size of the edition, Steevens thought that 'Perhaps the original impression of the book did not amount to more than 250\'⁴ Lee, impressed by the number of copies he had been able to trace, guessed that the edition 'could hardly have fallen short of 600 copies', an estimate that as more copies came to light he raised to 800 or 900: on the same vague foundation Henry Guppy guessed i,000.⁵ Pollard⁶

¹ Edited by Isaac Reed, ii. 150. The statement that Steevens quoted as his authority 'an entry in the accounts of a contemporary bookseller' (Pollard, *Folios and Quartos*, p. 140) appears to be based on a misunderstanding.

It must be remembered that in 1623 one pound was equivalent to at least five of modern money—nearer ten at current prices.

² McKerrow, *Introduction*, p. 134². The cost presumably varied with the nature of the printing and the size of the edition. The estimate hardly agrees with the sixpenny price of a quarto play, which commonly ran to about ten sheets, but these plays were no doubt cheaply printed in comparatively large editions: moreover the price of quarto plays may not have been constant (see Johnson, as below).

³ As assumed by F. R. Johnson ('Notes on English Retail Book-Prices, 1550-1640', *The Library*, Sept. 1950, v. 91), who quotes 's. 6d. as the price of such a binding and therefore puts the price in sheets as low as i6s. or 17s. He quotes i8.r. 6d. and 22s. as paid in 1637 and 1638 for (no doubt differently) bound copies of the Second Folio, which he therefore prices at 14'. or i's. in sheets. (In 1687 the binding of Newton's *Pnncipia* 'in calves' leather and lettered' was reckoned at 3'.; A. N. L. Munby, *TLS*, 21 Dec. 1951, p. 828.) According to Lee (*Survey*, p. 86) the Burdett-Coutts copy of the First Folio 'was purchased near the date of publication at the then high price of £3 by one William Skelton', but this information is too vague to be of much help, and in the *Census* (xx) the date of purchase is given as c. 1650.

⁴ *Variorum*, 1821, ii. 658.

⁵ Lee, *Introduction*, p. xxx, and *Survey*, p. 81: Willoughby, p. 24².

⁶ 'evidently basing his estimate upon the size of Jaggard's 1619 edition of Brooke's *Catalogue*' (see pp. 441—2), adds Willoughby (p. 24²), but nothing Pollard says

thought it 'quite probable that not more than 500 copies' were printed, though he was prepared to welcome a higher figure.¹ It has, however, been pointed out that if sixpence was the normal charge for a single play of which probably 1,250 or 1,500 copies were printed, it is doubtful 'whether the First Folio at £1 would have been a commercially attractive proposition unless the adventurers could hope to sell something approaching 1,000 copies'.² With this reasoning Willoughby agrees, and he supports the estimate with some interesting evidence respecting the costs of printing at the time.³ An edition of 1,000 copies will therefore be assumed in the calculation that follows.

This concerns the rate of production. And here Willoughby was able to base his conclusions on data afforded by the accounts of the Sheldonian Press at Oxford and by Joseph Moxon, who though writing in 1683 deals with the old-style press already in use in Jaggard's day. According to Moxon two workmen engaged on one press could print on one side 250 sheets an hour; that is to say that to print and perfect 1,000 sheets would take eight hours. Jaggard's men probably worked a twelve-hour day, but they may not have maintained a uniform rate, it is not clear whether the estimate includes 'making ready', and we know that there must have been occasional interruptions. The average rate of printing for the First Folio is therefore not likely, on a conservative estimate, to have exceeded one edition-sheet a day or two quires in a six-day week.⁵

Since it was usual to print each sheet as soon as the type had been set and imposed and to distribute the type as soon as printed, composition and press-work had to keep more or less in step if waste of time was to be avoided. It has been estimated that it would take a modern compositor over 17 hours to set up by hand one sheet of the Folio: to this must be added about 4 hours for distributing the type, making at

suggests this rather misleading analogy, and if he had Brooke's work in mind at all, it was probably subconsciously. ¹ Pollard, *Folios and Quartos*, p. 141.

² Greg, *Pub. First Folio*, p. 156.

³ Willoughby, pp. 24-27.

⁴ Moxon, who was a Fellow of the Royal Society, began the publication of his 'Mechanick Exercises, or the Doctrine of Handy-works' in monthly parts in 1678, but the work was interrupted and not resumed till 1683.

⁵ See Willoughby, p. 27, and Note D on p. 465.

least 21 hours in all. In the conditions of a seventeenth-century printing house the rate is likely to have been appreciably slower, and we may suppose that to set and distribute one sheet of the Folio must have occupied a compositor of Jaggard's two full working days of twelve hours each.¹ Since we have seen that, working an edition of 1,000 copies, a single press could print a sheet a day, it is clear that it must have taken two of Jaggard's compositors to keep up with the press-men.²

And in fact there is evidence that at least two compositors of different habits were employed on the First Folio. Some attention has lately been paid to the idiosyncrasies of seventeenth-century compositors, and chiefly as a result of careful consideration of prevalent spellings it has been possible to distinguish the work of several individuals, or perhaps we should rather say types, for the characteristics observed may possibly have been shared by more than one person. Thus in the Folio it has been observed that one compositor, whom it has become usual to designate A' shows a marked preference for the spellings 'doe' and 'goe', whereas another, 5, shows an equal preference for 'do(o)' and 'go', and there are several other words of which each has a consistent and distinctive spelling. No exhaustive analysis has so far been attempted, but the distinction has been observed to hold throughout *Julius Caesar*, *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* and also in *Richard II*, *i Henry T⁷*, and *Troilus and Cressida*. On the other hand, no such distinction has been found in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, *The Merchant of Venice* or *Romeo and Juliet* in which we must therefore suppose a different compositor (or, as Willoughby would assume, a different pair of compositors) with less settled orthographic preferences to have been at work.³

¹ Again Willoughby's estimate has been to some extent challenged by Hinman (*Headlines*, p. 209^f), who gives figures that work out at about two and a quarter days per sheet. No very close estimate, however, is possible, and for the present purpose it may be permissible, as it is certainly convenient, to adopt the round figure, even if it does give slightly too high a rate.

² Willoughby, p. 55. It is of course essential to the argument that the two compositors should work simultaneously. The copy for each quire in turn must, therefore, have been divided between them in minimum units of one leaf (written on both sides). The type must have been kept in galleys or tied up in blocks until such time as it could be imposed in formes and locked up in the chase.

³ See Note E on p. 466.

Willoughby gives a detailed analysis of the *Julius Caesar-Macbeth-Hamlet* sequence,¹ and it must be confessed that it hardly bears out his postulate of simultaneous composition. According to him, out of 74 pages, A set 23 and .851. Thus B set more than twice as much as A\ he has runs of 16, 13', and 13 pages, whereas A\ longest run is of 5': each has a minimum run of one page. The division of work in the several quires is even more remarkable. If we disregard the last two pages of *Hamlet* (set by 5) the three plays fill six quires and the distribution is as follows:

quire	A pages	B pages
kk	3	9
ll	2	10
mm	7½	4½
nn	2	10
oo	4	8
PP	—	4½ 7½
	<u>23</u>	<u>49</u>

This is a long way from the more or less equal distribution of work within each quire that we were led to expect if the two compositors were to keep abreast of the press-work.

There is another difficulty. If we accept Willoughby's division of the work of the two compositors as accurate, their 'takes' must be reckoned in printed pages, or at least columns. But simultaneous composition would necessitate a division of the copy, and the takes would correspond to leaves of the copy, and would bear no relation to the columns of the printed work.² The actual distribution, as it appears in the table, is in fact typical of two compositors working alternately rather than simultaneously.

Recent analysis, by methods more rigorous than those employed by Willoughby and other early investigators, confirms this impression. Careful consideration of the Folio text of *King Lear* (qq2¹-ss3¹) has led Cauthen to the conclusion that it was the work of compositor B throughout,³ and Hinman⁴ has found 'strong evidence' that the same is true of the

¹ p. 58.

² See p. 4572.

³ *Folio Lear*. Cruder methods led Alice Walker to the same conclusion. However, their results have lately been challenged by Williams, *Folio Lear*.

⁴ *Proof-sheet*, p. 106¹.

next play, *Othello* (ss3^v-w6^r).¹ It is difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile these facts with any theory of simultaneous composition.

Until a full and accurate survey has been made of the work of the several compositors whose presence can be detected in the Folio, no final verdict will be possible. But on the evidence at present available there seems to be no escape from the conclusion that where two compositors can be distinguished their work was alternate and not simultaneous. But two compositors working alternately can set up copy no faster than one, and it follows that the rate at which the set type was fed to the press can have been no more than half that at which the press could deal with it. The press, therefore, can have been employed only half the time on the First Folio. Fredson Bowers has given (privately) an account of the working that is probably very near the truth. While the compositor was setting the first half of a quire none of it, of course, could go onto the press, which must therefore have been employed upon some other work. As soon, however, as the compositor had set up the seventh page of the quire the inner forme of the inner sheet would be complete and could go onto the press, and thenceforth, since it would need only one page of fresh composition to complete each forme, the compositor would be able to keep up with the press-men till the end of the quire was reached. If, therefore, a compositor set up one quire (twelve pages) a week, we may suppose that during the first half of each week the press was kept busy on some other volume, and that during the second half it was continuously engaged on the Folio.

It appears, then, that the rate of progress was governed not, as Willoughby supposed, by the rate of printing but by that of composition, which is estimated to have been about half. Instead, therefore, of assuming a rate of a sheet a day, or two quires a week, as Willoughby did,² we must assume a rate of only one quire a week; and allowing for occasional holidays we should not reckon more than four weeks to a calendar

¹ Further findings by Cauthen (privately communicated) show that the same conditions obtain in the Comedies: thus *Gtf-H'* (13 pages) was set by A; R6^v-Ti^r (14 pages) and V5^r-X6^v (16 pages) were set by B. Elsewhere, however, in the Comedies A and E tend to alternate in takes of about four pages.

² See above, p. 256.

month. On these assumptions the 75 sheets printed before the interruption in October 1621¹ would have occupied rather over six months, and the 152¹- sheets printed after the interruption² would have occupied nearly thirteen months. We can thus construct a time-table (p. 461) for the printing of the First Folio. The times given may, indeed, seem venturesomely precise, and it is freely admitted that no great reliance can be placed on them, but they may help to make the whole process clearer, and no harm will be done if it is remembered that the dates are all conjectural and are intended as approximate only. There is the further doubt whether the printing of the volume was or was not complete at the time of the entrance of 8 November 1623. In the table it has been assumed that the entrance was made at the earliest possible moment and printing completed afterwards, not as in itself the more likely alternative, but because it allows of a more precise dating. If it is assumed that the book was complete by 8 November, the resumption of work would have to be placed about a month earlier.

Of proof-reading in the early seventeenth century we in fact know distressingly little in spite of Simpson's laborious garnering of the available evidence. Procedure varied. Jagard claimed that he had sent not only proofs but what he calls 'Reuiewes', that is revises, of Brooke's *Catalogue and Succession*³ to the author when he was confined to his house by illness.⁴ But the usual practice was for the author to attend at the printing-office to supervise the correction of his work.⁵ It is natural to suppose that some rough first proof was taken, possibly by pressing paper over the type before this was locked in the chase, but of such a custom we have in fact no evidence.⁶ The proofs and revises sent to Brooke were prob-

¹ See p. 443.

² See p. 452.

³ See p. 466.

⁴ A. Vincent, *Discovery of Errors*, 1622, sig. 6^v. The relevant passage from Jagard's epistle is quoted by McKerrow, *Introduction*, pp. 206-7, and by Simpson, *Proof-reading*, p. 7.

⁵ Simpson, *Proof-reading*, chap. i; McKerrow, *Introduction*, p. 2053. The custom was an old one: according to the colophon Taverner's translation of the *Adagia* of Erasmus was 'Printed in Flete strete very diligently vnder the correction of the selfe Richard Tauerner, by Richard Bankes' in 1540 (Bennett, *Books and Readers*, p. 218).

⁶ F. Bowers has put forward (privately) the interesting suggestion that it may have been the type itself that was read: this would, of course, present no difficulty to any one used to composition.

Time-table of the Printing of the First Folio

MATTER	SIGS.	NO. OF SHEETS	DATE
<i>Tempest</i> to <i>Twelfth Night</i>	A-Z ⁶	69	mid Apr. to early Oct.
<i>King John</i> and <i>Richard II</i> (pp. 23-24)	a-b ⁶	6	by 21 Oct.
		75	
Interval of 12 or 13 months.			
<i>Richard II</i> (pp. 25-36)	c ⁶	3	mid Nov.
<i>Winters Tale</i>	Aa-Bb ⁶ Cc ²	7	late Nov.
<i>Henry V</i> to 3 <i>Henry VI</i> (P- 152)	h-o ⁶	21	early Dec. to end Jan.
<i>Richard II</i> (p. 37) to 2 <i>Henry IV</i>	d-g ⁶ gg ⁶	16	beginning Feb. to early Mar.
3 <i>Henry VI</i> (p. 153) to <i>Henry VIII</i>	p-v ⁶ x ⁴	20	early Mar. to end Apr.
<i>Coriolanus</i> to <i>Romeo</i> , and <i>Troilus</i> (pp. 78-80)	aa-ff ⁶	42	beginning May to late June
<i>Julius Caesar</i> to <i>Cymbeline</i> (colophon)	ggi-4 kk-zz ⁶		late June to late Oct.
<i>Romeo</i> (last page reset) and <i>Timon</i>	aaa-bbb ⁶		
	Gg ⁶ hh ⁶	6	by 8 Nov.
Preliminaries	A ⁶ (Ai + i) [Bp	4i	late Nov.
<i>Troilus</i> (p. 2 reset [pp. 79-80 transferred])	[1]i ⁶ ii ⁶ iii ⁶ iiii ⁶	7	early Dec.
		152½	
		227½	

' Of the 18 pages 7 are blank and the rest are in large type that would take much less time to set than the text. No doubt the setting could have been done well within a week. But there is no sense in refining on a calculation that has so large a margin of error.

ably pulls taken after the formes had been made up and before the regular printing began, and the press must have awaited their return. When, however, the author visited the printing-house, or maybe sent someone in his place, it would appear that what he saw were not, to speak strictly, proofs at all, but early pulls of the sheets, and that printing continued while he was reading them. For almost all the material evidence of so-called proof-reading that we possess consists of variations between different pulls of sheets or formes found in copies of the same edition. Such variants, a corrected and an uncorrected reading, may be found, if we search diligently

enough, in most books of the time: they are familiar to all students who have examined, for example, the extensive differences between copies of the 1616 collection of Jonson's Works so diligently collected by Simpson in the Oxford edition.¹ In the absence of the author the printer must himself have performed the office of corrector as best he could, for it was certainly carried out by someone, and evidently in the printing-house.² In the case of the First Folio there could be no question of supervision by the author, nor is there the least likelihood that the proofs were read anywhere but in the printing-house. By whom is a question over which fancy has been allowed to range, as it has over the question of editorship. Indeed the questions are closely related, for it would seem that unless Isaac Jaggard made himself personally responsible, the most likely person to read the proofs would be the one who had prepared the copy for press.³

Four corrected proofs of the First Folio are known: all are in the Folger Shakespeare Library at Washington.⁴ The corrections in three of them are in the same hand, and in all cases are confined to a single page, showing that the proofs were read page by page and not forme by forme. One is page 71 in *Romeo and Juliet*, one page 292 in *King Lear* one page 333 in *Othello*, and one page 352 in *Antony and Cleopatra*. Nearly all the markings concern literals and the like that could be corrected at sight, but for one in *Othello*, though apparently a partial correction at best, the copy must have been consulted.⁵ It may be added that the corrections in-

¹ From the records of certain lawsuits of 1600-1 unearthed by Margaret Dowling ('The Printing of John Dowland's "Second Booke of Songs or Ayres"', *The Library*, Mar. 1932, xii. 365-80) it appears to have been the custom to print a number of 'overplus books' ostensibly as proofs. The possible bearing of this on the problem of variation has never been fully considered.

² For a full analysis of a particular case see Greg, *Variants in Lear*, 1940. It should, however, be mentioned that the details of method in printing and correction there suggested have been questioned by Bowers ('An Examination of the Method of Proof Correction in "Lear"', *The Library*, June 1947, ii. 20-44, and 'Elizabethan Proofing', *J. Q. Adams Memorial Studies*, Washington, 1948, pp. 571-86).

³ See p. 79.

⁴ Willoughby, pp. 62-64 and frontispiece; Hinman, *The Library*, Sept.-Dec. 1942, xxiii. 101-7, *Studies in Bibliography*, 1950, iii. 145-53, and 1953, vi. 61-70. All have survived through being accidentally bound up in copies of the Folio.

⁵ It is clear that the copy was often used in making the corrections in the 1608 *King Lear*: see above, note 2.

licated on the proofs were carried out in the majority of the sheets printed, though a few uncorrected pulls survive, and that in spite of the proof-reading a number of other obvious errors in the pages in question escaped correction.

The proof-sheets thus accidentally preserved point to regular attention by the press-reader either immediately before, or more likely just after, printing began. But printing on a hand press is slow, and it often happened in books of the time that while the sheets were being worked further errors were discovered. In that case printing was interrupted, and the necessary corrections were made before working was resumed. This is proved by the fact that some corrections are found in only a few copies, showing that they must have been effected quite late in the run. It occasionally happened that printing was interrupted several times in this way before the full number of sheets had been completed.

The study of the variants in the First Folio is in its infancy. It has, indeed, long been known that some errors in the signatures and many errors of pagination appear in some copies only; sometimes the error and sometimes the correction being the more common. The most remarkable textual variant that has so far been recorded is in *Othello*, and occurs on the very page of which a proof survives. In some copies, in place of the correct first line of p. 333 (sig. W3^r),

Rodori. I haue heard too much: and your words and
there appears the line,

And hell gnaw his bones,

repeated from line 13 of the second column on p. 332 (sig. vva'.¹ A rare uncorrected page in *Hamlet* (278) has also been recorded, besides of course many isolated variants elsewhere.² So far as its own unrivalled collection of First Folios is concerned, a systematic collation by Charlton Hinman with the aid of an ingenious optical contrivance is now in progress in the Folger Shakespeare Library at Washington.³

¹ The catchword at the foot of p. 332 is correct in all copies: 'Rodori. I'. It is not a case of the erroneous resetting of a line: the actual type from p. 332 (except for the final stop) was transferred to p. 333—though how this can have happened remains a mystery (Hinman, *Proof"-sheet*, pp. 104-7).

² Lee, *Additions*, pp. 18-19, ^{anc}*Introduction*, pp. xxxi-xxxii.

³ Already a study of the Folio variants in *Othello* has yielded proof that the

It has been the habit of some critics—Lee is a notorious example—to inveigh against the carelessness and negligence of which they have assumed Jaggard to have been guilty in printing Shakespeare's plays. The charge rests in no small measure on ignorance of the printing conditions of the time and the nature of the obstacles encountered in the course of the work. For the rest, however the result may fall short of what critics would wish, there is plenty of evidence to show that the printer was not indifferent to the accuracy of his text, and that he took what were thought in his day to be reasonable precautions, and went to some trouble, to reach a moderate standard in the execution of what may not have been at all times an easy task.¹

NOTE A ('433)

At one point in the reconstruction Willoughby was able to use, with modification, conclusions published by J. Q. Adams in an article on *Timon* in 1908, and at the same point his own conclusions have been modified by the later researches of G. E. Dawson (*Bibl. Problem*, 1951; see Note B). The most important question in regard to which his conclusions appear to need reconsideration is the rate at which printing proceeded (see pp. 459 ff.). The printing of the Folio had, of course, been discussed by earlier writers, but a good deal of the speculation on the subject was irresponsible. Willoughby picked out for mention Sidney Lee's introduction to the Oxford Press facsimile of 1902, which at least drew attention to the main problems, and A. W. Pollard's *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos*, 1909, written to accompany Methuen's facsimiles of the four folios, whose short chapter on the printing of the First Folio proved, he acknowledges, the starting-point of his own investigations. The substance of certain parts of Willoughby's monograph had previously appeared in articles and notes in *The Library*, Dec. 1928, ix. 262-6, Mar. 1929, ix. 385-7, *RES*, July 1928, iv. 323, Apr. 1929, v. 198-200, and *Modern Language Notes*, 1929, xlv. 373-4, 1930, xlv. 463-4.

NOTE B (page 446)

Here Willoughby's reconstruction differs from Adams's, and Dawson's from Willoughby's. The signature 'gg3' on the cancelled leaf containing the end of *Romeo* and beginning of *Troilus* proves, of course, that a six-leaf quire was originally intended (see p. 447¹). Adams (*Timon*) argued, improbably, that a six-leaf quire was actually printed with the last two leaves blank since the type for them had not been set up. This would make the cancelled leaf ('gg3') con-

'additional' passages in the second quarto (1630) were printed from the Folio and not from a manuscript as was generally supposed (Hinman, *Othello*, pp. 387-8). Some provisional results of the work are also to be found in Hinman, *Romeo* (pp. 63-70). He hopes to complete the collation by the end of 1955.

¹ See Note F on p. 466.

jugate with that containing the second and third pages (79—80) of *Troilus*, (which survives). Willoughby (p. 47) made the much more plausible assumption that what was actually printed was a quire of four leaves, which would make the cancelled leaf conjugate with gg2. Dawson (*Bibl. Problem*) showed that Adams was right about the conjugacy of the cancelled leaf, but pointed out that both he and Willoughby were wrong in supposing that ggi and ggz were separate leaves, for an examination of seventy-four copies proved that they were in fact conjugate; from which the given reconstruction necessarily followed.

NOTE C (page 'i')

Apparently a proof state that found its way into a few copies. One impression of the portrait alone (the so-called 'Halliwell proof') is in the Folger Library. It is mounted in a volume, and concerning it Halliwell wrote: 'This engraving belonged to an imperfect copy of the First Folio that was purchased by Lilly at a sale at Sotheby's on 11 May, 1863, lot 110, and I bought the engraving itself of Lilly exactly a year afterwards, n May, 1864, for one hundred guineas.' It presumably, therefore, once formed part of a complete title-page. In Malone's copy of the Folio in the Bodleian the engraving is genuine, but the rest of the title is an eighteenth-century facsimile reprint. The latter may have been printed on the blank border of the portrait, since there are no evident signs of this being mounted or inlaid. However, two genuine title-pages bear this early state, one in a magnificent copy of the Folio in the British Museum (C. 39. k. 15) and one in the Earl of Roden's copy now in the Folger Library. The Malone impression is reproduced in *Bodleian Folio*, plate i; that in the British Museum in Greg, *Eibl Drama*, frontispiece to vol. ii.

NOTE D (page 456)

If two presses were used on the job the rate would of course be doubled. By an order of 9 May 1615 Jaggard was allowed two presses (Arber, *Transcript*, iii. 699), the same number that Charlewood had had in 1583 (i. 248) and 1586 (v, p. iiii). But Jaggard was certainly printing other books at the same time as the Folio—Favyn's *Theatre of Honour* (see p. 440) and doubtless more. That both presses were employed simultaneously on the Folio is possible nevertheless. There is evidence that in quires F to Y and bb to ff two chases were used, and according to Willoughby (p. 13) the most likely explanation of this is that both presses were in use, though he admits that it is not the only possible one. Indeed, Hinman (*Headlines*, pp. 107-11) has shown that in certain circumstances the use of two chases, with two skeleton formes, may be adopted as a means of speeding up press-work, even if only one press is available, and the present tendency among those competent to judge is to discredit the use of two presses on the Folio, unless exceptionally. Hinman (p. 210¹) further questions the reliability of estimates based on Moxon and the Sheldonian accounts, and after a careful analysis concludes that 'the normal daily output of a one-press printing house of the early seventeenth century was probably rather less than 1,000 sheets a day'. The matter is not, however, very important since, as we shall see, the rate of printing appears to have been governed by that of composition rather than press-work.

The early investigation by T. Satchell into 'The Spelling of the First Folio' (TLS, 3 June 1920) is summarized and extended by Willoughby (pp. 56-59). The matter was carried further by Hinman in an important paper (*Variant Spellings*) based mainly on an examination of the quartos of *The Sun's Darling*, 1656, and *Othello*, 1622. It has also been treated or touched on by A. K. McIlwraith in connexion with *The Maid of Honour*, 1632 ('Some Bibliographical Notes on Massinger', *The Library*, June 1930, xi. 87-92); by Williams in connexion with *The White Devil*, 1612, *The Two Maids of Moreclacke*, 1609, *King Lear*, 1608, and the Folio *Troilus and Cressida*; and by Hoppe in connexion with *Romeo and Juliet*, 1597 (pp. 46-56). Among the most recent and most thorough investigations are those by Philip Edwards into the composition of *Pericles*, 1609 (pp. 29, 47-49), I. B. Cauthen, *Folio Lear*, and Williams, *Folio Lear*. The respective characteristics and relative accuracy of compositors A and B has been the subject of investigation by Alice Walker in connexion with i *Henry IF*. According to her determination compositor A set eleven pages (sigs. e4^r-fi^v and f2^v-3^v) and compositor B fourteen and a half (sigs. d5^v-e3^v, f2^r, and f4^r-6^v), their contributions being in the proportion of 22 to 29. The number of errors in the copy (E⁵, 1613) corrected by A is 12 and by B 22. The other variants introduced into the dialogue in the takes of the two compositors are as follows (figures for B in parentheses are adjusted for length):

	A	B
Literal errors	2	24(18)
Omissions	2	30 (23)
Interpolations	6	28 (21)
Substitutions	7	23 (17)
Transpositions	i	7 (5)
	18	112(85)

These figures are startling, and if B habitually introduced almost five times as many departures from copy as A and an average of nearly eight on each page, the textual implications for plays like *King Lear*, for which she assumes him to have been solely responsible, are serious. No doubt the figures given above must be accepted with some reserve till checked for other plays offering comparable conditions. Although nothing like full and reliable data are yet available, it is already apparent that a study of the habits of compositors will in the future not only influence editorial procedure but may even affect basic assumptions respecting the nature of the text.

Willoughby has some interesting pages both of contemporary testimony respecting the accuracy or otherwise of Jaggard's printing (pp. 61-62) and on the evidence, such as it is, regarding the closeness with which his compositors were in the habit of following their copy (pp. 64-70). When supplied with a

printed original they appear to have reproduced it pretty accurately (see, however, Note E): when the copy was manuscript greater latitude no doubt was the rule. We can, for example, feel tolerably certain that in general, though with exceptions that may possibly be significant, the spelling, capitalization, and punctuation in the Folio (and for the matter of that in most quartos too) is the compositor's rather than Shakespeare's, and reflects the practice of the printing-house rather than the delivery of the actors. On the other hand, though compositors were all, in varying degrees, for normalization, this was naturally more thorough when they were working from already normalized copy than when the spelling of the copy was old-fashioned and chaotic. Alice Walker (*Textual Problems*, chap. vi) draws attention to the remarkable difference in this respect between the orthographic regularity of *Macbeth* (which she therefore supposes to have been set up from a carefully prepared transcript) and the irregularity of the Folio *Hamlet* (which she believes to have been printed from a 'corrected'—and often corrupted—copy of the 1604—5 quarto) although the same two compositors were at work throughout. She also thinks it reasonable to suppose that their normalization of copy was more thorough when they worked at leisure than when they were hurried (*Textual Problems*, pp. 86 ff.), an opinion that may, however, be questioned.

POSTSCRIPT

'CHAPTER iv, NOTE j (page 168)

Fredson Bowers has privately protested that Miss Walker's postulate of a transcript intermediate between foul papers and prompt-book deserves more detailed consideration than it has here received. The suggestion was made primarily to account for the unexpected absences of colloquialisms in the humorous scenes in Q i *Henry 17* and F 2 *Henry 1*' (see p. 264, Note A). Since Miss Walker is a thoroughly able critic it naturally does this to perfection. The trouble is that, as is often the way with *ad hoc* postulates, it raises difficulties elsewhere.

The theory might take two forms. The simplest is that the transcript was made by a scribe from the foul papers and was then annotated by the book-keeper to serve as a prompt-book. In that case it is difficult to see how in its original state it could possibly have become the source of a printed text, as explained in Note J.

Or else (as Bowers takes Miss Walker to mean) the book-keeper may have used the scribe's transcript in place of the foul papers as the basis for a prompt-book written by himself. In that case the transcript may have been preserved rather than the foul papers and have thus become the copy for a printed text. But such a procedure would be extremely uneconomical and it is difficult to see what purpose the transcript was intended to serve.

The theory that foul papers were commonly preserved and used as printers' copy has itself little enough external evidence to support it, and its wide acceptance has been due mainly to pragmatic considerations. To postulate

a class of manuscripts for whose existence we have no external evidence whatever is to demand an act of faith of which few critics are likely to be capable.

Transcripts have also recently been postulated in another connexion. In the case of several plays, for example *Romeo and Juliet* and *Love's Labour's Lost*, it is immediately apparent that the Folio text was set up from a particular quarto, the textual evidence being supported by distinct typographical similarity; and even when there is considerable textual difference, due to conflation from another source, it may yet be possible by careful typographical analysis to prove that the same relation holds, as has been done in the case of *Troilus and Cressida*. But in certain other plays no such demonstration seems possible. In *Richard III* and *King Lear*, in *2 Henry IV* and *Hamlet*, it may be possible, so it is argued, to show a textual dependence of the Folio upon some particular quarto, but at the same time no typographical resemblance is apparent. This is shown particularly in the independence of the speech-headings. Such a state of affairs raises a very real problem. To account for it it has been suggested that in these cases *F* was not printed directly from a copy of *Q* that had been corrected from some independent source, but from a transcript of such a copy. This is, of course, a tenable hypothesis. But it remains in the air. To tie it down to actuality it is suggested that the corrected quarto was in fact one doing service as a prompt-book, and that consequently the company was unwilling to part with it and had a transcript made for the printer. The hypothesis has been recently advanced by Fredson Bowers ('A Definitive Text of Shakespeare: Problems and Methods', *Studies in Shakespeare*, University of Miami, 1952, p. 26) and Philip Williams (*Folio Lear*, pp. 456-60). One obvious objection presents itself, namely that, while a much altered and corrected quarto might afford sufficiently legible copy for a printer, it could hardly make a usable prompt-book. Williams avoids this difficulty in the case of *Lear* by supposing that only the most correct pages of the 1608 quarto were made use of for the prompt-book (and admittedly some pages would require very little correction) and that these were supplemented by sheets of manuscript, and that it was from a transcript of this composite original that *F* was printed. But though a 'book' so constructed would no doubt have been sufficiently legible to serve the prompter, it would have been intolerably inconvenient. Moreover it would have to be shown that the textual dependence of *F* on *Q* was confined to those pages of *Q* that needed little or no correction. It is very doubtful whether this can be done.

The fact is that speculation on these lines, however ingenious and plausible in the abstract, is at too great a remove from concrete probability to carry conviction.

Index

This is a selective index and only the more significant references to stationers and plays are included. S. = Shakespeare: s.d(s). = stage-direction(s): S.R. = Stationers' Register: ms(s). = manuscripts). Superior numbers and letters refer to notes.

'above', i.e. on the upper stage, 122.

'Abradas, the Macedonian pirate', i84^A.

abridgement a possible explanation of 'ghost' characters, 112³.

'absolute in their numbers', 82.

'accordingly', similarly dressed, 256.

'act', i.e. act-interval, 'act long', i.e. a long interval, 144¹.

act and scene divisions, only gradually introduced, 121; in extant mss., 141-2; in 'plots', 143²; authors' and book-keepers' attitudes to, 142-55 in F, 168^K; in plays generally from 1591 to 1610, 169; type of headings left standing in F, 453; irregular, due to alteration in i *Hen. VI*, 186; imperfect, editorial in *Rich. III*, 197; editorial, interrupts continuous action in *C. of E.*, 201; introduced later into prompt-book in *T. G. of V.*, 217; anomalous, probably editorial, in *John*, 249; editorial in i *Hen. IV*, 264; imperfect in *T.N.*, 296; very imperfect, editorial attempt abandoned in *Ham.*, 3295 in stage version in *Macb.j* 395.

act-division, conventional, 143; in 'plots' indicated by music, chorus, or dumb-shows, H3²; recognized in the Admiral's and Lady Elizabeth's men's plays, 144-5; editorial, interrupts continuous scene in *T.A.*, 205; editorial, clumsy in *T. of S.*, 215, and *L.L.L.*, 223; introduced in later performance with music, interrupts continuous action in *M.N.D.*, 243-4; indicated by chorus, on which is superimposed an incorrect editorial division in *Hen. V*, 283-4; only instance in early S. quartos, imperfect, possibly literary, in *Oth.*, 357; perhaps editorial in *Cor.*, 407; original in *Temp.*, 418¹; unsatisfactory modern

division following later quarto in *Ham.*, 329, 333¹.

action, obscurities of, perhaps due to censorship in *M.W.W.*, 337; inconsistencies of, perhaps due to cutting in *Macb.*, 389.

actors, English, in Germany, 308.

actors responsible for reports, 177 (2, 3 *Hen. VI*), 226 (*R. & y.*), 293 (*Hen. VI*), 302 (*Ham.*), 334 (*M.W.W.*).

actors' initials possibly used to distinguish similarly named characters, 35².

actors' names may be introduced either by the author in his foul papers or by the book-keeper in preparing the prompt-book, 114-21; their appearance in 'good' quartos erroneously supposed to indicate prompt-book origin, 93, 95; erroneously supposed to be used in dialogue for minor characters, 120, i66²; in prompt-book, liable to alteration, 281; belong to a revival in *Two Noble Kinsmen*, 100^c, 120⁴; introduced by book-keeper in ms. plays, 117-18; in printed plays, 119-20, and in S.'s plays, 119; introduced by S. himself, 115-16; in 2 *Hen. VI* by book-keeper, 182; in *T. of S.* by author, 213; in *Q. R. & y.* uncertain, removed in F, 235^{'''}; in *M.N.D.* (musician) added by book-keeper in F, 244; in 2 *Hen. IV* by author, removed in F, 266-7; another uncertain, also removed in F, 273^o; in *Much Ado* by author, retained in F, 279, but also alleged to be due to glossing of inadequate prefixes, n6³; doubtful in report of *Hen. V*, 282.

actors' 'parts', that of Orlando extant, 164^A; contains s.c.s., 157, 173^u; alleged to have been used for 'assembled' texts, 101¹, 156-8; a 'part' or

- memorial reproduction of it used in Qi R. & J., 226; a 'part' or a copy of it probably used in Qi Ham., 302.
- Adams, J. Q., works cited, xi; his edition of *Passionate Pilgrim*, 8⁷; on shorthand, 72⁷; Bright's Character and *Lear*, 380¹³; on *Massacre at Paris* fragment, 108⁴; on an author's 'plot', 164⁴; on Sir Henry Herbert, 170^M; on defects in T.A., 204³; on Crane and 2 Hen. IV, 272; on printing of *Tim.* in F, 464^{-B}.
- adaptation of an original Henry VI play to serve as introduction to the *Contention* plays, 185.
- addition, editorial, in chorus in Hen. V, 284.
- addition in proof, shown by verse printed as prose, 233" (R. & '); shown by crowding of type, 279 (*Much Ado*).
- addition of passage in later quarto, restoration of cut in *Rich. II*, 236; cuts similarly restored in Q2 *Oth.*, 302.
- addition of scene, alleged in *John*, 249, and *Ham.*, 303¹⁶; in report of *Ham.*, 3035 in F T.A., 204.
- additional seven plays in Third Folio, including *Pericles*, 98^A.
- additions by author possible in *L.L.L.*, 220⁴; in R. & J., 233^o; in *M. of 7.*, 2585 in epilogue to 2 Hen. IV, 266; to replace alleged cuts in Hen. V, 228^o.
- additions by book-keeper to author's s.d.s., 133-4, 182, 196¹⁶, 201.
- additions by other hands alleged in T.A., 204⁶; in *Lear*, 375⁵ in *Mach.*, 390-1; in *Cymb.*, 413-14; in *W.T.*, 417; in *Temp.*, 421.
- Adkinson, William, an actor in *A King and no King*, 160.
- Admiral's (Nottingham's) men, act with the Chamberlain's at Newington Butts, 210, 299; recognize act-division in their plays, 144-5; 164^B, 167^H, 219³, 347²².
- 'afar off, enter', 126, 135, 315.
- 'again', enter, 399.
- Aglaure*, presentation ms. of, 153³.
- Alborine*, 32-33.
- Alexander, Peter, work cited, xi; on Hen. 71, 176¹, 177, 189^A; on T. of S., 211, 212¹¹; on T. & C., 340⁸, 342-3, 347³, 2⁴, 254^B.
- 'alias', i.e. named, 127, 293.
- 'all, enter', 136; 'all but, exeunt', i.e. manent, 311, 424; 'all of Troy', 341-2.
- M's Well that Ends Well*, 351-3.
- Alde, Edward, 62.
- Alleyn, Edward, 164 ('mr allin'), 167⁴.
- allusion to incidents outside scope of play as presented, 249¹.
- 'aloof, 125, 181.
- Alphonsus Emperor of Germany*, 331^o.
- Alsop, Bernard, 64.
- alteration of ending alleged in *W.T.*, 417.
- alterations, structural, in scene-sequence in Hen. 7, 284, and textual in T.A., 203; in staging, in 2 Hen. VI, 176, in 2 Hen. IV, 268, in *Ham.* after Closet scene, 323, 333¹, and in fencing match, 320-1; on revival, songs in T.N., 297; in copy may confuse compositor, 110; inadequately executed in *L.L.L.*, 222; authoritative, in preparing prompt-book, conjectured in *Ham.*, 314-15, and in *Oth.*, 369; textual, in consequence of cutting, in Q *Rich. II*, 236, in T. & C., 345, in *Oth.*, 358; textual, in stage adaptation in *A/V Well*, 353; textual by book-keeper alleged in A. &? C., 402-3; literary, after production, alleged in *J.C.*, 289; verbal, by col-lator, misunderstood by printer in *Oth.*, 365²⁸, 369³⁴; in s.d., erroneous, in *M.N.D.*, 244; in names, see character-names; see also additions and excisions.
- alternative endings in *M.N.D.*, 242.
- 'ambo', 195, 212.
- Amboyna, allusions to massacre at, censored, 171¹.
- 'anatomy', 'atomy', skeleton, 272^B.
- Anne (of Denmark), Queen, 312²⁴, 320, 332^o; her company of players, see Queen Anne's men.
- anticipation, errors of, in transcript due to familiarity with text, 326.
- anticipations, a mark of reporting, 191.
- anticipatory s.d.s., 138.

anti-patriotic sentiment alleged as cause of omission, 268.
 Anth., an actor, *see* A. Brewer.
Antonio and Melhba, actors' names in, 119-20.
Antony and Cleopatra, 398-403; data of publication, 67.
 apostrophes, Crane's use of, 356, 415.
 'apparition', 393; 'in an apparition', 412.
 Arber, Edward, work cited, xi; 44¹.
Arcadia, The Countess of Pembroke's, 45-
Arden of Feversham, 99^A.
 Ariosto, Lodovico, 210.
 Armin, Robert, 285, 297, 386³⁰.
 'arms, in his', i.e. carrying, 377.
Arraignment of London, The, y2³, 145.
 arrangement of plays in F, 80.
 'arras', hangings at back of stage, 130;
 'at the arras', back stage, 139.
 Arundel, Earl of, Earl Marshal, 443¹.
 'as a boy', 4135 'as at first', 351; 'as at work', 424; 'as before', locally, 132, 404, temporarily, 399, 405; 'as being in', 132; 'as himself', 126; 'as in his home (chamber)', 132; 'as in battle', 404; 'as it were in' a place, 132, 405; 'as it were in retire', 404; 'as it were in triumph', 399; 'as king', 393; 'as prisoners', 377; 'as they died', 413; 'as to her trial', 416.
As you Like it, 293-5; data of publication, 67; alleged to be an 'assembled' text, i56³.
 'aside', i.e. go aside, retire, 129, 405; 'stands aside', retires, 221.
 asides marked, 131.
 Aspley, William, 65, 68.
 'assembled' texts alleged to be reconstructed from actors' 'parts', IOI^F, 156-8, 217, 335, 356⁶ 4'6.
 assignments, unregistered in S.R., 34; of unregistered copies, 35-37.
 assimilation a mark of reporting, 191.
 Astley (or Ashley), Sir John, Master of the Revels, 170^M.
 'astringer, a gentle', 351-2.
 'atomy', anatomy', skeleton, 272^B.
 authority for printing, 29.
 authority, textual, claims made in F,
 authors, remuneration of, 69^B; writing

s.ds. tend to use language of the stage, 122; sometimes demand stage noises, 122, 410.
 autograph copy, criteria of printing from, 147-9; prompt-books, 162-3, exceptional, 93-95, 104^K.
 autographs, Chettle's, 94, 163^A; Dekker's, 94, 163^A; Heywood's, 108, 162^A; Marlowe's?, 108; Massinger's, 93, 162^A; Mountfort's, 93, 163^A; Munday's, 93, 162-3^A; S.'s, 94, 99^A, 163^A, familiar to Heminge and Condell, 92.
 'axe with the edge towards him', 423.
 Bacon, Francis, publication of his *Essays*, 45.
 'bad' quarto, alleged to have been used in preparing 'good', 222⁹ (*L.L.L.*), 230 (*R. & J.*), 331^F (*Ham.*); occasionally consulted by printer of 'good', 231 (*R. & J.*), 315 (*ham*); used to supply defects in copy for Fi, i *Hen. VI*, 177, and possibly Q2 *R. & J.*, 231; supposed lost, *L.L.L.*, 219; preserves phrases lost in 'good' text of M.W.W., 335.
 'bad' quartos, list of, 427-8; replaced by 'good', 49; their supposed origin, 72¹; borrow from other plays, 177, 226; reprints of 1619 contain corrections, 177, 283; occasionally used in preparing 'good' texts, 426-7,
 Bakeless, J., 108⁴.
 'balcone, enter in the', 123.
 Bald, R. C., work cited, xi; 96³, 99^A, 158⁶, 165⁶, 168¹, 172^R, 433³.
Ball, The, 171^N.
 ballad, fragment of, incorporated in report of M.W.W., 335.
 Balls, Francis, an actor in *Believe*, 117², 118.
 'Bargulus the strong Illyrian pirate', 184^A.
 Barley, William, 63.
Earnavilt, *see* Sir John van Olden Barnavelt.
Battle of Alcazar, The, 'plot' of, 164^A.
 Baxter, Richard, an actor in *Believe*, 117², and in *Mad Lover*, 120.
 'bear, exit pursued by a', 416.
 Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647, 1², 18⁴, 434¹, 438¹, 449⁶ folios of 1647

- and 1679, progressive purging of oaths in, 152; *see also* H. Moseley.
- 'bed' drawn onto the stage, 128; 'thrust out', 140; 'put forth', 180, 425³.
- Beeston, Christopher, 171^N.
- Beggars' Bushy* nature of ms. text, 172^R.
- 'bell rings', 131, 393; 'bell rung', 359; 'ring the bell', 393.
- Belleforest, Francois de, his *Histoires tragiques*, 299, 304, 309, 313.
- Bennett, H. S., work cited, xi; 56³, 74^m, 460¹.
- Bentley, G. E., work cited, xi; 117¹, 170^M.
- bestrafte Erudermord, Der*, account of, 307-9.
- Bevis, an actor in 2 *Hen. VI*, 119, 182-3.
- bibliographical links between 'bad' and 'good' quartos, in *R. & J.*, 230¹¹; 231¹³, in *Hen. V*, doubtful, 283; in *Ham.*, 331^K; between Q and F 2 *Hen. IV*, 276⁵ *cf.* textual links.
- Bibliographical Society's Dictionaries of Printers &c., xi, 24^c.
- Bill, John, on entrance in S.R., 30; his English edition of the *Mess-Katalog (Catalogum uniuersalis)*, 440.
- 'bills', kind of halberds, 180.
- binding of F, cost of, 455.
- Birrell, A., 69¹.
- 'biting his thumbs', 129, *cf.* *R. & J.*, I. i. 48 ff.
- Blackfriars playhouse, music at the, 144; opened in 1609, 3925 an indoor house, 394¹⁸.
- Blagrove, William and Thomas, 170^M.
- blank pages in F, their significance, 438-9.
- 'bleeding captain' in *Macb.*, 391-3; his speech linked with the 'Pyrrhus' speech in *Ham.*, 391; his rank, 397^f.
- Blind Beggar of Eednal Green, The*, an actor's name in, 120.
- 'blocking' entries in S.R., 36³, 60³, 256, 338, 398.
- 'blood, by my', 171ⁿ.
- 'blot in his papers, scarce a', 82.
- Blount, Edward, his share in the publication of F, 4-5, 59; suggested editor, 78; suggested author of dedication and address, his literary pretensions and style, 18; entered A. & C. and *Pericles* in S.R., 67, 398; 451¹.
- Boas, F. S., 210³.
- Bodleian Copy of the First Folio of Shakespeare, The*, xii; of no special authority, 450¹; date of binding, 454.
- Bolton, J. S. C., 204³.
- Bond, Thomas, an actor in *Two Noble Ladies*, 118.
- Bonduca*, the ms. a private transcript by Knight of Fletcher's foul papers, 107, 153, which probably contained a good deal of alteration, no, and showed signs of uncertainty regarding characters and action, in; 162^A.
- Bonian, Richard, *see* Walley and Bonian.
- 'book', i.e. prompt-book, 94, 100^B, 150-1, 3382.
- 'book called the book of, a', implying entrance of a prompt-book in S.R., 100^B, 256.
- book-keeper, of the King's company, at one time Edward Knight, possible editor of F, 785 his functions, 100^B; his legitimate ordering of action and text, in, 324-5; his efforts at purging plays of offence, 171^N; as possible reporter, 177-
- bookseller, position of, 73^K.
- borrowings from other plays in reported texts, in *T. of S.*, 210; in *R. & J.*, 226; in *M.W.W.*, 337.
- Boswell, E., 162^A.
- botching, 268¹¹, 353.
- Bowers, Fredson T., vi; on *Erudermord* and *Alphonsus of Germany*, 331^o; on the composition of Qz *Ham.*, 331^E; on the method of printing F, 459; on proof-reading from type, 460^j 1522, 222⁴, 276¹, 348, 357⁶, 4622.
- 'boy the least that can play', 136.
- Bradley, A. C., 289.
- Bradwood, Richard, 65.
- 'brave', finely dressed, 126, 212.
- 'braving', quarrelling, 130.
- 'brawl ridiculous', danger of, 394¹⁷.
- Brew[er ?], Anthony, an actor in *Two Noble Ladies*, 118.
- Briggs, W. D., 20⁷, 26¹.
- Bright, Timothy, his *Charactery*, 380.
- 'Brooke' changed to 'Broome' in *M.W.W.*, 337.
- Brooke, Ralph, his *Catalogue and Sue-*

- cession, 440², 441, 4605 his *Discovery of Errors*, 441¹.
- Brooke, William, Lord Cobham, Lord Chamberlain, 232⁻, 262⁵; Henry, Lord Cobham, 262⁶.
- Brown, Arthur, 162^A.
- Brudermord*, see *bestrafte Brudermord*.
- Buc, Sir George, Master of the Revels, 170TM; 150, 151¹, 38^A, 415, 4391.
- Buckingham, Duke of, 191¹.
- Bullard, J. E., 41¹, 6¹.
- Bullen, A. H., 162^A.
- Burbage, Richard, i, 383²¹.
- Burby, Cuthbert, his alleged association with Danter, 52¹; 62-64.
- Burghley, Lord, possibly prototype of Polonius, 330^B.
- Busby, John, the elder, his bad reputation, 41¹; 64-66.
- Bussy D'Ambois, warning direction in Q2, 140; Qi possibly used as a prompt-book, i60⁴.
- 'bustle about', 405.
- Butter, Nathaniel, 12, 14, 66, 68.
- Byrne, Muriel St. C., on Munday's spelling, 148²; 163^A.
- 'called', named, 181, 201, 351; 'called up', i.e. warned ?, ny².
- Cambridge, *Ham.* acted at, 307.
- Cambridge editors (old), Clark and Wright, 192⁷, 279, 373^E, F¹; (new) Quiller-Couch and Dover Wilson, 279.
- Camden, William, Clarenceux King of Arms, his *Britannia*, 441⁴.
- Cameron, K. W., 151⁶.
- cancel, in course of printing, in *T. & C.*, 339; of a leaf in *F*, 445; after publication, in 2 *Hen. IV*, 266.
- canon for *F*, determination of, 76-77; work by *S.* outside it, 98^A.
- Capell, Edward, on *S.*'s text, 85; in⁵, 206, 222, 245, 332¹, 401⁶, 413.
- Captives*, *The*, autograph by Heywood, probably foul papers annotated by book-keeper, 108, 162^A; actors' names introduced by book-keeper in, 118; s.ds. in, 124-6, 128, 130-1; s.d. altered by book-keeper, 134; position of s.ds. in, 138³; warning directions in, 141.
- Cardenio*, a play by *S.* and Fletcher, 98^A.
- Carey, George, Lord Hunsdon, date of succession, 225; date of appointment as Lord Chamberlain, 225, 232^A.
- Carleton, G., his *Madness of Astrologers*, 1624, 452³, advertised in *Bill's Catalogus* in Oct. 1623.
- 'carrying the nobles to death at Pomfret', 193.
- Cartwright, William, presentation ms. of his *Royal Slave*, 153³; two plays in his collection of 1651 prepared as prompt-books and licensed by Herbert, 161².
- cast reduced in performance, 319 (*Ham.*), 386^A (*Lear*).
- Castelain, Maurice, 26^E.
- casting, changes in, lead to songs being transferred to another character in *T.N.*, 243; to omission of a song in *Oth.*, 358; to contradictions in text of *Ay.L.i.*, 293.
- Cauthen, I. B., work cited, xii; 38322, 458, 459¹, 466^E.
- Cecil, Robert, 261^A.
- censorship, a factor in modifying author's draft, 106; trends of, 149-52; suspected in Q 2 *Hen. IV*, 273^E, and in *F Lear*, 387^A.
- 'centerie', 399.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de, his *Don Quixote*, 98^A.
- 'chair, in a', 179, 181, 360, 377.
- Chalmers, George, printed extracts from Herbert's office-book, 170^M.
- Chamberlain, the Lord, intervenes to protect the King's men's plays, 15-16, 24^o, 46, 153; date of George Carey's appointment as, 225, 232^A; 17, 36³, 51¹, 256.
- Chamberlain's men, act with the Admiral's at Newington Butts, 210, 299.
- Chambers, E. K., vii; works cited, xi; on the releasing of plays by the companies, 91, despite their habitual reluctance, 102^o; follows Pollard regarding autograph prompt-books, 103^K; on s.ds., 121, 166^o; on the effect of the Act against profanity, 149, 157-2; on 'assembled' texts, 156-7; his chronology of *S.*'s plays accepted, 175; in error over the date of George Carey's appointment as Lord Chamberlain, 232^A; 3, n³, 24^o, 26^E, 28¹, 35², 36², 84¹, 101^E.

- 102^h, 103^j, 107², 112^(*), 116, 117¹, 150³, 155, 159⁵, 162^A, 166^F, 168^K, 170^M, Chap. V *passim*.
 Chambers, R. W., on *More*, 99^A.
Chances, The, 140.
 Chapel children criticized in *Ham.*, 312²⁴.
 Chapman, George, 145, 164^B, 421.
 character absent from *Temp.*, through oversight, 420; survives in A. & C. from J.C., 401⁶; appears by error, 323, 341, 402; appears owing to doubling of parts, 300, 330^o; unnecessarily introduced by modern editors, in *Cymb.*, 413, and speech transferred to him, in A. & C., 4015 takes over a second role through exigencies of casting in *M.N.D.*, 243.
 character-designations, contradictory respecting rank, 224^A (*L.L.L.*), 300 (*Qi Ham.*), 395²², 397ⁿ (*Mach*); irregular (or otherwise), 113-14 (evidence of foul papers), 120, 182, 195, 198^o, 201, 203, 214, 220-1, 224^A (alleged to be evidence of revision), 230, 234^o (also found in reports), 236, 241, 252, 257, 272^A, 278, 285, 291, 294, 314, 342, 352, 354, 361 (due to transcriber), 377, 381, 385, 395, 402, 406, 413, 424; normalized in F, 205 (*T.A.*), 267 (2 *Hen. IT*).
 character-names abbreviated in s.ds., 341 (*T. & C.*); altered in course of composition or production, 201 (*C. of E.*), 262 (1 *Hen. IP*), 266 (2 *Hen. IV*), 296 ([?] *T.N.*), 352 ([?] *All's Well*); in later performance of *M.W.W.*, 3375 *mQiHam.*, 300, 330^B; varied for a pun, 201 (*C. of E.*); corrupted in *Qi Ham.*, 300, 330^{A, B}, and in Q2, 313; taken by modern editors from Plutarch, 401⁵, 402 (*A. & C.*); invented by them, 41 1² (*Tim.*); possibly supplied by transcriber, 355 (*M. for M.*); reminiscent of earlier plays, 352-3 (*All V Well*); variation of form, 2892 (*J.C.*), 420 (*Temp.*); variation of spelling between Q and F, 361¹⁴ (*Oth.*), 385 (*Lear*), and in F, 402, 406-7 (*A. & C.*), 411 (*Tim.*), 413 (*Cymb.*); misprinted, 424-5 (*Hen. VIII*).
 characterization, difference in, of the Queen in Qi and Q2 *Ham.*, 303-4.
 characters, confusion over historical, in 2, 3 *Hen. VI*, 177, in *Rich. III*, 197^B, in *John*, 252; of minor in *R. & J.*, 235^F; distinguished by initials, of origin in *C. of E.*, 401, and possibly of actors in *All's Well*, 352; double named, 201 (*C. of E.*), 354 (*M. for M.*); identity uncertain, 257 (*M. of V.*), 279 (*Much Ado*), 293 (*A.y.L.i.*), 354 (*M. for M.*); insubstantial, 354-5 (*M. for M.*); minor, reduced in number in prompt-book, 319 (*Ham.*), 386^A (*Lear*).
 characters exit and immediately re-enter for a new scene, contrary to Elizabethan staging, 322 (*Ham.*), 356 (*M. for M.*), 400 (*A. & C.*), 4131 (*Cymb.*), 418¹ (*Temp.*).
 characters pass from one locality to another without leaving the stage, 299 (*R. & ?*), 251, 254^F (*John*), 322, 332¹ (*Ham*), 356 (*M. for M.*).
 'charges of, at the', 5.
Charlemagne, 162^A.
 Charlewood, Alice, 6.
 Charlewood, John, 6, 465^d.
 Charlton, H. B., 222.
 charter of the Stationers' Company, 1557, with confirmation of 1559 and exemplification of 1684, 29⁵.
 'chase' for type, 433.
 'chess, playing at', 129; 'at chess', 4195
 'chess-board ready', 140.
 Chettle, Henry, his participation in *More*, 94; his association with Danter, 232^B; his *Troilus and Cressida* with Dekker, 34722.
 Chetwind, Philip, publisher of the Third Folio, 98^A.
 chorus contradicts action of play in *Hen. V*, 284.
 choruses mark act-division, 143², 231, 283; possibly omitted in performance of *Hen. V*, 2836.
 Christian IV of Denmark, 389, 397^o.
 Cintio's *Ecatommiti*, 361¹³.
 'clapper-clawed', 339.
 Clark, Sill, an actor in *Blind Beggar of Bednal Green*, 120.
 Clarke, Sampson, 61.
 classical and non-classical Tragedies in F, arrangements of, 81.
 'clear' stage, 143¹, 160, 173⁵.

Cobham, the Lords (William and Henry Brooke), 23z^A, 262, 337.
 Cockpit company, 108-95 playhouse, 350^C.
 'coffin, enter', 318, 323.
 Cohn, A., his *Shakespeare in Germany*, 307²¹.
 Cokayne, Sir Aston, owned a transcript of *Mad Lover*, 153².
 Cole, an actor in *Antonio and Mellida*, 120.
 Cole, George, warden of the Stationers' Company, 59.
 collaboration in *Hen. VIII*, 422.
 collaborator, alleged directions to, in *All's Well*, 352.
 collation, bibliographical, of F, 436.
 collation, textual, imperfect, 192, 198^B (*Rich. III*), 237 (*Rich. II*), 349 (*T. & C.*), 371 (*Oth.*), 386 (*Lear*).
 Collection of 1619, 439.
 Collier, J. P., 22^C, 350^o, 373^E.
 colloquialisms removed in Q and restored in F in i *Hen. IV*, 265^B; removed in F 2 *Hen. IV*, 269.
 colophon used to correct imprint, 74^N.
Comedy of Errors, The, 200-2; confusion in distinguishing characters, 113; alleged to be an 'assembled' text, 156³.
 'commenting of this wedding', 351.
 communal reconstruction of text by performing company, 191, 380, 426.
 companies of actors, see
 Admiral's men.
 Chamberlain's men.
 Chapel children.
 Cockpit company.
 Derby's men.
 Hunsdon's men.
 King and Queen's young company.
 King's men.
 King's Revels' company.
 Lady Elizabeth's men.
 Paul's men.
 Pembroke's men.
 Prince Charles's men.
 Queen Anne's men.
 Queen Elizabeth's men.
 Strange's men.
 Sussex's men.
 Worcester's men.
 'compartner', copartner, 125, 277.

composite copy for F, 192 (*Rich. HI*), 204 (*T.A.*), 236-7 (*Rich. II*).
 composers, their treatment of copy, 466^F; their critical importance, 333; of various plays, 466^E; two distinguished in F, 457; whether working simultaneously or alternately, 457², 458; in *Rich. III*, 199^E; in i *Hen. IV*, 264^A, comparison of their work, 466^E; in *Ham.*, 328; in *T. & C.*, 350^o, 447²; in *Lear*, 38322, 458; in *Oth.*, 458-9; compositor of Q2 *Ham.* alleged to have been incompetent and hurried, 312, but his hurry questioned and there were probably two, 331^E; compositor of Q *Lear*, 387.
 Condell, Henry, see Heminge and Condell.
 confusion due to abbreviated prefixes, 214 (*T. of S.*); due to alleged use of 'bad' quarto, 222⁹ (L.L.,L.); due to use of foul papers, 233^C (*R. & 7-*)» due to cutting, 396^{B,C} (*Mach.*).
Conquest of the Indies, The, 167ⁿ.
 consecutive speeches by the same character, 246^A (*M.N.D.*), 400 (*A. & C.*).
 contaminated transcripts, 154-6; limits of plausible corruption in, 155-6; alleged in Q *Rich. III*, 190, in F *Ham.*, 236, in Q *Oth.*, 364, and in Q *Lear*, 381.
 contamination by omitted passages in report, 191.
Contention, The Whole, 12.
Contention between the Houses of York and Lancaster, The first Part of, 176; identified with 2 *Hen. VI* for purposes of copyright, 60.
 contents of F, 437.
 'continuous copy', 102ⁿ.
 Cook, M. McL., 162^A.
 copies, proportion unregistered in S.R., 35-
 copy for F, possible varieties of, 106 ff.; composite, 192 (*Rich. HI*), 204 (*T.A.*), 236-7 (*Rich. II*)-, for Q illegible, 312 (Q2 *Ham.*), 379 (*Lear*).
 copy-holder as printer or bookseller, 57-58, 68.
 copyright, nature and source of Elizabethan, 28 ff.; not established by mere printing, 34; the Act of 1709,

- 69^A; in S.'s plays before F, 67-695 difficulties over, upset printing of F, 443 (*Rich. II* and i *Hen. IV*), 445 (*T. & C.*).
 Corambis or Corambus, 300, 309, 330^B.
Coriolanus, 404-7; corruption in IO4².
 Coronet', 375, 384⁷.
 'corrected', on tide-page, ambiguity of, 220⁴.
 correction of quartos used as copy for F, 159; 192 (*Rich. III*), 237 (*Rich. II*), 243 (*M.N.D.*), 259 (*M. of V.*), 280 (*Much Ado*), 349 (*T. & C.*), 321 (*Oth.*), 386 (*Lear*); of historical errors in Q *Rich. II*, 236.
 corrections in quartos reprinted in 1619, 177 (*Contention*), 243 (*M.N.D.*), 258, 261^B (*M. of V.*), 283 (*Hen. V*).
 'corse, enter', 193, 311, 323.
 'counsel of war', staff officers, 400.
Court-Books of the Stationers' Company, xii; B, 4³, 32³, 37¹⁻², 38¹, 57^k; C, 24^o, 32⁴.
 court version of *Macb.* perhaps preferred for publication, in F, 395.
 'covent', convent, fraternity, 135.
Convent Garden, The, peculiar s.ds. in, 123.
 Cowley, Richard, an actor in *Much Ado*, 116, 279, 281.
 Crane, Ralph, his work as scribe, supposed to have prepared copy for several plays in F, 100^P; possibly originated regularly massed entries, 158; 144², 217, 269-72, 275¹¹, 335, 356, 391¹⁰; 415, 416-18, 419³, 420-1, 426-7.
 Creede, Thomas, 62, 65.
 Creizenach, W., 211, 307²¹.
 cues in actors' 'parts', 157.
 'cum aliis', 310-11; 'with cumaliis', 405-6.
Cupid's Revenge, 141¹.
 'cursing', 404.
 'curtain', traverse, 180, 424; 'curtains' of bed, 180, 227.
 Curt(is), see C. Greville.
 'cushions', 311, 405.
 cut text usually, but not necessarily, derived from prompt-book rather than from foul papers, 370.
 cutting necessary on the stage, 2; observed in making private transcripts, 101^E, 153; in extant mss., 145-7; in *Humorous Lieutenant*, 172; in *Rich. III* for provincial performance, 191, and also on political grounds, 191; for later performance in R. & J. 226; on political grounds in Q *Rich. II*, 257; in 2 *Hen. IV* on literary rather than on political grounds, and restored in F, 267, wrongly effected at one point, 276; in F *Ham.*, 312, at one point in later performance, 317, and at another carelessly marked in foul papers, 332; in report of M.W.W., 334, partly perhaps on political grounds, 336-7; for performance in *Oth.*, marked in foul papers but passages retained in prompt-book, 358, 370, at one point for a later performance and involving further consequential cutting, 358; for representation in F *Lear*, 375, alleged alternative cutting in Q and F unlikely, 375, some possibly on political grounds, 387^A; in extant text of *Macb.*, 389, resulting in confusion, 396^{B,C}.
Cymbeline, 412-14; misplaced among Tragedies, 80⁸, 414, 446.
 Daborne, Robert, his *Poor Man's Comfort*, 120; in Henslowe's correspondence, 92³, 145, 164^B, 165^C, 167^H.
Damnable Life of Doctor Faustus, The, 38-39, 449^I.
 Daniel, P. A., 111, 192⁶⁻⁷, 233^c, 334¹, 384.
 'Danish march', 320.
 Danter, John, 52¹, 61, 63, 220, 225. date altered in a quarto of 1619, 16².
 Davenant, Sir William, his alteration of *Macb.*, 391¹⁰.
 Davison, Francis, 261^A.
 Dawson, G. E., works cited, xii; 69^A, 464^{A,B}.
 Day, John, his *Blind Beggar of Bednal Green*, 120; 164^o, 167ⁿ.
Dead Man's Fortune, The, 'plot' of, 164^A.
 'dead march', 377, 405.
 'dearn' altered to 'stern', 386.
Decameron, The, published by Isaac Jaggard, 8.
 dedication and address in F signed by

- Heminge and Condell, **r**; possible authorship of, 17-21.
- defect in ms. copy supplied from 'bad' quarto, 177, 184^B (2, 3 *Hen. VI*), 230-1, 234' (*R. & J.*).
- defective copy of quarto used for reprint of *T.A.*, 204.
- defective entrances a sign of foul papers, 112.
- Defence of Cony-catching, The*, 164^C.
- Defence of Poetry, The*, 421^B.
- Dekker, Thomas, his participation in *More*, 94; his *Honest Whore*, n6², 144², 371^A; published some of his plays himself, 165^C; his *Troilus and Cressida* with Chettle, 34722.
- Demetrius and Enanthe*, a private transcript by Crane of *Humorous Lieutenant*, 162^A; 101^D, 153, 1728, 217².
- Derby's men, 208^B.
- derelict copies, 34.
- Dering ms. of *Henry IV*, 264.
- Dewe, Thomas, 61.
- Dewischeit, Curt, 72¹.
- dialogue replaced by descriptive s.d. in 'bad' quarto, 226.
- Dick of Devonshire*, 162^A; directions in, 140.
- Digby, Sir Kenelm, nominal editor of the posthumous volume of Jonson's Works, 78¹.
- Digges, Leonard, contributed verses to *F*, 450-1.
- 'discovers', 419; 'discovery', 425.
- displaced lines in *R. & J.*, 233^C.
- Doctor Faustus* pilfered in *A Shrew*, 210.
- 'Doll is dead, my', 287^A.
- Don Quixote*, source of *Cardenio*, 98^A.
- 'door, at the', i.e. back stage, 130.
- 'doors' in open country, 122.
- Doran, Madeleine, 106¹, 379.
- double-dealing over mss. of plays, 108, 164^C.
- double entrance in *S.R.*, 338 (*T. & C.*), 398 (*A. & C.*).
- Double Falsehood*, 99^A.
- doubling of parts, 177, 302; a note of it causes confusion in assignment of speeches, 230, 235ⁿ, 253, 330^o.
- Dowie, Rowland, an actor in *Believe*, 117², 118.
- Dowling, Margaret, 462¹.
- dramatic *enjambement*, whereby characters remain on the stage in spite of a change of locality, 254^C, 332¹, 356ⁿ, 425-
- dramatis personae, lists of, alleged to be characteristic of prompt-books, 121; those printed in *F*, 355, 411, 418; that for *M. for M.* alleged to belong to an earlier version, 355.
- Droeshout, Martin, his portrait of *S.* in *F*, 18⁴, 451, 465^o.
- 'dropping after', 126, 409.
- drunkenness at the Danish court in *Ham.*, 312²⁴; possibly a reflection on that at the court of James I, 332^o.
- Duchess of Malfy, The*, massed entries in, 1575 explanatory notes in, 168¹.
- 'dumb John, or', 277.
- dumb-show perhaps elaborated into a spectacular scene by another hand in *Cymb.*, 413¹.
- dumb-shows indicating act-division, 143².
- duplicate account of incident in *Brudermord*, 305.
- duplicate entrances, characteristic of foul papers, 112; in 2 *Hen. IV*, 166^E.
- duplicate setting of pages in *F*, 242.
- duplication in s.d.s., character and actor's name, 138-9; in 3 *Hen. VI*, 181-2; in *T.A.*, 205; in *T. of S.*, 213; in *L.L.L.*, 221; in *M.N.D.*, 240-1, 244-5; in *M. of V.*, 257, 259ⁿ in *Much Ado*, 278; in *Hen. V*, 286-7; in *J.C.*, 290; in *Ham.*, 311; in *T. & C.*, 344-
- duplication in text, characteristic of foul papers; due to restoration of cuts, 165^o; in *R. & J.*, 110-11, 230, 233^C; in *Rich. 11*, 236; in *J.C.*, 289; in *Qz Ham.*, 314; in *T. & C.*, 349.
- duplication of character under different names in *M.N.D.*, 240, 245.
- duplication of character-name, Bardolph in 2 *Hen. IV*, 266; Jaques in *A.y.L.i.*, 293.
- Duthie, G. I., works cited, xii; on shorthand, 73¹, 380; on *T. of S.*, 210⁴, 211; on *R. & J.*, 226², 232^B, 234^E; on *Qi Ham.* and *Brudermord*, 299-309; his edition of *Lear*, 380-1; 253^A, 282¹.

- Ecclestone, William, an actor, 352.
 echoes of other plays in reported texts, 177, 189.
 editing of F, 76 ff.; literary editing in i *Hen. IV*, 262; in 2 *Hen. IV*, 269, 271; in *Oth. Q*, 373^F, and F, 373°.
 editorial interference in F, 196 (*Rich. III*), 223 (*L.L.L.*), 275^G (2 *Hen. IV*)-, 'the usual sophisticating editor of F', 345-
 editorial work on Qz, *T.A.*, 204, 208^A; on quartos in the collection of 1619, 177 (2, 3 *Hen. VI*), 243 (*M.N.D.*), 258 (*M.ofV.*), z'i(*Hen.V*).
Edmond Ironside, 162^A; actors in, 118; s.ds. modified, 134; position of s.ds., 30.
Edward II, borrowed from in *Contention* plays, 177.
Edward III, ascribed to S. by Capell, 99^A; 126, 130-1, 167°.
 Edwards, Philip, work cited, xii; on *Pericles*, 98^A, 466^E.
 Eld, George, 66.
 Elizabeth, Princess, her marriage festivities, 280, 392, 415, 417-18; her company of players, see *Lady Elizabeth's men*.
 Elizabeth, Queen, sensitive on the subject of Richard II, 273^E; her company of players, see *Queen Elizabeth's men*.
 Ellis (Worth ?), an actor in *Poor Man's Comfort*, 120.
 Ellis-Fermor, Una, 408¹.
 'em' for 'them', a Jacobean spelling, 75^H, 357-
 'English march', 320⁴¹.
English Traveller, The, i08⁵, 449.
 engravings, printing of, 449.
 'enter' meaning come forward, 244, 344, 405-65 meaning speaks 'within', 343-
 entrance in S.R., 29 ff.; obligatory, 31; fines for omission of, 32; its alleged connexion with quality of text, 39 ff.; fee for, 42³, 74^P; conditional, 338; of the F plays, 59.
 entrance-directions, serve also as speech-headings, 341; inadequate (or otherwise), 141, 166^E, 182, 194, 197^A, 214, 257, 263, 266-7, 278, 291, 311, 323, 341¹, 344, 351, 354¹, 361¹, 37⁸, 381, 385¹, 387¹, 395, 401, 406, 411, 413, 416, 420, 424.
 epilogue to 2 *Hen. IV*, additional paragraphs out of place in Q, 266, corrected in F, 267.
 equivocation, doctrine of, 297.
 Erasmus' *Adagia*, 255°, 460°.
 errors, textual, numerical computation of, in F *Rich. III*, i98^E; that make good sense, 314; due to repetition or anticipation from neighbouring passages, 325-6; due to oversight or miscorrection by collator in F *Lear*, 387°; due to press corrector, 313 (*Qz Ham.*), 350^A (*T. & C.*), 387^C (*Q Lear*).
Escapes of Jupiter, The, autograph play by Heywood, 162^A; s.ds. in, 122¹.
 Essex, Earl of, *Rich. II* performed on the eve of his rebellion, 238; 273-4¹, 283°.
 Evans, G. B., 161², 189^A.
 excisions in proof, 203 (*T.A.*), 276¹ (2 *Hen. IV*).
 'exit' and 'exeunt', possibly confused owing to use of contracted forms, 361".
 exit with immediate re-entrance, often not marked, 361, 425, and sometimes imagined by modern editors, 424; in a new scene contrary to Elizabethan staging, see *under* characters.
 expansion of text in *T.A.*, 203.
 explanatory notes and glosses as s.ds., a peculiarity of Munday, 142, 167¹.
Faery Queen, The, i04^L.
 fair copy, author's, supposed to have sometimes served as prompt-book, 183, 187, 222¹⁰, 291-2, 426-7; scribal, intermediate between foul papers and prompt-book conjectured, i68J, 364²³, 467^{PS}.
Faithful Friends, The, 162^A, 164.
 'falls', lets fall, 192-3.
 false dates on quartos, 11-12, 16.
 false starts and first drafts in foul papers, no, 233^C (*R. & J.*), 222 (*L.L.L.*), 236 (*Rich. II*), 266, 273° (2 *Hen. IV*), 314 (*Ham.*), 346-7 (*T. & C.*), 364²¹, 369, 372° (*Oth.*), 403 (*A. & C.*).
Famous Victories of Henry V, The, 64.

- Farmer, Richard, recognized S.'s hand in *Pericles*, 98^A.
- Faustus*, see *Doctor Faustus* and *The Damnable Life*.
- Favin, Andre, his *Theatre of Honour*, 440, 442, 465°.
- fees for entrance and licence, 42³, 74^P.
- Fel., possibly an actor's name in *T. of S.*, 214.
- 'fellow, a', 310.
- fencing, rapier and dagger superseded by single rapier, 320-1.
- Field, Nathan, 164^B.
- 'finis actus primi (primus)', &c., 217, 223, 296.
- First Part of the Contention, The*, 176; identified with 2 *Hen. VI* for purposes of copyright, 60.
- First Part of the Reign of Richard 11, The*, see *Thomas of Woodstock*.
- Fisher, Thomas, 65.
- Flatter, Richard, 147¹.
- Fleay, F. G., 1482, 166^F, 192⁷, 242.
- Fletcher, John, his alleged unblotted papers, 92², no; his *Bonduca*, 107, and his uncertain handling in the foul papers, in; collaborated with S. in *Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Cardemo*, 98^A, and in *Hen. VIII*, 422; his portrait, 449⁶.
- Fletcher, Lawrence, 397^D.
- 'for', i.e. as, dressed as or in the character of (cf. 'like'), 127, 221, 257, 293.
- 'for, printed', meaning of, 5¹.
- foreign fashions, jibe at, removed in *F. Much Ado*, 280.
- foreigners, reflections on, censored in *More*, 260.
- Forman, Simon, 392, 413, 415, 417.
- 'forme', inner and outer, 433; skeleton, 435-
- Forster, Max, 72¹.
- Fortune playhouse, effect of its erection on the publication of plays, 91; burned down, 157⁶.
- Fortune's Tennis*, Part II, 'plot' of, 164^A.
- foul papers (or sheets), mentioned in Daborne's correspondence, 92³, 94, 106, 165°, and as the source of the transcript of *Bonduca*, 106-7, 110-11; likelihood of their preservation, 107-8, and reason for assuming it, 107²; handed over by S., 92, 94; the probable source of 'good' dramatic texts according to McKerrow's theory, 96; sometimes annotated by book-keeper, 97, 109; perhaps used on occasion as prompt-book, 1031, 348; few examples survive, 108; characterized by textual duplications and false starts, no, by textual tangles, in, by 'ghost' characters, mutes, and irregular entrances, 112, by irregular character-designations, 113, and by omitted or ambiguous speech-prefixes, 114; the manner in which actors' names may occur in them, 114 ff.; summary of differences between them and prompt-books, 141-2; unfinished in *Tim.*, 411; 426-32.
- Fox, W. M., 417⁶.
- Frankfort book-fair, 3.
- Frederick and Basilea*, 'plot' of, 164^A.
- 'French march', 320⁴¹.
- Frijlinck, Wilhelmina P., 162-3^A.
- functional character-designations in foul papers, 113-14; but may also occur in reports, 234°.
- 'fundamentalism', 76².
- 'funeral, enter the', 187.
- Furness, H. H., printed a translation of *Brudermord*, 307²¹.
- G., initial of an actor in *Honest Man's Fortune*, 118.
- Gabriel, see G. Spencer.
- '183⁹ 183⁹, 302, 337.
- Game at Chess*, A, by Middleton, private transcripts of, one wholly and one partly autograph and three by Crane, 162^A; one by Crane has regularly massed entries, 158; 153, 217²-
- 'garmombles', 336.
- Garnet, Father Henry, 298.
- Gascoigne, William, an actor in *Believe*, 117², 210.
- gatherings, see quires.
- Gaw, Allison, on the occurrence of actors' names in authors' mss., 115¹.
- Gebon, possibly an actor's name in *Q. Hen. V*, 283.
- 'gentle astringer, a', 351-2.
- Geoffrey of Monmouth, 413.

- George, an actor in *Woodstock*, 118, and possibly in 2 *Hen.* VI, 183.
- Gerard, John, his *Herbal*, 220ⁱ.
- Gericke, Robert, 234^E.
- Gerritsen, J., work cited, xii; 100^c, 162^A. *Gesta Grayorum*, 200², 340⁸.
- 'ghost(s)', in s.ds., 290 (*J.C.*), 300, 310, 318 (*Ham.*), 393 (*Macb.*), 413 (*Cymb.*), and see *Rich. III.*, V. iii. 118-62.
- ghost character in *M. of V.*, 258.
- ghosts and mutes, characteristic of foul papers, 112, 195, or perhaps of abridgement, 112³; in 2 *Hen.* IV, 266—7, in *Much Ado*, 2785 in *Hen.* V, 287; in *All's Well*, 352, in *A. & C.*, 401.
- Gibs, Anthony, an actor in *Two Noble Ladies*, 118.
- Gibson, H., an actor in *Ironsides* and *Captives*, n8.
- 'girke', jerk, stroke, 179.
- Globe playhouse, effect of its erection on the publication of plays, 91; 'not received custom of music' at 144; burned down, 157.
- Globe edition of *S.*, editors Clark and Wright, 233^C.
- Gollancz, Israel, work cited, xii; 59¹? 453²- 'good' quartos, printed in part from 'bad', 230 (*R. & J.*), conjectured, 229 (*L.L.L.*-) influenced by 'bad', 315 (*Ham.*).
- 'good' text, fragments of, alleged to be embedded in reports of 2, 3 *Hen.* VI, 177.
- Gosson, Henry, 67.
- Gough, Robert, an actor in *Second "Maiden's Tragedy"*, 117, and possibly in *All's Well*, 352.
- 'gown of humility', 127, 405.
- Gradwell, Henry, an actor in *Ironsides* and *Woodstock*, 118.
- grammatical construction, alleged recasting of, by transcriber, 366.
- 'grand possessors', 339, 348, 350^o.
- Granville-Barker, H., 375¹, 407³.
- 'graphic errors', mistakes due to misreading an author's handwriting, 148-9.
- Gray, H. D., 302.
- Gray's Inn, performance of *C. of E.* at, 200.
- Greene, John, an English actor in Germany, 308.
- Greene, Robert, accused of double-dealing over *Orlando*, 164^o; his 'mighty Abradas', 184^A; his *Menaphon*, 299²; his *Pandosto* (or *Dorastus and Fawnia*), 417.
- Greene's News from Heaven and Hell*, 104^L.
- Gresham College, 19¹, 21.
- Greville, Curtis, an actor appearing as 'Curt' in *Believe*, 118, and as 'Curtis' in *Two Noble Kinsmen*, 100^c, 119; alleged to be 'Curtis' in *T. of S.*, 166^F.
- Griffin, W. J., 191⁴.
- Grimaldus Goslicius, Laurentius, his *Counsellor*, 330^B.
- Guise, Due de, 224^A.
- Gwynne, Matthew, his *Vertumnus*, 396^A.
- 'ha' in place of 'a' for 'have', a Jacobean spelling, 357.
- 'hair about her ears', 193, 343-45 'hair down', 300.
- Hall Book or Register of the Stationers' Company, 58.
- Hall, Edward, his chronicle, *The Union of York and Lancaster*, 184^A.
- Halliwell[-Phillips], J. O., 88, 262¹, 465.
- 'halters about their necks', 126, 136, 180.
- Hamlet, The History of*, 299³.
- Hamlet*, 299-333; data of publication, 66; 'bad' quarto of, discovered in 1823, 86¹, replaced by 'good' quarto, 52; corruption in, 104^L; style deliberately varied in the players' play (and in the Tyrrhus' speech), 421.
- 'hand, in her', i.e. leading by the hand, 377; 'hand in hand', 399; 'holds her by the hand', 405; 'leading in his hand', 412.
- handwriting, Heywood's bad, 109.
- Harington, Sir John, 332^G.
- Harry the Sixth*, probably i *Hen. PL* 186, 189^A.
- Harsnett, Samuel, summoned to defend his licensing of Hayward's *Henry IV*, 274^E.
- Hart, Alfred, 273^E, 371^A.

- Hart, Horace, 439'.
 Hart, H. C., 334!.
 'ha's' for 'has', a spelling favoured by Crane, 275".
 Hasker, Richard, 237, 238^A.
 Haughton, William, 164^B, 167".
 Hayes, Lawrence, 65, 68.
 Hayes, Thomas, 65.
 Hayward, Sir John, his *First Part of the Reign of Henry the Fourth*, 27 f., 275^E.
 'headborough', 277.
 headlines left standing in F as part of skeleton forme, 435.
 'hearse, enter', 193, 323⁴⁷.
 'heave aloft', 400.
 'heavily', sadly, 419.
 Hecate, a later addition in *Macb.*, 391; 'Hecat', 393, pronunciation, 397^E.
 Helme, John, 61.
 Heminge, John, on the ms. of W.T., 4i5'439¹-.
 Heminge, John, and Condell, Henry, sign the epistle and address in F as nominal editors, i; the choice of dedicatees theirs, 17; their knowledge of the canon, 76; their editorial duties, 77; their claims respecting F, 81-82, misinterpreted, 83-88, correctly explained, 88-89; familiar with S.'s autographs, 92; their task of textual selection, 105; on S.'s unblotted papers, 107-9; 8⁶, 19³, 21, 342.
 Henri IV (of Navarre), 200, 219.
 Henry IV, Part I, 262-5; data of publication, 64; compositor analysis of, 466^E.
 Henry IV, Part II, 266-76; data of publication, 65; mutes and defective or redundant entrances in, 166^E.
 Henry V, 282-8; data of publication, 64.
 Henry VI, Part I, 185-9; reason for inclusion in F, 77¹.
 Henry VI, Parts II and III, 176-84; data of publication, 62; actors' names in, 119; interruption in printing of Part III in F, 444.
 Henry VIII, 422-5; reason for inclusion in F, 77, 80⁶.
 Henry Richmond, Part II, 167".
 Henslowe, Philip, 90⁶, 92³, 144², 165^c, 299; 371^A-.
 Hens Lowe Papers, cited, xiii.
 Henslowe's Diary, cited, xiii.
 Herbert, Sir Henry, Master of the Revels, 170"; his strictness as censor, 150-1; took fees for licensing, 42⁵; 78¹, 1588, 160⁵, 161², 415, 417⁵, 439¹.
 Herbert, Thomas, 170^M.
 'here' in s.ds., characteristic of Nashe, 187³, 2638; 187, 259, 263, 376, 404, 416.
 Heywood, Thomas, his *Apology for Actors*, 9; his *Captives*, 108, 162^A; his *Escapes of Jupiter*, 121¹, 162^A; his alleged participation in *More*, 99; alleged author of the masque in *Temp.*, 421; his prolific output of plays, 108⁵; his bad handwriting, 109, its peculiarities, 149; peculiarity of his spelling, 148²; on the reluctance of companies to print their plays, 102^G; on the double sale of plays, 165^c.
 Hickson, Samuel, 210'.
 Hinman, Charlton, works cited, xiv; 373^E, 434², 457¹, 458^B, 42', 463' '465^o, 466^E.
 'historica passio', 386.
History of Hamlet, The, 299³.
 Hobbes, Thomas, an actor in *Believe*, 117².
 hoboyes (oboes), indoor instruments, 394".
 Hodgson, S., his notes on the Stationers' Company, 29⁵.
 Holc(omb), Thomas, an actor in *Believe*, 118.
 Holinshed, Raphael, his *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, 147, 184^A, 396^A, 413, 422.
 Holland, Hugh, contributed verses to F, 449.
 Holland, John, an actor in *John of Bordeaux*, 118, and in 2 *Hen. VI*, 119, 182.
 Homer, knowledge of, shown in the cancel title-page of *T. & C.*, 349.
 homoeoteleuton, 372^o.
Honest Man's Fortune, The, 162^A; re-licensed, 160⁵; actors' names in, 118; its s.ds., 133, modified by book-keeper, 134, their position, 138; 'repetition brackets' in, 165^o.
Honest Whore, The, Part I, erratic scene-division in, 144²; 116², 371^A.

- Honigmann, Ernst, 254.
 Hoppe, H. R., works cited, xivj 34^s, 51^l, 52^l, 226, 466^E.
 Hort (Hjort), Greta, 222.
 Hor(ton), Edward, an actor in *Mad Lover*, 120.
 'host, with all his', 286.
 Houk, R. A., 211.
 Howard of Effingham, Lord, 170".
 Hubert, an actor in *Believe*, ny².
Humorous Lieutenant, The, s.ds. modified by book-keeper, 1372.
 Humphrey, see H. Jeffes.
 Hunsdon's men, 51^l, 225.
 'hurly-burly', 187 (cf. *Macb.*, I. i. 3).
 hyphens, Crane's excessive use of, 356.
- I., B., i.e. Ben Jonson, 449, 457^l.
 Illiard, see E. Swanston.
 Imogen or Innogen, form of name, 413.
 'impensis', 5^l.
 imperative and indicative s.ds., 123, 166-7^c, 257, 259.
 'impresa', 238.
imprimatur, 29-30.
 imprints, misleading, 4-5; names in, as acknowledgement of rights in copy, i4²; their interpretation, 55-58; corrected in colophons, 74; irregular, connected with Hodgets, 74^o.
 'in' and 'out', meaning of, 122³; 'in' = off the stage, 129, 227; 'in' = onto the stage, 359, 377 (F 'out'), 409, 419.
 'in a rage', 409; 'in bed, enter', 360; 'in her bed', 412; 'in his arms', 377, 412; 'in her hand', 377; 'in his hand', 188; 'in shape of', 419.
 inconsistencies in texts, 293 (*A.y.L.i.*), 389-90 (*Macb.*).
 indefinite s.ds., 135-6, 182, 196, 200, 203, 212.
 indelicacy removed, 268.
 indicative and imperative s.ds., 123, 166-7^c, 257, 259.
 'infinite numbers', 136.
 Inner Temple, order forbidding festivities at the, 340⁸.
 Innogen, 125, 277.
 Inns of Court audience, character of, 340-
 insertions (or substitutions) by another hand alleged, 204⁸ (*T.A.*), 294-5 (*A.y.L.i.*), 3751 (*Lear*), 390-1 (*Macb.*), 413-14 (*Cymb.*), 417 (*W.T.*), 421 (*Temp.*).
 'invisible', technical term, 123, 418; 'a robe for to go invisible', 123.
Ironsides, see *Edmond Ironsides*.
 Islip, Adam, 66.
 italic type used for certain speeches in Qi and Q2 R. & J., 230-2.
- Jack, an actor in *Captives*, 118.
 Jaggard, Dorothy, widow of Isaac, 5^l, 22^c.
 Jaggard, Isaac, son of William, assisted his father in his printing business, 6-16; his entrance of the F plays, 595 his position regarding F, 79-80.
 Jaggard, John, brother of William, 7^l; John the younger, his son ?, 7^l.
 Jaggard, Thomas, son of William, 7^l.
 Jaggard, William, his printing business, 6-16, purchased from Roberts, 2i^A; his infirmities, 22^B; 47-48, 62, 64-67.
 Jaggard, William and Isaac, Chap. VI *passim*.
 James I (and VI), i9i⁴, 274-5^l, 282-3, 389^l 395^l 397^D.
 Jeffes, Humphrey, an actor in 3 *Hen. VI*, 119, 183.
 Jenkin, Bernard, 400^l, 402.
 Jenkins, Harold, 333^L.
 joke missed by reporter, 210.
John, see *King John*.
John a Kent and John a Cumber, i62^A; the 'book' of, 100^B.
John of Bordeaux, 163^l actor in, 118; its s.ds. modified, 134; their position, 138.
 Johnson, Arthur, 12, 14, 65, 68.
 Johnson, F. R., 455³.
 Johnson, Samuel, on the state of S.'s text, 83-84; 176, 354.
 Jones, Inigo, 419³.
 Jonson, Benjamin, the case for his authorship of the epistle and address in F, 18-21, 26^E; his verses in F, 18, 449; on S.'s unblotted papers, 19, 107; his posthumous works edited by Sir Kenelm Digby, 78^l; 'Benjamins plot' for a tragedy, 145, i64^B; followed the neo-classical method of scene-division, which may have supplied a hint for the massing of entries, 158; published his own plays

- in quarto, 165^o; killed G. Spencer, 166^f; his reversion of the Mastership of the Revels, iyo^M; i, 2³, 3, 77², 153³, 392 419³, 434¹ 449⁶ 462²
 Jordan, J. C., 164^c.
 'Jove' as substitute for 'God', 297.
Julius Caesar, 289—92.
 'jump' altered to 'just', 373^F.
- Kemp, William, an actor in *Much Ado*, 116, 279, 2815 in *R. & J.*, 116, 117², 230, 235^F; possibly in 2 *Hen. IV*, 273^B; possibly the creator of Falstaff, 273ⁿ, 284-5, 335.
 'kettle drums', 310.
 King, Lucille, 184¹.
King and no King, A, Qi printed in 1619 from a private transcript, Q2 printed in 1625 from a copy of Qi that had served as prompt-book but in which the oaths remained, 26^D, 143¹, 151-2, 154, 160-1.
 King and Queen's young company of players, 24^o.
King John, 248-55; data of publication, 61; its relation to *The Troublesome Reign*, 189^A.
King Lear, 375-88; data of publication, 66; acted by a provincial company from a printed book, 161.
King Lear, data of publication, 66.
 King's men, 1², 10, 14-16, 24-25^D, 52.
 King's Revels' company, their policy of not printing plays, 102^o.
 Kirschbaum, Leo, 30¹, 34³, 42, 242¹, 380⁽¹²⁾.
 Knight, Edward, at one time book-keeper to the King's men, possibly concerned in the editing of *F*, 78-79; his identity established, 100^c; his hand not traceable in *F*, 100^o; his work on *Two Noble Kinsmen*, 98^A; his transcript of *Bonduca*, 107; his work on *Believe*, 133-4; transcribed *Honest Man's Fortune* for re-licence, 160⁵, 171^N; his efforts at purging plays of offence, 171^N; his punctuation, 172^R; 109, 360ⁿ.
 Kyd, Thomas, 299.
- Lady Elizabeth's men, 21, 109, 145.
Lady Mother, The, i63^A; warning directions in, 139.
- Launching of the Mary, The*, Mountfort's autograph prompt-book, i63^A, 93¹ 95-
 Law, Matthew, 63-64, 68, 443-4.
 Lawrence, W. J., 94¹, 158¹ 160⁴.
 Lea, K. M., 163^A.
Lear, see *King Lear*.
 'led by', 399 (cf. 'in her (his) hand'); 'led to execution', 194.
 Lee, Sidney, works cited, xiv; on copy-right, 42-44; on S.'s text, 86-87; on alleged characteristics of prompt-books, 121; 6⁶, 80, 152, 439³, 45Q², 455³¹ 5¹ 463², 44^A-
 Lefranc, Abel, 219².
 length and duration of plays, 146.
 Lever, J. W., 220¹.
 'lights', see 'torches' &c.
 licence for printing, 29; for acting, by the Master of the Revels, in the prompt-book, 160⁵, 174^w.
 'like', as, dressed or disguised as, in the guise of, 126-7, 205, 293, 412, 418-19; 'habited like', 423; 'like a statue', 416; 'like himself', 409.
 lines removed in the course of printing, 266, 276¹; misdivided, 241-2, 357, 379; divided in *F* because of narrow measure, and in *Q* because of alteration in copy, 357; divided to indicate a pause, 401; divided for no apparent reason, 408.
 Ling, Nicholas, 62—64, 66.
 literary editing in *F*, 269, 271, 364, 364^F, ^G; cf. s.ds., 342.
 Littledale, H., 163^A.
 locality recorded, 131-2; indicated in s.ds. of *C. of E.*, 200; less definite on the Elizabethan stage, 257; change of, while characters remain on the stage, 229, 251, 254^o, 322, 332¹, 356.
 Locne, 413.
 Lodge, Thomas, 299.
 London, City of, acting in, 307.
 'London stone', 128.
 'long' act-interval, 144.
Looking Glass for London and England, A, a quarto of, used as prompt-book, 143¹, 161.
Love's Labour's Lost, 219-24; data of publication, 64; a 'bad' quarto probably lost, 52; irregular character-designations in, 113.

Love's Pilgrimage, 140.

Lowen, G., an actor in *Barnavel*, 118.

Lowin, John, an actor in *Believe*, 117².

Loyal Subject, The, 'reformed' by Herbert, 151.

Lyly, John, 170^M.

M., I. (J. Mabbe), contributed verses to F, 450-1.

Mabbe, James, 451¹.

Macbeth, 389-97.

Macchiavel and the Devil, 92³.

McIlwraith, A. K., 1072, 466^E.

McKerrow, R. B., works cited, xiv; his theory of foul papers as the source of printed dramatic texts, 96-97, 107, of irregular character-designations as a mark of foul papers, 113, 201, 3525 on the occurrence of actors' names in foul papers, 115, i83¹⁰; on the recording of properties by the book-keeper, 141¹⁷; explained the apparent occurrence of fragments of 'good' text in 'bad' quartos by the use of 'bad' quartos to supply defects in 'good' copy, 177, 184^B, 231⁽¹⁶⁾, 124, 176¹, 191^{2,4}, 192¹, 204³, 2992, 433²⁻³, 450¹, 4552, 460¹. 5.

McManaway, James G., vi.

Mad Lover, The, actors' names in, 120, 125, 131; a transcript owned by Sir A. Cokayne, 1532.

Madan, Falconer, 450²⁻³.

Mago, William, an actor in *Believe*, 118.

Maid of Honour, The, 466^E.

Maid's Tragedy, The, 151, 362¹⁶.

Malone, Edmond, on S.'s text, 85-86; restored *Pericles* to the canon, 98; printed extracts from Herbert's Office Book, 170TM; 20⁷, 26^E, 176, 232^A.

'manet', 'rnanent', 212, 229, 263, 280, 286, 311, 318, 404.

manuscript plays, reference list of, 162—^A

Marcellus-theory in *Ham.*, 320.

marches, Danish, 320; English and French, 320¹¹; dead, 377, 405.

marginal additions in copy, 204, 241-2, 357, 408; without speaker's name, 114 (*More*), 229-30 (*R. & J.*).

Marguerite de Valois, 219, 224^A.

Marlowe, Christopher, his *Massacre at*

Paris, ms. fragment of, 108; his *Dido* with Nashe, 391³.

Marlowesque style in *A Shrew*, 210.

Marston, John, his *Antonio and Mellida*, 119; published his own plays in quarto, 165²; 451¹.

Masque of Blackness, The, 419³.

Masque of Queens, The, 392.

Massacre at Paris, The, ms. fragment of, possibly of foul papers, 118, its s.ds., 122; borrows from 2, 3 *Henry VI*, 1771.

massed entries, occasional, how they arise, 112; in Q *M.N.D.*, 240, corrected in F, 245; in Q 2 *Hen. IV*, 267, and in F, 2715 in *All V Well*, 351; in Q *Oth'* corrected in F, 359-60; in Q *Lear* corrected in F, 376; in A. & C., 402; none in M. for M., 356.

massed entries, regular, in *T.G. of V.*, *M.W.W.*, and *W.T.* alleged to indicate 'assembling' from actors' 'parts', 156-7; also found in *Duchess of Malfy*, 157, and in one ms. of *Game at Chess*, 158, and may be a habit of Crane's, 158; in *T.G. of V.*, 217; in *M.W.W.*, *MRK* *R.F.*, .

Massinger, Philip, his autograph prompt-book of *Believe as you List*, a recasting on a censored play, 103; prompt-books of his other plays scribal, 103¹; his punctuation, 172ⁿ.

Massingham, John, 297.

Master of the Revels, his censorship of plays, 150-2; licensed plays for printing as well as for acting, 71^E; his licence on plays, 77, 97, 108-9, 4545 *More* submitted to him, 94; *Launching* censored by him, 95, but the exact reading doubtful, 103; refuses to license original version of *Believe*, 103; his licence for acting possibly accepted as authority for entrance of *M. of V.*, 256; revised plays for court performance, 348; see also Sir G. Buc, Sir H. Herbert, and E. Tilney.

Masters of the Revels, succession of, 69-70^M.

Mathewes, Augustine, 6r.

Maxwell, J. C., 204^{3,6}, 275^F.

May, Edward, an actor in *Ironsides*, 118.

Mayne, Jasper, 451¹.

- Mayor of Queenborough, *The*, mentions the use of quartos as prompt-books by 'country-comedians', 161.
- Meadowcroft, J. W. R., 334^f.
- Measure for Measure, 354-6; alleged to be an 'assembled' text, 156³. 156³.
- memorial reconstruction, the origin of 'bad' quartos, 73¹; communal in *Rich. III.*, 191, and alleged to be so in *Lear*, 380⁵ spasmodic, alleged in *Oth.*, 360.
- memorially contaminated transcripts, 326-7.
- Merchant of Venice, *The*, 256-61; data of publication, 655 alleged to be an 'assembled' text, 156³. 156³.
- merry-andrew, 279^f.
- Merry Wives of Windsor, *The*, 334-7; data of publication, 65.
- Mess-Katalog, 3.
- Michael ('mighell'), an actor in *Barnauelt*, 183.
- Middle Temple, performance off *T.N.* at the, 297.
- Middleton, Thomas, his possible connexion with *Mach.*, 391, 397³ ^E, his *Game at Chess*, 1553, 1583, 1626² ^A, 217²; his *Witch*, 101¹⁰, 153, 1636³ ^A, 172⁹, 217², 191-2; 371^A.
- Midsummer Night's Dream, *A*, 240-7; data of publication, 55; a musician's name in F, 119.
- 'mighell', see Michael.
- Miller, E. H., 164^c. 164^c.
- Millington, Thomas, 61-64.
- 'minimum errors', 149¹.
- misassignment of speeches, 246^A (Q *M.N.D.*), 259-60 (Q *M. of V.*), 283 (Q *Hen. V.*), 324 (F *Ham.*), 378 (Q *Lear*).
- miscalculation of space needed for plays held up in printing E, 444-6.
- mishearings in Q *Lear*, 398.
- mislining, due to marginal additions, 241-2 (Q *M.N.D.*), 2711 (Q, F 2 *Hen. IV.*); due to running on half-lines to save space, 401 (A. & C.), 404 (Cor.); in *Tim.*, 408.
- misplacing, of chorus alleged, 284 (*Hen. V.*); of *affalitie*, 192⁹ (*Rich. III.*), or lines, 233⁶ (*R. & J.*); cf. s.ds. 213 (*T. & S.*), 223³ (*2 Hen. IV.*).
- misprints due to ambiguities in the
- ambles handwriting, graphic errors, 1449, 222-23, 401, 404.
- 'micks and mows', 419.
- Mommsen, Tycho, 88.
- Monpeghart, Count, 336.
- More, see Sir Thomas More.
- Moseley, Humphrey, responsible for Beaumont and Fletcher collection, for which he wrote the address, 1², containing remarks on Fletcher's autographs, 92², 109, on the nature of 'originals', 101^E, and on cutting in private transcripts, 1553, 3361⁵ attributed *Cardenio* to S. and Fletcher, 99^A.
- Mountfort, Walter, his autograph promptbook off *Launching of the Mary*, 103^f.
- Moxon, Joseph, 456, 465^B.
- Much Ado about Nothing, 277-81; data of publication, 655; a musician's name in F, 119.
- Muir, Kenneth, 380¹⁶.
- 'multitudes', 180.
- Munby, A. N. L., 455³.
- Munday, Anthony, the original version of *More* in his hand, 94, 163^A, also *John a Kent*, 162^A; his spelling, 148²; his use of 'enters', 167^o; his use of explanatory glosses as s.ds., 167¹.
- music between the acts, 143², 144³; at the Blackfriars, 144, but not at the Globe, 144⁴.
- mutes, 166^E, 266-7 (2 *Hen. IV.*), 195 (*Rich. III.*), 230 (*R. & J.*), 278 (*Much Ado*), 2387 (*Hen. W.*), 2911 (*J.C.*), 241 (*III. & C.*), 354-5 (*M. for M.*), 401-2 (*A. & C.*); "mutes", 310 (F *Ham.*).
- Nabbes, Thomas, his *Covent Garden*, 123.
- Narcissus, 213¹⁴.
- Nashe, Thomas, 1 *Hen. VI.* Act I, assigned to, 187³; his *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, 100^B; his use of 'here' in s.ds., 187³, 262; parallels with, in 1 *Hen. IV.*, 262; his preface to *Greene's Menaphon*, 299; 43³, 44².
- Nedding, William, 11³.
- neo-classical scene-division, 158.
- Newington Butts, playhouse at, 210, 299.
- 'newly corrected', on title-page, 50, ambiguity of the phrase, 219-20.

- 'next', afterwards, 375.
 'nick' altered to 'interim', 373^F.
 Nick, possibly an actor in *T. of S.*, 214;
 see also N. Underbill.
 'night-gown', 127, 267, 290, 300, 389.
 noises on the stage, 122-3, 131' 354' 410'
 nonsense defended by editors, 270.
 Norwood, an actor in *Antonio and Melhda*, 120.
 note for collaborator or for own future
 guidance alleged to be preserved in
 s.d., 352.
 Nottingham's men, *see* Admiral's men.
 numerals, large fount of, use in pagina-
 tion of F, 439.

 'oaken garland', 127, 405.
 oaths, purging of, 149-52; by the
 printer in Q2 *Oth.* and other King's
 men's plays, 151-2; 205 (*T.A.*), 264
 (i *Hen.* IV), 296-7 (*T.N.*), 337
 (*M.W.W.*), 357(*Oth.*), possibly intro-
 duced by transcriber of *Oth.*, 357⁵.
 obscurity a possible reason for omission,
 372 ^{c.d.}.
 'offers to', makes as though to, 182, 188,
 192, 201, 227, 405, 424; cf. 'seems to',
 424.
 Okes, Nicholas, 66.
 'old man', 'oldman', 227, 234^o (*R. & J.*),
 277-8 (*Much Ado*), 376 (*Lear*), 393
 (*Macb.*).
 Oldcastle, original name of Falstaff,
 262, 337.
 omission, of scene, accidental, 266 (Q
 2 *Hen.* IV), alleged, 249 (*John*), 333¹
 (*Ham*); of speech, owing to obscur-
 ity, 264(1 *Hen.* IV).
 omissions in 2 *Hen.* IV, 267, 273-5^E
 (Q), 268 (F); in *Ham.* 312 (Q2),
 316 (F); in *T. SfC.*, 344-5 (F), 349'
 (accidental); in *Oth.*, 358, 372^o (Q),
 372^o (accidental), 358⁷ (F); in *Lear*,
 375 (Q accidental); in printing,
 alleged to be out of deference to
 royalty, 312²⁴ (*Ham.* Qz), 332^o (F).
 'oration to his soldiers (army)', 192.
 order of scenes altered in report, 282
 (*Hen.* V), 302 (*Ham.*).
 ordinances of the Stationers' Company,
 29', 31'
 'original copies', 85, 89; meaning of the
 term, IOI^E.

 original drafts of plays, *see* foul papers.
Orlando Furioso, an actor's 'part' from,
 164^A.
 ornaments, their condition evidence of
 order of printing, 436, 439-40; in F,
 listed by Pollard, 439'.
 Orwin, Thomas, 61.
Othello, 357-74; data of publication, 67;
 alleged to have been released by the
 players owing to delay in printing of
 F, 443".
 'other' speaker, 114 (*More*), 311 (Q2
 Ham), 410 (*Tim.*).
 'out', onto stage, 377; 'out before',
 already on the stage, 126, 213.
 Oxford, *Ham.* acted at, 307.

 P., T., *see* T. Pavier WT. Pollard.
 Pafford, J. H. P., vi, 163*, 440².
 pages of F reset, 445, 447.
 'painted full of tongues', 266.
Pandosto, 417.
 'pantaloon', 212.
 parentheses favoured by Crane, 275",
 335, 356, 415, but also by compositor
 B in F, 275"; mistaken for marks of
 deletion, 372^o.
Parliament of Love, The, 163^A; a dupli-
 cated s.d. in, 134.
 Parr, William, an actor, possibly in
 T. of S., 119¹, 214.
 Partridge, A. C., 422.
 'parts', *see* actors' 'parts'.
Passionate Pilgrim, The, 8, 10.
 patents for books, 70^o-^D.
 Patrick, D. L., on the text of *Rich.* III,
 190-2, 380.
 Patrick, William, an actor in *Believe*,
 118.
 Paul's boys, 4, 91, 200.
 Pavier, Thomas, 9-16*passim*, 48, 61-68
 passim.
 Pembroke's men, 91, 176-7, 183, 186,
 189^A, 208^B, 210, 212, 215.
 Penn, William, an actor in *Believe*, 118.
 'perfecting', 433.
 performance, recollection of, possible
 source of correction in the Collec-
 tion of 1619, 177 (*Contention*), 243
 (*M.M.D.*), 258, 261^B (*M. of 7.*), 283
 (*Hen.* V).
 performances, subsidized, 103/.

- Pericles*, data of publication, 67; one of Pollard's 'bad' quartos, 49²; regarded as only in part S.'s, 77; admission to the canon, its reporting, 98^A; composers of Q, 466^E; acted by a provincial company from a printed book, 161.
- permissive s.ds., 136-7.
- personalities in plays censored, 171^N.
- Peter, possibly an actor in *T. of S.*, 214.
- petitory s.ds., 136-7, 200, 212.
- Philaster*, 152, 362¹⁶.
- Pierce Penniless his Supplication to the Devil*, 43³.
- 'pillars, silver', 422.
- place-name, variant forms of (Corioles), 407.
- plague, its effect on the publication of plays, 90; closes the theatres, 90, 371^A.
- play, unfinished, 408 (*Tim.*); written for a wedding, 242 (*M.N.D.*), 420 (*Temp.*).
- play-bills, the right to print, 10, 22-24^C.
- plays, in ms., reference list of, i62-3^A; printed before F, data of publication, 61-67; published by their authors, 165^o; released for press, the players usually reluctant, 102^o, but occasionally forced to sell in batches, 90-91.
- 'plots', authors', as basis of dramatic composition, 106, i64^B; in cases of collaboration, 422; possible source of certain s.ds., 164^B, 352, 406, 410.
- 'plots', theatrical, list of extant examples, 163-4' usually name the actor of a part on his first appearance, 120', 163^A; act and scene divisions in, 143¹⁻²; s.ds. in, 157, 173"; their possible use in reports, 177, 283; their alleged use in 'assembled' texts, IOI^F, 156, and source of massed entries, 416; 22^C, 183, 347²².
- Plutarch, 401^{5r}. W.
- political censorship, 171^N.
- Pollard, A. W., works cited, xiv-xv; his theory of a connexion between entrance in S.R. and the character of a quarto text, 39; ^ev. Lee on copy-right, 42-46; his importance in S. criticism, 54-55; on the arrangement of the plays in F, 80; on Heminge and Condell's honesty, 82¹; on Dr. Johnson, 84, IOI^F; on stolen and surreptitious editions, 88; on the release of plays by the companies, 90; his speculations on the source of 'good' quarto texts, 92, and on autograph prompt-books, 93-95; on S.'s hand in *More*, 99^A; on 'continuous copy', 102^H; on interference by the book-keeper, in²; his misinterpretation of s.ds., 123-4, 160⁵ on the use of quartos as prompt-books, 159, 174^w; on *Rich. II.*, 236-8; on the number of copies of F printed, 455-6; 3, 6⁶, 10¹, 11³, 14, 18¹⁻⁴, 191, 21^A, 26^E, 36³, 41, 48-49, 69^{A, B}, 72¹, 78, 87², 103^K, 105, 160, 282², 295³, 415³, 436¹, 439³⁺⁴, 449⁶, 450³⁺, 455ⁿ, 456⁴.
- Pollard, Thomas, an actor in *Barnavelt*, 118.
- Polonius, origin of the name, 330^B.
- Poor Man's Comfort*, *The*, actors' names in, 120.
- Pope, Alexander, his treatment of S.'s text, 83; 98^A, 209^o, 248, 369³⁵, 396.
- 'post blowing a horn', 181.
- preliminaries in F, their printing and order, 446, 449-51.
- 'presenters', of a play, 212.
- press reader, corrections by, 223; errors introduced by, 313 (Q 2 *Ham.*), 350' (*T. & C.*)-, *mQLear*, 387^o.
- Price, H. T., 34³, 72¹, 76', 204'.
- price at which F was published, 454-5.
- Prince Charles's men, 161.
- printed copy possibly substituted for ms. copy for F, 196; 'printed for', meaning of, 57; printed sheets of F possibly licensed as prompt-book, 417'.
- printer, over-emphasis on, 47; nominal, work being farmed out, 73!; able to produce accurate texts of Elizabethan works, 97, 104^r.
- printing, in the sense of publishing, 4³; orderly and disorderly, 28-29; seventeenth-century methods of, 433-6; Jaggard's accuracy of, 466^m.
- printing of F, troubled course of, 438-52; account of the main interruption in, 441-2; date of completion, 452-4; rate of, 456, 465^o; time-table of, 461.

- printing-rights, imaginary, 15, 48; reserved, 49, 51³.
- private transcripts, 152-4; cut as in production, IOI^E; extant examples by Knight and Crane, 1535 character of the text in, 154; 427-8.
- privilege (patent-rights), its relation to copyright, 28, 44.
- Privy Council, 28, 274^E.
- 'proclamation', 359.
- producer's copy, 398 (A. & C.), 404 (Cor.), 419 (*Temp.*).
- production, one of the factors that may modify an author's draft, 106-75^{as} well as prompting an aim of an author's directions, 121, 132.
- profanity in plays, forbidden by Act of 1606, 149; Herbert's reaction to, 150-1, 171^N; purging largely editorial, 151-2; particularly thorough in i *Hen. IV*, in which the editing in F is literary, 264; editorial purging in F greater in Histories than in Comedies, perhaps because of Herbert's accession to office, 171-2²; instances of purging in F, 191' (*Rich. III*), 223 (*L.L.L.*), 237 (*Rich. III*), 260 (*M. of V.*), 264 (i *Hen. IV*), 268 (2 *Hen. IV*), 280 (*Much Ado*), 296-8 (*T.N.*), 329 (*Ham.*).
- prompt-books, entered in S.R., 60³, 100^B, 398; autograph, 92 ff., alleged by Pollard to be the source of 'good' S. texts, 93, 96; Chambers supports Pollard's theory of autograph, IO3^K; need for legibility in, 97; that of *Welsh Ambassador* prepared from annotated foul papers, 109; one source of printed texts, 112-13, 426 ff.; actors' names in, 114 ff; summary of differences between them and foul papers, 141-2; quartos used as, 159-61; printed sheets of F possibly used as, i60⁶, 417⁵; new ones licensed to replace those lost, 160⁵, 415.
- prompters' directions in 'good' quartos, 93, 95, and in mss., 133-4.
- proof, additions in, 233" (R. & J.), 279 (*Much Ado*)\ excisions in, 203 (*T.A.*), 266, 276¹ (2 *Hen. IV*).
- proof-reading, 79-80, 460.
- proof-sheets of F, corrected, extant, 462.
- 'properly habited', 127, 419.
- properties, mention at time of entrance of those required later indicative of prompt-copy, I41¹.
- prose, verse printed as, owing to additions in proof, 233^o; and prose as verse, 378, 408.
- Pruvost, Ren6, 164^o.
- publisher, printer, and bookseller, 55; publisher usually but not always the copy-holder, 57.
- punctuation, S.'s, possibly preserved, 236 (*Rich. II*), 278 (*Much Ado*), 314 (*Q₂ Ham.*), 342 (*T. & C.*); of Mas-singer and Knight distinct, i72^R; characteristic of Crane, 217, 275^N, 415; defective in Q *Lear*, 379, 387⁵ of F habitually redundant, 385, and mainly the compositor's, 467^m.
- Purfoot, Thomas, 63-64.
- purging, see oaths and profanity.
- 'Pyrrhus' speech in *Ham.* linked with that of the 'bleeding captain' in *Macb.*, 39 1¹³.
- quarto, substituted for ms. as copy for F, 196 (*Rich. III*)', printing of, completed at another press, 225 (Q *R. & J.*).
- quarto copy supplemented from authentic ms. in T.A., 236; quarto plays usually sold for sixpence, 455; quarto reprint of *Oth.* makes use of F, 362; quarto reprints of 1619 corrected possibly from recollection of performance, 177 (*Contention*), 243 (*M.N.D.*), 258, 261^B (*M. of V.*), 283 (*Hen. V*)\ quarto texts, possible sources of, 89, their nature and authority, 92.
- quartos of S.'s plays, summary list of, 426-7; data of publication, 61-67; varying quality of the texts, 83; Pollard's distinction of 'good' and 'bad', 39, 88 ff.; list of 'good', their quality also varies, 428; 'bad' not used for F, 83, 88, subject to some qualification, 88²; many used, often with correction, as copy for F, 159-60, 174', 426 ff.; the question of their use as prompt-books, 159-615 so used by provincial companies, 161; possible instances, 206 (*T.A.*), 174% 238 (*Rich. II*); alleged instances, 197

- (*Rich. III*), 260 (AT. of 7.), 280 (*Much Ado*).
- Queen Anne's men, 22^C.
- Queen Elizabeth's men, 53, 91, 248.
- 'Queen Mab' speech in *R. & J.*, confusions in, 233°.
- 'queen mother', 195.
- 'queint device, with a', 419; 'queintly disguised', 126.
- quires, normal size of, 434¹.
- quotation abbreviated in foul papers, 233^C.
- quotation marks used to distinguish 'sentences', 316.
- 'rabble', 240, 4055 'rabblement', 135, 180.
- Rape of Lucrece, The*, by T. Haywood, 165.
- 'rash' altered to 'stick', 386.
- reading of plays before production, 124, 167^{ff}.
- readings altered because obscure, 386.
- Reason, Gilbert, an actor in *Looking-Glass for London*, 161.
- 'redeemer of my soul' censored, 171^N.
- reduction of cast in performance, 319 (*Ham.*), 386^A (*Lear*).
- redundancy a possible reason for omission, 372°.
- Reed, Isaac, 455¹.
- re-entry rarely specified, 133, but 'enter again', 201.
- Register, see Stationers' Register.
- 'Reine Margot', 224^A.
- release of plays for printing, usual reluctance of players, 102°, sometimes overcome by circumstances, 90-91.
- removal of lines in course of printing, 266, 276¹.
- Renwick, W. L., 163^A.
- repetition, see duplication.
- 'repetition-brackets', 165°, 184^B, 403®.
- replacing 'bad' quartos by 'good', 43.
- report, supplies a passage suppressed in *Qi Rich. II*, replaced by genuine text in *F*, 2365 supplies phrases accidentally omitted in *F M.W.W.*, 3355 influenced by earlier version of *Ham.*, 3045 possibly of a version earlier than that preserved in the 'good' text, 283, 334⁽²⁾, 335-
- reporter had acted in an early (full) and a more recent (abridged) version of *R. & J.*, 226; his possible knowledge of French in *Hen. V.*, 283; introduces a fragment of a ballad in *M.W.W.*, 335;
- reporting, distinguishing marks of, 380; different styles of, in *Pericles*, suggest two hands, 98^A, but not in *R. & J.* (225-6), or *Ham.*, 300-1.
- reports, origin of, whether for acting or printing, 306—75 borrow from other plays, 177 (*Contention*), 177³ (*Massacre at Paris*), 210 (*A Shrew*), 304ⁿ (*Ham.*), 337 (*M.W.W.*)-, furnished by actors, 177 (*Contention*), 226 (*R. & J.*), 283 (*Hen. V*), 302 (*Ham.*), 334 (*M.W.W.*), or possibly by book-keeper, 177; 426 ff.
- reprint from defective copy, 204.
- restoration by report in later quarto of *Rich. II* of passage earlier omitted on political grounds, 236.
- restoration from *F* in later quarto of *Oth.* of passages cut in *Qi*, 362.
- Revels, Master of the, see under Master.
- 'reviews', revised proofs, 460.
- revision, possible, after report, 176 (*Contention*), 283 (*Hen. V*), 335 (*M.W.W.*) in the quartos reprinted in 1619, 177, 243, 258, 261^B, 2825 on revival, probable in 2, 3 *Hen. VI*, 178, 184^A, alleged in *L.L.L.*, 222; needed in some passages of foul papers, 111, 233, 236; marginal, not necessarily later, in *M.N.D.*, 241—2; in preparing prompt-book, possible, 268, 275° (2 *Hen. IV*), 319-25 (*Ham.*), 369, 370³⁶ (*Oth.*), also alleged in *Ham.*, 314—15⁽²⁹⁾; by transcriber in *Oth.*, 365, 366³⁰; literary, subsequent to performance improbable, 375, but admissible on occasion, 345¹⁸ (*T. & C.*); theory of, in *Lear*, 379; by another hand possible in *Mach.*, 392, alleged in *Tim.*, 408; of conclusion of *W.T.*, 417.
- Rhoads, R. G., 163^A.
- Rhodes, John (J. Rho.), an actor in *Honest Man's Fortune*, 118.
- Rhodes, R. Crompton, work cited, xii; imagined 'printing-rights', 15¹, 48³ on the occurrence of actors' names in

- texts, 115° on 'assembled texts', 156, 416°; 26°, 483, 4478.
- Rice, John, an actor in *Barnavel*, 118.
- Richard II*°, 236-9; data of publication, 63; performed on the eve of Essex's rebellion, 103°; interruptions in the printing of, in F, 439, 443.
- Richard II, The First Part of the Reign of*, see *Thomas of Woodstock*.
- Richard III*, 190—9; data of publication, 63; alleged to be borrowed from in *Troublesome Reign of King John*, 189^A; itself borrows from *True Tragedy of Richard III*, 215¹⁹.
- Richard III, The True Tragedy of*, data of publication, 63; 60°, 215¹⁹.
- Rickner, George ('G. Rick.'), an actor in *Honest Mans Fortune*, 118.
- rights pretended in derelict copy, 49¹.
- 'Rob', see R. Robinson.
- Roberts, James, acquired Charlewood's printing business and sold it to Jagard, 6, 21^A; his name in false imprints, 12, 16; his monopoly of printing play-bills, 22°; 61, 65-66, 68.
- Robinson, Richard, an actor in *Second Maidens Tragedy*°, *Barnavel*, and *Believe* ('Rob.'), 117-18.
- Romeo and Juliet*, 225-35; data of publication, 63; evidence that Q2 was printed from foul papers, 110-11; irregular character-designations in, 114; interruption of the printing of, in F, 445.
- 'roses, white (red)', 181.
- 'rotten armour marvellous ill-favoured', 194.
- 'round', whisper, 129.
- Rowe, Nicholas, 98°% 275^F, 411², 416.
- Rowley, Samuel, 31, 167°.
- Royal Slave, The*, presentation ms. of, 153°.
- rules round the pages of F kept standing, 434-5.
- running-titles of F kept standing, 435.
- 'rustling in', 400.
- Saint Christopher*, a play acted by a provincial company from a printed book, 161.
- 'Sallies, the three', 257.
- 'saluo iure cuiuscunque', 36, 61-63.
- Sanderson, George ('Sands'), an actor in *Poor Mans Comfort*, 120.
- Satchell, T., 466^E.
- satyr ornament in F, 439.
- Saxo Grammaticus, his Danish history, 2998.
- 'scaling-ladders', 187, 286-7.
- scansion, liberties taken with, in S's later plays, 401.
- 'scedule', 424.
- scenarios, see 'plots', authors'.
- 'scene, the right (left, middle)', 123.
- scene, added in F T.A., 204; accidentally omitted in Q 2 *Hen. IV* but restored by cancel, 266; (or incident) suppressed in Qi *Rich. II*, but restored in Q4 and F, 236.
- scene-division, Elizabethan practice regarding, 142-3; neo-classical practice adopted by Jonson, 158; in 'plots', 143°; the practice in F in some respects different from that in modern editions, 356, 414; in battle scenes, 395-6; uncertain at one point in F *Lear*, 386; erroneous division in F *Cymb.*, 414; imperfect in F *Rich. III*, 197, and *Ham.*, 329; altered by modern editors in *Hen. VIII*, 425; modern divisions unsatisfactory, 250⁸ (*John*), 268¹² (2 *Hen. 17*), 292 (*J.C.*), 396 (*Mach.*).
- scene-locations, 121.
- scene-numbering, probably a literary convention, 144; erroneous in i *Hen. VI*, 186, and *Lear*, 388^E.
- scenes, multiplicity of, in *Macb.*, 389, and A. & C., 400; transposed in report of *Hen. V*, 282, and *Ham.*, 302.
- Schmidt, Alexander, 191², 192⁷, 379¹⁰.
- Schucking, L. L., 99^A, 373^E.
- Schiitt, Marie, 99^A.
- 'scilens', silence, 147-8.
- Scotland, Chamberlain's men alleged to have visited, 397°.
- Scots, reflections on, removed, 260.
- scroll, conjuration read from, 182; containing actor's 'part', 226.
- sea fights, 182, 399-400.
- Second Maiden's Tragedy, The*, 163^A; exceptional nature of actors' names in, 117.
- second thoughts, S's, 314.
- Secord, A. W., 451¹.

- Segar (and Sir William Segar), 170^M.
 'serviture', servant, 257.
Seven Deadly SmSj The, Part II, 'plot' of, i64^A, kept together with the prompt-book, 157^F.
 'sewer', server, 392.
 Shaa, Robert, 167ⁿ.
 Shaaber, M. A., 57, 269-72, 275^F.
 Shadwell, Thomas, 411.
 Shakespeare, possible dramatic work by, outside F, 77, 98^A; his participation in *More*, 94, 99^A; possibly available for consultation in preparing prompt-book, no, in².
 Sheldonian press, Oxford, accounts of the, 456, 465^o.
 Shelton, Thomas, his translation of *Don Quixote*, 98^A.
 Shirley, James, his *Toung Admiral* commended by Herbert as free from profanity, but his *Ball* condemned for personalities, 171^N.
 Shirleys, *The Three*, see *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*.
Shoemakers' Holiday, The, 152².
 Short, Peter, 62, 64.
 shorthand, 72¹, 191², 380.
 Schroeder, J. W., vn.
 'Sibyllae, tres', 396^A.
 'side, enter at the one (other)', 125, 179;
 'side, stand on one (other)', 125, 181.
 Sidney, Sir Philip, 45, 421¹.
 Simmes, Valentine, 61-66.
 Simpson, Percy, works cited, xv; 2³, 19¹, 26^E, 460, 462.
 Sincklo, John, actor in 2 *Hen. IV*, *T. of S.*, 3 *Hen. VI*, and *Malcontent*, H5-I6W, 119, 183, 213, 266-7.
 Sir "John Falstaff and the Merry Wives of Windsor", 12¹.
 Sir John O Ideas tie, *Parti*, 12.
 Sir John van Olden Barnavel, i62^A; prompt-book written by Crane, 100^B; actors' names in (some of prominent characters), 117-18; s.ds. altered by book-keeper, 134.
 Sir Thomas More, 163^A; the 'book of, 100^B; S.'s contribution to, 99^A; s.ds. in the additions, 121-2; s.ds. altered by the book-keeper, 134; erroneous deductions drawn from the state of the ms., 102ⁿ; 93-94, 108.
 Sisson, C. J., 19¹, 161², 162^A, 298¹
 size of the edition of F, 455-6.
 'skeleton forme', 435.
 Smart, J. S., 176¹.
 Smethwick, John, 62-64, 66, 68.
 Smith, D. Nichol, vi.
 Smithweeke, see Smethwick.
 SMT, see *The Second Maidens Tragedy*.
Soddered Citizen, The, 163^A.
 'sold by', meaning of, 57.
 'solus', 193, 245, 263, 376.
 'some speake', 410.
 'somewhat fast', 227.
 song repeated in different plays, 276;
 song omitted, not necessarily S.'s, 358.
 songs transferred from one character to another, 297.
 'Soto', 213.
 'sound, falls in a', i.e. swoons, faints, 129, 180.
 Southampton, Earl of, 223.
Spanish Curate, The, 140, 141¹.
Spanish Tragedy, The, xv, 37-39, 255^o, 314¹⁷, 449¹.
 'speak(s)', in s.ds., 205, 212, 263, 410, 419, 424; 'enter with a speech', 221.
 Spedding, Joseph, 422.
 speech, opening words only given, 222; printed as s.d., 230, 235^F, 246; transferred from one scene and character to another in course of composition, no; transferred from one character to another by way of correction, 208^A, 246^A, but still erroneous, 206.
 speech-prefixes, omitted or ambiguous, point to foul papers, 114; confusion of, due to abbreviation, 214 (*T. of S.*), 220 (*L.L.L.*), 279 (*Much Ado*), 385 (danger recognized in *F Lear*); misplaced, 258⁴ (*M. of V.*), 262¹ (*i Hen. IV*), missing, 289 (*J.C.*); indentation of, as a bibliographical clue, 289 (*J.C.*), 331-2^F (*Ham.*); serve also for entrance, 413; see also character-designations.
 speeches misassigned, 206, 208^A (*T.A.*), 246^A (*M.N.D.*), 259-60 (*M. of V.*), 270 (2 *Hen. IV*), 320, 324 (*Ham.*), and adapted to wrong speaker, 378 (*Q Lear*).
 spelling, that of F mainly the compositor's, 467^F; as a guide to distinguishing compositors, 457; abnormal, possibly due to compositor, 222

- (Q *L.L.L.*), 313-14 (Q2 *Ham.*); the author's sometimes persists in print, 147-8, 169⁺; phonetic -/ for -ed S.'s, 363; Crane's, 275⁺; possible traces of S.'s, 222 (Q *L.L.L.*), 241 (Q *M.N.D.*), 258 (Q *M. of T.*), 266 (Q 2 *Hen. IV.*), 278 (Q *Much Ado.*), 285 (F *Hen. V.*), 2892 (7.C.), 296 (T.M), 3n-H (Q2 *Ham.*)' 342 (Q T. & C), 395²⁰ (Macb.), 4⁰¹ (A & C)» 404 (Cor.); no trace of S.'s in *A.y.L.i.*, 293, or 'V Well, 353.
- Spencer, Gabriel, an actor in 3 *Hen. VI.*, 119, 183; killed by Ben Jonson, 166^F.
- Spielmann, M. H., work cited, xv; 452'.
- Stafford, Simon, 64, 66-67.
- 'stage', in s.ds., 123, 181, 203, 267, 290, 300, 310, 318, 392, 399, 405, 424.
- stage-directions, 121 ff. j mainly due to the author, 121; double function of, for production and prompting, 121, 132; language used in, 122; varieties of, 124-32; those characteristic of the author, 135-7? unspecified groups, 135, indefinite numbers, 135-6, permissive and petitory, 136-7, sometimes demand for noises, 122-3, 4¹⁰ J those characteristic of the book-keeper, 137-41, anticipatory, 138, duplicative, 138-9, warnings, 139-40, specification of properties, 141¹, 1728, 230⁸; author's altered by book-keeper in preparing prompt-book, 133-4, or on reading through foul papers, 188, altered by the printer, 184^B; added by book-keeper in assembling contributions of different authors, 122, 188; grammatical form of, 123, 166^o; their absence in certain plays, apart from massed entries, alleged to indicate 'assembling' from actors' 'parts', 156, 173^T, 217, 335, 356, 415; in actors' 'parts' and theatrical 'plots', 157, 173^u; those in 'bad' quartos represent action seen on the stage, 184^A, 228, or derived from recollection of the text heard, 228, or possibly from access to the 'plot', 177; occasional similarity between those of 'bad' and 'good' texts, 177, 311, and alleged, 283; of literary type, 318-19 (*Ham.*), 360 (*Oth.*), 406 (Cor.), 420 (*Temp.*); recording appreciation by the spectator, 419 (*Temp.*); attached to wrong scene, 188 (1 *Hen. VI.*); 259" (*M. of V.*), 343-4 (*T. & Q.*), 394 (*Macb.*); misplaced within scene, 188, 244, 267, 273^B, 278, 294, 372^B, 400, 404, 410; position altered by modern editors, 420; erroneous, 229-30, 235^F, 343-4, 360, 393¹⁶, 399, 400, 406, and alleged, 291; inadequate for production, 236, 413; printed as part of text, 393; duplicated, 394, 410; deliberately omitted in foul papers, 400.
- stage-keepers appear as supers in *Two Noble Ladies* and *Captives*, 118.
- stage-noises, 131; demanded by the author, 122-3, ^m *Tim.*, 410; unexpectedly absent in *M. for M.*, 354.
- stage-setting, multiple, in *C. of E.*, not designed for the regular theatre, 200.
- staging altered, 178 (2 *Hen. VI.*), 268 (2 *Hen. IV.*), 320-3 (*Ham.*), 390, 394 (*Macb.*).
- 'stand by', i.e. apart, 126, 212; 'stand in their tent', 341.
- standing type, 434.
- Stansby, William, 44.
- Star-chamber decree of 1586, 28; of 1637, 2i^A, 31.
- Stationers' Company, its monopoly of printing, 28; its charter of 1557 with confirmation of 1559 and exemplification of 1684, 29⁵; its Register C, notes on the fly-leaf of, 24^o.
- 'stay behind', i.e. manent, 351.
- staying of plays, 24^o, 49.
- Steevens, George, 18, 26^E, 454-5.
- Stevenson, Allan, n³.
- 'still', = soft, 'music still', 245 (*M.N.D.*), 'still music', 293 (*A.y.L.i.*); = continuous, 290 (*J.C.*), 376 (*Lear*), 'continues still', 404 (*Cor.*); cf. 'music continues', 'music ceases' in *Hen. VIII.*, 424.
- 'stocks brought out', 376.
- 'stolen and surreptitious copies', 82; meaning of the phrase, 88.
- Stow, John, his *Survey of London*, 340^B.
- 'Strachey, the Lady of the', 298^o.
- Strange's men, 177, 186, 200, 208^B.
- 'strewers of rushes', 267.
- Sturman, Bertha, 160².

- Stutfield, George ('Stut(f).'), an actor in *Two Noble Ladies* and *Ironside*, 118.
 style varied for purposes of distinction, 421.
 Suckling, Sir John, presentation ms. of his *Aglaura*, 153³.
Summer's Last Will and Testament, 187³.
Sun's Darling, The, 466^K.
Suppositi, Gli, by Ariosto, translated by Gascoigne as *Supposes*, 210.
 Sussex's men, 19, 200, 208^B.
 'swaggering upspring reels', 332^o.
 Swanston, Eyllaerd ('Mr. Illiard'), an actor in *Wild-Goose Chase*, 120.
Sydney Papers, 232^A.
 Symcock, Thomas, 22^C.
 synopsis, see 'plot', author's.
- T., R., an unidentified actor in *Barnaveil*, 118.
 'table brought in', 205, 425.
 'table-book', writing-tablets, 221.
 'take', a portion of text allotted to, or continuously set by, one compositor, his 'stint', 458.
 'taking leave for the Florentine wars', 35¹-
TamarCam, Part I, 'plot' of, 164^A.
Tamburlaine, pilfered in *A Shrew*, 210; comparison with, challenged in *Troublesome Reign of King John*, 248.
Taming of a Shrew, The, identified with *The Taming of the Shrew* for purposes of copyright, 60.
Taming of the Shrew, The, 210-16; data of publication, 625 Sincklo an actor in, 115-165 other possible actors in, 119¹, 214; some minor characters in, alleged to bear the names of actors, 166^F.
 tangles and loose ends in text point to foul papers, III; left to the book-keeper to deal with, 1075 in *R. & J.*, 233^o in *Rich. II*, 2365 in *2 Hen. IV*, 266, 273^o; and perhaps in *Ham.*, 3⁴-
 Tannenbaum, S. A., 99¹.
 'taper', see 'torches' &c.
 'tarras', terrace, 180.
 Taverner, Richard, 460⁵.
 Tawyer, William (Heminge's man, but a regular member of the company), a trumpeter in *M.N.D.*, 119, 244.
- Taylor, an unidentified actor in *Two Noble Ladies* and *Captives*, 118.
 Taylor (Joseph), an actor in *Believe*, 117², 118.
Tempest, The, 418-21.
 ten Brink, Bernard, 211, 215¹⁹.
 text, partly replaced by s.d. in report, 226 (*R. fef y.*); partly converted into s.d. in *F*, 244 (*M.N.D.*); fragments of printed as s.ds., 221 (*L.L.L.*), 229-30 (*R. & y.*), 246 (*M.N.D.*), 300 (*Ham.*), 416 (*Cor.*).
 texts, summary of sources of printed, 426-32; made up from actors' parts, see 'assembled' texts.
 textual authority of *F*, claims made respecting, 81; that of quartos variable, 83; textual sources difficult to determine, 105; textual links between *R. & y.* *Qi* and *Q2*, 231, and between *Ham. Qi* and *Q2*, 315, 331^F, and *Q2* and *F*, 328; textual errors see errors.
 Theatre playhouse, 299.
 theatres, effect of their closing on the publication of plays, 90.
 Thelwell, Simon, 170^M.
 'then', in s.ds., 205, 263, 300, 392, 412, 419.
 Theobald, Lewis, on *S.*'s text, 84-85, his *Double Falsehood*, 99^{Aj} 332ⁿ, 402.
Thierry and Theodoret, 152, 362TM.
 Third Folio, its seven additional plays include *Pericles*, 98^B.
 Thomas, Sidney, 323^B, 230.
Thomas of Woodstock, 163^A; actors in, 118; s.ds. altered by book-keeper, 1345 warnings in, 140.
Three Shirleys, The, see *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*.
 'thrusts him in', i.e. stabs him, 362¹⁷.
 'thumbs, biting his', 129, cf. *R. & y.*, I. i. 48 ff.
 Tillyard, E. M. W., 76².
 Tilney, Edmund, Master of the Revels, 150, 169^M.
Timon of Athens, 408-11.
 title-pages as advertisements, 339¹.
Titus Andronicus, 203-9; data of publication, 61.
 'to them (him)', characteristic of 'plots', 157, in plays, as correlative of 'clear', 173²; to them', 404 (*Cor.*); 'enter to',

- 198° (*Rich.* 7/7); 'to the place of execution', 128 (*T.A.*); 'to death at Pomfret', 132, 193 (*Rich.* III)-, 'to the Priory (Abbess)', 200 (*C. of E.*).
- Toby (? Edward Tobby), an actor in *Woodstock*, 118.
- Todd, W. B., 6¹.
- 'top, on the', 123, 188, 418.
- 'torches' &c., 180 ('taper'), 320, 359 (also 'lights'), 360 ('lights'), 363²⁰, 376 (also 'lights'), 385 ('lights'), 392-3-393 ('taper') } 394 (in error), 424.
- Tourneur, Cyril, 145.
- 'tower', 179.
- Towne, Thomas, an actor in i *Honest Whore*, 116².
- transcription for press the policy when F was planned, 217, 336.
- transcripts intermediate between foul papers and prompt-books postulated, i68J, 364²³, 370³⁶, 467^{PS}; made to replace worn-out prompt-book, 327; cf. foul papers and prompt-books, 426 ff.; see also contaminated transcripts and private transcripts.
- transference of speech from one scene and character to another in course of composition, 346.
- transposition a mark of reporting, 191.
- Travels of the Three English Brothers*, *The*, acted by a provincial company from a printed book, 161.
- 'traverse', a curtain across the alcove at the back of the stage used for 'discoveries', 251, 332¹, 356, 386, 425.
- Treasury of Ancient and Modern Times*, *The*, i04⁴.
- Troilus and Cressida*, 338-50; data of publication, 66; difficulty over printing in F, position altered, omitted from catalogue, copyright open to question, 445-8.
- Troilus and Cressida*, by Chettle and Dekker, 'plot' of, 164^A, 347²¹¹.
- Troublesome Reign of King John*, *The*, 248-9; identified with *John* for purposes of copyright, 60; alleged to borrow from i *Hen.* VI, *Rich.* III, and *John*, 189 its relation to *John*, 254^B.
- 'true originals', see 'original copies'.
- True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York*, *The*, 176; identified with 3 *Hen.* VI for purposes of copyright, 60.
- True Tragedy of Richard* 111, *The*, data of publication, 63 } 60², 215¹⁹.
- Trundle, John, 66.
- Tuckfield, Thomas, an actor in *Two Noble Kinsmen*, 100^c, 119.
- 'turrets', 187.
- Twelfth Night or Whatyou Will*, 296-8.
- Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The*, 217-18.
- Two Maids of Moreclacke*, *The*, 466^E.
- Two Noble Kinsmen*, *The*, by S. and Fletcher, 77, 98^A; actors' names in, 119, belong to a revival, 120⁴; warnings in, 140.
- Two Noble Ladies*, *The*, 163^A; actors' names in, 118; s.ds. in, altered by book-keeper, 134; position of s.ds. in, 138-
- type, standing, stocks limited, 434; wear of, 439; that in F of Dutch origin, 439³.
- types of text in 'bad' quartos, reconstruction and rewriting, 300-1.
- typographical links between Qi and Q2 of *R. & J.*, 230, and of *Ham*, 331^F.
- Ulrici, H., 408.
- unblotted papers, 107, 109-10.
- un-Christian sentiment alleged as cause of omission, 268, 273^c.
- Underbill, Nicholas ('Nick'), an actor in *Batnatuelt* and *Believe*, 118.
- university presses, 28².
- un-Shakespearean verse in 'bad' quartos, 211⁵; 225-6, 232^B (*R. & y.*), 301, 304 (*Ham.*), 335 (*M.W.W.*)-, none in *Hen.* V, 282.
- un-Shakespearean work, possible presence of in F, 76-77; alleged to be found in 2, 3 *Hen.* VI, 178; in i *Hen.* VI, 186, 187³; in *T.A.*, 204 (Dover Wilson and Maxwell assign Act I to Peele); in *A.y.L.i.*, 294-5; in *Lear*, 375⁵; in *Macb.*, 390-1; in *Tim.*, 408; in *W.T.*, 417; in *Cymb.*, 413-14; in *Temp.*, 421.
- Ursley or Ursula, 277.
- 'vails', obeisance, 130.
- Van Dam, B. A. P., 222, 379.
- variant readings between copies of the same edition, 461-2; 261^B (*M. of V.*), 313 (*Ham.*), 383-4 (*Lear*); in F, 79, 463; see also press reader.

- Veil over her face', 205.
- Vernon, G. ('Ver.'), an actor in *Honest Mans Fortune*, 118.
- verse fossils in prose, alleged, 295.
- verse misdivided, occasionally in Q *Oth.*, 357; frequently in Q *Lear*, 379; due to marginal additions in Q *M.N.D.*, 241-2.
- verse printed as prose and prose as verse, 378 (*Lear*), 408 (*Tim.*); as prose owing to addition in proof, 233° (*R. & J.*).
- verse rhythms in S.'s prose, 2952.
- Vertumnus*, 396^A.
- Vincent, Augustine, his *Discovery of Error*-s, 440, 442-3, 460*5 his presentation copy of F, 450², 453.
- Violenta, 296, 351-2.
- Voltemand or Voltemar, error for Valdemar, 330^A.
- Walker, Alice, vi; works cited, xv-xvi; postulates transcript intermediate between foul papers and prompt-book, 168J, 467^{PS}; on distribution of profanity in F, 171°; on ms. behind F *Rich. Ill.*, 193—5, and amount of corruption in F, 198-9^E; on composers in i *Hen. IV.*, 264-5^A, 466^E; on copy for F 2 *Hen. IV.*, 270¹⁴, 272, 275^{F-H}, 276^{F,H}; on copy for F *Ham.* and printing of Q₂, 318⁴⁰, 327-8, 331^E, 332^F, 333^{K,L}; on copy for Q *T. & C.*, 350^B; on copy for Q and F *Oth.*, 362-4, 366, 367³¹; 370³⁶; on copy for Q *Lear*, 375, 381-3; 155, 231¹⁶, 261^B, 447², 467^F.
- Walkley, Thomas, 67-68, 362, 371.
- Walley, Henry, and Bonian, Richard, 66, 68, 338-9, 348²⁴, 445-6, 448-9.
- Walter, J. H., 162-3^A, 288^A.
- Ward, Roger, 22°.
- warning directions, 139—40; alleged, 244⁷.
- watermarks, n³.
- Webster, John, his *Duchess of Malfy*, 157; his hand suspected in the additional scene in *T.A.*, 204°.
- wedding, plays written for a, 242 (*M.N.D.*), 420 (*Temp.*).
- Weird Sisters, 396^A.
- Welsh Ambassador, The*, 163^A, a typical prompt-book transcribed from annotated foul papers, 109; warnings in, 139.
- Welsh speeches and song not given in text, 263; dialect, inconsistent use of, in *M.W.W.*, 334².
- Westward Ho*, 357.
- White, Edward, 61—62, 66.
- White, William, 62-64, 67.
- White Devil, The*, 131, 466^E.
- 'whole army, enter the', 351.
- Whole Contention, The*, 12.
- Whyte, Rowland, 232⁴.
- Wildgoose, William, 450².
- Wild-Goose Chase, The*, an actor's name in, 120.
- Will, possibly an actor (sc. W. Kemp), 273^B.
- Williams, Philip, works cited, xvi; 272, 343, 350^B, 383²², 387ⁿ, 466^B.
- Willis, John, his *Stenography*, 380.
- Willoughby, E. E., vi-vii; work cited, xvi; on Jaggard's printing of play-bills, 22^C; 2^{1,3,4,7}, 8⁴, 10⁵, 151, 4176, Chap. VI *passim*.
- willow song in *Oth.*, 358.
- Wilson, F. P., works cited, xvi; on the *Mess-Katalog*, 3³; on R. Crane, 100°; 7², 85, 162-3^A.
- Wilson, Harry, a musician in *Believe*, 117².
- Wilson, Jack, a musician in *Much Ado*, 119, 280.
- Wilson, John Dover, vii; works cited, xvi; on 'continuous copy', 102ⁿ; on authors' spellings, 148¹, 169²; on graphic errors, 148³; on contaminated transcripts, 155, 156¹; on 'assembled texts', 156, 157³, 158⁶⁻⁸; on alleged actors' names in *T. of S.*, 166^F; Chap. V *passim*.
- Wilson, Robert, 167ⁿ.
- Windet, John, 63-64.
- 'window', 227.
- Winter's Tale, The*, 415-17; an afterthought in F, 438.
- Wise, Andrew, 63—65.
- Wise Woman of Hogsdon, The*, 149.
- Witch, The*, a private transcript by Crane, 163^A; IO1^D, 153, 172^B, 217², 391-2.
- 'witches', 392-3, 396^A.
- Wither, George, his *Scholars' Purgatory*, 44.

- 'within' and 'without', 122; 'enter within' with entrance repeated later', 229; speech 'within', followed by entrance, 354.
- Woman's Prize, The*, 'offensive matters' in, 151; repetitions in, 165^D nature of the ms. text of, 172^R.
- Women Pleased*, 213¹⁴.
- Woodstock*, see *Thomas of Woodstock*.
- Worcester's men, 22^C, 335.
- Worrall, Thomas, 59, 453.
- Worth, Ellis, an actor, perhaps the 'Ellis' of *Poor Mans Comfort*, 120.
- Wright, John, 66.
- Xanadu, The Road to*, by J. Livingston Lowes, 301.
- Yorkshire Tragedy*, A, 12.
- Young Admiral, The*, 171^N.
- Your Five Gallants*, 144⁸.

