

A STUDY OF SHAKESPEARE'S TEXT
IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty of the Department of English
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Judith M. Norris
August, 1974

FOREWORD

The author of this thesis would like to thank Dr. Earl L. Dachslager for his introduction to Shakespearean textual matters and for his advice and encouragement throughout; to Mrs. Marian Orgain, who is Assistant Director of Libraries at the University of Houston and who directs the Special Collections, the author is especially indebted for her invaluable services.

A STUDY OF SHAKESPEARE'S TEXT
IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

An Abstract of a Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty of the Department of English
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Judith M. Norris
August, 1974

A STUDY OF SHAKESPEARE'S TEXT IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

No manuscript copies of Shakespeare's plays are available. Less than half of his plays were printed during his lifetime, and there is no evidence that Shakespeare himself oversaw any of these quarto publications. Moreover, his other plays, more than half of the total he wrote, were not printed until seven years after his death with the publication of the First Folio in 1623.

With this basis, two centuries of editors prepared Shakespeare's plays for publication, relying to a great deal on personal preference or public demands, not on any real textual authority. The nineteenth century editors, however, realized that, despite early editors' claims of having restored Shakespeare's text, the text had become more and more corrupt. Thus, they began to study the transmission of the text and the conditions under which the earliest manuscripts had been printed and to collate carefully and extensively. Without the groundwork laid by these textual scholars and editors, the substantial advances made in the twentieth century would have never been accomplished.

CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
I. THE TEXT UP TO THE NINETEENTH CENTURY	1
A. Introduction	1
B. Nicholas Rowe	13
C. Alexander Pope	19
D. Lewis Theobald	26
E. Thomas Hanmer	36
F. William Warburton	38
G. Samuel Johnson	41
H. Edward Capell	45
I. George Steevens	48
J. Edmond Malone	53
II. THE EARLY EDITORS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY	60
A. Introduction	60
B. James Boswell	62
C. Charles Knight	69
D. J. Payne Collier	75
E. James Orchard Halliwell	91
F. Alexander Dyce	100

CONTENTS CONTINUED

	Page
III. THE LATER EDITORS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY	113
A. Introduction	113
B. Howard Staunton	116
C. William Aldis Wright and William George Clark . .	126
D. Horace Howard Furness	133
IV. SUMMARY	138
APPENDICES	142
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	174

I. THE TEXT UP TO THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

"Where is to be found the best text of Shakespeare's works? of the many editions before the public, which is the one preferred?" These questions, posed by Thomas Lounsbury in The Text of Shakespeare (1906),¹ imply that by the early twentieth century an authoritative edition of Shakespeare's plays had not yet been produced.

The problems inherent in attempting to establish an authoritative text of Shakespeare's works are numerous, but such a text is so vitally important that the problems must be understood and, if possible, overcome. Among the problems, first and foremost, is that no authorial manuscripts of Shakespeare's plays are extant.² The importance of this statement cannot be emphasized too greatly. With no authorial manuscripts, an editor must realize that what Shakespeare actually wrote in his autograph manuscripts can never be exactly known. He must depend on

¹The Text of Shakespeare: Its History from the Publication of the Quartos and Folios Down to and Including the Publication of the Editions of Pope and Theobald (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), p. 1.

²Shakespeare delivered the foul papers of a play to his company. These might then be copied by a paid scribe to become the prompt book. If such were the case, the foul papers probably became the printer's copy. The foul papers might, however, have been transcribed by a scribe to a fair copy, and the prompt book transcribed from this fair copy. If so, the printer's copy might be either the original foul papers (if they were preserved) or the scribal fair copy. In any case, the author's manuscript did not survive after an authorized printed copy existed; and the earliest copies of Shakespeare's plays extant are printed editions.

a printed copy of the text, the printing of which introduced intermediaries between the author's manuscript and the reader. The presence of intermediaries results in the possibility of textual contamination--errors being introduced, perhaps unknowingly, into the printed text. As a result, the editor must decide which printed copy of the plays is "best"--most authoritative. To do so he faces dual problems: first, what was the nature of the copy underlying the printed text and second, how accurate was that copy reproduced in type?³

What was the copy for the printed texts of Shakespeare's plays? The answer varies play by play, but some general observations can be made. First, prior to the publication of the First Folio in 1623, nineteen of Shakespeare's plays had appeared in quarto editions.⁴ Of the eighteen plays appearing in his lifetime (all of the quarto editions except Othello, 1622), "some are so imperfect," according to Lounsbury, "that it is impossible to suppose they were subjected to the revision of

³These two problems have been discussed in great detail. For information about the first, the nature of the printed text copy, see W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955). For the second, see Charlton Hinman, The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare, 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1963).

⁴The plays which had appeared in quartos before 1623 were Henry VI, Part 2, Henry VI, Part 3, Romeo and Juliet, Henry V, The Merry Wives of Windsor, Hamlet, Pericles, Richard III, King Lear, Othello, Titus Andronicus, Richard II, Love's Labor's Lost, Henry IV, Part 1, Henry IV, Part 2, A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Merchant of Venice, Much Ado About Nothing, and Troilus and Cressida.

Shakespeare."⁵ The editions which have been labeled "Bad Quartos" are Henry VI, Parts 2 and 3 (1594, 1595), Romeo and Juliet (1597), Henry V (1600), The Merry Wives of Windsor (1602), Hamlet (1603), and Pericles (1609).⁶ The "Bad Quartos" are those which were not published with the consent of Shakespeare's acting company; their texts are corrupt, being printed from actors' memorial reconstructions, scribal transcripts attempted during a performance, or other unauthorized means; and their publication was not entered, or was irregularly entered, in the Stationers' Register.⁷ "Good Quartos," on the other hand, were authorized by the company, although a company generally did not like to submit for publication one of its plays, since the resulting availability might lessen attendance at the theater. Often, however, as a result of the publication of a "Bad Quarto," they authorized publication of Shakespeare's play and the play was duly entered in the Register.⁸ Even if Shakespeare's company authorized the publication of one of his plays, there is no evidence to indicate that Shakespeare had any interest in the publication of his plays;⁹ thus, any revisions in the quartos may have

⁵Text of Shakespeare, p. 44.

⁶W. W. Greg, "The First Folio and Its Publishers," in Studies in the First Folio (London: Oxford University Press, 1924), p. 138.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, p. 90.

⁹See Gerald Eades Bentley, Shakespeare and His Theatre (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), pp. 6-14. Here, Bentley presents his arguments against Shakespeare's involvement with the published texts of his plays. His reasons, briefly, are

been made without his approval.

Some of the quartos, nonetheless, were probably pretty close to what Shakespeare actually wrote. From all available evidence, the copy-text for the earliest good quarto editions seems to have been one of three kinds: the author's foul papers, the prompt book, or a scribal transcription of either of these.¹⁰ If the printer worked from the foul papers, and worked carefully, the resulting text would have been highly authoritative. Either of the other types of copy-text suggest an additional intermediary and therefore additional corruption. It is important to remember, in addition, that some of the quartos were reprinted two and sometimes three times. The later quarto editions have no authority unless it can be demonstrated that they were revised by reference to authorial manuscript. Actually, as the quartos were

-
- a. Shakespeare never wrote a dedication, preface, or address to the readers.
 - b. He did not prepare a list of characters to precede the text for the convenience of the readers.
 - c. There are no divisions into act and scene in the quartos for the readers' convenience.
 - d. There are similar characteristics of the good and the bad quartos, namely no list of dramatis personae, no act and scene divisions, mistakes in character names, errors in spelling and punctuation, and wrongly assigned speeches and nonsense words.

If Shakespeare were involved in the publication of his plays, argues Bentley, he would have corrected these situations. Bentley also shows that in the case of his poems, Venus and Adonis and The Rape of Lucrece, Shakespeare was interested in the readers and prepared "as clean texts as any Elizabethan literary publication" (pp. 13-14).

¹⁰ Charlton Hinman, ed., The First Folio of Shakespeare: The Norton Facsimile (New York: Norton, 1968), p. xii and Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, pp. 87, 96.

reprinted, error upon error entered, simply as a result of the text's going through one or more intermediary.¹¹

The second major problem facing an editor of Shakespeare's plays is implied by the question "How accurate was the copy reproduced in type?" The problem is to determine what happened in the printing house from the time the copy-text was made available to the time the final pages were printed. According to Hinman, the printing and proof-reading of the various types of copy material was often carelessly done.¹² As a result, a relatively good copy-text could result in a poorly printed text; or a copy-text of little authority could be printed very accurately. The editor must know whether the copy-text was faithfully reproduced. If it was, an apparent error might, indeed, be authorial in origin rather than a printing-house corruption. Such a distinction is vital to the editor of Shakespeare.

The First Folio presents further problems. The Folio, published in 1623, is the sole, and thus authoritative, text for the eighteen plays not printed in quarto before 1623.¹³ It is, furthermore, the only

¹¹J. Dover Wilson, "The Task of Heminge and Condell," in Studies in the First Folio (London: Oxford University Press, 1924), p. 64.

¹²Charlton Hinman, Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio, pp. 8-9. Hinman proceeds to detail the types of corruptions that could enter a text because of printing-house errors. Some of the changes are in spelling, line divisions, printing verse as prose and prose as verse, altering words, and omitting words or speeches.

¹³Those plays published for the first time in the First Folio were The Tempest, The Two Gentlemen of Verona, Measure for Measure, The Comedy of Errors, As You Like It, The Taming of the Shrew, All's Well That Ends Well, Twelfth Night, The Winter's Tale, King John, Henry VI, Part 1,

authoritative text for each of the "Bad Quartos" except Romeo and Juliet and Hamlet.¹⁴ It is vitally important, then, to discover the type of copy submitted to the publishers for these plays. (See Appendix A for a brief summary of the copy-texts for each play in the First Folio). In most cases, according to Hinman, the copy-text was "highly respectable."¹⁵ In fact, Greg points out that the author's original draft was often the copy-text, the company's not wanting to turn over the prompt-copy, "since it usually bore the Master of Revel's licence."¹⁶ Even then, however, problems existed. For example, in Timon of Athens which was printed from Shakespeare's foul papers,¹⁷ Timon says to his servant,

Go, bid all my Friends again,
Lucius, Lucullus, and *Sempronius Vllorxa*: All,
 Ile once more feast the Rascals.

(III.iv.1246-1248)

Vllorxa is obviously incomprehensible; editors throughout the centuries have dealt with this problem simply by omitting Vllorxa and printing

Henry VIII, Coriolanus, Timon of Athens, Julius Caesar, Macbeth, Antony and Cleopatra, and Cymbeline.

¹⁴Hinman, The First Folio, p. xiv.

¹⁵Ibid., p. xii.

¹⁶The Shakespeare First Folio, p. 97.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 411.

Go, bid all my friends again,
 Lucius, Lucullus, and Sempronius.¹⁸ All--
 I'll once more feast the Rascals.

There are other problems with the printing of the Folio. The punctuation was extremely careless; there are commas where none should be and none where one should be; there are examples of verse printed as prose and prose printed as verse;¹⁹ there are lines omitted.²⁰ There are six

¹⁸ Lewis Theobald, ed., The Works of Shakespeare: In Eight Volumes (London: C. Bathurst, 1773), VI (III.iii), p. 158. Samuel Johnson and George Steevens, eds., The Plays of William Shakespeare, 10 vols. (London: C. Bathurst, 1785), VIII, 404; and Edward Capell, ed., Mr. William Shakespeare: His Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies, 10 vols. (London: J. & R. Tonson, 1768), VIII, 43. Only Steevens notes in his edition that the "old copy" replaced All with Vlllorxa.

¹⁹ Hinman, The First Folio, p. 758. The Folio prints as one line, "Will sate itself in a Celestial bed, & prey on Garbage" what was originally two lines, "Will sate itself in a celestial bed, / And prey on garbage." (I.v.56-57) [Horace Howard Furness, ed., A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Hamlet (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1877), p. 101]. Also, in Timon of Athens (Hinman, The First Folio, p. 711) the Folio prints as irregular verse what should be prose:

Poet. What's to be thought of him?
 Does the Rumor hold for true,
 That hee's so full of Gold?
 Painter. Certaine.
Alcibiades reports it: *Phrinica* and *Timandyle*
 Had Gold of him. He likewise enrich'd
 Poor stragling Souldiers, with great quantity.
 'Tis said, he gave untu his steward
 A mighty summe.

(V.i.2195-2203)

²⁰ Hinman, The First Folio, p. 873. In Antony and Cleopatra Proculeius is given two speeches in a row:

Pro. This Ile report (deere Lady)
 Have comfort, for I know your plight is pittied
 Of him that caus'd it.
 Pro. You see how easily she may be surpriz'd:
 Guard her till *Caesar* come.

(V.ii.3238-3242)

plays (Timon of Athens, Antony and Cleopatra, Romeo and Juliet, Troilus and Cressida, and Henry VI, Parts 1 and 2) which begin "Actus I, Scene I" and have no other act or scene divisions.²¹ There are only seven plays with a list of characters (however incomplete);²² the other twenty nine have none.²³

An editor has other considerations when dealing with the Folio, also. Since half of the plays had appeared in quarto, he must determine which provides the better text for these plays--the quarto or the Folio copy. If one were to believe Heminge and Condell, the text of the Folio is certainly superior. In their address "To the Great Variety of Readers" they state that they have collected and published the plays "perfect of their limbes," thus improving upon the "diverse, stolen, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed"²⁴ available until 1623. Their comment

When the first speech was said, Cleopatra was not in Roman custody; when the second was made, she had evidently been captured--her capture, or at least, the report of it being omitted.

²¹Henry B. Wheatley, "Shakespeare's Editors, 1623-To the Twentieth Century," Transactions of the Bibliographical Society, XIV (October 1915 to March 1917), 145-173 is mistaken when he says there were four plays in the First Folio without act and scene divisions after Actus primus, Scena prima.

²²Lounsbury, The Text of Shakespeare, p. 75 indicates there are eight plays with a list of characters. However, an examination of the Hinman First Folio indicates there are only seven: The Tempest, Two Gentlemen of Verona, Measure for Measure, The Winter's Tale, Henry IV, Part 2, Timon of Athens, and Othello.

²³The thirty-seventh play attributed to Shakespeare, Pericles, did not appear until the Third Folio is 1664.

²⁴Hinman, The First Folio, p. 7.

suggests that all of the quarto editions of the plays were error-filled. However, the fact that Heminge and Condell printed eight of the plays in the Folio from an earlier quarto text indicates that they were not condemning all quartos.²⁵ The printed quartos that they used had themselves been based on manuscript. Evidently, as Hinman declares, "considerable pains really were taken to see that no very bad copy was used."²⁶

Even when the Folio text was printed from an earlier "good" quarto, discrepancies are obvious. And, it is important to recognize that, although there are great discrepancies between the quarto and the Folio texts, either may be the original authority or, to complicate matters further, both may have some degree of authority. For example, Greg reports that the second quarto of Hamlet was based on a manuscript but was extremely poorly printed.²⁷ There is, further, evidence that the Folio Hamlet was set from a copy of the second quarto which had been corrected by reference to a manuscript (probably a transcript of the original worn-out prompt book). Thus, while the quartos read

There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Than are dreamt of in your philosophy.

(I.v.166-167)

the Folio prints

²⁵ The eight plays in the Folio which were based on a quarto text were Titus Andronicus, Richard II, Love's Labor's Lost, Henry IV, Part 1, Romeo and Juliet, A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Merchant of Venice, and Much Ado About Nothing. Hinman, The First Folio, p. xv.

²⁶ Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio, p. 4.

²⁷ The Shakespeare First Folio, pp. 326-329.

There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Than are dreamt of in our philosophy.²⁸

The authority of both readings is indeed high. Similarly, the 1609 quarto of Troilus and Cressida, which Hinman reports was based on a transcript of the foul papers,²⁹ prints

The welcome ever smiles,
And farewell goes out sighing.
(III.iii.175-176)

However, the 1623 Folio text, which was printed from a copy of Troilus corrected by reference to the prompt book reads

The welcome ever smiles,
And farewells goes out sighing.³⁰

The importance of the early editions cannot be overemphasized. Re-printing results in further contamination. Thus, the earliest printed editions must be examined closely to determine as many characteristics as possible of the hypothetical manuscript and to estimate the relationship of the earliest printed example to that manuscript, or to put it more simply, to discover as nearly as possible what the author wrote.

The seventeenth-century editors of Shakespeare did not recognize the importance of the earliest editions. Even Heminge and Condell sometimes printed from the latest quarto rather than the earliest.³¹

²⁸Furness, Hamlet, p. 111.

²⁹Hinman, The First Folio, p. xv.

³⁰Harold N. Hillebrand, ed., A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Troilus and Cressida (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1953), p. 185.

³¹Hinman, The First Folio, p. xiv and Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, p. 86.

The First Folio was evidently very successful,³² for it was followed by three other folio editions in the seventeenth century--in 1632, 1664, and 1685. Each of these editions was printed from the latest preceding Folio;³³ thus, the changes introduced are editorial and lack authority. The changes are many but fall into three major categories: corrections of misprints, modernization in spelling and punctuation, and the introduction of unintentional errors.³⁴ Hinman, in fact, characterized the course of Shakespeare's text in the seventeenth century as "one of progressive deterioration."³⁵

³²This opinion is expressed by Arthur Brown, "The Great Variety of Readers," in Shakespeare Survey, ed. Allardyce Nicoll (Cambridge: The University Press, 1969), p. 11.

³³Ronald B. McKerrow, "The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text by his Earlier Editors, 1709-1768," in Studies in Shakespeare, ed. Peter Alexander (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 105.

³⁴*Ibid.*

³⁵"Shakespeare's Text, Then, Now and Tomorrow," in Shakespeare Survey, ed. Allardyce Nicoll (Cambridge: The University Press, 1969), p. 23.

This opinion, however, is debated by Matthew W. Black and Matthias A. Shaaber, Shakespeare's Seventeenth Century Editors, 1632-1685 (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1937), pp. 710-716. After studying the four seventeenth-century Folios, the authors conclude that, although half of the changes were due to "havoc" wreaked by the printers, the last three Folios are not merely reprints of the first but are "true critical editions themselves." They point, particularly, to the editor of the Second Folio, whom they call "brilliant." Generally, they list some eight accomplishments made by the seventeenth-century editors:

- a. supplying omitted words necessary to the meaning
 - b. correcting inconsistencies of fact and circumstance
 - c. correcting unobtrusive corruptions of the text
 - d. emending glaring corruptions by inspired guesswork
 - e. rectifying stage directions
 - f. ironing out any number of mistakes in grammar
 - g. restoring the rhyme in defective rhyming passages
 - h. modernizing the style.
-

At the end of the seventeenth century, then, many quarto editions and four folio editions of Shakespeare's plays were available for use by later editors. During the next two centuries hundreds of editions were published. This thesis will concern only those editors who, through the centuries, concerned themselves with preparing a comprehensive edition of all of Shakespeare's plays. Out of the hundreds of editions of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and particularly nineteenth centuries, only those dealing with all of Shakespeare's plays were considered; and only those editions which made significant changes, contributions, and innovations were chosen. It goes without saying that without the groundwork laid by the textual scholars and editors of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, the real and substantial advances contributed by such men as Pollard, McKerrow, Greg, and Hinman to the editing of Shakespeare's plays might never have been accomplished.

As Shakespeare's reputation continued to advance in the hundred years following his death, demand grew for satisfactorily edited copies of his plays rather than the indifferently edited folios of the seventeenth century, into which multiple corruptions had been introduced. The demand to reform the text was answered by eighteenth-century editors, who printed about thirty editions of the plays, as compared to only the four folio editions of the preceding century. However, it must be remembered that, despite their zeal for correcting the texts, these editors, according to McKerrow, "aimed at producing, and did in fact produce, a text which is easy to read and intelligible, without

asperities either of grammar or of metre, and provided with all those helps in the way of stage directions, indications of locality, and the like which enable the lazy-minded to fathom the meaning without puzzlement and the lover of literature to savour the poetry without distraction."³⁶ The resulting texts "concentrated on reforming the spelling, making the lines regular, providing stage directions and indications of localities, and explaining some of the more difficult passages."³⁷ There was, thus, little thought given to the preservation of the original text. "It was deemed the duty of the reviser to improve it so as to adapt it to the taste of the more refined age to which he had the happiness to belong."³⁸ Generally, the eighteenth-century editors took the latest edition of Shakespeare's works, "patched it with their pet emendations and sat back to defend their choices."³⁹

The first man to edit Shakespeare's plays in the eighteenth century was Nicholas Rowe, and his six octavo volumes were published in 1709.⁴⁰ In his dedication to the Duke of Somerset, Rowe stated his

³⁶"The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text," pp. 103-104.

³⁷Milwaukee Public Library, William Shakespeare: His Editors and Editions (1964), p. 13.

³⁸Lounsbury, Text of Shakespeare, p. 93.

³⁹Milwaukee Public Library, William Shakespeare, p. 13.

⁴⁰Rowe was commissioned by the publisher Jacob Tonson to edit Shakespeare's plays. Apparently influenced by the Copyright Act which was to become effective in April, 1710, Tonson, who had obtained the rights to Shakespeare's plays from the editors of the Fourth Folio, wanted to call attention to this fact by printing an edition of the plays. Rowe, who had been trained as a lawyer but who had always been interested in the

intention to "redeem him from the Injuries of former Impressions" and, by comparing several editions, restore the "true Reading" of Shakespeare.⁴¹ He knew that it was impossible to restore the text to the author's original manuscripts since "Those are lost, or, at least, are gone beyond any Inquiry [he] could make,"⁴² but he realized that to approach Shakespeare's text he would have to consult the First and Second Folios and some of the earlier quarto editions. In doing so, he was able to emend several obvious errors that had crept into the text because of faulty printing and proof-reading. However modern Rowe's approach was, and he was the first editor to turn back to the original editions, he nonetheless based his text on the Fourth Folio, the most corrupt of the seventeenth-century editions. But that he improved greatly on this edition is true. The Fourth Folio omitted several lines and one entire scene in Hamlet (IV.iv) which Rowe restored.⁴³ He also added the prologue to Romeo and

stage and who had, in fact, written plays himself, was a logical choice. As a dramatist, he published Shakespeare's plays as he would his own, [D. Nicol Smith, ed., Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare (New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1962), p. xxviii] and, because he paid serious attention to previous texts, can be called the first editor of Shakespeare, since he made more corrections than merely the kind which "might be made by a compositor or proof-reader." (McKerrow, "The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text," p. 92).

⁴¹ McKerrow, "The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text," p. 94; David Nichol Smith, Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1928), p. 32; and N[icolas] Rowe, The Works of Mr. William Shakespear, 6 vols. (London: Jacob Tonson, 1709; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1967), dedication [n.p.].

⁴² Rowe, Works of Mr. William Shakespear, n.p.

⁴³ Furness, Hamlet, p. 322-326.

Juliet which had appeared in the 1599 quarto but in none of the folio editions. That this portion was brought to his attention after the play had gone to press is suggested by the fact that he printed it at the end, rather than at the beginning of the play.⁴⁴ In addition, he modernized spelling, using for example the contemporary spelling "whilst" and "been" for "whiles" and "bin," respectively. He also made some emendations which would not be accepted by modern textual critics by correcting what he called "obvious errors" on Shakespeare's part. For example, in Troilus and Cressida Hector says,

Unlike young men, whom Aristotle thought
Unfit to hear moral philosophy.
(II.ii.173-174)

Rowe, realizing that Hector could not have known about the anachronistic Aristotle some eight hundred years before he lived, changed "Aristotle" to "graver sages."⁴⁵ And, following early eighteenth-century practice, practically all the nouns are capitalized.⁴⁶ Thus, although many of his emendations were faulty, Rowe was, in many ways, a textual critic of Shakespeare in the modern sense.

⁴⁴ Rowe, Works of Mr. William Shakespear, V, 2156.

⁴⁵ Hillebrand, Troilus and Cressida, p. 106.

⁴⁶ Rowe, Works of Mr. William Shakespear, I, 133. For example, in The Merry Wives of Windsor, Rowe prints,

Bardolph follow him, a Tapster is a good Trade; an old Cloak makes
a new Jerkin; a wither'd Sewing-man, a fresh Tapster; go, adieu.
(I.iii)

and in Much Ado About Nothing, I, 357, he prints,

However, Rowe was also an editor, not merely a reprinter of Shakespeare's plays. As an editor he designed his edition for the convenience of the readers. First, he practiced uniformity in the designation of the characters. Two instances from his editions are exemplary. In all the folio editions of The Comedy of Errors, the father of the Antipholus brothers is named Aegeon in the text, but in the speakers' names and the stage directions he is variously called the "Merchant of Syracuse," "Merchant," "Merchant Father," or "Father," but never Aegeon. In Rowe's edition he is Aegeon throughout. In A Midsummer Night's Dream Puck is variously referred to as "Robin," "Robin Goodfellow," or "Puck." In Rowe's editions he is Puck throughout. A second editorial change for the benefit of the reader was Rowe's addition of a list of dramatis personae at the beginning of each play. Only seven of the folio plays had such a list⁴⁷ (which often was incomplete), and in six of those the list appeared at the end of the play. Rowe expanded the existing lists, added one for all the other plays, and printed the list before the play. In addition, he corrected the stage directions, especially with reference to the entrances and exits of the characters. He was the first editor to concentrate on the divisions of

That shows thou art unconfirm'd, thou knowest that the Fashion of a Doublet, or a Hat, or a Cloak, is nothing to a Man.

(III.i)

⁴⁷The seven Folio plays with a list of dramatis personae were The Life of Henry the Fifth, The Tempest, Two Gentlemen of Verona, Measure for Measure, The Winter's Tale, Timon of Athens, and The Tragedy of Othello. Hinman, The First Folio, pp. 37, 56, 102, 321, 422, 715, 847.

the plays into acts and scenes. Evidently none of the manuscripts had been divided; the only quarto edition before 1623 with such divisions was Othello, and none of the plays had scene divisions.⁴⁸ Either Heminge and Condell, the editors of the First Folio, or Jaggard, the printer, had somewhat haphazardly divided all but six Folio plays into acts.⁴⁹ Rowe systematically divided all the plays and, furthermore, indicated the localities of the scenes. This latter editorial change was, again, for the reader's convenience. Only two of the Folio plays had indicated scene locations: The Tempest on "an uninhabited island" and Measure for Measure in "Vienna." Rowe's edition noted scene localities for all other plays and within a play whenever a change occurred.

As a beginning to making Shakespeare more available to the public, then, Rowe modernized the spelling and standardized the printing of characters' names, provided act and scene divisions, entrances and exits of characters, added a list of dramatis personae for all plays, and provided stage directions. In addition, the octavos were a much handier size than the cumbersome folios. But Rowe's greatest contribution to his edition was neither textual nor contributed to reading ease; it was the life of Shakespeare which he printed at the beginning. Although some

⁴⁸McKerrow, "The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text," p. 113.

⁴⁹These six plays were Henry VI, Part 2, Henry VI, Part 3, Troilus and Cressida, The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet, Timon of Athens, and Antony and Cleopatra. Hinman, The First Folio.

of Rowe's information was authentic, much seems to be hearsay.⁵⁰ Rowe's "Life of Shakespeare" was reprinted by most of the eighteenth-century editors and, indeed, became the standard "Life" until the Malone-Boswell variorum in 1821.

Thus, Rowe's edition remedied many of the defects of the folio editions but, being based on the Fourth Folio, the most corrupt of the four, and incorporating many changes acceptable to the eighteenth century, Rowe's edition was, despite his turning the the First and Second Folios, still very little closer to an eclectic edition. However, with this first eighteenth-century edition, the publishing of Shakespeare's plays was entrusted for the first time to an editor rather than to a contemporary who merely reprinted from an earlier edition. It is significant that now Shakespeare's plays had an appeal as literature rather than only as acted drama. Shakespeare's works were edited with all the apparatus for the reader and this, in turn, made available a text which could be the vehicle for literary criticism. Nevertheless, textual accuracy--the necessary foundation for literary criticism--was still lacking.

⁵⁰ Rowe recounts, for example, the story that John Combe, a usurer, asked Shakespeare to compose the epitaph for his tombstone. Rowe indicates that Shakespeare wrote four lines:

Ten in the hundred lies here ingrav'd;
'Tis a hundred to ten his soul is not sav'd:
If any man ask, Who lies in the tomb?
Oh! ho! quoth the devil, 'tis my John-a-Combe. (Works of Mr. William Shakespear, I, xxxvi)

Although the story appears fanciful, not until Malone (1790) did any editor investigate this account, which Malone proved to be false. (See page 65 of this thesis).

Rowe's second edition appeared in nine duodecimo volumes in 1714. Although it corrects many misprints of the 1709 edition, it does not carry out improvements in scene divisions and localities which were suggested by the 1709 edition.⁵¹ It was this edition which was the basis of the text of the next editor, Alexander Pope.

Pope's edition appeared in 1725, in six quarto volumes. Although it was based on Rowe's second edition, Pope rejected Pericles and the other six plays added by the Third Folio and kept by Rowe in his edition.⁵² Also, distinct from Rowe, he organized the plays into four categories, varying for the first time the order of the Folio editions. Pope's new arrangement included Comedies; Historical Plays, where he placed King Lear; Tragedies from History, in which he put the classical plays and Macbeth; and Tragedies from Fable, which included Troilus and Cressida, Cymbeline, Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet, and Othello. Pope went far beyond Rowe in other changes he made, although he kept Rowe's list of dramatis personae. First, he completed the divisions of all the plays into acts and scenes, a division followed by Hanmer, Warburton, and Johnson. In addition, he added localities for every scene, not just when the scene changed. Next he printed in the margin of his text lines which he felt were play-house interpolations and in small type at the foot of the pages passages which, in his opinion, were of doubtful

⁵¹McKerrow, "The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text," p. 101.

⁵²The other six Pope rejected were Lochrine, Sir John Oldcastle, Yorkshire Tragedy, Lord Cromwell, The Puritans, and London Prodgal.

authenticity. He also noted, by placing a comma in the margin, "shining passages," and by placing an asterisk before it, any scene he considered to be of excellence. For example, Pope marks with a comma the passage in Hamlet, Polonius' advice to Laertes:

Give thy thoughts no tongue,
 'Nor any unproportion'd thought his act:
 'Be thou familiar, but by no means vulgar;
 'The friends thou hast, and their adoption try'd,
 'Grapple them to thy soul with hooks of steel:
 'But do not dull thy palm with entertainment
 'Of each new-hatch'd, unfledg'd comrade. Beware
 'Of Entrance to a quarrel: but being in,
 'Bear't that th' opposed may beware of thee.
 'Give every man thine ear; but few thy voice.
 'Take each man's censure; but reserve thy judgment. 53
 (I.vi)

Interestingly, however, Pope did not feel the rest of Polonius' speech to be a "shining passage," and he did not mark

Neither a borrower, nor a lender be;
 For loan oft loses both itself and friend:
 A borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry.
 This above all; to thy own self be true;
 And it must follow, as the night the day,
 Thou canst not then be false to any man.
 (I.vi)

With an asterisk, Pope marked all of one scene in The Tempest. This scene is Caliban's denunciation of Prospero which begins

All the infections that the sun sucks up
 From bogs, fens, flats, on Prospero fall, and make him
 By inch-meal a disease! his spirits hear me,
 And yet I needs must curse. 54
 (II.ii)

⁵³Alexander Pope, ed., The Works of Shakespeare, 6 vols. (London: Jacob Tonson, 1723-1725); rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1969), p. 362.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 36.

In making his changes, Pope consulted the First and Second Folios and twenty-nine quartos, some of which were the earliest editions printed. He published a list of those he used in his "Table of Several Editions of Shakespeare's Plays Made Use of and Compared in This Impression" (see Appendix B).

Pope's theory that the "dull duty" of an editor was to go back to the beginning, since the later editions compounded errors of the earlier ones, foreshadowed the responsibilities of modern critics. John Butt writes that Pope got together with two of his friends, Fenton and Gay; one read while the other two noted differences in the text he was using.⁵⁵ Thus, Pope was able to restore to the text many of the readings from the quartos which had been eliminated in the First Folio. There are numerous occurrences of such restorations. For example, Pope restored to the text the following passage in Hamlet which had been omitted from the Folio:

This heavy-headed revell, east and west;
 Makes us traduc'd, and tax'd of other nations,
 They clip us drunkards, and with swinish phrase
 Soil our addition; and indeed it takes
 From our atchievements, though perform'd at height,
 The pith and marrow of our attribute.
 So oft it chanches in particular men,
 That for some vicious mole of nature in them,
 As in their birth (wherein they are not guilty,
 Since nature cannot chuse his origin)
 By the o'ergrowth of some complexion,
 Oft breaking down the pales and forts of reason;
 Or by some habit, that too-much o'er-leavens
 The form of plausible manners; that these men

⁵⁵ Pope's Taste in Shakespeare (London: Oxford University Press, 1936), p. 57.

Carrying, I say, the stamp of one defect,
 (Being nature's livery, or fortune's star)
 His virtues else, be they as pure as grace,
 As infinite as man may undergo,
 Shall in the general censure⁵⁶ take corruption
 From that particular fault.

(I.iv)

Likewise, Pope added the following underlined words to Troilus and Cressida which had been in the 1609 first edition but not in the Folio, "At your own house, there he unarms him" (I.iv);⁵⁷ furthermore, Pope restored to the correct place two lines, also from Troilus and Cressida which had been misplaced in all of the Folio editions; these lines are indicated in the following passage by italics:

. . . if he do set
 The very wings of reason to his heels,
And fly like chidden Mercury from Jove,
Or like a star dis-orb'd--Nay if we talk of reason,
 Let's shut our gates, and sleep . . .⁵⁸

(II.ii)

The Folio editions had printed

. . . if he do set
 The very wings of reason to his heels:
 Or like a Starre disorb'd. Nay, if we talke of Reason,
 And flye like chidden Mercurie from Ioye,
 Let's shut our gates and sleepe . . .⁵⁹

(II.ii.44-48)

He was the first editor to recognize the value of the quartos and reprint passages from them. Indeed, Pope considered that the Folio "is far

⁵⁶ Pope, The Works of Shakespeare, VI, 365-366.

⁵⁷ Ibid., I, 59.

⁵⁸ Ibid., VI, 38.

⁵⁹ Hillebrand, Troilus and Cressida, p. 96.

worse than the Quarto's [sic]."⁶⁰ He gives two conclusive arguments: "In some places their [the actors'] names are tho' carelessly set down instead of the *Personae Dramatis*: And in others the notes of direction to the *Property-men* for their *Moveables*, and to the *Players* for their *Entries*, are inserted into the Text." He continues and supports his arguments with examples in a footnote:

Much ado about nothing. Act 2. Enter prince Leonato, Claudio, and Jack Wilson, instead of Bathasar. And in Act 4. Cowley, and Kamp, constantly thro' a whole scene and "My Queen is murder'd!" Ring the little Bell--⁶¹

Nonetheless, Pope also indicated the lines which had been printed in the Folio but not in the earliest quarto edition. For example, in Othello Pope indicates that the two speeches following, marked by asterisks, were not included in the first edition quarto:

Oth. What needs this iteration woman?
 I say thy husband.
 **Aemil.* Oh mistress! villany has made mocks with love.
 My husband say she was false?
 **Oth.* He woman;
 I say thy husband; do'st understand the work?
 My friend, thy husband, honest honest *Iago*.⁶²
 (V.ii)

He also changed words for metrical regularity. For example, in Hamlet, he altered the authoritative printing of the line "Dared to the combat; in which our valiant Hamlet" (I.i) to "Dar'd to the fight. In which, our valiant Hamlet" (I.i.84) by changing the two-syllable word

⁶⁰ Pope, The Works of Shakespeare, I, xvi.

⁶¹ Ibid., pp. xvii-xviii.

⁶² Ibid., VI, 583.

combat to fight.⁶³ Furthermore, for the same reason, in Julius Caesar he changed "Looke, I draw a Sword against Conspirators," to "Behold, I draw a Sword against Conspirators." (V.i.58)⁶⁴ He altered words in Shakespeare's Roman plays to omit anachronisms,⁶⁵ and he changed the Elizabethan double superlative into a contemporary, grammatically correct construction. Again in Julius Caesar, Pope prints "This, this was the unkindest cut of all" (III.ii)⁶⁶ rather than "This was the most unkindest cut of all." (III.ii.193)⁶⁷ In many ways, Pope foreshadowed later editors in that he saw the value of using the earlier editions; however, he did, erroneously, print from the latest edition available--that of Rowe in 1714.

Pope's greatest errors as an editor and textual critic occurred, though, when he made alterations which could not have been authoritative. He omitted or inserted words for the sake of rhythm. For example, in Hamlet he printed "Did slay this Fortinbras; who by seal'd compact"

⁶³Furness, Hamlet, p. 14.

⁶⁴Horace Howard Furness, Jr., A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: The Tragedy of Julius Caesar (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1913), p. 244.

⁶⁵In Coriolanus, Timon of Athens, and Julius Caesar Pope saw the "necessity" of changing "hats" to "caps." However, in Julius Caesar he could not substitute "caps" in ". . . their hats pluck'd about their ears," so he merely put a --- in his text. McKerrow, "The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text," p. 104 and Pope, The Works of Shakespeare, V, 238.

⁶⁶Pope, The Works of Shakespeare, V, 270.

⁶⁷Furness, Julius Caesar, p. 178.

instead of ". . . who by a seal'd compact." (I.i)⁶⁸ He often altered lines to fit the iambic pentameter meter. The First Folio, the authoritative text for Julius Caesar, prints

Mar. Wherefore rejoyce?
What Conquest brings he home?
(I.i.40-41)

while Pope prints this as one line.⁶⁹ Significantly, Pope never indicated that he had made these alterations from the authoritative text.

These changes are unforgivable for a textual critic, particularly one of Pope's intelligence who recognized that "the dull duty of an editor"⁷⁰ was to gather as many old texts together as possible, collate carefully, and not make any changes unless dictated by an authoritative text. Pope realized this and the fact that, since each edition was normally printed from an early edition, if changes occurred they were therefore probably spurious (unless corrected by reference to the manuscript copy). But Pope did not often select authoritative readings and, in fact, made many emendations of his own which could not have authority. One critic summarized Pope's treatment of Shakespeare's text as follows:

He said that he had carefully collated the texts of the original copies. He did nothing of the kind. He only consulted them occasionally. He said that the various readings were fairly put in the margin where they could be compared by everyone. Not once in fifty times was anything of the kind done. He said he never indulged his private sense or conjecture.

⁶⁸Pope, The Works of Shakespeare, VI, 348.

⁶⁹Furness, Julius Caesar, p. 19.

⁷⁰Lounsbury, The Text of Shakespeare, p. 86.

He did it constantly and without notification to the reader. He said he had exhibited a religious abhorrence of all innovations, and had not preferred any reading into the text unless supported by the early copies. On the contrary, the changes he made solely on his own authority ran into the thousands, and it was rarely the case that any indication of the fact was given anywhere. He said that he had explained the more obsolete or unusual words. It was not often that he explained any and when he did he sometimes explained them wrongly, and at other times explained them differently.⁷¹

Pope published a second edition in 1728; every correction he introduced was of an error discussed by Lewis Theobald in his Shakespeare Restored, published in 1726.⁷²

Although not an edition of Shakespeare's works, Shakespeare Restored is a very important contribution to Shakespearean textual scholarship. In it Theobald first expressed his belief that an editor should take upon himself the task of "retrieving, as far as possible, the *original Purity* of his [Shakespeare's] *Text*, and rooting out that vast Crop of *Errors*, which has almost Choak'd up his *Beauties*."⁷³ Theobald vows that he had hopes of Pope's proceeding on this premise; however, Theobald admits that "this learned *Editor* [Pope] seems purposely . . . to have declined."⁷⁴ Theobald then begins with Pope's edition of Hamlet, chosen, he claims, not because of the numerous errors,

⁷¹Ibid.

⁷²Ernest Walder, "The Text of Shakespeare," The Cambridge History of English Literature, V (1910), pp. 301-302.

⁷³Lewis Theobald; Shakespeare Restored: or, A Specimen of the Many Errors as well Committed, as Unamended, by Mr. Pope in his Late Edition of this Poet (London: R. Francklin, 1726; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1970), p. 1.

⁷⁴Ibid., p. iii.

but because of the popularity of the play; one by one he discusses the errors in Pope's text and offers suggested emendations. Theobald's corrections fall into six categories: various readings, conjectural emendations, emendations, false pointing, false printing, and omissions. He notes altogether ninety-seven changes in Hamlet and one hundred and seven other changes in the other plays, these changes being noted in Theobald's appendix--over two hundred changes in all! One example of each of these categories of changes will show how carefully and how scholarly Theobald approached his task. He shows that Pope's edition of Hamlet printed

Giving to you no further personal power
Of treaty with the King.

(I.ii)

Theobald feels that this reading, which appeared in the 1676 quarto edition of the play as well as in Rowe's 1709 edition, should be

Giving to you no further personal Pow'r
To business with the King.

(I.ii)

He supports his reasoning--Shakespeare made nouns into verbs--with eighteen parallel passages from other plays. For example, in A Midsummer Night's Dream, Theobald quotes

And as Imagination *bodies* forth
The Forms of Things unknown, the Poet's Pen
Turns them to Shape

(V.i.)

and in Henry IV, Part 2

⁷⁵Ibid., pp. 7-8.

And therefore will he wipe his Tables clean,
 And keep no Tell-tale to his Memory,
 That may repeat and *history* his Loss
 To new remembrance.

(IV.i)

Theobald's practice here, of citing parallel passages to support his reading and emendations, was an important step in textual study. He does so to support his conjectural emendations. Also in Hamlet, Theobald notes that Pope printed

. . . and we here dispatch
 You, good Cornelius, and you Voltimand,
For bearers of this greeting.

(I.ii)

Theobald feels the passage should be printed

. . . and we here dispatch
 You, good Cornelius, and You, ⁷⁶Voltimand,
Our Bearers of this Greeting.

(I.ii)

He defends his change by saying the plural pronoun Our "connects exactly" with the rest of the passage, beginning "We have here writ / To Norway" and by indicating that the mistake of For for Our is so easy that in the Second Folio edition (which Pope said he used extensively) it occurred in another passage in the same act; here, however, later editors have corrected it.

Haml. Never to speak of This that you have seen,
 Swear by my Sword.
Ghost. Swear.
Haml. *Hic, & ubique?* Then we'll shift for Ground.

(I.ii)

Whenever Theobald offered emendations, he gave his reasons clearly. For

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 7; Theobald's defense of this change, explained next, is also included in this reference.

example, again in Hamlet, Pope printed

So excellent a king, that was, to this,
Hyperion to a Satyr: So loving to my Mother,
That he permitted not the winds of Heav'n
Visit her face too roughly.

(I.iii)

Theobald says that Pope has copied the passage from the modern editions
"for Want of understanding the Poet."⁷⁷ He admits that the text is
corrupt in all the old editions, having been printed

So excellent a king, that was, to this,
Hyperion to a Satyr: So loving to my Mother,
That he might not beteeme the Winds of Heav'n
Visit her face too roughly.

(I.iii)

Noting that good sense can be restored by changing only a single letter
and separating two words which evidently appeared too close together in
the manuscript, he emends the passage to read

So excellent a king, that was, to this,
Hyperion to a Satyr: So loving to my Mother,
That he might not let e'en the Winds of Heav'n
Visit her Face too roughly.

(I.iii)

Furthermore, Theobald corrects false pointing and false printing. He
says, for example, that the passage which Pope printed as

King. I have nothing with this answer, *Hamlet*, these words are not
mine.

Hamlet. No, nor mine now, my Lord. You play'd once i' th' University,
you say?

(III.vi)

should be printed

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 19.

King. I have Nothing with this Answer, *Hamlet*; these Words are not mine.

Hamlet. No, nor mine.--Now, my Lord,--You play'd once i' th' University, you say?

(III.vi)

to indicate that Hamlet first answered the king abruptly and then turned his attention to Polonius, whom he addressed as "my Lord."⁷⁸ And

Theobald, noting an error in printing, says that Pope's

. . . I will work him
To an Exploit now ripe in my devise,
Under the which he shall not chuse but fall.

(IV.ix)

should be printed, as in all other editions,

. . . I will work him
To an Exploit now ripe in my Device,
Under the which he shall not chuse but fall.

(IV.ix)

since the noun form is always written with a c, not an s, which makes the verb devise.⁷⁹ Finally, Theobald supplies omitted words and passages,

such as, in *Hamlet*, he added hath to the line "What is't, Ophelia, he hath said to you?" (I.vi) and two lines (those italicized below) to

Hamlet's speech:

I will speak Daggers to her but use none.
My Tongue and Soul in This be Hypocrites!
How in my Words soever She be shent
*To give them Seals never my Soul consent.*⁸⁰

(III.viii)

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 86.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 116.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 98. This passage is in III.ii in Horace Howard Furness, ed., A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: The Tragedy of Othello, Moor of Venice (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1886), p. 274.

In his comments in the Appendix about Antony and Cleopatra, Theobald also accuses Pope of carelessness in carrying out what he said he would do, namely, remove from the text all the directions to the property-men. He cites the following passage from Macbeth:

I 'gin to be a weary of the Sun,
And wish the State o' th' World were new undone.
Ring the alarum-bell, blow wind, come Wrack,
At least we'll dye with Harness on our Back.
(V.v)

Theobald explains that "Macbeth, feeling that he cannot be safe within his Fortifications, resolves to issue out upon the Enemy. But in a besieg'd Town, is it ever customary to order an Alarum, or Sally, by the ringing of a Bell? Or rather is not this Business always done by Beat of Drums?"⁸¹ Theobald continues by giving supporting arguments from classical works as well as citing the proper use of an "Alarum Bell" in Macbeth earlier: ringing the alarum bell to wake the household after the murder of Duncan was discovered.

From these comments in Shakespeare Restored it is clear why Ernest Walder described Theobald as having "few rivals as a textual critic."⁸² In fact, repeatedly Theobald has earned praise. Churton Collins is quoted by Henry Wheatley as writing, "It may be said with simple truth that no poet in his own or any language has ever owed so great a debt to an editor as Shakespear owes to this man."⁸³ He has been called "the

⁸¹Ibid., p. 157.

⁸²Walder, "The Text of Shakespeare," p. 301.

⁸³Wheatley, "Shakespeare's Editors," pp. 157-167.

first great editor of Shakespeare"⁸⁴ and "the true founder of modern Shakespearean scholarship."⁸⁵ He has been credited with doing "more towards rectifying the text of Shakespeare than has been effected by any single editor since."⁸⁶ Nevertheless, Pope's characterization of Theobald as "piddling Theobald" and a "dullard" and his crowning Theobald as the first king of The Dunciad hurt Theobald's personal reputation for almost a century.⁸⁷ The difference between these two men was noted by David Nichol Smith: "On the one hand you have a man of genius [Pope] pursuing a wrong method; on the other you have a man of very moderate capacity [Theobald] striving toward the right method."⁸⁸ Theobald's edition of Shakespeare's works appeared in 1733. In his preface, Theobald admitted that there were no authentic manuscripts extant and that the author's text had become "depraved."⁸⁹ For these reasons, Theobald felt the responsibilities of an editor were great. He saw the duty of an editor to be two-fold: "the Emendation of corrupt Passages; the Explanation of obscure and difficult ones."⁹⁰ To this end,

⁸⁴Lounsbury, Text of Shakespeare, p. 155.

⁸⁵McKerrow, "The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text," p. 109.

⁸⁶Lounsbury, Text of Shakespeare, p. x.

⁸⁷Theobald, Shakespeare Restored, pp. 1-2.

⁸⁸Smith, Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century, p. 38.

⁸⁹Lewis Theobald, Preface to the Works of Shakespeare (London, 1734; rpt. by The Augustan Reprint Society, Los Angeles: University of California, 1949), p. xl.

⁹⁰Ibid.

he writes, "Nothing is alter'd, but what by the clearest Reasoning can be proved a Corruption of the true Text; and the Alteration, a real Restoration of the genuine Reading."⁹¹ Theobald continues, "In his *Historical Plays*, whenever our *English* Chronicles, and in his Tragedies when *Greek* or *Roman* Story could give any Light; no Pains have been omitted to set Passages right by comparing my Author with his Originals."⁹² Also, Theobald claims "Wherever the Author's Sense is clear and discoverable (tho', perchance, low and trivial;) I have not by any Innovation temper'd with his Text." Furthermore, he explains, "Where, thro' all the former Editions, a Passage has labour'd under flat Nonsense and invincible Darkness, if, by the Addition or Alteration of a Letter or two, I have restored to Him both Sense and Sentiment, such Corrections . . . will need no Indulgence. And whenever I have taken greater Latitude and Liberty in amending, I have constantly endeavored to support my Corrections and Conjectures by parallel Passages and Authorities from himself, the surest Means of expounding any Author whatsoever."

Theobald, a diligent and laborious editor, collated very carefully; his care and accuracy can be contrasted to the carelessness and suppositions of Pope by noting his most widely accepted emendation. In Henry V Miss Quickly described the death-bed scene of Falstaff as follows:

⁹¹Ibid.

⁹²This comment of Theobald's as well as those which are quoted next about the method he adopted in preparing his edition will be found on pp. xlii-xliii.

"A made a finer end, and went away and it had been any Christome child: a parted ev'n at the turning o' th' Tyde: for after I saw him fumble with the sheets, and play with Flowers, and smile upon his fingers end, I knew there was but one way; for his Nose was as sharpe as a Pen, and a Table of green fields." (II.iii) The phrase, "and a Table of green fields," as printed in the Folios, could obviously not be authoritative. Pope solved the problem by omitting the phrase entirely with the following explanation:

These words, "and a Table of green fields," are not to be found in the old editions of 1600 and 1608. This nonsense got into all the following editions by a pleasant mistake of the Stage editors, who printed from the common piecemeal-written Parts in the Play-house. A table was here directed to be brought in, (it being a scene in a tavern where they drink at parting) and this direction crept into the text from the margin. Greenfield was the name of the Property man in that time, who furnish'd implements &c. for the actors. A Table of Greenfield's.⁹³

Theobald attacked the problem with less originality but more practicality.

First, commenting that Pope "selcom corrected a text but to its injury,"⁹⁴ he refuted Pope's argument.

As to the history of Greenfield being then Property-Man, whether it was really so, is a Point which I shall not contend about. But allowing the marginal Direction and supposing that a "Table of Greenfield's" was wanting; I positively deny that it was ever customary . . . to add the Property-Man's name whose Business it was to provide them [implements]. Surely, Mr. Pope cannot imagine, that when Implements are wanted in any Scene, the Direction for them is mark'd in the Middle of that Scene, tho' the Things are to be got ready against the Beginning of it. . . . And⁹⁵ therefore "Greenfield's Table" can be of no use to us for this Scene.

⁹³Pope, The Works of Shakespeare, III, 422.

⁹⁴Beverly Warner, ed., Famous Introductions to Shakespeare's Plays by the Notable Editors of the Eighteenth Century (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1906), p. xx.

⁹⁵Theobald, Shakespeare Restored, pp. 137-138.

Then, he emended the words in question to become part of the text. He writes that he had an edition of Shakespeare with notations in the margin which corrected the passage to be "for his Nose was as sharp as a Pen, and a' talked of green Fields." Using this suggestion of talked, Theobald comments that people near death are often delirious and talk about many things. However, he changed "table" not to talked, but to "babled," an even more descriptive word to denote the delirious ravings of a person near death. "Babled" was closer to the Folio printing of "Table," and Theobald's emended text read ". . . for his Nose was as sharp as a Pen, and a' babled of green Fields."⁹⁶ All editors since have adopted this conjecture.

Again it is interesting to note that, although he predictably placed Pope's edition under the heading "Editions of No Authority,"⁹⁷ he also quite predictably based his text on Pope,⁹⁸ preserving many of Pope's needless emendations. However, he did correct carefully with early editions, using forty-one quartos (twenty-eight before 1623), and thus can be praised as Lounsbury praises him: "It is well within bounds to say now that no such advance has been made by any single person upon previous conditions as was then made by him."⁹⁹ and as the publication of the Milwaukee Public Library praises him: "His edition of Shakespeare

⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 138.

⁹⁷ Smith, Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century, p. 38.

⁹⁸ Milwaukee Public Library, William Shakespeare, p. 25.

⁹⁹ Lounsbury, Text of Shakespeare, p. 189.

was the best then available--and in some respects, the best available up to the 20th century."¹⁰⁰

Following Theobald's was the edition of Sir Thomas Hanmer. Hanmer's edition, published in six handsome quarto volumes in 1744, professed to be a "true and correct edition of Shakespeare's works cleared from corruptions with which they have hitherto abounded."¹⁰¹ However, Hanmer neglected most older copies, despite his boast on the title page that the text had been "carefully revised and corrected by the former editions"¹⁰² and used Pope's edition, correcting it in some places by reference to that of Theobald.¹⁰³ In his preface Hanmer wrote that "no alterations hath been made but what the sense necessarily required" and that "Most of those passages are here thrown to the bottom of the page and rejected as spurious, which were stigmatized as such in Mr. Pope's Edition."¹⁰⁴ For example, he, like Pope, rejects the following passage in Two Gentlemen of Verona and therefore, like Pope, prints it at the bottom:

Speed. What an ass art thou? I understand thee not.
 Laun. What a block art thou, that thou canst not? My staff
 understands me.
 Speed. What thou say'st?

¹⁰⁰Milwaukee Public Library, William Shakespeare, p. 26.

¹⁰¹Thomas Hanmer, ed., The Works of Shakespear, 6 vols. (Oxford: The Theater, 1744), I, ii.

¹⁰²Walder, "The Text of Shakespeare," p. 303 and Hanmer, Works of Shakespear, I, ii.

¹⁰³Smith, Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century, p. 43.

¹⁰⁴Hanmer, Works of Shakespear, I, iii.

Laun. Ay, and what I do too: look thee, I'll but lean and my
staff understands me.

Speed. It stands under thee indeed.

Laun. Why, stand-under, and understand, is all one.¹⁰⁵

(II.viii)

Hanmer did not stop with using Pope's edition as his copy-text and the passages Pope felt were spurious; he reprinted Pope's preface. He also borrowed, as most editors did until 1821, Rowe's life of Shakespeare. He did add, however, a glossary at the end of volume VI "for the explanation of all those terms which have hitherto been so many stumbling-blocks to the generality of Readers."¹⁰⁶ Furthermore, although he writes that "where there is any obscurity in the text not arising from the words but from a reference to some antiquated customs, now forgotten, or other causes of that kind a note is put at the bottom of the page to clear up the difficulty,"¹⁰⁷ the consensus is that Hanmer's is a very poor edition. One critic writes,

Aside from the impressive appearance of the six volumes when they appeared in 1744, it is difficult to find much good to say about Hanmer's edition. It competes with Warburton's of 1747 for lowest place among the eighteenth century editions. . . . His method was . . . to reprint the latest edition or editions, accepting their emendations or guesses as the established text and further emending any passage the meaning of which did not strike his fancy. . . . Hanmer was perhaps a little more arbitrary in his emendations and a little less sound in his judgements than most of the other [editors].¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ Pope, The Works of Shakespeare, I, 183 and Hanmer, Works of Shakespear, VI, 171.

¹⁰⁶ Hanmer, Works of Shakespear, I, v.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Giles E. Dawson, "Warburton, Hanmer, and the 1745 Edition of Shakespear," Studies in Bibliography, II (1949), 41-42.

William Warburton's edition, published in 1747, was based on Theobald's but used Pope's scene numbering; Hanmer's glossary which he incorporated whenever a word needed an explanation, not in a list at the end; and his own notes. However, despite his use of Theobald's and Hanmer's earlier works, he accused both of plagiarism!¹⁰⁹ He criticized Theobald and Hanmer's editions as early as on his title page, by writing that he had published in eight volumes, "The Genuine Text . . . Being restored from the *Blunders* of the first Editors, and the *Interpolations* of the two Last." At the same time he showed his reverence for Pope by crediting him as a co-editor; the title page reads "By Mr. Pope and Mr. Warburton."¹¹⁰ Warburton's animosity toward Theobald and Hanmer is best indicated in his own letters. Apparently, Theobald and Warburton had corresponded about Shakespeare for a considerable length of time while Theobald was in the process of preparing his edition for the printer. As the editor, Theobald evidently felt that he "should have a free hand to select or discard as he might see fit,"¹¹¹ for he did not use all the notes that Warburton had sent him. As a result, Warburton wrote to Theobald on May 17, 1734, "I have transcrib'd ab^t. 50 Emend. & remarks w^{ch}: I have at several times sent you, omitted in y^e. Edition of Shakespeare w^{ch} I am sure are better than any of mine publish'd there.

¹⁰⁹ Walder, "The Text of Shakespeare," p. 303.

¹¹⁰ William Warburton, ed., The Works of Shakespear in Eight Volumes, 8 vols. (London: Jacob Tonson, 1747; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1968), title page.

¹¹¹ Hanmer, Works of Shakespear, I, 37.

These I shall convey to you soon & desire you to publish them (as omitted by being mislaid) in y^e Edition of the Poems, w.^{ch} I hope you will soon make ready for the Press."¹¹² However, Theobald never did publish an edition of Shakespeare's poems and Warburton's notes were not made public by Theobald. Likewise, Warburton was upset with Hanmer for attempting to publish his edition of Shakespeare with Warburton's notes but without Warburton's knowledge or approval. Warburton wrote on November 1, 1762, the following account of his actions of 1742: "But the bookseller understanding that he made use of many of my notes, and that I knew nothing of the project, thought fit to send me this account; on which I wrote to Sir Th. Hanmer, upbraiding him with his behaviour."¹¹³ Before judging Warburton's edition by noting what he claims in the preface and accomplishes in the following eight volumes, it is interesting to note that he also reprinted Pope's preface and Rowe's life, although he complained it was "meagre."¹¹⁴ However, he did not supply any additional information. Furthermore, he appended to his sixth volume an "Index of the Characters, Sentiments, Similies, Speeches and Descriptions in Shakespeare." The index provides the topic, the play, the volume, the page, and, if applicable, the person. This index is, in all particulars except the volume and page numbering, identical to Pope's index!¹¹⁵

¹¹² Ibid., p. 36.

¹¹³ Ibid., p. 40.

¹¹⁴ Warburton, Works of Shakespear, I, viii.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., VI, 405-462 and Pope, The Works of Shakespeare, VI, 593-623.

In considering Warburton's edition, one must judge him, to a great extent, on what he said in his preface he would accomplish. He begins by praising Pope's edition as "the best Foundation for all Further Improvements" for several reasons: "He separated the genuine from the spurious plays and attempted to clear the genuine Plays from the interpolated Scenes: He then consulted the old Editions; and, by a careful Collation of them, rectified the faulty . . . in a great number of places."¹¹⁶ He finds only one advantage to Theobald's edition: "By a punctilious Collation of the old Books, he corrected what was manifestly wrong in the *latter* Editions by what was manifestly right in the *earlier*."¹¹⁷ His admiration for Theobald here results from Warburton's concept of the first duty of an editor: "to correct the faulty Text."¹¹⁸ To do this Warburton consulted many old editions (see Appendix C) and collated carefully, thus carrying out in practice the principles of textual criticism he noted in his preface.¹¹⁹ His edition shows evidence of detailed collation, especially from the old quartos, but his notes are mainly those of Pope and Theobald. Often he emends without justification, as in Hamlet where he prints "Almost to jelly with th' effect of fear" rather than "Almost to jelly with the act of fear" (I.ii.205) as all

¹¹⁶ Warburton, Works of Shakespear, I, ix.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. xi.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. xiii.

¹¹⁹ Warner, Famous Introductions, p. xxiii.

other editions printed.¹²⁰ Warburton's reason for his change is that "Shakespeare could never write so improperly as to call the *passion of fear*, the *act of fear*."¹²¹ Similarly, without any justification other than "Without question Shakespeare wrote," Warburton prints, again in Hamlet, "Or to take arms against assail of troubles"¹²² rather than, as in all other editions, "Or to take arms against a sea of troubles."¹²³ (III.ii.59) Obviously, while some of Warburton's emendations may seem logical, they are without authority or justification; thus, his edition is worth little to the serious scholar.

The next man to edit Shakespeare's plays provided the "most valuable critical estimate of Shakespeare's genius" of the eighteenth century.¹²⁴ That man was Samuel Johnson. His edition, which appeared in 1765, provides a good text but much more important are his notes, which provide much historical knowledge and his Preface, which indicates the principles on which editors of textual criticism of printed books should proceed. According to Johnson, "In perusing a corrupted piece, he must have before him all possibilities of meaning, with all possibilities of expression. Such must be his comprehension of thought, and such his copiousness of language. Out of many readings possible, he must be

¹²⁰Furness, Hamlet, p. 52.

¹²¹Warburton, Works of Shakespear, VIII, 131.

¹²²Ibid., I, 182.

¹²³Furness, Hamlet, p. 207.

¹²⁴Warner, Famous Introductions, p. xxiii.

able to select that which best suits."¹²⁵ And, according to his Preface, Johnson did collate carefully.

Having classed the observations of others, I was at last to try what I could substitute for their mistakes, and how I could supply their omissions. I collated such copies as I could procure, and wished for more, but have not found the collectors of these rarities very communicative. Of the editions which chance or kindness put into my hands I have given an enumeration, that I may not be blamed for neglecting what I have not the power to do.

By examining old copies, I soon found that the later publishers, with all their boasts of diligence, suffered many passages to stand unauthorized, and contented themselves with Rowe's regulation of the text, even where they knew it to be arbitrary, and with a little consideration might have found it to be wrong.

The emendations, which comparison of copies supplied, I have inserted in the text; sometimes where the improvement was slight, without notice, and sometimes with an account of the reasons of the change.¹²⁶

Johnson explained that he began by collating all four Folio editions; however, he soon came to the conclusion that an individual who has one Folio has, in effect, all four, except for printing errors. Finally, he realized a fundamental discovery--the First Folio was the only one with any authority.

Since Johnson had examined so many editions, he commented on the relative merits of each. First, he defended Rowe who had "been clamorously blamed for not performing what he did not undertake" by asserting that he "made many emendations . . . which his successors have received without acknowledgment."¹²⁷ Johnson also admits to having used Rowe's life

¹²⁵ Samuel Johnson, Prose and Poetry, ed. Mona Wilson (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1967), p. 515 and [James Boswell], ed., The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, 21 vols. (London: C. Baldwin, 1821), I, 93.

¹²⁶ Johnson, Prose and Poetry, p. 523. See Appendix D for a list of the editions Johnson used.

¹²⁷ Boswell, William Shakespeare, I, 92.

of Shakespeare. Next, he applauds Pope for acquainting the public with the true corrupt state of Shakespeare's text. Although he agrees that Pope collated old copies and restored many lines, Johnson claims that Pope did not understand "but half his undertaking," rejected whatever he disliked, and "thought more of amputation than of cure."¹²⁸ Nevertheless, Johnson retains all of Pope's notes as well as his valuable preface. Of Theobald, Johnson writes, "He collated the ancient copies and rectified many errors; . . . what little he did was commonly right."¹²⁹ Johnson, in fact, kept many of Theobald's notes, though not in as great detail as the originals. Of Hanmer, Johnson writes, "By inserting his emendations, whether invented or borrowed, into the page, without any notice of varying copies, he has appropriated the labour of his predecessors, and made his own edition of little authority."¹³⁰ Johnson admits, however, that Hanmer's notes were written with "careful enquiry and diligent consideration" and therefore uses them in his own edition. Finally, he says he also used those notes of Warburton's which were "learned and sagacious" but eliminated those which were "perverse interpretations" and "improbable conjectures."¹³¹ For example, in King John, Johnson prints,

¹²⁸Ibid., I, 92-93.

¹²⁹Ibid., I, 94.

¹³⁰Ibid., I, 95.

¹³¹Ibid., I, 96.

Now, by my life, this day grows wond'rous hot;
 Some airy devil hovers in the sky,
 And pours down mischief.

(III.ii.4-6)

Warburton printed "Some fiery devil," since, in his words, "the cause" must equal "the effect."¹³² Johnson argues that "Dr. Warburton will have the devil *fiery*, because he makes the day hot; the authour makes him airy, because *he hovers in the sky*."¹³³

Johnson did accomplish in his eight volumes most of what he proposed. In fact, his collation was so detailed, his sources so well documented, and his notes so extensive that he practically published a variorum edition. He used mainly, as his authoritative texts, the First Folio and some of the early quarto editions. Unfortunately, however, Johnson's text is ultimately faulty, since he printed from Warburton's text,¹³⁴ which had errors taken over from Theobald's second edition, which was based on Pope's 1725 edition which in turn was based on Rowe's second edition and all these, finally, on the Fourth Folio, which Johnson felt lacked authority. Nevertheless, Johnson's edition, though not a major contribution to textual scholarship, is valuable for its scholarly preface, excellent notes, and careful, reasoned judgments on the plays.

For approximately fifty years after Johnson, the editors of Shakespeare enlarged the scope and their illustrative examples and, in

¹³² Horace Howard Furness, Jr., A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: The Life and Death of King John (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1919), p. 234.

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Walder, "The Text of Shakespeare," p. 305 and Milwaukee Public Library, William Shakespeare, p. 29.

fact, worked toward a variorum edition. Edward Capell was the first of these, and his ten volume octavo edition appeared in 1768. One author has stated that "Scientific criticism of the text begins with Edward Capell."¹³⁵ And, indeed, the clarity and reasonableness of his observations on the duty and methods of an editor, made in his introduction, supports Walder's contention. They are so important that the major ones deserve enumeration. First, Capell notes that "The more distant they [editions] are from the original, the more they abound in faults; 'till, in the end, the corruptions of the last copies become so excessive, as to make them of hardly any worth."¹³⁶ Thus, Capell criticized Rowe and his successors for printing from the latest, rather than the earliest, text. The "best" text for the basis of an edition, he felt, was the one closest to the manuscript, not the latest text patched with earlier editions. In fact, he notes that Rowe's edition of 1709 was printed "with great exactness" from the 1685 Folio, "the last and worst."¹³⁷ Next, Pope's 1725 edition, according to Capell, was an improvement because of the insertion of many passages from the quartos; nevertheless, the edition did have faults: Pope was a careless collator and his using his predecessor's copy as the one he followed has "sunk them [his labors] in neglect."¹³⁸ Theobald and Hammer also erred by

¹³⁵Walder, "The Text of Shakespeare," p. 305.

¹³⁶Capell, Mr. William Shakespeare, I, 13.

¹³⁷Ibid., I, 16.

¹³⁸Ibid., I, 19.

using Pope's edition as copy text, as did Warburton who printed from Hanmer's. Capell says that, even if these last four editors were dedicated and brilliant, they still would not have succeeded with good editions, since "the superstructure cannot be a sound one, which is built upon so bad a foundation as that work of Mr. Rowe's."¹³⁹ As a result, Capell insists that he was determined to work from the earliest Folio and as many quartos as he could procure (see Appendix E).

McKerrow indicates that for his purpose Capell gathered "The largest collection of Shakespeare material that had ever been assembled," material which he left to Trinity College and thus greatly "facilitated the work of the Cambridge editors of 1863-6."¹⁴⁰ With this collection Capell had the materials to carry out his theory that the best text was the one closest to the manuscript and readings from a later text which differed from the earlier one on which it had been printed were of no authority. However definite Capell is, he still selected readings from, in McKerrow's words, "whatever improves the Author."¹⁴¹ Despite this drawback, Capell did require that his text be set from his manuscript copy rather than from an earlier printed text. According to Alice Walker, Capell seems to have transcribed the plays ten times, and by using his own transcripts as the copy-text, avoided the errors inherent

¹³⁹Ibid., I, 19.

¹⁴⁰"The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text," p. 129.

¹⁴¹Ibid., pp. 129-130.

in using a printed edition as the copy.¹⁴² Capell also notes in his Introduction that his edition will make note of all discarded readings, all additions, and all variations, specifying the editions to which each belongs.¹⁴³ However sound as his theories are, Capell's edition suffers from a scarcity of footnotes with the very information he said he would provide. It does, however, provide the reader with other information, not indicated by earlier editors. Obvious stage business is indicated by a dagger (†).¹⁴⁴ Capell's own conjectures that were not in older editions are printed in black letter.¹⁴⁵ When a dash is at the bottom of a line, it indicates a change of address; when a dagger with two crosses (‡) is printed, it indicates that the speaker points to or delivers an object.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴² Alice Walker, "Edward Capell and His Edition of 'Shakespeare,'" in Studies in Shakespeare, ed. Peter Alexander (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 138.

¹⁴³ Capell, Mr. William Shakespeare, I, 22.

¹⁴⁴ For example, in The Tempest the reader knows Ariel is to assume a pose similar to Ferdinand when Capell prints, on page 14,

The king's son I have landed by himself;
Whom I left cooling of the air with sighs,
In an odd angle of the isle, and sitting,
His arms in this (†) sad knot.

(I.ii)

¹⁴⁵ Capell prints the word do in black letter in the following line from Two Gentlemen of Verona, p. 69: "But better, indeed, when you do hold your peace." (V.ii).

¹⁴⁶ In The Tempest, p. 74, Capell shows that Alonzo changes from talking to Prospero to the Boatswain in this manner:

It is interesting to note, however, that even with the care Capell took with his text, he did introduce changes, as the other editors had done, without an indication to the reader. In The Tempest, Capell prints the lines

. . . But thy vile race,
Though thou didst learn, had that in't which good natures
Could not abide to be with.

(I.ii)

although the authoritative First Folio printed "vild race."¹⁴⁷

The next editor concerned with Shakespeare's plays was George Steevens who, in 1766, published a four volume edition of twenty of Shakespeare's plays--those plays printed in quarto before the Restoration. Steevens admits in his "Advertisement to the Reader" that he has "only collected materials for future artists" and, therefore, that his edition is "no more than an apparatus for their use."¹⁴⁸ And, indeed,

Alo. These are not natural events; they strengthen,
From strange to stranger: __Say, how came you hither?
(V.i)

In The Merry Wives of Windsor, p. 24, Capell prints,

To thy great comfort in this mystery of ill opinions,
Here's ‡ the twin brother of thy letter.

(II.i)

¹⁴⁷Capell, Mr. William Shakespeare, I, 19. Horace Howard Furness, ed., A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: The Tempest (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1892), p. 74 does not indicate Capell's change, however.

¹⁴⁸George Steevens, ed., Twenty of the Plays of Shakespeare, Being the whole Number printed in Quarto During his Lifetime, or before the Restoration, 4 vols. (London: 1766; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1968), I, 20.

Steevens has done no more in this edition, which was prepared by collating the quarto editions of each play (see Appendix F). Like Capell, Steevens realized that "some of them were much more correctly printed than the Folio" and that "the oldest were in general the most correct."¹⁴⁹ Since he was using more than one edition as the basis for his published text, Steevens saw the necessity to indicate to the reader the source of each variant reading. Thus, he printed what he called "the poet's first thoughts as well as words"¹⁵⁰ from the earliest quartos; and additions to this, from later editions, were indicated by italics. He admits that in this edition he did not choose "to determine for others which were useless, or which were valuable"¹⁵¹ and, therefore, he prints the various readings gained from multiple collation. Thus, Steevens avoided one of the responsibilities of an editor--to select the one reading which seems, from all evidence, to be the most authoritative. Steevens does, however, choose to include The Winter's Tale and the three parts of Henry VI which had been rejected earlier as spurious by Pope and Warburton, respectively.

Before the printing of each play, Steevens reproduces the title page, indicating which quarto copy he used for his text, and reminds the reader which quarto editions he used for his collation. A glance at his

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., I, 10, 14.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., I, 14.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

printed version indicates that Steevens did accomplish his purpose--the collecting and printing of the plays in their earliest, and therefore usually most authentic, version. He does not, like all the editors from Rowe onward, divide the plays into acts and scenes unless such divisions were given in the quarto source. His notes merely indicate variant readings; Steevens makes no attempt to justify any single reading.

Evidently, however, Steevens' work on these twenty plays must have kindled in him a desire to do more than merely collate and reprint. He became associated with Johnson and, together, they printed an edition of all of Shakespeare's plays in 1773. One critic characterizes this text, which was based on Capell's 1768 edition, as the "best that had yet appeared."¹⁵² The two men published a second edition in 1778, and Steevens printed a third in 1785. These editions of the complete works of Shakespeare were extremely careful, very detailed and complete, and quite valuable. Steevens, for example, restored the only really authoritative reading of the lines in The Merchant of Venice:

Oh father Abram, what these Christians are,
Whose own hard dealings teaches them suspect
The thoughts of others.

(I.iii)

as the two quartos of 1600 and the Folio of 1623 had printed them. However, as early as the 1632 Folio, dealings had been changed to dealing. Pope realized the change and restored dealings; he then made the verb teach instead of teaches for the purpose of agreement. However, the meter

¹⁵² Walder, "The Text of Shakespeare," p. 306.

was inconsistent, and Pope changed the line by adding to between them and suspect so that the line read "Whose own hard dealings teach them to suspect." Every edition until Steevens in 1773 had an incorrect (and unauthoritative) reading.¹⁵³

Steevens also restored to Theobald the credit for having introduced the emendation in Twelfth Night to alter the comment about Sir Andrew Aguecheek's hair from "it will not cool my nature" to "it will not curl by nature." (I.iii) Lounsbury indicates that Theobald had communicated to Warburton his theorized change by letter; when Warburton's edition was published in 1747, however, he did not mention that the change had been that of Theobald. Lounsbury writes, "'We should read,' said Warburton, after quoting the original, 'it will not curl by nature.' The joke is evident. Much more evident is his own unscrupulousness."¹⁵⁴ Lounsbury notes that not until Steevens' edition is Theobald given credit for the emendation.

The third edition credited to George Steevens was published in 1785. This work, in ten volumes, reprinted much material from other sources;¹⁵⁵ it did much more, however. In its comprehensiveness it

¹⁵³Horace Howard Furness, ed., A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: The Merchant of Venice (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, Co., 1888), pp. 52-53.

¹⁵⁴Lounsbury, Text of Shakespeare, p. 543 and Steevens, Twenty Plays, IV, 172.

¹⁵⁵The reprinted material included Johnson's Preface (1765); Johnson's advertisement to the second edition (1778); the First Folio dedication from the players; the preface of the players; Pope's, Theobald's, and Warburton's prefaces; Steevens' advertisement from his

became almost a variorum. Four examples will support this statement; but many more can easily be found. First, in The Tempest Steevens prints

. . . and sometimes i'll get thee
Young scamels from the rock.
(II.ii)

To this line he appends the following note of Johnson, "This word [scamels] has puzzled the commentators: Dr. Warburton reads *shamois*; Mr. Theobald would read anything rather than *scameles*. Mr. Holt, who wrote notes upon this play, observes, that limpets are in some places called *scams*, therefore I have suffered *scameles* to stand."¹⁵⁶ He likewise supports this observation. Also, in The Merry Wives of Windsor Steevens indicates two meanings for the word abstract in the following passage: "Neither press, coffer, chest, trunk, well, vault, but he hath an abstract for the remembrance of such places, and goes to them by his note: There is no hiding you in the house." (IV.ii) He notes that his own interpretation is "a list, an inventory" but that Malone explains it as "a short note or description."¹⁵⁷ Again, in The Merry Wives of Windsor Steevens discusses the line "Let me stop this way first--So, now uncape." (III.ii) According to his notes, this line reads rightly from the 1623 Folio;

1766 edition of twenty plays; Rowe's life, Shakespeare's will; portraits of Shakespeare; poems about Shakespeare; a list of editions of Shakespeare's plays; a list of Stationers Company entries; and Malone's comments on the order of the writing of Shakespeare's plays.

¹⁵⁶ Johnson and Steevens, The Plays, I, 69-70.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., I, 361.

uncape is a fox-hunting term meaning "to dig out the fox when unearth'd" and "here is as much to say, take out the foul linen under which the adulterer lies hid." He notes, however, that the Oxford edition reads "uncouple" "out of pure love to an emendation."¹⁵⁸ Finally, again from The Merry Wives of Windsor, Steevens notes the changes that have been made in the lines ". . . that become the ship-tire, the tire-vellet, or any tire of Venetian admittance." (III.iii) The line was printed in this manner in the authoritative quarto (1602) and the First Folio. However, Warburton changed tire-vellet to tire-valiant, Steevens changed it to tire-velvet, and Malone changed ship-tire to shiptire.¹⁵⁹ Indeed, the copiousness of Steevens' notations makes his third edition an important one.

The last edition of Shakespeare's plays in the eighteenth century was that of Edmond Malone in 1790. This ten volume edition showed tremendous diligence on the part of the editor. The entire first volume (414 pages) concerns itself with Malone's opinions about textual study; with his account of the chronological order of Shakespeare's plays; with the reprinting of Pope's, Johnson's, and Steevens' introductions; with a list of ancient translations from classic authors (from Steevens' edition, with additions) which might have been source material for Shakespeare; with Rowe's life and other materials relating to Shakespeare, such as the dedicatory work of the players, Shakespeare's

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., I, 342.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., I, 335-336.

coat of arms, his will, his mortgage; with poems of Shakespeare; and with a list of the most authentic ancient editions of Shakespeare's plays (see Appendix G). Malone's prefatory comments and his discussion on the order of Shakespeare's plays (see Appendix H) are both extremely valuable contributions; the other information is not original and for that reason alone, is less significant.

Malone's observations on textual study--with particular reference to Shakespeare--are the definitive ones of the eighteenth century and should, therefore, be noted briefly. First, he comments about the other editors of Shakespeare's plays, noting that during the first half of the century "to alter Shakespeare's text and to restore it, were considered as synonymous terms,"¹⁶⁰ since the editors thought expressions that they did not understand to be corrupt and, therefore, necessitous of change. From about 1750 to 1790, according to Malone, the "principal employment [of Shakespeare's editors] has been to *restore*, in the true sense of the word; to reject the arbitrary and capricious innovations made by our predecessors from ignorance of the phraseology and customs of the age in which Shakespeare lived."¹⁶¹ Then he notes the duty and responsibilities of an editor to explain and illustrate; but, more important, Malone feels that "to ascertain his [Shakespeare's] genuine text, to fix what is to be explained, is his [the editor's] first and

¹⁶⁰ Edmond Malone, ed., The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, 10 vols. (London: 1790; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1968), I, xi.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

immediate object: and till it be established which of the ancient copies is entitled to preference, we have no criterion by which the text can be ascertained."¹⁶² To this end, Malone considers the relative value of the quartos and the Folios, concluding "as editions of books are multiplied, their errours are multiplied also; and that consequently every such edition is more or less correct, as it approaches nearer to or is more distant from the truth."¹⁶³ Many examples of the truth of his statement can be noted. For example, in Romeo and Juliet, the 1599 quarto (the authoritative edition) printed the line "I' faith, I am sorry that thou art not well." The First Folio printed, "In faith, I am sorry that thou art so well" (I.v.52); and the Second Folio printed, "In faith, I am sorry that thou art so ill."¹⁶⁴ Also, from the same play, one notes the following corruption:

Q ₁₅₉₇	"The earth hath swallow'd all my hopes but she."
F ₁	"Earth hath swallow'd all my hopes but she."
F ₂	"Earth up swallow'd all my hopes but she." ¹⁶⁵
	(I.ii.14)

Similar corruptions can be seen in Julius Caesar, where the First Folio provides the authentic copy; for example,

¹⁶²Ibid., I, xii.

¹⁶³Ibid., I, xiii.

¹⁶⁴Horace Howard Furness, ed., A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Romeo and Juliet (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1899), p. 146.

¹⁶⁵Ibid., p. 31.

F₁ "Of the dank morning"
 F₂ "Of the dark morning"¹⁶⁶
 (II.i.291)

and

F₁ "Caius Ligarius doth bear Caesar hard."
 F₂ "Caius Ligarius doth bear Caesar hatred."¹⁶⁷
 (II.i.239)

and

F₁ "The noise of battle hurtled in the air"
 F₂ "The noise of battle hurried in the air"¹⁶⁸
 (II.ii.27)

Malone, therefore, felt that the only edition of any authority was the first one (except in the case of the 1597 quarto of Romeo and Juliet which he described as an "imperfect sketch") and paid no attention to any other. Furthermore, Malone indicated that in his attempt to deliver a perfectly faithful edition he had the proof sheet of his work read aloud to him while he read either the authentic quarto or the authentic Folio edition; by "this laborious process, not a single innovation, made either by the editor of the Second Folio, or by any of the modern editors could escape."¹⁶⁹ In this way Malone was able to restore many readings which had, through the years, been incorrectly printed. For example, in Troilus and Cressida, the authoritative quarto of 1609 printed the line "To see great Hector in his weedes of peace." (III.iii) The Folio of

¹⁶⁶Furness, Julius Caesar, p. 104.

¹⁶⁷Ibid., p. 101.

¹⁶⁸Ibid., p. 115.

¹⁶⁹Malone, Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, I, xlv.

1632 and all editions following it until that of Malone, however, printed "To see great Hector in the weedes of peace." (III.iii.250) Malone, then, restored the authentic reading.¹⁷⁰ Similarly, the authentic First Folio text of Julius Caesar reads "Hence, I will follow." (V.v.53) From Pope's edition to that of Malone the editors had printed only "Hence, I will."¹⁷¹ Another example from the same play shows that Malone restored the authentic reading "Or else were this a savage Spectacle" (III.i.248) rather than following the corrupt version of Pope, Theobald, Warburton, Johnson, and Steevens: "Or else this were a savage Spectacle."¹⁷² Whenever Malone chose to deviate from the authentic copy, he noted his change and gave credit to the editor responsible for the alteration. And, to quote Malone, "When it is considered that there are one hundred thousand lines in these plays, and that it often was necessary to consult six or seven volumes, in order to ascertain by which of the preceding editors from the time of the publication of the Second Folio, each emendation was made, it will easily be believed that this was not effected without much trouble."¹⁷³ Finally, Malone, like most of the others, evaluated the works of the other editors of Shakespeare. His conclusions are quite sound in many cases and, in some areas, quite humorous. Of Rowe, he write that, since Rowe printed from the faulty Fourth Folio, "almost every page of his work was

¹⁷⁰ Hillebrand, Troilus and Cressida, p. 193.

¹⁷¹ Furness, Julius Caesar, p. 273.

¹⁷² Ibid., p. 157.

¹⁷³ Malone, Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, I, xlviii-li.

disfigured by accumulated corruptions."¹⁷⁴ He admits that Pope detected some errors by examining the oldest copies, but calls Pope one of "the two great corrupters of our poet's text" along with the editor of the Second Folio because of the arbitrary changes, transpositions, and interpolations he made.¹⁷⁵ Malone's evaluation of Theobald was similar to his judgement of Pope; Theobald, too, made too many innovations of his own. Of Hanmer, Malone wrote "it is only necessary to say that he adopted almost all the innovations of Pope, adding to them whatever caprice dictated."¹⁷⁶ He added, however, that "The editions of Pope and Hanmer, may, with almost as much propriety, be called their works, as those of Shakespeare."¹⁷⁷ His evaluation of Warburton is equally critical: "His unbounded licence in substituting his own chimerical conceits in the place of the author's genuine text, has been so fully shown by his revisers, that I suppose no critical reader will ever again open his volumes."¹⁷⁸ Only for Johnson does Malone have praise; he commends Johnson's "admirable preface (perhaps the finest composition in our language)," and adds "that his vigorous and comprehensive understanding threw more light on his authour than all his predecessors had done."¹⁷⁹ The same, indeed, can be said for Malone himself.

¹⁷⁴Ibid., I, lxvi.

¹⁷⁵Ibid., I, xix, xlvi.

¹⁷⁶Ibid., I, lxvii.

¹⁷⁷Ibid., I, lxxiii.

¹⁷⁸Ibid.

¹⁷⁹Ibid., I, lxviii-lxix.

In summary, in the eighteenth century, textual criticism was conducted almost without reference to the supposed origin of the text or to the supposed cause of error. The editors during this hundred-year period picked at random the individual variants they felt best, without realizing that the authority of the earliest printed texts had to be observed. Few editors realized that if all texts could be derived from one printed edition, then a single line of descent could be arranged, and, if no new authorial revision could be shown to have occurred, the editor is not free to choose the variant which appeals to him the most. Thus, the authoritative edition of Richard II is not that of the Folio which was derived from Q₅ but Q₁, the first printed edition, which used the author's foul papers for copy. The most authoritative edition of Macbeth was not that of the 1685 Fourth Folio, but the text printed in the 1623 Folio. Despite their obvious errors, the early editors did, however, make an important contribution; they restored to the text of Shakespeare reading which, through ignorance of Elizabethan usage, had been thought to be corrupt. And, as the eighteenth century ended, although "All of them failed to do the whole and complete job,"¹⁸⁰ these editors did lay the framework on which those of the nineteenth century built.

¹⁸⁰ Milwaukee Public Library, William Shakespeare, p. 13.

II. THE EARLY EDITORS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The nineteenth-century editors of Shakespeare cannot be classified easily, as can those of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The seventeenth-century editors can be described primarily as reprinters, not true editors; those of the eighteenth century can be regarded generally as popularizers--they wanted, in general, to make Shakespeare "readable" for the general public. The work of the nineteenth century, however, does not generally lend itself to one classification. The early editors of this century still wanted to provide reading editions. Thus, the trend toward modernization continued, along with the editors' eclectic treatment of the text. The fact that the printing procedures of two hundred years did nothing to guarantee the authority of the text encouraged editors to select what each considered "best" without any real respect for authority or precision. The early nineteenth-century editors--Boswell, Knight, Collier, and Dyce--made no distinction between the general and the scholarly reader, and the editions each published reflected this attitude. They were concerned with an explanation of the text and with the history of Shakespeare's life and literary career. Thus, there was much biographical work done on Shakespeare to supplement the eighteenth-century editors who were content to reprint Rowe's account of Shakespeare's life. Their work did, however, continue in the direction of Edmond Malone, who edited the first variorum, by

printing various readings at the bottom of the page. Towards the end of the century, however, a distinction between the general and the critical reader was observable. The business of the editors became "chiefly concerned with the elucidation and restoration of his [Shakespeare's] text."¹ The work of these later editors--notably William Aldis Wright and William George Clark in 1863, and Horace Howard Furness in 1871--is of immense value. Their work culminated in the Cambridge Shakespeare and the Variorum, respectively. Furness summarizes the attitude of the nineteenth century (up to his monumental achievement) by writing "Shakespearian criticism has made great progress, greater in fact than during any other preceding half-century; and, although in the list of recent editors are found no such world-renowned names as Pope and Johnson, yet Shakespeare has never had critics who brought to their task greater learning, keener critical sagacity, and more reverential love than have been shown by his more modern editors."² His opinion was echoed by Lounsbury, writing "By the dawn of the nineteenth century the authoritative consideration of the text of Shakespeare and of the proper manner of treating it had passed into the hands of specialists."³

During the first half of the nineteenth century the editors of Shakespeare relied to a great extent on the work of Malone, whose

¹Aron Y. Stavisky, Shakespeare and the Victorians: Roots of Modern Criticism (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969), p. 47.

²Furness, Romeo and Juliet, p. v.

³Text of Shakespeare, p. viii.

authority remained great. Like the editors of the eighteenth century, those of the first half of the nineteenth century also emphasized the preparation of an easily readable, popular edition. According to Fredson Bowers, "The nineteenth-century editors . . . did not invent the modernized general-purpose reading editions: they were in the direct line from the Shakespearean editors headed by Rowe, Pope, Theobald, and Malone."⁴ The first publication of the complete works of Shakespeare in the nineteenth century appeared in 1821; it was James Boswell's variorum edition, which he based on the notes and corrections of Malone. Furness characterizes this edition as a "storehouse whence succeeding editors of Shakespeare have drawn copious supplies of illustration and criticism."⁵ And, indeed, it is. The twenty-one volume variorum surveys many who had worked with Shakespeare's text during the eighteenth century and reprints the prefaces of Pope, Theobald, Hammer, Warburton, Johnson, Steevens, Capell, and Malone. The first volume also reprints Rowe's Life of Shakespeare and, among other matters, a very scholarly and well-documented "Essay on Shakespeare's Phraseology and Metre" by Boswell, based Boswell indicates in his Advertisement, on Malone's notes.⁶ The second volume begins with Malone's account of Shakespeare's life which included his essay on the chronological order of composition of the plays of Shakespeare. This account reveals the

⁴Textual and Literary Criticism (Cambridge: University Press, 1959), p. 117.

⁵Romeo and Juliet, p. v.

⁶William Shakespeare, I, xi.

care Malone took to document his information. It was the first major contribution to the biography of Shakespeare since Rowe's life, many parts of which were questionable.⁷ This volume ends with a mass of valuable supporting detail: legal documents of Shakespeare, entries in the Stationers' Register, and a detailed description of the editions of Shakespeare (see Appendix I). The next volume (III) commences with another important contribution by Malone--his "History of the Stage"--which is supplemented by information of Steevens and Chalmers. These three volumes, altogether more than sixteen-hundred pages, thus provide the student of Shakespeare with a vast reservoir of information.

The "Essay on Shakespeare's Phraseology and Metre" was based, as noted previously, on the materials left by Malone, who did not live to complete it. In the essay Boswell expresses the opinion, grasped by later editors, that the language of the plays was typical of Shakespearean England and, despite the fact that his mode of expression and versification may not be "perfectly consonant to our modern notions of metrical harmony," it should not be altered; such alterations were "altogether unjustifiable."⁸ His opinion forshadowes the beliefs of the editors of the latter part of the nineteenth century. For example, in Julius Caesar the 1821 variorum prints the line "The posture of your blows are yet unknown" with the note "It should be is yet unknown. But

⁷ See this thesis, Chapter I, p. 18.

⁸ William Shakespeare, XII, 401.

the error was certainly Shakespeare's."⁹ Boswell, using Malone's notes, supports his reasoning by commenting that a transcriber or printer would not purposely change a correct sentence to become incorrect; he further indicates that Shakespeare often made the same error of verb agreement with a plural noun in the objective case rather than a singular noun in the nominative case. He then refers the reader to his notes on Love's Labour's Lost where he indicates other occurrences.¹⁰

Boswell also restored the authoritative readings of lines which had been altered for the sake of the iambic meter. For example, Steevens had printed in The Tempest "This is as strange a thing as e'er I look'd on." (V.i) The folio and Boswell omit the first conjunction as; its addition was not authoritative. Similarly, Boswell's edition prints the

⁹Ibid., I, 511.

¹⁰Boswell reprints Malone's footnote to Love's Labour's Lost (IV.iii), pp. 387-389, which includes these citations to other plays:

. . . the voice of all the gods
Make heaven drowsy with the harmony."
(Love's Labour's Lost)

. . . for every one of these letters are
in my name.
(Twelfth Night)

The venom of such looks, we fairly hope,
Have lost their quality.
(Henry V)

How oft the sight of means to do ill deeds
Make ill deeds done.
(King John)

repetitious (but authoritative First Folio) double possessive in King John, "With them a bastard of the king's deceased" (II.i) rather than Steevens' "With them a bastard of the king deceased."¹¹ In these ways the first step toward the restoration of Shakespeare's writing--rather than the revision of it to accommodate the language of the time--was taken.

Malone's concern for detail and truthfulness can be seen repeatedly in his life of Shakespeare. As noted in Chapter I (page 18), from Rowe onward the story was reprinted that Shakespeare provided a sarcastic epitaph for the tombstone of John Combe, a noted usurer. Throughout the eighteenth century, although some editors, like Steevens, expressed disbelief in the story, it was still reprinted without any apparent investigation. Boswell indicates, however, in a lengthy footnote that Malone disproved the story entirely by examining Combe's will which provided for a tombstone after his death and did not indicate that he had already arranged for one and, further, which indicated that on his death Combe left "to Mr. William Shakespeare Five Pounds"--hardly the action of one whom, Rowe says, "never forgave" Shakespeare.¹² His attention to detail can also be noted in reading his essay on the chronological order of Shakespeare's plays. Throughout Malone uses both external and internal evidence to date the plays. For example, he dates The Merchant of Venice as being written in 1594 from Portia's comment

¹¹ Boswell, William Shakespeare, XV, 224.

¹² William Shakespeare, II, 497-502.

He may win
 And what is musick then? then musick is
 Even as the flourish when true subjects bow
 To a new crowned monarch.

(III.ii)

Malone supports his argument by writing, "Shakespeare is fond of alluding to events occurring at the time when he wrote, and the coronation of Henry the Fourth of France, who was crowned at Chartres in the midst of his true subjects in 1594 (Rheims, where that ceremony ought to have taken place, being possessed by the rebels,) seems to have excited great interest in England."¹³

Of the other eighteen volumes in this impressive work, Volumes IV-XIX present a carefully annotated text for all of Shakespeare's plays. Volumes IV-XV include the the plays except the histories and Pericles and Titus Andronicus. These twenty-five plays are arranged in the order which Malone gives for their composition.¹⁴ Volumes XV-XIX include the histories, presented chronologically by events in English history--King John, Richard II, Henry IV, Part 1, Henry IV, Part 2, Henry V, Henry VI, Part 1, Henry VI, Part 2, Henry VI, Part 3, Richard III and Henry VIII. Volume XX presents Shakespeare's poems; and Volume XXI includes Pericles and Titus Andronicus, the two plays of doubtful Shakespearean authorship, as well as the Addenda and the Index.

Boswell was apparently concerned not only with quantity; his work is also of very high quality. In fact, one critic wrote that Boswell's

¹³Ibid., II, 331-332.

¹⁴Ibid., II, 295-296.

variorum was "better even than Malone could have done"¹⁵--high praise indeed. The two men--Malone and Boswell--became friends when Boswell was still a child.¹⁶ There was a deep friendship between Malone and Boswell's father, Samuel Johnson's biographer, and the young Boswell often conversed with Malone on the topic of Shakespeare. According to Boswell's account, as Malone's eyesight began failing, Boswell took over much of the detail work--the examination and collation of copies--and became, in essence, Malone's partner. Upon Malone's death Boswell saw his duty as one of organizing Malone's notes and publishing the edition Malone would have completed, had he lived. Consequently, the plan of the book and the majority of the opinions are those of Malone. Although Boswell respects Malone's knowledge, industry, and scholarly abilities, he does not allow Malone's errors to stand uncorrected. For example, Malone's preface, in a series of illustrations demonstrating the faultiness of the Second Folio as compared to the First, printed the comment that in Henry IV, Part 1 the line "Why what a candy deal of curtesie" (I.iii) had been printed "caudie deal" in the First Folio and "gawdy" in the second. Boswell indicates that Malone erred here; according to Boswell "the second folio merely adopted the misprint of the first."¹⁷ Had Boswell done a little more investigation, he would have discovered that "gawdy" was the reading of the Third and Fourth

¹⁵Wheatley, "Shakespeare's Editors," p. 166.

¹⁶Boswell, William Shakespeare, I, v-vi.

¹⁷Ibid., I, 204.

Folios (gaudie and gaudy, respectively).¹⁸ This incident demonstrates only one of several places Boswell, despite his admiration for Malone, follows an editor's duty rather than allowing a personal friendship or respect to govern his actions.

Boswell does, indeed, pursue diligently and carefully the dull and repetitious task of an editor. He collates extensively; he indicates the originator of any emendation or conjecture he adopts; he includes in notes a mass of explanatory material and various readings; and he follows scrupulously the text of the oldest edition, unless it had the appearance of being imperfect. Whenever the "ancient copies . . . are deviated from, the reader is apprised of the alteration, and of the reasons upon which it is founded."¹⁹

Finally, Boswell provides the reader with an alphabetized glossary-index of great value. He introduced two innovations here. First, whenever all the commentators concurred on the meaning of a word or phrase,

¹⁸ Samuel Burdett Hemingway, ed., A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Henry IV, Part 1 (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1936), p. 82.

¹⁹ Boswell, William Shakespeare, I, xxi. An example of this situation occurs in Boswell, XII, 295. In Antony and Cleopatra Boswell prints, according to Malone's notes, Capell's correction:

. . . and the high gods,
To do you justice, make them ministers
Of us and those that love you
(III.vi)

rather than the First Folio lines

To do justice, make his ministers
Of us and those that love you.

Boswell gave the agreed-upon definition in the index, along with the page reference of the illustrative passages. When they disagreed, however, Boswell indicated all the passages in which the word appeared, to allow the reader to form his own opinion. Second, Boswell indexed both the readings of the quartos and the Folio when there were changes of sufficient merit to necessitate such an inclusion. (See Appendix J for the editions collated by Boswell). This early edition of the nineteenth century is a very important work--perhaps the most important edition until those of the Cambridge editors and Furness during the last half of the century.

Charles Knight's The Works of Shakespeare appeared near the middle of the nineteenth century; no date is indicated on the title page, but Furness' Variorum indicates the probability of its publication in 1838.²⁰ His two volume work was, apparently, the first printed in folio in more than one hundred years. In it he divides the plays into three traditional categories--comedies, histories, and tragedies. The comedies and tragedies are arranged "according to the evidence of the dates of their composition. The histories follow the chronology of the several reigns" (see Appendix K).²¹ He also prints Shakespeare's poems, discusses the plays ascribed to Shakespeare and expresses reasons for his doubts that

²⁰ Furness, Romeo and Juliet, p. xvii.

²¹ Charles Knight, ed., The Works of Shakespeare (New York: Virtue & Yorston, n.d.), I, 2.

any one was his work except Pericles,²² and provides a Glossarial Index and an index to the dramatis personae. His Glossarial Index provides two kinds of information. Arranged alphabetically, any words which can be defined by a synonym are printed in italics; the synonym is given, as well as the play or plays in which the word appears (with act and scene), and an n indicates the discussion of the word in the notes. Finally the line in which the word appears is printed. For example: "*Dissemble* (v.)--disguise. T.N. iv,2,n, Well, I'll put it on, and I will *dissemble* myself in it."²³ But if the definition or discussion is too long or too involved for a brief synonymous explanation, he prints the word in Roman type, after which he gives the same information. For example:

Monopolies in the reign of Elizabeth. L.i,4,n, If I had a *monopoly* out, they would have part on't.²⁴

The second index, to the dramatis personae, simply indicates the name of the character, the play in which that person appears, and the important act and scenes in which he appears. For example, "Hamlet, son to the former and nephew to the present King. H.i.2,4,5; ii.2; iii.1,2,3,4; iv.2,3,4; v.1,2."²⁵ At the end of Volume I Knight prints a biography

²²Ibid., II, 675-724. These plays are The Tragedy of Locrine, First Part of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, Chronicle Historie of Thomas Lord Cromwell, The London Prodigall, The Puritaine, and A Yorkshire Tragedy.

²³Ibid., II, 748.

²⁴Ibid., II, 758.

²⁵Ibid., II, 775.

of Shakespeare which attempts to "associate Shakespeare with the circumstances around him."²⁶ The biography differs greatly from Rowe's and Malone's. Rather than tell a documented, factual life of Shakespeare, Knight chooses to divide his life into areas such as "Ancestry," "The Schoolboy's World," "Holidays," "Home," "Social Hours," "The First Ride to London," and "The Last Birthday." In doing so, he emphasizes the times and society in which Shakespeare lived. Thus, Knight felt that he had "an approximation to the truth, which could not have been reached by a mere documentary narrative."²⁷ Knight's edition also has numerous illustrations of various scenes in the plays.

Knight's introduction to his edition is very brief; here he indicates no new information about Shakespeare or his text.. But before each play Knight provides an "Introductory Notice" where he discusses the state of the text, the chronology of the play, the source of the plot, the period of the action, and the costume. The majority of this information is interesting to the reader but hardly a necessity for the student of his text. However, the material he presents on the state of the text is informative. He indicates whether the First Folio or an earlier quarto was the authoritative text and, if so, the printer's apparent correctness or carelessness in completing his job.²⁸ Knight also

²⁶ Ibid., I, n.p.

²⁷ Ibid., I, n.p.

²⁸ For example, of Two Gentlemen of Verona, Knight comments "The text is singularly correct" (I,3). Also, he approves of the state of the texts of The Merchant of Venice: "All these editions [two in 1600

criticizes other editors for the corruptions they made in the text. One notable example, discussing The Tempest, follows:

The original text is printed with singular correctness; and if, with the exception of one or two obvious typographical errors, it had continued to be reprinted without any change, the world would have possessed a copy with the mint-mark of the poet upon it, instead of the clipped and scoured impression that bears the name of Steevens. Fortunately, however, in consequence of this remarkable correctness of the original, the commentators have been unable to do much in the way of what they call emendation; but what they have done is done as badly as possible.²⁹

Besides introductions, Knight appends what he calls "Notes" to each play. The "Notes" provide additional material of interest to the reader, more than can be gained by examining the footnotes on each page. In these, Knight explains the meaning of passages which might confuse the reader as well as details the sources for many of his readings. For example, in The Tempest Knight explains the meaning of trash in the lines,

Being once perfected how to grant suits,
How to deny them; Whom to advance, and whom
To trash for overtopping; new created
The creatures that were mine . . .
(I.ii)

and 1623] present the internal evidence of having been printed from correct copies. (I,193); A Midsummer Night's Dream: "The text appears to us as perfect as it is possible to be, considering the state of typography in that day." (I,165); and Twelfth Night: "With the exception of a few manifest typographical errors, the original copy is remarkably correct." (I,288). However, he condemns the copy of a Comedy of Errors: "This copy presents many typographical errors; and in a few passages the text is manifestly corrupt." (I,108) and Love's Labour's Lost: "The manifold errors of the press in the Latin words of the first edition [Q1598] have not been corrected in the second [F1623]." (I,38).

²⁹Works of Shakespeare, I, 416.

He writes, "A *trash* is a term still in use among hunters, to denote a piece of leather, couples, or any other weight fastened round the neck of a dog, when his speed is superior to the rest of the pack."³⁰

Similarly, in Troilus and Cressida Achilles comments

The dragon wing of night o'erspreads the earth,
And, stickler-like, the armies separate.
(V.ix)

Knight writes that "A *stickler* was an *arbitrator*, or *sidesman*; one who presided over the combats of quarter-staff and wrestling."³¹ He also indicates variant readings and interpretations, even where he favors one particular reading. In King Lear Knight prints, "Ask her forgiveness? Do you but mark how this becomes the house?" (II.iv). He notes,

Theobald changed this fine expression to *the use*. Capell, who, in spite of his obscurities, often displays a fund of good sense which has been too much neglected, says, "This is one of the lines that mark Shakespeare . . . *the house* is an expression worthy his genius: fathers are not the heads only of a house or a family, but its representatives; they are *the house*, what affects them affects the rest of its body." Mr. Collier's corrected copy reads *the mouth* instead of *the house*.³²

Also following each play are "Illustrations" in which Knight gives extensive background material to explain some of Shakespeare's references. The discussions are not necessary to an understanding of the play but do provide the reader with interesting information. For example, in King Lear the fool says "Here's my coxcomb." (I.iv) The Illustration of this passage is composed of three columns of text identifying fools in

³⁰ Ibid., I, 422.

³¹ Ibid., II, 399.

³² Ibid., II, 306.

English history--particularly those of Thomas More, Cardinal Woolsey, and Henry VIII--supporting the action of Lear's fool in offering the king his coxcomb, and illustrating the stage dress of fools in the Elizabethan period.³³ After the "Illustrations," Knight prints "Supplementary Notices" which are generally used to identify the reaction of various scholars and critics to the play in question.³⁴

Knight's edition, while not as significant as the 1821 variorum of Boswell, is nevertheless, an important addition to the study of Shakespeare for three reasons. First, Knight prints generally from one source, as the Cambridge editors and Furness later realized the necessity of doing. Second, he seldom approves of the conjectural emendations made by Shakespeare's editors; throughout his edition he upheld the authority of the First Folio.³⁵

³³Ibid., II, 324.

³⁴See, for example, the "Supplementary Notices" to King Lear (II, 329-333) and Othello (II, 254-257).

³⁵For example, Knight is the only one of the modern editors to print, as the Folio did in The Tempest, "But these sweet thoughts, do even refresh my labours, / Most busie least, when I do it" (III.i). Most editors, following Theobald's emendation, print "Most busie-less." See Furness, The Tempest, p. 144. Similarly in Romeo and Juliet Knight is almost alone in printing Juliet's question (II.ii) "What o'clock to-morrow / Shall I send to thee?" as the Folio had printed, rather than "At what o'clock to-morrow / Shall I send to thee?" as most of the other editors, following Pope, had done. See Furness, Romeo and Juliet, p. 108. Also, in The Tempest, Knight punctuates Prospero's answer to Miranda's question "How came we ashore?" by ending the first line with a comma, "By providence divine, / Some food, we had, and some fresh water, . . . " (I.ii). He and Singer are the only two editors to adopt that punctuation (properly, Furness comments). Rowe put a semi-colon; Pope and all the other editors, a period. Knight's argument was that Prospero's entire narrative is the answer to Miranda's question, and therefore should not be divorced from the rest by the insertion of a period. See Furness, The Tempest, p. 47.

In such manner, Knight indeed is characteristic of the nineteenth-century's attempt to print, as much as possible, what he felt to be the most probable readings of Shakespeare. Since the First Folio is the authoritative text for twenty of his plays, Knight relies on it almost exclusively for the plays; furthermore, the Folio text seems to be the basic authority for the other plays too. Most important, however, is the fact that he does present the reader with a concise and well-documented history of the text of each play. For this alone, his edition deserves praise.

The next important editor of Shakespeare in the nineteenth century was J. Payne Collier, who was the founder of the Shakespeare Society. His edition--eight volumes--appeared in 1844, almost a quarter of a century after the Boswell-Malone variorum. The two editions differ considerably, exhibiting almost contrasting opinions on the parts of the editors. Whereas Malone and Boswell had printed the plays in chronological order as written, with slight exceptions, Collier adopted the arrangement of Heminge and Condell in the First Folio on the ground that "they executed their task with intelligence and discretion in other respects . . . and did not without reason settle the order of the plays."³⁶ His argument hardly seems sound in light of the information available now

³⁶J. Payne Collier, ed., The Works of William Shakespeare. The Text Formed From an Entirely New Collation of the Old Editions: with the Various Readings, Notes, a Life of the Poet, and a History of the Early English Stage, 8 vols. + supplement (London: Whittaker & Co., 1844), I, vii.

about the publication of the 1623 Folio.³⁷ While Boswell and Malone felt the obligation to provide the reader with as many notes and as much illustrative material as possible, Collier's edition carries out his intention of brevity expressed in his preface to Volume I: "My main object has been to ascertain the true language of the poet, and my next to encumber his language with no more, in the shape of comment, than is necessary to render the text intelligible."³⁸ Collier further admits that the substance of his limited notes "has been derived, in many if not in most instances, from those of preceding editors."³⁹ Whereas Malone and Boswell chose the best reading from several possibilities, especially if the authoritative edition were obviously wrong, Collier steadfastly adhered to the quarto copies. Two examples of his faith in the quartos support this opinion. First, in Othello Collier is almost alone in his printing

And all indigne, and base adversities
Make head against my reputation.
(I.iii)

following the quarto of 1622. All the other editions print estimation

³⁷ For a detailed account of the publication of the First Folio, see Hinman, Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio. Hinman's detailed account indicates, among other information, that the Folio was set in type by five men, only one of whom was at all careful. The proofing was limited to obvious errors, evidently noted and changed without reference to the copy-text. While the very inadequate proofing was being done, however, the press continued to run, printing copies with errors. There were mistakes, too, casting-off the copy which caused even more errors.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid., I, vi.

(the Folio reading) in place of reputation.⁴⁰ Likewise, in A Midsummer Night's Dream, Collier supports the 1600 Quarto reading of "strange companions" rather than the accepted emendation "stranger companies" in the line "To seeke new friends and stranger companies." (I.i)⁴¹

Reading Collier's notes to any of the plays, however, indicates the closeness with which he followed the oldest copy--either in quarto or Folio. In doing so, Collier based his text on a sound foundation by avoiding errors which could enter the text because of the printing process. Repeatedly he indicates his approval of the quarto reading, although the Folio editors through Malone may have supported another emendation. However, it is interesting to note that Collier did alter the earliest reading if his change improved the meaning, the rhyme, or the meter; in essence, he too was concerned with providing a "readable" Shakespeare for the general public. For example, in Titus Andronicus Collier printed

. . . for so he bade me say,
And so I do, and with his gifts present
Your lordships, that whenever you have need,
You may be armed and appointed well.
(IV.ii)

⁴⁰Furness, Othello, p. 78.

⁴¹Collier, Works of William Shakespeare, II, 398; Horace Howard Furness, A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: A Midsommer Nights Dreame (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1895), p. 29. The Variorum indicates that the reading "stranger companies" was first suggested by Theobald, and the entire passage should be in rhyme; Hamner, Johnson, Malone, Steevens, Knight, Collier, Dyce, Staunton, and the Cambridge editors, according to the Variorum, all concur. However, the Variorum should not have listed Collier as being in agreement with Theobald's emendation. Not even in his 1853 supplement did Collier indicate the printing "stranger companies" (see page 84).

That in the third line had been omitted in all the old copies, but Collier inserts it since it is "necessary to the sense."⁴² Also, in The Tempest Collier printed the first part of Ariel's song as follows:

Come unto these yellow sands,
 And then take hands:
 Court'sied when you have, and kiss'd
 The wild waves whist,
 Foot it neatly here and there;
 And, sweet sprites, the burden bear.⁴³
 (I.ii)

In all the editions until that of Pope the last line had been printed "And, sweet sprites, bear the burthen." Here, Collier, for the sake of rhyme, adopted an emended reading rather than the earliest. It is interesting to note, also, that Collier does not give Pope credit for the change, nor does he give Capell credit for printing the last lines as two instead of the one of the Folio; he adopts both as his own without showing the earlier editors' contributions.⁴⁴ A third example indicates his willingness to delete a word, if necessary, for the regularity of the iambic pentameter line. In A Midsummer Night's Dream, the authoritative quarto (1600) printed "Not Hermia, but Helena now I love." (II.ii) However, Collier omitted now for the meter and printed "Not Hérmiá, / but Héléná / I love." [accent marks are mine].⁴⁵ It is hardly necessary to indicate that, despite Collier's assertion that

⁴² Works of William Shakespeare, VI, 329.

⁴³ Ibid., I, 26.

⁴⁴ Furness, The Tempest, p. 79.

⁴⁵ Works of William Shakespeare, II, 417.

"I have in every instance traced the text through the earlier impressions, and have shown in what manner and to what degree, it has been changed and corrupted,"⁴⁶ he has seldom done so. In Romeo and Juliet Collier prints

. . . what care I
What curious eye doth quote deformities.⁴⁷
(I.iv)

He does not indicate, however, how he changed the earliest readings; the first quarto printed coate instead of quote and the second cote.⁴⁸ Again, in Romeo and Juliet, Collier prints Juliet's words "Oh! if I wake, shall I not be distraught" (IV.iii) with the note that "all the old copies, with evident corruption, read walk for "wake."⁴⁹ Again, Collier has not as he claims in his preface, "traced the text through the earlier impressions and . . . shown in what manner . . . it has been changed and corrupted."⁵⁰ The second and third quartos printed "Oh if I walke"; the fourth and fifth "Or if I wake."⁵¹ But Collier makes no indication of these variant readings, despite the fact that he wrote in his preface "I have had the opportunity of going over every line and letter of the text, not merely with one, but with several original

⁴⁶Ibid., I, vii.

⁴⁷Ibid., VI, 398.

⁴⁸Furness, Romeo and Juliet, p. 57.

⁴⁹Works of William Shakespeare, VI, 471.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. vii.

⁵¹Furness, Romeo and Juliet, p. 232.

copies (sometimes varying materially from each other) under my eyes."⁵² Nor has he supplied the reader with any indication of the "original copies" to which he had access. One is left with the impression that Collier wanted, in many cases, to supply favorable readings but ones which disagreed with earlier texts. Thus, he avoided mentioning the other readings, perhaps so he would not have to defend his own reading.

Nevertheless, despite these objections, Collier has provided in many instances a conjectural reading adopted by later editors. For example, in Much Ado About Nothing the quarto printed the lines "This is the summe of all: *Leonato*, signior *Claudio*, and signior *Benedicke*; my deere friend *Leonato* hath invited you all." (I.i). Most editors until Collier wrestled, unsuccessfully, with the punctuation of this passage. Collier, however, punctuated the lines "That is the sum of all.--Leonato, --signior Claudio, and signior Benedick,--my dear friend Leonato hath invited you all." Furness comments about the change of Collier:

The correct punctuation of these puzzling lines seems to have been given by Collier . . . His note thereon is: 'Don Pedro, we must suppose, has been talking apart with Leonato; and, ending with this sentence, turns to Claudio and Benedick to tell them the subject and result of his conversation.' This punctuation the Cambridge Editors adopted first in their own ed., and afterward in the Globe ed., and this in turn has been followed by Rolfe, White,ii, Deighton, and naturally by W. A. Wright in the Clarendon ed.⁵³

⁵²Works of William Shakespeare, I, vi.

⁵³Collier, Works of William Shakespeare, II, 192 and Horace Howard Furness, A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Much Adoe About Nothing (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1899), pp. 22-23.

Another example of acceptance of Collier's emendation occurs in A Midsummer Night's Dream. The lines involved read

Then will two at once wooe won,
That must needs be sport alone.
(III.ii)

Collier's explanation of the phrase "sport alone" and the acceptance of his interpretation by others is best shown by Furness' note in the

Variorum:

Collier: A coarse character, under the name of Robin Goodfellow, is introduced into the play of Wily Beguiled, the first edition of which is dated 1606, but which must have been acted perhaps ten years earlier; there one of Robin Goodfellow's frequent exclamations is, "Why this will be sport alone," meaning such excellent sport that nothing can match it. --Halliwell: A vernacular phrase signifying excellent sport. "This island were a place alone for one that were vexed with a shrewd wife."--Holinshed, 1577. "Now, by my sheepe-hooke, here's a tale alone."--Drayton, Shepherd's Garland, 1593. [Collier's interpretation is the better. "Sport alone" means sport all by itself, that is, unparalleled. E. A. Abbott (1870) gives as its equivalent above all things, and cites in addition to the present passage, "I am alone the villain of the earth."--Ant. & Cleop. IV,vi,30; "So full of shapes is fancy That it alone is high fantastical."--Twelfth Night, I,i,15.--Ed.]⁵⁴

Also of value in Collier's edition are his introductions to individual plays. This introductory material does provide, as Collier indicated in his preface, "all the existing information regarding the origin of the plot, the period when each play was written and printed, the source of the most accurate readings, and any remarkable circumstances attending composition, production, or performance."⁵⁵ In addition, Collier supplies a glossarial index which provides the general

⁵⁴Furness, A Midsommer Nights Dreame, p. 143.

⁵⁵Works of William Shakespeare, I, vii.

reader a means of locating not only the meanings of words but also of reference to notes where explanatory information is available. Collier indicates that this is the "first time an alphabetical list of words used by Shakespeare had been made to answer . . . [this] double purpose."⁵⁶ For example, Collier's glossarial index has the entry "Convey, to defraud, to rob, i.190; iv.193; v.19.292."⁵⁷ With this entry he gives the reader the definition of the word, as well as an index to editors' discussions of the word in all the plays. To a general reader, the information is extremely useful. The eighteenth-century editors provided either a glossary or an index; and Malone's edition provided a glossarial index, but did not index notes.

Thus, although his explanations and the number of various readings supplied were meager, Collier did further the trend of the early nineteenth century in his tendency to emend liberally. In addition, he continued to investigate Shakespeare's life and in his biography of the poet determined to "include the most minute particles of information, whether of tradition or discovery."⁵⁸ While using much of Malone's material, he provides, in addition, information about Shakespeare not included in Malone's account. For example, he points out that Malone indicated Mary Arden brought 110*l*.13*s*.4*d*. to Shakespeare's father on

⁵⁶ Ibid., I, ix. However, Collier must have overlooked Knight's glossarial-index, which provided similar information and, in addition, quoted a line from a play in which the word was used.

⁵⁷ Ibid., I, ccxciii.

⁵⁸ Ibid., I, viii.

their marriage; Collier says, however, that Malone knew nothing of her property in Snitterfield which had been bequeathed to her by her father, Robert Arden.⁵⁹ Also, he produced a document, apparently unknown to Malone, which indicated that in February 1598 Shakespeare was occupying New Place in Chapel-streetward, Stratford. Thus Collier introduced proof of the fact that Shakespeare had purchased New Place before 1598.⁶⁰ Further, his investigations revealed much more about Shakespeare's life in London and his relationship to the theater at that time. Collier documents his evidence well, showing perhaps, more dedication to researching the life of Shakespeare, whom he repeatedly describes as either "our great poet" or "our great dramatist," than to investigating the text of his works.

Collier published a supplement to his edition in 1853, a supplement that aroused a great deal of controversy. According to Collier, after the publication of his eight-volume Shakespearean edition, he discovered a Second Folio (1632) which had been emended by an unknown corrector during the seventeenth century. Only by luck and chance, according to Collier, did he discover this important work. In the spring of 1849, while he was in the Great Newportstreet bookshop of Mr. Rodd, Collier had the opportunity to purchase two folio volumes--one was Florio's

⁵⁹ Ibid., I, lxv. Collier indicated that Robert Alden had deeded the land Snitterfield in trust to his daughters and, on his death, named Mary to be one of the executors of the will. (I.lxiii and lxv)

⁶⁰ Ibid., I, clxxxi and clxiv.

"New World of Words," dated 1611; the other a Second Folio edition of Shakespeare's plays, in very poor condition. He bought it for 30 shillings with a purpose of using some of the leaves to replace lost ones in a Second Folio in his possession. Subsequently, he sold the other Second Folio and kept only the newly-purchased one for reference. Not until 1850 did Collier, according to his testimony, discover the valuable changes in the printed copy made by the unknown "old corrector."⁶¹ Collier assumed that the corrections were authentic and indicated his belief that the handwriting was of the early seventeenth century. So certain was Collier of the validity of his amended copy that he altered two passages for which he had argued strongly the authority of the earliest printed texts when his 1844 edition was published. The passage about "strange companions" (Collier's text) or "stranger companies" (Theobald, et al.) was altered by Collier on the evidence of the old corrector's notations to "strange companies."⁶² And Juliet's words "Oh! if I wake, shall I not be distraught" (Collier's text), became, on the corrector's evidence, "Or if I wake."⁶³ He supports his belief in the authority of the old corrector's text by offering the reader several additions or changes which are not present in any old copies of the plays; these additions, according to Collier, were probably made after the corrector had seen a manuscript of the play, since

⁶¹Works of William Shakespeare, Supplement, pp. vi-vii.

⁶²Furness, A Midsommer Nights Dreame, p. 29.

⁶³Furness, Romeo and Juliet, p. 232.

lost. Two examples of many such emendations will show Collier's reasoning. In Henry VI, Part 2 the corrector adds the line printed below in italics to the speech of Queen Margaret; no other copies extent have the added line:

My staff? here, noble Henry, is my staff;
To think I fain would keep it makes me laugh;
 As willingly I do the same resign,
 As e'er thy father Henry made it mine.
 (II.iii)

Collier comments that "There appears no sufficient reason for disbelieving that these changes and additions might be made on some independent authority."⁶⁴ Also, from Coriolanus Collier's corrector adds the italicized line in the following speech

Pray be counsell'd.
 I have a heart as little apt as yours
To brook control without the use of anger,
 But yet a brain, that leads my use of anger
 To better vantage.
 (III.ii)

Collier argues that "the compositor was, doubtless, misled by the recurrence of the same words at the end of two lines, and carelessly omitted the first. From whence, if not from some independent authority . . . was this addition to the text derived?"⁶⁵ There are numerous other corrections, in spelling, in punctuation, and in the addition or deletion of letters and words. Altogether Collier indicates that over 20,000

⁶⁴ Works of William Shakespeare, Supplement, p. 282.

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 357.

emendations were made,⁶⁶ certainly a laborious task. Many of these changes are apparently without any necessity, much less authority. For example, in The Tempest, the corrector altered provision to prevision in the following speech of Prospero:

The direful spectacle of the wreck, which touch'd
The very virtue of compassion in thee,
I have with such provision in mine art
So safety order'd, that there is no soul--
No, not so much perdition as an hair
Betid to any creature in the vessel.

(I.ii)

Collier presents the argument that prevision is much more probable, since it makes reference to Prospero's ability to foresee what the result of the tempest would be.⁶⁷ However, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, in Shakespeare's time provision meant foresight.⁶⁸ The change, then, is needless and probably not what Shakespeare wrote. Even Collier admits that some of the corrections were not necessary, as in

You demi-puppets, that
By moonshine do the green-sour ringlets make
Whereof the ewe not bites

(Tempest, V.i.)

Collier explains the change: "For 'sour' the corrector substitutes

⁶⁶Ibid., p. iv.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 2.

⁶⁸James A. H. Murray, ed., A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles; founded mainly on the materials collected by The Philological Society (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1909), VII, Part 2, 1525. The OED, in fact, uses this line from The Tempest as an example of the definition foresight.

sword--'the *green-sword* ringlets,' or ringlets on the green-sword, which sheep avoid, and to which the unusual compound epithet 'green-sour' may properly be applied. Here we may not see the necessity of the alteration"⁶⁹ However, many changes are inspired ones that may be what Shakespeare had indeed written. In The Taming of the Shrew every copy from the first printing of the play in the 1623 Folio through Collier's edition of 1844 printed the lines

Only, good master, while we do admire
This virtue, and this moral discipline,
Let's be no stoics, nor no stocks, I pray,
Or so devote to Aristotle's checks,
As Ovid be an outcast quite abjur'd.

(I.i)

Collier indicates that the corrected 1632 Folio changed checks to ethicks.⁷⁰ Also, in Coriolanus many of the editors of Shakespeare have offered various conjectures about the word woolvish in the lines

Why in this woolvish toge should I stand here
To beg of Hob and Dick?⁷¹

(II.iii)

The corrector, however, simply changed woolvish to woolless; as the toga was described as "napless" earlier, so it was also woolless.⁷² Both of these emendations are logical, improve the sense of the passage,

⁶⁹Collier, Works of William Shakespeare, Supplement, p. 14.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 144. See also Malone, Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, III, 259.

⁷¹Malone, Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, VII, 211, shows that Johnson defined woolvish as hirsute or rough and that Steevens, Malone and others discussed wolves and indicated a connection between Coriolanus and wild beasts.

⁷²Collier, Works of William Shakespeare, Supplement, p. 354.

and indicate the possibility of a printing error. The corrected copy of the 1632 Folio, then, is characteristic of the early nineteenth-century to correct and remedy Shakespeare. Collier's old corrector, who was neither "bld" (seventeenth century) nor "correct," reflected the belief of the majority of editors that Shakespeare's plays could not be presented to the public with errors present; thus, changes which were logical and acceptable to the editors were made.

The authority of the work, however, came into question almost immediately. Among others Singer, Dyce, and Halliwell expressed doubt about the validity of some of the emendations.⁷³ The work of Nicholas Hamilton, of the British Museum, finally proved that the corrections were a fabrication, a hoax.⁷⁴ The arguments against the folio's authenticity were, according to Hamilton, based on intrinsic qualities of the text, which had always been subject to question and debate. These changes, Hamilton

⁷³ Samuel Weller Singer, The Text of Shakespeare Vindicated from the Interpolations and Corruptions Advocated by John Payne Collier Esq. in His Notes and Emendations (London: William Pickering, 1853), pp. x-xii; Alexander Dyce, Remarks on Mr. J. P. Collier's and Mr. C. Knight's Editions of Shakespeare (London: 1844; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1972), pp. 25-26; and J. O. Halliwell, Curiosities of Modern Shaksperian Criticism (London: John Russell Smith, 1853), pp. 20-31. Singer says that Collier is a "victim of a delusion" who has been misled by "knaving ingenuity into believing the work authentic." Dyce criticizes Collier severely, saying "Mr. Collier's judgment . . . was at times affected by his blind admiration of the Corrector's Emendations with their particles of golden ore and their abundant dross." Halliwell writes of the spurious manuscript as a "modern forgery" which would "not even pass muster in a facsimile."

⁷⁴ N. E. S. A. Hamilton, An Inquiry Into the Genuineness of the Manuscript Corrections in Mr. J. Payne Collier's Annotated Shakespeare Folio, 1632 (London: Richard Bentley, 1860).

argues, were not written in the seventeenth century and, despite their excellence in some instances, lacked authority of any kind.⁷⁵ Hamilton based his opinion on one important external piece of evidence--the authenticity of the handwriting. To note his discoveries is of great interest:

1. There were the same words or letters on the same page, some characteristic of the sixteenth century, some of the seventeenth, and some of modern character, all evidently written by one person.⁷⁶
2. Some letters were exaggerated seventeenth century style, some evidently retouched to aid their appearance.⁷⁷
3. The ink for their retouching was of a different shade than the original.⁷⁸
4. There were pencil marks (in modern handwriting) and ink notations (in the pretended older writing) which corresponded; some of these pencil marks "actually underlying" the ink.⁷⁹
5. The pencil marks are in modern hand, form, and spelling, evidently directing the alterations to be made later; nowhere do the pencil marks overly the ink.⁸⁰

Thus, Collier's reputation as a credible Shakespearean editor was seriously damaged. Further, Hamilton proves that Collier failed to indicate in his Complete List of Emendations in the 1632 Folio (published

⁷⁵Ibid. See especially pp. v-ix.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 23.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 24.

⁷⁸Ibid.

⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰Ibid., pp. 24-25 and p. 29.

in 1856), many of the emendations made by the corrector.⁸¹ This failure also caused his reputation to suffer. And, following Hamilton's pioneering work, many critics have corroborated his findings.⁸² Despite the "common sense" of some of the emendations, Alexander Dyce states that the majority of the changes "cannot stand the test of criticism."⁸³ Similarly, Grant White, a noted Shakespearean scholar, condemns Collier's Notes and Emendations as follows: "To the well read, critical student of the text, the book is useless; to him who has but commenced his studies, indescribably confusing; to the general reader, a delusion and a snare . . . I must say that the publication of that volume was a crime against the republic of letters."⁸⁴ Unfortunately, Collier's belief in the unknown corrector has, indeed, destroyed to some extent the good reputation he gained as a result of some of the emendations and restorations of his 1844 edition. Wheatley summarizes the general attitude toward Collier when he indicates that Collier originally had a high reputation as a Shakespearean editor but no longer possessed such respect, having mixed much false information with his truths.⁸⁵

⁸¹Ibid., p. 34. A copy of this page from Hamilton's book is shown in Appendix L.

⁸²Henry N. Hudson, ed., The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (Boston: Ginn & Company, 1886), I, xix. He comments that there was much controversy about the authenticity of the emendations in this work and concludes "All [editors] . . . are now pretty much agreed . . . that none of them have any claim to be regarded as authentic."

⁸³Dyce, Remarks, p. v.

⁸⁴Quoted in Hamilton, An Inquiry, p. 33.

⁸⁵"Shakespeare's Editors," p. 172.

Next to produce complete editions of Shakespeare's works were all men who had criticized Collier's faith in his amended 1632 Folio. Their works were all published within four years of each other: James Orchard Halliwell's edition appeared in 1853; Alexander Dyce's and Howard Staunton's were both published in 1857. All three of their editions are very interesting and are of value to the student of Shakespeare. The first two editions are representative of the earlier editors of the nineteenth century; but, although published in the same year as that of Dyce, Staunton's edition marks a new era of Shakespearean textual practice.

Halliwell's edition has much to offer.⁸⁶ It was the first to include, as part of an edited volume of Shakespeare's plays, facsimiles from the First Folio of 1623.⁸⁷ Also included were facsimiles from the first edition quartos of many of the plays.⁸⁸ Both of these novel additions aided the study of the text; for the first time comparison was possible in one volume. Halliwell accomplished even more than this, however. He provided the reader with a detailed introduction to each play; in the introduction Halliwell indicated the early editions of the play, gave an account of the history or tale on which Shakespeare's work

⁸⁶ Among other characteristics, Halliwell's edition was printed in folio, and the appearance of the sixteen volumes is magnificent. The paper is sturdier than in other editions of the nineteenth century; the print is easy to read; and there are illustrations and wood-engravings by Frederick William Fairhold.

⁸⁷ James O. Halliwell, ed., The Works of William Shakespeare, 16 vols. (London: C. & J. Adlard, 1853). See, for example, The Tempest facsimile, I, 338.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* See for example Troilus and Cressida, XII, 219.

was based--the first edition to include the source for Shakespeare's plays--and a history of its performances, in addition to various other comments of significance. Furthermore, at the end of each act of each play, Halliwell appends notes which explain obscure or difficult passages or indicate variant readings from the one selected for the text. His obvious care in selecting notes, much fewer than those of Boswell or Collier, makes the volume more readable for the general public.

Halliwell was not overly concerned with presenting every editor's reading for every possible emendation; in fact, he comments (in his notes to the first act of The Tempest) about Alonzo's line "Good boatswain, have care" (I.i), that "Dryden and Davenant write, have a care, which is also the reading of Mr. Collier's annotated folio. Trifling and unnecessary variations of this description will not generally be noticed."⁸⁹ However, he does, when necessary, offer the various readings of several editors when the meaning of a passage is in doubt. For Twelfth Night, Halliwell prints Sebastian's soliloquy as follows:

. . . Where's Antonio, then?
 I could not find him at the Elephant:
 Yet there he was; and there I found this credit,
 That he did range the town to seek me out.
(IV.iii)

He notes that credit means "credible information, any information or intelligence credited to the hands of a second person." However, he also provides the reader with the alterations made by Theobald (credent) and

⁸⁹ Ibid., I, 360.

Hanmer (current).⁹⁰ Also, in Henry VIII, Halliwell prints

O, God's will! Much better,
She ne'er had known pomp: thou it be temporal,
Yet, if that quarrel, fortune, do divorce
It from the bearer, 'tis a sufferance panging
As soul and body's severing.

(II.iii)

with the explanation "Quarrel seems here used in a singular sense, a quarreler, Fortune being a deity very apt to quarrel with her favorites." He acknowledges that he suspects a corruption but says he cannot agree with Steevens that quarrel alluded to the argument between Catharine and Henry. Then he gives others' interpretations: Warburton interpreted quarrel as an arrow, for its striking so deep and suddenly; Hanmer read quarrel as quarreler. Halliwell notes that Johnson agreed with this interpretation, saying "I think the poet may be easily supposed to use *quarrel* for *quarreler*, as *murder* for the *murderer*, the act for the agent."⁹¹ Likewise, in The Tempest the line "When I have deck'd the sea with drops full salt" (I.ii) caused Halliwell to indicate many editors' interpretations. He feels deck'd here means grac'd or adorn'd, but gives Johnson's and Steevens' interpretation to cover and Malone's explanation "to sprinkle."⁹² And, further, he does give credit to earlier editors who proposed explanations or changes which Halliwell adopted. Many examples of his doing so are readily apparent to the reader. For example, again

⁹⁰Ibid., VII, 416.

⁹¹Ibid., XII, 129.

⁹²Ibid., I, 371-372.

in The Tempest, the stage directions print, at the destruction of the ship, "A confused noise within.--'Mercy on us! We split, we split!-- Farewell, my wife and children! Farewell, brother! We split, we split, we split!" (I.i). Halliwell subjoins the following note: "Dr. Johnson is evidently right in considering that the lines succeeding the 'confused noise within' should be considered as spoken by no determinate characters. The epithet *confused* of course implies that the exclamatory sentences were uttered at the same time, by different persons in the vessel."⁹³ Also, Halliwell gives Knight credit for the restoration of the word year, instead of years, in the passage "Twelve year since, Miranda, twelve year since." (I.i) Halliwell explains "Nouns of time and distance were frequently written in the singular instead of in the plural; but the usage was not general after the time of Shakespeare."⁹⁴

This latter note of Halliwell's is but one example of the conservativeness of his text. Halliwell generally disapproves of changes which were not of absolute necessity. The conservative approach is obvious if one examines the notes to the first act of the first play edited, The Tempest. He begins his notes by expressing his disapproval of the addition to the first stage directions made in Collier's annotated Second Folio. The directions are "Enter a Shipmaster and a Boatswain" (I.i) to which Collier's edition added "as on ship-board, shaking off wet." Halliwell says that "the addition is unnecessary, at least, if not

⁹³ Ibid., I, 363.

⁹⁴ Ibid., I, 368.

incongruous with the intended action of the scene, the tempest being suddenly induced by preternatural influence. It is also inconsistent with a succeeding direction in the original 'Enter mariners, wet.'"⁹⁵ Thus, Halliwell argues for the original, unamended text. He does so repeatedly. Again in The Tempest, Gonzalo, wishing he were on land, cries "Now would I give a thousand furlongs of sea for an acre of barren ground; long hearth, brown furze, anything." (I.i) This original folio reading Halliwell adopts, rejecting Hammer's "long, heath, broom, furze" as unnecessary.⁹⁶ Also, Halliwell adopts the Folio description of Sycorax in The Tempest as "This blue-ey'd hag" (I.ii) rather than Collier's corrected reading "blear-ey'd" which he calls "an ingenious but unnecessary variation."⁹⁷ Halliwell's refusal to adopt changes is carried throughout his sixteen volumes. For example, he steadfastly refuses to emend Shakespeare's use of the double negative. Consequently, for Henry VII, Halliwell prints

I do not know
 What kind of my obedience I should tender:
 More than my all is nothing; nor my prayers
 Are not words duly hallow'd, nor my wishes
 More worth than empty vanities: Yet prayers, and wishes
 Are all I can return.

(II.iii)

rejecting Pope's substitution of for for nor.⁹⁸ Halliwell also prints

⁹⁵ Ibid., I, 357.

⁹⁶ Ibid., I, 363.

⁹⁷ Ibid., I, 385.

⁹⁸ Ibid., XII, 131.

Shakespeare's double superlative describing Brutus' assault on Caesar:

"This was the most unkindest cut of all" (III.ii) rather than Pope's

"This, this, was the unkindest cut of all."⁹⁹

He does not, however, refuse to adopt what must be changed. In Julius Caesar, he prints Brutus' question to Lucius "Is not to-morrow, boy, the ides of March" (II.i) rather than "The first of March" which had been printed in the Folio.¹⁰⁰ Halliwell notes, "This is a modern correction of the old copies which every one must approve. 'The *first* of March' can only have been the careless error of some transcriber. Whatever opinion may be formed of Shakespeare's scholarship it cannot be placed so low as that he was not so far acquainted with the Roman calendar; but he had the information before his eyes in the very book which he used [Sir Thomas North's 1587 translation of Plutarch's Lives]."¹⁰¹

Halliwell's notes also provide the reader with much explanatory material to further his understanding of the plays. In The Tempest, he explains that Alonzo's comment "Play the men" (I.i) means "behave like men, act with spirit" and quotes other examples of the same or similar passages in other Elizabethan works.¹⁰² For Twelfth Night Halliwell explains the use of tabor, in the question "Dost thou live by thy tabor?" (III.i), thus:

⁹⁹ Ibid., XIII, 438 and Pope, Works of Shakespeare, V, 270.

¹⁰⁰ Hinman, The First Folio, p. 722.

¹⁰¹ Halliwell, Works of William Shakespeare, XIII, 417-418.

¹⁰² Ibid., I, 360.

The tabor and pipe were used by fools long before the time of Shakespeare. See an example in a woodcut in a French translation of St. Augustine de Civitate Dei, 1486; and, at a later period, Tarlton is represented with a tabor in an engraving on the title-page of his Jests, 1611. The subjoined representation of a man playing with the tabor is from an illumination in an early manuscript. "In Herefordshire, and parts of the marshes of Wales, the tabor and pipe were exceedingly common. Many beggars beg'd with it, and the peasants danced to it in the churchyard on holydays and holyday-eves. The tabor is derived from the Sistrum of the Romans, who had it from the (sc. a brazen or iron timbrel) Crotalum, a ring of brass struck with an iron rod, as we play with the key and tongues." Aubrey, MS.¹⁰³

This explanation is typical of the detail and care Halliwell takes with his notes. Throughout all sixteen volumes Halliwell provides the reader with such valuable background and explanatory information. One more example may be of interest. In Henry VIII, Cranmer's possession of Henry's ring stays his judges from their decision to send him to the tower. Halliwell explains:

'It seems to have been a custom, begun probably in the dark ages, before literature was generally diffused, and before the regal power experienced the restraints of law, for every monarch to have a ring, the temporary possession of which invested the holder with the same authority as the owner himself could exercise. The production of it was sufficient to suspend the execution of the law; it procured indemnity for offences committed, and imposed acquiescence and submission to whatever was done under its authority. Instances abound in the history of almost every nation.¹⁰⁴

Halliwell's edition also presents a detailed biography of Shakespeare; here, too, he has provided the reader with facsimiles of documents related to Shakespeare's life.¹⁰⁵ Following his "Life of Shakespeare"

¹⁰³Ibid., VII, 375.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., XII, 208.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., I, viii. These documents are as follows: Facsimile from a deed of trust of Robert Arden, Shakespeare's maternal grandfather, and

Halliwell includes his essay on the formation of Shakespeare's text. His observations are exemplary. He indicates the dilemma faced by modern editors: "A too rigid adherence to the original text, on the one hand, and an undue facility in admitting variations from it, on the other, are errors easily incurred."¹⁰⁶ He says, however, the responsibility of an editor is "to adhere to the phraseology of the earliest editions, whenever the idiom is clearly established to be genuine, and . . . to accept the best emendations in cases where the old readings are corrupt or unmeaning."¹⁰⁷ He then indicates the situation of Shakespeare's plays (see Appendix M) and warns the reader that the earliest quarto is not always the most authoritative.¹⁰⁸ The value of the quartos he assessed individually, taking into account the circumstances under which

of the Court-Roll of Gétley's house; Facsimile of an ancient deed which proves that Shakespeare's father lived at the house now shown as the birthplace; Facsimile of a writ of distringas against John Shakespeare, of anecdotes from Manningham's Diary, and of notes from Dr. Hall's Case-book; Facsimile of Aubrey's biographical account of Shakespeare, from the original MS. in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford; Facsimile from a MS. containing anecdotes of Shakespeare, collected in the year 1693; Facsimile of Shakespeare's marriage-bond, from the original manuscript preserved at the Consistory Court, Worcester; Facsimile of the petition of Blackfriars Company of actors, including Shakespeare, to the Privy Council, 1596, from the original preserved in the State Papers Office; Facsimile of a letter from Richard Quiney to Shakespeare, soliciting a loan, 1598, from the original in Mr. Wheler's possession; and of biographical notices from Shakespeare, from the original at Corpus Christi College, Oxford; and Facsimile of the particulars of the action brought by Shakespeare against Philip Rogers, 1604.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., I, 284.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., I, 286-287.

the earlier editions appeared and the state of the texts. He concludes that, "The real and only authorities . . . for the text of Shakespeare are the First Folio and the earlier editions of some of the quartos. Every old edition is, of course, worthy of careful examination, for it may contain happy corrections of corrupted passages; but, beyond this, none of the later copies are of any value whatever. . . . Among these, may be mentioned the second and later folios."¹⁰⁹ Halliwell illustrates his opinion of the lack of authority of the Second Folio by printing six pages of errors--from only five plays--which were made by the printer.¹¹⁰ He then indicates the principles on which he proceeded in his edition:

1. He will correct "vulgarisms" in the Elizabethan language (such as the use of a singular verb with a plural subject). (I, 265)
2. He will not correct such as "vulgarism" if it is required by metre or rhyme. (I, 266)
3. He will not correct what is considered accurate in Shakespeare's time (double negatives, double superlatives.) (I, 267)
4. He will vary or correct the punctuation if necessary. (I, 285)
5. He will arrange the text, without changing a word of the original, in either prose or poetry to eliminate its metrical irregularities. (I, 285)

Thus, the reader is provided with the rules Halliwell followed throughout his edition. He knows on what grounds emendations were made or eliminated. For this advantage alone, if for no other reason, the edition is of value.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., I, 288.

¹¹⁰Ibid., I, 289-294.

The Reverend Alexander Dyce was the next to edit a collection of Shakespeare's plays. His ten volume edition appeared in 1857, thirteen years after his Remarks on Mr. J. P. Collier's and Mr. C. Knight's Editions of Shakespeare. To note some of his comments about these two most recent editors' works is revealing. First, he comments "It is my deliberate opinion that Shakespeare has suffered greatly from both."¹¹¹ Dyce clarifies the fact that he is criticizing their treatment of the text, for he writes also "Mr. Collier's Life of Shakespeare exhibits the most praiseworthy research, a careful examination of all the particulars which have been discovered concerning the great dramatist, and the most intimate acquaintance with the history of our early stage. Mr. Knight's Shakespeare, A Biography I have not read."¹¹²

Following his preface, Dyce begins his notes, taking each of the plays and pointing out the errors committed by Knight and Collier in punctuation, or stage directions, or emendation, or following the Folio in obviously erroneous readings.¹¹³ For example, Collier prints in Macbeth

A little water clears us of this deed:
How easy is it, then?

(II.i)

¹¹¹Dyce, Remarks, p. v.

¹¹²Ibid., vi.

¹¹³Although many of the editors seem to be aware that the punctuation of the plays may not have been Shakespeare's, they still felt, even if the punctuation were his, that their duty was to correct errors which were present. Their main concern, rather than restoring Shakespeare was, in this case as in all others, to remedy what they considered to be his errors.

Dyce comments that Lady Macbeth is not questioning the ease of the murder but rather, she is stating emphatically

A little water clears us of this deed:
How easy it is, then!¹¹⁴

There should, then, be an exclamation mark rather than a question mark for the end punctuation. In considering stage directions, Dyce is again critical of Collier, whose edition of Macbeth has the direction "A show of eight Kings, and Banquo last, with a Glass in his Hand." (IV.i) Collier's comment "Such is the old stage-direction, which, being complete in itself, and applicable to what follows, there is no sufficient reason for altering, as has been done in the modern editions," is ridiculed by Dyce who accuses him of not reading the text: "'Applicable to what follows'!! It makes Banquo bear a glass in his hand; while, on the contrary, Macbeth exclaims that he sees the eighth King bearing it, and Banquo coming after him."¹¹⁵ In Dyce's edition of Macbeth, he changes this stage direction to read "Eight Kings appear, and pass over in order, the last with a glass in his hand; Banquo's Ghost following."¹¹⁶

Dyce also criticizes both Collier and Knight for retaining the reading in Julius Caesar:

The Genius, and the mortal instruments,
Are then in council; and the state of a man,
Like to a little kingdom suffers then
The nature of an insurrection.

(II.i)

¹¹⁴Dyce, Remarks, p. 194.

¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 200.

¹¹⁶Alexander Dyce, ed., The Works of William Shakespeare, 4th ed., 10 vols. (London: Bickers & Son, 1880), VII, 264.

He believes the addition of the a to be "the barbarous and impertinent addition of a transcriber or printer."¹¹⁷ Dyce supports this argument by citing a parallel passage:

My thought, whose murder yet is but fantastical,
Shakes so my single state of man, that function
Is smother'd in surmise, and nothing is,
But what is not.

(Macbeth, I.iii)

Although Dyce often accepted the earliest readings as the authoritative one, he made changes when he felt the old edition was obviously incorrect. When Collier and Knight followed the old edition, Dyce often reprimanded them for doing so. For example, in Macbeth the Folio, followed by both Collier and Knight, printed "To make them kings, the seeds of Banquo kings!" (III.i) which Dyce emended to "To make them kings, the seed of Banquo kings!" His rationale was that "seed" conveyed the same meaning as "seeds" and was more in line with Shakespeare's common phraseology.¹¹⁸ On another occasion, Dyce agrees with Rowe's emendation of "boat" for "butt" in The Tempest's "A rotton carcass of a butt, not rigg'd" (I.ii), while dismissing as nonsense the notes of Collier and Knight who defend the Folio's use of "butt." He particularly ridicules Knight's description of butt by writing "a butt (and perhaps, as Mr. Knight says, a wine-butt) big enough to contain, not only Prospero and his infant daughter, but 'food,' 'fresh water,' 'rich garments, linens, stuffs, and necessities,' and several 'volumes' from Prospero's

¹¹⁷Dyce, Remarks, p. 185.

¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 196.

Whenever Dyce criticized Collier's or Knight's editions for what he felt to be an error, or whenever he approved of their interpretations, he adopted these in his own edition of Shakespeare. In his preface to this edition, Dyce indicated some of the principles guiding him in his work, principles he evidently felt concerned neither Knight nor Collier. First, Dyce summarized the state of Shakespeare's text and the relative value of the quarto and the folio editions. He supplied detailed accounts of the probable date of composition, history of the text, and the production of the play in his introductions to each separate play. (See Appendix N for the editions Dyce used). His opinions are similar to others in many respects but have the advantage of being clearly and concisely stated. He indicates that the eighteen plays which were printed in quarto before the appearance of the 1623 Folio had been printed without the consent of the author or the managers; however, he continues, "it is certain that nearly all of them were printed, with more or less correctness and completeness, from transcripts of Ms. copies belonging to the theater."¹²³ Thus, he disagreed with the Folio preface which characterized the quartos as imperfect "maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes [sic] of injurious imposters."¹²⁴ When the Folio was printed, however, "Heminge and Condell made up the Folio of 1623, partly from those very quartos which they denounced as worthless, and partly from manuscript stage-copies, some of which had been depraved,

¹²³Ibid., I, 17.

¹²⁴Hinman, The First Folio, p. 7.

in not a few places, by the alterations and botchery of the players."¹²⁵ Thus, Dyce sees value in both the Folio and early quartos. He further explains that "any editor who . . . content[s] himself with reprinting the Folio, without large additions from the quartos, would present but an imperfect notion of the drama as it came from the hands of the poet."¹²⁶ He continues ". . . even when the quartos do not supply absolute deficiencies, and though in various passages they may be themselves defective or corrupt, they frequently enable us to restore the language of Shakespeare where it had suffered from the tampering of the players."

In his edition, Dyce does, indeed, choose the best readings from the quartos or the Folio. Thus, in Hamlet, Dyce prints, in Hamlet's speech to the players, "Speak the speech, I pray you, as I pronounced it to you, trippingly on the tongue: but if you mouth it, as many of your players do, I had as lief the town-crier spoke my Lines. Nor do not saw the air too much with your hand, thus." (III.ii)¹²⁷ This reading follows the quarto of 1604 rather than the Folio reading "I had as live the Town-Cryer had spoke my Lines: Nor do not saw the Ayre too much your hand thus."¹²⁸ But, in A Midsummer Night's Dream, he adopts the Folio reading

¹²⁵ Dyce, Works of William Shakespeare, I, 21.

¹²⁶ Ibid., I, 23.

¹²⁷ Ibid., VII, 361.

¹²⁸ Hinman, The First Folio, p. 774.

And never since the middle summer's spring,
 Met we . . .
 In the beached margent of the sea"
 (II.i)

rather than the 1600 quarto reading "On the beached margent of the sea."¹²⁹

Although rejecting the authority of the Second Folio on the ground that the editor "certainly never consulted manuscript copies of the plays"¹³⁰ he does not feel that no changes should be made in the earlier texts. On the contrary, he says that an editor of Shakespeare's works should not hesitate to adopt emendations made "by men of great sagacity and learning" if such "deviations from the early editions are duly recorded."¹³¹ Indeed, Dyce applauds those editors who have "retrieved Shakespeare's genuine readings which the ignorance and presumption of the actors, the somnolency of the transcribers, and the carelessness of the player-editors had conspired to ruin."¹³² Thus, he approves highly of Theobald's emendation in Julius Caesar of Antony's description of Lepidus:

A barren-spirited fellow; one that feeds
 On abject orts and imitations
 (IV.i)

¹²⁹Dyce, Works of William Shakespeare, II, 273. Dyce offers a long explanation for his addition, again using parallel passages to support his choice.

¹³⁰Ibid., I, 22.

¹³¹Ibid., I, 2.

¹³²Ibid.

rather than the Folio's "On Objects, Arts, and Imitations."¹³³ Dyce's note to this passage explains clearly his reasons: "I adopt Theobald's correction, 'On abject orts,' &c,--'i.e. on the scraps and fragments of things rejected and despised by others,'--a correction which Capell calls 'decisive.'" He further substantiates his choice by offering parallel passages in other Shakespearean plays. From Troilus and Cressida he quotes "The fractions of her faith, orts of her love" (V.ii) and from Timon of Athens he prints "It is some poor fragments, some slender ort of his remainder." (IV.iii)¹³⁴

He does not, however, approve of unwarranted and unnecessary alterations. Two examples from Julius Caesar indicate his disapproval of such alterations. First, he does not agree with Rowe's alteration of "Soothsayer" to "Artemidorus." (II.iv) He claims that Rowe's argument that "the introduction of the Soothsayer here is unnecessary" has nothing to support it; thus Dyce refuses to alter the Folio text.¹³⁵ Also, he supports the Folio reading of Cassius' line¹³⁶

Coming from Sardis, on our former ensign
Two mighty eagles fell
(V.i)

rather than Rowe's substitution of foremost and Collier's forward. Dyce explains that former has the meaning fore and is therefore quite

¹³³Hinman, The First Folio, p. 731.

¹³⁴Dyce, Works of William Shakespeare, VII, 169.

¹³⁵Ibid., VII, 143.

¹³⁶Hinman, The First Folio, p. 735.

acceptable.¹³⁷ One other example of his refusal to adopt unwarranted readings must be given, for it illustrates not only Dyce's acumen but also his ability to destroy completely another's interpretation when he feels strongly that interpretation to be incorrect. The following passage and note is printed by Collier concerning Othello (IV.ii)

Oth. Being done,
 There is no pause.
 Des. But while I say one prayer.
 Oth. It is too late. [He smothers her.]
 Des. Oh Lord, Lord, Lord!
 Emil. [Within]. My lord, my lord! what ho! my lord, my lord!

These exclamations ['O Lord, Lord, Lord!'] are only in the quarto, 1622."

Dyce remarks "And there [in the quarto] Mr. Collier ought (with the other modern editors) to have left them; for they were most probably foisted into the text by the players. So far is 'O Lord, Lord, Lord!' from adding to the terror or pathos of the scene that it is disgustingly vulgar; and being immediately followed by Emilia's 'My lord, my lord! what ho! my lord, my lord!' the effect of the whole is not a little comic."¹³⁸

Dyce, too, suggests some emendations, generally accepted by later editors. For example, Dyce suggested the Change in Henry VI, Part 3 in the Folio reading of the lines

Let me embrace the sower Adversaries
 For wise men say it is the wisest course.
(III.i)

He changed the lines to read

¹³⁷Dyce, Works of Shakespeare, VII, 187.

¹³⁸Dyce, Remarks, p. 242.

Let me embrace thee, sour Adversity,
For wise men say it is the wisest course.¹³⁹

This reading was adopted by Clark and Wright in the Cambridge and the Globe texts.¹⁴⁰

Originally Dyce had not intended to append any notes to his text; however, in his words, "It soon became evident that, though notes explanatory of words, manners, customs, &c., might not be essentially necessary . . . yet notes regarding the formation of the text were indispensable."¹⁴¹ He originally places these notes at the end of each play, enlarged them for his second edition (1865), and moved them to the bottom of the pages in his fourth edition (1880). His notes are detailed, give an indication of copious collation, and show, basically, a conservative approach to the text. The value of his edition is shown by its characterization as a "monument of editorial judgment and accurate scholarship, as well as of careful typography"¹⁴² and the best text of Shakespeare available.¹⁴³

¹³⁹Hinman, The First Folio, p. 512; Dyce, Works of William Shakespeare, V, 272.

¹⁴⁰William George Clark and William Aldis Wright, eds., The Works of William Shakespeare, 16 vols. (Philadelphia: George Barrie & Son, Publishers, 1899), VII, 227 hereafter cited Cambridge Text; also see the Globe Edition (Cambridge, 1864; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1970), p. 539.

¹⁴¹Dyce, Works of William Shakespeare, I, 26.

¹⁴²Walder, "Text of Shakespeare," p. 312.

¹⁴³Ibid., p. 311 and John Bulloch, Studies on the Text of Shakespeare; With Numerous Emendations and Appendices (London: Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1878), p. 9.

Dyce's edition--with its rather "buckshot" adoptions from the Folio as well as earlier sources, with its refusal to adopt any readings from the Second Folio, with its copious notes and lengthy explanations, with its tendency to present all editors' opinions on a questionable passage rather than selecting only those within the realms of possibility, with its tendency toward modernization of punctuation and stage directions and eclecticism (the adoption of the "best" readings, in the editor's opinion)--brings to a close one era of textual practice. In retrospect, what had those who were concerned with Shakespeare's text accomplished? To begin, they produced an excellent variorum, a monument to the efforts of its editor, James Boswell. There now existed a source to which the succeeding editors could go to find various readings, determine the authority for emendations, and encounter a detailed, extensive summary of two hundred years of textual history. Thus, the Boswell-Malone 1821 edition became the "standard"--the basic--edition of the first half of the nineteenth century.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴One disadvantage, however, inherent in the format and purpose of a variorum, was the fact that any editor could see not only the variant readings, but also could realize the imperfections in the text. The tendency to emend, thus, grew rapidly, since editors became aware of the unsettled state of the text. While professing the restoration of "our poet's" text, hundreds, even thousands, of changes were made, many of which lacked any authority whatever. These editors did, however, succeed in restoring many passages which had been corrupted over the period of two hundred years. Many of the alterations occurred in the grammar and punctuation, in an attempt to present a more readable text to the public. Editions became illustrated (such as Knight's and Halliwell's), glossaries and indices were added; and explanations of unusual words or allusions became more plentiful and more detailed--all for the pleasure and edification of the reading public.

The opportunity offered to the early nineteenth-century editors to pick and choose what they considered best was eagerly seized upon by most of them. During this time, the public eulogized Shakespeare.¹⁴⁵ "Coleridge considered Shakespeare the greatest artist who ever lived"; Hazlitt "hailed Shakespeare as the greatest, most universal genius who ever lived"; others were "unstinting in their admiration" and many reviews "were often concerned with eulogizing Shakespeare." This climate fostered the editors' natural inclination to emend; they probably felt they could not present to this public an edition of Shakespeare riddled with what, to the nineteenth century, were errors.

A concerted attempt to discover more about Shakespeare's life and the Elizabethan theater resulted in a more factual and informative biography. Also, the public's interest in Shakespeare and his text must have increased by the controversy initiated by J. Payne Collier's Manuscript Corrector; certainly the editors of Shakespeare debated this topic heatedly in letters published in the Times.¹⁴⁶

More than these changes were evident however. Perhaps the biggest step in Shakespearean textual criticism was the realization that the First Folio was the authoritative folio and that the three succeeding

¹⁴⁵Oscar James Campbell, ed., The Reader's Encyclopedia of Shakespeare (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1966), pp. 156-157, indicates the opinions quoted.

¹⁴⁶See Hamilton, An Inquiry, p. i and pp. 63-69. Much correspondence appeared in the London Times from July 2 to August 1, 1859 about the Collier controversy. Some of the letters are reprinted in Hamilton's book, pp. 131-155.

folios had no authority. The early nineteenth-century editors accepted this fact, but none of them accepted the possibility that a Second Folio reading, while perhaps without any real authority might, indeed, be what Shakespeare wrote. They did, however, understand the necessity of concise collation of all quarto editions with the Folio and appear, generally, to be concerned about their carefulness. By the middle of the nineteenth century, most of Shakespeare's actual words and phrases had probably been restored; he also was credited with much he had likely not written. Certainly, his text--which he had probably never considered publishing--had become encumbered with a great deal of needless comment and conjecture. To the editors of the last half of the century was left the task of deletion rather than addition.

III. THE LATER EDITORS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

By the middle half of the nineteenth century, then, several periods in Shakespearean textual study had passed. The first hundred years was characterized by texts which gradually became more corrupted. Then editors began the practice of explanation and modernization. And, finally, as their knowledge of the printing history of the plays increased, editors began the laborious task, "the dull duty of an editor" in Pope's words, of minute collation. In so doing, the editors discovered the thousands of variations which had entered the text. As a result, in addition to correcting obvious blunders, they also introduced hundreds of conjectural emendations and weighted their texts with justifications for their own, and arguments against others', changes. Editor after editor, in an attempt to advertize the merits of his edition, had carefully indicated errors in others' interpretations and argued for his own emendation. In many instances such a practice did indeed present a great deal of valuable information. However, the notes often became mere scholastic squabbles, indicating little of importance and serving only to present each editor's personal conjectures. One needs only to read, for example, in his variorum edition of The Tempest Furness' summary of the various editorial opinions on the lines

His mother was a Witch, and one so strong
That could controule the Moone; make flowes, and ebs,
And deale in her command, without her power:
(V.i.320-322)

to realize this fact,

MALONE: He who 'deals in the command,' or, in other words, executes the office of another, is termed his lieutenant or vicegerent, and is usually authorised and commissioned to act his superior. Prospero, therefore, I think, means to say that Sycorax could control the moon, and act as her vicegerent, without being commissioned, authorised, or *empowered* by her to do so. If Sycorax was strong enough as by her art to cause the sea to ebb, 'when the next star of Heaven mediated to make it flow,' she in this respect might be said to control her. [In all his editions DYCE holds that Malone has thus rightly explained the passage.]--COLLIER (ed.ii): The MS puts an end to the difficulty, telling us that 'without' as we can well suppose, was a blunder for *with all*; Sycorax dealt in the command of the moon, '*with all* her power' in making ebbs and flows.'--KNIGHT (ed.ii, replying to Collier): But how is the difficulty, if any, removed? To 'control the moon' is to interfere with the general action of the moon. The moon makes 'flows and ebbs' according to natural laws. If Sycorax by her witchcraft would 'deal' in the moon's 'command' by an occasional suspension of natural laws, it could not be said that she possessed *all the power* of the moon. Sycorax exercised, locally and exceptionally, the office of the moon, but *without her power* as a universal cause of the tidal action.--LETTSON (Blackwood's Maga. Aug. 1853): By 'power' we are here to understand legitimate authority [see Waller's note, post]; and of this Sycorax has none. By means of her spells and counter-natural incantations she could make ebbs and flows, and thus wielded to some extent the lunar influences; but she had none of that rightful and natural dominion over the tides of the ocean which belongs here, only to the moon. Our verdict, therefore, is in favor of the old reading [as opposed to Collier's MS].--WALKER (Crit.iii, 9): 'Power' here is used in its original and etymological sense of power or *pouvoir*; *potestas*, not *vis*; what we now call *authority*, or *legal power*.--STAUNTON (in a note on Mid. N.D. IV,i,150): 'Without the peril of Athenian law': That is, *beyond* the peril, &c. 'Without' in this sense occurs repeatedly in Shakespeare and the books of his age. [In The Tempest] 'without her power' means beyond her *power*, or *sphere*, as I am strongly inclined to think the poet wrote. Thus, too, in Johnson's Cynthia's Revels, I,iv: 'Oh, now I apprehend you; your phrase was *Without* me before.' [This note of Staunton seems to me to be decisive,--although Dyce (Gloss. s.v. 'deal') believes it to be 'quite erroneous.'--W. A. WRIGHT, corroborating Staunton, adds from 2 Corinthians X,13: 'But we will not boast of things beyond our measure.' And Chapman, Bussy d'Amboise (Works, ii, 65): 'Not I, it is a worke, without my power.'--ED.]¹

¹Furness, The Tempest, pp. 262-263.

It is easy to understand why the feeling arose that the unprincipled emendations made by two centuries of Shakespearean editors led to the works being flooded with a huge amount of doubtful material.²

A turning point in Shakespearean scholarship occurred in the latter half of the nineteenth century. For the first time in almost two hundred years, the editors of Shakespeare made a conscious effort to be more selective in the notes and emendations they adopted. The task of the later editors was not only that of ordering the priorities of the early texts and determining which were "good" and which were "bad" but also of remedying the excesses of the previous editors.

The later Victorian editors reacted to the trend of multitudinous, often unnecessary and doubtful emendations and explanations by editing texts which deleted rather than added. These texts, the results of careful collation, were much more conservative than their predecessors, the editors refusing emendations unless of absolute necessity. The later nineteenth-century editors--notably Howard Staunton, William George Clark and William Aldis Wright--all based their editions on the First Folio and adopted into their texts a conjectural reading if valid support could be found for making such a change. Their method and result differed greatly from those of their predecessors, who had "failed to settle on a basic copy text and [had] overloaded the plays with wrong or unnecessary emendations in their eagerness to improve Shakespeare."³

²Milwaukee Public Library, William Shakespeare, p. 13.

³Ibid.

The first of this new school of thought was Howard Staunton, whose edition of The Works of Shakespeare was published from 1857-1860, and was, in his words, "an attempt to supply the best text of Shakespeare which the means at command allow."⁴ Although the texts, notes, comments, and illustrations comprise only three volumes, the edition is valuable to the scholar, for the textual emendations Staunton chooses to include are judicious and his evident care in collating multiple copies obvious. The three volumes contain a wealth of information, organized carefully.

Staunton's preface summarizes the condition of Shakespeare's text from the earliest quarto copies through the efforts of Collier's old corrector. His remarks are penetrating and have stood the test of time; Ernest Walder comments that Staunton did, indeed, exercise "sound judgment on textual questions."⁵ Staunton begins by summarizing the state of the text during Shakespeare's lifetime and comments that "there is no evidence to show that any one of them [his printed plays] was ever corrected by his own hand."⁶ But the quarto editions, according to Staunton, do not deserve the criticism as frauds heaped on them by the Folio editors, Heminge and Condell. Indeed, he continues, "Their deprecation of those editions is merely a clap-trap to enhance the value of their own folio. The facts, which are indisputable, that in many of the plays the folio

⁴Howard Staunton, ed., The Works of Shakespeare, 3 vols. (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1857), p. xii.

⁵Walder, "The Text of Shakespeare," p. 311.

⁶Staunton, Works of Shakespeare, I, v.

text is a literal reprint of that in the quartos, even to the errors of the press, and that some of the publishers of the latter were bought off and included among the proprietors of the folio, prove that, if not absolutely authentic, the earlier copies had strong claims to accuracy and completeness."⁷

He continues by expressing the opinion, proved later beyond any doubt by Charlton Hinman, that the Folio, which is the only authority for over half of Shakespeare's plays, is a very poorly printed book. "It abounds," says Staunton, "not only with the most transparent typographical inaccuracies, but with readings disputable and nonsensical beyond belief."⁸ The Second Folio is no more accurate than the First nor, in Staunton's opinion, are the Third or Fourth. He then lists many distinguished editors who compiled Shakespeare's work during the eighteenth century, among them Rowe, 1709; Pope, 1725; Theobald, 1733; Hanmer, 1744; Warburton, 1747; Johnson, 1765; Capell, 1768; Johnson and Steevens, 1773; and Malone, 1790. Staunton discusses the editions of his century only long enough to summarize the events surrounding Collier's manuscript corrector and condemn its authenticity, like Knight, Halliwell, and Dyce.

Staunton's preface then explains the principles on which he proceeded to work in preparing his edition:

1. "His most immediate task was the first and indispensable job of a modern editor of Shakespeare, an accurate collation of the early printed copies." (p. xii.)

⁷ Ibid., p. vi.

⁸ Ibid., p. vii.

2. Despite its many errors, the First Folio was the basis of his text throughout; and when he substitutes letters, words, or passages from another source, he always indicates the Folio reading in a note. (pp. xii-xiii)
3. The Folio reading was printed whenever there was a dubious passage; any conjectural emendations, Staunton's or those of other editors, were printed in notes. (p. xiii)
4. To correct "positively corrupt" passages he went first to the modern editions and only if they failed to remedy the reading did he supply one of his own. Again, however, no change was made without notification to the reader. (p. xiii)
5. He explained any obscurities in meaning, interpretation, or allusion. (p. xiii)

Staunton's edition is conservative in the number of conjectural emendations he adopts and in the amount of explanatory information he provides. However, his edition was not void of supplementary material. He also includes a biography of Shakespeare, reprinting the preliminary matter of the 1623 Folio, each of Shakespeare's thirty-seven plays, as well as the poems and the sonnets, and finally, a glossarial index which provides an alphabetized listing of the words with a short definition and a reference to the volume and page on which a discussion of the word is to be found in the notes.⁹ Staunton adopted the same procedure in presenting each play; that is, he has a "Preliminary Notice" in which he discusses its printing history and the apparent value of each edition, the source for the play, and the dates of composition. The play is then printed, following the principles enumerated in the preface concerning

⁹Thus walks is noted as "bounds", iii.416. The reference is Volume 3, page 416 (Julius Caesar). The line "That her wide walks encompass'd but one man" (I.ii) is footnoted with varying editors' comments on the validity of walks or the conjectural emendation walls.

the texts and the notes. Staunton then provides "Illustrative Comments," by acts, for each play. These comments explain allusions and extremely difficult passages, too long to include in the footnotes, and they present any miscellaneous information Staunton feels is necessary. Finally, for every play except Merry Wives of Windsor Staunton provides "Critical Opinions" of noted scholars, such as Johnson, Malone, Coleridge, Goethe, and Schlegel.¹⁰

Throughout his edition, Staunton has abided strictly by the principles stated in his preface. Although he does not, unfortunately, present the reader with a list of the editions he collated, a glance at his notes reveals that he did consult many of the early printed copies. (See Appendix O for a list of the copies referenced in his notes to Romeo and Juliet). Staunton used the First Folio consistently, supporting its authority often against the emendations suggested by others. For example, in Romeo and Juliet, Staunton prints

I will die,
And leave him all; life, living, all is death's
(IV.v)

as in the Folio. He notes, however, that "most modern editors follow Capell, and read '. . . lif leaving, all is death's'." He defends his selection from the Folio with an explanation of the word living and the citation of a parallel passage in Shakespeare: "The change is uncalled

¹⁰Staunton apparently respected very highly the opinions of the German critic, poet and translator August Wilhelm von Schlegel; there are only three plays for which he does not print Schlegel's criticisms: Titus Andronicus, Troilus and Cressida, and King Lear.

for; '*living*' here implies *possessions, fortunes, not existence*. We meet with the same distinction between *life* and *living* in the Merchant of Venice, where Antonio, whose life has been saved by Portia, says,

Sweet lady, you have given me *life* and *living*;
For here I read for certain, that my ships
Are safely come to road.¹¹

Again, Staunton adopted the Folio reading in Coriolanus when he prints

Yet we will ask;
That, if you fail in our request, the blame
May hang upon your hardness
(V.iii)

rather than the proposed emendation, "That, if we fail in our request" with the explanation of the line as "If you fail to grant what we require."¹² Nevertheless, he did not rely on the Folio as his only authority. He adopted readings from the earlier quartos and even the 1632 Folio, as well as other editors' works, when he felt these emendations to be more probably what Shakespeare wrote. Consistently, however, he noted the respective Folio reading. Thus, he printed "His agile arm beats down their fatal points" (III.i) in Romeo and Juliet, following the 1597 quarto, rather than "His aged arm" which, he notes, was the printing in the Folio.¹³ He printed Romeo's speech as "I warrant thee; my man's as true as steel" (II.iv), following the Second Folio, rather than the defective "Warrant thee" which he indicated was the printing of

¹¹Staunton, Works of Shakespeare, I, 203.

¹²*Ibid.*, III, 181.

¹³*Ibid.*, I, 188.

the First Folio and the quartos.¹⁴ When he adopted Johnson's emendation "What fear in this, which startles in our ears" (V.iii) in Romeo and Juliet, Staunton indicated the old copies had "your ears."¹⁵ Such examples can be indicated over and over; Table I indicates some examples of Staunton's willingness to adopt but also reject others' emendations.

When the text was corrupted and no early edition supplied an acceptable reading, Staunton went first to other modern editors. For example, Staunton accepts Theobald's reading, in Coriolanus,

At some time when his soaring insolence
Shall reach the people . . .
(II.i)

rather than the Folio's "shall teach the people." He offers, too, Knight's suggestion, "Shall touch the people" which he says "is equally probable and good." Either of these readings takes precedence over the Folio text.¹⁶

Whenever a definitely corrupt passage could not be emended by reference to other editions, he then supplied a conjecture of his own but indicated this reading in the notes. Thus, in Macbeth, Staunton supplied

Augurs that understood relations, have
By magot-pies, and choughs, and rooks, brought forth
The secret'st man of blood
(III.iv)

¹⁴Ibid., I, 181.

¹⁵Ibid., I, 211.

¹⁶Ibid., III, 146.

TABLE I

SAMPLE ADOPTED AND REJECTED READINGS IN STAUNTON'S

THE WORKS OF SHAKESPEARE (1857)

Edition	Adoptions	Alternative (Rejected)
Quarto (<u>Romeo and Juliet</u>) 1597	"It is an <u>honour</u> that I dream not of" ¹ (I.iii)	<u>hour</u> (F ₁)
Folio-1632	"You conclude that my master is a shepherd then, and I <u>a</u> sheep?" ³ (I.ii. <u>Two Gentlemen of Verona</u>)	omit <u>a</u> (F ₁)
Rowe-1709	". . . till strange love <u>grown</u> bold Think true love acted, simple modesty" ⁵ (III.ii <u>Romeo and Juliet</u>)	<u>grow</u> bold (Q1599) (Q1609) (F ₁)
Theobald-1733	". . . confusion's <u>cure</u> lives not In these confusions" ⁷ (IV.v. <u>Romeo and Juliet</u>)	<u>care</u> (Q1599) (Q1609) (F ₁)
Collier-1744	"Oh, let me kiss This <u>impress</u> of pure white, this seal of bliss" ⁹ (III.ii. <u>A Midsummer Night's Dream</u>)	<u>princess</u> (F ₁)

¹I, 166; ³I, 4; ⁵I, 188; ⁷I, 204; ⁹I, 364.

TABLE I

SAMPLE ADOPTED AND REJECTED READINGS IN STAUNTON'S

THE WORKS OF SHAKESPEARE (1857)

Rejections	Alternative (Rejected)
"Romeo, the <u>hate</u> I bear thee, can afford No better term than this--Thou art a villain" ² (III.i)	<u>love</u> (Q1599) (Q1609) (F ₁)
"Her <u>beauty</u> hangs upon the cheek of night As a rich jewel in an Ethiop's ear." ⁴ (I.v. <u>Romeo and Juliet</u>)	It seems she (Q1599) (Q1609) (F ₁)
" <u>Thou</u> last of all the Romans, fare thee well." ⁶ (V.iii <u>Julius Caesar</u>)	<u>The</u> last (F ₁)
"Say to Caesar this: -- in <u>deputation</u> I kiss his conquering hand." ⁸ (III.xiii <u>Antony and Cleopatra</u>)	<u>disputation</u> (F ₁)
"The pale reflex of Cynthia's <u>bow</u> " ¹⁰ (III.v. <u>Romeo and Juliet</u>)	<u>brow</u> (Q1599) (Q1609) (F ₁)

²I, 186; ⁴I, 169; ⁶III, 456; ⁸II, 563; ¹⁰I, 194.

rather than the "unintelligible reading" in the Folio "Augurs, and understood relations."¹⁷ Likewise, in Hamlet, Staunton suggests the line "O, horrible! O, horrible! most horrible!" (I.v) should be spoken by Hamlet rather than the ghost. He argues, "Notwithstanding the unanimity of the old copies in assigning this line to the Ghost, there can be little doubt it was intended to be spoken by Hamlet."¹⁸ And, last, in The Tempest, Staunton suggests that Ferdinand described the effect of thinking about Miranda as follows:

But these sweet thoughts do even refresh my labour;
Most busy felt, when I do it.

(III.i)

He appends this note:

This is the great crux of the play. No passage in Shakespeare has occasioned more speculation, and on none has speculation proved less happy. The First Folio reads, "Most busie *lest*, when I doe it," the Second, "Most busie *least* when I do it;" Pope prints "*Least busy* when I do it," Theobald, "Most *busy'ess* when I do it;" Mr. Holt White suggests, "Most *busiest* when I do it," and Mr. Collier's annotator, "Most busy, - *blest* when I do it." Whatever may have been for which "*lest*" was misprinted, "Most busy" and that word bore reference, unquestionably, not to Ferdinand's task, but to the sweet thoughts by which it was relieved. We have substituted *felt* as a likely word to have been mis-set '*lest*;' but are in doubt whether *still*, in its old sense of *ever*, *always*, is not preferable,--"Most busy still, when I do it."¹⁹

Staunton, finally, provides the reader with definitions and explanations for words or allusions with which he may not be familiar. However, these explanations, unlike those of the editors of the first half

¹⁷ Ibid., III, 146.

¹⁸ Ibid., III, 344.

¹⁹ Ibid., III, 29.

of the nineteenth century, are kept to a minimum. Thus, he notes that teen in Miranda's speech in The Tempest

O, my heart bleeds
To think o' the teen that I have turned you to
(I.ii)

has the meaning of sorrow or vexation.²⁰ In Two Gentlemen of Verona, Staunton explains the allusion "Why, that's noddie" (I.i) as follows: "There is a game at cards called Noddy, but the allusion is rather to the common acception of Noddy, which is, a noodle, a simpleton. In 'Wit's Private Wealth,' 1612, we find, 'If you see a trull, scarce give her a nod, but do not follow her, lest you prove a noddie.'"²¹ Whenever such explanations are too long to be included in the footnotes, Staunton includes them in the Illustrative Comments at the end of each play. Thus, for Two Gentlemen of Verona, he appends the following explanation for the line "I, a lost mutton, gave your letter to her, a laced mutton." (I.i):

Laced mutton was, from a very early period in our history, a cant phrase to express a courtesan. In our author's time, according to Malone, it was so established a term for one of these unfortunates, that a street in Clerkenwell, much frequented by them, was then called Mutton Lane. Mr. Dyce suggests that, in the present instance, the expression might not be regarded as synonymous with courtesan; and that Speed applied the term to Julia in the much less offensive sense of--a richly-attired piece of woman's flesh. We believe there was but one meaning attached to the term; and the only palliation for Speed's application of it in this case is, that in reality it was not the lady, but her waiting-maid, to whom he gave the letter.²²

²⁰Ibid., III, 8.

²¹Ibid., I, 5.

²²Ibid., I, 41.

As a result of the work of the previous editors, the stage was set for what proved to be "the greatest edition of the nineteenth century,"²³ and "the culmination of nineteenth-century Shakespearean textual study."²⁴ William Aldis Wright and William George Clark published from 1863-1866 their edition--the result of six years' work--The Works of Shakespeare in eight volumes.²⁵ This edition (the Cambridge Shakespeare) became the basic text of Shakespeare.

The editors of the sixty years preceding the Cambridge editors had argued for the restoration of Shakespearean readings while adopting emendations from non-authoritative sources. The Cambridge editors, however, apparently mistrusted the majority of the previous emendations and argued for the authority of the First Folio. Unless the Folio text was hopelessly corrupt, they admitted no changes into their text. Therefore, the Cambridge Shakespeare retained all three of the following Folio readings in Julius Caesar, which had been emended in other editions:

- 1) Boy! Lucius! Fast asleep? It is no matter;
Enjoy the hony-heavy-Dew of Slumber.
(II.i.229-230)
- 2) I had rather be a dog, and bay the moon
Than such a Roman.
(IV.iii.27-28)

²³Wheatley, "Shakespeare's Editors," p. 172.

²⁴Milwaukee Public Library, William Shakespeare, p. 44.

²⁵John Glover was the co-editor of Volume I; the others were edited by Clark and Wright after Glover's death. Clark and Wright are the men generally regarded as the Cambridge editors.

- 3) He only, in a general honest thought
 And common good to all made one of them
 (V.v.71-72)

And even when they realized that the original reading was obscure, they printed it if they could not substitute a better. Thus, in Measure for Measure, they retained the Folio text

Since I am put to know that your own science
 Exceeds, in that, the lists of all advice
 My strength can give you; then, no more remains
 But that, to your sufficiency, as your worth is able,
 And let them work.

(I.i.6-10)

despite the possibilities offered by others:

Then no more remains
 But your sufficiency as your worth is able,
 And let them work.

(Steevens)

Then no more remains
 But that to your sufficiencies your worth is abled,
 And let them work.

(Collier, M.S. corrector)²⁶

Similarly, the reading in Romeo and Juliet, of the line "That runaways' eyes may weep" (III.ii) was retained, despite the many opinions offered during two hundred years. Clark and Wright's note best explains their position:

This passage has been a perpetual source of contention to the commentators. Their difficulties are well represented by Warburton's question-- "What runaways are these, whose eyes Juliet is wishing to have stopped?" Warburton says *Phoebus* is the runaway. Steevens proves that *Night* is the runaway. Dyce thinks that *Juliet* is the runaway. In several early poems Cupid is styled *Runaway*. Monck Mason is confident that the passage ought to be, "That *Renomy's* eyes may wink." *Renomy* being a new

²⁶ Cambridge Text, XVI, 19.

personage, created out of the French Renommée, and answering, we suppose, to the "Rumor" of Spenser. An unlearned compositor, Zachard Jackson, suggests that *runaways* is a misprint for *unawares*. The word unawares, in the old orthography, is *unawayres* (it is so spelt in 'The Third Part of Henry VI.', and the r, having been misplaced, produced this word of puzzle, *runawayres*. Mr. Collier adopted this reading in his edition of 1842. Mr. Dyce suggests "that rude day's eyes may wink." Mr. R. G. White proposes "*rumor's* eyes," which had been previously suggested, without his knowledge, by Heath. Mr. Singer would read "*rumorers*." Lastly, in Mr. Collier's corrected folio, we have *enemies'* eyes." Amidst all these amusing guesses it is the safer course to abide by the old "*runaways*."²⁷

When, however, a corrupt passage has been improved by sound reasoning and parallel structure to support the emendation, the editors adopted it.

Thus, they admit Theobald's famous "for his nose was as sharp as a pen, and a'babbl'd of green fields" (II.iii.16-18) in Henry V in place of the Folio's "for his nose was as sharpe as a Pen, and a Table of Green fields."²⁸ Finally, when other editors had not offered satisfactory emendations and Clark and Wright felt a change was needed and could be supported, they offered their own emendation. Thus, the Folio line in Twelfth Night describing the leg of Sir Andrew Aguecheek, "It does indifferent well in a dam'd-colored stock" became in the Cambridge Shakespeare, "It does indifferent well in a dam'sk-colored stock" (I.ii.143-144) on the ground that "Many words in Shakespeare are elided both in prose and verse. . . . Sir Andrew would not have chosen a dun-colored [Collier, MS. Corrector] stocking to set off the excellent constitution of his leg."²⁹

²⁷ Ibid., XVI, 71-72.

²⁸ Hinman, The First Folio, p. 429.

²⁹ Cambridge Text, XVI, 40.

Similar examples of the conservative nature of the text can be found on every page. Table II indicates the reading adopted by the Cambridge editors for many of the disputed passages presented thus far in this study. The hesitancy of the editors to alter at the whim of their personal interpretation is, indeed, one of the advantages of this text. They did not, however, print a text void of notes or others' conjectural readings. In fact, John Bullock describes the results of Clark and Wright's efforts as follows: "In these nine volumes, with their 5500 pages and 55,000 notes, are the labours of nearly six years embodied, presenting a complete summary of the variations of all the texts and the conjectural emendations of all the editors and critics of the last hundred and fifty years. If it cannot be said that we have yet got a perfect text we have all the materials from which a more perfect one may be elaborated."³⁰

Although the Cambridge Shakespeare is not a "perfect text," it became the standard text of Shakespeare, especially the one-volume edition, without notes, published as the "Globe Edition" in 1864.³¹ One innovation, adopted by Clark and Wright, which contributed to world-wide acceptance of the Cambridge Shakespeare was their practice of numbering every line in the play.³² "Almost all concordances, dictionaries and quotation

³⁰Bullock, Studies, p. 1.

³¹This edition is still in print, being printed as recently as 1970.

³²In addition to line numbering, this text also incorporated--for the first time--a section on Familiar Quotations, alphabetized by key words and referenced by play, act and scene divisions, and the situation in which the line occurred. For example,

TABLE II
 READINGS OF DISPUTED PASSAGES ADOPTED IN THE CAMBRIDGE TEXT

Adopted Reading	Source
<u>Hamlet</u>	
There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio Than are dreamt of in your philosophy. (I.v.166-167)	Quartos 1603 1604 1611
So excellent a king; this was, to this, Hyperion to a satyr; so loving to my mother That he might not betwixt the winds of heaven Visit her face too roughly. (I.iii.138-142)	Quartos 1603 1604 1611
<u>Troilus and Cressida</u>	
. . . welcome ever smiles, And farewell goes out sighing. (III.iii.168-169)	Quarto 1609
<u>Coriolanus</u>	
Why in this woolvish toge should I stand here (II.iii.122)	First Folio
<u>Othello</u>	
Emil. My husband!	First Folio
Oth. What needs this iteration, woman? I say thy husband.	
Emi. O mistress, villany hath made mocks with love! My husband say that she was false!	
Oth. He, woman; I say thy husband: dost understand the word? My friend, thy husband, honest, honest Iago. (V.ii.149-155)	

TABLE II CONTINUED

READINGS OF DISPUTED PASSAGES ADOPTED IN THE CAMBRIDGE TEXT

Adopted Reading	Source
<u>The Tempest</u>	
But that the sea, mounting to the welkin's cheek, Dashes the fire out. (I.ii.4-5)	First Folio
. . . a brave vessel, Who had, no doubt, some noble creature in her, Dash'd all to pieces. (I.ii.7-9)	First Folio
I have with such provision in mine art. (I.ii.28)	First Folio
But these sweet thoughts do even refresh my labours, Most busy lest, when I do it. (III.i.14-15)	First Folio
<u>The Taming of the Shrew</u>	
Or so devote to Aristotle's checks (I.i.32)	First Folio

books used the Globe numbering system as reference. So pervasive was this that some editors of independent texts have gone to the trouble of fitting the Globe number system on their texts."³³

To Clark and Wright's credit is the fact that they used the First Folio systematically as their copy-text. They did admit some variances from the quarto editions of some of the plays and some conjectural emendations from other editors, but they indicated in their notes whenever they had altered the Folio text. To support their readings, the Cambridge editors examined the printing and textual history of each play. Only in doing so could they determine the best authority for each reading. Bowers believes, in "Today's Shakespeare Texts, and Tomorrow's" that in only two respects were they led astray and founded their text on imperfect authority. They were deceived, he says, by the falsely dated Pavier Quartos of 1619 and, taking some of these second editions as first editions, adopted some readings of spurious authority. They also, Bowers says, "assigned unwarranted value to readings of what we now know as bad quartos"³⁴ (Hamlet, King Lear, The Merry Wives of Windsor, and

738 The ripest fruit falls first. King Richard II., Act II, Scene I. (The King on hearing of Gaunt's death." (Vol. 10, 165).

There were, also, two indices--one to quotes, the other to characters, giving a brief description of each and the play in which he appeared.

³³ Milwaukee Public Library, William Shakespeare, pp. 46-47.

³⁴ Fredson Bowers, "Today's Shakespeare Texts, and Tomorrow's," Studies in Bibliography, XIX (1966), 40.

Richard III) and emended some of the correct Folio readings because of their belief in the validity of these quartos. Even knowing these errors, it is difficult to agree with Van Dam, who writes, "So long as the Victorial Shakespearians, among whom in the first place we count the Cambridge Editors . . . are held to rank with the great Shakespeare authorities, there is not the least chance for sounder views respecting the text of Shakespeare to obtain a hearing."³⁵ Furness best expressed the importance of the Cambridge text when, in 1871, he wrote, "It is hardly possible to over-estimate the critical and textual value of such an edition."³⁶

Following the Cambridge editors, Horace Howard Furness was single-handedly responsible for beginning what has been described as "the most valuable of all the hundreds of editions of Shakespeare"³⁷--the new Variorum. At the present time twenty-three of Shakespeare's plays have been edited and published, by several editors, following the plan established by Dr. Furness in the fifteen editions he himself completed. (See Appendix P for a list of the plays in print). One of these editors, M. A. Shaaber, described Dr. Furness' involvement with Shakespeare's text at a meeting of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia in

³⁵B. A. P. Van Dam, William Shakespeare: Prosody and the Text: An Essay in Criticism, Being an Introduction to a Better Editing and a More Adequate Appreciation of the Works of the Elizabethan Poets (London: William & Norgate, n.d.), pp. 27-28.

³⁶Furness, Romeo and Juliet, p. vi.

³⁷Milwaukee Public Library, William Shakespeare, p. 47.

1935. He reports that after the end of the Civil War, Furness who was then in his early thirties, turned to the study of Shakespeare, since growing deafness had made his pursuit of a law career infeasible. Shaaber continues, "Dissatisfaction with the apparatus for the study of the plays then available, he planned a new edition on a scale as yet unattempted . . . [he planned] a variorum edition which would include the readings and elucidations of all the editors and critics and thus put in the reader's hands the final results of all the study and investigation that had been bestowed on Shakespeare's works." This was what he accomplished in his gigantic work which, according to Shaaber, "enjoys a world-wide reputation, and in its own field in unrivaled."³⁸

To begin with, one must remember the purpose of a variorum: it should present a detailed compilation of the opinions, changes, and interpretations of all variant readings. Furness' preface to the first volume of the Variorum, Romeo and Juliet, indicates this purpose of his work: "To abridge the labour and to save the time by collecting these comments after the manner of a Variorum and presenting them, on the same page, in a condensed form, in connection with the difficulties which they explain, is the purpose and plan of the present edition."³⁹ Thus, the preparation of a variorum requires minute collation of all the major editions previous to its publication; it does not require original

³⁸M. A. Shaaber, "The Furness Variorum Shakespeare," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, LXXV (1935), 281-282.

³⁹Furness, Romeo and Juliet, p. vi.

research or interpretation. This comment is not meant, in any way, to disparage the labors of Furness et al., for the variorum editors do excel in their dedication to research, and they do take stands on disputed readings.⁴⁰

In fulfilling his purpose, Furness undertook to supply a deficiency of the Cambridge edition of Clark, Wright, and Glover. In his words, While it gives the readings of the old editions, it omits to note the adoption or rejection of them by the various editors, whereby an important element in estimating these readings is wanted; however uncouth a reading may seem at first sight, it ceases to be the 'sophistication' of a printer when we learn that men so judicious as Capell or Dyce had pronounced in its favor; and in disputed passages it is of great interest to see at a glance on which side lies the weight of authority. Moreover . . . credit is not always given to that editor who, from among the ancient readings, first adopted the text since generally received.⁴¹

⁴⁰That they do not merely report different readings, but, indeed, reveal their own interpretations is obvious throughout the Variorum. For example, Furness indicates in The Tempest (V.i.295) that the reading of the line should follow Rowe "Which shall be shortly, single, I'll resolve you" rather than Theobald's "shortly singled" and the line should have been interpreted as meaning "to you alone, in private" rather than Wright's meaning "by myself" or Delius' interpretation "one by one." (p. 259). Likewise, Harold N. Hillebrand, in his variorum edition of Troilus and Cressida indicates his approval of the emendation of Collier's corrector, changing *married* to *mirror'd* in the lines "For speculation turnes not to it selfe, / Till it hath travail'd, and is married there / Where it may see itself" (III.iii.115-117) rather than the quarto or First Folio reading *married*. (p. 177). And, finally, Matthias A. Shaabar, in Henry IV, Part 2 variorum, voices his approval of the Folio rather than the quarto reading of "To us, and to our purposes confin'd" (IV.i.184) with the explanation that "The meter, if nothing else, makes it certain that this word [to] was omitted from Q by accident." (p. 300). Numerous examples can be found throughout the Variorum.

⁴¹Furness, Romeo and Juliet, p. vii.

The problem of the best method to present such a voluminous amount of information confronted Furness almost immediately. Outlined below are the principles on which he proceeded.⁴²

1. Furness had originally decided to use the text of the Cambridge Edition and note all variations in the Quartos and Folios, and the other editions. He altered his plan, however, and decided to print his text by adopting the reading in each instance of a majority of the editors and to note the variations from this majority opinion.
2. Furness collated the major editions of each play he edited, examining every word in every one of them. He provides the reader, in every instance, a list of the editions he used (See Appendix Q). His notes indicate all variations from his printed text; all the editions not listed agree with his printed text.
3. Furness provides a Commentary at the foot of each page, beneath the notes which contains
 - a. the notes adopted by modern editors from the Variorum of 1821 and the name of each editor (in italics) who adopted it,
 - b. the original notes of the English and German editors,
 - c. criticisms and notes too fragmentary for inclusion in the Appendix (see Appendix R for a copy of one page of Romeo and Juliet which is characteristic of the format of the Variorum.)
4. Furness provides an Appendix for each play which includes
 - a. notes too long for the commentary,
 - b. the Prefaces of the modern editors divided into four categories: "Sources of the Plot," "Date of the Play," "The Text," and "Costume."
 - c. extracts from English, French, and German critics.
5. Furness provides a list of books which he either quoted or consulted in the preparation of the Variorum edition.

This plan and these principles have been adopted, with minor alterations, by the other editors of the Variorum. As the type and amount of information on each play differs greatly from the other plays, to indicate

⁴²The plan and principles of Furness' edition here summarized are reported in extensive detail on pp. vii-xvi of his Variorum edition of Romeo and Juliet.

that all of the volumes contain all of the same information is impossible. However, it is possible to state that the editors provided all the information specified in Furness' plan and, in most instances, surpassed it. (See Appendices S, T, U, V, and W.)

To overestimate the value of the Variorum is impossible. It has been described as "America's most distinguished contribution to Shakespeare scholarship,"⁴³ and Henry Wheatley comments, "One cannot praise it enough."⁴⁴ The edition provides the reader--as well as the scholar--with a single source for the study of Shakespeare's text. The text and notes appear, with minor exceptions, to be accurate; the information is certainly detailed and complete, and the presentation of such a wide variety of material is organized. Furness' praise of Boswell's 1821 variorum as "a storehouse . . . of illustration and criticism . . . indispensable to a thorough study of Shakespeare"⁴⁵ can, with equal justification, be applied to his own magnificent edition.

⁴³ Shaaber, "Furness Variorum," p. 282.

⁴⁴ Wheatley, "Shakespeare's Editors," p. 173.

⁴⁵ Furness, Romeo and Juliet, p. v.

IV. SUMMARY

The nineteenth century was brought to a close, then, in a fashion similar to the way it had begun--with a monumental variorum. These two variorum editions, published fifty years apart, became the cornerstones on which later editors built. Every editor of the nineteenth century used the 1821 Boswell-Malone variorum as a source; similarly, modern textual criticism demands familiarity with the Furness variorum.

The trend in twentieth-century textual criticism has been to determine the nature of the manuscript prior to approaching the authentication or emendation of individual words in a text. This demand of attempting to discover what Shakespeare really wrote--of constructing the manuscript which lies behind the printed text--is diametrically opposed to the concern of eighteenth-century editors--of making a reading edition by clearing the text of the Elizabethan vulgarities and correcting Shakespeare's errors. It is, however, the principle on which many of the nineteenth-century editors proceeded. They were limited in their knowledge of Elizabethan printing, but they realized, fundamentally, that the latest-printed edition was farthest in time from Shakespeare and the text, therefore, would be farthest from what he wrote.

During the nineteenth century much investigation was done to discover the relationship between the early quartos and between these quartos and the Folio. To this end, editors strived to achieve an

exhaustive collation of variants and an accurate presentation of them. Thus, they laid the foundation on which modern textual criticism can proceed.

The basic principle of modern textual scholarship is that one should know everything about the document on which the desired text is to be based--their relationship to one another and, so far as can be determined, their history back to the holograph. This necessity poses three questions:

1. What was the nature of the lost manuscript that served as printer's copy?
2. What was the nature of the printing process, and what can be gathered from this to shed light on the transmission of the text from the lost manuscript to the printed document with which an editor must work?
3. What is the relation between all preserved examples of the text, in printed or manuscript form, and what are the degrees of authority in these examples?⁴⁶

These questions suggest several problems, problems which any editor wishing to produce an authoritative text must confront. First, the printing of a text depends not only on the legibility of the manuscript but also upon the compositor's fidelity to his copy. Second, have the variants which have entered the text been the result of printing-house errors or were they text revisions? And if they were revisions, were they authorial? To answer these questions an editor must rely on his own knowledge and on the work of bibliographers; in the end, however,

⁴⁶Fredson Bowers, On Editing Shakespeare (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1966), p. 8.

the editor must rely on his own judgment. Sir Walter Greg has perhaps best summarized the task of an editor. He writes "I cannot but think an editor is wise to back his own judgment--not, of course, his personal preference, but a judgment of which he can give a reasonable account"⁴⁷ and "No emendation can be or ought to be considered in vacuo but that criticism must always proceed in relation to what we know, or what we surmise, respecting the history of the text."⁴⁸ This principle is the very one which directed much of the work on Shakespeare's plays during the nineteenth century.

The history of Shakespearean textual criticism, like almost all of man's knowledge, is the history of building blocks. Without the desire of Heminge and Condell to preserve the dramas of their fellow actor and friend, the majority of Shakespeare's plays might have been lost forever. Without the efforts of men like Pope, Rowe, Theobald, and Johnson--none of whom was primarily an editor--to popularize Shakespeare's works through reading editions, many of his plays might have passed into obscurity. Without the dedication of the editors of the nineteenth century--none of whom will probably gain the fame of Pope or Johnson--to discover and restore the most authoritative readings, much of what we know as the work of Shakespeare would actually have been "the mistakes of an unknown transcriber" or "the errors of a careless printer." To attempt to

⁴⁷"McKerrow's 'Prolegomena' Reconsidered," Review of English Studies, XVIII (April 1941), 143.

⁴⁸"Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare," Proceedings of the British Academy, XIV (1928), 152.

remove one block from the pile without disturbing the rest would be virtually impossible. To attempt to study Shakespeare without the work of any of the three centuries of editors, would pose similar difficulties. The editors of the nineteenth century, building on the work of those of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, prepared the foundation on which modern critics are adding another block of knowledge.

APPENDIX A

COPY-TEXTS FOR THE PRINTING OF THE FIRST FOLIO

Title	Copy-Text
<u>The Tempest</u>	Scribal transcripts of foul papers
<u>The Two Gentlemen of Verona</u>	Transcript of prompt book
<u>The Merry Wives of Windsor</u>	Crane transcript of foul papers
<u>Measure for Measure</u>	Scribal transcript of foul papers
<u>The Comedy of Errors</u>	Foul papers
<u>Much Ado About Nothing</u>	Q, printed from foul papers
<u>Love's Labour's Lost</u>	Q, printed from foul papers
<u>A Midsummer Night's Dream</u>	Q, printed from foul papers
<u>The Merchant of Venice</u>	Q ₁ , printed from transcript
<u>As You Like It</u>	Prompt book
<u>The Taming of the Shrew</u>	Foul papers
<u>All's Well That Ends Well</u>	Foul papers
<u>Twelfth Night</u>	Prompt book
<u>The Winter's Tale</u>	Scribal notes
<u>King John</u>	Revised authorial manuscript
<u>Richard II</u>	Q ₅ , with additions from manuscript-source (perhaps prompt book)
<u>Henry IV, Part 1</u>	Q ₅ , printed from foul papers
<u>Henry IV, Part 2</u>	Manuscript prompt book or corrected Q
<u>Henry V</u>	Authorial manuscript
<u>Henry VI, Part 1</u>	Revised authorial manuscript
<u>Henry VI, Part 2</u>	Authorial manuscript
<u>Henry VI, Part 3</u>	Authorial manuscript
<u>Richard III</u>	Q ₆ corrected by foul papers
<u>Henry VIII</u>	Foul papers
<u>Troilus and Cressida</u>	Q, printed from transcript of foul papers and corrected by prompt book
<u>Coriolanus</u>	Foul papers
<u>Titus Andronicus</u>	Q ₃ , with additions from manuscript source
<u>Romeo and Juliet</u>	Q ₃ , printed from foul papers
<u>Timon of Athens</u>	Foul papers
<u>Julius Caesar</u>	Prompt book
<u>Macbeth</u>	Prompt book
<u>Hamlet</u>	Corrected Q ₂ , printed from foul papers or manuscript (perhaps transcript of prompt book)
<u>King Lear</u>	Q corrected by prompt book

APPENDIX A CONTINUED

COPY-TEXTS FOR THE PRINTING OF THE FIRST FOLIO

Title	Copy-Text
<u>Othello</u>	Q corrected by prompt book
<u>Antony and Cleopatra</u>	Foul papers
<u>Cymbeline</u>	Prompt book

For a complete discussion of the reasoning behind each of the conclusions, see Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, pp. 176-432.

APPENDIX B

LIST OF EDITIONS CONSULTED BY POPE

Title	Format	Date
<u>Mr. William Shakespear's Comedies,</u> <u>Histories, and Tragedies</u>	Folio	1623, 1632
<u>A Midsummer Night's Dream**</u>	Quarto	1600
<u>Sir John Falstaff and The Merry Wives</u> <u>of Windsor</u>	Quarto	1619
<u>The Merchant of Venice**</u>	Quarto	1600*
<u>Love's Labors Lost**</u>	Quarto	1598
<u>The Taming of a Shrew***</u>	Quarto	1607
<u>King Lear</u>	Quarto	1608
<u>Richard II</u>	Quarto	1598
	Quarto	1608
	Quarto	1615
<u>Henry IV, Part 1</u>	Quarto	1599
	Quarto	1604
	Quarto	1608
<u>Henry IV, Part 2**</u>	Quarto	1600
<u>Henry V**</u>	Quarto	1600
	Quarto	1608
<u>Henry VI, Parts 2 and 3</u>	Quarto	n.d.
<u>Richard III</u>	Quarto	1598
	Quarto	1602
	Quarto	1612
<u>Titus Andronicus</u>	Quarto	1611
<u>Troilus and Cressida**</u>	Quarto	1609

APPENDIX B CONTINUED

LIST OF EDITIONS CONSULTED BY POPE

Title	Format	Date
<hr/>		
<u>Romeo and Juliet</u> **	Quarto	1597
	Quarto	1599
<u>Hamlet</u>	Quarto	1605
	Quarto	1611
<u>Othello</u> **	Quarto	n.d. (probably 1622)

*Two editions in same year, both printed by J. Roberts.

**These quartos are the first quarto editions.

***This edition was evidently a play similar to that first published in the First Folio as The Taming of the Shrew. The Taming of a Shrew, Pope admits, was probably not by Shakespeare.

APPENDIX C

LIST OF EDITIONS CONSULTED BY WARBURTON

Title	Format	Date
<u>Mr. William Shakespear's Comedies,</u> <u>Histories and Tragedies</u>	Folio	1623
<u>Second Impression</u>	Folio	1632
<u>Third Impression</u>	Folio	1664
<u>A Midsummer Night's Dream**</u>	Quarto	1600*
<u>Syr John Falstaffe, and the Merry</u> <u>Wives of Windsor</u>	Quarto	1602
	Quarto	1619
<u>The Merry Wives of Windsor</u>	Quarto	1630
<u>Much Ado About Nothing**</u>	Quarto	1600
<u>The Merchant of Venice**</u>	Quarto	1600*
	Quarto	1637
<u>Love's Labors Lost**</u>	Quarto	1598
	Quarto	1631
<u>The Taming of a Shrew***</u>	Quarto	1607
	Quarto	1631
<u>King Lear**</u>	Quarto	1608
	Quarto	1655
<u>King John, Part 1</u>	Quarto	1591
<u>King John, Part 2</u>	Quarto	1591
<u>King John, Parts 1 and 2</u>	Quarto	1611
	Quarto	1622
<u>Richard II</u>	Quarto	1598
	Quarto	1608
	Quarto	1615
	Quarto	1634

APPENDIX C CONTINUED

LIST OF EDITIONS CONSULTED BY WARBURTON

Title	Format	Date
<u>Henry IV</u>	Quarto	1599
	Quarto	1604
	Quarto	1608
	Quarto	1622
	Quarto	1639
<u>Henry IV, Part 2</u> **	Quarto	1600
<u>Henry V</u> **	Quarto	1600
	Quarto	1608
<u>Henry VI</u>	Quarto	[n.d.]
	Quarto	1600
<u>Richard III</u> **	Quarto	1597
	Quarto	1598
	Quarto	1602
	Quarto	1612
	Quarto	1624
	Quarto	1629
	Quarto	1634
<u>Titus Andronicus</u>	Quarto	1611
<u>Troilus and Cressida</u> **	Quarto	1609
<u>Romeo and Juliet</u> **	Quarto	1597
	Quarto	1599
	Quarto	1637
<u>Hamlet</u>	Quarto	1605
	Quarto	1611
	Quarto	1637
<u>Othello</u>	Quarto	1622
	Quarto	1630

*Two editions in same year. **These quartos are the first quarto editions. ***This edition was evidently a play similar to that first published in the First Folio as The Taming of the Shrew. The Taming of a Shrew Warburton, like Pope, admits was probably not by Shakespeare.

APPENDIX D

LIST OF EDITIONS CONSULTED BY JOHNSON

<u>Quartos</u>			
<u>A Midsummer Night's Dream</u>	1600	<u>Henry V</u>	1608
<u>The Merchant of Venice</u>	1600	<u>Henry IV, Part 2</u>	n.d.
<u>The Merry Wives of Windsor</u>	1602	<u>Henry VI, Part 3</u>	n.d.
<u>Much Ado About Nothing</u>	1600	<u>King Lear</u>	1608
<u>Richard II</u>	1598		1655
	1615	<u>Titus Andronicus</u>	1611
<u>Henry IV, Part 1</u>	1599	<u>Troilus and Cressida</u>	1609
	1622		
	1639	<u>Hamlet</u>	1637
<u>Henry IV, Part 2</u>	1600	<u>Othello</u>	1622
			1630
			1650
<u>Folios</u>			
<u>Mr. William Shakespear's Comedies,</u>			1623
<u> Histories, and Tragedies</u>			1632
			1664

APPENDIX E

LIST OF EDITIONS CONSULTED BY CAPELL

<u>Quartos</u>			
<u>Hamlet</u>	1605	<u>The Merry Wives of Windsor</u> **	1602
	1611		1619
	[n.d.]		1630
	1637		
		<u>A Midsummer Night's Dream</u> **	1600*
<u>Henry IV, Part 1</u> **	1598		
	1599	<u>Much Ado About Nothing</u> **	1600
	1604		
	1608	<u>Othello</u> **	1622
	1613		1630
	1622		1655
	1632		
	1639	<u>Richard II</u> **	1597
			1598
<u>Henry IV, Part 2</u> **	1600*		1608
			1615
<u>Henry V</u> **	1600		1634
	1602		
	1608	<u>Richard III</u>	1598
			1602
<u>Henry VI</u>	1600*		1612
			1622
<u>King John</u>	1591		1629
	1611		1634
	1622		
		<u>Romeo and Juliet</u> **	1597
<u>King Lear</u> **	1608*		1599
	1655		1609
			[n.d.]
<u>Love's Labor's Lost</u> **	1598		1637
	1631		
		<u>The Taming of the Shrew</u>	1631
<u>The Merchant of Venice</u> **	1600*		
	1637	<u>Titus Andronicus</u>	1611
	1652		
		<u>Troilus and Cressida</u> **	1609

APPENDIX E CONTINUED
LIST OF EDITIONS CONSULTED BY CAPELL

<u>Folios</u>	
<u>Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies,</u>	1623
<u> Histories, & Tragedies</u>	
<u>Second Impression</u>	1632
<u>Third Impression</u>	1664
<u>Fourth Impression</u>	1685

*Two editions in same year.

**These quartos are the first quarto editions.

APPENDIX F

LIST OF EDITIONS CONSULTED BY STEEVENS

<u>Quartos</u>		
<u>A Midsummer Night's Dream</u> **	1600* <u>Henry IV, Part 2</u> **	1600*
<u>The Merry Wives of Windsor</u> **	1602 <u>Henry V</u> **	1600
	1619	1602
	1630	1608
<u>Much Ado About Nothing</u> **	1600 <u>Henry VI</u>	1600*
		[n.d.]
<u>The Merchant of Venice</u> **	1600*	
	1637 <u>Richard III</u> **	1597
	1652	1598
		1602
<u>Love's Labor's Lost</u> **	1598	1612
	1631	1622
		1629
<u>The Taming of the Shrew</u>	1607	1634
	1631	
	<u>Titus Andronicus</u>	1611
<u>King Lear</u> **	1608*	
	1655 <u>Troilus and Cressida</u> **	1609*
		[n.d.]
<u>King John</u>	1591	
	1611 <u>Romeo and Juliet</u> **	1597
	1622	1599
		1609
<u>Richard II</u> **	1597	[n.d.]
	1598	1637
	1608	
	1615 <u>Hamlet</u>	1604
	1634	1605
		1611
<u>Henry IV, Part 1</u> **	1598	[n.d.]
	1599	1637
	1604	1695
	1608	
	1613 <u>Othello</u> **	1622
	1622	1630
	1632	1655
	1639	

APPENDIX F CONTINUED

LIST OF EDITIONS CONSULTED BY STEEVENS

<u>Folios</u>			
<u>Mr. William Shakespeare's</u>	<u>Comedies, Histories,</u>		1623
	<u>& Tragedies</u>		
	<u>Second Impression</u>		1632
	<u>Third Impression</u>		1664
	<u>Fourth Impression</u>		1685
 <u>Modern Editions</u>			
Rowe	1709	Warburton	1747
Pope	1723	Johnson	1765
	1728		
		Steevens	1766
Theobald	1740	Capell	1768
Hanmer	1744		
	1771	Johnson and	1773
		Steevens	1778

*Two editions appeared in the same year.

**These quartos are the first quarto editions.

APPENDIX G

LIST OF EDITIONS CONSULTED BY MALONE¹

<u>Quartos</u>			
<u>Romeo and Juliet</u>	1597	<u>King Henry IV, Part 2</u>	1600
	1599*		(2 editions)
	[n.d.]		
	1609	<u>King Henry V</u>	1600*
	1637		1602
			1608
<u>King Richard II</u>	1597*		
	1598	<u>A Midsummer-Night's Dream</u>	1600
	1608		(2 editions)
	1615		
	1634	<u>The Merchant of Venice</u>	1600
			(2 editions)
<u>King Richard III</u>	1597*		
	1598	<u>Much Ado About Nothing</u>	1600
	1602		1602
	1612		1619
	1622, &c.		
		<u>The Merry Wives of Windsor</u>	1602*
<u>Love's Labour's Lost</u>	1598*		1619
<u>King Henry IV, Part 1</u>	1598*	<u>Hamlet</u>	1604
	1599		[n.d.]
	1604		1605
	1608		1611, &c.
	1613, &c.		
		<u>King Lear</u>	1608
<u>Titus Andronicus</u>	1611		(2 editions)
<u>Othello</u>	1622	<u>Troilus and Cressida</u>	1609
	[n.d.]		[n.d.]

Folios

<u>Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies</u>	1623*
	1632
	1664
	1685

APPENDIX G CONTINUED

LIST OF EDITIONS CONSULTED BY MALONE

Editor	<u>Modern Editions</u>	
	Format	Date
Rowe	Octavo	1709
Rowe	Duodecimo	1714
Pope	Quarto	1725
Pope	Duodecimo	1728
Theobald	Octavo	1733
Theobald	Duodecimo	1740
Hanmer	Quarto	1744
Warburton	Octavo	1747
Johnson	Octavo	1765
Steevens	Octavo	1766
Capell	Octavo	1768
Hanmer	Quarto	1771
Johnson and Steevens	Octavo	1773
Johnson and Steevens	Octavo	1778
Johnson and Steevens	Octavo	1785
Malone	Octavo	1789

¹The editions marked with an asterisk are the ones of greatest authority. The quarto editions of Henry VI, Parts 2 and 3 (1594, 1595) and Pericles (1609) are not included in this list since Malone did not consider the first two to be of any real authority and the last to be entirely the work of Shakespeare.

APPENDIX H

MALONE'S LIST OF THE ORDER OF COMPOSITION OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS*

Number	Title	Date
1	<u>King Henry VI, Part 1</u>	1589
2	<u>King Henry VI, Part 2</u>	1591
3	<u>King Henry VI, Part 3</u>	1591
4	<u>A Midsummer-Night's Dream</u>	1592
5	<u>Comedy of Errors</u>	1593
6	<u>Taming of the Shrew</u>	1594
7	<u>Love's Labour's Lost</u>	1594
8	<u>Two Gentlemen of Verona</u>	1595
9	<u>Romeo and Juliet</u>	1595
10	<u>Hamlet</u>	1596
11	<u>King John</u>	1596
12	<u>King Richard II</u>	1597
13	<u>King Richard III</u>	1597
14	<u>King Henry IV, Part 1</u>	1597
15	<u>King Henry IV, Part 2</u>	1597
16	<u>The Merchant of Venice</u>	1598
17	<u>All's Well That Ends Well</u>	1598
18	<u>King Henry V</u>	1599
19	<u>Much Ado About Nothing</u>	1600
20	<u>As You Like It</u>	1600
21	<u>Merry Wives of Windsor</u>	1601
22	<u>King Henry VIII</u>	1601
23	<u>Troilus and Cressida</u>	1602
24	<u>Measure for Measure</u>	1603
25	<u>The Winter's Tale</u>	1604
26	<u>King Lear</u>	1605
27	<u>Cymbeline</u>	1605
28	<u>Macbeth</u>	1606
29	<u>Julius Caesar</u>	1607
30	<u>Antony and Cleopatra</u>	1608
31	<u>Timon of Athens</u>	1609
32	<u>Coriolanus</u>	1610
33	<u>Othello</u>	1611
34	<u>The Tempest</u>	1612
35	<u>Twelfth Night</u>	1614

*Titus Andronicus and Pericles are not mentioned in Malone's discussion, since he felt that they were not entirely of Shakespeare's composition.

APPENDIX I

LIST OF EDITIONS DESCRIBED BY MALONE AND BOSWELL

<u>Quarto Editions</u>			
<u>Richard II</u>	1597	<u>Much Ado About Nothing</u>	1600
	1598		
	1608	<u>Merry Wives of Windsor</u>	1602
	1615		1619
<u>Richard III</u>	1597	<u>Hamlet</u>	1607
	1612 or		
	1613	<u>King Lear</u>	1608
	1629		
<u>Romeo and Juliet</u>		<u>Troilus and Cressida</u>	1609*
	1597		
	1599	<u>Othello</u>	1622
<u>Love's Labours Lost</u>	1598	<u>Titus Andronicus</u>	1600
			1611
<u>Henry IV, Part 1</u>	1599		
	1604	<u>Pericles</u>	1609
	1613		1619
<u>Henry IV, Part 2</u>	1600*	<u>Henry VI, Part 2</u>	1594
			1600
<u>Henry V</u>	1600		
	1608	<u>Henry VI, Part 2</u>	1595
<u>Merchant of Venice</u>			1600
	1600		
	[n.d.]	<u>Henry VI, Part 3</u>	1595
<u>Midsummer Night's Dream</u>			1600
	1600*	<u>Henry VI, Parts 2 and 3</u>	[n.d.]

Folio Editions

<u>Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies</u>	1623
	1632
	1664
	1685

APPENDIX I CONTINUED

LIST OF EDITIONS DESCRIBED BY MALONE AND BOSWELL

<u>Modern Editions</u>		
Editor	Format	Date
Rowe	Octavo	1709
	Duodecimo	1714
Pope	Quarto	1725
	Duodecimo	1728
Theobald	Octavo	1733
	Duodecimo	1740
Hanmer	Quarto	1744
	Duodecimo	1771
Warburton	Octavo	1747
Johnson	Octavo	1765
Steevens	Octavo	1766
Capell	Octavo	1768
Johnson and Steevens,	1st ed. Octavo	1773
	2nd ed. Octavo	1778
	3rd ed. Octavo	1785
	4th ed. Octavo	1793
(published by Bell)	Duodecimo	1788
(published by Stockdale)	Octavo	1790
Malone	Octavo	1790
(published by Clarendon Press)	Octavo	1786-1794

*Multiple copies, date same year

APPENDIX J

LIST OF EDITIONS CONSULTED BY BOSWELL

<u>Quarto Editions</u>			
<u>Richard II</u>	1597	<u>Hamlet</u>	1604
	1598		1605
	1608		1607
	1615		1609
<u>Richard III</u>	1597	<u>King Lear</u>	1608*
	1598		
	1602	<u>Troilus and Cressida</u>	1609*
	1612 or		
	1613	<u>Othello</u>	1622
	1622		
	1629*	<u>Titus Andronicus</u>	1600
			1611
<u>Romeo and Juliet</u>	1597		
	1599	<u>Pericles</u>	1609
	1609		1619
	[n.d.]		
<u>Love's Labours Lost</u>		<u>Henry VI, Part 2</u>	1594
	1598		1600
<u>Henry IV, Part 1</u>	1598	<u>Henry VI, Part 3</u>	1595
	1599		1600
	1604		
	1608	<u>A Midsummer Night's Dream</u>	1600*
	1613		
	1622	<u>Much Ado About Nothing</u>	1600
<u>Henry IV, Part 2</u>	1600*	<u>The Merry Wives of Windsor</u>	1602
			1619
<u>Henry V</u>	1600		
	1602	<u>The Merchant of Venice</u>	1600
	1608		[n.d.]

Folio Editions

<u>Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, and</u>	1623
<u>Tragedies</u>	1632

APPENDIX K

KNIGHT'S CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF SHAKSPERE'S PLAYS*

Title	Reference	Date
<u>Henry VI, Part 1</u>	Alluded to by Nash, in "Pierce Penni-lesse"	1592
<u>Henry VI, Part 2</u>	Printed as the "First Part of the Con-tention"	1594
<u>Henry VI, Part 3</u>	Printed as "The True Tragedy of Rich-ard, Duke of York"	1595
<u>Richard II</u>	Printed	1597
<u>Richard III</u>	Printed	1597
<u>Romeo and Juliet</u>	Printed	1597
<u>Love's Labour's Lost</u>	Printed	1598
<u>Henry IV, Part 1</u>	Printed	1598
<u>Henry IV, Part 2</u>	Printed	1600
<u>Henry V</u>	Printed	1600
<u>Merchant of Venice</u>	Printed 1600. Mentioned by Meres	1598
<u>Midsummer Night's Dream</u>	Printed 1600. Mentioned by Meres	1598
<u>Much Ado About Nothing</u>	Printed	1600
<u>As You Like It</u>	Entered at Stationers' Hall	1600
<u>All's Well That Ends Well</u>	Held to be mentioned by Meres as "Love's Labour's Won"	1598
<u>Two Gentlemen of Verona</u>	Mentioned by Meres	1598
<u>Comedy of Errors</u>	Mentioned by Meres	1598
<u>King John</u>	Mentioned by Meres	1598
<u>Titus Andronicus</u>	Printed	1600
<u>Merry Wives of Windsor</u>	Printed	1602
<u>Hamlet</u>	Printed	1603
<u>Twelfth Night</u>	Acted in the Middle Temple Hall	1602
<u>Othello</u>	Acted at Harefield	1602
<u>Measure for Measure</u>	Acted at Whitehall	1604
<u>Lear</u>	Printed 1608. Acted at Whitehall	1607
<u>Taming of the Shrew</u>	Supposed to have been acted at Hens-low's Theatre, 1593. Entered at Stationers' Hall	1607
<u>Troilus and Cressida</u>	Printed 1609. Previously acted at Court	1609
<u>Pericles</u>	Printed	1609
<u>The Tempest</u>	Acted at Whitehall	1611

APPENDIX K CONTINUED

KNIGHT'S CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF SHAKSPERE'S PLAYS*

Title	Reference	Date
<u>The Winter's Tale</u>	Acted at Whitehall	1611
<u>Henry VIII</u>	Acted as a new play when the Globe was burned	1613

Out of the thirty-seven Plays of Shakspeare the dates of thirty-one are to some extent fixed in epochs. These dates are, of course, to be modified by other circumstances. There are only six plays remaining, whose dates are not thus limited by publication, by the notice of contemporaries, or by the record of their performances; these certainly belong to the poet's latter period. They are:-- Macbeth, Cymbeline, Timon of Athens, Julius Caesar, Antony and Cleopatra, and Coriolanus.

*Knight, Works of Shakespeare, I, 2.

APPENDIX L

A PAGE FROM N. E. S. A. HAMILTON'S AN INQUIRY*

34

INQUIRY INTO

"EMENDATIONS" IN THE PLAY OF "HAMLET," FROM THE "CORRECTED FOLIO" 1632.

[The left-hand column contains the printed text of the folio 1632. The words, letters, &c., to the right placed between crotchets, refer to words, letters, &c. in italic, and placed between crotchets in the text, and exhibit the manuscript "*corrections*" found on the margins of Mr. J. P. Collier's "Corrected Folio," 1632, such of these as have been published by Mr. Collier in the Complete List being distinguished by the letter C. The foot-notes show the sources from which the manuscript corrections to which they refer were originally derived.]

p. 272, col. 1.	<i>Printed Text of Folio 1632.</i>	<i>MS. Corrections.</i>
	<i>Enter</i> BERNARDO <i>and</i> FRANCISCO.	[Act I.]
	BAR. Tis n[o]w struck twelve[,] get thee to bed, Francisco.	[e] ¹ C.[:] [,]
	[MAR.] What, ha's this thing appear'd againe	[HOR.] ²
	Wh[o]n yond same Starre, that's Westward	[e] ³ [,]
col. 2.	The Bell then [beating] one	[tolling] this in a modern hand in ink, but afterwards partially obliterated.
	<i>Enter the Ghost.</i>	[armed]
	BAR. Looke, it not like the King?	[s] ⁴
	HOR. Most like [:]	[.] with pencil cross in margin.
	When, th' Ambitious Norway combatted	[he] ⁵ C.
	He smot, the sledded Pollax	[e] with pencil mark.
	MAR. Thus twice before, and just at this [same] houre	[dead] ⁶ afterwards part. oblit.
	HOR. In what particular [thoughte to] worke	[it] partially obliterated.

¹ Steevens. ² 4to 1604. ³ 4tos and fol. 1623. ⁴ 4tos. ⁵ 4tos. ⁶ Fol. 1623, and 1st and 2nd 4tos.

*N. E. S. A. Hamilton, An Inquiry Into the Genuineness of the Manuscript Corrections in Mr. J. Payne Collier's Annotated Shakespeare Folio, 1632 (London: Richard Bentley, 1860), p. 34.

APPENDIX M

LIST OF EDITIONS CONSULTED BY HALLIWELL

Title	Format	Date
<u>The Tempest</u>	First folio	No quarto
<u>Two Gentlemen of Verona</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>Merry Wives of Windsor</u>	ib.	No early authentic quarto
<u>Measure for Measure</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>Comedy of Errors</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>Much Ado about Nothing</u>	ib.	Quarto, 1600
<u>Love's Labour's Lost</u>	ib.	Quarto, 1598
<u>A Midsummer Night's Dream</u>	ib.	Quarto, 1600
<u>The Merchant of Venice</u>	ib.	Quarto, 1600
<u>As You Like It</u>	First folio	No quarto
<u>The Taming of the Shrew</u>	ib.	No early quarto
<u>All's Well that Ends Well</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>Twelfth Night, or What You Will</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>The Winter's Tale</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>King John</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>Richard II</u>	ib.	Quarto, 1597
<u>Henry IV. Two Parts</u>	ib.	Quartos, 1598, 1600
<u>Henry V</u>	ib.	No early authentic quarto
<u>Henry VI, Part 1</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>Henry VI, Parts 2 and 3</u>	ib.	No early authentic quarto
<u>Richard III</u>	ib.	Quarto, 1597
<u>Henry VIII</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>Troilus and Cressida</u>	ib.	Quarto, 1609
<u>Coriolanus</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>Titus Andronicus</u>	ib.	Quarto, 1594
<u>Romeo and Juliet</u>	ib.	Authentic quarto, 1599
<u>Timon of Athens</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>Julius Caesar</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>Macbeth</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>Hamlet</u>	ib.	Authentic quarto, 1604
<u>King Lear</u>	ib.	Quarto, 1608
<u>Othello</u>	ib.	Quarto, 1622
<u>Antony and Cleopatra</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>Cymbeline</u>	ib.	No quarto
<u>Pericles</u>	Third folio	Quarto, 1609

APPENDIX N

LIST OF EDITIONS CONSULTED BY DYCE

<u>Quartos</u>			
<u>King Richard II</u>	1597	<u>A Midsummer Night's Dream</u>	1600*
	1598		
	1608*	<u>Much Ado About Nothing</u>	1600
	1615		
		<u>Titus Andronicus</u>	1600
<u>King Richard III</u>	1597		1611
	1598		
	1602	<u>Merry Wives of Windsor</u>	1602
	1605		1619
<u>Romeo and Juliet</u>	1597	<u>Hamlet</u>	1603
	1599		1604
			1611
<u>Love's Labour's Lost</u>	1598		[n.d.]
<u>King Henry IV, Part 1</u>	1598	<u>King Lear</u>	1608*
	1599		
	1604	<u>Troilus and Cressida</u>	1609*
	1608		
		<u>Pericles</u>	1609
<u>King Henry IV, Part 2</u>	1600		1619
<u>King Henry V</u>	1600	<u>Othello</u>	1622
	1602		1630
	1608		
		<u>The Taming of the Shrew</u>	1631
<u>The Merchant of Venice</u>	1600*		

Folios

<u>Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories &</u>	1623
<u>Tragedies</u>	1632
	1663**
	1664
	1685

*Two editions

**Copies so dated do not contain the seven spurious plays (Dyce, I, 176).

APPENDIX O

COPIES REFERENCED BY STAUNTON IN HIS NOTES TO ROMEO AND JULIET

Quartos

1597

1599

1609

[n.d.]

Folios

First Folio, 1623

Second Folio, 1632

Modern Editions

Rowe

Steevens

Theobald

Malone

Johnson

Knight

Warburton

Collier

Capell

APPENDIX P

THE VARIORUM EDITIONS OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS*

Title	Editor	Date
<u>Romeo and Juliet</u>	Horace Howard Furness	1871
<u>Macbeth</u>	Horace Howard Furness	1873
<u>Hamlet</u> (2 vols.)	Horace Howard Furness	1877
<u>King Lear</u>	Horace Howard Furness	1880
<u>Othello</u>	Horace Howard Furness	1886
<u>The Merchant of Venice</u>	Horace Howard Furness	1888
<u>As You Like It</u>	Horace Howard Furness	1890
<u>The Tempest</u>	Horace Howard Furness	1892
<u>A Midsummer Night's Dream</u>	Horace Howard Furness	1895
<u>The Winter's Tale</u>	Horace Howard Furness	1900
<u>Much Ado About Nothing</u>	Horace Howard Furness	1900
<u>Twelfth Night</u>	Horace Howard Furness	1902
<u>Loves Labour's Lost</u>	Horace Howard Furness	1904
<u>Antony and Cleopatra</u>	Horace Howard Furness	1907
<u>Richard III</u>	Horace Howard Furness, Jr.	1908
<u>Julius Caesar</u>	Horace Howard Furness, Jr.	1913
<u>Cymbeline</u>	Horace Howard Furness	1913
<u>King John</u>	Horace Howard Furness, Jr.	1919
<u>Coriolanus</u>	Horace Howard Furness, Jr.	1928
<u>Henry IV, Part 1</u>	Samuel Burdett Hemingway	1936
<u>Henry IV, Part 2</u>	Matthias A. Shaaber	1940
<u>Troilus and Cressida</u>	Harold N. Hillebrand	1953
<u>Richard II</u>	Matthew W. Black	1955

*Three other volumes of Shakespeare's writings have been published as part of the Variorum:

The Poems	Hyder Edward Rollins	1938
The Sonnets (2 vols.)	Hyder Edward Rollins	1944

APPENDIX Q

THE EDITIONS COLLATED BY HORACE HOWARD FURNESS IN HIS PREPARATION OF THE VARIORUM TEXT OF ROMEO AND JULIET

Edition	Date
The First Quarto	1597
The Second Quarto	1599
The Third Quarto	1609
The Fourth Quarto	[n.d.]
The First Folio	1623
The Second Folio	1632
The Fifth Quarto	1637
The Third Folio	1664
The Fourth Folio	1685
Rowe	1709
Pope (First Edition)	1725
Pope (Second Edition)	1728
Theobald (First Edition)	1733
Theobald (Second Edition)	1740
Hanmer	1744
Warburton	1747
Johnson	1765
Capell	1768
Rann	1786-1794
Steevens	1793
The Third Variorum [Boswell]	1821
Harness	1825
Singer (First Edition)	1826
Campbell	1838
Knight (First Edition)	1838
Cornwall	1839
Collier (First Edition)	1842
Verplanck	1847
Hazlitt	1851
Ulrici	1853
Delius	1855
Hudson	1856
Singer (Second Edition)	1856
Dyce (First Edition)	1857
Staunton	1857
Collier (Second Edition)	1858
R. G. White	1861
Chambers	1862

APPENDIX Q CONTINUED

THE EDITIONS COLLATED BY HORACE HOWARD FURNESS IN HIS
PREPARATION OF THE VARIORUM TEXT OF ROMEO AND JULIET

Edition	Date
Charles and Mary Cowden Clarke	1864
Halliwell (Folio Edition)	1864
Knight (Second Edition)	1864
Dyce (Second Edition)	1865
The Cambridge Edition [Clark and Wright]	1865
Keightley	1865

ACT II, SC. II.]

ROMEO AND JULIET.

103

Rom. Lady, by yonder blessed moon I swear,
That tips with silver all these fruit-tree tops,—

Jul. O, swear not by the moon, th' inconstant moon,
That monthly changes in her circled orb, 110
Lest that thy love prove likewise variable.

Rom. What shall I swear by?

Jul. Do not swear at all;
Or, if thou wilt, swear by thy gracious self,
Which is the god of my idolatry,
And I'll believe thee.

Rom. If my heart's dear love— 115

Jul. Well, do not swear. Although I joy in thee,

- | | |
|--|--|
| 107. <i>blessed</i>] Qq. om. Ff, Rowe. | Capell from (Q ₁), Var. Knt. Sing. Dyce |
| <i>swear</i>] (Q ₁) Mal. <i>vow</i> QqFf, | (ed. 1), Sta. Ktly. |
| Pope, &c. Capell, Del. Sta. | <i>inconstant</i>] <i>unconstant</i> F.F. |
| 108. <i>tops,—</i>] Capell. <i>tops</i> — Rowe. | 113. <i>gracious</i>] <i>glorious</i> (Q ₁) White. |
| <i>Tops.</i> QqFf. | 115. <i>heart's dear</i>] <i>true heart's</i> (Q ₁) |
| 109. <i>th' inconstant</i>] <i>the inconstant</i> | Pope, &c. |

107. *swear*] ULR. *Swear*, although quite synonymous with *vow*, is required by the reply of Juliet.

DEL. The ascent from *vow* to *swear* in Juliet's reply seems to have been intended by the poet.

S. WALKER. ('*Crit.*' vol. i, p. 215). The folio omits *blessed*, and has *vow* for *swear*. Can this have originated in the Profanation Act?

108. *tips with silver*] HOLT WHITE. This image struck Pope: 'The *moonbeam* trembling falls, And *tips with silver all* the walls.'—*Imit. of Horace*. Again, in the celebrated simile on the *moon* at the conclusion of the eighth book of the *Iliad*: 'And *tips with silver* every mountain's head.' [*Sing. Verp.*]

VERP. Tom Moore has put it to a profane use in the way of parody, when, alluding to the rouge with which his dandy sovereign used to disguise the ravages of age, he makes it, '— tip his whiskers' top with red.'

109. *the moon*] HUNTER. This was a commonplace comparison when Sh. made it, and has been made more commonplace by his successful use of it. Thus Wilson, in his *Rhetorique*, chapter on Amplification, 'as in speaking of constancy, to shew the sun who ever keepeth one course; in speaking of inconstancy, to shew the moon which keepeth no certain course.' I have already remarked upon the resemblance of the moonlit garden of Verona to the moonlit garden of Belmont; both scenes among the most delicious creations of fancy. At Belmont the silver light of the moon fell upon a pair not unhappily united; here it falls on an impassioned youth in the hour of his proudest exultation, soon to be followed by deepest anxieties, misery and death. Such is life!

113. *gracious self*] WHITE. 'Thy gracious self' of QqFf is less suitable to *Juliet's* mood, and to the remainder of her speech, in my judgment, and in that of a most intelligent and sympathetic reader of her own sex, to whom I referred the question.

*Horace Howard Furness, *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Romeo and Juliet* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1871), p. 103.

APPENDIX S

INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THE VARIORUM EDITION OF
JULIUS CAESAR, EDITED BY HORACE HOWARD FURNESS, JR.

Preface

Text

*Notes

*Commentary

Appendix

*The Text

*Date of Composition

*Source of the Plot

Character of Caesar

Character of Brutus

*Criticisms

*Stage History

*List of Editions Collated

*List of Books Consulted

Index**

*This information is similar in plan and purpose to that of Furness and therefore follows his principles enumerated in the preface to Romeo and Juliet.

**Furness did not provide an index to volumes 1 and 2 (Romeo and Juliet and Macbeth). He began indexing his volumes with volume 3, Hamlet.

APPENDIX T

INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THE VARIORUM EDITION OF HENRY IV, PART 1, EDITED BY SAMUEL BURDETT HEMINGWAY

Preface

*List of Editions Collated

Table of Contents

Text

*Notes

*Commentary

Appendix

*The Text

*Date of Composition

*Sources of the Plot

*General Criticism

Characters

Falstaff

Prince Hal

Hotspur

King Henry

Glendower

John of Lancaster

Sir Walter Blunt

Poins

Bardolph

Peto

Lady Percy

Mistress Quickly

*Stage History

Stage Versions

List of Abbreviations

*List of Books

*Index

*This information is similar in plan and purpose to that of Furness and therefore follows his principles enumerated in the preface to Romeo and Juliet.

APPENDIX U

INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THE VARIORUM EDITION OF HENRY IV, PART 2, EDITED BY MATTHIAS A. SHAABER

Preface

Table of Contents

The Plan of the Work**

Text

*Textual Notes

*Commentary

Appendix

*The Text

*Date of Composition

Authenticity of the Text

*The Sources

*Criticisms

Characters

Falstaff

The King

The Prince

Prince John

The Archbishop

The Chief Justice

Northumberland

Shallow and Silence

Pistol

The Page

The Hostess

Doll Tearsheet

Acting Versions

*Stage History

*List of Works Consulted

*Index

*This information is similar in plan and purpose to that of Furness and therefore follows his principles enumerated in the preface to Romeo and Juliet.

**Includes a list of the editions collated.

APPENDIX V

INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THE VARIORUM EDITION OF TROILUS AND CRESSIDA, EDITED BY HAROLD N. HILLEBRAND

Preface

Table of Contents

Plan of the Work**

Text

*Textual Notes

*Commentary

Appendix

The Printing of Quarto and Folio***

*Sources

*Criticisms

General

Characters

Troilus

Cressida

Pandarus

Thersites

Ulysses

Ajax

Achilles

Helen

Hector

*List of Works Consulted

*Index

*This information is similar in plan and purpose to that of Furness and therefore follows his principles enumerated in the preface to Romeo and Juliet.

**Includes a list of the works collated.

***This information is found under the general heading "The Text" in all other volumes of the Variorum. In his discussion Hillebrand included information on manuscript sources, early stage history, and the date of composition.

APPENDIX W

INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THE VARIORUM EDITION OF THE LIFE AND DEATH OF KING RICHARD THE SECOND, EDITED BY MATTHEW W. BLACK

Preface

Table of Contents

Plan of the Work**

Text

*Textual Notes

*Commentary

Appendix

*The Text

*Date of Composition

Authenticity of the Text

Dramatic Time

*Sources

*Criticisms

General

Characters

Richard

York

Gaunt

Bolinbroke

Aumerle

Mowbray

Northumberland

Hotspur

The Bishop of Carlisle

The Gardener

The Groom

The Queen

The Duchesses of York and Gloucester

*Stage History

*List of Works Consulted

*Index

*This information is similar in plan and purpose to that of Furness and therefore follows his principles enumerated in the preface to Romeo and Juliet. **Includes a list of the works collated.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bartlett, Henrietta C. Mr. William Shakespeare. Original and Early Editions of his Quartos and Folios, His Source Book, and Those Containing Contemporary Notices. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922.
- Bentley, Gerald Eades. Shakespeare and His Theatre. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964.
- Black, Matthew W. "Shakespeare's Seventeenth Century Editors." American Philosophical Society Proceedings, LXVI (1936), 707-717.
- Black, Matthew W. and Shaaber, Matthias A. Shakespeare's Seventeenth Century Editors, 1632-1685. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1937.
- [Boswell, James], ed. The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. 21 vols. London: C. Baldwin, 1821.
- Bowers, Fredson. On Editing Shakespeare. Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1966.
- _____. On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Library, 1955.
- _____. Principles of Bibliographical Description. New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1949.
- _____. "Shakespeare's Text and the Bibliographical Method." Studies in Bibliography, VI (1954), 71-91.
- _____. Textual and Literary Criticism. Cambridge: University Press, 1959.
- _____. "Today's Shakespeare Texts, and Tomorrow's." Studies in Bibliography, XIX (1966), 39-65.
- Brown, Arthur. "Editorial Problems in Shakespeare: Semi-Popular Editions." Studies in Bibliography, VIII (1956), 15-26.
- _____. "The Great Variety of Readers." Shakespeare Survey. Ed. Allardyce Nicoll. Cambridge: University Press, 1969, XVIII, 11-22.

- Bulloch, John. Studies on the Text of Shakespeare: With Numerous Emendations and Appendices. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co., 1878.
- Butt, John. Pope's Taste in Shakespeare. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.
- Campbell, Oscar James, ed. The Reader's Encyclopedia of Shakespeare. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1966.
- Capell, Edward, ed. Mr. William Shakespeare: His Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies. 10 vols. London: J. & R. Tonson, 1768.
- Chambers, Sir Edmund Kerchever. "The Unrest in Shakespearean Studies." Nineteenth Century and After, CI (February 1927), 255-266.
- Clark, William George and Wright, William Aldis, eds. The Works of William Shakespeare. 16 vols. Philadelphia: George Barne & Son, Publishers, 1899.
- _____. The Works of William Shakespeare. Globe Edition. Cambridge; 1864; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1970.
- Collier, J. Payne. Notes and Emendations to the Text of Shakespeare's Plays from Early Manuscript Corrections in the Copy of the Folio, 1632. London: Whittaker and Co., 1953.
- _____, ed. The Works of William Shakespeare. The Text Formed From an Entirely New Collation of the Old Editions: with the Various Readings, Notes, a Life of the Poet, and a History of the Early English Stage. 8 vols. + supplement. London: Whittaker & Co., 1844.
- Dawson, Giles E. "Warburton, Hammer, and the 1745 Edition of Shakespeare." Studies in Bibliography, II (1949), 35-48.
- Delius, Nicolaus, ed. Shakspeare's Werke. 7 vols. Elberfeld: Verlag von R. L. Friderichs, 1859.
- Dyce, Alexander. A Few Notes on Shakespeare; with Occasional Remarks on the Emendations of the Manuscript-Corrector in Mr. Collier's Copy of the Folio 1632. London: John Russell Smith, 1853.
- _____. Remarks on Mr. J. P. Collier's and Mr. C. Knight's Editions of Shakespeare. London: 1844; rpt. New York: AMS Press Inc., 1972.

- _____, ed. The Works of William Shakespeare, 4th ed. 10 vols. London: Bickers & Son, 1880.
- Furness, Horace Howard, et al., eds. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. 27 vols. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1871-1955.
- Furness, Horace Howard, Jr. "Shakespearean Editors Past and Present." Library Journal, XXXV (March 1910), 112-113.
- Greg, W. W. "The First Folio and Its Publishers." Studies in the First Folio. London: Oxford University Press, 1924, pp. 129-156.
- _____. "McKerrow's 'Prolegomena' Reconstructed." Review of English Studies, XVII (April 1941), 139-149.
- _____. "Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare." Proceedings of the British Academy, XIV (1928), 148-216.
- _____. The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Guppy, Henry. A Brief Summary of the History of the "First-Folio" Edition of Shakespeare's Dramas, 1623-1923. Manchester: The University Press, 1923.
- Halliwell, J. O. Curiosities of Modern Shakesperian Criticism. London: John Russell Smith, 1953.
- _____, ed. The Works of William Shakespeare. 16 vols. London: C. & J. Adlard, 1953.
- Hanmer, Thomas, ed. The Works of Shakespear. 6 vols. Oxford: The Theater, 1744.
- _____. The Plays of William Shakespeare. 8 vols. London: C. Bathurst, 1765.
- Hamilton, N. E. S. A. An Inquiry Into the Genuineness of the Manuscript Corrections in Mr. J. Payne Collier's Annotated Shakespeare Folio, 1632. London: Richard Bentley, 1860.
- Hinman, Charlton, ed. The First Folio of Shakespeare: The Norton Facsimile. New York: Norton, 1968.
- _____. The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1963.

- _____. "Shakespeare's Text--Then, Now and Tomorrow." Shakespeare Survey. Ed. Allardyce Nicoll. Cambridge: University Press, 1969, XVIII, 23-33.
- Howard-Hill, T. H. Shakespearian Bibliography and Textual Criticism: A Bibliography. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Hudson, Henry N., ed. The Complete Works of William Shakespeare. 20 vols. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1886.
- Ingleby, C. M. Shakespeare Hermeneutics: or The Still Lion, Being an Essay towards the Restoration of Shakespeare's Text. London: Trubner & Co., 1875.
- Johnson, Samuel. Prose and Poetry. Ed. Mona Wilson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- _____. The Plays of William Shakespeare. 8 vols. London: C. Bathurst, 1765.
- Johnson, Samuel and Steevens, George, eds. The Plays of William Shakespeare. 10 vols. London: C. Bathurst, 1785.
- Knight, Charles, ed. The Works of Shakespeare. 2 vols. New York: Virtue & Yorston, [n.d.]
- Lounsbury, Thomas R. The Text of Shakespeare: Its History from the Publication of the Quartos and Folios Down to and Including the Publication of the Editions of Pope and Theobald. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.
- Malone, Edmond, ed. The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. 10 vols. London: 1790; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1968.
- McKerrow, Ronald B. An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1928.
- _____. Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare: A Study in Editorial Method. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1939.
- _____. "The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text by his Earlier Editors, 1709-1768." Studies in Shakespeare. Ed. Peter Alexander. London: Oxford University Press, 1964, pp. 103-131.
- Milwaukee Public Library. William Shakespeare: His Editors and Editions, 1964.

- Murray, James A. H., ed. A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles; founded mainly on the materials collected by The Philological Society. 10 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1909.
- Nicoll, Allardyce. "The Editors of Shakespeare from First Folio to Malone." Studies in Shakespeare. Ed. Peter Alexander. London: Oxford University Press, 1924, pp. 157-178.
- Pollard, Alfred W. The Foundations of Shakespeare's Text. London: Oxford University Press, 1923.
- _____. Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates and the Problems of the Transmission of his Text. London: Alexander Moring Limited, 1917; 2nd ed., rev. Cambridge: University Press, 1920.
- Pope, Alexander, ed. The Works of Shakespeare. 6 vols. London: Jacob Tonson, 1723-1725; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1969.
- Raleigh, Walter. Johnson on Shakespeare. London: Oxford University Press, 1908.
- Rowe, N[icolas]. The Works of Mr. William Shakespear. 6 vols. London: 1709; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1967.
- Shaabber, Matthias A. "The Furness Variorum of Shakespeare." American Philosophical Society Proceedings, LXXV (1935), 281-285.
- Sherbo, Arthur. Samuel Johnson, Editor of Shakespeare. Vo. 42. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1956.
- Shroeder, John W. The Great Folio of 1623: Shakespeare's Plays in the Printing House. [n.p.]: The Shoe String Press, 1956.
- Singer, Samuel Weller. The Text of Shakespeare Vindicated from the Interpolations and Corrections Advocated by John Payne Collier Esq. in His Notes and Emendations. London: William Pickering, 1853.
- Smith, D. Nicol, ed. Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare. New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1962.
- _____. Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1928.
- Staunton, Howard, ed. The Works of Shakespeare. 3 vols. London: George Routledge and Sons., 1857.

- Stavisky, Aron Y. Shakespeare and the Victorians: Roots of Modern Criticism. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969.
- Steevens, George, ed. Twenty of the Plays of Shakespeare, Being the whole Number printed in Quarto During his Lifetime, or before the Restoration. 4 vols. London, 1766; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1968.
- Theobald, Lewis. Preface to the Works of Shakespeare. London, 1734; rpt. Los Angeles: University of California, 1949.
- _____. Shakespeare Restored: or, A Specimen of the Many Errors as well Committed, as Unamended, by Mr. Pope in his Late Edition of this Poet. London: R. Franklin, 1726; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1970.
- _____, ed. The Works of Shakespeare in Eight Volumes. 8 vols. London: C. Bathurst, 1773.
- Van Dam, B. A. P. William Shakespeare: Prosody and the Text: An Essay in Criticism, Being an Introduction to a Better Editing and a More Adequate Appreciation of the Works of the Elizabethan Poets. London: Williams & Norgate, [n.d.].
- Vaughan, Henry Halford. New Readings & New Renderings of Shakespeare's Tragedies. 2nd ed. London: Kegan Paul, French, & Co., 1886.
- Walder, Ernest. "The Text of Shakespeare." The Cambridge History of English Literature, V (1910), 289-312.
- Walker, Alice. "Edward Capell and His Edition of Shakespeare." Studies in Shakespeare. Ed. Peter Alexander. London: Oxford University Press, 1964, pp. 132-148.
- _____. Textual Problems of the First Folio. Cambridge: University Press, 1953.
- Warburton, William, ed. The Works of Shakespear in Eight Volumes. 8 vols. London: Jacob Tonson, 1747; rpt. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1968.
- Warner, Beverly, ed. Famous Introductions to Shakespeare's Plays by the Notable Editors of the Eighteenth Century. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1906.
- Wheatley, Henry B. "Shakespeare's Editors, 1623-To the Twentieth Century." Transactions of the Bibliographical Society, XIV (October 1915 to March 1917), 145-173.

- Williams, Philip, Jr. "New Approaches to Textual Problems in Shakespeare." Studies in Bibliography, VIII (1956), 3-14.
- Wilson, F. P. Shakespeare and the New Bibliography. Rev. and ed. Helen Gardner. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Wilson, J. Dover. "The Task of Heminge and Condell." Studies in the First Folio. London: Oxford University Press, 1924, pp. 53-77.