Premier Critical Perspective | Vol. 5, Issue 1, July 2021 | 01-34

Discussing the Trends in the Editing of Shakespeare's Plays: From the Early 17th Century to the Postmodern Time

Mohit Ul Alam*

Abstract

This paper summarizes the editing trends on Shakespeare's works from the early modern period to the advent of digital texts. In doing this, I have highlighted the moral burden with which editors from Heminges and Condell through the eighteenth-century editors down to the New Bibliographers have tried to improve on Shakespeare, or, thereby, to re-present him from different editorial perspectives: from viewing the editor as a parent to viewing him as an inspector of facts and figures. In preparing this essay I have depended on certain scholarly essays, which I have acknowledged within the text. I have also stood by the postmodernist perception that a unitary text for a Shakespearean play is never possible to establish.

On 25th August 1987, I bought a copy of *Hamlet* from a bookshop at College Street in Kolkata. It was the *Arden Shakespeare* Hamlet edited by Harold Jenkins and published by Methuen simultaneously from London and New York in 1982. Before this, I of course read Shakespeare in a perfunctory manner at the graduate and post-graduate levels as a student and also afterwards when I became a teacher at a university. But this edition of *Hamlet* sort of opened my eyes to the importance of editing a Shakespearean text. Until this point of time, I always thought there was only one fixed copy for each play by Shakespeare, but having gone through this Jenkins's text I became aware that not only *Hamlet* but all plays and poems by Shakespeare have undergone from minor to major editorial changes over the centuries. This is a new kind of reality that dawned on me, and I found myself taking interest in the changes of words, phrases, punctuations, stage directions, and many other aspects that have become the issues of editorial studies dealing with the quartos and the First Folio of 1623, and all this for chasing, in the language of Greenblatt, a dream of the master text (71).[1]

*Mohit Ul Alam, PhD
Professor
Department of English Language and Literature (DELL), Premier University.
Email: mohitalam1952@gmail.com

[1] Stephen Greenblatt, et al. eds. *The Norton Shakespeare Based on the Oxford Edition* (New York. London. W. W. Norton and Company, 1997).

Most importantly, my attention got drawn to the editorial excogitation Jenkins offers on the use of the word "sullied" in Hamlet's first soliloquy, "O that this too too sullied flesh would melt" (1.2.129)[2]. In the LN (Long Notes) Jenkins begins his more than one and a half pages of discussion with "The most debated reading in the play in recent years." (Jenkins 436) In the F1, the word is printed as *solid*, whereas Q1 and Q2 have it as *sallied*, and Jenkins having made a thorough examination of the variants of the word *solid*, *sallies* and *sullied*, accepts John Dover Wilson's modification to *sullied*, who speculated that *sallied* was the misspelled form of *sullied*, and comes to an interpretative conclusion that "The possibility of an intended play on both words [*solid* and *sullied*] cannot be ruled out; but what happens perhaps is that by a natural mental process the word (*sullied*) which gives at once the clue to the emotion which the soliloquy will express, brings to mind its near-homonym (*solid*), which helps to promote the imagery of *melt*, *thaw*, *resolve*, *dew*." (Jenkins 437-38)

In course of time I also got my hand to editing *Hamlet* for a Bangladeshi publisher, the *albatross classics* based in Dhaka, in which I safely retained Jenkins's "sullied" with a footnote that it looks to be the more appropriate word for 'contamination' as suggested by Jenkins to be dominant on Hamlet's mind.[3] This engagement with editing of *Hamlet* extended further into the editing of *Macbeth* for the same publisher, which is finished and awaiting publication, though before this, however, I edited *As You Like It* for the same publisher in 2014.

I grew interest in knowing more about the editorial history of Shakespeare's works, and this present paper is very much a reflection of my research on the history of the editorial business in Shakespeare. Before I start discussing my ideas, I must first refer to an essay by Fredson Bowers, entitled "Scholarship and Editing," to understand the nature of the difficulty in editing Shakespeare. Bowers narrates an encounter with a famous Shakespearean scholar (not named) who dampened his editorial spirit by saying that it did not matter to him "whether Hamlet's flesh was solid or sullied." (164)[4]

---

[2] For all quotations from Shakespeare, the edition followed is *The Arden Shakespeare, Complete Works, Revised Edition*. Edited by Richard Proudfoot, Ann Thompson, and David Scott Kastan. Consultant Editor Harold Jenkins. First published by Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, from London in 1998. But at this point Jenkins's isolated edition of *Hamlet* is referred to, pages 436-438.

[3] *Hamlet*, ed. Mohit Ul Alam (Dhaka: albatross classics, 2019), p. 26.

[4] Fredson Bowers, "Scholarship and Editing," in *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, Second Quarter, 1976, Vol. 70, No. 2 (Second Quarter, 1976), pp. 161-188. Published by the University of Chicago Press on behalf of the Bibliographical Society of America, Stable URL: http://www.jstor.com/stable/24302091.

The scholars' unresolved debate with the 'solid-sullied' pair opens up the whole debate between textual studies and critical studies. Let us, for a starter, refer to Swinburne's emphatic disapprobation of the painstaking editorial hard work of Furnivall (discussed later in this essay) or, contrarily, Bowers's sticking to a non-complacent view about editing, giving no room to nonfactual critical conjectures (also discussed later in this essay) to say that in Shakespeare studies the critical apparatus and the textual apparatus do not often agree on findings and neither do they offer similar conclusions.

But my aim in this paper is not to discuss the binarily oppositional approaches of textual and critical studies but to concentrate on the textual studies mainly and summarize the important approaches or movements or trends from the early modern time to the twenty-first century. I must make a disclaimer that about the subject matter itself, that is, editing Shakespeare, there is no way one can comprehensively arrive at any definite conclusion, as the subject has grown quite large over the centuries and is crisscrossed with diversified arguments, all of which look equally tenable. Again, in discussing the textual apparatus, I am concentrating on the reading text, for which the critical nomenclature goes as 'Shakespeare, the page', with very little reference to the performance text or 'Shakespeare, the stage'. Another further disclaimer to make is that in preparing this paper I have very largely depended on several downloaded essays from *jstor.com*, which appears to me to be a major source of information and interpretation, particularly in a situation, where gaining possession of printed books as many as one would like to have is delimited by extra-textual or paraliterary factors, like the foreign-book procuring policies, etc. So, the digital archive has been the main source for me to develop this essay. In respect of spellings, I have followed the British English spellings, though I did not meddle with the spellings in the quoted passages by the scholars.

I

Ben Johnson, the rival poet, and friend of Shakespeare contributed a panegyrical poem to the Folio edition, known as F1, which was jointly edited by two of Shakespeare's actor-friends, John Heminges and Henry Condell, titled *The Works of William Shakespeare, containing all his Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies: Truly set forth, according to their Original.*[5] Jonson, in his poem, addressed "To the memory of my beloved, the Author, Master William Shakespeare," raised this slight objection

[5] Stephen Greenblatt, et al. eds. *The Norton Shakespeare Based on the Oxford Edition* (New York. London. W. W. Norton and Company, 1997), p. 1084.

to Shakespeare's poetry that he gave preference to natural spontaneity disregarding the discipline of art: "Yet must I not give nature all; thy art, / My gentle Shakespeare, . . ./ For a good poet's made as well as born." (Greenblatt, *Norton Shakespeare* 1080). A poet is not only a genius by birth, but he also strives to become a genius. Noticing Shakespeare's indifference towards this discipling factor, Jonson thought that there was enough room left in Shakespeare's works to be improved.

This presence of clumsiness in his works is also harped on by the F1 editors in their editorial note to "The great variety of readers," where they wished that "the author himself had lived to have set forth and overseen his own writings," which was never to be, as "he by death departed from that right." They further requested the readers to realize that they (the readers) had been "abused with divers stolen and surreptitious copies, maimed and deformed by the frauds and stealths of injurious imposters." They assured that the folio edition "offered to your view [a text which is] cured, and [made] perfect of their limbs; and all the rest absolute in their numbers, as he conceived them." (Greenblatt, *Norton Shakespeare* 1078).

From the beginning of the publication history of Shakespeare, this is to be noted that efforts have been made in a twofold manner by editors to present him either (a) in an authentic form or (b) in a more modified form to make him acceptable to the contemporary readers/audience of every given age. I am going to discuss in a historical narrative how this twofold approach has enlivened the overall Shakespeare studies. As I will cover a long period from the early seventeenth century to the early twenty-first century, my paper will provide a summary of all the major editorial trends within the stipulated period rather than make detailed critical comments. That is to say, I will try to familiarize the readers with divers editorial trends rather than pass critical judgment on them.

II
The Desire for Editing

Focusing on the F1 editors' wish that if "the author himself had lived to have set forth and overseen his writings," W. W. Greg loves to conjecture that perhaps Shakespeare had such a plan of revising or editing his works and had discussed the matter with his friends, Heminges and Condell: "Is this merely rhetorical regret, or is it a hint of a project actually discussed? We can never know. Only

we can say that had the dream come true the editorial problem in Shakespeare might have been very different from what it is."[6]

If we go back to the eighteenth century, we hear this wry comment from Samuel Johnson, recorded in his Preface to his 1765 edition of Shakespeare, *The Plays of William Shakespeare*:

> So careless was this great poet of future fame, that, though he retired to ease and plenty, while he was yet little declined into the vale of years, before he could be disgusted with fatigue, or disabled by infirmity, he made no collection of his works, nor desired to rescue those that had been already published from the depravations that obscured them, or secure to the rest a better destiny, by giving them to the world in their genuine state. (Johnson xiv; Qtd by Murphy 205)

Far from Greg's hope or Jonson's admonition is Stephen Greenblatt's guess, which rather conforms to Johnson's sense of disappointment, that "there is no indication that he [Shakespeare] wanted to assert his authorial rights over his spirits." (Greenblatt, *Norton Shakespeare* 67) Greenblatt emphasizes that "The dream of the master text is a dream of transparency" (71), which is impossible to establish. He further argues that the present-day scholarship tends to view Shakespeare as a writer of "collaborative commercial enterprise" rather than a singular genius whose works had to remain unmediated. (Greenblat, *Norton Shakespeare* 68) Thus redefining Jonson's famous comment that "He was not of an age, but for all time!" Greenblatt stresses that the phrase "'To be 'not of an age, but for all time' means in Shakespeare's case not that the plays have achieved a static perfection, but that they are creatively, inexhaustibly unfinished." (Greenblatt, *Norton Shakespeare* 67)

Stephen Orgel, in his well-known essay,[7] "The Authentic Shakespeare," argues for a degree of relativism in the reception of Shakespeare. Authenticity, he said, was "a matter of authentication, something bestowed, not inherent" (Orgel 5). Having denied that 'an authentic Shakespeare' does necessarily mean the original Shakespeare since there is know way for sure to know about how much definite is a definitive Shakespearean text, or what Shakespeare actually wrote and

[6] Greg is quoted from his book, *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare: A Survey of the Foundations of the Text*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1951), 157 by Andrew Murphy in his essay, "To Ferret out Any Hidden Corruption": Shakespearean Editorial Metaphors" in Text, 1997, Vol. 10 (1997), pp. 202-219, Published by Indiana University Press; Stable URL: http:// www.jstor.com /stable/ 30228060. Pages 202-03.

[7] Stephen Orgel, "The Authentic Shakespeare," in *Representations*, No. 21 (Winter, 1988), pp. 1-25, Published by: University of California Press, Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2928375.

what he intended to write, it is better to fix the idea of the authentic Shakespeare by how he is editorially and critically established in every different age from every different perspective. That is, the original Shakespeare may not ever be found, but an authentic Shakespeare may be reconstructed. Orgel's concluding remarks are therefore suggestive of the idea that the text cannot be a reliable signified, but maybe a reliable signifier that provides scopes for reconstructing a Shakespearean text in a relative dimension bearing on circumstances and parameters unique to an editor.

In this essay, Orgel has discussed the various stage presentations of a particular scene in *Macbeth* (2.2), when Macbeth returns to Lady Macbeth after killing Duncan. Orgel stresses that the text itself is always indicating something beyond the text, which the editor and the director have to realize. The idea of authenticity thereby does not lie in any production of a play, it is the authenticity of the people who produce the play or edit the play in their own socio-literary contexts that determine it. He refers to David Garrick's 1744 production of *Macbeth* and says that though Garrick claimed it to be one "as written by Shakespeare" (Orgel 15) but in reality it was a much-changed play from that of Shakespeare. He omitted the Porter scene, the scene of Macduff's son dying, and the scene showing the testing of Macduff's loyalty by Malcolm. He also refers to the paintings of Garrick's performances in the said scene (2.2) by Johann Fuseli and Johann Zoffany respectively and says that while Fuseli's painting reduces the status of the characters from being tragic into caricatures, Zoffany's painting, despite being true to showing Mrs. Pritchard as taller than David Garrick (an amusing fact at the time) still lets her wear a costume as if she was going to join an evening party rather than playing in *Macbeth*. If these paintings are any indication of Garrick's actual performance, Orgel assumes that neither Garrick's claim for establishing the play "as written by Shakespeare," nor the painters' views of his performance, does dramatize Shakespeare truly, though it attests to what kind of authenticity does Garrick or the painters wants to give to the scene.

> The assumption is that texts are representations or embodiments of something else, and that it is that something else which the performer or editor undertakes to reveal. What we want is not the authentic play, with its unstable, infinitely reversible script, but an authentic Shakespeare, to whom every generation's version of a classic drama may be ascribed. (Orgel 24)

To enumerate Orgel's idea of the authentic Shakespeare, we can refer to the baffling kind of efforts expended in adjudging an authentic *Hamlet*. *Hamlet* was written between 1599 and 1601.[8] In the early seventeenth century three texts of it were available, Quarto 1 or Q1, Quarto 2 or Q2, and the text published in the Folio edition of 1623. Of course, no manuscript, fair copy, or promptbook was ever found of the play. Q1, published in 1603 was considered a 'bad quarto' by A. W. Pollard, the pioneer New Bibliographer, in 1909.[9] It was a pirated copy published without the knowledge of the playwright. It is thought to be produced, as W. W. Greg first said, from 'a memorial reconstruction' (Greg 131)[10], and usually, the player who performed the role of Marcellus is given the credit for such an accomplishment. Q1 has only 2154 lines. Q2, claiming to be published from Shakespeare's 'foul papers' contains 3723 lines. Seven copies of it do exist, of which three copies show the date as 1604 and four as 1605. The Folio 1623 text of *Hamlet* containing 3535 lines, printed from a playhouse manuscript, but also deriving from Q2, has omitted several passages from Q2 amounting to 222 lines but added five new passages for 81 lines. Many copies survive even to this day, but most importantly the 7th soliloquy, "How all occasions do inform against me" (4.4.34ff) is omitted[11].

Observing the difference between the titles, critic J. Gavin Paul writes that ". . . from its first incantations in print, *Hamlet* has registered such rift, with Q1 championing the play . . . and Q2 locating its authority in superior text." (391)[12] The Q1 title suggests its bias to performance and the Q2 to the superiority of the text. The title of the Q1 is "The Tragical History of Hamlet *Prince of Denmark*. By William Shakespeare. As it hath been diurse timis acted by his Highness seruants in the Cittie of London : as also in the two Vniversities of Cambridge

---

[8] See my Introduction in *Hamlet*, ed. Mohit Ul Alam (Dhaka: Albatross Classics, 2019), pp. xxi-xxxv, where I have also discussed Verity's claim for the time of composition to have extended even to 1602.

[9] A. W. Pollard, *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos: A Study in the Bibliography of Shakespeare's Plays*.

[10] Joe Falocco, "'This is too long': A Historically-Based Argument for Aggressively Editing Shakespeare in Performance," in *Shakespeare Bulletin*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Summer 2012), pp. 193-143, Published by The John Hopkins University Press, Stable URL: https: // www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26354854.

[11] Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, eds. *The Complete Works: The Oxford Companion* in 1988, did not include the soliloquy in the main body of the text, but printed it at the end of the play in "Additional Passages". Philip Edwards, ed. *Hamlet: Prince of Denmark, The New Cambridge Shakespeare* (1985) printed the soliloquy in its Q2-directed place but argued in his Introduction that Shakespeare meant to exclude it and put an instruction to that effect on the manuscript which got ignored by the compositor. And Stephen Greenblatt, et al., published the soliloquy in its original place but in italics. But Harold Jenkins, ed. *Hamlet, The Arden Shakespeare* (1982) included the soliloquy as retained by Q2 and supposes that Shakespeare oversaw the proof, and, thereby, it was authentic. (I have discussed this issue in greater detail in the Introduction to my edition of *Hamlet* cited earlier.)

12 J. Gavin Paul, "Performance as 'Punctuation': Editing Shakespeare in the eighteenth century," in *The Review of English Studies*, June 2010, New Series, Vol. 61. No 250 (June 2010), pp. 390-413, Published by Oxford University Press, Stable URL: http://www.jstor.com/stable/40783068.

and Oxford, and elsewhere. At London printed for N : L and John Trundell. 1603," whereas the Q2 title runs thus: "THE Tragical Historie of HAMLET, *Prince of Denmarke*. By William Shakespeare. Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much againe as it was, according to the true and perfect Coppie. At London, Printed by I. R. for N. L., and are to be sold at his shoppe under Saint Dustons Church in Fleetstreet. 1604."

Margreta de Grazia and Peter Stallybrass in an article entitled "The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text" argue that the problems in shaping an unmediated Shakespearean text may be encapsulated by explaining the following four factors: Work, Word, Author, and Paper.[13] On the problem related to 'Work', they bring up the dispute of the scholars regarding the texts of *King Lear*, mentioning that neither the 1608 quarto *Lear* nor the 1623 Folio *Lear* does perfectly represent "the *Lear* Shakespeare had written" (Grazia and Stallybrass 258). Rejecting the eighteenth-century editorial practice of having the two plays conflated as one, they mention Michael Warren, who in 1976 prescribed that the two versions of *King Lear* should be considered as distinct from each other. Greenblatt et al print three texts of *King Lear* in their Norton Shakespeare edition (1997) in the following manner: *The History of King Lear: the Quarto Text; The Tragedy of King Lear, the Folio Text*, and *The Tragedy of King Lear: A Conflated Text*. On the other hand, Michael Warren produced as many as four versions in *The Complete* King Lear *1608-1623*. (Grazia and Stallybrass 258)

But we must be aware of the fact that in any Shakespeare editing project every piece of assertion is invariably contested by a newer development of knowledge in editorializing. Brian Vickers published his outstanding book, *One King Lear* in 2016, in which he strongly argues in defense of the earlier decision--but somewhat made outdated the idea that 'One King Lear' was the source from which two texts appeare via corruption in Q1 and F1 respectively. (Vickers 196)[14] The case of *King Lear* is only one example of the textual anomalies that prevail all across Shakespeare's oeuvre presenting editorial cruces of all sorts. Honigmann asserted that a Shakespearean text had to be "infinitely adjustable" because of the various modes of performances "at the Globe or Blackfriars, at court, at private houses, [or] on provincial tours." (Falocco 136)

---

[13] Margreta de Grazia and Peter Stallybrass, "The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text," in *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Autumn, 1993, Vol. 44, No. 3 (Autumn, 1993), pp. 255-283, Published by Oxford University Press, Stable URL: http: // www.jstor.com/stable/2871419.

[14] Qtd by Hans Walter Gabbler, "Sourcing and Editing Shakespeare: The Bibliographical Fallacy," in his book, *Text Genetics in Literary Modernism and other Essays*, Published by Open Book Publishers, Stable URL: http://www.jstor.com/stable/j.ctv8-j3xd.12.

Paul Werstine reminds us of all other agents that drop out of this picture:

> [Shakespeare's] texts were open to penetration and alteration not only by Shakespeare himself and by his fellow actors but also by multiple theatrical and extra-theatrical scriveners, by theatrical annotators, adapters, and revisers (who might cut or add), by censors, and by compositors and proofreaders." (Qtd by Grazia and Stallybrass 279).

'Word' presents another formidable job in determining which word or phrase did Shakespeare use. Of many instances, Grazia and Stallybrass choose to refer to the use of the words "weird sisters" in *Macbeth*. This phrase, first suggested by Theobald, is used by most modern editors, but in the F1, it is either "weyward Sisters" or "weyard Sisters." Hecate, however, mentions Macbeth as "wayward" in the F1. If "wayward" or "weyard" is changed to "wayward" to apply to the witches, Grazia and Stallybrass caution about the danger such a change will effect. By "a simple vowel shift" the sisters will be transposed from the world of witchcraft into the world "of perversion and vagrancy." (Grazia and Stallybrass 263)

The 'Character', as Harry Berger Jr. suggests, did not necessarily precede the word or the language in Shakespeare's age. The dramatic character was dependent on language. Berger said, "Speakers don't have childhoods unless and until they mention them" (Qtd by Grazia and Stallybrass 267). The psychological component of the character was not necessarily invested in determining the use of its language. Shakespeare did not perceive character in the way Bradley does, that the character will determine what language it will speak. Berger reverses this order implying that "'speakers as characters are the effects rather than the causes of their language.'" (Qtd by Grazia and Stallybrass 267) They also mention that the list of dramatis personae which has been put at the beginning of the text since the eighteenth century was not practiced in Shakespeare's time: "the Folio includes lists for only seven out of thirty-six plays, and in every case the list appears *after* rather than *before* the play" (Grazia and Stallybrass 267, emphasis theirs). They also refer to the confused and mixed-up use of the proper names in speech prefixes like *Cor*, *Cori*, *Corio*, *Coriol* in *Coriolanus*, or in *Macbeth*, *Seyton* as *Seyt* once, and as *Sey* in other cases; *Seyward* as *Syew*, *Syw*, and *Sey*. (Grazia and Stallybrass 268)

Another editorial problem pointed out by Grazia and Stallybrass is the mixing up of pronominal gender in early modern English texts. Shakespeare's sonnet

20 has a confusing phrase "Master Mistris," which allowed the later generation of transcribers like John Benson to "convert the masculine pronouns to feminine" (Grazia and Stallybrass 268) at will. Chalmers, an eighteenth-century philologist, is mentioned for claiming that Queen Elizabeth went by both the pronouns, equally using *his* or *her*.

> *His*, *her* and *him*, were frequently confounded: and the personal pronoun, *his*, was often used in a neutral sense, and in the same manner, *him*, in those days, often referred to *it*. . . . Our grammarians have not, I think, observed, that the pronoun *his* was, in those days, not only used in a *neutral* sense, but in a *feminine* sense. (Qtd by Grazia and Stallybrass 271)

In the 1609 quarto edition of the Sonnets, the gender of the addressee is unspecified in over four-fifths of the Sonnets. Malone, however, maintained that Sonnets 1-126 were addressed to a young man (W.H.) and the remaining 127-154, that is, 28 sonnets to a female. But Sonnet 18, in the first group, yet seems to be addressed to a female character. Homosexuality and heterosexuality were not established as different categories. William Lyly's *Grammar* classifies seven forms of genders: *male, female, neuter, doubtful gender,* and *epicene* (both male and female).

About the 'Author' the same kind of uncertainty exists as with the 'Word'. Grazia and Stallybrass mention E. K. Chambers as having found eighty-three variant spellings of the single form "Shakespeare": *Willm Shaksp, williamShakespe, Wm Shakesp, William shakspere*, and *William Shakespeare*, etc. (273) There have been found six supposed autographs by Shakespeare, with the problematic one: Shak-speare. The implication is that authorial agency/ control was hardly present, and often the publication industry chose to print the names of authors in variant spellings. It is also possible that many works were printed with Shakespeare as the author, which he did not write. And again, of his plays published before 1600, seven or eight were first printed anonymously. (Grazia and Stallybrass 274) All this accounts for the perception that it was not possible to accord "unitary authorship" (Grazia and Stallybrass 276) to Shakespeare. Scott McMillin, as this duo of critics informs us, studied *The Book of Sir Thomas More* to establish which one was Shakespeare's handwriting of the six different hands. It is Hand D, consisting of 147 lines, that is considered as Shakespeare's handwriting. (Grazia and Stallybrass 277)

In some cases, it was found that though a text carried the name of a single author, in the payment register many were seen to be paid the royalty. G. E. Bentley is mentioned by Grazia and Stallybrass as having opined that by "comparing title pages and the Stationer's Register entries with Henslowe's diary," it becomes obvious that "[a]lthough a play might be attributed to in print to one author, several authors . . . Were paid for their contribution" (275).

As Grazia and Stallybrass's essay is discussing the materiality of Shakespeare's texts, they should naturally refer to the very 'Paper' used in printing the text—the 'Paper' being the most existentialist aspect of the printing industry. Paper was made from the rags, and a short rhyme punningly identifies the process of pauperization involved in the publication industry:

RAGS make paper,
PAPER makes money,
MONEY makes banks,
BANKS make loans,
LOANS make beggars,
BEGGARS make RAGS.

In a footnote, numbered 109, Grazia and Stallybrass mention that "Sixteenth-and seventeenth-century protests against the exporting of rags bear witness to the centrality of rags in the paper-making progress." (281) England at the time was in short supply of paper, which was due to the dearth of the linen industry. Therefore, the paper was an expensive material, as William Prynne "claimed that Shakespeare's plays in the Second Folio were 'printed in the best Crowne paper, far better than most Bibles.'" (Qtd by Grazia and Stallybrass 281)

The duo of critics pronounces that paper produces a binarism between surface and depth in which the former leads to the latter. (280) Paper and text continued to create a "schism" that, according to Jerome McGaan, "characterizes current literary studies." (280) The paper is the material on which the text is printed, hence the existential presence of the paper becomes the subject of study for the editors, whereas the "literary critics probe its interior significance." (280)

In their conclusion, Grazia and Stallybrass say that the editorial efforts are at best bi-focal. On the one hand the aim has been to establish an authentic

Shakespeare, and on the other, the presence of "textual proliferation" remains an undeniable fact. They quote Barbara Mowatt for succinctly identifying the dilemma about *Hamlet*:

> Driven by a desire to recover the *Hamlet* that Shakespeare wrote—to replace passage lost through actors' excisions or printers' errors, to restore words garbled by interfering players or incompetent printers, to take *Hamlet* out of the hands of previous editors and print Shakespeare's own *Hamlet* (either his original text or his final text, but in any event *his* text), editors from Rowe to Hibbard have searched for Shakespeare's words, and the result has been almost as many *Hamlets* as there are editors. (Qtd by Grazia and Stallybrass 282)

Greenblatt further adds to the debate the problem with censorship, that is, the government regulations on printing might have been a great curbing influence on the printing industry. He also adds that how the theatrical performance impacted the "surviving documents" (71) needs to be reckoned with.

III

Shakespeare's Scant Interest in Publication

The above discussion as to why Shakespeare took little or no interest in publication will be better contextualized if we refer to the actual stage conventions of the time.

The Theatre and the Rose

Shakespeare initially wrote for a variety of stage conditions. At the time the Queen's Men founded in 1583 was the largest playing company in London. In 1594 Lord Chamberlain formed a company, The Lord Chamberlain's Men, which performed at The Theatre, the oldest public playhouse in London, founded by James Burbage. Lord Chamberlain's son-in-law the Lord Admiral formed another company, the Lord Admiral's Men, which played at the Rose, built in 1587 by the famous theatre manager Philip Henslowe. The Theatre was located at Shoreditch, a suburb to the north of London. Its chief actor was Richard Burbage, James Burbage's son, who was a close friend of Shakespeare. The Rose was located in the suburb of Southwalk, on the south bank of the Thames. Its leading player was Edward Alleyn, who was the son-in-law of Henslowe. Some of Shakespeare's earlier plays *1 Henry VI* and *Titus Andronicus* were performed at the Rose before he joined the Lord Chamberlain's Men in 1594. For the next three years, all Shakespeare's plays were performed at the Theatre.

Shakespeare was a busy writer, producing at least two plays every year and his company preserved the copyright. The companies formed rather like guilds, and the leading sharers of the company, of whom Shakespeare was one, controlled the business. Shakespeare made most of his fortune from his "share," invested first in the company, and later in its two playhouses.

In 1597, James Burbage's original contract for twenty-one years for the use of the Theatre expired, and the landlord, Giles Allen by name, who hated theatre, refused to renew the contract. Having anticipated it, Burbage built a roofed theatre at the Blackfriars precinct near St. Paul's Cathedral. The rich people of the neighbourhood objected to the project for which the Privy Council did not permit it to operate.

From April 1597, Shakespeare's company had to rent the Curtain, which was located in the same neighbourhood as the Theatre, which was already uprooted. At the Curtain, four of Shakespeare's plays were performed, namely, *2 Henry IV, Much Ado About Nothing, The Merry Wives of Windsor,* and *probably Henry V*.

The Globe

In December 1598, having lost hope of a new lease for the old Theatre, the Burbage sons had it pulled down and overnight quietly transported the huge timber frames, made of oak, across the Thames to make a structure for the Globe on the river's south bank, near the Rose. Allen sued them but never got his timbers back. (Paul quotes Gurr 369).

The Globe was unique in fund raising as the players contributed their shares. In the theatre history of England, it was the first public theatre to be owned by the players alone. They also designed it according to performance suitability. Referring to its round shape (though it was actually not round, but octagonal), Shakespeare famously calls it "this wooden O" in the Prologue to *Henry V*, 1.1.13. It is said that Shakespeare owned one-eighth of the Globe's shares, and all his major plays were performed here: *Julius Caesar, As You Like It, Hamlet, Twelfth Night, Othello, All's Well that Ends Well, Measure for Measure, King Lear, Macbeth, Pericles, Antony and Cleopatra, Coriolanus, Cymbeline, The Winter's Tale*, and most likely *Troilus and Cressida* and *Timon of Athens* too.

The Elizabethan perception of the world as a theatre was a commonplace: "All the world's a stage," as Jaques says in *As You Like It*, 2.7.139. The Globe was not

actually O-shaped but was a twenty-sided polygon with a circumference of 300 feet and a diameter of almost 100 feet. On its flag was inscribed an image of Hercules carrying a globe on his shoulders. Hamlet refers to "the throbbing head on his shoulders as 'this distracting globe'" (Paul quotes Gurr 369). It had three tiers to the gallery, no roof and only the open sky, and the platform, which was raised from the ground by five feet and jutted into the middle of the yard. The platform was open on three sides, and the fourth side was connected with the tiring house.

In 1603, two months after Queen Elizabeth's death, King James VI of Scotland assumed the throne of England as King James I, who felt the need to unify the kingdoms. Out of his unification agenda, he gave royal patent to Shakespeare's company, and, thereby, the Lord Chamberlain's Men turned into the King's Men. In 1609 the permission to perform was given to the Blackfriars, the roofed hall. In 1613 the Globe accidentally caught fire during a performance of *All is True* (*Henry VIII*), when a cannonball was shot and the thatched gallery got burnt down. It was rebuilt and continued until the closure of all the theatres by Parliament in 1642.

This keen interest in the performance aspect of his plays raises the question as to how far Shakespeare was willing to look at his works as saleable items through publication. In this respect, certain observations made by scholars may be recorded here.

Greenblatt in his General Introduction to the *Norton Shakespeare* inferred that since the plays were the property of the theatre company of which Shakespeare was a shareholder, he subscribed to the company's principles of not encouraging their scripts to be circulated in print. This was done to protect their plays from rival companies. Secondly, Greenblatt thinks that Shakespeare perhaps did not want to see his plays constituting a canon. On the other hand, Shakespeare's great contemporary, Ben Jonson, rewrote his plays to publish his first folio edition in 1616. Further, as Greenblatt suggests, the desire for immortality, so dominant a theme in Shakespeare's sonnets, did not seem to spread out to his plays. Moreover, there is no indication that he wanted to impose his authorial right over his scripts. (67)

But Lukas Erne, David Kastan, and other modern editor-scholars hold a slightly different view by suggesting that there is enough indication that Shakespeare

meant his plays to be also read as texts.[15] Even Greenblatt speaks about Shakespeare's generous texts: "There is an imaginative generosity in many of Shakespeare's scripts as if he was deliberately offering his fellow actors more than they could use . . . ." (67)

Stephen Orgel estimated that any printed Shakespearean text was far too long for the stage where the performance would normally run from "two to two-and-one-half hours that is universally accepted as the performing time of plays in the period." (7)

Recent scholarly studies uphold that Shakespeare's longer plays were not performed on the stage in their entirety. At the Globe, the running time of an actual performance was more or less two hours in the afternoon. The Lord Chamberlain assured the Lord Mayor of London "in October 1594 that 'where heretofore they began not their Plaies til towards Fower a clock' the company under his patronage would now 'begin at two and have done between fower and five." (Gurr quoted by Falocco 127) Falocco further refers to Alfred Hart's line counts, who said that a performance text by Shakespeare averaged 2400 lines, 1200 lines to be spoken out in each hour. (124) The pre-show, which constituted instrumental music, would be there for half an hour, and the post-show would invariably include a jig for another half an hour.

> Until about 1600, performances by Shakespeare's company would also have concluded with a "jig." More than the simple dance implied by their name, jigs were bawdy musical sketches that David Wiles describes as "a form of soft commercial pornography." These popular pieces were up to 600 lines in length. With this much dialogue and the added time required for song, dance and comic shtick, jigs could easily last thirty minutes. Pre-show entertainment, the play itself, and a post-show jig therefore all had to be staged within a performance window that would "begin at two and have done between fower and five." (Falocco 127)

It is also presumed that the longer versions might have been performed at the Blackfriars taking advantage of the candlelight. J. M. Noseworthy, as stated by Falocco, assumes that the Q2 *Hamlet* because of its substantial university material may have been performed at the universities of Oxford and Cambridge in its entirety. (Falocco 136)

---

[15] I have discussed this point in detail in my other essay on a similar theme in "Shakespeare as text and/versus performance in the academic arena of Bangladesh," published in *Ideas: A Journal of Literature Arts and Culture, Vol 5, 2020*. Editor-in- Chief and Publisher, Professor Mustafizur Rahman (Dhaka, 2020).

Shakespeare's manuscripts—'foul papers' and 'fair copy'

Except for a disputed small fragment of *Sir Thoma More* "virtually nothing Shakespeare actually wrote in his own hand survives." (Greenblatt 69) Actors were never given the whole script, only parts with cues, as evident in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, 3.1.80-88, known as scrolls. 'Foul papers' referred to the manuscript, and as Shakespeare was human,[16] Greenblatt suggests that he made revisions, crossed out old lines, inserted new lines, and blotted or added second or third thoughts scribbled in the margins and between the lines. (69) 'Fair copy' meant the authorial draft either made by the author or by a professional scribe.

Promptbook

When the 'fair copy' was transformed into the "book of the play" or "playbook", (Greenblatt 70) it was called the 'promptbook'. Shakespeare by habit gave very sketchy and inconsistent stage directions. The promptbook clarified these and added others. It also marked out the theatrical properties and orchestrated the sound effects. And very frequently, the promptbook cut out the full text to suit a performance play. It is the promptbook that was presented to the Master of the Revels for licensing, and it incorporated any changes insisted upon by the Master. The foul papers represented the text "in an as yet individual, private form" and the promptbook became the "socialized text". (Greenblatt 70) But the woeful fact remains that for Shakespeare's plays scholars have found neither foul papers, nor fair copies, nor promptbook.

The Quartos and the First Folio 1623

Numerous individual quartos from Shakespeare's time and the First Folio, after his death, are the only extant copies to study him for the original. Quartos refer to a page format when a sheet of paper is folded twice, producing four leaves or eight pages front and back. Folio sheets were folded once, making two leaves and four pages front and back. The texts become substantive when they date from Shakespeare's lifetime or from the collected works edited by his associates using or claiming to use his own manuscript to print. Editors attempt to reconstruct each play's transformation from manuscript into print. Different plays took very different journeys. (Greenblatt 70)

---

[16] In a similar tone, Orgel ponders: "Do we believe that Shakespeare was incapable of writing a bad poem? Were there no false starts, no rejected pages, no lines tossed off in ten minutes and then thrown away, perhaps to be rescued by some admirer?" (1-2)

Quartos – 'good' and 'bad'

'Good quartos' are synonymous with the 'fair copy'. It was perhaps made from the author's draft copy or the scribal transcript of the play. And 'bad quartos' are those texts which were published from an unreliable source, mainly from the memorial reconstruction of a player. As mentioned earlier, A. W. Pollard (1859-1944), *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos: A Study in the Bibliography of Shakespeare's Plays*, 1909, first gave the idea that the unreliable quartos should be called 'the bad quartos'. The occasion for the memorial reconstruction came, according to W. W. Greg (1875-1959), when the actors were forced to perform away from London without a prompt book, or when they were trapped by money-wise publishers. The 'bad quarto' is marked by garbled lines, dropped or misplaced speeches, and gaps filled up with lines from other plays. (Greenblatt 70). Another view is that the 'bad quartos' may be treated as distinctly individual plays, as the cases, discussed earlier, with *Hamlet* and *King Lear* had been.

The First Folio, 1623

The title of the First Folio of 1623 was *Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories and Tragedies*. The publishers were Edward Blount and William Jaggard. It was dedicated to William Herbert, 3rd Earl of Pembroke, and his brother Philip Herbert, Earl of Montgomery (later 4th Earl of Pembroke). The edition contained 36 plays. The two plays not included are *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. The two lost plays *Cardenio* and *Love's Labour's Won* were not included either. The syndicate that prepared the Folio had access to the manuscripts of the King's Men.

Stephen Orgel asserts that the publication of the folio edition was strong proof that there grew up "a literate and wealthy audience that wanted not only to read Shakespeare in authoritative texts but also to have in their personal collections the plays in a handsome, expensive, and thereby permanent format" (5). Orgel also observes that in 1612 Sir Thomas Bodley (the founder of the famous Bodleian Library) wrote to his librarian not to purchase "idle books, and riff-raffs" by which he referred also to playbooks. Contrary to it, however, the library's assessment report for the year 1623 shows the entry of the First Folio in its register. The library goes on record as the first purchaser of a copy of the Folio (5). Through the publication of the First Folio came into being what we understand as the Shakespearean canon. However, the First Folio made editors of succeeding generations alert to the fact that, as Falocco so succinctly says,

"What we don't know about how Shakespeare's plays were originally produced will always be greater than what we know" (123).

The Dream of the Master Text

Assuming that the Ideal Text or the Master Text of a Shakespearean play does never exist, Greenblatt pronounces that "The dream of the master text is a dream of transparency," (71). To establish a text in "unsullied" form is difficult, according to Greenblatt (71), for the following reasons: It needs (a) the careful weighing of alternative readings; (b) the production of a textual apparatus; (c) the writing of notes and glosses; (d) the modernizing and regularizing of spelling and punctuation; (e) the insertion of scene divisions; (f) the complex calculation of the process of textual transmission from foul papers to print; (g) the equally complex calculation of the effects that censorship, government regulation, and above all, theatrical performance had on the surviving documents. (71)

IV

Improving on the Original[17]

If Heminges and Condell's desire for having to see Shakespeare do some editing himself for a Master Text had failed for the natural cause of his death, there developed another trend which emphasized the reworking on Shakespeare to update him for the audience/readers of any given age, when Shakespeare was reproduced either on stage or in print.

Sir William Davenant (1606-1668)

This attempt at improving upon the original was initiated by Sir William Davenant in the middle of the seventeenth century. In 1660 after Charles II was restored to the throne, he gave royal patent to Thomas Killigrew and Davenant to take charge of two royal theatrical troupes: The Duke of York's Company and The King's Company. (Dobson 47)

The modern trend in Shakespeare scholarship is to attack the idea of worshipping the text, opposed to which, as Gurr reports, was Mark Rylance, the director of the New Globe, who was "reluctant to cut the sacred text"(qtd by

[17] I owe this idea to Michael Dobson, who in his essay, "Improving the Original: Actresses and Adaptations," discusses Davenant's treatment of Shakespeare on the stage as well as in writing. The essay appears in *Shakespeare: An Illustrated Stage History*, eds. Jonathan Bate and Russell Jackson (Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 45-68.

Falocco 120). But this was not the case with Sir William Davenant, who claimed Shakespeare to be his godfather (Dobson 50), and who was the Poet Laureate under Charles I, and whose group performed at the covered Salisbury Court. For his 1661 production of *Hamlet* Davenant issued a Prefatory Note to the Reader:

> This copy [of *Hamlet*] being too long to be conveniently Acted, such Places as might be least prejudicial to the Plot or Sense, art left upon the Stage: but that we may no way wrong the incomparable Author, are here inserted according to the Original Copy, with this Mark (‘). (Qtd by Paul 391)

Davenant's edition of *Hamlet*, which goes on record as Quarto 6, was published in 1676, eight years after his death. J. Gavin Paul considers the placing of the quotation mark (‘) in his edited text as a path-breaking policy in the editorial job on Shakespeare.

> These passages distinguished by quotation marks are not insignificant: around 800 lines of the Q2 text were evidently cut from performance, including most of the play's political undercurrents (the Danish ambassadors, most mentions of Fortinbras before the final scene, roughly half the 'O, what a rogue and pleasant slave am I' speech, all of Hamlet's advice to the players, and the entirety of Hamlet's final soliloquy. (391)

Falocco quotes Peter Holland as having said, "Many speeches which no modern full-scale performance would dream of eliminating are marked as having been cut in performance of this version." (121)

Gavin Paul further argues that such quotation marks gave the scope to the readers to visualize the play in their imagination like a performance text.

> The introduction of a relatively simple bit of code into the text—quotation marks identifying lines not spoken in the theatre—allows readers the opportunity to utilise the printed page to produce imagined approximations of the play in performance. (391)

Davenant's version was used by Thomas Betterton as his text, and, according to Alfred Hart, the line count of this text was 2827. (Falocco 121)

Davenport's rendition of the "To be or not to be" soliloquy provides a good example of what he meant by improvement. Shakespeare's lines go thus:

> Thus conscience does make us cowards of us all,
> And thus the native hue of resolution
> Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,
> And enterprises of great pitch and moment
> With this regard their currents turn awry
> And lose the name of action. (3.1.90-95)

And Davenant's 'improvement' has this:

> Thus Conscience does make Cowards,
> And thus the healthful face of Resolution
> Shews sick and pale with Thought:
> And enterprises of great pith and moment,
> With this regard, their currents turn awry,
> And lose the name of action. (Paul 390)

Of course, the superiority of the original is obvious, as Paul notes that the 'native hue' of resolution has become "'the healthful face', and this face is no longer 'sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought' but rather 'Shews sick and pale with Thought'." (390) He also famously changed the word "grunt" in the same soliloquy in the line, "To grunt and sweat under a weary life" (3.1.84) to "groan" to keep to the genteel taste of the age. (Dobson 50)

The Eighteenth-Century Editors: The Moral Dimension

After Davenant's age was over, the eighteenth century saw the rise of unprecedented interest in editing Shakespeare, and that with a bias for morality. Critic Andrew Murphy, in his essay, "'To Ferret out Any Hidden Corruption': Shakespearean Editorial Metaphors," discusses the editorial efforts pursued in the eighteenth century as having been emerged from a perception of parenting as well as curing.[18]

In this section we first discuss in (A) the nature of the job the editors took up to perform and in (B) the particular contribution each editor made.

[18] Andrew Murphy, "'To Ferret out Any Hidden Corruption': Shakespearean Editorial Metaphors," in *Text*, 1997, Vol. 10, pp. 202-219, published by Indiana University Press, Stable URL: http://www.jstor.com/stable/ 30228060. I owe to this essay greatly for the discussion of the eighteen-century Shakespearean editors.

(A) The Editors' Roles

i. The editors perform in loco parentis

Murphy observes that Heminges and Condell conceived themselves as parents to Shakespeare's works when they were preparing the First Folio (206). In their dedication, they wrote to the Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery "that their lordship will 'vse the like indulgence toward' Shakespeare's works as they 'have done to [the texts'] parent." They further added that by collecting the plays they had "done an office to the dead, to procure his Orphanes, Guardians" (206). Murphy thereby concludes that parentage became synonymous with editing: "we might say that the trope of fosterage is one of the originary images of editorship to be found within the Shakespeare editorial tradition" (206).

ii The Ostrich Image

Continuing on this fosterage concept, Murphy draws on a metaphor conceived by Edward Capell in his edition of 1768. Equaling the role of the author with that of the mother ostrich, which only lays eggs but is indifferent to hatching them, Capell says that the role of the editor is to play in loco parentis by taking care of the text left almost abandoned by the author.

Capell wrote:

> It is said of the ostrich, that she drops her egg at random, to be dispos'd of as chance pleases; either brought to maturity by the sun's kindly warmth, or else crush'd by beasts and the feet of passers-by: Such, at least, is the account which naturalists have given us of this extraordinary bird; and admitting it for a truth, she is in this a fit emblem of almost every great genius: they conceive and produce with ease those noble issues of human understanding; but incubation, the dull work of putting them correctly upon paper and afterwards publishing, is a task they cannot away with.

By comparing the author with the ostrich mother, Capell echoes the feelings of Heminges and Condell's that Shakespeare's works needed a surrogate parent.

Based on Cappell's ostrich-author conjunction, Murphy defines the role of the editor as "one who must settle himself down to the work of incubation and hatching, straddling atop the author's abandoned egg and helping to bring his offspring into the world." (205)

iii The Physician Image

Murphy refers to Heminges and Condell's role again and says that apart from playing the role of the parents, they also suggested the role of the editors as physicians. While some of the plays--before they were included in the First Folio, were--as claimed by Heminges and Condell (also noted earlier in this essay)--"maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealth of injurious imposters, that expos'd them: euen those, are now offer'd to your view cur'd, and perfect of their limbes; and all the rest, absolute in their numbers, as he conceiued them." (Murphy 207)

Murphy then refers to the fact that "The same lexicon of disease and injury turns up again and again in subsequent editions. For Rowe, many of the texts have been 'lamely printed'; for Pope they are 'mangled'; for Theobald they are 'maim'd,' 'deform'd,' and 'mangled'; for Hanmer 'they are 'injured and abused'; for Johnson they are 'mutilated'." (Murphy 207)

iv The metaphor of the depraved

Pope speaks of the 'corruptions of innumerable Passages', and of seeking to 'restore the corrupted sense of the Author'. Theobald undertakes 'the Emendation of corrupt Passages', and informs us that 'there are very few Pages in *Shakespeare*, upon which some Suspicions of Depravity do not reasonably arise'. Hanmer expresses a desire to 'restore the genuine sense and purity of the Shakespeare text'. (Murphy 208)

v Text as body and soul

Murphy claims that the editors of this time viewed their job from a holy perspective too. The text was imagined as a body, and thereby it must have a soul. So, the editor was functioning multi-level. He was a parent, a physician, and, finally, a priest. They sought to "exorcise the corruptions manifest in the text." (Murphy 208) Thus editing also partook of moral responsibility. Theobald edited to assure "a High degree of *moral certainty*" (emphasis added by Murphy 209), and claimed that his duty was to take "the work to a state of grace."

(B) The Editors

i. Nahum Tate (1652-1715)

He made himself famous by changing the ending scene of *King Lear*, where Cordelia is seen married to Edgar. This happy ending sustained well into the 19th century.

ii. Nicholas Rowe (1674-1718)

Rowe published *The Works of William Shakespeare in Six Volumes* in 1709, saying in his dedication that his principal job was "to redeem him from the Injuries of former Impressions" (Paul 393). While Davenant was a theatre-based personality, Rowe was the first editor dedicated to emending and modernizing the text. In setting his editorial principles, Rowe said:

> I must not pretend to have restor'd this Work to the Exactness of the Author's Original Manuscripts. Those are lost, or, at least gone beyond Inquiry I could make; so that there was nothing left, but to compare the several Editions, and give the true Reading as well as I could from thence. (Paul 394)

He updated spellings and punctuations to suit the standards of his time, and he divided the plays into acts and scenes. Further, he added a list of *dramatis personae* to each play and gave a brief description of the location of each play, which in some cases also included the scenes. Rowe was a dramatist himself, so his editing was done with an eye on the performance aspects of the plays, as many scenes also include stage directions. His blending of the reading text and the performance text thus provides a guideline for the editors of Shakespeare in the coming generations. (Paul 394-95)

Rowe's other distinct contribution to Shakespeare editing was creating a 'paratext' to his edition. What is meant by the 'paratext' is the illustrative part his volume contains. Rowe included engravings that illustrated particular scenes from each play that highlighted the conventions of the contemporary stage. One of the engravings, used as the frontispiece of *Hamlet* shows an upturned chair in the forestage in the Closet Scene (3.4.). The prop of the upturned chair was a pointed reference to the actor's getting startled by the sudden appearance of the Ghost. Thomas Betterton (1635-1710) made this gesture of puzzlement popular on the stage. These illustrations, according to Paul, "subordinate the imagination to the realistic portrayal of the moods of the contemporary theatre" (396). Each illustration appears before the list of dramatis personae.

iii. Alexander Pope (1688-1744)

In 1725 came out Pope's edition of Shakespeare, entitled, *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear. In Six Volumes. Collated and corrected by the former editions, BY Mr. Pope*. London: Jacob Tonson, 1723-25. Pope allowed his poetic self to

dominate over his editorial self, and because of his latent distrust of performers doing the job of editing, he despised the 1623 Folio, as it was edited by two men, who were merely actors. He rather thought that the theatre cast a "poisonous influence" (Paul 400) on Shakespeare's written works. In an instance of extremity, Pope condemned the theatrical editors by saying that their "Procrustean surgery" (Murphy 208) involved "either lopping, or stretching an Author, to make him just fit for their stage." (Murphy 208) Abandoning the F1, he rather chose to read the earlier quartos. But he lacked the sheer tenacity involved in the editorial task, which explains why Pope famously called the editorial job a "dull duty" and declared that he executed his duty "with a religious abhorrence of all Innovation and without any indulgence to my private sense of conjecture." (Paul 400) Pope, however, did a lot of excisions and emendations to his edition. He placed these excisions in his edition separately with asterisk marks, and according to Paul, this very method ironically leads his readers to pay attention to the very passages that he wanted to suppress. For example, Pope put the first forty lines of the Porter Scene (2.4.) in *Macbeth* on the margin with an asterisk sign suggesting them to be dropped, but the readers may still read them. Perhaps the following comment by Orgel sums up Pope's status as a Shakespeare editor: "Pope's edition was declared amateurish and ill informed by the textual scholars, which it certainly is, but the attitude it embodies is nevertheless still firmly embedded in a great deal of very respectable editorial practice." (12)

iv. Lewis Theobald (1688-1744)

Theobald's edition of Shakespeare consists of seven volumes, and they bear the following titles: *Shakespeare Restored* and *The Works of Shakespeare*, published in 1734. Paul has defined Theobald's editing as a "defensive methodology" by which he means that Theobald, instead of updating Shakespeare for the contemporary readers, wanted that "An Editor should be well vers'd in the History of Manners of the Author's Age, if he aims at doing him a Service." (Paul 406) He was a well-read editor having read Hall, Holinshed, and Plutarch. Central to Theobald's practice was to blend the text with the paratext, that is, extra-textual information. By depending on documented extra-textual sources, the editor's impulsive or aesthetic response may be regulated by a more realistic assumption. To maintain 'a State of Purity and Integrity', Theobald did away with any unreliable sources that came from performance history, or from memory of performances or such like.

As we mentioned earlier, there took place an important connection between Theobald and David Garrick (1717-1779), the foremost Shakespearean actor-manager of the time. In 1744, Garrick staged *Macbeth* with the claim that his version recovered the authentic text for the first time "as written by Shakespeare". (Orgel 14-15) However, as Orgel argues, this was not a true claim as because Garrick used Theobald's edition of *Macbeth* as his 'control text' instead of the prevalent Davenant-edited text, even though he cut it short by 10 percent by chopping off the 'drunken porter', 'the murder of Lady Macduff's son', and the scene (4.3), where Malcolm tests Macduff's loyalty. (15)

v. Edward Capell (1713-1781)

Capell's ten-volume edition, entitled, *Mr. William Shakespeare: His Comedies, Histories and Tragedies*, published in 1768, as we have already mentioned, is geared by acknowledging a parental responsibility by the critic to take care of the text left behind by the other, like the ostrich mother abandoning her young. One distinction of his editing process is that instead of attaching notes and annotations in the edited texts, he published a three-volume corollary text entitled *Notes and Various Readings to Shakespeare* (1779-83). Capell also enjoys the distinction of having edited his texts from the original versions rather than depending on the texts of his predecessors, which, if he wished, he could have annotated and updated further. David Garrick engaged Cappell to write a performance version of *Antony and Cleopatra* to be staged at Drury Lane in 1758.

In his edition of *Antony and Cleopatra*, he added certain new features to the presentation of the Monument Scene (4.15). While Theobald just improves on the Folio stage direction by changing the word 'heave' to 'draw',[19] Capell furnishes the stage direction as: '*Cleopatra and her women, throw out Certain Tackle, into which the People below put Antony, and he is drawn up*'—which is the same direction he attached to the version he had prepared for Garrick ten years ago. Thus, Capell's editing was a great help in effecting the transition from the page to the stage, as Paul says, "The fuller direction includes—relatively speaking—more information than users of the text might otherwise sharpen—again, in relative terms—their imaginings of the moment as it could be performed." (409-10). W. B. Worthen said that Capell was able "to literally encode performance into the body of the playtext." (Qtd by Paul 412) These signals, which Paul calls 'punctuations', were distributed throughout the text.

[19] The Folio reads: 'They heaue Antony aloft to Cleopatra,' and Theobald: 'They draw Antony up to Cleopatra'.

vi. Samuel Johnson (1709-1784)

Samuel Johnson made a declaration in 1745 that he would be editing a complete volume of Shakespeare. But even ten years after, the work did not finish and instead of it what came out from Johnson was the first dictionary of the English Language, *A Dictionary of the English Language*. It is seen that much of the source for meanings and illustration of meanings in this dictionary was Shakespeare's works themselves. Another ten years went by before Johnson could finally come out with his edition of Shakespeare in 1765, titled The *Plays of William Shakespeare*, in eight volumes, with an introductory essay attached to it, entitled "The Preface to Shakespeare"—in which he explained the difficulties of editing Shakespeare.

The pressing need as to why Johnson took up such an arduous job can be understood from the "Proposals" he wrote in 1756, where he said he required to raise funds "for Printing by Subscription the Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare, Corrected and Illustrated by Samuel Johnson." Johnson's main concern was similar to Pope's as regards the ill-fate of the author in being subjected to editing by the most inept group of editors, but unlike Pope, he made sensible remarks about the durability of Shakespeare, and hence arose the need for careful editing:

> It is not easy for invention to bring together so many causes concurring to vitiate a text. . . no books could be left in hands so likely to injure them, as plays frequently acted, yet continued in manuscript: no other transcribers were likely to be so little qualified for their task as those who copied for the stage, at a time when the lower ranks of people were universally illiterate: no other editions were made from fragments so minutely broken, and so fortuitously reunited; and in no other age was the art of printing in such unskillful hands. (Qtd by Murphy 206-07)

Johnson's greatest contribution to Shakespeare editing is his determining the place of the author as a universal writer who has withstood the onslaught of time, the differences in cultures, and the obvious limitations put on by the technical aspects like the three unities. Johnson's statements that Shakespeare is a poet of nature, drawing upon human characters as a species, not portraying heroes, but only men do imply that Shakespeare needs to be edited with this concept of universality in mind, as the following passage from "The Preface to Shakespeare" clarifies:

> Shakespeare is, above all writers, at least above all modern writers, the poet of nature, the poet that holds up to his readers a faithful mirror of manners and of life. His characters are not modified by the customs of particular places, unpracticed by the rest of the world; by the peculiarities of studies or professions, which can operate but upon small numbers: or by the accidents of transient fashions or temporary opinions: they are the genuine progeny of common humanity, such as the world will always supply and observation will always find. His persons act and speak by the influence of those general passions and principles by which all minds are agitated and the whole system of life is continued in motion. In the writings of other poets a character is too often an individual: in those of Shakespeare it is commonly a species.[20]

vii. Edmond Malone (1741-1812)

Edmond Malone published the *Works of Shakespeare* in 1790. Murphy reports that Margreta de Grazia has called his edition "a watershed text in Shakespeare Verbatim as he placed his editorial principles on 'notions of textual authority'"(211). He pursued his work with "a dogged thoroughness; his dominant register is that of the scrupulous, scrutinizing pragmatist" (211).

The great sense of exactitude that determined the principles of his editorial method is revealed in the following passage Murphy quotes from Malone's introduction:

> Having often experienced the fallaciousness of collation by the eye, I determined, after I had adjusted the text in the best manner in my power to have every proofsheet of my work read aloud to me, while I pursued the first folio, for those plays which first appeared in that edition; and for all those which had been previously printed, the first quarto copy . . . I had at the same time before me a table which I had formed of the variations between the quartos and the folio. By this laborious process not a single innovation made either by the editor of the second folio, or any of the modern editors, could escape me. (211-212)

The above narration on the eighteenth-century editors is a manifestation of the great contribution the editors made to the survival of Shakespeare. The moral

[20] Samuel Johnson, "The Preface to Shakespeare," in *The Norton Anthology: English Literature, Sixth Edition, Volume 1*, p. 2394.

editing was foremost no doubt, but gradually we saw the transition was taking place in establishing Shakespeare more as what he was as a dramatist than what he should have been. Capell and Malone, in particular, deserve to be mentioned as playing a pioneering role to open up the passage for the birth of New Bibliography.

V. The Great Transition: from subjectivity to objectivity

Malone's inheritors are A. W. Pollard, W. W. Greg, Fredson Bowers, and R. B. Mckerrow, who have all edited Shakespeare by scientifically "analyzing the text's material history." (Murphy 212) McKerrow (1872-1940), however, refused to call the editorial job a science. He wanted to balance scientific findings with literary judgment. A gap thereby widened between textual studies and literary criticism as the editorial work continued in the twentieth century.

i The disintegrationists versus the organicists

F. J. Furnivall (1825-1910), a British philologist and a Shakespearean scholar can be considered the pioneer of bibliographical studies. Interestingly enough, he became the target of a scathing attack by A. C. Swinburne (1837-1909) in his book, *Study of Shakespeare*, which is quoted by Murphy at length.

> For all the counting up of numbers and casting up of figures that a whole university—nay, a whole universe of pedants could accomplish, no teacher and no learner will ever be a whit nearer to the heaven where they would be. In spite of all tabulated Statements [sic] and regulated summaries of research the music which will not be dissected or defined, the 'spirit of sense' which is one and indivisible from the body or raiment of speech that clothes it, keeps safe the secret of its sound. (Murphy 213).

Swinburne is prophetically true in perceiving that the Shakespearean music could not be appreciated by the science of counting and computing, but opposed to this view is the voice of the new bibliographer, Fredson Bowers (1905-1991), who, in his book, *On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists* (1955), argued that the status of scientific bibliography must be prioritized over critical interpretation. In his other book, *The Bibliographical Way* (1959), Bowers states that at any moment of judgment, it is the factual accuracy that needs to be given priority over the opinions made by the critic from a subjective perspective:

> Impersonal judgment is to be preferred to personal judgment. The mechanical interpretation of analytical bibliography based on physical

> fact is always to be preferred to the interpretation of the critical judgment from values. When bibliography and critical judgment clash, the critic must accept the bibliographical findings and somehow come to terms with them. Critical assumptions can never be so valid as strict bibliographical evidence. Indeed, this is not a question of degree: when a clash develops, strict bibliography must be right since step by step it rests on the impersonal interpretation of physical facts according to rigorous laws of evidence; and, correspondingly, criticism must be wrong since its interpretation of evidence can only rest on opinion. (Qtd by Murphy 213-14)

Thus, rejecting critical interpretation as subjective and inaccurate, Bowers vindicates the value of textual scholarship as based on four factors: (i) Removing unprincipled emendation, (ii) Establishing a rationally principled text constructed by acceptable methodology to deal with a transmission problem, (iii) Studying the full apparatus of Shakespeare's text, and (iv) Formally analyzing the available documents. He praised Charlton Hinman (1911-1977) for his 1968 Norton Facsimile of the 1623 First Folio, where he studied the variant readings with "meticulous analysis." (Murphy 214)

ii. The connection between the eighteenth-century critics and the Bibliographers

Though apparently of very different categories of editing, Murphy yet detects a connection between the eighteenth-century editors and the New Bibliographers based on the concept of family and removal of corruption. Alfred Pollard's *Shakespeare's Folios and Quartos* (1909) speaks about the "good quartos" (Qtd by Murphy 215) as belonging to a family. Bowers in his book, *Textual and Literary Criticism* (1959) says,

> The most important concern of the textual bibliographer is to guard the purity of the important basic documents of our literature and culture. This is a matter of concern on which there can be no compromise. One can no more permit 'just a little corruption' to pass unheeded in the transmission of our literary heritage than just 'a little sin was possible in Eden'. (Murphy 215)

When Bowers speaks about sins that need to be extracted from ill-editing, he is holding a position not far from the standpoint of the bulk of the eighteenth-century critics, whom we found to be taking up the job of editing Shakespeare with an edifying concern. Murphy's conclusion reveals the link:

> What links the New Bibliographers with their eighteenth-century predecessors, then, is a general sense of the power of the editor and of the hierarchical relationship that exists between the editor and the metaphorical text: where the text is an abandoned orphan, the editor is a foster-parent who must take the text in hand; where the text is a diseased body, the editor is a surgeon who must excise the disease and cure the patient; where the text is a sinful soul, the editor is a priest who restores the text to a state of grace. (Murphy 216)

iii. Criticism of the New Bibliography: The Intentional Fallacy

As this paper has been showing that every editorial procedure has been countered by another equally powerful approach like that of Swinburne's against Furnivall's, here also we find John Drakakis raising a question in his essay, "Intention and Editing," on the concept of 'authority' by saying that in the name of editing, the editor imposes his (or her) intention on the text to be edited. He calls it a fallacy grown out of the editor's intention. He argues that the editor prefers to represent the text the way he thinks it should be presented, but not the way the text deserves to be represented. He gives an instance of intentional fallacy by referring to the character of Imogen in *Much Ado About Nothing*. In both the quarto and folio texts, Imogen remains a silent character. Because of this the Arden 2 editor of the play, A. R. Humphreys eliminated her from the text saying that the dramatist had failed to realize the character. This very excision of Imogen's character, according to Drakakis, is a case of intentional fallacy, which is not supported by the text. (369) The second instance of arbitrary editing by Humphreys is not to retain the several names for Dogberry, like Andrew, Kemp (a real comedian in Shakespeare's company), and Couly. It is not to be known for sure whether Shakespeare made the mistake or the compositor did it. If Shakespeare did it, then was it a mistake or a deliberate intention to produce confusions? What authority does the Arden editor have to bring uniformity to Dogberry's names?

Let us hear Drakakis:

> The issue of "authority" must remain in question given the collective nature of the theatrical enterprise. Greg and his contemporaries—and indeed, some of his successors—continue to fudge this important distinction. The ideological investment that Greg and many others make in a Romantic theory of authorial expressive creatively cannot be allowed to stand after Ronald Barthes' essay on 'The Death of the Author' or

> indeed often Foucault's 'What is an author?' Both these texts imply a very strong distinction between "agency" and "authority," and they lead us to ask further questions about the distinction between what we might call 'meaning production' and 'sense making'. (373)[21]

By 'meaning production' Drakakis must mean the intentional arbitrariness of the editor, and by 'sense making' he must mean for the editor to arrive at a perfect sense on a textual crux. And then he raises a question about the role of the reader in this kind of "editorial self-conception," where the editor conceives of an interpretation intending to cover it for the author. Agreeing that the relationship between the text (a Shakespearean text for that matter) and the reader can never be unmediated, he asks how much mediation is to be tolerated! In the same essay, Drakakis criticizes Stephen Greenblatt on his biography of Shakespeare, *Will in the World: How Shakespeare became Shakespeare*? (2005), for treating unsubstantiated facts as true. He refers to Greenblatt's finding in the phrase "Orion on a dolphin's back" in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* a biographical source that narrates that Shakespeare's father might have taken the young Shakespeare to the Kenilworth entertainment to view "a twenty-four-foot-long mechanical dolphin [which] rose up out of the waters of the lake adjacent to the castle" (365). On this typical Greenblatt-ian speculation, Drakakis comments:

> We do not know, if Shakespeare knew about this particular entertainment; we do not know whether he had watched it as a boy, . . . agency and intention combine in the moment of composition, to the point where it is difficult to determine whether the dramatist is engaged in an act of creation *ex nihilo* so to speak, or whether, pace the structuralist assumptions of new historicism that we have come to associate with Greenblatt's critical methodology." (365-66) (The emphases are Drakakis's)

Drakakis, thus, determinedly rejects the textual criticism as it has been spoiled by the intentional method of the editors.

> Behind what appears to be a series of empirical and historical statement is—and I use the words here of Wimsatt and Beardsley—'an analytical

[21] John Drakakis, "Shakespeare and Intention," in Style, Vol. 44, No. 3, (Fall 2010), pp. 365-377, Published by Penn State University Press, Stable URL:https://www.jstor.org/stable /10.5325/style.44.3.365.

> argument' that rests in the final analysis upon an 'intentional fallacy [that] is a romantic one'. I leave aside where this leaves a "New Historicist" reading, simply because I want to identify a tendency in which, even in the discourse as extraordinarily astute and theoretically aware a reader of Shakespeare's writings as Greenblatt, the intentional fallacy is deeply embedded. (366)

VI.

Most recent studies clarify that since an ideal text cannot exist, the best way to look at the editorial job is to take it not as a thing to be completed for good, but as something in which the process will continue. That is, the editorial job cannot be any longer viewed as a project to be finished by a deadline, but as an assignment where the finishing line recedes further and further into the horizon with every newly found evidence. In this regard Murphy's quoting a passage from Espen Aarsneth is tale-telling:

> After the celebrated deaths of the author, the work, and reading, the text is now giving up the spirit, betrayed by its most trusted companion, the signifier. What is left is linear and nonlinear textuality, or better, linear or nonlinear textualities. This empirical evolution makes possible a shift in method from a philological to an anthropological approach in which the object of study is a process (the changing text) rather than a project (the static text). (Murphy 217).

i. The Hypertext and the electronic text

In explaining the nature of a hypertext Murphy says that it allows "the reader to have access to a great variety of texts." (Murphy 217). The hypertext or the electronic text, first of all, does away with the authority of the editor. As Kathryn Sutherland says, it "denies any provisional or mediated status" (Qtd by Murphy 218), and thus dealing with the archive, the reader enjoys the freedom of choosing, editing, excising the text according to his discretion. That is, in the digital medium, the reader partakes of the job of the editor. The solid authority of the printed and bound edition becomes thereby melted and its authority gives itself away. "What is rendered fluid (potentially if not actually in the electronic archive)," says Sutherland, "is the fixed, prioritizing relation which characterizes the book-bound edition—the relation of 'definitive text', 'copy text',' 'ideal text,' 'Ur text,' and so on." (Qtd by Murphy 218)

VII. Conclusion: the day of the unitary text is over

The idea of a unitary text guided by the guardians is over. Our discussion above about the role of the editors as parents, physicians, pastors, and mentors can no longer work as no single text will be considered a master text. The ideal text does not exist. As Grazia says, the idea of "The fixed signifier, the single text, unified character" is gone. (276). Murphy emphatically says, "our faith in the notion of such a unitary text is interrogated by the wider dissemination of nonlinear electronic materials . . ." (218).

Having concluded thus, I feel that there is a big 'but' to confront. Do we really feel happy with an electronic text as much as with a printed copy? I can only speak for myself in contesting the idea that the hypertext will dominate the scholarly field. Yes, of course, we can download any number of texts available online, or any number of articles on the subject of editorship (as I have virtually done here in preparing this essay) to build up our knowledge, but it is not equal to the pleasure of reading a text itself in the printed form within a bound book, aided by introduction, footnotes, annotations, indexes, and other after-text materials. One may argue that if we can download the hypertext from the internet and print it in a bound form, it will appear as good as any book published by the standard publishing houses. At this point then, paradoxically, the question of taking recourse to an authoritative text comes in, whereby we go back to square one. Which text then do we download for turning into a book to be preserved on the bookshelf? The hypertexts are not always prepared by renowned scholars, they are mainly done by, I presume, middle-ranking genius, who are internet-experts, maybe sound scholars to a degree, maybe more perfect in line counts and other such technical paraphernalia, but they are always to be the group, whom serious students/researchers or young scholars of Shakespeare will not seek to be helped by, they will rather prefer to read a text edited by a Jenkins, an Edwards, or a Greenblatt available in printed bound-book form. I, myself, for one "loathe to forgo" (Grazia 272) the enjoyment of reading a text documenting the unitary authorship of Shakespeare. Though I am quite aware of the massive development in the field of hypertext that might turn all our no's into yes's—and which will ultimately force me to shift my ground. After all, 'change' seems to be the ultimate catchword in the field of Shakespeare editing.

Works Cited

Alam, M. U. (Ed.). (2019). *Hamlet*. Dhaka: Albatross Classics.

Bowers, F. (1976). Scholarship and editing. *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 70(2), 161-188. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.com/stable/24302091.

Dobson, M. (1996). Improving the original: Actresses and adaptations. In J. Bate, & R. Jackson (Eds.), *Shakespeare: An Illustrated Stage History* (pp. 45-68). Oxford University Press.

Drakakis, J. (2010). Shakespeare and Intention. *Style, 44*(3), 365-377. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable /10.5325/style.44.3.365

Edwards, P. (Ed.). (1985). *Hamlet: Prince of Denmark, (The New Cambridge Shakespeare)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Falocco, J. (2012). "This is too long": A historically-based argument for aggressively editing Shakespeare in performance. *Shakespeare Bulletin*, 30(2), 119-143. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26354854

Gabbler, H. W. (2018). Sourcing and editing Shakespeare: The bibliographical fallacy. In *Text Genetics in Literary Modernism and other Essays* (pp. 195-207). Cambridge: Open Book Publishers. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.com/stable/j.ctv8j3xd.12

Grazia, M. d., & Stallybrass, P. (1993). The materiality of the Shakespearean text. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 44(3), 255-283. Retrieved from www.jstor.com/ stable/2871419

Greenblatt, S., Cohen, W., Howard, J. E., & Maus, K. E. (1997). *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Johnson, S. (1993). The preface to Shakespeare. In M. H. Abrams (Ed.), *The Norton Anthology: English Literature* (6 ed., Vol. 1, pp. 2392-2403). New York, London: W. W. Norton & Company.

Murphy, A. (1997). To ferret out any hidden corruption: Shakespearean editorial metaphors. *Text, 10*, 202-219. Retrieved from http:// www.jstor.com /stable/ 30228060.

Orgel, S. (Winter, 1988). The authentic Shakespeare. *Representations, 21*, 1–25. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/2928375.

Paul, J. G. (2010). Performance as 'Punctuation': Editing Shakespeare in the eighteenth century. *The Review of English Studies*, 61(250), 390-413. Retrieved from URL: http://www.jstor.com/stable/40783068.

Proudfoot, R., Thompson, A., & Kastan, D. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works* (Revised Edition ed.). London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.

Stanley, W., & Taylor, G. (Eds.). (1988). *The Complete Works: The Oxford Companion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.