

Shakespeare Variorum Handbook: A Manual of Editorial Practice

MLA Committee on the New Variorum Edition of
Shakespeare

Web publication, 2003

© 2003 by The Modern Language Association of America

All material published by the Modern Language Association in any medium is protected by copyright. Users may link to the MLA Web page freely and may quote from MLA publications as allowed by the doctrine of fair use. Written permission is required for any other reproduction of material from any MLA publication.

Send requests for permission to reprint material to the MLA permissions manager by mail (26 Broadway, New York, NY 10004-1789), e-mail (permissions@mla.org), or fax (646 458-0030).

SHAKESPEARE VARIORUM HANDBOOK

A Manual of Editorial Practice

Second Edition

Revised and enlarged by

Richard Knowles

Prepared for the

Committee on the New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare

of

The Modern Language Association of America

New York

2003

Approved in April 2003 by the Committee on the New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare:

Thomas L. Berger (2000-4)
A. R. Braunmuller (1999-2005); 2002-5 (Ch.)
William C. Carroll (2002-6)
Richard Knowles (general editor; ex officio 1992-)
Anne Lancashire (1999-2003)
Leah S. Marcus (2000-4)
Scott McMillin (2002-6)
Mary Beth Rose (1999-2003)
Paul Werstine (general editor; ex officio 1997-)

Copyright © 2003 by the Committee on the New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare of the
Modern Language Association of America. All rights reserved.

CONTENTS

Preface and Acknowledgments	vi
I. Introduction: The Scope and Purpose of the New Variorum Shakespeare	1
II. The Treatment of the Text	6
The choice of copy-text	6
The general nature of the Variorum text	6
Substantive emendation	6
Dramatis personae list	8
Bibliographical information	9
Emendation of accidentals	9
Lineation	12
III. Act-and-Scene Division and Numbering	14
IV. Line-Numbering	22
Line-numbering procedures for TLN	22
Riverside act-scene-line numbers	25
V. A Procedure for Typing the Text	26
VI. Textual Notes	28
Mechanics	28
Emendations of the copy-text	33
Emendations recorded in the textual notes	33
Emendations recorded in the appendix	34
Emendations not recorded	34
Historical collation	35
General principles	35
Substantive variants	37
Semi-substantive variants	37
Variants of accidentals	40
Variant lineation	42
Variant stage directions	45
Variant speech prefixes	46
Variant act and scene headings	47
Variant place headings	47
Conjectures	48
General principles of writing (and re-writing) textual notes	49
Lists of editions collated	51
VII. Collating Editions: Procedures	52
Preliminaries: choosing and ordering the editions	52
Mechanics: a working method for historical collation of texts	53
VIII. Notes on Editions of Shakespeare	58

- IX. Commentary Notes 106
 - Scope and contents 106
 - Quotation and citation 107
 - Definitions 107
 - Proverbs 107
 - Biblical parallels 107
 - Shakespeare 107
 - Style of the notes 107
 - Writing Variorum commentary 108
 - Working space 108
 - Preliminaries 108
 - Note-taking 109
 - Selection 110
 - Consistency of form 111
 - Cross-references 112
 - Citation of dictionaries 113

- X. The Appendices 115
 - Emendations of Accidentals 115
 - Conjectural emendations 115
 - Text 116
 - Date of composition 116
 - Sources 116
 - Criticism 118
 - Style 119
 - Topicality 119
 - Staging and stage history 120
 - Performances 120
 - Special problems of staging 121
 - The text of the play on the stage 121
 - Costume, scenery 122
 - Doubling of parts 122
 - Music 122
 - Bibliography 122
 - Index 123

- XI. Editorial Policy and Style 124
 - Permissions 124
 - Quotations 124
 - Citation of sources 127
 - Cross-references 129
 - Act-scene-line reference 129
 - Use of Abbreviations 130
 - Spelling 130
 - Capitalization and italics 130
 - Spacing 131
 - Numbers 131
 - Dates 131
 - Submitting the manuscript 132

- XII. Abbreviations and Sigla 133
 - Shakespeare's plays and poems 133

- Journals, series, and reference books 135
- Scholarly and editorial terms 136
- Editions of Shakespeare 142

- XIII. Bibliographies 148
 - The contents of the entries 148
 - The style of the entries 151
 - Procedures 155

- XIV. The Role of Computers 157
 - Practical uses of personal computers 157
 - Internet research resources 159
 - Anticipating electronic publication 164

- XV. Appendices: Supplementary Finding-Lists 166
 - 1. Commentators and Conjectors 166
 - Persons 166
 - Manuscript annotations 172
 - 2. The Stage Historian at the British Library and the Folger 175
 - 3. Theatrical Records at the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust 178
 - 4. Theater Editions 182
 - 5. Notes on Shakespeare in the *Gentleman's Magazine* 184
 - 6. Notes on Shakespeare in the *St. James Chronicle* 190

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS (2003)

The *Shakespeare Variorum Handbook* is intended primarily to establish standards for Variorum editions and to specify how formal details of their apparatus are to be handled. The rules have grown out of the practice of past Variorum editors and the experience of those who are presently at work on Variorum volumes. In his Foreword to the first edition, James G. McManaway cautioned, "As experience increases it will be necessary to add to the rules or to modify them, although no changes are expected to be so radical as seriously to affect the uniformity of the volumes." In fact, since 1971 the General Editors and individual editors of the New Variorum series have collectively learned a great deal about the making of Variorum volumes. Much of this knowledge has been shared in yearly meetings of the editors and has been circulated in annual supplements to the *Handbook*. By now these supplements, with their countless cross-references, deletions, addenda, and revisions, have become too multifarious and bewildering to be a sure and easy guide to editors. The time has arrived for consolidation into a second edition of the *Handbook*.

The time is right for another reason, and that is the decision of the New Variorum Shakespeare Committee of the Modern Language Association to publish future Variorum volumes in electronic as well as paper form. In addition to all the old problems of making a Variorum, future editors will have also to face a wholly new set of considerations arising from electronic publication. This edition of the *Handbook* includes substantially all of the advice given to past editors, but it includes as well a new ch. XIV on the role that computer research tools, delivery systems, markup languages, and forms of publication will play in the preparation and uses of Variorums in the future. Advice for this chapter has been offered by Clifford Wulfman of the Perseus Project at Tufts University; the list of helpful web sites is largely the contribution of Prof. Michael Best at the University of Victoria, with additions suggested by several Variorum editors. Earlier guidance on matters electronic was generously provided by S. W. Reid, Robert O'Hara, John Nitti, Todd Bender, Michael Sperburg-McQueen, Edward Mendelson, Janet Murray, Peter Donaldson, Donald Foster, Susan Hockey, Ian Lancashire, Allen Renear, John Unsworth, Joachim Neuhaus, Greg Crane, and Clifford Wulfman.

As was the case with the first edition, the examples provided to illustrate rules or principles are usually real, occasionally fictitious.

We wish to thank again the contributors to the first edition, whose many and various offerings are acknowledged throughout. The chief contributor to this second edition is Robert K. Turner, whose expertise, unflagging dedication, imagination, good judgment, and sense of humor are responsible not only for many of the improvements in this revision but for the general health of the whole New Variorum enterprise. I wish to thank also George Walton Williams, who arranged to have the original *Handbook* scanned into electronic form at the Duke University Humanities Computing Facility, and Bernice Kliman, who had the many supplements typed onto electronic discs. Among the editors who shared their Shakespearean knowledge and discoveries are Cyrus Hoy, Mark Eccles, G. Blakemore Evans, John Velz, John Hazel Smith, David George, Marvin Spevack, William Woodson, James Kuist, Paula Glatzer, Michael Hiltcher, Paul Werstine, Joseph Candido, Michael Steppat, William P. Williams, Eric Rasmussen, and Andrew Gurr.

It is also a pleasure to acknowledge the continuing and generous support of the New Variorum Shakespeare by Kenneth L. Frazier, Director of Libraries at the University of Wisconsin--Madison, and by Peter Watson-Boone, Director of the Golda Meir Library at the University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee. Without the matchless special collections of Shakespeare editions and reference works maintained at these two libraries and made available to the Variorum General Editors for more than a quarter of a century, the writing of this book and the editing of the New Variorum series would hardly have been possible.

Several proofreadings were the gift of my inestimable wife, Dr. Jane B. Knowles. Any surviving errors are my responsibility. Special thanks also go to Joseph Gibaldi and David

Nicholls for enabling and supervising this publication, and to Judith Altreuter for making its electronic version possible.

R. K.
Madison, February 2003

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS (1971)

After a meeting of New Variorum Shakespeare editors in December 1968 the General Editor appointed a three-man committee to write a handbook to help and guide fellow-editors, to insure uniformity within the New Variorum series, and if possible to find more economical ways for the editions to encompass the present mass and variety of Shakespeare scholarship. Many new departures have been adopted; many other proposals (e.g., a liberally edited critical text) were adopted in early versions of the *Handbook* only to be withdrawn later because of the immense problems they created. We have followed many of the practices of previous Variorum editions not simply out of respect to custom and a wish for continuity in the series, but because lengthy comparison with alternate proposals persuaded us often that our illustrious predecessors had in fact found the best way of doing things.

We are indebted to the wisdom and imagination of many people associated with the New Variorum: to the editors and bibliographers who responded to lengthy questionnaires; to the Variorum Committee--Fredson Bowers, Mark Eccles, Charlton Hinman, Richard Hosley, James G. McManaway, and Robert K. Turner--who carefully scrutinized the last drafts and suggested revisions; to John Hurt Fisher and Michael F. Shugrue of the Modern Language Association for their advice about publication; and above all to the General Editor of the Variorum, James G. McManaway, who from beginning to end watched over this project, and whose encouragement and generosity of his time and advice slumbers not nor sleeps. Among Variorum editors special thanks go to Matthias Shaaber, Mark Eccles, G. B. Evans, Christopher Spencer, and John Velz for their information about editions of Shakespeare; to Ruth L. Widmann for her knowledge of manuscript annotations and computer collation; and to William R. Elton, Editor of *Shakespearean Research and Opportunities*, for permission to absorb most of G. B. Evans's "Rough Notes on Editions Collated for *1 Henry VI*," *SRO* 2 (1966) and of my companion piece on *As You Like It*, *SRO* 4 (1968/69).

We are also pleased to express our gratitude to many people not directly associated with the Variorum series: to John Pomfret and Mary Isabel Fry of the Huntington Library for information about its holdings; to the directors and staffs of the Newberry Library and the Folger Shakespeare Library for conference rooms and hospitality; to the Graduate School of the University of Wisconsin for a travel grant; and to Dr. Walker Cowen, Associate Director of the University Press of Virginia, for permission to print passages from Fredson Bowers's *On Editing Shakespeare*, 2nd ed. (1966). Dr. Cathryn A. Nelson assisted in preparing several sections of the *Handbook*, and Miss Leslie A. Eldridge has our special thanks for typing, assembling, and otherwise helping to prepare several complete drafts.

While every member of the handbook committee contributed to every part of the *Handbook*, the section on textual notes and early versions of the section on text were mainly written by Ruth McGugan, the sections on act-and-scene division and on abbreviations and sigla are mainly the work of Richard Hosley, and I am mainly responsible for the rest. The final editing of the manuscript is the gift of my wife, Jane B. Knowles; any oversights are my responsibility, not hers.

Richard Knowles
Chairman, Handbook Committee
1971

I. INTRODUCTION: THE SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE NEW VARIORUM SHAKESPEARE

The essential purpose of the New Variorum Shakespeare, from Furness's original volumes to those presently being edited under the auspices of the New Variorum Shakespeare Committee of the MLA, has always been to provide a detailed history of critical commentary together with an exhaustive study of the text. Each Variorum edition has therefore provided an authoritative text and a history of direct or implied commentary on that text in the form of editorial emendation, conjecture, and elucidation; of source study, critical analysis, and assessment; and of adaptation or production.

Variorum editions have always attempted to be as comprehensive as human energy and the limits of the printed book allow. They have never pretended to be an archive of every word written about a play, but at best a judicious selection of fact and commentary, representing insofar as humanly possible the whole range of knowledge and opinion that readers might find useful in understanding the play as an artifact and as part of our cultural history. Since Shakespearean study and performance now produce a Niagara of new information every year, the aim of comprehensiveness becomes ever more difficult to achieve. Many of the innovative guidelines in the first edition of this *Handbook* were designed to enable the most efficient presentation of as much of that flood of information as was possible within the covers of a (quite large) book. One cannot include everything, of course; nonetheless, a Variorum provides what no other alternative--annotated bibliographies, anthologies of essays, glossaries, companion commentaries--is able to offer. Nothing else matches its comprehensiveness and detail. It offers instant mastery of all the significant knowledge relevant to a play, knowledge that would take any individual scholar weeks, months, or years to gather on his or her own.

During the past decade, when publication outside the limits of the book--on tape, disc, CD, the Internet--has increased so dramatically, the question has sometimes been raised whether the effort to give "comprehensive" coverage within a Variorum's two covers is not now outmoded. Acknowledging that there is some truth in the suggestion, the Variorum Committee has responded by planning for electronic publication of all future Variorums and perhaps eventual electronic retroconversion of most former ones. The committee has not, however, been persuaded that the growing availability of electronic archives of Shakespearean scholarship has rendered the Variorum approach to scholarship an archaism. If anything, it seems more necessary today than when the extant archives were only of printed paper. Nor is an electronic Variorum likely in the foreseeable future to replace the printed version; each mode of publication has advantages that the other does not.

Virtually no one talks now of the demise of the book. A decade of searching the Internet (or even of retrieving the data in one's own constantly changing computers) has reminded readers of how convenient, accessible, reliable, and easily usable the codex is, and how long a shelf-life it has. Books, unlike electronic hardware and software, do not change much in form every few years, and are always accessible without technical mediation. They also last much longer than fading magnetic charges on disc or tape. Probably basic scholarly works will continue to appear in codex form for the foreseeable future, and the Variorum Committee currently expects to publish its volumes *both* electronically and in print.

Nor are there present plans radically to change the scope and overall approach of the Variorum. The variorum form, like that of dictionaries, encyclopedias, Biblical and Talmudic commentaries, and case-law indexes, has evolved by trial and error over many centuries into a very efficient means of retrieving and assimilating information. It is arguably the most sophisticated and complex form of scholarly hypertext ever developed. The Variorum Committee and its General Editors are therefore proceeding cautiously in modifying it, lest any of its old advantages be lost in the pursuit of those many new advantages offered by the electronic mode, such as rapid searches and possible hypertext links beyond the covers of a printed book.

It has sometimes been suggested that in electronic form the Variorum, instead of excerpting the pith of a comment or criticism on a play, could by hypertext links to a limitless

electronic archive (presumably provided in part by the editor) call up the whole essay or book from which that criticism is excerpted. It is even suggested that the ability to do rapid Boolean searches through existing and future electronic archives on the Internet will render the Variorum useless; to find what has been said about the nature of Hamlet's madness, one will simply search for the key terms "*Hamlet* and *madness*," or depend on someone's tagging of that concept in all extant electronic texts. Or instead of reading the Variorum's notes recording earlier editors' emendations and comments, the reader will go directly to electronic facsimiles of some hundred or more important editions of a play and read the originals for himself or herself. According to these arguments, the Variorum either should convert itself into an analyzed and tagged electronic archive of all books, editions, journals, and manuscripts concerning a play, or else it will be wholly replaced by one.

But of course no one is likely to attempt such a search more than once, any more than one would search through electronic texts (if they existed) of all the thousands of works excerpted in the *OED* rather than simply look up a definition in that work. No sensible reader will ever search anew through the whole corpus of Shakespearean commentary for each question of interpretation concerning a play, when thorough and accurate digests of the sought-for information are instantly to hand in the Variorum. Most readers will not want to read, on screen or in printout, the tens of thousands of pages, most of them repetitious, that have been written on Hamlet's madness, when a Variorum editor who has read all of those pages can summarize the dozen theories that have been proposed in them. (The editor does, of course, refer the reader to the relevant books and articles, providing him or her the means to test, challenge, or transcend what he or she finds in the Variorum.)

For the time being, at least, the obviously preferable alternative to replacing the Variorum as we know it by an unlimited electronic archive is to combine all its past efficiency in selecting and condensing material with the new flexibility and reach of electronic retrieval. Without trying pointlessly to reproduce extant electronic archives and research tools, the electronic Variorum will acknowledge that they are already easily accessible to its readers; perhaps eventually the electronic Variorum will make them even more easily accessible by hypertext links. Already there are digital archives of primary and secondary editions in facsimile, of STC primary texts, of linguistic resources such as concordances and dictionaries and lexical databases, of whole runs of journals, of illustrations and art; these and other resources will doubtlessly continue to proliferate and to become accessible in ways not yet imagined. It is easy to foresee that the electronic version of the Variorum, as it evolves, will increasingly be able to reach out beyond itself and link with these, while offering its own unique digest of the present state of knowledge about a play. Such flexibility will help situate the Variorum as a locus of original research, and make it less a museum of past critical artifacts.

In the meantime the Variorum will remain basically a book (though an electronically searchable and manipulable one). As such it will continue to include features that have made it a convenient guide to vast amounts of scholarly and critical information. As in recent volumes, the text will be of the kind most convenient to hang notes and commentary upon, a modified diplomatic reprint of the earliest full substantive text, in some cases with prose relined to accommodate Folio through-line numbering (TLN; see ch. IV), in some cases supplemented by lines from a collateral text. Students whose interests require full knowledge of the typographical and accidental details (bibliographical, textual, linguistic) of a given substantive text will naturally and necessarily consult a photographic facsimile (in paper or electronic form) or even a live copy of the book itself. But students whose interests, like those presumably of most users of the New Variorum Shakespeare, are primarily literary will continue to be better served by our modified diplomatic text than by a facsimile, since they will be spared the necessity of coping with many literarily insignificant typographical characteristics of the particular edition chosen as copy-text. At the same time they will be presented with such typographical features of the copy-text as may possess literary or textual significance.

A typical page of the edition proper will, as before, have three sections--text, textual notes (including historical collation), and commentary notes--as well as page numbers, the

Riverside edition's act-scene-line cross-reference numbers in the running heads (see ch. IV), and Quarto and/or Folio signature and column numbers in the margins of the play text. This elaborate, convenient, and easy-to-use hypertext page layout will (for the near future at least) be preserved by electronic presentation in a PDF format, which experience has shown to be more stable than on-screen reconstruction from separate files by various browsers using different softwares. The textual notes (including historical collation) will generally record only substantive and semi-substantive emendations, such as are relevant to the vast majority of the commentary on the play. The extremely rare reader who wishes to investigate purely accidental matters in the primary substantive texts or later editions may do so in electronic or printed facsimiles or in live copies; the vast majority of scholars who will use a Variorum edition will be interested in substantive matters, not in non-substantive textual minutiae. However, any emendations of purely accidental details of the copy-text that may be of any possible textual or bibliographical interest will be recorded in a list of emended accidentals as part of the appendix on text, for the use of those few readers especially interested in them. No doubt in collating editions the editor will need to record many non-substantive variants of spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and even typography before he or she can choose what variants to record in the textual notes; and the editor will often find such data useful in determining relationships among the editions collated (e.g., by the use of agreement of accidentals, he or she may show that one edition served as the printer's copy for another). But once the editor has selected the significant variants and established relationships between editions, the bulk of the evidence of the accidentals will be of no conceivable use to most users of the Variorum Shakespeare, and so will not be recorded anywhere in the volume. Perhaps electronic data banks of such textual accidentals may eventually be established, if there is a call for them, but they will not be part of the Variorum. (For further distinctions between substantive, semi-substantive, and accidental variants, see ch. VI under "Historical Collation.")

Another category of variants--unadopted conjectural emendations--will continue to be eliminated from the historical collation recorded on the page with the text and relegated to an appendix. Any conjectural readings adopted in any of the texts collated will of course be recorded in the historical collation, and credit will there be given to the original proposer of the conjecture. Some unadopted printed conjectures may be discussed in the commentary notes; all others will be recorded in a separate list as part of the appendix on text. Obviously none of the conjectures in such an appendix will ever have been considered of much merit (since never adopted) and no doubt, as M. A. Shaaber says in the preface to his Variorum *2 Henry IV*, the world would be a better place if many of them could be forgotten. But such conjectures are indirectly part of the history of the text and should therefore be made available in a Variorum edition for the sake of the occasional student who may be interested in them. The situation is somewhat different in the case of unadopted conjectural emendations in manuscript. Here the editor will be highly selective, including all significant 17th-century examples and perhaps a few 18th-century ones, but virtually none later than the 18th-century.

Thus, the historical collations in future New Variorum volumes will continue to take up as little space as possible on the page of text and yet provide a record of all substantive or semi-substantive emendations. Some of the information previously found therein in older Variorums will now continue to be eliminated entirely from the edition, and other information will be sorted out into separate appendices. The economical style of recording variants that has been used in recent Variorums will continue to be used for the textual notes; and to facilitate its use a complete chronological list of editions collated, with their sigla, will be given on pastedowns inside the front and back covers of the edition, and easily called up on-screen in the electronic version. While it would be possible to store in a data bank and to call up a record of every variant of a word or line in every edition collated, the compression of such data into formulas that has in the past been required by limited space on the printed page still seems preferable for the vast majority of Variorum users. Almost every reader will prefer to see at a glance that at *Ant.* 1534 most editions follow F in reading "whither," that only editions

from Pope's to Johnson's omit the word, and that Capell adopts Thirlby's conjecture "where," rather than repeat the work the Variorum editor has already done by sorting through all the readings of 80 or 100 editions to find these few variants. That will be even truer in cases such as *Ant.* 1630-7, where various editors have rearranged a series of lines in many different ways that can be sorted out only by a considerable amount of time and effort; since the Variorum editor will already have done that work, and will have reported his or her findings in as succinct a way as is possible, probably few readers will prefer to spend their time in duplicating those labors. The Variorum's textual formulas are a powerful tool for compressing a great deal of textual information into minimal space; there is no reason to abandon them for a less efficient method of information retrieval.

As for the more purely critical kind of scholarly information provided in the commentary notes and in the critical appendices, the New Variorum editions will continue to be as inclusive and self-contained as the bulk of modern scholarship will allow. At this point in history no one person can keep up with Shakespeare scholarship and know everything that has been written about the plays and poems; and the main justification for the existence of a Variorum edition is that it is the one place where scholars can expect to find out everything significant that has been thought and known about a work up to that date, in order that they may avoid duplication of effort and uninformed conclusions. The Variorum must continue to attempt to be inclusive, however difficult the burgeoning of scholarship makes that attempt.

The following chapters therefore suggest in detail a number of ways in which, it is hoped, inclusiveness can be realistically approached if not achieved. In the commentary notes factual and objective information must be as economical as comprehensive coverage will allow. When an authority is cited, it must usually be the first (for the sake of a historical survey) or the best authority for an idea, and other sources are to be briefly cited or else ignored. An immense amount of Shakespeare commentary is derivative, imitative, repetitive, and redundant, and does not need or deserve to be endlessly repeated in Variorum notes. In both the commentary notes and the critical appendices, quotation of sources will inevitably become more of a luxury to be justified by the necessity or high desirability of a verbatim report; paraphrase must be widely employed, and many sources of information must simply be cited as being in agreement or disagreement with an idea, without even a paraphrase. When the Variorum cannot reproduce or summarize critical comment as expansively as one might wish, it must at least try to act as an index to it, so that even if readers cannot sample all the pertinent material on a question while they are using the edition, they will at least be apprised that such further material exists and will be given the means to find it easily. Certain kinds of material available elsewhere on a scale not possible in the Variorum--complete stage histories of plays, collections of music, etc.--will simply be referred to if they are generally and easily available, and no attempt will be made to emulate them in this edition. Even texts of sources for the plays, now so easily available elsewhere, may be reproduced selectively, though usually not excluded altogether.

Finally, the Variorum editor must attempt to give a balanced representation of every aspect of scholarship on a play. A Variorum edition is not primarily a place to publish one's original research, and the editor must resist the natural temptation to ride his or her particular hobby-horse at the expense of other interests. An editor should not, for example, let a personal interest in stage history result in an appendix on that subject whose size is all out of proportion to the place of stage history in the history of critical interest in the play. An editor who has done a complicated compositor analysis of the printing of a quarto should not print all the data that he or she has collected in making the analysis, for the sake of making generally known the habits of certain compositors; rather the editor should include in the appendix on text the minimum information needed to establish his or her points, and should print a fuller discussion of the data and the conclusions from them as a separate journal article or monograph. Inevitably the editor will find that he or she has collected many times more material than can be put in the edition; and in cutting out potentially usable material, the editor must see to it that the

selection does justice to the scholarly readers and, of course, to Shakespeare. The editor may wish to save unused data on disc and perhaps make it available in such electronic data banks as may be established for such a purpose. That purpose, however, is different from that of the Variorum, which is the difficult one of providing a critical guide to the whole range and variety of fact and opinion on a play, not the impossible one of recording every word in all the collective Shakespeare libraries of the world.

For the origin and early history of the New Variorum Shakespeare, read James M. Gibson's enjoyable biography of Horace H. Furness, *The Philadelphia Shakespeare Story* (New York, 1990).

II. THE TREATMENT OF THE TEXT

The choice of copy-text.

Throughout the following pages *copy-text* is used in R. B. McKerrow's sense of "the text used . . . as the basis of mine" (*Works of Thomas Nashe*, 1 [1904]:xi) and not in W. W. Greg's sense as given in "The Rationale of Copy-Text," *SB* 3 (1950-1), 19-36.

In each case the first edition of a play, provided it is authoritative, should be the copy-text. The so-called "bad quartos"--the earliest printed texts of *2H6*, *3H6*, *Rom.*, *H5*, *Wiv.*, and *Ham.*--cannot qualify; the *Per.* quarto, in the absence of any other text, must qualify. The General Editor(s) and the Special (Textual) Editor will decide which of multiple substantive texts should be the copy-text, as well as which complete scenes or other passages missing from substantive texts but regarded as important parts of a play should be inserted into the copy-text from earlier or later editions.

The general nature of the Variorum text.

After lengthy study, discussion, and trials of different kinds of facsimile and critical texts, the Handbook and Variorum Committees concluded that the proper kind of text for a Variorum edition is that form of modified diplomatic reprint of the copy-text which is a literatim reprint, according to (or adjusted to) Folio lineation, and with minimal editing. Since a New Variorum Edition is primarily a research rather than a reading edition, the editor's first responsibility is not to smooth out the text, making the rough places plain for the sake of general readability, but rather to preserve as much of the original texture as will be useful to a student of the editorial treatment of, and critical commentary about, the play. What distinguishes a Variorum edition from all others is the volume of commentary it contains, and the volume of data on transmission of text, many times that in other editions. It is precisely for the extensive commentary and collations that scholars are motivated to consult this edition. Therefore, the main purpose of the text of a Variorum Edition should be to accommodate the commentary and collations as efficiently, i.e., as economically and conveniently, as possible.

Clearly a text which offers a minimum of editorial intervention between text and commentary is best. On the one hand, a text in which the editor has attempted to resolve all the textual cruxes that have troubled other editors and critics and has recorded all emendations in the textual notes, forces a user to puzzle through collational formulae to find the original data of a textual problem. The simpler and more efficient procedure, as Furness discovered when he abandoned an edited text for a type facsimile, is to leave the difficulties in the text. Similarly, a text in which the editor has corrected, normalized, expanded, and modernized purely stylistic matters, may have suffered complete removal from the edition, or at best to notes and appendices, of textual features that are either suggestive in themselves or that have formed the basis of previous bibliographical theories. Such texts would swell the edition's apparatus and make the edition less convenient and useful for research purposes. On the other hand, with accurate photographic facsimiles of Folio and Quarto texts easily available in print or electronic form, there is no need for a text which at the cost of great pains and expense seeks to reproduce insignificant details of archaic typography. A modified diplomatic reprint of the copy-text, therefore, best serves the Variorum's need of economy, convenience, and usefulness. In general the guidelines described below ought to be followed scrupulously, and any exceptions to them should be cleared with the General Editor(s).

Substantive emendation.

As the name "diplomatic" (from Lat. *diploma*, "document") suggests, the aim of a diplomatic text is to give a literal transcription of a copy-text, accurate in all essential details

though not reproducing some kinds of unessential features found in a facsimile. In general the diplomatic editor is confined to the emendation of purely typographical details; his or her text reprints the exact readings of the original, even readings believed to be erroneous, without editorial interference of any kind. The textual emendations of other editions will be recorded in the textual notes, and the Variorum editor should indicate in the commentary notes which of these readings (or which unadopted conjectures, including any of the editor's own) are believed to be correct, when he or she has a definite opinion on such a matter; but the editor will not in any way alter the text in accordance with his or her opinions, as would be done in a critical edition. Any reading found in the copy-text (including even such redundancies as the two "grey-eyed morn" speeches in *Romeo and Juliet*, Folio through-line numbers 999-1002 and 1006-9) will be reprinted exactly in the Variorum text.

One kind of substantive emendation that will be allowed in the Variorum text is the addition of authoritative material not found in the copy-text. Upon agreement of the Special Editor and the General Editor(s), such material will be added, to provide a full version of the play containing all the lines that have appeared in editions during the past four centuries. If the Variorum editor is to fulfill the role of representing the whole history of commentary on the play, he or she must somehow include in the Variorum text all the lines to which commentary has been attached in the past. The general principle behind the importation of such material from a secondary substantive text should be to print it if it supplements the copy-text, but not to print it if it is essentially a variant or an emendation of an error in the copy-text. Thus a whole scene or authoritative speeches within a scene might be printed; but individual words within a line, or a missing speech prefix, would probably not be supplied, on the grounds that they would be essential alterations of the existing text rather than necessary supplements. Stage directions may pose special problems. In a pure diplomatic text the existing stage-directions in the original would not be supplemented with others from a secondary text; and an editor might decide that it was inadvisable to mix two sets of stage directions from original texts of different provenances. Exceptional cases should be cleared with the General Editor(s), but the following example from *MV* will illustrate a solution to the problem arising when F contains a stage-direction (on a line to itself) which is wanting in copy-text Q:

Let all of his complexion choose me so. *Exeunt.*

<i>Enter Salarino and Solanio</i>	2.8 1054
<i>Sal.</i> Why man I saw <i>Bassanio</i> vnder sayle,	1056

In the textual note the apparently missing line is accounted for:

1055 *Om.* Q1; *Flo.* *Cornets* F1

(Note that in this special instance the marginal through-line number [TLN; see ch. IV] and the act-scene number must share a line. The special problem of act and scene division is discussed in ch. III.)

The other kind of substantive emendation permitted in the Variorum text is the substitution of readings from a corrected state of the copy-text. In the case of press-altered formes the editor may wish to adopt the corrected state except in cases of positive error; the textual note should list the variants as corrected (c) or uncorrected (u). A complete record of press corrections will be given in an appendix. Use a "corrected" state of the text only if you have examined the line in question and can be sure that the correction really is one rather than the result of necessity on the part of the compositor or directions issued by a proofreader.

Examples from *Lr.*:

a. 1067 seuerall] Q1(u); seueral Q1(c)

- b. 1474 varlot] Q1(u); varlet Q1(c)
 c. 1481 allow] Q1(u); Allow Q1(c)

In each of these instances, read with the uncorrected state. In a., the compositor, in changing incorrect *hand* to correct *home*, was compensating for the wider *m* by eliminating the last *l* in *seueral*; yet it is likely that the uncorrected spelling with two *l*'s is what the compositor was looking at. In b. and c., read *varlot* and *allow*: since the (u) state contains obsolete variants of words, the compositor may be following MS, the proofreader merely sophisticating.

As a general rule, semi-substantive emendations--i.e., changes of accidental details that affect meaning--will not be made in the text. See the discussion of treatment of accidentals below.

The mechanics of indicating substantive additions to the copy-text are as follows. When a single line is added, an asterisk should be printed at the beginning and end of that line, without space and within the margins. E.g.,

Yor. *Should I do so I should bely my thoughts,*
 Comfort's in heauen, and we are on the earth. . . . (R2 1031+1-1032)

Whilst we were wandering with the Antipodes,
 Shall see vs rising in our Throne, the East, . . . (R2 1404+1-1405)

When more than one line is added, an asterisk should appear at the beginning of each line and at the end of the last line, thus:

*The meanes that heauens yeeld must be imbrac't
 *And not neglected. Else heauen would,
 *And we will not, heauens offer, we refuse,
 The profered meanes of succors and redresse. (R2 1355+1-+4)

For an example of the treatment of a quarto text, see ch. V on typing the text.

In the rare case when less than a line is added, or when a press-correction is substituted, asterisks precede and follow the addition or substitution, thus:

Needs must I like it well. *I weepe for ioy.* (fictitious example)
 mine, twice or thrice in that *last* Article: rehearse that (TGV 1416)
 Clo. A ripe age: Is thy name *William*? (AYL 2361)

When words or lines from two collateral texts are combined in the Variorum text, the editor may wish to distinguish omissions from one text as well as additions from the other, by enclosing the omitted parts in half-brackets. Thus in this example from *Lr.*, whose copy text is Q,

May be preuented now. The 'two great' Princes *France* and *Burgundy*, 50

the words within asterisks are imported from F1, and those in half-brackets are original Q words missing from F.

Dramatis personae list.

If a *dramatis personae* list is part of the copy-text, it should be printed along with and according to the same standards as the copy-text. If necessary, names of characters may be

added, provided they are preceded by single asterisks to indicate substantive emendation. If the copy-text has no dramatis personae list, the Variorum editor may print one of his or her own choosing or devising. Since the earliest list (especially if it is Rowe's) may have become the basis of many or most later lists, and since commentary may often refer to its conventional wording, the editor may find that list the most convenient one to adopt, adding names as needed: but if any other listing seems equally convenient, the editor may choose it if he or she wishes.

Dramatis personae lists should precede the head-title with edition line numbers arbitrarily assigned to them. Of the five plays in F1 which have lists printed after the texts, the three (*Tmp.*, *MM*, and *WT*) which are necessarily copy-texts should be assigned line numbers in logical sequence after the last Norton facsimile through-line number (TLN; see ch. IV). Thus in *WT* "The Names of the Actors." is numbered 3370; "*Emilia*," 3380; "*Autolicus*," 3385. The treatment of F1's lists in the other two plays (*2H4* and *Oth.*) will be dictated by the choice between Q1 and F1 as copy-text.

If a locus of the action is supplied by the copy-text, it should be moved along with the dramatis personae to precede the title, but it should retain its copy-text position with respect to the dramatis personae. Thus in *Tmp.* "The Scene, an uninhabited Island" is edition line 1 but is numbered marginally according to its TLN, 2342, and "*Reapers*" is edition line 22 but is numbered marginally according to its TLN, 2363. The two lines of the head-title "THE | TEMPEST." would be designated 0.1 and 0.2 (see ch. IV on line-numbering, rule 5).

Examples of dramatis personae lists may be seen in Mark Eccles's *MM* or Robert Turner's *WT*.

Bibliographical information.

The Variorum text will not reproduce such features of the copy-text as headlines and catchwords nor record in the textual notes significant variants of these, though significant variants and press alterations of such features should be recorded and discussed in the appendix on text. The text will, however, indicate in the right-hand outer margin the beginning of each quarto page and/or Folio column. When the copy-text is the Folio, the New Variorum page of text will print flush right opposite the first line of each Folio column a signature and column indicator in parentheses, thus: (R3^vb), indicating signature R3 verso, column b. When the copy-text is a quarto, both Folio columns and quarto pages will be indicated; opposite the first line of each quarto page the New Variorum text will print, in the outer margin, the quarto page signature in square brackets, thus: [C1], [D2^v]. When the copy-text is the Folio but a full quarto text exists, both Folio and quarto indicators will be given. These page and column indicators will not compete for space with the line numbers in the right margin of the Variorum text, since they will be in the outer margin.

Emendation of accidentals.

The modified diplomatic text of the New Variorum editions will leave intact as much as possible of the original accidental texture as might have any conceivable significance, including copy-text spelling, punctuation, italics, capitals, and abbreviations. The kinds of patent errors and meaningless typographical peculiarities that may be emended or ignored are detailed below. Insignificant emendations of typographical details or of accidentals are to be made silently (see "Emendations not recorded" in ch. VI on "Textual Notes"); if any changes of semi-substantive importance are made in the text, they are to be recorded in the textual notes; and all others, including changes of details that might have bibliographical significance or that a reader interested in reconstructing important aspects of the copy-text would need to know about, are to be recorded in an appendix of emended accidentals.

Archaic typographical features of the copy-text which have no bearing on meaning and which are unnecessary and costly to reproduce will be ignored or silently replaced by modern

typographical equivalents. Box rules and ornaments will not be reproduced. Display and swash capitals, factotums, and ornamental initials will be printed as simple roman or italic capitals, and the capitals following display capitals will be printed in lower case. The abnormal use of a small or large capital will be normalized to a regular capital or a lower case, as the context demands. Ligatures and digraphs (except *æ* and *œ*) will be printed as separate letters. The use of *u* for *v*, *v* for *u*, *i* for *j*, and *vv* for *w* should be retained as in the copy-text; although these are technically typographical practices, they were conventional (if less regular) in manuscript as well and so have some claim to be considered as Elizabethan spelling. Since there is no absolute need to normalize these usages to modern practice, since they may reflect the spelling in the manuscript copy, and since questions of ambiguity treated in the textual notes and commentary must often refer to the use of these conventions in script and print, it seems advisable to leave the copy-text as intact as possible in such matters. Although the same argument could be made for retaining the long-*s* for modern *s*, it seems doubtful that the great trouble and (possibly) expense necessary to retain it would be justified by the few occasions when long-*s* and *f* are confused, since such a case of ambiguity as *fight/sight* may be easily explained in the commentary notes. Long-*s* will therefore be normalized to modern *s* in the Variorum text (and in all quotations appearing throughout the edition; the one possible exception may be in the exact quotation of textual data in the appendix on press-variants).

Abbreviations such as *L.*, *Mr.*, *gent.*, *w^c*, *y^e*, *y^t*, *remōstrate*, *&*, *&c.*, arabic numbers, and pound-shilling-pence signs will not be expanded. To avoid the trouble and cost of making special types, however, digraphs such as *y^t* (where the second letter is directly above the first) should be printed as two letters, *y^t*, the second letter as a superscript following the first rather than directly above it. Abbreviated proper names will not be expanded in the text proper or in the accessories.

All wrong-font, damaged, doubtful, or misprinted letters should be corrected. Abnormal occurrences of italic, roman, or swash type (including italic *A*, *a*, *I*, *O*, and *o* when they are used as words in a roman context) should normally be corrected silently. Thus an editor may silently emend “bird” to “bird” as well as “Bero.” to “Bero.,” but the latter instance, if it apparently resulted from a shortage of italic *B*, would be mentioned along with other type-shortage evidence as a part of the discussion of the printing of the copy-text. In some early printing little distinction seems to have been made between roman and italic marks of punctuation. The general rule for Variorum texts is that italic punctuation appears in italic context (as, for example, the lyric of a song) and roman punctuation in roman context, even in association with italicized proper names or mottoes within roman context. The anomalous old punctuation should be altered silently as though it were merely wrong-font type, although its occurrence should be mentioned in the appendix on the text if it is bibliographically significant. A broken or doubtful letter should be corrected silently unless meaning is in doubt because of it, in which case its emendation and any history of editorial disagreement occasioned by it should be recorded in the textual notes. Similarly a printing space-type or printing shoulder of a letter-type should be silently corrected, but where editors have regarded the defect as a letter, comma, or apostrophe, it should be recorded in the textual notes.

Incorrect, turned, and transposed letters should be corrected. When such changes are from a non-word to the correct form of the intended word (e.g., from *anp* or *nad* to *and*, from *thete* to *these*), they should be recorded in the appendix of emended accidentals. When, however, a clearly erroneous letter makes a standard English word, so that the emendation is from one word to another (e.g., from *lone* to *loue*, *own* to *now*, *wot* to *woe*), the change should be recorded in the textual notes, along with the readings of later editions.

The spacing of sections, lines, words, contractions, elisions, etc., should be silently normalized wherever such changes do not have semi-substantive or bibliographical importance. Unnecessary white space between lines should be eliminated. A space should be introduced after periods, commas, colons, semicolons, question marks, and close parentheses where the copy-text has no space, though where two punctuation marks appear together no space

should separate them. *Bury_al^l* should be printed as *Buryall* and *rec ord* as *record* without note, but the repair of all such run-together words as *myhand* should be recorded in the Appendix of Emended Accidentals. There should be no attempt to normalize such legitimate forms as *a loft* for *aloft* or *my selfe* for *myselfe*; they are not errors, and the preponderance of one form over another in the copy-text may simply be the result of the compositor's own imperfect normalization of the manuscript or of his justification of lines.

Capital letters should be supplied silently only if their omission in the original is clearly a typographical accident, as at the beginning of a verse line, of a sentence, of a stage direction, of a proper noun, or of a speech prefix. However, in special cases likely to be commented upon, such as the many consecutive lines of verse in the 1600 quarto of *MV* which begin with lower-case letters, capitals should not be supplied. The copy-text should be followed in the capitalization or non-capitalization of un-named characters (Servant, Boy, Officer, etc.) in stage directions, of individual common nouns (including apparent personifications), of the first word following a colon, semi-colon, or question mark, and of *I* and *ile*, *A*, *O*, and *ô*.

The copy-text should be followed exactly in its italicization or non-italicization of whole words, including speech prefixes, proper nouns, foreign words and sentences, stage directions, songs, poems, incidental verse, allusions, quoted matter, letters, proclamations, prophecies, and inset plays. Even such an exceptional case as the roman speech prefixes and italic speeches in *Rom.* 1.3 and 1.5 should be allowed to stand unaltered.

The copy-text punctuation, no matter how inadequate, careless, or erroneous it may seem by modern or Elizabethan standards, should virtually always be reproduced exactly as it stands, except that punctuation errors of a clearly typographical nature may be corrected. A missing period after a speech prefix, stage direction, or act or scene heading, whose absence can not affect meaning in the least, may be supplied silently, unless such omissions seem to be a regular feature of the copy-text, in which case the editor may wish to leave them unemended and discuss them in the appendix on text. A period which, in the judgment of the editor, is needed to end a full sentence may be supplied and the change recorded in the appendix of emended accidentals; if such omissions seem repeatedly to signify suspensions, however, they should be allowed to stand and be discussed in the appendix on text. Such normal Elizabethan practices as linking complete sentences with commas, ending interrupted speeches or rhetorical questions with a period, putting the question mark after the question proper rather than at the end of the sentence, and using the question mark after an exclamation should all be followed without change. Copy-text hyphenation should be followed even when it seems illogical by modern practice, as in "You cloudy-Princes, & hart-sorowing-Peeres"; and conversely, the copy-text should be followed when it apparently omits a hyphen from a compound epithet, as in "fearefull bloody issue." No special marks of punctuation should be added to indicate that a speech is left incomplete or intended to be an aside, and a comma at the end of a speech that might signal its incompleteness should not be emended.

All copy-text spelling should be retained except for those cases that are demonstrably erroneous because of typographical error. Merely abnormal spellings, including variant spellings of a character's name, or common variants like *of/off*, *to/too/two*, and *the/thee*, should not be changed except where a misprint is certain. The mis-spelled or corrupt forms of foreign words should be reproduced exactly; such distortions may either have some point or may represent what Shakespeare thought was reasonably correct form. Normal variants in word division, such as *no body/nobody*, *good man/goodman*, *all together/altogether*, *a gain/again*, *to morrow/tomorrow*, *shall be/shalbe*, etc., should be printed as they appear in the copy-text. The printing of an unnecessary apostrophe to indicate elision, as in *put's*, *ha's*, *do's*, *can'st*, *it's*, *whil'st*, *among'st*, *by'th'way*, *i'th'right* should not be considered a typographical error, since the practice is conventional. Conversely the copy-text should be followed in leaving out an apostrophe where one might be expected, as in such common variants as *where* (for *where*, 'whether'), *eer* (for *e'er*, 'ever'), *wast* (for *was't*, 'was it'), *toot* (for *to't*, 'to it'), *i'th way* (for *i'th'way*), etc. The spelling of passages imported from a secondary text should not be changed

to conform with the normal spellings in the primary text. Speech prefixes should not be expanded or normalized, though a clear typographical error in a prefix should be corrected.

Lineation.

Verse lineation should follow the copy-text. All turned-under or turned-over verse lines should be printed as single continuous typographic lines; the parenthesis mark that usually precedes the turnunder or turnover should be omitted from the text, words divided by turning under or over should be printed whole, and these alterations should be recorded in the appendix of emended accidentals. This rule applies to turnunders with their own Folio TLN number (e.g., *IH6* 1797). No part-line will be indented to indicate that it continues or completes a full line of verse; variant attempts to arrange lines as verse will be recorded in the textual notes.

Lines of verse (often hypermetrical) that exceed the measure are sometimes printed not as turnovers or turnunders, but as two lines in Q and F with different line division. Cf. *MV* 8-9:

Q	I am to learne: and such a want-wit sadness
	makes of mee,
F	I am to learne: and such a Want-wit sadnesse makes of
	mee,

Since Q is the copy-text, and the Variorum reproduces the copy-text lineation of verse, these lines may be printed and numbered thus:

I am to learne: and such a want-wit sadness	8
makes of mee,	8-9

Here the line division follows Q, while the vertical stroke indicates how the line division is different in F (and where the change in TLN occurs).

Prose lineation for both Folio and quarto copy-texts should exactly reproduce the Folio lineation (except in exceptional cases where the sequence of lines in a quarto copy-text differs from that in the Folio). Quarto prose will frequently have to be relined to conform to counterpart lines in the Folio. The reason for this relining is to insure an exact correspondence between the Variorum line and the Folio TLN numbers used for reference throughout the edition (see ch. IV). When unique quarto lines are imported into a Folio copy-text, they will be printed in their original quarto length, and the “plus-numbers” (+1, +5) by which they will be identified in the margin and referred to in the notes will correspond with the original quarto lineation.

When end-of-line word-division is caused by relining the prose of a quarto copy-text, the appendix of emended accidentals will record the word-division and hyphenation only if the end-of-line hyphen in the Variorum text was originally present in the copy-text as joining the parts of a true compound. Conversely, when an end-of-line hyphen in the copy-text is retained in mid-line after relining because the hyphen joins the parts of a true compound, the appendix of emended accidentals will record that the compound was originally broken and hyphenated at the line-ending. All other changes to or from hyphenation that are caused by re-lining should be made silently.

The arrangement and placement of stage-directions should as much as possible reflect that in the copy-text. Stage directions should not be re-located to follow a different line of text; ornamental arrangements of lengthy stage directions (as inverted pyramids, etc.) should be reproduced for the sake of keeping Folio TLN numbers and line-length in correspondence; and for the same reason an *Exit* or *Exeunt* should not be raised to the level of the line it follows.

When F1 prints as one line (with one TLN) a stage-direction that occupies two lines in a Q copy-text, treat thus:

Enter Bassanio, Portia, Gratiano, and all | their traynes. 1341

The Variorum text's lining and TLN indicate that the SD occupies one line in F, while the line-division stroke shows where it is divided into two lines in Q.

III. ACT-AND-SCENE DIVISION AND NUMBERING (By Richard Hosley, 1971)

Folio through-line numbering (TLN; see ch. IV) provides an “absolute” system of reference to the lines of Shakespeare, but it does not provide a system of reference to the parts of a Shakespearean play. Act- and scene-divisions therefore remain a practical necessity. They pose a complex editorial problem which can be clarified by observing a distinction between act- and scene-*headings* (conventional formulas printed as part of the text) and act- and scene-*numbers* (a numerical system making possible precise reference to any scene in Shakespeare). In most editions act- and scene-*headings* themselves constitute the reference-numbers, but it is possible to have a complete system of numerical reference without (or without invariably) printing headings as part of the text if the act- and scene-numbers are invariably printed in the margin, as in the Pelican Shakespeare or the Cambridge Beaumont and Fletcher. The point is made because Shakespeare’s plays are heterogeneous in having been printed originally, some with, some without, act- and scene-*headings*. In this respect the plays fall into three classes.

<i>Class 1</i> Plays having a copy-text without act- and scene- <i>headings</i> :	<i>Class 2</i> Plays having a copy-text with act- <i>headings</i> only:	<i>Class 3</i> Plays having a copy- text with both act- and scene- <i>headings</i> :
1. <i>Ado</i> (Q)	1. <i>Err.</i> (F)	1. <i>Tmp.</i> (F)
2. <i>LLL</i> (Q)	2. <i>Shr.</i> (F)	2. <i>TGV</i> (F)
3. <i>MND</i> (Q)	3. <i>AWW</i> (F)	3. <i>Wiv.</i> (F)
4. <i>MV</i> (Q)	4. <i>H5</i> (F)	4. <i>MM</i> (F)
5. <i>R2</i> (Q1; or Class 3 if copy-text F)	5. <i>Cor.</i> (F)	5. <i>AYL</i> (F)
6. <i>IH4</i>	6. <i>JC</i> (F)	6. <i>TN</i> (F)
7. <i>2H4</i> (Q; or Class 3 if copy-text F)		7. <i>WT</i> (F)
8. <i>2H6</i> (F)		8. <i>Jn.</i> (F)
9. <i>3H6</i> (F)		9. <i>IH6</i> (F)
10. <i>Tro.</i> (Q)		10. <i>R3</i> (F)
11. <i>Tit.</i> (Q)		11. <i>H8</i> (F)
12. <i>Rom.</i> (Q2)		12. <i>Mac.</i> (F)
13. <i>Tim.</i> (F)		13. <i>Oth.</i> (F; or Class 2 if copy-text Q)
14. <i>Ham.</i> (Q2; or Class 3 if copy-text F)		14. <i>Cym.</i> (F)
15. <i>Lr.</i> (Q1)		15. <i>TNK</i> (Q)
16. <i>Ant.</i> (F)		
17. <i>Per.</i> (Q)		

It is assumed that each of the three methods of arrangement is significant and hence to be preserved in a conservative scholarly edition. (Each method is, of course, representative of a much larger class of Elizabethan dramatic texts.) Accordingly, each edition in the New Variorum Shakespeare will reflect the arrangement of its copy-text, as the case may be either omitting act- and scene-*headings*, printing act-*headings* only, or printing both act- and scene-*headings*.

In view of occasional incompleteness and inconsistency in the act- and scene-divisions of the copy-texts, it is necessary to use a non-substantive system of act- and scene-numbers for the sake of reference. And since it is impossible at the present time to create a system of

numbering that will be “absolute” (in the sense that TLN is absolute for line-references), it seems advisable to adopt the generally accepted act- and scene-numbering of the Riverside edition (which has replaced the Globe edition as the edition of general outside reference in the Variorum). This expedient is admittedly unsatisfactory, but then so are all other systems of numbering. The clear advantage of the Riverside numbering is that its use in the Spevack concordances has led to its adoption as a standard of reference in many recent studies, editions, and reference works. The confusion attendant upon the occasional renumbering of scenes in recent editions such as the second Arden and New Oxford Shakespeares should emphasize the value of a commonly accepted system of act- and scene-numbering. Each edition in the New Variorum Shakespeare will therefore refer to and marginally print the act- and scene-numbering of the Riverside edition (but will not necessarily adopt its act- and scene-division or its act- and scene-headings). The immediately following notes relate to the mechanics of printing the act-scene numbers.

1. Act-scene numbers will use arabic numerals connected by a period but without a space (e.g., **3.5**).
2. The appropriate Riverside act-scene number will be printed (in boldface arabic numerals) flush with the right margin on a level with the first line of text (heading, stage-direction, or dialogue) of the scene in question. (If it displaces a regular marginal TLN number, the next line of text will be assigned such a number.)
3. The appropriate Riverside act-scene number(s) will also be printed in the headline of each page, since the inclusive Riverside act-scene-line numbers for each page will be printed flush with the outer margin (as discussed in ch. IV on line-numbering).
4. Act-scene numbers in the right margin (but not in the headline) will be printed in boldface type. Normally the number will be in roman boldface, but in those few cases where the act-scene heading differs from the act-scene number, the reference number (as explained in pars. 10-12 below) will be in italic boldface.
5. All act- and scene-headings retained in the text will be printed, as normally in F, between a pair of horizontal rules running the width of the type page. No attempt will be made to imitate the box resulting from the meeting of horizontal and vertical rules in F.
6. A single horizontal rule will be printed immediately before most scenes not headed with an act-scene heading. The procedure is explained in pars. 13, 15 below.

It is axiomatic that the editorial treatment of act- and scene-divisions in the New Variorum Shakespeare should be based on practices observable in the substantive texts of Shakespeare. Three principles of scene-division are employed in those texts. (a) The basic principle is that a new scene is marked after a cleared stage attended by an obvious change of locale. Practically all instances of scene-division in Shakespeare conform to this principle (example under par. 7 below). (b) A corollary of the foregoing principle is that a new scene is not marked if the cleared stage is attended by “continuing” locale. Of this convention there are some two dozen instances in Shakespeare (example under par. 17 below). However (c), an exception to the foregoing corollary is that a new scene sometimes is marked after a cleared stage attended by continuing locale. Of this convention there are some three or four examples in Shakespeare (example under par. 11 below). Still another convention, according to which a new scene is marked in the case of a cleared stage attended by continuing locale and a lapse of dramatic time, is of doubtful relevance to the substantive texts of Shakespeare (see par. 19 below).

It is a curious fact that the two different methods of dealing with continuing locale after a cleared stage (b, c) are found together in a single text. Most editors redivide *Cymbeline* in accordance with the principle (a) that a new scene is marked only after a cleared stage attended by a change in locale. They suppress the F division 1.2 at 1.1.70 by combining F 1.1 and 1.2 as Riverside 1.1, thus converting the seven scenes of Act 1 in F into six scenes; and they suppress the F division 3.7 at 3.6.28 by combining F 3.6 and 3.7 as Riverside 3.6, thus converting the last three scenes of Act 3 in F into two scenes. The practice is dubious, however, in a conservative scholarly edition, since the F scene-headings emended by deletion are not erroneous; they are simply based on a variant, if abnormal, method of scene-division. Inconsistently, the same editors mark a new scene at Riverside 2.5 (= F 2.4.153), although the locale there continues; yet (a further inconsistency) they fail to mark a new scene at Riverside 4.2.101, where again the locale continues (some early editors marked a new scene at this point also). The New Arden editor (Nosworthy) sensibly preserves the two variant methods of scene-division in F, but he is able to do so only at the expense of departing from the traditional (Globe) and Riverside numbering of the seven scenes in Act 1 (six scenes in Riverside) and of the last three scenes of Act 3 (two scenes in Riverside). Clearly it is desirable to employ an editorial procedure that will preserve the system of reference represented by the Riverside act- and scene-numbers as well as the two conflicting methods of marking scenes in F after a cleared stage attended by continuing locale.

The following notes attempt to deal with most of the problems that will arise in thus combining the traditional Riverside act- and scene-numbers with the act- and scene-headings to be found in the Shakespearean copy-texts.

7. In the case of a copy-text act- or scene-heading judged to be not erroneous, the heading will, of course, be retained. Example: *Mac.* 3.3:

	3.2	...
<i>Macb.</i> . . .		
So prythee goe with me.	<i>Exeunt.</i>	1215
<i>Scena Tertia.</i>	3.3	
<i>Enter three Murtherers.</i>		
1. But who did bid thee ioyne with vs?		

8. In the case of a copy-text act- or scene-heading judged to be erroneous, the heading will not be emended. Example: *IH6* 5.5:

	5.4	...
<i>Yor.</i> . . .		
For heere we entertaine a solemne peace.	<i>Exeunt.</i>	
<i>Actus Quintus.</i>	5.5	
<i>Enter Suffolke in conference with the King, Glocester, and Exeter.</i>		2820
<i>King.</i> Your wondrous rare description . . .		

9. In the case of a copy-text act- or scene-heading judged to be erroneously omitted from the text, the heading will not be supplied. Example: *IH6* 1.2 (the dividing rule in the example is explained in pars. 13 and 15 below):

<i>Winch. . . .</i>	1.1 . . .
And sit at chiefest Sterne of publique Weale.	190
<i>Exit.</i>	

<i>Sound a Flourish.</i>	1.2
<i>Enter Charles, Alanson, and Reigneir, marching with Drum and Souldiers.</i>	
<i>Charles. Mars his true mouing, . . .</i>	195

10. In the case of a copy-text act- or scene-heading which varies in number from the corresponding Riverside act- or scene-number because of Riverside's different act-division, the copy-text heading (not being erroneous) will be retained. In this case the Riverside's reference-number will necessarily vary from the number of the heading, and the discrepancy in numbering will be acknowledged by printing both the marginal act-scene number and appropriate headline numbers in italic boldface type. Example: *H5 4.7*:

<i>King. . . .</i>	4.6 . . .
Giue the word through.	<i>Exit.</i>

<i>Actus Quartus.</i>	4.7

<i>Enter Fluellen and Gower.</i>	2525
<i>Flu. Kill the poyes and the luggage, . . .</i>	

11. A situation analogous to that discussed in the preceding paragraph is caused by Riverside's occasional omission of a copy-text scene-heading because it is based on a system of scene-division different from the system normally employed in the copy-text and from the system generally employed in the Riverside edition. In the examples that have been noticed, the copy-text heading accords with the principle of marking a new scene at a (technically) cleared stage even though the locale "continues," whereas the Riverside omission of the heading accords with the principle of marking a new scene only after a cleared stage attended by a change of locale. (In these examples the stage is only technically cleared because owing to the "enjambement" or linking of successive actions, the entering players of the second scene have come on stage before the exiting players of the first scene have gotten themselves off.) In such cases the copy-text heading (not being erroneous) will again be retained, and the appropriate headline numbers will again be printed in italic in acknowledgement of the discrepancy between text and reference-number. The Riverside scene number will not be repeated in the margin opposite the heading. Example: *Cym. 1.1.70*:

1 We must forbear. Heere comes the Gentleman, The Queene, and Princesse.	1.1 . . . 80
<i>Exeunt.</i>	

<i>Scena Secunda.</i>	

<i>Enter the Queene, Posthumus, and Imogen.</i>	
<i>Qu. No, be assur'd . . .</i>	

12. A consequence of the cases described in the two preceding paragraphs is that, until the end of the act in question, the copy-text numbers of any scenes subsequent to the scene in question

will be different from the Riverside scene-numbers used for reference. In any such case the copy-text heading in question (not being erroneous) will again be retained, and both the marginal reference-number and appropriate headline numbers will be printed in boldface italic in acknowledgement of the discrepancy between text- and reference-number. Example: *Cym.* Riverside 1.2 (= F 1.3):

<i>Imo.</i> . . .	1.1 . . .
For this time leaue me.	<i>Exeunt.</i>

<i>Scena Tertia.</i>	1.2

<i>Enter Clotten, and two Lords.</i>	
1. Sir, I would aduise you . . .	

13. In the case of a copy-text without act- or scene-headings, headings will not be introduced to the text, but the beginning of each new scene (or “action”) will be indicated by the typographical device of a single horizontal rule similar to one of the pair of rules that will bracket copy-text act- and scene-headings. Thus in undivided texts an unobtrusive mark of punctuation will be provided that will correspond to the “punctuation” afforded by act- and scene-headings in divided texts. The system of scene-division employed will be that which is dominant in the substantive texts of Shakespeare, namely that a new action will be judged to begin after a cleared stage attended by an obvious change of locale. (The requirement that the change of locale be “obvious”--that is, explicitly stated in the dialogue--is designed to avoid subtle argument about an alleged change of locale that would not be readily apparent to an audience viewing a performance on a stage without scenery [an example occurs at *Mac.* 5.8.34]). The action-dividing rule (as it may be called) corresponds to the action-dividing printer’s ornament used in the Pelican Shakespeare except that, wherever the end of an action corresponds to the end of a printed page of text in the New Variorum Shakespeare, the rule will be printed at the beginning of the new action--that is, at the head of the later page of text rather than at the foot of the earlier. In fact, a secondary function of the action-dividing rule will be to indicate the beginning of a new action at the top of a page where the reader might not readily understand that the entrance there recorded is to a cleared stage attended by a change of locale. (Another difference between the action-dividing rule here proposed and the action-dividing printer’s ornament of the Pelican Shakespeare is discussed below under Par. 19.) Example: *Ham.* (Q2) 1.4:

<i>Ophe.</i> I shall obey my Lord.	1.3 . . .
	<i>Exeunt.</i>

<i>Enter Hamlet, Horatio and Marcellus.</i>	1.4
<i>Ham.</i> The ayre bites shroudly, . . .	

14. In the case of a copy-text with act-headings only, the copy-text act-headings will (as in Par. 5) be retained and printed within a pair of horizontal rules. Example: *JC* 4.1:

Away, go.	3.3 . . .
	1850
	<i>Exeunt all the Plebeians.</i>

<i>Actus Quartus.</i>	4.1

Enter Antony, Octavius, and Lepidus.

Ant. These many then shall die, . . .

15. In the case of a copy-text with act-headings only, scene-headings will not be introduced to the text but the action-dividing rule will be used (as specified in Par. 13) at the heads of all new actions not beginning an act. Example: *JC* 4.2:

	4.1 . . .
<i>Octa.</i> . . . Millions of Mischeefes.	<i>Exeunt.</i>
<i>Drum.</i> Enter Brutus, Lucillius, and the Army. Titinius and Pindarus meete them.	4.2
<i>Bru.</i> Stand ho.	1910

16. In the case of continuing action in the copy-text where Riverside marks a new scene (usually there is a change of locale with actors, in Elizabethan production, remaining on stage), the action-dividing rule will not be employed, and the text will be printed without interruption and with normal spacing. There are some sixteen occurrences of this phenomenon in Shakespeare. Ten are in the case of a copy-text without act- or scene-headings: *MND* (Q) 2.2-3.1, 3.2-4.1; *R2* (Q1) 5.3-4; *2H4* (Q) 4.1-2, 4.4-5; *Tit.* (Q) 1.1-2.1; *Rom.* (Q2) 1.4-5, 2.1-2, 4.4-5; *Ham.* (Q2) 3.4-4.1. Three are in the case of a copy-text with act-headings only: *Shr.* Ind. 2-1.1, 1.1-2; *JC* 4.2-3. And two are in the case of a copy-text with both act- and scene-headings: *MM* 3.1-2, *1H6* 4.5-6; cf. *Lr.* (F) 2.2-4. Because of its importance, several examples of the phenomenon are given.

(a) *JC* 4.2-3:

	4.2 . . .
<i>Bru.</i> . . . Let Lucius and Titinius guard our doore.	<i>Exeunt.</i>
<i>Manet Brutus and Cassius.</i>	4.3
<i>Cassi.</i> That you haue wrong'd me, . . .	1970

(b) *2H4* (Q).4.1-2:

	4.1 . . .
<i>West.</i> The prince is here at hand, pleaseth your Lordship To meet his grace iust distance tweene our armies.	2095 2096
<i>Enter Prince Iohn and his armie.</i>	2100
<i>Mow.</i> Your grace of York, in Gods name then set forward.	2097-8
<i>Bishop.</i> Before, and greete his grace (my lord) we come.	2099
<i>Iohn.</i> You are well incountred here, . . .	4.2

(c) *Lr.* (F) 2.2-4 (Q1 copy-text, however):

	2.2 . . .
<i>Kent.</i> . . . Smile, once more turne thy wheele.	<i>sleepes.</i> 1250
<i>Enter Edgar.</i>	2.3
<i>Edg.</i> I heare my selfe proclaim'd, . . . That's something yet, <i>Edgar</i> I nothing am.	<i>Exit.</i>
<i>Enter King.*Foole, and Gentleman.*</i>	2.4
<i>Lear.</i> Tis strange	1274

(d) *Tit.* (Q) 1.1-2.1:

<i>Saturn.</i> Be it so Titus, and gramercie to.	<i>Exeunt.</i>	1.1 . . .
<i>Sound trumpets, manet Moore.</i>		2.1
<i>Aron.</i> Now climeth Tamora Olympus toppe, . . .		555

(e) *MND* (Q) 2.2-3.1:

<i>Enter Tytania Queene of Fairies, with her traine.</i>		2.2
<i>Quee.</i> Come, . . .		651
<i>Her.</i> . . .		
No, then I well perceiue, you are not ny:		810
Either death, or you, Ile finde immediately.	<i>Exit.</i>	
<i>Enter the Clownes.</i>		3.1
<i>Bott.</i> . . .		
The Wren, with little quill.		945
<i>Tytania.</i> What Angell wakes me from my flowry bed?		

(f) *Ham.* (Q2) 3.4-4-1:

<i>Ham.</i> . . .		3.4 . . .
Good night mother.	<i>Exit.</i>	2584-5
<i>Eenter King, and Queene, with Rosencraus and Guyldensterne.</i>		4.1
<i>King.</i> There's matter in these sighes, . . .		

It will have been noted that copy-text continuity of action is violated by the Folio act-division at *Tit.* Act 2 (with adjustment of staging to the demands of an act-interval) and at *MND* Acts 2 and 3 (in the latter case again with an adjustment of staging to the demands of an act-interval). The reason for the difference is that in each case the text without act-headings (*Tit.* Q 1594, *MND* Q 1600) relates to performance without interruption in a public playhouse before about 1609, whereas the text with act-headings (F 1623) relates to performance interrupted by act-intervals in a private playhouse or in a public playhouse after about 1609. (Copy-text continuity of action is violated also by the Riverside act-division at *Ham.* Act 4.) The “violation” of copy-text continuity of action is one of the reasons why act-headings of a secondary substantive text should not be introduced to the text of an edition based on a copy-text without act-headings.

17. In the case of a cleared stage attended by continuing locale, the action-dividing rule will not be employed, and the text will be printed without interruption and with normal spacing. Example: *Mac.* 5.7-8:

<i>Sey.</i> Enter Sir, the Castle.	<i>Exeunt.</i>	<i>Alarum.</i>	5.7 . . .
	<i>Enter Macbeth.</i>		5.8
<i>Macb.</i> Why should I play the Roman Foole, . . .			2436

18. The rule proposed in par. 17 will not be invoked in a case where to do so would involve omitting a scene-heading found in the copy-text. The reason for this rule is that even

within a single text the scene-division can accord with more than one principle of scene-division. At *Mac.* 5.8 a new scene is not marked, presumably because the locale continues (par. 17), but at *Mac.* 2.3 a new scene *is* marked *although* the locale continues. Cf. par. 11.

Example: *Mac.* 2.3:

	2.2 . . .
<i>Macb.</i> . . .	
Wake <i>Duncan</i> with thy knocking:	
I would thou could'st.	<i>Exeunt.</i> 740
<i>Scena Tertia.</i>	2.3
<i>Enter a Porter.</i>	
<i>Porter.</i> Here's a knocking indeede: . . .	<i>Knocking within.</i>

19. In the case of a cleared stage attended by continuing locale and a lapse of dramatic time, the action-dividing rule will not be employed. (In such a case the Pelican technique requires the action-dividing printer's ornament.) Only two Shakespearean examples of the phenomenon have come to notice (*R3 F* 4.3, 5.4). In each of these the copy-text, although generally equipped with act- and scene-headings, omits a scene-heading. (The omission is not unquestionably "correct," but it seems reasonable that the copy-text should here be given the benefit of the doubt.) Continuing locale, even if attended by a lapse of dramatic time, will therefore be treated in the manner suggested in par. 17.

IV. LINE-NUMBERING

The Variorum page of text will have two sets of line numbers printed on it. Flush with the right margin of each page will be the Folio through-line numbering (TLN) for the play--that is, the numbers of the successive type-lines of the Folio as counted straight through each play. This is the "absolute" numbering system proposed by McKerrow in 1939 and since adopted in the Norton facsimile of the First Folio, in the Oxford Shakespeare Concordances, in the latest volumes of the Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, and in the headlines of the Riverside Sh. The TLN numbers will be used for all internal reference to the play within its own edition--that is, for all reference to the play in the textual and commentary notes and in the appendices. These Folio numberings will be used even when the copy-text is a quarto. The TLN numbers for most plays can simply be copied from the Norton facsimile; *Pericles* and *Two Noble Kinsmen* will have to be provided with their own through line numberings according to the principles used in the Folio TLN, as explained in McKerrow's *Prolegomena*, pp. 60-2, or in the introduction to the Norton facsimile, p. xxiv. Those for *Per.* are provided in Trevor Howard-Hill's Oxford Concordance (1972), and for both plays in the headlines of the Riverside Sh. (ed. Evans, 1974). To avoid any doubt that these are quarto-based line numbers, the editor may wish to prefix a Q to them: e.g., Q1348.

The Riverside act-scene-line numbers will also be included in the Variorum edition for purposes of external reference: since, as a result of their adoption in the Spevack concordances, they will probably be the standard line reference for some time to come, the Variorum editions need to print them on the page of text for convenient cross-reference to present and many future editions and works of scholarship. However, since they are included only as an added convenience for the user of the edition, to allow him or her to locate a passage by its Riverside numbers, there is no need to take up space in another margin with a second set of line-numbers: the inclusive Riverside numbers for each page of text will therefore appear flush with the outer margin in the headline for each page, thus: 2.3.4-12 (on a verso page); 2.3.13-15 (on the following recto page); and so on. Since the average number of lines of text on the Variorum page is between 7 and 8, the reader can locate a passage by such headline numbers just as easily as if the Riverside numbers were given by 10's in the margin alongside the text. Riverside act-scene numbers will of course appear in the margins as explained in the section on act-and-scene division and numbering.

Line-numbering procedures for TLN.

Since the TLN numbers will be used throughout the Variorum volume as the edition's own basic system of line reference, these numbers should be in exact correspondence with the lines printed in the Variorum text; where quarto lineation of verse or prose differs from that in the Folio, as it occasionally does, the Variorum's marginal numbers should reflect and indicate the nature and extent of the divergence, so that a reader can determine the TLN number of a given word or line in the text as printed, without having to consult the Norton facsimile or any other edition. The reason for relining the prose of a quarto copy-text to conform to that in the Folio is to keep such divergences to a minimum. Line-numbering should be indicated according to the following rules.

1. The marginal numbers printed opposite the text will be multiples of five; but when a page contains fewer than five lines of text and no multiple-of-five number appears in the margin, the top line on the page should be numbered. Except where quarto lineation differs from the Folio, or where there are very short pages of printed text, therefore, the TLN numbers will be separated by four typographic lines of text. The editor preparing the typescript need only include the regular multiples of five in the margin.

Whenever a TLN number falls on the same line as a marginal act-scene-number, the latter will always take precedence over the TLN number and be printed instead of it. In such cases a TLN number will be printed opposite the next line.

The dramatis personae list will of course have its own separate numbering, by fives.

2. When the Variorum text contains one or more quarto lines absent from the Folio, including stage directions less than a full line in length imported (if they ever are) into a Folio copy-text, each typographic line or part-line peculiar to the quarto is considered as having its own number, just as each typographic line in the Folio has its own regular TLN number. In such cases the last line before and the first line after the material not in F will be given their F numbers marginally, the first line not in F will be marked +1 and the last one +17 (or whatever it may be), and the appropriate intermediary lines will be marked by fives, +5, +10, +15, etc. These “plus-numbers” will be printed flush against the right margin, just as the TLN numbers are. Reference to such lines in the notes or appendices should be by the last previous Folio line-number and the plus-number for the particular line or lines from the quarto, thus: 786+1, 786+3, 786+1-+3, 786+3-788.

When such additional quarto lines interrupt a Folio line, the last Folio line before the material not in F is given its TLN followed by a hyphen to indicate the line’s incompleteness, and the first Folio line after the extra material is given the same TLN preceded by a hyphen to indicate the completion of the interrupted line. Thus in *Ado* 4.2, the marginal numbering will read 2010, 2013-, +1, +4, -2013, 2015, to indicate that four lines of quarto text appear in the middle of the Folio line 2013. The hyphen would not, of course, appear in numbered references to the quarto lines: that is, one would refer to 2013+2, not to 2013-+2. See examples at the end of ch. V, “A Procedure for Typing the Text.”

3. The omission from a quarto copy-text of a significant part (i.e., an important word, phrase, or clause) of a Folio line may, at the discretion of the editor, be signaled by a hyphen after the TLN number, thus: 146-. The hyphen will not, of course, appear in references to the line or to any part of it.

4. When a quarto copy-text line contains significantly more material (i.e., an important word, phrase, or clause) than is in the Folio line, that fact may, at the discretion of the editor, be signaled by a plus sign after the TLN number, thus: 268+. The plus sign will not, of course, appear in references to the line or to any part of it. When part of a quarto verse line omitted from the Folio line appears in the Variorum text, it should not be given a separate “plus-number” but should be assigned the TLN for that Folio verse line. Thus at *Lr.* 769-75:

<i>Lear.</i> We that too late repent’s, ‘O sir, are you come?’ ¹	
is it your will*, speake Sir?*	770
‘that wee ¹ prepare any horses,	
ingratitude! thou marble harted fiend,	
more hideous when thou shewest thee in a child,	
then the Sea-monster,	
* <i>Alb.</i> Pray Sir be patient.	
* <i>Lear.</i> * detested kite, thou list	775

Here Q’s false prose has been correctly set as verse in F, save that the Q phrase “O . . . come?” has for some reason been omitted from F, leaving the verse line incomplete. There is no reason to give this Q-only phrase a separate “plus-number” (769+1) since it was almost certainly intended to complete the verse line in the manuscript behind Q, and so may be given the number of the short verse line in F (769) that it naturally completes. The F-only “Pray . . . patient” of course gets its Folio TLN number 774. Contrast the following example from *Lr.* 109-10:

Halfe my care and duty, | sure I shall neuer
Mary like my sisters, 'to loue my father all.¹

109-10
110, 110+1

Here the (doubtless incorrect) verse lineation of the Q copy-text is preserved, as it should be, the Q-only “to . . . all” completing the verse line as it does in Q. That phrase, however, cannot be considered part of F’s complete verse line 110 (“Sure . . . sisters,”) and so must be assigned the kind of “plus-number” (110+1) given to lines or part-lines not in F.

5. Titles of plays, which are not assigned regular TLN numbers, will be numbered 0, and the 0 will be printed in the margin opposite the first line of the title. Titles occupying more than one line on the Variorum page will be referred to by separate decimal numbers for each line, reflecting the number of lines in the copy-text, thus: 0.1, 0.2, etc.; but these numbers will not be printed in the margin. Thus the title *The Tempest*, printed on two lines in the Folio, will be numbered 0 in the margin, and a note on its second word, occupying a second line in F, would be numbered 0.2; the title *The second Part of Henry the Sixth, with the death of the Good Duke HVMFREY*, occupying three lines in the Folio, would be referred to by the numbers 0.1-0.3, while words in some part of that title would be referred to as occupying line 0.1, 0.2, or 0.3 as appropriate; but only 0 will be printed in the margin, opposite the first line.

6. A turned-under or turned-over part of a verse line is to be considered as essentially part of that line rather than as part of the typographic line in which (or more exactly, to the right of which) it was printed in the copy-text. This is implied by the fact that no TLN number is assigned to a Folio line that contains only a turnover or a turnunder, and by the practice in the Variorum text of relining turnovers and turnunders as continuous parts of their respective verse lines. Any note on a turnover or turnunder, therefore, will refer to it by the TLN of the verse line it completes, and not by the number of the typographic line to the right of which it was printed in the copy-text. The one exception is the rare case where a turnunder is printed at or near the left margin in the Folio and is given its own TLN (e.g., *IH6 1797*). Here, although the turnunder will be printed continuously with the verse line that it completes with a vertical rule separating the two elements, the notes will refer to that final portion of the line by its proper TLN (1797) rather than by the number of the rest of the line (1796). The text should be rendered as

Sent from our Vnkle Duke of Burgundy.

Glo. What means his Grace, that he hath chaung'd | his Stile 1796-7

7. When two separately numbered Folio lines are combined into one verse line in a quarto copy-text (e.g., *2H4 2097* and *2098*), the marginal number opposite the Variorum line will be compound (*2097-8*) to indicate the joining of two typographic lines, and notes for the first part, last part, or the whole of the line will be numbered by the appropriate TLN number or compound number (in this example, *2097*, *2098*, and *2097-8* respectively). Here is another example from *Lr.*, where the (erroneous) verse lineation of the Q copy-text is preserved:

I find she names my very deed of loue, | onely she came short, 76-7
That I professe | my selfe an enemye to all other ioyes, 77-8
Which the most precious square of sence possesses,
And find I am alone felicitate, | in your deere highnes loue. 80-1

Similarly with a Folio copy-text, compound numbers will be printed opposite a Variorum verse line formed by adding a separately numbered turnunder to the previous Folio line: in the example given in rule 6, the compound number would be *1796-7*. In each instance, a vertical

stroke will be printed in the Variorum text to separate the two elements and show precisely where the line-division occurs. This rule does not apply to prose, since quarto prose is always relined to agree with the Folio lineation, and since Folio turnunders occur usually in verse.

8. In the unlikely event that one line of Folio verse is printed as two lines of verse in the quarto copy-text, the same TLN number will be printed opposite two successive Variorum lines. Occasionally the same problem arises when a short Folio stage-direction shares a typographic line with some dialogue, as in *Lr.* 1586:

Or ere ile weepe, O foole I shall goe mad.	1586
<i>Exeunt</i> ^r <i>Lear, Leister, Kent, and Foole</i> ¹ .	1586

Here *Q*'s long *Exeunt* . . . was reduced to a single word in *F* and put on the same typographic line as verse line 1586. It is numbered accordingly in the Variorum text, since there is no substantial difference between the *Q* and *F* directions.

9. When a quarto copy-text's location of a line is different from that in the Folio, the line's TLN will be printed in the margin between the TLN numbers of the Variorum lines before and after it, and its removal from its place in the Folio sequence of lines will be noticed by two unconsecutive TLN numbers in the Variorum margin at that place. For example, in *2H4* the location of the SD at Folio 2100 at a place three lines earlier in the quarto would result in the following sequence of TLN numbers in the margin: 2096, 2100, 2097-8, 2099, 2101.

Riverside act-scene-line numbers.

The Riverside numbers will be added to the edition at the time of page proofs. At that time the editor will go through a set of preliminary proofs and make a double-column list of inclusive act-scene-line numbers to be added to the headlines of facing pages, thus:

	Verso	Recto
p. 9		1.1.1
pp. 10-11	1.1.2-9	1.1.9-14
pp. 12-13	1.1.15-20	1.1.20-3
pp. 14-15	1.1.24-1.2.3	etc.

The printer will then add these numbers to the pages all at once, and print sets of final proofs.

V. A PROCEDURE FOR TYPING THE TEXT

I describe here a procedure for keyboarding the text which may be helpful to editors and which, if followed, should result in reasonably uniform typescripts, with consequent advantages to the General Editor(s) and the publisher. It is based on my experience with *Lr.*, a quarto-based text with long prose lines; editors will want to make adjustments accordingly for their own different texts. (It should be obvious that in the following discussion the terms originating with the mechanical typewriter, such as *type*, *typescript*, *tabulator*, *keyboard*, etc., refer equally to their electronic counterparts, and that (typed) manuscript, typescript, and computer printout are taken to be functionally the same.)

1. *Setting margins and tabulators.* The editor should first determine the length of the longest line in the play. This can usually be done easily by counting the number of characters (including spaces) in the longest turned-over or turned-under verse line (seldom more than 65 characters), but a prose line in or imported from a quarto might be longer (up to 75 characters). Once the length of the longest line has been determined, the editor needs to set the text-width, margins, and tabulators. For *Lr.*, using an elite (12 pitch) type size, I needed to set the text width at 80 characters. This in turn required my widening the text width from the default 78 characters (6.5 in., at 12 chars. per inch), and making room for the wider text by narrowing the left margin, using (in my program) an Offset command. Then I set five tabs: 2 (for indenting speech prefixes 2 spaces), 28C (for the centering of stage directions), 51R (for the right margin of exits), 70R (for the right margins of TLNs and boldface Act-scene numerals), and 80R (for the bibliographical markers of signatures and columns). The principles will be the same in other programs though the setting and commands may differ. The longest TLN will generally be seven characters--e.g., 2319-20, 2347+14--, the longest quarto signature will be five characters--e.g., [R2^v]--, and the longest Folio column indicator will be seven characters--e.g., (Ss3^{va}).

2. *Spacing lines of text.* The lines of all text should probably be typed out in single-spaced lines. Since the manuscript will ultimately be printed out doublespaced, there will in most cases be adequate white space before and after act-scene rules. Special adjustments can be made before the final printout.

3. *Typing speech-prefixes.* Go to the first tabulator position. This will indent the speech-prefix two spaces. The terminal period of the prefix should be followed by a single space. Lines of text (not accessories) without speech-prefixes should be typed flush with the left margin (unless, of course, they are clearly intended to be indented or centered--e.g., a song).

4. *Typing centered accessories.* For centered stage directions (usually entrances or manets), act- and scene-headings, song headings, and other occasional accessories that seem intended to be centered in the copy-text, use the second (centering) tab setting. Do not bother trying to reproduce variant, off-center placements of such accessories in the copy-text unless the spacing seems somehow significant; in general, regularize.

5. *Typing short stage directions flush right.* Use the third tab setting for exits and short action-directions that are printed flush with the right margin in the copy-text. If the tab setting is correct, these should also appear roughly at the Variorum (spoken) text's right margin; if not, readjust the tab setting. Regularize all insignificant spacings; when accessories are only near the right margin in the copy-text but not quite flush, they should be typed flush right unless there seems some special reason for maintaining their position nearer the center.

6. *Typing marginal numbers.* Use the fourth tab for all TLNs and boldface act-scene numbers, and the fifth tab for signature and column indicators which will be typed flush with the farthest right margin.

7. *Spacing after punctuation.* In the text and accessories (but not in the marginal numbers), a single space should follow each period, comma, colon, semicolon, question mark, exclamation mark, close quotation mark, and close parenthesis, except that where two punctuation marks appear together no space should separate them. All spacing irregularities in the copy-text should be normalized by this rule; and conversely, unnecessary spaces in the copy-text following a hyphen or apostrophe, or between two marks of punctuation, should be closed up.

Two examples of typescript appear below.

HAMLET

<i>Ham.</i> Then is Doomes day neere, but your newes is not true; *Let me question more in particular: what haue	1285
*you my good friends, deserued at the hands of Fortune,	
*that she sends you to Prison hither?	
* <i>Guil.</i> Prison, my Lord?	
* <i>Ham.</i> Denmark's a Prison.	
* <i>Rosin.</i> Then is the World one.	1290
. [1291-1313 imported from F1]	
* <i>Ham.</i> No such matter. I will not sort you with the	
*rest of my seruants: for to speake to you like an honest	1315
man: I am most dreadfully attended; But in the beaten way of friendship, what make you at <i>Elsonoure</i> ?	

For Textual note, see "Emendations recorded," rule 1, in ch. VI.

MUCH ADOE ABOUT NOTHING

<i>Ke.</i> Pray write downe Borachio. Yours sirra.	2010
<i>Con.</i> I am a gentleman sir, and my name is Conrade.	
<i>Ke.</i> Write downe maister gentleman Conrade: maisters, do you serue God ?	2013-
<i>Both.</i> Yea sir we hope	+1
<i>Kem.</i> Write downe, that they hope they serue God: and write God first, for God defend but God shoulde goe before such villaines:	
maisters, it is prooued alreadie	+4
that you are little better than false knaues, and it will go neere to be thought so shortly, how answer you for your selues?	-2013
	2015

VI. TEXTUAL NOTES

The following are guidelines and examples for the writing of textual notes according to a more selective and compact system than that used in older Variorum editions. The notes will contain two kinds of information: a record of significant emendations (if any) of the copy-text made by the Variorum editor; and a record of the historical collation of substantive and semi-substantive variants in major editions other than the copy-text, down to the present day. An earlier plan to record these two kinds of information in two separate ranks of notes was abandoned because the method promised to take up too much space on a page of Variorum text. Although when both kinds of information are to be recorded they will appear in the same note, rules for handling each kind are grouped in separate sections below because of the different kinds of problems each presents; and the question of the mechanics of recording both kinds of information is treated in the first section of all so that the examples given in the other sections will be immediately comprehensible. For the sake of editorial style in this *Handbook*, the examples here are single-spaced, but in the Variorum editor's typescript they will be double-spaced. Most of the examples throughout are from *1 Henry VI* unless otherwise identified, though a few are fictional.

As will be seen from the following rules and guidelines, the writing of textual notes is an exacting and complex enterprise. All editors are advised to send a first draft of their notes on, say, the first 100 or 200 lines of their plays, for a preliminary check by the General Editor(s), who may head off problems that would otherwise keep appearing in the next four acts, and so may save everyone much work.

Mechanics.

1. TLN is used for the reference numbers--e.g., 1259 or 2013+3.
2. The lemma is in the type and spelling of the Variorum (i.e., copy-) text, and the variant is in the type and spelling of the first edition cited after the variant. Thus (to use a fictional example) in the note 513-14 *Two lines ending* looks, . . . me. Ff, "looks" reproduces the F1 spelling, not the Q1 copy-text spelling "lookes," since the Folio lineation is the variant being noted. When quoting readings as lemmata or as variants, be scrupulous to reproduce such typographical features of the original as small capitals (indicate by double underlining or by enclosing capital letters within curly brackets), italics, and oe/ae ligatures. Do not record the typographical devices--italics, black letter, brackets, obeli--by which some editors call attention to their emendations. Do not insert a vertical stroke in lemmata or in variant readings unless there is some special reason to indicate line-division. Normally one would simply write 2-3 then enter] Enter below, *not* then | enter]. These typical notes reproduce the accidentals of the texts quoted:

1763 *Poictiers*] Pataie v1785+ (-NLSN, CAM3, PEL, EVNS)
2027 2. *Mes.*] *Lucy* THEO1+

3. The lemma sign (a swung, or wavy, dash: ~) is used to avoid printing the word(s) of the lemma when the variant is a matter of sentence punctuation only.

1625 sword,] ~ ? ROWE1-WARB, HAN3

It should not, however, be used when the punctuation affects the form of single words rather than sentence syntax:

2322 proud commanding] proud-commanding [*not* ~ - ~]

2519 John] John's [*not* ~ 's]

If the note involves verbal changes as well as alterations in punctuation, the variant readings should be entirely spelled out and punctuation simply omitted if there is none in the original. One wavy dash represents one word in the lemma. Thus one writes

one_^ way,] ~ , ~ _^ XXX

but

one way,] one, weigh XXX

and not

one_^ way,] ~ , weigh_^ XXX

A space should be left before and after the lemma sign.

4. The plus sign means that all completely collated editions after that siglum read as that edition does in all essential details. E.g., in 2027 (see rule 2) all editions after THEO1 identify the messenger as Lucy, although the type may differ--roman, italic, caps, etc.

5. Most textual notes will be on variants not sufficiently significant to require consultation of additional occasionally quoted editions. In these notes, the hyphen between sigla, as in

37 fearful?] ~ . F3-HAN3; tearful? JOSEPH (ed. 1964)

means that all completely collated editions between and including F3 and HAN3 read as the immediately preceding variant. When an occasionally quoted edition is cited in a note, use its siglum if it has one, and otherwise the editor's name.

6. The minus sign (as in the example for 1763 in rule 2) means that the editions whose sigla follow the sign and are enclosed in parentheses do not read as the variant but *do read as the Variorum text*. This device is intended to save space by reducing the number of sigla to be written down. Editions whose sigla follow the minus sign *must* read as the Variorum text.

7. The caret sign (^) means that punctuation present in either lemma or variant is missing in the other. There should be a space between a caret and a lemma sign, but not between a caret and the word it follows.

5 *Exeter*_^] ~ , F2+
1923 Victories,] ~ _^ COL, HAL, ALEX, ARD2

8. Variants which involve several lines or a whole line precede those which involve smaller groups, i.e., parts of lines or single words.

2256-9 *Degr.* POPE, HAN
2256 *Om.* JOHN3, v1773-v1813, KTLY
2258 he . . . thinkes] me thinkes he smiles POPE
who should] he would KTLY
say,] ~ ? ARD2

While it is true that a note on two or more lines precedes a note on anything in the first of those lines, a note on a word or phrase that runs over from the end of one line to the next should appear in normal order--that is, after notes on anything earlier in the first line. Thus for notes on the following lines,

Yes, I think he is not a picke purse, nor a horse-stealer, but for his verity in loue,

1732

notes would appear in this order:

1732-3 *Two lines of verse* . . .
 1732 picke purse] . . .
 1732-3 horse-stealer] . . .

9. A lemma, variant reading(s), and sigla for the editions in which the variant(s) appear are regarded as an entry. The first line of an entry for a given line of text is preceded by that line's TLN number, indented five spaces. If the entry continues beyond one line, the second and successive lines of the entry begin at the left margin. When there is more than one entry for the same line of text, the TLN number for the line is not repeated before the second and successive entries, and the first line of each successive entry for that line of text is indented as far as the first word in the first line of the first entry.

Char. So we be rid of them, do with him what y^u wilt.

 2329 of them,] *Om.* CAP, v1773, ARD2; of 'em, KTLY
 with him] *Om.* POPE1-JOHN2, HAN3, mCOL1, COL2, DYCE2, HUD2,
 ARD2
 him] them F3-ROWE1, ROWE2, CAP, v1773, NLSN, KIT1-ALEX, SIS,
 ARD2; 'em MAL-KTLY, WH1, DEL2, DYCE3, WH2-EV1, RID, CAM3, MUN,
 PEL1+

10. A variant and the sigla for editions in which it appears constitute a unit which is separated by a semicolon from the next unit of variant-and-sigla (if there is more than one variant per lemma). There is no terminal punctuation for the entry as a whole. (See example for 2329 in rule 9 above.)

11. Sigla are in caps; since they will be printed in the edition in small caps, they will have to be marked in the typescript by double underlining or some other means (see "Submitting the manuscript" in ch. XI). Sigla are separated from other sigla either by a hyphen (F2-ROWE1) or by a comma and space (CAM1, ALEX). When two sigla are separated by a hyphen, indicating the agreement of three or more editions in succession, give the full siglum for the first and the last edition in the run, and not some shortened form. Thus Q1-Q3, *not* Q1-3; ROWE1-ROWE3, *not* ROWE1-3; and ROWE1-JOHN1, *not* ROWE-JOHN.

Do not allow overlap in the formulas; thus do not write WH, HUD2-IRV if both WH and HUD2-IRV are formulas that include WH2; instead, write WH1, HUD2-IRV, in which WH2 is recorded only once (by implication, in HUD2-IRV).

12. If the abbreviation that is the basis of several sigla for a family of related editions (as CAM is the basis for CAM1, CAM2, CAM3a, CAM3b, etc.) stands alone (without arabic numerals or letters) in a note, it indicates the agreement of all completely collated editions in that family. Thus THEO would indicate the agreement of THEO1, THEO2, and THEO4 (the fully collated editions) but not the further agreement of THEO3 and THEO5 (because they were only occasionally quoted editions) nor of other editions intervening in the chronological list, such as HAN1 and WARB (because they are not members of the same family of editions).

Because some editions or some volumes of multi-volume editions were revised (e.g., RID, CAM3, ARD2, PEL1), editors may have to collate both the original edition and its

revision, the latter as a source of occasionally quoted readings. An edition may be considered revised rather than new when the editor remains the same and when less than half its type has been reset. An edition and its revision are distinguished by the addition of lower-case letters to the siglum: CAM3a, CAM3b. When an edition and its revision are collated, both of course should be assigned sigla and listed by date in the Plan of the Work and in the endpaper (pastedown) summary of Editions Collated. In the Textual Notes, however, cite only the basic siglum when the readings of the two are identical and reserve the distinguishing sigla for reporting different readings:

1752 hot] spot F2-CAM3
1752 hot] spot F2-CAM3a; shot CAM3b

If the edition varies from the Variorum text but the revision reads with it, write an *etc.* note in order to avoid repetition of the lemma among the variants:

1752 hot] F1, CAM3b; spot F2 *etc.*

Should this prove awkward, however, the lemma may be repeated among the variants:

1752 hot] spot F2-CAM3a; hot CAM3b
1752 hot] spot F2-BEV; hot CAM3b

13. If the siglum of a completely collated edition does not appear in any Textual Note, the reading of that edition is the same as that of the Variorum Edition.

In notes using the abbreviation *etc.*, meaning “all other editions,” make sure that the note does in fact account for all other editions, including the copy-text. Thus wind] wine ROWE; whined POPE1 *etc.* would be an incorrect note, since presumably the folios and quartos read wind, but the note says instead that all editions but ROWE read whined. For a Q1 copy text, the note should read

21 wind] Q1-F4; wine ROWE; whined POPE1 *etc.*

in which case all editions are accounted for. A note that read wind] Q2-F4; wine ROWE; whined POPE1 *etc.* would seem to imply that the copy-text reading originated in Q2, which is misleading.

14. Although it will be usual practice to identify a complete line (or several complete lines) merely by its (their) TLN number(s), the editor may occasionally wish for the sake of complete clarity to give a lemma consisting of the first and last words of the line(s), separated by spaced ellipsis points:

492 Never . . . oh, oh!] *As an aside* ROWE1+ (-CAM, RID, KIT1)

15. Although variants usually appear in chronological order, in cases where greater economy of space can be achieved by another order, the editor should use his or her own discretion, as long as non-chronological order does not sacrifice clarity in the note. E.g., for MV 411,

411 pyld] pil'd Ff, ROWE, CAP, YAL2; pill'd KNT, HUD1, SING2,
HAL, STAU, KTLY, RLF, NLSN, CAM3, RID-ALEX, ARD2, MUN, EVNS; peel'd
POPE *etc.*

Normally the variant introduced by POPE would precede that introduced by KNT, but here the order is changed in order to permit the use of *etc.* to indicate all other (fully collated) editions

not hitherto accounted for in the note. The *etc.* should always come at the end of the note. To have recorded the variant “peel’d” in chronological sequence among the other variants would have necessitated listing all the sigla for all those other editions--a far longer list than for those editions reading as KNT, since Pope’s “peel’d” is the most common variant.

16. If an emendation is repeated by the same editors within a scene or within a few lines, it can be recorded economically in one note.

2693, 2708 Heaven] heav’n ROWE1-JOHN2, HAN3

But such economy is possible only if both the lemmata and the list of editions printing the emendation are the same in all the occurrences of the reading. E.g., if in line 2708 almost all of these editions made the same emendation except that ROWE2 printed the original “Heaven,” a separate note would have to be written for 2708.

17. Editorial comments (including almost all abbreviations) are italicized to set them off from variants in roman, but they are in roman if the variant adjacent to the formula or abbreviation is in italics. Editorial comments are put in parentheses only if they are parenthetical in nature; a few unitalicized abbreviations which are always parenthetical--(c), (u), (text), (errata)--are always enclosed in parentheses. If the first word of an entry (other than a lemma) is not a variant--i.e., if it is an editorial comment or abbreviation--it is capitalized.

143 *Falstaffe*] *Fastolfe* (throughout) THEO1-ALEX (-HAN, CAP,
CAM3, ARD2+)
269 *Prose* POPE1+
314 *Om.* THEO, WARB
564 too] *Om.* HAN

18. When an edition prints a reading and later retracts or changes it in an errata list or elsewhere, both the original reading and the revision (and its source) are indicated:

2367 too] to CAM1(text); two CAM1(errata)
3117 very] *Om.* CAP; very CAPN

19. The abbreviations to be used in the textual notes, such as *Om.*, *Degr.*, (u), (c), *conj.*, *conj. apud*, *subst.*, and others, are explained in the section on editorial abbreviations in ch. XII of this *Handbook*; see pp. 136 ff. Two of them deserve special comment:

Ad. should be used sparingly; it is most useful to indicate something added to the preceding variant in the note. For instance, in the rewritten versions of notes 935 and 95 below (“General Principles . . . Notes,” note 4), there is no reason to put *ad.* before “DEM. *throws*” or “*Exeunt*” or “SCENE III” or “SCENE *the Palace*” or “*Trumpet*” or “*Enter a Captain*,” since these are already clearly additions to the text. But the abbreviation is very useful in indicating an addition to a previous variant in the note (see rewritten n. 935) since it avoids the need to keep repeating earlier portions of a stage direction as one records its growth by accretion in successive editions.

(*subst.*) should be used only for notes on stage directions, not for those on verbal variants in the text. Accessories, and especially stage directions, are treated with more latitude than the text itself; any change of wording in the text must be recorded in the textual notes, but changes of wording and even of non-essential details of fact in the stage directions are frequently overlooked (as in rewritten notes 935 and 95 below), and (*subst.*) is the abbreviation used to alert the reader that editions cited as including a certain stage direction may differ in wording though in no essential or practical way.

For the many verbal formulae which the editor will need for special cases from time to time--e.g., *Prose*, *One line*, *Separate line*, *As the last verse of the song*, *Included in the verse*, *Transposed to follow --*, *Marked as "Burthen,"* etc.--no exhaustive list can be provided here; the best guide in such cases will be previous Variorum editions.

Emendations of the copy-text.

Except in the case of press variants, only substantive and semi-substantive emendations of the copy-text are recorded in the textual notes. All other emendations are either made silently or are recorded in the list of Emended Accidentals that forms part of the appendix on text.

Emendations recorded in the textual notes.

1. Substantive emendations are made and recorded only in the case of lines, part-lines, groups of lines, or whole scenes adopted from a secondary substantive text. The following example illustrates how the addition of Folio lines 1285-1316 to a quarto copy-text of *Ham.* would be noted:

<i>Ham.</i> Then is Doomes day neere, but your newes is not true; *Let me question more in particular: what haue	1285
.....	
man: I am most dreadfully attended; But in the beaten	1316

1285-1316 Let . . . attended;] <i>Om.</i> Qq	

If the added text is whole lines rather than part-lines, there is usually no need to give the first and last words in the lemma--e.g., in *Ham.* 481:

His greatnes wayd, his will is not his owne, *For hee himselfe is subiect to his Birth:* He may not as vnualed persons doe,	480

481 <i>Om.</i> Qq	

2. Semi-substantive emendations are made and recorded in such cases as

a. Press variants. E.g., in *IH4*,

1080 Cup] F1(c); Cop F1(u)

Such variants should be recorded only when they make a substantive difference in the context, especially, of course, all those that have led to subsequent editorial disagreement. All others should appear only in the complete listing of press variants, forme by forme, in the appendix on the text.

b. Deformed or imperfectly printed letters which have given rise to substantive variation. E.g., in *JC*,

199 chafing] *Broken* f (?) F1; chasing F2, F3, QU1-QU3

c. Printing space-type or printing shoulder or foot of a letter-type which has

resulted in editorial disagreement.

- d. Corrected turned, incorrect, or transposed letters which have resulted in a word.

1432 now] own F1
2255 woe] wot F1

Emendations recorded in the appendix.

The list of emended accidentals in the appendix on text will include emendations of the copy-text not substantive enough to record in the textual notes, but of enough significance to warrant recording in an appendix. Except for such purely typographical matters as turnovers, the source of the emendation will be shown. The list will include such things as

1. Corrected turned, incorrect, or transposed letters which have not resulted in a word.
2. Normalization of italic *A*, *a*, *I*, *O*, and *o* (when they are used as words) in a roman context was, in the original edition of the *Handbook*, to be recorded. The policy was soon changed, and now such changes are to be made silently.
3. End-of-line division of two words in a true compound, or middle-of-line joining of two words in a true compound, caused by relining prose in a quarto copy-text:

1241 tooth-|ache] Q2; tooth-ache Q1
1587 bed-fellow] Q2; bed-|fellow Q1

4. Turnovers and turnunders:

2017 [^]Burdeaux] (~ (*turnunder*) F1
1198 fiue-score] fiue-|(score (*turnover*) F1
3106 seruant] ser-|(uant (*turnover*) F1

5. Terminal punctuation omitted from the copy-text but supplied in the edition.

Except for those detailing typographical changes (like 2, 3, and 4), notes should indicate the source of the emendation:

1771 there] F2; thete F1
121 tongue] Q2; togue Q1
1340 period.] F4; ~ [^] F1-F3

Emendations not recorded.

The following is a checklist of silent emendations of accidentals in the copy-text:

1. Change of long *s* to modern *s*.
2. Printing of digraphs as separate letters: e.g., *y*^{*t*} (with *t* above the *y*) printed as *y*^{*t*}.
3. Reduction of ornamental initials, display caps, factotums, swash caps, etc., to simple roman or italic caps.

4. Reduction of caps to lower-case following initials or factotums.
5. Normalizing of unusual occurrences of italic, roman, swash, or other wrong-font type (though any of bibliographical interest should be discussed in the appendix on text), including *A*, *a*, *I*, *O*, *o* used as words (see Rule 2 under “Emendations recorded in the appendix” above, and “Emendation of accidentals” in ch. II, “Treatment of the Text”).
6. Capitalization of letters erroneously in lower-case in the copy-text, as at the beginning of a verse line, sentence, stage direction, proper noun, or speech prefix. But see “Emendation of accidentals,” par. 7, under ch. II, “Treatment of the Text,” for occasions when such errors may have bibliographical importance.
7. Corrections of broken or turned letters that have not resulted in editorial disagreement (cf. rule 2b under “Emendations recorded in the textual notes” above).
8. Removal of printing space-type or printing shoulder or foot of a letter-type which has not resulted in editorial disagreement (cf. rule 2c under “Emendations recorded in the textual notes” above).
9. Normalizing of spacing of sections, lines, words, contractions, elisions, etc., except where such changes may have bibliographical importance.
10. Elimination of unnecessary white space between lines.
11. Introduction of a space after periods, commas, colons, semicolons, question marks, and close parentheses where copy-text has no space. See “Emendation of accidentals,” par. 6, under “Treatment of the Text” above.
12. End-of-line word division and middle-of-line joining of parts of a word, caused by relining prose in a quarto copy-text (cf. rule 3 under “Emendations recorded in the appendix”).

Historical Collation.

General principles.

In an attempt to keep relatively useless information from swelling the textual notes, four different kinds of economy will be practiced in recording data collected in the historical collation of editions: (1) only substantive and semisubstantive variants will be recorded in the notes, and variants of accidental details that do not affect meaning will be ignored; (2) all substantive and semisubstantive variants from fully collated editions will be recorded in the notes; (3) variants in the accessories--stage directions, speech prefixes, act-and-scene headings, and place headings--will be listed more selectively than variants in the text proper; and (4) only those conjectural readings adopted in one of the texts collated will be recorded in the textual notes.

Substantive variants are all verbal changes that affect meaning--i.e., all changes, substitutions, omissions, additions, and re-ordering of words, phrases, lines, or scenes. *Semisubstantive variants* are changes of accidental details--spelling, punctuation, typography, spacing, lineation--that affect meaning. Examples of and sample notes for these two kinds of variants are given in separate sections below. The following supplementary remarks by Robert K. Turner (distributed to editors in 1975) are intended further to clarify the distinction between substantive and accidental variants:

“Modernizations are accidentals. In his *Prolegomena* McKerrow made the point that every edition of Sh. until recent times has been modernized, the editor or printer having

eliminated antiquated spellings to the best of his or her ability. Since this process is only to be expected, there is no point in detailing it in the TN, and McKerrow's rule is sensible: true variant readings are those 'the later of which cannot have been derived from the earlier by the normal process of modernization: or, to put the matter in another way, a reading in a later edition can only be considered as a "variant" in respect of an earlier reading if it implies an attempt to emend that reading.' I would add 'or does emend that reading.' In application, this means that when one consults the *OED* and finds that under 'Mushrump' the entry is 'see Mushroom' and that under 'Mushroom, one of the forms is given as 'mushrump,' he has determined that only a formal and not a lexical difference exists and that an alteration from 'mushrump' to 'mushroom' or vice versa should be excluded from the TN.

"McKerrow evidently planned to apply this rule rigidly, more rigidly than is desirable in a Variorum edition. If the copy-text reads 'and' so placed that the word might be the equivalent either of the co-ordinating conjunction 'and' or of the subordinating conjunction 'if,' and if modern editors have sometimes printed 'and' and sometimes 'an,' McKerrow would have excluded the variant, covering the difference of interpretation in an explanatory note. In such an explanatory note, however, one would be constrained to write something like 'Dyce here prints "an" (an if) and interprets the passage' This seems cumbersome and in a way a betrayal of the purpose of the TN, for the alteration of form reflects an act of editorial judgment, a decision that in this instance 'and' means one thing and not the other. Thus we may follow the rule that if a commentary note arises from a formal change, the formal change should be included in the TN. We would not, however, write a TN if the word had always been understood as 'if,' although we may wish to include a CN to that effect.

"Following common practice, we use the *OED* to determine words' lexical status--that is, to determine whether words are distinct as to meaning or are variant forms. In general, if a word is the subject of a main article we regard it as lexically different from words that are subjects of other main articles, but even this simple rule must be applied with discrimination. The *OED* gives separate listing to some words that in many of their usages appear to be modernizations. Two examples are *mo(e)* and *more* and *vild* and *vile*. Between these two pairs of words, however, a distinction may be drawn. 'Vild' is said by the *OED* to be a variant of adjectival 'vile' and to have the same meaning. That seems to me a good enough reason to exclude its alteration from the TN, even though the *OED* devotes main articles to both the forms. With respect to "mo(e)" and "more," however, no such statement is made, and each has separate listing. I would therefore not regard a change from the one word to the other as a modernization even though editors intended to modernize, and I would include the change in the TN, writing summary notes wherever possible. Quite frequently a question as to whether such a variant emends the copy-text may be settled by context. At the beginning of *MV*, Antonio wonders what stuff his sadness is made of, 'whereof it is borne.' F3+ change Q's 'borne' to 'born,' but the change is no variant, for it is next to impossible that Q Antonio means 'carried,' the lexically different word."

Fully collated editions are those editions of such primary importance in the history of the transmission of the text that they have been compared with the copy-text line by line, word by word, letter by letter, and point by point. All substantive and semi-substantive variants from such editions will be recorded in the textual notes. In the process of collating, the editor will no doubt want to collect numerous variants of accidentals on the possibility that some of them may prove to be semi-substantive or that they will help to establish relationships between editions; but probably the majority of these details will prove to be merely accidental and so will be excluded from the notes. *Occasionally quoted editions* are editions of secondary importance (often because they derive from a parent edition from whose readings they seldom vary, or because their texts are in general not very original or interesting), and readings from them are recorded only occasionally when they are of special interest.

Each Variorum editor must decide which editions deserve full collation and which only occasional quotation; a later section of this *Handbook*, "Notes on Editions," is intended to give

some guidance in this matter. It is entirely possible that after fully collating an edition an editor may decide that it deserves only occasional quotation, if that.

Variants in the accessories differ from those in the text proper in that variant wording may express the same essential information--who comes in or goes out, what action is performed, what the scene number is, where the scene takes place, etc. There is no need to record all the stylistic variations and minute differences of detail from edition to edition, and so they are not individually recorded in the textual notes. If, for example, the different ways of staging an action are a matter of unusual interest or importance, they should be discussed either in the commentary notes, or at greater length in the appendix on staging and stage history.

Because of the special problems of recording variant lineation, variants in the accessories, and conjectural readings, they are discussed below under separate headings.

Substantive variants.

1. Changes or substitutions.

1761 Crauens] craven THEO1-JOHN2, HAN3, v1773, RANN, mCOL1, COL4
 1791 thy doom] thou doom THEO1
 1949 *Burdeaux*] *Poictiers* HAN, KTLY

2. Omissions.

1839 enuious] *Om.* F2-F4; sharp and ROWE1-POPE2, HAN
 2024-5 *Om.* POPE, WARB

3. Additions.

1842 represent] present F2-F4; represent the color of ARD1

4. Rearrangements.

1978 *Inserted after* 1974 F2-ROWE1, ROWE2
 2177 am I] I am ROWE1, ROWE2
 581-3 *Degr.* POPE, HAN

When lines are degraded in an edition, they may sometimes be omitted by other editors. Omit the degraded lines from the sequence of sigla and give them a separate entry--818-29 muscle . . . beach] *Degr.* POPE, HAN. If relineation takes places in the degraded lines, write *Degr. as* word . . . word . . . word . . . word.

Relining of verse is treated in a separate section below.

Semi-substantive variants.

1. Punctuation that affects meaning. E.g., in *JC* 920-1,

Bru. Kneele not gentle *Portia*.
Por. I should not neede, if you were gentle *Brutus*.

921 gentle₁] ~ , STAU

Robert Turner (1975) further advises:

“The punctuation variants worth recording will nearly always be those which change modification, as may occur when the strengthening or weakening of punctuation on either side of a modifier will cause it to refer to elements of the sentence which precede or follow. With regard to whether meaning is affected, the test of common sense, rather than that of theoretical possibility should apply. If the copy-text prints ‘long lost brother’ without a hyphen, it is possible in grammar that ‘long’ could be an adjective rather than an adverb, but because no one in his right mind would so construe it, the later introduction of a hyphen would be ignored. A sentence with subject and verb inverted ninety-nine times out of a hundred will be a question regardless of its terminal punctuation; the syntax, not the question mark, makes it interrogative, and when a later edition prints a question mark it will have done nothing but recognize the obvious. We should not waste a TN on it.”

Do not include punctuation after a word quoted as lemma or variant unless the punctuation is somehow at issue as part of the variant. Specifically, do include it in these cases:

a. When recording an addition to the text--an entrance or exit, stage direction, scene division, locale indication, or a line of text--do include the terminal punctuation, because it is part of the addition.

b. Do the same when recording an omission, when the punctuation is part of what is omitted.

c. For the lineation variants recorded in the form 45-6 *Two lines ending* water; . . . after!, always include the final punctuation in the text being quoted from, since the punctuation is part of the way the line ends.

2. Spelling that affects meaning.

That plotted thus our Glories ouerthrow?

32 Glories] Glory’s ROWE1-JOHN2, v1773+; glories’ CAP

Yorke. Is all our trauell turn’d to this effect,

2743 trauell] travail v1793

In this second example the fact that most editions after THEO1 spell the word *travel* is not recorded, since the change of spelling does not affect meaning. Cf. rule 9 under “Variants of accidentals” below.

Mere misprints forming a new word that makes no sense in context should not be recorded as textual variants. If v1785 inexplicably changes “lost in a fog” to “lost in a frog,” the resulting nonsense is clearly due to error and not worth a solemn notice in the historical collations. Nor does it seem worth the trouble to write a note like 180 grow] grows PEL1a (*corr. to grow in* PEL1b). Robert Turner: “On the other hand, readings that probably are misprints are noted if they make some, even remote, sense and are not gross violations of acceptable syntax (e.g., WT 426 ‘Sully the . . . witness of my sheets’ for ‘ . . . whiteness’ in F4, 2620 ‘whereupon command’ for ‘whereupon I command’ in Rowe ed. 1714, and 2676-7 ‘I’ll bring you where he is abroad’ for ‘ . . . is aboard’ in Bethell ed. 1956). Nonsense readings are collated if they recur (e.g., 2611 ‘Are yon’ for ‘Are you’ in F2 and F3.)”

3. Typography that affects meaning. E.g., in AYL 1882,

That the old *Carlot* once was Master of.

1882 *Carlot*] carlot v1778+ (–MAL, CALD1, KTLY, KIT, YAL2)

Here the change from italics and a capital indicates a change from a proper noun to a common noun.

4. Spacing and/or hyphenation that affects meaning. E.g., in *JC* 2545-6,

O setting Sunne:
As in thy red Rayes thou doest sinke to night;

2546 to night] to-night TJOH1, v1773

But in this example the editions which spell *to-night* are not distinguished from those that spell *tonight*, since the variant does not affect meaning.

Bed. Ascend braue *Talbot*, we will follow thee.
Tal. Not altogether: Better farre I guesse,

708 altogether] all together ROWE1+ (–CAP, v1821)

But a spacing variant such as *meane while/meanewhile* which did not affect meaning would be ignored.

5. Spelling or punctuation that significantly affects meter in verse. E.g., such variants as *boisterous/boist'rous*; *th'English/the English*, *wintred/wintered*, *over/o'er*, *Heaven/Heav'n* would be ignored except where the changes would affect the number of metrical feet or accented syllables or displace the accent from one syllable to another. Cf. rules 5 and 7 under “Variants of accidentals” below in this chapter.

Robert Turner (1975) adds a further qualification:

“We all know, however, that some editions either elide or expand words of the copy-text, their intent evidently being to make the metrical structure of the verse clearer or to make the language of the text more correct. We also know that Elizabethan texts often spell out in full words requiring elision or, less frequently, elide words that must be given a full complement of syllables if the line is to make meter. When they printed ‘raged’ in ‘For young hot colts being ragde, do rage the more’ (*R2*, 713), Valpy, the Cambridge editors and the rest cannot have intended to introduce an accented syllable to the destruction of scansion. Or if *Q R2* had read ‘raged’ and Pope had changed to ‘rag’d,’ Pope would merely have been making explicit what is implicit in *Q*--the fact that the preterite ending has to be elided to make a pentameter. Neither should go into the *TN*.”

6. Spelling that affects rhyme in verse, such as *shrew/shrow*.

7. Relining of verse as prose, prose as verse, or verse as different verse. This is discussed in a separate section below.

8. Diacritical marks added by editors to indicate the number of pronounced syllables (i.e., marks which affect meter). E.g., in *Ham.* 484,

The safty and health of this whole state,

484 safty] sanctity Ff, ROWE1-THEO3, CALD2, KNT1; sanity
THEOBALD *conj.*, HAN1, JOHN1-HAN3, WH1; safëty SING

In this example, if later editions had agreed with SING in making *safety* a trisyllable but had used different diacritical marks--e.g., saféty, safèty-- such distinctions would not be listed as separate variants, and the editions would simply be listed as substantially agreeing with SING.

Lest this rule unnecessarily add a lot of notes, it should be used selectively, perhaps to note only the addition of diacritical marks which distort or significantly change what seem to be natural speech rhythms, as in the example above. The rule of thumb for Variorum notes, as Turner says in rule 5 above, is to record only those cases where the accent is shifted from one syllable to another or where the number of feet (or accented syllables) per line is changed. All of the other elisions, expansions, addition of unaccented syllables, and diacritical marks that do not affect the number and placements of accents should be ignored. For “Alarbus limbs are lopt,” one would not record the variant “Alarbus’s”; the genitive possessive is already implied, and the addition of the unaccented syllable “s” does not add or shift accent. For “Make way to lay them by their brethren,” one would not record a change to “bretheren,” since to read the line as regular meter one naturally reads “brethren” as a trisyllable; in most cases one can assume that the line is intended to be read as regular meter, and ignore editorial refinements that merely do the obvious. For the line “Dishonoured thus and challenged of wrongs,” one can safely assume that both “dishonoured” and “challenged” are to be read as trisyllables; an editor who marks “dishonourèd” is indicating a preferred pronunciation for the word, but he is certainly not adding an accented syllable to the end of the word, and so this refinement may be ignored.

9. Variants in names of characters when there has been editorial disagreement about which character is involved or question about identification of an originally unnamed character--e.g., 2. *Mes./Lucy*. But do not record variants of the name used in the accessories to designate the same character--e.g., Richard/Yorke.

Variants of accidentals.

Regard as merely accidental, and therefore do not record, such things as:

1. Variant but equivalent punctuation for

- a. A full stop [!./] or [?!]. Furthermore, all changes of sentence length which do not affect meaning or syntax should be ignored.
- b. A partial stop [./;:/ . ./--]
- c. A parenthesis [()/-- --/, ,]
- d. Quotation [“ ”/‘ ’/-- --/smaller type/italics]
- e. Vocatives, appositives, interjections [()/, ./-- --]
- f. Exclamations (Oh,/Oh!/O/Oh.) or [Why,/Why!/Why/Why--/Why;]
- g. Rhetorical questions [./!/?]

Robert Turner (1975) adds, concerning 1a and 1b:

“The rule [1] is stated in such a way as perhaps to imply that variations between full and partial stops (e.g., periods and commas) should be noted. That is not the intent; instead, the significance should determine. After ‘ouerthrowne’ in Orlando’s exclamation ‘O poore *Orlando!* Thou art ouerthrowne | Or Charles, or something weaker masters thee’ editors variously have put a comma, a semicolon, a colon, a period, or an exclamation point. None is a matter of consequence, for none changes F1’s meaning.”

Most variants within the equivalencies above will be obviously of an accidental nature and not even possibly semi-substantive. Should such a variant be the subject of a commentary note, it must be included in the textual apparatus. In general, however, a semi-substantive

variant makes a *pronounced* change in tone, emphasis, or modification; most alterations in punctuation do not and should be ignored as accidental. If, however, an editor feels strongly that a particular variant is semi-substantive, he or she should record it and defend doing so to the General Editor(s). In some such cases he or she may wish to record variants as alternates without specifying which editions use which form:

K. Staine to thy Countrymen, thou hears't thy doom?

1791 doom?] ~ ! F2-ROWE3; ~ ; *or* ~ : POPE1+

2. Dramatic punctuation, i.e., pointing that does not affect syntax or meter but may have been intended to indicate pace, emphasis, or intonation of the actor's delivery.
3. Hyphenation and spacing of words where meaning is not affected--e.g., mean while/meanwhile/meanwhile.
4. Variant diacritical marks added by modern editors to indicate the same accent on a syllable. Cf. rule 8 above under "Semi-substantive variants."
5. Apostrophes to indicate elision, unless meter or rhythm is affected--e.g., boistrous/boist'rous, or Ile/I'le/I'll, or in prose, what's/what is. Cf. *WT* 1558 what's] what is F4-ROWE2. This should not be recorded. If such changes from informal-colloquial to formal are characteristic of the F4 compositor, the editor may wish so to indicate in the discussion of the history of the text. Except when a substantive variant results (as at *WT* 2594), differing interpretations of the copy-text's apostrophes may be ignored. Nor do editorial additions of apostrophes need to be recorded (e.g., "This'" indicating "This is" at *WT* 3363).
6. Typographical peculiarities--e.g., Capell's special "marks" (single or double crosses, lowered dashes, inverted commas, etc., as explained in his *Prologues*, London, 1760, pp. v-vi) unless they have influenced later editors in suggesting stage business not clearly implied in the text.
7. Spelling conventions--e.g., the policy of such editions as CAM, GLO, WH2, SIS, MUN to expand 'd and 't to -ed without any effect on meter. In general one may ignore elision or expansion of copy-text spellings to indicate metrical structure unless there has been significant disagreement among editors over the scansion.
8. Spelling variants in names--e.g., Gloster/Glocester/Gloucester--where there has been no editorial disagreement about which character is indicated and no significant difference in pronunciation. In cases where there has been editorial disagreement about a spelling which does affect pronunciation (e.g., Berowne/Biron), do not record the variants but discuss the problem in commentary notes on *Dramatis Personae*.
9. Spelling variants in words unless, in context, there is a possibility of ambiguity, either intentional or accidental, which has led to editorial disagreement. E.g., in *IH6* 1789, do not record variants of borne/born, or in 2041 and 2042, do not record loose/lose. Other similar variants, resulting from modernization or representing merely formal change, are a/an (before *h* and *u*), affeard/afraid, amongst/among (in prose), further/farther, happily/haply (in prose), humane/human, in- (as in incertain, ingrateful)/un-, swounded/swooned (in prose), then/than, toward/towards.

Variant lineation.

1. A change from prose to verse or from verse to prose may be recorded by a simple verbal formula. E.g., in *2H4* 2318-22,

COL4+ 2318-20 *Three lines of verse ending* go . . . court, . . . report. DYCE, HAL-GLO,
2321-2 *Prose* Q1, JOHN1

For sake of consistency, try to avoid indicating line division by a vertical stroke whenever the preferred formula *Three lines ending* . . . can be used instead.

If only two lines are involved, as frequently, it is usually clear to write *Verse lines ending* word . . . word. XXX-YYY. If more than two, it is helpful to have the number: *Three verse lines ending* word . . . word . . . word. XXX-YYY. If the number of lines differs, the number should be specified: *Two verse lines ending* word . . . word XXX; *three verse lines ending* word . . . word. . . word. ZZZ. If the number of lines remains the same although the lineation differs, there is no need to repeat the entire formula: *Verse lines ending* word . . . word. XXX; *ending* diff. word . . . diff. word. ZZZ or *Three Verse lines ending* word . . . word . . . word. XXX; *ending* diff. word . . . diff. word . . . diff. word. ZZZ.

2. Variant indentations of copy-text part-lines in order to indicate complete lines of verse, beginning with v1793, may be indicated by the following kind of short formula. Some of the actual relinings of *AYL* 847-53 are reproduced for illustration after this note describing those linings:

847-53 *Arranged to make full lines of verse, thus:* 847-8, CAM1-KTLY, WH2, OXF1-KIT1, SIS+; 848-9 v1793-STAU, DYCE2-HUD2; 849-50 CAM1, GLO, WH2, OXF1-RID, SIS+; 849-51 KTLY; 850-52 KIT1; 851-2 CAM1, GLO, DYCE2-RID, ALEX+; 852-3 *two lines ending* say . . . friend CAP, v1793-COL2, SING2, DYCE1, COL3, STAU, KTLY

F1:

I faint almost to death.

Clo. Holla; you Clowne.

Ros. Peace foole, he's not thy kinsman.

Cor. Who cal's?

850

Clo. Your betters Sir.

Cor. Else are they very wretched.

Ros. Peace I say; good euen to your friend.

v1793:

I faint almost to death.

Touch. Holla; you, clown!

Ros. Peace, fool; he's not thy kinsman.

Cor. Who calls?

850

Touch. Your betters, sir.

Cor. Else are they very wretched.

Ros. Peace, I say:--

Good even to you, friend.

CAM1:

I faint almost to death.

Touch. Holla, you clown!
Ros. Peace, fool: He's not thy kinsman.
Cor. Who calls? 850
Touch. Your betters, sir.
Cor. Else are they very wretched.
Ros. Peace, I say. Good even to you, friend.

KTLY:

I faint almost to death.

Touch. Holla; you clown!
Ros. Peace, fool; he's not thy kinsman.
Cor. Who calls? 850
Touch. Your betters, sir.
Cor. Else are they very wretched.
Ros. Peace, I say.
 Good even to you, friend.

ALEX:

I faint almost to death.

[then separate lines until]

Touch. Your betters, sir.
Cor. Else are they very wretched. 851
Ros. Peace, I say. Good even to you, friend.

Robert Turner (1975) adds further advice:

“Although older Variorum editors were scrupulous in recording variants of many kinds, they generally ignored differences in the indentation of part-lines to indicate complete lines of verse, a practice introduced by the Variorum of 1793. I believe some present Variorum editors may be following their example, although the *Handbook* directs the indentation variants be kept. There is also doubt about the preferred form for recording them. Consider the following from F1 *MM*:

Duke. Prouost, a word with you. 1258
Pro. As manie as you please. 1259

The lines were arranged as they stand here, of course, until v1793. v1793 indents 1259 to make one verse line of twelve syllables. However, because some editors have reverted to F1's arrangement, a TN is required:

1258-9 *One verse line* v1793-ARD1 (-COL, CAM1, GLO, CAM2).

On the assumption that users of the Variorum will take it for granted that uncomplicated instances of two lines totaling ten or eleven syllables will be arranged as full lines, we can generally omit notice of indentations over which there has been no editorial disagreement. There will, of course, be special cases. In the example above, I do not think v1793's arrangement is inferential from F1, and I would write, even if there has been no variation:

1258-9 *One verse line* v1793+

“Or, to examine a slightly different situation:

Isab. But might you doe't & do the world no wrong

If so your heart were touch'd with that remorse,	
As mine to him?	804
<i>Ang.</i> Hee's sentenc'd, tis too late.	805
<i>Luc.</i> You are too cold.	806
<i>Isab.</i> Too late? why no: I that doe speak a word	

Here 805 can make a pentameter with either 804 or 806, and, of course, some editors have elected one option and some the other. The TN goes

804-6 *Lines ending* late. . . . cold. v1793-DYCE1, COL3-SIS, ARD2, EVNS; *ending* him? . . . cold. WH1, PEL1, PEN2

It will be noticed that this formula is different from that given [elsewhere] in the *Handbook*. The most concise expression that can be achieved without sacrifice of clarity is to be desired, and exactly what one writes may vary with the circumstances. It is a good idea when copy-text prose has been arranged as verse to indicate that fact by *Verse lines ending*."

Describing his own practice in *WT*, Turner adds that metrical linking is ignored in his notes "provided that taken together the lines contain nine, ten, or eleven syllables and that all editions collated from Var. 1793 to the present indent the linking line(s). If the lines may contain a shortage or a surplus of syllables (as at *WT* 1440-1) their linking is reported even though no editor has disagreed with the arrangement of Var. 1793. Notes are also provided for amphibious sections (ABBOTT, §513), whether or not the section has been uniformly handled by editors."

Lineation notes are especially troublesome to write when one is in doubt about, say, whether two short speeches form one verse line, or whether a line that goes to the right margin is verse or prose. In accordance with the principle that the textual notes should be a record of fact, one should resist the temptation to make lineation notes on such lines a record of one's own uncertainty, by adding qualifying language such as "*perhaps intended as verse* POPE1, v1785" or "*either verse or prose* DEL2, OXF1." These inform the reader only of the Variorum editor's doubts. If one can tell from his commentary or other evidence that an editor prior to v1793 (which indents succeeding speeches to indicate one complete verse line, thus usually removing ambiguity) intended two successive lines to form one verse line, identify them as verse in the note; if one can't tell about earlier editions, then simply record in the note what one *does* know: 435-9 *Three verse lines ending* . . . v1793+. Similarly, if there is real doubt that justified lines are verse, then say what one *is* sure of--*Two lines ending* . . . (rather than what one merely suspects as a possibility: *Two verse lines ending* . . .)--and let it go at that.

3. Variant lining which involves the actual division or combining of lines in the copy-text should be recorded in a somewhat fuller form than is the case for variant indentation.

<i>Char.</i> Go take their bodies hence.	2325
<i>Lucy.</i> Ile beare them hence: but from their ashes shal be reard	2326-7
A Phoenix that shall make all France affear'd.	

2325-7 *Two lines of verse ending* bear . . . rear'd v1773-v1785, RANN; *two lines of verse ending* hence: . . . rear'd POPE1-HAN3, MAL, v1793-HAL, KTLY-HUD2, OXF1, ARD2

This form of recording line division by last words of the lines should be preferred to the form "Go . . . bear | Them . . . rear'd" because it takes somewhat less space.

4. When relining of verse is accompanied by verbal changes apparently made for metrical purposes, these changes should be recorded separately from the changes in lineation even though there is an evident relationship between the two kinds of variants, so that the reader will not have to attend to more than one kind of variant at once as he reads an entry. Thus in the example for rule 3 the entry for variant lineation would be followed by entries for verbal variants in these lines:

2326 Ile] I v1773
 but] But doubt not DYCE2, HUD2
 ashes] ashes Dauphin POPE1-HAN3; very ashes COL2, COL3, COL4

Variant stage directions.

Record only variants which affect the substance of the stage direction, and ignore minor differences of wording, of secondary details, etc. Unique and lengthy stage directions which are merely props to a reader's imagination (as many in CAM3 are) and minor bits of stage business such as *going, stops, turns, bows, sits, plucks her sleeve*, etc., may be ignored. Do not record the addition of stage directions that are clearly inferential from the dialogue. When Titus says, "I giue him you . . . The eldest sonne of this distressed Queene," there is no need for a note 125 *giving them* Alarbus. CAP.

1. Record actual changes in persons specified.

1745 *and Governor Exeter]* and Exeter, *Governor of Paris* ROWE; Exeter, *and Governor of Paris* POPE1-JOHN2, v1793+

2. Record omission of names.

6-7 *and . . . Somerset]* Om. ALEX

3. Record addition of names. E.g., in R3,

1123 Wooduill.] *Wooduill, Scales*, OXF2

4. Record additions of or to stage directions in substance but not in detail.

1753 *Exit marked by* CAP, MAL, v1793+ (*subst.*)

This note is a condensation of non-significant variants which, if recorded in detail, would take up a great deal of space:

1753 *Exeunt Gov. and train.* CAP, MAL, v1793-HAL, KTLY-OXF1, NLSN, N&H, ALEX, ARD2, EVNS; *Governor retires.* KIT1, PEL1; *Exit Governor.* SIS, MUN; ad. *King comes from his throne.* CAP

The verbal formula "*Exit marked by*" is used instead of simply *Exit* because the "*Exit*" would look like the actual variant introduced by CAP, when in fact CAP prints something else. In other cases the variant itself might serve better than a verbal formula.

5. Record semi-substantive changes of punctuation and other accidentals.

5 Exeter_] ~ , F2+

6. Record relocation of SD.

502 *Enter Page]* After 507 CAM1+
 1925 *Exeunt.] Flourish. Exeunt.* THEO1+ (-NLSN, N&H, PEL1)
 1934 *Flourish.] Om.* THEO1+ (-NLSN, N&H, MUN, PEL1)

Ordinarily only the relocating of a stage direction from one line to another will be recorded; the appearance of the SD in various places within the same line will be recorded only if the variance seems significant. In cases where exact placement of a stage direction makes no practical difference--e.g., where it can make no difference whether persons on stage see the person approaching, or whether he overhears their conversation--there is no need to record refinements such as *after 745/after 746*.

7. Record editorial disagreement about interpreting a stage direction.

No more but plaine and bluntly? (*To the King.*)

 1798 bluntly?] ~ , ROWE1-HAN3, v1778-N&H, CAM3-MUN, EVNS; ~ .
 v1773; ~ ^ ALEX, ARD2, PEL1
 (*To the King.*)] ^ ~ ^ (*as a quotation*) ROWE1+
King.] ~ ? CAP, v1778-KNT1, DYCE, STAU, HUD2, KIT1, SIS, PEL1; ~ !
 COL, HUD1, HAL, CAM1, GLO, WH1-RID, N&H-CAMa, MUN, ARD2, EVNS
 Ad. *Reading.* ROWE1-JOHN2, HAN3-v1785, RANN

8. Record *aside* only if there has been editorial disagreement about which lines or parts of lines are spoken aside.

1268-71 *Marked as an aside* HAN1, CAP-v1778, MAL-DYCE2, DEL4+
 1271 *Om.* v1785; *marked as an aside* WH1

Asides are variously marked, sometimes after the speech prefix (*Ham. [Aside.]*), sometimes at the end of the whole speech. When these indicators clearly mean the same thing, there is no need to record such variations of form; simply write 2436-41 *Marked as aside* or 2436-41 Thou . . . fair] *Marked as aside*.

9. Record change from *Exit* to *Exeunt* or the reverse, and *Manet/Manent*, only if there has been editorial disagreement about how many people go out, since early texts often use the singular *Exit* to indicate a plural *Exeunt*. For example, in 2168 there has been disagreement about whether only Talbot or both Talbot and his son exit:

2168 *Exit]* *Exeunt* F2-WH2, CAM+; *om.* OXF1

But do not record such a case as that in 1688 where F3-ROWE1, ROWE2 read *Exit* for *Exeunt* though the stage must have been cleared of French before the entrance of King Henry VI and his party in 1690.

Variant speech prefixes.

1. Record actual changes in attribution of speeches. E.g., for 1258-9,

Warw. Roame thither then.

My Lord, it were your dutie to forbear.

1258 *Warw.*] *Glo.* HAN, CAP, RANN, ARD2, EVNS
 1259 *My]* *Som.* My THEO1, THEO2, WARB-CAP, v1773-KNT1, DYCE,
 STAU, CAM1, GLO, DEL4, HUD2, WH2-CAMa, MUN, PEL1; *War.* My HAN,
 ARD2, EVNS

2. Record changes in name of character.

1544 *Falst.*] *Fast.* (throughout) THEO1-ALEX (-HAN, CAP, CAM3,
 ARD2+)

3. Do not record mere variants in spelling--e.g., *Fal./Falst.* or *Glo./Glos./Glost.*---unless there is possible ambiguity about which character is speaking--e.g., in the case of the *Sal.*'s in *MV* 1.1.

4. Do not record mere variants in the form of a speech prefix--e.g., in *Rom.* 1.3, *Wife./Old La./La. Cap.*--unless there has been editorial disagreement about who is actually speaking. Such variants will probably be discussed in the appendix on text.

5. Do not record variants which merely reflect use of the real or disguised character name.

Variant act and scene headings.

1. Record significant variants of act or scene numbers.

2332 *Scena Secunda*] ACT V. SCENE I. CAP, MAL, v1793+; SCENE THEO

But do not record such variants as FIVE/V/5/Quintus, or *Scena/Scoena/Scene*.

2. Record additions of act or scene divisions. E.g., between 462 and 463, where F1 has no division,

463 SCENE VIII. POPE, HAN, WARB; SCENE THEO; SCENE IV CAP+
 (*subst.*)

Note that the line number is for the first line of the entrance or stage direction beginning the new scene.

2169 *Alarum*] SCENE VI. *Alarum* CAP, v1773+ (*subst.*)

3. Record omissions of act or scene divisions.

2942 *Scæna Secunda.*] *Om.* THEO, HAN

Variant place headings.

Additions of place headings to the copy-text, and variant indications of the location of a scene, are to be recorded as substantive in importance. But different ways of indicating the same place, and varying degrees of particularity about the location, should generally be ignored. For example, in *AYL* 1915, one would record the first indication of the locale:

1915 SCENE *the Forest*. ROWE1+ (*subst.*)

But there is no need to record the variant wordings of the same information--*Continues in the FOREST./SCENE continues in the FOREST./The same./The Forest/The Forest of Arden.--or even such further particularizations as Rosalind's cottage./The clearing near the sheepcote/The forest near the sheepcote/etc.*

Note that the line number for the place heading is the number for the scene heading, even though the heading was a separate line in ROWE1+.

Conjectures.

Conjectures should be recorded in the textual notes only if they have been printed later in one of the editions collated for the particular play. The Variorum editor does not need to establish that the conjecture was known to and adopted by the first editor printing that reading (though often that is the case), but simply that the conjecture preceded the reading of the printed text. Some conjectures never printed in any edition may be discussed in a commentary note if they are of particular interest, but most such unadopted conjectures will simply be recorded in a separate list as part of the appendix on text (see ch. X on appendices, p. 115). If a scholar or editor arrives independently at a conjectural reading that someone has proposed before, or gives support to an earlier reading, that fact will be recorded in the appendix, not in the textual note. In the Textual Notes and the Appendix of Unadopted Conjectures name only the original conjector unless there is evidence to indicate that a subsequent conjector hit upon the reading independently. If the original conjecture appears in a printed source, assume the subsequent conjector knew of it; if it appears in a MS source, assume the subsequent conjector did not know of it unless there is reason to think otherwise, and record both manuscript and printed appearances. More than one conjector may be named if priority is uncertain, and no effort is made to indicate the degree of confidence expressed by the conjector in the reading.

65 bright----] bright Berenice JOHNSON *conj.* *apud* v1773, DYCE2, HUD2;
bright Cassiopé mCOL1, COL3

Here the authority for Johnson's conjecture is v1773 and the first text to print the reading is DYCE2. Note that Collier's forged emendations in the Perkins Folio (mCOL1) are treated as conjectures although not marked as such--i.e., they are recorded only if Collier (or someone else) actually adopted them in a later edition (but see below). The fact that Pope conjectured "bright Francis Drake" is recorded in the appendix of conjectures because no text ever printed that reading.

189 send] steal MASON (1785, p. 210) *conj.*, RANN, SING1, COL2, SING2-
STAU, CAM1, GLO, DYCE2, WH1, KNT3, DEL2, HUD2, WH2-NLSN, RID-
ALEX, SIS-PEL1

Here Mason is credited as the first author of a reading printed in many editions, and Keightley's reading of "fetch," never printed in any edition, is recorded in the appendix. The fact that Collier forged the reading in the Perkins Folio (mCOL1) is not recorded because he adopted it in COL2, an edition designed solely to exhibit the Perkins readings. That is, there will seldom be a reason to quote mCOL1 at all. As a general rule there is no need to report that an editor "adopts" a reading of his or her own invention; only if he or she adopts another's conjecture should credit be given to the originator of the reading.

If any conjectures for the above lines were discussed in their respective commentary notes, any additional conjectures in the appendix would be indicated in those commentary notes by across-reference to the appendix (thus: "See p. 000"); but if no readings were discussed

in a commentary note, there would be no such cross-reference, and the reader would discover the further conjectures only by going to the appendix on his or her own.

Reproduce the form of the emendation as it appears in the first text to adopt the conjecture, since that is the form usually copied by succeeding editors. Thus if mTBY3 conjectured “Song: ‘the hunt is up’” and COL3 printed “They sing ‘The hunt is up,’” the note would be

711 *They sing “The hunt is up”* mTBY3 conj., COL3, DYCE4, [etc.]

It is the editor’s obligation to track down conjectures to their original source. One should not write CAPELL *conj. apud* CAM2 when one can find the conjecture in CAPN. The countless conjectures in the notes of CAM1 and CAM2, which often originate in letters sent to the Cambridge editors, can often be identified by recourse to the Wright Shakespeariana in Trinity College, Cambridge. The “Finding-List for Commentators and Conjectors” found in ch. XV of this *Handbook* will help to identify many more.

The Variorum ed. of *AYL*, following past practice, did not in the Textual Notes identify adopted conjectures by date and page, partly to keep the notes brief, but also in the belief that the textual notes are primarily a record of editions. In the Appendix of Unadopted Conjectures, however, all conjectures were given full citations so that readers could track them down and consider the reasons given in their support. In subsequent editions, however, dates and pages for conjectures not identified by sigla have regularly appeared in the Textual Notes as well.

General principles of writing (and re-writing) textual notes.

1. Don’t write unnecessary notes. The typescripts (double-spaced) for the textual notes for the Variorum editions of *AYL* and *MM* came to about 100 pages in each case; notes for difficult two-text plays such as *Lr.* will necessarily be longer. If you find that your typescript for a clean Folio-text play comes to 200 or 250 pages, probably half of your notes are unnecessary and will ultimately be junked. The main reason for such overkill is the over-scrupulous attempt to record variants of the most doubtful substantive value. As Robert Turner has advised above, editors should not be tempted to record variants like t’is/’tis, than/then (=than), ere/e’er (=ever), swear/sware (pres. t.), countrimen/country-men, Caesars/Caesar’s, etc., when there is no possible ambiguity in context; or elisions or expansions of words to make explicit a verse structure that is already clearly implied; or directions for stage action that is obvious from the text; etc.

2. Use the shortest formula. For instance, don’t write THEO, WARB, JOHN, v1773-v1785, MAL+ when THEO1-v1785 (–HAN, CAP), MAL+ does the job. One or two unnecessary sigla per note add up to hundreds of lines of print. A note like base] Q1, RLTR, KIT1+; bad Q2 *etc.* looks very compact, but it can be written even more compactly as base] bad Q2-YAL1 (–RLTR). Lemmata need not be given for most lining variants, or for added stage-directions: e.g., see *AYL* nn. 313-14, 380-1, 426, 1164, 394, 413, 453.

3. Keep the TN as much as possible a record of simple fact, with a minimum of editorial language. Do not fill the notes with verbal explanations such as belong in the commentary notes, with cross-references to other lines or notes, or conjectural remarks about whether a reading is or is not an error. Do not speculate whether an ambiguous line is verse or prose; simply record those lines which are clearly one or the other.

4. For the sake of clarity and ease of reading, it is usually best to treat separate issues separately even though they overlap in the same line. For instance, one might initially write a note for *Tit.* 935 that looked like this:

935 *Exeunt*. F2-JOHN2, v1773-VALPY, COL1, COL2, DEL, SING2, COL3, WH1, HAL, KTLY; *Exeunt* Dem. Chi. *Dragging Lav*. RAV; DEM. *throws the dead body of Bas. into the Pit: Exeunt he and CHI. dragging off Lav*. CAP, DYCE, GLO, CAM2, HUD2, WH2-CAM2, EV1-NLSN, YAL1-CAM2 (*ad. . . . pit thereafter covering it with branches*. CAM2, SIG), ALEX, SIS, MUN, PEL, K&R; *Exeunt all but TAMORA, HUD1, ARD2; Exeunt Chiron and Demetrius, the former dragging off Lavinia, and the latter the body of Bassianus*. STAU; *Throwing in the body of Bassianus. Exeunt*. COL4; *They put Bassianus in the pit. Exeunt. Manet Tamora*. RLTR.

That is an accurate note, but it is almost unreadable. There are several things wrong with it, including an interrupting parenthesis and the fact that some of the differences are of wording rather than of substance (e.g., HUD1=F2). But mainly what makes the note so long and confusing is that it attempts to record two issues at once--the stage business before the exit, and the exit itself--with much resulting complication and redundancy. The note would be both shorter and clearer if these issues were separate, thus:

935 DEM. *throws the dead body of Bas. into the Pit*. CAP, DYCE, GLO, CAM, COL4, HUD2, WH2-OXF1, ARD1-N&H, ALEX, SIS, MUN, PEL1, K&R
Exeunt. F2+ (-KNT, VERP); *ad. Dragging Lav*. RAV, CAP, DYCE, STAU, GLO, CAM, HUD2, WH2-OXF1, ARD1-NLSN, YAL1-N&H, ALEX, SIS, MUN, PEL1, K&R; *ad. and . . . the body of Bassianus*. STAU

From this note one may see immediately what is different in each edition; the covering of branches and the choice of who drags off Bassianus are, in the judgment of the editor, inessential details and so are ignored; if they had any significance they would of course be recorded.

95 SCENE III. *Enter a Captain*. POPE, HAN1-WARB, v1773-v1785; *ad. and Others*. MAL-v1813; SCENE *the Palace*. THEO; SCENE II. *Antiochus' Palace. Trumpet. Enter a Captain, and Others*. CAP; SCENE II. *A Room in the Palace. Enter a Captain, and Others*. v1821-HUD1, COL3, HAL, KTLY, WH1, KNT3, COL4

Here are several issues in one note: scene division numbering, scene locale, trumpet, and number of people entering. Make four notes:

95 SCENE III. POPE, HAN1-WARB, v1773-v1785; SCENE II. CAP, v1821-HUD1, COL3, HAL, KTLY, WH1, KNT3, COL4
 SCENE *the Palace*. THEO, CAP, v1821-HUD1, COL3, HAL, KTLY, WH1, KNT3, COL4 (*subst.*)
Trumpet. CAP
Enter a Captain. POPE, HAN1-WARB, CAP, v1773-HUD1, COL3, HAL, KTLY, WH1, KNT3, COL4; *ad. and Others* CAP, MAL-HUD1, COL3, HAL, KTLY, WH1, KNT3, COL4

Here the rewritten note is easier to sort out; it appears to be considerably longer, but when its four parts are set in sequence as in the Variorum *MM*, rather than in vertical columns as in *AYL* and previous eds., there will be little difference in length.

5. The converse of rule 4 is, treat in combination those issues that are related. An obvious instance would be variant punctuation at the beginning and end of an interior phrase or clause in a sentence. For the sentence

He is come hither,
 Looke you, now youle find him close at hand

the clause “Looke you” may be grammatically connected with the clause before it or the one after it, depending on whether there is a heavy stop after “you” or one after “hither.” It would make no sense to write two notes, one for the punctuation variants after 25 hither and another for the punctuation variants after 26 you; rather, one would combine into one note:

25-6 hither, . . . you,] ~ ; . . . ~ , POPE1-JOHN1, v1773+; ~ , . . . ~ ; CAP

In *Tit.* 1171 f. the Q1 and F1 texts read

Q1: They would not pittie me, yet pleade I must,	1171
And bootlesse vnto them	+1

F1: They would not pittie me.	1171
-------------------------------	------

One could write a separate note for 1171 yet . . . must, pointing out that many editions have followed F1 in omitting it; and a separate note for 1171+1, pointing out that fewer editions have followed F1 in omitting it; and then still another note on 1171 They . . . me *and* 1171+1 And . . . them, showing how other editors have tried to combine them into one verse line. But clearly all these variants are related, and the best way to write the note would be to combine the related information:

1171-1171+1 They . . . them] They would not pittie me F1 [etc.];
All bootless unto them, they would not pittie me CAP [etc.]

Lists of editions collated.

Two lists of editions whose readings are recorded in the textual notes are printed on the front and back paste-downs of each volume. The lists are chronological, and the first, of fully collated editions, is segregated from that of editions and manuscript sources which are only occasionally quoted. Examples may be seen in Mark Eccles’s *Measure for Measure*, Marvin Spevack’s *Antony*, and all subsequent editions (the lists in Richard Knowles’s *AYL* are atypical because they specify editions subjected to the now-discontinued practice of partial collation). By checking these lists in a Variorum a reader may easily see what editions are included in such a formula as HAN3-COL1. Lists of editions will appear in two other places in each Variorum volume: in the comprehensive list of all abbreviations used in the work, the sigla for all editions collated will appear, followed by brief bibliographical citations; and in the Plan of the Work, chronological lists of fully collated and occasionally quoted editions will give full bibliographical entries for those editions.

VII. COLLATING EDITIONS: PROCEDURES

Preliminaries: choosing and ordering the editions.

Nothing is more important than having the final list of editions fixed before the notes are written. To remove some editions and add others after the basic draft of the notes has been completed is very time-consuming and inevitably leads to error. The *Handbook's* "Notes on Editions" provides some basic guidance about what editions are worth fully collating, as do the recent editions of *AYL* and *MM*, but some further general remarks might be helpful.

1. In general, editions should not be fully collated unless they are of real importance to our understanding of the text and its history. HAN1 should be fully collated, even though the majority of its emendations are misguided, because it exerted an influence on several later important editions; but HAN2 is for most plays hardly more than a reprint of HAN1 and so should be excluded, and HAN3 seems more and more to be a revision of doubtful value by some still unknown reviser. In the few cases where HAN2 or HAN3 originate a reading, they should be credited, but usually they should be treated as editions of secondary or tertiary importance and be listed as editions occasionally consulted rather than fully collated. In other cases where an editor wants to include an edition generally found elsewhere to be of doubtful worth, such as EV1 or YAL1, he or she might want to discuss it with the General Editor(s) before writing the textual notes rather than find him- or herself persuaded later on to excise a whole parcel of readings from the notes. Conversely, an edition such as COL2 should be included if for no other reason than its historical importance as the first place where hundreds of Perkins Folio readings first found their way into the textual tradition. Editions which are merely eccentric, and originate a large number of readings which no one else has ever adopted, should usually be treated as occasionally quoted, and their readings noted when they seem genuinely useful or when they have been adopted; but a high number of unique or novel readings should not by itself establish an edition as important enough to deserve full collation. Expurgated editions, such as many volumes of RLF1, should not be fully collated, since the principle governing emendation is often something other than reconstructing an authentic text; these should be treated as occasionally quoted editions for their useful and interesting readings, but there is no reason to clutter the textual notes with a record of their bowdlerizations. The obvious corruptions of the so-called "bad quartos" may also needlessly swell and complicate the textual notes; one solution is to exclude "bad-quarto" readings from the textual notes but to reprint the "bad quarto" text in the appendix.

2. Make sure you use the right editions. The General Editor(s) have found cases where a Variorum editor has been misled by the name of, e.g., Halliwell or Staunton on a title-page and has completely collated a piracy or reprint.

3. Make sure you have the editions in the right sequence. It is hell having to rework a hundred pages of textual notes, trying to recognize whether formulas like HAL-DYCE2 or DYCE1-HAL or GLO-CAM1 have now to be rewritten because it has been discovered too late that WH1 now comes before HAL1 rather than after GLO. Plays in multi-volume editions should be listed according to date of the first volume or fascicle in which they appear, not according to the date of the first volume in the set. The point is to fix the date when an editor's readings were published and so could affect another editor. If you can ascertain from introductions or commentary notes that an editor sometimes borrows from a predecessor of the same year, list that edition second. Otherwise convenience may rule: for example, one might want to put DEL2 (1857) before DYCE1 (1857) because DEL2 often borrows from the two preceding eds. in the list, COL2 (1853) and SING2 (1856), while STAU (1858) often borrows from DYCE1, and having these eds. contiguous may simplify writing notes. Editors should make

every effort to ascertain that the volumes they use are from the original edition, and not get the sequence of editions wrong because the date in their library's copy is that of a later reprint.

4. Make sure the sigla are right. Don't invent sigla like CAM5 or ARD4 when in fact there has never been a fifth edition of Cambridge or a fourth of Arden; if a particular volume of CAM4 is revised, refer to the original as CAM4a and to the revision as CAM4b.

5. Special cases: Treat mCOL1 and CAPN as conjectures, recording them only when their readings are adopted in some edition. Treat readings in SISNR as errata or conjectures.

Mechanics: a working method for historical collation of texts

An editor who has never done collation on anything like the scale required by a Variorum edition may welcome advice about how to make this most tedious and exacting of jobs as painless and as accurate as possible. The usual way of doing it is to compare each edition against the copy-text (or a clear photocopy of it) and to record significant variants on 5 x 8 cards, either one card per variant or one card per line. This method has many advantages: it is a fairly portable and compact method, requiring as it does only a box or two of cards and a copy of the text; it is fairly flexible in that it allows the editions to be collated in almost any sequence (though chronological order is by far the best), as one has to move from library to library to locate them; and it goes a long way towards organizing the results as they are recorded. It is also, however, a fairly slow method, and when one has a research fellowship of limited duration, speeding the job along becomes important. It is slow because each time one finds a variant, one has to stop and find (by its TLN) the appropriate card in the file box, take it out and record the variant and the name of the edition in which it occurs (or at least the latter, after the first occurrence of the variant has been recorded on the card), and then refile the card. This is a cumbersome process, and though there are shortcuts, such as collating a family of editions--all the Colliers or Theobalds or Knights--simultaneously or one against another, recording two or three hundred variants per play takes a long time. Furthermore, there is the chance of uneven results: unless one records almost everything, one may find oneself recording at a late stage a kind of variant that one had not troubled or thought to record from editions looked at six months before. Another problem is variants that span several lines, such as variant lineation of an extended passage, or related verbal or punctuation variants in successive lines; these will multiply the number of cards and the complexity of recording data. Nonetheless this is a time-tested method, and will get the job done.

The method might be applied analogously on a computer, if the data were entered in a collations file instead of on 5 x 8 cards. Supposedly one would enter variants by numerical order, according to each line's TLN; each TLN would introduce a list of one or more lemmas and their variants, just as on the 5 x 8 cards, and just as in the finished textual notes in the Variorum edition. During collation, when one found a variant for a particular line, one would, in the collation file, search for the right TLN and the relevant lemma, and after the appropriate variant for that lemma list the siglum for the edition in hand. I do not know that anyone has yet tried this method, but in theory it should not involve much more mechanical business than finding a 5 x 8 card, entering a variant, and then re-filing the card. Conceivably one could even enter variants randomly in a file and trust a sort program to order them at the end of the collation process; this would probably be an even more time-consuming process, because one would have to type out TLN, lemma, variant, and siglum for every variant one found in every edition, an unthinkable redundant process.

In the first edition of this *Handbook* we offered a suggestion for computer collation using IBM cards; obviously this method is now archaic and is not included here. There does exist at least one computer program for collation of texts, called COLLATE, developed at Oxford by Peter Robinson more than a decade ago. It has never been used for Variorum collation for the

simple reason that the preparation of texts of editions to be collated would be prohibitively costly of time and money. First, each edition would have to be translated into electronic form. While some important editions are available electronically, the plays in most of the eighty or so editions that we regularly collate would have to be scanned or typed into electronic form, preferably by two different scanners or typists and then compared to ensure accuracy; scanning of unfamiliar older type faces is notoriously inaccurate. Then the electronic texts would have to be marked up into comparable units. TLN would have to be assigned to every line in each edition; and since editions often rearrange, recombine, omit, and add lines, the process would often not be simple. The editions would also have to be marked for verse and prose; in verse, line endings and indentations of part lines to form verse lines would have to be marked so that the program could recognize and record lineation variants. In all probability, the time and effort involved in preparing the electronic texts will be more than are required by old-fashioned hand-and-eye collation, and most of us do not have the hundreds of thousands of dollars it would cost to hire out the work to reliably competent assistants.

We therefore describe below, as an alternative method, an efficient hand-and-eye method of collation. Its drawbacks are outlined in the discussion of it.

What follows is a description of the method I used for recording variants in my collation of the editions of *As You Like It* and *King Lear* for the New Variorum edition. The basic idea was suggested to me long ago by M. A. Shaaber, and I simply refined upon it. I have described it below and listed the advantages and disadvantages of it as I see them.

Shaaber's suggestion was to type each line from the copy-text across the top of a legal-size sheet of paper, and below that line to record changes from edition to edition or else to note constant readings by ditto marks. Because I did not want to write the names of editors or editions thousands of times, I mimeographed a standard worksheet with sigla for a chronological list of editions running (double-spaced) down the left-hand margin; the number of editions I was to work with necessitated my using both sides of the sheet. Such sheets can be prepared easily today by two-sided xeroxing. Then, as I collated an edition, whenever I found a difference from the previous edition, I recorded it (vertically) directly below the word or mark in the original line and (horizontally) opposite the siglum of the appropriate edition or editor. If there was no difference between editions I recorded nothing; on the whole I did not use ditto marks lest they slow me down and perhaps be confused with quotation marks. My one exception was this: I knew that when I came to digest all this information I would in crucial readings want assurance that the absence of any markings for several editions in a row did in fact mean agreement of the editions rather than oversight on my part, and in such cases I confirmed the agreement by columns of ditto marks. In time I evolved other marks--a caret to show omission of a mark of punctuation, a vertical stroke to show line-division, an x to show the absence of a previous line-division, and brief notes to myself within pointed brackets.

Such is the essential outline of the method: the particular mechanics of it are outlined below for anyone who might want to consider using it. It is a method with a number of disadvantages. First of all it is bulky: for a 3000-line play one needs six reams of heavyweight copy paper rather than a couple of file boxes of 5 x 8 cards. I acquired five sturdy cardboard boxes, one for each Act of the play, of a size to hold a four-inch depth of legal-size paper; this kept the sheets in order and made them easy to handle. Obviously this bulk of paper is not easy to transport from library to library--a serious consideration unless one is able, as I was, to spend several consecutive months at the Folger. Lack of portability is not a prohibitive consideration, however, since accurate collation can be done at home from high-quality xeroxes of editions. These can be acquired in a week or so of work at a library that owns all or most of the major editions, such as the Folger, Furness, U. of Wisconsin, and U. of Wisconsin--Milwaukee libraries. Secondly, it is an inflexible method in a couple of ways: one pretty much has to work in chronological order; and one has the selection of editions fixed from the beginning (making up the sheets therefore takes careful preparation). And there is the chance

of oversight--as the eye sweeps up and down the worksheet during collation, one may miss a change in punctuation that has been noted in an earlier edition and thus fail to record a return, in the edition at hand, to the original punctuation, so that months later in the analysis of the data one will be led to think that one or more editions had adopted the earlier change. A certain amount of re-checking is inevitable.

The advantages, on the other hand, are several. It is a very efficient and quick method of recording a great deal of information with a minimum of writing, simply because it takes less time to write a comma on the worksheet than to write a comma on a 5 x 8 card and then the siglum of every edition that prints that comma subsequently. One can do full collations almost as quickly as one can read, and one can record much more information than one is likely to need, thus postponing many editorial decisions until the data are complete. I was able to collate some eighty texts of *As You Like It* in about six months of full-time work; the longer and much more difficult texts of *Lear* took a year. Secondly, one can see at a glance everything that has ever happened to a line, visually as well as conceptually: one can see from the blankness of the page how long and continually a reading has gone unchallenged, more simply than from reading a list of editors' names. This aspect of the method makes the final digest of information into note form easier. Third, the system helps to catch oversights: since one gradually gets a visual as well as a conceptual sense of patterns of change from edition to edition, one tends the more easily to notice and recheck departures from those patterns. I confess that I have caught dozens of slips in just this way.

What follows is particular advice about making and using the worksheets.

Listing the editions. With this method one has to know ahead of time all the editions one intends to collate, and the exact date of publication of the play-text in multi-volume or serially published editions. The "Notes on Editions" in ch. VIII will suggest the core list of editions to be collated, and every editor will have to decide ahead of time what other editions of the play may also be worth doing. My own worksheets for *AYL* included a number of editions which turned out to be fairly worthless, and omitted several that turned out to be worth doing (readings from the latter I had to squeeze in where I could on the sheets). It is easier to include an edition in the list and later decide to ignore it than to try to squeeze it in later. With necessary double-spacing, a legal-size sheet has room for at most eighty editions; if one has more, he may wish to segregate some of them--he might, for instance, wish to record separately the variants among the different copies of a quarto copy-text. The siglum for an edition ought to be ranked among the other sigla by the date of the volume in which the play appeared, not by the first of the inclusive dates for a multi-volume edition. In order to get exact chronological order one ought to make a trip to the Folger to see the date on a particular volume in a multi-volume edition; a couple of dates on my worksheets were incorrect because of my inability to do this. The most useful way to list the editions on the worksheets is to use the sigla for editions devised by the *Handbook* committee, and to put after each the date of the particular volume containing the play. By using the sigla, rather than names of editions or editors, from the start of the job, one will avoid having to translate such names into sigla while writing up the Variorum edition's collation notes; and having the dates on the worksheet page will prove to be useful in many ways.

Printing the worksheets. The best and heaviest grade of copy paper should be used to minimize show-through. The editor should discard sheets with specks that might be mistaken for punctuation marks, as well as sheets on which the printed matter has drifted up or down on the page more than an eighth of an inch (I explain the reason for this below). He or she should print extra sheets to replace those on which typing errors are made or to provide sheets for additional lines, stage directions, etc. that will crop up from time to time in the collation; these sheets will have to be added to the pile in order of occurrence.

Typing the lines. I found that typing one line at the top of the sheet front and back was not enough: as the page filled out with variants, it became too tiring and too much an invitation to error to make the eye sweep up and down the whole length of each legal-size page searching for similarities with or differences from the text in hand. I thus decided it was necessary to type a line from a text across the middle of each page as well. Capell was my choice for the middle of Side One, since he made so many changes that influenced later editors: White 2 simply happened to be the edition for full collation nearest the middle of Side Two. This typing of each line four times should be done all at once, to avoid feeding the sheet into the typewriter four times and to avoid smudging readings that one has recorded. It is very time-consuming and should be done by a professional typist if possible; the editor has to collate the editions anyway, and so he or she will catch any errors by the typist. The typist should be careful that the line clears the furthest-extended siglum and date printed at the left margin so that the columns of variant readings don't have to be shifted sideways partway through the collation. I found that pica type allowed the lines to fit on the page, but that elite type with double spacing between words was preferable for two reasons: it left room between words for the clusters of punctuation marks often used by 18th century editors; and occasional lines could be shortened by single-spacing between words to leave room for the stage directions that 19th-century editors tended to insert within the lines. Since it is difficult to find a typewriter with a long *s*, the typist might be instructed to indicate that character by using a dollar-sign, or by marking a typewriter's modern short *s* with an asterisk or plus-sign or brackets.

Recording variants. To keep the readings in perpendicular columns under the appropriate place in the typed line, and opposite the appropriate editor's name, I bought and prepared a small transparent plastic T-square. With the T-square in vertical position on the worksheet, I marked with a piece of colored tape on the right edge of the T-riser the position (the height down from the top or up from the bottom of the worksheet) of the typed line from the play, and then with another piece of tape the level of the siglum of the edition I was working with that day. When I found a variant, I slid the T-square across the page until its right edge came to the appropriate place in the typed line, made sure that the upper piece of tape was aligned with the typed line (in case the printed pattern on the worksheet had drifted up or down more than an eighth of an inch; if so, I adjusted the height of the T-square accordingly; regularly printed sheets would obviate the problem) and then I recorded the variant opposite the other (lower) tape marker.

I found that for minor variations in spelling or for alternations between long and short *s* or between capitals and lower case, it was usually enough to record only the letters that changed rather than write the whole word each time, though if there was any chance of ambiguity I recorded the whole word. Italics I came to indicate by simply drawing a line where the word would be in the column rather than by writing the word and underlining it; when the word reverted to roman in a later edition I noted that fact within pointed brackets, thus--<rom.>--under the appropriate word or words. Recording the different forms of the speech prefixes before each speech I found to be a waste of time: the normal form of each character's name in each edition can be listed on separate sheets, and only variations from the norm recorded in the worksheets. I marked a caret in the column to indicate the omission of a punctuation mark; when a cluster of punctuation marks in one edition was followed by different punctuation in a later edition, to avoid ambiguity I either used multiple carets to indicate all the previous marks that had been omitted, or else recorded the whole new cluster even though it contained one or more characters from the former cluster. To indicate the omission of words from *Lr*. I used pointed brackets and the abbreviation for omission, thus: <om.>. All editorial comments should be enclosed in pointed brackets because both parentheses and square brackets occur in the texts themselves. Since the Variorum text no longer prints the long *s*, editors will probably not wish to record its appearance in editions collated except where it has been confused with *f*.

In general it is better to record too much than too little. One can easily, mindlessly, record virtually all punctuation marks from an edition as quickly as one may read the lines; inevitably, many instances of punctuation that seem meaningless at the time will prove to be points of contention in later editions, and if one has not recorded such data, there is no help for it but to pull out all previous editions and search out the line in each of them to see how it was pointed--a very time-wasting process.

Other mechanics. The sheets can be turned quickly, one or two a second, if one uses a rubber thumb-tip. The edges of the pile of sheets have to be kept reasonably square so that the T-square aligns entries accurately. If as they are turned the sheets are deposited in a box or tray that aligns them, the pile can simply be turned over for the next collation without further straightening. I found legal-size storage boxes hard to come by and had a box company make five for me, one for each Act. Pencil is preferable to ball-point or felt-tip pen for recording variants, because many rare-book libraries (such as the Folger) insist on pencil, because errors are more easily corrected, and because the base for ball-point or felt-tip ink shows through copy paper in time.

VIII. NOTES ON EDITIONS OF SHAKESPEARE

The following list attempts to do two things. First, it tries to give, in chronological order, accurate bibliographical entries, including sigla, for most past and ongoing editions of Shakespeare that are likely to be of interest to New Variorum editors. The choice of editions is based on the experience of many past and present editors, and is intended to be suggestive, not limiting. Certain kinds of other works relevant to the editions--manuscripts, notes, companion volumes or supplements, etc.--are also included in the list. Secondly, following each entry is, for the majority of editions, a set of notes containing several kinds of information that might conceivably be of use to editors planning to consult these editions.

In a full note the following information may be found. First, following the number of the entry, is a siglum for the edition agreed upon by the Variorum Handbook Committee in 1970 or subsequently by the General Editor(s), to be used in the Variorum textual notes. Next follows a bibliographical entry for the edition or book, full and accurate enough to allow an editor unfamiliar with the edition to find it without delay or confusion. This bibliographical information should not be relied on absolutely, however; for some of the lesser-known series of editions, of which I was unable to see every volume, I have had to rely on library card catalogues, published bibliographies, publishers' trade lists, and the like, and accordingly the dates and the number of volumes especially may be inaccurate on occasion. Following the entry is information about the availability of the edition. Since practically all items cited are available at the Folger Shakespeare Library, I have not troubled to specify its ownership of any but special items. Where I know that the Huntington Library owns a copy, I record that information for editors who might plan to work on the West Coast; possibly the Huntington owns still other editions than those I have indicated. Many if not most of the editions are available at such major libraries as the Bodleian, Trinity College (Cambridge), the British Library, the Library of Congress, Harvard, Yale, the Boston Public Library, and the Furness Library at the U. of Pennsylvania, and I have not tried to catalogue their holdings here, especially since several of them have readily available printed or electronic catalogues. I have, however, noted the rich holdings in several mid-western libraries--the Newberry Library (NL), U. of Chicago (UC), U. of Wisconsin--Madison (UW), and U. of Wisconsin--Milwaukee (UWM)--which may not be so well known.

When the first edition of the *Handbook* was prepared, several presses promised reprints of major editions of Shakespeare; many of these never materialized. OLMS, for instance, announced in 1970 their plans to reprint SING1, KNT1, COL1, DYCE1, WH1, STAU, CAM1, KTLY, DEL4, and HUD2, but I have been unable to find copies of any of these reprints. I have therefore listed only such paper and electronic reprints as I am fairly sure exist; there are certainly others that I do not know about. I have taken pains to record the locations, within the editions, of errata lists, special indexes, and the like, because they are often hard to find, easily overlooked, or even missing from a given copy. I have also recorded information of special interest concerning multiple issues, variations in dating, questions of editorship, circumstances of publication, and other matters to the extent that I know about them.

The next and in most cases the largest section of commentary in each entry concerns the text itself. To suggest recent editorial opinion of editions I have recorded the extent to which their texts have been collated by the most recent editors who have prepared volumes in the New Variorum series, Matthias A. Shaaber, Matthew W. Black, G. Blakemore Evans, Richard Knowles (*AYL*), Mark Eccles, Marvin Spevack, Robert K. Turner, and Knowles (*Lr.*, forthcoming). The plus-sign (+) means all subsequent editors, usually the editors of all recent Variorums from 1977 onward. The various editors' treatments of the texts are recorded in their respective editions, and Evans's experience as editor of the *Supplement to 1 Henry IV* and more particularly as former textual editor of *1 Henry VI* has been recorded in the *Supplement* and in his "Rough Notes on Editions Collated for *1 Henry VI*," *SRO* 2 (1966), 41-8. This

section of the entry continues with descriptions and appraisals of the texts, including information about provenance, peculiarities, apparatus, and general worth. The general appraisals of editions draw on two older works, Jane Sherzer, "American Editions of Shakespeare: 1753-1866," *PMLA* 15 (1907), 633-96, and Harrison Ross Steeves, "American Editors of Shakspeare," in *Shaksperian Studies*, ed. Brander Matthews and A. H. Thorndike (New York, 1916), pp. 347-68; and on the remarks of Fredson Bowers in "Today's Shakespeare Texts, and Tomorrow's," *SB* 19 (1966), 39-65, reprinted in his *On Editing Shakespeare*, 2nd ed. (Charlottesville, Va., 1966), pp. 137-79; and my companion piece to Evans's "Rough Notes," in *SRO* 4 (1968-9), 66-72. Matthias A. Shaaber kindly permitted me to reproduce his remarks on various editions in a letter sent to me before I did my collations for *AYL*, and Christopher Spencer and John Velz contributed notes resulting from their experience with the texts for *The Merchant of Venice* and *Julius Caesar*, respectively. Spencer provides further information on relationships between major editions in a computer-aided study of their original readings, "Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* in Sixty-Three Editions," *SB* 25 (1972), 89-106. Dates of publication for individual plays in complete editions issued serially over several years are provided in Knowles, "Dates for Some Serially Published Shakespeares," *SB* 40 (1987), 187-201. Other more special studies are referred to occasionally in the notes. Spoken and written advice from Giles Dawson, G. B. Evans, James G. McManaway, Mark Eccles, and Ruth L. Widmann was helpful in writing the original draft of this section of the *Handbook*, and several Variorum editors, among them George Walton Williams, Marvin Spevack, and Robert K. Turner have provided further details since then. Andrew Murphy has kindly compared the publication facts in the entries below against those recorded in the chronological appendix of his book *Shakespeare in Print* (Cambridge, 2004), which should be consulted for all other editions.

The advice about editions that is quoted or paraphrased from the above sources often originally used the term "partial collation(s)," the term of art being used at that time to refer either to an inspection of only a limited number of key cruxes in an edition, or to the recording of the limited number of variants found at those cruxes. The recording of the data of "partial collations" was abandoned in all editions after *AYL* (1977) because the notes became overly complicated to write and read. Since then, Variorum textual notes mainly record completely the data gleaned from fully collated editions, and only occasionally quote interesting readings found in other editions. Since the term "partial collation(s)" is no longer relevant to the process of collecting textual data or to the manner of recording it in Variorum textual notes, it is not used in this revised *Handbook*. To avoid any possible confusion or ambiguity, it has been silently replaced in the quotations or paraphrases below by synonymous terms within square brackets, either "occasional (or partial) inspection" (of editions) or "occasional quotation" (in the textual notes).

The last section of the entry, appearing only for 17th- and 18th-century editions, is information about manuscript annotations found in some copies of the editions, mainly in those owned by the Folger Shakespeare Library. Most of this information was compiled and kindly conveyed to me by Ruth L. Widmann. Such manuscript annotations may be of use in the commentary notes of the Variorum editions as well as in the textual collations and list of conjectured readings.

The authors' names before the commentary indicate the following sources:

Shaaber: Matthias A. Shaaber, personal letter concerning editions to be collated for *AYL*.

Bowers: Fredson Bowers, "Today's Sh. Texts, and Tomorrow's."

Evans: G. Blakemore Evans, "Rough Notes on . . . *1 Henry VI*."

Knowles: Richard Knowles, "Rough Notes on . . . *As You Like It*."

Spencer: Christopher Spencer, private notes on *MV* texts.

Velz: John W. Velz, private notes on *JC* texts.

Widmann: Ruth L. Widmann, private notes on MS annotations in Folger copies.

Since editorial treatment sometimes varies noticeably from play to play and from volume to volume within the same edition, these authors' comments about particular plays are prefaced

by notations of the play, volume number, and date, when such information is useful. On the whole, the commentary is reproduced verbatim from the sources, except where names of plays have been reduced to abbreviations and names of editions reduced to sigla, and where sigla have been revised to agree with those finally settled upon by the Variorum Handbook Committee. Quotations from Professor Bowers's essay are distinguished by quotation marks from the occasional paraphrases of his remarks that seemed desirable.

0. Qq: Quartos of individual plays (1593-)

The availability of live copies of quartos of Sh.'s plays is detailed in Henrietta Bartlett & Alfred Pollard, *A Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto 1594-1709*, rev. ed. (New Haven, 1939). Thomas L. Berger surveys past studies and present knowledge of variant copies in "Press Variants in Substantive Shakespearian Quartos," 6 *Library* 10 (1988), 231-41. As for reprints, the 48 Ashbee vols. (1861-71) are lithograph facsimiles made from tracings of the originals; they are apparently accurate but rare (only 31 sets were issued) and have no apparatus. The 43 Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles (18[80]-91) prepared by William Griggs and Charles Praetorius offer photo-lithographic facsimiles of not very high resolution, as well as introductions of interest, esp. those by P. A. Daniel. The New Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, begun by W. W. Greg in 1939 to replace that set, were discontinued after vol. 16 in 1975, but the Malone Society has undertaken to finish the series; there are useful introductions. A selection of the most important quartos in clear facsimiles is provided by J. B. Allen and Kenneth Muir in the single-volume *Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto* (Berkeley, 1981), unfortunately without line numbering. Electronic texts may be acquired from the Oxford Electronic Text Archive, and an increasing number of digital facsimiles are being provided on-line by electronic centers at the University of Virginia, MIT, the University of Pennsylvania, and elsewhere. Chadwyck-Healey, *Editions and Adaptations of Shakespeare*, offers electronic texts of 24 quartos.

1. F1: First Folio (1623)

Available at Huntington Library, NL, U. of Toronto. Sidney Lee's *Census of Extant Copies* (Oxford, 1902; suppl. 1906) has been updated by Harold M. Otness, *The Shakespeare Folio Handbook and Census* (1990) and by Anthony J. West, *The Shakespeare First Folio*, 2 vols. (OUP, 2001-2).

The UW library owns facsimiles of 1864 (1-vol.), 1864 (Booth, 3 vols.), 1866 (Staunton), 1876 (Halliwell-Phillipps), and the Lee (1902), Methuen (1910), and all later facsimiles. All Methuen facsimiles (F1-F4) are on the open shelves of Rare Books and Music at the BL. The Norton facsimile prepared by Professor Hinman supersedes all previous facsimiles, of course; its recent reissue has a new introduction by Peter Blayney. One may usefully keep in mind the imperfections of some earlier facsimiles. J. H. P. Pafford, "The Methuen Facsimile, 1910, of The First Folio, 1623," *N&Q* 111 (1966), 126-7, gives evidence of significant "touching up" of the Methuen text; cf. the note below on F2. The tampering with the text of the Yale facsimile (1954) is well known: see Fredson Bowers's review, *MP* 53 (1955), 50-7. H. J. Oliver, "An Alleged Variant in 'As You Like It,'" *N&Q* 112 (1967), 136, shows how in at least one case the Furness copy of F1 was altered. J. Dover Wilson published individual volumes of facsimiles of Folio texts of some 10 plays ca. 1929-31, with introductions. Electronic texts are available from the Oxford Electronic Text Archive, from Chadwyck-Healey, and from various on-line sites (see ch. XIV).

Widmann, Folger MSS (incomplete list):

Copy 4: Some MS notes. Charles Verney copy.

Copy 10: Some marginal MS notes. Sheldon-Burdett Coutts copy.

Copy 49: Very few notes by Hawkins, not worth opening the volume for, because the copy is in bad condition.

2. F2: Second Folio (1632)

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UW, UWM, U. of Toronto. UW also owns the Methuen (1909) and Spevack (1985) facsimiles.

Issued with six variant imprints but apparently no other differences. See Bartlett 120 and *STC* 22274-22274e.

John Velz, "The Text of *Julius Caesar* in the Second Folio: Two Notes," *SQ* 20 (1969), 95-8, shows evidence of significant sophistication (or touching-up) by inking and deletion in the Methuen facsimile (1909) of F2. This fact, along with Pafford's similar discovery about F1, casts serious doubts on the reliability of the Methuen facsimiles of F3 and F4.

Widmann, Folger MSS (incomplete list):

Copy 20: MS notes by Theobald and Johnson. [Knowles, 1982, corrects this note: With the aid of the Folger's MS letters of Theobald to Warburton, and after consultation with Laetitia Yeandle and Giles Dawson, I am prepared to say that most if not all of the annotations are Theobald's. Not only are the hands in the letters and annotations clearly the same (see especially Theobald's use of the old-fashioned backwards *e* along with Greek and modern cursive *es*, and the florid capitals), but they are often in the two colors of ink (black and red) that Theobald uses in the letters. I would guess that the Folio annotations antedate the letters, since they seem to be partial and exploratory attempts to rectify and understand the text, not the voluminous and confident commentary found in the letters. One feature that suggests this impression is the fact that in a number of plays the emendations first written in black ink have been reaffirmed at some later time with red ink, by underlining changes made within the line and by repeating marginal comments *literatim*. Numerous emendations are signed "L.T."]

As for Johnson's more upright, unadorned, spiky, and difficult hand, I found no trace of it in the annotations, though I did not scrutinize every page. The very few small annotations of F1 readings, made in pencil (apparently graphite rather than lead) in a very small and light hand, seem not to be Johnson's. Perhaps they are by one of the later owners, who included Samuel Ireland, the Earl of Aylesford, and Henry Irving. That Johnson once owned the volume seems fairly certain, since a flyleaf note by Samuel Ireland reads: "Bo.¹ at D.^r Johnsons' Sale Feb. 18, 1785. S.I." A week later Ireland added the following note: "This book at the death of Theobald the Editor of Shakespear, came into the hands of Osbourn y^e bookseller of Grays Inn--who soon after presented it to the late D.^r Johnson. S.I.--Feb. 25 1785."]

Copy 21: Annotated, supposedly by Theobald. [Knowles, 1982, corrects this note:] The annotations here are clearly not Theobald's. The mistaken notion that they might be apparently derives from one of the book's owners, John William Pease of Saltwell, whose flyleaf note of 1860 makes it clear that he thought he had bought Theobald's copy of F2. That he later came to have doubts is apparent from an added note of 22 March 1888, recording the sale of the Theobald-Johnson-Aylesford copy of F2 to Henry Irving. The hand is clearly not Theobald's: smaller, less florid, more slanted, using modern *es* throughout. Moreover, about a score of annotations *passim* are attributed to "Theobalds Ed(ition)" or "T-s Ed(ition)," and a note on *Ham.* 3869 reads, "M^r Theobald seems quite mistaken in referring this (as he does in his Note hereon) to Hamlet." Whose hand it is is unknown. Despite Pease's note that when he bought the book it was being studied by British Museum librarians for similarities between its notes and those of John Payne Collier's "Old Corrector" in the Duke of Devonshire's Folio, the hand is nothing like that of the Perkins Folio forgeries, but a mid-18th-c. hand. Upton's *Critical Observations* (1746) is referred to by page at Comedies p. 71B, and Grey's *Notes* (1754) are cited several times--e.g., the note on *Rom.*, p. 82, cites Grey and is a close paraphrase of *Notes* 2:263. Though Warburton is cited a couple of times (*Ham.*, p. 187; *Oth.*, p. 364) and the emendation of Illiads to Oeliads (*Tmp.*, p. 41) is a Pope conjecture first adopted by Hammer, Theobald, Grey, and Upton are the only editors or commentators specifically named.

One may suspect these annotations to be of the mid-18th c., probably before the editions of Johnson, Capell, and Steevens had appeared.

What the annotations represent is another question, to which there is yet no answer. They are very full for some plays, virtually non-existent for others. The freedom with which lines are excised, rewritten, or relinedated implies something other than mere editing, as do the frequent gratuitous criticisms of scenes as pointless or “execrable” (e.g., in *I* and *2H4*), or the headnote to *Othello*: “It is a Capital mistake in the Acting of This Play to represent the Moor as a Negro or Blackmoor” etc. On the other hand, despite the full supply of added locales and stage business, it shows no signs of having been used for prompt or actor’s copy--no indications of positions up- or down-stage, entrances left or right, etc. Perhaps comparison with contemporary acting versions might yield the clue. The annotations are a fertile source of conjectured readings of a sort, but since the emendations are far more often to improve or adapt Shakespeare than to recover his meaning, one needs to be very selective.

[Robert Turner adds: For *WT*, a few original notes, but most from Hanmer, one from Grey (1754). Since nothing from Johnson, perhaps date ca. 1755 (now, 1754-65).]

Copy 27: Poor copy, many 18th c. MS annotations.

Copy 41: Some MS notes.

Copy 43: A couple of notes.

Copy 48: Some contemporary MS notes. [For *WT*, Robert Turner found only 2 original readings, the rest imported from Rowe, Pope, and Theobald and recorded in two different inks and two hands. Werstine (1986): “Theobald is explicitly credited with a reading at TLN 366-7 of *Romeo*.” Since *WARB* is not referred to, perhaps date -1747.]

Robert K. Turner: Thomas Tyrwhitt (1730-86) bequeathed his copy of F2 to BL (C.39.i.13). Annotations in brown and black ink introduce readings from Rowe, Pope, Theobald, Hanmer, and Warburton into *WT*, none of which show up in Tyrwhitt’s *Observations* (1766), 3 of which are in *CAP*. Unclear whether he knew *CAP* or Capell knew Tyrwhitt.

The U. of Wisconsin copy has a few uninteresting notes by John Horne Tooke.

S. W. Singer (*Sh. Vindicated*, 1853, pp. ix f.) describes a copy of F2 that he purchased in 1852, containing MS corrections in several hands. Its whereabouts are unknown.

3. F3: Third Folio (1663-4)

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UWM. UW owns the Methuen (1905) and Spevack (1985) facsimiles.

See note on F2 for comment on the Methuen facsimile.

The second of two issues (1663, 1664; Bartlett 121, 122; Wing S2913, S2914) contains *Per.* and six apocryphal plays; Jaggard says they appear also in some copies of the first issue.

Widmann, Folger MSS (incomplete list):

Copy 20: HCF: “It is claimed that vol. belonged to Pope and that the MS notes throughout are in his handwriting.” Knowles (1982): Supposedly Pope’s copy, with annotations in his hand. This seems probable, though for *Lr.* I found the annotations of little interest. They often merely record variants in the Qq, or locale indications from Rowe; when emendations are proposed, they are generally those made in POPE1.

Copy 22: Some MS notes.

S. W. Singer, *Sh. Vindicated* (1853, pp. vi-ix) describes a copy of F3 accessible to him, containing theatrical markings.

4. F4: Fourth Folio (1685)

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UWM. UW owns Methuen (1904) and Spevack (1985) facsimiles.

See note on F2 for comment on the Methuen facsimile.

Issued with three title pages (Bartlett 123; Wing S2915, S2916, S2917).

For revised sheets, see below under 4a.

Widmann, Folger MSS (incomplete list):

Copy 5: Signed and with notes by Allan Park Paton.

Copy 14: (George Eliot's copy, no signature.)

Copy 21: (Edmund Kean copy.)

Copy 24: MS notes by Allan Park Paton, 1900.

Copy 33: A few notes by Thomas Southerne. [Knowles, 1982, questions this note]: Both Marvin Spevack and Laetitia Yeandle doubt that the annotations are Southerne's.

Velz, *JC*: Folger copy 33 of F4 has the signature of Thomas Southerne, the Restoration dramatist, on its t.p., and a pencil note of unknown provenance on the flyleaf says that MS notations in the text are believed to be Southerne's as well. For *JC* these consist of five original substantive readings, eight anticipations of 18th-century substantive readings, and five restorations of F1 (and one of F1-F3). Southerne lived on till 1746, but a contemporary described him as "withered by extreme old age" in 1726 (*DNB*), so it is the less likely that he did the annotating with access to more than ROWE and POPE1. If he worked before 1709, of course, his importance would be the greater. Two interesting coincidences with Thirlby, one with Hanmer.

Dyce had seen this copy of F4; he refers to it in his notes to DYCE2 (1865). Collier mentions it in COL1 (1842-4).

The copy of F4 from which Josiah P. Quincy copied the MS annotations that he published in *Manuscript Corrections* (Boston, 1854) has not been identified. Justin Winsor, *Bibliography of the Original Quartos and Folios of Shakespeare* (1876, p. 107) indicates an "imperfect" copy owned by Quincy, adding (p. 108) that in 1848 J. J. Vanderkemp of Philadelphia had "a fine copy, as if fresh from the bookseller's shop, with manuscript annotations." Though Quincy (d. 1910) was a member of the Harvard class of 1850, his F4 is not among Harvard's 6 cops.

4a. F5: "Fifth Folio" (ca. 1700)

See Giles E. Dawson, "Some Bibliographical Irregularities in the Sh. Fourth Folio," *SB* 4 (1951-2), 93-103, for his discovery, in about ten percent of F4 copies, of seventeen sheets reprinted c. 1700 and therefore now designated F5. The substantive textual variants in these sheets from *Jn.*, *2H4*, *H5*, *1H6*, *2H6*, *H8*, *Tro.*, *Cor.*, *Tit.*, and *Rom.* have been compiled by Eric Rasmussen in *The Shakespeare Fifth Folio (c. 1700)* (Tulsa: privately printed, 1994), available at Folger, Huntington, and UW.

5. Restoration Players' Quartos

Velz, *JC*: From my experience with the six quartos of *JC*, it certainly seems that Restoration quartos are worth careful collation. They have been largely untouched in this century (I was probably the first modern reader to work through all six of them), but Hunter knew of them, drawing some conj. emendations from Q 1691 readings. There is no evidence that they had any direct influence on the 18th-century editorial tradition, though one of them was being used as a promptbook by George Garrick in the 1760's, and in a number of cases they anticipate the editorial emendations of Capell and other editors. They provide significant information about the production of the play on the Restoration stage (especially stage business and doubling and fusion of roles). Though they have no textual authority, and though they do not directly influence the editorial tradition, I think we should regard them as "editions." A final benefit: you never know what you will find in such dusty books. One of my six turned out to be an 18th-century forgery (an "edited" text by an unknown editor, probably ca. 1715-20), and three others seem to be piracies dating from the 1690s--see "Pirate Hills and the Quartos of *Julius Caesar*," *PBSA* 63 (1969), 177-93.

[These Qq may be interesting for the occasional odd reading or conjecture, but as Velz says, they were not part of the main editorial tradition, and should be quoted from only sparingly if at all.]

6. ROWE1: Nicholas Rowe, *Works*, 6 vols., 1709. A supplementary vol. 7, containing Poems, critical remarks by Charles Gildon, etc., was issued in 1710 by a different publisher.

Available at Huntington Library, apparently in a late state of the edition; many of Ford's distinguishing marks (see note on ROWE2) seem to have been removed by press-correction. Available at UC, UW, NL (incl. supplementary vol. 7), and UWM (AMS rept.). The Chadwyck-Healey electronic text should be checked to see if it is of ROWE1 or ROWE2.

No errata.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 3: "Printed from F4, with occasional use of F2 and F3."

Barbara Mowat, "The Form of *Hamlet's* Fortunes," *Ren. Drama* NS 19 (1988), 97-126 gives evidence that to F4 Rowe added lines from quartos of *Ham.*, *Rom.*, and *Oth.*

Widmann, Folger MSS:

Copy 4: Vol. 1, notes on end papers, flyleaf.

Vol. 2, for *MND* points out famous passages. Similar notes in all vols.

[Werstine (1986): Though the copy is named the John Dennis Copy, the annotations are not in Dennis's hand.]

Copy 8: Vol. 6, one note on flyleaf by John Sherwen (about imputed plays of Sh.).

Copy 10: Vol. 6, corrections (for a printer) in red ink on *Cromwell*, *Sir John Oldcastle*, *The Puritan*, *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, *Lochrine*.

7. ROWE2: Nicholas Rowe, *Works*, 6 vols., 1709.

Available at Huntington Library, UWM (AMS rpt.).

No errata.

Spencer: One should check each volume of ROWE1 or ROWE2 that he uses, since the two editions look the same, and some sets catalogued as one or the other actually contain some volumes of each. See McKerrow, *TLS*, 8 March 1934, p. 168; and H. L. Ford, *Shakespeare: 1700-1740* (1935), pp. 9-18.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black+, except occasional quotation, Evans.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 3: Printed from ROWE1; corrects some errors of ROWE1.

Spencer, *MV*, vol. 2: There are about 100 differences between ROWE2 and ROWE1 in *MV*; most of these are punctuation, but more than a dozen are substantive. Some misprints in ROWE1 are corrected, and a larger number of new ones are introduced. The changes do not seem to be authoritative.

Velz, *JC*: Introduces one of the most controversial emendations of the century and a number of other readings as well. I suggest full collation.

8. TJOH1: Thomas Johnson, *A Collection of the Best English Plays*, 12 vols., The Hague, 1710-12.

Includes *Ham.*, *JC*, *Mac.*, *Oth.*, *IH4*, *Wiv.*

Velz, *JC*: Both TJOH1 and TJOH2 (1711, 1720, ca.) are important editions of *JC*. In at least a dozen major readings, TJOH1 anticipates later 18th-century opinion (often Capell) and in one major reading TJOH2 anticipates POPE1. The two editions together introduce 76 substantive readings. TJOH2 occasionally reverts to Rowe or F1 from a TJOH1 emendation.

Copy-text: ROWE1 for TJOH1, TJOH1 for TJOH2. See H. L. Ford, *Shakespeare: 1700-1740* (1935), pp. 46-56, for more information, including a discussion of the different states of the *Wiv.* text.

9. ROWE3: Nicholas Rowe, *Works*, 8 vols., 1714.
Available at Huntington Library, UC, UW.
Rowe named on t.p. of vol. 4. Index to “Beauties” in vol. 8. No errata.

Full collation: Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4: Printed from ROWE2; makes a number of substantive changes. (In view of the order of texts here I question the value of collating ROWE2 throughout; I would place it in the list of editions [occasionally quoted].)

Spencer, *MV*, vol. 2: ROWE3 was printed from ROWE2, but it restores substantive readings from the 17th century (fifteen through Act 3, including a half-line at 2.7.17, omitted in F3-F4 and ROWE1, ROWE2). ROWE3 retains about half the substantive alterations in ROWE2. However, all three editions omit a full line (4.1.22) and include a misprint in 5.1.182 that one would expect a compositor to correct if an editor did not. In general, the first three acts in ROWE3 seem to have received more attention than the last two.

Joseph Candido (*N&Q* 236, 1991) gives evidence supporting McKerrow’s suggestion that Rowe’s editor, John Hughes (poet and ed. of Spenser), drew readings from one or more early folios, most likely F1.

Widmann, Folger MSS:

Copy 3: Vols. 1-7, notes following Pope’s readings (see slip pinned to last p. of vol. 1).

10. TJOH2: Thomas Johnson, *A Collection of the Best English Plays*, 16 vols., The Hague, 1720-22.

See note on 1710-12 edition.

11. POPE1: Alexander Pope, *Works*, 6 vols., 1725.

Available at Huntington Library, UC, NL, UW, and UWM (AMS rpt.); Chadwyck-Healey electronic text.

Indexes in vol. 6. No errata. As was often the case in 18th-century editions, the first volume was printed last and bears the latest date. Though sometimes dated 1723-5, in fact the set was not released to the public until 1725, the actual date of publication.

Full collation: Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4 (printed 1723): Printed from ROWE3.

Widmann, MSS:

A 1725 Pope in Trinity College has Capell’s corrections (mCAPI). The call number is Capell E.6. Folger Shakespeare Library has FOLGER FILM ACC 42 with *Tmp.*, *MND*, *Wiv.*, and *Ado* only. Greg, *Capell Shakespeariana*, p. 119, says *Lr.* in vol. 3 is also corrected in Capell’s hand.

12. POPE2: Alexander Pope, *Works*, 10 vols., 1728.

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC (vol. 10 only), UWM.

Index and list of readings or conjectures in vol. 8; glossary in vol. 10. No errata.

Full collation: Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 5: Printed from POPE1; some changes in text, but mostly in accidentals.

13. mTBY1, 2, 3, 4: Styan Thirlby MS Notes, 1709-25, 1725-, 1733-, 1747-.

Spencer: Styan Thirlby (1686?-1753) annotated four copies of different editions of *Sh.* with a view of publishing his own edition. [The first of these is a now-lost set of ROWE1 or ROWE2, the second a set of POPE1 at Yale, Beinecke Library. The third, a copy of THEO1, is in the Folger, as is the fourth (WARB), lacking vol. 6.] Thirlby allowed Theobald to examine mTBY2 and sent him annotations by letter (printed in Nichols's *Literary History*, 2:222-30); Dr. Johnson used mTBY4 and lost vol. 6. mTBY3, 4 contain valuable notes and emendations (about 1000 for *MV* in m3, 750 in m4 mostly repeating m3); the annotation in m3 seems to be heaviest in *Tmp.*, *Wiv.*, *MND*, *MV*, and *Lr.* Many of Thirlby's emendations and notes appear elsewhere, especially in THEO, JOHN, and, curiously, mCOL1 (the "Perkins" Folio). Bibliography: *DNB*; Nichols's *Literary History*, vol. 2; Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes*, 4:264-71; R. F. Jones, *Lewis Theobald* (New York, 1919); Arthur Sherbo, *Samuel Johnson, Editor of Sh.* (Urbana, 1956). [On Theobald's debt to Thirlby see also A. R. Braunmuller, ed., *Jn.* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 101-3.]

The lost vol. 6 of Warburton (mTBY4) is in a mixed set formerly owned by Johnson, now in the library of the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth. See *RES* 3 (1927), 208-12. Professor McManaway, the source of this information, has arranged for a microfilm of the volume to be deposited in the Folger Library. The Variorum General Editors have complete microfilms of mTBY2, mTBY3, and mTBY4.

Though Thirlby's annotations are fairly legible, he used an extensive set of abbreviations to fit his notes into the margins. John Hazel Smith has deciphered these and explains them in his article on Thirlby in *Shakespeare Studies* 11 (1978). Many are self-explanatory: Q, F(ol.), R[owe], P[ope], T[heobald], H[anmer], W[arburton]; some are private: M[arginal gloss in POPE1], M[arginal gloss in]R[OWE1/2], MT[HEO1], PP (loose papers), Letter (to Theobald, 7 May 1729); etc. The majority are abbreviations of Latin words or phrases: an(non), f(orte) = a probable emendation; n(on) p(lacet), n(on) m(uto), n(on) n(ecess) m(utare) = do not emend; d(elere), t(ollere) = delete punctuation; f(ortasse) s(unt) q(ui) l(egant), f(ortasse) q(uidam), q(uid) s(i) = doubtful conjecture; l(egendum), scrib(endum) = emend; etc.

14. THEO1: Lewis Theobald, *Works*, 7 vols., 1733.

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UW, UWM, and in AMS rpt.
Erratum, vol. 7, p. 494.

Full collation: Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4: Printed from POPE2; notes of this edition reprinted for first time in full in 1733 edition of Theobald.

Widmann, Folger MSS:

Copy 2: Notes by Styan Thirlby (mTBY3).

Copy 4: Some notes in vols. 3, 4, 5, 7.

Copy 5: Some notes in vols. 1, 5. [Andrew Gurr: Annotations made on flyleaves and text by Henry Lushington ca. 1754 mainly record conjectures by Upton, Warburton, and Edwards, and mark Dodd's Beauties.]

Copy 6: Notes by Hanmer in all vols. [Knowles, 1982: Hanmer's annotations and conjectures generally agree with those later made in HAN1. For *Lr.*, almost nothing of interest but two conjectures.]

Copy 9: Vol. 1, notes by Maurice Morgann (interleaved).

Copy 10: Vol. 6, pencil MS notes on *JC, Ant.*

Copy 12: Vol. 1, one note on *Wiv.*; vol. 7, two notes on *Oth.*

Copy 14: All vols. have odd pencil scrawls in margins, no MS notes to speak of.

Edward Capell's copy, formerly Warburton's, is in Trinity College Library, Cambridge.

A note of Capell's in the edition reads, "This copy of Mr. Theobalds edition was once Mr. Warburtons who has claim'd in it the Notes he gave to the former, which that former deprived him of and made his own and some Passages in the Preface, the Passages being put between hooks and the Notes signed with his name." See Ford, p. 27. Also see entry below for HAN2.

The Bodleian has a copy (Mal. C. 98) with notes that the catalogue identifies as Styan Thirlby's, but John H. Smith says that they are not his.

15. Tonson's Edition, 8 vols., 1734-5.

Folger 1734-35b. Not really an edition, but a reissue of the 1734-35a collection of plays. See Ford, *Sh. 1700-1740*, pp. 33-7, 40-45.

Widmann, Folger MSS:

Copy 7: Vols. 1-7, some MS notes; none in vol. 8.

Copy 17: Vol. 7, some notes.

16. THEO2: Lewis Theobald, *Works*, 8 vols., 1740.

Available at Huntington Library, UW, UWM.

Table of editions and indexes in vol. 8. No errata.

Full collation: Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4: Printed from THEO1; some textual changes; notes considerably curtailed.

Widmann, Folger MSS:

Copy 3: All vols. have MS notes by Gray (set lacks vol. 2).

Copy 4: Some notes in all vols. by George Tollet. [Knowles, 1982: In his annotations Tollet cites HAN1, WARB, and JOHN1, and refers to Edwards's *Canons*. For *Lr.*, two new conjectures and one new annotation.]

17. HAN1: Thomas Hanmer, *Works*, 6 vols., 1743-4.

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UW, UWM, and in AMS rpt.

Often referred to as the Oxford Edition.

Glossary in vol. 6, sigs. [Zzz3]-Bbbb. Errata in vol. 6, sig. [Bbbbv].

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4 (1743): Printed from POPE1.

18. HAN2: Thomas Hanmer, *Works*, 6 vols., 1745.

Available in NL, UWM.

Glossary in vol. 6. No errata.

Full collation, Black, Turner; ignored, Shaaber; occasional quotation, Evans etc.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4: A reprint based on HAN1; valuable for the light it throws on the claims of Hanmer and Warburton to certain readings in the text.

Knowles: Giles Dawson's argument in *Studies in Bibliography* 2:35-48, that Warburton is responsible for the notes identifying the authors of emendations, has been questioned by Arthur Sherbo in *JEGP* 51:71-82. Professor Dawson has informed me that he now (1970) has new evidence about the 1745 Hanmer edition and that he intends shortly to publish proof that his earlier conjectures based on incomplete evidence were completely correct. [Apparently never published?]

See note on THEO1 MSS.

Knowles, *AYL*: Warburton claims in HAN2 a number of emendations which do not occur in his own edition of 1747.

19. [Thomas Hanmer], *Works*, 9 vols., London: J. and P. Knapton, 1747.

Reissue of Osborne's sheets of his pirated reprint of Hanmer 1744 after these were surrendered to Tonson, Knapton, et al.; Folger no. 1747c2. There exists also a reprint of this edition, Folger no. 1747c3.

Widmann, Folger MSS:

1747c2, copy 2: Vols. 1-5 have occasional notes in most plays.

1747c3, copy 3: MS notes by Dodd.

20. WARB: William Warburton, *Works*, 8 vols., 1747.

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UW, and UWM (AMS rpt.); Chadwyck-Healey electronic text.

Errata on verso of t.p. in each vol. Index in vol. 8.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4: Printed from THEO2.

Widmann, Folger MSS:

Copy 2: Styan Thirlby: notes (mTBY4). [For the Folger microfilm of the "lost" vol. 6, see entry 13 on mTBY4.]

Copy 4: Some notes in all vols. (but set lacks vol. 3). [Werstine, 1986: The anonymous annotations can be dated: the MS list of eds. in 1:d8 is dated 1766; verses on the rear flyleaf of vol. 1 are dated "Jan. 27, 1768, and signed "I. [or J.] W."]

Copy 5: Vols. 1-5, some notes by Warburton. See Black, *R2*, v1955, p. xx. [Knowles, 1982: Warburton's MS annotations are, surprisingly, of great interest. He retracts or revises many of the readings and comments in WARB, and proposes a number of new conjectural readings.]

21. THEO3: Lewis Theobald, *Works*, 8 vols., 1752.

Available at UC, UW.

Occasionally quoted by Spevack.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4: Printed from THEO2; almost no textual changes. I doubt whether this edition deserves even [occasional quotation].

Widmann, Folger MS:

Copy 1: MS notes by Hawkins.

Hawkins edited a 3-vol. edition of Elizabethan plays. John Velz says his MS comments on *JC* are valuable. See HAN3 note.

22. BLAIR: Hugh Blair, *Works*, 8 vols., Edinburgh, 1753.

Blair is not named on the t.p.; this is often called the Scotch or Scots editor's edition.

Errata and omissions at end of vol. 6. Glossary, indexes, and list of various readings in vol. 8. Blair explains his editorial methods in vol. 1, pp. vi-viii.

Murphy: May have been edited not by Blair but by the Edinburgh printer John Reid. See Warren McDougall, *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions* 5.5 (1988), 2-31.

Occasional quotation, Evans, Eccles.

Knowles, *AYL*, vol. 2: I tested Blair's text of *AYL* in about eighty places, using my own list of disputed readings, Blair's list in vol. 5, and a selection of rhetorical passages such as would have interested him. In every case he followed WARB to the letter, making only insignificant changes in capitalization and punctuation. Christopher Spencer's experience with the *MV* text was the same. Giles Dawson says (in Fredson Bowers, *Principles of Bibliographical Description*, pp. 473-7) that Blair differs from WARB on the average of once a play, but we didn't find even that much difference. For our plays the edition was apparently not worth collating.

Velz, *JC*: I collated fully and found 10 original substantive readings, careful collation (of Hanmer against Warburton, chiefly), and a striking anticipation of Johnson's punctuation. Of course, *JC* is a play a rhetorician might give special attention to, but Blair behaves like a serious editor.

23. THEO4: Lewis Theobald, *Works*, 8 vols., 1757.

Available at UWM.

Index and list of editions in vol. 8. No errata.

Full collation, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4: Printed from THEO2. This is an important edition showing very definite signs of careful editorial revision and should be fully collated. (See JOHN1, entry 25.)

24. THEO5: Lewis Theobald, *Works*, 8 vols., 1762.

No one collates or quotes from this edition.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4: Printed from THEO4 and is essentially a mere reprint, correcting only certain obvious errors. I doubt whether this edition deserves even [occasional quotation].

25. JOHN1: Samuel Johnson, *Plays*, 8 vols., Tonson-Corbet, 1765.

Available at Huntington Library. Chadwyck-Healey electronic text should be checked; is it JOHN1 or JOHN2?

Appendix with additional notes in vol. 8.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4: Printed from THEO4, with occasional use of WARB.

Christopher Spencer provides this bibliography on Johnson's edition:

Evans, G. B. "The Text of Johnson's *Sh.*" *PQ* 28 (1949), 425-8.

Eastman, A. M. "The Texts from Which Johnson Printed his *Sh.*" *JEGP* 49 (1950), 182-91.

----- "Johnson's *Sh.* and the Laity: A Textual Study." *PMLA* 65 (1950), 1112-21.

Monaghan, T. J. "Johnson's Additions to his *Sh.* for the Edition of 1773." *RES NS* 4 (1953), 234-48.

Sherbo, Arthur. Review of Monaghan. *PQ* 33 (1954), 283-4.

Black, M. W., ed. *Richard II* (New Variorum ed.). 1955. Pp. xv-xvi n.

Sherbo, Arthur. *Samuel Johnson, Editor of Sh.* Urbana, 1956.

Eastman, A. M. "In Defense of Dr. Johnson." *SQ* 8 (1957), 493-500.

See also a forthcoming article by William McAvoy, who has discovered that sheets from JOHN1 and JOHN2 were sometimes bound together. [Never published?]. Sheets from JOHN1 may be distinguished from those of JOHN2 or later imprints by press-figures: see Donald D. Eddy, "Samuel Johnson's Edition of Shakespeare (1765)," *PBSA* 56 (1962), 428-44.

Widmann, Folger MSS:

Copy 5: Some MS notes, probably 19th c. [Robert Turner adds: Heavily annotated from COL2, possible also COLNE; no readings from COL1. Werstine (1986) finds opposite *Rom.* 803-4 a note cited from p. 406 of COL1, though virtually all others postdate mCOL2, COLNE, and COL2.]

Copy 7: Some notes on most plays.

26. JOHN2: Samuel Johnson, *Plays*, 8 vols., Tonson-Woodfall, 1765.

Available at NL, UW, UWM (AMS rpt.). The AMS reprint of Johnson 1765 is based on this edition, not on JOHN1. The UC set has JOHN3 vols. 2, 3, 7, not JOHN2.

Appendix with additional notes and errata in vol. 8.

See bibliographical note on JOHN1.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Eccles, Turner, Knowles (*Lr.*); occasional quotation, Evans, Knowles (*AYL*), Spevack.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4: A paginary reprint of JOHN1 with occasional slight textual changes. The reading at 5.3.25 (Riverside numbering) has been followed ever since; that at 4.3.51 adopted by SING1, SING2 and CAM1, CAM2; otherwise of no textual significance. I question the value of complete collation, so long as it is made clear that it is JOHN1 that is being collated. Place in lists of texts [occasionally quoted].

Velz, *JC*: Ten variants from JOHN1 worth recording, but no evidence that any were introduced deliberately--e.g., 2 obvious errors in JOHN1 go uncorrected in JOHN2.

26a. STVNS: George Steevens, *Twenty Plays*, 1766. UW and AMS rpt.

Steevens reprints 20 quartos from David Garrick's collection, incl. *Sonnets* and *Leir* (1605).

27. mCAPI, 2, 3, 4: Edward Capell, MSS.

For mCAPI, see MSS note for POPE1 (entry 11). For mCAP3, see note on CAPN (entry 35). For mCAP4, see note for CAP (entry 28). The rest of this entry concerns mCAP2.

W. W. Greg's *Catalogue of the Books Presented by Edward Capell to the Library of Trinity College in Cambridge*, 1903, p. 164, lists as M.S. 1 a manuscript, presumably a holograph, of Capell's text, titled "Mr William Shakespeare his Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies." Professor McManaway has arranged for a microfilm of the complete MS to be deposited at the Folger Library. Both the University of Illinois Library and the Furness Sh. Library at the University of Pennsylvania also own nine reels of microfilm containing the following (in order): *Tmp.*, *TGV*, *Wiv.*, *MM*, *Err.*, *Ado*, *Wiv.*, *MM*, *Wiv.*, *MM*, *Cym.*, *Lr.*, *Rom.*, *Ham.*, *Oth.*, *R2*, *IH4*, *2H4*, *R3*, *H8*, *Mac.*, *Cor.*, *JC*, *Ant.*, *Tim.*, *Tit.*, *Tro.*, *Shr.*, *AWW*, *TN*, *WT*, *Jn.*, *Tmp.*, *Ado*, *LLL*, *R2*, *Ant.*, *Tro.*, *Rom.*, *Ham.*, *Tmp.*, *Err.* (1 page), *Ado*, *LLL*, *Tro.*, *Rom.*, *Ham.* Furness Library also owns *AYL* complete. Capell marked his intended

linkings of part-lines of verse throughout the holograph, which did not serve for printer's copy: see Werstine, Knowles in *6 Library 7* (1985).

Occasional quotation, Evans.

Evans: Capell's autograph (?) transcript in Trinity College Library deserves [occasional quotation], since it shows with what a struggle Capell finally arrived at the comparative purity of his published text and serves to correct occasional slips in the printed edition.

Knowles, *AYL*: It is possible to date Capell's editing of each play, since at the head of each is the date of commencement, at the end the date of completion. The dates range from 1749 to 1766.

28. CAP: Edward Capell, *Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies*, 10 vols. 1768.

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UW, UWM (AMS rpt.); Chadwyck-Healey electronic text.

Though the t.p. of vol. 1 is dated 1767, the vols. were printed between 1760 and the end of 1767, and the whole set was evidently published at once in 1768 (Peter Blayney, privately, citing 1:18-19, n. 8). Corrigenda appear both in vol. 10 and in *Notes and Various Readings to Shakespeare* (3 vols., 1783). The substantive importance of Capell's several symbols in the text (crosses, lowered dashes, etc.) is explained in his *Prolusions* (1760), pp. v-vi. There is an unpublished Illinois dissertation: Hymen Hart, "Edward Capell: The First Modern Editor of Shakespeare," *DA* 28(1968), 5017A.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 6: Printed from a transcript by Capell, not from an earlier printed text. Textually the most important of all eighteenth-century editions, being the basis of all the later Variorum editions so far as punctuation, scene division, and stage directions are concerned.

Velz, *JC*: It is worth struggling with Capell's prose in the *Notes and Various Readings*. I found two or three insights there which Malone is usually credited with. Also a number of second thoughts about individual readings in his own text. Note that Capell also proposes emendations in his table of Variant Readings for the play.

Widmann, Folger MS:

Copy 6, probably owned by Collier, has notes in at least two hands; one clearly is not Capell's for there are hostile references to him. Possibly there are three hands here, one of them the Rev. H. Barry's. See Black, *R2*, v1955, p. xx.

Trinity College Library, Cambridge, owns Capell's holograph (mCAP2) as well as a copy of CAP with Capell's MS notes (mCAP4), dated "end of year 69," 1:t.p.

A. R. Braunmuller: Malone's copy of CAP in the BL (C.60.g10) includes Malone's collations of previous editions, and his own emendations. It's fascinating.

29. JOHN3: Samuel Johnson, *Plays*, 8 vols., 1768.

No one collates or quotes from this edition.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4: A paginary reprint of JOHN2, correcting a *few* of the frequent careless errors of that text. No reason for even [occasional quotation].

30. HAN3: Thomas Hanmer, *Works*, 6 vols., 1770-1.

Available at UW, UWM.

Full collation, Black; occasional quotation, Shaaber, Spevack, Turner; ignored, Knowles, Eccles.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4 (1770): Printed from HAN1; note list of variant readings from Theobald's and Capell's editions. I have put off collating this edition. What is it worth, full collation or [occasional quotation]?

Shaaber: May be omitted.

Spencer, *MV*, vol. 2 (1770): Hanmer died in 1746. The text is based on HAN1 or HAN2, with very few substantive alterations, but many punctuation changes--mostly readings which first appeared in THEO. [Occasional quotation].

Velz, *JC*: HAN3 is a paginal reprint of HAN1, and it shows remarkable fidelity to HAN1 verbal readings, even when the tradition from 1745 to 1770 had rejected them. But in punctuation this edition is entirely independent of Hanmer; the punct. is from Capell, though there are four original (and ingenious) punct. emendations, and a number of survivals from Hanmer. (In two cruxes HAN3 adopts Capell's punct. but not his reading, to the utter defeat of sense.) HAN3 uses the dash almost entirely as CAP does, to indicate change of address, not as in Rowe-Johnson, to indicate hesitation or pause.

It is quite possible that Thomas Hawkins did *not* prepare this revision of HAN1 (*pace* L.C. card). In about twenty major readings HAN3 stays with HAN1 against the Hawkins notes in the Folger copy of THEO3, and in most cases where Hawkins's MS and HAN3 coincide, the reading will be found in Capell as well.

One original SD. An interesting anomaly among editions, but perhaps not worth collation.

Widmann, Folger MS:

Copy 4: Some uninteresting pencillings.

31. JEN: Charles Jennens, *Lear, Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello, Julius Caesar*, 1770-4.

Available at Huntington Library (*Lr.*, *Mac.*, *JC*), UW (*Lr.*, *Oth.*)

Velz, *JC*: Jennens is the most careful and intelligent collator in the century--better far than Capell and Johnson-Steevens. He records, e.g., a misspelled and therefore ambiguous speech tag which passed unnoticed from ROWE2 through five editors and persists as late as v1773. His readings are always judicious and his commentary pithy and often brilliant.

Knowles, *Lr.*: One of the most important and independent editions of the century, by the librettist of Handel's *Messiah*. Full collation.

32. v1773: Samuel Johnson and George Steevens, *Plays*, 10 vols., 1773.

Available at UC, UW.

Two appendices of addenda to all volumes in vol. 10; the second, beginning on sig. Oo, is mostly notes from Farmer.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 6: Printed from JOHN1 (though it seems to reproduce a nonce-reading from JOHN3 at 2.3.66). Begins the heavy filching from Capell (in spite of the remarks in the Preface); retains some of Johnson's punctuation, but not much.

Steevens changes Johnson's text relatively little, preferring to give alternate readings in the notes. He does alter the scene-division on the Elizabethan principle of a cleared stage.

Widmann, Folger MS:

Copy 3: Annotated copy of George Steevens (though Giles Dawson in Black's *R2*, v1955, p. xx, doubts these are Steevens's notes). [They are not in his hand, and are mainly

additions from v1778, complete with p. nos.] [Robert Turner adds: MS notes chiefly transcribed from v1778, but two dozen glosses seem to be original. The hand is not Percy's.]

33. GENT: Francis Gentleman, *Plays*, Bell's [Theatre/Acting] Edition, 9 vols., 1773-4.

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UW, UWM (Cornmarket rpt.), Chadwyck-Healey electronic text.

Plays published separately and then in 8 vols., with a 9th vol. of the Poems. Not to be confused with Bell's [Library] Editions of 1778?, 1785-7, 1786-8, which are really reprints of Johnson-Steevens. The Theatre or Acting Edition incorporates 18th c. acting traditions. The complex publication history is reconstructed in A. Murphy's forthcoming *Shakespeare in Print*.

34. v1778: Samuel Johnson and George Steevens, *Plays*, 10 vols., 1778.

Available at Huntington Library, UC, UW, UWM; Chadwyck-Healey electronic text. UW and UWM own Malone's *Supplement* (2 vols., 1780), which includes *Per.* and apocryphal plays. Folger copy 5 has marginalia by Steevens, Malone, Whalley (?), etc. The Folger and Furness libraries own his *Second Appendix* (1783).

Errata for all vols. in vol. 1, preliminary p. [350].

Addenda in Malone's *Supplement*, 2 vols., 1780, in the Appendix in vol. 2, pp. [681]-732 of the *Supplement*, and in Malone's *Second Appendix*, 1783.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 6: Printed from v1773. Completes the steal from Capell (except for occasional snatches by Malone in 1790 edition); except for the notes almost nothing of Johnson left.

Many additional notes from Steevens, more readings recorded from F and Qq.

A Brit. Libr. copy (C.117.e.3) has MS notes by Isaac Reed and others.

35. CAPN: Edward Capell, *Notes and Various Readings to Shakespeare*, 3 vols., 1783.

Available at Huntington Library, UW (also 1774 issue), UWM (AMS rpt.); Burt Franklin rpt., 1970); Chadwyck-Healey electronic text.

The Folger Library owns the MS for this (mCAP3).

E. K. Chambers, *Wm. Sh.* (1930), 2:289, says "The first part of the commentary was published] in 1774, but withdrawn, reprinted with a second part in 1779, and republished, with third and fourth parts printed in 1780, in *Notes and Various Readings to Sh.*, 3 vols. (1783)." The note is accurate: though earlier dates of printing appear in the volumes, the whole set was published at once in 1783. UW owns the 1774 publication; material from it that is reprinted in 1783 should be cited as (1783 [1774]).

See note on CAP (entry 28) for the uses of CAPN.

36. [Samuel Ayscough], *Works*, Stockdale's Edition, 1784.

Widmann, MS:

The copy in the Furness Sh. Library at the University of Pennsylvania has MS notes by Phineas Pett.

37. v1785: Samuel Johnson, George Steevens, and Isaac Reed, *Plays*, 10 vols., 1785.

Available at UC, UW, UWM.

No errata.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Eccles, Knowles (*Lr.*); occasional quotation, Evans, Knowles (*AYL*), Spevack.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 6: Printed from v1778. Textually this edition is merely a careless reprint and does not figure in the transmission of the text. Of 36 readings found first in v1785, 29 are found no where else, and of these 29, 19 are misprints, the remaining 10 being colon and semi-colon variations, with one or two exceptions. Of the 7 readings first appearing in v1785 and later occurring in other texts, only one need be considered as anything but coincidence. I feel strongly that v1785 deserves nothing but [occasional quotation].

William Woodson has discovered in BL a copy (C.117.e.3) of v1778 that was used as printer's copy for most of the plays in v1785. It shows that some plays were revised lightly, some moderately, some heavily; that notes were sent to Reed or Steevens by Malone, Whalley, Henley, Henderson, Mason, and Reynolds, and were typed in or transcribed, mainly by Reed; and that the careless printer introduced manifold errors.

Notes considerably added to, esp. by Malone.

38. RANN: Joseph Rann, *Dramatic Works*, 6 vols., 1786-[94].

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UW, UWM.

Errata for the same or previous volumes in preliminary pages of vols. 1 and 2 and at end of vols. 3 and 4.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black+, except occasional quotation, Evans.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4 (1791): Printed from v1778, with occasional reference to MAL and CAP. Contains 17 unique readings, of which at least 9 are misprints and only one of any textual significance (5.3.124-6). Not worth more than [occasional quotation]. Does not influence later editions.

Knowles, *AYL*, vol. 2 (1787): Both Christopher Spencer and myself, working with *MV* and *AYL* in vol. 2, believe that for our plays Rann's edition was worth full collation. I tested Rann in about a hundred places where editorial dispute has been common, and found a great deal of independence from his model, v1778. A full collation turned up seventeen additional substantive changes. In most cases Rann was adopting for the first time conjectures proposed by Capell, Johnson, Blackstone, Heath, Mason, and Steevens, and in all cases, as I recall, he could have found these in Malone's or Steevens's notes. Although I cannot prove any influence on later editions, he was in several cases the first editor to make important emendations which became quite common soon thereafter, and in four cases he antedated by almost a hundred years readings by Collier, Dyce, and Keightley. Christopher Spencer's experience with *MV* was even more surprising. In [occasional inspection] he turned up three substantive variants (counting Rann's repeated use of Solanio for Salanio as one variant). In a full collation he found 24 substantive variants: 3 misprints, 5 readings found in only one earlier text (4 from Capell, one from Hanmer), 6 earlier conjectures (4 from Johnson, one from Farmer, one from Capell), five readings found in several earlier texts other than v1778, and 5 new and original readings. Rann seems to have been an editor of considerable independence, and often made changes in unexpected places that would not be found in a partial inspection. We therefore recommend full collation.

Velz, *JC*: RANN follows v1778 very closely in incidentals; there are fewer than 100 variants in the play. But 28 of these are of substantive significance, and Rann is the first editor to print 13 of the 28. He shows a good knowledge of other editions, in one case going back to Pope for a reading, and he sometimes adopts conjectures from the *Notes and Various Readings* of Capell or even from Upton's *Critical Observations*. There is some evidence that he checked Jennens also. I consider him worth full collation.

39. AYS: Samuel Ayscough, *Dramatic Works*, 2nd ed., 3 vols., 1790. (1st ed. 1784.)

Widmann, Folger MS:

Copy 8: MS notes supposedly in the hand of Charles Lamb. But Giles Dawson denies they are Lamb's or Mary Lamb's. See Black, R2, v1955, p. xx.

40. MAL: Edmond Malone, *Plays and Poems*, 10 vols., 1790.

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UWM, UW (AMS rpt.).
Appendix with errata in vol. 10.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 6: ?Printed from v1778 or ?CAP. Malone completes the steal from Capell, particularly in the matter of stage directions.

Widmann, Folger MSS:

Copy 2: Vol. 1, part 1, and vol. 2, part 2, are heavily annotated. *Per.* has some MS notes, *Mac.* has some, *Tro.* has some.

Copy 3: MS notes by George Steevens and James Boaden.

Copy 4: Some MS notes by John Horne Tooke. See Black, R2, v1955, p. xx.

41. George Steevens and Isaac Reed, MS for Boydell Edition, 1791-1802.

Widmann: The Folger Library owns the proof sheets of the 1802 Boydell edition (see item 45a) with corrections in autograph of George Steevens, the editor, and Isaac Reed, his successor. Giles Dawson's note on endpaper says these belonged to Bulmer.

Finished posthumously; no annotations.

42. v1793: George Steevens and Isaac Reed, *Plays*, 15 vols., 1793.

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UW, UWM.

Addenda for all volumes in vol. 1, pp. xxxvii-xl. Glossarial index in vol. 3.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 6: Printed from MAL; the basis of v1803 and v1813.

Velz, *JC*: Over 30 substantive variants (indeed, few that are not substantive). Of these 30, 4 are original readings.

Substantial textual changes; Johnson had died in 1784. Some following of Malone. Qq and Ff have been collated. Half-lines completing a pentameter are indented.

Widmann, Folger MS:

Copy 5: Notes by Rev. J. Whitaker (are some by Malone as well?). Apparently no notes on *AYL*, *Shr.*, *WT*, *Err.*, *Mac.*, *1-2H4*, *AWW*, *H5*, *1-3H6*, *R3*, *H8*, *Tro.*, *Tim.*, *Cor.*, *Ant.*, *Cym.*, *Tit.*, *Per.*, *Lr.*, *Rom.*, *Oth.*

43. ECC: Ambrose Eccles.

Available at Huntington Library (*Lr.* and *Cym.*), UC (*Lr.*), UW (*Lr.*).

Important editions of *Lr.* (1792), *Cym.* (1793), and *MV* (1805). The projected edition of *AYL* was never completed. The edition of *Lr.* is superb, with exhaustive commentary.

44. Edmond Malone, *Plays and Poems*, 16 vols., Dublin, 1794.

Apparently a straight reprint of MAL.

Widmann, Folger MS:

Copy 1: Many notes tipped in for *Err.* (vol. 4), *Cor.* (vol. 10), *JC* and *Ant.* (vol. 11), *Tim.* and *Tro.* (vol. 12).

45. *Plays*, 8 vols., London: Bellamy and Robarts, 1796.

Widmann, Folger MS:

Copy 1: Vol. 1 and 2, occasional pencil notes. In the three Folger copies of this edition the plays are mixed, apparently from three editions: ed. A, signatures centered and with catchwords; ed. B, signatures centered and with no catchwords; ed. C, signatures far right. B and C editions are never mixed.

45a. BOYD: George Steevens, rev., *Works*, Boydell Sh., 9 vols., 1802[-3?].

Available UW.

The ed. is known for its sumptuous folio engravings, often cut out, framed, and sold separately by booksellers. In the UW copy, each t.p. is dated 1802, and the Dedication is dated 1803. The text has never been tested.

46. v1803: Isaac Reed, *Plays*, 21 vols., 1803.

Available at NL, UC (lacks vol. 18), UWM.

Addenda in vol. 21.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 13: Printed from v1793; supposed to contain corrections left by Steevens; very few textual changes.

Velz, *JC*: The partial inspection turned up only 3 variants (one of them substantive--a restoration of Malone). I later went back and made full collation: 49 variants, 11 of them subst. (of the 11, 10 are original readings--though one may be an error). 21 of the 49 are punct. and 14 are *-ed* suffixes in prose. The suggestion is that partial inspection doesn't get to where the gold is.

Adds a few notes left in MS by Steevens.

47. BOWD: Thomas Bowdler, *Twenty Plays*, Family Sh., 1807; 1818.

Available UWM.

Bowdler's Family Sh. went through more than a score of editions spanning the 19th century. Bowdler died in 1825.

48. v1813: Isaac Reed, *Plays*, 21 vols., 1813.

Available at Huntington Library, UC, UW, UWM.

Addenda for all vols. in vol. 21, pp. 421-3. Glossarial Appendix in vol. 21, pp. 425-96.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black+, except occasional quotation, Evans, Knowles (*AYL*), Spevack.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 13: Paginary reprint of v1803, varying only six times from that text, all matters of punctuation. Not worth more than [occasional quotation].

Velz, *JC*: About all v1813 claimed to do was correct errors in v1803 (see vol. 1, p. i). Adds very few notes; corrects three errors in v1803 (but does not restore one missing line). Of the 45 other variants in v1803, v1813 fails to follow in one (non-subst. punct.) and introduces only one punct. variant in the two scenes I tested with a full collation. Not worth more than [occasional inspection]. See appendix to vol. 21 for addenda to the commentary.

Murphy: Corrected by William Harris after Reed's death in 1807.

49. CALD1, 2: Thomas Caldecott, *Hamlet* and *As You Like It*, 1819, 1820; 1832.
Available at Huntington Library (1819 and 1832).
The 1819 t.p. does not bear Caldecott's name. Single erratum in the 1819/20 edition; several at the end of the 1832 edition.

Knowles, *AYL*: Caldecott (1819, 1820, 1832). A very important edition for *Ham.* and *AYL* editors only. I found no difference between the 1819 and 1820 impressions, but the 1832 edition has a considerable number of new readings, often in unexpected places. I would recommend full collation of both 1819/20 and 1832.

Caldecott's annotations (mCALD) in a BL copy of v1813 (11762 dd) are extensive and well worth consulting. He originally intended to do a complete edition.

50. v1821: James Boswell, *Plays and Poems*, 21 vols., 1821.
Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UW, UWM, and in AMS rpt.; Chadwyck-Healey electronic text.
Addenda in vol. 21, pp. 389-469. Errata vol. 21, p. 547. Glossarial and other indexes, vol. 21, pp. 471-546.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 18: Printed from v1803; incorporates a great many readings which Malone would not have admitted; textually not very important in itself, but influential.

Velz, *JC*: A carefully edited conservative text. Copy-text v1803 which it follows closely. Of 53 variants 30 are substantive (of these 20 restore F1 readings where MAL and v1793 ff. had innovated), and many of the others are semi-substantive punctuation.

51. CUMB: George Daniel, *Cumberland's British Theatre*, 39 vols., 1823-31; Supplement, 14 vols., 1831-2.
Available NL, UC, UW.

Daniel (usually identified only as D. G.) edited and wrote prefaces, often perceptive, to each of the hundreds of plays in the series. Republished in 64 vols., in 1838 and thereafter up to ?1875.

52. HARN: William Harness, *Dramatic Works*, 8 vols., 1825; rpt. 1830, with Poems in vol. 8.
Available UWM, UW (1830 rpt.).

Occasional quotation, Knowles (*AYL*), Eccles, Turner.

- 52a. Ludwig Tieck, *Dramatische Werke*, tr. A. W. Schlegel, 9 vols., Berlin 1825-33.
Available at NL, UW (vols. 1 and 2).
Unser Shakespeare.

53. SING1: Samuel W. Singer, *Dramatic Works*, 10 vols., Chiswick, 1826.
Available at NL, UW, UWM.
No errata. Often called the Chiswick edition.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 6: ?Printed from v1803.

54. VALPY: A. J. Valpy, *Plays and Poems*, 15 vols., 1832-4.
Available at UC (inc.), UWM.

Full collation, Black; occasional quotation, Turner.

55. PEAB: O. W. B. Peabody, *Dramatic Works*, 7 vols., Boston, 1836.

Jane Sherzer calls this edition epoch-making in that Peabody was the first American editor who aimed to restore F1 readings. She admits that the original work is meager; the text on the whole remains Singer's, and the edition is probably not worth collating. None of the conjectural readings is original, and the preliminary remarks and footnotes are usually from Singer and otherwise from v1821.

Professor McManaway raises the question, whose Folio could Peabody have consulted? The date of the edition is too early for the Barton copy, bought in 1845. There were, however, two type facsimiles available, that edited by Douce in 1807 and that by John Britton in 1808; perhaps one of these found its way into Peabody's hands.

56. KNT1: Charles Knight, *Works*, Pictorial Edition, 8 vols., [1838-43].

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UWM.

The Pictorial Edition (or Illustrated Sh.) was issued in 55 parts (1838-43) and then issued in eight volumes; six volumes include Sh.'s plays, vol. 7 includes doubtful plays, and vol. 8 a biography. Vol. 8 has a letterpress title page dated 1842 and an engraved one dated 1843. For the date of the original, serial issue of each play, see Knowles, *SB* 40 (1987).

I recall some errata in a late volume, but have no record of the location.

Murphy: An advertisement in *Quarterly Literary Advertiser* for Dec. 1842, p. 79, announces that vol. 7 (completing the first 46 parts) will be finished on 31 Dec., and that vol. 8 (an additional 10 parts, for a proposed total of 56) will be finished in June 1843.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 3 (1839): I have been unable to connect Knight with any older edition; textually this is the best edition yet to appear, restoring a number of Folio readings and getting rid of 18th-century dashes in some degree; also loosens up the punctuation, omitting a good number of the Folio medial commas.

Velz, *JC* (1841): Very few variants among the Knight editions. KNT1 may be printed from v1803, though two readings would suggest SING1. There are significant differences between KNT1 and the P. F. Collier New York reprint of that ed. Some, at least, of them would seem to be editorial, rather than compositorial, in origin.

57. COL1: John Payne Collier, *Works*, 8 vols., 1842-4.

Available at Huntington Library, UW.

"Additional Notes and Corrections" for all volumes in vol. 1, pp. cclxxxiv-ccxc.
Glossarial index, vol. 1, pp. ccxci-ccc.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 5 (1842): ?Printed from v1821.

Velz, *JC*: COL1 was an influential text: as late as 1864, Halliwell uses it as copy text.

58. KNT2: Charles Knight, *Comedies, Histories, Tragedies, and Poems*, "Second Edition," 12 vols., 1842-4.

Available at UC, UW, UWM, and in AMS rpt.

No errata.

Full collation, Black, Eccles, Turner, Knowles (*Lr.*); occasional quotation, Knowles (*AYL*); ignored, Spevack.

Knowles, *AYL*, vol. 3 (1842): Professor Evans has no opinion about this edition. Both Christopher Spencer and I believe it is worth [occasional quotation]. I found five important textual differences from the Illustrated Shakespeare of 1841, two of which survived in the 1867 edition; apparently a somewhat larger number survive in the text of *MV*.

59. VERP: Gulian C. Verplanck, *Plays*, Illustrated Sh., 3 vols., New York, 1844-7.

Available at Huntington Library, UW.

Issued in separate parts 1844-7, and as 3 vols. in 1847. For the dates of issue of individual plays, see Knowles, *SB* 40 (1987).

Sherzer and Steeves say the text is based on Collier but with numerous changes to F1 readings. Verplanck seldom adopted conjectures of other editors, and apparently offered only one new reading, for *Tro.* 5.3. According to Steeves, his notes are signed but the notes of other editors are not; these come mainly, according to Sherzer, from v1821 and SING1. Sherzer appraises his editorial and critical methods, pp. 661-6. Steeves says the apparatus lacks originality and scholarship.

Full collation, Black; occasional quotation, Shaaber, Eccles.

Shaaber: Not sufficiently independent to be worth collation.

Velz, *JC*: In the first 230 lines (and a later 65) I found 1 substantive variant from COL1 (in a SD), 3 semi-subst., and 63 accidentals. VERP is independent of COL's accidentals, apparently, more than of his text. [Occasional quotation.] VERP's notes are worth combing, however, despite his disclaimer about their derivativeness. I found 8 bits of commentary worth extracting, including a suggestion I've not encountered elsewhere about a possible source for Brutus's character and his oratorical style.

60. HUD1: Henry N. Hudson, *Works*, 11 vols., Boston, 1851-6.

Available at LC.

No errata.

Sherzer discusses this edition pp. 670-9. She finds that although Hudson claims to be revising Singer's Chiswick edition of 1826 and declares F1 the chief standard of the true text, he introduces many textual changes, most of them unnecessary and most of them not from Folios or Quartos, but from other critics or himself. She thinks his most valuable work is in the eclectic introductions. Steeves says Hudson distrusted Perkins Folio readings, and signed only his own notes.

Full collation, Black+, except occasional quotation, Evans, Eccles.

Shaaber: Hudson 1851 should be collated; later Hudsons should be tested to see whether they have been revised (probably not much).

Knowles, *AYL*, vol. 3 (1851): Professor Evans has no opinion about this edition. It is a careful edition and deserves at least [partial inspection] and perhaps full collation. In his Preface Hudson admits being influenced by Collier, Singer, Knight, Verplanck, and Halliwell, and like them he restores a number of F1 readings. He also restores F1 distinctions between *ed* and *'d* verb and participle forms.

Spencer, *MV*: Agrees with Knowles.

61. mCOL1: The "Perkins" Folio.

The Huntington Library owns the Perkins Folio (F2), the Furness Library at the University of Pennsylvania owns a microfilm of it (film 612), and Professor McManaway has arranged for a microfilm of it to be deposited at the Folger Library (Folger film Acc. 447). Variorum editors do not need permission from the Huntington to quote from the Folger film.

Occasional quotation, Black, Evans.

Evans, *IH6*: The CAM2 collation of the Perkins Folio is not entirely complete.

Knowles, *AYL*: Collier's alterations in "secretary hand" are perfectly legible on film. In his printed text of 1853 Collier adopted only a fraction of his own manuscript emendations and frequently modernized their spellings (*crowners* to *coroners*) or punctuation--thus showing his editorial independence.

Professor McManaway finds support for his doubts that the Perkins Folio is worthy of consideration in a recent letter from Giles Dawson, who writes that he is nearing the completion of a manuscript [see *SB* 24, 1971] that demonstrates the Perkins Folio annotations to be wholly a Collier forgery, and that he too thinks they should be ignored by Variorum editors. They cannot be ignored entirely, of course, because their occasional adoption by later editors makes them part of the history of the text. Generally, however, editors derive them from COLNE or COL2.

The efforts of Dewey Ganzel (*Fortune and Men's Eyes*, 1982) to absolve Collier seem not to have been successful.

62. COLNE: John Payne Collier, *Notes and Emendations*, 2nd ed., rev. and enl., 1853.
Available at UW, UWM (Burt Franklin rpt.)
First edition was published by the Shakespeare Society in 1852.

63. COL2: John Payne Collier, *Plays*, 1853.
Available at NL, U. of Minnesota, UWM; AMS rpt.?
No errata.

Full collation, Knowles (*AYL*)+, except occasional quotation, Evans, Eccles.

Evans, *IH6*: Printed from COL1, plus the readings of the Perkins Folio. As the only text which preserves nearly all of the Collier Perkins Folio readings this deserves [occasional quotation]. It records, for example, some 69 readings not later incorporated by Collier in his 1858 edition, but it does not entirely exhaust the Perkins Folio, which in its turn deserves [occasional quotation].

Knowles, *AYL*: The Folger Library owns Collier's personal copy of COL2, and a manuscript note on the title page says he has underlined in red ink in this copy all the "variations in my folio" (i.e., the Perkins Folio) as well as some "mistakes" made in printing the volume. [COL2 was edited essentially to exhibit mCOL1 readings.]

Velz, *JC*: COL2 is only worth [occasional quotation], but is *very* important if Collier did indeed annotate it in the fifties (he underlined readings which appeared in the Perkins Folio). If he did the work in the fifties, we have some indication of what the Perkins Folio looked like at that time. There is definite evidence that the Folio was added to by Collier over a long period of years.

64. HAL: James O. Halliwell, *Works*, 16 vols., 1853-65.
Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UW, UWM, and in AMS rpt.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black+, except occasional quotation, Evans.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 9 (1853): Printed from COL1, textually almost worthless; makes two restorations of a Folio reading (2.4.134; 2.5.68); otherwise variations from COL1 are either misprints (nine in number) or adoptions of other editors' suggestions. Deserves only [occasional quotation].

Knowles, *AYL*, vol. 6 (1856): Professor Evans thinks the *IH6* text is worth only [occasional quotation] because of its heavy dependence on and few differences from COL1. My own experience with the *AYL* text of three years later has been extraordinarily different. Collier does not seem to have been Halliwell's model: there are about three score of substantive differences from COL1, and Halliwell's edition differs from both of Collier's in hundreds of details of spelling, punctuation, and contracted forms, in which he is generally closer to Knight or Hudson or the later variorum editions. A number of his readings are original, a number are unique to earlier single editions (notably Johnson and Capell) and a few restore F1 readings for the first time. In preparing the *AYL* text Halliwell seems to have taken great pains and to have been extremely independent. I strongly recommend full collation. [The commentary is also very full and frequently original.]

Spencer, *MV*, vol. 5 (1856): For *MV*, more independent than most 19th-century editions. Worth full collation.

Velz, *JC* (1864): Based closely on COL1, but shows considerable independence: 17 subst. variants (of which one originates with HAL) and 14 semi-subst. sp. or p. variants. Restores F1 in two subst. readings.

65. "DELI": "Nicolaus Delius," *Complete Works*, 1 vol., Leipzig, 1854.

The identification now seems to be erroneous. The title page reads "Edited by Dr. D-----." Jaggard mis-identifies as "The first edition edited by Delius." The title page also reads "The text regulated by . . . the recently discovered folio of 1632"--i.e., Collier's Perkins Folio; Delius on the contrary was severely skeptical of COL2, refused to treat the Sonnets biographically, and spelled Sh.'s name "Shakspere." The notes seem to borrow from Delius's *Shakspere-Lexicon*, Bonn, 1852.

Evans, *IH6*: I judge that Delius (1854), one vol., is only a reprint of COL2 (1853), though if Delius had anything to do with it his later texts are remarkably free from the influence of the Perkins Folio.

No one collates.

66. "Charles Knight," *Works*, 3 vols., New York, [1854-6].

Professor Black refers to such an edition (*R2*, v1955, p. xxi) and Jaggard lists for those years a three-volume edition "edited by C. Knight. With notes by R. Grant White," published by Martin and Johnson of New York--White's first editing of Sh, according to Jaggard. (See note on WH1.) But I have found no such edition(s). Martin and Johnson did publish in 1854-6 a three-volume edition naming Knight, but according to Jane Sherzer (pp. 681-4), it is not edited by Knight, and the appearance of Knight's name on the title page apparently refers only to his *Life of Shakespeare*, which is included in the edition. The preface says that the text was collated by a "competent Shakespearian scholar" with the editions "of the three most distinguished Shakespearian editors of the day--John Payne Collier, Charles Knight, and James Orchard Halliwell." It is conceivable that the competent scholar was Knight, but unlikely for several reasons: since the publishers cite his distinction, they would have advertised him if they could have; the text is not Knight's, but comes from Tallis's pirated copy of Halliwell (London and New York, 1850-53), with some emendations adopted from the 1853 edition of Collier (whom Knight elsewhere excoriates); and some of the notes and introductions are right out of Tallis's edition, while others are reworkings of Knight, Collier, and an 1826 Variorum. Joseph Crosby identifies the collator as R. G. White.

67. Charles Knight, *The Stratford Shakespeare*, 10 vols., 1854-6.

Although I have not inspected the scores of reissues of Knight's edition, as the Illustrated Sh., Cabinet Sh., Companion Sh., Knight's Library Edition, etc., I suspect they are not significantly different from KNT1, KNT2, and KNT3. The Stratford Sh., however, is a thoroughly reworked edition. It is a popular edition for "The Million" rather than for scholars-- Knight had an idea to call it the "People's Sh." and emphasizes that the apparatus is designed to help the mass of readers with a commentary that is economical of time and cost (i.e., there isn't so much of it as in the Pictorial Sh.). There are no footnotes or introductions to the plays; there is an appendix of various textual readings (mostly disputing readings from Collier's *Notes and Emendations*, 1853), a glossary whose definitions are all shortened versions of the notes in the Pictorial Sh., and an appendix on criticism, thoroughly rewritten and abridged from the introductions in the Pictorial Sh. Since it is a popular edition making no pretensions at scholarly importance, it can probably be ignored.

68. DEL2: Nicolaus Delius, *Werke*, 7 vols., Elberfeld, 1854-61.

UWM owns vol. 3.

Errata at ends of some volumes.

Probably the true DEL1 (see item 65). First published in separate parts for each play, each with its own title page, and then issued in 7 vols. The Barton Catalogue of the Boston Public Library Sh. collection lists the final date as 1865 because of an 8th vol., a supplement entitled "Nachträge und Berichtigungen" (see note on Delius 1864). Jaggard also mentions an 8th volume of apocryphal plays.

The Folger has an anomaly in its set: in vol. 1, in which all other plays are dated 1854 or 1855, is bound a *Hamlet* dated 1859, and reading on the title page, "Zweite Auflage." According to Michael Hiltcher (1987), this is apparently a revision of the 1854 issue, prompted by a review by Tycho Mommsen in *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* NS 1 (1855), 57-75, 107-27, 159-77. No such revisions of other plays are known, and in the Preface to DEL3 only this revision is referred to.

Full collation, Black, Turner, Knowles (*Lr.*); occasional quotation, Evans, Knowles (*AYL*), Spevack; ignored, Eccles.

Evans, *IH6* (1858): Closely based on COL1. DEL2 is only worth [occasional quotation].

69. SING2: Samuel W. Singer, *Dramatic Works*, 10 vols., 1856.

Available at Huntington Library, UC, UW.

No errata.

Jaggard and M. W. Black date as 1855-6; M. A. Shaaber dates 1856. All copies that I have seen are dated 1856 in every volume, though the Preface in vol. 1 is dated September 20, 1855.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 6: Printed from SING1, but text greatly improved under influence of Knight and Collier.

Spencer, *MV*, vol. 2: I found little of value here and would have found that by checking readings from Knight and Collier in SING2. I think that [occasional inspection] would have been sufficient.

70. DYCE1: Alexander Dyce, *Works*, 6 vols., 1857.

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UW.

Addenda and Corrigenda in vol. 1, pp. cxcī-cxvī.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4: Printed from v1821 ?

71. WH1: Richard Grant White, *Works*, 12 vols., Boston, 1857-66.

Available at NL, UW, UWM.

“Supplementary Notes and Corrections” in vol. 1, pp. xxxv-liv. Tables of emendations and corruptions in vol. 12, pp. 439-58.

Steeves denies that White edited an earlier edition as Jaggard claims (see note on “Charles Knight,” [1854-6]), as well as the myth maintained by Bohn, Jaggard, Saintsbury, Neilson and Thorndike, etc., that there were two editions, 1857-60 and 1859-65. George W. Williams: “In his *Studies in Shakespeare* (1886), p. 366, White refers to ‘my edition of 1857,’ adding, ‘The date of this edition has been incorrectly given by some editors and bibliographers as 1859-65. The Comedies were published in 1857; the Histories, in 1859; the Tragedies, in 1862; and the first volume . . . in 1865,’ Preface dated April 23, 1865. There were, however, two issues, one in letterpress and one in stereotype.” Williams also notes an earlier 3-vol. transatlantic edition issued in monthly (?) parts and received by the BM in 1857-9. Though it contains notes from White’s *Shakespeare Scholar* (1854), the real work of editing and putting the other notes together was evidently the labor of R. H. Horne (Richard Hengist).

Steeves and Sherzer attest that White was a conservative editor, following his copy-text, especially in preserving *d/-ed* preterite distinctions, such elisions as *sland’red*, and *it* as a possessive form, though Sherzer finds many of the emendations unnecessary or no improvement, and little original in the introductions.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 5 (1865): Printed from COL1, but far from a slavish reprint; makes some valuable restorations; makes substantial use of DYCE1.

72. COL3: John Payne Collier, *Comedies, Histories, Tragedies, and Poems*, 6 vols., 1858.

Available at NL, UC, UW.

“Supplemental Notes” in vol. 1, preliminary pp. [261]-[280]. “Indicial Glossary” at end of vol. 6.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 3: Printed from COL1, with some readings from the Perkins Folio.

Velz, *JC*: The notes to COL3 and COL4 show Collier praising his own emendations (the Perkins Folio readings).

73. STAU: Howard Staunton, *Plays*, 3 vols., 1858-60.

Available at UWM, and at UW in a one-vol. Park Lane facs. rpt. (1979).

Issued serially in 50 pts., 1856-60. For dates of issue of individual plays, see Knowles, *SB* 40 (1987). Often reprinted; Mark Eccles reports that the 1861 rpt. at UW contains textual differences from the original. Staunton’s 4-vol. ed. of 1864 has many new readings and notes.

Addenda and Corrigenda in vol. 1, pp. lxxv-lxxviii.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 2 (1859): Printed from one of the earlier Variorums, but which? Shows clear dependence on DYCE1 (some 58 readings), but still slightly more old-fashioned in matters of punctuation.

74. HTR: John Hunter, 1860-1893?

Hunter's editions of the separate plays in various school series were apparently reissued and revised irregularly, so that each Variorum editor will have to determine how many editions exist and which to use. The earliest plays in the Folger are in the Oxford Exam series and the Middle Class and Training School Exam series; from 1869? to 1893? the plays were published by Longmans, and issues are designated variously as belonging to the Longmans Series or the Annotated Sh. For any play there may or may not be revisions between the early series and the Longmans, or between the numerous reissues of the Longmans. A. Murphy (*Shakespeare in Print*, forthcoming) dates first editions by Hunter for Longman, Green & Co. 1860-73.

Furness and other editors often referred to Hunter.

Shaaber: Should be tested.

Knowles, *AYL* (1867): Little expurgation; several new readings.

75. CAM1: William George Clark and William Aldis Wright, *Works*, The Cambridge Sh., 9 vols., 1863-6.

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UW, UWM, Chadwyck-Healey electronic text.

Addenda p. 464 of vol. 2; addenda and corrigenda slips tipped into preliminaries in vols. 3 and 6; full page of addenda and corrigenda in preliminaries of vols. 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Bowers: This edition is "the first editorial recasting of the text since the Malone Variorum of the turn of the century." "With its sometimes incomplete and inaccurate collations of the basic quartos and folios, this edition became the modern foundation, or source, text of Shakespeare." The editors "proposed to construct a conservative eclectic, or critical, text from the best original editions. Given the elementary state of textual scholarship at the time, the results were much better than might have been anticipated from the vantage-point of our superior knowledge." Clark and Wright did make serious errors: they mistook some of the falsely dated Pavier quartos, which were second editions, as first editions and hence as of superior authority in their readings; they also took the highly corrupt, perhaps memorial texts of such plays as *Ham.*, *Wiv.*, and *R3* to represent early Shakespeare drafts, and so used them as the basis of emending *F1* and, in the case of *R3*, as the basic copy-text. Traditional texts of *H6*, *Rom.*, *H5*, and *R3*, have constantly suffered as a result of this error. It never occurred to Clark and Wright that "a complexly variant Folio *Hamlet* or *Othello* or *King Lear* or *Richard III* might have been printed not from a different manuscript but instead by marking up a copy of a quarto to bring it into general conformity with some manuscript." The listing of variants was also unsatisfactory. Yet "although not infallible, the critical sense of these editors was broad, humane, and shrewd; and their excellent taste served in some part to repair the blunders of their occasionally faulty textual theories," as may be seen in *R3*. Furthermore, "the universal adoption of the Globe act, scene, line numbering [esp. in the Bartlett concordance and in Schmidt's *Lexicon*] as the standard for reference may have added in maintaining its authority." "Between the publication of the Old Cambridge text in 1863 and the start of publication of the New Cambridge [i.e., New Sh.] edition in 1921, the various complete editions of Shakespeare were little more than refinements of the basic Globe text."

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 5 (1864): Printed from DYCE1?; strongly influenced by DYCE1 in punctuation.

76. GLO: William George Clark and William Aldis Wright, *Works*, Globe Ed., 1864.
Available in AMS rpt. at UW, UWM.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Bowers: "A modification [of the Cambridge text] that in some few cases accepted emendations of doubtful words unaltered in the original Old Cambridge. In substance, this critical edition of 1864 has remained up to the present the only complete text worth mentioning formed from a systematic reexamination of the textual situation, save in a limited sense for the New Cambridge [i.e., New Sh.] edition."

Evans, *IH6*: Based on CAM1 text, with some conjectural emendations admitted into the text for popular consumption. Probably should be collated complete.

77. DEL3: Nicolaus Delius, *Werke*, "Neue Ausgabe," 7 vols., Elberfeld, 1864.
Available at UWM (lacking vol. 3).

This was first issued in separate parts in 1864 and then was issued in 7 vols., apparently in both 1864 and 1865. In the Folger copy, at least, the "Nachträge und Berichtigungen" (see note on Delius 1854-61) supplement is bound in vol. 7.

Almost everything in this edition is printed from the same plates as the 1854-61 edition, though occasionally the material is bound in different sequence and the "Nachwort"s in vol. 1 (1854) are left out of the 1864 ed. *But: Ham., Oth., and Lr.* in vol. 1, and *Rom.* and *JC* in vol. 2 have all been re-set and have revisions in introductions, notes, and perhaps in text. The title page for each play in this edition reads "Neue Ausgabe," which seems to imply simply a reissue, but obviously it is partly a new edition. Moreover, at least six plays were revised for a later issue ("Neue Ausgabe. Zweite Auflage") of the edition: *Tit., MV, Jn., Mac., Tim.* (all 1865), and *Cor.* (1868); these incorporate the corrections in the 1st issue's "Nachträge und Berichtigungen." The Folger owns a single-issue *Jn.*, clearly designated on its title page for binding as the third play in the third volume, but dated 1865 and reading on the title page "Neue Ausgabe / Zweite Auflage," and it is indeed reset and revised from the 1864 edition. Such alternate versions may be distinguished as DEL3a, DEL3b, etc.

Velz, *JC*: I collated the whole of DEL3 against DEL2 and found 20 subst., 2 semi-subst., and 35 accidentals. Of the subst., only 7 would have turned up in a partial [inspection]. I consider DEL3 worth testing for full collation in *Ham., Oth., Lr., and Rom.*, even though DEL3 follows DEL2 so closely that two typos in Act V are carried over into the later edition.

78. KTLY: Thomas Keightley, *Plays*, 6 vols., 1864.

UW owns an 1866 rpt., apparently from the original plates; UC owns an 1868 ed., 7 vols. in 13.

"Corrections" in vol. 6, preliminary leaf A4r; apparently missed by Furness.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4: ?Printed from SING2, but the text is the most radical (except COL3 [COL2?]) since the 18th century in the matter of emendations.

79. DYCE2: Alexander Dyce, *Works*, 9 vols., 1864-7.

Available at UWM; NL and UW own 1866-7 rpt.

Addenda and Corrigenda in vol. 8, pp. 473-9, for vols. 1-7; in the preliminaries for vol. 3 are addenda and corrigenda for vol. 2. Vol. 1 contains appendices on Collier's forged dramatic documents.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 5 (1864): Printed from DYCE1; textually a throwback, leaning heavily on earlier emendations.

Knowles, *AYL*, vol. 3 (1864): A very independent and eclectic edition. Although Professor Evans is correct in saying that it is textually a throwback in that it revives older readings--dozens of them in the *AYL* text--it is more than that. While its original emendations are relatively few, they have commanded considerable respect, and have reappeared in editions of Hunter, Neil, Rolfe, Collier (COL4), Deighton, Chambers, Dover Wilson, Kittredge, and Sisson; and the majority of Dyce's crucial readings were adopted wholesale in HUD2 and the Irving Shakespeare. Deserves full collation.

Spencer, *MV*, vol. 2 (1866): I agree with Knowles about DYCE2, though it should perhaps not be recorded fully, since in the overwhelming majority of variants, it agrees with DYCE1.

80. C&MC: Charles and Mary Cowden Clarke, *Plays*, Cassell's Illustrated Sh., 3 vols., [1864-9]. Available at UW, UWM.

Serially issued in 270 weekly parts, 1864-9, with undated t.p.'s for three vols. For dates of issue of individual plays, see Knowles, *SB* 40 (1987). Available in many undated issues, some later ones with added accessory matter such as photos of actors. Earlier ones seem to be from the same plates as the original, and most later reprints may be as well, but revision is possible.

Errata in vol. 3, preliminary sig.

Occasional quotation, Shaaber.

Shaaber: Should be tested; probably not worth full collation.

Knowles, *AYL*: Fairly unadventurous text except for expurgations. They cut *Tit* altogether. Very full commentary, much quoted by Furness, Rolfe, Craig, and others, applying esp. the Clarkes' method of finding parallel passages in Sh. They began their useful *Shakespeare Key* two days after finishing the ed.

Velz, *JC*: Printed, doubtless, from the 1864 Bickers edition of Charles and Mary Cowden Clarke, which may be based on an early Knight or on DYCE2. It was *not* printed from COL1, despite the high admiration the Clarkes felt for Collier (see letters to J. P. Collier from Mary Victoria Clarke, Aug., 1843, e.g., in FSL) and despite their defense of him in the Preface to the Bickers edition. In the first 270 lines of *JC* there are 3 subst. differences from DYCE2, 8 semi-subst., and 17 accidentals. *JC* is not expurgated. The 1864 Bickers & Son four-vol. ed. differs in the first 2760 lines from C&MC only in 16 accidentals and one semi-subst. spelling variant. All but 3 of 107 readings in partial [inspection] are identical in the two eds. (the later ed. representing the better reading in each of the three). It should be borne in mind that the earlier text is not expurgated. It has no notes, but has a 37-p. preface which lays out the editorial principles of the edition. See pp. xxiv-xxv for rationale for the 8 original emends. the Clarkes claim (*Err.*, *Shr.*, *LLL*, *Rom.* [2], *Ant.*, *Cym.*, *Lr.*). The notes in C&MC are strikingly good, some of them. Various ones show that the text is rationally arrived at in this edition. I recommend ignoring the Bickers ed. (except for passages expurgated from C&MC and for its preface) and [occasional quotation] of C&MC. Significant departures from the tradition are discussed in the notes. For a treat, see *Modern Corruption of Shakespeare's Text: A Letter to a Friend on the Subject of Cassell's Illustrated Shakespeare* (1866/1869), a 7-page attack on the Clarkes' expurgations in *Tmp.*, *TGV*, and *Wiv.* (FSL PR2753 C7 J2).

81. KNT3: Charles Knight, *Works*, Pictorial Ed., 8 vols., 1867.

Available at UWM.

Vols. 7 and 8 are supplemental. Errata in vol. 8.

This edition was first issued in 32 monthly parts and then in 8 vols., and designates itself “A New and Revised Issue of the Pictorial Edition.”

Full collation, Black, Eccles, Turner, Knowles (*Lr.*); occasional quotation, Shaaber, Evans, Knowles (*AYL*); ignored, Spevack.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4: Not yet collated; following Shaaber, I suspect it to be only worth [occasional quotation].

Shaaber: May be omitted.

Knowles, *AYL*: This differs significantly from KNT1 and KNT2 in eight places; and in five other places where KNT1 and KNT2 differ, KNT3 retains two readings from KNT2 and restores three from KNT1. Uncorrupted by COL2 emendations. Spencer’s experience with the *MV* text was similar, and we both recommend [occasional quotation].

Velz, *JC*: KNT3 is a paginal reprint of KNT1.

81a. H. Ulrici, *Dramatische Werke*, tr. A. W. von Schlegel & L. Tieck, 12 vols., Berlin, 1867-71.

Of interest because Alexander Schmidt shared the editing.

81b. DEL?: Delius, *Werke*, 2. Auflage, separate parts 1868-72? See *SJ* bibliographies 1871-3.

Virtually unknown ed., copies rare; possibly a serial issue of DEL4?

82. CLN1: William George Clark and William Aldis Wright, Clarendon Press Series, 1868?-1906.

UW owns 13 vols.; NL and UC also have incomplete holdings.

Apparently Clark worked on only the first four volumes.

A. Murphy (*Shakespeare in Print*, forthcoming) identifies 17 vols., 1868-97.

Occasionally quoted by Knowles (*AYL*), otherwise ignored.

Shaaber: Collate in full unless it proves to be the Globe text.

Knowles, *AYL*: Except for the occasional expurgation, this differs only five times from the Globe text.

Velz, *JC* (ed. Wright, 1879): Possibly worth [occasional quotation], but no more. In Act 5 it differs from GLO in 10 accidentals, one semi-subst. spelling, and one subst. spelling (both restoring F1). The notes are copious and learned; where v1913 draws on “Wright” it is nearly always this ed. The 40-p. preface is largely extracts from North’s Plutarch.

Knowles, *Lr.*: Important, influential commentary, much quoted by Furness. The glosses usually derive from Schmidt’s *Lexicon*.

83. Staunton 1870? (presumed ghost edition)

In his note on Staunton (1859) Professor Evans has a query about a Staunton 1870 edition, referred to by S. B. Hemingway in his New Variorum edition of *1 Henry IV*. In a note on p. 2 of his *Supplement* to that edition Professor Evans says that he has been unable to locate such an edition, and he has written to me that so far as he knows none exists. Nor have I been able to locate it. The 1862-3 Staunton (3 vols.) is a reissue, printed from the same type as the 1858-60 (3 vols.) original edition. There is a 4-vol. “Library Edition” reissue of 1864, without illustrations. This may be the original of the 1869 (8 vol.) Staunton, from a different setting of

type and without the engravings of the earlier edition, which, like the 1864 ed., contains Staunton's 1860 Preface and a publisher's advertisement dated October 1863 which states that the "edition" is a "reprint" of the "Routledge Illustrated Shakespeare." Both the earlier versions were published by Routledge and were illustrated but were not so named on the title page. I have tested all the cruxes in the 1869 text of *AYL* and have found no difference from earlier readings. I have been unable to inspect editions or issues of 1875 and 1879, listed in Jaggard, and I would welcome further information about them.

Spencer: I can offer an hypothesis here. The *British Museum Catalogue* lists the F1 facsimile edited by Staunton in 1866 with the *catalog number* 1870.a.20. Did the catalogue number become confused with the date in someone's notes?

83a. HUDSS: Henry N. Hudson, *Plays of Shakespeare*, Ser. 1-3, Boston, 1870-3.

Ser. 1 and 3 available at UW.

Later reissues bear the name "Hudson's School Shakespeare" on the spine. In fact these three vols. are an early run anticipating Hudson's single-vol. school editions of individual plays. Much if not most of the commentary that appears in those school eds. and in HUD2 (no. 94) originates in these vols., and should be dated accordingly. They were reprinted several times. See NUC cat. 540:616.

84. RLF: William J. Rolfe, *Rolfe's Sh.*, New York, 1870-1911?

UWM; UW owns a full set of RLF1, occasional vols. of later issues.

As with Hunter, the Rolfe editions were reissued under various series and irregularly revised. The Folger owns 160 copies published by Harper and Bros. from 1872-1907; the majority of these are called Rolfe's English Classics, others Rolfe's Shakespeare. The Folger owns a four-volume set of the works published by Baker and Taylor (1898?-1904?), apparently not significantly revised from the Harper editions, though each editor will have to check this. The separate plays were apparently completely revised for publication by American Book between 1903 and 1905, though they continued to be reissued as late as 1911 and perhaps later, since, according to Mark Eccles, Kittredge used them as his basic text in his classes. Christopher Spencer found that some of Rolfe's punctuation shows up in Kittredge's text. Furness set great store by his friend Rolfe's valuable commentary.

Full collation, Black (2 editions); occasional quotation, Shaaber (2 editions), Knowles (*AYL*), Eccles.

Shaaber: RLF1 should be tested and perhaps collated in full; all later Rolfes are probably not worth collating.

Knowles, *AYL* (1878): Light expurgation; only a couple of unconventional variants.

Spencer, *MV*: RLF1 (1870), RLF2 (1883), RLF3 (1903). In I.i (185 lines) there are 33 changes in punctuation or contraction in RLF2 and an additional 20 in RLF3; this is roughly typical of the play. In the whole play there are eleven substantive changes in RLF2 (none in RLF3), all of which I would have caught if I had spot-collated about 80 points where late 19th-century editors were most likely to disagree. There are important additions to the notes in RLF2 and RLF3.

Velz, *JC*: In *JC* the Harper's *Friendly Shakespeare* (1884) is a paginal reprint of the 1884 English Classics Edition (apparently from the same plates). The Harper edition (1871-96, in which the plays are separately paginated but bound in sets of four) is a paginal reprint, apparently from the same plates, of the 1872 English Classics Edition (which precedes, *pace* that 1871 date). The Whitcombe and Tombs ed. (1893, New Zealand) is a new setting of type. Among the English Classics Editions: in 5.1 of *JC* there are dozens of accidental changes from 1872 to 1884 (no substantives); the 1884 edition appears to be identical to the 1888 and 1900 editions. A check of my [occasional quotation] list shows only one difference from 1872 to

1884. I recommend full collation of RLF1 (i.e., 1872 for *JC*) and also of RLF2 (1903 for *JC*) and not even partial [inspection] for all the others. I have found some changes in the 1884 notes from those of 1872, but am quite sure it is safe to work with the 1872 notes, taking only the addenda from 1884. I have not yet examined the 1903 notes.

85. v1871, etc.: Horace H. Furness and Horace H. Furness, Jr., *New Variorum Sh.*, 1871-1928. Cf. no. 133.

Available at NL, UC, UW, UWM.

Each separate edition will be identified by its own date, e.g., *Ham.* as v1877; thus *JC* and *Cym.* will both be identified by the siglum v1913.

Furness's life as America's leading 19th- and early 20th-century Shakespearean scholar may be read in James Gibson's *The Philadelphia Shakespeare Story* (N.Y., 1990).

86. DEL4: Nicolaus Delius, *Werke*, 2 vols., Elberfeld, 1872.

Available at NL; UC owns the 1876 issue, UW the 1882.

The title page of the Folger copy reads "Dritte, Revidirte Auflage./ Stereotype-Ausgabe." What it is a stereotype of I don't know, unless of the parts issued separately in 1868-72; see item 81b.

This edition was reprinted by stereotype in 1876 as "Vierte Auflage"; the 1876 issue was in turn reprinted in 1882, 1898, and 1919 as "Fünfte," "Sechste," und "Siebenste Auflage" respectively.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black (1882 reprint), Evans+, except occasional quotation, Knowles (*AYL*), Spevack.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 7: Printed from DEL2, which is closely based on COL1. DEL2 is only worth [occasional quotation].

Knowles, *AYL*: Professor Evans advises [occasional quotation] for the earlier Delius (7 vols., 1854-61) and full collation for this. My experience with the *AYL* text in vol. 1 (1872) suggests that this edition isn't worth more than [occasional quotation] either. I gave full collations to both editions and found only a few typographical differences between them (of no significance) and only two substantive differences: one was a printing of three verse lines as prose, and the other a change in a disputed passage that would have been noticed in an [occasional inspection]--and no other editor adopted either reading.

Spencer, *MV*, vol. 1: Seems to deserve no more than [occasional quotation]: follows Collier closely.

Velz, *JC*: In the first 200 lines I found no subst. between DEL4 and DEL3, one semi-subst., and nine accidentals. In the twenty readings where DEL3 differs from DEL2 substantively, DEL4 coincides with DEL3 in nineteen (the 20th supplies an exit omitted from DEL3). I stumbled on one substantive difference from both DEL2 and DEL3 later in the play, but conclude nevertheless that DEL4 was printed from DEL3 and that it is not worth even [occasional quotation].

87. RUG: Charles E. Moberly et al., *Rugby Ed.*, 10 vols.?, 1872-83.

School editions of several plays. Furness quoted their commentaries extensively.

Shaaber: Should be tested.

Knowles, *AYL* (1872): Heavily expurgated; a couple of interesting readings.

88. ECL: D. Morris et al., *English Classics Edition*, 15 vols., London & Glasgow, 1873-5.

Murphy: Simply the same as CLNS (no. 89) in another issue.

89. CLNS: Samuel Neil et al., Collins' School and College Sh., 1873-9.

Shaaber: Should be tested.

Knowles, *AYL* (1876): Light expurgation; several new readings .

Velz, *JC* (ed. Samuel Neil, 1877): Not as venturesome as FAL (no. 98) but nonetheless worth [occasional quotation]. I found one original reading in the testing, but it may be a typo. The notes are less concerned with text than those of many school editions; Neil is less thorough in the notes than other school editors I have worked with (e.g., is unaware that it was Warburton who originated a celebrated and controversial interpretation in *JC* 5.4).

90. DYCE3: Alexander Dyce, *Works*, 9 vols., 1875-6.

Available at Huntington Library, UC, UW.

Entire vol. 9 is a glossary. No errata.

According to John Velz, Dyce made changes only in the first four vols., whereupon he died; the remaining volumes are simply a diplomatic transcript not worth even [occasional quotation], and all the notes in these volumes are unchanged.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Knowles, Eccles; occasional quotation, Evans, Turner; ignored, Spevack.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 5 (1875): Not yet collated. Is it worth full collation?

Shaaber: May be omitted.

Knowles, *AYL*, vol. 3 (1875): I found only five textual differences from DYCE2. Three of these were intentional and were marked in the notes; one was an insignificant spelling error, and one a highly significant spelling error that reappeared in the White 2, the Irving Shakespeare, Verity, and E. K. Chambers. The latter was simply a fluke, however, and could have been traced back to its source, and is hardly enough to justify more than [occasional quotation] for this edition. It should get at least that because it is the text most heavily relied on by HUD2 and the Irving Shakespeare.

Spencer, *MV*, vol. 2 (1875): Judging from an [occasional inspection], DYCE3 has only one substantive change from DYCE2 in *MV*. There is no copy of DYCE3 at the BM, but the Dyce Collection at the Victoria and Albert has one.

91. COL4: John Payne Collier, *Plays and Poems*, 8 vols., 1875-8.

Available at Huntington Library, NL.

Serially issued in 43 pts., 1875-8. For dates of issue of individual plays, see Knowles, *SB* 40 (1987). Collier issued t.p.'s for the 7 vols. 1875-7 as *Plays*; with supplemental vol. 8 in 1878, new title pages for previous volumes were issued, reading *Plays and Poems* and dated 1878. No errata.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black+, except occasional quotation, Evans, Knowles (*AYL*).

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 4 (1878): Not yet collated. Is it worth more than [occasional quotation]?

Shaaber: May be omitted.

Knowles, *AYL*, vol. 2 (1875): This edition differs from COL3 in more than two dozen places, sometimes rejecting or reintroducing Perkins Folio readings and in several cases seconding readings introduced by Staunton and Dyce. Worth [occasional quotation].

Spencer, *MV*, vol. 2 (1878): Contains a number of changes of significance in *MV*, including a rehandling of the "Sallies [i.e., Salanio, Salarino, etc.]." Worth at least a sharp-eyed [occasional inspection].

Velz, *JC*: COL4 is independent, rejecting many Perkins readings which appear in COL2 or COL3. It makes some pretentious rephrasings of SDs. An important text.

92. LEO: *The Leopold Sh.*, [1877].

Available at UW, UWM. UC owns several 19th-c. rpts., NL a 20th-c. rpt.

Lengthy introduction on chronology by Frederick J. Furnivall. The preface by an anonymous editor, apparently not Furnivall, credits Delius with the texts of *Edward III* and all other plays but *TNK*, prepared by Harold Littledale. I would guess the Delius text is DEL4 (1872).

93. W&P: W. Wagner and L. Proescholdt, *Works*, 12 vols., Hamburg, 1879-91.

94. HUD2: Henry N. Hudson, *Complete Works*, Harvard Ed., 20 vols., Boston 1880-1.

Available at UW, UWM; UC set lacks vols. 14, 17, 18.

Index in vol. 20. No errata.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Knowles, *AYL*, vol. 7 (1880): An extremely eclectic edition. Although it relies on DYCE3 for dozens of crucial readings, it also selects many older or rare readings from other texts, adopts conjectures by Walker, Staunton, Daniel, Jervis, Lettsom, and others, and provides six original emendations. Full collation.

95. WH2: Richard Grant White, *Comedies, Histories, Tragedies, and Poems*, Riverside Sh., 3 vols., Boston, 1883.

Available at Huntington Library, UC, UW, UWM.

Also published in a six-volume set the same year, though Jaggard lists it as 1883-4.

Steeves: Mainly a reworking of the first edition (1857-66).

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 3: Not yet collated, but I should judge deserves complete collation.

Knowles, *AYL*: A careful and generally conventional text. I found only two unique readings and only three other unusual ones: the latter three were of interest because they were the only adoptions of two readings and a conjecture proposed by the Cambridge-Globe editors. Three of these five emendations were in unexpected places. I would recommend full collation, as Professor Evans does.

96. WORD1: Charles Wordsworth, *History Plays*, 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1883.

Available UWM.

Occasional quotation, Spevack.

Velz, *JC*: In the first two acts there are ten unique subst. (two of them expurgations). In the same two acts WORD1 adopts a reading only CAP had printed before and another not printed since JOHN. His copy-text would appear to be DYCE2, but WORD1 is an independent, eclectic (and intelligent) text.

97. QFAC1: Frederick J. Furnivall, gen. ed., *Sh. Quarto Facsimiles*, 43 vols., [1885]-91.

Available at Huntington Library; UW lacks *Ham.* (Q2), *MV* (Q2), *IH4* (Q1), *R2* (Q1 Huth), *Per.* (Q1), *Rom.* (Q1), *Jn.* (Q1 pt. 2).

The editions were prepared by William Griggs and Charles Praetorius; Furnivall, Herbert A. Evans, and P. A. Daniel supply introductory remarks. Cf. entry no. 0 above.

Murphy: "I seem to have seen one volume that can be dated to 1881."

98. FAL: E. K. Chambers et al., Falcon Edition, 13 vols., 1886-91.

Velz, *JC* (ed. H. C. Beeching, 1886): Punctuation and SDs from GLO. Ed. claims to read with F1 in most cruxes and to discuss his departures. A partial [inspection] (107 readings) turned up 22 subst. departures from F1, 19 of them discussed. He restores two 18th-century emendations and in four other cases is virtually alone before the 20th-century in reading with F1. The notes are well informed and more literary than those of grammatically oriented school editions. [Occasional quotation.]

99. IRV: Henry Irving and Frank Marshall, *Works*, Henry Irving Sh., 8 vols., New York, 1888-90.

Available NL, UW, UWM.

Errata in vol. 8, following introduction. Index in vol. 8.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Eccles, Turner, Knowles (*Lr.*); occasional quotation, Evans, Knowles (*AYL*), Spevack.

Knowles, *AYL*, vol. 4 (1888): Textually this edition is mainly important for its numerous stage directions. In crucial readings it generally relies indiscriminately on DYCE3, and only one independent reading was in an unexpected place. It deserves only [occasional quotation], and if an editor brought to it a list of readings peculiar to DYCE3 he would certainly catch all of the important textual variations.

Velz, *JC*: More independent of DYCE3 (p. 90) than Knowles found in *AYL*. In the first 230 lines there are 39 accidental variants, 3 semi-subst. and 3 subst. Except in stage-directions this is not an innovative text; however, it is more conservative than DYCE 3. [Occasional quotation.] Edward Dowden, *Introduction to Shakespeare* (1900) contains (pp. 76-81) material on *Oth.*, *Lr.*, *Mac.*, *Ant.*, and *Tim.* not found in his "Introduction" to IRV. Pp. 111-128 on the great actors since Burbage are also added. Otherwise the book very closely follows IRV's "Introduction."

100. BNK1: Appleton Morgan and Willis Vickery, gen. eds., *Comedies, Histories and Tragedies*, Bankside Sh., 22 vols., New York, 1888-1906.

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UW, UWM, and in AMS rpt.

Not to be confused with the Bankside acting edition for school children edited by Harvey Darton.

In 21 of the volumes, the texts of the plays originally published in quartos are printed opposite F1 texts. A series of further editions printing texts of plays originating in F1 opposite the F1 text was projected, but only *Err.* appeared.

According to Steeves (pp. 364-6), much of the apparatus is amateurish and incompetent, and many of the editors ride their particular hobby-horses.

101. DTN: Kenneth Deighton, individual plays, 24 vols., 1888-93?

UW owns cops. of some plays.

First issued as Deighton's Grey Cover Sh.; reissued after 1894 as Deighton's Red Cover Sh.; some vols. reprinted into the 1970s. *R3* was ed. by C. H. Tawney; *TGV* may have first appeared in 1905.

Full collation, Black; occasional quotation, Shaaber, Knowles (*AYL*); otherwise ignored.

Shaaber: [Occasional quotation].

Knowles, *AYL* (1891): Considerable expurgation. [Deighton is a competent editor and commentator; he did ARD1 vols. of *Per.*, *Tim.*, and *Tro.*]

Velz, *JC*: The Red Cover DTN is a paginal reprint (apparently from the same plates) of the Grey Cover, which in turn is very faithful to GLO. In three scenes (177 lines) I found one semi-subst.--nothing else. The text can probably be ignored. DTN's notes are rather obvious, largely lexical, paraphrasing the text. His Introduction is largely a plot summary. Not a scholarly edition.

102. PITT: A. W. Verity et al., Pitt Press Sh., 16? vols., Cambridge, 1890-1936?
UW owns 16 vols., UC an incomplete set.

Shaaber: Should be tested.

Knowles, *AYL* (1899): Very considerably expurgated.

Velz, *JC*: The verso of the t.p. of the 1931 *JC* lists printings since 1895, indicating which include revisions. The Introduction in the later eds. have been revised in small ways and expanded by two sections. The most important additions to the notes in later eds. are responses to the characters and a section on metrics. The text of PITT 1895 is identical to 1931 in the 309 lines of *JC* used for a test (12 other printings intervene between 1895 and 1931). Verity shows less [interest?] in textual problems than many editors; not a venturesome text. [Occasional quotation] of 1895.

Knowles, *Lr.*: Verity is one of the great commentators of the late 19th- and early 20th-century, on both Milton and Sh. He combines extensive erudition and critical acumen, and is worth reading carefully even in a student ed.

103. OXF1: W. J. Craig, *Complete Works*, Oxford Sh., [1891].

Available at UWM; AMS rpt. is of the 1904 edition.

A note by Giles Dawson in the front of the Folger copy reads, "There is some reason for thinking this is the first issue. Jag. dates it '[1891]'--with this impr., no portrait. He calls it 8vo; all others are 16mo in sigs." The edition was re-set in 1905.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+, except occasional quotation, Eccles.

Bowers: An example "of old-fashioned but shrewd literary taste applied to the problems [of text] without the necessary technical information to direct the editing to certain overlooked basic criteria."

Knowles, *AYL*: A very independent edition. Eight emendations common in the 18th and 19th centuries make their last appearance here; four other readings are unique, four unusual, and a half-dozen are errors. Many of these are in unexpected places. Full collation.

Velz, *JC*: There are eleven substantive readings in OXF1 that are either unique, first introduced there, or quite unusual. I found no difference between the 1891 and the 1906 reprint of it.

104. CAM2: William Aldis Wright, *Works*, Cambridge Sh., 9 vols., 1891-3.

Available at NL, UC, UW, UWM, and in AMS reprint.

An addenda page in each vol., and "Additions and Corrections" for all volumes at end of vol. 9.

Revised by Wright alone. Textual notes are augmented; other notes seem practically unchanged. Many textual conjectures by contributors make their first appearance in the notes; often full attribution requires consultation of Wright's correspondence (Shakespeariana) at Trinity College, Cambridge.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Eccles; occasional quotation, Evans, Knowles, Spevack, Turner.

Evans, *IH6*, vol. 5 (1892): Printed from CAM1. From McKerrow's remarks in *Prolegomena* I doubt the value of a complete collation, though, of course, the textual notes are considerably expanded. (See note on Perkins Folio.)

Shaaber: May be omitted.

Velz, *JC*: In Act 1 CAM2 varies from CAM1 in two accidentals and one subst. The latter would have shown up in a partial [inspection] but was not discussed in the textual notes to CAM2. In 107 cruxes for a partial [inspection], the two eds. coincide in 105. In the other two CAM2 restores F1.

105. WORD2: Charles Wordsworth, *History Plays*, 3 vols., 1893.
Available at UC.

Occasional quotation, Shaaber.

Velz, *JC*: A simple reprint of WORD1 (no. 96).

106. WARW: Charles H. Herford, gen. ed., *Warwick Sh.*, 23? vols., 1893-?
UW owns 15 vols.

A popular school edition, reprinted for decades into the 20th c.; vols. are usually undated. Extensive annotation, often by first-rate scholars such as E. K. Chambers and D. Nichol Smith. These were reissued as the *American Arden Sh.* (see no. 124), which offered at least 24 plays.

Velz, *JC*: GLO virtually unaltered. Ed. Arthur Innes claims to have discussed every alteration from GLO in his notes. The notes are full and (as school eds. go) good, with various original insights and some aesthetic criticism.

107. GOL: Israel Gollancz, *Temple Sh.*, 40 vols., 1894-6.
Available at UC, UWM (exc. vols. 9, 18, 22, 31, 33).

Velz, *JC*: No more than a reprint of CAM2; in Act 2 (505 lines), GOL differs from CAM2 in only three accidentals, one semi-subst. (probably a typo) and one subst. (almost certainly a typo). The GOL text can be ignored. Notes worth examining, however, as GOL records some conjectures not in CAM2 textual notes and some interpretative insights of his own.

108. DON: T. Donovan, *English History Plays*, 2 vols., 1896.

109. EV1: Charles H. Herford, *Works*, Eversley Ed., 10 vols., 1899.
Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UW, UWM.
No errata.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black; occasional quotation, Eccles.

Shaaber: Heavily dependent on Cambridge.

Velz, *JC*: Reissued in 1900 (same plates; only pagination altered) in 37 vols. (no poems apparently). In 350 lines EV1 differs from CAM2 in 20 accidentals, 4 semi-subst. (slightly altered SDs and rhetorical punctuation) and 1 subst., which would have turned up in a partial [inspection].

110. ARD1: W. J. Craig and R. H. Case, *Works*, *Arden Sh.*, 39 vols., 1899-1931.
Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UWM (inc.), UW (exc. *Rom.*).

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Shaaber: Collate in full.

Knowles, *AYL* (1914): If the quality of editorial supervision of the whole series is to be judged by this volume, one might wish to question the value of full collation of the Arden Shakespeare. It may be that the four unique or unusual readings, three of them in unexpected places, justify full collation; but the text contained more than two dozen verbal blunders and errors--words omitted, added, misplaced in the line, and substituted for (*by* for *with*, *a* for *any*, etc.). Since these changes were not noted, were unnecessary, and often made no sense, there is no doubt they are simply the result of editorial carelessness. [The *Lr.* vol., however, is superb in every way.]

110a. HEN: W. E. Henley, *Works*, "Edinburgh Folio," 10 vols. in 40 pts., Edinburgh, 1901-4. Available at UW.

111. P&C: Charlotte Porter and Helen A. Clarke, American First Folio Edition, 40 vols., New York, 1903-12.

Available at NL (inc.), UC, UW (exc. *Ant.*, *Ham.*, *IH4*, *MND*, *R2*, *Shr.*, *TGV*).

In 1903 Porter and Clarke published the Pembroke ed. (apparently also called, or reissued as, the Croxley ed.), 12 vols., containing a text based on F1 and minimal notes. This was reproduced in a 13-vol. English version of 1906, intro. Churton Collins. In 1903 P&C began their American First Folio ed., which was completed in 1912. Although names of both editors appear on t.p.'s until 1909, apparently only the first 4 vols. were done jointly, thereafter by Porter alone. Porter, friend of Furness, edited *Shakespeareana*, and she and her life-long companion Clarke founded and edited *Poet-Lore*. Their devotion to F1 sometimes leads them to absurd defenses of F1 corruptions, but the extensive commentary is first-rate.

Velz, *JC*: At FSL the *JC* vol. is from another issue, offering a Preface (pp. vii-xv) on text which claims complete typographical fidelity to F1 (apparently for the whole ed.) with the exceptions i/j, u/v, long s, and expanded contractions. The appendix listing variant readings and their originators is apparently compiled from CAM. The notes and introduction are definitely worth consulting.

111a. Esther Wood and Goldwin Smith, *The Personal Sh.*, 15 vols., N. Y., 1904.

An early critical old-spelling ed., presenting an edited F1 text with additions from the "earliest complete" Qq in the places where the Globe ed. makes such additions, and with Globe stage directions.

112. BUL: Arthur H. Bullen, *Works*, Stratford Town Ed., 10 vols., Stratford-on-Avon, [1904-7].

Available at NL, UC, UWM.

Full collation, Black, Eccles, Turner; occasional quotation, Shaaber; ignored, Knowles, Spevack.

Shaaber: Not sufficiently independent to be worth collation.

Velz, *JC*: The textual notes in vol. 10 are all on passages in my [occasionally quoted] list. Only one of them offers a venturesome reading. A partial [inspection] turned up unusual approaches to five other cruxes. No introductions to individual plays nor interpretative notes. Essays by various hands on such topics as Jonson and Shakespeare, the Globe stage, Shakespeare's life--all in vol. 10.

113. RLTR: E. K. Chambers, *Red Letter Sh.*, 39 vols., [1904-8].

The introductions to the several plays were later collected as *Sh.: A Survey*, and in the preface to that work Chambers dates the editions as 1904-8. The Red Letter editions are apparently rare; neither the Folger Library nor the Library of Congress owns the original issues by Blackie; both libraries and UWM, however, own issues by Gresham, apparently reprinted from the same plates (though I have so far been unable to prove this).

Full collation, Knowles (*Lr.*); occasional quotation, Knowles (*AYL*), Eccles, Turner.

Shaaber: Should be tested.

Knowles, *AYL* (1905): Chambers's "Red Letter" series of individual editions of the plays may be worth [occasional quotation] although it is not intended for scholars. Chambers's readings are never original but they are all arrived at independently of any one edition. He departs from the F1 text in some thirty places and then usually adopts well-established variants; he is, however, among the first to follow a reading originating with Spedding and a couple first printed by Dyce.

Velz, *JC*: Definitely worth [occasional quotation] and I am considering full [collation], since Chambers restores F1 in three unexpected places. The notes are few and purely lexical. No General Introduction to the series; no explanation of editorial principles, which anticipate modern practice in some striking ways. (Later: I have done a full collation and regard RLTR as a major ed.)

114. OSP: Frederick J. Furnivall and Walter G. Boswell-Stone, *Old Spelling Sh.*, 13 (17?) vols., 1904 (*LLL* only; A. Moring), 1907-12 (London: Chatto & Windus, and N.Y.: Duffield). Murphy: At least 14 vols.

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UWM (9 vols.); 7 vols. at UW.

The series was discontinued, then picked up by another publisher. Both Q and F texts; introductions and notes by F. W. Clarke, Furnivall, and Boswell-Stone. The Birmingham Library catalogue indicates 17 vols.

Velz, *JC*: There are two issues (from Duffield [N.Y.] and Chatto and Windus [Ln.], both of them), identical except imprint, at FSL (PR 2753 1907-1909a1, a2). a1 consists of 13 unnumbered vols. (one play per vol.). The FSL catalogue describes the other as a 12-vol set, though the library owns only *LLL* in this issue.

115. TUT: Arthur F. Watt, et al., *Tutorial Sh.*, 1904?-1924?

Also called University Tutorial Sh.

Murphy: 28 plays, 30 vols.?

Full collation, Black; occasional quotation, Shaaber; otherwise ignored.

Velz, *JC*: In three scenes there was only one variant from CAM2, a semi-subst. spelling that might have been an oversight. No reason even for [occasional quotation]. The notes are worth sifting, and the brilliant Introduction anticipates some mid-20th-century views of the characters.

116. BRAND: George Brandes, *Garrick Sh.*, 12 vols., 1905.

Velz, *JC*: Vol. 12 contains criticism of individual plays beyond what appears in "Introductions" in other vols. No notes. Brandes' text is a simple reprint of GLO--two accidentals in 214 lines of *JC*.

117. NLSN: William A. Neilson, *Complete Dramatic and Poetic Works*, Cambridge Ed., Boston, 1906.

Available at Huntington Library, UC, UW, UWM.
Textual notes pp. 1203-12; glossary pp. 1215-37. No errata.

Full collation, Shaaber, Black, Evans+.

Bowers: An example “of old-fashioned but shrewd literary taste applied to the problems [of text] without the necessary technical information to direct the editing to certain overlooked basic criteria.”

Knowles, *AYL*: In general this text follows F1 closely in cruxes. Otherwise I found only one unique stage direction, one other unique reading, four unusual readings, and one error, some in unexpected places. Full collation.

118. LEE: Sidney Lee et al., *Works*, Univ. Press Sh., Renaissance Ed., 40 vols., 1906-9.
Available at UC, UWM.

Velz, *JC*: In the first 185 lines of *JC*, the text is exactly as described in the front matter--a literal reprint of CAM. A handsome limited ed., not intended for scholars; the “Introduction” to *JC* (by Lee) was worth examining, however, for its criticism of the play, and some of the lexical and interpretative notes are not merely derivative. The glossary in vol. 40 is a revision and expansion of the one in GLO 1891. Lee has a General Introduction in vol. 1 which ranges widely and, though a little effusive, shows good sense.

119. H&B: Henry N. Hudson and Ebenezer C. Black et al., *New Hudson Sh.*, 1906?-1926?
Incomplete sets at UW, UWM.

Revisions of Hudson’s School Sh. (see no. 83a). Ebenezer Black did work on every one of the revised editions that I have seen, though he collaborated with various editors on several of the volumes. At least 19 plays.

Occasional quotation, Shaaber.

Knowles, *AYL* (c. 1906): Considerable expurgation, and the text is so conservative as to be unrecognizable as Hudson’s.

Velz, *JC*: Eds. claim to indicate every departure from F1 in their textual notes. They record even sp. variants and minor differences in SDs. Partial [inspection], since in *JC* the notes show no subst. departures from F1 beyond list of readings for a[n occasional quotation]. The lexical notes are sometimes etymological and interesting; interpretative notes are, some of them, first-rate.

120. BNK2: Appleton Morgan, gen. ed., *Plays*, Bankside Restoration Sh., 5 vols., New York, 1907-8.

Available at NL, UC, UW.
Shakespearean texts printed opposite texts of Restoration adaptations of *Tim.*, *Ant.*, *Ham.*, *MM*, *Tmp.*

121. LOB: J. H. Lobban, Granta Sh., Cambridge, 1910?-1918?

There are at least thirteen plays in this series, all done by Lobban. Were there more plays or editors?

Occasional quotation, Shaaber.

Velz, *JC* (1915): Copy-text v1793 with modernized spelling and punctuation. Independent enough in treatment of 18th- and 19th-century emendations to be worth [occasional quotation]. The Introduction is largely character analysis; some notes are very good.

122. W. J. Craig, *Comedies, Histories, Tragedies*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1911-12.
Available at UW.

Oxford text, but contains general intro. by Algernon Charles Swinburne and introductions to each play by Edward Dowden. Each vol. has its own glossary.

123. TUD: William A. Neilson and Ashley H. Thorndike, gen. eds., *Tudor Sh.*, 39 vols., 1911-13.

Available at NL, UC, UW (inc.), UWM (inc.).

Neilson's 1906 text. Volumes reprinted well into the 1930's.

Velz, *JC* (ed. Robert M. Lovett): Notes unsophisticated, though I found three of them worth extracting. The Introduction is first-rate, especially on theme and characters.

124. AARD: Charles H. Herford, gen. ed., Heath's [American] *Arden Sh.*, New York, 1914?-33?. The editors are mainly British, and some volumes appeared in England as early as 1895. They are essentially the same as WARW (no. 106). American issues bearing dates seem to appear mainly in 1915-17; by 1917 Heath advertised 20 plays in print, and 4 others--*Oth.*, *Ant.*, *Tim.*, and *Tro.*--appeared thereafter. At least some vols. were minimally revised by American scholars in trivial matters of language and line- and paragraph- numbering, and at least one play (*Rom.*) was wholly prepared by an American (R. A. Law).

Available at UC, UWM (8 vols.).

Occasional quotation, Shaaber.

Velz, *JC*: Copy-text GLO. In 325 lines no punctuation variants, four in capitalization, and one subst. A partial [inspection] turned up six differences from GLO in 107 readings. The ed. announces itself as more concerned with aesthetic than with textual and philological matters; the introduction, notes, and appendices are worth attention.

125. YAL1: Wilbur L. Cross and C. F. Tucker Brooke, gen. eds., *Yale Sh.*, 39 vols., 1917-28.
Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UWM (lacks 9 vols.).

Full collation, Black; occasional quotation, Shaaber.

Shaaber: Ignore; follows Oxford with a few exceptions, listed in an appendix.

126. CAM3: J. Dover Wilson et al., New [Cambridge] *Sh.*, 39 vols., 1921-66.

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UW, UWM.

Bowers: "Wilson . . . made a unique effort to investigate the conjectural nature of the manuscripts, and also the bibliographical relationships of the texts, as an informed basis for a new view of the textual problems in each play. It is perhaps ungrateful to remark that his highly speculative mind produced more random insights than it did comprehensive working hypotheses that have stood the test of informed scrutiny. It follows that despite some illuminating revelations, the textual theory that for each play guided his principles of editing has too often proved faulty in its major hypotheses. . . . The virtues of the uneven New Cambridge

text are due more often to Wilson's literary acumen than to the so-called bibliographical theory that was supposed to inform his texts. Indeed, in such plays as *Romeo and Juliet* his literary taste runs quite counter to his textual theory, and his edition exhibits an enlightened but conventional text that in its choice of readings is often squarely opposite to what would have been produced if he had actually applied his textual hypotheses. On the other hand, the virtues of critical taste and bibliographical theory operate to make his *Hamlet* text a superior one in many respects."

Full collation, Black, Evans+.

Shaaber: Collate in full.

Knowles, *AYL* (1926): A very influential text: its many new and expanded stage directions and some of its peculiarities of punctuation (such as the use of ellipsis points to indicate a pause) have not been copied, but it has been followed often in its setting of prose lines as verse and its adoption of a number of older or unusual emendations. Full collation.

Spencer, *MV*: CAM3a (1926), CAM3b (1953), CAM3c (1962). There are three substantive alterations in CAM3b and several important notes are rewritten. There are six more substantive changes, one SD omitted, 17 spelling changes, and over 250 alterations in punctuation (170 of them substitutions of semi-colon, colon, or period for rows of three or four dots used in CAM3a, CAM3b in CAM3c). There are further revisions of the notes in CAM3c, and changes were made in the Glossary in both editions.

127. H&P: George B. Harrison and Francis H. Pritchard, *New Readers' Sh.*, 1925-9?

Available at UW.

Murphy: 21 vols.?

An American edition was prepared by Essie Chamberlain in 1932.

Velz, *JC*: GLO fitted with Shavian SDs. No introduction, no notes, a short glossary, and some study questions aimed at very unsophisticated readers.

128. TCH: *Teaching of English Series*, Henry Newbolt, gen. ed., 1925-37.

Murphy: 25 vols. Reissued in paper covers as "Nelson's Sixpenny Sh."

Velz, *JC*: (ed. John Hampden): Intended audience young; notes are obvious explications and show virtually no interest in textual matters. I have not been able to trace the text, but it is probably a reprint of some earlier ed.

129. RID: Maurice R. Ridley, *New Temple Sh.*, 40 vols., 1934-6. Reissued (RIDb) in 1947-62.

Available at UW (exc. *Err.*, *Shr.*, *Tmp.*), UWM.

Full collation, Black, Knowles, Spevack; occasional quotation, Shaaber, Eccles, Turner.

Shaaber: Full collation; he is capable of strong independence.

Knowles, *AYL* (1934): Very independent text. Two of its restorations of F1 readings are unique and five others are unusual; three emendations are old or unusual, two are original, and two are errors. Ridley also erases the divisions between several of the scenes. For *AYL* this edition needed full collation. Professor Mark Eccles, however, tells me that the Ridley text of *MM* did not deserve full collation. [Ridley's *Lr.* is the first modern text based on Q1.]

Spencer, *MV* (1935): *MV* has an independent text; full collation.

130. EV2: Guy Boas, gen. ed., *New Eversley Sh.*, 23 vols., 1935-7.

Full collation, Black.

131. KIT1: George Lyman Kittredge, *Complete Works*, Boston, 1936.
Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UW, UWM.

Full collation, Black, Evans+, except occasional quotation, Shaaber.

Bowers: "The 1936 text of George Lyman Kittredge, though often traditional, benefitted materially from his wide acquaintance with Elizabethan idiom and his profound understanding of the processes of Shakespeare's thought and expression."

Knowles, *AYL*: A careful and independent though not often unconventional text. It restores a number of F1 spellings, adds three new stage directions, prints as prose two lines usually set as verse, and adopts two unusual F1 readings and two unusual, older emendations. Some of these changes are in unexpected places. Many shorter sentences. Full collation.

132. H&M: Karl J. Holzknecht and Norman E. McClure, *Selected Plays of Sh.*, 4 vols., New York, 1936-41.

Available at UWM (vol. 3 only).

133. v1936, etc.: Joseph Q. Adams et al., gen. eds., *New Variorum Sh.*, 1936-.
Each edition will be identified by its own date. Thus the siglum for *2H4* is v1940.

134. PEN1: George B. Harrison, *Penguin Sh.*, 1937-59.
Available at UC (inc.), UWM (nearly complete).

Occasional quotation, Knowles, Turner, Spevack.

Velz, *JC*: Three unique readings, one a speech assignment and one probably an error. Harrison's stubborn clinging to F1 punctuation results in some anomalies: despite his disclaimer, he retains F1 pointing when it makes no sense at all (many cases of this); on the other hand, in three or four readings he is the only editor to read correctly, the tradition since Rowe having misinterpreted the punctuation of F1.

135. CLN2: Ralph E. C. Houghton, gen. ed., *New Clarendon Sh.*, 21 vols., 1938-70.
Available at NL, UW (some vols.), UWM (*Oth.* only).

- 135a. FAR: Herbert Farjeon, Limited Eds. Club, 37 vols., N.Y. 1939-40.
Critical old-spelling ed. Text F1 with Q imports, some emendations.

136. KIT2a, b: George Lyman Kittredge, individual plays, Boston, 1939-45.
Collected as *Sixteen Plays*, 1946 (KIT2b).

Available at NL, UW, UWM.

Indispensable commentary, but according to Professor Irving Ribner there are no textual differences from KIT1.

137. QFAC2: W. W. Greg and Charlton Hinman, *Sh. Quarto Facsimiles*, 16 vols. Sh. Assn., 1939-75. Additional volumes will be issued by the Malone Society.

Available at Huntington Library, UC, UW.

138. N&H: William A. Neilson and Charles J. Hill, *Complete Plays and Poems*, Cambridge, Mass., 1942.

Available at Huntington Library, UC, UW, UWM.

Full collation, Evans.

Knowles, *AYL*: Hill's main revisions are to bracket all non-Folio readings and to make a number of insignificant changes in punctuation. His three changes of words are all in usual places and the changes are conventional. He contracts ten words with apostrophes; in seven cases there is justification in F1 for doing so, and in only two or three cases could these contractions make the slightest metrical difference. This text seems to deserve only [occasional quotation].

139. VIK: *Seven Plays, Songs, Sonnets, Selections*, Viking Portable Sh., 1944.
Available at UWM.

140. ALEX: Peter Alexander, *Works*, 1951.
Available at UW, UWM.

Bowers: "The 1951 text of Peter Alexander is in some respects the best of the collected editions, but it is marred by the fact that Alexander was brought in to rescue another editor and therefore did not have control of the operation from the beginning. His penetrating mind gives us, often, our best readings, but these may be mixed with faulty ones not weeded out with sufficient rigor from the old Collins text that served as basis."

In *R3* Alexander "did not fully emancipate himself from traditional unauthoritative readings by applying with rigor a consistent textual theory based on the modern recognition of the correct relationship of the two texts [Q and F]."

Murphy: "[In] the files on the Alexander edition, now at HarperCollins in Glasgow, I've found no evidence . . . that anyone had been reworking this [old Collins text] before Alexander came along."

Full collation, Knowles, Eccles, Spevack, Turner.

Shaaber: Collate in full.

Evans, *IH6*: Full collation.

Knowles, *AYL*: Returns to several spellings and punctuations (of no significance) from F1 and seems to adopt others from Kittredge. None of the F1 verbal restorations was significant, and the one unusual emendation was in a commonly disputed place. Professor Evans expected this edition to merit full collation, but the *AYL* text needed only [occasional quotation].

141. ARD2: Una Ellis-Fermor et al., *New Arden Sh.*, 38 vols., 1951-82.
Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UW, UWM.

Bowers: "The general editor was a brilliant scholar but no textual critic, and as a result the editors of the individual volumes had an unduly free hand without sufficient check from superior authority and experience. The chief virtue of the New, as it was of the Old Arden, is the commentary notes. As a result, some editors seem to have been chosen less for their textual experience than for their interest in the criticism of Shakespeare, although a few of the more recent volumes are redressing the imbalance. Hence the text runs the gamut. From the early volumes we have an eccentric *King Lear* by a critic who denied the likelihood of press-variants in the Folio text, although Dr. Hinman has since shown them to exist in some quantity. Or an infuriating-to-read *Antony and Cleopatra* in which a ridiculous attempt is made to keep as much of the Folio punctuation as possible despite the modernization of every other feature of the text."

“On the other hand, such volumes as *Much Ado About Nothing* have been edited with scrupulous care for the bibliographical history of the text and what can be conjectured about the nature of the underlying manuscript.”

Full collation, Eccles+.

Evans, *IH6*: Full collation.

Shaaber: Collate in full.

Spencer, *MV*: ARD2 of *MV* exists in two editions with a few substantive differences between them.

Knowles, *Lr.*: Several supplements, each with supplements, but text unchanged.

141a. NONE: Herbert Farjeon and Ivor Brown, *New Nonesuch Sh.*, 4 vols., Ln. and N.Y., 1953. Available at UW.

Farjeon's 1939-40 old-spelling text, mainly based on F1, with Q variants in the margins. Includes Q1 texts of *Per.*, *TNK*, *Ed3*, added “bad-quarto” texts of *Rom.*, *Ham.*, *H5*, 1 and *2H6*, and *Wiv.*, and *Thomas Moore*. Vol. 4, Poems, includes *Sonnets to Sundry Notes of Musicke*.

142. SIS: Charles J. Sisson, *Complete Works*, 1954.

Available at Huntington Library, NL, UC, UW, UWM.

G. B. Evans says in the Supplement to *IH4* that the copy-text for that play was A. H. Bullen (1906).

Bowers: “In some recent years Charles Sisson has championed his paleographical theories for improving the complete text; but his critical taste is far from impeccable, and his reliance on alleged paleographical evidence too often merely masks an erratic series of subjective speculations.”

Full collation, Knowles (*AYL*)+

Shaaber: Collate in full.

Knowles, *AYL*: Six restorations of rarely seen F1 readings, five unusual emendations, six original readings (including three stage directions), and a couple of errors. Very open punctuation and many shorter sentences. Full collation.

Velz, *JC*: So independent in punctuation, SDs, and crucial readings that it would be misleading to speak of Bullen (or any other ed.) as copy-text.

143. YAL2: Helge Kökeritz and C. T. Prouty, gen. eds., *New Yale Sh.*, 1954-60?

Available at Huntington Library, UC, UW, UWM (inc.).

Full collation, Evans, Knowles; occasional quotation, Spevack.

Knowles, *AYL* (1954): This restores a large number of F1 spellings and Americanizes some others (*color* for *colour*, etc.). The text includes one unique stage direction, a number of contractions of words which affect the meter, the setting of three verse passages as prose (two were originally prose in F1), and a return to four rarely printed F1 readings. It probably needs full collation in spite of signs of carelessness in textual supervision: ten obvious errors, one of them a repetition of an error introduced by the Arden edition of 1914.

Spencer, *MV* (1960): My experience much as Richard Knowles's.

144. SISNR: Charles J. Sisson, *New Readings*, 2 vols., 1956.

Available at UW, UWM.
Essentially the notes to SIS.

145. PEL1: Alfred Harbage, gen. ed., Pelican Sh., 38 vols., 1956-67.
Available at UWM (inc.).

Full collation, Eccles, Turner, Knowles (*Lr.*); occasional quotation, Knowles (*AYL*).

Bowers: "I can testify to the amazing care [Professor Harbage] has devoted to reviewing the work of his editors of the Pelican Shakespeare, not only in technical details but especially in the criticism of the text."

146. MUN: John Munro, *Works*, London Sh., 6 vols., 1957.
Available at Huntington Library, NL (1958 issue), UW, UWM.

Occasional quotation, Knowles, Spevack, Turner.

Bowers: "In 1957 John J. Munro attempted a fresh survey, complete with collations. His scholarship proved unequal to the task."

Knowles, *AYL*: Professor Evans expected that this edition would need full collation. I wish to raise the doubt that it is worth any collation at all. The *As You Like It* text contained not a single original or even unconventional reading, and certainly needed no more than [occasional quotation].

Spencer, *MV*, vol. 1 (1958): *MV* has a very conventional text; perhaps is worth only [occasional quotation].

147. SIG: Sylvan Barnet, gen. ed., Signet Sh., 40 vols., 1963-8.
Available at UWM (inc.).

Velz, *JC* (ed. William and Barbara Rosen): Not a venturesome ed. Some careless errors (e.g., the V omitted from ACT V) persist as late as the 9th printing; the Harcourt Brace Jovanovich one-vol. Signet (1972) is typographically very bad indeed; it purports to offer some revision of the earlier Signet texts, but I have not compared the later text with the earlier.

148. K&R: George Lyman Kittredge and Irving Ribner, *Works*, Waltham, Mass.,
1966-9; 1 vol., 1971.
Available at UWM.

Knowles, *AYL*: Except for a number of insignificant changes in spelling and punctuation, and three or four apparent errors, Professor Ribner is careful to record in the footnotes his departures from Kittredge's original text (though I did find one exception). Apparently [occasional quotation] is enough.

Velz, *JC*: Six major typographical errors are carried over from the paperback edition into the Xerox Corporation's one-vol. ed. I have not regarded K&R as worthy of even [occasional quotation].

149. PEN2: Terence J. B. Spencer, gen. ed., New Penguin Sh., 41? vols., 1967-2001?
Available at UWM.

Full collation, Eccles, Turner, Knowles (*Lr.*); occasional quotation, Knowles (*AYL*).

150. PEL2: Alfred Harbage, gen. ed., Pelican Sh., rev. ed. in one vol., 1969.

Available at NL, UC, UW, UWM.

Occasional quotation, Spevack, Turner.

Turner (collating 1969 reprint of *TN*): PEL 2 differs from PEL1 in one subst. misprint. The Note on the Text (“a complete list of substantive departures from the folio text”) is incomplete and contains errors. Mr. Harbage says, however, that Penguin is very good about cleaning up the edition, so these errors may be corrected in later reprints.

Anne Lancashire: In preparation for PEL2, Harbage hired a graduate student to check the PEL1 texts against their copy-texts; and at least for *Oth.* PEL2’s list of substantive departures from the copy-text should be different from that in PEL1.

151. MACM: Macmillan Sh., 1969?-.

152. BEV1: David Bevington, *Works*, “Revised ed.,” Glenview, Ill. & Brighton, Eng., 1973.

Bevington’s first revision of Hardin Craig’s 1951 ed. The text is conservative, introducing limited (except for *R3*) substantive departures from Craig’s text, which was essentially that of the Globe (GLO).

153. EVNS: G. Blakemore Evans et al., Riverside Sh., 1974.

Available at UC, UW, UWM.

In the 2nd ed. (1997) the text apparently is essentially unchanged.

Full Collation, Knowles (*AYL*)+.

154. BEV2: David Bevington, *Works*, 3rd ed. Glenville, Ill. 1980

Bevington’s second revision of Hardin Craig’s ed. of 1951. The text differs from BEV1 mainly in matters of format, accessories, and accidentals.

Full collation, Turner (*WT*)

155. CHAL: G. A. Wilkes, gen. ed., Challis Sh., Sydney, 1982-.

“Designed specifically for the Australian reader.”

E. A. M. Colman’s ed. of *Lr.* is occasionally quite independent and original.

156. OXF2: Stanley Wells et al., *Works* (Modern Spelling), Oxford Sh., 1986.

This will probably be the edition collated, rather than OXF3.

Full collation, Turner (*WT*), Knowles (*Lr.*)

157. OXF3: Stanley Wells et al., *Works* (Original Spelling), Oxford Sh., 1986.

There should be no substantive differences from the Original Spelling ed. (OXF2), but there may be occasional reason to cite OXF3.

158. OXF4: Stanley Wells, gen. ed., Oxford Sh., 1982-. [Individual plays.]

If there are textual differences between the hardbound and paperback issues, use the siglum OXF4a for the hardbound and OXF4b for the paperback.

Full collation, Knowles (*Lr.*)

159. CAM4: Philip Brockbank et al., New Cambridge Sh., 1984-.

Full collation, Knowles (*Lr.*)

160. BAN2: David Bevington et al., Bantam Sh., 29 vols., N. Y., 1988.

Here called (perhaps arbitrarily) BAN2 to distinguish it from many paperback volumes of Shakespeare previously published by Bantam.

Text completely re-edited.

Full collation, Knowles (*Lr.*)

161. GUIL: John F. Andrews, Guild Shakespeare, 21? vols., Garden City, 1989-92.

Complete works, usually two plays per volume.

162. BEV3: David Bevington et al., *Works*, "Fourth Edition," N.Y., 1992.

Bevington's third revision of Hardin Craig's 1951 ed., drawing substantially on his BAN2 ed. of 1988. Updated and reissued by Longman in 1997.

163. FOLG2: Barbara A. Mowat & Paul Werstine, New Folger Library Sh., 1992-.

Full collation, Knowles (*Lr.*)

164. EMAN: John F. Andrews, Everyman Sh., London & Rutland, Vt., 1993-8?

Single-play revisions of Guild Sh. (no. 161). 16 vols. to date.

Idiosyncratic commentary in *Lr.* vol.

165. ARD3: Richard Proudfoot et al., Arden Sh., Third Ser., 1995-.

Full collation, Knowles (*Lr.*)

166. APPL: John Russell Brown, gen. ed., Applause Sh., N. Y. & London, 1996-.

Text freshly edited, with a "theatre commentary," i.e., the annotation is much concerned with staging.

167. PEL3: Stephen Orgel & A. R. Braunmuller, gen. eds., *Complete Pelican Shakespeare*, rev. ed., 2002.

IX. COMMENTARY NOTES

The commentary notes will provide, as in previous New Variorum editions, a condensed historical survey of significant attempts (including those of the present editor) to establish, elucidate, and interpret particular words, phrases, lines, and passages. Like the surveys of opinion in the appendices, the commentary should provide a comprehensive, historical perspective. This means that much commentary that seems to the editor mistaken will be included along with that which seems to him correct (mere nonsense of course to be excluded), and that wherever possible, credit will be given to the first editor, scholar, or critic to provide each explanation.

Scope and contents.

The commentary notes may be expected to provide the following kinds of information:

1. Editorial discussion of textual variants. The editor may wish to provide commentary on only the important and enduring cruxes and to exclude discussions of relatively unimportant variants; certainly cruxes which have been debated into the twentieth century should be treated. Only those variants actually printed in someone's text need to be discussed; unadopted conjectures are usually to be listed only in an appendix, without discussion. If, however, an editor thinks an unadopted conjecture warrants discussion, he or she is of course free to make an exception for it and treat it in the commentary notes. The discussion of variants should be in the briefest possible form--possibly a digest of arguments pro and contra the readings, with the names of the scholars and editors who introduced and/or espoused each argument, followed by the date and, for books, the page number, thus: JOHNSON (2nd ed. 1765), CAPELL (1783, 2:80), KINNEAR (1880, p. 156), WILSON (ed. 1939). A commentary note on textual variants should include a cross-reference to other conjectures in the appendix, thus: "See p. 000." However, no commentary note should be created merely to give such a cross-reference, since if neither the conjecture nor the original reading needs discussion in the commentary, the conjecture is probably of minor importance and does not merit the line of space among the notes that the cross-reference will take up.

2. Elucidation of particular words and phrases by defining terms, construing syntax, adducing parallel passages, identifying literary allusions, suggesting analogues and sources, etc. The commentary notes should not accumulate needless examples of usage or of verbal parallels; see below under "Selection." A word or phrase need be commented on only once, generally but not always at its first occurrence in the text. At the end of that comment, cross-reference should be made by TLN to other lines in which the term recurs with that meaning; those lines should in turn be given cross-reference notes to the original full comment, and the index should cite by line-number all occurrences of the term in the text. If, however, the editor intends to create an appendix on style in which all occurrences of a stylistic trait are tabulated by line number, that tabulation may serve in the place of such cross-references in the notes, rendering them unnecessary.

3. Interpretations of lines and passages, drawn from critical studies as well as from editions and commentaries. Such interpretation may include explanations of the sense of the lines, inferences about tone of voice, state of mind, or intent of the speaker, identification of metrical or stylistic features, placement of the passage in its larger contexts, comparison of the lines with others in the play or in the sources, the pointing out of topical allusions or basis in historical fact, the supplying of stage business, and so on. In light of the growing importance of performance criticism, such commentary may from time to time take into account theatrical "discoveries" by actors and directors about the interpretations of lines--a kind of commentary

first widely practiced by Furness. Actors' insights may be especially useful in interpreting what Alan Dessen calls "gestic terms," "like *this, there, here, yon, and thus*, where the meaning . . . is (presumably) to be completed or fulfilled by a motion or action from the speaker" (1984, p. 53). Of course, details of performance, however striking, should be included in the commentary only if they shed light on, or resolve some actual difficulty in, the text. In general, interpretation which attempts to be factual or objective should take precedence over subjective comments on literary merit and the like, but the fact that certain editors and critics noted particular passages as "beauties" or "shining passages" may be recorded here if anywhere, and not in the historical collation. There will probably be little or no room in the commentary notes for purely esthetic or appreciative criticism of the lines.

Quotation and citation.

In the commentary notes, as in the appendices, the editor must decide when to quote, when to paraphrase, and when merely to cite the commentary of other scholars and editors. Given the limits of space on a page, he or she ought to quote only when the originality of the criticism, the distinctiveness or precision of the style, the presence in the passage of the irreducible crux of an author's argument, or the probable unavailability of the book or essay to present or future readers makes direct quotation seem highly advisable. For a full discussion of the use and style of quotations, consult the later section on Editorial Policy and Style. The following are suggested as economical guidelines for some special cases:

Definitions. Quote the first glossary, dictionary, or edition to give each explanation of the Shn. instance. If further corroboration seems desirable, cite the *OED* by definiendum and number--e.g., "*OED* (Rebuke, *sb.* 1b)"--but quote from the *OED* only when its definition adds further illumination. See below under "Citation of dictionaries." Omit the definiendum if it is identical with the lemma or a near spelling or inflection of it. Further advice on style of citation is given below.

Proverbs. Credit the first person to recognize the line of the play as proverbial, and quote some form of the proverb if it seems useful to do so. If the form of the proverb in Tilley or in Dent's two Indexes is close enough, quote it; if one has a closer analogue, quote it, and cite but do not quote the proverb in Tilley or Dent. The names of others who have recognized the line as proverbial may be cited if additional support seems needed, but further examples of the proverb are unnecessary.

Biblical parallels. Credit the person to notice the allusion, but quote parallel Biblical passages sparingly, only when it seems instructive to do so--as, for example, when the language of the Geneva or Bishops' translation is closer to Shakespeare's language or meaning than that of the King James or other standard translations.

Shakespeare. There should seldom be any need to do more than cite lines from Shakespeare's other plays or poems; on the whole, quotation should be avoided. Any quotations from other Shakespearean plays should be from original texts, whether F1 (Hinman facs.) or a facsimile of a quarto. If there is doubt about which text to quote from, see "Quotations" in ch. XI, "Editorial Policy and Style."

Style of the notes.

With the few exceptions listed below, the form of the commentary notes will be that of the most recent Variorum volumes. The concrete examples in those editions will be a surer guide for handling special problems than any attempt to anticipate all such problems here, though some further advice is given later in this chapter.

Each note will begin with the TLN number(s) for the line(s) containing the matter being commented on; the number(s) will be indented two spaces and followed (in the printout) by one space but no period. A note for several consecutive lines should precede a note for the first of those lines. If the matter being commented on is a word or phrase, that word or phrase next appears as a lemma, followed without space by a square end-bracket; if the phrase is long, the first and last words of the phrase should be given, separated by spaced ellipsis points, thus:

183-4 **take . . . gage]**

Unlike the Textual Notes, in which some notes are prefaced only by line numbers, all commentary notes should have lemmata, in boldface type of the style (roman or italic) of the text itself. (Since all word-processing programs now provide boldface and italic boldface, there is no longer a need to signify it by wavy underlining in the typescript.) Lemmata should reproduce exactly all the accidental details of spelling, capitalization, spacing, hyphenation, etc., found in the Variorum text. Punctuation following the word or phrase is not included in the lemma unless the punctuation itself is commented on.

All the lines of the note after the first are printed flush left. When more than one lemma has the same line number, the number is not repeated for the second and successive lemmata, but these later lemmata are indented as far as the first (numbered) lemma. The note following each lemma begins with a capital and ends with a period. For the treatment of quotations and the citing of comments see ch. XI, "Editorial Policy and Style." All quotations in the notes will be set off by quotation marks, and this departure from older Variorum practice entails two further differences of style: ordinarily the Variorum editor will not need to set off his or her own comments in square brackets or to use the abbreviation "ED"; and comments by various authorities will not be separated from each other within a note by a long dash but simply by a space.

The original *Handbook* at this point included a sample page illustrating the layout of text, textual notes, and commentary notes. Since virtually any page of notes in any recent Variorum exhibits this format, no further example is offered here.

Writing Variorum commentary.

Here is a batch of helpful hints on writing line-by-line commentary notes.

Working space.

You need a large and well-stocked office, preferably in your library so that you have immediate access to any book or journal you might need, as well as to microfilms of STC items. You ought to have ample desk space, with room for computer, bookstands, standard reference works that you will use hourly, and for a spread of books, papers, snakes, notecards, etc. in use at any given minute.

You should have at arm's reach certain reference works that you will use constantly. These will certainly include facsimiles of F1 and the Qq, the Oxford and Spevack concordances, Globe and Evans's Riverside editions, Schmidt's *Lexicon*, the *OED* and J. Schäfer's *Documentation*, the Harbage-Schoenbaum *Annals*, the grammars of Abbott and Franz, Tilley's Proverbs and Dent's two Indexes to proverbs, the Bishops' and Geneva Bibles and Book of Common Prayer, a book or two on Elizabethan script and perhaps Hand D, and standard reference editions of Chaucer, Spenser, and major Renaissance dramatists.

Preliminaries.

Before you start even collecting material for the commentary you probably should have finished and have ready to hand the following:

1. Your text of your play, edited, supplied with TLN, and supplemented by lists of your emended accidentals and of press variants of the copy-text. You may want to keep this on a tilted bookstand next to your keyboard, since you will refer to it constantly for accurate lemmas and TLNs. Alternatively, you may simply want to have it on disc and call it up on a split screen while you write notes about it; in this way you can easily search back and forth in it by keyword or by TLNs obtained from the Oxford concordance or approximated from the running heads in Evans's Riverside ed.

2. A concordance (in old spelling) to your text. If yours is a Folio- or Quarto-only play, Trevor Howard-Hill's Oxford concordances will serve adequately (though note that in two or three volumes the TLNs must be adjusted). If yours is a mixed Q-F play, give a disc of your text to a computer technician, who will in an hour or two make a concordance from it by some standard program. If in addition you can easily separate out the stints of composers of your play, individual concordances for each of them can also be useful. I have concordances of Compositors B and E for the whole Folio, and would be willing to answer the occasional question about their stints.

3. Your textual notes, recording your historical collations and including the sources of conjectures adopted in editions.

4. Your appendix of unadopted conjectures.

5. Source texts with lineation established. If you have these on disc, you may as you go along add to them the bracketed TLN cross-references to notes referring to the sources, as they will appear in the printed Variorum.

6. Optional but very useful: on your disc, all F1 and Q texts, for searches of other occurrences of spellings, contexts, etc. of words you are annotating. These texts can be purchased from the Oxford electronic text archives. I have found them not always reliable but useful nonetheless. Alternatively, Q and F texts are now becoming accessible on-line.

7. Reference handlists: of which composers set which lines of your play; of which text (Q or F) of other plays you should generally quote from (the Oxford concordances are usually based on them); a list of phrases in your computer's phrase or macro library; etc.

8. A full bibliography, chronologically arranged, of all editions (and their supplements), commentaries, dictionaries, grammars, and books and articles. Since there is room in the commentary for little if any interpretive criticism, which is treated in a separate appendix, you may want to make an initial discrimination of purely critical works that do not promise to be relevant to commentary, and segregate these in a separate bibliography of criticism. Whatever occasional brief bits of material from these works may be judged to belong in the line-by-line commentary can be added to it later.

Note-taking.

1. If you are editing a play previously done by Furness, do not rely on his quotations or selection of material. Furness altered his quotations freely, and much that he recorded at length will now seem worth minor coverage while things that he overlooked altogether may seem surprisingly significant. You will have to re-read everything that he read. The same may be true of his son's editions.

2. If possible, take notes directly onto disc, so that in writing your commentary you can simply move around and re-copy your data rather than re-typing it all. You should use a program with a multitude of windows; you will need at least one file for each Act and will want to move between later and earlier Acts freely, and eventually you may wish both a file of rough notes for each Act and a counterpart file of your reworked and finished commentary based on them. You may also want to have enough windows to bring up other things--your text, textual notes, sources, etc.--for reference while you are note-taking or writing commentary.

3. Keep a daily log of each edition, article, etc. that you have taken notes from (one easy way to do this is to insert dates of completion in the margin of your chronological bibliography).

Thus if for some reason you lose a file with several days' work in it, you can reconstruct what needs to be re-done and re-inserted into an older, less complete backup copy of the file.

4. Work chronologically. Editors steal from each other endlessly, and the Variorum attempts to credit the originator of a comment, not a plagiarist. Also, editors quarrel with each other, and some later comments will make no sense unless you know what is being responded to. Many comments that appear in editions originate in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, *Notes & Queries*, etc. so that journals need to be read concurrently with editions; so do glossaries and dictionaries (as those by Hanmer, Capell, Nares, Dyce, Schmidt, and Onions, and the *OED*). It is always necessary to look in later vols. of multi-vols. eds., or in separately printed supplements to those editions, lest comments in errata and addenda lists be overlooked--for instance, Farmer's notes in the Appendix in Vol. 10 of Steevens (ed. 1773), Malone's in his 1780 *Supplement to Steevens* (ed. 1778), etc. One exception to strict chronology is the *OED*, which you will refer to endlessly throughout the whole process of the edition. If you have it on disc or have access to it on-line, you may want to search for all the citations for your play and enter them in your notes all at once. Eventually you will add many other definitions from *OED* too.

5. File (type) your notes under the appropriate TLN, and under the right lemmas for a given TLN. This half-organizes your notes from the outset.

6. Quote fully and accurately. Inevitably you will take many times more notes than you will ever use in the commentary. To avoid unnecessary work and waste of space, quote with a certain amount of ellipsis, cutting out anything you are unlikely to use in the note. There is no need to record endless periphrasis, repetition, needless quotation from the lines being discussed, the bad-mannered mutual insults of 18th- and 19th-c. editors, and so on. You will reduce everything still further in writing the commentary. In taking notes, reproduce accents and diacritical marks, small capitals, significant typography (italics, boldface), etc., which will usually (though not always) be reproduced in the commentary.

7. Check immediately (before you forget to) every citation and quotation adduced in your source so that you know from then on that it is genuine and accurate. If you find that that is sometimes impossible, mark the citation or quotation with some special mark that your computer can search for to allow later verification. I simply write myself notes within dollar signs, such as \$check this date\$, and from time to time search for \$ and clean up the whole batch of leftover problems.

The rest of these remarks concern special problems in *writing* the commentary.

Selection.

The selection of material is of course the responsibility of the Variorum editor. It is assumed that he or she will represent the whole range of known fact and opinion fairly and judiciously (attempting when possible to adjudicate between rival claims of different worth), and that the editor will not waste the reader's time with pointless and redundant material. Material too extensive for a note will be relegated to an appropriate appendix, though appendices will not be created unnecessarily to accommodate overlong notes, because multiplied appendices make the volume more difficult to use and can usually be avoided by judicious cutting or consolidation. As a corollary, anything that properly belongs in one of the usual appendices--interpretive criticism, stage traditions, theories of copy-text, matters of dating, unadopted conjectures, etc.--will normally not appear in the commentary notes. Instead, when necessary, the note will include a cross-reference to an appropriate appendix. Words, constructions, facts, ideas, etc. are annotated only once, and all recurrences in the text receive in the commentary only a cross-reference to the original note (see below).

There are some obvious economies. One may and should eliminate all *unnecessary* cross-references to other works of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. If Schmidt's *Lexicon* or

Abbott's *Grammar* cite sufficient examples to establish a Shakespearean usage, there is no need to cite all other parallel passages that have been adduced by dozens of editors. Similarly, if a definition is well established in *OED*, or a proverb in Tilley, or an idea or a theatrical or literary convention is discussed and documented exhaustively in some standard secondary work, there is no need in the Variorum to duplicate or augment the wealth of supporting data in those works; a reference to such definitive works is enough, and the additional citation provided by editors across the centuries can be ignored (though important exceptions are always possible, of course). Lengthy quotation from source texts is not necessary in the notes because the sources are printed in the appendix; simply include in the note a cross-reference to the appendix on sources: "See p. 000." Explanations which reappear with little change in note after note--e.g., of why the nature of copy text rules out certain proposed interpretations--probably should be replaced by cross-references to a place in the appendix where the subject is discussed fully once and for all--in this case, the appendix on Text. Stage traditions are a special problem; if a bit of traditional business actually clarifies a textual problem it may be included in the commentary note, but all other instances of business, however interesting, should appear only in the appendix on stage history, if anywhere. Material which does not elucidate the play but, for instance, shows the influence of the play on later artists in their visual illustrations, musical tone poems, literary imitations, etc., does not belong in the Variorum at all but in editions of those later artistic works. At present there are no plans to include expensive half-tone reproductions in Variorum volumes, especially since on-line collections of illustrations and photographs of actors, paintings, etc. are becoming increasingly available. Since in the future the Variorum will exist in electronic form and may eventually be available on-line, links to such collections may be possible.

Consistency of form.

For efficiency and reader ease the notes should resemble each other in their arrangement. Since the Variorum is a historical encyclopedia, chronological order is probably the overriding principle of organization: earliest comments tend to precede later comments. But in notes of any complexity or length other patterns of organization will also be used, and they should probably be as consistent as possible from note to note. If a word's lexical meaning is non-controversial, it might most conveniently come at the beginning of the note, followed by more interpretive comments. In *Lear*, where hundreds of readings vary between Q and F, I sometimes found it most efficient to dispose of the textual issues before moving on to definitions and interpretations; in general, however, I tried to begin a note with the glosses that most readers have an immediate interest in, before getting to details of textual bibliography, allusions, sources, etc. Long notes may be subdivided into paragraphs. For instance, a note at the beginning of a scene might have a paragraph on questions of scene division and numbering, another on the variant locales suggested for the scene, another on the time interval since the previous scene, another on staging problems, and another on critical statements about the scene's structure or importance. In particularly difficult notes, where dozens of different interpretations of a phrase have been offered, a merely chronological arrangement, jumping back and forth between one kind of interpretation and another as they appeared over time, would be utterly confusing. It would be better to organize such a note into three or four sub-headings--e.g., according to the several major *kinds* or classes of interpretation, or according to the three or four *sources* of disagreement (textual variants, ambiguities of syntax, etc.). Cross-references might generally go at the end of the note unless there was a reason to put them earlier, after a particular part of the note.

There should also be consistency of citational form from one note to the next. One way to ensure this is to make a phrase library for commonly used formulas, assigning macros to single computer keys. Then one can simply hit the *n* key (=noun) and get

OED (*sb.*): " "

or hit the *c* key and get

C{OLERIDGE} (MS notes, 1818-19, ed. Foakes, 1989, p.)
and so on, saving time and ensuring consistency. Using this method, one will not need every time to type in the curly brackets { } to indicate small caps, or remember if T{ILLEY}, H312 should have a comma and a space between letter and identification number, or what keys to strike to get the section symbol for A{BBOTT}, §32, etc. It is very time-saving to dedicate keys to frequently-used words--e.g., Z--to whatever book or edition one is working with at a given time, and then to change its macro with the next work used. Thus one week Z would mean F{URNESS} (ed. 1899), the next week B{RADLEY} (1904, p.).

In the case of *OED*, one might want to keep handy a written list of several different ways in which *OED*, citations are added to the notes, e.g.:

OED (How *adv.* 4b): “ .”

OED (*ppl. a.* 1): “ .” [where the lemma does not need repeating]

L{EE} (ed. 1908): “Disgrace” (*OED*, *sb.*¹ 2).

which means “invention” (*OED*, 3).

etc. Eventually one will collect a reference list of other repeated but not so frequently used special formulas: M{ALONE} (*apud* S{TEEVENS}, ed. 1778), etc.

Cross-references.

To the extent that it is possible, these should be added to the notes as you write them:

1. For words. Normally the first time a word that needs glossing appears in the text it will be fully annotated--for sake of example, *Nature* at line 29. At the time of writing that note, check in the concordance of the play and see how many other times *nature* occurs with that same meaning; then insert a list of the line numbers of those occurrences at the end of the note, in this form:

Cf. 103, 336, 854, 2166, 3469.

Then, also at that time, insert cross-reference notes in the later, still-to-be-written files of notes, at the appropriate TLN numbers, in this form:

2166 **Nature**] See n. 29.

Later when you arrive at line 2166 and see this note in your file, you will realize that you need do nothing more; a note for the word already exists earlier in the edition. This practice will save effort and avoid duplication of the same note.

2. For particles, features of syntax, etc., that are not easy to search for in the concordance or by computer search, keep a running list as you go along of notes you have written on such things as a = on, a = o', a = of, a = at, a = in, a = he, an't = of it, an't = on it, ath' = of the, ath' = on the, etc. Then as you find the same feature later on you can just consult your list and find out which early note to refer back to instead of writing a new note. Similarly with a grammatical structure described by Abbott: the first time you quote from Abbott, check his index for the play to find all the other times he thinks that that structure appears in the play, and at this time insert in the later note files at these places all cross-references to your original note quoting Abbott on this feature. This will save a lot of hunting backwards later on to see if a note on a subject already exists.

3. Explanatory cross-references. For references to earlier definitions, probably the form “Nature] See n. 29.” is clear enough; the reader will expect to find a definition of that word at n. 29. If a letter is referred to in line 2289, and the editor wishes to direct the reader to an earlier mention of that same letter in line 402, again the form “letter] See 402.” is probably clear enough. But the intent of other cross-references may not be so immediately obvious, and in

such cases one should give some minimal hint to the reader of their purpose, so that the reader may decide if he or she wants to turn back in the edition or note, e.g.:

1176 **create**] For the truncation of the participle see n. 43.
662 **Nothing . . . nothing**] The same idea as in 96.

Citation of dictionaries.

Often the first definition of a Shakespearean word occurs in the glossary of an edition--Hanmer, Capell, Dyce--or in a separate Shakespeare glossary--Nares, Schmidt, Onions. These usually cite several parallel passages from Shakespeare and so obviate the need for further cross-referencing to his plays. Nonetheless, especially for rare words, supporting evidence from Shakespeare may be sparse or non-existent, and the given glosses may be conjectural or unreliable. I regularly follow such glosses with a parenthetical citation of the counterpart definition in *OED*, thus:

motion] S{CHMIDT} (1875): "An attack in fencing" (*OED*, *sb.* 3c).

This not only gives support to Schmidt but also provides a wider context of reference than simply Shakespeare's works.

In citing the *OED*, it is useful for understanding of the Shakespearean idiolect if our citations give all the information about it that the *OED* provides. If the *OED* quotes from your play (or cites by line number) the very usage you are defining, in order to exemplify its definition, you might usefully include that information, thus:

charges] *OED* (v. 22): "Attack or assail with impetuosity," quoting this line.

alarumd] M{OBERLY} (ed. 1876): "Roused . . . as by an alarum" (*OED*, Alarmed *ppl.* a. 1, quoting this line as its first ex.).

D{EIGHTON} (ed. 1891): "Ridicule . . . by your grins" (*OED*, Smile v. 7, quoting this line as its only ex.).

vpon his misconstruction] W{RIGHT} (ed. 1875): "In consequence of his misunderstanding me" (*OED*, Upon *prep.* 11c; Misconstruction 1: "misconstruing . . . words or actions," citing this line).

In cases where the *OED* implies that Sh. coined the word, always check in Jürgen Schäfer, *Documentation in the O.E.D.* (Oxford, 1980). In cases where a later ed. merely repeats the *OED* definition and the *OED* had originally cited or quoted the Shn. line in its definition, there is no need to quote the editor at all; just cite *OED*, where the definition originated.

OED3 has abandoned the old abbreviation *sb.* (substantive) in favor of *n.* (noun). I (RK) am content to leave *sb.* for definitions derived from the original *OED* and use *n.* for newer ones, since such designations are historically accurate, reproducing the text cited; other editors may wish to use only the current *n.* throughout. It makes little difference.

The first ed. of the *Handbook* was unfortunately ambiguous on the use of older (i.e., 16th-, 17th-, and 18th-c.) dictionaries, advising that the first dictionary to define a word should be quoted. The intent was not to quote the first dictionary ever to define the word at all, but rather the first to define it as it appeared in the given Shakespearean play, as Dr. Johnson often does (and as *OED* does in the examples above). There was never any intent that the Variorum editor needed to read every early dictionary to find the first definition of a word that might suit a given Shakespearean context. The editors of the *OED* have already done much of that work, and often quote from these early dictionaries. Nonetheless, editors often find that a definition from a contemporary glossary is worth quoting because it adds a nuance

or synonym not in *OED*. For the convenience of Variorum editors, therefore, we append a list of some of these early dictionaries, all available in modern reprints, and some electronically via the EMEDD (see ch. XIV):

- Galfridus Anglicus. *Promptorium parvulorum*. 1449.
 Palsgrave, John. *Lesclarcissement de la Langue Francoyse*. 1530.
 Huloet, Richard. *Abcedarium Anglico-Latinum*. 1552.
 Cawdrey, Robert. *A Table Alphabetical*. 1604.
 Cotgrave, Randle. *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues*. 1611.
 Florio, John. *Queen Anna's New World of Words*. 1611.
 Bullokar, John. *An English Expositor*. 1616. 3rd ed. 1663.
 Minsheu, John. *Ductor in Linguas*. 1617.
 Cockeram, Henry. *The English Dictionarie*. 1623. 2nd ed. 1626.
 Blount, Thomas. *Glossographia*. 1656.
 Phillips, Edward. *The New World of English Words*. 1658. 4th ed. 1678.
 Blount, Thomas. *A World of Errors Discovered in the New World of Words*. 1673.
 Ray, John. *A Collection of English Words*. 1674. 2nd ed. 1691.
 Holme, Randle. *Academy of Armory*. 1688.
 E., B. *A New Dictionary of the Terms . . . of the Canting Crew*. [1699].
 Kersey, John. *A New English Dictionary*. 1702.
 ----- . *Dictionarium Anglo-Britanicum*. 1708.
 Bailey, Nathan. *An Universal Etymological Dictionary*. 1721.
 Wesley, John. *The Complete English Dictionary*. 1753.
 Johnson, Samuel. *A Dictionary of the English Language*. 2 vols. 1755. 4th ed. 1773.
 Grose, Francis. *A Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue*. 1785.

Some later dictionaries of interest are:

- Farmer, John S., & W. E. Henley. *Slang and Its Analogues*. 7 vols. 1890-1904.
 Wright, Joseph. *The English Dialect Dictionary*. 6 vols. 1898-1905.
 Partridge, Eric. *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*. 1937. 6th ed., 1967.
 ----- . *Shakespeare's Bawdy*. 1948. Rev. ed. 1969.
 Colman, E[rnest] A. M. *The Dramatic Use of Bawdy in Shakespeare*. 1974.
 Williams, Gordon. *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature*. 3 vols. 1994.

X. THE APPENDICES

As in past New Variorum volumes there will be appendices on the Text, Date, Sources, Criticism, Stage History, Music, and special problems of the play. In most respects these appendices will resemble those in recent editions, and no attempt has been made to give detailed instructions about most of them. The following remarks attempt mainly to clarify some points and to discuss a few questions of scope and of procedure.

Emendations of Accidentals.

This appendix, related to the text of the play, should present a selected list of accidentals emended in the copy-text. The list should include those changes of the text which are not even of semi-substantive importance and so are not recorded in the textual notes, yet are of sufficient textual or bibliographical interest that they merit recording in the edition. The discussion in ch. II, "The Treatment of the Text," indicates what kinds of changes of accidentals should be recorded in this list, and a checklist of such details has also been provided in ch. VI on "Textual Notes." The style of the entries will be similar to that for the textual notes: the emendations are to be listed consecutively by TLN, and each entry will include a lemma as emended in the text, the source of the emendation (except for such purely typographical matters as turnovers), and the original reading of the copy-text, thus:

1771 there] F2; thete F1
1879 yerewhile?] yere-|(while? (*turnover*) F1

When no misunderstanding will result and economy is gained, subsequent emendations of the same kind may be summarized in the note on the first such emendation. E.g.,

14 alone.] ~ ^ F1. *Periods are also supplied at 132, 1810, and 2045*

or

147 *Exit.*] ~ ^ F1. *Periods are also supplied after stage-directions at 1001, 1340, and 1481*

Conjectural Emendations.

This appendix presents a comprehensive list of unadopted conjectural emendations of the text (other conjectures, that have been adopted by editors, are recorded in the textual notes). The purpose of this list is to remove from the textual notes those proposed emendations of the text that are so doubtful that no editor has ever adopted them, and yet to preserve them in an appendix as part of the historical record of attempts to emend the text. The list should include all conjectures ever published in editions, commentaries, notes, etc., that are not already recorded in the Variorum's textual or commentary notes--i.e., this is a supplementary rather than a complete list. Manuscript conjectures and emendations, such as appear in the marginalia of a number of early editions in the Folger Library, may be included in the appendix, but the choice may be highly selective, to exclude the silly and trivial. Any Collier (Perkins Folio) emendations which neither Collier nor any other editor adopted in a text should be ignored. Editions used for their manuscript annotations should be listed with other editions consulted, in the introductory "The Plan of the Work," as in recent Variorum volumes, and they should be assigned sigla if those are not already assigned, for the sake of economical recording of the conjectures (see ch. XII, "Abbreviations and Sigla"). The entries should include a lemma, each conjecture, and in small caps the siglum for every edition or the last name of every scholar

who ever proposed the emendation, as well as the date and page when the absence of a siglum makes them necessary, thus:

171 where] whence {CAPN}, {SIS}; when m{TBY}2, {BULLOCH} *apud* {CAM}2; were {TIECK} (1920, p. 321).

Text.

Besides the customary discussion and representation of opinion on the problems of the text--authenticity, multiple versions, provenance, composition, kinds and sources of corruption, etc.--this appendix will include one or two tabular lists:

1. A complete record of variants due to press-correction of the copy-text and of any other substantive texts. All such variants should be recorded, even for features not reproduced in the Variorum text, such as headlines, catchwords, and page numbers. The arrangement of variants should be by formes, and line numbers for variants should be given in TLN. The edition of Beaumont and Fletcher edited by Fredson Bowers provides adequate models for the format of the list of press-variants, as do recent Var. eds. of *AYL*, *Ant.*, and *WT*. In this list the original typography (including long-*s*, *vv* for *w*, ligatures, digraphs, turned letters, and printing space-types) should be reproduced as accurately as possible, and the treatment of special problems (ornaments, swash letters, rules, and broken types) should be agreed upon jointly by the Special (Textual) Editor and the General Editor(s).

2. An optional list of trivial substantive variants introduced into modern editions. Certain verbal changes--*who/whom*, *does/doth*, and the like--though technically substantive have little or no actual effect on meaning. They are usually modernizations or attempts to achieve grammatical consistency. Should such variants arise in seventeenth-century editions they must be accorded textual notes and be carried through the full range of collation. Should they arise in post-seventeenth-century editions they may be ignored, though the editor may list them in the textual appendix for the benefit of students of language. If there are too few such variants for a separate list, they may be included in the Textual Notes or ignored altogether. See rule 9 under "Variants of accidentals" in ch. VI, "Textual Notes."

Editors may find useful Trevor H. Howard-Hill's *Shakespearian Bibliography and Textual Criticism: A Bibliography*, 2nd ed., rev. & enl., 2000.

Date of composition.

Recent Variorum editions will provide models for handling the various kinds of evidence generally used to locate the play's date of composition--external historical facts (S.R. entries, contemporary reference, title-pages, etc.), internal allusions to persons and events, apparent influence from (or upon) the play's literary and theatrical milieu, stylistic evidence (vocabulary, rhetorical devices, versification, etc.), Shakespeare's artistic development as possibly inferable from his genres, subjects and themes, modes, tones, etc., and his characteristic or possible rate of composition as represented in various proposed chronologies of his works.

Sources.

The new Variorum editions will continue to include texts of sources, though the increasing availability of such texts elsewhere authorizes an editor to limit what he or she prints in the edition, and the treatment of sources will differ somewhat from play to play. The principle of selectivity will be: the closer the play's following of the source, and the more detailed the

indebtedness, the more desirable to print the source, even though it may be easily available in Bullough or elsewhere. The Variorum should be as self-contained as possible, and it is a great convenience to have the source within the volume or electronic version for instant consultation. In the case of an extremely long source, such as a complete play or novel, the editor may provide only selections; certainly any passage alluded to in the commentary notes or critical appendices should be included among such selections. For sources in foreign languages the editor will in all probability wish to substitute a close translation, esp. one that Sh. could have known; for remote or doubtful sources, and for mere analogues, the editor may be content to provide no more than a paraphrase or synopsis.

The source texts will be presented in a diplomatic reprint, as far as possible according to the same standards used in the editing of the text of the play, so that the reader is presented with a source text that is identical in all essential details with the text Shakespeare would have used. Significant variants in other substantive texts of the source may be noted, though unnecessary proliferation of costly footnotes is to be avoided. Such footnotes should be numbered consecutively for each source and typed separately from the source text. There should be no glossarial or otherwise explanatory notes to the source texts; translations of Latin mottoes in the text may be provided in the notes, as well as the occasional textual variation among substantive texts. For the handling of such special problems as black-letter typography or translations, the guidelines detailed in ch. XI, "Editorial Policy and Style," under "Quotations" should generally be adequate. The original paragraphing and verse lining of the source should be followed, but prose is to be freely relined. The beginning of a new page in the original edition of the source is always to be indicated by the page (or folio or signature) number in italics within square brackets: in prose sources the bracketed number will be inserted into the line of text; in scenes from plays the bracketed number will appear in the outer right-hand margin to the right of the column of the line numbers (as in the Variorum play text itself), opposite the first line of the page; and in non-dramatic verse the bracketed number will appear either before a numbered verse or canto (as in the text of Daniel's *Civil Wars* in Matthew Black's Variorum *Richard II*) or in the outer right-hand margin opposite the first line of the page.

At the beginning of each passage of a source whose relationship to the play is discussed in a commentary note, the TLN number of that note should be inserted into the source text within square brackets; and in the commentary note a cross-reference should be made to the source text, thus: "See p. 000" (the page number to be supplied after page proofs are printed). Although elsewhere in the edition the references to particular lines of the play are made simply by the TLN number without the abbreviation "TLN," such references within the source text must be in the form [TLN 219] so as to distinguish such a cross-reference to a line of the play from [219], the indication of a new page in the original edition of the source. If the source text is in prose, these bracketed numbers will be inserted within the prose line; if the source is in verse or is a scene from a play, these bracketed numbers will appear in the same column as the line numbers, opposite the line containing the first word of the passage discussed.

Each major source text will in all probability be introduced by a headnote giving the basic facts of original publication, identifying exemplars consulted, explaining the choice and treatment of the copy-text, listing previous editions, and the like. As part of this note the editor should provide a list of the TLNs of all commentary notes in which some comparison is made between Sh.'s play and the source; this list will include all the TLNs that appear within brackets somewhere in the Variorum's source text. For examples see *AYL* (1977, p. 477), *MM* (1980, p. 302), or *Ant.* (1990, pp. 395-7).

The appendix on sources will as usual include quotation or summary of comments on Shakespeare's use of his sources. This section may immediately precede or follow the source text, whichever the editor thinks most appropriate.

At the discretion of the editor the appendix on sources may include a section on general influences, such as the work of other playwrights, theatrical fashions, literary traditions and modes, and intellectual or historical milieu. If it is included at all, this discussion should be

kept distinctly a subordinate part of the appendix: no texts will be printed, only those influences that seem to be consciously exploited or alluded to in the play should be discussed, and the treatment may be as limited as a brief essay or bibliographical note. Such material would not, of course, be duplicated in the appendix on literary criticism.

At the discretion of the editor, lengthy lists of sources and analogues suggested for particular passages that, if listed in the commentary notes, would unduly interrupt the text of the edition for a page or more may be collected in the appendix on sources, with cross references in the commentary notes.

Criticism.

The great mass of interpretive, analytic, and evaluative criticism on a given Shn. play is the most difficult part of the whole commentary on a play to represent adequately in the *Variorum*. The cause lies not only in the sheer amount written, but (especially recently) in the great variety of schools and approaches, many of which lead centrifugally away from the play as imaginative artifact experienced in the theater or study, and away from the customary terms and foci of literary discourse, to one or another branch of history, politics, epistemology, linguistics, esthetic theory, psychology, sociology, anthropology, and the like. The most honest advice to be given to *Variorum* editors about how to represent this mass and profusion is, We don't know how, but try anyway.

Furness's original spacious plan of printing a chronological series of excerpts of criticisms with a minimum of subdividing by topic seems impracticable, both because the bulk of criticism is now too large to allow anything like a comprehensive survey by this method, and because a series of consecutive criticisms going at the play in quite different ways results in a disjointed survey. There tend to be too many loose ends and blind alleys when quotations are excerpted from their contexts. On the other hand, it is always preferable to hear a critic speaking in his or her own words and voice, rather than at second hand in generalized paraphrase; and despite the availability of much older criticism in electronic data banks, the whole mass of criticism surveyed by a *Variorum* editor will never be available to readers, and hence some of the excerpts that he may provide may not be otherwise accessible (as is often the case in the old Furness volumes). It would seem that an ideal survey of criticism would have a considerable number of direct quotations of some length.

An alternative method used in recent book-length surveys of criticism on given plays is to write an essayistic summary and analysis of existing criticism, organized topically; but such a survey limits the amount of immediate and usable direct quotation that *Variorum* users have come to expect, and may tend to over-represent feebler and shallower kinds of criticism, almost implying that some sentimental Victorian essayist is on a par with Coleridge simply because he has been included. This kind of essayistic survey also makes more demands on the compiler than does a collection of excerpts, not simply in doing so much paraphrasing but also in describing critical schools or trends and locating particular critical works within them. This kind of analysis, however, is just what many readers will be looking for, a kind of topographical guide to the whole terrain.

To enjoy the advantages and avoid the weaknesses of both approaches, the *Variorum*'s survey of critical opinion will probably continue to employ the combination of both methods used in the most recent volumes. The survey will be topical in that it will be subdivided into sections on the play as a *whole*, its *merit*, its *genre* and relation to other plays, its *structure*, the individual *characters*, the *themes* and import (including topical or *drame à clef* significance), *style* and imagery, and any other subjects about which there has been significant discussion. The choice and order of these subdivisions may differ somewhat from play to play, but the classes just enumerated, moving from the most general to most particular of the old Aristotelian categories, seem to have appealed the most to recent editors. Within these categories the arrangement of entries will be generally chronological, and the criticisms will be

represented by a combination of directly quoted excerpts, of paraphrase and explanation, and of simple bibliographical citation. The one exception is the section on characters, in which the characters may be listed either in alphabetical order or according to diminishing importance of role, and the remarks about each character will be chronological. In deciding whether or not to quote directly, the editor should consider the guidelines in the section on "Quotation" in ch. XI, "Editorial Policy and Style," and both that subsection and the following one, "Citation of Sources," should provide adequate guidelines for the representation and citation of critics. After a body of quotation or paraphrase of an author has been given, later critics who substantially agree or who take pointed issue with the position may be briefly cited (in chronological order if possible) before the commencement of quotation or paraphrase of the next author in the overall chronological sequence; or general bibliographical notes may be appended to each subdivision of the appendix. Acceptable models for such procedure may be found in any recent Variorum.

Criticisms of the play's structure, characters, style, meaning, etc. made by actors, directors, and reviewers might well form a greater part of the history of criticism of the play than it has in past Variorum editions, not simply because they form a growing part of extant criticism but because they may help an actor think through a characterization or the shape of a scene, and thus make the Variorum more useful in the theater. In general, of course, such theatrical criticisms must be judged as academic criticisms are, i.e., quoted and discussed if they seem valuable and merely cited if they are unenlightening, unoriginal, or otherwise marginal.

Insofar as is practicable, the survey of critical opinion should do justice to both different times and different places and languages. A Variorum is in part a history of changing critical modes and tastes, and illustrates the changing construction of our concepts of an author. Brian Vickers's 6-vol. *Shakespeare: The Critical Heritage* is a good starting place for 18th-c. criticism, any volume by Furness will point towards important 19th-c. English and German criticism, and Garland bibliographies aim to cover 20th-c. criticism comprehensively; these should identify many of the historically important works. The criticism appendix should also try to suggest how Sh. has been received and understood by different cultures. The immense importance of German criticism in the 19th c. as surely has to be represented in some measure as does the growing volume of Japanese criticism in recent decades. Fortunately both the old *Sh. Jahrbuch* annual bibliographies and the recent *World Shakespeare Bibliography* are international in scope. Foreign-language criticism should of course be represented in English translation or by paraphrase. Unless the editor is multilingual, he or she may have to throw him- or herself on the kindness of foreign-language colleagues, or find grant money to hire a graduate assistant.

Style.

In order to include a great deal of information about style that would otherwise have to be given repeatedly in the commentary notes or else excluded altogether, the editor may wish to have a sub-appendix on style which names and discusses such stylistic features as metrical patterns, figures of rhetoric, images, features of the diction, passages printed as both verse and prose, etc., and then after each such discussion cites by TLN the lines of the play in which each feature appears. If such an appendix is used, it will probably be part of the survey of general criticisms on style found in the criticism appendix.

Topicality.

If identification and other topical allusions are too numerous or too unimportant to be treated conveniently in the commentary notes, they may be collected in a separate appendix (as in M. A. Shaaber's *2 Henry IV*) with cross-references in the commentary where advisable. More recent editors have collected such supposed allusions under the heading "Drame à Clef"

following the section on Themes. Since often the best in this kind are but shadows, the list may be highly selective and the discussion brief.

Staging and Stage History.

The history of the play on the stage should regularly include two essays--a history of performances, and a history of the text as modified for stage performance--and may occasionally include one or more discussions of special staging problems

Performances.

The basic fact about the history of performance in a Variorum is that it is an appendix to the rest of the volume. It cannot afford to be so generous of detail as an independent monograph would be. It needs mainly to record all the historically important performances and to give the reader useful information about changing styles of performance and the interpretive insights that great directors and actors have contributed to our understanding of the play. It cannot hope to assimilate and re-create appreciatively all the interesting details of setting, costume, stage business, gesture, interpretations of roles etc. as recorded by reviewers of each revival, but must select those details that convey the pith and essence of the production and the roles. Usually the particular flavor, innovations, limitations, special insights, etc. of a performance can be given in a sentence or two or three, and that, for better or worse, is the kind of compression that is needed if we are to fit 400 years of performance history into an essay of 25 or 30 pages of print. Brief as it must be, such an account may nonetheless give to a reader, actor, director, or designer some sense of the theatrical and interpretive possibilities realized in past productions

The appendix on stage history must necessarily cover an extremely selective list of performances of the play, limited to those of critical or historical importance. In general the list will include only performances in English on the professional stage in the largest cities and in the major Shakespeare theaters and festivals. Any performance referred to in the commentary or appendices of the edition will be considered to be of critical importance; any performance during Shakespeare's lifetime and the rest of the seventeenth century will be considered to be of historical importance. As for productions out of the mainstream of London and New York, there seems to be no point to recording the first known performance in every foreign country. Certainly the Stratford-upon-Avon performances are of major importance, but most of the fifty or so Shakespeare festivals now going on in Europe and North America, routinely reviewed in Shakespeare and theater journals, can probably be ignored unless they have caused a ripple--e.g., were widely imitated or cited in critical studies. Occasionally an off-off production, say by Poel or Nugent Monck, might be of real historical importance. Significant productions in media other than the legitimate theater, such as film, television, minstrel show, etc., may also be included, reflecting the burgeoning scholarship on Sh. in these other media, such as Robert Ball's book on silent movies, Kenneth Rothwell's and Annabelle Melzer's *Filmography and Videography*, histories of Sh. films by Rothwell, Anthony Davies and Stanley Wells, etc. Where important there should be a section on adaptations of the play into other kinds of plays, into operas, burlesques, etc. This section probably need be no more than a general summary, with reference to detailed treatments of the subject in works by Hazelton Spencer, Christopher Spencer, G. C. D. Odell, Montague Summers, and the like. Treatment of other "spinoffs" in imitative plays, narrative poems, novels, etc. should be minimal if included at all, since these only obliquely illuminate Sh.'s play, if at all.

The history should probably be more or less in chronological order and should give the date and place of an opening performance and the number of subsequent performances during the season; usually the names of the chief actor or actors, the director, and/or designer should also be given. The history of productions may from time to time quote from or refer to important

critical discussions and reviews. A discussion of changing styles of production of some plays might illuminate changing theatrical attitudes towards them, as would a discussion of changing theatrical conceptions of certain major characters (such as Hamlet or Shylock). The need for such discussion in the Variorum stage history, and its nature and extent, will depend largely on the kind of scholarship already available.

Special problems of staging.

Important details of stage business should be treated in the commentary notes at the appropriate place in the text rather than in a separate part of the appendix on stage history. If a staging problem needs more extended discussion than can conveniently be given in a commentary note, that discussion should be put at the end of the appendix on Staging and Stage History (see, e.g. Spevack's *Ant.*, 1990, pp. 777-93), and a cross-reference be given in the commentary note, thus: "See p. 000." Of course such extended discussions will be needed mainly in cases where a major staging technique, not mere stage business, is at issue, where there is a complex textual history to cope with and elaborate theories built on the evidence--e.g., the action above in *Rom.*, the monument scenes in *Ant.*, the fluid changes of scene in Act 4 of *2H4*, the staging of the bed in *Oth.*, the use of a trap in *Tit.* or *Ham.*, the use of suspension-gear in *Tmp.* or *Cym.*

The text of the play on the stage.

An innovation of the edition of *AYL* in 1977 was an appendix on the text of the play as it had been adapted by theatrical directors (as distinct from editors) from the first performances to the present day. This historical record of what portions of the play have seemed to need alteration in the theater has seemed so potentially useful as a guide to modern directors considering possible cuts and changes that it has been generally praised by reviewers and imitated in almost all subsequent Variorums. For the earlier centuries it has been based necessarily on the printed editions of stage versions, actual promptbooks being only occasionally available. For late nineteenth-century and twentieth-century productions, fewer printed stage editions are available, while quite a number of accessible promptbooks are listed in G. B. Evans's *Shakespearean Prompt-books of the Seventeenth Century* and Charles Shattuck's *The Shakespearean Promptbooks: A Descriptive Catalogue*; a select number of these, especially for influential productions, may be analyzed. The treatment of extant prompt-books will necessarily have to vary from volume to volume, since the number of prompt-books to be taken account of will vary widely from play to play, from very few for some plays to an enormous number for a popular play like *Hamlet*. William Halstead's 14-vol. *Shakespeare as Spoken and Statistical History of Acting Editions of Shakespeare*, based on the collation of 5000 acting editions and promptbooks, is sometimes inaccurate and lacking full discussion of the reasons for alterations, but it may serve as a useful adjunct to and check on the Variorum editor's similar analysis. Chadwyck-Healey's *Editions and Adaptations of Shakespeare* offers electronic texts of 95 adaptations. One of the appendices to this *Handbook* (see ch. XV) lists promptbooks in the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust library at Stratford, available on microfilm at the University of Illinois. Another appendix identifies, distinguishes, and attempts to provide means of dating some of the most important theater editions.

The organization of this section of the Variorum's appendix on Staging and Stage History should probably not duplicate the line-by-line, scene-by-scene record of textual changes found in Halstead's account. Rather, something like the approach found in Shaaber's treatment in *AYL* (1977) or Marga Munkelt's in *Ant.* would be more appropriate: an initial summary of the shape of each performance edition or prompt-book, and then analytical discussions of the kinds of cuts, alterations, and additions found in acting versions and the probable reasons for these changes.

Costume, Scenery.

There will be no appendix on costume; any historically important points should be made in the commentary notes or in a subsection of the appendix on staging and stage history.

There are no plans at present to include line or half-tone reproductions of scenes or scenery from historical productions, famous actors in their roles, artists' imaginative renderings of scenes or characters, etc. The Variorum has never been able to afford the space or expense for such illustrative material. So much of it is now becoming available at a number of on-line sites that the more likely expedient, in an electronic Variorum, would be hypertext links to such sites (or independent access to them).

Doubling of parts.

There will be no appendix on doubling. If the subject is to be handled at all it can be done within or just after the commentary notes on the dramatis personae. However, speculations about how the parts may have been assigned to members of Shakespeare's company, including possible doubling of roles, may most naturally appear in the discussion of original performance in the appendix on stage history.

Music.

Discussion of the dramatic function of each song ought to appear in the commentary notes at the appropriate place in the text if that is at all possible, and only if it is impossible should the discussion be moved to the appendix on music.

Phyllis Hartnoll's *Shakespeare in Music* (London, 1964) and Bryan Gooch and David Thatcher's *A Shakespeare Music Catalogue* (5 vols., Oxford, 1991) provide such thorough lists of musical settings of the songs that there seems no point in duplicating them in the edition, though omissions and recent additions to the list might be given if desired.

If the songs appear in the text as songs (and are not imported in performance) or if certain lines are clearly meant to be sung (such as the snatches of song in *Twelfth Night* 2.3), the appendix on music should include a musical score in accurate modern notation of the most likely or most important contemporary setting of the song, assuming one exists.

Studies of the songs and of related subjects such as operatic treatments of the plays should be cited. In addition to earlier works by Barclay Squire, Christopher Wilson, and Winton Dean, Gooch & Thatcher's *Catalogue* and Sadie's *New Grove Dictionary of Opera* are very helpful.

Bibliography.

The guidelines for the scope, content, and form of the bibliography are given in ch. XIII. Editions of the play that were consulted for textual variants or commentary, and special manuscript sources, should not be included in this general bibliography but should be listed separately, along with their sigla, in the introductory "Plan of the Work." If some kind of brief description of an edition is necessary it should follow the entry, within square brackets: but such commentary should be kept to a minimum. There should be no attempt to provide information about the provenance or peculiarities of each edition: if such information is worth recording it should be done in a separate essay printed outside the Variorum edition, as several have appeared in past years in *Shakespearean Research and Opportunities*, and more recently in *Shakespeare Newsletter* and other journals.

Index.

Each edition will have an index to the notes and appendices, listing all words and phrases in the copy-text that have been altered or commented upon, all authorities cited, and a limited list of subjects discussed. In a two-volume edition the index will be at the end of the second volume. All references in the index will be by page number, not by TLN or act-scene-line number; preparation of the index will therefore have to await page proofs.

Any word or phrase that appears as a lemma in either the textual notes (including those in the appendix on text) or in the commentary notes should be indexed. However, words in a lemma which are listed only because they are the first and last words of long phrases or passages do not need to be indexed. Generally the words should be given standard modern spellings in the index, unless there is some special reason for retaining an archaic or ambiguous spelling. Textual variants and conjectures should not appear as entries in the index. The entry for a given term should list all the pages on which that term appears in the text.

The index should list all works cited in the notes and appendices. Although Shakespeare's plays should be entered separately by title rather than under "Shakespeare, William," all other primary sources should be listed under the author's name; if the author is unknown, the source should be listed by short title. Works of scholarship and criticism should be listed by author only; the author's name should appear as it does in the bibliography, except that square brackets used to show editorial expansion or addition of names in the bibliography should not be printed in the index. If the author is not known, a short title of the book or journal (not of the journal article) should be listed. Textual readings and conjectures cited by sigla in the textual notes should not be indexed, but conjectures or comments identified by a full last name should be listed. Thus under "Theobald, Lewis" one would not list variants or conjectures recorded in the textual notes by the siglum "THEO," but one would list any conjecture or comment attributed to "THEOBALD." The bibliography will not, of course, be indexed, but all sources listed by short bibliographical reference in the commentary notes or in the appendices, rather than by full entries in the bibliography, should be indexed.

The subject-entries in the index should be a highly selective list. All proper names of persons, places, institutions, etc., should be listed, but beyond that there should be no attempt to give a complete index to all the subjects discussed in the edition. Only the most significant topics of discussion should be indexed, and of those topics, any that are discussed in a separate section of the edition need not be listed in the index.

The Chicago Manual of Style (14th edition or later) will be a good guide to the making of an index. It recommends the letter-by-letter system of alphabetizing, which the *MLA Style Manual* advises is more widely used than the word-by-word system.

XI. EDITORIAL POLICY AND STYLE

The following list of guidelines to be followed by Variorum editors is not exhaustive. Many matters of procedure and style that apply to only one part of the edition, such as the textual notes or the bibliography, are fully discussed in the *Handbook* chapters on those parts, and such discussions are not repeated here. For problems about other matters not covered in the following discussion, the editor should consult as the immediate authority Joseph Gibaldi's *MLA Style Manual* (1998 or later); if further advice is needed he or she should consult the latest edition of the *Chicago Manual of Style* and when necessary the General Editor(s). Except where specified the guidelines on style do not apply to quoted matter.

Permissions.

The MLA policy on permissions is the following: "The editors of the Shakespeare Variorum editions are responsible for securing any necessary permissions for the quotation of copyrighted material or unpublished noncopyrighted material. For guidelines on ascertaining when permissions are required, the editors should consult the *MLA Style Manual and Guide to Scholarly Publications*, 2nd edition (1998) 2.1.13-14 (pp. 43-45). Further guidance may be sought in *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 14th edition, 4.46-72 (pp. 144-53)" (private letter, 2002). This policy is based on the expectation that present "fair-use" doctrine obviates the need for permissions for most quotation that is likely to occur in a Variorum, and that editors will seldom if ever have to seek permission to quote.

Quotations.

As the amount of Shakespeare scholarship that must be represented in a Variorum edition increases with each passing year, there is less and less room in the edition for direct quotation of critical and editorial comment and more pressure for representation by paraphrase or mere citation. Nonetheless, since direct quotation is generally more immediate, vivid, and interesting, and often more exact and useful than paraphrase, a very considerable amount of direct quotation is highly desirable if not indispensable. In view of the limitations of space, the Variorum editor should select carefully those passages to be rendered verbatim and should be prepared to justify quoting them because of the originality and value of the criticism, the distinctiveness or precision of the style, the presence in the passage of the irreducible crux of the author's argument, or the probable unavailability of the book or essay to present or future readers.

All quotations should reproduce the original spelling and punctuation exactly except where patent error is silently normalized; [*sic*] should be used sparingly. The use of *u* for *v*, *i* for *j*, *æ* and *æ* digraphs, and the like should be retained, but purely typographical features such as long-*s*, swash letters, ligatures, etc. should be silently normalized to modern practice. Words printed in capitals or (in German books) with spacing between letters should be printed (with normal capitalization) in italics, and original italicization of proper nouns, emphasized words, etc. should be preserved. Titles of plays or of books given in quotation marks in the original should be normalized to italic. Black-letter should be normalized to roman, and roman in a black-letter context should be normalized to italic. All references and quotations in the comments of other editors and scholars should be verified; the accidental details of such quotations may be allowed to stand as they appear in the secondary source (except for the kinds of normalization described above), but substantive differences from authoritative texts of the originals should be noted by the Variorum editor wherever necessary. The treatment of act-scene-line numbers occurring within quoted passages is explained in a separate section below.

In direct quotations the text of Sh. quoted by the critic may be reproduced. Otherwise, quote from the following:

<i>Ado</i>	Q	<i>Ham.</i>	Q2+F	<i>Rom.</i>	Q2
<i>Ant.</i>	F	<i>JC</i>	F	<i>Shr.</i>	F
<i>AWW</i>	F	<i>Jn.</i>	F	<i>Son.</i>	New Var.
<i>AYL</i>	F	<i>LLL</i>	Q	<i>TGV</i>	F
<i>Cor.</i>	F	<i>Lr.</i>	Q1+F	<i>Tim.</i>	F
<i>Cym.</i>	F	<i>Mac.</i>	F	<i>Tit.</i>	Q+F
<i>Err.</i>	F	<i>MM</i>	F	<i>Tmp.</i>	F
<i>1H4</i>	Q	<i>MND</i>	Q	<i>TN</i>	F
<i>2H4</i>	Q+F	<i>MV</i>	Q	<i>TNK</i>	Q
<i>H5</i>	F	<i>Oth.</i>	Q+F	<i>Tro.</i>	Q+F
<i>1H6</i>	F	<i>Per.</i>	Q	<i>Wiv.</i>	F
<i>2H6</i>	F	<i>Poems</i>	New Var.	<i>WT</i>	F
<i>3H6</i>	F	<i>R2</i>	Q1+F		
<i>H8</i>	F	<i>R3</i>	F		

When commentary originally written in a foreign language is to be quoted rather than merely cited or paraphrased, it should be presented in translation rather than in the original language, and followed by a parenthetical identification of the original language: (Ger.), (Fr.), etc. There is, of course, no need to translate incidental occurrences in an English context of such things as well-known words, phrases, proverbs, and literary quotations in a foreign language.

All direct quotations (including translations and dictionary definitions) within the Variorum volume, whether in notes or appendices, will be enclosed within double quotation marks, so as to distinguish them clearly from paraphrase or editorial comment. (Source texts reprinted in the Sources appendix will not, of course, be enclosed in quotation marks.) Double quotation marks within a quoted passage will be normalized to single quotation marks according to standard practice. The punctuation within quoted passages will also be normalized in that periods and commas will go within both single and double quotation marks, regardless of their placement in the original. The initial letters of complete sentence are capitalized even though they may have been lower-case in the original. All editorial interpolations or substitutions within quoted material will be enclosed in square brackets; all editorial comment not inserted within a quotation will not be placed in brackets unless there seems some special reason for doing so. When a commentator quotes or paraphrases another writer, identify the source if it is possible and helpful to do so; and supply TLNs after quotations from your play:

“Very truly he has been described [A{NON}., 1931, p. 554] as rather a power than a character. So far from ‘shirking his proper responsibility’ [Q{UILLER}-C{OUCH} in W{ILSON}, ed. 1922, p. xxxiv], he controls the fate of all the characters.”

S{MITH} (ed. 1894): “Bacon, too, calls poetry ‘feigned history’ [*Advancement of Learning*, 2.4.2].”

“She would be ready to sacrifice her life for her brother, ‘as frankly as a pin’ [1323].”

In general, put regular citations before quotations and paraphrases, and interpolated editorial identifications after:

B{ARNET} (1968, pp. 122 ff.) argues that Sh. intentionally made the plot less plausible, and in particular that the love at first sight of Rosalind and Celia suggest that (p. 126)

“suddenness and improbability are part of the meaning of the play.”

To K{ITTREDGE} (ed. 1936) this seems “‘a great reckoning in a little room’ [*AYL* (3.3.15 [1625-6])].”

The treatment of verse passages from plays or poems will vary with the occasion. In the commentary notes, where space is at a premium, quoted verse will be lined continuously, with capital initials for each line but without vertical lines to indicate line-division, thus: “I know a bank where the wilde time blowes, Where Oxslips and the nodding Violet growes.” In the

critical appendices, the verse quoted within a critical comment should be arranged as it appears in that source, either lined continuously with the text or separated from the text and centered. The editor may, of course, choose not to quote the Shakespearean lines but rather to elide and cite them.

Observe the following general rules in dealing with critics' quotations of Sh.:

a) If the quotation is merely ornamental or casual, no citation need be given, particularly if the quotation is not from the play being edited.

b) If the quotation is brief and especially if it is so integral to the structure of the sentence that ellipsis would create an ugly hiatus, let it stand and add a [bracketed] citation.

c) If ellipsis is a genuine saving and a whole line or whole lines are being quoted, delete the quotation and substitute, for example, [quotes 2023-7], [Quotes "I know . . . growes, *MND* 2.2.249-50 (630-1)]. The notation "Quotes" may be omitted if the syntax flows smoothly without it. In the appendix on criticism (and in other appendices in which comments may be quoted at length), when commentators quote from the play at hand, as a general rule substitute TLN citations if the quotation is more than a few words: "She has said so to Angelo [quotes 1109-12]"; "She speaks of the Duke as of a Person she had been long acquainted with. [Quotes 1778-9]." (In the second case the quotation was separated by a period from the sentence.)

d) If partial lines are quoted, the form is [quotes 'I . . . mackerel' (1998-9)]. In this case the Variorum text is quoted.

e) Numbers should be in their briefest form, as in (d); write 1999 f. rather than 1999-2000.

See also *Act, scene, and line reference*, below in this chapter.

The omission of material within a quoted comment should be indicated by three spaced periods (ellipsis points) following the final punctuation mark (if any) of the clause, whether the omission amounts to a word, one or more sentences, whole paragraphs, or pages. If the ellipsis affects the end of a sentence but leaves standing the expression of a complete thought, the terminal punctuation is closed up to the last word and the ellipsis points follow. If it affects the beginning but leaves standing a complete thought, the new initial letter is capitalized. Thus "All Shakespeare's imagery can be grouped in relation to Life and Death, as we saw in Chapter V. We also noticed that the imagery connected with Love is correlated with that of Life." may be rendered "All Shakespeare's imagery can be grouped in relation to Life and Death. . . . The imagery [etc.]" In the appendices (but not in the commentary notes) the beginning of a new page in the source being quoted from should always be indicated by the italicized page number within square brackets. Thus a quotation headed FLEMING (1905, pp. 199-200) might indicate the beginning of a new page in such ways as the following:

a) within a sentence: "----- [200] -----
-----."

b) with a new paragraph: "-----
[200] "-----
-----."

c) following ellipsis: "----- . . . [200] -----
-----."

d) new paragraph after ellipsis: "----- . . .
[200] "-----
-----."

The beginning of a new page will not be indicated in quotations within the commentary notes. The page or folio indications within the reprinted texts of Shakespeare's sources are treated above in ch. X on the appendices, under "Sources."

Except in the commentary notes, the paragraphing of the original source of a quotation should be reproduced: i.e., any sentence beginning a paragraph in the original should begin a

paragraph in the Variorum appendix. However, when successive passages of quoted commentary do not themselves begin a paragraph in the original, they may be run together in the Variorum appendix, even though whole paragraphs or pages intervene in the original. The following imaginary example illustrates several kinds of changes of page and ellipsis:

CHARLTON (1939, pp. 51-6, 81): “-----
 ----- . . . [52] -----
 ----- . . . [54] -----
 [55] “-----
 ----- . . . [56] -----
 ----- . . . [81] -----
 -----.”

In this example the fifth line from the bottom is understood to be the last line on p. 54, and the next line to begin a new paragraph on the top of 55. If there were any intervening lines (omitted from the quotation) either on p. 54 or on p. 55, three ellipsis dots would follow the period in the fifth line from the bottom in the example. In lengthy quotations, show every new paragraph-beginning by indentation, even when the new paragraph follows ellipsis points at the end of the previous line, or is preceded by bracketed numbers indicating page division. But when, after ellipsis, the next quoted line is not in fact the beginning of a new paragraph in the original (even though it may be somewhere *in* a new paragraph), simply run on this next line continuously immediately after the ellipsis points, so as not to indicate erroneously that this line began a paragraph in the original.

Editorial comment following a quotation in a commentary note should generally continue in the same paragraph; editorial comment (including citation of other sources) following a particular quotation in an appendix should begin a new paragraph without a line of space between the quotation and the paragraph; when such editorial comment follows a whole subsection in an appendix rather than a particular quotation, it should be separated by a line of space from the preceding quotation.

Citation of sources.

The sigla for editions are to be used only for the citing of textual readings or conjectures in the Variorum’s textual notes or appendix on text; any reader interested in checking the original passage may locate it by using the full bibliographical reference for a given edition supplied in the Variorum’s introductory “Plan of the Work.” A chronological list of the sigla and brief citations of the editions they represent will be printed on pastedowns within the front and back covers of the edition for the sake of easy reference by readers using the textual notes. Reviews of play performances cited in the appendix on stage history, and editions of primary sources occasionally referred to in the commentary and appendices, will be given brief bibliographical citations *ad loc.*, sufficient for a reader to locate the review or passage, and such items will not be entered in the Variorum’s general bibliography. For all other information or commentary cited throughout the edition--i.e., for the great majority of the scholarship and criticism referred to--the source will always be indicated by the last name of an author or editor, followed by a parenthesis containing the minimum of bibliographical information which will enable a reader to locate the original passage with the help of the Variorum’s list of editions or its general bibliography of works cited. The sigla for editions will never be used to record an editor’s opinions (as opposed to textual readings and conjectures), not only on the humane grounds that these sigla butcher or ignore the name of the person whose ideas one is using, but also for the practical reason that the sigla by themselves do not give any sense of the chronology of the comments, necessary in both the notes and appendices. The author should be named by last name only; initials should precede the name only if there is a need to distinguish

him or her from someone with the same name writing in the same year--e.g., to distinguish F. P. Wilson (1939) from J. D. Wilson (1939). Whether the author is being quoted, paraphrased, cited, or merely mentioned, his or her last name should be typed in caps (to be printed in caps-small caps), thus--C{APELL}, E{LZE}, A{NON}, C{HAMBERS}. Any square brackets around all or part of this name as it appears in the bibliography, indicating that the name is not so printed on the title page of the book or essay, should not be printed in these short citations, whose main purposes are to name the author and to direct the reader to the full and precise entry in the general bibliography: e.g., the bibliography's [Heath, Benjamin] would be indicated by H{EATH}; N[icholson], B[rinsley] would be indicated by N{ICHOLSON}; etc.

The parenthesis following the author's name should contain the minimum of information the reader needs to locate the original, given the Variorum's lists of editions and works cited. Dates should always be given except for the *OED* and *DNB*. An indication that the work being cited is an edition of Shakespeare should always be given so that the reader is directed to the list of editions rather than to the general bibliography. Page numbers should be given if they help the reader to locate the passage quickly: they would not be given for a note keyed to a line in an edition of the play, or for an item in a book arranged alphabetically, or for a one-page note in a journal; they would be given for a passage in the introduction or an appendix to an edition of the play. Volume numbers should be given for books of more than one volume, and section numbers (e.g., §29) may be substituted for page numbers where advisable. Short titles should be given only when the bibliography lists two titles for an author in the same year, or for anonymous works, which are arranged alphabetically by title in the bibliography. The following are some sample citations:

W{ILSON} (ed. 1939): [Citing a note on a line of the play.]
 W{ILSON} (ed. 1939, p. 168): [Citing an appendix in an edition]
 J{OHNSON} (2nd ed. 1765): [Citing the second of two editions by Johnson in 1765]
 K{INNEAR} (1880, p. 156): [Citing a passage in a book]
 L{AW} (1927, p. 238): [Citing a passage in a journal article]
 C{APELL} (1783, 2:80): [Citing the second volume of Capell's *Notes*, 1783]
 A{NON}. ("Shakespearian Glossaries," 1869, p. 85): [Now known to be by Thomas S. Baynes, rpt. 1894.]
OED (Shot *sb.*¹ 21b):
 O{NIONS} (1911):
 A{BBOTT} §27, F{RANZ} §49
 S{CHMIDT} (1874): [vol. 1]; S{CHMIDT} (1875) [vol. 2]
 I{DEM} (ed. 1728): [Citing a note from Pope's 1728 ed. immediately after citing one from his 1723 ed.]
 L{LOYD} (*apud* SINGER, ed. 1856, 5:305-6)

The citation for a direct quotation should precede the quotation, separated from it by a colon followed by a space, thus:

W{ATT} (ed. 1907): "-----."
OED (Fire *sb.* 14): "-----."

When such a citation heads a specimen passage of criticism in one of the appendices it should be indented two spaces. When paraphrasing or merely citing sources, the editor may work citations into the sentence as seems most convenient, thus:

C{HAMBERS} (1930, 1:381) also dallies with the idea.
 . . . a position also taken by T{OLMAN} (1925, p. 12) and P{INK} (ed. 1935, pp. 2-3).

In citing a volume of a work whose volumes were published over several years, the date given will be that of the volume cited--B {ULLOUGH} (1966, 6:21), the earlier volumes having been published 1957-64. For such a special case as Capell's vol. 1, pt. 1, which was printed in 1774, withdrawn, and republished unchanged in 1783, the form CAPELL (1783 [1774], 1:46) may be used.

Cross-references.

Rather than repeat the substance of a note in other notes, the editor should make cross-reference notes to one note discussing the issue fully. For instance, a note for line 786 explaining the significance of a certain kind of image that is repeated elsewhere in a play might end, "Cf. 235, 495, 1246, 2365," and each of those lines would have a note like "235 **Eye of Heauen**] See n. 786." If, however, an editor decides to create an appendix on style in which all occurrences of stylistic traits are tabulated by line number, that tabulation will serve in the place of such cross-references in the notes and will render them unnecessary.

In cross references, distinguish between "see 2469," a reference to a line of the play, and "see n. 2469," a reference to the commentary note on that line.

A cross-reference from a note to an appendix will not name the appendix but will simply read "See p. 712." Since the exact page number cannot be known until page proofs are printed, the typescript for such a note should read "See p. 000."

Act, scene, and line reference.

All reference to lines of the play being edited will be by the through line numbering (TLN) of consecutive lines, printed in multiples of five in the margin to the right of the text. Since this system of numbering lines involves only line numbers and not act and scene numbers, there is no need to prefix the abbreviation 1. or 11. to the numbers when citing the lines: one may simply say "See 235," "Cf. 2417, 2530," "An example of this idea is found in 1872-92," etc. Any reference in quotations to lines of the play by act-scene-line numbers should be supplanted by the correct TLN numbers in brackets, thus: "A similar figure occurs at [254]; cf. [486, 698]."

Whenever reference is made to lines from a Shakespearean play other than the one being edited, both Riverside act-scene-line numbers and TLN numbers should be given; as in the previous paragraph, such numbers should be substituted within square brackets for any line numbers appearing within quoted matter. If the act-scene-line number is in parentheses (or brackets), the TLN number should be put in the same parentheses and separated from the Riverside numbers by parentheses or brackets as appropriate--e.g., [4.3.102-4 (2617-19)]; if the act-scene-line number is not in parentheses, then the TLN number should follow in its own parentheses--e.g., *TN* 2.3.27 (726). TLN numbers for quoted lines from any play may easily be found by looking up the first and last words of the passage in the appropriate volume of the Oxford Concordances (though one should beware of occasional misnumbering in those volumes, noted in their prefaces).

In referring to a single act, use the form "Act 2." In referring to an individual scene, use either the act- and scene-number (3.2) or, if the act is clear from the context, the scene-number with the abbreviation "Sc." (Sc. 2). A scene-number should be given to a scene which is the only scene in an act, e.g., *Tit.* 1.1, *Jn.* 1.1, 2.1.

Line references to plays or poems by other writers than Shakespeare should use the lining system of the edition being used; if one is lacking, at least the number of the page, leaf, or signature of the original on which the passage occurs should be given. Some cases may require special treatment, as for example the reference to page, column, and line of the 1587

Holinshed, vol. 3 in the form 493/2/48-51--i.e., page 493, column 2, lines 48-51. A list, provided in the Plan of the Work, of standard editions of standard authors that are cited

throughout the volume will avoid the need to give full citations of those editions every time their authors are cited or quoted in the notes: see, e.g., Mark Eccles's *MM*, 1980, pp. xix f.

Use of abbreviations.

A full list of abbreviations to be used in the Variorum edition is given separately in ch. XII. They are not to be used in quotations or titles, since words in quotations and titles are to be given *literatim*, not in abbreviated form. The editor must use the sigla for editions in the textual notes, and should generally use the abbreviations provided for Shakespeare's plays, literary journals, and well-known reference tools. Some option is allowed for common reference abbreviations, though *Sh.* (Shakespeare), *Sh.'s* (Shakespeare's) and *Shn.* (Shakespearean, Shakespearian, Shaksperian, etc.) should always be used if at all possible. Generally accepted abbreviations for well-known literary works (*F.Q.* [or *FQ*], *P.L.* [or *PL*]) may be used at the discretion of the editor. As in recent Variorum editions a list of all abbreviations and symbols used in the edition will be provided in the introductory "Plan of the Work."

Spelling.

The spelling in quotations and titles should be reproduced exactly. Otherwise, standard American spelling, as given in the latest edition of Webster, should be used. For words not found in Webster, use the *OED* spelling. The use of the abbreviation "*Shn.*" should generally avoid the problem of which form, *Shakespearean* or *Shakespearian*, ought to be used; but if ever the problem cannot be avoided, the spelling *Shakespearean*, which seems now to have become the standard American spelling, is preferable. The spelling *Vergil* should be preferred.

Hyphenation is usually determined by common usage, but where alternatives exist we try to apply a rule of thumb: do not hyphenate unless the two words are sometimes printed as one: thus *prompt-book*, but *stage direction* and *speech prefix*.

The voiced genitive *s* should be used after the singular form of proper nouns: Burns's poems, Marx's theories, Berlioz's music, Lovelace's book, Furness's conjecture. After the plural form only an apostrophe should be used: Williamses'.

Numbers designating centuries should be abbreviated rather than spelled out: "18th-century ideas" (or "18th-c. ideas") rather than "eighteenth-century ideas"; "16th century" or "16th c.," not "sixteenth century." Decades should be spelled out--"the nineties"--unless the whole number is given--"the 1590s."

Capitalization and italics.

Follow these conventions:

King's men, Duke's company, Paul's boys

In book titles in Latin, Italian, French, etc., follow *MLA Style Manual* rules.

Capitalize the first word of subtitles.

In any quotation (including readings in the textual notes), distinguish caps and small caps, roman and italic in the original: SCENE/*S*{*CENE*}/*{SCENE}*, HAMLET/*H*{*AMLET*}/*{HAMLET}*, II.i/{II}.i

Follow capitalization of primary texts, but in quoting criticism and commentary, reduce initial sentence capitals to lower case when the quotation is indirect discourse or otherwise forms a part of the syntax of the sentence which introduces it:

He later revised his opinion: "It is the diminutive of *carl*."

His later opinion was that "it is the diminutive of *carl*."

In play and source texts, mark italic punctuation within italic contexts like stage directions, songs, poems, letters, prefaces, epilogues; otherwise roman.

In the textual notes and the appendix of conjectural emendations (which is a continuation of the textual notes), editorial language is in italics, thus: LETTSOM *in* DYCE2. But in other citations, use roman: LLOYD (in SINGER, ed. 1856).

In bibliographical entries, normalize play titles. In a book title in italics, the play title will be in roman. In article titles, play titles within single or double quotes will be normalized to italic.

Spacing.

A single space should follow every mark of sentence punctuation, except that where two marks of punctuation occur together no space should separate them. Ellipsis points are separated from each other and from the text by single spaces. Generally a space should follow the period after an initial--e.g., E. K. Chambers--but established usages without space, such as in abbreviations of degrees (M.A., Ph.D.), of states (N.J.), of countries (U.S.), of indications of time (B.C., A.D.), etc., should be observed. No space should follow the colon separating volume and page numbers (2:384-5) or biblical chapter and verse (Gen. 2:3-6), nor should spaces follow the points in act-scene-line numbers (2.3.56). A space should precede and follow the lemma sign (~ ; ~ ^). A space should precede and follow the line-division bar (singer | I) except when line-division involves word-division (sing-|er).

Numbers.

All numbers will be given in arabic throughout the edition. Act-scene-line numbers will be given in the form 2.3.45-51 rather than in the common older style II.iii.45-51; III.iv will be given as 3.4, Act IV as Act 4, Sc. viii as Sc. 8, etc. In citing subdivisions of non-dramatic literary works, give only arabic numbers if there will not be doubt about what the subdivisions are--e.g., *F.Q.* 2.8.14, *Meta.* 13.89--but give abbreviations also if they help to clarify--e.g., *Gawain*, pt. 2, st. 1, ll. 21-4. All volume and issue numbers will likewise be in arabic: vol. IX, p. 358 will be given as 9:358 rather than as IX, 358; see also the discussion of volume and issue numbers in ch. XIII on bibliographies. For works in which separate parts are separately paginated, use the form C{APELL} (1783, 1.2:140)--i.e., vol. 1, part 2, page 140.

The style for consecutive numbers for pages, dates, lines, etc. throughout the edition will be the "least-digit" system: that is, the least number of digits necessary should follow the hyphen in an inclusive number, with the exception that the numbers 11 through 19 are to be treated as units. Thus 10-16, 30-6, 43-5, 102-8, 311-17, 1344-52; but 1355-1426, since 14 (hundred) is to be considered a unit.

When TLN numbers and page-division numbers are introduced into quoted texts, they are distinguished from one another in the following ways:

In Sources texts:	[TLN 236]	[236]	cha-[236]rily
In criticisms:	[236]	[236]	Shak-[236]spere

In referring to signatures, use a number for every leaf (i.e., write Mm1 rather than Mm) and do not add square brackets to indicate verso sides or unsigned leaves (i.e., write B7^v, not [B7^v]). In referring to the recto and verso of folio leaves, use superscript *r* and *v* instead of *a* and *b*: "fol. 19^v" rather than "fol. 19^b." Superscript *a* and *b* are to be reserved for designating columns: a2^{va}, a2^{vb}, etc.

Dates.

In dates, months of the year (except May, June, and July) should always be abbreviated: Jan., Feb., Mar., Apr., Aug., Sept., Oct., Nov., Dec. Outside of dates, months of the year should not be abbreviated.

Dates should invariably be given in the day-month-year order rather than the month-day-year order: 2 Feb. 1922.

Dates between 1 Jan. and 25 Mar. should, if necessary, be silently converted from the Annunciation-year style to the legal-year style: e.g., 3 Feb. 1604 rather than 3 Feb. 1603 or 1603/4. If it is not clear which style is in question, the obscurity should be indicated: “1604 (or 1603)”; “1604 (if the legal year is in question)”; “‘1604’ (style of year uncertain)”; etc. Any conversions from old-style Julian to modern-style Gregorian dates should be indicated: “Harvey predicted a solar eclipse on 2 Oct. [O.S.; 12 Oct. N. S.] 1605.”

Dates of theatrical seasons should use the form 1622-3 (not 1622/3). The hyphen of the typescript will be printed as a one-en dash.

When citing a quotation taken from other than the original edition, give the date of the original, then a semicolon, then the date and page of the ed. quoted (the bibliography entry will give both the original date and the date of the reprint used):

TRAVERSI (1942; 1969, pp. 370-1):

SHAW (1898; ed. Wilson, 1961, pp. 141-2):

When quoting from a later translation, separate the items by a comma:

HOFMANNSTHAL (1905, tr. 1952, pp. 253-4):.

Submitting the manuscript.

Sections of the edition should be sent to the General Editor(s) as soon as they seem to the authors to be complete and satisfactory; the General Editor(s) will read and comment on them, possibly suggesting revisions, possibly (if they seem in nearly-final shape) sending them to outside readers. It is probably a good idea for individual editors to send preliminary samples (a few hundred lines in length) of the play text and of particularly long and complex sections such as the textual notes, so that the General Editor(s) may check them for problems that should be corrected from the outset.

Manuscripts should be prepared with double-spacing and ample margins. Each section should have its own pagination in the upper right-hand margin, as well as an abbreviated name of the unit: *WT TN 14*, *WT CN 580*, *WT StagHist 28*, etc. Footnotes should be avoided, but when necessary should be consecutively numbered within a particular section and be typed on separate sheets. Do not mark up the manuscript excessively. Word-processing type fonts now usually include italic, bold, and bold-italic faces, superscript and subscript characters, and such special characters as æ, ä, ã, õ, ú, ì, þ, ð, ¶, §, £, and †, so that no marginal explanations of them are necessary in the manuscript. As for the small capitals which are used throughout the Variorum in sigla and authors' names, the editors may either type authors' names in caps and then go through the manuscript later, double-underlining the small caps; or, as several Variorum editors have been doing recently, they may enclose letters to be set in small caps within curly brackets, thus: J{OHNSON}, M{AC}D{ONALD}. These curly brackets are an ongoing useful reminder--to the Variorum editor during the many years of writing the edition, and possibly to a copy-editor or SGML markup editor faced with a typescript--as to which letters should be in small caps; but these curly brackets should be stripped from any and all computer discs submitted to MLA, since they will only get in the way of final markup; and for the same reason, MLA may request a final working manuscript without them.

When it is in final form, the whole manuscript should be sent to the General Editor(s), who will forward it to the publisher; the same process will be repeated for galleys, page proofs, and the index.

XII. ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGLA

This section lists (or otherwise indicates) four major classes of abbreviations or sigla for use in the Variorum editions: (1) abbreviations of the titles of Shakespeare's plays and poems; (2) abbreviations of names of journals, scholarly series, and standard reference books; (3) abbreviations of general scholarly and special editorial terms useful in an edition of Shakespeare; and (4) sigla for most of the Shakespeare editions (and a few related works) whose variants might be collated for a given volume in the New Variorum Shakespeare (the individual editor to establish his or her own list of editions judged worthy of collation). Classes (1) and (2) should generally be used throughout the edition in preference to a full or short title, and class (4) must be used for the textual notes (including those in the appendix on text) and not elsewhere. Class (3) is to be used at the discretion of the editor: although he or she is urged to record commentary in the most economical form, the existence of an abbreviation in this list does not oblige anyone to use it; but if the editor does decide to abbreviate a term, he or she should do it consistently according to the preferred form in this list. Although the following lists are classified for easy location of an abbreviation, the list of abbreviations provided in the Plan of the Work of the Variorum edition itself will be one continuous list in alphabetical order.

It should be noted that abbreviations or sigla entirely in caps are in italic in the case of standard reference works (*OED*, *DNB*) and journals (*SQ*, *MLR*, *PMLA*), but in roman in the case of editions of Shakespeare (*JOHN1*, *CAP*, *N&H*, *ARD2*), series of publications (*MSR*, *EETS*), libraries (*BL*, *FSL*), and a few special terms (*ED*, *SD*, *HC*, *TLN*). Abbreviations for Shakespeare's plays and poems are always in italic (*Ado*, *Ham.*, *MND*, *PhT*, *R3*). Periods are not used in any abbreviation entirely in caps (*MS*, *OS*, *GLO*, *TNK*, *ELH*). Periods are used, however, in most abbreviations in lower case (etc.) or in mixed caps and lower case (*Sh.*). Exceptions to the latter convention are abbreviations for some plays and poems (*Ado*, *PhT*), some journal titles (*ShS*), and a few lower-case abbreviations for use only in the editorial apparatus: *m*, *v*, *(c)*, *(u)*. Abbreviations of Latin terms are not italicized. Abbreviations in class (3) may be italicized or not depending on where they are used: in textual notes, where everything that is not a variant or a siglum is reduced to italics, they will be in italics; in commentary notes and elsewhere they will be in roman.

None of these abbreviations is to be introduced into titles or quoted matter.

Shakespeare's Plays and Poems.

Ado: *Much Ado about Nothing.*

H5: *Henry V.*

Ant.: *Antony and Cleopatra.*

1H6: *1 Henry VI.*

AWW: *All's Well that Ends Well.*

2H6: *2 Henry VI.*

AYL: *As You Like It.*

3H6: *3 Henry VI.*

Cor.: *Coriolanus.*

H8: *Henry VIII.*

Cym.: *Cymbeline.*

Ham.: *Hamlet.*

Err.: *The Comedy of Errors.*

JC: *Julius Caesar.*

1H4: *1 Henry IV.*

Jn.: *King John.*

2H4: *2 Henry IV.*

LC: *A Lover's Complaint.*

LLL: Love's Labour's Lost.

Lr.: King Lear.

Luc.: The Rape of Lucrece.

Mac.: Macbeth.

MM: Measure for Measure.

MND: A Midsummer Night's Dream

MV: The Merchant of Venice.

Oth.: Othello.

Per.: Pericles.

PhT: The Phoenix and Turtle.

PP: The Passionate Pilgrim.

R2: Richard II.

R3: Richard III.

Rom.: Romeo and Juliet.

Shr.: The Taming of the Shrew.

Son.: The Sonnets.

TGV: Two Gentlemen of Verona.

Tim.: Timon of Athens.

Tit.: Titus Andronicus.

Tmp.: The Tempest.

TN: Twelfth Night.

TNK: The Two Noble Kinsmen.

Tro.: Troilus and Cressida.

Ven.: Venus and Adonis.

Wiv.: The Merry Wives of Windsor.

WT: The Winter's Tale.

Journals, series, and reference books.

Abbreviations for journals should be those listed in the latest *MLA International Bibliography* (print version). For discontinued journals the editor should consult an earlier volume of that bibliography. A similar list of abbreviations, more continuously relevant to Shakespeare studies, may be found in James Harner's *World Shakespeare Bibliography* in *SQ* volumes before 1995; in later volumes abbreviations of journal titles are not used. Abbreviations should remain as consistent as possible from one Variorum volume to the next. The following list includes only a few special examples of journal abbreviations, in order to distinguish among ambiguous cases. Series titles should be abbreviated in accordance with standard abbreviations of the elements in question (see list 3 below); the abbreviations for series in the *MLA Bibliography* are not to be used: e.g., Yale Stud. in Eng. (not YSE), Illinois Stud. in Lang. and Lit. (not ISLL), Univ. of California Pubs. in Mod. Philol. (not UCPMP), etc. It should be noted that the name of the university is not abbreviated. Any additional abbreviations for reference books must be cleared with the General Editor(s).

BEPD: Bibliog. of the Eng. Printed Drama (Greg).

DNB: Dict. of Nat. Biog.

E&S: Essays and Studies by Members of the Eng. Assn.

EETS: Early Eng. Text Soc.

ES: English Studies.

ESn: Englische Studien

MED: Middle Eng. Dict.

MSC: Malone Soc. Coll.

MSR: Malone Soc. Repr.

N.S.S. Trans.: Or preferably spell out full title, with its date.

OED: Oxford Eng. Dict. (not *NED*).

OED2: 2nd ed., 1989.

SAB: South Atlantic Bull.

ShAB: Sh. Assn. Bull. (not *SAB*).

ShakS: Shakespeare Studies (U. of Cincinnati, Vanderbilt, South Carolina, Burt Franklin, Assoc Univ. Presses.

ShS: Sh. Survey

ShStud: Sh. Studies (U. of Tokyo).

SJ: Sh. Jahrbuch (1963 or before, 1994 and after).

SJH: Sh. Jahrbuch (Heidelberg, 1964-93).

SJW: Sh. Jahrbuch (Weimar, 1964-93).

S.P. Dom. Eliz.: *State Papers, Domestic Ser., of the Reign of Elizabeth.*

S.R.: Stationers' Register.

STC: Short-Title Catalogue (Pollard & Redgrave; rev. Pantzer et al.).

Wing: Short-title Catalogue (Wing; rev. Morrison et al.)

Scholarly and editorial terms.

For abbreviations not in this list consult Joseph Gibaldi, *MLA Style Manual* (1998 or later) or the latest *Chicago Manual of Style*.

a: (in a signature, superscript)
left-hand column (*not* used
for “recto”).

a.: after (for use with dates).

abbr.: abbreviated, abbreviation
(*pl.* abbrs.).

abr.: abridged.

absol.: absolutely.

acc.: according, accordingly.

ad.: in text. notes, added,
additionally.

adj.: adjective.

ad loc.: ad locum, in that place

adv(b): adverb, adverbial.

AFr.: Anglo-Fr.

AH: act heading.

Am.: American.

AN: Anglo-Norman.

anon.: anonymous.

app.: apparently; appendix.

approx.: approximate, approximately.

Apr.: April.

apud: *See* conj. apud

arch.: archaic.

art.: article (*pl.* arts.).

ASLN: act-scene-line number,
numbering.

assn.: association.

attrib.: attribution, attributively,
attributed to.

Aug.: August.

b: (in a signature, superscript)
right-hand column (*not*
used for “verso”).

b.: before (for use with dates);
born.

betw.: between.

bibliog.: bibliography, biblio-
grapher, bibliographical.

biog.: biography, biographer,
biographical.

bk.: book.

BL: Brit. Libr.

BM: Brit. Mus.

BN: Bibliothèque Nationale.

Bodl.: Bodleian Libr.

Brit.: British.

bull.: bulletin.

c.: century

(c): corrected (in citing press-
variants); *see also* corr.

ca.: circa, around

- cal.: calendar.
- cf.: *confer*, compare (*not cp.*).
- ch.: chapter (*pl. chs.*).
- cl.: clause.
- class.: classical.
- CN: commentary note(s).
- col.: column (*pl. cols.*).
- coll.: collation, collated; collection, collected, collective, collectively.
- colloq.: colloquial, colloquially, colloquialism.
- comb.: combined, combining, combination.
- comp.: compiler, compiled by, compilation.
- compl.: complement; complete, completely.
- conj.: conjunction; conjecture, conjectural, conjecturally.
- conj. apud: conjecture recorded in the notes of [the ed. whose siglum follows this abbr.].
- cons.: consonant.
- const.: construction; construed with.
- cont.: continued.
- copr.: copyright.
- corr.: corrected; *see also* (c)
- c.t.: copy-text.
- CUP: Cambridge Univ. Pr.
- d.: daughter; died (preferable to *ob.*).
- dat.: dative.
- Dec.: December.
- degr.: in text. notes, degraded to foot of page (as a suspected interpolation).
- dept.: department.
- deriv.: derivative, derivation, derived.
- dial.: dialect, dialectal.
- dict.: dictionary.
- diss.: dissertation.
- div.: division, divided.
- DP: *dramatis personae*.
- ED: the present editor (*pl. EDS*).
- ed.: editor (*pl. eds.*), edition, edited by.
- ed. cit.: *editio citata*, edition cited.
- EE: Early Eng.
- e.g.: *exempli gratia*, for example.
- ellipt.: elliptical.
- EModE: Early Mod. Eng.
- Eng.: English.
- enl.: enlarged, enlargement.
- epil.: epilogue.
- (errata): in HC, a reading as corr. in the errata list of an ed.; *see also* (text).
- esp.: especially.
- et al.: *et alii*, and others.

- etc.: *et cetera*, and so forth; in text, notes, all eds. not otherwise accounted for.
- et seq.: *et sequens, sequentia*, and the following.
- ex.: example (*pl. exx.*).
- exam.: examination.
- exc.: except, exception.
- F: folio.
- f.: the foll. p. (*pl. ff.*).
- facs.: facsimile.
- fasc.: fascicle.
- Feb.: February.
- Ff: F1, F2, F3, and F4.
- fig.: figure (*pl. figs.*); figurative, figuratively.
- fl.: *floruit*, flourished.
- fn.: footnote (*pl. fnn.*).
- fol.: folio, leaf (*pl. fols.*).
- foll.: following, followed.
- Fr.: French.
- freq.: frequently.
- FSL: Folger Sh. Libr.
- Gael.: Gaelic.
- gen.: general, generally.
- Ger.: German, Germanic.
- Gr.: Greek.
- HC: historical collation.
- hist.: history, historical, historian.
- HL: Huntington Libr.
- ibid.: *ibidem*, in the same place.
- id.: *idem*, the same person (not abbr. in citations).
- IE: Indo-European.
- i.e.: *id est*, that is.
- illus.: illustrated, illustrator, illustration(s).
- imp.: imperative.
- incl.: inclusive, inclusively.
- ind.: induction; indicative; individual.
- inf.: infinitive.
- inst.: institution.
- int.: interjection.
- intr.: intransitive.
- introd.: introduction (by).
- It.: Italian.
- Jan.: January.
- jour.: journal.
- l.: line (*pl. ll.*).
- lang.: language (*pl. langs.*).
- Lat.: Latin.
- libr.: library.
- lic.: license, licensed.
- lit.: literal, literally; literature (*pl. lits.*).

loc. cit.: *loco citato*, in the place cited.

m: in text, notes, manuscript (whether a text in MS like mCAP2 or MS annotations in a pr. text like mTBY2); *see also* MS.

m.: married.

Mar.: March.

marg.: margin(s), marginalia.

ME: Middle Eng.

ment.: mentioned.

MHG: Middle High Ger.

mil.: military.

misc.: miscellaneous.

MLA: Mod. Lang. Assn. of America.

mod.: modern.

ModE: Mod. Eng.

MS: manuscript (*pl.* MSS); *see also* m.

mus.: music, musical; museum.

n.: note (*pl.* nn.); new; noun; (*not* natus, 'born'; *see* b.).

nat.: national; natural.

N.B.: *nota bene*, take careful note.

n.d.: no date.

no.: number (*pl.* nos.).

Nov.: November.

n.p.: no place.

N.S.: New Style (of dates acc. to

Gregorian cal.).

NS: new series.

NVS: New Var. Sh.

O: octavo.

o.: old.

obs.: obsolete (*not* a dagger).

Oct.: October.

OE: Old Eng.

OFr.: Old Fr.

OHG: Old High Ger.

om.: omitted by, omission.

ON: Old Norse.

op. cit.: *opere citato*, in the work cited.

orig.: originally.

O.S.: Old Style (of dates acc. to Julian cal.).

OS: old series.

OUP: Oxford Univ. Pr.

p.: page (*pl.* pp.).

par.: paragraph(s).

perf.: performer, performed, performance (*pl.* perfs.).

pers.: person(s).

philol.: philology, philological.

philos.: philosophy, philosophical.

phr.: phrase(s).

pl.: place(s); plate(s); plural.

- poet.: poetical.
- poss.: possible, possibly; possessive.
- ppl. a.: participial adj.
- pr.: print, printed, printer(s); press.
- pref.: preface (by).
- pret.: preterite.
- prob.: probable, probably.
- prog.: progress.
- prol.: prologue.
- pron.: pronoun.
- prop.: proper, properly.
- pseud.: pseudonym.
- pt.: part (*pl.* pts.).
- pub.: publication (*pl.* pubs.), publisher, published, published by.
- punct.: punctuation.
- Q: quarto.
- Qa: first issue of a given Q.
- Qb: second issue of a given Q.
- Q1: the first quarto (Q2, the second, etc.).
- Qq: all quarto eds. (Q1, Q2, Q3, etc.).
- QU1: a Q of uncertain date, but earlier than QU2, etc.
- quart.: quarterly.
- q.v.: *quod vide*, which see.
- r: (in a signature, superscript) *recto*, right-hand page.
- ref.: reference (*pl.* refs.).
- refl.: reflexive, reflexively.
- rpt.: reprint, reprinted, reprinted by.
- rev.: reviser(s), revised (by), revision; review, reviewed by. In journal titles, spell out, to distinguish *Revue*, *Revista*, etc.
- s.: son.
- sb.: substantive (i.e., the part of speech); *see also* subst.
- sc.: *scilicet*, understand, supply.
- Sc.: Scene.
- SD: stage direction.
- sec.: section.
- sel.: selected.
- Sept.: September.
- ser.: series.
- SH: scene heading.
- Sh.: Shakespeare (regardless of sp.).
- Shn.: Shakespearean (regardless of sp.).
- sig.: signature (*pl.* sigs.).
- sing.: singular.
- soc.: society.
- SP: speech prefix.
- Sp.: Spanish.

- sp.: spelling.
- spec.: specific, specifically.
- st.: stanza (*pl.* sts.).
- stud.: studies.
- subst.: (in text. notes) substantially the same SD or place; substantive (*not* the part of speech); *see also* sb.
- supp.: supposed, supposedly; supplement.
- s.v.: *sub verbo*, under the word (*not* to be used unnecessarily with definitions in CN).
- (text): in text. notes, a reading as printed in the text of an ed.; *see also* (errata).
- text.: textual.
- TLN: through line number, numbering.
- TN: text. notes.
- t.p.: title page.
- tr.: translator, translated by, translation.
- trans.: transactions; transitive.
- transf.: transferred sense.
- (u): uncorrected (in citing press-variants); *see also* uncorr.
- uncorr.: uncorrected; *see also* (u).
- univ.: university.
- UP: Univ. Pr.
- v: in text. notes, Var. ed. (whether a compl. ed. like v1821 or an indiv.-vol. ed. like *JC* v1913, *2H4* v1940, etc.); (in a signature, superscript) *verso*, left-hand page.
- v.: verb; verse (*pl.* vv.) (*v.* in the sense of *vide* should be avoided in favor of *see*).
- Var.: Variorum.
- Var. Supp.: NVS Supp.
- vb.: verb.
- vbl. sb.: verbal substantive.
- viz.: *videlicet*, namely.
- vol.: volume (*pl.* vols.).
- yr.: year (*pl.* yrs.).

Editions of Shakespeare.

The sigla for editions of Shakespeare are limited to a total of five characters. More specifically, in order to avoid exceeding a total of five characters, the basic sigla for most editions have been limited to four characters so as to permit the addition of a number distinguishing the original from a later edition (THEO1, THEO2): and the basic sigla for most modern editions have been limited to three characters so as to permit the addition of a number distinguishing the original from a “new” edition bearing the same name (ARD1, ARD2) and a letter distinguishing the original from a revised edition of a particular play within a “new” series (CAM3a, CAM3b). It should be noted that, in the case of numbered sigla (THEO1, THEO2, THEO3, etc.), the unnumbered siglum (THEO) designates all editions that have been completely collated (as opposed to occasionally quoted) for the Variorum edition in question, as defined by the individual editor. In sigla designating manuscript notes in editions of Shakespeare, the annotator’s name (if known) has been preferred to the name of the edition in which he made his notes. Thus Collier’s manuscript notes in the “Perkins” Folio are designated mCOL1 rather than by a siglum relating to the edition in question (F2). Individual editors may need additional special sigla for editions peculiar to the texts they are editing (e.g., Duthie’s *King Lear*). Such sigla should be decided on in consultation with the General Editor(s), who will coordinate them with the special sigla required by other editors.

As in previous Variorum editions, 16th- and 17th-century quartos will be designated as Q1, Q2, Q3 (note that the subscript number style--Q₂--is to be avoided). For anonymously edited quartos of the 18th century or later the siglum should be Q plus the date of the quarto, thus: Q1788. In the case of an anonymous octavo the editor might wish to use an O plus the date, thus: O1759; but since the letter O may be confused with a zero, it will probably be safer to indicate all such anonymous editions, whether quarto, octavo, duodecimo, or whatever, by a Q plus the date--in the case at hand, Q1759. As the following list indicates, the symbol for a family of editions (as ROWE stands for ROWE1, ROWE2, and ROWE3) is ordinarily used only when all editions in the family have been completely collated.

AARD: Heath’s Am. Arden Sh., gen. ed. Herford, 1914-33.	BAN2: Bantam Sh., ed. David Bevington et al., 1988
ALEX: Alexander, 1951.	BEV1: Bevington, 1973.
APPL: Applause Sh., gen. ed. John Russell Brown, 1996-	BEV2: Bevington, 1980.
ARD: ARD1 and ARD2 (if both compl. coll.).	BEV3: Bevington, 1992.
ARD1: “Old” Arden Sh., gen. eds. Craig and Case, 1899-1931?	BLAIR: Blair, 1753.
ARD2: Rev. Arden Sh., gen. eds. Ellis-Fermor et al., 1951-	BNK: BNK1 and BNK2 (if both compl. coll.).
ARD3: Arden Sh., Third Series, gen eds. Richard Proudfoot et al., 1995-.	BNK1: Bankside Sh., gen. eds. Morgan and Vickery, 1888-1906.
AYS: Ayscough, 1790.	BNK2: Bankside Restoration Sh., gen. ed. Morgan, 1907-8.
	BOWD: Bowdler, <i>Twenty Plays</i> (Family Sh.), 1807; 1818.

- BRAND: Garrick Sh., ed. Brandes, 1905.
- BUL: Stratford Town Sh., ed. Bullen, 1904-7.
- CALD: CALD1 and CALD2 (if both compl. coll.).
- CALD1: Caldecott (*Ham.*, *AYL* 1819; rpt. 1820).
- CALD2: Caldecott (*Ham.*, *AYL* 1832).
- CAM: all compl. coll. eds. of the Cambridge Sh.
- CAM1: "Old" Cambridge Sh., ed. Clark, Glover, and Wright, 1863-6.
- CAM2: "Old" Cambridge Sh., 2nd ed., 1891-3.
- CAM3: New [Cambridge] Sh., ed. Dover Wilson et al., from 1921.
- CAM4: New Cambridge Sh., eds. Philip Brockbank et al., 1984-.
- C&MC: C. and M. C. Clarke, 1864-9.
- CAP: Capell, 1768.
- CAPN: Capell, *Notes and Various Readings*, 1783.
- CHAL: Challis Sh., gen. ed. G. A. Wilkes, 1882-.
- CLN: CLN1 and CLN2 (if both compl. coll.).
- CLN1: Clarendon Pr. Sh., ed. Clark and Wright, 1868-83. (possibly 1866-1906).
- CLN2: New Clarendon Sh., gen. ed. Houghton, 1938-61?
- CLNS: Collins School and College Sh., ed. Neil et al., 1873-9.
- COL: all compl. coll. eds. of Collier.
- COL1: Collier, 1842-4.
- COL2: Collier, 1853.
- COL3: Collier, 1858.
- COL4: Collier, 1875-8.
- COLNE: Collier, *Notes and Emendations*, 2nd ed., rev. and enl., 1853.
- CUMB: *Cumberland's Brit. Th.*, ed. Daniel, 1823-32; 1838-75?
- DEL: all compl. coll. eds. of Delius.
- DEL1: Delius, 1854.
- DEL2: Delius, 1854-61.
- DEL3: Delius, 1864.
- DEL4: Delius, 1872.
- DON: Donovan, *Eng. Hist. Plays*, 1896.
- DTN: Deighton, 1888-1907.
- DYCE: all compl. coll. eds. of Dyce.
- DYCE1: Dyce, 1857.
- DYCE2: Dyce, 1864-7.
- DYCE3: Dyce, 1875-6.
- ECC: Eccles (*Lr.*, *Cym.* 1792-3; *MV* 1805).
- ECL: Eng. Classics Sh., ed. Morris et al., 1873-5.

- EMAN: Everyman Sh., ed. Andrews, 1993-8?
- EV: EV1 and EV2 (if both compl. coll.).
- EV1: "Old" Eversley Sh., ed. Herford, 1899.
- EV2: New Eversley Sh., gen. ed. G. Boas, 1935-7.
- EVNS: Riverside Sh., ed. Evans, 1974.
- F1: Sh. First Fol. (1623).
- F2: Sh. Second Fol. (1632)
- F3: Sh. Third Fol. (1663-4).
- F3a: Sh. Third Fol., first issue (1663).
- F3b: Sh. Third Fol., second issue (1664).
- F4: Sh. Fourth Fol. (1685).
- F5: indiv. later sheets in F4.
- FAL: Falcon Sh., ed. Chambers et al., 1886-91.
- FOLG2: New Folger Libr. Sh., ed. Mowat & Werstine, 1992-.
- GENT: Bell's Sh., ed. Gentleman, 1773-4.
- GLO: Globe Sh., ed. Clark and Wright, 1864.
- GOL: "Old" Temple Sh., ed. Gollancz, 1894-6.
- GUIL: Guild Sh., ed. Andrews, 1989-91
- HAL: Halliwell, 1853-65.
- HAN: all compl. coll. eds. of Hanmer.
- HAN1: Hanmer, 1743-4.
- HAN2: Hanmer, 1745.
- HAN3: Hanmer, 1770-1.
- H&B: New Hudson Sh., ed. Black et al., 1906?-1926?
- H&M: Holzknecht and McClure, 1936-41.
- H&P: New Readers' Sh., ed. Harrison and Pritchard, 1925-9?
- HARN: Harness, 1825-30.
- HTR: Hunter, 1860-93? (Each NVS ed. must establish his or her own numeration of HTR--Oxford Exam. Ser., Longman's Ser., Annotated Sh., Middle Class and Training School Exam. Ser., etc.).
- HUD: HUD1 and HUD2 (if both compl. coll.).
- HUD1: Hudson, 1851-6.
- HUD2: Harvard Sh., ed. Hudson, 1880-1.
- HUDSS: Hudson, *Plays* (later Hudson's School Sh.), 1870-3.
- IRV: Henry Irving Sh., ed. Irving and Marshall, 1888-90.
- JEN: Charles Jennens, *Lr., Ham., Oth., Mac., JC*, 1770-4.
- JOHN: all compl. coll. eds. of Johnson.
- JOHN1: Johnson, 1765 (1st ed., Tonson-Corbet).
- JOHN2: Johnson, 1765 (2nd ed.,

- Tonson-Woodfall).
- JOHN3: Johnson, 1768.
- K&R: Kittredge, rev. by Ribner, 1966-9.
- KIT1: Kittredge, 1936.
- KIT2: sixteen ind.-vol. plays ed. Kittredge, 1939-45; one-vol. ed. 1946.
- KNT: all compl. coll. eds. of Knight.
- KNT1: Pictorial Sh., ed. Knight, 1838-43.
- KNT2: Knight, 1842-4.
- KNT3: Pictorial Sh., ed. Knight, 1867.
- KTLY: Keightley, 1864.
- LEE: Lee et al., Univ. Press (Renaissance) Sh., 1906-9.
- LEO: Leopold Sh., introd. Furnivall, 1877.
- LOB: Granta Sh., ed. Lobban, 1910-18?
- MACM: Macmillan Sh., from 1969?.
- MAL: Malone, 1790.
- mCAP1: Capell's MS notes in copy of POPE1.
- mCAP2: Capell's holograph for CAP.
- mCAP3: Capell's holograph for CAPN.
- mCAP4: Capell's MS notes in copy of CAP.
- mCOL1: Collier's MS notes in the "Perkins" Folio (F2).
- mMORG: Morgann's notes in copy of THEO1.
- mPOPE: Pope's notes in copy of F3.
- mSTV1: Steevens's notes in v1773.
- mSTV2: Steevens's notes in copy of MAL.
- mSTV3: Steevens's notes in Boydell Proof Sheets.
- mTBY1: Thirlby's notes in lost copy of ROWE1 or ROWE2.
- mTBY2: Thirlby's notes in copy of POPE2.
- mTBY3: Thirlby's notes in copy of THEO1.
- mTBY4: Thirlby's notes in copy of WARB.
- mTHEO1: Theobald's notes in copy of F2.
- mTHEO2: Theobald's letters to W. Warburton, Folger Libr.
- mTHEO3: Theobald's letters to W. Warburton, Brit. Libr.
- MUN: London Sh., ed. Munro, 1957.
- N&H: Neilson and Hill, 1942.
- NLSN: Cambridge Sh. (Boston), ed. Neilson, 1906.
- NEWB: Newbolt, *Sel. Plays*, 1912.
- NVS: New Variorum Sh., 1871-.
- OSP: Old-Spelling Sh., ed. Furnivall and Boswell-Stone, 1904, 1908-12.
- OXF: OXF1, OXF2 or OXF3, and OXF4 (if all compl. coll.).

- OXF1: Oxford Sh., ed. Craig, 1891.
- OXF2: Oxford Sh., Mod. Sp., ed. Wells et al., 1986.
- OXF3: Oxford Sh., Orig. Sp., ed. Wells et al., 1986.
- OXF4: Oxford Sh., indiv. plays, gen. ed. Wells, 1982-.
- P&C: Am. First Fol. Sh., ed. Porter and Clark, 1903-12.
- PEAB: Peabody, 1836.
- PEL: PEL1, PEL2, and PEL3 (if all compl. coll.)
- PEL1: Pelican Sh., gen. ed. Harbage, 1956-67.
- PEL2: Pelican Sh., rev. ed., gen. ed. Harbage, 1969.
- PEL3: Pelican Sh., rev. ed., gen. eds. Orgel & Braunnmuller, 2002.
- PEN: PEN1 and PEN2 (if both compl. coll.).
- PEN1: Penguin Sh., ed. Harrison, 1937-59.
- PEN2: New Penguin Sh., gen. ed. Spencer, from 1967.
- PITT: Pitt Press Sh., ed. Verity, 1890-1936?
- POPE: POPE1 and POPE2 (if both compl. coll.).
- POPE1: Pope, 1725.
- POPE2: Pope, 1728.
- QFAC1: Sh. Quarto Facsimiles, ed. Furnivall, Griggs, and Praetorius, 1885-91.
- QFAC2: Sh. Quarto Facsimiles (Sh. Assn.), ed. Greg and Hinman, from 1939.
- RANN: Rann, 1786-94.
- RID: New Temple Sh., ed. Ridley, 1934-6.
- RIDb: New Temple Sh., ed. Ridley, 1947-62.
- RLF: Rolfe, 1870-1911? (Each NVS ed. must establish his or her own enumeration of RLF--Rolfe's Eng. Classics, Rolfe's Sh., Rolfe's Sh. pub. Baker and Taylor, same pub. for Am. Book, etc.).
- RLTR: Red Letter Sh., ed. Chambers, 1904-8.
- ROWE: all compl. coll. eds. of Rowe.
- ROWE1: Rowe, 1709 (1st ed.).
- ROWE2: Rowe, 1709 (2nd ed.).
- ROWE3: Rowe, 1714.
- RUG: Rugby Sh., ed. Moberly et al., 1872-83.
- SIG: Signet Sh., gen. ed. Barnet, 1963-8.
- SING: SING1 and SING2 (if both compl. coll.).
- SING1: Singer, 1826.
- SING2: Singer, 1855-6.
- SIS: Sisson, 1954.
- SISNR: Sisson, *New Readings*, 1956.
- STAU: Staunton, 1856-60.
- TCH: Teaching of Eng. Sh., 1925-31.

- THEO: all compl. coll. eds.
of Theobald.
- THEO1: Theobald, 1733.
- THEO2: Theobald, 1740.
- THEO3: Theobald, 1752.
- THEO4: Theobald, 1757.
- THEO5: Theobald, 1762.
- TJOH: TJOH1 and TJOH2 (if
both compl. coll.).
- TJOH1: Thomas Johnson, 1710-12.
- TJOH2: Thomas Johnson, 1720-2.
- TUD: Tudor Sh., ed. Neilson
and Thorndike, 1911-13.
- TUT: Univ. Tutorial Sh., ed.
Watt et al., 1904?-24?
- v1773: Johnson and Steevens, 1773.
- v1778: Johnson and Steevens, 1778.
- v1785: Johnson, Steevens, and
Reed, 1785.
- v1793: Steevens and Reed, 1793.
- v1803: Reed, 1803.
- v1813: Reed, 1813.
- v1821: Boswell, 1821.
- VALPY: Valpy, 1832-4.
- VERP: Verplanck, 1844-7.
- VIK: Viking Portable Sh., 1944.
- W&P: Wagner and Proescholdt,
1879-91.
- WARB: Warburton, 1747.
- WARW: Warwick Sh., gen. ed.
Herford, 1893-8.
- WH: WH1 and WH2 (if both
compl. coll.).
- WH1: White, 1857-66.
- WH2: Riverside Ed., ed.
White, 1883.
- WORD: WORD1 and WORD2 (if
both compl. coll.).
- WORD1: Wordsworth, *Hist. Plays*,
1883.
- WORD2: Wordsworth, *Hist. Plays*,
1893.
- YAL: YAL1 and YAL2 (if both
compl. coll.).
- YAL1: Yale Sh., gen. eds.
Cross and Brooke, 1917-28.
- YAL2: Rev. Yale Sh., gen. eds.
Kökeritz and Prouty,
from 1954.

XIII. BIBLIOGRAPHIES

No rules are needed concerning the scope of the bibliographies in the Variorum editions, since these lists simply include all scholarly and critical works that are quoted from or referred to anywhere in the edition. As in recent New Variorum volumes, editions of the play cited in the collations and commentary will be listed separately in the introductory "Plan of the Work," editions of primary sources used for illustration in the commentary will be given brief citations in the commentary notes only and not in the bibliography, and reviews of performances of the play will be cited only in the appendix on Staging and Stage History. Since citation of books and articles within the edition is by an author's last name (and a date and a page number), a single alphabetical list of books, rather than a classified list, is all that is needed.

The contents of the entries.

Authors' names.

For books, always give an author's first name and a middle initial unless common usage dictates otherwise, since such information helps readers to locate authors in library card files and electronic catalogues. When such information is not given on the title page but is gotten from an LC card or some other source, put inside brackets whatever information is supplied, and omit the original period after the initial. There is no need to provide a first name for a journal article, since it will be of no help in finding the article.

Titles such as *Mr.*, *Mrs.*, *Dr.*, *Rev.*, and *Sir*, often prefixed to authors' names on title pages, may be omitted from the author part of the entry. In most cases *Lord* and *Lady* will also be omitted except where common usage makes the inclusion seem advisable.

If a book is generally attributed to an author not named on the title page, supply the author's name in brackets and alphabetize the entry accordingly. In some cases a cross-reference by title might also be advisable.

If a note or article in a journal is signed only with initials but it is clear who the author is--as it might be clear that "B. N." in *Athenaeum* or *Shakespeareana* for a given year was Brinsley Nicholson--expand the name, putting the expanded parts in brackets, thus: N[icholson], B[rinsley].

If it is known that for a given year a writer conducted a section of a journal without signing it, as Furnivall did with "Scraps" in the *New Shakspeare Society's Transactions*, supply his or her name in brackets.

If a title page prints a pseudonym, the author's real name (if it is known) should be supplied in brackets following the pen name, thus: Oxon [Henry S. Skipton], and a cross-reference entry should be given under the author's real name, thus: Skipton, Henry S.---*See* Oxon.

Authors of commentary printed only in the notes of someone else's edition and not elsewhere should be identified thus: Hawkins, Sir John (1719-89). Contributor to v1778.

Titles.

The title of a chapter of a book should be given only when doing so seems necessary or especially helpful.

Unnecessarily long titles may be shortened. The frequent custom, as in some volumes of *Notes and Queries* and *New Shakespeareana*, of including in the title of a commentary on a particular passage a quotation of the whole passage and a full act-scene-line citation of it, should not be duplicated in the bibliography. Omit all quotation from the title, and convert the citation to the numbers of the Variorum edition in question and to present editorial style of the New Variorum editions, the fact of change to be indicated by placing the reference within square brackets, and the citations converted to TLN numbers, thus: [341].

A translation of a title in a relatively unknown language may be given in brackets, thus: “Gorzka Arkadia Shakespeare’a [‘Shakespeare’s Bitter Arcadia’].”

Subtitles.

Give subtitles only if they clarify and particularize.

Nineteenth-century editions often contain lengthy subtitles such as “Printed from the Acting Copy as It Was Recently Performed at . . .” etc. Since such subtitles are usually reproduced in Jaggard’s bibliography, it should be sufficient in most cases to omit them and, if desirable, to supply the substance of them in a bracketed annotation of a word or two after the entry.

Names of Editors, Translators, etc.

In many cases the person who prepared an edition is not so much strictly an editor as a bookmaker, who prints someone else’s text and often someone else’s notes, and then provides a preface or introduction or glossary or some kind of appendix. The Var. editor may in some cases choose to designate “Intro.” or “Preface” or some such name rather than “Ed.” in the interest of accuracy, but usually it will be easier to use a loose definition of “editor,” especially when two or more people have collaborated on an edition, one doing introduction, another the notes, etc.

A number of important artists have done illustrations for editions of Shakespeare’s plays--Salvador Dali for one--and the compiler may wish to include such information.

Translators’ names should be given or supplied when they are known.

Edition.

The entry should be for the latest revised edition of a book unless there is good reason to list another edition. The date of the first edition should be given in parentheses following the entry, thus: (1st ed. 1803.).

When old or out-of-print books have recently been reprinted by a publisher such as Blom or AMS, that information may be appended to the entry in parentheses, thus: (Rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1969.); but the Var. ed. need not feel obliged to provide such information for all entries.

Series.

The name of the series (in abbreviated form) and the number of the work should be given. When there may be doubt about the standard form of the name of a series, it should be transcribed exactly from the title page. When the reference is to part of a collection or multi-volume set that is not strictly serial, the more general title should be given as follows:

Brandes, Georg. “Die Melancholie und Misanthropie bei Molière und Shakspeare.”
Die Emigrantenliteratur. In vol. 1 of *Die Hauptströmungen der Literatur des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.* Uebersetzt und eingeleitet von Adolf Strodtmann. Berlin, 1872. Pp. 56-62.

Bullough, Geoffrey, ed. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare.* Vol. 2: *The Comedies, 1597-1603.* London & New York, 1958.

Series names for editions should always be given. They should be put immediately after the title, before the name of the editor.

Number of volumes.

The number of volumes with the particular title, if more than one, should always be given.

Place of publication.

As has been the practice in previous New Variorum volumes, no place of publication need be indicated for books printed in London, and a note to that effect should precede the bibliography. Otherwise one, or at most two, places of publication should be given; usually two cities should be named only if they are in different countries. If a publisher lists editorial offices in more than one place, give only the place of the main editorial office. Up to recent times only the original place of publication is needed; for current books, the place of a reprint should be given as well; for instance, Geoffrey Bullough's *Narrative and Dramatic Sources* would require both London (where it was published by Routledge and Kegan Paul) and New York (where it was reprinted by Columbia UP).

In general the name of the city rather than of a university press should be given. The one exception may be Oxford University Press, because of its several branches of publication and its several places of issue. If OUP published a book originally in England, whether at London or at Oxford, simply give the publication facts as OUP, 1935; if it is known that OUP originally published the book in New York, give the publication facts as New York: OUP, 1966.

It is helpful to specify journals with a common name by adding the name of the place of publication in parentheses after the name of the journal, thus: *Times* (London), *The Stage* (New York).

Names of cities should not be abbreviated. Cambridge, Mass. should be specified, but not Cambridge, Eng. For cities under a million in population, except for those with well-known university presses such as New Haven, Chapel Hill, Durham, Madison, etc., the name of the state should be supplied in conventional abbreviated form (but not in the recent two-letter postal codes--Mich. rather than MI, etc.). In the case of a book published in a city with the same name as another city more widely known for its scholarly publishing, the less familiar city should be specified: thus Durham, Eng., but not Durham, N.C. If both are well known, specify the state or country for both.

If neither place nor publisher is known, the lack of such information should be indicated by the abbreviation N.p.

Publisher.

In general it is unnecessary to give the name of the publisher, but such information might be helpful for eighteenth-century editions of the play which are not otherwise identified by editor, series, etc., and for modern reprints of books such as are published by Blom, AMS, Burt Franklin, etc.

Where no place of publication is known, it is useful to list the publisher: e.g., Privately printed for F. J. Furnivall.

Date.

When the date of a book appears not on the title page but in a copyright or a colophon, it may be supplied in the entry without being enclosed in brackets; an American copyright date may generally be taken as the date of publication. Dates conjectured from dated prefaces or other evidence, or taken from the LC catalogue or other bibliographical listings, should be given in brackets.

The date given for a particular edition of a book should be the date of that edition's first printing or impression.

For journal entries, smaller discriminations of season, month, week, and day should be given only if each issue is paginated separately rather than continuously with issues before or after it. Avoid the redundancy of giving both an issue number and the name of a season or month; for a monthly magazine it would probably be more useful to name the month, in a semi-annual periodical probably more helpful to give the issue number.

Pages.

If a title is given for any part of a book or journal--i.e., a chapter, essay, article, note, review, etc.--the inclusive pages for that part should be given.

Addenda.

Supplementary information about the work cited should be put in parentheses at the end of the entry. If an entry cites a later, revised edition of a work, the date of the first edition should be given in parentheses, thus: (1st ed. 1762.), (1st Ger. ed. 1839.). Spell out "first" used adverbially: "(First pub. as . . .)". If an entry cites an early edition, later editions may be noted if there seems some point in doing so. A change of title ought to be noted, thus: (Reissued as *The Shakspeare Allusion-book: 1591 to 1700* in 1909 and 1932.) The original date of published lectures should be given, thus: (Delivered in 1808.) An entry for an article, essay, or monograph should note its later incorporation into a book, thus: (Rpt. in *Shakespeare's Industry*, 1916.), (Absorbed into *Shakespeare Improved*, 1927.), (Rev. in *Anatomy of Criticism*, 1957.).

The style of the entries.

In general the style of the entries is that of *The MLA Style Manual*. The rules below are intended mainly to supplement that work with a few rules to cover special cases that may arise, and to note some differences from MLA style that seem advisable.

Authors' names.

In an entry of joint authorship, only the name of the first author should be reversed for the sake of alphabetizing, and the other names should appear in normal order, thus: Day, M[uriel] C., & J[ohn] C. Trewin. Use "&" rather than "and," preceded by a comma.

Titles and subtitles.

Some degree of regularization is permissible in the capitalization of titles and subtitles of books in English, especially when they appear on the title page all in capitals or block letters; articles at the beginning of a subtitle should be capitalized regardless of what appears on the title page. Titles in foreign languages which distinguish upper and lower case should be reproduced literatim to avoid error; if the titles are printed all in capitals, however, they should be normalized according to the rules for capitalization of titles in the *MLA Style Manual*, and perhaps checked against some authoritative listing, such as the LC catalogue.

Punctuation in titles should be regularized as little as possible. A colon (followed by a space) should be supplied between title and subtitle whenever there is no punctuation on the title page and when no other punctuation mark seems implied or customary. However, dates in titles that define the period covered by the study in question should not be preceded by

punctuation if there is none on the title page, thus: *The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theatre 1605-1625*. Omissions within the portion of the title cited should be indicated by three spaced periods. Titles and subtitles of books, of separately published monographs, and of editions should be italicized (i.e., underlined); if part of the title (e.g., the name of a play) was originally printed in italics, it should be normalized to roman in the entry. Titles of essays, articles, notes, dissertation abstracts, monographs published in a journal or collection, and unpublished dissertations should be enclosed within double quotation marks; quotation marks within the original title should be normalized to single quotation marks. The description of an untitled review or letter to a journal editor should not be put in quotation marks but in brackets, thus: [Rev. of *Shakspeare's Five-Act Structure*, by T. W. Baldwin.], [Letter.].

Spelling in titles should not be regularized at all.

Act-scene-line numbers in titles should be converted to TLN (in brackets) if the play is the one being edited, and to Riverside act-scene-line numbers in arabic (within brackets) for other Shakespearean plays: [2.3.78]. Play and novel titles which appear within quotation marks in entries should be converted to italics without quotation marks.

Editor.

Substitute "Ed." for "Herausgegeben von," "a cura di," and the like; but if there is further information about the editing that is worth including--e.g., the foreign equivalent of "Edited in collaboration with the author by . . ."--copy all the editorial information literatim from the title page without any attempt to translate or abbreviate.

Edition.

For English books give this information in abbreviated form: 2nd ed. *or* Rev. ed. Since foreign words for "edition" (*Auflage*, *édition*, etc.) often refer to another printing (*Ausgabe*, *impression*) rather than to a new edition proper, it is generally safer and easier to reprint literatim what appears on a foreign title page--"Zweite Auflage"--than to attempt a translation that may be misleading. Moreover, the precise wording may help to distinguish between that particular issue and another one labeled "Zweite revidierte Auflage."

Series.

The name of the series for a book or monograph should immediately precede the publication facts. If, however, a book (not a volume of a journal) is one of a series of annuals or successive volumes having the same title, the series should be named immediately after the title, thus: *English Studies Today*, 3rd Ser.

Series titles should be abbreviated in accordance with standard abbreviations of the elements in question; the abbreviations for series in the MLA annual bibliography are not to be used: e.g., Yale Stud. in Eng. (not YSE), Illinois Stud. in Lang. and Lit. (not ISLL), Univ. of California Pubs. in Mod. Philol. (not UCPMP), etc. It should be noted that the name of the university is not abbreviated.

Journals.

A current journal appearing in two or more entries should be cited by its abbreviation in the "Master List and Table of Abbreviations" of a recent *MLA International Bibliography* (print version), or in the similar list preceding the *World Shakespeare Bibliography* in issues of *SQ* prior to 1995. For discontinued journals appearing in more than one entry, the editor may consult an earlier list in *PMLA*; if that is not successful, the editor may supply abbreviations at his or her own discretion. A list of all such abbreviations used should appear in the Plan of the Work. Instead of *NSST*, write *New Shakspeare Society's Transactions. 1877-9. [1879]*.

Volume and issue numbers.

Print "2 vols." for "Zwei Bände," "2 Tomes," etc. Consider such designations as "Jahrgang," "année," etc., as equivalent to a volume number if no word for "volume" appears on the title page.

All volume numbers for series and journals will be in arabic; they will not be preceded by the abbreviations "Vol." or "No." or by a comma. Thus "Yale Studies in English, No. 17" will be given as "Yale Stud. in Eng. 17."; "University of Washington Publications in Language and Literature, Vol. XII" will be given as "Univ. of Washington Pubs. in Lang. and Lit. 12."; volume XLV (1948) of *Modern Philology* will be given as *MP* 45 (1948), with a space before and after the volume number.

For journals with old and new series of volume numbers, use the following form: OS 128 (1911); NS 3 (1924). For journals such as *N&Q* with two or more numbered series, use this form: 5 *N&Q* 7 (2 June 1877)--that is, series 5, volume 7. For later volumes in *N&Q* after the numbered-series system was abandoned, use the consecutive volume numbers: *N&Q* 157 (19 Mar. 1932).

When an issue number is given in addition to a volume number--and it should be given only if it is paginated separately, not continuously with the rest of the volume--it should be in arabic, separated from the volume number by a period, thus: *Alighieri* 8.4 (1967), for vol. 8, separately paginated part 4. When a journal gives only issue numbers, instead of volume numbers, consecutively from the beginning of its publication, use the following form: *Athenaeum* No. 2847 (20 May 1881) for weekly issues; but if issues appear monthly or less frequently, the issue numbers may be treated as if they were volume numbers.

Place of publication.

For books printed in the roman alphabet, print the place name as it appears on the title page: Wien (*for* Vienna), Minden in Westf., etc. For books printed in another alphabet, use the most common form of the place-name in English: Tokyo, Moscow, etc.

Date.

Use arabic numbers for dates: 1788 for MDCCLXXXVIII. Dates that are conjectured or supplied from a source other than title page, colophon, or copyright should be put in brackets. All months should be abbreviated except May, June, and July. There should be no comma between a month or season and the year (Nov. 1966, Summer 1967), and the form for the date of a day, month, and year should be 19 Mar. 1932, without separating commas. If a work is incomplete, give a date plus a dash, thus: 1957--.

A date following the volume or issue number of a journal should be enclosed in parentheses; but when no such number precedes, no parentheses are necessary: e.g., *Harpers*, Nov. 1966, pp. 101-10; *TLS*, 14 May 1925, p. 335; *Cairo Studies in English*, 1961/1962, pp. 111-20.

Pages.

The number style for consecutive numbers throughout the New Variorum Sh., for page numbers as for dates, line-references, etc., will be the "least-digit" system: that is, the least number of digits necessary should follow the hyphen in an inclusive number, with the exception that the numbers 11 through 19 are to be treated as units. Thus 10-16, 30-6, 43-5, 102-8, 311-17, 1344-52; but 1355-1426, since 14 (hundred) is to be considered a unit.

Page numbers following the volume or issue number of a journal should be preceded by a comma immediately following the date-parentheses and by a space after the comma, without

the abbreviations “p.” or “pp.”, thus: *MP* 45 (1948), 27-9; *BRP* 4.2 (1965), 28-45. When there is no volume or issue number, and no parentheses around the date, the page numbers should be separated from the date by a comma and a space, and the abbreviations “p.” and “pp.” should be used; see the examples at the end of the previous section on “Date.”

Citation of pages in a book should use this form: Pp. 22-54. When a volume number for a book is cited, however, use this form: 2:22-54 (without abbreviations for volume or page). Consecutive numbers should be used rather than the abbreviations “f.” and “ff.”

Joint entries.

Several-part essays appearing in successive issues of a journal should be listed as separate entries only if they have different titles in each issue; otherwise they should be combined in a joint entry giving successive dates and pages, thus: (1833), 22-36, 125-49, 256-75; *or* June 1857, pp. 33-41; July 1857, pp. 11-19; Aug. 1857, pp. 17-26. Letters written in rejoinder to a journal article should be listed as separate items, not jointly with the original article.

Books which exist in both a foreign language and an English translation should be given a double entry, as follows:

Clemen, Wolfgang. *Shakespeares Bilder: ihre Entwicklung und ihre Funktionen im dramatischen Werk*. Bonn, 1936. Trans. and enl. as *The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery*. London, 1951.

Foreign translations of English books need not be listed.

Addenda.

Additional information about publication etc. should be given in parentheses at the end of the entry, thus:

Empson, William. *Some Versions of Pastoral*. 1935. (Rpt. as *English Pastoral Poetry*. New York, 1938.)

Editions of the Plays.

Entries for editions of the play or of the works of Sh. will be collected in the “Plan of the Work.” Since there is no need for an author entry, the entries should begin with the title of the edition as it appears on the title page, except that usually Shakespeare’s name may be omitted from the title, and individual play titles should be abbreviated. Thus: *Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies; Works; Werke; Tro.*

The name of the series should appear immediately after the title. It should be set off by periods and should not be in italics, thus: *Works*. Globe Ed.; *As You Like It*. Deighton’s Red Cover Sh.; *King Richard the Second*. Falcon Ser.

The names of editors, illustrators, etc. should follow the series and should be set off by periods.

Dissertations.

Entries for dissertations not published in book or microfilm form will give the author’s name, the title in quotation marks, and the facts of issue in this form:

Floyd, John Paul. “The Convention of Melancholy in the Plays of Marston and

Shakespeare.” Harvard diss., 1942.

All dissertations published in any form should be entered in standard book or journal entries, followed by a parenthesis giving the facts of issue. A separately published dissertation would be entered as a book, and the entry followed by such a parenthesis as this: (Univ. of Pennsylvania diss.). A dissertation published in a monograph series such as *Palaestra* would be entered as a book in a series, with a following parenthesis: (Munich diss.). American dissertations published in microfilm would be given their *Dissertation Abstracts (International)* listing in journal form, followed by a parenthesis simply naming the university: (Univ. of Illinois). Dissertations that are quoted in a Variorum edition, however, should be given full listing (as in the example above), followed, if appropriate, by their *DA(I)* citations in parentheses.

Procedures.

Collecting the entries.

Editors should enter in their working bibliography every item that concerns a play, even those that seem clearly marginal or nonsensical. No doubt they will exclude hundreds or even thousands of such entries from their final bibliographies, but it is safer to have a record of an item from the outset than to miss it altogether.

Finding entries for the bibliography will of course be a continuing process; items will keep appearing unexpectedly in someone’s else’s footnotes even after a completed manuscript has been submitted to the General Editor(s). One must simply start with the obvious sources, aim at completeness, and then keep a sharp eye out for what one has missed. If an old Furness Variorum of your play exists, it will probably name most of the important 18th- and 19th-c. editions and commentaries. If it doesn’t exist, you should look through his bibliography for a comparable play. With luck your play may also have an old Tannenbaum bibliography, or a New Variorum supplement, or a modern Garland volume. For the last three decades, James Harner’s electronic *World Shakespeare Bibliography* makes life very easy. Thereafter there is no help for it but to work laboriously through Jaggard, A. Ralli, Ebisch & Schücking, Gordon Ross Smith, John Velz; the NUC, BL, Folger, and Birmingham catalogues; and the annual bibliographies of *PMLA*, *ShAB*, *SQ*, *MHRA*, *YWES*, and especially *SJ* from 1865 to the present. The lack of *SJ* bibliographies for the war years is partly made up for by H. Lüdecke, “Shakespeare-Bibliographie für die Kriegsjahre 1939-1946,” *Archiv* 187 (1950), 25-36; 188 (1951), 8-40. In ch. XV are also some helpful indexes to the *Gentleman’s Magazine* and the *St. James Chronicle*, and in ch. VIII a guide to the important editions of Shakespeare.

Now that laptop computers are easily usable in most libraries, most editors will probably wish to enter items into bibliographical files on their hard drives. For later sorting into usable groups of entries, they may wish to add before or after each entry a bracketed classification into which the item seems most likely to fall: [Text], [Commentary], [Conjectures], [Criticism], [Sources], [Stage History], etc. They may wish to sort items in each of these categories both chronologically (since working through the items chronologically is the most convenient way of reading and taking notes from them) and, in another list, alphabetically (so that one may see easily whether one has an item in the list or not). The editor may also find it useful to keep a file of items that have already been read (or rejected), in which to see if he or she has already consulted an item not found in the file of accepted entries. In going through thousands of items over several months and years, inevitably the editor will forget titles already seen. The editor will probably also wish to keep separate files of editions of the play and of reviews of performances.

Arranging the entries.

The finished bibliography published in the edition should be arranged alphabetically by the first word (author's last name) of the entry. The lists of fully collated and other editions in the Plan of the Work will be in chronological order.

In alphabetizing, the letter-by-letter system should be used rather than the word-by-word system. (See the *MLA Style Manual* 6.5 [1998, pp. 154-5]). That is, alphabetizing is according to the sequence of letters before the comma separating the last and first names, regardless of spaces or other intervening punctuation such as hyphens or apostrophes. German names with umlauts should be treated as if spelled out (*ae*, *oe*, and *ue*), and *von* does not begin the last name unless by established convention. In French names, *de* and *d'* are not part of the last name unless established by convention, but *du* and *des* generally are. Similarly, Spanish *de* is not used but *del* is. An article (*a*, *an*, *the*) before the name of a corporate author should be printed as it stands, though the entry should be alphabetized by the first word after the article: thus The New Shakspeare Society would be printed as such and alphabetized under *N*. In alphabetizing by title, treat numerals as though they were spelled out and years as though they were spelled out in their usual spoken form (e.g., alphabetize 1984 as if spelled out *Nineteen-eighty-four*).

When an author's name appears several times for different reasons (author, editor, co-author, etc.), use the following sequence of entries:

Blow, Joseph (1746-1809). Contributor to MAL.
 ----- [Books, articles]
 -----, ed.
 ----- See Blowupsky, Giuseppe.
 -----, & J. Horne Tooke.

For entries under Anon., alphabetize by title, rather than list chronologically.

Typing the MS.

The entries should be in the "flush-and-hang" style--i.e., each entry should begin flush left, and runover lines should be indented two spaces. After the first entry for an author, all other entries for that author should print a long dash (typed hyphens, *not* underline bars) instead of the author's name, even though the form of the name may differ somewhat from entry to entry. Double-space between lines and between entries.

XIV. THE ROLE OF COMPUTERS

For a survey of uses of computers in Shakespeare research in the past decade, especially for stylometrics, see Ian Lancashire, "The State of Computing in Shakespeare," *The Shakespearean International Yearbook 2* (2002), 89-110. The following three sections offer advice particularly for Variorum editors.

Practical uses of personal computers.

Text.

Electronically readable and searchable transcribed or edited texts of plays and their sources, and facsimile images of F and Q documentary texts, are available from a number of sources; see below. They may conveniently avoid the necessity of typing one's text from scratch, may serve for reference or checking, etc.

Proofreading.

Many PC word-processing programs include file comparison programs. These may be of use when one is unsure if a file includes corrections, whether material has been accidentally deleted from a file, etc. There is also a variety of proofing and file-comparison software available for many platforms. The *Micro-OCF* proofreading program will detect typos but not omissions.

Concordances and word searches.

All word-processing programs include rapid search functions, and many online data bases have search engines that enable both basic keyword searches and more sophisticated Boolean searches for two or more terms in combination. The Text Search program that is part of the Norton Utilities is an extremely fast search algorithm that provides several lines of context for each find. It will search through the First Folio in a few seconds, to see if a word or spelling ever appeared there. Electronic searches using the ETC Wordcruncher software can be done electronically via SHAKSPER. See also the note below on GOOGLE.

A concordance of one's own Variorum text is well worth making. For one-text plays the Oxford Concordances serve well enough for most purposes, but for conflated two-text plays a concordance specific to the Var. text will prove very handy, especially for writing commentary, when one wants to compare the same word in different contexts and also to avoid duplicate notes on the same word. Most campuses will have a computer expert who, using available programs, can prepare such a concordance in a few minutes from one's machine-readable text. Concordancing programs may be found in *Oxford Concordance Program*, *TUStep*, *TACT*, *WordCruncher*, and other text-analysis programs. For surveys of such programs see Ian Lancashire, *Humanities Computing Yearbook 1989-90* (1991) and Lancashire et al., *Using TACT with Electronic Texts* (1996). Ian Lancashire particularly recommends, for its simplicity and usefulness, the program *Concordance* developed by R. J. C. Watt, Senior Lecturer at the University of Dundee; it is available at <http://www.rjcw.freemove.co.uk/>.

Concordances of compositors may also be useful. I (RK) have created concordances (in ASCII plain text) of all words thought to have been set by Folio Compositors B and E, in order to determine preferred spellings and prior settings of any word. Since a line of context is provided for each occurrence of a word, these concordances amount to thousands of printed pages, even though a list of stopwords has suppressed the most frequently-used common words and though italicized accessories--speech-prefixes, stage directions, etc.--are not concorded. Copies of these concordances will be provided to Var. editors upon request, in diskette (not paper) form.

Collation.

No computer program has yet been devised to handle the great variety of type faces and the many kinds of variants, including those of lineation, that must be dealt with in collating some fifty to a hundred Shn. texts printed over four hundred years. Andrew Gurr at the University of Reading has experimented for several years with machine collation for his *Variorum Tempest*, and may be willing to give advice on progress. Peter Robinson's program *Collate* requires that all texts be fully typed out, encoded, and of course proofread before machine collation; that will certainly be prohibitively expensive of time and money when one is dealing with the large number of editions to be collated for the *Variorum*. Hand-and-eye collation still seems the most efficient approach. It is a big job, but not impossible, and doing the work makes one aware of most of the textual problems (and many of their possible solutions) and so is hardly a waste of time. Collation for *AYL* took about a half-year of daily work, for *Lr.* about twice that time.

Recording notes and excerpts.

Taking notes directly onto one's hard drive, from which they may be copied, duplicated, and manipulated, saves the time and error of writing notes and then rewriting them into commentary. All editors now record their annotations directly into appropriate computer files, organizing material roughly by TLN (building a file of comments on each line) or by name of character, topic of appendix, etc. When these data files are complete, the editor can boil them down to something like a final commentary by cutting and pasting blocks of material from within them.

Scanning.

Machine scanning of printed material by an Optical Character Reader (e.g., a Kurzweil machine) to turn it into characters in an electronic file is still too inaccurate for editorial use. Most scanners can recognize only characters from a few typefaces, mainly those commonly used in the business world, not the great variety found in the texts from several centuries that *Variorum* editors deal with. Even though educable OCR scanners have been developed that can be taught to recognize printed characters which at first give them trouble, and though much higher accuracy is now being achieved with such machines, even 99% efficiency is unacceptable: it means that, on average, one out of each hundred characters is wrong.

Preparing copy.

As is now the common practice in academic publishing, *Var.* editors will be required to provide files on diskettes for each part of their edition--text, textual notes, commentary notes, appendices, etc. These electronic files will be copy-edited, tagged in SGML, HTML, or another markup language, and merged into master files from which the printed books and electronic versions will be produced. An earlier recommendation from the General Editors, that in note-taking and in preparing MSS the distinction between capitals and small capitals be demarcated, should still be scrupulously observed. However, the suggestion that small caps be indicated by putting caps within curly brackets, thus--S{CENE}, C{APELL}, etc.--in the expectation that a software program would ultimately convert them automatically to small caps, has not yet borne practical results; the MLA copy-editors so far have struck out the curly brackets and indicated small caps by the conventional double underlining, and the *Variorum* editor may wish to do the same. Still, not all word-processing programs offer small caps, and the curly brackets do clearly indicate what characters are to be printed in small caps. If one creates a

library of macros such as J{OHNSON} (ed. 1765), K{ITTREDGE} (ed. 1940), etc. that can be inserted into one's text at a single keystroke, the use of curly brackets takes no extra time or attention in the writing of commentary. Ultimately they will all have to be stripped from the discs that are turned over to MLA's taggers and printers, however, since they will get in the way of electronic markup; alternatively, they may possibly be simply replaced by conventional markup tags. They are chiefly of use to the Variorum editor as an ongoing reminder of what should be in small caps as opposed to lower-case, and as a guide to the copy editor marking up the final manuscript. In parts of the edition where small caps are numerous, such as the textual and commentary notes, the copy-editor might find it helpful to be provided with two manuscripts, one indicating small caps within curly brackets and a second, clean manuscript without them, for the preparation of final copy.

On the question of the Variorum editors' possible involvement in the electronic tagging of their manuscripts, see the last section of this chapter, pp. 164-5.

Translation into other programs.

Although many software programs now exist for translating files from one word-processing program into another, Var. editors will probably have no need of them. Probably by now most of us use one of a small handful of widely used word-processing programs, and may prepare our MSS for MLA's use in any one of them. After the Var. editor supplies accurate paper copy, the MLA editors and taggers will prepare both copy-edited manuscript and working electronic files from that copy.

Storage of data.

Eventually Var. editors will have collected vast electronic files of raw material. Past plans to deposit typed or handwritten MS notes in the Folger Library after completion of an edition have (probably rightly) come to nothing. However, electronic files that could be rapidly searched are another matter. The REED files are all being stored at the University of Toronto for future searches, and it seems at least theoretically possible that Variorum raw files, including all material excluded from a published ed., could be imprinted in CD-ROM form for use by future scholars.

Internet research resources.

The following is a joint compilation, based on a core list provided by Professor Michael Best of the University of Victoria and amplified by entries suggested by a number of Variorum editors. One may also wish to consult Lisa Hopkins, "Shakespeare and the Renaissance on the Web," *European English Messenger* 10 (2001), Prof. Best warns that "the field is moving so quickly that any list will be out of date very quickly. There are obvious standards, but . . . :

"1. Variorum editors should look regularly at two or three of the major maintained lists of links for Shakespeare scholars to see what is available. The following sites have been stable for some time, but addresses do change and new works appear regularly. . . .

"2. Editors . . . should look carefully at the options provided for searching. There is usually a 'help' page, or something called 'advanced search' that will be helpful. An example: LION uses old-spelling texts, so there are a number of ways in which a searcher can use 'wildcards' or other means to simplify a search [among variant archaic spellings]. Searches that produce too many 'hits' can also be limited by time, by period, by genre, and so on, so that the task of winnowing becomes less daunting. Sites often use external search engines such as Google, and it is worth visiting the main Google site to learn how to narrow or broaden a search."

Sites for Shakespeare in general.

Shaksites. <http://www.uvic.ca/shakespeare/Annex/Shaksites1.html>

Michael Best's comprehensive "portal" to Sh., updated in the summer.

Best. <http://www.uvic.ca/shakespeare/Library/Criticism/guide.html>

Michael Best's special page of refereed sites in conjunction with his chapter in the forthcoming Oxford Guide to Shakespeare.

Mr. William Shakespeare and the Internet. <http://shakespeare.palomar.edu/>

Terry Gray's comprehensive and often-cited page of links has useful comments on the materials listed but does not list commercial sites.

Shakespeare in Europe. <http://www.unibas.ch/shine>

From Basel U.

Humbul Humanities Hub. <http://www.humbul.ac.uk>

Hosted by Oxford U., a comprehensive portal for all sites on the internet that deal with humanities subjects. The sites are fully reviewed and annotated, but may take time to find because the coverage of this portal is so complete.

SHAKSPER. <http://www.shaksper.net>

Hardy Cook's site includes a substantial archive. The above URL is to the website and will not involve one in the discussion group unless one so wishes.

Voice of the Shuttle. <http://www.vos.ucsb.edu>

Alan Liu's humanities megasite, supported by the University of California at Santa Barbara, has many Shakespeare research resources and links. The Renaissance and seventeenth-century portion is found at shuttle/eng-ren.html. As of 2002 this site still lacks the capacity for Boolean searches.

Text databases

On the perils of trusting in the textual reliability of electronic resources, see William P.

Williams, "Caveat Lector. English Books 1475-1700 and the Electronic Age," *AEB* 12 (2001), 1-29.

A. Shakespearean texts

The Oxford Text Archive. <http://ota.ahds.ac.uk>

For many years Oxford has sold electronic texts of all F and good Q plays (and of hundreds of other works including some source plays). The archive is now online. The Sh. texts are ASCII, original-spelling versions, occasionally containing small errors.

The Oxford University Press Electronic Shakespeare.

Forty-four texts in ASCII files on PC diskettes. The tagging in the early informal markup language COCOA, enabling use of the *Micro-Oxford Concordance Program*, is described by Lancashire (2002, pp. 95-6).

Michael Best, Internet Shakespeare Editions. <http://web.uvic.ca/shakespeare>

Transcribed Q and F texts of most of the plays. No search engine yet.

Chadwyck-Healey's Editions and Adaptations. <http://lion.chadwyck.com>

Lancashire (2002, p. 96): "Searchable, browsable, printable and save-able transcriptions of eleven major editions, twenty-four Shakespeare quartos from 1594 to 1634, six apocryphal plays from the Third Folio (1664), versions of plays possibly related to Shakespeare's works, and a hundred adaptations, sequels and burlesques including Bell's edition of 1774. The major editions include the 1623 folio and editions by Nicholas Rowe (1709-10), Alexander Pope (17[25]), Lewis Theobald (1733), William Warburton (1747), Samuel Johnson (1765), Edward Capell (1768, 17[83]), George Steevens (1778), Edmond Malone and James Boswell (1821), and John P. Collier (184[2-]4, 1853). This is the largest and most accurate electronic library of Shakespeare editions produced to date." Available on CD-ROM.

Arden Shakespeare CD-ROM

This provides searchable texts of all ARD2 editions, facsimiles of F1 and 29 quartos, and a number of reference works.

B. Other literary texts

Literature on Line (Chadwyck-Healey). <http://lion.chadwyck.com>

The most accessible and fully searchable database at present available, by subscription. LION is not always accurate, and sometimes takes its texts from later printings, so references will need to be checked against the originals. Includes English poetry 8th c. to present, English drama 1280 to 1915, English fiction 16th to 19th centuries.

Early English Books on Line. <http://www.lib.umich.edu/eebo/>

Available by subscription. It offers photographic reprints of STC items, searchable in most cases only by general terms in titles. Only a few texts have been transcribed into machine-readable format, and some early attempts had difficulty interpreting and reproducing archaic type characters such as macrons, digraphs, black-letter turned *r*, etc. But for editors who know what they want, EEBO can save a trip to the British Library or the Folger.

Renascence Editions. <http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~rbear/ren.htm>

This site, maintained by Richard Bear, provides very good texts, though originals should be consulted for reference.

Renaissance Electronic Texts. <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/utel/ret/ret.html>

The U. of Toronto's RET has some useful items, such as the *Homilies*.

Oxford Text Archive. <http://ota.ahds.ac.uk>

The OTA offers on-line resources on literature and linguistics, and sells ASCII old-spelling versions of original editions of many works besides Shakespeare's, reportedly not so accurate as those on the Internet Shakespeare site.

University of Virginia E-text Center. <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/ebooks>

Many texts, including all of Shakespeare.

Bartleby. <http://www.bartleby.com>

Some interesting titles, such as Chapman's Homer. A searchable database of the Oxford Shakespeare can be found at bartleby.com/70/index.html

Christian Classics Ethereal Library. <http://www.cel.org>

Some useful texts, including some of Donne's sermons. Their methodology for developing the texts is highly professional.

Furness Library. <http://dewey.lib.upenn.edu/SCETI/Furness/>

The Center for Electronic and Text Image provides images of early books, including the Furness F1. Many useful texts, though not machine-readable (searchable). An alternative address is <http://www.library.upenn.edu/etext/collections/furness/index.html>

Perseus Project. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/Texts/Marlowe.html>

Besides providing vast information about the literature and culture of the ancient classical world, Prof. Greg Crane's Perseus site from Tufts U. provides Marlowe's works and a number of PDF (searchable) versions of the oldest Furness Variorum volumes.

Cleary. <http://tech.org/~cleary/middhome.html>

Chris Cleary has put the most widely read of Middleton's plays on-line.

Representative Poetry Online. <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/utel/rp/index1stlines.html>

Ian Lancashire's anthology includes early poetry.

Luminarium. <http://www.luminarium.org>

Aniina Jokinen's anthology of early poetry.

Linguistic databases

OED Online. Includes the 20 vols. of the 2nd ed. and three Additions vols., 1993-7, and is being continually added to and revised. One may search and print out all citations from one's play. By subscription.

Early Modern English Dictionaries Database.

<http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/english/emed/emedd.html>

Ian Lancashire at U. of Toronto provides a powerful and useful means of searching for possible meanings of individual words. The associated "Patterweb" site provides some advanced methods of searching.

Michigan Early Modern English Materials. <http://www.hti.umich.edu/index-all.html>

A database for word searches. Michigan provides public-domain early modern texts, including most of Jonson's plays.

Shakespeare Database CD-ROM

The preview version of 1995 by H. Joachim Neuhaus and Marvin Spevack anticipates the scope and structure of this huge forthcoming resource for Shakespeare stylometric research. In response to queries made through "access templates," this database will be able to generate data on Shakespeare's vocabulary (lexis), inflection (grammar), word-formation (morphology), thesaurus (semantics), and dramatis personae, as well as edited text (Riverside, with variants from Oxford and Bevington) and copy-text facsimiles (incl. quartos from Huntington, Folger, Bodleian, and BL).

Donald Foster's long-awaited Shaxicon has not yet been published. I (RK) own an intermediate version on PC diskettes.

Library catalogues

Worldcat (OCLC Union Cat.)

Virtually a world union catalogue, of 44 million books in OCLC libraries worldwide. By subscription.

Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN). <http://www.eureka.rlg.org>
 Another vast union catalogue, covering materials not listed in OCLC, such as manuscripts, films, illustrations, maps, etc.

Touchstone. <http://www.touchstone.bham.ac.uk>
 This entry to the combined UK Shakespeare libraries is funded by the BL but runs out of the University of Birmingham. In progress.

British Library Public Catalog. <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/blpc.html>

Library of Congress Online Catalog. <http://catalog.loc.gov/>

Folger Shakespeare Library. <http://www.folger.edu/welcome.htm>
 Hamnet catalogues materials 1800-present. Earlier books are in the Folger ESTC database.

Furness Library. <http://www.franklin.library.upenn.edu>

Huntington Library. <http://www.huntington.org>

Bibliographies

World Shakespeare Bibliography <http://www.worldshakesbib.org>
 James Harner's bibliography is available from Cambridge U. P. on a CD-ROM for the years 1983-95 and is available online (by subscription) for (in 2002) the years 1971-2002.

MLA International Bibliography. 1963-present. By subscription.

English Short-Title Catalogue. English books 1473-1800. By subscription.

Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (formerly MHRA bib.). 1920-present; catalogues reviews. Chadwyck-Healey.

Reprints of journals

JStor. Full-text database of more than 100 academic journals, with graphic images. Includes *SQ*, *Speculum*, *ELN*, *MLN*. By subscription.

Proquest. Indexes 2000 general-interest and academic journals and provides full text of nearly 1000. By subscription.

Project Muse. Johns Hopkins' full-text database of 40+ journals. By subscription.

Internet Library of Early Journals. <http://www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/ilej/>
 Searchable file of digital images of 6 18th-c. and 19th-c. journals, including *GM*, *N&Q*, and *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*. To search for Sh. items in, e.g., *N&Q*, select Search, *N&Q*, and Subject Index--but you will have to look under spellings of Shakspeare etc. as well as Shakespeare in order to find all items.

Studies in Bibliography. <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/bsuva/>

*Special resources**A. Bibles and concordances*

Bible Browser. <http://www.stg.brown.edu/webs/bible-browser/>
Enables searches for words and passages in 8 Bibles, Latin & English.

The Holy Bible, King James Version. <http://etext.virginia.edu/kjv.browse.html>
Searchable text of OT, NT, and Apocrypha in King James version side-by-side with Revised Standard Version.

Humanities Text Initiative, U. of Michigan <http://www.hti.umich.edu/relig.kjv>
Searchable edition of the King James Bible.

The Unbound Bible. <http://unbound.biola.edu>
Searchable texts of 24 versions of the Bible, incl. Hebrew, Greek, and 7 English translations.

B. Miscellaneous

Shakespeare Illustrated.
(www.cc.emory.edu/ENGLISH/classes/Shakespeare_Illustrated/Shakespeare.html)

There are two databases from the University of Reading offering information on theaters, including performance schedules:

Globe Theater. <http://www.rdg.ac.uk/globe/>
Includes a research database.

Rose Theatre. <http://www.rdg.ac.uk/rose/>

Shakespeare Prompt-Books of the Seventeenth Century <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/bsuva/>
Gwynne Evans's facsimiles and his analyses of the texts.

Internet Movie Database. <http://imdb.com>
Includes film adaptations of Sh.

Nineteenth-Century Productions, Performers and Critics of Shakespeare
<http://classicaltheatre.com>

Anticipating Electronic Publication.

Several electronic consultants to the Variorum Committee have suggested that instead of preparing conventional manuscripts with a word-processing program, Variorum editors should, from the moment they begin taking notes, and subsequently during the writing of the editions, begin the process of electronic tagging of their material, if possible producing plain ASCII files tagged according to a standard markup scheme such as TEI. According to one system of tagging or another they would identify by invisible SGML, XML, or other markers either the semantic content of their items of collected material (bibliographic citation, name, commentator) or their place in a database of bibliographic entries. Such tagging is intended "to generate multiple, simultaneous products, including the printed volume but also perhaps

screen-based texts in a variety of formats, citation and cross-reference databases, sophisticated search-and-retrieval programs, and so on,” according to Clifford Wulfman, an authority on such markup. Anyone interested in seeing the rationales for such systems of tagging, and the kind and amount of markup involved, may purchase from the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) their 2-vol. *Guidelines for Electronic Text Encoding and Interchange*, or visit <<http://www.tei-c.org>> for advice about software, tutorials, discussion groups, and other resources.

While admitting the incalculable potential of such markup, neither the recent Variorum Committees who have discussed it nor the present General Editors can generate much enthusiasm for adding yet one more very time-consuming and complicated task (tagging) to the already gargantuan and complex task of collecting material for and producing a Variorum edition. In the General Editors’ own experience, complete attention is needed in taking notes and assimilating them into coherent parts of a Variorum; additional concerns, such as how to insert tagging in a sentence, must be an added distraction. Any editor who wishes to undertake it has their blessing, but no one at present is being urged to do so. Software for tagging is continually being developed and the process made more simple and automatic; some word-processing programs already contain elements that enable certain kinds of XML tagging. It therefore seems prudent to wait a while to see what the future brings, and to expect that in the meantime expert taggers will supply markup to the conventional manuscripts that MLA receives from us.

XV. APPENDICES: SUPPLEMENTARY FINDING-LISTS.

The following appendices are supplementary guides which should help editors locate certain kinds of material relevant to commentary, stage history, etc.

Appendix I: Commentators and Conjectors. (Richard Knowles, 1985.)

The following list is intended to help Variorum editors find comments and conjectures that they have seen mentioned but for which they lack the bibliographical information needed to track them down and verify them. This list is just a beginning; all Variorum editors are urged to supply additional information so that this list may be supplemented and updated. It often happens that an interesting or useful comment or a proposed reading is alluded to by a Cambridge or Arden editor merely by the author's last name, and that we subsequently spend inordinate amounts of time trying to track down the original in editions and journals from previous years. Sometimes the search is fruitless because the source is a letter to William Aldis Wright, and in fact one of the most efficient and pleasant ways to track down a great number of such troublesome items is simply to spend a couple of days in Trinity College Library, Cambridge, going through the several boxes of Wright papers. But more often the source is printed, and is available to us if only we knew somewhat more about it. What follows is a checklist of some of the places where fugitive commentary and conjectures may be located. Books of commentary written by the persons listed below are usually not cited because they will be already known to the Variorum editor. Please supplement and correct this list when you can by sending additional information to the General Editor(s).

Additional material about relatively unknown authors and their work can sometimes be found in *DNB* and *DAB*, Joseph Foster's *Alumni Oxonienses*, and J. A. Venn's *Alumni Cantabrigienses*. A wealth of information about 18th-c. editors and commentators is to be found in Arthur Sherbo's *Birth of Shakespeare Studies: Commentators from Rowe (1709) to Boswell-Malone (1821)* (1986) and *Shakespeare's Midwives: Some Neglected Shakespeareans* (1992), as well as in Peter Seary's *Lewis Theobald and the Editing of Shakespeare* (1990), Margreta De Grazia's *Shakespeare Verbatim* (1991), and Peter Martin's *Edmond Malone, Shakespearean Scholar* (1995). One may glean a great deal of information about 19th-c. Shakespeare scholars from Dewey Ganzel, *Fortune and Men's Eyes: The Career of John Payne Collier* (1982), John Velz, *One Touch of Shakespeare: The Letters of Joseph Crosby to Joseph Parker Norris 1875-1878* (1986), and Marvin Spevack, *James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps: Life and Works* (2001). Fugitive 19th-c. articles can usually be tracked down in Walter E. Houghton's *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900*. For material that one can identify only by the author's initials or pseudonym, James Kuist's published index to the *Gentleman's Magazine* often provides the full name; supplements to Kuist have been provided by Emily Lorraine de Montluzin in a series of articles in *Studies in Bibliography* 44-7, 49, 50 (1991-4, 1996, 1997); see also her on-line site at <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/bsuva/>. Electronic files of many complete runs of older periodicals may be accessed by way of J-Stor and ProQuest, and the new Internet Library of Early Journals already provides searchable facsimiles of *Blackwood's*, *Gentleman's Magazine*, and *Notes & Queries*, including indexes listing items about Shakespeare.

Persons.

Ainger, Alfred (1837-1904). Contributor to Wright's Clarendon ed. (CLN1)

Allen, George (1808-76). Professor of classics at the U. of Pennsylvania and friend of

Furness, who often adopted his suggestions and credited them to Allen MS. The Furness

- Sh. Library owns two sets of Allen's annotations. One is an interleaved Delius ed. (1864); the other, a set of CAM1 volumes, is heavily annotated for *MM*, *Lr.*, *Mac.*, *Rom.*, *Oth.*, *IH4*, and *Ham*.
- Amner, [Rev. Richard] (1737-1803). Often when George Steevens (perhaps with help from Joseph Ritson) wanted to explicate an indecency, he credited the explication to this hapless cleric, who preached at Hampstead 1765-77. The notes appear in v1778, Malone 1780, v1793.
- As You Like It [pseud. in *GM*]. Kuist identifies as either Thomas Holt White or John Loveday.
- B, A. E. See Brae, Andrew E.
- B, G. S. See Bower, George Spencer.
- Barlow, [not further identified]. Contributor to CAM1. Perhaps the Dante scholar Henry C. Barlow (1806-76).
- Barry, Rev. H. Contributor to COL1.
- Blackstone, Sir William (1723-80), Solicitor-General, legal scholar. Contributor to Malone 1780. Notes in 1780 signed "E" are by Blackstone.
- Blair, Alexander (1834-96). Contributor to CAM2; letters in Wright Shakespeariana, Trinity College, Cambridge.
- Blakeway, John B. (1765-1826), antiquary. Contributor to v1821.
- Boaden, James (1762-1839), biographer, dramatist, collector. Contributor to v1803, SING1.
- Bohn, Henry G. (1796-1884). Bibliographer, publisher, ed. S. Butler. Contributor to CAM1.
- Bowle, Rev. John (1725-88), vicar of Idmiston near Salisbury, collector. Contributor to v1778, MAL. MS notes to Malone, BL.
- Brae, Andrew E. (d. 1881), part of Collier controversy; many journal articles, some correspondence in Folger.
- Bright, B. H. Contributor to CAM1. Probably Benjamin H. Bright (fl. 1809-45), collector.
- Bright, Henry A. Contributor to CAM1. Probably Henry Arthur Bright (1830-84), ed. poems of Kenelm Digby.
- Browne, William (?) S. (fl. ca. 1885). Quoted by CAM2. The *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals* identifies him only as antiquary. Wm. Sainsbury Browne (1829-?) was rector of Stanton Prior in Bath, 1866.
- Buchanan, [not further identified]. Quoted by CAM2.
- Bulloch, John, of Aberdeen (1805-82). Books, contributor to CAM1.
- Burney, Dr. Charles (1726-1814), musicologist, playwright. Contributor to v1773, MAL, v1793.
- Caldecott, Thomas (1744-1833). Collector, ed. *AYL* and *Ham*. Extensive MS notes in v1813, BL.
- Capell, Edward (1713-81). Trinity College Library, Cambridge, owns both a holograph of his edition, with inclusive dates for the editing of each play and showing the metrical linking of lines of verse, and a copy of his ed. of 1768 in which he has marked the metrics for every play, often with differences from the holograph. The holograph was not used for printer's copy; the marked edition was apparently used to prepare for his study of meter in CAPN. See P. Werstine, R. Knowles, *6 Library 7* (1985). The Folger Library owns a microfilm of the holograph.
- Case, Robert H. (1857-1944). Contributor to ARD1 vols. edited by others.
- Chalmers, George (1742-1825), antiquary. Books, contributor to v1803.
- Chamier, Anthony (1728-80). Stockbroker, Secretary of the War Office, member of Johnson's circle. Contributor to JOHN1; v1773?.
- Chedworth, John Howe, Lord (1754-1804). Books, some posthumous notes in Seymour's *Remarks* (1805).
- Collier, John Payne, editor and forger. The Huntington owns his annotated Perkins F2 (mCOL1) and Bridgewater F1 (mCOL2). BL owns a COL1 with correspondence tipped in. Folger owns a COL2 with Collier's annotations.

- Collins, [not further identified]. John Mitford, *Cursory Notes* (1856, p. 22) refers to “the long note . . . in the 15th volume of the *Variorum Shakespeare*, signed Collins (*i. e.* G. Steevens).” I have seen other references averring that some Collins notes are fictional; and see Sherbo, *Birth*, pp. 56-63. One and perhaps two real Collinses may be represented in the Variorums; see next two entries.
- Collins, Rev. John, of Ledbury (1741-97). He was Capell’s literary executor and superintended the printing of the last sheets of CAPN. According to Malone he was author of *Letter to George Harding*; though Nichols mistakenly attributed this work to William Collins (*Lit. Anecd.* 9:803), he correctly identifies John as the author in *Lit. Illus.* 3:839-42. This work, published in 1777, takes issue with Steevens’s Preface to v1773, accuses Steevens of plagiarizing from Capell, and includes a “Sonnet to Mr. Capell.” It would not be unlike Steevens to include fictional notes from a man named “Collins” in v1778; but the “Mr. Collins of Hampstead” is quoted earlier in v1773 and is reported dead in 1783, and so may be entirely pseudonymous. Correspondence in the Furness Library between Furness and Penzance bookseller John Kinsman in 1872 reveals that Furness bought several quartos with Capell’s annotations (now in the Furness Library) from the heirs of Rev. John Collins of Ledbury. See Nichols, *Lit. Illus.* 3:839-42 on Capell’s friend and Steevens’s enemy.
- Collins, William (1721-59), poet. According to CAM1 Preface, he contributed to early variorums, though how he did it posthumously is not explained. Sherbo, *Birth*, pp. 23-4, says that his notes passed from Warton to Johnson and hence to v1773.
- Corney, Bolton (1784-1870), clerk at Greenwich Hospital. Contributor to CAM1, ed. vol. of travels for Hakluyt Soc., author misc. essays and journal notes on Sh.
- Craig, William J. (1843-1906). Ed. OXF1, contributor to ARD1.
- Crosby, Joseph (1822-91). Collector, contributor to CLN1, HUD2, CAM2, etc., author of misc. notes on Sh. For his MSS at the Folger, his MS notes in eds. owned by U. of Wisconsin, etc., see John Velz’s index to Crosby’s work.
- Cunningham, Peter (1816-69). Contributor to COL1.
- Daniel, George (1789-1864), collector of Shakespeareana, ballads. In a letter to William Aldis Wright dated 25 Feb. 1893 (Trinity Coll. Add. MS 6.61(3)), Peter A. Daniel (see next item) says that any “Daniel” mentioned in CAM1 was not him, but perhaps George Daniel.
- Daniel, Peter A. *Notes* (1870), ed. some Sh. Soc. Quarto Facsimiles, contributor to CAM2, copyist for MS notes of Howard Staunton (q.v.).
- Dawson, Henry (d. 1755). Quoted in mTBY2. See Thirlby, Styan.
- Douce, Francis (1757-1834), Keeper of MSS, BM, antiquary, friend of Farmer, Steevens, and Malone. *Illustrations* (1807), contributor to v1793; notes rpt. v1821.
- Elwin, Hastings (fl. 1853). See Furness, ed. *Mac.* (1873), p. x.
- Eyton, [not further identified]. Contributor to CAM2. Possibly Robert Eyton (1845?-?), vicar of Holy Trinity, Upper Chelsea, or Robert William Eyton (1815-81), historian.
- Fairholt, Frederick William (1814-66), illustrator. Contributor to HAL.
- Farmer, Richard (1735-97), Canon of St. Paul’s. Books, contributor to v1773, v1778, Malone 1780, v1785, v1793. See esp. v1773, 10:202^v-206^v.
- Field, Barron. Conjectures published in Sh. Soc. *Papers* (1845), contributor to COL1.
- Furness, Horace Howard. The Furness Shakespeare Library at the University of Pennsylvania contains a number of notebooks of newspaper and journal cuttings that Furness collected after he had edited a play, and on general subjects as well. These are largely reviews of performances, but often there are nuggets of commentary from obscure journal articles that one might otherwise miss. The Furness call numbers are 94.-- / F98NC; the two digits following the “94.” vary with each play, as follows: .04 *Ant.*; .06 *AYL*; .12 *Cym.*; .14 *Ham.*; .20 *JC*; .42 *Lr.*; .50 *LLL*; .52 *Mac.*; .56 *MM*; .58 *MV*; .64 *Wiv.*; .66 *MND*;

- .68 *Ado*; .70 *Oth.*; .76 *Rom.*; .80 *Shr.*; .82 *Tmp.*; .92 *TN*; .98 *WT*. The numbers for *Poems* are 95.2; for *Sh. Eds. & Editors*, 80.8 and 87.2; for *Philology* 9.400, and for *Actors and Actresses*, 51.8. Robert K. Turner owns Mrs. Furness's index to William S. Walker.
- Gildon, Charles. "Glossary" and "Remarks" in supplementary vol. 7 (1710) added to Rowe, ed. 1709.
- Glover, John. Joint editor of vol. 1 of CAM1; conjectures noted in CAM2.
- Goodwin, C. W. Contributor to CAM1. Probably Charles Wycliffe Goodwin (1817-78), Cambridge antiquary.
- Gould, George, of Bermondsey. Conjectures in his *Corrigenda* are difficult to find unless one knows that they exist in at least three places. Those in the 1st-ed. pamphlet of 1881 were absorbed in the second issue of 1884, and in 1884 the second issue appeared again with supplementary pages introducing still a third set of readings. Mark Eccles dates this supplement 1887.
- Gow, James (1854-1923). Contributor to CAM2.
- Greg, Walter W. (1875-1959). Contributor to CAM3.
- Hall, Henry T. (1813-79). Rector at Semley, Dorset, 1856-79. Contributor to HUD2.
- Halliwell, James O. (1820-89). Contributor to CAM1.
- Hamilton, Nicholas E. S. A. (d. 1915), assistant to Frederick Madden at BM and involved in the Collier controversy through Madden. Contributor to CAM1.
- Hanmer, Sir Thomas (1677-1746). Correspondence with William Warburton, 1735-9, BL.
- Harris, [not further identified]. Contributor to v1803, v1813. Sherbo, *Birth*, pp. 155, 157-60, identifies him as W. Harris, librarian of the Royal Institution, who did proofreading for v1803, and not, as I earlier guessed, Thomas Harris (d. 1820), manager and patentee of Covent-Garden Th., friend of Sheridan, Mrs. Inchbald.
- Hawkins, Sir John (1719-89), musicologist, biographer of S. Johnson. Contributor to JOHN1, HAN3, v1773, v1778. See also Percy.
- Heath, Benjamin (1704-66). Furness says that Heath, *Revisal* (1765) adopted readings of JOHN1, but in his Preface Heath says he finished his MS "about six years ago" and let it lie unpublished until notice "last spring" [1764?] that Johnson intended to publish his edition "about the beginning of the winter" [1764-5], from which notice he concluded that "present publication would not be unseasonable," with "no other improvements since it was first written, than some few alterations which on the review seemed necessary" and some minor adjustments occasioned by material in later editions of Thomas Edwards's *Canons of Criticism* (1748; 7th ed. 1765).
- Henderson, [not further identified]. Contributor to v1785. He is John Henderson, well-known actor and friend of Steevens, Reed, and Malone, d. 1785.
- Henley, Samuel (1740-1815). Tr. Beckford's *Vathek*. Contributor to Malone 1780, v1785; annotations in MAL, v1793, v1821 may derive from John Bell's *Annotations* (1787): see B. Kliman, *ShN* 48 (1998-9).
- Hudson, Henry N. Shn. ed., contributor to CAM2.
- Hull, Thomas (d. 1808). MS notes quoted in HAL.
- Hunter, Alexander (fl. 1799). See Rowe, Harry.
- Jefferson, Daniel, of Boston. Contributor to HUD2.
- Jenkins, Harold (1909-2000). Contributor to ARD2.
- Jourdain, W. C. Conjectures published in *Trans. Philol. Soc. 1860-1*, contributor to CAM1. Notes in Folger v1821.
- Krauth, C. P., Philadelphia philosopher and friend of H. H. Furness; contributor to Furness Variorum. See Furness, ed. *Tmp.* (1892), p. 453.
- Kynaston, John (1728-82). Contributor to *Gent. Mag.*, *St. James Chron.*
- Langton, Bennet (1737-1801), friend of Johnson and Boswell, ed. *Idler*. According to CAM1 Preface, contributor to early variorums, but perhaps only to JOHN1.

- Letherland, [not further identified]. CAM1 Preface says he contributed to early variorums. He is Dr. Joseph Letherland (1699-1764) from Stratford, collector and physician to the Queen. His notes were lent to Steevens and appeared posthumously in v1773; see Sherbo, *Birth*, p. 50.
- Lettsom, William Hanson (1796-1865). Ed. William S. Walker's *Critical Examination* (1860), contributed to CAM1, DYCE2. His copy of his F1 facs. (1807?) in the Victoria and Albert Museum's Dyce collection (Dyce LFo 8937) is heavily if microscopically annotated. His friend Dyce adopted some conjectures in DYCE2, others are later.
- Lewis, [not further identified]. Contributor to CAM1. Possibly John Delaware Lewis (1828-84), London collector.
- Lloyd, Rev. Julius (1830-92). Contributor to CAM1.
- Long, Roger (1680-1770). The "Long MS" quoted by CAM2 is notes in a copy of F2 formerly owned by Roger Long and now owned by Pembroke College, Cambridge. Long, a mathematician and astronomer, was Master of Pembroke 1733-70. Date Long annotations 1700- (he took his AB in 1700) or 1733-?
- Lushington, Rev. Henry (1709-79), vicar of Eastbourne. Notes in THEO1, Copy 5, Folger Libr., ca. 1754. (Andrew Gurr.)
- Malone, Edmond (1741-1812), editor. Contributor to v1778, v1785. His notebook in BL (Add. 30,943) contains annotations to Sh., as does another in the Furness Collection, Univ. of Pennsylvania Libr.
- Mason, John Monck (1726-1809). Books, contributor to v1785, quoted in MAL.
- Maxwell, J. C. (1916-76). Contributor to ARD2.
- Mitford, Rev. John (1781-1859), collector, Benhall, Suffolk. Books; anonymous emendations in *GM NS* 22 (1844), 115-36, 451-72, and NS 23 (1845), 115-32, 571-85; contributor to COL1.
- Musgrave, Samuel (1732-80). Physician, friend of Johnson and Tyrwhitt, ed. Euripides, contributor to v1778.
- Nichols, James (fl. ca. 1861-4). Books, contributor to CAM1.
- Nichols, John N. (1745-1826). Contributor to v1778. Ed. *Lit. Illus.*, 8 vols., 1817-58, containing correspondence of Theobald and Warburton. Original letters in Folger and BL.
- Nicholson, Brinsley (1824-92), Ed. Jonson, Sh., Reginald Scot; many notes to *Athenaeum*, *N&Q*; contributor to CAM1. MS notes in Daniel's *Cursory* (1870), Folger.
- Oldys, William (1696-1761). MS quoted by Malone in v1778.
- Orson, S. W. (fl. 1890-1900). Published notes and conjectures (signed O. S. W.) in *Literary World*: 16 Jan. 1891, p. 58 (*LLL*, *MND*); 13 Feb. 1891, p. 153 (*MND*, *AWW*, *AYL*); 22 May 1891, p. 489 (*Mac.*, *Jn.*, *Cor.*); 25 Sept. 1891, p. 240 (*IH4*, *2H4*, *H5*); 17 Aug. 1894, p. 118 (*Ado*, *LLL*). A MS in the Furness Library (80.7/Or8) includes these and more, on *LLL*, *MND*, *MV*, *AYL*, *AWW*, *Jn.*, *IH4*, *2H4*, *H5*, *H8*, *Cor.*, *Mac.*, *Ham.*, *Ant.*, *Cym.*, *Tro.*. Letters in Wright Shakespeariana, Trinity Coll., Cambridge.
- Percy, Thomas (1729-1811), Bishop of Dromore. Ed. *Reliques*, contributed to JOHN1, HAN3, v1773 (see vol. 10 Appendix), v1778, Malone 1780, MAL, v1793, v1803. Folger MS S.b.111 is a glossary copied by Percy from HAN1, with some additions found in HAN3, and some entries apparently by John Hawkins.
- Perring, Philip (1828-1920). *Hard Knots* (1885, 1886), *N&Q*, letters in Wright Shakespeariana, Trinity Coll., Cambridge.
- Porson, Richard (1759-1808). Classical scholar, contributor to Malone 1780, v1785.
- Quincy, Josiah P. Published *Manuscript Corrections from a Copy of the Fourth Folio* (1854). His annotated copy of F4, often called the "Quincy MS," has never been identified.
- Reed, Isaac (1742-1807). Shn. editor, v1785, v1793, v1803, v1813; contributor to v1778. BL owns a copy of v1778 with his MS notes.
- Reynolds, Sir Joshua (1723-92), portrait painter, Johnson's circle. Contributor to JOHN1,

- Malone 1780, MAL.
- Ritson, Joseph (1752-1803). Books, contributor to v1793.
- Roberts, William Hayward (1734-91), barrister and dramatist; Sherbo, *Birth*, p. 53, identifies him as Provost of Eton. Contributor to v1773, v1821 (posthumously).
- Rodd, Thomas, Jr. (1796-1849), London bookseller. Contributor to KNT1.
- Roderick, Richard (1710-56), Fellow of Magdalen Coll., Camb., and of the Royal Soc. and Antiquarian Soc. Contributed "Remarks on Shakespear" to Thomas Edwards's 1758 edition of *Canons*, pp. 212-38.
- Rossiter, Arthur P. (d. 1957). Contributor to Winny ed. *MM* (1959).
- "Rowe, Harry" (pseud. A. Hunter). See Furness, ed. *Rom.* (1871), pp. ix-x.
- Seward, [not further identified]. According to CAM1, contributed to early variorums. Probably Thomas Seward (1708-90), ed. Beaumont & Fletcher 1750, an edition which contains occasional conjectures concerning lines in Sh. Otherwise possibly William Seward (1747-99), author of *Anecdotes, Biographiana*.
- Sharswood, Chief Justice (fl. 1864-5). See Furness, ed. *Tmp.* (1892), p. 453.
- Singer, Samuel Weller (1783-1858), Shn. editor. The annotated copy of F2 that Singer cites in SING2 (as if in emulation of Collier's Perkins F2) has never been identified.
- Smith, Archibald. Contributor to CAM1 and under the initials A. S. to *N&Q*. Possibly the editor and writer on navigation (1813-72).
- Smith, Goldwin. Contributor to CAM1. Probably Goldwin Smith (1823-1910), sometime professor at Oxford, writer on history, literature.
- Smith, William (1690-1767). Contributor to Zachary Grey's *Notes* (1754). Grey identifies himself (p. xii) as "Mr. Smith of Harleston in Norfolk" who assisted Thomas Hanmer and contributed to Grey's *Hudibras*.
- Spedding, James (1808-81). Literary historian who did ed. and biog. of Bacon. Contributor to CAM1.
- Staunton, Howard (1810-74), Shn. editor. Notes from his papers were copied by Peter A. Daniel into a copy of Staunton's ed. (1864) now in the Folger Library. Through Daniel, W. J. Craig was acquainted with and used these annotations. Notes in *Athenaeum* 1872-3. Clement Ingleby surveys Staunton's whole corpus in 6 *N&Q* 4, mentioning 18 *Athenaeum* articles.
- Steevens, George (1736-1800), Shn. editor. Contributor to Malone 1780, v1803. The Bodleian owns a copy of v1793 with his MS notes. See also Amner; Collins. BL owns annotated Mason, *Comments B&F* (1798).
- Talbot, [not further identified]. Contributor to v1821. Not, apparently, Montague Talbot (1774-1831), but Boswell's near contemporary at Brasenose and in London barristry, Richard Talbot; see Sherbo, *Birth*, pp. 175-6.
- Taylor, John. Notes in a copy of v1813 owned by Trinity College Library, Cambridge, quoted in CAM1, CAM2. In 1866 he is cited in CAM1 (8:195) as "the late Mr. John Taylor." He is very likely the John Taylor (1781-1864) who wrote on the Junius letters and on economic theory.
- Theobald, Lewis (1688-1744), Shn. editor, playwright. His MS annotations include notes in Folger Library copy 20 of F2 (mTHEO1) and two collections of letters to William Warburton: Phillipps MS (1729-34; mTHEO2), Egerton MS (1729-36; mTHEO3). Early conjectures in *Restored*, 1726.
- Thirlby, Styan (ca. 1686-1753). The best account of Thirlby's many collections of annotations, and an explanatory key to his Latin abbreviations, may be found in John Hazel Smith's article in *Shakespeare Studies* 11 (1978), 219-41. Partly as a result of Smith's research the Thirlby sigla in the *Variorum Handbook* have been revised as follows:
- mTBY1 Notes in ROWE1 or ROWE2, now lost (1709-25).
 - mTBY2 Notes in POPE1, Yale (1725-33)
 - mTBY3 Notes in THEO1, Folger (1733-47)

- mTBY4 Notes in WARB, Folger (1747-53)
 Other loose papers dated 1729 are now lost. The Variorum General Editors possess microfilms of all extant Thirlby annotations.
- Thompson, Edward Maunde (1840-1929). Contributor to CAM3.
- Tollet, George (1725-79), gentleman-farmer, friend of Steevens. Contributor to v1773 (vol. 10, App.), v1778.
- Tooke, John Horne (1736-1812). Notes in Folger copy of MAL.
- Tovey, Rev. Duncan C. (d. 1918). Gray scholar, reviewer, essayist, ed. *Lr.* He wrote reviews of CAM2 in the *Guardian*, 22 July 1891 (vols. 1, 2), 1 June 1892 (vols. 3-5), 14 Sept. 1892 (vols. 6, 7). A number of his conjectures appear in the Wright Shakespeariana, Trinity Coll., Cambridge.
- Tyrwhitt, Thomas (1730-86). Ed. of Chaucer, contributor to v1773, v1778, Malone 1780, v1785. MS notes in BL copy of F2.
- Vaillant, Paul (d. 1802), London bookseller and publisher. Contributor to v1793.
- Verges, S. (pseud.?). Contributor to *N&Q*.
- Wagner, [not further identified]. Notes on several plays in CAM2 addenda.
- Walker, Alice (1900-?). Contributor to ARD2.
- Warburton, William (1698-1779), Shn. editor. Three sets of annotations are known:
 mWARB1 Letters to Theobald (1729-36), Folger, rpt. Nichols *Lit. Illus.*
 mWARB2 Notes in WARB, Folger.
 mWARB3 Notes in JOHN1, Folger.
- Warton, Thomas (1728-90), literary historian, ed. of Milton, poet, friend of Steevens and Malone. Contributor to HAN3 and Malone 1780; notes rpt. in v1773, v1778, v1785, and MAL.
- Whalley, Peter (1722-91). Books, ed. Jonson, contributor to Malone 1780, v1785.
- White, Richard Grant (1821-1885), Shn. editor. Contributor to CAM1.
- White, R. S. MS notes dated 1799 in Folger copy 2 of MAL.
- White, T[homas] Holt (1763-1841), Miltonist. Contributor to *GM*, Malone 1780, v1785, v1793.
- White, [W.] Thomas (1771-?) of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. MS notes, Birmingham Public Library, printed inaccurately in James H. Fennell, *Shakespeare Repository*, nos. 2-4 (1853), pp. 14-15, 20-1, 29-31. Only four numbers of this journal were published; it is rare and fragile. It is owned by Furness (4 SH14 oversize) and U. of Wisconsin. The notes are on *Tmp.*, *TGV*, *Wiv.*, *MM*, *Err.*, *Ado*, *LLL*, *MND*, *MV*, *AYL*. There may be others in the original MS.
- Williams, W. W., of Oxford. Contributor to COL3, CAM1.
- Wray, G. O. Contributor to CAM1 or CAM2; letters in Wright Shakespeariana, Trinity Coll., Cambridge. Possibly either George Wray (fl. 1838-70), Prebendary of York, or George Octavius Wray, who published a religious pamphlet in 1892. Wright Add. MS b.61 (100), dated 1891 with return address of Surbiton Hill, Surrey has conjectures on all the plays.

Manuscript annotations.

The following is a list, with sigla, of sources of manuscript annotations that recent Variorum editors have occasionally found valuable enough to quote in the textual notes, commentary notes, or appendix of conjectural emendations. Some of these are mentioned (without sigla) in the "Notes on Editions of Shakespeare" or the "Finding-List of Commentators and Conjectors" above.

mF1H MS notes in F1, Honeyman copy. See HOOK (1959).

1650?

mFLV.a.80	[Evans, John. "Hesperides, or The Muses Garden."] Commonplace book, Folger Libr. See SORELIUS (<i>Library</i> , 1973).	1655-9.
mF4Q	MS notes in copy of F4 <i>apud</i> Quincy (1854)	1685-
mF2J	MS notes in copy of F2 sold in 1649 by Sarah Jones, <i>apud</i> Halliwell (1868)	-1700
mF1FL10	MS notes in F1, Copy 10, Folger Libr.	1700-
mTBY1	Styan Thirlby's notes in a lost copy of ROWE1 or ROWE2; now lost but quoted in mTBY2.	1709-25.
mPOPE	Alexander Pope's notes in F3, Copy 3, Folger Libr.	-1723
mF4FL33	MS notes in F4, Copy 33, Folger Libr.	-1723
mTBY2	Styan Thirlby's notes in POPE2, Beinecke Libr., Yale.	1725-33
mTHEO1	Lewis Theobald's notes in F2, Copy 20, Folger Libr.	1723-33
mTHEO2	Lewis Theobald's letters to William Warburton, Phillipps MS 8565, Folger Libr.	1729-34
mWARB1	Letters to Theobald (1729-36), Folger Libr.; rpt. Nichols, <i>Lit. Illus.</i>	1729-36
mTHEO3	Lewis Theobald's Letters to William Warburton, Egerton MS 1956, Brit. Libr.	1729-36
mLONG	Roger Long, notes in F2, Pembroke Coll. Libr., Cambridge.	-1733?
mF4TCC	MS notes in F4 (H.18.12), Trinity Coll. Libr., Cambridge.	1733?-
m1733FL	MS notes in THEO1, Copy 4, Folger Libr.	1733?-
mTBY3	Styan Thirlby's notes in THEO1, Copy 2, Folger Libr.	1733-47
mHAN	Thomas Hanmer, letters to William Warburton, Brit. Libr.	1735-9
mF2FL48	MS notes in F2, Copy 48, Folger Libr.	-1747
mTBY4	Styan Thirlby's notes in WARB, Copy 2, Folger Libr.	1747-53
mGREY	Zachary Grey, Notes and Extracts from Mr. Warburton's Shakespear, Cambridge Univ. Libr.	1747-66
mWARB2	William Warburton's notes in WARB, Copy 5,	

	Folger Libr.	1747-79
mCAP2	Edward Capell, holograph of CAP, Trinity Coll. Libr., Cambridge.	1749-66
mF2FL27	MS notes in F2, Copy 27, Folger Libr.	ca. 1750
LUSH	Henry Lushington's notes in THEO1, Copy 5, Folger.	ca. 1754
mF2FL21	MS notes in F2, Copy 21, Folger Libr.	1754-65
mF2FL20	MS notes in F2, Copy 20, Folger Libr.	-1765
mWARB3	MS notes in JOHN1, Folger Libr.	1765-79
mCAP4	Edward Capell's notes in CAP, Trinity Coll. Libr., Cambridge.	1768-9
mMAL1	Edmond Malone, Notebook, Add. 30,943, Brit. Libr.	1773-90
mMAL2	Edmond Malone, Notebook, Furness Collection, Univ. of Pennsylvania Libr.	1777-80
m1773FL3	MS notes v1773, Copy 3, Folger Libr.	1778?-
m1778BL	Isaac Reed and others (Edm. Malone? Samuel Henley? John[?] Henderson?). MS notes in v1778, Brit. Libr.	-1785
mTYR	Thomas Tyrwhitt's notes in F2, C.39.i.13, Brit. Libr.	-1786
m1768FL	MS notes in CAP, Folger Libr.	ca. 1790
mTOOK	John Horne Tooke, MS notes in MAL, Folger Libr.	1790-1812
m1790FL	MS notes in Ayscough's 1790 ed., Copy 8, Folger Libr.	1790-
mSTV2	George Steevens's & Isaac Reed's notes in proof sheets for Boydell ed.	1791-1802
m1793Bod	George Steevens, Isaac Reed et al., MS notes in v1793, Bodleian Libr.	1793-1803?
mF2TCC	MS notes in Capell's copy of F2, Trinity Coll. Libr., Cambridge.	-1800
mCALD	Thomas Caldecott's notes in v1813, 11762.dd, Brit. Libr.	1813-33
mCOLE	Samuel Taylor Coleridge's notes in Theobald ed. 1773 (not 1733), Brit. Libr. (C.45.a.21)	ca. 1834
mLET	William Nance Lettsom's notes in his F1 facs., V&A	

	Dyce Coll. LFo 8937.	1840-65.
mCOL2	John Payne Collier's notes in F1, Bridgewater copy, Huntington Libr.	ca. 1840
mCOL1	John Payne Collier's notes in F2, Perkins copy, Huntington Libr.	ca. 1850
mTAY	John Taylor's notes in ed. 1813, Trinity Coll. Libr., Cambridge.	ca. 1850
mCOL3	John Payne Collier's notes in COL2, Bodleian Libr.	1858-78?
mSTAU	Howard Staunton, MS notes, copied by P. A. Daniel, in Staunton's 1864 ed., Folger Libr.	1864-74
mPER	Philip Perring, MS notes on plays, Trinity Coll. Libr., Cambridge.	1885-1920?
mWRAY	G. O. Wray. Corrections and suggestions from the revd. Dr. Wray, Trinity Coll. Libr., Cambridge.	1891-3?
Wright MSS	William Aldis Wright Shakespeariana in Wren Library, Trinity Coll., Cambridge, Add. MS. b. 58.1-217, 59 1-376, 60 1-258, 61 1-138, and 62 1-47.	

Appendix 2: The Stage Historian at the British Library and the Folger. (David George, 1990.)

British Library.

See Annotations to The British Library Reader Guide No. 9: Named Special Collections in the Department of Printed Books Compiled by Alison Gould, January 1981, and Notes on the Playbill Collections at the Folger Library. This pamphlet may be picked up on entering the Reading Room on the rack where BL publications are kept. It is, however, rather inaccurate and will be much more useful with the following annotations [written before the move to St. Pancras in 1997].

- Page 4, Item 7. Archer, William. London and Provincial Theatre Programmes. 335, A, 1895-1924. 336, C, same dates. 337, D-G, ditto. 338, H-I, ditto. 339, K-R, ditto. 340, S-W, ditto. 341, not lettered, 1898-1923.
- Page 5, Item 20. Banks, Miss Sophia Sarah. Private theatrical performances. New #. Microfilm C 11856. Reel 6. (Restrictive material available only in Gallery.) At bindery in 1990.
- Page 6, Item 33. Bulloch, John Malcolm. London and Aberdeen Theatres. 1882-1938. "Plays I Have Seen." Programmes and newspaper cuttings.
- Page 6, Item 35. Burney, Charles. Private performances 1750-1808, 937.g.96; UK stage 1660-1801, 938 a-d; UK actors 1560-1816, 939.b.1; UK stage 1538-1807, 939 e, f.
- Page 6, Item 36. Burney, Charles. Playbills. 59 vols. DL, CG, Haymarket 1768-1817, 937.b-e; provincial playbills, 937.f.1,2; private performances, 937.g.96.

- Page 8, Item 51. Coxe, Francis. 94 vols. Untidy collection of clippings. 1788-1833.
- Page 8, Item 62. Daniel, George. The Stratford Jubilee vol. (1769).
- Page 10, Item 80. Evanion, Henry. If you call Tab.11748.a., you get a "Short List of French War Posters, 1914-19." The slip added helpfully "Related." This man was a conjuror and magician, real name Henry Evans. Call number not found. See Elizabeth Harland, "The Evanion Collection," *British Library Journal* 13 (Spring 1987): 64-70. The collection of this conjuror falls into two groups: (1) ephemera relating to conjurors and the entertainment world (posters, bills, programs, admission tickets, late 18th c. to 1845) and (2) ephemera of all kinds bearing on everyday Victorian life. Page 70, Harland: "of enormous value for anyone undertaking research into Victorian social life and the entertainment world." Call no. Evan.1-6 gets you 6 pamphlets on political elections.
- Page 11, Item 87. Garrick, David. Catalogue of Garrick Plays, call no. 643.
- Page 11, Item 96. Glynn, Sidney Carr. Playbills 342-63. A collection of London theatre playbills in 12 vols., 1801-1919. Typed handlist at Information Desk. London theatre playbills for theatres D-G, 1870-1901; theatres H-0, 1870-1904; theatres P-W, 1870-1904 in no. 345. Covent Garden, Jan. 1791 to 1818, nos. 354, 355. CG, 1833-56, no. 356. CG, 1835-80, no. 357. Haymarket, March 1801 to 1830, no. 358. Sadler's Wells, March 1837-Jan. 1859, no. 362. See Handlist for other theatres covered, 36 in all. Her Majesty's Theatre vol. (no 359) not to be used without conservator's permission.
- Page 11, Item 98. Gordon, Diana. Miscellaneous programmes for opera, theatre, ballet, concerts, choir, dance festival. 1932-74.
- Page 12, Item 111. Harris, Sir Augustus. 6 vols. of newspaper clippings on London theatres. 1706-1810. In poor condition. Vol. 1, 1706-79; Vol. 2, 1736-40; Vol. 3, 1744-60; Vol. 4, 1772-75; Vol. 5, 1770-72; Vol. 6, 1719-1810.
- Page 12, Item 112. Harris, Sir Augustus. 45 vols. of DL playbills, Oct 1780-March 1885. These 45 vols. are available only in the stacks, and special permission must be sought from a supervisor.
- Page 12, Item 113. Haslewood, Joseph. 11791.dd.18. Vol. 2 is misnumbered. dd. 19. instead of .dd.18. 9 vols. of newspaper and magazine clippings on the theatre, dating very haphazard. Vol. 1, ?1838-19 [sic]; Vol. 2, 1840-22; Vol. 3, 1714-40; Vol. 4, 1725-40; Vol. 5, 1712-43; Vol. 6, 1752-66; Vol. 7, 1767-9; Vol. 8, 1779-1823; Vol. 9, 1701-1755.
- Page 15, Item 141. Lacy, Thomas Hailes. 11795.k: The Dramatic Authors of England and Their Works, Vol. 1. 11795.k and df: Ditto, Vol. 2. 11795.k.df: Collections of Plays Comprising Editions of Dramas Written by Different Authors. Note: All three hardbound vols. are labeled simply 11795k on the outside. They consist of lists of plays. I cannot determine what the description in Gould "six manuscript volumes" refers to, nor can I tell what is meant by "a collection of four copies of D. E. Baker. Biographica dramatica."
- Page 18, Item 175. Percival, Richard. 14 vols. of materials relating to Sadler's Wells. Vol. 1, 1683-1786. Vol. 3, 1796-1809. Other vols. presumably cover 1786-96, 1809-1848.
- Page 18, Item 186. Russell, -----. Playbills. Not checked.
- Page 19, Item 193. Smith, Richard John. 25 vols. of materials toward a history of the English Stage. ?1825-40. Vol. 25 missing, presumed stolen, in 1971 or before. The vols. can be read en masse only in the [BM] stacks; otherwise individual vols. must be selected and called up. Special permission to see

- them tout ensemble is available; under certain circumstances the whole set can be brought up, but special clarification is required.
- Page 19, Item 199. Squire, William Barclay. 29 vols. of playbills and programmes. CG programmes, 1881-1908. Foreign playbills, 1873-1908. London theatres, programmes. London theatres, programmes arranged alphabetically in 4 vols., 1870-1904, 1913-15, 1847-1919.
- Page 20, Item 205. Stoker, Bram. American and provincial tour programmes of Henry Irving's performances. 1900-1, 1904-5.
- Page 20, Item 208. Streatfeild, W. E. 34 vols. of newspaper theatre-review clippings. 1847-92, but some reviews go back to 1829. Can only be seen en masse in the stacks. Index available. Vols. 1-6 are really 7 vols., since two vols. are both marked vol. 4. Vol. 7 missing. Vol. 20 is two vols. Vol. 27 missing.
- Page 21, Item 226. Winston, James. DL 1616-1830, in 19 boxes. Clippings in chronological order. Box 1, DL 1782-4; Box 2, 1785-8, with MS notes in hand of compiler starting with the Phoenix or Cockpit in Drury Lane, 1616; Box 3, 1770-6; Box 4, 1776-81; Box 5, 1789-93; Box 6, 1793-7; Box 7, 1798-1801; Box 8, 1801-4; Box 9, 1805-7; Box 10, 1808-9; Box 11, 1810-11; Box 12, 1812; Box 13, 1820-1, 1821-2; Box 14, 1813-14; Box 15, 1815-16; Box 16, 1817-18; Box 17, 1819; Box 18, 1823-5; Box 19, 1826-30. Production of *Lear* in 1788; *Henry VIII* on 13 Dec. '88.

Playbills at the Folger.

1. The Henderson Collection. William Henderson (1831-91) was a Scots printer and music composer who made an important collection of playbills, now at the Folger. They were described in *Scottish Notes and Queries* (October 1889, pp. 76-7) as filling 70 folio volumes, 23 of these relating to 32 Shakespeare plays and 5 plays relating to Shakespeare. Nothing on 2 and 3 *Henry VI*, *Troilus*, *Titus Andronicus*, or *Pericles*. *Hamlet*, 353 bills; *Macbeth*, 325; *Othello*, 236; *Richard III*, 205; *Merchant*, 200; *Romeo*, 194; *AYL*, 158; *Timon*, 2; *Ant.*, 2; *LLL*, 1; *1 Henry VI*, 1.

Laetitia Yeandle of the Folger reports that an intern started to list the manuscript's contents, but the whole collection has not been catalogued. Thus it is necessary to call for the boxes by play and look through.

2. The loose and bound volumes of Folger playbills have been catalogued to the extent of two card files, one arranged by place and the other by date, 1697-1953. These do not include playbills in extra-illustrated volumes or those scattered here and there in manuscripts. When calling for Folger playbills other than Henderson playbills, one specifies the date, often a seasonal date. For example, I found *Coriolanus* playbills under Covent Garden 1820-21a and 1833-35. The bills are very fragile and it is easy to tear them along the creases.

Nota Bene:

Do not overlook other sources for performance dates, even if you have done well with Alison Gould's pamphlet and the Henderson and Folger collections. The *DNB* will sometimes give a performance date under the entry for a famous actor that is not found elsewhere. W. Davenport Adams's *A Dictionary of the Drama* (2 projected vols., 1 only published, 1904) will help you if your actor is in the first half of the alphabet, A-M. Also, Charles Shattuck's *The Shakespeare Promptbooks* (1965) will offer promptbooks for many performances that are not elsewhere found. The trouble arises when one fails to be able to match a prompt copy with a known performance; was the book made ready and no performance followed?

Appendix 3: Theatrical Records at the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust. (Robert Turner, 1980.)

The following is a letter to Robert Turner describing the theatrical records of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust now available on microfilm at the University of Illinois.

21st May, 1980

Dear Professor Turner,

Thank you for your letter of the 25th April concerning the microfilms of the Royal Shakespeare Company's "Theatre Records."

The microfilms that we have deposited at the University of Illinois Library at Urbana-Champaign fall into two categories. First the Shakespeare prompt-books in the Shakespeare Centre Library were filmed by play title in date of production order up to 1975. The prompt-books for 1975 to 1978 were later filmed in production date order. The total number of films in this sequence is now fifty-seven reels (see the list enclosed).

Secondly, the newscutting scrapbooks known as "Theatre Records," which cover the years 1879 to 1979, have been filmed in chronological order. There is no separation of these books into individual plays and the sequence therefore contains much material that relates either to the theatre building, to the Stratford Shakespeare festivals, or to non-Shakespearian productions as well as to the reviews of the Shakespeare productions of the last hundred years. The complete set of films, covering 101 volumes of newscuttings, consists of ninety-six reels of film.

I have explained the nature of these microfilm sequences in some detail so that you can appreciate the extent of this material. The whole sequence of prompt-books and "Theatre Records" volumes have been indexed by the University of Illinois under the direction of Dr. Michael Mullin, and it is hoped that the computerized index and catalogue lists may be published in the near future.

Copies of any, or all, of the microfilms of these Royal Shakespeare Company archives may be supplied providing they are for research use only. The cost of making the films is at present approximately £11.00 per reel, plus postage. An estimate of the full cost can be supplied on receipt of your instructions as to what the editors of the *New Variorum Shakespeare* will require. Payment of the estimated cost for any microfilms to be supplied is requested in advance, and the balance of the costs (if this differs from the estimate) is payable on completion of the order.

Yours sincerely,

[Dr. Levi Fox]

Director

Microfilms of Shakespeare prompt-books in the collections of the Shakespeare Centre Library. Microfilms prepared for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1975, 1979.

<i>Play</i>	<i>Film number</i>	<i>Production dates</i>
All's Well That Ends Well	627	1898, 1922, 1935, 1955, 1959, 1967

Antony and Cleopatra	537 539	1912, 1953, 1972, 1973
As You Like It	627 629 630 751	ca 1750, 1820, ca. 1860 ca. 1904, ca. 1906, 1904-21, 1907, 1935, 1944, 1946, 1953 1957, 1967, 1968, 1973 1977
Comedy of Errors	630 631 683 750	1938, 1962 1963, 1965, 1972 1811 1976
Coriolanus	588 589 753	1933, 1939, 1952, 1959, 1967 1972, 1973 1978
Cymbeline	631	1884, 1922, 1957, 1962, 1974
Hamlet	539 540 541 682 743 750 747	1807, 1854, 1873, ca. 1900 1916, 1927, 1933, 1948, 1958, 1961, 1965 1966, 1970 1878, 1936, 1956, 1965 1965 1975 1944, 1916
Henry IV, Part I.	591 592 751 743	1852, 1864, 1932, 1935, 1951 1953, 1964, 1966 1976 1864
Henry IV, Part II	592 593 750	1821, 1852, 1932, 1951 1951, 1964, 1966 1975
Henry V	594 595 683 750 751 752	ca. 1852, 1927, 1934, 1937, 1943, 1946 1951, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1971, 1970 1811 1975 1976 1977
Henry VI (3 parts)	595 596 752	1889 1899, 1963, 1964 1977
Henry VIII	596 609 610 743	1822 [18--?], 1938, 1945, 1949, 1950, 1969 1970 1822

Julius Caesar	589	ca. 1830, 1889, 1909, 1921, 1932 590 1934, 1936, 1941, 1950, 1957, 1963, 1968 591 1968, 1972, 1973 683 1815
King John	610 611 612	1823, 1830s, 1851, 1866, 1925, 1940, 1948 1957, 1970, 1974, 1975 1970
King Lear	541 542 675 750 752	1937, 1959, 1964 1968, 1974 1962 1976 1977
Love's Labour's Lost	632 683	1934, 1946, 1947, 1956, 1965, 1973, 1975 ca. 1860
Macbeth	542 560 561 752	1820, 1842, 1864, 1917, 1938/42 1942, 1944, 1949 1952, 1955, 1962, 1967, 1974, 1975 1976
Measure for Measure	633 743	1906, 1931, 1946, 1947, 1950, 1956, 1962, 1970, 1974 1956
Merchant of Venice	634 676 683 743	ca. 1750, 1858, 1849, 1877, 1905, 1909, 1932, 1942, 1944 1947, 1953, 1956, 1960, 1965, 1971, 1972 1810 1956
Merry Wives of Windsor	677 644 750	ca. 1876, 1928, 1931, 1935, 1937, 1938 1945, 1955, 1964, 1968, 1969 1975
Midsummer Night's Dream	645 646 647	1897, 1920, 1932, 1934, 1936, 1944 1949, 1954, 1959, 1962, 1963 1963, 1970, 1971, 1972
Much Ado About Nothing	647 648 649 751 752	1850s, 1858, 1873 1877, 1929, 1933, 1934, 1936, 1945, 1949, 1950, 1955 1958, 1961, 1968, 1969, 1971 1976 1977

Othello	684	1900?, 1907, 1900, 1927, 1930, 1943, 1945, 1948
	562	1953, 1954, 1956, 1959, 1961, 1971
	675	1972
	561	1838, 1861
Pericles	649	ca. 1890, 1947, 1958, 1969
Richard II	611	1930, 1947
	612	1951, 1964, 1971, 1973, 1974
	682	1929, 1933, 1944
Richard III	612	1823, 1837, 1877
	625	1867, 1928, 1929, 1939, 1953, 1961
	626	1963, 1964
	627	1970
	750	1976
Romeo and Juliet	562	1900, 1905
	563	ca. 1900, 1933, 1934, 1941, 1945, 1947, 1954
	564	1958, 1961, 1967, 1973
	683	1815
	751	1976
Taming of the Shrew	649	ca. 1860
	661	ca. 1900, 1904, 1933, 1936, 1939, 1944
	662	1948, 1853, 1954, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1967, 1973
	743	1953, 1935
Tempest	663	ca. 1868, ca. 1870, 1875, 1930, 1934, 1935, 1942, 1947, 1951
	664	1952, 1957, 1957-8, 1970, 1974
	683	1946
	753	1978
Timon of Athens	564	1928, 1965
Titus Andronicus	587	1955, 1957, 1972
	588	1973
Troilus and Cressida	564	1936
	587	1948, 1962, 1969
	683	1954, 1960
	751	1976
	752	1977
Twelfth Night	672	1900, 1932, 1934, 1937, 1939, 1943, 1945, 1947, 1955, 1958
	673	1960, 1966, 1970, 1972, 1974
	753	1978

Two Gentlemen of Verona	673	1925, 1938, 1960, 1969, 1970
The Winter's Tale	674	1852, 1932, 1937, 1943, 1948, 1960, 1969
	675	1970
	683	1811
	751	1976

[According to the University of Illinois library catalogue as of 2001, the library (also?) owns all these prompt-books on 195 microfiches, with a 9-page microfiche guide to the set, call no. MFICHE 822.33 CR812.].

Appendix 4: Theater Editions. (Richard Knowles, 1989.)

The following are some rough notes, subject to correction by the collective knowledge of Variorum editors, about some of the multitude of cheap nineteenth-century "acting" or "theater" editions of Shakespeare's plays. These editions are useless for textual purposes, occasionally interesting for stray comments, and very useful for stage history, especially the history of the text on the stage. They are also a bibliographical nightmare. More often than not they are undated, evidently so that they could be kept in stock and reissued, or reprinted without change. Library catalogues often attempt to date them from cast lists frequently given in the preliminaries, but these may in some cases be several decades out of date--that is, they may have been for a recent performance when the edition first appeared but not when it was reprinted years or decades later. The plays were usually issued in separate numbers but often in bound volumes as well; the separate numbers were often issued by separate publishers concurrently, sometimes bearing the imprint of a series but often not. To complicate matters more, these series were occasionally merged or bought up by another publisher, so that a play issued in mid-century might very well have appeared in practically identical form much earlier in the century in another series. The following rough notes are intended to give some help in establishing the families and sequence and dates of these editions. One may also wish to consult Roger E. Stoddard, *Notes on American Play Publishing, 1765-1865*, Worcester, Mass., 1971.

Dean's British Theatre.

Published by R. & W. Dean, Manchester. Perhaps the first of the 19th-c. competitors with Bell's Sh. Jaggard lists titles from 1800 to 1808.

Roach's Edition.

Published by John Roach (fl. 1794-6), London. Jaggard lists titles from 1802 to 1814. Few titles, apparently.

Mrs. Inchbald's British Theatre.

25 vols., 1808. Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, Paternoster Row. Jaggard lists a few editions with Mrs. Inchbald's commentary (*Ham.*, *Wiv.*, *Rom.*) from two years earlier (1806). Since the plays in the bound volumes are all separately paginated, these may be earlier issues in separate covers. There were several later reprints of the series.

New English Drama.

Ed. William Oxberry (1784-1824). 20 (21?) vols., 1818-25. Published by W. Simpkin, R. Marshall, & C. Chapple. Various reprints from Edinburgh, New York, Boston, etc.

Oxberry edited 113 plays, including many by Shakespeare; these appeared two per month, apparently usually with dates, and were subsequently issued in bound volumes. Considerable annotation, many stage directions. Several later reprints.

Dolby's British Theatre.

Published by Thomas Dolby, ca. 1825 in the case of *Lr.*, which subsequently reappeared virtually unchanged in John Cumberland's series. How many plays Dolby did, and his relationship with Cumberland, I have not discovered. Dolby was in business 1808-30, and his editions may perhaps be dated by the address Dolby gives on title-page or in colophon. These are:

1808-19	34 Wardour St.
1819-24	299 Strand
1824-5	17 Catherine St.
1827	2 Litchfield St.
1828	Tavistock St., Covent Garden
1830	340 Strand

Cumberland's British Theatre.

Ed. D. - G. [i.e., George Daniel (1789-1864)]. Published by John Cumberland. In the *Variorum Handbook* (1971, p. 71, no. 51) I reported that 39 vols. appeared in 1823-31, and a supplementary 14 vols. in 1831-2, but I am not now sure that that is right. In an autobiographical memoir signed Dec. 1838 in vol. 39, Daniel says he "became the Editor of Cumberland's British and Minor Theatre" (two separate series) in 1825, and that by Dec. 1838 the series had reached 440 numbers and fifty volumes. Jaggard reports that Daniel wrote prefaces for Oxberry's *Jn.* and *Oth.* in 1819, and he wrote the introduction to Dolby's *Lr.* in 1824, reprinted as Cumberland's *Lr.* in 1826. Cumberland, according to Jaggard, published an *AWW* in 1811 and a *MND* in 1816, but the majority of Shakespearean titles appear in 1823-31. Daniel's excellent introductions may account for the popularity of the series; there were many reprintings. Unfortunately the originals are generally undated; Cumberland's addresses may be some help:

Pre-1820	Address unknown to me
1820-5	Brecknock Pl., Hampstead Rd.
1826-9	19 Ludgate Hill
1829-30	2 Cumberland Terr.
1831-47	Camden New Town

G. H. Davidson.

Davidson seems (insofar as I can tell from Jaggard) to have printed and distributed Cumberland's *Wiv.* (1824), *JC* (1825) and *Lr.* (1831) along with his own editions of *MV* (1823), *Mac.* (1827), and *3H6* (1830). He also published Davidson's Shilling Volumes of Cumberland's Plays ca. 1849-55, though at about this time (?) the ownership of Cumberland's passed to Thomas H. Lacy (see below).

Lacy's Acting Editions.

Published by Thomas Hailes Lacy (1809-73). According to the *DNB*, Lacy published Lacy's Acting Editions in 99 vols. from 1848-1873, at which point he sold the series to Samuel French (see below), and he also became (at an unspecified date) proprietor of the 48-vol. John Cumberland's British Theatre. Library catalogues give widely differing dates for their bound sets, which also differ widely in their number of vols. Jaggard lists Lacy editions of *Wiv.*, *MV*, and *Mac.* in 1840, of *R3* in 1844, most editions from the 1850s, and *R2* in 1868. Lacy addresses are:

1849-57	17 Wellington St. (addresses 1830-48 unknown to me)
1857-73	89 Strand

Modern Standard Drama.

Ed. Epes Sargent (1813-80), vols. 8-9 by John W. S. Hows (1797-1871), vols. 10-12 by F. C. Wemyss. Published by William Taylor, New York, 1846-?. To Sargent the NYPL catalogue attributes *Ham.*, *Jn.*, *R3*, and *TGV* in 1846 and *Oth.*, *Rom.*, and *TN* n.d.; to Hows it attributes *AYL*, *H8*, and *Lr.* in 1848. The LC catalogue dates *TN* 1847. In 1850 S. French (see below) became Taylor's agent for Mod. Std. Drama and eventually absorbed it.

Taylor's addresses are given by R. E. Stoddard:

1845-7	2 Astor House
1847-8	11 Spruce
1849	Unlisted
1850-1	11 Spruce, 151 Nassau (cf. French, below)
1852	Unlisted
1853-7	18 Ann

French's Acting Editions (title varies).

In 1850 Samuel French became N.Y. agent for both Taylor's Modern Standard Drama and for Lacy's Acting Editions, eventually absorbing both series. He moved to London in 1872 and in 1873 bought Lacy's. French's editions, sometimes reprints of Taylor's and Lacy's, sometimes original, were constantly reprinted, usually undated. French's addresses are:

1846-50	293 Broadway (acc. to R. E. Stoddard, p. 190)
1850-54	151 Nassau (ditto)
1854-57	121 Nassau
1857-78	122 Nassau. In 1870, Thos. Henry French joined the firm; in 1872, Samuel French to London
1878-87	38 E. 14th St.
1887-96	19 W. 22nd St. and 28 W. 23 St.
1896-1910	24 and 26 W. 22nd St.

Dicks' Standard Plays.

Published John Dicks. The individual plays are undated; the Dicks' Complete Edition was apparently printed ca. 1864 and issued ca. 1869. Dicks' addresses are:

1848-62	7 Wellington St. North, Strand
1858	Also 40 Parker St., Drury Lane
1861-2	Also 25 Wellington St.
1863-68	313 Strand

A dated catalogue of the Flower editions, printed to accompany revivals at the Memorial Theater in Stratford, is badly needed.

Appendix 5: Notes on Shakespeare in the Gentleman's Magazine. (Robert Turner, 1977.)

Preparing for a book on the history of *The Gentleman's Magazine*, James M. Kuist made an analytical index to articles in that periodical from 1731 through 1800, from which he kindly allowed me to extract items pertaining to Shakespeare. You may find this compilation handier to use than the indexes to the *GM*. The attributions added in brackets derive from annotations in the editorial file copies (see Kuist, "*The Gentleman's Magazine* in the Folger Library: The History and Significance of the Nichols Family Collection," *SB* 29 [1976], 307-22). Mr. Shaaber tells me there is a German dissertation on the Shakespeare-Kritik in the *GM* (by Johannes Adler, Königsberg, 1906), but he adds that it is neither systematic nor exhaustive.

[See also the supplements by Emily Lorraine de Montluzin in *SB* 44-7, 49, 50 (1991-4, 1996, 1997.)

Robert K. Turner, Jr. (28 April 1977)

General criticism

1. 24 (1754), 233-4. Comparison of Sh. to Ariosto (T. B.).
2. 30 (1760), 308. Information about the current repair of Shakespeariana in Stratford (anon.).
3. 39 (1769), 375. Proposals for critical entertainment (in the manner of Fontenelle) for the true Literati during a forthcoming festival at Stratford (anon.).
4. 39 (1769), 421-3. An account of the festival at Stratford (anon.).
5. 42 (1772), 522-3. Comparison of Sh. and Jonson (Horatio).
6. 44 (1774), 24-5. Letter discussing Sh.'s superior descriptions of night (Q.).
7. 44 (1774), 76. Another letter on Sh.'s descriptions of night (H. L.).
8. 44 (1774), 105-6. Another letter on descriptions of night, in Sh. and others (Q.).
9. 44 (1774), 106-7. Sh.'s knowledge of the Bible (anon.).
10. 50 (1780), 518-20. "Instances of Similarity of Thought and Expression in Shakespeare," which had been sent to Johnson but which was not used in his ed. (W. R.).
11. 50 (1780), 558. An answer to prior query regarding Faeries in Eng. lit., with comment on Sh. (Cantab.).
12. 51 (1781), 16. Approval of some imitations of Sh. printed (in *GM* 50 (1780), 518 [no. 10] (P. E. F. S.)).
13. 51 (1781), 363. Letter with two epitaphs written by Sh. (on Elias James and Richard Burbage). (A New Correspondent).
14. 53 (1783), 933-5. "New Observations on Shakespeare," citations and explications (T. H. W.). [Thomas Holt White.]
15. 54 (1784), 407. "Original Observations on Shakespeare" (Omega).
16. 55 (1785), 277-8. "Parallel Passages and Remarks on Shakespeare" (T. H. W.). [Thomas Holt White.]
17. 55 (1785), 498-9. Explications of words and passages in Sh. with reference to no. 16 (A. C.).
18. 56 (1786), 301-2. Brief discussion of references to heraldry in Sh.'s plays (M--).
19. 56 (1786), 732-3. "Parallel Passages in Authors of Note" (C--T--O). [Mr. Headley.]
20. 56 (1786), 1020-1. Comments on references to cuckoldry in Sh. and Jonson (M. Green). [John Nichols.]
21. 52 (1787), 478-80. "Further Remarks on Shakespeare's Plays" (T. H. W.). [Thomas Holt White.]
22. 59 (1789), 1198-1200, 1200, 1200-1. "Illustrations of Several Passages in Shakespear" (Eudemon, D.T., Rich. Geo. Robinson).
23. 60 (1790), 306-7. "Original Elucidations of Shakespear" (M. H.).
24. 60 (1790), 605-6, 695-6. "Classical Illustrations of Verses on Ancient Inscriptions on Fonts" (G. D.).
25. 60 (1790), 793-4. "Conjectural Queries on Shakespeare" (A. M. T.).
26. 60 (1790), 1088-90. "Critical Remarks on the late Exhibition at Shakespeare Gallery" (H.).
27. 65 (1795), 209-10, 285-6, 457-8. Letters concerning proposal for a volume of "Shakespearean Novelties" (K. S., anon., K. S.). [anon. = Samuel Ireland.]

Biography

28. 31 (1761), 268. Anecdotes of Sh. (R. W.).

29. 35 (1765), 475. Anecdote of Sh. (-----).
 30. 39 (1769), 344-5. General remarks about Sh.'s birthplace (T. B.).
 31. 59 (1789), 25. Remark on a statement in Sh. perhaps showing Sh.'s familiarity with the region of Hinckley (Hinckleiensis). [J. Ward.]
 32. 61 (1791), 33. Comments on a statement (60 [1790], 306) that Sh. knew Hebrew (S. E.). [Probably Samuel Egerton Brydges.]
 32. 61 (1791), 601-3. "Shakespeare's Wainscot Chair and his Mulberry Tree" (T. T. S.).
 34. 64 (1794), 1067-8, 1183. "Shakespeare's Crabtree," incl. some anecdotes (M. E., Nugator).

Editions

35. 61 (1791), 1098-1101. "Proposal for regenerating and modernizing Shakespeare" (Willm Stanley).
 36. 64 (1794), 327. Letter concerning a 1790 ed. of Sh. entirely by ladies (B. C. J.).
 37. 65 (1795), 120-1. Letter from Malone, incl. his proposal for a new ed. of Sh. (E. M.).

Orthography

38. 52 (1782), 511. The spelling of names, incl. Sh.'s (Antiquarius). [Probably Dr. John Loveday.]
 39. 54 (1784), 253-4. "Orthography of Shakespeare's Name" (J. Bowle).
 40. 54 (1784), 264. Comment on orthography of Sh.'s name (Antiquarius). [Dr. John Loveday.]
 41. 54 (1784), 505. Remark on the spelling of Sh.'s name (S. E.). [James Brown.]
 42. 57 (1787), 24-5. Letter on the orthography of Sh.'s name and on the fashion of modernizing names (Philo-Shak.).
 43. 57 (1787), 125. Letter on the orthography of Sh.'s name (J. T.).
 44. 57 (1787), 204. Letter on the orthography of Sh.'s name (Timothy Crab).
 45. 57 (1787), 302. Letter on the orthography of Sh.'s name (H.S.).
 46. 57 (1787), 478. Letter on the orthography of Sh.'s name (Miso-Shak.).
 47. 59 (1789), 494. Letter on the orthography of Sh.'s name (Diplom.).

Illustrations, portraits, etc.

48. 29 (1759), 257, 380, 454. Letter on "the unlikeness of Shakespear's Busts" in the Stratford Church; plus reply and counter-reply (J.G., J.S., J.G.).
 49. 64 (1794), 1068-9, 1183, 1186; 65 (1795), 110. Letters incl. lists of "Engraved Portraits of Shakespeare" (J. B., Nugator, J. S. H., E.). [J. B. = J. Bowden; J. S. H. = J. Sydney Hawkins.]
 50. 62 (1792), 613. Letter incl. miniature painting of Sh. (G. Henderson).
 51. 57 (1797), 931. Letter concerning engravings made for the Norfolk-Street Sh. Folio (anon.). [George Steevens.]

Manuscripts, documents, forgeries, etc.

52. 66 (1796), 7-8. "Remarks on Mr. Ireland's Shakespeare" (K. S.).
 53. 66 (1796), 93. Letter from the writer of the pamphlet "Free Reflections of Miscellaneous Papers and Legal Instruments, under the Hand and Seal of William Shakespeare" concerning an inadvertent mistake he had made (F. G. Waldron).

54. 66 (1796), 267. A list of those who have committed themselves for or against the authenticity of recently “discovered” Shn. MSS (editors).

55. 66 (1796), 298. Comments on Malone’s remarks regarding the late Sh. forgeries (Etumophilus).

56. 66 (1796), 92-3. Letter from Malone on supposed Sh. MSS (E. M.).

57. 66 (1796), 364. Letter concerning Ireland’s publication of Sh. documents (Bob Short).

58. 66 (1796), 363-4. Remarks on Malone’s vindication of Sh. (H. E.). [Henry Ellis.]

59. 66 (1796), 562. Letter on the Sh. forgeries (M. H. F. S. A.).

60. 67 (1797), 91-2. Comments on Chalmers’s “Apology for the Believers in the Shakespeare Papers” (anon.).

Reviews of criticism and editions.

61. 18 (1748), 25-7. Review of *An Enquiry into the Learning of SHAKESPEAR, with Remarks on several Passages of his Plays, in a Conversation between EUGENIUS and NEANDER.* By PETER WHALLEY, A.B. Fellow of St John’s College, Oxford.

62. 20 (1750), 252-3. Unfavorable review of Warburton’s ed. (T. P.)

63. 20 (1750), 362-3. Critical discussion of Warburton’s ed. (T.P.)

64. 25 (1755), 5. Detection of an error in Warburton’s ed. (S. Pegge).

66. 35 (1765), 65-7, 110-11. “Some Account of a work lately published entitled, A Revisal of Shakespear’s Text.” See also correction, pp. 127-8 (W. H. T.---n).

67. 35 (1765), 616-17; 36 (1766), [22-4.] New Illustrations of Shakespeare, cont’d from December Book Review (editors).

68. 45 (1775), 368-9. Letter on some errors in Johnson’s ed., with a critical discussion of certain passages (Q.).

69. 62 (1792), 41-3. “Remarks on Malone’s Edition of Shakespeare” (Philalethes).

70. 65 (1795), 575, 575. Letters explaining a term occurring in Steevens’s Shakespeare (Candide, N. J.).

Commentary on individual plays.

Ant.

71. 17 (1747), 179. Note on a passage in Act IV (Ruricola).

AWW

72. 46 (1776), 26. Note on a passage (Q.).

AYL

73. 38 (1768), 615. Discussion of song (anon.).

74. 54 (1784), 21-3. Discussion of the Holly Tree, or English Evergreen, used for the basis of an emendation of a passage (T. A. W.). [Thomas Holt White.]

I and 2H4

75. 1 (1731), 207-8, 245-6. Resume of *Weekly Register* No. 59, for May 29, “Sir John Falstaff in the Shades to the Modern Patriots.”

76. 22 (1752), 459-61. *Observations on Shakespeare’s Falstaff* (P. T.).

77. 37 (1767), 341. Letter elucidating passages (D. Y.).

78. 51 (1781), 516. Letter on Sir William Gascoigne as Chief Justice (Fred. Scarisbing).

79. 52 (1782), 72-3. More on Chief Justice Gascoigne (A Judicial Biographer).

80. 56 (1786), 639. Remarks in reaction to a comment by T. H. N. on a Falstaff scene (A.).

81. 65 (1795), 913. Discussion of a passage in *2H4* (J. M.). [Either the Rev. J. Mills or John Milner.]

82. 66 (1796), 375-6, 490. Query about where Sh. derived the character of Falstaff; and reply (J. Laskey, Leviter Eruditus).

H5

83. 65 (1795), 552. Remark that a speech is borrowed from Tyrtæus (E. E. A.).

84. 70 (1800), 614. Comparison of a recent general to one described in the play (A. A.).

1, 2, and 3H6

85. 50 (1780), 272. Query regarding the meaning of reference to a book in *2H6* (Consanguineus).

86. 51 (1781), 625-6. Letter with discussion (B. B. C. C.).

87. 51 (1781), 504, 626. Discussion of a passage in *2H6* and reply (S. H., P. Q.). [P. Q. probably = Richard Gough.]

88. 52 (1782), 23. Comment on the reading of a word in *2H6* (anon.).

89. 52 (1782), 132. Reply to no. 86 (S. H.).

H8

90. 49 (1779), 491-2. "A Brief Comment on the Appearance of Cardinal Wolsey, in the Procession to Black Fryers, 1529, as given in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*. Act III. Scene 6." (T. Row). [Samuel Pegge.]

91. 53 (1783), 751. Through explication of a passage, a discussion of whether Wolsey poisoned himself, according to Malone's notes (T. Row). [Samuel Pegge.]

92. 69 (1799), 102-5. Quotation and discussion of a scene about taxation (Alcestriensis). [Probably the Rev. J. Bartrum.]

Ham.

93. 3 (1733), 114. Reference to a sentiment involving pity (anon.).

94. 35 (1765), 229. Remark on a passage (anon.).

95. 42 (1772), 418. Remark on a passage (Q.).

96. 42 (1772), 555-6. Defense of a metaphor (Q.).

97. 44 (1774), 454-6. "Critical Illustration of an Obsolete Passage in Shakespeare" (Q.).

98. 45 (1775), 80. Comment on a phrase (Q.).

99. 46 (1776), 124. Discussion of a passage (J. B.).

100. 46 (1776), 157-8. Further remarks, supplementing no. 98. [Q.]

101. 46 (1776), 266-7. Remarks on a passage (Juvenis).

102. 46 (1776), 512. Discussion of a passage (W. & D.). [Samuel Denne.]

103. 54 (1784), 84. Explication of a specific passage, with other remarks on Sh. (Y.).

104. 56 (1786), 375. "Illustration" of a passage (D. N.).

105. 56 (1786), 918. Addition to no. 104 (M. Green). [John Nichols.]

106. 58 (1788), 199-200. Explication of two terms, with other remarks on Sh. (F. W.).

107. 58 (1788), 778-9. Editorial discussion of a scene as painted by Fuseli (anon.).

108. 59 (1789), 388. Discussion of a word (G. S.). [George Steevens.]

109. 67 (1797), 369-70. Description of present Elsinor Castle, as background for the play (X. Y. Z. &c.).

LLL

110. 23 (1753), 126. *Remark on SHAKESPEAR'S LOVE'S LABOUR LOST.*

ACT IV. *near the End* (P. T.).

111. 30 (1760), 169-70, 218-19, 219, 276-7. Discussions of the meaning of a word (M. N----1., T. A., Eboracensis, Rawligh Wittem).

- Lr.*
 112. 22 (1752), 253-5. Discussion of historical background of the story and of
 Sh.'s art (A. B.).
 113. 56 (1786), 214. "Remark on a Reading in Shakespeare" (Laertes).
- Mac.*
 114. 22 (1752), 458. Remarks on topographical background (T. C.).
 115. 55 (1785), 952. Comment on the idiomatic meaning of "aroint" (M. Y. R.).
 116. 58 (1788), 392. Illustration of a passage (E. P.).
 117. 58 (1788), 766-7. "Comment on a Passage in Macbeth" (X.).
 118. 58 (1788), 789. "Remarks on Macbeth" (anon.).
 119. 58 (1788), 879-80. Comment on the use of a word (Palaeophilus). [Probably
 Richard Gough.]
 120. 59 (1789), 20-21. "Critique on Macbeth" (C. J.).
 121. 63 (1793), 987-9. Letter paralleling characters of Hageal and Macbeth, with a
 general discussion of the value of drawing parallels from history (P.).
- MM*
 122. 7 (1737), 557-9. Resume of *Craftsman* No. 585, *Authority of Princes often abused.*
Illustrated from a Play of Shakespear (anon.).
 123. 50 (1780), 21-2. Remarks toward the supplement to the notes of Steevens and
 Malone (S. H.). [Dr. Samuel Henley.]
 124. 65 (1795), 644-7. "Various Passages in Measure for Measure illustrated by
 correspondent Passages from a Book of more antient Date than those which his Commentators
 seem principally to have consulted" [i.e., the Bible] (M. S.).
- MND*
 125. 54 (1784), 98-9, 343, 347. Discussions of the meaning of the phrase "Lamb's
 Wool on Christmas-eve," showing Shn. allusion to the custom (Josiah Beckwith, D. A. B.,
 anon.).
- MV*
 126. 24 (1754), 221-2. Characterization of Shylock (T. S.).
 127. 24 (1754), 311. Discussion of sources (Palaeophilus).
 128. 55 (1785), 166. Remarks on the inscription in the ring given to Portia (W. &
 D.). [Samuel Denne.]
 129. 55 (1785), 425. Correction to no.. 128 (W. & D.). [Samuel Denne.]
 130. 60 (1790), 506. "Illustration" of a passage (G.).
- Oth.*
 131. 21 (1751), 119-120. *A Specimen of A new Paper entitled the LITERARY*
GAZETTE. OBSERVATIONS on the late Performance of OTHELLO (anon.).
 132. 21 (1751), 121-2. Resume of an account of a new performance of the play
 from the *London Evening Post* (anon.).
 133. 21 (1751), 122-3. Letter criticizing the *Literary Gazette* account [no. 131] of
 the play (B. C.).
 134. 33 (1763), 160-2. "Critical Remarks on a Passage in Othello" (T. Row).
 [Samuel Pegge.]
 135. 43 (1773), 68-9. Discussion of passages (Q.).
 136. 61 (1791), 225-6. Brief letter arguing against representing Othello as a Negro
 (Verbum Sat).

- Rom.*
 137. 23 (1753), 255-6. *An account of the Novel and Play of ROMEO and JULIET; from Shakespear Illustrated* (anon.).
 138. 60 (1790), 681. Remarks on a passage (X.).
 139. 60 (1790), 807-11. Reply to no. 138 (J. Henn).
 140. 68 (1798), 103. Letter showing Martial to be the source of a line (Davus).
 141. 70 (1800), 827-8. Comparison of passages in Sh. and Luigi Grato (Eugenio).
 [John Nichols.]
- Tmp.*
 142. 42 (1772), 573-6. Discussion of passages (anon.).
 143. 55 (1785), 338-9. Parallel passages (W. & D.). [Samuel Denne.]
 144. 55 (1785), 532. Remarks on Sh. as illustrated in natural history (P. B. C.).
 145. 59 (1789), 35. "Critique on Shakespere" (anon.).
- TN*
 146. 57 (1787), 135. "Illustration of Shakespear" (G. F. N.).
- Tro.*
 147. 59 (1789), 35-6. Discussion of passages (M. H.).
- WT*
 148. 58 (1788), 767-8. Comment on a passage (Peter).

Appendix 6: Notes on Shakespeare in the St. James Chronicle. (John Hazel Smith, 1978.)

St. James's Chronicle; or, The British Evening-Post, edited by Henry Baldwin, was one of the most widely read--it frequently claimed to be *the* most widely read--of the London evening newspapers in the latter part of the eighteenth century. It was published three times a week, each issue (numbered in sequence, though often erroneously) a folio of two leaves (four unnumbered pages) dated to cover Tuesday and Thursday, Thursday and Saturday, or Saturday and Tuesday. Almost invariably they also contained a number of letters "To the Printer," usually signed with pseudonyms but sometimes anonymous, on an almost infinite variety of subjects. The Shakespearean contributions were quite numerous.

Runs of this newspaper are not easy to find. The Bodleian Library has perhaps the most nearly complete run for the period 1765 through 1797, and I recently went through its issues in order to compile a list of the Shakespeare items. This run is missing all of 1769, which I therefore have not seen; all but about three months of 1784 are also missing from the Bodleian's run, as are individual issues from most other years. The first four years of publication of *St. James's Chronicle* (1761-4) are essentially unrepresented at the Bodleian, and there were certainly Shakespeare items in those years, because two of them were reprinted in an anthology from the journal published in 1762 (see #7 and #30 below). The 221 entries provided below are thus not an exhaustive list. Besides omitting items that I have not seen, the list also omits theatre reviews that do not include significant critical comments on the plays discussed.

All references to Shakespeare's plays in the list are by Through-Line-Numbering keyed to Hinman's facsimile of the First Folio. References to *St. James's Chronicle* are by issue number and date, followed by interpolated page numbers in brackets. I have reproduced the names appended to each item in the newspaper even when (as in most cases) they are pseudonymous, and have collected under "Anonymous" those items that were unsigned.

1. Anonymous. "Benefits." No. 5675 (May 8-10, 1794), [4]. Parody announcement of *Macbeth* benefit.
 2. ----- "Candour, Pens, Ink, and Paper. A Fable." No. 742 (Dec. 3-5, 1765), [4]. On remarks about Kenrick in *Gentleman's Magazine*.
 3. ----- "A Card." No. 795 (Apr. 5-8, 1766), [4]. Poem parodying *Othello*.
 4. ----- "A Card to Mr. Capell." No. 2004 (Dec. 16-18, 1773), [4]. Emends *Lear* 2014+9 (citing a 1570 play).
 5. ----- "Discovery of a New Portrait of Shakespeare." No. 5267 (Nov. 15-18, 1794), [2].
 6. ----- "Examination of Mr. Kenrick's Review of Dr. Johnson's Shakespeare." No. 795 (Apr. 5-8, 1766), [4]. On *Tempest* 114.
 7. ----- "A False Pointing in Hamlet Rectified." (Oct. 1761.). Repr. in *The Yearly Chronicle for M, DCC, LXI. Or, A Collection of . . . Essays, Letters, &c. . . in the St. James's Chronicle for that Year*. London, 1762. P. 321. Not seen: Bodleian holdings of newspaper do not include 1761, and page removed from 1762 reprint volume.
 8. ----- "A Fragment." No. 765 (Jan. 25-8, 1766), [2]. On editing Shakespeare.
 9. ----- "The Interview; or Shakespeare's Ghost. Occasioned by the Review of Dr. Johnson's Edition of That Poet" (poem). No. 737 (Nov. 21-3, 1765), [4].
 10. ----- [Letter]. No. 738 (Nov. 23-6, 1765), [4]. Answers #103 on *Henry V* 321.
 11. ----- [Letter]. No. 954 (Apr. 11-14, 1767), [4]. Suggests that Shakespeare wrote parts of *Double Falsehood*.
 12. ----- [Letter]. No. 1984 (Oct. 30-Nov. 2, 1773), [4]. Extracts of Vertue MS: Court plays.
 13. ----- [Letter]. No. 2004 (Dec. 16-18, 1773), [4]. Satiric thrusts at Edward Capell, as in #56.
 14. ----- [Letter]. No. 2265 (Aug. 19-22, 1775), [4]. Prefers performances over new editions.
 15. ----- [Letter]. No. 2404 (Aug. 3-6, 1776), [4]. Glosses *Antony and Cleopatra* 715.
 16. ----- [Letter]. No. 2439 (Oct. 22-4, 1776), [4]. Answers #85 on *Hamlet*.
 17. ----- [Letter]. No. 2528 (May 22-4, 1777), [4]. On *Hamlet* 1724.
 18. ----- [Letter]. No. 2809 (Mar. 13-16, 1779), [2]. On alterations for the stage.
- Attributed to George Steevens by Malone and thus repr. in Vickers, *Shakespeare: The Critical Heritage*.
19. ----- [Letter]. No. 2831 (May 4-6, 1779), [4]. Glosses a phrase in *Macbeth* by virtue of a parallel in current events.
 20. ----- [Letter]. No. 2989 (May 9-11, 1780), [4]. On *Macbeth* 1382.
 21. ----- [Letter]. No. 2989 (May 9-11, 1780), [4]. On *Richard III* 3847.
 22. ----- [Letter]. No. 2990 (May 11-13, 1780), [4]. On *Macbeth* 490.
 23. ----- [Letter]. No. 2991 (May 13-16, 1780), [4]. On *Tempest* 251 and 282.
 24. ----- [Letter]. No. 4147 (Sept. 4-6, 1787), [2]. On the spelling of the playwright's name.
 25. ----- [Letter]. No. 4265 (Sept. 9-11, 1788), [4]. Advises Boydell not to freeze unnatural postures (acceptable for the transient moment of the stage) into the paintings.
 26. ----- [Letter]. No. 6036 (Aug. 27-30, 1796), [4]. How Garrick and Barry differed in stressing *Romeo* 991.
 27. ----- [Letters]. No. 2993 (May 18-20, 1780), [2]; 2994 (May 20-3), [4]; 2995 (May 23-5), [2]. Answers #216 on surviving MS plays.
 28. ----- [Letters, with excerpts from Bell's edition]. No. 2008 (Dec. 25-8, 1773), [4]; 2009 (Dec. 28-30), [4].
 29. ----- "Malone's Shakespeare." No. 4622 (Dec. 2-4, 1790), [4]. On errors or omissions (non-textual).
 30. ----- "A Passage in Shakespeare's Cymbeline Amended." (Dec. 1761.) Repr. in *The Yearly Chronicle for M, Dcc, LXI. Or, A Collection of . . . Essays, Letters, &c. . . in*

the St. James's Chronicle for that Year. London, 1762, P. 380. Not seen: Bodleian holdings of newspaper do not include 1761, and page missing from 1762 reprint volume.

31. ----- "Polonius." No. 2480 (Jan. 30-Feb. 1, 1777), [4]. Answers #44.
32. ----- "Postscript. London." No. 4780 (Nov. 12-15, 1791), [4]. Cites an alleged misquotation (*grunt* for *groan*) in *Hamlet* 1730.
33. ----- "Postscript. The Shakespeare Gallery." No. 4376 (May 5-7, 1789), [4], and several subsequent issues in May. Comments on paintings in the Boydell collection.
34. ----- "Prologue to Vortigern" (satirical poem). No. 5973 (Apr. 2-5, 1796), [4].
35. ----- "Quotation from Shakespeare." No. 4783 (Nov. 19-22, 1791), [4]. Answers #32 and #66 on *Hamlet* 1730.
36. ----- [Review of performance of *Othello*]. No. 2805 (Mar. 4-6, 1779), [4].
37. ----- "Shakespeare." No. 786 (Mar. 15-18, 1766), [4]. Emends *Hamlet* 628 and *Othello* 3560.
38. ----- "Shakespeare." No. 788 (Mar. 20-2, 1766), [4]. Answers #37 on *Hamlet* 628 and *Othello* 3560.
39. ----- "Shakespeare." No. 3995 (Oct. 12-14, 1786), [4]. Supplements Variorum 1785 note on 2 *Henry IV* 277 by noting a German doctor who still practices urinalysis.
40. ----- "Shakespeare a Reader of His Bible." No. 2050 (Apr. 5-7, 1774), [2]. Notes Biblical parallels to *Dream* 2154 and *Othello* 3240.
41. ----- "Shakespeare in the Shades." No. 1979 (Oct. 19-21, 1773), [4]. Poem with added comments on Theobald as editor.
42. ----- "Shakespeare." No. 5794 (Feb. 10-12, 1795), [3]. Announces the Ireland "discoveries."
43. ----- "Sir John Falstaff." No. 4421 (Aug. 20-2, 1789), [4]. Says the historical Falstaff was not a coward.
44. ----- "Theatre." No. 2467 (Dec. 31, 1776-Jan. 2, 1777), [4]. Review, with comments on Hamlet's madness and on Polonius.
45. ----- "Theatre." No. 2437 (Oct. 17-19, 1776), [4]. On *Hamlet*.
46. ----- "To David Garrick, Esq." No. 1983 (Oct. 28-30, 1773), [4]. Moved by Macklin's bad performance in *Macbeth*, makes specific suggestions for costuming, cuts, etc.
47. ----- "To the Word-catching Collector of Extracts from the Comments on Bell's Edition of Shakespeare." No. 2100 (July 28-30, 1774), [1]. Answers someone who has accused Bell of stealing.
48. ----- "The Witches of Shakespeare." No. 5661 (Apr. 5-8, 1794), [2]. On *Macbeth*: proper costuming and lighting.
49. Admirer of Shakespeare, An. [Letter]. No. 734 (Nov. 14-16, 1765), [4]. Answers #92 on handkerchief in *Othello*.
50. ----- [Letter]. No. 1987 (Nov. 6-9, 1773), [4]. Asks for gloss on ambiguous "thus" in *King John* 1918.
51. ----- "Shakespeare." No. 1213 (Dec. 5-8, 1768, [4]. Questions where Juliet got the dagger in Act V.
52. ----- "Shakespeare." No. 5679 (May 17-19, 1794), [1]. Upset by Kemble's alterations in *Macbeth*, including an invisible ghost of Banquo.
53. AE. "Shakespeare." No. 794 (Apr. 3-5, 1766), [4]. On *Othello* 129, which he would prefer unglossed because of its indecency.
54. Alciphron. [Letter]. No. 3474 (June 3-5, 1783), [4]. Attacks Ritson's *Remarks*.
55. Animadverter. "As You Like It." No. 2343 (Feb. 17-20, 1776), [4].
56. Annotator. [Letter]. No. 1980 (Oct. 21-3, 1773), [1]. Demands of Edward Capell when his *Notes and Various Readings*, delayed seven years, will be issued. See #195, #4, and #172.
57. Anti-Pirate. [Letter]. No. 2008 (Dec. 25-8, 1773), [4]. On Bell's edition.
58. Aristophanes. "Grunting and Groaning." No. 4786 (Nov. 26-9, 1791), [4]. On *Hamlet* 1730: attacks #32, #35, #66, and #176.

59. Avon. [Letter]. No. 1986 (Nov. 4-6, 1773), [4]. Corrects misquotation from Milton in *Variorum* 1773 (note on *Twelfth Night* 11).
60. B., A. [Letter]. No. 1701 (Jan. 16-18, 1772), [4]. Emends *Merchant of Venice* 86.
61. -----. "Shakespeare." No. 1671 (Nov. 7-9, 1771), [1]; 1687 (Dec. 14-17), [3]. Answers #78 on *Hamlet* 761.
62. B., I. [Letter]. No. 1833 (Nov. 12-14, 1772), [4]. Emends *Hamlet* 2548.
63. B., J. [Letter]. No. 2006 (Dec. 21-3, 1773), [4]. Answers #212 on *Lear* 2014+9.
64. -----. [Letter]. No. 2355 (Apr. 11-13, 1776), [2]. Finds in Fabian's *Chronicle* a precedent for *Hamlet* 761.
65. -----. [Letters]. No. 2019 (Jan. 22-5, 1774), [4]; 2023 (Feb. 1-3), [4]. On *Merry Wives* 749.
66. B., W. "Quotation from Shakespeare." No. 4782 (Nov. 17-19, 1791), [4]. Answers #32 on *Hamlet* 1730.
67. Anonymous. [Comments on Johnson's Preface, with excerpts]. No. 718 (Oct. 8-10, 1765), [2]; 719 (Oct. 10-12), [2]; 720 (Oct. 12-14), [2].
68. -----. "The Shakespeare Gallery." No. 4510 (Mar. 16-18, 1790), [4]; and several subsequent issues through December. Comments on the Boydell collection.
69. Bell, John. [Letter]. No. 2009 (Dec. 28-30, 1773), [2]. On his copyright; answers #57.
70. -----. "To . . . Delta." No. 2007 (Dec. 23-5, 1773), [1]. Answers #102.
71. Bentleius Minimus. [Letter]. No. 1769 (June 20-3, 1772), [4]. Answers #217, #106, #178, #132, #196 on *Hamlet* 2784.
72. Bentleius Minor. [Letter]. No. 2048 (Mar. 31-Apr. 2, 1774), [4]. Emends *Macbeth* 180 (apparently as topical satire against the Scots).
73. Berkenhout, John. [Excerpts from the Preface to *Biographia Literaria*]. No. 2526 (May 17-20, 1777), [4]. General comments on Shakespeare.
74. -----. [Thirty-fourth letter to his son]. In "Shakespeare." No. 4622 (Dec. 2-4, 1790), [2]. On Shakespeare's errors; emends *Bohemia* to *Illyria* in *The Winter's Tale*.
75. Bull, John. "Observations upon the Alterations of Hamlet." No. 1849 (Dec. 19-22, 1772), [4].
76. C., A. [Letter]. No. 2758 (Nov. 14-17, 1778), [2]. On *Much Ado*.
77. C., G. [Letter]. No. 2004 (Dec. 16-18, 1773), [4]. Answers #153 on *Coriolanus* 1125.
78. C., M. "Unhouzzled, disappointed, unnaneld." No. 1668 (Oct. 31-Nov. 2, 1771), [2]. On *Hamlet* 761.
79. Candidus. [Letter]. No. 770 (Feb. 6-8, 1766), [4]. Answers #114 on *Tempest* 13.
80. Capell, Edward. [Excerpts from his edition]. No. 1147 (July 5-7, 1768), [4]; and periodically through 1768.
81. -----. [Excerpts of *Notes on Shakespeare*]. No. 2226 (May 20-3, 1775), [4], and two subsequent issues.
82. -----. "Specimen of the New Glossary to Shakespeare." No. 2225 (May 18-20, 1775), [4].
83. Carolus. [Letter]. No. 2163 (Dec. 22-4, 1774), [4]. Questions where Juliet got the dagger in Act V.
84. Carolus Junior. [Letter]. No. 2166 (Dec. 29-31, 1774), [4]. Answers #83 on Juliet's dagger.
85. Caveat. [Letter]. No. 2438 (Oct. 19-21, 1776), [4]. Answers #45 on *Hamlet*.
86. Cook upon Littleton. [Letter]. No. 2167 [2] (Jan. 3-5, 1775), [2]. Answers #83 on *Romeo* 3033.
87. Crab, Timothy. [Letter]. No. 4070 (Mar. 31-Apr. 3, 1787), [4]. Answers #173 on the spelling of the playwright's name.
88. Criticaster. "Malone's Shakespeare." No. 4831 (Mar. 24-7, 1792), [4]; 4832 (Mar. 27-9), [4]. Defends Malone against Ritson.

89. Criticulus. [Letter]. No. 2015 (Jan. 13-15, 1774), [4]. Defends received reading of *AYL* 1777.
90. ----- . "Shakespeare." No. 2034 (Feb. 26-Mar. 1, [1]. On *As You Like It* 1726.
91. Criticus. "Shakespeare." No. 1115 (Apr. 21-3, 1768), [4]; 1123 (May 10-12), [4]. On "forsen" (said to be in Shakespeare): offers gloss, withdraws it after response by #120.
92. Crito. [Letter]. No. 730 (Nov. 5-7, 1965), [2]. On the contradictions in the two accounts of the handkerchief in *Othello*.
93. ----- . [Letter]. No. 2015 (Jan. 13-15, 1774), [4]. Compares Hanmer's and Bell's prints.
94. ----- . [Letter]. No. 4350 (Mar. 24-6, 1789), [4]. Rejects Shakespeare's authorship of *Two Gentlemen* because he would not have committed the ignorant error concerning the Italian seacoast.
95. D. [Letter]. No. 1981 (Oct. 23-6, 1773), [2]. On *Hamlet* 1054-5 and other issues.
96. ----- . [Letter]. No. 2000 (Dec. 7-9, 1773), [4]. On *Othello*: Desdemona's resuscitation, and the modern practice of stabbing her.
97. ----- . [Letter]. No. 2497 (Mar. 11-13, 1777), [2]. On *Hamlet* 1482-3.
98. ----- . [Letters]. No. 2165 (Dec. 27-9, 1774), [4]; 2167 [1] (Dec. 31, 1774-Jan. 3, 1775), [4]. Answers #83 on *Romeo* 3033.
99. D., C. "A Card. To the Putter-Together of the English Review." No. 4207 (Jan. 15-17, 1788), [2]. Defends *Concordance* against hostile review.
100. D., T. [Letter]. No. 1981 (Oct. 23-6, 1773, [4]. Satiric thrust at Macklin in the form of emendations of *Hamlet* 639 and 812 gleaned from Macklin's performance.
101. Dally's Passengers. [Letter]. No. 2409 (Aug. 15-17, 1776), [4]. Answers #112 and #161 on *Antony* 652.
102. Delta. [Letter]. No. 2006 (Dec. 21-3, 1773), [4]. On the format of Bell's edition.
103. Dennis, Christopher. [Letter]. No. 730 (Nov. 5-7, 1765), [4]. Comments and emendations on five passages of *Henry V*.
104. Dennis, Peter. [Letter]. No. 960 (Apr. 25-8, 1767), [4]. Rejects suggestion in #1 that Shakespeare wrote parts of *Double Falsehood*.
105. Diogenes. "Literary Forgery." No. 5939 (Jan. 14-16, 1796), [4]. Occasioned by Ireland papers.
106. Disciple of Shakespear and No Bold Critic, A. [Letter]. No. 1702 (Jan. 18-21, 1772), [1]. Answers #217 on *Hamlet* 2784.
107. Douglas. [Letter]. No. 3556 (Dec. 20-3, 1783), [1]. Objects to Siddons's alteration ("son" for "child") in *King John* 460.
108. Dramaticus. "Shakespeare." No. 773 (mislabelled 733) (Feb. 13-15, 1766), [4]. On *Julius Caesar* 168.
109. Dull, Goodman. [Letter]. No. 732 (Nov. 9-12, 1765), [4]. On Johnson's Preface. Claims Fribble's letter (#125) as his own.
110. Duns Scotus. [Letter]. No. 1075 (Jan. 19-21, 1768), [4]. Praises the dress of witches in Powell-Yates production of *Macbeth* at Covent-Garden.
111. Dunsinane. [Letter]. No. 1088 (Feb. 18-20, 1768), [4]. Supplements #110 on performing practices involving *Macbeth*.
112. E., A. [Letters]. No. 2406 (Aug. 8-10, 1776), [4]; 2409 (Aug. 15-17), [4]. Glosses *Antony and Cleopatra* 652.
113. ----- . [Letters]. No. 2412 (Aug. 22-4, 1776), [4]; 2413 (Aug. 24-7), [4]. On *Timon* 279, 611, 1001.
114. E., E. "Observation on Shakespeare." No. 765 (Jan. 25-8, 1766), [4]. On *Tempest* 13.
115. E., M. "Shakespeare." No. 5794 (Feb. 10-12, 1795), [2]. Biographical anecdote.
116. Eboracensis. "Shakespeare." No. 785 (Mar. 13-15, 1766), [4]. Corrects glosses on Yorkshire dialect in a review of Johnson's edition (*Critical Review* 21 [1766], 13-26).
117. Ebruius. "The Drunken Martyrs." No. 2386 (June 22-5, 1776), [4]. Includes paragraph on Cassio.

118. Elidurus. [Letter]. No. 2411 (Aug. 20-2, 1776), [4]. Answers #112 and #161 on *Antony* 652.
119. Elisa. "Shakespeare." No. 4376 (May 5-7, 1789), [4]. Answers #184, calls Bassanio's act unethical in *The Merchant of Venice*.
120. Englishman, An. "Card." No. 1119 (Apr. 30-May 3, 1768), [4]. Rejects #91 on "forsen".
121. Eumenes. [Letter]. No. 1985 (Nov. 2-4, 1773), [2]. Answers #46 on *Macbeth*.
122. Fairplay. "Shakespeare." No. 4891 (July 5-7, 1792), [4]. Answers #187 on *Dream* 719.
123. Fire and Brimstone. "Shakespeare." No. 1127 (May 19-21, 1768), [4]. Answers #163 on *Hamlet* 1734.
124. Fire Plug. "Shakespeare." No. 1132 (May 31-June 2, 1768), [4]; 1139 (June 16-18), [4]. Answers #123 on *Hamlet* 1734.
125. Fribble. "Fifty Words on Johnson's Edition of Shakespeare. Mus gerebat Bellum. A Mouse Waged War." No. 721 (Oct. 15-17, 1765), [4]. See #109.
126. Gibby. [Letter]. No. 2046 (Mar. 26-9, 1774), [1]. On Hamlet's madness and Othello's race: answers Kenrick's lecture and #185.
127. Gridiron, Lucifer. "Shakespeare." No. 1136 (June 9-11, 1768), [4]. Answers #124 on *Hamlet* 1734.
128. H. [Letter]. No. 1891 (Mar. 30-Apr. 1, 1773), [2]. *Hamlet* criticism; same as Horatio?
129. Hic et Ubique. "Dramatic Strictures on the Composition and Performance of Hamlet." No. 1716 (Feb. 18-20, 1772), [4]; 1717 (Feb. 20-2), [4]; 1722 (Mar. 3-5), [4]; 1723 (Mar. 5-7), [4].
130. ----- . "Dramatic Strictures, upon the Comedy of Twelfth Night." No. 1704 (Jan. 23-5, 1772), [4].
131. Higgins, John. [Letter]. No. 1859 (Jan. 14-16, 1773), [4]. Emends *Macbeth* 1624.
132. Hint. [Letter]. No. 1712 (Feb. 11-13, 1772), [4]. Answers #217, #106, #178 on *Hamlet* 2784.
133. Horatio. [Letters]. No. 1799 (Aug. 25-7, 1772), [1]; 1834 (Nov. 14-17), [1]; 1841 (Dec. 1-3), [4]. On *Hamlet*: general and on 747, 1379, 1472. Cf. also H. (#128).
134. Jackson, W. "Shakespeare." No. 1157 (July 28-30, 1768), [4]. Asks J. K. about *Hamlet* 2404.
135. Johnson, Ben. [Letter]. No. 1836 (Nov. 19-21, 1772), [4]. Answers #62 on *Hamlet* 2548.
136. Johnson, Samuel, and George Steevens. [Excerpts from *Variorum* 1773]. No. 1973 (Oct. 5-7, 1773), [1]; and many subsequent issues through early 1774.
137. Justice. [Letter]. No. 3476 (June 7-10, 1783), [4]. Answers #54 on Ritson's *Remarks*.
138. Juvenis. [Letter]. No. 2393 (July 9-11, 1776), [4]. Emends *Hamlet* 761.
139. K., C. "Malone's Shakespeare." No. 4871 (May 26-9, 1792), [4]. Answers #88, #160, #190, discussing passages in *Tempest*, *Merry Wives*, *Dream*, *1 Henry VI*, and *Coriolanus*.
140. K., J. (sometimes called "The Scalper"). [Letter]. No. 1090 (Feb. 23-5, 1768), [4]. Praises Colman's alterations of *Lear* and urges alteration of *The Maid's Tragedy* and *Troilus*. This writer also wrote letters signed Z.
141. ----- . [Letter]. No. 1107 (Apr. 2-5, 1768), [4]. Argues for removing indelicacies from *AYL*.
142. ----- . [Letter]. No. 1113 (Apr. 16-19, 1768), [4]. Praises Theobald as editor.
143. ----- . [Letter]. No. 1118 (Apr. 28-30, 1768), [1]. Comments on oral readings in *The Merchant*.
144. ----- . [Letters]. No. 1115 (Apr. 21-3, 1768), [1]; 1122 (May 7-10), [2]; 1138 (June 14-16), [4]; 1182 (Sept. 24-7), [2]. Critical analysis of *The Maid's Tragedy*.

145. ----- [Letter]. No. 1172 (Sept. 1-3, 1768), [1]. Critical discussion of *Macbeth*. Suggests Marston as source of 629 ff. (withdrawn in #219)
146. ----- "Shakespeare." No. 1131 (May 28-31, 1768), [4]. Answers #163 on *Hamlet* 1734.
147. [Kenrick, William]. [Excerpts from Kenrick's comments on *Tempest* in his *Review* of Johnson's edition]. No. 737 (Nov. 21-3, 1765), [2].
148. Kynaston, J. [Letters]. No. 733 (Nov. 12-14, 1765), [2]; 734 (Nov. 14-16), [2]. On *All's Well* 2036 and *Antony and Cleopatra* 442.
149. L. "Shakespeare." No. 774 (Feb. 15-18, 1766), [4]. *Macbeth* 1532.
150. L., D. "Shakespeare." No. 2585 (Oct. 4-7, 1777), [4]. On Hamlet's madness.
151. Lancashire Witch, A. [Letter]. No. 772 (Feb. 11-13, 1766), [1]. On a comment by Kenrick about the Witch of Endor.
152. Law Reporter, A. "Shakespeare Forgeries." No. 6104 (Feb. 2-4, 1797), [4].
153. Lovechild, A. [Letter]. No. 2003 (Dec. 14-16, 1773), [4]. Emends *Coriolanus* 1125 and comments on the spelling "Shakespeare."
154. M., C. "On Shakespeare. By a Bookseller." No. 797 (Apr. 10-12, 1766), [4]. Satiric poem on editors.
155. ----- "On Shakespeare's Commentators" (poem). No. 749 (Dec. 19-21, 1765), [4].
156. Malone, [Edmond]. [Extract from his *Inquiry*]. In "Forgeries on Shakespeare." No. 5972 (Mar. 31-Apr. 2, 1796), [4].
157. Many. "Shakespeare." No. 1674 (Nov. 14-16, 1771), [1]. Answers #61 on *Hamlet* 761, asks about *Macbeth* 2239-40.
158. Margery the Cookmaid. "A Card." No. 728 (Oct. 31-Nov. 2, 1765), [4]. Corrects Johnson commentary on *Lear* 2639.
159. Married Man, A. [Letter]. No. 4649 (Feb. 1-3, 1791), [4]. Asks the origin of horns as mark of cuckold. Cf. #206; neither query was answered.
160. Misologos. "Shakespeare Criticks." No. 4847 (Apr. 17-19, 1792), [4]. Answers #88, defending Ritson.
161. New Correspondent, A. [Letter]. No. 2408 (Aug. 13-15, 1776), [4]. Answers #112 on *Antony and Cleopatra* 652.
162. ----- [Letter]. No. 3208 (Sept. 18-20, 1781), [4]. Suggests that Shakespeare wrote epitaph on Elias James.
163. Nibbler. "Shakespeare." No. 1125 (May 14-17, 1768), [4]. On *Hamlet* 1734.
164. ----- "Shakespeare." No. 1166 (Aug. 18-20, 1768), [4]. Answers #134 on *Hamlet* 2404.
165. No Skeptic, for I Have Not a Single Doubt. "Shakespeare." No. 5939 (Jan. 14-16, 1796), [4]. Satirical thrust at Ireland papers.
166. Nobody. "Shakespeare." No. 1142 (June 23-5, 1768), [4]. Glosses *Lear* 2253.
167. Old Correspondent. [Letter]. No. 2118 (Sept. 8-10, 1774), [1]. Glosses *Tempest* 1654.
168. Old Stager, An. [Letter]. No. 2902 (Oct. 16-19, 1779), [4]. On Barry's Othello, and the recent practice of stabbing Desdemona.
169. One of the Faithful. "Shakespeare in Ireland." No. 5974 (Apr. 5-7, 1796), [4]. Answers #156 on the Ireland papers.
170. P., P. "Shakespeare." No. 4880 (June 9-12, 1792), [4]. Answers #187 on *Dream* 719.
171. Philalethes. "Forgeries on Shakespeare." No. 5977 (Apr. 12-14, 1796), [4].
172. ----- [Letter]. No. 2009 (Dec. 28-30, 1773), [2]. As a friend of Capell, requests that the attack on him be stopped; see #13, #56, #195.
173. Philo-Shake. [Letter]. No. 4049 (Feb. 10-13, 1787), [3]. On the spelling of the playwright's name.
174. Philo-Shakespeare. [Letter]. No. 757 (Jan. 7-9, 1766), [4]. On *Othello*: the problem of Desdemona's coming to life.

175. ----- [Letter]. No. 2441 (Oct. 26-9, 1776), [4]. Defends Shakespeare against Voltaire.
176. Philo-Shakespeare. "Shakespeare." No. 4785 (Nov. 24-6, 1791), [4]. Answers #32 on *Hamlet* 1730.
177. Pluto's Link-Boy. "Shakespeare." No. 1149 (July 9-12, 1768), [4]. Answers #163, ##123-4, #146, #127 on *Hamlet* 1734.
178. Posthumus. [Letter]. No. 1707 (Jan. 30-Feb. 1, 1772), [3]. On *Hamlet* 2784; answers #217.
179. Puzzle Any Mouse. "Epigram" (satirizing correspondents disputing about Shakespeare: #112, #161, #101). No. 2410 (mislabelled 2401) (Aug. 17-20, 1776), [4].
180. Q. [Letter]. No. 2027 (Feb. 10-12, 1774), [2]. Traces *Macbeth* 629 to *Antonio's Revenge*.
181. ----- [Letter]. No. 2143 (Nov. 3-5, 1774), [1]. On *Hamlet* 245.
182. ----- [Letter]. No. 2281 (Sept. 26-8, 1775), [2]. On *Two Gentlemen* 864 and *Antony* 442.
183. ----- [Letter]. No. 2337 (Feb. 3-6, 1776), [4]. On *All's Well* 2036.
184. Querist. "A Question in Ethicks." No. 4371 (Apr. 23-5, 1789), [4]. Asks for opinions on the ethics of Bassanio's giving up Portia's ring in *The Merchant of Venice*. See #119.
185. Query. [Letter]. No. 2027 (Feb. 10-12, 1774), [1]. On Hamlet's madness, which a lecturer [Kenrick] has described as real.
186. Quolibet. [Letter]. No. 1720 (Feb. 27-9, 1772), [1]. Answers #129 on *Hamlet*.
187. R., W. "Shakespeare." No. 4872 (May 29-31, 1792), [4]. Answers #139 on *Dream* 719.
188. Rat, A. [Letter]. No. 1836 (Nov. 19-21, 1772), [2]. Answers #62 on *Hamlet* 2548.
189. Reflection. [Letter]. No. 5246 (Oct. 11-14, 1794), [4]. Applies *Macbeth* lesson about predicting.
190. Retrospectus. "Shakespeare--Again and Again." No. 4863 (May 8-10, 1792), [4]. Supports #160.
191. S. [Letter]. No. 3265 (Feb. 7-9, 1782), [4]. Traces "weird sisters" (*Hamlet* 1416) to Holinshed, correcting a statement by Bryant in *Observations on . . . Chatterton*.
192. St. Andre, N. [Letter]. No. 2988 (May 6-9, 1780), [4]. On *As You Like It* 1527.
193. Scaliger. [Letter]. No. 2492 (Feb. 27-Mar. 1, 1777), [2]. On *Two Gentlemen* 864.
194. Secundus. [Letter]. No. 2056 (Apr. 19-21, 1774), [4]. Answers #40, glossing *Othello* 3240 ff. differently from Variorum 1773.
195. Several of the Purchasers . . . "Shakespeare." No. 1989 (Nov. 12-13, 1773), [4]; 1997 (Nov. 30-Dec. 2), [4]. Makes same demand as Annotator (#56).
196. Shakespearella. [Letter]. No. 1718 (Feb. 22-5, 1772), [3]. Answers #217 etc. on *Hamlet* 2784.
197. Short, Bob. [Letters]. No. 1736 (Apr. 4-7, 1772), [4]; 1755 (May 19-21), [4]. Answers #129. On *Hamlet* 247, 1218, 1473, 2379.
198. ----- "Shakespeare's Othello." No. 1771 (June 23-5, 1772), [1]. Emends or glosses 23, 2119, 2223, 2276, 3093, 3465.
199. Simplex. [Letter]. No. 977 (June 4-6, 1767), [2]. On *Othello* 3093.
200. Spectator. [Letter]. No. 2553 (July 19-22, 1777), [4]. On an alteration (*Sheep-Shearing*) of *The Winter's Tale*: response to an anonymous review in No. 2552 (July 17-19), [4].
201. Stanley, Will. "Plan for Regenerating and Modernising Shakespeare." No. 4808 (Jan. 17-19, 1792), [2]. Several emendations in *Hamlet* 1730 ff.
202. Strolling Player. "Shakespeare." No. 1680 (Nov. 28-30, 1771), [1]. Answers #157 on *Macbeth* 2239-40.
203. Suum Cuique. [Letter]. No. 2020 (Jan. 25-7, 1774), [4]. Answers #65, pointing out that Kenrick had already proposed the emendation in *Merry Wives* 749.
204. T. "Shakespeare." No. 812 (May 15-17, 1766), [4]; 815 (May 22-4), [4]; 818 (May 29-31), [4]. On *Henry V* 3369; *I Henry IV* 516; *Richard II* 426+4, 1190; and *Hamlet* 2016.

205. T., B. "Banquo's Ghost." No. 5698 (June 21-4, 1794), [4]. Answers #52.
206. -----. "Cuckoldom." No. 4452 (Oct. 31-Nov. 3, 1789), [4]. Asks origin of horns as mark of cuckold. Cf. #159; neither query was answered.
207. -----. "Fuseli." No. 4866 (May 12-15, 1792, [4]. On Falstaff's "foreshortened phiz."
208. Vericola. [Letter]. No. 1682 (Dec. 3-5, 1771), [2]. Answers #202 on *Macbeth* 2239-40; comments on *Hamlet* 761 and *Tempest* 177.
209. Vindex. [Letter]. No. 1998 (Dec. 2-4, 1773), [4]. Corrects comment in Variorum 1773 on Hanmer's disposition of a scene in *Cymbeline*.
210. Voltaire, Francois Marie Arouet. "Bon Mot." No. 2935 (Jan. 1-4, 1780), [4]. Witticism on Shakespeare's low characters.
211. W., I. [Letter]. No. 1683 (Dec. 5-7, 1771), [3]. Answers #202 on *Macbeth* 2239-40.
212. W., T. [Letter]. No. 2005 (Dec. 18-21, 1773), [4]. Answers #13 on *Lear* 2014+9.
213. W. & D. [Letter]. No. 2459 (Dec. 12-14, 1776), [4]. Emends *Hamlet* 1009.
214. W**ds. "Prologue to king Lear." No. 993 (July 11-14, 1767), [4].
215. Walpole, Horace. [Excerpts from *Historic Doubts on . . . Richard the Third*]. No. 1080 (Jan. 30-Feb. 2, 1768), [4]. Argues that "The Winter Evening's Tale was . . . a second Part of Henry the Eighth" (jealous Leontes/Henry VIII).
216. Warburton, John. [Transcript of MS "A Dead List of Dramatick Pieces" allegedly destroyed by his cook]. No. 2992 (May 16-18, 1780), [2].
217. Warburton, Junior. [Letter]. No. 1698 (Jan. 9-11, 1772), [1]. Emends *Hamlet* 2784.
218. X., X. [Letter]. No. 1086 (Feb. 13-16, 1768), [2]. Disputes the historicity of Shakespeare's making the Duke of Gloucester be present at Wakefield and St. Albans.
219. Z. [Letter]. No. 1205 (Nov. 17-19, 1768), [2]. On *Dream* 2145, which he now suggests as a source for Marston (see #145).
220. -----. "Shakespeare." No. 1154 (July 21-3, 1768), [4]. On *Hamlet* 245 and 761. Apparently the same author as J. K.
221. -----. "Shakespeare." No. 1171 (Aug. 30-Sept. 1, 1768), [4]. Answers #134 (claiming to be the person addressed in that letter); also praises Capell ed.

The following additional items represent notes found in volumes for the years 1762-4, 1769, and 1784 (volumes not seen at the time of the earlier list). [S = supplementary.]

- S1. Anonymous. "Address to David Garrick, Esq: on the late Jubilee at Stratford-upon-Avon." No. 1348 (Oct. 17-19, 1769), [4].
- S2. -----. "A Card." No. 1243 (Feb. 14-16, 1769), [4]. Answers #S20 on *TN* 934.
- S3. -----. "The Cento for Shakespeare's Birthday, Selected from Himself. To be spoken at the approaching Jubilee at Stratford." No. 1329 (Sept. 2-5, 1769), [4].
- S4. -----. "Dialogue between an Actor and a Critic, by way of Prologue to the English Opera, called the Iennasi, which was spoken, but never printed." No. 259 (Nov. 4-6, 1762), [1-2].
- S5. -----. [Letter]. No. 281 (Dec. 23-5, 1762), [4]. Defends *TGV* against #S11.
- S6. -----. [Letter]. No. 404 (Oct. 4-6, 1763), [2]. General.
- S7. -----. "On Miss Brids in the Character of Imogen." No. 144 (Feb. 9-11, 1762), [3]. Poem with general comments on *Cym*.

- S8. -----. "Postscripts." No. 480 (Mar. 31-Apr. 3, 1764), [4]. Review of Powell's *Othello* ("the finest Play, perhaps, in our own, or any other Language").
- S9. -----. "Postscript." No. 425 (Nov. 22-4, 1763), [4]. Rev. of performance of *Dream* with comments on play.
- S10. -----. "Postscript." No. 406 (Oct. 8-11, 1763), [4]. Praises Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster* and Colman's alteration.
- S11. -----. "Postscript." No. 280 (Dec. 21-3, 1762), [4]. Review with strictures on *TGV*. Cf. #S5.
- S12. -----. "Shakespeare." No. 1342 (Oct. 3-5, 1769), [4]. Answers #S17 on Garrick's delivery.
- S13. -----. "Shakespeare." No. 3562 (Jan. 3-6, 1784), [4]. On *TGV* 790.
- S14. -----. Admirer of Shakespeare, An. [Letter]. No. 1226 (Jan. 5-7, 1769), [1]. Wants Mr. Love to play Falstaff.
- S15. -----. "Shakespeare." No. 1319 (Aug. 10-12, 1769), [4]. Emends *Jn.* 1351.
- S16. Aeneasensis. "Shakespeare." No. 1299 (June 24-7, 1769), [1]. On *Ham.* 1713.
- S17. B., R. [Letter]. No. 1338 (Sept. 23-5, 1769), [4]. Disagrees with the author of "Upon the Writings and Genius of Shakespeare" (in the last *Monthly Rev.*) on Garrick's delivery of a line in *Lr.*; also describes his delivery of a line in *Mac.*
- S18. B., T. [Letter]. No. 307 (Feb. 19-22, 1763), [4]. On Garrick's anachronistic set for *2H4*.
- S19. D., C. [Letter]. No. 1269 (Apr. 15-18, 1769), [4]. On *Oth.* 3240.
- S20. Friend to Viola, A. "Shakespeare." No. 1235 (Jan. 26-8, 1769), [4]. Answers #S26 on *TN* 934.
- S21. Friend to Viola and Well-wisher to Susannah Meanwell, A. "To Susannah Meanwell." No. 1246 (Feb. 21-3, 1769), [4]. Answers #S2 on *TN* 934.
- S23. Hanmer, Thomas. [Letter to Dr. Smith, Queen's College, Oxford, Oct. 28, 1742]. No. 411 (Oct. 20-2, 1763), [4]. Previously suppressed letter on his disagreements with Warburton and on his edition.
- S24. K., J. "Shakespeare." No. 1311 (July 22-5, 1769), [4]. On *Oth.* 613 ff.
- S25. Mardonius. [Letter]. No. 413 (Oct. 25-7, 1763), [1]. Criticizes character of Bessus in Beaumont and Fletcher's *A King and No King*.
- S26. Meanwell, Susannah. "Shakespeare." No. 1232 (Jan. 19-21, 1769), [4]. Gloss on *TN* 934.
- S27. N., W. [Letter]. No. 499 (May 15-17, 1764), [4]. On Ross as Lear.
- S28. Nobody. "Shakespeare." No. 1289 (June 1-3, 1769), [4]. On *MM* 920.
- S29. Observator. [Letter]. No. 1345 (Oct. 10-12, 1769), [4]. Contrasts Shakespeare with "the rest of his Townsmen."
- S30. Philo-Shakespeare. [Letter]. No. 3593 (Mar. 16-18, 1784), [4]. On the source of *Mac.* 524-5.
- S31. R., D. "Shakespeare. Remarks on the Tragedy of Macbeth." No. 1273 (Apr. 25-7, 1769), [4].
- S32. Settlewould, Elkanah. "Shakespeare." No. 1240 (Feb. 7-9, 1769), [4]. Answers #S26 on *TN* 934.