

PAPER ABSTRACTS

SHAKESPEARE & BOOK DESIGN SAA 2015

Claire M. L. Bourne / Virginia Commonwealth University
cmbourne@vcu.edu / @roaringgirle

Jonathan P. Lamb / University of Kansas
jonathanplamb@ku.edu / @JonathanPLamb

“Prison Be My Scope”: Shakespearean Books Arts Among the Incarcerated

Sheila T. Cavanagh / Emory University

In my paper, I will be looking at the work of the Georgia State Prison Initiative, where Sarah Higinbotham and Bill Taft combine textual study of Shakespeare with the creation of books crafted from materials accessible to the prisoners within Phillips State Prison.

The Visual Experience of Textual Variation

Alan Galey / Faculty of Information, University of Toronto

Shakespeareans have evolved a truly complex set of visual conventions and abstract information structures to manage the unwieldy history of Shakespeare’s texts. How did those conventions come about in relation to— even in tension with—book design? What other visual forms has textual variation taken in Shakespeare editions, and what is at stake in the differences? This paper will consider the seemingly mundane topic of textual notes, and the history of the phenomenon of textual variation they represent, through a set of examples in which book design meets information design. As I hope to show, with reference to recent work by Johanna Drucker, the history of Shakespearean textual notes leads us into contested boundary between visualization as a technique developed within the sciences to represent *data*, and visualization as a humanistic practice based on interpretation of *texts*.

Miscellaneous Design: Textual Genre and Poetic History in *Englands Helicon*

Megan Heffernan / DePaul University

The history of the early modern poetry miscellany is caught up in an episode of Victorian forgery. In the 1860s, after being exposed for false annotations in a copy of Shakespeare’s Second Folio, the antiquarian John Payne Collier began editing a set of what he termed “Seven English Poetical Miscellanies,” including *Tottel’s Miscellany* (1557), *A Gorgeous Gallery* (1576), and *Englands Helicon* (1600). Strangely, we still apply Collier’s designation to these volumes today. By reading documents relating to Collier’s editions—including his annotations in a copy of *Helicon*, correspondence with subscribers, and transcriptions of early modern volumes—this paper unsettles a synchronic, nineteenth-century history of textual genre and discovers an unexpected poetic sensitivity in volumes gathered by sixteenth-century press agents.

Pica and Small Pica: Changing Font in Editions of Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness*

Margaret Jane Kidnie / University of Western Ontario

This seminar paper will draw potential connections between the second edition of Heywood's *Woman Killed* (1617) and the Pavier Quartos (1619). At the moment, my material is suggestive rather than conclusive. In my forthcoming edition of *Woman Killed*, I pull together evidence that strongly indicates that the two surviving editions of this play (the first – Q1 – is dated 1607) are both printed from a no longer surviving edition (Q0). Q1 was printed by William Jaggard, and Q2 by his son, Isaac. Collation of these surviving editions indicates that William Jaggard undertook little to no preparation of Q0 prior to publication of Q1 (which corresponds to Heywood's own low estimation of him as a printer). Isaac Jaggard, however, seems to have undertaken immense preparation and correction of Q0; Sonia Massai (2008) argues that this copytext was read and marked-up by an in-house annotator, possibly Isaac himself. It is strange, then, that Jaggard chose to print Q2 in pica rather than small pica. This small design innovation led to serious layout problems for the compositor, who was frequently forced to interrupt and disrupt Heywood's long verse lines, either setting a single verse line as multiple lines or as prose. Why so carelessly bungle the layout of a quarto, the text of which he had spent time, and perhaps money, "perfecting" (the word is Massai's)? This essay links this oddity to research by Alan Farmer, and Zachary Lesser and Peter Stallybrass, which indicates that at least one copy of *Woman Killed* was once bound with plays now known as the Pavier Quartos, and that the "Pavier Quartos" may not have been intended exclusively as a collection of Shakespearean drama. I end with a question which I will pursue further over the summer (perhaps ultimately to discount): did Jaggard alter the font of Q0 *Woman Killed* – a design choice that otherwise seems unaccountable – because this play was earmarked for inclusion as part of what would at this time have been the earliest collection of Renaissance drama?

Sewing Shakespeare

Jeffrey Todd Knight / University of Washington

If by design we mean "a plan conceived in the mind," i.e., prior to making or building, this paper will explore one way in which Shakespearean book design unmade itself: sewing. Hypothesizing that all books in the hand-press era were designed to be sewn, and that sewing in (unlike writing on) paper had the benefit of being undone, I explore the long genealogy of "stitched books," capaciously imagined, from the stab-stitched dramatic quartos of the Renaissance to the sewn-in corrections, repairs, and embellishments of medieval manuscripts.

Marginal Shakespeare

Ted Leinwand / University of Maryland

This paper samples some of what I have discovered about the ways John Keats, John Berryman, Ted Hughes, and Allen Ginsberg read Shakespeare by discussing snippets of their marginalia, their signs of admiration and self-assertion, of response and argument. All book design attends either explicitly or implicitly to margins, hence to the presumption of marginalia. The marginalia-friendly Shakespeare edition socializes the often solitary act of reading, making it what we now call "interactive." It gives readers an opportunity to converse with themselves, with Shakespeare, with editors, and with other readers.

Designing History in 1655: William Shakespeare's *King Lear* and Robert Davenport's *King John and Matilda*

Marissa Nicosia / Scripps College

@Nicosia_Marissa

In 1655 a cluster of plays about medieval and ancient English history that were performed during the Caroline era were printed for the first time. This belated act of publication unmoors these plays from their theatrical origins, but in turn generates instead echoes of the 1640s and 1650s in narratives of England's distant past. For example, Robert Davenport's *King John and Matilda* documents ongoing conflict between King John and his nobles, reflects on the national wounds of civil war, and proposes an array of rebellions and beheadings. This is heady stuff for 1655. Moreover, this delightful, ridiculous, and obscure play was published alongside the first reprinting of William Shakespeare's *King Lear* in thirty-five years. In this paper I will examine the typographic and design features of these two playbooks. The excessive use of parentheses in the pages of *King John and Matilda* performs a kind of virtual containment: The typesetting of verse as prose in *King Lear*, copied from Q2, strips the play of its visual poetic signifiers. I will show that the untimely Medievalism of these plays is heightened by their design features.

Publishing for Collection: Designing Playbooks Before & After the Folios

Aaron T. Pratt / Yale University

@aarontpratt

Most publishers in early modern England were also retail booksellers, and they no doubt made their investments, at least in part, based on their understanding of customers' behavior—what they bought, how much they bought, and what they wanted to buy. This brief paper examines the ways that that English readers bought and preserved quarto playbooks in order to understand how publishers designed and marketed them. In doing so, it offers a reassessment of Shakespeare's First Folio, and asks us to rethink the relationship between dramatic authorship and the cultural status of vernacular drama itself.

Cutting Shakespeare

Whitney Trettien / Duke University

@whitneytrettien

Henrietta Maria Bowdler's editorial work on *The Family Shakespeare* (1807) has been cut from history, overshadowed by that of her brother Thomas. Yet her bowdlerization of Shakespeare – which predates Thomas's by 11 years – is sophisticated and subtle, adapting the cutting-edge editorial principles of her day to the specific purpose of social reading, or reading aloud. By reading Bowdler's work alongside the design of a unique cut-and-paste seventeenth century book owned by the Bowdlers, this paper places Bowdler's editorial labor within a longer tradition of materially editing boutique “editions” of printed texts with scissors and paste. In so doing, it attempts to restore an appreciation for Harriet Bowdler's work, and bowdlerization more generally as a theory of editing.