

### **Rhizomatic Influence & the Sole Survivor**

Ian De Jong

As a genre, the early modern lottery book epitomizes print's hybrid potential. Its design usually invites active readerly involvement and engagement, sometimes participates in ideological contention, and always troubles its own classification as "book." The *Booke of Fortune*, a 1618 translation of the Italian *Libro di Sorti* (1482), is one such hybrid, thick with material puzzles. It survives in one copy, as do most continental editions of the *Libro di Sorti*. So what happens to the edition/copy dichotomy when the edition is the copy? I argue that traditional models of comparative bibliography, which imagine texts as descendant from one another, fails to answer key questions about *The Booke of Fortune* and its place in early modern European book markets. Instead, I borrow Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's conceptual model of the rhizome, repurposing it to express the complex interplay between the material, ideological, aesthetic, and commercial impulses which may be imagined to have shaped *The Booke of Fortune*. Thinking of books as nodes in a rhizome opens novel possibilities for imagining both the history of the book and the book's impact on early modern European history and culture.

•

### ***Sir John Van Olden Barnavelt* and the Uniqueness of Censored Plays**

Gabriella Edelstein

"[C]ensorship is censorship", Fredson Bowers wrote in his textual introduction to Fletcher and Massinger's *The Tragedy of Sir John Van Olden Barnavelt*, in order to justify his editorial decision to present the play without the cuts and interpolations of the Master of the Revels, Sir George Buc, and the self-censoring scribe, Ralph Crane. Whilst the manuscript (BL MS Add. 18653) exhibits the process by which the play was made ready for the stage – involving Crane, Buc, and probably Fletcher – Buc and Crane's changes are treated like aberrations/imperfections in need of correction. But any "original text" that Bowers pursued was long lost to history because several scenes were cut and re-written either by the Revels Office or in the playhouse. Plays like *Barnavelt* prompt the question of how we should categorise heavily censored plays: are they exemplary copies even when they exist in only a unique, usually manuscript, form? If *Barnavelt* is a unique copy, then this has implications for how it is edited. Rather than attempting to find the playwrights' "foul papers", future editions of *Barnavelt* (and perhaps censored plays more generally) should present the play in its censored form.

•

### **Seventeenth-Century Music Meetings: When Copies Produce Editions**

Sharon J. Harris

In the mid-to-late seventeenth century, music meetings became more prevalent. Gathering in homes and taverns, trained and aspirational musicians alike joined forces with poet-lyricists to perform music for public or semi-public audiences. Some songs were newly composed while others were repurposed from plays and masques. As these proto-concerts developed and became more widespread, their music grew more popular as well, generating a demand for music books that could be used in domestic settings. John Playford responded to this opportunity by publishing dozens of music books. Focusing especially on music drawn from the English

stage and masquing hall, this paper considers how those songs changed from the version composed for their dramatic context to collected editions of songs printed for public consumption. In a reversal from the expected sequence of printed editions producing individual copies of works, these musical copies produced printed editions. But the route they took was not necessarily from fair copy or foul papers to print. Instead, extracted from their context within plays and masques, they were performed in music meetings. Then, when a market for these extracted songs had been established, Playford printed them in various songbook editions. I look at Playford's 1655 publication *Court Ayres*, its rebranded 1662 edition titled *Courtly Masquing Ayres*, and the three editions of *Select Ayres and Dialogues* (1652, 1653, 1659) as probable editions that contain early Stuart court masquing music.

•

### **“Killing the Fly in *Titus Andronicus*: Pacing, Repetition, and Violence in Shakespeare’s Folio”**

Joshua Held

Shakespeare’s First Folio includes a scene in *Titus Andronicus* absent in the quarto—the mid-play flying-killing scene. Rather than focusing on questions of authorship or collaboration regarding this scene, as many scholars have done, I focus on its role as the key difference between early editions, or copies, of the play, quarto and Folio. Through an extended close reading of the scene, I show that Titus’s self-admitted “Frantique” (TLN 1483) reaction to the fly-killing only recapitulate his vain indignation at Marcus’s indelicate use of the word “hands” earlier in the scene. Yet in both these cases of seemingly petulant rage, Titus almost immediately cools, returning the scene twice to an emotional equilibrium that begins to feel more normal at its recurrence. These two successive swings in emotion generate a kind of stasis in the scene, which functions like a subsiding pendulum for the preceding frenzy of rape, death, and maiming, which resumes in the following scenes. Thus, in its very absurdity and lack of important action, the scene functions for the play more broadly as a temporal buffer in the fast-paced violent action that surrounds it, and more broadly as an oasis from violence itself.

•

### **The Materiality of the Text between General and Particular, Edition and Copy**

Zachary Lesser

My thoughts in this paper emerge from my work on two different digital projects, separated by a decade. The first, *DEEP: Database of Early English Playbooks*, was created with Alan Farmer around 2005-2007; the second, *Shakespeare Census*, was created with Adam Hooks in 2018. The first project focuses on editions; the second on copies. What kinds of knowledge are made available by each focus? The trajectory traced here also coincides with the trajectory of my own work, from a focus on the publisher-readers of drama and the editions they produced, to my current interest in the bibliographic evidence present in each individual copy of an edition. I will particularize my question about what each lens lets us see—as book historians, literary critics, and bibliographers—through an example from my current work on the “Pavier Quartos.”

•

### **Patterns to Succeeding Men**

Dianne Mitchell

When Shakespeare refers to the youthful addressee of his “fair friend” *Sonnets* as a “patterne to succeeding men” (19.12), he seems to characterize this friend as a valued original from whom future-proof copies – both human and textual – might be taken. In fact, I’ll argue, there was never an “original” at all. But the strange reiterability of the *Sonnets*’ friend, far from being a problem, is entirely in keeping with a lyric practice based on the duplication of existing materials. Not only do Shakespeare’s poems unapologetically participate in a poetics of

replication, their emphasis on male-male affection places them among some of the most derivative lyrics of the Renaissance: friendship poems. Extant verses to early modern friends consistently borrowed images, conceits, and whole passages from poems written for other addressees. The essay concludes by examining a little-known seventeenth-century friendship lyric in manuscript that draws repeatedly on Shakespeare's *Sonnets*. Rather than reading this poem as a wholly unoriginal re-treatment of homosociality, I argue that its gestures to an earlier collection reinforce its rather surprising message: that what the poet values in a friend is not his originality but precisely this friend's ability to be an excellent copy.

•

### **The Accidentals Tourist: Greg's 'Rationale of Copy-Text' and the Dawn of Transatlantic Air Travel**

Sarah Neville

In an article published in *Studies in Bibliography* in 1950, W.W. Greg outlined a new editorial theory in an attempt to free scholarly editors from what he called 'the tyranny of copy text' that had been established by 'best-text' editions. By separating out textual variants into the distinct categories of 'accidentals' (punctuation/spelling variants) and 'substantives' (syntactic differences), Greg surmised that it is the former category of readings, rather than the latter, which should ultimately determine the text selected as copy. Once this base text is selected on the basis of its accidentals, eclectic editors are free to evaluate and select substantive readings in accordance with their larger editorial policy. Since the 1980s, editorial theorists and proponents of 'unediting' have chipped away at Greg's *Rationale*, speculating that the accidental/substantive division is deceptively reductive, as even minor variants can have major implications. This essay contextualizes debates over Greg's *Rationale* by recognizing that his theory of accidentals was a practical affordance designed to ensure that a copy text (and often a specific document) could be reconstructed by working backwards from a scholarly edition – a vital bibliographic resource in an age before scholars were easily able to fly across the Atlantic Ocean in order to check variant copies. By considering shifting editorial values alongside the rapid development of the technologies of travel, 'The Accidentals Tourist' demonstrates that theoretical texts – and the subsequent revisions and corrections of them – are the products of the affordances of their own historical moments.

SN note: I'm an unapologetic "New Bibliography whisperer", and this paper builds on some of my earlier work critiquing both "social text editing" and "unediting" as impractical, hypocritical, or unviable systems for asserting editorial authority.

•

### **'The perfect and exact Cobby': Commonplacings of Author and Editor in John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi***

Ruby Kilroy

The 1623 quarto edition of John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* makes strong claims to authorial authenticity, declaring that the play text is 'The perfect and exact Cobby, with diuerse things printed that the length of the Play would not beare in the Presentment.' The claims made on the title page assure the reader of Webster's authorial presence within the text, a presence that is sustained at moments when a number of specific lines of dialogue are marked as potential commonplaces for readers. These indicated commonplaces are identifiably Websterian, both in their (often) self-referential content and their italicised presentation on the page.

Moments of authorial intervention sit alongside a distinct editorial presence that also manifests in indicated commonplaces. As Stallybrass and Lesser have noted, editorially suggested commonplaces differ from their authorial counterparts as they are marked by inverted commas that do not directly engage the text itself. My

paper argues that Webster uses the mechanisms and presentation of indicated commonplaces to occupy the positions of author and editor within the play text. Doing so questions the title page classification of *The Duchess of Malfi* as an ‘exact Coppy’, as opposed to an edition, and allows Webster to access various referential networks and voices to reproduce his play text as a distinctly literary product.

•

### **Defective or Ideal? The Fisher’s Copy of Lewis Sharpe’s *The Noble Stranger***

Scott Schofield

At the University of Toronto’s Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library is a copy of Lewis Sharpe’s *The Noble Stranger* (London: 1640), one of the lesser known examples of English Caroline drama. Bound in modern light green cloth, the Fisher’s copy is missing various leaves, including its title page. The loss in print is made up for in provenance, however, since the copy was owned by the famed bibliographer, W.W. Greg, and dated January 1899. Moreover, additional manuscript evidence suggests that the quarto may have been bound with seventeen other ca.1630-40 English plays as part of a larger sammelbände.

Using this copy as case study, this paper will engage with questions central to this seminar. What happens when we imagine *The Noble Stranger* as part of an anthology, one where the new plays of the late 1630s by Brome and Shirley mingle with earlier plays of the decade by Heywood and even a reprint by Shakespeare? How might our current protocols for editing and rare book cataloguing shift when the traces left by readers and owners take precedent over the particulars of format and collation? How can the current focus on the materiality of play texts and the long history of collecting serve to reimagine the ways in which we describe and map books in digital censuses? Might Greg’s own copy offer the clue to move us beyond the bibliographical taxonomies he helped create?

•

### **Moore among the Manuscripts**

Misha Teramura

“All manuscripts are copies: all printed books are unique.” Nicolas Barker’s book-historical paradox invites a question: how might the theoretical stakes of “copy” and “edition,” exceptionality and exemplarity, change by widening our perspective beyond the realm of print? My paper considers a famously exceptional manuscript: *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore* (British Library, MS Harley 7368). While one might assume that a text surviving in a single manuscript witness would require necessarily copy-specific forms of analysis, I propose that recent editing of the play has nevertheless been predicated on assumptions of exemplarity—not of an abstracted print edition idealized from surviving copies, but of an abstracted dramatic script reproduceable in performance. While such literary critical approaches to the play qua play are only to be expected, my paper proposes that such approaches occlude other ways we might understand the manuscript as a material object. Departing from the norm, I resituate the *Moore* manuscript within a new context, namely, the manuscript circulation of Catholic martyrdom accounts. Based on Nicholas Harpsfield’s unpublished biography of More, the play’s sympathetic depiction of the first English Catholic martyr makes it representative of precisely the kind of text that did not get printed, and a consideration of the play in this light offers new insights about its material form, its sources, and the question of why the manuscript survives today. In reconsidering what a “copy-specific” approach to this manuscript entails, I will also ask: What would it mean to edit *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore* not primarily as a *play* at all?

•

### **Reflections on Editing in the Time of Book History**

To address the question posed by this seminar about the value of considering copies vs. editions in the editorial process, this paper reviews the results of collating texts from my three former editing projects: Edmund Tilney's *The Flower of Friendship* (1568-87), which required collation of the twelve extant copies of its seven octavo editions; Thomas Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One* (1608), which required collating fifteen copies of its first quarto printing; and Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*, which led to proofreading the play in Hinman's *Norton Facsimile* against the Houghton Library's First Folio, since that copy was not included in Hinman's collation. I review the pleasures and challenges of this work and how discrepancies among the copies did or did not influence my editorial decisions about the text. If meaningful discrepancies did not become evident among multiple copies of the same edition, was that in part because a focus on editions rather than copies did not alert me to potential differences? Or were the discrepancies not significant enough to have an impact on editorial decisions? How worthwhile was that time-consuming work after its results were tabulated and assimilated? What were the other results for this editor of working so closely with those rare books?

•

### **Reconsidering the Relationship Between *Richard II* and Samuel Daniel's *Civil Wars* Based on Evidence from Daniel's Manuscript of the First Two Books**

David S. Weiss

In a forthcoming *Huntington Library Quarterly* essay, I suggest that Shakespeare may have referred to an extant early manuscript of the first two books of Samuel Daniel's *The Civil Wars* rather than or in addition to the first printed edition of the poem while writing *Richard II*. The essay raises the possibility that the play appeared after the scribal version of the poem but before the publication of the quarto of *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars*. This paper builds on that analysis, raising the question of whether Shakespeare's play could have influenced revisions Daniel made between the two. It analyzes variants in the early versions of *The Civil Wars* and identifies similarities to *Richard II* reflected in only the quarto, not the manuscript. It also considers the possibility that these similarities reflect Shakespeare's influence on Daniel as he revised his epic before it first appeared in print.

•

### **The Crane technique: What may Ralph Crane's punctuation in *A Game at Chesse* contribute to our understanding of early modern print and manuscript cultures?**

Daniel Yabut

Often referred to as 'scribe to the King's Men', Ralph Crane's prolific output is reflected in more than two dozen surviving manuscripts on diverse subject matters, ranging from poetry to Francis Bacon's letters and to nautical matters. He is best known, though, for his dramatic output, and more specifically for his scribal transcripts that may have served as printer's copies for the first four plays in the 1623 Shakespeare folio – *The Tempest*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Measure for Measure* – as well as a fifth, *The Winter's Tale*. This recognition is dependent on shared aspects of punctuation, spelling, elision and the like, between the Shakespeare folio and extant Crane dramatic MSS. Paul Werstine argues that the very appearance of such features in the printed texts indicates that the compositors who set these plays into print were 'not so fixed in their habits as to escape the influence of their manuscript copy'.<sup>1</sup> In addition to these Shakespeare editions, Crane's hand has been identified in eight MS playbooks, as well as no fewer than ten other printed editions (such as *The Duchess of Malfi* and *Cymbeline*). But how much can one rely on Crane's technique in his manuscript works to identify his hand in printed editions? To what extent is Crane diverging from his copy? Should his transcriptions be considered as

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul Werstine, 'Scribe or Compositor: Ralph Crane, Compositors D and F, and the First Four Plays in the Shakespeare First Folio', *PBSA* 95:3 (2001), pp. 315–39, 316.

‘exceptional’ or unique copies? This paper will focus primarily on Crane’s work on four of these MSS – namely, his three presentation copies of *A Game at Chesse*, and of *The Witch* – in comparison to Middleton’s holograph copies of *A Game at Chesse*.

•

### **‘We are their parents and original’: Textual Reproduction and Editorial Taxonomy**

Molly G. Yarn

During the nineteenth century, publishers embraced the lucrative practice of repackaging a previously edited and published Shakespeare text under the auspices of a new editor, thus creating an item that they marketed as a new edition. The use of one editor’s text in another editor’s edition presents numerous issues. Who is the editor of the new edition? How do we classify a publication that has literally copied another editor’s text? Is it functionally a copy or a separate edition? How do paratextual elements influence these judgments? Underlying these topics are questions about the roles of originality and generative creativity in editing, as well as the effects of hierarchical, and often gendered, understandings of textual labor. In this paper, I will demonstrate how these issues interact in *fin de siècle* editions by and/or for women, which are consistently deemed derivative—copies, as it were—and excluded from the Shakespearean textual family tree.