

Abstracts for 2022 Shakespeare Association of America seminar  
Shakespeare in Quarto and Folio

Henry VI in Verona: Revising Shakespeare, 1594-97  
Meghan C. Andrews, Lycoming College

In recent years, editorial/critical opinion on the textual origins of *2 Henry VI* has agreed that the long-held theory of memorial reconstruction alone is insufficient to explain the relationship between *The First Part of the Contention* and *2 Henry VI*. Many recent editors and critics now suggest that, while *The First Part of the Contention* may have been a reported text, it reports an earlier version of the text that was later revised into *2 Henry VI*. I examine two different instances where the quarto and Folio texts of *The First Part of the Contention* and *2 Henry VI* diverge to argue that the Folio text of *2 Henry VI* bears resemblances to *Romeo and Juliet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (both traditionally dated to 1595-96) where the quarto text does not. I suggest that these resemblances support recent editorial/critical dating of revision to between 1594 and 1597, and thereby that they also support the recent agreement that, whatever the origins of *The First Part of the Contention*, the text that lay behind it was subsequently revised into *2 Henry VI*.

Alan B. Farmer  
Ohio State University  
SAA 2022  
Abstract

Shakespeare and Correction: Q3 *1 Henry the Fourth* (1599)

My paper will seek to extend an argument I made in my 2015 essay, “Shakespeare as Leading Playwright in Print, 1598-1608/09.” In that essay, I pointed out not only that Shakespeare was the top-selling dramatic poet in this period, but also that he was one of the best-selling authors writing in any genre in the entire English book trade. In addition, the title pages of Shakespeare’s plays routinely included editorial pledges that advertised the plays as having been “corrected,” “augmented,” “amended,” and “enlarged” by the author. Shakespeare was thus a best-selling author being sold to readers as unusually committed to the accuracy of the printed texts of his plays, a claim that runs counter to the prevailing view of him as an playwright largely indifferent to print and the book trade. Even scholars who maintain that Shakespeare revised his plays for performance have been reluctant to see him as an author invested in the accuracy of the printed texts of his plays.

Part of the reason for this reluctance has to do with the larger narratives we have for what kind of playwright and author Shakespeare was—was he really only a “man of the theater”?—but another reason has to do with what we consider to be evidence of revision. How big must the changes to a text be in order for it to be considered as revised, as in say *Hamlet* or *King Lear* or *Romeo and Juliet* or *Richard the Second*, rather than corrupted? From the other perspective, how small can the changes to a text be in order to count as authorial revision? It is this latter issue—small changes—that I plan to examine in this essay.

When *Henry the Fourth, Part One* was published in its third quarto in 1599, it was advertised as “Newly corrected by *W. Shake-speare*.” Three years later, in 1602, the third quarto of *Richard the Third* was sold as “Newly augmented, *By William Shakespeare*.” The changes made to the texts of both these plays are relatively minor, which has led editors to dismiss the title-page claims of authorial revision as somewhere between misleading and deceitful. In my essay, though, I want to look again at the changes made to these plays for what they might tell us about Shakespeare’s practices as a corrector of printed play texts. In doing so, I might also look at some other examples of authorial revision to other, non-dramatic printed texts, as a way of assessing the kinds of changes made to other printed editions that were advertised as revised or corrected in some manner. I don’t yet know where this analysis will lead, but I do want at least to hold open the possibility that the editorial pledges on these playbooks were not deceptive marketing ploys and instead possibly do tell us something about how Shakespeare may have tinkered and corrected and augmented his plays in small ways.

Hidden Gems: The Watermarks of the First Folio

The Shakespeare First Folio was always a prized possession. The choice of crown paper on which to print it ensured its pricing for a select level of privileged customer, which seems odd for a collection of publicly produced plays. William Prynne, a prominent Puritan lawyer, complained in his 1632 *Histrion-mastix* that “Shakespeare’s plays are printed on the best Crown paper, far better than some Bibles” (sig. \*\*6v). This paper will examine the paper used to print the First Folio using watermark data.

Compiling bibliographic data for *The Shakespeare First Folios: A Descriptive Catalogue* (Rasmussen/West 2012), allowed for a unique bibliographic experience. While most bibliographic studies focus on a single copy of a book or compares several copies of an edition, this project enabled data to be examined across 219 of the extant First Folios. In other words, rather than tracing data leaf by leaf within a single copy, a particular sheet across of all the examined copies can be seen. With this data, certain conditions in the Jaggards’ printshop while compiling the First Folio becomes evident. This paper will discuss the patterns in the watermark data to make observations about the crown paper chosen for the venture.

Mark C. Hulse Abstract for SAA Conference 2022 – Shakespeare in Quarto and Folio

**Title:** “Smile Heaven upon this Fair Conjunction”: Textual Authority and the Word *Whereas*

**Abstract:** Ascertaining the origins of Shakespeare’s quarto texts is essential to critics and editors, but consensus about their share of authority compared with their Folio counterparts remains elusive. This is especially concerning with the more divergent quartos, whose existence is variously ascribed to memorial reconstruction, stage adaptation, authorial revision, or some combination of these processes—competing explanations that affect our understanding of print culture, theatrical practice, and whether or not Shakespeare was a regular reviser of his own works. Despite the current wealth of research aimed at resolving authorship mysteries, little attention has been given to quarto texts sometimes regarded as “bad.” And while these texts’ incongruent parts are not always easy to isolate or subject to complicated analyses, they share a more obvious feature that marks them as un-Shakespearean: the conjunction (and formerly adverb) *whereas*. The surprising operation of this common word in the canon rules out the theory that Shakespeare was responsible for the six most frequently disputed quartos, which are effectively proven to be corruptions by other hands. The essay ends by addressing likely critiques of the method, with chronology, genre, printshop meddling, or an evolution in Shakespeare’s style all failing to explain the hitherto overlooked pattern.

Sujata Iyengar

## Shakespeare in Quarto and Folio: Editing (out?) the Ethiop

I have been asked to propose an edition of *Much Ado* for the Arden4 series and am nervously awaiting comments on a draft proposal (by SAA I should know whether my proposal and its presumed revisions have been accepted). If I understand my brief correctly, the Arden4s resist “versioning” and have given potential editors the freedom to edit the text of a single, speculative historical performance, rather than to try to recreate an authorial version, a performance version, an idealized Folio, and so on. I have proposed to recreate a Folio text as it might have been performed in the later 1620s in front of its early fan, Leonard Digges (1588-1635), who writes in a dedicatory poem in the front matter of the 1640 *Poems*, “Let but *Beatrice* / And *Benedicke* be seene, loe in a trice / The Cockpit Galleries, Boxes, all are full” (\*3v and \*4r).

The question with which I’m engaging is not a textual crux at all – but is rather a question about the relationship between edited and performed texts today. In 5.4.61, Claudio expresses his determination to marry the woman of Leonato’s choice regardless of her physical appearance: “Ile hold my minde were she an Ethiop” (all texts). While this line is not a textual crux, it is a performance crux in late twentieth- and twenty-first-century stage and film performances, in which actors and audiences – more likely than in previous centuries to have a wide range of skin tones, phenotypes, and ancestral origins – no longer automatically understand, and appreciate still less, the supposed association of dark skin with ugliness. Kenneth Branagh’s popular film (1993) cut the line from the text (along with much else), but Joss Whedon’s 2012 black-and-white, small-scale production, filmed in his own home over a two-week period, cast a Black actress as a guest standing behind Claudio at the second wedding ceremony, kept the line in its entirety, and zoomed to the Black character’s indignant reaction at Claudio’s words. Iqbal Khan’s RSC production (2012) retained the line in order to bring out a latent caste-consciousness among its modern Delhi characters (although this subtlety was lost on most theatre-goers, in my experience). Most productions offer an alternative ending to the line, such as the Atlanta Shakespeare Tavern’s 2017 performance, which gave “I’ll hold my mind, as I have sworn to do.” Kenny Leon’s all-Black 2019 Shakespeare in the Park gave Claudio a reflective pause, stopping the line firmly at “I’ll hold my mind.”

Should editors include such alternatives along with traditional textual collation? If we take seriously recent suggestions that early modern plays exist between “book” and performance (see Stern, ed., *Rethinking Theatrical Documents*, 2020), should student editions consider relegating the text to the collation and the alternative to the main text, i.e. engaging in bowdlerization?

Zachary Lesser  
University of Pennsylvania  
SAA 2022  
Abstract

### To the Weyard Sisters (Again)

In this paper I revisit the *weyward* / *weyard* sisters in *Macbeth*, who are almost always *weird* in editions since Theobald (1733). I consider this crux in light of the editorial principles of Arden 4, for which I serve as a general editor and will edit *Macbeth*. Arden 4 envisions a “return” to editing after the New Textualism, incorporating its critiques of New Bibliography but refusing the “versioning” often associated with it. Editors must try to reconstruct some early modern *work*, the *text* of which will by its nature not be perfectly represented in any surviving material *document* (see Tanselle 1989). But that work need not be the author’s final intentions, nor, as in Oxford 1 (1986), the play as first performed. Editors may attempt to reconstruct either of these, or something else such as the text of a revival, depending on the particularities of their title. *Macbeth* provides an interesting test of this kind of editing, not least because it is an “F-only” play. How might our ideas of textual authority change for an edition that reconstructs the text of a revival of the play around 1616? Adopting an editorial goal other than authorial intention or first performance might make some “nonauthoritative” editions suddenly “authoritative.”

Suzanne Tanner  
SAA 2022 – Shakespeare in Quarto and Folio  
10 December 2021

### Shakespeare's *Hamlet* Quartos and Folio as Interfaces: Visual and Language Icons of Access

Many scholars argue that a text does not exist independently of the material object through which it is presented (see Dane 2010). With multiple conflicting quartos and folios, each printing of a Shakespeare play arguably creates a new, distinct text. Yet, while scholars argue that *King Lear* is in fact two plays, or that the modern *Hamlet* is a collated text that never existed on Shakespeare's stage, we still seem to have the ability to speak of these plays as single texts with an existence in the collective conscious outside of their material embodiments. My paper uses interface theory to explore the relationship between the various material versions of Shakespeare's plays and a disembodied system of the text, and considers how materiality influences reader experience. Joanna Drucker defines "interface" as a "constitutive boundary space" allowing cooperation, interaction, and access between two "systems" ("Reading Interfaces" 216). I argue that quartos and folios act as interfaces between the reader and the system of the play, with each designed to provide specific access and different user experiences. Interface theory situates the central importance of the reader, and explores the relationship between the material text with the non-material aspects of text and cognitive experience.

Evelyn Tribble

*The Merry Wives of Windsor: A New Edition*

This paper will test some of the hypotheses underpinning my in-progress edition of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (Arden 4). This play exists in two distinct forms: the much-maligned 1602 Quarto and the Folio version. Almost all modern editions have been based upon F, despite its many inadequacies, although there have been two editions based upon Q. This edition attempts instead to reconstruct the playhouse manuscript (PM) of *Merry Wives of Windsor* as it was performed before being revised, possibly for a Jacobean court production, as has been proposed by Richard Dutton.

My hypothesis is that both F and Q are flawed but independent witnesses to a lost playhouse manuscript (PM). F is a heavily revised version of PM, preserving much of its linguistic complexity, but adding, deleting, and revising considerable material, including Garter references, quibbles around heraldry and coats of arms, specific place names localizing the action around Windsor, the expansion of the role of Slender and wooing negotiations, the Latin lesson, and the final masque scene. Q is not based on F, but is instead an incomplete transmission of PM. It features numerous reconstructed or paraphrased passages and is heavily condensed, but it also bears witness to the original structure, plot and stagecraft of PM.

The first and final scenes are the most heavily revised. My edition of 1.1 follows the structure of Q: It omits both the minutiae of the match-plot with Anne Page and the puns on heraldry, on the premise that the heraldic jokes are occasional revisions, and the scene was not simply expanded but was also restructured to showcase Slender and his love for Anne Page. Stripped of these additions, the scene more straightforwardly introduces the Falstaff and Mistress Page/Mistress Ford plot. Where Q and F converge, I follow F, on the assumption that PM was just as linguistically complex as Shakespeare's other plays of the period. In this paper, I will present excerpts from my edition of the first scene.



Steven Urkowitz

Those Once and Future Quartos and Folios,  
or  
“What does a revision really look like?”

The craft of playing plays in Early Modern professional theaters required many interpretive and physical skills from its practicing players. Some were learned in the disciplined rooms of Latin grammar schools, some in the popular fencing schools and open-field training grounds where recreational sword-and-buckler fencing and the more dangerous rapier-and-dagger play were practiced, some developed through apprenticeships with master-actors, and some picked up helter-skelter while building the early modern equivalent of garage-bands like Peter Quince’s buddies, The Rude Mechanicals.

In our modern days, many of those sportive skills are no longer practiced or even recognized by players or by academic students of the plays. For our seminar I would like to catalog and illustrate with brief examples several of the often-unrecognized actor’s “moves” called for in Shakespeare’s Quarto and Folio texts. These among others include crucially meaningful entries and exits, flowing or sharply interrupted sequences of speeches, and physically indicated pointing (deixis) or directions of address. I think of it as the prolegomena for a handbook on the order of *Shakespearean Acting and Directing for Dummies*.

Though likely in many ways as illegitimate as Gloucester’s lad Edmund, significant or “signifying” textual alternatives present in the Q and F texts of *HAMLET*, *KING LEAR*, and other multiple-text plays reveal patterns of perhaps thoughtful revision or perhaps merely haphazard correction. Some take printer’s errors and typesetters’ gibberish found in early printed versions and turn them into theatrical gold. Some take gibberish and merely turn it into nonsense. Alas, the alternative Quarto and Folio readings never directly reveal their own sources. Were they invented, or guessed at, or blundered upon by Charlie the Composer? Peter the Pirate? Martin and Max the Memorial Reconstructors? Steven the Stenographer? Arnold the Actor? Or maybe even by Shakespeare the Bard? My catalog, I hope, will help us distinguish the gold from the gibberish.

In much of today’s textual discourse, number-crunching of massive linguistic data-sets and myopic concentration on obvious compositorial confusion -- adumbrated by a concomitant, often willful, theatrical ignorance -- downplays to the point of disappearance these patterns fundamental to all of Shakespeare’s dramatic writing. Gotta start somewhere, so I’m heading out to play in the Rivers of Revision. Come on down.

**Daniel Yabut (CNRS/Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3)**  
**daniel.yabut@univ-montp3.fr**  
**Seminar: Shakespeare in Quarto and Folio**

**Abstract: 'let your owne Discretion be your Tutor': acting pointers from early printed and manuscript playbooks**

This paper seeks to propose an acting method by which early printed text facsimiles are introduced early in the rehearsal process or alongside the playtexts distributed in educational environments, as part of an actor's or student's research and learning of a script. While inspired in part by Patrick Tucker's work on cue-script performances, it also draws from studies by Sonia Massai on accents and Laurie Maguire on blank space, as well as my own research on manuscript playbooks and actors' parts. It does not privilege any one edition like Shakespeare's first folio or treat an early printed or manuscript text's punctuation as sacrosanct. Rather, it encourages consultation of as many early printed texts (and manuscripts, when available) as possible, calling for attention to punctuation, spelling, capitalization, typography, indentation, and other often modernized elements, in order to provoke questions, inspire choices, and develop their roles.

My interest in this topic stems from my experiences as an actor, which since the beginning of the pandemic have primarily been comprised of Zoom readings for which I've now downloaded well over a hundred texts from *EEBO* to supplement our modernized scripts. Also, as a teaching artist, I've been experimenting with different ways in which I could introduce early print and manuscript texts to students at university, primary, and secondary school levels.