

## **ABSTRACTS: Shakespeare's Editors (Seminar 40)**

Claire M.L. Bourne (Penn State) and Molly G. Yarn (Athens, GA)

### **Editing Shakespeare and Race**

Brandi K. Adams, Arizona State University

This paper considers carefully the history and implications of editing Shakespeare plays in which early modern conceptions of race—a subject matter that has been a significant area of study for the last forty years—have largely been marginalized or ignored. Until recently, most editions of Shakespeare have only addressed ideas about race in plays that concern racialized characters (*Othello*, *Merchant of Venice*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Titus Andronicus*, and sometimes, *The Tempest*). This tendency may be the result of an editorial aversion to considering race as a significant factor in the performance, printing, and publication of Shakespeare's plays, or an investment in the seemingly neutral, scientific language and rhetoric of influential nineteenth and twentieth century editors A.W. Pollard, W.W. Greg, R.B. McKerrow, and other practitioners of New Bibliography. These particular white, male, early editors of Shakespeare (and his contemporaries) seemed to operate under the premise that they were able to edit in a neutral, objective way that could produce the clearest uncontroversial text possible for literary scholars and other readers. Their work also obfuscated a reality: that the editing of early modern plays is not a neutral endeavor and that the choices editors make both affect and shape social, political, and even racial histories.

This paper will also explore what happens if contemporary editors of Shakespeare consider race (which includes whiteness) as a matter inherent in editing all of his plays (or his sonnets). By taking the Henriad cycle (*Richard II*, *I Henry IV*, *II Henry IV*, and *Henry V*) as a set of plays in which editors do not think to address race (particularly whiteness), and then applying the work of scholars including Francesca Royster, Kim F. Hall, Miles P. Grier, Ian Smith, Margo Hendricks alongside the work of Sonia Massai, M.J. Kidnie, Claire Bourne, Paul Werstine, and Zachary Lesser it is possible to produce editions of Shakespeare that demonstrate a thoughtful consideration of Shakespeare and race.

### **The Political Economy of an Edition: Richard Grant White's 1883 *Riverside Edition***

Mark Bayer, University of Texas at San Antonio

By the late nineteenth century, in both Britain and the United States, editions of Shakespeare were so prolific that they threatened to saturate the market, making it extremely difficult for new editorial projects to achieve either commercial success or scholarly notoriety. It was not, then, an auspicious time to embark on one of the most ambitious editions published that century, and one that would endure to introduce millions of students to Shakespeare for well over a century.

In this paper, I argue that the *Riverside* was no ordinary edition in its design, execution, and longevity. It was the result not just of White's prodigious editorial facility, but also the business acumen of Henry Houghton, who used the edition to popularize the company's relatively new *Riverside* imprint, and Horace Elisha Scudder, who envisioned widespread educational reform where literary texts replaced the Bible as the primary means of instilling moral values and promoting engaged citizenship. I will trace the ways in which this veritable 'dream team' of editorial, publishing, educational talent helped navigate the complex nineteenth century market for Shakespeare and other literary texts, and ultimately positioned the *Riverside* to stand out in this turbulent landscape.

## **Erasing “E.K”:** John Hughes and the *Works of Spenser* of 1715

Mathieu D.S. Bouchard, McGill University

In Shakespearean editorial history, John Hughes is best known for having done something that we are not, in fact, entirely sure he did: he is often credited with having edited Jacob Tonson’s 1714 edition of *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear*. While Hughes’s name was listed in one of Tonson’s manuscript receipts of payments made to Shakespeare’s editors, it appeared nowhere in the edition of 1714. This conundrum has engendered much debate about the nature of his editorial labours, at least as they relate to Shakespeare. We do know, however, that Hughes was the editor of Tonson’s 1715 edition of *The Works of Mr. Edmund Spenser*. His name appeared prominently on the title page, and within the edition itself, Hughes seemed intent on signaling his editorial credentials. In *The Shepheardes Calendar*, he boldly erased the glosses provided by Spenser’s mysterious first editor, “E.K,” and replaced them with his own. Tellingly, in the very first sentence of the edition’s dedication, Hughes referred to himself as an “editor,” employing a word that few others had yet used in reference to their editorial work on English literary texts. As I will show in this paper, Hughes’s editing of Spenser provides a counterpoint to his ghost-like involvement with Shakespeare. In an early example of editorial self-fashioning, he harnessed the apparatus of the 1715 edition to signal his control over the text and to promote his scholarly reputation.

## **Shakespeare for the People: The Staunton-Gilbert Edition**

Darlena Ciraulo, University of Central Missouri

From 1858-60, the publishing house of Routledge and Warne issued *The Plays of Shakespeare*. This handsome edition—a serial publication released in shilling monthly parts and later bound as a three-volume set—grew out of the collaborative editorial and artistic work of Howard Staunton and John Gilbert. At the time of its publication, Staunton had won acclaim as England’s Chess Master from 1843-51, while Gilbert had gained a commendable reputation for historical painting and illustration, especially literary texts. Staunton’s new career as a Shakespearean editor dovetailed well with Gilbert’s rising popularity. Yet it was the vast number of quality images that accompanied Staunton’s editorial work that proved a major selling point in the commercial market of the mid-Victorian era. Publicized as the “Routledge Illustrated Shakespeare,” *The Plays of Shakespeare* trumpeted over eight hundred wood engravings by the Brothers Dalziel after the designs of Gilbert. One anonymous critic even refers to the Staunton-Gilbert edition as the “Shakespeare of the People,” precisely due to its remarkable visual content and appealing production value for the general reading public (*Athenaeum*, 1858 [No. 1606], 158). The “Routledge Illustrated Shakespeare” offered a pictorial edition that stood, according to the critical consensus of the day, unrivalled. Capitalizing on Gilbert’s knighthood in 1872, Routledge repackaged the admired set into a single volume called “The Gilbert Shakespeare” and later “Sir John Gilbert’s Shakespeare.” These name changes not only uniquely saw Gilbert eclipsing Staunton, artist overshadowing editor, but they also reinforced the link between Pictorial Shakespeare and popular editions of the works.

## **“From You I Have Been Absent”:** Shakespeare’s Problematic Place in Early-Nineteenth-Century School Readers and the School Readers of Father and Son Albert and John Pickett

Joseph Haughey, Northwest Missouri State University

Through much of the first half of the nineteenth century, Shakespeare was absent from American school readers, the equivalent of today's English Language Arts textbooks. The evolution of Shakespeare in these volumes – by the end of the nineteenth century, his presence would dominate these texts and the curriculum and canon they represent – tell a larger story of Shakespeare's place in American education in the nineteenth century. Editors Albert Picket and his eldest son, John Picket, for example, allude to the problematic nature of including Shakespearean passages in reader compilations. The two compiled a series of readers beginning in 1808, which underwent several series of revisions and remained popular through four decades. Their third reader, the *Juvenile Mentor*, presents an unusual and intriguing history, originally including a single Shakespearean lesson through the 1810s, and then briefly including a significant number of Shakespearean passages in the 1820s, before abruptly removing them in 1829. This paper will tell their story – or rather what is known thus far of their story – and is part of a larger project exploring Shakespeare's evolving place in American school readers in the nineteenth century.

### **Rowe, Dyce, and the *Love's Labor's Lost* “Black-moores”**

Elizabeth Zeman Kolkovich, Ohio State University

In the final scene of *Love's Labor's Lost*, the King and his men dress as Russians to woo the ladies with a masque. A stage direction in both early texts indicates that the men do not enter alone: “Enter Black-moores with musicke, the Boy with a speech, and the rest of the Lordes disguysed” (Q, 1598). When Nicholas Rowe edited the play in 1709, he rewrote the direction and erased the blackmoors. Early editors followed suit, using their own versions of Rowe's emendation, until Alexander Dyce reinserted the blackmoors in 1857 without comment. My paper explores how biographical context for Rowe (the playwright) and Dyce (the scholar) enriches our understanding of this textual moment, as well as the interpretive possibilities their choices enabled. Early editors' interest in hierarchies and ambivalence about the scene's unnamed black figures underscore a need to interrogate the play's racial and gender dynamics, especially its emphasis on whiteness as crucial to women's power. I end with a call for discussing the value of empathetic scholarship.

### **‘Germany is *not* Hamlet’: H.H. Furness's *New Variorum Shakespeare from Matter to Ideal***

Ali Madani, Brown University

H.H. Furness dedicated his 1877 New Variorum edition of *Hamlet* with a curious slight: “To the German Shakespeare Society of Weimar, representative of a people whose recent history has proved one for all that ‘Germany is *not* Hamlet’, these volumes are dedicated with great respect by the editor.” This short essay turns to the editor's archive, specifically his “mighty variorum Hamlet” workbook, to consider the mid-nineteenth century American reception of a German idealist aesthetics that had come to dominate scholarship of the play. By examining Furness's workbook and its cut-and-paste construction, I offer alternative aesthetic possibilities obscured by the edition's standardization in print. I conclude with reflections on the 2021 debut of the digital *NVS*, a project one of its editors describes as the “ideal” expression of Furness's scholarly vision.

### **The Taming of the Editor: A Preparatory Manifesto**

James J. Marino, Cleveland State University

There has never been and cannot be a politically neutral edition of *The Taming of the Shrew*. Every editor must at least implicitly condone or condemn Petruchio and Katherine's marriage, answering

the political question, “Is this marriage acceptable?” But no editor has been expected to answer that question in personal terms. Respect for privacy makes it impossible to ask, “Would you stay in such a marriage?” to say nothing of the gruesome corollary, “Are you in such a marriage?”

The pressure to excuse Petruchio, and thus Shakespeare, is overwhelming, for fear of giving misogynists and abusers William Shakespeare as their mascot. In a real sense, the professional demands of editing tame us, requiring us to work within certain acceptable parameters. Generations of feminist scholars have therefore worked to salvage the play, teasing out glints of subversion and resistance and often grounding their scholarship in profound ambivalence.

Consequently, an unknown and unknowable number of editors, of both genders, have necessarily provided public answers incompatible with the private ones, endorsing a marriage whose terms they themselves would never tolerate. Editors are entitled to personal privacy, but doublethink is a poor substitute for objectivity. Any edition of *The Shrew* becomes a test of personal conscience.

### **Horace Howard Furness and the Making of the Shakespeare Editor in Nineteenth-Century Periodical Culture**

Joseph Navitsky, West Chester University

When *Shakespeariana*, the first American literary magazine devoted to Shakespeare, proclaimed that Horace Howard Furness had “linked his name, not only with American Editors, but with the posthumous and eternal history of Will Shakespeare” (6:347), it highlighted two salient points about the position of the editor in the late nineteenth century. First, the practice of editing Shakespeare’s plays had assumed a public—and surprisingly publicity-driven—dimension that helped elevate the work of the editor into something more than mere vocation. And second, editing Shakespeare’s works had become a patriotic activity in which nations such as the United States claimed ownership over the immortal legacy of the playwright by specifically promoting the collective achievements of its textual editors. In regard to the consistently positive reviews afforded to Furness’ Variorum project, we can also see how much personal reputation and public outreach played a role in placing Furness “at the head of any list of Shakespeare’s American Editors” (6:344).

With field theory serving as the primary framework for my research, I argue that the massive publicity apparatus supporting Furness’ achievements demonstrates how late nineteenth-century magazine editors promoted not only the Variorum project but also the essential function of the Shakespeare editor. As a result, this essay is less about the specific editing practices employed by Furness and more about how those practices were marketed to the public. In particular, I examine two types of documents: accounts of Furness’ methods written by magazine editors as well as Furness’ own published lectures and autobiographical sketches. Ultimately, I argue that the magazine editors who heralded the Variorum editions became, in their own right, spokespeople for the emergent field of Shakespeare studies. Indeed, while affirming the need for expertly edited Shakespearean texts, these editors also drew on the renown of Furness and the public-facing aspects—lectures, play readings, interviews—of his work to assert the field-shaping capabilities of periodical culture.

### **Modesty in *Twelfth Night*: Practicing Queer Editing of Shakespeare**

Anthony Guy Patricia, Concord University

As a gay man, I would not deny that I have a vested interest in how Shakespeare's plays and poems are edited, especially when it comes to the glosses and annotations in the texts. It is, in fact, that energy that has piqued my interest in the subject of this paper, which concerns itself with Shakespeare's use of the word modesty in *Twelfth Night*. When we are first introduced to Antonio and Sebastian, the latter tells the former, "I perceive in you so excellent a touch of modesty that you will not extort from me what I am willing to keep in, therefore it charges me in manners the rather to express myself" (2.1.11-14). In a queer editorial context, the use of modesty here is immediately suspect because it is a word usually (although, granted, not always) applied to women rather than men. More specifically, it is a word often used to characterize women's ideal (at least according to the proscriptions of men) sexual behavior. In any case, in the Arden<sup>3</sup> edition of *Twelfth Night*, modesty in 2.1.11-14 is glossed as "courtesy, self-control" (205), which effectively occludes the operation of any other meanings, including those that might well bring Antonio's manhood, such as it is, into question in a play rife with confusion regarding gender and sexual(ity). So situated, in this paper, I will investigate Shakespeare's use of the word modesty in *Twelfth Night* as well as a number of his other plays, ranging from *The Taming of the Shrew* to *The Tempest*, and how Shakespeare's editors have glossed/annotated modesty in these plays over the years. This investigation will be complemented by turning to the venerable *OED*, pertinent secondary criticism, and to what can be gleaned about modesty from early modern English conduct books for women. Thus, I hope to provide one example of how the "personal is political" as regards my sexual identity – and the biases inherent in that identity – can have an effect on Shakespearean editorial practice.

### **A Great War Editorial Battle: The Colonial Quest for an Indo-British Single-Volume Shakespeare**

Kevin A. Quarmby, The College of St. Scholastica

An eventful year in the 1914–18 "War to End All Wars," 1916 proved synonymous with blood-drenched battlefields and seaways. The Battle of the Somme, the Battle of Jutland, German U-Boats sinking unarmed passenger liners, the first employment of flame-throwers and tanks in combat, and a saboteur attack on Jersey City's munitions factory, with shrapnel from the explosion pockmarking New York's Statue of Liberty. Violent times indeed. 1916 also saw the 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Shakespeare's demise, commemorated by scholarly editors, keen to perpetuate the colonial supremacy of Shakespeare in the British Empire.

While the pan-colonial conflict raged, 1916 likewise saw the Indo-British publishing house Macmillan and Co. issue *The Tragedy of Macbeth*, with "Introduction and Notes by Rev. J.C. Scrimgeour, M.A.," in a small though sturdy green volume that the play's Calcutta-based editor intended for educational use in his adopted missionary homeland. As the wartime letters sent by Scrimgeour to his publisher in London display, an editorial skirmish was fought between M.C. Macmillan and Scrimgeour, whose requests to publish a "single-volume edition of Shakespeare," incorporating Bible-inspired marginalia notes, fell on deaf ears. The ensuing clash of words informs our understanding of British colonial appetites for "promoting the cult of Shakespeare" among non-European students, while blowing any "myth of neutrality" in editorial practice firmly out of its wartime waters.

### **"The New Oxford Shakespeare and its Editorial Discontents"**

Robert Sawyer, East Tennessee State University

When the innovative collection of Shakespeare's plays called the *New Oxford Shakespeare* (ed. Taylor, et al) burst on the scene (2016-17), it drew numerous reviewers, both in the UK and abroad, and many led their essays with clickbait headlines such as the following one in the *New York Times*: "Shakespeare may have had a little more help than previously suspected." It went on to detail that the collection "lists Christopher Marlowe as Shakespeare's co-author on the three *Henry VI* plays, parts 1, 2 and 3," the correspondent emphasizing that "[i]t's the first time that a major edition of Shakespeare's works has listed Shakespeare's colleague and rival as a co-author on these works" (Shea *NYT*, online).

The most important point for this editorial team was to print the names of both authors -- Marlowe and Shakespeare -- on the title page of the play. In the same *Times* article, the volume's general editor, Gary Taylor, admitted that it was "perfectly reasonable" not to include Marlowe's name on the plays in earlier editions because as early as the eighteenth century, speculation has long suggested that the *Henry VI* plays were a collaborative effort; numerous other contemporary dramatists, such as Robert Greene, George Peele, and Thomas Nashe were often mentioned, along with Marlowe. The only reason Marlowe's name can now be definitively added, according to Taylor, is because "Shakespeare has entered the world of big data," and no earlier editors have "had the confidence" to put Marlowe's "name actually on the title page" (Shea, *NYT* online). Taylor's team of two dozen researchers used numerous textual analyses to conclude that Marlowe wrote "most of *Henry VI, part 1* while Shakespeare wrote the largest share of *Part 3*" (Shea online). The "[l]ead authorship on *Part 2*," Taylor confessed, is "harder to identify" (Shea online). In short, their findings make Marlowe, at the very least, a confirmed contributing author of the three parts of *Henry VI*. While my essay may attempt to come to some conclusion about early modern authorship of this play, my main focus will be on how the Oxford editors made such difficult decisions.