

SAA 1623 Folio: ABSTRACTS

Person	Contact	Abstract	Notes
Patricia Badir	patribad@mail.ubc.ca	<p><u>What's Past is Prologue: Mobilizing the UBC First Folio</u></p> <p>A copy of the Shakespeare First Folio has recently been acquired by the University of British Columbia. UBC's copy is only the second such volume in Canada (the other is in the Fisher Library at the University of Toronto). This is, therefore, a critical moment in our institutional history. From one angle, UBC now has stewardship over an artefact that has the capacity to engage the imagination of students, faculty, and the public alike. From another angle, because of the resources required to procure the book and to house it, and more importantly because of the role Shakespeare's drama has played in naturalizing settler colonialism, the First Folio now sits awkwardly in a university committed to decolonization and reconciliation.</p> <p>Ultimately, the goal of our newly formed F1 research cluster is to better understand how we can mobilize the Folio for teaching and research in a manner that acknowledges the evolving relationship that literary history has to our institutions and to our communities. In sum, we think the First Folio enables us to ask questions about a heritage we have uncritically celebrated for too long and, in the process, reorient our perceptions about the premodern past and its surprising relation to both the present and future of the places in which we live and work. Taking the UBC library's access policy as its principle subject, my paper will be a preliminary attempt to articulate the stakes of what we expect will be a long and, at times, challenging engagement with the Folio, as we seek to balance the excitement with the controversy that accompanies an acquisition like this.</p>	Paper in
Erika M. Boeckeler	e.boeckeler@neu.edu	<p><u>Dogs Urinating on the 1623 Folio: A Jaggard Press Ornament in Context</u></p> <p>The Folio is an assemblage of parts that had material existences in other contexts prior to 1623. If we care about the coalescence of these disparate pieces in the Folio to create a pervasive vision of the Shakespearean, then we ought to</p>	Paper in

		<p>consider how the Folio's images play a role. This paper mulls over the first headpiece--in which Dionysus, hybrid archers, hares, floriated strapwork, and urinating dogs appear--to look both out of the Folio and to peer deeper into it. Looking outward, an examination of the headpiece captures the resonances of books and ideas that touch down on the Folio through it. Looking inward, the headpiece seeps into elements of the opening pages' rhetoric while constructing the volume's overall visual architecture. The larger questions this paper interrogates are: What material, discursive, intellectual, and aesthetic work does such printing material accomplish as it fluidly moves within and between edition(s) and printing house(s)? What interpretive tools do we gain from investigating this convergence of the bibliographic codes with the linguistic codes? And how do we understand this 1623 Folio assemblage better by plumbing this dimension of its semantic distribution?</p>	
Sidney J. Fox	foxsj08@gmail.com	<p><u>Six Degrees of Separation - "wants twelve month and a day ... That's too long for a play"</u></p> <p>An inquiry into the importance of Ben Jonson's "To the Memory of My Beloved Author ...", back story of the First Folio, the deep reading, into history, the Classics, behind which lay the educational system created by Erasmus, used in the English Grammar Schools. Was this Jonson's first opportunity to read, in depth, for the first time, all the plays, together as a whole, many not yet seen on stage? (Lauren Gunderson's <i>Book of Will</i>) How might he have reacted to the plays of the first English History Cycle, beginning with Civil War, grown out of a failed foreign war? How might Ben's praise have emerged from a recognition of his author's deep reading of Grecian Troy, and haughty Rome, shaped by his favorite, Ovid, his Classical Creation story, and in <i>Lucrece</i>, and <i>Titus Andronicus</i>, the founding of the Republic, and its eventual fall into barbarism?</p> <p>But, understanding Shakespeare, his importance for future generations, also suggests our understanding the early story of his community's and family's</p>	Paper in

		<p>experience, and schooling in Stratford; his reputation among his contemporaries, and his particular connections, among ‘the nobler sort’ from his earliest days in London. In what unique ways did the introduction into Quintilian, and others, by his Oxford educated Schoolmaster, lead to unique insights and literary skills, in composition, construction, and imagery? How might early connections with James Burbage, head of Leicester’s Company, instrumental in the formative stages of the Queen’s Men, lead to entry to the English stage, and early years in London?</p> <p>The story in the 2020 book, <i>Shakespeare Before Shakespeare</i>, adds new perspective, telling of the intrusion of Elizabethan national politics into the countryside around Stratford, how it affected the lives of the Stratford community, over multiple decades: the rise and fall of Shakespeare’s father, and his neighbors, and the Stratford community, in credit, and local politics, and the downfall of the head of the Arden family in Warwickshire, his trial and execution in London. How might this have shaped Shakespeare’s views on society and social justice? How might Erasmus’ humanist writings, especially an inquiry into the <b>origins of war in the human species</b>, “rape is miniature war”, “war is rape on a social scale”, posed fifty years before with his English Band of Brothers, have influenced Shakespeare’s earliest works? Berowne’s remarks, in the nature of raising questions, only provides hints, questions for future speculation, of the Shakespeare Ben Jonson.</p>	
Andrew J. Hartley	ajhartle@uncc.edu	<p><u><i>Julius Caesar</i> Problems in F: Personnel issues in 2.2 and 3.1.</u></p> <p>As part of my work on the Arden 4 <i>Julius Caesar</i>, I want to scrutinize peculiarities of the Folio’s accounting for personnel in key scenes (notably 2.2. and 3.1) in order to explore the apparent disconnect between what was likely true in original performance practice and F’s representation thereof in print. I will explore the way various modern editions have “solved” F’s idiosyncrasies—missing entrances and exits, the apparently mistaken inclusion and omission of key characters—to see how they square with an expressly theatrical logic (partially informed by</p>	Paper in

		<p>Platter's [somewhat contested] accounting of what he saw on stage in terms of numbers ['about fifteen']). I am particularly interested in the appearance of Publius, the omission of Cassius from 2.2. (the scene set on the morning of the assassination at Caesar's house), the absence of Caius Ligarius from 3.1 (the assassination scene) and the inclusion of Lepidus (a character who, by my expressly theatrical logic, cannot possibly appear on stage in this moment). My purpose is to approach a sense of how the <i>F</i> text "remembers" early or subsequent performance practice, and where textual scholars have failed to apply certain theatrical principles in their sense of what should and should not be corrected from <i>F</i> in subsequent editions.</p>	
Joshua R. Held	jrheld@tiu.edu	<p><u>Editing Egeus: Quarto to Folio <i>Midsummer Night's Dream</i></u></p> <p>A pair of textual cruxes near the end of Shakespeare's <i>A Midsummer Night's Dream</i> have long exercised editors. These cruxes (or cruces) derive from differences between speech prefixes and stage directions in the earliest quarto text (Q: 1600) and those in the First Folio of 1623 (F). In Q, Philostrate acts as master of the revels; in F, the frustrated father Egeus does. In Q, the duke Theseus reads the catalog of possible plays; in F, Lysander reads the options while Theseus comments on them. As some editors have suggested, these changes appear linked.</p> <p>This essay will provide a historical survey of editorial approaches to the cruxes, from the eighteenth century to the present. Many editors either point to stage protocols in their eras or assume certain performance-based choices regarding the cruxes, but my analysis questions these assumptions and attends instead to the interactions of the affected characters in the final act, with implications for how current editing might be informed by past efforts. I argue that the Folio text provides the more compelling presentation of characters, including a more climactic interaction between Egeus and his new son-in-law Lysander. I argue that Egeus is an especially sensible choice to include in the play's end since it also revises the conception of the master of the revels, which critics (even some who</p>	Paper in

		<p>support the Folio) have taken to be Philostrate’s distinctive role. Contemporary protocol allowed for the master of revels, whom I take to be Egeus, to have other servants involved in his office—in the Folio’s case, Philostrate. Although editors for centuries have preferred Q here, or have split the readings between Q and F, I contend that the Folio presents a coherent set of textual changes and that these are arguably better than the material in Q.</p>	
Ben Higgins	ben.higgins@ell.ox.ac.uk	<p><u>400 Years: The End of the Celebrations?</u></p> <p>This paper will explore a central idea that is clearly wrong. The paper will suggest that, after four hundred years, the status of the First Folio may be about to change, and that a particular way of thinking about Shakespearean textual authority may be reconfigured.</p> <p>After two decades of work by scholars of authorship and revision, we now understand some of the ways in which the First Folio is itself “maimed and deformed”, to borrow Heminges and Condell’s famous phrase from the Folio preliminaries. While we have recognized the Folio’s “incomplete” status for some time (in that it lacks <i>Pericles</i>, <i>The Two Noble Kinsmen</i>, the poetry and so on), it is only now that we can see other ways that it misrepresents “Shakespeare”. The Folio performs this misrepresentation, we now know, both by filtering out the presence of Shakespeare’s collaborators in order to champion the sovereignty of the individual author, and also by excluding some plays to which we now think Shakespeare contributed (<i>Edward III</i> or <i>Arden of Faversham</i> for example).</p> <p>With these bibliographic tactics in mind, this paper will compare the First Folio to other collections that represent “Shakespeare” in some form, such as the 1619 collection of quartos; the lyric miscellany <i>The Passionate Pilgrime</i>; and some examples of readerly sammelband collections. By moving between the First Folio and these “alternative Shakespeares”, the paper will challenge our habit of dismissing non-Folio conceptions of Shakespeare as somehow inauthentic or illegitimate. The paper will argue that, as technology allows us to read the First</p>	Paper in

		Folio in new ways, and as we come to realise the volume's own fraudulences, we might now take seriously the interpretive life of the alternative Shakespeares that orbit this fascinating book.	
Jesse M. Lander	jlander@nd.edu	<p><u>Spectacle and Invisibility: <i>The Tempest</i> and its Stage Directions</u></p> <p>As the Shakespearean play most emphatically identified with theatrical spectacle, <i>The Tempest</i> includes a number of elaborate stage directions detailing special effects that are integral to both its plot and performance. Though <i>The Tempest</i>, a single-text play that first appears in the Folio, presents few textual complications, these stage directions have attracted scrutiny. The long-established theory that the text was printed from a transcript prepared by Ralph Crane, a scribe associated with the King's Men, raises the possibility of discriminating between authorial and scribal elements of the F text, and since one of Crane's established habits was a willingness to alter stage directions, scholars have treated the stage directions in <i>The Tempest</i> with some suspicion.</p> <p>In what follows, I will review some recent work on stage directions and <i>The Tempest</i> in an effort to clarify the relationship between the Folio text and the performances that occurred when the play was first produced. Though I will examine the protracted debates surrounding Juno's entrance during the masque and the famous stage direction concerning the disappearance of the banquet "<i>with a quiet deuce,</i>" my main focus will be on staging invisibility.</p>	Paper in
Zoltán Márkus	zomarkus@vassar.edu	<p><u>The Folgers' First Folios</u></p> <p>The Folger Shakespeare Library has 82 copies of First Folios, which is more than a third of the surviving total of 235 copies. The Folger's website reports, "All of the Folger First Folios were acquired by Henry and Emily Folger between 1893 and 1928. Together, the books are at the heart of their Shakespeare collection, for which the Folgers built the Folger Shakespeare Library." Both a current Library podcast and most of the available publications that discuss the Folgers' zeal for collecting First Folios concentrate primarily on Henry Clay Folger's biography and financial backing of the couple's book collecting project. Only secondarily, if at all,</p>	Paper in

		<p>is the focus on Emily Jordan Folger’s contribution to the collection. Current narratives are still dominated by the 19<sup>th</sup> century patriarchal formula: the collection was created by Standard Oil tycoon Henry Clay Folger and his wife.</p> <p>What is less known is that Emily Jordan Folger, a Vassar College alumna of 1879, was awarded a Master’s degree in 1896 and the title of her thesis was “The True Text of Shakespeare.” The thesis opens with a Preface on the “Appropriateness of study of verbal criticism of Shakespeare by an American-speaking woman,” while its central argument is that “The First Folio is the edition of authority.” Not the subsequent 17<sup>th</sup> century Folios, nor the various contemporary Quartos, nor the later editions—it is Shakespeare’s First Folio that embodies “The True Text of Shakespeare.” Love of books combined with business acumen and philanthropic fervor may have been vital to the couple’s obsession for collecting First Folios, as most narratives about the Folgers claim today, but the intellectual framework of concentrating, above all, on First Folios was developed by Emily Jordan Folger in her MA thesis.</p> <p>The research for my seminar contribution focuses on this thesis and the work of Emily’s thesis advisor, Horace Howard Furness. My hunch is that Furness and the editorial principles of his New Variorum series may be an indirect yet crucial reason why the Folger Shakespeare Library can boast of the most copies of the First Folio in the world.</p>	
Jyotsna G. Singh	jsingh@msu.edu	<p><u>The “Afterlife” of Shakespeare’s First Folio (1623): The Readers of the Fourth Folio (1685)</u></p> <p>Given the growing scholarly explorations into evolving editorial practices as they intersected with histories of cultural reception, I believe a reconsideration of the Fourth Folio (1685) offers us new opportunities for evaluating a key edition in the “Afterlife” of the First Folio. It is an important publication in Shakespeare’s afterlife, making his collected plays available again in more than 20 years, and forming the basis of Nicholas Rowe’s 1709 edition. This paper begins by a brief</p>	Paper in

		<p>recapitulation of its moment of publication (including the roles of Herringman and Bentley) as well its sale and circulation. My main focus, however, will be to examine how the editors and publishers may have envisaged the readership of the plays in 1685. In this endeavor I will examine the paratexts (or prefatory sections) for the Fourth Folio, observing the additions or changes from the First Folio (1623); through this exercise, I believe, suggestive possibilities emerge regarding the new generation of readers and audiences of the plays. While this edition reproduces the original sales pitch to the “Great Varietie of Readers,” can we extrapolate who would be these readers in 1685? How do the para-texts frame the inclusion of the 7 new plays into this edition? The materials of the paratexts in this volume display a disjunct temporality, with new dedicatory and additional plays inserted into the original. (with only one play with confirmed Shakespearean authorship). The question then arises: would the scope of the intended readership be wider and more inclusive when compared with the 1623 “Original”? Finally, I will consider the formal “architecture” of the full volume to describe how the different elements – sequence, headings, titles, list of characters etc. -- may have shaped the experiences of the readers of the 1685 edition.</p>	
Suzanne Tanner	suzanne.tanner@ku.edu	<p><u>The Impact of Folio Formatting on the Perception of Play Paratexts</u>  This paper argues that the print design of the First Folio significantly altered individual play paratexts in ways that have impacted the reception and interpretation of these paratexts throughout time. While all individual play paratexts were affected by the transfer of these plays into a large collection, I look specifically at prologues and epilogues. Approaching these paratexts through the lens of an interface metaphor (as opposed to the “threshold” metaphor offered by Gerard Genette), I argue that establishing or erasing the paratextual status of prologues and epilogues affects how audiences use these speeches to access the rest of the play. Early modern printers of Shakespeare’s quartos seemed to agree on the paratextual nature of prologues, evidenced by the print design of spatially locating the prologue with other front-matter material outside</p>	Paper in



		<p>of the body of the play text. Epilogues also received printed spatial distance from the play text. However, due to the spatial exigencies of collecting all the plays together, the Folio formatting tends to confuse and even negate the paratextual status of prologues and epilogues. Some prologues and epilogues in the Folio are spatially removed from the text through the use of print boxes, while others are printed as visually contiguous with the body of the play text, considerably blurring the line between text and paratext. This has led to extensive debate in later centuries over identifying which Shakespeare speeches “count” as prologues and epilogues. While some argue that any distinction between text and paratext is unnecessary, recognizing that early modern audiences and readers understood these speeches as distinctly paratextual impacts our modern understanding of how audiences use these speeches as interfaces to access the play.</p>	
Steven Urkowitz	surkowitz@aol.com	<p><u>The Circus of Folio Follies, or How Razzle-Dazzle Fools the Faithful</u></p> <p>Our contemporary First Folio discourse encompasses an often entertaining clown-show of editorial ignorance, counter-factual theatrical speculation, and pseudo-scientific conspiracy-theorizing . These powerful and noisy discussions regularly occupy at least one of the three rings in our circus of contemporary Shakespeare First Folio scholarship.</p> <p>My paper for this SAA seminar will indicate just a few of the egregious but nevertheless powerfully persistent errors that turn large segments of our field into a Cloudcuckooland for deluded practitioners of seductive but completely unfounded myths. The smog of oft-repeated error accidentally masks the brilliance of Shakespeare's theatrical accomplishment.</p> <p>Three distinct <i>fabulae</i> seem to have been and continue to be most seductive, drawing befuddled believers into their matrices of preposterous confusions. (1) First is the wobbly hallucinatory tale of Shakespeare's practice as a writer of scripts far too long for practical production on professional stages. (2) Second is</p>	Paper in

		<p>the condescending narrative of rapacious printers in league with piratical actors or play-house scribblers who, independent of authorial attention, generated those Quarto and Octavo texts quite similar to but also radically distinct from their later-printed Folio versions. And (3) finally is the mantra of "memorial reconstruction," a scholarly shibboleth that with rhetorical acrobatics and time-reversing fantasies simply denies, denigrates, or ostentatiously ignores the extensive evidence of how early modern plays were composed, memorized, and then performed.</p>	
--	--	--	--