

Alan B. Farmer (Ohio State University) and Sarah Neville (Ohio State University)
“Wither Memorial Reconstruction?”
SAA 2024

Terri Bourus, Florida State University
“An Elizabethan Box of Theatrical Curiosities”

The most systematically unreliable text in the First Folio is *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. The New Bibliography, in one of its few uncontested discoveries, demonstrated that it was printed from a manuscript prepared by Ralph Crane. The spelling and punctuation are systematically Crane’s, overlaid by a thin, erratic veneer of changes by Jaggard’s compositors. Unlike every Shakespeare quarto printed in Shakespeare’s lifetime, F is divided into Latinate acts, which are also divided into Latinate scenes, and its only stage directions are so-called “massed entrances”: every scene begins with a list of all characters who appear in that scene, and all but two end with an exit direction (III.1, IV.4, where in both cases there is no room at the end of the scene’s final line). F has been politically censored (systematically changing ‘Brooke’ to ‘Broome’). F has also been systematically bowdlerized by removing all oaths and all occurrences of the word ‘God’. F’s idiosyncratic unShakespearian elements have been concealed by centuries of editors, who have normalized its act and scene divisions (by providing such divisions for all Shakespeare’s plays) and normalized its unShakespearian spelling and punctuation (by modernizing both in the same way they are modernized in all the other plays). F’s other deficiencies have been concealed by asset-stripping the 1602 quarto: inserting into F many of Q’s stage directions and many of its uncensored unbawdlerized variants (and some of its phonetic spellings to indicate accents). Having robbed Q of its undisputably Elizabethan and Shakespearian features, editors then dismiss it as an incoherent memorial reconstruction by actors or spectators. My paper will challenge such denigrations of Q, in part through the evidence of a 2019 Florida State University production (documented with photographs and with ten contemporary reviews).

Joshua R. Held, Southeastern Oklahoma State University
“Dissecting English Race in Shakespeare’s Folio *Henry V*: Memorial Reconstruction Revisited”

Shakespeare’s play *Henry V* appeared first in a 1600 quarto, and then as a much longer text in the 1623 Folio. The quarto text was a charter member of Pollard’s “bad quartos,” and has been considered as a memorial reconstruction. Yet in a series of recent articles, Gary Taylor has argued that the Folio version of the play is a later, expanded version of the quarto, and this argument coincides with other work by Richard Dutton, Laurie Maguire, and Emma Smith, which advocates Shakespeare’s revising of short quartos into longer Folio versions.

In one of the largest Folio additions, the “Once more vnto the Breach” speech (all of act 3, scene 1), Henry appeals to the shared births and upbringings of the English. He specifically appeals to English “blood” and exhorts his soldiers—at least some of them—to serve as an example to those of “grosser blood.” The stakes are high: for Shakespeare in the Folio, to what degree is English blood, or race, divisible? If, as I suggest, Henry distinguishes between ranks of English blood, then Shakespeare would appear to present Whiteness, at least for a historical instance of his own English race, as less than hegemonic.

Peter Holland, University of Notre Dame

“Mishearing, misreading or misremembering: ‘a dogge, so bade in office’”

For the moment let’s forget about the differences between Q and F *King Lear* that may – or may not – have something to do with Shakespeare revising the play once or many times with or without interjections from non-authorial agents (actors, scribes, censors, etc., etc.). My contribution to the seminar focuses instead on the long history of critical discussion of the possible evidence for the presence of shorthand recording of a text in performance and the errors that may arise through misreading a shorthand symbol in transcribing into longhand, mishearing by the shorthand reporter or by a compositor and misremembering in the wide or narrow gap of time between speech and its transformation into shorthand, longhand or the placing of type in the composing-stick (a compound word Okes’ and Jaggard’s compositors would probably not have known). From the arguments of Greg and Doran and Duthie for and against the possibility of shorthand reporting of theatre performance through to the recent revival of the pro-shorthand claims by Adele Davidson and her dispute with Richard Knowles, shorthand as a means of reconstructing for publication a text of an unpublished play offers a site for rethinking which senses and skills are in play in the transmission of the text of *King Lear* between a man with a quill and the publishing of a book in quarto or folio, a journey from “a dogge, so bade” to “a Dogg’s obey’d”.

Mark C. Hulse, Jackson College

“The Painful Adventures of Alfred Pollard: Rhetoric, Logic, and Optimism”

Bibliographer Alfred Pollard is credited with pioneering influential theories about “bad” Shakespearean quartos, wherein the more Folio-divergent texts resulted from memorial reconstructions of plays in performance. This view has received challenges on practical grounds, as critics debate the specific methods of transmission this might entail and whether the conjectural mechanisms would produce outcomes in accord with what we observe in various suspected quartos. Setting aside these complex questions for the moment, this essays instead examines external evidence and the diminishing of critics’ esteem for Pollard’s interpretation of it. I trace this decline in part to a series of *ad hominem* attacks depicting him as a peddler of fantasy, a judgmental moralist, or a would-be usurper of power over Shakespeare, charges that distract from effective analysis of the documentary record, often distorting or wholly misunderstanding arguments posited a century ago. I offer evidence to vindicate Pollard’s reasoning on several vital points: the viability of surreptitious printing, the soundness of the classes of quartos he proposed, and the logic behind his optimistic assessment of the Folio editors as faithful stewards of the author’s legacy. I then address Pollard’s observations about patterns of entry in the Stationers’ Register. The conclusion he drew from this evidence has been mishandled by modern critics, a collective failure by English scholars to recognize the principles underlying inductive versus deductive argumentation. When this logical oversight is corrected the entry patterns again constitute powerful corroboration for the theory that “bad” texts derived from corrupted and reported manuscripts, printed without the involvement of the author and his company, and even despite their resistance. I argue that all considerations align to render alternative explanations insufficient, encouraging future editors and critics to restore the former orthodoxy.

Charles Adams Kelly, University of Michigan

“The Case of Q1 *HAMLET*: The Diminishing Probability of Memorial Reconstruction, and the Role of Graphic Tools in Certain Findings”

Since the arrival of desktop computing, scholars have been directly involved in creating graphic tools to facilitate textual research. One such tool revealed an unusual pattern in the text of Q1 *Hamlet* vs. Q2/F and the subsequent recognition of the “statistical certainty” that Q1 was not derived from either Q2 or the Folio text.

The technique of color highlighting words unique to Q1 made it convenient to identify three categories of Q1 text: lines identical or nearly identical to lines in Q2/F; lines that are identifiably concordant (lines that might have been revised as the text of Q2 was created); and finally, 26 Q1 passages that have no relationship to Q2 or F. Will stylometrics identify these 26 passages as those of another author, Shakespeare himself, or have they been tainted by too many revisions by too many hands?

Another graphic will help reduce the probability of the Marcellus actor as the possible source of an unauthorized Q1 text. Also, a graphic focused on the *To be* soliloquy will add to the probability that the Q1 version was not derived from Q2/F, and

Finally, to facilitate study of the (German) *Brudermord* text in the context of Q1, Q2, and F, all four texts were converted to brief plot element descriptions and displayed in a parallel format, ultimately aiding consideration of a unified theory of all four texts.

Laurie E. Maguire, University of Oxford

“Revision and Memorial Reconstruction”

I want to examine (and question) the ways in which revision (Greg’s rival textual scenario for New Bibliography’s shibboleth text for memorial reconstruction, *Merry Wives of Windsor*) has supplanted memorial reconstruction as an explanation for the variant Q/F texts of *King Lear*. While memorial reconstruction has been taxonomically subcategorised (reconstruction by actors who recalled their own parts; reconstruction by actors who were also charged with recalling parts they had witnessed but not played; reconstruction and adaption etc), revision has not been similarly theorised or subdivided; as a result ‘revision’ still functions as a blanket one-size-fits-all term. In *The Work of Revision* (2013), Hannah Sullivan notes that ‘those who advocate revision and those who denigrate it tend to assume that it works in the same way for all writers at all points in time, regardless of medium’. In this paper I put Sullivan’s work in dialogue with that of the contributors to *The Division of the Kingdoms* (1982), rethinking theories, practice and evidence of revision.

Steven Urkowitz, City College of New York, CUNY

"Reading Textual Evidence Against Theory: or 'Authors at Work (Please Hush-Up Your Army of Monkeys!)"

For over four decades now I have been pointing out "authorial" textual variants that challenge two most absurd narratives used to support the still fashionable ideas of "Memorial Reconstruction" and a postulated Early Modern reduction of Shakespeare's long scripts to allow them to be played as "two hours traffic." I've learnt a great deal from my close analysis of Shakespeare's multiple-text plays -- about how single characters differ from one version to another, how stage properties can enhance or reconstruct the action of a moment, and how fine-grained language-forms can be used to vary the psychological impact of (and an audience's expectations for) a theatrical scene.

My paper for this seminar will look back at some of my earlier findings, particularly for the Q1 and Q2 texts of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*, as well as introduce a few obvious but hitherto unnoticed sets of variants too systematic to be considered accidental and too extensive in the "bad" quarto versions to be considered as part of an effort to shorten the much longer "good" versions.

In general, the waters of Theory run deep. Evidence though, at least the kind I find most interesting, floats lightly right up on the surface where it can be seen. As in the past, I pursue the obvious.

Paul Werstine, King's University College, Western

"*Romeo and Juliet* Q1 1597: After and Before MR"

W. W. Greg's theory of memorial reconstruction of dramatic texts by actors identifiable by their roles (fully developed by 1910) never had application to *Romeo* Q1. When Harry R. Hoppe published his fullest attempt to apply the theory to the quarto in 1948, identifying the actors who played Romeo and Paris as the reporters, Greg himself, reviewing the book, noted that the quality of reproduction of Q2 in Q1 varied not by roles present onstage but between the first and second half of Q1. Nonetheless, the best of the New Bibliographical editors of *Romeo*--Richard Hosley (1954), George Walton Williams (1964), G. Blakemore Evans (1984)--accepted Hoppe's findings, which were also promulgated in school editions such as David M. Bevington's (e.g. 1980 and, remarkably, 2014). After Laurie Maguire's *Shakespeare's Suspect Texts* (1996), which declared Q1 "Not MR," Hoppe has lost ground among editors. Again Shakespeareans find themselves where they were before 1910. Then the dominant view was Alexander Pope's that Q1 was Shakespeare's first draft, revised by him and his company to become Q2. My paper examines the dissatisfaction among many nineteenth-century Shakespeareans with this revision theory.

Daniel Yabut, CNRS/Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier III

“Revise and Resubmit? The ‘Curious’ Case of *Callisto, or The Escapes of Jupiter*”

Perhaps no other area of English dramatic textual research has benefitted more from advances in quantitative analysis than attribution studies, with W. W. Greg’s theory of memorial reconstruction still at the forefront more than a hundred years after he suggested it as a justification for unusual features in the ‘bad’ quartos. For some, stylometric analysis of large data sets of the available printed texts found primarily on *EEBO-TCP* effectively trumps other possible transmission explanations, such as revision or adaptation, for the origin of these much maligned playbooks.

Rather than conduct a study on a playbook of questionable composition, this paper will instead focus on a text for which there is no current debate (to my knowledge) over its origin: Thomas Heywood’s holograph manuscript play *Callisto, or The Escapes of Jupiter*. While notably Greg and Henry D. Janzen in his Malone Society Reprint have investigated *Escapes*’ relationship with its printed antecedents, Heywood’s *The Golden Age* and *The Silver Age*, I am particularly interested in examining how *Escapes* has not merely extracted but in most cases, heavily revised scenes from the two *Ages* plays, with an eye on assessing the plausibility that certain other suspect texts may have been revised or adapted in a comparable manner.