Randall McLeod

for Margreta with best wishes Randy June 86

*IMAG*INATION

The Image of Shakespeare's text (if one would only *look* at it) subverts Shakespeare's Text.

That is: the image of the original *evidence* of Shakespeare's text subverts the *edited* versions we all study.

The matter is likely to remain so, for the new editions of Shakespeare summoned into being, generation after generation, are publishing ventures launched in a marketplace, where to survive and prosper they must appeal to consumers, whose conservative expectations and needs have been shaped by the very tradition of unconservative editing, which spans more than two and a half centuries. This market now wags the dog.

Editing began in the 18th century, an age of thorough rationalization and reform of language--spoken, written, and thought; an age of enforcement of decorums and proprieties upon language. Accordingly, we who are the children of both the Renaissance and the 18th century (not to mention a host of other parents in various marriages and other liaisons, here and abroad--some recorded), find the terrain of our ancestry sundered by a Great Fault. On this side, our Shakespeare is accommodated. On the other lies a stranger uttering chaotic language, not tidy enough for the parlour. Our parents are no longer on speaking terms, and who among us can grasp how they fell out?

One of the achievements of 18th-century language reform was the suppression of linguistic uncertainty. This is evident in the largely successful attempt to achieve coherent tone in standard literary English, in the preoccupation with national literary culture, in the legitimization of the lexicon by the dictionary, in the spread of education and suppression of dialect, and in the consequent diminishing of lexical ambiguity.

This Enlightenment program did not arise in a vacuum. It had long roots into the 17th century, even into the 16th. But even if the 18th century had not forced literature into a strait-jacket, and thereby inevitably caused a diminution in our aptitude to grasp Shakespeare's richness--now to be viewed as wildness, resistance to reasonable rule, and unbearable penchant for punning--spoken and written English had been undergoing "on its own", as it were, the inevitable evolutionary processes of a living language and so had become partially unintelligible to the England of a century after Shakespeare's death.

The implicit curriculum of modern editions of Shakespeare, where all the text is reset in familiar spellings, is rationally pointed, and elegant in appearance, is introduced by Professor So-and-So (who ought to know what Shakespeare means) is that He is one of Us. That's its body language, even before we read a word. But to look at the icon, a photograph, even-- and in our age especially a photograph-- of the 1609 quarto of SHAKES-PEARES SONNETS, is to perceive a strange mediation of the long-ago poet and the here-and-now us. As if in a dream, suddenly a stranger had asked, "Will you dance," he already dancing, waiting for me to join in. If only I could hear the music. (And *where* did I leave my clothes?) Modernizing and, therefore, *anachronizing* editions deliver Shakespeare already translated. But before the old icon it is we who must wander down the dark and dusty centuries, translating. And who are we then?

Editors of SHAKE-SPEARES SONNETS re-present the text after they have read it cover to cover. This can be an appropriate way to proceed; but it can also get out of control, or be too much controlled, rather, as when one's final understanding is bulldozed retroactively through the poem. When one approaches the first sonnet through the notes of the editor, John Dover Wilson, for example--and I pick an editor who, having gone to Shakespeare's bosom, is beyond any harm I can do him (or he to me)--we see this kind of process at work.

> The young man's duty to Nature and Society at large: gardeners cultivate to produce the finest flowers and fruits, cattle-breeders to develop the finest stocks; if you, loveliest of men, neglect to do likewise, you will rob the world of its due by wasting your own rich substance.

If the editor reads in *that* much into this poem, how intelligently can he understand the words before him, let alone the strange countenance of the quarto icon that confronts him,

FRom faireſt creatures we deſire increaſe,
That thereby beauties *Roſe* might neuer die,
But as the riper ſhould by time deceaſe,
His tender heire might beare his memory:
But thou contracted to thine owne bright eyes,
Feed'ſt thy lights flame with ſelfe ſubſtantiall fewell,
Making a famine where aboundance lies,
Thy ſelfe thy foe, to thy ſweet ſelfe too cruell:
Thou that art now the worlds freſh ornament,
And only herauld to the gaudy ſpring,
Within thine owne bud burieſt thy content,
And tender chorle makſt waſt in niggarding:
Pitty the world, or elſe this glutton be,
To eate the worlds due, by the graue and thee.

for to read the sonnet itself is not to know the sex of the speaker or the addressee

(or to find more than a very small percentage of Wilson's vocabulary). The first word of the third line, a pronoun, which might seem to decide the issue of the sex of the addressee, was indistinguishably masculine or neuter in Shakespeare's time. (Paradoxically, Wilson, who defines the addressee as male, glosses this pronoun in a subsequent note as neuter only).

Look at the tenth line.

Within thine owne bud buriest thy content,

The editor's gloss on "content" suggests the two words, which we distill from that graphic shape by shifting stress: *con*tent and con*tent*. The written medium in Shakespeare's time evidently used one graphic shape to cover two very different meanings, just as we still do. No problem here.

Earlier in this line, the quarto's "owne" is rendered by the editor as "own". Immediately we come up against what must seem to most as a merely innocent re-setting of the type and slight modernizing, as if a squiggly "owne" were no different from an "own" in a modern fount. But to look deeply at the quarto's "owne" in all its ungainliness and with that silent vowel at the end of it is to have impressed upon one the oddity and unfamiliarity of the graphic shape; I wonder how a Renaissance reader would have leapt from that shape to whatever sense he would make of it. Its physical bearing will certainly make it always alien to the world of graphic conventions in which I was raised, a world other than that of Shakespeare's time; but not as, to those of us who speak English, Chinese is an *other* language, rather as a world that has made itself *other* specifically by denying, or suppressing, or replacing the graphic medium of Shakespeare's time, even as a child becomes who she will be by pushing off against her parents. History is written by the victorious, and one must always be aware that the elegant modern medium has survived a battle in which it can scarcely be expected to report its own glorious achievements dispassionately.

Consider these two verses from Marvell's "Garden":

Two Paradises 'twere in one,
To live in Paradise alone.

Phonologists can tell us that there was a perfect rhyme in these lines in Marvell's time and in Shakespeare's, and a rhyme all the more rich because it was of cognates. The original pronunciation of "one" (it didn't sound like "won") is conserved still in such cognates as "only" and "atone". For the latter word, most of us learn the etymology, if ever, only as adults. In Shakespeare's England, it would have been transparent to anyone who could speak and hear. The former word, "only", occurs in the preceding line of the poem, and is therefore played upon by the present "owne"--to modern and Renaissance auditors alike, though with different understandings of that play in each era. Such phonetic effects are not insignificant in poetry, especially in that genre known as a "little sound".

So, the words we separate graphically as "own" and "one" were phonetically indistinguishable in Shakespeare's time. The *Oxford English Dictionary* confirms the corollary you might have anticipated, that neither did the graphic forms prejudice the meaning in Shakespeare's time. Therefore, the following readings should not have troubled a 16th-century reader:

Own, two, thre, ...
As I one this house, Im the bosse.

When we in the 20th century hear our word "one" spoken, the context must help us differentiate it from the word we write as "won." When Shakespeare heard his "owne" spoken, there was no confusion of it with the idea of winning; rather the idea of ownership was confused with that of singularity, and context would have to assist the auditor to differentiate *them*.

What may seem, therefore, the least innocuous of an editor's housekeeping chores, to make the poem of easy access for modern readers by sprucing up the typeface, by familiarizing it, by taking off the final, silent, superfluous "e" is scarcely innocent. Once the icon goes, the visible symbol of Shakespeare as alien is lost. My reaction would be substantially different if Wilson had an apologetic note saying that his edition modernized the quarto's "owne" as "own", but that "one" was just as plausible, and that he, deeply conservative, had chosen to follow the path of every other modernizer. But he has no note for this editorial change, and one suspects that he and all the other editors who do not provide such a note, are unaware of the issues--and have patronized their readers by legitimizing with notes only the mysteries they cared to countenance or that they knew about. Of course, if a modern editor did opt for the reading "one", would he not feel obliged to alter the preceding word, from "thine" to "thy" ("Within thy one bud...")? And then the cat would be out of the bag. Another note would be called for. Readers who knew the poem from another edition would see the embarrassing nature of the editor's game. Such a seemingly gross alteration of the poem would call attention to the fact that neither translation is responsible, as neither is competent alone to convey the complexity of the original. And what is Shakespeare's poetry, if not intricacy and complexity--and simplicity?

What I have been saying addresses a completely different issue than whether *written* English in Shakespeare's time was competent to convey the complexity of the contemporary *spoken* language, or vice versa. Spoken and written media could not be completely and unambiguously mapped onto each other then or now. The crucial thing to realize, the issue that the editing tradition buries in the sand along with the ostrich's head, is that the capacities and styles of mapping of the two epochs, divided by the Great Fault, are not compatible. In both eras (and in all eras) the struggle for the text is part of the text. Anachronizing editions vitiate that poetic struggle.

As for the phrase "beauties *Rose*" in the second line, Wilson follows the tradition of every other edition I have seen that is printed after the style of marking possessive case with an apostrophe sprang up: "beauty's rose". His rendering "beauty's" requires the word to be singular. To my sensibility, this rendering of the quarto's "beauties" forces on me an allegorical response--as if "Beauty's", a form I have actually seen in some editions, and which is accompanied with the decapitalization of the quarto's *"Rose"*. (The long *s* is itself part of the strangeness of the icon and deserves a paper in in its own right--but another time.) If editors ever modernized to the other option "beauties'", they would evoke for me concrete individuals. To modernize, then, is to close down the ambiguities. That's what our modern graphic language--our reformed language--is about. And for editors to use it is to deny and frustrate the very medium of Renaissance English literature.

To help us understand his phrase, "beauty's rose", Wilson quotes from the *OED* to indicate that the rose is "A peerless or matchless person; a paragon; esp. a woman of great beauty, excellence, or virtue." This commentary serves to feminize the rose, but where is this sense of gender countenanced in his interpretation I quoted above? And how does it square with his interpretation of "His" as neuter.

*

It is now time to distinguish between the Renaissance ear and the Renaissance eye (on the one hand) and the modern ear and the modern eye (on the other.) Let us assume that a Renaissance wife reads the first sonnet aloud to her husband, and that a modern wife reads the edited version aloud to hers. Let's bring it down to familiar practice.

1. --the Renaissance wife reads "beauties *Rose*" and understands the first word as singular or plural or both; and so does her husband.

   --when the modern wife encounters the phrase "beauty's rose", she must understand the first word only as singular, but her husband understands singular or plural or both.

2. --encountering the phrase "thine owne bud", the Renaissance wife understands in the middle word both what we write as "own" and what we write as "one"; the same is true of her husband.

   --when the modern wife reads the edited phrase "thine own bud", she understands in "own" only ownership, as does her husband.

3. --In the case of "thy content", both Renaissance and modern wives must choose a stress option, (*con*tent or con*tent*) even if they are aware of both options, and their husbands will perforce understand only the option their mates have chosen. The neglected option

remains potential but, unactivated. And if those wives had been reading silently, they might have absorbed both meanings--not having to choose.

Here are three cruxes exhibiting three structures of ambiguity: Only the third one functions in kind now as it did then, to reader and to auditor. The first one equates the experience of both Renaissance and modern auditors in contrast to the experiences of both Renaissance and modern readers. The second crux equates the experience of reader and auditor, but only within their own periods. All in all each period therefore, has its own distinct structure of ambiguities deriving from the textual icons peculiar to each age.

No poem is an island entire of itself. It floats in a changing linguistic medium. And so our attempt to understand a poem of so removed an age as Shakespeare's must be simultaneously to understand its relationship to that medium. It is here that the editorial tradition fails us.

*

The question of sexual ambiguity continues to linger in most of the first two dozen sonnets, to take an arbitrary bite. You might try an unprejudiced reading of them, asking yourself what evidence there really is for the sex of the speaker and the sex of the addressee, and when you have found it, *if* you can find it, whether you think the context allows it to remain unequivocal. Forget the critical and editorial baggage you're accustomed to carry with you, such as the euphemism,

"The opening poems constitute the *marriage* sonnets...."

or the imported story line, at best a retrospective story line,

"*Shakespeare* urges the young *man*...",

for all this is no substitute for the intolerable wrestle with words and meanings. As you read this way, line after line, the question of the sexual identity of the addressee especially seems raised and about to be answered--the "he" of Sonnet 19 is as definitive (though late) as one can get; but for the most part the poems shy away from specific identification; they equivocate sex. Sonnet 19 may mark the place of triumphant self-congratulation on the reader's part: male at last. But characteristically, SONNETS follows it with a sonnet that re-opens the hole question. All the earnestness of the foregoing sonnets yields to a joyous romp, a send-up of the entire issue. Here is a good place to see how editorial translation disambiguates the complex linguistic play.

These commas, divide subject and object; as these skeletal sentences, show they, are grammatically inappropriate:

> Our nurse, is repose,
> Lest rage, dissolve life,
> The trick, I remember.

But in their fleshed contexts the commas can work rhetorically as pauses, and Keats' pauses at them may represent something of his actual intonation of these folio lines. Whatever its authority, the folio punctuation made its point on one of Shakespeare's most sensitive readers. Once we notice how thoroughly Keats responded even to the oddities of Renaissance punctuation, we surely must confess that we would never have guessed how he read the text, if we had not seen the traces of it from his pen. How this man particularly understood "King Lear" and "reading" — those words from his title — are vital mysteries that we have not yet grasped. But where can be begin? — not in any edition of Keats and Shakespeare yet produced. Not to understand these issues is to miss the pulse of their shared blood.

I have concluded Keats' grand search for mastery of the "eternal theme" in a comma. As I think Keats is a literalist of the imagination, the defense of his art and life could arise even from so seemingly insignificant a detail; and if I were going to offer you a peroration, I would not blush to start it at this point.

In approaching Shakespeare slowly through *Lear*, and *Lear* through Keats, I hoped to evoke the dynamics of a literary tradition, on which axis of genius the questions of editing should be seen to turn. I commented on printing technology to suggest why this perception of editing was alien, and why new technology may soon make it familiar. In both sections of the paper I have not hidden my own values, but I have tried to show that they need have little to do with the argument.

If this approach has at all succeeded, it may have done so at the cost of making *Lear* seem the only Shakespeare that needs unediting. In closing, then, I would like briefly to offer three various perspectives on editorial obscurity, which may in sum suggest how pervasive the darkness is. Shakespeare's text is all before us.

Textgate

Spellbound: Within the last half century conservative editing has focused on the "old-spelling edition." The aim was to respect the so-called "accidental" features of early editions and to preserve them in re-editions in the hope occasionally of seeing through the "veil of print" to the underlying manuscript, now lost, where greater authority resided. So far so good. But the great problem is that the "accidentals" were not under-

stood in a physical sense, but were interpreted through the atomistic abstraction of spelling, which, oddly, seems never to be defined by old-spelling editors, although their practice can be defended only on the basis of such a definition. So far so bad, for abstraction founders on the actualities of the concrete text. It can be shown that, as many of the old kerning type sorts could not be set next to each other without fouling and breaking, combinations of these types tended to be avoided in composition. In such problematic settings other types were required to mediate them, types which were compatible with the problematic kerns, which extend typeface off the edge of the typebody. In some founts, for example, *k* followed by the ligature in long-*s* and *p* will break both the *k* and the long-*s*, hence —

Shake-ſpeare

— in which the typographically exigent *e* and the hyphen are not necessarily part of the spelling.

kerns

kerns

This space must be filled with types whose face is without descenders: eg. spaces, an *e*, a hyphen, etc..

There is more good news. Types can kern vertically.

Composition with these types must avoid clashes of ascenders from below

and descenders from above when one or both kern. One of the obvious compositorial expedients in Shakespeare's time, in the days before *orthography*, was to add a terminal e to a word in one line to bring its types out of the vertical line of conflict with types in adjacent lines. Interchanging upper- and lower-case settings could also often solve such problems, by adjusting the alignment as a function of the different (horizontal) set of the substitute type, by eliminating a descender or ascender, or by moving its relative position in the shape of the letter. Now, for editors to transtype an early text from a kerning fount to the non- or minimally-kerning founts of modern re-editions is precisely to hide the equivocal relationship of concrete typesetting and abstract spelling in the early text. The editorial criterion of spelling does not allow us to distinguish in the reprint the material causality of the copytext image. Conservative editorial practice cannot be founded on the quicke-sand of spelling.[25]

Concordance: Theoretically a concordance is simply an edition of a work, the shape of which derives not from its inherent literary form, but from an extrinsic literal sequence. Now that computers are employed in editing, concordances tend to be made during editorial projects for their own internal guidance. In the past, however, the concordance has been a derivative of an existing edition. Concordances are useful because they locate examples of diction relevant to that of some crux editors may be struggling with, and so familiarize them with authorial usage on a large scale. They are especially valuable for authors who are outside of standard English, like Shakespeare who came before it, and who helped to form it, or writers in dialect like Burns, or idiolect like Joyce. The scholarly usefulness of concordances declines abruptly with any incompletion, or, if they are selective, with any fuzziness about the basis of selection.

There is no complete concordance for all of Shakespeare's substantive texts, though people talk as if there were. At any moment this lack can leave editors in the awkward position of possessing the little knowledge that is a dangerous thing. Now being published is a massive, multivolumed computerized *Complete and Systematic Concordance to the Works of William Shakespeare*, really a number of concordances; and the one-volumed *Harvard Concordance to Shakespeare*, which is the main concordance of the former,[26] and claims to offer "the first complete and reliable one-volume concordance to all the plays and poems of Shakespeare." Unfortunately no rigor has gone into the definition of text, or, if it has, of conveying the definition to the reader. Many scholars who use it will realize that the Riverside edition it concords is, by its anachronizing and its elimination of text, a significant shortfall on the whole canon. But few will know that certain parts of the chosen edition are not concorded, because the omissions are not admitted or detailed. Most users would want a concordance of Shakespeare, for example, that retained the unique phrase "Twelfth Night" and omitted the 27,575 occurences of "the." The *Complete Concordance* leans completely the other way. One may

decide eventually that to the concorder "text" means "dialogue only," for *The Complete Concordance* omits stage directions and speech prefixes as well as titles. But like many classical and modern authors Shakespeare frequently wrote dialogue into stage directions.

Here doe the Ceremonies belonging, and make the Circle, Bullingbrooke or Southwell reades, Coniuro te, &c. *It Thunders and Lightens terribly : then the Spirit riseth.*
Spirit. *Ad sum.*
Witch. *Asmath,*by the eternall God,
Whose name and power thou tremblest at,

From this passage in *2 Henry 6* (1.4) you will find "adsum" glossed in the concordance; but do not look for "conjuro" there. Nor will you find "&c" from this location, though it is glossed in this one (from that play without a title).

Clowne sings.
When that I was and a little tine boy,
with hey, ho, the winde and the raine :
A foolish thing was but a toy,
for the raine it raineth every day.

But when I came to mans estate,
with hey ho,&c.
Gainst Knaues and Theeues men shut their gate,
for the raine,&c.

But these examples of "&c" are even less possibly dialogue than the usage in *2 Henry 6*. There seems to be no accepted term for these "dialogue directions," though "stage direction" comes closest. If that is what the concorder thought them, then some stage directions are less equal than these.

Not all of Shakespeare is dramatic art; there are, for example, sonnets and narrative poems. Not only are their titles not dialogue, it seems, but neither are the hundreds of words in the letters dedicatory of the poems or the "Argument" to one of them (*The Rape of Lucrece*), for they are not concorded — with the loss to the vocabulary of seven new words, eight new inflections, 50 new spellings, and one new homograph. One of the omitted words happens to be "Shakespeare" in its two occurences in the edition concorded. Its omission suggests that art is completely above life.

Curiously, the great Shakespeare concordance of the past, Bartlett's, also excludes "Twelfth Night," "Shakespeare," and "conjuro," and therein lies the claim of the *Complete Concordance* to its unique distinction. Recently a study of Shakespeare's complete foreign vocabulary appeared in *Fremdsprachen bei Shakespeare*;[27] it too has nothing to do with "*Coniuro te*.

&c." Modern philology thus affirms Shakespeare's "small Latine," of which Jonson spoke proudly in 1623. Nor does any of these three studies include "THRENOS" — Shakespeare's "lesse Greeke" — which occurs in the auspicious location after line 52 of "The Phoenix and Turtle." As the Greek word is, like titles and stage directions, not assigned a line number in the Riverside edition, we may suspect that its editorial enumeration plays a subtle role in the concorder's criterion of text.

I gather that "*Puer*" is not part of the foreign vocabulary of *Titus Andronicus*, though the edition I am reading (admittedly a very old fashioned one, propped here on a bundle of xeroxes of manuscript underlinings by Keats, my right foot rather askew upon the computer terminal) has it. In my text it occurs in the speech prefixes, suggesting that the self-conscious Latinity of the dialogue of this play pushes out of the picture and into the frame: "*Boy*," says the modern edition, smoothing the way for complete modern comprehension. Neither, it seems, are *Cumalijs* and *Ambo* part of Shakespeare's foreign vocabulary, though I saw them in one of these books a moment ago.

In fairness I should acknowledge that the lack of Shakespearean vocabulary is made up by the inclusion of some words that are not in his text, like *craggy*, *Dowland*, *solfull'st*, *Pandion*, *skips*, *Spenser*, *tereu* and *unlac'd*. I am sorry that some personal favorites were not concorded; I am very partial to Milton's "Star-ypointing" from his verse in the second folio, and to Jonson's "shake a Stage" and "shake a Lance" from his verse in the first. But one cannot have everything in a complete concordance.

Dramatic personae: Very few of Shakespeare's substantive texts have *dramatis personae* lists. Editors since Rowe in 1709 have made them part of the text, ranking and characterizing the roles hierarchically, men above women, gentle above common, all neat and proper, with their relationships detailed just as Shakespeare would want it. Looming into the edited text, this increscence seems a kind of editorial paradigm, a potential, the dynamic of which is played out by the subsequent text. Occasionally the subsequent text fails to use quite the proper names, and so editors have been quick to correct the poet, as in this example from *All's Well* in the unique substantive text, the folio.

> *Con.* You haue discharg'd this honestlie, keepe it to your selfe, manie likelihoods inform'd mee of this before, which hung so tottring in the ballance, that I could neither beleeue nor misdoubt : praie you leaue mee, stall this in your bosome, and I thanke you for your honest care : I will speake with you further anon. *Exit Steward.*
>
> *Enter Hellen.*
>
> *Old.Cou.* Euen so it vvas vvith me when I was yong:
> If euer vve are natures, these are ours, this thorne
> Doth to our Rose of youth righlie belong
> Our bloud to vs, this to our blood is borne,
> It is the show, and seale of natures truth,
> Where loues strong passion is imprest in youth,
> By our remembrances of daies forgon,
> Such were our faults, or then we thought them none,
> Her eie is sicke on't, I obserue her now.

There is only one speaker here, her speech punctuated by an exit and entrance of other characters. She is named again, and renamed at that, in the middle of her speech around these theatrical events, and a corresponding change of theme. The Countess becomes "Old" precisely when she sees young Hellen and recalls her own youth. Correcting Shakespeare's mistake, editors eliminate the "Old." and the second prefix.

The same kind of shift for the Countess (if this is to be her name) occurs in a setting by another compositor — a fact that allows us to rule out compositorial causes of these varying names.[28]

> *Hel.* Looke on his Letter Madam, here's my Pasport.
>
> *When thou canst get the Ring vpon my finger, which neuer shall come off, and shew mee a childe begotten of thy bodie, that I am father too, then call me husband: but in such a (then) I write a Neuer.*
> This is a dreadfull sentence.
> *La.* Brought you this Letter Gentlemen?
> *1.G.* I Madam, and for the Contents sake are sorrie for our paines.
> *Old La.* I prethee Ladie haue a better cheere,
> If thou engrossest, all the greefes are thine,
> Thou robst me of a moity: He was my sonne,
> But I do wash his name out of my blood,
> And thou art all my childe. Towards Florence is he?
> *Fren.G.* I Madam.
> *La.* And to be a souldier.
> *Fren.G.* Such is his noble purpose, and beleeu't

Here speaking as "*La.*" or *Lady* (*Shakespeare has wandered again*), she is reidentified as "*Old La.*" (*and again*) when addressing the "Ladie," Hellen. This same character speaks under the name "*Mother*" (*and again*) elsewhere in the play, at a time when she relinquishes her son, as he becomes a ward of the King. Shakespeare's texts abound in these polynomials, but as the editors have hidden all trace of them, the Newton of their calculation has yet to appear. (For Keats, however, the apple would have fallen; in his folio *Lear* speeches are assigned to the same role under the titles *Edmund* and *Bastard*.)

By so improving Shakespeare, editors have eliminated from the text its clear and evocative evidence of layering and joints. Not only that, they have added their own junctions — in the formal divisions of Act and Scene, conventions which Shakespeare shows no evidence of having regularly used. They have thus obliterated the text's inherent capacity to

indicate some of its own episodic and thematic divisions and preoccupations. The result is obliterature. For editors to foist single names on characters to whom Shakespeare responded, while creating them, with many names, is to impose retrospective understanding upon text, to seek artofficial creation rather than real creating. It is a practice that props up the critical notion of consistent characterization, when it is uncalled for, indeed contradicted, by the text.

Over half a century ago Allison Gaw observed that the frequent occurrence of actors' names in early Shakespeare texts indicated theatrical functions of the underlying manuscripts.[29] Shakespeare readers now know little of this (although they are, paradoxically, warned that Shakespeare wrote for the stage, not for the study), because editors have removed "Wil Kempe" from a stage direction in *Romeo* and substituted "Peter," the role name. Tawyer with his trumpet is gone from *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and Sinklo has disappeared from numerous plays. Gaw shows that the last named actor was a bean pole, and that some of Shakespeare's parts, like that of the Apothecary in *Romeo* or that, literally, of Sinklo in the quarto of *2 Henry 4* ("Beadle" or "Officer" in F), were likely written with a thin man in mind. By eliminating hints of the resources of Shakespeare's company which influenced him as he scripted, or which were his company's way of responding to his scripts, editors have made sure that Shakespeare is not of his age, but for all time. And yet there are contemporary plays like *Antonio and Mellida*, *The Road to Parnassus*, *Bartholomew Fair* and *The Malcontent* in which the actor's own personality and sometimes his name were as much part of the stage business and audience response as was his fictive role.[30] How could it have been otherwise with repertory theatre, unmasked actor and regular clientele? How otherwise in a dramatic tradition obsessed by the interrelationship of theatre and life, of Globe and globe? The editors have condemned such plays, in which the actors' names cannot sensibly be eliminated, to be not for all time, but of their age. This is one reason why for us Shakespeare towers above his contemporaries.

Speech Prefixity: The mention of type names brings me to a final comment on the widespread misunderstanding of Shakespeare occasioned by editorial behavior. When one bypasses the editors to read *Loues Labours Lost* in Q or in F, one discovers that certain roles are denominated by both type names and personal names, the principles of their distribution not being immediately clear:

Pedant	is also	Holofernes
Braggart		Don Adriano de Armado
Curate		Nathaniel
Clown (Foole)		Costard
Page (Boy)		Moth

Most names occur in both audible and inaudible text in Q, but the editors

consistently opt for the right-hand column to use in their speech prefixes (though some of them allow these names to be supplemented in stage directions by names in the left-hand column, if they are already there in the copytext).

Some kind of layering of text can be detected in the distribution of the various names of the second-named role. His speeches are introduced with an abbreviation of *Armado* in 1.2 and of *Braggart* in 5.1 and 5.2; both names occur in 3.1, the Braggart names appearing in a block at the beginning of the scene, rather than the end, and the Armado names occuring at the end, rather than the beginning. (In F almost all the Armado names are replaced with Braggart.) The first editor, Rowe, used a later folio, in which, as noted, the Braggart name was predominant — but he changed these wholesale to Armado. He invented the first list of *dramatis personae*, where we find "Don Adriano de Armado, a fantastical Spaniard," — and *Exit Braggart in toto*. Thus Rowe and his followers steer readers away from Scylla (our dangerous propensity to think Don Adriano is a Polish-Lithuanian name), only to drown us in Charybdis (our dangerous propensity to treat the role as unified under a personal and family name). Yet the theatrical type name, Braggart, is essential for readers to know, as when we are told late in the play that Armado's child "brags" in Jaquenetta's (The Wench's) (the Maid's) belly, or in this crucial recognition (the only time "Braggart" appears in the dialogue), uttered by Berowne when he catches sight of all the characters listed above, and proclaims (Q; 5.2.542):

> *Bero.* The Pedant, the Bragart, the Hedge-Priest, the
> Foole, and the Boy,

To read this line in Rowe's tradition is to miss the fact that Berowne seems here to be naming them not as persons in the fiction, but as theatrical types, and the name he uses, for this character at least, is the same as Shakespeare uses outside the dialogue. *Readers* of the early texts of the play can see Shakespeare's left and hear his right hand, each keeping to its own diction, and then experience them come together in Berowne's strategic line. Perhaps they see thereby something that hearkens back to the nature of the theatrical experience of the play in Shakespeare's time, something that can be reconstructed only out of such slight textual clues (since, as is not the case in the French theatre, there is no continuous conservative tradition of acting Shakespeare).

If one reads the standard editorial introductions, one may learn that Armado descends from the Latin *miles gloriosus* of Plautine comedy; one might even be told that the Latin phrase means "braggart soldier." But this is no more informative than explaining that Hamlet is a descendent of Adam, when we realize that Berowne's line, just quoted, names typical roles of the *commedia dell' arte:* and that the direct influence on Shakespeare is not the Plautine *miles* but the *commedia's* Braggart. Shakespeare's

play, then, is something of a commedy. Concerned with drama as mimesis, editors have forgotten that it is construction as well. The terminology that the editors remove from view again and again is the specific working diction of a contemporary dramaturgic tradition. What they substitute for it is the kind of tidy learning that would have incapacitated Shakespeare if he had known it.

Godspeare

Not all scholars share the attitudes of Shakespeare editors toward the question of textual transmission. Talking to a Hebrew scholar recently, I was struck when he recalled a text by remembering that it was half way down a right hand page. When I expressed amazement at his spatial sense of text (Why not cite chapter and verse?), he replied that Hebrew scripture, both in its essence and for purposes of transmission, is like a concrete poem. Form and content have not yet fallen apart. For example, although the Hebrew alephbeth has no upper and lower case letters, in several places in scripture letters are written out of size; and this feature, deemed mystically allegorical,[31] is, along with line endings, page endings, and even text of doubtful meaning, repeated — "religiously" is the word, I think — with every copying, because meaning permeates all aspects of text. The editorial function, as a Shakespeare editor might see it, is limited to commentary. Text and reading are distinct. In this way the text resists being made to conform to its interpretation.

So be it.
Awe men.

NOTES

1. I wish to thank my colleagues V.A. DeLuca, JoAnna Dutka, Margaret Ann Fitzpatrick and Phil Oxley for their very helpful criticism of an early draft of the essay. Stephen Booth, Northrop Frye and Richard Van Fossen will understand, and Joe Barber would have understood, why I thank them again. I am also grateful for support to the Social Sciences and Research Council of Canada.

My understanding of Keats' biography, and particularly of his "Shakespearolatry," comes from Walter Jackson Bate, *John Keats*, Cambridge, Mass., 1963, and John Middleton Murry, *Keats and Shakespeare: A Study of Keats' Poetic Life from 1816 to 1820*, London, 1925. For letters by and to Keats the following are invaluable: Hyder Edward Rollins, *The Letters of John Keats, 1814-1820*, 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1958, and his *The Keats Circle, Letters and Papers 1816-1878*, 2 vols. (including the supplement of 1955), Cambridge, Mass., 1965. For the poetry, Jack Stillinger's superb variorum edition, *The Poems of John Keats*, Cambridge, Mass., 1978. For some of Keats' underlining of Shakespeare, Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, *Keats's Shakespeare: A Descriptive Study Based on New Material*, Oxford, 1928; and also Keats' folio at Keats House, Hampstead, and Keats' Whittingham edition at the Houghton Library, Harvard.

2. Quotes like this from *The Letters (op. cit.)* will be identified simply by the number and date assigned to them by Rollins, in this case No. 21 (15 April 1817). I have tried to be as conservative as possible of Rollins' un-normalizations, though, as his notes say, not all his copy-texts are authors' manuscripts. Rollins' text is printed in roman, but I have chosen italic when printing it in letter format (as opposed to the brief quotation here.) If I could have photoquoted the letters, I would have done so.

3. Rollins 22 (17 April 1817).

4. Murry, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-38.

5. Rollins 110 (8 October 1818).

6. Rollins, 22 (17 April 1817).

7. Rollins, 26 (10, 11 May 1817).

8. Rollins, 55 (23 January 1818).

9. The following collation of the four variant versions (two being holographs by Keats, the other two being copies by Woodhouse and Jeffrey), has been photo-quoted from Stillinger's edition, which modernizes spelling and punctuation freely, and quotes minor variants selectively. (Note, for example, the omission or neglect of the title in the Jeffrey transcript, of which more below.)

***On Sitting Down to Read "King Lear."* Text (including heading) from the extant holograph fair copy (*FC*). Variants and other readings from Keats's draft (*D*), Woodhouse's W^2 transcript, and Jeffrey's transcript of Keats's now lost letter to George and Tom Keats, 23, 24 January 1818 (*JJ*).** *Heading* On] Sonnet. On W^2 2 queen of] Queen of *altered to* Queen! if *JJ* 4 thine] *made out of* thy *D* 4 pages] (Books) Pages *D*; volume *JJ* 6 damnation] Hell-torment W^2, *JJ* 7 humbly] *interlined above* (must I) *D*; *the word omitted in JJ* 8/9 (Chief! what a gloom thine old oak forest hath!) (thine *made out of* thy) *D* 9 Chief Poet] (O) Chief Poet *interlined above* (Chieftain) *D* 10 our] this *D*, W^2; our *interlined above* (this) *FC* 11 through . . . am] I am through the old oak forest *JJ* 13 in] with *JJ* 14 at] to *D*, W^2; at *written over* (to) *FC*

10. Rollins 56 (23, 24 January 1818).

11. Rollins 166 (9 June 1819). Rollins reports that the manuscript is somewhat unclear and "clouded" actually reads "couded."

12. The problem of self-assessment before Shakespeare and confrontation with him can be seen in more detail by considering draft D, collated in footnote 9 by Stillinger. In the deleted line between lines 8 and 9 ("Chief! what a gloom thine old oak forest hath!") the oak forest ("gloomy in D only) is specifically the *Chief's*, or the *Chieftain's*, to cite another word in this draft — words of unparticularized authority, unlike "Chief Poet." In the folio version, however, the gloom lifts, and the forest is shared with the Clouds of Albion (if indeed the forest is to be associated here with either of them, as it is "the" not "their" oak forest). Thus a specifically Shakespearean darkness seems lightened in the later drafts by projecting some of it up onto a transcendent national identity, which Keats and Shakespeare can share (to happy thought) equally, as in "*our* eternal theme."

I gather that the phrasing of the early stages of D can be reconstructed to look like this:

. . . for once again, the fierce dispute	5
. . . humbly	
Must I burn through, once more ~~must I~~ assay	7
The bitter-sweet . . .	8

The originally repeated "must I" suggests compulsion: the deletion of the second use does not totally eliminate either the suggestion or the diction of compulsion at the end of line 7, for the clause beginning there lacks a subject and verb, and the only ones available to fill in the elipsis are "must I." Nevertheless, the replacement of "must I" with "humbly" suggests a movement from the seemingly outward compulsion to the inner virtue of humility, with regard to which it is somewhat paradoxical, and prepares us well for the immediate oxymoron, "bitter-sweet".

The tension between flying *to* or *at* his desire seems to have been a question only in the latest stage of composition.

13. Quoted from Rollins, *The Letters of John Keats*, vol. 1, p. 323, n. 8 (quoted in turn from his *Keats Circle*, vol. 2, p. 271).

14. Rollins, *Keats Circle*, vol. 2, supplement (*More Letters and Poems . . .*), p. 24.

15. All the illustrations of Keats' markings in his folio are reproduced (not to size) from the original by permission of the London Borough of Camden from the collection at Keats House, Hampstead, to whose Director, Mr. F. D. Cole, and Assistant Curator, Mrs. C. M. Gee, I wish to express my sincerest thanks. I am grateful also to Steve Jaunzems for photoprocessing and to Felix Fonteyn for the negatives.

16. A parallel may support my contention. Joyce's autobiographical *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* comes to a close in diary form. Here the hero chronicles his escape from Ireland over the sea. The book ends like this:

> 27 *April*: Old father, old artificer, stand me now and ever in good stead.
>
> Dublin 1904
> Trieste 1914

The question is whether the terminal references to Dublin and Trieste are part of the *Portrait* or part of its frame. The answer is that the question is biased against "authorbiography." A similar problem arises in the paintings of Seurat (his *Un Dimanche d'Été à l'Ile de la Grande Jatte*, for example), in which he actually paints the frame around the subject. It is not a *trompe l'oeil* border, but a reversal of adjacent interior coloration in the same pointilistic style as the framed. The frame thus refuses to delimit the artefact by its inner edge.

17. Rollins 159 (14 . . . February . . . 1819 — actually composed in stages until 3 May 1819).

18. The essay appeared in 1936, and is available with others by Benjamin in Hannah Arendt, ed., *Illuminations*, New York, [1968].

19. I say "approximately" because I am thinking of setting by formes. In quarto one might set pages 2, 3, 6 and 7, and then 1, 4, 5, 8.

20. Shakespeare's manuscripts seem all to be lost.

21. The current wave of new thought on the multiple substantive texts of *Lear* is led by Michael J. Warren, "Quarto and Folio *King Lear* and the Interpretation of Albany and Edgar," in David Bevington and Jay L. Halio, eds., *Shakespeare: Pattern of Excelling Nature*, Newark, Del., 1978. More recently Steven Urkowitz, *Shakespeare's Revision of King Lear*, Princeton, 1980 explores the theatrical differentiation of Q and F. Forthcoming from Oxford is Gary Taylor and Michael J. Warren, eds., *The Division of the Kingdom*, offering a range of essays on the two texts and the editing tradition.

22. Spurgeon, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-49. The folio *1 Henry 4* also shows signs of Keats' collation, presumably with his Wittingham.

23. See also E. A. J. Honigmann, *The Stability of Shakespeare's Text*, London and Lincoln, Neb., 1965 for study of Keats' attention to minute detail in revision.

24. Hazlitt, Whittingham Shakespeare and Spenser volumes are at Harvard; Milton and the folio Shakespeare at Keats House.

25. For related typographical argument see my "Spellbound: Typography and the Concept of Old-Spelling Editions," *Ren&R*, n.s., Vol. 3 # 1, 1979, pp. 50-65. Two other pieces that exploit typographical detail are my "A Technique of Headline Analysis, with Application to *Shakespeares Sonnets*, 1609," *SB*, Vol. 32, 1979, pp. 197-210, and "Unemending Shakespeare's Sonnet 111," *SEL*, Vol. 21, 1981, pp. 75-96.

26. Marvin Spevack, comp., *The Complete Systematic Concordance . . .* , 9 volumes to date, Hildesheim, 1968 —; *The Harvard Concordance*, Cambridge, Mass., 1973. The Riverside ed., on which these concordances are based, is edited by Gwynne Blakemore Evans; of the student editions it is, admirably, the most oriented to textual scholarship, and the most encouraging of textual scepticism.

27. A. Staufer, *Fremdsprachen bei Shakespeare: Das Vokabular und seine Dramatischen Funktionen*, Frankfurt, 1974.

28. The F pages are V3r and X1r. Charlton Hinman, *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1963, vol. 2, p. 515, assigns these to compositors A and B respectively.

29. Allison Gaw, "John Sincklo as One of Shakespeare's Actors," *Anglia*, vol. 49, 1925, pp. 289-303.

30. "Paul Newman *is* Hud!"

31. Here is John Smith's word on it from *The Printer's Grammar*, London, 1755, pp. 293-4.

> The Hebrew has no Capitals; and therefore letters of the same shape, but of a large Body, are used at the beginning of Chapters, and other parts of Hebrew work.
>
> But we must not pronounce it a fault, if we happen to meet in some Bibles with words that begin with a letter of a much larger Body than the mean Text; nor need we be astonish'd to see words with letters in them of a much less Body than the mean Text; or wonder to see final letters used in the middle of words; for such Notes shew that they contain some particular and mystical meaning. Thus in 2 Chron. I. 1. the word *Adam* begins with a letter of a larger size than the rest, thereby to intimate, that Adam is the father of all Mankind. Again, in Genes. I. 1., the great Beth in the word *Bereschith* stands for a Monitor of the great and incomprehensible work of Creation. Contrary to the first, in Prov. XXVIII. 17. the Daleth in the word *Adam* is considerably less than the Letter of the main text, to signify that whoever oppresses an other openly or clandestinely, tho' of a mean condition; or who sheds innocent blood, is not worthy to be called Man.
>
> Sometimes the open or common Mem stands in the room of a final one; as in Nehem. II. 13. where the word *hem* has an open Mem at the end, in allusion to the torn and open walls of Jerusalem, of which there is mention made; and, in Es. VII.14. where the Prophet speaks of the Conception of the Virgin Mary, the Mem in the word *haalma*, or Virgin, is a close or final letter, to intimate the virginity of the mother of our Saviour. Such are the peculiarities of some Jewish Rabbi's in Bibles of their publication; of which we have instanced the above, to caution Compositors not to take them for faults, if such mystical writings should come under their hands.

© Randall McLeod, U. of Toronto, July 1981.