INTRODUCTION

There are basically two versions of *Richard III*: one, the first quarto, published in 1597; the other as part of the First Folio of 1623. They show some two thousand verbal differences – roughly, 10 per cent of the words of the play. The 1597 text omits lengthy passages found in the Folio, but it includes an important section not found in 1623. Sixty years ago D. L. Patrick suggested that the 1597 version was based on a memorial reconstruction by the actors.[1] The manuscript lying behind the Folio is thought to be Shakespeare's foul papers collated with one of the reprints of the first quarto.[2] There is no evidence to suggest that a prompt-book for the London theatre was available for either Q1 or F.

This edition is limited in its intentions; it seeks only to explore the nature of the quarto version of *Richard III* printed in 1597 and the circumstances that led to its production. It is not designed to establish what the author, or Shakespeare's company, the Lord Chamberlain's Men, 'intended' to be 'the' *Richard III*, and although comparison is constantly made with the Folio text of 1623 (the version, by and large, preferred by most editors), it is not with the purpose of preparing a critical edition of *Richard III*. Thus, although the layout and accidentals (e.g., the spelling, capitalisation, and punctuation) have been modernised, only such textual emendations have been made where error can reasonably be attributed to a scribe or compositor; editorial additions are shown within square brackets and, in the Collation, an asterisk marks all changes from Q1. The analysis of the quarto inevitably throws light on the Folio and it would be a relatively simple matter to produce from this edition a 'corrected version' of Q1 that would be as close as conjecture allows to a version of Q1 as performed in Shakespeare's day. Such a version would be closely akin to editions based on the Folio but distinct from them. The quarto of *Richard III* is fascinating in its own right for it

---

[1] D. L. Patrick, *The Textual History of Richard III* (Stanford, 1936); see also p. 5, n. 1; as 'Patrick' hereafter. David Bradley maintains 'that the evidence so far produced for memorial reconstruction is unconvincing and vulnerable in fact and logic', *From Text to Performance in the Elizabethan Theatre: Preparing the Play for the Stage* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 10; as 'Bradley' hereafter. Bradley does not discuss *Richard III*, for which I hope to demonstrate he is wrong. *A Textual Companion* to the Oxford Shakespeare, ed. Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, *et al.* (Oxford, 1987), believes 'Patrick's hypothesis holds the field, and has held it, virtually uncontested, for half a century' (p. 228); and that Q can, 'because of other variants, be played by a smaller cast with less equipment than the Folio' (p. 228). Earlier, Taylor maintained that 'Q1 is the proper copy-text for *Richard III*' (*The Library*, VI, 3 (1981), 35), a position with which I agree.

[2] 'Considering the evidence as a whole, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that behind F there lies not a prompt-book but foul papers', W. W. Greg, *The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History* (Oxford, 1955), p. 195; so too, Antony Hammond, the Arden *Richard III* (London, 1981), pp. 43–4. The balance of opinion favours Q6 as the quarto collated with the manuscript (Greg, p. 196; Hammond, pp. 32–3) but J. K. Walton has argued for Q3 in *The Quarto Copy for the First Folio of Shakespeare* (Dublin, 1971); see Hammond, pp. 33–41. Although I do not always agree with Hammond, I should like to stress that I have found his edition particularly helpful. Hereafter I refer to him simply as 'Hammond' and the edition as 'Arden'.

1

can tell the inquiring reader a great deal about how this play was performed. It makes an important contribution to a world of drama that tends to be disregarded and even looked down upon as inferior: the touring drama. But that is to anticipate.

Theories of the genesis of Q1

Editors tend to consider Q1 a deformed version of the Folio text and, up to a point, they are correct. Theories as to Q1's origin have been many, but since D. L. Patrick in 1936 published *The Textual History of Richard III*, the starting point has been, in the main, that the text of Q1 was 'collaboratively prepared by the company in order to replace a missing prompt-book'.[1] Greg assumed that the company that prepared this text was the Chamberlain's Men but A. S. Cairncross[2] and Karl P. Wentersdorf[3] have linked Q1 with the 'bad' quartos of *2* and *3 Henry VI*, *The First Part of the Contention*, and *The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of York*; they have argued that these were all produced by Pembroke's Men when they toured the provinces in 1592. Forty years ago, Sir Walter Greg, in a study of ' "Bad" quartos outside Shakespeare', in particular Peele's *Battle of Alcazar* and Greene's *Orlando Furioso* (both first published in 1594), remarked that 'two facts emerged: one that there really existed a class of shortened texts (originating, it is commonly supposed, with reduced companies forced to tour the provinces) the other that not all shortened texts were of the same character'.[4] Andrew Gurr does not believe that the argument that these 'bad' quartos derived from shortened texts used by touring companies will withstand close inspection[5] and David Bradley thinks there is 'nothing much . . . to indicate that the provinces were regularly treated to maimed or truncated performances'.[6] Although Q1 in verbal detail differs greatly from F1 and is some 140 lines shorter, I am sure that when *Richard III* was toured it was presented virtually complete and with no intention of offering a text radically cut down from that regularly given in London. I shall try to show its characteristics can be explained by the circumstances attendant upon the production of the play in London and on tour. Antony Hammond has argued cogently for the association of Q1 with the Chamberlain's Men on the grounds of the 'enormous qualitative difference between Q1 of *Richard III*' and the *Henry VI* 'bad' quartos and because the Chamberlain's Men would not tamely have allowed the publication of such a piracy with their name on the title-page.[7] I share that view. To his arguments can be added the particular circumstances of the licensing of Q1 for printing in 1597, to which reference will be made later.

[1] Sir Walter Greg, reviewing Patrick's book, *The Library*, IV, 19 (1938), 118–20, quoted by Hammond, p. 10.
[2] 'Pembroke's Men and some Shakespearian piracies', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 11 (1960), 335–49.
[3] 'The repertory and size of Pembroke's Company', *Theatre Annual*, 33 (1977), 71–85; '*Richard III* (Q1) and the Pembroke "bad" quartos', *English Language Notes*, 14 (1977), 257–64.
[4] W. W. Greg, *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1954), p. 56.
[5] Information kindly provided by Professor Gurr, who let me see the typescript of a chapter on 'Travelling companies', ch. 3, *Playing Companies* (Oxford, 1995).
[6] Bradley, p. 74.
[7] Arden, p. 11.

Important alternatives to the Patrick–Greg conclusion have been put forward by Kristian Smidt and Stephen Urkowitz. Smidt, in two studies,[1] has argued that Q1 is a revision, not a memorially constructed text. Revision was probably involved but that does not necessarily invalidate reporting, and Smidt later slightly modified his approach and in the Preface to his enormously useful parallel text (published a year earlier than his studies) he seemed to admit the possibility of memorial transmission.[2] Urkowitz has argued that Patrick's case for memorial reconstruction has been too readily accepted. Patrick, he concludes:

offers no secure evidence indicating that the underlying source of the Quarto text was a memorial reconstruction; nor do we know, reliably, when or by whom the Folio text was generated. We may have two texts representing an author's work in progress, or we may have one 'authorized' text and another generated by professional players intimately familiar with the authorized version in performance, or we may have two texts influenced, benignly or malignantly, by Shakespeare's fellows in the playhouse or even by theatrical professionals associated with other companies.

He offers 'a model of *Richard III* as a work in progress, an early state in the Quarto, a later state in the Folio'. In one aspect of this, all can agree: we do not know reliably the nature and relationship of the manuscripts underlying Q1 and F, nor can we be absolutely certain of their provenance. Urkowitz demonstrates that if an editor is determined to see F's manuscript as preceding Q1's, differences in reading offered by Patrick (or by me) can be made to support that progression, but that if the order of manuscripts is reversed, then alternative explanations can be offered for Patrick's differences, some of which are at least as convincing.[3]

There is another troubling aspect to the Patrick–Greg position. Q does not strike one as a wholly satisfactory prompt-book; it has some vague directions and it lacks a number of exits. However, if the text is a memorial transcript of what the actors recalled doing and saying it may be that prompt-book precision was less important, especially if, as is likely, the bookkeeper prepared a Plot as a guide to entrances, exits, etc. As Hammond summarises it, 'it is worth underlining that Greg himself saw nothing inherently impossible in the supposition that Q1 was a reconstructed prompt-book'.[4]

It would be less than honest to pretend that anyone can come to *Richard III* with a wholly fresh, unencumbered mind over half-a-century after Patrick and the discussions he prompted. The Patrick–Greg reported-text conclusion may by and large be

[1] *Iniurious Imposters and Richard III* (Oslo, 1964); *Memorial Transmission and Quarto Copy in Richard III: A Reassessment* (Oslo, 1970).

[2] See Smidt's *Reassessment* and *The Tragedy of King Richard the Third: Parallel Texts of the First Quarto and the First Folio with Variants of the Early Quartos* (Oslo, 1969): 'It is generally admitted that the Q text of *Richard III*, whether or not it is memorially contaminated, exhibits a degree of completeness and coherence which relates it not too distantly to an authorial text. And in any case a text reported from memory may transmit variants produced by the author, or at least accepted by him, after his fair copy first left his hands' (p. 8).

[3] Stephen Urkowitz, 'Reconsidering the relationship of quarto and Folio texts of *Richard III*', *English Literary Renaissance*, 16 (1986), 442–66; the references are to pp. 465 and 466; as 'Urkowitz' hereafter.

[4] Arden, p. 12.

correct; Smidt was surely right to argue for revision and possibly quite pervasive revision; Urkowitz cannot be dismissed out of hand. The problem may be resolved by a fresh re-examination of the variants to see whether the theory of reporting can be sustained; to point to what revision may have taken place; and to try to distinguish between revisions that may have been made in London and those, if any, for a tour (possibly a tour earlier than that of the year in which Q1 was published). The problem of Q1 must be regarded as still unresolved. Urkowitz's approach is salutary and a proper warning not to take the accepted order as absolutely determined.

Q1 and F

Five editions of *Richard III* are known to have been published in Shakespeare's lifetime. These were all quartos, the first in 1597 (Q1), then Q2 (1598), Q3 (1602), Q4 (1605), and Q5 (1612). A sixth edition (Q6) appeared in 1622, the year before the publication of the First Folio edition of all Shakespeare's plays (F), which had been got together by two of Shakespeare's colleagues, John Heminges and Henry Condell. Before the theatres were closed in 1642, two more quartos were published, Q7 in 1629 and Q8 in 1634. In published form therefore, as well as on the stage, *Richard III* was a very popular play. The Folio was reprinted in 1632 (F2), 1663–4 (F3) and 1685 (F4). All the quartos are dependent upon Q1 and the folios on F1 so that Q1 and F1 are the prime authorities. F1 was influenced by later quartos as, for example, the Collations for 3.1.1–165, where Q is the prime authority for F, make plain. For example, 3.1.123 shows the Q3 compositor erroneously repeating 'as'; the Q4 compositor corrects but the F compositor, working here from Q3, endeavours to make sense of the repetition by adding commas after each 'as', so that young York appears to stutter. (See also below, p. 26.) The title-page of Q1 reads:

[Ornament 23 × 75 mm.] THE TRAGEDY OF / King Richard the third. / Containing, / His treacherous Plots against his brother Clarence: / the pittiefull murther of his iunocent nephewes: / his tyrannicall vsurpation: with the whole course / of his detested life, and most deserued death. / As it hath beene lately Acted by the / Right honourable the Lord Chamber- / laine his seruants. / [ornament 19 × 51 mm.] / AT LONDON / ¶ Printed by Valentine Sims, for Andrew Wise, / dwelling in Paules Chuch-yard, at the / Signe of the Angell. / 1597.

This edition is based on the British Library copy, Huth 47; this is the copy W. W. Greg used for his *Shakespeare Quarto Facsimile*, No. 12, 1959.

Although the narrative lines of Q1 and F1 are virtually identical, the differences between Q1 and F1 (hereafter referred to as Q and F unless a later quarto or Folio is specifically referred to) are legion. Thus, Q deploys fewer characters, characters lose their names, they are combined, become mutes, and take over the lines of others. Parts of Q are arranged differently from F – for example, the Ghosts appear out of chronological order in Q – and whereas throughout F Richard is so described in speech heads, in Q he is referred to as Gloucester until he is crowned and then, from 4.2, as King. Among other differences of varying significance are the naming of the Pursuivant in Q as Hastings, so that Hastings meets Hastings. A full account of these changes is given below. Many of the two thousand or so verbal differences between Q and F are slight

and seemingly insignificant, yet, cumulatively, they build up Q's nature and origins; some even give an insight into the way the play was performed in the sixteenth century, for example, the 'improvements' several actors made to their parts (the additions of 'Well', 'Tut, tut', 'Come, come' etc.).

Yet, despite all these differences, the two versions of *Richard III* are far more closely akin than are *The First part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster* (Q1) and *The true Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke, and the death of good King Henrie the Sixt, with the whole contention betweene the two Houses [of] Lancaster and Yorke* (O) to the Folio texts of *2* and *3 Henry VI*, or of Q1 *Hamlet* to Q2 and F. Given that many stage directors take a pretty free hand with the text of Shakespeare, even a reasonably well-informed theatregoer might be forgiven for thinking that, if he or she attended a production of Q1, amended (as would be any 'good' text in order to eliminate errors), it was a production of the play based on the Folio text. The only line that might appear to be missing would be Richard's command when Buckingham is taken: 'Off with his head! So much for Buckingham', following 4.4.444. And that, of course, is not by Shakespeare but by Cibber (and still to be heard as late as the mid-1950s, e.g. in Olivier's film version).

This edition

I propose these hypotheses: (1) that Shakespeare's company, the Chamberlain's Men, lost a combined prompt-book used for its London and touring performances of *Richard III* on one of the visits it made to the provinces in 1596 and 1597 and had no alternative available; (2) that the actors recalled their parts and one or more scribes took them down to produce a memorially reconstructed text; and (3) that this memorially reconstructed text provided the manuscript for the 1597 quarto.

I have endeavoured to start afresh by comparing anew what is demonstrably different: the variant readings of Q and F, aware that there is an ever-present danger of falling prey to circular arguments. In studying the variant readings, I have adapted techniques developed by George Thomson for Aeschylus and George Kane in editing *Piers Plowman*, *A*.[1] As Kane puts it: 'The sole authority is the variants themselves, and among them, authority, that is originality, will probably be determined most often by the identification of the variant likeliest to have given rise to the others.'[2] They argue that variant readings in manuscript copies may arise from deliberate alteration (e.g., in

---

[1] George Thomson, 'Marxism and textual criticism', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*, Ges.-Sprachw. R., 12 (1963), 43–52; 'Simplex ordo', *Classical Quarterly*, 15 (1965), 161–75; and 'Scientific method in textual criticism', *Eirene* 1 (1960), 51–60; George Kane, *Piers Plowman: The A Version* (London, 1960); see especially ch. 4, 'Editorial resources and methods', pp. 115–72; as 'Kane' hereafter. I was fortunately able to teach a course in editorial method with George Thomson and other colleagues at the University of Birmingham for three years and I learned much from him. Patrick devotes his chapter 4 to 'Errors of memory – shifting', suggesting that the many transpositions could not all be attributed to the several compositors who set the play but were 'tricks of the actor's memory' (p. 35); and chapter 5 to 'Errors of memory – substitutions'. Both chapters give many examples of these characteristics.

[2] Kane, p. 115.

the case of *Richard III*, revision for performances in London or on tour), or mechanical error, e.g.: anticipation, repetition, inversion and transposition, exaggeration, substitution, approximation, and telescoping. For Kane and Thomson, this technique is especially applicable when no hierarchy can be established and recension is not practicable. A hierarchy of quartos and Folios can readily be established for *Richard III*, so I have used Thomson's and Kane's approach for a different purpose: to try to work out how the readings of Q1 came to be as they are. But, as Kane emphasises: 'presumption of originality is never strictly equivalent to proof, and varies greatly in strength. [. . .] The authority of the text reconstructed by these means must vary with the character of the evidence available; it cannot be uniform any more than it can be exactly determinable. In the last analysis all decisions about originality are provisional only.'[1]

Recently, G. Thomas Tanselle discussed 'Editing without a copy-text', taking as his starting point a re-assessment of the implications of Fredson Bowers's work on radiating texts. What he proposes is directly relevant to editing *Richard III*:

Every choice made among variants in radiating texts is an active and critical choice; no reading is settled on by default, for there is no text that offers a fall-back position. When the variants in radiating texts seem 'indifferent,' an editor may of course choose a reading from the text that supplies the largest number of other readings; but the decision is still an active one, in which one of the factors taken into account is the apparent general reliability of a particular text. The process remains one of building up a new text rather than making changes in an old one. If this idea – that critical editing is constructive rather than emendatory – were also applied to texts in linear genealogies, the rôle of judgment might more clearly be seen as dominant, and any practical guideline (such as Greg's rationale), might be better recognized as an aid to judgment, not a brake on it. [. . .] What I am proposing . . . might be called 'constructive critical editing' to distinguish it from an approach that emphasizes emendation. To see critical editing as an activity of rebuilding rather than repairing forces the judgment to play its central rôle in recovering the past.[2]

The virtue of examining each Q/F variant individually and then applying a constructive rather than an emendatory critical approach to *Richard III* is that no overall hypothesis defines the text because the variants themselves are the source of authority and the validity of each must be considered separately. As Kane says of his *Piers Plowman*, all decisions made about the variants of *Richard III* cannot be exactly determinable and must be provisional. Only in assessing the Q/F variants, using neither text as copy-text, lies hope of a convincing edition of the play. The present study is, of course, concerned only with Q's rôle in preparing a 'constructive critical edition' of *Richard III*.

Q1 was set in two printing houses. One compositor in Valentine Simmes's house set to the end of G; Alan Craven has examined his work. Two compositors in Peter Short's house set from H to the end; they set by formes and their work has been identified by MacD. P. Jackson. Both houses and all three compositors are well represented in all groups with more than a few variants. Susan Zimmerman has argued against establish-

---

[1] Kane, pp. 148, 149.
[2] G. Thomas Tanselle, 'Editing without a copy-text', *Studies in Bibliography*, 47 (1994), 19, 22. For Bowers's study, see 'Editorial apparatus for radiating texts', *The Library*, v, 29 (1974), 330–7.

ing correlations between compositor and press-work in general and in particular in Peter Short's house. However, Q1 was set in two printing houses and Ms Zimmerman suggests that there is 'strong prima-facie evidence for two compositors in [the Short section] of *Richard III* which cannot be refuted by any other single test of equal weight'.[1] The many variants are a result of revision when the play was presented in London and on tour, and also attributable to the work of one or more scribes, three compositors, and, if memorial reconstruction took place, the actors. The editor's task is to distinguish between these. The knowledge that characteristics found throughout the play in a particular rôle (e.g. Buckingham's) appear in settings in two printing houses by three compositors demonstrates that they cannot derive from an individual compositor's laxness or idiosyncrasy.

   The ensuing lists deal first with readings attributable to scribes and compositors; then the kinds of variant attributable to recall by actors are summarised; these are followed by examples of actors' 'improvements' – ad-libs – and changes which reflect production (often for touring purposes); finally, revision (which may be authorial) is considered. It can be argued, for instance, that it is not Q that inverts F, but F that inverts Q. But given the loss of force of many substitutions, and in the light of the argument advanced as a whole, I believe Q must appear to be the less authorial text. Whenever some such expression as 'Q's variants' is used, it should be assumed that this means Q1 as compared to F1. The origins of many variants cannot be firmly distinguished; some variants could be attributable to scribe, compositor, actor, or even the author. Examples include Q's 'her' for F's 'my' at 1.2.222; Q's 'perilous' for F's 'parlous', 2.4.35; the aural error in Q, 'Graces pleasure' for F's 'gracious pleasure', 3.4.17; and Q's 'dead' for F's 'deare', 4.1.64. As Kane put it in the passage quoted above (reading 'interpretation adduced here' for his 'text reconstructed'): 'The authority of the text reconstructed . . . must vary with the character of the evidence available; it cannot be uniform any more than it can be exactly determinable. In the last analysis all decisions . . . are provisional only.' Some particularly doubtful instances are double entered and marked with a question mark, but Kane's caveat is always applicable. As the accuracy of the compositors is clearly important, the list below gives a generous, widely drawn record of such demonstrable errors. The other lists refer to the Textual Notes; these notes list other examples of similar categories of variants to be found in that scene in the Collation or Textual Notes. The intensity of variants in the individual scenes is highlighted by such grouping.

SCRIBAL CHANGE

The bookkeeper would have acted as the scribe but he may have been assisted, perhaps by the author if time pressed. The expansion of elided forms in Q, though not wholly consistent, is almost certainly the work of a scribe. Examples include 1.3.180 ('ever' for

---

[1] For a summary of the work of the compositors, see Arden, pp. 23–30. For Susan Zimmerman, 'The use of headlines: Peter Short's Shakespearian quartos *1 Henry IV* and *Richard III*', *The Library*, VI, 7 (1985), 217–55, especially pp. 238 and 241. See also P. Davison, 'The selection and presentation of bibliographic evidence', *Analytical and Enumerative Bibliography*, 1 (Spring 1977), 101–36.

F's 'ere'); 1.3.276 ('I will' for F's 'Ile') – but compare Q's 'Ile' for F's 'I will' at 283; 'I pray thee' for F's 'I prythee' (e.g. 1.4.66 and 101), but Q and F both have 'I pray you' at 3.1.110 and 3.4.61. A scribe may have been responsible for punctiliously correcting 'who' to 'whom' on a number of occasions (see 1.3.54n); and see 1.3.98n for 'yea'/'I'. Lineation errors were inevitable in producing a memorial text, e.g. 2.1.132. It may have been the scribe or the actor who corrected what is found in F at 3.4.84, 'rowse our Helmes' to 'raze his helm'. The scribe may be responsible for Tyrrel being given the first name Francis (instead of James) at 4.3.0 SD. Some of the errors attributed to compositors may stem from the scribe(s), e.g. 1.3.66, 2.2.56, 4.3.19, 5.3.11.

COMPOSITORIAL ERROR

Q1's shortening to 'lo' at 1.2.1 was not because there was a lack of space in the line for two or three more letters. The later quartos took 'lo' to be an abbreviation for 'lord', which makes sense, though F's 'load' is more imaginative (and is selected here) and Anne later refers to 'your holy load' (line 27). The use of the shortened form is strange; as it lacks a full point it may be that the compositor was interrupted and simply failed to complete the word and that the proof-reader either did not notice or let it pass as if it were an abbreviated form. Q1's 'squakt' at 1.4.51 looks like an example of what Kane describes as a scribe's distracted attempt to make out a word resulting in 'a meaning-less group of letters of shape similar to the supplanted word',[1] but here the work of a compositor; 'squawked' did not enter the language for another two-and-a-half centu-ries; 2.1.24–5 may be an omission arising from *homoeoarchy*, but could be an authorial revision; the error at 2.3.39, 'bread' for 'dread', is certainly compositorial, probably a result of faulty dissing; the speech head in Q at 3.5.50, *Dut.* for *Buc.*, is impossible in this scene because the Duchess does not appear, and must be a compositorial misread-ing; the repeated speech head at 3.7.40, *Glo.*, is also likely to be compositorial, though it may stem from a repeated use of the indication made by the scribe when he started a fresh leaf; ' *ſ*oule-fac't' for 'foul-faced' at 3.7.211 may be a result of faulty reading or dissing, confusing long '*ſ*' and 'f'; there is a rash of compositorial errors in 4.1 (corrected in the text but not included in the Collation because given here) starting with 'the' for 'thy' at 4.1.34: 'ftom' for 'from', 44; 'hatch' for 'hatcht' and 'thc' for 'the', 49; 'thar' for 'that', 53; 'were' for 'Were', 55; 'rhy' for 'thy', 59; and 'Richatds' for 'Richards', 65 (and see 3.3.10); 4.4.328 (omission of 'by'). The effect of setting by formes in Peter Short's printing house and the need for copy-fitting may be the cause of the reading discussed at 3.7.182n. Q2 may have been printed from a copy of Q1 that had been corrected in the course of printing but which has not survived. See notes to 1.1.101–2, 2.1.5, and 5.3.10 (where copy must have been consulted).

　　For further certain and possible compositorial (or scribal) errors, see also Textual Notes or Collation at: 1.2.100; 1.3.3, 5, 48, 255, 299; 1.4.32, 69, 122, 142, 199, 224; 2.2.56, 59, 105; 2.4.12, 22, 30, 68; 3.1.78 (Q2); 3.2.9, 82, 85 ?; 3.3.0 SD, 2, 10, 21; 3.4.17, 42, 57, 87; 3.5.0 SD, 31, 50; 3.7.40; 4.2.71, 87; 4.3.19, 25, 31; 4.4.38, 54, 69, 92, 129 (where the omission of trumpets and drums in the stage direction looks like a simple

[1] Kane, p. 132.

failure by the compositor to complete the line), 174, 214, 228, 266?, 273, 297, 305, 328, 374; 5.1.10 ?, 26; 5.2.24; and 5.3.11, 142, 158, 226, 263.

Sometimes Q's compositor is correct and the F compositor wrong: at 2.1.54 the F compositor evidently read a crossed double 'l' in 'unwillingly' and produced 'vnwittingly'; and at 2.3.44, Q's 'Ensuing' is correct – F's 'Pursuing' is revealed to be an error by its preceding catchword: 'Ensuing'; and see Textual Note at 4.4.122, where F has 'intestine' for Q's 'intestate'.

The following groups illustrate characteristics that can reasonably be attributed to actors recalling their parts, although the possibility that such variants may be the work of the compositor can never be as demonstrably ruled out as at Q2, 4.2.69, where instead of 'two enemies', the compositor, setting from Q1, anticipated 'deep enemies' of the next line and set that. Although individual examples from these groups may be the work of a compositor (or scribe), the sheer quantity, crossing the work of two printing houses and three compositors, indicates another source – the actors. Anticipation (such as that in Q2 noted here), or repetition, inversion etc., are far, far rarer in the dependent quartos. These references are to the Textual Notes (where further examples within these scenes will be found).

ANTICIPATION
1.2.11, 104, 224; 1.3.77, 269, 328; 1.4.13, 114; 2.1.9, 32, 76; 2.2.40–1, 116; 2.3.6; 2.4.26; 3.2.24, 26; 3.7.33; 4.2.49–50 ?; 4.3.27; 4.4.34, 238, 266.

COLLOQUIAL SUBSTITUTION
2.3.1 (possibly of the actor's own form of greeting); 2.3.17; 4.3.35.

EXAGGERATION
Q's 'Ten thousand men', for F's 'A thousand men', 1.4.24, could easily be taken to be the kind of careless exaggeration typical of medieval scribes and in memorial reconstruction. Thus George Kane, *Piers Plowman: The A Version* (1960):

the most striking of the variations originating from the scribe's association of himself with what he copied are those designed to increase the emphasis of statements [. . .] Such variation took place because scribes were enthusiastic for the poem, and consciously or unconsciously, if sometimes without intelligence or taste, strained to participate in the experience that it recorded, as well as to contribute to its purpose.[1]

Kane gives many examples of numerical exaggeration: e.g., fifteen becoming four score (III. 38), and eleven becoming fifteen which, in turn, became thirty in different manuscripts at V. 141. However, here, editors regularly take F to be in error; Arden, for example, argues that F's 'thousand' is compositorial repetition of that word in the preceding line and that 'Ten' is logically correct: if there are a thousand wrecks there must be many more men to be gnawed upon – though that implies that dreams are

[1] Kane, pp. 138–9.

logical. F may not be someone's error, however, but Shakespeare's first thoughts and 'Ten thousand' his revision. What is plain is that such variants can be argued for and against, and supported and denied, in contrary ways. See also notes to 1.2.14; 1.3.41; 1.4.54, 179; 2.2.77, 78, 113; 4.2.121. But compare Q1's 'nearer' for F's 'nearest' at 4.4.375.

INCREASED ALLITERATION
1.4.242; 2.1.43; 2.2.8; 4.1.87.

INVERSION AND TRANSPOSITION
1.2.167–9; 1.3.109, 227 (possibly an authorial change), 287; 1.4.3, 136; 2.1.7; 2.2.6; 2.3.26; 2.4.20, 25; 3.1.167; 3.2.14; 3.3.15, 16; 3.4.26; 3.5.3, 48–9; 3.6.8; 3.7.54; 4.1.45; 4.2.23, 30–1, 78; 4.3.1, 2; 4.4.21, 29–31, 58, 62, 282–3, 292–5, 324–5, 417; 4.5.16–18; 5.3.38–41, 143–50.

OMISSION
1.1.101–2; 1.2.15–16, 23–4 ?, 154–5; 1.3.304, 315; 1.4.26–7, 34, 65–6, 99–100, 146–7, 231–2, 237–8; 2.1.1, 24–5, 64; 2.2.15–16, 87, 109; 2.3.9; 2.4.69; 3.1.169–72; 3.2.0 SD, 15; 3.3.13–14; 3.4.78–80, 103–4; 3.5.7, 100; 3.7.32, 92–3, 131; 4.1.1–2, 9; 4.2.1–2; 4.3.35; 4.4.22, 29–31, 48–9, 95–8, 141, 153, 164, 170, 171–2, 210–11, 260–1, 305, 317–18, 345–6 ?; 4.5.15; 5.3.4–5.

REPETITION
1.3.278; 1.4.133, 199; 2.2.66; 3.2.77; 3.5.23, 102; 3.7.216; 4.1.22–3 (of 1.1.84 and 103), 70 (of 1.2.25), 82 (of 58); 4.2.81–2 (of 3.1.186), 98; 4.4.106; 5.3.34, 159–60.

SIGNIFICANT ADDITIONS
3.3.1; 3.5.25; 3.7.200, 207; 4.2.98–117; see also 'Ensemble playing' below.

SUBSTITUTION (INCLUDING APPROXIMATION, PARAPHRASE, AND TELESCOPING)
Listings of Textual Notes and Collations are given at these references: 1.1.50; 1.2.26; 1.3.6; 1.4.3; 2.1.18; 2.2.7; 2.3.5; 2.4.1–2; 3.1.182; 3.2.5; 3.3.11; 3.4.1; 3.5.16; 3.6.6; 3.7.1; 4.1.10; 4.2.4; 4.3.4; 4.4.4; 4.5.2; 5.1.2; 5.2.11; 5.3.1.

WEAKENING
Only the clearest weakening changes are listed: many substitutions in the section above might be regarded as weaker than the words replaced: 1.2.25–6, 156; 1.3.5, 193; 1.4.191; 2.1.76, 101; 2.4.55; 3.7.219–20, 222; 4.4.229, 266.

The variety, quantity, and pervasiveness of these variants, found in the work of all three compositors, point to memorial reconstruction by the actors. That it was the various actors and not a single presiding genius, like John Bernard who recalled *The School for Scandal* in 1777 (see p. 12 below), is indicated by the wide variation in accuracy of those playing the different rôles.