Shakespeare in Print

A History and Chronology of Shakespeare Publishing

ANDREW MURPHY
University of St Andrews

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011–4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

http://www.cambridge.org

First published 2003

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Ehrhardt 11/13 pt. *System* LaTeX 2ε [TB]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Murphy, Andrew.
Shakespeare in print: a history and chronology of Shakespeare publishing / Andrew Murphy.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0 521 77104 8 (hardback)
1. Shakespeare, William, 1564–1616 – Criticism, Textual. 2. Early printed books –
Great Britain – Bibliography. 3. Shakespeare, William, 1564–1616 – Bibliography.
4. Shakespeare, William, 1564–1616 – Chronology. 5. Great Britain – Imprints.
6. English imprints. I. Title.
PR3071.M87 2003
822.3′3–dc21 2003046033

ISBN 0 521 77104 8 hardback

Contents

Introduction

The year 1864 marked the three-hundredth anniversary of Shakespeare's birth. Various schemes were proposed for celebrating the occasion. A committee was formed with the intention of commissioning a public statue of the playwright. The publishing trade journal, *The Bookseller*, poured scorn on the idea, accusing the committee members of empty pomposity: 'self-seeking', the journal complained, 'was their only motive; [the aim of] the proposal to raise a statue was, that the pedestal might be sufficiently large to convey their names to posterity'.[1] *The Bookseller* suggested an alternative form of tribute to the committee's vainglorious plan. 'It would not form a bad Shakespearian monument', the journal suggested, 'if a copy of all the editions of his works and comments upon them were collected and piled together.' 'A tribute of this kind', the journal noted, 'would be more rational than a senseless pillar or column of stone.'[2]

It is interesting to contemplate the manner in which *The Bookseller*'s imagined monument would have evolved century by century. In 1664, a column of Shakespeare editions would have been somewhat more than 150 volumes high. By 1764, something in the region of 500 books could have been heaped on top of each other. At the time of the three-hundredth anniversary, the number of volumes forming the column would already have been approaching the point where counting the individual texts would have been difficult, as editions proliferated at an unprecedented rate, in America as well as Britain, and, indeed, elsewhere throughout the world. By 1964, the exponentially multiplying building materials would have produced a monument rivalling that biblical 'tower, whose top may reach unto heaven'. And still there was no end in sight, despite the optimism of one textual scholar who, at the mid-point of the twentieth century, looked forward to the day when 'the accumulation [of bibliographical facts] will reach the limits of human endeavour and the fact-finding be exhausted'. When that day arrived, he predicted, 'the final capstone [could] be placed on Shakespearian scholarship and a text achieved that in the most minute details is as close as mortal man can come to the original truth'.[3] Such twentieth-century dreams

of an edition of Shakespeare so compellingly definitive that it would bring the editorial process to an end proved no more, indeed, than fantasy, and so still, uncapped, the tower of editions continues inexorably to rise. Like Bruegel's famous vision of Babel, Shakespeare's monument is destined to remain forever in an unfinishable state. When 2064 arrives, whole new strata of materials will have joined the accumulated tons of rag fibre, woodpulp and ink: plastic, silicon, magnetic media . . . who can say what else.

If the accumulated mass of Shakespeare editions is indeed a kind of Tower of Babel, then the aim of *Shakespeare in Print* is to chart a journey from the lowest floors to the unfinished heights. But the journey time available is relatively short, the building massive, and the rooms myriad. For these reasons, John Velz has described the business of writing a book such as this as an 'awesome task'.[4] Other scholars have, very sensibly, confined themselves to an individual room or two or to parts of particular floors. Thus, for instance, Margreta de Grazia, Peter Martin and Peter Seary have devoted entire books to the work of a single Shakespeare editor, and Simon Jarvis and Marcus Walsh have written about Shakespeare editing in extended periods of a single century.[5] Arthur Sherbo has produced a covey of books which, taken together, constitute a history of Shakespeare editing over a stretch of several decades.[6] At the risk of overloading a fanciful extended metaphor, it might be said that still other scholars have offered a non-stop elevator ride from the bottom of the tower to the top, providing snatched glimpses of each floor along the way. So, for example, a slightly breathless Paul Werstine presents a complete history of Shakespeare editing in a bravura thirty-page essay entitled 'William Shakespeare' in the MLA's *Scholarly Editing: A Guide to Research*, and Barbara Mowat attempts to cover the same general territory in about half that number of pages in a chapter contributed to Margreta de Grazia and Stanley Wells' *Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*. With a deal more space to spare in his masterful short monograph, *Shakespeare and the Book*, David Scott Kastan lingers lovingly on certain floors, but then shoots silently past others, attending most closely to material that holds for him a broader theoretical significance.

By contrast with the work of these scholars – which I find entirely admirable and to which (as will repeatedly be seen in the chapters that follow) I am enormously indebted – my own aim in this book is to offer, for the first time, an extended single volume study that covers the entire history of Shakespeare publishing century by century, and which treats every period in some detail. It is inevitable that this book – lengthy though it is – will itself miss much along the way. Doubtless there will be readers who will consider it an unforgivable omission that I have neglected to discuss some particular

edition, or that I have treated of another in a condensed and hurried manner. However, I hope that such readers may also feel that if – to lean again on my Bruegellian metaphor – I rush too quickly past particular rooms, or fail even to push open the door to many another, then, in compensation, I also attempt a considered exploration of certain areas where the settled dust of decades' neglect has seldom enough been disturbed by the tread of scholarly enquiry. So, for example: it is striking that so much recent scholarship on the history of Shakespeare publishing has concentrated exclusively on the eighteenth century (the work of de Grazia, Martin, Seary, Jarvis, Walsh and Sherbo referred to above is all concerned with this period). By contrast, very little sustained attention has been paid to Shakespeare publishing in the nineteenth century.[7] There is a certain irony in the fact that scholarly work has been oriented in this way, given that it was precisely in the nineteenth century that the Shakespeare text became – from a publishing point of view – a genuinely popular commodity, to be mass-produced, mass-marketed and mass-distributed. *Shakespeare in Print* attempts to redress such imbalances as this by devoting a roughly equal measure of attention to every phase of the extended history of Shakespeare publishing.

Setting out the scope of my project and its general parameters is relatively easy, defining its precise focus is a touch more difficult. An alert reader may already have noticed that, in this introduction, I have tended to slide back and forth between speaking of editing and of publishing, writing interchangeably of editions and of texts. As this duality indicates, the history of the reproduction of Shakespeare's texts could potentially be approached from two distinctive perspectives. What John Velz characterised as 'awesome' was, in fact, the 'task of writing a comprehensive history of the Shakespearean *editorial tradition*' (emphasis added) and one could indeed write a study of the history of the Shakespeare text which focused exclusively on the history of editing, on what the most important of Shakespeare's editors have done to the text century by century and how the general theory of editing has evolved over the course of this time period. But books, of course, are not just edited, they are also – as Jerome J. McGann, D. F. McKenzie and others have forcefully reminded us – *produced*.[8] They appear in different formats, in different quantities, in different places, aimed at different markets, under a variety of different circumstances. So: one could also write a study of the Shakespeare text that focused exclusively on the history of Shakespeare publishing, on how publishers have handled the text in different ways over time. I have, however, felt very strongly in writing this book that an exclusive focus either on editing or on publishing would not produce an adequate general history of the reproduction of Shakespeare's texts.

Editorial history has tended – certainly at least until very recently – to have a certain teleological cast to it.[9] Thus, the best Shakespeare editors are seen as being those who have helped to advance the theory of Shakespearean editing in some way, who have, we might say, stepped along the road that leads towards ever more advanced conceptions of the editorial project. This view of editing thus resonates with what S. M. Parrish has characterised as 'the Whig interpretation of literature'.[10] The eighteenth century provides a convenient example. From the point of view of editorial history, Shakespeare publishing in the eighteenth century is dominated by a succession of editors, running from Nicholas Rowe to Edmond Malone, and the achievements of each editor in turn can be weighed, to see how much of a contribution he has made to the development of the editorial tradition. The logic of this framework necessarily suggests that some editors merit far more attention than others and that some deserve hardly any attention at all. For instance, in 1743–4, Sir Thomas Hanmer, one time Speaker of the House of Commons, published an edition of Shakespeare's works with the university press at Oxford. Hanmer was not well versed in contemporary editing theory and, textually, his edition is decidedly undistinguished. Writing of his text in 1933, R. B. McKerrow observed that

> Hanmer seems to have known little and cared less about such matters as early editions or the language of Shakespeare's time, and attempted to reform the text by the light of nature alone, with the result that though his conjectural emendations are sometimes ingenious and seem at first sight attractive, the work as a whole can hardly be regarded as a serious contribution to Shakespearian scholarship.[11]

McKerrow's judgement is perfectly reasonable in the context of the terms of reference that he is applying here – the terms of reference, that is, of editorial history. But there is more – much more – to Hanmer's edition than McKerrow's dismissive assessment suggests. Hanmer's was the first English Shakespeare edition to be published outside the city of London and the first to be produced by a university press. It was also an enormous commercial success, quickly selling out its print run, and subsequently changing hands at an ever-increasing price as the years went by.[12] Furthermore, it enjoyed an extended afterlife, immediately spawning a range of other editions. The Tonson cartel, indignant at what they saw as an encroachment on their private property, reacted to the Oxford edition by appropriating the Hanmer text and reissuing it in a cheap octavo London edition in 1745. Hanmer's edition thus became part of the important larger-scale battle over copyright which raged during the course of the eighteenth century. Another

publisher – John Osborn – produced an duodecimo edition of the Hanmer text in 1747. The Tonson cartel bought up this edition too, and reissued it with a substitute title page. The pocket-sized volumes proved popular and so the cartel decided to reprint them in 1748, 1751 and 1760. In 1770–1, Oxford University Press itself issued a second edition of Hanmer's text and this too proved a commercial success. By 1892, one bookseller in London was offering the second Oxford Hanmer edition for 30*s*. at a time when he was selling a copy of Nicholas Rowe's 1709 text – described as a 'Very rare Edition' – for exactly one third of this price.[13]

A history of Shakespeare editing would very largely overlook Hanmer's edition. It would also pass over texts considered, in editorial terms, to be 'derivative', which is to say, editions that simply reproduce an existing text without further conscious editorial intervention. But, again, these texts have their own particular significance. To take a nineteenth-century instance: the London publisher John Dicks was prompted by the tercentenary of Shakespeare's birth to add his own few modest blocks to *The Bookseller*'s Shakespeare monument.[14] He issued individual plays at the price of two for a penny. It is not entirely clear what edition his texts were based on, but certainly they were derivative. Dicks shifted 150,000 play texts in this way. He then drew his individual texts together into a 2*s*.-collected volume and sold 50,000 copies of this edition. He next moved this collected text into paperback format and sold a staggering 700,000 further copies – in the space of about two years. These sales figures might be compared with the equivalent figures for high-profile editorially significant editions. The towering academic edition of the nineteenth century was the Clark and Wright text, produced as a joint venture by Macmillan's and Cambridge University Press, and issued at around the same time as Dicks' texts. Alexander Macmillan had initially thought to print just 750 copies of this edition. In the event, he increased the print run to 1,500 copies, but he did not think it a worthwhile investment to produce stereotype plates so that further issues could easily be released. Looking at these figures, we can see that in just two years Dicks' 2*s*. and 1*s*. editions sold, between them, 1,000 times the original projected print run of the most editorially significant edition of the nineteenth century. In 1864, *The Bookseller* predicted that texts of Shakespeare would 'be poured upon the country until every person has possessed himself of a copy'.[15] If *The Bookseller*'s prediction proved to be accurate, then the imprint carried by the flood of Shakespeares washing through the country was 500 times more likely to be that of the obscure John Dicks, rather than of the prestigious house of Macmillan or the Cambridge University Press.[16] Dicks' derivative text thus made an enormous contribution to the wide dissemination and

popularisation of Shakespeare's works, and yet his name finds no place in standard histories of the reproduction of the text.[17]

I am suggesting, then, that a thorough and useful account of the history of Shakespeare's texts cannot be written from the perspective of editorial history alone. But it is also true, of course, that an exclusive focus on publishing history would be equally unbalanced. For example: from a publishing point of view, Alexander Pope's 1723–5 edition was a dismal flop. It failed to attract a convincing number of subscribers – even Swift and Arbuthnot did not sign up for the set – and a significant portion of the edition remained unsold some four decades after publication, when outstanding stock was sold off at auction at around one tenth of the original price.[18] Quite a contrast, we might say, with Thomas Hanmer's edition. Yet no one who truly understands the history of Shakespeare publishing would suggest that Pope's edition lacks significance simply because it was a commercial failure. Pope systematised and regularised the text – especially the metre – in ways that persisted in the canon for decades, if not centuries. His edition provoked Lewis Theobald to write the first ever book devoted exclusively to Shakespearean editorial concerns: *Shakespeare Restor'd*. Additionally, he prompted Theobald to produce his own edition of the plays – an edition which, some would argue, helped significantly to lay the groundwork for much later textual work. Pope's edition is thus absolutely central to the early history of Shakespeare editing – and therefore to the general history of the Shakespeare text – even if his edition had little immediate commercial impact.

One might also make the point here that attempting to write an account of the Shakespeare text exclusively from the perspective of publishing history would be a very difficult task indeed, given the sheer volume of Shakespeare editions that have been issued over the course of the past four centuries. Anyone seeking to write a history of these texts needs some kind of stable navigation points – otherwise Shakespearean history would run the risk of becoming a record of just one damn text after another. This book takes as its fixed navigation points those editions which are consensually regarded as being textually significant – the editions, in other words, that any serious editor of Shakespeare would be expected to consult. But the book does not confine itself simply to travelling the shortest line between these beacon texts; it also attends to a broad range of other editions not normally covered in survey histories of the editorial tradition.

Shakespeare in Print, then, attempts to meld editing and publishing history, in order to produce as multifaceted an account of the history of the reproduction of the Shakespeare text as possible. As already indicated, the book discusses all of the editions that are commonly regarded as being textually

important and it gives some account of why these editions are considered to be significant. So, a reader working through this volume will discover that the 'editor' of the Second Folio retrieved Greek and Roman names and many foreign language phrases and bits of dialogue that had been lost in the First Folio; that Edward Capell was the first editor to build his own text from the ground up, instead of marking up a copy of his predecessor's edition; that Charles Knight valorised the First Folio texts over their Quarto counterparts; that the editors of the 1986 Oxford text privileged what they considered to be the most 'theatrical' versions of the plays. Such a reader will also be able to reconstruct, from this book, a general history of the evolution of Shakespearean editorial theory, from the work of the earliest anonymous quarto and folio 'editors', to Pope's aesthetically oriented reframing of the text, through Malone's insistence on the documentary and the authentic, on to the formulation of a would-be scientific approach (initially in the New Shakspere Society and then, more coherently, in the work of the New Bibliographers), thence to the impact on the editorial project of the evolution of social and poststructural conceptions of textuality and, finally, to the reshaping of editorial concerns in the light of the emergence of electronic modes of publishing.

In tandem with this focus on editors and editing *Shakespeare in Print* also attends closely to the wider context of Shakespeare publishing, examining peripheral, derivative and popular editions. So this book finds room to trace the history of eighteenth-century Scottish and Irish editions of Shakespeare and indicates why these editions are important; it maps out a history of cheap Shakespeare publishing in the nineteenth century; it logs the emergence of schools and expurgated editions. Just as a history of editors and editing is combined here with a history of the theory of editing, so I also attempt to combine the history of popular and peripheral editions with a certain element of general historical contextualisation of the business of producing texts. In covering the eighteenth century, for example, I try to place the emergence of opposing strands of Shakespeare publishing – metropolitan/Celtic, prestige/popular – in the context of battles over the exact legal status of Shakespeare's text and the dispute over the precise meaning of copyright. Likewise, publishing trends in the nineteenth century are discussed in the context of the broadening of the educational franchise and technological advances which very significantly reduced the cost of producing editions. In charting the rise of Shakespeare publishing and editing in America, I have tried to sketch some of the history of book collecting in the United States, since no serious editing work could be undertaken in America until the necessary materials had been accumulated in easily accessible libraries. Part of

the aim of this book, then, is to set the extended narrative of Shakespeare publishing within something of its greater historical and cultural contexts.

The book also attempts – where it can – to give some attention to the quotidian logistics of editing and publishing. *Shakespeare in Print* draws – in many instances for the first time – on a range of archival materials connected with the publication of particular editions. I have made use of the Macmillan archives at the British Library, the archives of Oxford and Cambridge university presses, the Routledge archives at the University of London Library, Edward Dowden's papers at Trinity College Dublin, the John Dover Wilson and David Nichol Smith papers at the National Library of Scotland, and many other manuscript sources. These materials provide an insight both into the intellectual formation of the edited text and into the logistics of bringing an edition to press and to the marketplace. For example, a series of letters exchanged between David Nichol Smith and W. W. Greg, coupled with the Oxford University Press Shakespeare files, serves neatly to indicate the shift in editorial conceptions which occurred in the opening decades of the twentieth century. Smith, increasingly influenced by the emergent New Bibliography, grew frustrated with the traditionalist Walter Raleigh, with whom he was trying to create a new edition for the Oxford press. Raleigh thought that the best new edition would simply present a corrected transcription of the First Folio, but Smith strongly disagreed. The intellectual tensions between the two scholars ultimately proved to be irresolvable and had the effect of sinking the project (at least as it was originally conceived). From a somewhat different perspective, Edward Dowden's papers help to remind us that even those editions that are driven by the best intellectual motives still have their commercial context, as Dowden – dismayed by the sales figures for his inaugural *Hamlet* volume – quickly withdrew from the general editorship of the *Arden Shakespeare*, on the grounds that the series was unlikely to enjoy much enduring success. In slightly more mundane terms, I have also drawn on archival materials to provide details of print runs and sales figures for some editions – for example, tracking the *Globe Shakespeare* through the Cambridge University Press prizing books (effectively the company's publication ledgers) to discover exactly how many copies of it were printed over a period of about half a century.

I have said that *Shakespeare in Print* attends to this kind of backstage logistical history *where it can* and the qualification is important to note here. The editors and publishers of editions of Shakespeare are legion. But few enough of them have left much of a trace behind. The extensive collection of Macmillan materials held at the British Library is very much the exception rather than the rule. Even this well-preserved archive is incomplete, as the

process used by the company in the nineteenth century for mechanically making copies of its outgoing correspondence was imperfect, with the result that some volumes of Macmillan letters held by the British Library now consist entirely of blank pages. The experience of having fastidious librarians deliver neatly bound blank books to one's desk in the rarefied atmosphere of the British Library manuscript reading room is not without its own peculiar surreal charm, but one cannot help registering a sense of genuine loss also. Other major archives are subject not to the whim of imperfect reproduction technologies, but to the pressing need that working publishing companies necessarily feel to save on storage space. In the case of one archive that I visited, many file covers indicated that the enclosed contents had been 'weeded', which is to say that documents had been removed and destroyed, in order to slim the files down. For some commercial publishers – notably corporate multimedia giants who inherit once venerable imprints like the small change of great legacies – the conservation of archives may seem a useless frivolity: why spend money to preserve the past if the past cannot be made to generate a speedy profit? Some other archives have survived in fragmentary form by chance, such as a Thomas Nelson ledger preserved in the Edinburgh University Library and an account book for the 1853–65 James Orchard Halliwell edition in the same collection (the latter acquired when the university bought a set of Halliwell materials that had originally been held by the Public Library of Penzance). Other archives have, like the Library of Alexandria, suffered at the hands of history itself: a call to one London publisher to enquire about materials relating to their nineteenth-century editions of Shakespeare was met with the response that all of their early records had been destroyed in the Blitz. The archival material presented here should, then, be treated with a certain degree of caution. This is the material – or some of it, at least – which happens to have survived. It may be difficult to say to what extent, exactly, it is representative of the culture of Shakespeare publishing more generally.

In addition to the archival limitations discussed in the previous paragraph, a further problem might also be noted here. John Sutherland has identified a tendency in certain forms of publishing history to concentrate on, as he has put it, 'picking the lowest apples' on the tree.[19] Sutherland's vivid metaphor indicates, as I take it, an overreadiness among some scholars to scavenge in archives for easily useful material and to leave behind the mass of other, less immediately accessible data. I must plead guilty here to being myself something of an archival scrumper. I have tended in many instances to look to archives for material which easily fits with the narrative line of this book, declining, in many cases, to ascend through dense branches of accounting

figures and convoluted reprint histories. The Routledge archives held at the University of London Library provide a nice indication of what some of these largely unclimbed documentary limbs might look like.[20] The library holds six of the company's late-nineteenth-century Publication Books. They cover the period 1850–1902, but they do not run in strict sequence – many volumes overlap in their periods of cover. A very wide range of Shakespeare entries is included: Hazlitt's, Knight's Pictorial, the *Shakspere Companion Histories*, Campbell's, the *Illustrated*, Staunton's, the Guinea, the Edition de Luxe, the Blackfriars, the Shilling, Routledge's, the Sir John Gilbert, the Mignon, the *Ariel*. Some of these texts were published in multiple editions; some were published in multiple issues; some were issued in multiple sizes and/or configurations; some were issued in parts. Complex lines of accounting and production figures run through the ledgers like a bubbling stream of black ink, and mapping a complete publication history of any one of these editions would be a major undertaking. Untangling such histories lies outside the scope of this present volume, so the more closely detailed data included in such archives remain – for now, at least – an underexplored resource (at least from a Shakespearean point of view).

I have set out the scope and objectives of *Shakespeare in Print* and I have also touched on some of the book's limitations. There are a further set of specific omissions that I would also like to register here. An early attempt to include a broad-brush history of translations of Shakespeare's texts into other languages proved to be unsatisfactory, as the topic is far too great and too complex to be treated in a useful way in a study of this kind. For instance, the earliest translation of Shakespeare into Italian would appear to be a set of three texts (*Othello*, *Macbeth* and *Coriolanus*), produced by Giustina Renier-Michiel, commencing in 1798. But Renier-Michiel's command of English was not particularly good, so her edition was effectively an Italian reworking of Pierre Le Tourneur's 1776 French edition of the plays. Various other editions followed Renier-Michiel's, but it was not until the middle of the nineteenth century that a satisfactory Italian translation of the plays was produced.[21] Given the complexity of such histories, I have limited myself here to discussing English-language texts. I should note, however, that I have also concentrated on charting the history of editions of Shakespeare published in Britain and Ireland and in the United States. But, of course, the production of English-language editions has not been confined to these locations, and the history of the publication of Shakespeare editions in, for example, Canada, Australia and the Indian sub-continent still remains to be unravelled.[22] I should also make clear that the focus of this book is on the printed text of Shakespeare's own plays. For this reason, theatrical

adaptations are very largely ignored and theatrical issues more generally are not much attended to either. I also have very little to say about illustrations, beyond commenting briefly on some of the very earliest illustrated texts and noting the fact that pictorial editions became much more economical to produce – and therefore became much more popular – in the nineteenth century. Illustration, like translation, is a very large-scale topic in its own right, a topic which would merit a complete study in itself.[23]

These are the aims and the general parameters of the main text of *Shakespeare in Print*. The text is supplemented by a chronological appendix which provides a listing of major editions from the Renaissance through to the beginning of the twenty-first century. A separate introduction is provided for this appendix, indicating the scope and rationale of the entries included in the listing. Each text included in the chronological appendix is assigned its own number and references to editions in the main body of the book are keyed to this numbering system. Such reference numbers are signalled by the symbol '§' in the main text of the book.

The names of Shakespeare's editors are legion; who now remembers H. Bellyse Baildon, Henry Ten Eyck Perry, N. Burton Paradise, Thomas M. Parrott or Virginia Gildersleeve? Or who remembers that George Santayana, Algernon Swinburne and George Saintsbury produced editions of Shakespeare texts, or that Sir Walter Scott and Lewis Carroll commenced work on Shakespeare editions which they never finished?[24] Editions of the playwright's work have been produced in every conceivable form and format, ranging from the 'Elephant folios' of Halliwell's 1853–65 edition to the miniature volumes of a William Pickering text, printed in 'Diamond Type', of which the *Dublin University Magazine* observed that it 'seems exclusively intended for sale in the kingdom of Lilliput, or for the benefit of opticians in general'.[25] The text has been edited and amended in a wide variety of different ways, from modern-spelling editions to old-spelling editions, to an edition of *Shaekspeer'z Hamlet*, being 'A Vurshon in Nue Speling, Edited Bie P. A. D. MacCarthy' and 'Publisht on Behaaf ov Dhe Simplified Speling Sosiëty bie Sur Iezak Pitman & Sunz, Ltd' in 1946.[26] Editions have ranged from the humble to the exalted, from Thomas Johnson's cheap pocket-book texts, clandestinely exported from the Netherlands into England at the beginning of the eighteenth century, to 'the finest edition of *Hamlet*, I dare to say, in the world', specially edited by John Dover Wilson for the German millionaire Count Harry Kessler, with illustrations by Edward Gordon Craig, seven copies being printed on vellum, 'fifteen on imperial Japanese paper, and three hundred on hand-made paper'.[27] Editions have been issued by

university presses and by fly-by-night publishers; Mills and Boon – best known in the UK for sentimental romances – once issued an illustrated text of *Henry V*, edited by C. R. Gilbert, Rector of Seagrave.[28] The texts have been turned into comic books and the BBC once considered providing the petrol company Exxon with cut-price copies of the plays to give away to its customers.[29] So many widely distributed editions were available at the close of the twentieth century that, in 1992, the Open University in the UK issued a volume entitled *Which Shakespeare? A User's Guide to Editions*.[30] It would be impossible to cover all of this rich history in detail in a single-volume study such as this. I do hope, however, that enough of the story is told here to make the journey to the top of the Shakespearean Tower of Babel seem worth the effort of the climb.

Chronological appendix

Explanatory note

2° – folio	8° – octavo	16° – sextodecimo
4° – quarto	12° – duodecimo	24° – vicesimoquarto

Ff – folios
Qq – quartos

Where the individual entries are annotated, the annotation is preceded by a bullet point (•)

Open bullet points (◦) are used to indicate editions which appear to be ghost entries in Jaggard's *Bibliography*.

Year	*Title and details*	*No.*
No date	Locrine (apocryphal) Q0 • This text – if it existed – does not survive. It is presumed to exist on the basis of Q1's advertising itself as 'Newly set foorth, ouerseene and corrected'.	1
No date	1 Henry IV Q0 • Only a fragment consisting of a single sheet of four leaves survives of this edition.	2
1593	Venus and Adonis 1 [Signed 'William Shakespeare' in dedication. London: Richard Field. 4°]	3
1594	2 Henry VI (variant) Q1 *The first part of the contention betwixt the two famous houses of Yorke and Lancaster, with the death of the good Duke Humphrey: And the banishment and death of the Duke of Suffolke, and the tragicall end of the proud Cardinall of Winchester, with the notable rebellion of Iacke Cade: And the Duke of Yorkes first claime vnto the crowne.* [Anon. London: by Thomas Creed, for Thomas Millington]	4
	Lucrece 1 *Lvcrece.* [Signed 'William Shakespeare' in dedication. London: by Richard Field, for Iohn Harrison. 4°]	5

Titus Andronicus Q1 6

The most lamentable Romaine tragedie of Titus Andronicus: As it was plaide by the right honourable the Earle of Darbie, Earle of Pembrooke, and Earle of Sussex their seruants.

[Anon. London: by Iohn Danter, and are to be sold by Edward White & Thomas Millington]

Venus and Adonis 2 7

Venvs and Adonis.

[Dedication signed William Shakespeare. London: by Richard Field. 4°]

1595 3 Henry VI (variant) O1 [octavo] 8

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 Lancaster and Yorke, as it was sundrie times acted by the Right Honourable the Earle of Pembrooke his seruants.

[Anon. London: by P. S. for Thomas Millington; P. S. is Peter Short]

Locrine (apocryphal) Q 9

The lamentable tragedie of Locrine, the eldest sonne of King Brutus, discoursing the warres of the Britaines, and Hunnes, with their discomfiture: The Britaines victorie with their accidents, and the death of Albanact. No lesse pleasant then profitable. Newly set foorth, ouerseene and corrected.

['By W. S.' London: by Thomas Creede]

1595 (?) Venus and Adonis 3 10

• Surviving copy (STC 22356, Folger – STC number is also shelfmark number) lacks quire A.

[STC suggests R. Field for J. Harrison, 1595. 8°]

1596 Edward III Q1 11

The raigne of King Edward the third: As it hath bin sundrie times plaied about the Citie of London.

[Anon. London: Printed for Cuthbert Burby]

Venus and Adonis 4 12

Venvs and Adonis.

[Dedication signed William Shakespeare. London: by R. F. for Iohn Harison; R. F. is Richard Field. 8°]

1597 Richard II Q1 13

The tragedie of King Richard the second. As it hath beene publikely acted by the right honourable the Lorde Chamberlaine his seruants.

[Anon. London: by Valentine Simmes for Androw {sic} Wise]

Richard III (variant) Q1 14

The tragedy of King Richard the third. Containing, his treacherous plots against his brother Clarence: the pittiefull murther of his iunocent [sic] *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 Chamberlaine his seruants.*

• Greg suggests in *Editorial* (p. 87, n. 4) that only sheets A to G were printed by Simmes, the remainder probably being printed by Peter Short.

[Anon. London: by Valentine Sims, for Andrew Wise]

Romeo and Juliet (variant) (SQ) Q1 15

An excellent conceited tragedie of Romeo and Iuliet. As it hath been often (with great applause) plaid publiquely, by the right honourable the L. of Hunsdon his seruants.

• Danter printed quires A-D only. The remainder was printed by Edward Allde.

[Anon. London: Printed by Iohn Danter]

1597 (?) Love's Labour's Lost Q0 16

• This text – if it existed – does not survive. It is presumed to exist on the basis of Q1's advertising itself as 'Newly corrected and augmented'. Freeman and Grinke, in 'Four New Shakespeare Quartos?' (p. 18) have noted an entry in a manuscript catalogue of the (now largely lost) Viscount Conway library which lists an edition of *Love's Labour's Lost*, giving a date of 1597.

1598 1 Henry IV Q1 17

The history of Henrie the fovrth; With the battell at Shrewsburie, betweene the King and Lord Henry Percy, surnamed Henrie Hotspur of the north. With the humorous conceits of Sir Iohn Falstalffe [sic].

See §2 above for another early edition, only a fragment of which survives.

[Anon. London: by P. S. for Andrew Wise; P. S. is Peter Short]

Love's Labour's Lost Q1 18

A pleasant conceited comedie called, loues labors lost. As it was presented before her highnes this last Christmas. Newly corrected and augmented By W. Shakespere.

• Capitalisation of 'By' in attribution of authorship is retained here, but it should be noted that the attribution itself is a separate line, printed in italics.

['By W. Shakespere', as above. London: by W. W. for Cutbert Burby; W. W. is William White]

Lucrece 2 19

Lvcrece.

[Dedication signed William Shakespeare. London: by P. S. for Iohn Harrison; P. S is Peter Short. 8°]

Richard II Q2 20

The tragedie of King Richard the second. As it hath beene publikely acted by the right honourable the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants.

['By William Shake-speare'. London: by Valentine Simmes for Andrew Wise]

Richard II Q3 21

The tragedie of King Richard the second. As it hath beene publikely acted by the right honourable the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants.

['By William Shake-speare'. London: by Valentine Simmes, for Andrew Wise]

Richard III (variant) Q2 22

The tragedie of King Richard the third. Conteining his treacherous plots against his brother Clarence: the pitiful murther of his innocent 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 Chamberlaine his seruants.

['By William Shake-speare'. London: by Thomas Creede, for Andrew Wise]

1599 (?) Passionate Pilgrim 1 23

• Surviving copy (STC 22341.5, held at the Folger and shelfmarked as STC 22342) lacks title page. STC suggests 1599 as publication date. Appears to predate 1599 edition listed below.

[No indication of authorship. STC suggests London: T. Judson for W. Jaggard. 8°]

1599 Edward III Q2 24

The raigne of King Edward the third. As it hath bene sundry times played about the Citie of London.

[Anon. London: by Simon Stafford, for Cuthbert Burby]

1 Henry IV Q2 25

The history of Henrie the fovrth; with the battell at Shrewsburie, betweene the king and Lord Henry Percy, surnamed Henry Hotspur of the north. With the humorous conceits of Sir Iohn Falstalffe [sic]. *Newly corrected by W. Shake-speare.*

['by W. Shakespeare', as above. London: by S. S. for Andrew Wise; S. S. is Simon Stafford]

Passionate Pilgrim 2 26

['By W. Shakespeare'. London: for W. Iaggard and are to be sold by W. Leake. 8°]

Romeo and Juliet (LQ1) Q2 27

The most excellent and lamentable tragedie, of Romeo and Iuliet. Newly corrected, augmented, and amended: As it hath bene sundry times publiquely acted, by the right honourable the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants.

[Anon. London: by Thomas Creede, for Cuthbert Burby]

Venus and Adonis 5, 5a 28 (neuer), 29 (& neuer)

Venvs and Adonis.

• Two editions in this year, with minor variations on title page. One has A2r catchword 'neuer', the other '& neuer'. The former edition printed by Peter Short; the latter by R. Bradock. Farr, in 'Shakespeare's' (p. 229), suggests that Bradock printed from the Short edition.

[Dedication signed William Shakespeare. London: for William Leake. 8°]

1600 2 Henry IV Q1, Q1a 30, 31 (with new sheet)

The second part of Henrie the fourth, continuing to his death, and coronation of Henrie the fift. With the humours of Sir Iohn Falstaffe, and swaggering Pistoll. As it hath been sundrie times publikely acted by the right honourable, the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants.

• In a second issue in the same year gatherings E3–4 are cancelled and replaced with a complete sheet of four leaves to make good the omission of a passage corresponding to III.i.

['Written by William Shakespeare'. London: by V. S. for Andrew Wise and William Aspley; V. S. is Valentine Simmes]

Henry V (variant) Q1 32

The cronicle history of Henry the fift, with his battell fought at Agin Court in France. Togither with Auntient Pistoll. As it hath bene sundry times playd by the right honorable the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants.

[Anon. London: by Thomas Creede, for Tho. Millington and Iohn Busby]

2 Henry VI (variant) Q2 33

The first part of the contention betwixt the two famous houses of Yorke and Lancaster, with the death of the good Duke Humphrey: And the banishment and death of the Duke of Suffolke, and the tragical end of the prowd Cardinall of Winchester, with the notable rebellion of Iacke Cade: And the Duke of Yorkes first clayme to the crowne.

[Anon. London: by Valentine Simmes for Thomas Millington]

[1600] 3 Henry VI (variant) Q , ed 2 34

The true tragedie of Richarde Duke of Yorke, and the death of good King Henrie the sixt: With the whole contention betweene the two houses, Lancaster and Yorke; as it was sundry times acted by the right honourable the Earle of Pembrooke his seruantes.

[Anon. London: by W. W. for Thomas Millington. W. W. is William White]

Lucrece 3, 3a 35 (London,), 36 (London.)

Lvcrece

• Two issues in the same year, one with 'London,' instead of 'London.' on title page. In the latter E3 is incorrectly signed B3. Farr, 'Shakespeare's' (p. 248) suggests that the 'London.' edition was printed from the 'London,'.

[Dedication signed William Shakespeare. London: by I. H. for Iohn Harison; I. H. is John Harrison III, publisher is John Harrison I. 8°]

Merchant of Venice Q1 37

The most excellent historie of the merchant of Venice. With the extreame crueltie of Shylocke the Iewe towards the sayd merchant, in cutting a iust pound of his flesh: And the obtayning of Portia by the choyse of three chests. As it hath beene diuers times acted by the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants.

['Written by William Shakespeare'. London: by I. R. for Thomas Heyes; I. R. is James Roberts]

Merchant of Venice Q2 –

• 1619 quarto falsely dated for this year – see entry under 1619 below.

Midsummer Night's Dream Q1 38

A midsommer nights dreame. As it hath beene sundry times publickely acted, by the right honourable, the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants.

['Written by William Shakespeare'. London: for Thomas Fisher; printer was probably Richard Bradock]

Midsummer Night's Dream Q2 –

• 1619 quarto falsely dated for this year – see entry under 1619 below.

Much Ado About Nothing Q 39

Much adoe about nothing. As it hath been sundrie times publikely acted by the right honourable, the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants.

['Written by William Shakespeare'. London: by V. S. for Andrew Wise, and William Aspley; V. S. is Valentine Simmes]

1 Sir John Oldcastle (apocryphal) Q1 40

The first part of the true and honorable historie, of the life of Sir John Old-castle, the good Lord Cobham. As it hath been lately acted by the right honorable the Earle of Notingham Lord High Admirall of England his seruants.

[Anon. London: by V. S. for Thomas Pauier; V. S. is Valentine Simmes]

1 Sir John Oldcastle (apocryphal) Q2 –

• 1619 quarto falsely dated for this year – see entry under 1619 below.

Titus Andronicus Q2 41

The most lamentable Romaine tragedie of Titus Andronicus. As it hath sundry times beene playde by the right honourable the Earle of Pembrooke, the Earle of Darbie, the Earle of Sussex, and the Lorde Chamberlaine theyr seruants.

[Anon. London: by I. R. for Edward White; I. R. is James Roberts]

1601 [The Phoenix and the Turtle 1] 42

Loves martyr or, Rosalins complaint. Allegorically shadowing the truth of loue, in the constant fate of the phœnix and turtle. A poeme enterlaced with much varietie and raritie; now first translated out of the venerable Italian Torquato Cœliano, by Robert Chester. With the true legend of famous King Arthur, the last of the nine worthies, being the first essay of a new Brytish poet: collected out of diuerse authenticall records. To these are added some new compositions, of seuerall moderne writers whose names are subscribed to their seuerall workes, vpon the first subiect: viz. the phœnix and turtle.

[Poem is signed 'William Shake-speare'. London: for E. B.; E. B. is Edward Blount. 4°]

1602 Henry V (variant) Q2 43

The chronicle history of Henry the fift, with his battell fought at Agin Court in France. Together with Auntient Pistoll. As it hath bene sundry times playd by the right honorable the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants.

[Anon. London: by Thomas Creede, for Thomas Pauier]

Merry Wives of Windsor (variant) Q1 44

A most pleasaunt and excellent conceited comedie, of Syr Iohn Falstaffe, and the merrie wiues of Windsor. Entermixed with sundrie variable and pleasing humors, of Syr Hugh the Welch knight, Iustice Shallow, and his wise cousin M. Slender. With the swaggering vaine of Auncient Pistoll, and Corporall Nym. By William Shakespeare.

As it hath bene diuers times acted by the right honorable my Lord Chamberlaines seruants. Both before her maiestie, and else-where.

['By William Shakespeare', as above. London: by T. C. for Arthur Iohnson; T. C. is Thomas Creede]

Richard III (variant) Q3 45

The tragedie of King Richard the third. Conteining his treacherous plots against his brother Clarence: The pittifull murther of his innocent nephewes: His tyrannicall vsurpation: With the whole course of his detested life, and most deserued death. As it hath bene lately acted by the right honourable the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants. Newly augmented, By William Shakespeare.

• Capitalisation of 'By' in attribution of authorship is retained here, but it should be noted that the attribution itself is a separate line, with 'William Shakespeare' in italics.

['By William Shakespeare', as above. London: by Thomas Creede, for Andrew Wise]

Thomas Lord Cromwell (apocryphal) Q1 46

The true chronicle historie of the whole life and death of Thomas Lord Cromwell. As it hath beene sundrie times publikely acted by the right honorable the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants.

['Written by W. S.' London: for William Iones; printer is Richard Read]

Venus and Adonis 7, 8, 9 –

Venvs and Adonis.

• Three texts of the poem bear the date 1602 on their title pages, but STC suggests that the dates are incorrect. The editions are distinguishable by minor variations on the title pages and, in one instance, by a catchword variation (noted in individual entries). See entries under 1607 (?), 1608 (?) and 1610 (?). For an account of these editions, see Farr, 'Shakespeare's'.

1602 (?) Venus and Adonis 6 47

• Surviving copy (STC 22359, Bodleian – shelfmark Arch.Gg.4(2)) lacks title page. Handwritten title page gives 'London. Printed by I.H. for Iohn Harison', but this simply copies the imprint of an edition of *Lucrece* bound in the same volume. On the basis of the printer's ornaments, Farr, 'Shakespeare's' (p. 229) suggests that the printer was R. Bradock.

[Dedication signed William Shakespeare. STC speculates R. Bradock for W. Leake. 8°]

1603 Hamlet (variant) (SQ) Q1 48

The tragicall historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke by William Shake-speare. As it hath beene diuerse times acted by his highnesse

seruants in the Cittie of London: As also in the two vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxford, and else-where.

['By William Shake-speare', as above. London: for N. L. and John Trundell; N. L. is Nicholas Ling; printer is Valentine Simmes.]

1604 1 Henry IV Q3 49

The history of Henrie the fourth, with the battell at Shrewsburie, betweene the king, and Lord Henry Percy, surnamed Henry Hotspur of the north. With the humorous conceits of Sir Iohn Falstalffe [sic]. *Newly corrected by W. Shake-speare.*

• 'Newly corrected by W. Shake-speare' printed together on a separate line, with Shakespeare's name italicised.

['by W. Shake-speare', as above. London: by Valentine Simmes, for Mathew Law]

1604/5 Hamlet (LQ1, LQ1a) Q2, Q2a 50 (1604), 51 (1605)

The tragicall historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke. By William Shakespeare. Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much againe as it was, according to the true and perfect coppie.

• One state of the title page gives the date as 1604, this was subsequently revised to 1605.

['By William Shakespeare', as above. London: by I. R. for N. L.; I. R. is James Roberts; N. L. is Nicholas Ling]

1605 London Prodigal (apocryphal) Q 52

The London prodigall. As it was plaide by the kings maiesties seruants.

['By William Shakespeare'. London: by T. C. for Nathaniel Butter; T. C. is Thomas Creede]

Richard III (variant) Q4 53

The tragedie of King Richard the third. Conteining his treacherous plots against his brother Clarence: The pittifull murther of his innocent nephewes: His tyrannicall vsurpation: With the whole course of his detested life, and most deserued death. As it hath bin lately acted by the right honourable the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants. Newly augmented, By William Shake-speare.

• Capitalisation of 'By' in attribution of authorship is retained here, but it should be noted that the attribution itself is a separate line, with Shakespeare's name italicised.

['By William Shake-speare', as above. London: by Thomas Creede, and are to be sold by Mathew Lawe]

1607 Lucrece 4 54

Lvcrece.

[Dedication signed William Shakespeare. London: by N. O. for Iohn Harison; N.O. is Nicholas Okes. 8°]

The Puritan (apocryphal) Q 55

The pvritaine or the widdow of Watling-streete. Acted by the Children of Paules.

['Written by W. S.'. London: by G. Eld]

1607 (?) Venus and Adonis 7 56

• Imprint gives 1602. See unnumbered 1602 entry above. A2r catchword is 'and'.

[Dedication signed William Shakespeare. London: for William Leake. STC suggests printer R. Raworth and date 1607. 8°]

1608 1 Henry IV Q4 57

The history of Henry the fourth, with the battell at Shrewseburie, betweene the king, and Lord Henry Percy, surnamed Henry Hotspur of the north. With the humorous conceites of Sir Iohn Falstalffe [sic]. *Newly corrected by W. Shake-speare.*

• 'Newly corrected by W. Shake-speare' printed together on a separate line and italicised.

['by W. Shake-speare', as above. London: for Mathew Law]

Henry V (variant) Q3 –

• Falsely dated quarto issued in 1619 – see entry for 1619 below.

King Lear Q1 58

M. William Shak-speare: His true chronicle historie of the life and death of King Lear and his three daughters. With the vnfortunate life of Edgar, sonne and heire to the Earle of Gloster, and his sullen and assumed humor of Tom of Bedlam: As it was played before the kings maiestie at Whitehall vpon S. Stephans night in Christmas hollidayes. By his maiesties seruants playing vsually at the Gloabe on Bancke-side.

['M. William Shak-speare', as above. London: for Nathaniel Butter; printer is Nicholas Okes]

King Lear Q2 –

• Falsely dated quarto issued in 1619 – see entry for 1619 below.

Richard II Q4, Q4a 59, 60 (additional scene)

The tragedie of King Richard the second. As it hath been publikely acted by the right honourable the Lord Chamberlaine his seruantes.

Variant title:

The tragedie of King Richard the second: With new additions of the parliament sceane, and the deposing of King Richard. As it hath been lately acted by the kinges maiesties seruantes, at the Globe.