

STUDIES IN BIBLIOGRAPHY

PAPERS OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

EDITED BY

FREDSON BOWERS

L. A. BEAURLINE, *Associate Editor*



Volume Twenty-Four

Published for

THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

THE UNIVERSITY PRESS OF VIRGINIA, CHARLOTTESVILLE

1971

Copyright © 1971 by the Bibliographical Society of the
University of Virginia

Virginia. University. Bibliographical Society.

Studies in bibliography; papers v.1—
1948/49—
Charlottesville.
v. illus. 26cm. annual.

Title varies; 1948/49, Papers.

1. Bibliography—Societies. I. Title.

Z1008.V55

010.6275549-3353 Rev*

Contents

	PAGE
John Payne Collier's Great Forgery. BY GILES E. DAWSON	1
The Bibliographical Description of Paper. BY G. THOMAS TANSALLE	27
<i>Cupids Revenge</i> (Q ₁) and Its Compositors. Part I: Composition and Printing. BY HANS WALTER GABLER	69
Printing Charges: Inference and Evidence. BY KEITH I. D. MASLEN .	91
Woozles in Brontëland: A Cautionary Tale. BY JOAN STEVENS . . .	99
William Gilmore Simms and <i>The Family Companion</i> . BY ROBERT A. REES and MARJORIE GRIFFIN	109
The "Raleigh Group" in <i>The Phoenix Nest</i> . BY MICHAEL RUDICK . .	131
John Beale's Compositors in <i>A King and No King</i> Q ₁ (1619). BY HANS WALTER GABLER	138
The Printing of James Shirley's <i>The Polititian</i> (1655). BY ROBERT J. FEHRENBACH	144
A New Light on the Dramatic Works of Thomas Killigrew. BY ALBERT WERTHEIM	149
Arthur Maynwaring, Richard Steele, and <i>The Lives of Two Illustrious Generals</i> . BY HENRY L. SNYDER	152
John Oldmixon and <i>An Impartial Enquiry</i> (1715). BY PAT ROGERS	163
Pope in Russian Translations of the Eighteenth Century. BY LEONID M. ARINSHTIEN	166
The Composition and Revision of Coleridge's Essay on Aeschylus' <i>Prometheus</i> . BY S. W. REID	176
Some Sources of the Essays in Robert Walsh's <i>Didactics</i> . BY GUY WOODALL	184

CONTENTS

Emerson's Annotations in the British Museum Copy of the <i>Dial</i> . BY BURTON R. POLLIN	187
"Bartleby the Scrivener" and Melville's Contemporary Reputation. BY GEORGE MONTEIRO	195
Dating Whitman's Early Notebooks. BY FLOYD STOVALL	197
Mechanized Textual Collation and Recent Designs. BY GORDON LINDSTRAND	204
Check List of Bibliographical Scholarship for 1969. BY HOWELL J. HEANEY and DEREK A. CLARKE	215
Notes on Contributors	235
Society Announcements and Publications	237

Cupids Revenge (Q1) and its Compositors

Part I: Composition and Printing

by

HANS WALTER GABLER

THE FIRST QUARTO (1615) OF BEAUMONT AND FLETCHER'S *Cupids Revenge* is the only text of the play with claim to authority. But the extent of its reliability is less than assured. Because of the singular position of Q₁ in the textual tradition, its degree of authority can be inferred only from a close bibliographical analysis of the quarto itself. Such an analysis is the purpose of this paper. Its intention is to provide the bibliographical evidence to which the editorial decision for a critical text can be referred.¹ Its concern is therefore not so much with the text as with the securing and testing of that evidence. The printing process has been investigated, and the data that shed light on it, such as the arrangement of the text on certain pages, or the stages of compositorial work as they are recognizable from the use and re-use of type, were considered in great detail. The working habits of compositors were distinguished. The analysis of the quarto of *Cupids Revenge* was at all critical stages controlled by reference to the closely parallel conditions of composition and printing in a second dramatic quarto, that of Wentworth Smith's *Hector of Germany*. Thus, the matter that is here most immediately presented for its relevance to the printed text of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Cupids Revenge*, is, in more general terms, also a contribution to the study of printing in an early seventeenth-century London printing-house.

On April 24, 1615, the two plays were entered in the Stationers'

1. The definitive edition of *Cupids Revenge* is that of Fredson Bowers in the forthcoming second volume of *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, (1966 —) which I have had the

opportunity of consulting in proof on completion of my own independent investigations. To Fredson Bowers I am deeply grateful for his advice and guidance during eighteen months of 'bibliographical apprenticeship.'

Register for Josias Harrison.² *Cupids Revenge* was written before 1612. It was acted at Court in January, 1612, and again in January, 1613, by the 'Children of her Maiesties Reuels,' i.e. the second Children of the Queen's Revels who existed between 1610 and 1616.³ *The Hector of Germany, or The Palsgrave*, a thoroughly fictional history play, was probably written in 1613, in connection with the marriage of Frederick V, Elector of the Rhenish Palatinate (i.e. a 'Palsgraue'), to Princess Elizabeth of England, and, as the title-page and the Prologue testify, it was acted on the stages of the Red Bull and the Curtain by a group of young amateur players.⁴ Josias Harrison handed both plays over for printing to Thomas Creede. Both appeared in quarto⁵ and with the date 1615, so that it can be assumed that they were produced at the

2. How and why he should have acquired them in 1615 is not documented. The printed versions of both plays, although hardly based on the actual prompt-books, show definite signs of mark-up for the theatre. Harrison's copy of *Cupids Revenge*, at least, is therefore likely to have originated from the company. (The complex question of copy for *Cupids Revenge* is exhaustively discussed in Bowers, Textual Introduction, pp. 321 ff.) We know that after the Children of the Queen's Revels had amalgamated first with the Lady Elizabeth's players in 1613 and 1614, and then, in 1615, also with the Prince Charles's Men (see Chambers, *ES*, II, 60; 244; and especially Bowers, p. 331, for the probable connection of these facts with Harrison's acquisition of the play), it was Philip Henslowe who was their 'manager' and who would therefore have been the likely person for the publisher to deal with in securing his copy. As for *Hector*, the wording of Smith's dedication of the play to Sir John Swinnerton seems to suggest that the author himself had been anxious to get it printed. It is not improbable that Henslowe, again, may have acted as Smith's agent in his efforts to find a publisher. Smith knew Henslowe, since he had formerly collaborated a good deal on plays for the Admiral's Men. He might in this instance even have tried to interest one or the other of Henslowe's companies in his play. For, as it happens, the Admiral's Men were now the Elector Palatine's Men. Smith, in his dedication,

praises the players who gave *Hector* its world premiere. But, if we are to believe the title-page, he has also written "new Additions"; and what he may really have desired when approaching Henslowe may have been to get the play performed by the professional actors of one or the other of the troupes of those patrons whose marriage he had been inspired to celebrate by writing his less than masterful history play. Perhaps all Henslowe could do for him, however, was to suggest publication. But these guesses cannot be substantiated and are only put forward here in an attempt to probe the possibilities of a common source for Josias Harrison's copies for the two plays which he may well have acquired as a pair, since he also secured the rights for them and published them together.

3. See Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage* (1923), II, 23; 59-61; Harbage/Schoenbaum, *Annals* (rev. ed., 1964, and *Supplement*, 1966); and Bowers, "Textual Introduction", p. 331.

4. See further the "Introduction" to L. W. Payne, Jr. (ed.), *The Hector of Germanie . . .*, by Wentworth Smith. Publ. of the University of Pennsylvania, Series Philology and Literature, Vol. XI (1906).

5. *Cupids Revenge*: A2 B-L4 (L4 blank); *Hector*: A-H4 I2 (cancel title-leaf printed on I2); Greg, *Bibliography*, nos. 328 and 329.

printing-shop under similar working conditions and within a short time of each other.⁶

Cupids Revenge was set by two compositors, a Compositor X and a Compositor Y. The division of their work on the quarto⁷ can be determined as follows:

X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
B1-C2 ^v ;	C3-D2 ^v ;	D3-E2 ^v ;	E3-E4 ^v ;	F1-F2 ^v ;	F3-G1;	G1 ^v -G2;	G2 ^v -G4 ^v ;
	X		Y	X		Y	X
H1-H2 ^v ,	line 14;	H2 ^v ,	line 15-H3 ^v ;	H4;	H4 ^v -I2 ^v ,	line 14;	I2 ^v ,
	Y	X	X				
15-K4;	K4 ^v ;	L1-L3 ^v ;	title-page + A2.				

Compositor X set the title-page, 48 pages and two half-pages, Compositor Y set 29 pages and two half-pages of *Cupids Revenge*.

The basic spelling tests for the identification of compositors X and Y in *Cupids Revenge* prove to be equally useful when applied to the quarto of *Hector*. They enable clear-cut attributions for a majority of its pages, and corollary evidence obtainable from the special word-material of this play (such as variations in its speech-prefixes, e.g. *Clynton* vs. *Clinton*, etc.) establishes fully its similar compositorial pattern:

X		Y		X		Y		X		Y
A1 (first title);	A2 (dedication);	A2 ^v (Prologue);	A3-B2 ^v ;	B3-C2 ^v ;	C3;					
X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y	
C3 ^v ;	C4-D1 ^v ;	D2;	D2 ^v ;	D3-E2 ^v ;	E3-E3 ^v ;	E4;	E4 ^v -F2 ^v ;	F3-G2 ^v ;	G3-I1 ^v ;	
	Y									

second title.

Compositor X set the original title-page and 28 pages, Compositor Y set 36 pages and the cancel title-page of *The Hector of Germany*.

While there are irregularities in each case, some of which will call for explanation and interpretation, it seems safe to say that the general pattern represents a procedure of non-simultaneous *seriatim* composition, with the take-over of one compositor from the other ideally at §3, or the beginning of the second half, of each gathering. Thus, according

6. In "Thomas Creede's Pica Roman", *SB*, XXIII (1970), 148-153, W. Craig Ferguson asserts that *Hector* (STC 22871) was set in Thomas Creede's fount no. 6 of pica roman which came into use in his shop in 1613. From the demonstrably close links

between the quartos there can be no doubt that the same type was used for *Cupids Revenge*.

7. The evidence necessary to secure the division is summarized in Bowers, "Textual Introduction", pp. 317-321.

to what seems to have been their basic work plan, each compositor set the second half of one, followed by the first half of the next sheet. When one finished his stint, his partner was ready to proceed from the fifth page of text of the sheet in hand, having had ample time since ending composition at the bottom of page four of the previous gathering to fulfill the auxiliary duties required of him during the printing process, and to distribute type. Performed in each case by one compositor while the other was setting type, these tasks would not influence the progress of composition and printing of the text. Collaboration was thus apparently aimed at largely cutting out the 'non-productive' phases of compositorial work, allowing only the time of composition itself to count in the compositor:press relationship. It was therefore also limited, so it seems, to sections of a quarto where efficient distribution would directly affect the continuity of composition. At the beginning of a quarto, however, where work presumably started from a full case of type, and at the end, where a case could be allowed to run low, there was no immediate need for distribution, and, therefore, apparently also no need for two compositors. Thus, we find Compositor X alone setting a whole gathering and a half at the beginning of *Cupids Revenge*, and both X and Y are seen, at the end of *Cupids Revenge* and *Hector*, to compose on their own stretches of text considerably longer than the usual two consecutive half-gatherings.

But where collaboration was in effect, it allowed for great flexibility. Composing by two consecutive half-gatherings meant, in terms of the printing, a division by half-formes. Two of a compositor's four pages went into the inner, two into the outer forme of a sheet. Consequently, just two pages of wrought-off type at a time would be returned to him for distribution. Theoretically, and perhaps ideally, he would find four pages of type waiting to be distributed when he finished a stint of composition, and he received another four pages and distributed them, too, before beginning a new stint. This ideal situation may, of course, in practice never have occurred. Instead, what was of practical importance was that each two pages of type distributed replenished a compositor's case just sufficiently to allow him, in an emergency, to step in and resume composition early, and at short notice. The compositors were thus not strictly bound to work-units of the size they had set out to compose in — they would have been much more so bound had they originally settled for *seriatim* composition by sheets, or for setting by formes — but could alternate freely. If run, or improvised, to perfection, their alternation could presumably be made to mesh so smoothly as to equal the continuous setting of one

man from a 'bottomless' case. It would, basically, have required no casting-off, but simply the handing over of copy from one compositor to the other at the end of each stint, without a break in the continuity of composition. However, if one compositor happened to be ready to begin his prospective new stint before the other man had quite finished the preceding one, a little bit of *ad hoc* casting-off would enable him to proceed, thereby for a brief period actually setting simultaneously with his partner. If, on the other hand, he reappeared before his time to make up for a delay, he would, rather, be concerned with setting a relief page or two in his partner's stint. And, since a relief page could be the fourth page in a forme, the basic sequence of *seriatim* composition by two men was thus, when the need arose, apparently also open to an approximation of the principle of composition by formes.

In short: an initial survey of the pattern of compositorial stints in both *Cupids Revenge* and *Hector* shows two compositors at work in alternation, according to a system of non-simultaneous *seriatim* setting of type. The preceding observations indicate that it was a system with great flexibility in technical matters. This will have to be further substantiated, and it remains to be seen just how, as a mode of composition, it may also have been adaptable to the varying nature of printer's copy and thus have had an influence on the texts it produced.

The evidence of running-titles shows that both quartos were printed in two skeletons. The running-titles in *Hector* read 'The Palsgrae' on recto and verso, except for A₃, C₄^v and D₁ which have 'Palsgrae' without the article in what are two, or possibly even three distinct settings. The running-titles in *Cupids Revenge* read 'Cupids Revenge' on recto and verso throughout, except for 'Kupids Revenge' on C₃ and C₄^v in the uncorrected state of C(o). While in *Cupids Revenge* the identification of running-titles and the tracing of the formes through the press is relatively uncomplicated, the running-titles in *Hector* are at times impossible to re-identify. Among the identifiable ones shifts of position within the skeleton-formes in consecutive printings are so common that one suspects many accidents may have befallen the others, with consequent re-lockings or resettings that prevent recognition. It is, however, possible to determine that, basically, the two skeletons which are found to be established in B(o)/C(i) and in C(o) print the subsequent formes of the quarto in regular alternation.

From the initial pattern of running-titles, and from the frequent shifts between compositors in the sequence of composition between C₃ and D₂^v, an order of printing for the first three sheets of *Hector* can be reconstructed which explains the late consolidation of two alternat-

ing skeleton-formes, and which not only suggests the order of composition of the early text and the pages of preliminary material, but also accounts for the deviation from the usual eight-page length of compositorial stints between C₃ and D₂^v. From the manuscript of *Hector* it was certainly a simple matter to determine that the preliminaries, including the Prologue, would occupy the first half of gathering A, and that the text was to begin on A₃. Compositor Y started here on his first full stint which took him through B₂^v. Compositor X followed with a full stint through C₂^v. While X was setting type, Y constructed two skeleton-formes which successively printed B (i) and B (o). Y resumed composition on C₃, but he must have seen that he could not for long afford to have four pages of his type tied up in A, so he interrupted his stint, set the dedication for page A₂, and imposed A (i). He used the skeleton from B (i) and, needing only two running-titles, he removed the other two. X, after setting C₃^v, followed suit in returning to sheet A and composed the play's original title-page and the Prologue, in order to prepare A (o) for the perfecting of A (i). It is possible that Y, before embarking on his four-page stint C₄-D₁^v, stripped B (o) and placed the three pages of C (i) that had already been composed in its skeleton. For X constructed a separate skeleton-forme for A (o), with two new, and differing, running-titles in positions A₃ and A₄^v. The printing of A (o) must then have progressed far enough by the time Y had composed D₁^v for him to interrupt his type-setting again in order to make C (i) ready for the press. X, meanwhile, set no more than D₂ before he, presumably, was called upon to strip A (o) and impose C (o). C (o) contains the running-title from A₄^v in position C₃, and, in all likelihood, its forme-mate from A₃ in position C₄^v. The running-title in position C₁ is taken from B₃^v and is one of the two that were removed when A (i) was imposed in the forme of B (i). The running-title in position C₂^v is disturbed in all copies of the quarto and cannot be identified, but it may be the other one that was removed from B (i). Compositor Y, meanwhile, set page D₂^v, being the last page of a stint that should have been consecutively his from C₃ onwards. Compositor X, although he had twice relieved Y in its course, quite orderly took over at D₃, and regular stints of two consecutive half-gatherings resume.

The skeleton-formes printing C (i) and C (o), then, are the ones that subsequently alternate in the quarto. The inference about the sequence of composition, imposition, and printing which establishes them draws additional support from the observation that the third of the three original skeleton-formes is demonstrably only used in A (i)

and B (i). The two running-titles in common to A (i) and B (i) do not reappear. The skeleton was thus presumably discarded in a state that contained these two running-titles only, and the likely order of the formes it printed was therefore B (i)-A (i). From this assumption, the rest of the argument follows, and it is not improbable that compositors X and Y worked in the manner described through page D₂^v of *Hector*, in the easy alternation and flexible timing that their mode of collaboration permitted. Further aspects of that collaboration will become evident from *Cupids Revenge*.

In *Cupids Revenge*, the stage at which half-sheet A was printed, cannot be deduced from the available evidence; but otherwise, there is no reason to doubt an order of printing that started regularly at B (i). The two skeleton-formes which in alternation printed the quarto are found established in B (i) (skeleton A, with running-titles I, II, III, IV), and C (o) (skeleton B, with running-titles V, VI, VII, VIII). Skeleton B had been used before to print B (o), but of the three running-titles in evidence there, only no. VI (B₂^v→C₂^v) survived into C (o). In skeleton A, running-title no. II (B₂→C₂) was reset for C (i), but from C (i) and C (o) onwards, the two skeletons move — with a few turnings, but only occasional resettings of running-titles, or shifts in their relative positions — smoothly through all the formes of the quarto but the last four. Of these, skeleton B prints K (o) only, and skeleton A prints K (i), L (i), and L (o), in that order, as L (i) takes all its three running-titles from K (i), whereas L (o) preserves only two of them and uses a reset third one.

As long as the skeletons alternate, skeleton A regularly prints inner formes, and skeleton B outer formes, except for an exchange of formes in sheet F. A double reversal of their order therefore took place for sheets F and G, and this may indicate a time lapse in the printing which in each case was sufficient to make both skeleton-formes available at the time of imposition of the first forme of each succeeding sheet. By tracing the order of composition from the beginning of the quarto to sheet G, in stints that, in spite of apparent difficulties incurred by Compositor Y in the course of setting E₃-E₄^v, mesh smoothly and on two occasions actually overlap, it can be shown that the compositors may at that stage of the printing indeed successively have had both formes of type for sheets F and G available when the press was ready for them.

Compositor X set the first full sheet and a half of the play.⁸ The

8. Within this stint, the appearance of small amount of text over the page, dividing B₃^v is puzzling. X spreads an uncommonly ing up a prose passage into irregular short

shifts at C₃ and D₃ were regular. Thereafter, Compositor's Y's second stint was due to begin at E₃, which is indeed a page of sheet E he set. However, he could hardly have been fully occupied, at least not on work connected with *Cupids Revenge*, while X was working on D₃-E₂^v; for only six pages at the very most (two each from C (i), C (o), and D (i)), though probably less, could during that interval have been returned to him for distribution. Thus, he would have been ready to set again before X had finished the last page or two of his stint. X may have held a part of the copy that contained the beginning of E₃, and so it is likely that a beginning for E₃^v was determined, and that Y composed E₃^v and E₄ before reverting to E₃. E₃^v-E₄ are comfortably set, but E₃ is exceedingly cramped, and this seems to point not to a simple handing-down of copy, but rather to faulty casting-off as intervening between the stints of compositors X and Y in sheet E. There are signs on E₃ not only of desperate shortage of space — two lines of dialogue are set in italics in the margin, without speech-prefixes, and there is no spacing whatsoever before the entry line of scene (II,5) — but even of possible textual corruption, perhaps cuts in the dialogue.⁹ E₄^v must thereupon have been the last page of sheet E to be set by Y, as is apparent from its relation to F₁. E₄^v is again cramped, though less so than E₃. It prints verse as prose, and has 37, rather than 36, lines to the page. On F₁, X reappears, and in effect takes over what would have been the second half of Y's stint through F₂^v. Therefore, Y must have been held up in his composition of sheet E, especially in E₃ and E₄^v, and whatever cause prevented him from continuing into sheet F must have been foreseen, too, so that X got in ahead of him and started setting F₁.

lines, some only three or four words long. I do not believe that he proceeded by formes in sheet B, setting B (o) before B (i) as the appearance of B₃^v would in that case have it; nor can I detect signs of a cut in the text. But neither is there any other explanation from the analysis of the composition, unless one assumes that for some reason the positions of the Priest's 'Measure' at the bottom of B₄, and of the *Song* beginning B₄^v, had been predetermined, with more space left on the preceding page and a half than there was text to fill it.

9. Dialogue could have been left out around lines 8-10, and again around lines

31-32. There is even a slight possibility that Y tampered with the end of X's page E₂^v to make room for essential passages of text. At the bottom of E₂^v, there are two short speeches by Leontius in succession, both prefixed *Leon*. This just might indicate a cut to ensure that the page ended with Leontius' necessary exit line, to be followed by Timantius' comment and concluding remarks which head page E₃. The second of the *Leon*. prefixes is punctuated by an inverted period — or by a badly inking colon; a colon would be a characteristic of Y. Also, the catchword on E₂^v does not conform to X's, but rather to Y's styling.

Y returned at F₃ and worked into sheet G, X once more prematurely relieved him for two pages, G₁^v and G₂, and Y completed sheet G. This irregularity of stints in sheet G may be related to the order of printing. If the press, due perhaps to a delay caused by Y's difficulties over E₃-E₄^v, was still occupied with sheet E while composition progressed through sheet F, then both formes of sheet F would have been available for imposition into what happened to be a reversed order of skeleton-formes when the press was ready to print sheet F. The pattern of composition in sheet G (reinforced by the pattern of distribution of X's type, where type from F (i)(o) is not distributed until after H₄, and before I₂^v) may, by analogy to the compositorial shifts in C₃-D₂^v of *Hector*, indicate just where the compositors attended to the make-ready of the formes of sheet F. Again, the composition of G would have been completed by the time the press was ready for this sheet, and the order of the skeleton-formes could be once more reversed. Correspondingly, brief stints of composition once more alternate in sheet H. In addition, compositor X fails to distribute enough type before beginning to set H₁; it will be shown that his cases are depleted by the end of page H₂. These facts may indicate that efforts were concentrated on getting sheet G through the press, and, as compositor X entered Y's stint to set the single page H₄, forme H (i) may have followed at the earliest opportunity.

That H₄ was set by X for the express purpose of completing H (i) swiftly, can only be surmised. In sheet K, however, there is strong evidence that compositor Y entered X's stint for the length of one page to aid in the early completion of one forme of the sheet. Compositor Y ends his last full stint on *Cupids Revenge* in the middle of page I₂^v. The composition of the remaining 18½ pages of the quarto is left to X, except for page K₄^v. Two-skeleton printing, however, continues through sheet K. But it can be shown that skeleton B was abandoned early precisely because the full collaboration between the compositors had effectively ceased after I₂^v, and an order of printing in the last two sheets can be determined which resulted in a major disturbance of the text.

When Compositor X embarked upon his long final stint from I₂^v, line 15, to the end of the play, he did not have the advantage of a full case of type. He had, on the contrary, accumulated a considerable backlog of undistributed type, and, as is evident from the pattern of type-substitutions which will be discussed in greater detail below, he distributed all the wrought-off type available to him at ever shorter intervals: his four pages of sheet H between I₄ and I₄^v, his two pages

of D (o) after K₂ and into K₃, and his two pages of I (i) before K₃^v. I (i) had thus already come off the press, and I (o) was presumably being printed, while the type-setting had advanced no further than K₃. Faced with the need to distribute type before setting K₃^v, X must have recognized that he by himself would not soon have another forme ready. K (i) was only half set; but of K (o), three pages were in type, and this forme could next go to press if its fourth page, K₄^v, was set out of sequence, and ahead of time. For this purpose, compositor Y's assistance was once more secured, and the copy was cast off accordingly. K (o) was ready when I (o), printed in skeleton B, came off the press, and K (o) was imposed in the same skeleton. Skeleton A, after printing I (i), had apparently become immediately designated to print K (i); and it seems as if X, to retrieve his pages from I (i) for distribution, and to make room on his work-bench, had picked I₃^v and I₄ out of skeleton A and dropped the two pages of K (i) he had finished, K₁^v and K₂, in their places. For the skeleton turns between I (i) and K (i), and the running-title from I₃^v goes to K₁^v, that from I₄ to K₂.

But K (o) in skeleton B undoubtedly preceded K (i) through the press, and skeleton B, and thus two-skeleton printing, was thereupon abandoned for the last three formes of the quarto, K (i), L (i), and L (o). This assumption is confirmed by the typographical appearance of the text in X's pages K₃^v-K₄. A comparative survey of X's and Y's pages in both *Cupids Revenge* and *Hector* shows that the pages of X generally accommodate less text and are the more liberal in their spacing.¹⁰ But this distinction does not apply to pages K₃^v and K₄. Both have 37 lines of text instead of the 36 lines standard in this quarto, and all but the first three lines of K₃^v (continuing correct verse from the preceding page) and two-thirds of K₄ are set in solid blocks of lines to the full measure. Short exclamations by characters in dialogue are squeezed in where preceding paragraphs carry over only a word or two into their last lines, and even stage directions are not given lines by themselves. A relief to the eye comes only at the bottom of K₄, where correct verse lineation resumes with the beginning of scene (V,3). But the entry of (V,3) is preceded by another entry, "*Cornets. Cupid from above.*", which, in analogy to previous entries of Cupid, should be followed by a speech. *Cupids Speech* which belongs here is in fact printed on L₃^v, following the final *Exeunt.* of the last scene. It was only by leaving it out of its correct position, therefore, that X could find

10. This difference is most strikingly evident in the alternative title-pages for *Hector*.

enough room on K₄ for the thirteen lines of text of scene (V,3) that would join correctly with their continuation on K₄^v. Thus, K₄^v must have been previously set, following a casting-off of copy that was hasty and conspicuously faulty. The text for K₄^v must have been determined before X entered on K₃^v, for he begins to make his adjustments as soon as line 4 of that page. Therefore, it is also likely that K₄^v, in its forme K (o), was going to press early. For, as X discovered the faulty casting-off immediately on resuming composition, yet struggled for two pages to make ends meet, the alternative course of resetting K₄^v may not have been open.

From the evidence established thus far we conclude that the speed and intensity of production of *Cupids Revenge* varied appreciably through the sheets of the quarto. Beyond what has been said, any amount of statistical detail could be brought to bear on a strengthening or a modification of these preliminary findings. A survey of type reappearances, for example, would be suited to supplementing them most fully, by minutely tracing each phase of composition, printing and distribution, and would thus also do equal justice to both compositors. Such a survey has not been undertaken. We shall therefore have to forego the closer view of Compositor Y which only it would have given, and shall confine ourselves to tracing the work pattern of X by scrutinizing the type substitution he practiced in I's, P's and L's.

If a view of one compositor's work in isolation is to be meaningful, or even at all possible, it must be assumed that each of the two men set from, and distributed into, his own cases. At least one piece of evidence, the occurrence of a tailed italic *m* in Y's pages only, supports this assumption from the outset. Then, to arrive at standards for subsequent counts, it will have to be decided whether X started out with a full case, and whether his first sheet and a half, pages B₁-C₂^v, were set with or without intermittent distribution. Here, the early occurrence of type substitutions for upper-case roman P provides the necessary evidence. There are five roman capital P's in sheet B, three in B (i) and two in B (o). In C₁, C₁^v, and C₂^v there is one substitution each by an italic capital P for correct-fount roman, and, in addition, four small-cap roman P's or upper-case roman P's from another fount, in B₂^v, and one each in C₁ and C₁^v, which are clearly also used as substitutes. The occurrence of a substitution as late as C₂^v, by which time distribution of the first wrought-off forme of B could theoretically have taken place, suggests that there was no distribution and re-use of type from sheet B before the end of C₂^v. This, in turn, implies that X must have set his first long stint of twelve pages from a full case. The

Compositor X's use of P and I:

cor- rect- fount	Roman P + (substitutions)								Roman + <i>italic</i> I								cor- rect- fount
	4 ^v	4	3 ^v	3	2 ^v	2	1 ^v	1	1	1 ^v	2	2 ^v	3	3 ^v	4	4 ^v	
3 :							2	B(i)	4	6			12	7		: 29	
2 :	2				(4)			B(o)	7			11	11		4	: 33	
:						(2)		C(i)		10	17					: 27	
:					(1)		(2)	C(o)	6			18				: 24	
1 :		(2)	1					D(i)					11/3	15/4		: 15	
4 :	2			2				D(o)					14		19	: 33	
1 :						(1)	1	E(i)		10+7	6+3					: 13	
1 :							1	E(o)	10+7			10				: 20	
:						(3)		F(i)		11	7					: 18	
1 :					1+(1)			F(o)	9			17				: 26	
:						(1)		G(i)		9	5					: 14	
2 :		(2)					2	H(i)		15/1	8/7			11		: 20	
:								H(o)	8+7							: 8	
:								I(i)					15	8		: 23	
1? :				(3)	1?			I(o)				10?	20		9+6	: 39?	
3 :			1			(1)	2+(2)	K(i)		14/4	14		14/2	11/5		: 39	
3 :				2	(1)		1	K(o)	18			24	7/16			: 49	
:								L(i)		8	17			10		: 35	
:								L(o)	10			7	19			: 36	

On pages with intermittent substitution the patterns are mixed as follows:

K1^v: 1+(1)+1+(1)

D3^v: 9+2+2+7

K1^v: 2+4+12

D4^v: 2+2+4+1+2+1+7

K3^v: 5+3+1+3+1+10

H1^v: 9+1+6

K3^v: 12+2+2

H2^v: 4+6+4+7

K4^v: 8+5+3

I4^v: 3+6+6

one surprise element in these observations is that the case from the outset should have contained no more than five upper-case P's of pica roman no. 6.¹¹ Subsequent counts in *Cupids Revenge*, however, and the recurrence of similar conditions in *Hector*, support this calculation.¹²

In his first twelve pages, X set a total of 113 I's (see table). If, before resuming composition at D₃, he distributed B (i), he regained 29 I's, and he used 29 I's in D₃-D₄. As an irregular pattern of intermittent substitution starts at D₃^v, line 27, it is likely that the last of the pages of B (i), page B₄ with 7 I's, was distributed piece-meal during the composition of D₃^v, line 27-D₄. Altogether, the substitutions show that more pieces of roman I would have been needed than were supplied by the distribution of B (i). This suggests that the total of 113 I's in pages B₁ through C₂^v had in fact drained X's supply to the last piece, and therefore constitutes the entire number of capital roman I's his case held.

An analysis of the numerical occurrence of correct-fount and wrong-fount I's suggests the following sequence for the progression of composition and distribution in the pages of Compositor X from the beginning of the text at B₁ through K₄:

before	distributes	gains	uses	in	spare
D ₃	B ₁ ^v , B ₂ , B ₃ ^v	22	22	D ₃ -D ₃ ^v	
during					
D ₃ ^v -D ₄		B ₄	7	7	D ₃ ^v -D ₄
D ₄ ^v	B ₂ ^v -B ₃	22	19	D ₄ ^v	3
E ₁	B ₁	7 (+3)	10	E ₁ , to line 26	
E ₁ ^v	B ₄ ^v , C ₁	10	10	E ₁ ^v , to line 33	
E ₂ , line 17	C ₂ ^v	18	13	E ₂ , l. 17 thru E ₂ ^v	5
F ₁	C (i)	27	27	F ₁ -F ₂	5
F ₂ ^v	E (i)	13 (+5)	17	F ₂ ^v	1
G ₁ ^v	E (o)	20	14	G ₁ ^v -G ₂	7
H ₁ before and dur- ing H ₂	D ₃ ^v	11 (+7)	8	H ₁ -H ₁ ^v	
					9
H ₄	G (i)	14	11	H ₄	4

11. See above, footnote 6.

12. Incidentally, the assumption of separate type-cases for the two compositors is

hereby also reinforced; for Y is never beset with a shortage of P's. For example, he uses the letter seven times in his first stint of *Hector* alone.

I ₂ ^v	D ₄ , F (i)(o)	48 (+4)	56 [?]	I ₂ ^v , line 15 — I ₄ ^v , line 14	
I ₄ ^v , line 26	H ₁ -H ₂ , H ₄	28	28	I ₄ ^v , line 26 — K ₁ ^v , line 8	
K ₂ ^v	D (o)	33	31	K ₂ ^v -K ₃	2
K ₃ ^v	I (i)	23 (+2)	25	K ₃ ^v -K ₄	

The initial stages in this reconstructed sequence show composition and distribution in a but slightly precarious balance. Compositor X worked into his second stint D₃-E₂^v almost the entire supply of I's he successively retrieved from formes B (i), B (o), and C (o), and there are five spare I's in his case when he ends E₂^v. As a wrong-fount I does not occur again until the last line of H₁, the order of X's subsequent moves can only be hypothesized by assuming a postponement of the distribution of D (o), with 33 I's tied up in pages D₃ and D₄^v, until some point after completion of sheet H. By evidence from the reappearance of very few pieces of roman P and the absence from the pages of the quarto for a very long time of the four P's tied up in D (o), this hypothesis will presently be substantiated. The counts of I derived from pages F₁ to H₁, and the peculiar substitution pattern found on pages H₁^v-H₂, furthermore suggest that forme D (i), too, was left standing longer than might have been expected, and, with the distribution of D₃^v, only began to be drawn on during the composition of H₁-H₂. This leaves formes C (i) and E (i) (o) as sources of supply for the necessary type used in the two stints F₁-F₂^v and G₁^v-G₂, and the sequence of their distribution is inferred in a manner that allows for their successive return from the press.

Only minimal distribution, or none at all, can have preceded X's initial stint in sheet H. After setting 8 I's, seven of which were left over after G₂, he runs out of the sort at the bottom of H₁ and sets 16 substitute italic I's through H₁^v, and seven more, interspersed by 4+4 correct-fount I's, on H₂. There is one solitary correct-fount roman I on H₁^v. The total count of roman I's in evidence on pages H₁-H₂ is just one short of the sum of his spare pieces left over after G₂ plus the number he could have retrieved from D₃^v. The assumption that it was D₃^v he fell back on is strengthened by the appearance of two correct-fount roman P on H₁^v, one of which could have come from D₃^v, while the other had become available through distribution of E (o) before G₁^v and not used on G₂, where there is, instead, a substitution. Judging from the substitution pattern, D₃^v must have been distributed piecemeal during H₁-H₂, although the precise course of distribution cannot be determined. If our analysis is correct, there is only one

roman I left in X's case at the end of H₂. At the same time, the italic *L*'s which are so much in demand for the speech-prefixes in this play are fourteen times out of fifteen substituted by roman *L*'s in pages H₁^v and H₂. It seems not unwarranted to believe that X was incurring a very acute shortage of type. Yet the beginning of H₂^v is free from all substitutions. If Compositor X did set the first fourteen lines of H₂^v, as the spelling evidence on the page seems to indicate, he can have done so not from his own, but from Y's cases, until Y was free to work from them in person, from line 15 onwards.

The next point of firm orientation is the complete absence of roman *I*'s in K₂, preceded by 12 (+2) substitutions in K₁^v, and another six, flanked by three and six correct-fount *I*, on I₄^v. The number of *I*'s from I₄^v, line 26 (last letter) to K₁^v is 28 — or exactly the number contained in the pages of sheet H which were set by X from his cases. The interval between the end of H₂ and I₄^v can be accounted for, albeit with a minor uncertainty in relation to page I₂^v. Here, the spelling evidence once more suggests a division of the page between compositors Y and X. If X entered at line 15,¹³ and if he set his section of the page from his own case, the number of correct-fount *I*'s he used up to I₄^v, line 14, was 56, or four in excess of the number available after a distribution of D₄ and F(i)(o). If, rather than taking over at line 15 as is suggested by the typographical change from prose-as-verse to genuine prose setting, he actually entered at line 20 where his own spelling characteristics truly resume, the number of correct-fount *I*'s to be accounted for is still 54, or two more than our counts make available out of the 113 *I*'s which until now have been repeatedly confirmed as the total number of *I*'s X was using. Moreover, the possibility remains that, although divided between compositors, page I₂^v was yet composed from only one set of cases, those of Compositor Y, just as page H₂^v had been. If so, X would, by returning to his own cases with page I₃, indeed have been using six pieces less than his total by the time the substitution of *I*'s begins in page I₄^v. As forme *I*(o) is distributed only after the composition of K₄, and as there are no substitutions of *I*'s and *P*'s in sheet L, and those of *L*'s prove unreliable, there is no way by our present method of testing how page I₂^v was dealt with.¹⁴

13. See argument in Bowers, "Textual Introduction", p. 319 f.

14. A coherent hypothesis from the evidence of *I*'s alone, however, is this: there was no distribution before H₁, or none

even until the composition of H₁^v was completed. Seven *I*'s were left over from G₂, the eighth *I* on H₁ and the solitary one on H₁^v are additional pieces of inexplicable origin (foul-cased?), raising the total to 115. After the distribution of D₃^v

It seems, however, that this uncertainty does not invalidate the subsequent analysis of composition and distribution in pages I4^v, line 26, to K4. All of sheet H is distributed, as suggested, before composition on I4^v is completed, and, although the supply of I's runs out again during K1^v, the cases must otherwise have been full enough to sustain uninterrupted composition to the bottom of K2. Before K2^v, D (o) is — at last — distributed, and of its 33 I's, 31 are immediately in demand on K2^v and K3. To be more precise: the absence of correct-fount P on K2^v, although four P's would have been released from D (o), and the subsequent appearance of two of them on K3, suggests that not all of D (o) was distributed before composition started on K2^v. Rather, I believe that D3 and D4^v were lying ready for distribution side by side on the compositor's work-bench; distributing the type successively on the whole width of the two pages, he got as far down as line 25 on each page before starting to compose K2^v. These 2 x 25, or 50 lines of type would have yielded 9 plus 15, or precisely the 24 I's needed for K2^v. The mixed substitution pattern of I's on K3 would thus be accounted for by a piece-meal distribution of the remainder of the two pages during the composition of K3, and the four P's from D (o) would indeed have been retrieved only during this latter operation, so that none had been available for K2^v, but the two P's on K3 could be set correctly. By distributing I(i) before beginning to struggle with the composition of K3^v-K4, X then gained another 23 I's to the two that were left over at the end of K3. 25 I's are used in K3^v and K4, and the supply is once more drained to the last piece.

At this juncture, skeleton B is abandoned. It is now evident that at the end of X's stint in sheet K a considerable amount of distribution would necessarily have to intervene before the composition of pages L1-L3^v could be begun and completed. It is likely, therefore, that X was at this point left to finish the setting of the text at his own

before H2, and the setting of H2, X consequently had not one, but three I's to spare, and six, not four, after H4. He did not set his section of H2 from his own cases, but did use his own type in I2^v from line 20 onwards, setting a total of 54 I's (48+6) between I2^v, line 20, and I4^v, line 14. This makes numerical sense, but could override such conflicting evidence as the reappearance of a P from D3^v on H1^v, and especially the typographical change at I2^v, line 15, only by support from incontrovertible proof — which, alas,

cannot be ascertained; for this line of argument would lead to a further, and rather tempting, speculation, namely that the typographical and the orthographical shifts on I2^v should perhaps be distinguished in their origin as indicating a change of compositors in line 20, but a new leaf of manuscript in line 15. Admittedly, though, the assumption of such an alteration in the manuscript, occurring as it does in the middle of a scene, would not exactly uncomplicate the over-all hypothesis about the nature of the copy for this play.

pace, and that no further effort was made to turn the entire resources of the shop to pulling the quarto through, as had apparently been attempted before, at least during the production of sheets H to K. Pages L₁-L₃^v successively accumulate a total of 71 I's, which are easily within the range of Compositor X's case, if fresh supplies were always retrieved in time. This must have been possible, for there are no more substitutions in the last pages. But, consequently, no further statements can be made about stages of distribution and composition in L₁-L₃^v.

The reconstruction of Compositor X's work pattern through *Cupids Revenge* hinges ultimately on the hypothesis of the delay in distribution of forme D(o). Our analysis will have some claim to representing the true order of events, if within the pattern of substitutions and reappearances of the letter P, proof for this delay can be furnished. It was argued before that X started out with only five roman capital P's in his case, which were used on B₁^v (P_{1,2}), B₃^v (P₃), and B₄^v (P_{4,5}). If, according to our earlier assumptions, B(i) was distributed before D₃, the two P's in D₃ and the one in D₃^v were P₁₋₃ retrieved from B₁^v and B₃. But, with B₄^v according to the same assumptions not distributed earlier than between composition of E₁ and E₁^v, the two P's appearing on D₄^v cannot be P_{4,5}. They must therefore be two additional pieces, P₆ (on D₄^v, line 29), and P₇ (D₄^v, line 32). To prove that this is not mere speculation, two of the copies of *Cupids Revenge* in the British Museum¹⁵ have been scrutinized closely in an attempt to trace the actual types. It has not been possible to identify beyond doubt each single one of them in its repeated occurrences. But, by good fortune, P₆ is unmistakable by a characteristic damage to the lower part of its loop. It can be positively stated that, while used twice in *Hector* (*Hector* B₄^v and G₁^v), P₆ does not reappear in *Cupids Revenge*. When, therefore, on distribution of D(o) during the composition of K₃, four P's were gained but only two were re-used, P₆ cannot have been one of them. Furthermore, the P in K₃, line 30, can with great confidence be identified as P₁; it prints first in B₁^v, line 7, then in D₃, line 27, but nowhere in the interval between D₃ and K₃. In combination, these observations seem sufficient proof that D(o) was indeed not distributed before K₂^v/K₃. Of the remaining pieces, P₄, too, seems sufficiently characteristic to be traced from B₄^v, line 21, to E₁^v, line 17, to F₂^v, line 1, to I₂^v, line 35. This would confirm that F(i)(o) were distributed before I₂^v, but not earlier, and B₄^v was distributed between E₁ and E₁^v. From the evidence of the reappearance of P₄ and P₅ in E₁ and E₁^v, the exact point where

15. Shelf-mark 644.d.2 (an incomplete copy, lacking A₁₋₂), and C₇₁.d.27.

distribution of B₄^v must have been undertaken can in fact be closely determined. If, as said in relation to the shortage of I, B₁ was distributed before E₁, and B₄^v together with C₁ before E₁^v, no correct-fount P for E₁, line 32, would have been available. However, as the one wrong-fount I on E₁ occurs in line 26 of that page, the necessity of substitution at this point may have induced Compositor X to relieve immediately the impending shortage of I's and distribute B₄^v before even completing composition of E₁. By distributing B₄^v somewhere between lines 26 and 32 of E₁, he would have retrieved P₄ and P₅, using P₅ on E₁ and P₄ on E₁^v.¹⁶

No further individual types can be identified and traced. But the general pattern of reappearances and substitutions of the letter P is such that, almost without fail, correct-fount P's reappear in the pages of Compositor X whenever, and as soon as, pages or formes which themselves contained correct-fount P's are supposed to have been distributed. One exception has been mentioned: the P which was regained by distribution of E (o) before G₁^v, and could therefore have been used in G₂, does in fact not show again until H₁^v, where it joins the P which was retrieved from D₃^v. The second irregularity in the pattern occurs in K₁/K₁^v, where there are three correct-fount P, although the preceding distribution of H (i) (o) provided only two. However, an examination shows quite clearly that the two pieces in K₁, line 8, and K₁^v, line 11, must be the ones retrieved from H₁^v; the latter is followed by one substitution and then the third correct-fount P. This is an identifiable piece, battered and knocked about; it can confidently be called P₈, and it appears nowhere else in X's pages in the quarto.

The hypothetical reconstruction of the phases of composition and distribution in the pages of Compositor X in Q₁ of *Cupids Revenge*, which was based on the evidence of type shortages and the substitution pattern of italic *I* for roman I, has thus been confirmed and proved by a matching pattern of *P* for P, and by the identification of reappearing single exemplars of upper-case roman P. In conclusion, it must for the sake of completeness be added that the substitution pattern due to shortages of italic *L* in speech-prefixes is not fully consistent with the work-phases determined in the preceding analysis. However, the patterns are compatible for X's pages in sheets B-G, and in sheet H as far as H₂. Thereafter, a consistently correct distribution ought at each stage to have regained sufficient numbers of correct-fount italic *L* to

16. Whether C₁ was distributed together with B₄^v before the completion of E₁, or in a separate operation between E₁ and E₁^v, cannot of course be determined.

make all those substitutions unnecessary which do in fact occur in H₄, and in sheets I, K, and L, where the speech-prefixes in *L*- are so relatively few in number. We can account for this inconsistency only by assuming a disproportionate amount of foul-casing in the distribution of speech-prefix type-material.

Compositor X in his progression through the quarto, then, is surprisingly often seen to work from very low supplies of type, and even to distribute while composing. An inference of haste and undue pressure is tempting, and at certain times such factors perhaps contributed to setting the pattern for his work. However, they cannot be claimed to govern it, for, basically, there is nothing to be gained by distribution in small installments of a page or less and frequent alternation between composition and distribution, as against distribution by forme or half-forme and composition of correspondingly larger units. If one compares the situations in *Cupids Revenge* and in *Hector*, where the absence of type substitution suggests that at no time any acute shortage of type arose, they differ largely in only one respect: in *Hector*, neither X nor Y ever overreached himself as X did once in *Cupids Revenge*, when, by uninterruptedly composing the full length of the first twelve pages, he sacrificed from the outset the advantage his full cases had initially given him. After this beginning, what the pattern of type shortages and substitutions reveals may essentially be but a mildly modified 'normal' working process. The lack of corresponding evidence prevents an analysis of Y's work phases for comparison. But the expectation would be that they follow a very similar course, and that Y neither in *Cupids Revenge* nor in *Hector* incurs type shortages simply because he never drains his supplies to the same extent as X did in his first stint on *Cupids Revenge*. His manner of distribution might well be found to be very similar to that observed in X's stints, for it would ultimately be dictated by the system of composition adopted. This system was, of course, only by a certain degree of abstraction recognized as the underlying 'ideal pattern' of collaboration between compositors X and Y — but no more abstraction is required to see that distributing just two pages at a time was basically the habit that X adhered to. Indeed, as a habit it may have been so ingrained that perhaps it never occurred to him to make an early effort at retrieving more wrought-off type than usual, although he had in fact more type standing in the early formes of *Cupids Revenge* than was warranted within the limits of his total supplies. Thus, when getting into sheets F and G, he did not distribute in order, but turned to his most recent wrought-off type from sheet E. He simply skipped his pages in D and

temporarily left them standing until he had no choice but distributing them when only they could help him out of his shortages. Their distribution would, of course, then require additional time, and, moreover, there are signs that Y was not always available to do his expected share of the work on *Cupids Revenge*. The stretch of the quarto thereby affected is approximately sheets H-K, and here, the factors of 'haste' and 'pressure' can to some extent be supposed to have influenced the work. But, as we have seen, the situation was remedied by a temporary recall of the other compositor, and by a basic change of pace in the final reversion to one-skeleton printing.

On the whole, I believe that no strong argument can be advanced for haphazard or unsound compositorial workmanship in *Cupids Revenge*. This must be emphasized before conclusions are drawn from a comparison with *Hector*, which appears in so many ways as the superior quarto, and which certainly is a more successful printing job. It has been recorded above that the composition and the printing of *Hector* are performed in a manner very similar to that observed in *Cupids Revenge*. The cooperation of the two compositors is slightly more regular than in *Cupids Revenge*, and two-skeleton printing is in *Hector* consistent throughout. Beyond that, such irregularities and blemishes of production as have been observed in *Cupids Revenge*, provide only slight leverage for bibliographical analysis in *Hector*. Compositor X's setting of *Hector*, page E4, for example, soon after his previous stint had ended in E2^v, may be another case of rushing the completion of a forme. And again, twice towards the ends of stints of both compositors — in B2^v for Y, and in E2-E2^v for X — there are signs of casting-off for overlapping composition. Among these signs are a few brief prose-settings of verse to save space. But in the entire quarto, there is no major mislineation, except in the last scene which stretches over H4^v, line 13 - I1^v, and which, in the hands of Y who is finishing the quarto, becomes thoroughly garbled in its lining. But the over-all picture is one of an ease of composition and typographical disposition in the pages of *Hector* which is truly superior to almost anything seen in *Cupids Revenge*.

In conclusion, the marked differences which exist between the quarto of *Hector* and that of *Cupids Revenge* may be largely due to a difference in the quality of the manuscripts. In *Hector*, there is evidence that both compositors are equally capable of giving a page a satisfactory lay-out, of calculating page-units with fair accuracy when the need for casting-off arises, and, above all, of consistently setting correct verse and prose. The copy for *Hector* which was responsible for

these results appears in all respects to have been clear and unambiguous in its textual arrangement. But the copy for *Cupids Revenge* seems to have had none of that clarity. Both compositors constantly show signs of struggling with the text and lineation. Prose is found to be set as verse, verse as prose, or verse to be mislined, on innumerable occasions. Both compositors apparently have much the same difficulties with the copy, although X is more resourceful and determined to solve them. His pages contain the larger percentage of what must be regarded as correct passages in either verse or prose; thus, for example, after Y has been setting all but the very end of an entire scene, (II, 6), in straightforward prose through pages E₃^v-E₄^v, X takes over on F₁ in midcourse of a speech and ends it in verse.¹⁷ But X does by no means avoid all the pitfalls of the text. He is almost as likely as Y to be thrown off by a half-line at a change in dialogue and garble the lineation of the subsequent verse passage. And in both his and Y's pages, there are, occasionally, very curious sections where what should clearly be prose is split up into irregular lines that have upper-case initial letters, just as if they were verse. Passages of this sort may show a compositor's bewilderment at its highest and reflect his retreat to a line-by-line reproduction of the copy; this, at least, is a possibility suggested by the appearance of a page such as I₂^v where X sets prose out of confidence that he is dealing with a prose scene, whereas Y at the top of the page may well be representing the original lining (and, as in the case of the abbreviation 'Gentl:', even some word forms) of his copy. If this were to indicate that Y, for better or for worse, was generally more inclined than X to take the copy at its face value, then, in assuming that he himself did the casting-off necessary to determine the beginning for his page K₄^v, one would recognize this casting-off as being not excessively faulty. If from the manuscript he did not gain a clear picture of which proportion of the text for K₃^v-K₄ should be prose and which verse, the miscalculation would seem to be more or less within the limits of expectation for Compositor Y and his tendency to crowd more text into a page than X generally does.

These last few considerations taken together should act as a check on the inclination to accuse Compositor Y of unusual ineptitude in view of his work on *Cupids Revenge*. Within a larger context, they should be incorporated into the body of observations and conclusions

17. Bowers' opinion about the break between E₄^v and F₁ notwithstanding ("Textual Introduction", p. 328). Bowers differs

in his view of the compositors (pp. 324 ff.), and he treats II,6 as a pure prose scene. I believe prose and verse are mixed in II,6.

established in this paper to give foundation to a consistent hypothesis about the nature of the copy for *Cupids Revenge*. To argue such an hypothesis in every detail is inseparable from closest editorial attention to the play.¹⁸ The object of this paper has been a more narrowly circumscribed study of the composition and printing of *Cupids Revenge* Q1. To complete a full analysis of its compositors, it yet remains to turn the attention to X and Y as their spelling habits reveal them. By again setting off their usage in *Cupids Revenge* against that in *Hector*, and in other work where and when the need arises, I hope, in a second article, to consolidate their characteristics of orthography in a range sufficiently wide to allow conclusions to be drawn about copy spellings and, perhaps, even tentative statements to be made about authorial characteristics as they may be seen to survive into a quarto text.

18. It has, consequently, been most comprehensively and most convincingly put forward in Bowers, "Textual Introduction", pp. 322-331.

Notes on Contributors

GILES DAWSON, Professor of English at Catholic University, is now editing a selection of the Bagot letters from the Folger Library manuscripts.

G. THOMAS TANSALLE, Professor of English in the University of Wisconsin, is Bibliographical Editor of the Northwestern-Newberry Edition of *The Writings of Herman Melville* and is preparing a checklist of material on American printing and publishing.

HANS WALTER GABLER pursued bibliographical studies at the University of Virginia on a Harkness Fellowship 1968-70, and he has returned to Munich, where he teaches at the University.

KEITH I. D. MASLEN, Senior Lecturer in English, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand, is editing the Bowyer printing ledgers 1710-75 for the Bibliographical Society (London). He also runs a "bibliographical" press, using a royal Columbian hand-press.

JOAN STEVENS of Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand, has written on Thackeray, Dickens, the Brontës, and New Zealand literature. She is now editing the letters of Mary Taylor, Charlotte Brontë's friend.

ROBERT A. REES teaches American literature at UCLA and is currently co-editing Washington Irving's *The Adventures of Captain Bonneville* and a collection of bibliographic essays on American authors to 1900.

MARJORIE GRIFFIN is an administrative assistant in the Center for the Study of Comparative Folklore and Mythology at UCLA. She is a fiction writer, having published one novel under a pseudonym.

MICHAEL RUDICK teaches medieval and renaissance literature at the University of Utah.

ROBERT FEHRENBACH, associate professor of English at William and Mary, has surveyed scholarship on Thomas Nashe for *Recent Studies in Renaissance Drama* and is making a concordance of the works of Marlowe in connection with Bowers' Cambridge edition.

ALBERT WERTHEIM of Indiana University is writing a critical study of James Shirley's plays.

HENRY L. SNYDER, author of a number of articles on politics and the press in Augustan England, is editor of the Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence to be published by the Clarendon Press. He is Associate Professor of History at the University of Kansas.

PAT ROGERS of King's College, London, has a book on *Grub Street* forthcoming from Methuen and is a contributor to Volume II of the *New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*. He is now at work on a study of *Defoe: The Critical Heritage*.

LEONID ARINSHTEIN is a Russian scholar, living in Leningrad, who writes mainly about Victorian poetry.

S. W. REID, who teaches at Kent State University, is completing a dissertation at the University of Virginia.

GUY R. WOODALL has written various essays on Robert Walsh and the *American Review*. He teaches in the Department of English at Tennessee Technological University.

BURTON POLLIN's researches in nineteenth-century literature continue, as he is preparing an edition of Benjamin Constant's translation of Godwin's *Political Justice*.

GEORGE MONTEIRO of Brown University is at work on a book-length study of Henry James and Henry Adams, and he is editing John Hay's short fiction.

FLOYD STOVALL was Edgar Allan Poe Professor of English at the University of Virginia until his retirement in 1967. Among his other important work, he edited Whitman's *Prose Works 1892* for the *Collected Writings* of Walt Whitman.

GORDON LINDSTRAND at the University of South Carolina is surveying the textual problems in the works of Joseph Conrad and Dreiser. He is now preparing a critical edition of *Nostromo*.

HOWELL J. HEANEY is Bibliographer in the Rare Books Department of the Free Library of Philadelphia.

DEREK A. CLARKE is Librarian of The British Library of Political Science at the London School of Economics.