

1965

# The first quarto of Henry V

LeRoy L. Panek  
*Lehigh University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://preserve.lehigh.edu/etd>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Panek, LeRoy L., "The first quarto of Henry V" (1965). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3353.  
<https://preserve.lehigh.edu/etd/3353>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Lehigh Preserve. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Lehigh Preserve. For more information, please contact [preserve@lehigh.edu](mailto:preserve@lehigh.edu).

THE FIRST QUARTO OF HENRY V

by

LeRoy Lad Panek

A THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Faculty

of Lehigh University

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Lehigh University

1965

This thesis is accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

July 28, 1965  
(date)

Frank S. Hook  
Professor in charge

J. Burke Sowers  
Head of the Department

## Table of Contents

I. Abstract.....	1
II. Introduction.....	3
III. Abridgement in Q.....	11
IV. Memorial Reconstruction and Q.....	20
V. Stenography and Q.....	34
VI. Conclusion.....	48
VII. Notes.....	52
VIII. Bibliography.....	62
IX. Vita.....	67

Modern criticism has grouped the quarto editions of Shakespeare's plays into two categories: good and bad quartos. Good quartos present texts which are substantially the same as the texts in the First Folio and their authority is as great or greater than that of the Folio. Bad quartos, however, present corrupt texts. These are reported texts which differ substantially from their F counterparts and which are not based on authoritative manuscripts. Perhaps the most typical, yet atypical, of these bad quartos is the first quarto of Henry V. It is the purpose of this thesis to examine Q in order to discover, if possible, the type of play which it represents, and the method of reporting used to compile the text.

Q is an abridged version of F's Henry V. This can be surmised from the absence of three scenes and the Choruses in Q. Critics, however, have argued that the abridgement was made to prepare a text for a small cast playing in the provinces. This assumption is not borne out by the text. The mute characters, the permissive stage directions and the stage mechanics of Q all indicate that the object of the abridgement was not to reduce the number of actors. Since Q was not abridged with the number of actors in mind, we must conclude that it was cut with an eye toward time. Because of the lack

of knowledge about Elizabethan stage conditions, however, it is impossible to estimate to what extent Q had been abridged and to what extent its omissions of F material were caused by faulty reporting.

The system of reporting used to obtain Q was definitely faulty, but this is all one can say with assurance about the reporting of Q; none of the proposed systems of reporting can account for all of Q's eccentricities. Memorial reconstruction can account for textual rearrangement, word substitution and omission, but it cannot explain the absence of non-Shakespearean material or the specific method of reporting used in Q. Likewise shorthand can explain omission, word substitution and the presence of non-Shakespearean additions, but it cannot explain the textual rearrangements or the presence of phonetic transcription. Therefore, a solution to this critical impasse, albeit hypothetical, would be to posit a reporter who used both shorthand and memorial reconstruction to obtain the Q text of Henry V.

During the summer of 1600 the book stalls of London offered for sale a new book bearing the title

THE/ CRONICLE/ 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./ [Printer's device: Mc Kerrow, no. 299] / LONDON/ Printed by Thomas Creede, for Tho. Milling- / ton, and Iohn Busby. And are to be/ sold at his house in Carter Lane, next/ the Powle head. 1600.

Two years later the same book was reprinted, but it had a new publisher, replacing Millington and Busby. Thus the title-page states that it was

Printed by Thomas Creede, for Thomas/ Pauier, and are to be sold at his shop in Cornhill,/ at the signe of the Cat and Parrets neare/ the Exchange. 1602.

In 1619 the book was again reprinted for Thomas Pavier, but this edition was printed by William Jaggard (whose device appears on the title-page) instead of Thomas Creede.<sup>1</sup> All of these books are quartos, and they all contain virtually the same text. Both the second and third quartos were printed from copies of the first with changes only<sup>2</sup> in the most obvious mechanical and spelling errors.

The publication of the first of these quarto editions was somewhat irregular in that there was no entry in the Stationers' Register establishing the ownership for the copyright to this book.<sup>3</sup> However, a loose leaf of the Stationers' Register, usually dated 1600, contains a

reference that probably applies to Q:<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Augusti As you like yt/ a booke HENRY the FFIFT/ a booke Euery man in his humor/ a booke The commedie of 'muche A doo about nothing'/ a booke	}	to be staid
---	---	-------------

We can be fairly certain that the HENRY the FFIFT mentioned in the Register was the book that we are considering, since all of the other plays listed belonged to the Chamberlain's Men, and the other plays that we know of concerning Henry V belonged to the Admiral's Men and the Queen's Majesties Players.<sup>5</sup> Another thing that we can be fairly certain of is that the motivating power behind the order that these books "be staid" was the Chamberlain's Men, who did not want their plays published, since publishing would enable rival acting companies to obtain scripts of plays that had hitherto been exclusively acted by the Chamberlain's Men.<sup>6</sup>

In spite of the objections to the publication of Q, the stay had little effect on the actual publication or the Stationers' Company's recognition of the legitimacy of printing and selling Q. Ten days after the stay was noted, another entry in the Register duly records the transfer of the rights to Q from Millington and Busby (who are not named) to Thomas Pavier:<sup>7</sup>

Thomas Pavyer	<sup>4</sup> Augusti [1600] Entred for his Copyes by Direction of master white warden vnder/ his hand wrytinge. These Copyes followinge beinge thinges/ formerlye printed and sett over
---------------	---



to the sayd Thomas Pavyer.

viz

The Pathway to Knowledge.....vj<sup>d</sup>  
 The historye of Henry V<sup>th</sup> with the battell  
 of Agencourt.....vj<sup>d</sup>  
 The Spanishe Tragedy.....vj<sup>d</sup>

This reference is, again, almost certainly to Q, since Pavier seems to have based his right to reprint the book in 1602 and again in 1619 upon this entry. Exactly why Millington and Busby sold their interests in Q to Pavier is not known. A plausible explanation, however, is put forth by Greg, who suggests that Millington and Busby, finding their position rather precarious in the light of the order for the stay of publication, decided to transfer their rights to "the more adventurous Pavier."<sup>8</sup>

Although Q does not name the author of the text which it presents, the text itself bears many striking resemblances to Shakespeare's play King Henry V. But in spite of the many and unmistakable resemblances, the text of Q is quite different from the text of Shakespeare's Henry V as it appears in the First Folio. Q is 1721 lines in length (including stage directions), which makes it some 1655 lines shorter than the text of Henry V as it appears in F. There are no counterparts in Q for I.i, III.i, IV.ii, the Prologue, or the Choruses, as well as about 1367 additional lines of text contained in F. About 950 or 60% of the lines in Q are exactly or substantially the same as their counterparts in F. The remaining 40%, however, differ substantially from those in F in that they 1) paraphrase

the F text, 2) replace two or more words of F with synonyms or antonyms, 3) transpose the order of words or lines from their order in F, 4) occur before they appear in F, or 5) occur after they appear in F. In many cases what appears as prose in F is printed as verse in Q, and what appears as verse in F is printed as prose. In addition to these differences between F and Q, of the forty-seven parts in F, Q eliminates eight (Mackmorris, Jamy, Westmoreland, the Duke of Bretagne, Rambures, Grandpre, the Chorus and one Herald) and adds one character not in F (Gebon, who appears in two of the French scenes of Q).<sup>9</sup>

Faced with these differences between the F and Q of Henry V, critics long ago began to concern themselves with the nature of the Q version. Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the most popular answer to this question was the theory proposed by Pope: Q represented Shakespeare's first draft of the play which was exhibited in its finished form in F.<sup>10</sup> Although the theory was repeated many times during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries,<sup>11</sup> perhaps the most picturesque statement of it was given by George Steevens in his 1766 edition of reprints of Shakespeare's plays which had been previously published in quarto form:

...there are many persons, who not contented with the possession of a finished picture of some great master, are desirous to procure the first sketch that was made for it, that they may have

the pleasure of tracing the progress of the artist from the first light colouring to the finishing stroke. To such the earlier editions of King John, Henry the Fifth, Henry the Sixth, The Merry Wives of Windsor, and Romeo and Juliet, will, I apprehend, not be unwelcome; since in these we may discern as much as will be found in the hasty outlines of the pencil, with a fair prospect of that perfection to which He brought every performance He took the pains to retouch.<sup>12</sup>

Although the belief that Q represented a first draft of Shakespeare's Henry V was popular and persistent, it was not universally accepted; Theobald,<sup>13</sup> Malone,<sup>14</sup> Capell,<sup>15</sup> and Halliwell<sup>16</sup> felt that Q was one of those plays to which Heminges and Condell referred in their address "To The Great Variety of Readers" in the First Folio:

... we pray you do not envie his Friends, the office of their care, and paine, to haue collected & publish'd them; and so to haue publish'd them, as where (before) you were abus'd with diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of iniurious imposters, that expos'd them...  
(sig. A3)

This belief that Q was one of the plays that Heminges and Condell referred to as "stolne" and "maimed, and deformed," however, was only the secondary trend in textual criticism until 1877.

Thus throughout the eighteenth and three-quarters of the nineteenth centuries the most popular opinion regarding the nature of Q was that it was a first draft of the play which was expanded in F. This belief rested mainly upon the fact that Q does not contain much of the material that is included in F. In 1877, however, P. A. Daniel negated most of the criticism of the past one hun-

dred and fifty years.<sup>17</sup> In his introduction to Nicholson's parallel text edition of the F and Q editions of Henry V Daniel proved that Q was a version derived from F and not a first draft by demonstrating that passages in Q make sense only in relation to other passages in F, which are not in Q; these passages must, therefore, have been present in the play which Q represents. Daniel examined the passage of the play in which the Bishop discourses on King Henry's legal claim to the throne of France (F. I.ii.67-91; Q. I.ii.47-55),<sup>18</sup> and found evidence that Q omits parts of the speech found in F. Thus at Q. I.ii.47 the Bishop speaks of "Hugh Capet also that usurpt the crowne." In Q, however, "also" makes absolutely no sense, because no other usurpers are mentioned. This can, however, be readily explained by reference to F. In F "also" refers to the account at l. 67 of "King Pepin, which deposed Childerike." Q has, therefore, omitted this passage regarding King Pepin and the word "also" remains as a vestige of the original version preserved in F. Further along in the same speech Daniel noted another instance in which Q actually omits material that must have been present in the play it represents. At Q. I.ii.51 a reference is made to the "Daughter of Charles, the foresaid Duke of Loraine." In Q there has been no previous mention of the Duke of Loraine, so he can hardly be "foresaid." This, again, is explained by F, where the Duke of Lor-

aine is properly "foresaid" because he has been mentioned at I.ii.72. After citing several instances in which Q either omits or confuses material present in F, Daniel concluded his introduction with several assertions that have formed the basis for modern textual study of Q:

To sum up all, it may then be with confidence asserted--

1. That the Q was certainly not printed from an authentic manuscript.
2. That when it was printed, the fuller version had already been in existence some time.
3. That in itself it contains evidence of omission of passages found in the fuller version.
4. That this circumstance, and the absence from it of certain historical errors found in the fuller version, are strong presumptive evidence of its later date; and, therefore, that instead of regarding it as the author's first sketch, we can only look on it as an imperfect copy of his work.<sup>19</sup>

Modern criticism has been able to do little more with Daniel's treatment of Henry V than add perspective into which Q as an imperfect version of Shakespeare's play can be placed. Today critics almost unanimously place Q of Henry V with six other quarto versions of Shakespeare's plays which they class as "bad quartos," or editions that were stolen and which have no pretention to authenticity.<sup>20</sup>

Greg defines the "bad quartos" as

essentially derivative texts corrupted from more authoritative versions through some kind of reporting...printed with a view to passing them off as the genuine Shakespearian plays, while in fact they were inferior texts.<sup>21</sup>

Of these "bad quartos" perhaps the most simple, yet complex, typical, yet atypical, is Q of Henry V. It is the purpose of this paper to examine Q in order to discover,

if possible, the nature of the play which Q imperfectly represents and the method by which the publishers of Q obtained their "surreptitious" version of Shakespeare's play.

## II

The first problem presented by Q is understanding what kind of play it represents. Most critics are of the opinion that, because Q is a drastically shorter text than the version of Henry V in F, it is a mutilated version of a play which had been abridged with the sanction of the company which acted it in order to make it conform to limitations in time or theatrical conditions. Thus Chambers says:

Cutting may be estimated to have reduced the 3,381 lines by about 1,000, making a performance in two instead of three hours possible. Eleven speaking parts are saved by the process, and this may point to a provincial performance.<sup>1</sup>

It is not an unusual theatrical practice for companies to cut the plays which they produce in order to make them conform to their requirements, and it is not too difficult to believe that the Chamberlain's Men may have presented an abridged version of Shakespeare's play. Because, however, Q is a mutilated version of whatever kind of performance it represents, it is difficult to say with any assurance to what extent Q represents an official abridgement of F. This difficulty is made even more evident when we recall that Q omits things which must have been presented in the performance(s) which it imperfectly records. It is, no doubt, with this in mind that Greg says:

It is not quite clear whether what we have is a

more or less full report of a shortened performance, or a much abbreviated report of a full performance.<sup>2</sup>

This, then, is the difficulty: to what extent do the omissions in Q represent official abridgement and to what extent do they represent failures on the part of the reporter to record what went on upon the stage? Since this question impinges heavily upon the query of how Q was reported, it is necessary for us to examine Q in order to discover to what extent it represents an acting abridgement, and to what extent its omissions were caused by faulty reporting.

Before we begin our search for the purpose of the abridgement in Q it seems proper to state that we can be fairly certain that the F text had undergone some kind of abridgement before it was presented in the form which Q imperfectly represents. This is borne out by the fact that there are three scenes (I.i, III.i, and IV.ii<sup>3</sup>) as well as all of the Choruses which appear in F and of which there is absolutely no trace in Q. Because there is no trace of these things in Q, there is little or no basis for believing that they were omitted by the reporter; when the reporter of Q omitted, he usually left at least some of the material which he missed or skipped over as it was presented on the stage. As Price (p.18) has pointed out, it is altogether consistent with the subsequent stage history of Henry V that the Choruses be omitted when the play is presented on



the stage. As for the three scenes which appear in F but not in Q, it is difficult to say. It is entirely possible that they were cut by the company in order to make the play meet its limitations, but they may also have been censored or even omitted by the reporter in a more competent manner than was his practice elsewhere. Since, however, further discussion of this point can only further obscure the issue, we are prepared here to admit that these scenes were cut by the acting company.

To what end, then, did the acting company cut these three scenes and the Choruses? Chambers and others<sup>4</sup> believe that Q represents a version of F which had been cut in order to reduce the number of speaking parts and, therefore, to accommodate the play to a smaller cast of actors for the purpose of touring the provinces. It seems, however, from all of the indications of the text itself that, contrary to Chambers' belief, the reason for the abridgement of Q was not to make it playable by a reduced number of actors. The evidence which gives witness to this thesis is the presence in Q of mute characters and permissive stage directions.

Q contains eight mute characters: Clarence (I.i), Berri (II.iv), Burbon (II.iv), Bardolphe (III.ii), Erpingham (IV.i), Gower (IV.viii), Warwick (IV.viii) and Queen Isabel of France (V.ii). Investigation of these mute characters (characters who are named in stage dir-

ections but have no lines to speak while they are on stage) reveals 1) that Q omits the lines of some of the characters who appear as mutes in Q but not in F, and 2) that Q retains other mutes who appear as mutes in F.

Clarence and Berri are mutes both in F and Q. One would expect mute characters to be the first to go if one were concerned with cutting to save actors. Therefore, saving actors was unlikely to have been a major concern of the agent responsible for the cutting.

All of the other Q mutes except Burbon<sup>5</sup> have speaking parts in their respective scenes in F: Bardolphe (F. III.ii.1), Erpingham (F. IV.i.16-17, 29, 34), Gower (F. IV.viii.11) and Warwick (F. IV.viii.19). It would not be surprising that an abridger interested in saving roles would cut these speeches or assign them to other characters. But if he were interested in saving characters, surely he would not have included them as mutes. Apparently these idiosyncrasies are to be explained as errors in reporting. This seems very likely because of the shortness of these speeches and the fact that the characters are specifically named by the stage directions. The case of Queen Isabel is much the same as that of the other characters who appear as mutes in Q but not in F, except that there are twenty-four lines to account for. Whether Q omitted these twenty-four lines is a debatable point, but it seems that, since she is mentioned by the stage direction and since V.ii is one of the most mutilated

scenes in Q, in all probability the Queen's lines were not cut but simply missed by the reporter.

In addition to the indication given by the mute characters that Q represents a version of Henry V that had not been abridged to reduce the number of actors, there are permissive stage directions (i.e., stage directions which call for unnamed extras on the stage) which seem to verify this theory.

There are nine permissive stage directions in Q, six of which correspond to permissive stage directions in F and three of which have no counterpart in F:

<u>Quarto</u>	<u>Folio</u>
I.ii. Enter King Henry, Exeter, 2. Bishops, Clarence and other Attendants.	I.ii. Enter the King, Humfrey, Bedford, Clarence, Warwick, Westmerland, and Exeter.
II.iv. Enter King of France, Burbon, Dolphin and, others.	II.iv. Enter the French King, the Dolphin, the Dukes of Berry and Britaine.
III.iii. Enter the King and his Lords. alarum.	III.iii. Enter the King and all his Traine before the Gates.
III.vi. Enter King, Clarence, Gloster and others.	III.vi. Drum and Colours. Enter the King and his poore Souldiers.
IV.i. Enter the King, Gloster, Epingham, and Attendants.	IV.i. Enter the King, Bedford, and Gloucester.
IV.vi. Enter the King and his Nobles, Pistoll.	IV.vi. Alarum. Enter the King and his trayne, with prisoners.
IV.vii. Enter the King and the Lords.	IV.vii. Alarum. Enter King Harry and Burbon with prisoners. Flourish.
V.ii. Enter at one doore, the King of England with his Lords. And at the	V.ii. Enter at one doore, King Henry, Exeter, Bedford, Warwicke, and other Lords.

other doore, the King of France, Queene Katherine, the Duke of Burbon, and others.

At another, Queen Isabel, the King, the Duke of Bour-  
gogne, and other French.

V.ii. Enter the King of France, and Lordes.

V.ii. Enter French Power, and the English Lords.

The six instances in which both Q and F have permissive stage directions (III.iii, III.vi, IV.vi, IV.vii, V.ii and V.ii) indicate that in the performance which Q represents there was no dearth of extras, since in these scenes the supernumeraries of F would certainly have been the first to be eliminated from a cut version, yet in most cases they are duly recorded by the reporter of Q.

The remaining three permissive stage directions (I.ii, II.iv and IV.i) show that Q misses the parts of several characters who were present in the version from which Q was pirated. This can be seen most clearly by examining the fortunes of the Duke of Bedford in Q and F. Although in F the Duke of Bedford appears in three scenes (I.ii, IV.i and V.ii) which are also represented in Q, he makes no appearance as a character in Q. In all three F scenes Bedford is a mute; he neither speaks nor is spoken to, even though he is explicitly named by F and not included in a sweeping general stage direction like "others." All of these scenes in which Bedford should appear in Q, however, have permissive stage directions, while only one (V.ii) has a permissive direction in F. From this diversity in permissive stage directions between F and Q we may infer that Bedford prob-

ably did appear on stage during the performance which Q imperfectly records. This inference is strengthened when we recall that in most of his scenes in F Bedford appears as a mute.<sup>6</sup> What happened, no doubt, was that the reporter, not finding Bedford identified for him in the text of the play which he was reporting, simply listed his appearance as "others." It is, therefore, my contention that Bedford as well as several other characters (e. g. Westmoreland and Warwick) did appear on stage during the performance which Q records imperfectly, but were omitted in Q through the ignorance or oversight of its reporter. Thus, even though these characters are not named by Q they remain in vestige in its permissive stage directions.

In addition to the evidence of the mutes and permissive stage directions in Q, there are other indications that the abridgement was not designed to accommodate F to a smaller cast. We know that the F version of Henry V requires at least eleven actors, since in F. I.ii eleven characters are named. Without considering the implications of the mutes and permissive stage directions, Q requires a cast of nine, for nine characters are named in Q. IV.i. It seems that a reduction in the cast from eleven to nine is not much of a reduction at all, and if we consider the implications of the mutes, the permissive stage directions and the quality of the reporting in Q it would seem that the cast of Q was

probably the same size as that which is required in a full production of F. In conjunction with this is the fact that all of the parts missing from Q are minor parts which easily could have escaped the notice of the reporter. Thus it is reasonable to assert that Q does not represent a version of F which had been abridged in order to accommodate the play to a smaller cast.

Since the purpose of the abridgement was not to accommodate F to a smaller cast, we are forced to settle on the only other possibility: that Q represents a version which was shortened in order to make it conform to the time limitation set for the performance of plays. We know that two hours was the customary time allotted for the presentation of a play. Thus in the Prologue to Romeo and Juliet Shakespeare refers to the play as "two hours traffic of our stage." Likewise Jonson in the prologue to The Alchemist says

Fortune, that favors Fooles, these two short howers  
We wish away; both for your sakes, and ours,  
Judging Spectators.

We do not know, however, exactly how closely the time limit of two hours was observed by the acting companies. Henry Lord Hudson, the Chamberlain, wrote to the Lord Mayor of London that his players had assured him that

they will now begin at two, and haue don  
betwene fower and fiue.

Thus, it is possible that acting companies took liberties with the two-hour limitation.

In addition to this problem with the length of time which a play usually took, there is some question about how many lines Elizabethan actors could cover in two hours. Hart estimates that the average Elizabethan speech tempo was 175 words per minute,<sup>8</sup> but Förster believes it was 125 words per minute.<sup>9</sup>

Considering these two problems to which there are no apparent solutions, it is impossible to estimate with any accuracy how much of F was cut in order to make Henry V conform to the time limit set by the Chamberlain's Men. Adding to this impossibility is the fact that it is difficult to distinguish between cuts and lapses on the part of the reporter. Thus, although we know that F must have been abridged to make it playable in a shorter period of time, we have no way of determining with any accuracy the extent of this abridgement.

## III

In the first section of this paper we demonstrated that Q belongs to that class of mutilated texts (both Shakespearean and non-Shakespearean) which have been labeled as bad quartos. In the second section we attempted to show that Q was derived from an abridgement of the F text, but one in which the abridgement was neither extensive nor for the same purpose as most critics believe it to have been. Throughout both of these sections we have frequently used the terms "reporter" and "report" without discussing fully their meaning or their implication for Q. It is, then, the purpose of this section to discuss the meaning and the application of these terms in order to discover, if possible, how Q came to be a shortened and mutilated text of the hypothetically abridged version of F which it represents.

To begin with, "reporting" is a term which has at the same time one and many meanings. The most general, and hence acceptable, of these definitions of "reporting" is given by Greg, who defines it as

the process of transmission by which one material copy is linked to another in the absence of transcription, including as varieties of transcription, printing or mechanical reproduction, and the accident of dictation.<sup>1</sup>

In other words, reporting denotes the processes, other than direct transcription, by which persons obtained



copies of texts, especially those of plays. This blanket definition of reporting is as far as we can go with unanimous approval, since there exists a hotly contested dispute among critics concerning the methods used by publishers to obtain their reported or "sur-reptitious" copies of authoritative texts. Likewise virtually all modern critics agree that Q represents a reported text, but beyond this they are widely split concerning the actual method used by the publishers to obtain their copy of Henry V. It, therefore, behoves us to investigate thoroughly all of the possible means by which Millington and Busby might have obtained their copy of the play and to test these systems of reporting against the actual conditions in Q in order to discover how Q was pirated.

Before we begin any full-scale examination of the reporting in Q it is necessary for us to demonstrate that Q was not derived from the manuscript that was the basis of F. There are in Q certain bibliographical links which have led some critics<sup>2</sup> to believe that the compilers of Q made reference to some manuscript (actor's part, plot, prompt copy, etc.) closely related to that upon which F was based. It seems, however, that this view is erroneous<sup>3</sup> in the light of a study by Andrew Cairncross, who demonstrates in a very convincing manner that F was set from corrected copies of Q2 and Q3. Rather than linking Q with F, therefore, the bibliographical links

connect F with Q and show that, if anything, the links resulted from F use of Q as copy. Buttressing this view that Q did not depend on a manuscript which later became F is the existence of gross confusion on the part of Q as well as many instances in which Q represents apparent mishearings of the F text. The evident confusion and mongrelization by Q of the material in F makes it extremely unlikely that even the poorest of manuscripts could have been used. In addition to the instances in which Q confuses material from F there are many places where Q confuses words in F because of mishearing. The presence of these mishearings seems to point toward the fact that Q was somehow derived from an actual performance of the play rather than from a transcription of a manuscript. The phonetic nature of the French scenes present convincing examples of this, and in addition there are many instances of note in which English is misheard:

	<u>Quarto</u>		<u>Folio</u>
I.ii.45	the function	I.ii.60	defunction
I.ii.76	foraging	I.ii.112	forrage in
I.ii.85	England	I.ii.144	in-land
I.ii.139	dy all center	I.ii.212	dials center
III.ii.20	they meant	III.ii.43	the men
III.v.2	spranes	III.v.5	sprayes
III.vi.132	heire	III.vi.147	ayre
IV.vi.17	to rest	IV.vi.17	a brest

These mistakes in Q could have been caused by a scribe mishearing a manuscript as it was read, but the number of mishearings as well as the chaotic nature of much of the rest of the text weighs heavily against the use of a manuscript and for the fact that they were caused by

someone making a record of an actual performance.

Because the condition of Q argues strongly against a piracy by transcription it also testifies to the fact that none of the theatrical functionaries like the prompter and the bookkeeper, who were in immediate contact with authoritative manuscripts, could have perpetrated the piracy of Q. Since both the bookkeeper and the prompter have been exonerated of the charge of piracy by transcription, who then are we to charge with the piracy, and what method did he use to report Q?

The most accepted answer to this query about the method of reporting used to pirate Henry V is memorial reconstruction. Greg originally defined memorial reconstruction as

any process of transmission which involves the memory no matter at what stage or in what manner.<sup>4</sup>

This definition, however, included stenographic transcription, which is a record of the actors' memories. This facet of the definition has almost disappeared, and the term has come to imply a method of obtaining texts exclusively by means of memory. Memorial reconstruction, therefore, is the procurement of texts by a person or persons using only their memories to recall and reproduce the text.

The application of the theory of memorial reconstruction to Q explains in a satisfactory manner many of the errors which it contains. Thus it is able to account

for word substitution, paraphrases, and textual rearrangement (anticipation and recollection). The passage cited below gives witness to all of these mistakes. At line 10 Q substitutes "friends" for F's reading of "neighbors." The line "Then will he strip his sleeve and shew his skarres" (Q. 29-31, F. 11-13) is a recollection because it appears in Q after its normal position in F. Likewise the line "Be in their flowing Cups freshly remembered" (Q. 12-14, F. 21-22) is an anticipation in Q because it appears before its normal position in F. Also the Q line "My gracious Lord, The French is in the field" (Q. 39-41) is a paraphrase of its counterpart in F (F. 39-43).

Quarto

This day is called the day of Crispin, / He that outlives this day, and sees old age, / Shall stand a tiptoe when this day is named, / And rowse him at the name of Crispin. / He that outlives this day, and comes safe home, / Shall yearely on the vygill feast his friends, / And say, to morrow is S. Crispines day: / Then shall we in their flowing bowles / Be newly remembered. Harry the King, / Bedford and Exeter, / Clarence and Gloster, / Warwick and Yorke. / Familiar in their mouthes as household words. / This story shall the good man tell his sonne, / And from this day, unto the generall doome: / But we in it shall be remembered. / We fewe, we happie fewe, we bond of brothers, / For he to day that sheads his blood by mine, /

Folio

This day is call'd the Feast of Crispian: / He that outlives this day, and comes safe home, / Will stand a tip-toe when this day is named, / And rowse him at the Name of Crispian. / He that shall see this day, and live old age, / Will yeerely on the Vigil feast (10) his neighbors, / And say to morrow is Saint Crispian. / Then will he strip his sleeve, and shew his skarres: / Old men forget; yet all shall be forgot: / But (15) heele remember, with advantages, / What feats he did that day. Then shall our Names, Familiar in his mouth as household words, / Harry the King, Bedford and Exeter, / Warwick and Talbot, Salisbury and Gloucester, / Be in their flowing Cups freshly remembered. / This story shall the good man teach his sonne: / And Crispian Crispian (20) shall ne're goe by, / From this day to the ending of the World, /

Shalbe my brother: be he ne're  
 so base, / This day shall  
 gentle his condition. / Then  
shall he strip his sleeves, (30)  
and shew his skars / And say,  
 these wounds I had on Crisp-  
 pines day: / And Gentlemen in  
 England now a bed, / Shall  
 thinke themselves accurst, / (35)  
 And hold their manhood cheape,  
 While any speake / that  
 fought with us / Upon Saint  
 Crispines day. / Glost. My  
 gracious Lord, / The French  
 is in the field. /

(Q. IV.iii.23-50; my italics  
 and my numbers)

But we in it shall be remembred; /  
 We few, we happie few, we band of  
 brothers: / For he to day that  
 sheds his blood with me, / Shall  
 be my brother: be he ne're so  
 vile, / This day shall gentle his  
 Condition. / And Gentlemen in  
 England, now a bed, / Shall thinke  
 themselves accurst they were  
 not here; / And hold their Man-  
 hoods cheape, whiles any speakes, /  
 That fought with us upon Saint  
 Crispines day. / Enter Salisbury. /  
 (40) Sal. My Soveraign Lord, bestow  
 your selfe with speed: / The French  
 are bravely in their battailes  
 set, / And will with all expedience  
 charge on us. /

(F. IV.iii.42-71; my italics  
 and my numbers)

In spite of the fact that memorial reconstruction can explain many of the mistakes found in Q there are several problems which it poses. The first of these is: what type of memorial reconstruction was used to compile Q? Memorial reconstruction as a means of reporting plays can take on several theoretical forms. The first of these was suggested by Greg in conjunction with the bad quarto of The Merry Wives of Windsor. The theory is that one of the players supplied, from memory, his own and the other parts in the play. Thus Greg suggests that the pirate was the actor who played the Host of the Garter Inn because of

the comparative excellence of the reporting of those scenes in which the Host is on stage even where he takes no prominent part in the conversation.<sup>5</sup>

This thesis that a play could be memorially reconstructed

by one of its players has been practically substantiated by Betty Shapin. Miss Shapin "conspired" with the player of Sarah in a play entitled Witch Hunt, which was given by the Columbia University Theatre Associates, and produced a text of the play by means of memorial reconstruction which approximated in its variants with the authoritative text a bad quarto.

These variants include the omission of a short intervening line and the running together of speeches originally separated; the anticipation of a word or line and its omission from its rightful place; the transposition of clauses in a sentence; the assigning of lines to the wrong characters, and others.<sup>6</sup>

In addition to this hypothetical report based on an actor's memory, Greg suggested yet another method by which plays might have been pirated by means of the memory. After attending six performances of Shaw's play, John Bull's Other Island, Greg produced a text of the play which compared favorably with the texts of the bad quartos.<sup>7</sup> This method of piracy is not unknown in the history of the English theatre, for in 1776 Tate Wilkinson reconstructed Sheridan's play The Duenna in this manner. Touching on this Wilkinson wrote in his Wandering Patentee

Mr. Harris bought that excellent comic opera of The Duenna from Mr. Sheridan. I saw it several times, and finding it impossible to move Mr. Harris's tenderness, I locked myself up in a room, set down first the jokes I remembered, then I laid a book of the songs before me, and with magazines kept the regulation of the scenes, and by the help of numerous collection of obsolete Spanish plays I produced an excellent opera;

for whenever Mr Younger, or any other country manager wanted a copy of The Duenna, Mr Harris told them they might play Mr Wilkinson's.<sup>8</sup>

Thus, although he could not have seen six successive performances of Henry V, it seems that a reporter in the audience could have gained sufficient mastery of what was said on stage to produce a bad text which would contain all of the features of memorial reconstruction (i.e., anticipations, recollections, transpositions, etc.).

Having defined, in a cursory sort of way, what memorial reconstruction is it is now necessary to examine Q in order to discover if, in fact, it was pirated by this means. For convenience we shall discuss first the application of the actor-reporter theory to Q and then the application of the audience-reporter theory.

One of the basic features of a bad text reported by one of the actors taking part in the play is the fact that the quality of the reporting is highest when the actor-reporter is on stage. Thus in the bad quarto of the Merry Wives the quality is highest when the Host is on stage and in the bad quarto of Hamlet the text deteriorates when Marcellus leaves the stage. We would expect the best scenes to be those in which the actor-reporter appears and the worst to be those in which he is not included. The scenes in Q which most closely agree with F in their percentages of non-corrupt lines are I.ii (78%), II.ii (77%), II.iv (71%), III.iii (100%), IV.viii (60%) and IV.vi (79%).<sup>9</sup> If Q represents an actor's report it

would seem reasonable to assume that the actor-reporter(s) would appear in all or most of these scenes. The characters in the play who have the highest percentage of correct lines are Exeter, Gower, and the Governor of Harfleur. Of these three the most likely reporter is Exeter, who appears in I.ii, II.ii, II.iv, IV.iii, IV.vi, and V.ii. In these scenes Exeter has 108 lines assigned to him in Q, of which 67 are exactly the same as their counterparts in F, 30 are substantially the same (although they do contain minor omissions, additions, transpositions and word substitutions), and 11 lines are totally corrupt. Exeter does appear in five of the better scenes of Q, but he also appears in V.ii, which is one of the most corrupt scenes in Q (61% of the lines are totally corrupt and over half of the scene of F is missing), and the quality of V.ii is only slightly better when Exeter is on stage. Also Exeter does not appear in the best scene of Q (III.iii) which has no totally corrupt lines,<sup>10</sup> and in I.ii and II.ii many of the parts are as good as or better than Exeter's. For example, in I.ii Exeter's lines are 80% correct or substantially correct, but the Ambassador's lines are 63% good, the "Lord's" lines are 85% correct and substantially correct and the Bishop's lines are the same or nearly the same as F in 89% of his speeches. It would seem strange for Exeter as the reporter to know the parts of two other characters better than his own. Along with this we must remember that one of Exeter's



speeches in F is assigned to Gloucester in Q (II.ii. 3-6)<sup>11</sup> and also that about 30% of Exeter's cue lines are corrupt. This last fact seems to cast doubt upon Exeter as the reporter, since cue lines, or the last lines of speeches preceeding his own, were integral to an actor's part and which he would have to know as well as his own speeches. Thus, because of the corruptness of his cue lines, his appearance in V.ii, and the fact that in some scenes other characters have higher percentages of non-corrupt lines, it seems unlikely that Exeter<sup>a</sup> was the actor-reporter who reported the text from memory. We must, therefore, look elsewhere for another character who might have memorially reconstructed Q.

<sup>12</sup>Chambers suggests that the Governor of Harfleur may have been the actor-reporter who pirated Q. The Governor of Harfleur appears in only one scene (III.iii) which is the least corrupt scene in Q. He has no totally corrupt lines, but 57% of his lines involve minor errors, while King Henry, the only other character who appears in the scene, likewise has no corrupt lines and only 27% of his lines embody minor mistakes. Furthermore, since the Governor appears in only one scene he would probably have been called upon to fill another part, but there are no other minor parts which are comparable to the excellence of the reporting in III.iii. Again, it seems unlikely that the Governor was the pirate of Q because the King's speeches are better than his in III.

iii and because he appears in only one scene. We must again turn to the last member of the acting company who can be accused of pirating Q by means of memory.

This last character who has any claim to the unsavory role of actor-reporter is Gower. Gower appears in five scenes (III.ii, III.vi, IV.i, IV.vii and V.i) in which he is assigned 45 lines in Q of which 51% are exactly the same as their counterparts in F, 33% are substantially correct and 16% are corrupt. His best scene is IV.vii in which, however, his part is only 60% correct and 27% substantially correct. If Gower was the actor-reporter his presence is not felt heavily, for the quality of the rest of the characters is noticeably bad. Thus the King's lines are 41% corrupt, Fluellen's lines are 73% corrupt and Montjoy's lines are over 67% corrupt. In addition to this, Gower appears in many of the most corrupt scenes in Q--III.ii is 64% corrupt, IV.i is 55% and V.i is 51% corrupt--and his part involves constant verbal interplay with Fluellen who has one of the highest percentages of tainted lines in Q (67% corrupt). If an actor's cue lines were as important to the Elizabethan actor as they are to his modern counterpart they also can be used to judge exactly how well Gower's part is reported in Q. Gower's cue lines, however, are overwhelmingly bad. All of this seems to demonstrate, both separately and cumulatively, that Gower's part is not as good as it has been assumed to be by

critics like Duthie,<sup>13</sup> and that the actor who took the part of Gower seems to be out of the question as far as the search for an actor-reporter goes.

Turning from a member of the acting company itself, it is possible to posit an audience-reporter, who, like Tate Wilkinson, reconstructed the play from his recollections of an actual performance. This hypothesis is supported by the lack of any certain evidence to indict any specific actor in the cast. Also the mixture of corrupt and non-corrupt material which runs consistently through Q points toward an audience-reporter. It seems probable that the corruption arising from a memorial reconstruction by an audience-reporter would follow some kind of overall rising and falling pattern. For example, it would seem that since the end of the play was closer in time to the reporter's reconstruction of the play that it would contain a higher percentage of correct lines, and as the reporter's memory moved backward in time that the percentage of correct lines would diminish. Failing this, it would also be possible that the comic scenes would be more easily remembered than the serious (remember that the jokes were what stuck in Wilkinson's mind), or vice versa. None of these things, however, occur in Q. In fact, as far as we can discern, the corruption in Q has no apparent pattern whatsoever. All of this, of course, does not preclude an audience-reporter, but it suggests an important

question: could a reporter whose memory was subject to so many lapses and mistakes reconstruct by means of his memory alone a text which contains the number of correct lines which are in Q? The question, of course, is unanswerable, but it gives one pause.

During this pause we must also consider the fact that Q is unique among the bad quartos of Shakespeare in that it contains no additions of non-Shakespearean material.<sup>13</sup> A classic example of the addition of non-Shakespearean material can be found in the "To be, or not to be" soliloquy in the bad quarto of Hamlet:

To be, or not to be, I there's the point,  
 To Die, to sleepe, is that all? I all:  
 No, to sleepe, to dreame, I mary there it goes,  
 For in that dreame of death, when wee awake,  
And borne before an euerlasting Iudge, (5)  
 From whence no passenger euer retur'nd,  
 The vndiscovered country, at whose sight  
The happy smile, and the accursed damn'd.  
But for this, the ioyfull hope of this,  
 Whol'd beare the scornes and flattery of the world, (10)  
Scorned by the right rich, the rich curssed of the poore?  
The widow being oppressed, the orphan wrong'd,  
The taste of hunger, or a tirants raigne,  
 And thousand more calamities besides,  
 To grunt and sweate vnder this weary life, (15)  
 When that he may his full Quietus make,  
 With a bare bodkin, who would this indure,  
 But for a hope of something after death?  
 (sig. El; my italics and numbers)

Like Q much of the material in this passage is based on material that is present in F. However unlike Q the bad quarto of Hamlet adds non-Shakespearean material (lines 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13) to that which it derives from F. This occurrence of non-Shakespearean matter adds credence to the assumption that Hamlet and other bad quartos were

memorially reconstructed, but its absence may make the application of memorial reconstruction to Q less sure. It seems most natural for a reporter in reconstructing a play to make good those things which he could not recall from his own mind; yet in Q there is nothing which is not based upon the play as it is presented in F.

Along with this we must consider, even from an idealistic point of view, the presence in Q of F lines reduced to nonsense. In order to explain the existence of nonsense in Q by means of memorial reconstruction one is forced to twist the process until it becomes a kind of sixteenth century stream of consciousness which was subject to Freudian slips et. al. This is, naturally, absurd, but it points to the difficulty of accounting for everything in Q by means of memorial reconstruction. Thus, although memorial reconstruction can account for features of Q like anticipation, recollection, transposition and paraphrase, it cannot have been the sole method used to obtain Q because of the lack of non-Shakespearean matter in Q and because no method of memorial reconstruction explains the features of Q. We must, therefore, examine yet another system of reporting which has been proposed as the method used to pirate Q.

## IV

Several German and English critics<sup>1</sup> have suggested that Q may have been reported by means of a stenographic transcription of a performance of Henry V. It is the purpose of this chapter to examine the systems of stenography available in the sixteenth century and to determine whether Q could have been pirated by means of shorthand.

During the last quarter of the sixteenth century shorthand writing began to move toward the popularity that it achieved in the mid-seventeenth century. This popularity caused the scholar Comenius in 1641 to say that "many boys and men followed the sermons at church with their pencil and took down every word by shorthand."<sup>2</sup> Philipp Harsdörffer, a German diplomat, likewise testified in 1653 that "shorthand is such a common thing in England that even women do know it, so that they can take down a whole sermon word for word."<sup>3</sup> During Elizabeth's reign, however, there were only four methods of shorthand known in England. The first of these was Timothy Bright's Characterie, which was published in book form in 1588. For this book Elizabeth granted the inventor a royal patent which gave Bright a monopoly for fifteen years to teach and publish his shorthand. In spite of the royal patent, in 1590 another system of shorthand appeared in the third part of Peter Bale's The

Writing Schoolmaster. Bale invented a second system of shorthand which he published in 1600 in A New Year's Gift for England. In 1602 John Willis published anonymously his system of shorthand in the Arte of Stenography. Of these four systems of stenography, only those of Bale and Bright were available before 1600 for any hypothetical piracy of plays. It is possible that Willis' system may have also been available for pirates, but this seems doubtful, since Willis was a respectable cleric waiting for a benefice in London and would, no doubt, have been loath to let his yet unpublished system be used to steal another's play.<sup>4</sup> Bale's systems have also been rejected by all of the critics who espouse the shorthand theory because of their extremely cumbersome nature.<sup>5</sup> If, therefore, shorthand was used to pirate Q, the system that must have been used was that invented by Timothy Bright.

Before we discuss the features of Bright's system and their applications to Q, it is first necessary to demonstrate that 1) Bright's shorthand was used for the illicit procurement of texts, and 2) that stenography was actually used to pirate plays. Bright's book, Characterie: An Arte of Shorte, Swifte and Secrete Writing by Character, was published in 1588. The system described by the book was apparently quickly adopted, for in 1589 Jane Seager, one of Elizabeth's ladies in waiting, presented the Queen with a copy of

The Divine Prophecies of the Ten Sibills, which was transcribed "in that rare arte of charactery invented by Dr. Bright."<sup>6</sup> Soon after this, Characterie was being used to transcribe sermons for the purpose of publication without the consent of the author. A sermon given at Blackfriars by one Stephen Egerton was "taken by Characterie" and published only to be decried by the author in his subsequent edition of his sermons.<sup>7</sup> In 1590 another sermon appeared in print, bearing on its title-page: "A Sermon of the Benefite of Contention. By H. Smyth. Taken by Characterie."<sup>8</sup> Smyth, being of the same mind as Egerton, also decried the piracy in his subsequent edition of his sermons. In addition to this evidence that Bright's shorthand was used for pirating sermons, there is abundant evidence to demonstrate that stenography (though not necessarily Bright's) was used to obtain "surreptitious" copies of plays as they were acted. Thus Sir George Buck, the Master of the Revels, wrote in his Third Universitie of England:

They which know it [shorthand] can readily take a Sermon, Oration, Play, or any long speech, as they are spoke, dictated, acted, and uttered, in the instant.<sup>9</sup>

The dramatist Thomas Heywood also makes two references to stenography as a tool of pirates. The first is in the prologue to his play If You Know Not Me, You Know No Bodie:



This: (by what fate I know not) sure no merit,  
 That it disclaims, may for the age inherit,  
 Writing 'bove one and twenty; but ill nurst  
 And yet receiv'd, as well perform'd at first,  
 Grac't and frequented, for the cradle age  
 Did throng the seates, the Boxes and the stage  
 So much; that some by Stenography drew  
 The plot; put it in print: (scarse one word trew:)  
 And in that lamenesse it hath lim'pt so long.<sup>10</sup>

Heywood's second reference to stenography is in the preface to The Rape of Lucrece:

For my owne part, I proclaime my selfe ever faithful in the first [writing for the stage] , and never guilty of the laste [writing for the printer] : yet since some of my Playes have (unknown to me, and without any of my direction) accidentally come into the Printer's hands, and therefore so corrupt and mangled, (copied onely by the eare) that I have been as unable to know them, as ashamed to challenge them.<sup>11</sup>

In spite of these two references by Heywood to stenography Mr. Giordano-Orsini has put forward the view that the two plays which Heywood believed to have been stolen by short-hand were, in fact, memorially reconstructed.<sup>12</sup> This does not, however, injure the validity of Heywood's testimony on stenography, for if Heywood assumed that his plays were stolen by shorthand it must have been a well known (at least to Heywood) method of illicitly obtaining copies of plays.<sup>13</sup>

Another contemporary allusion to the piracy of plays by means of stenography appears in John Webster's The Devil's Law Case (IV.ii.29-30) where one of the characters admonishes the officials of the court to "let in no brachygraphy men, to take notes."<sup>14</sup> Thus we have the testimony of Buck, Heywood and Webster that the piracy of plays by

shorthand, rather than being an unknown practice, was fairly popular in a period roughly contemporary to the compilation of Q by its publishers.

Timothy Bright's Characterie was a system of shorthand based on the principle of representing words by symbols. The system revolved about eighteen basic symbols which were to represent the letters of the alphabet:

a		b	┘	c, k, q	└	d	┆	e	┆	f	┘	g	└	h	┆
i, j, y	┆	l	┘	m	└	n	┆	o	┆	p	┆	r	┆	s, z	┆
t	┆	u, v, w	┆	.											

These eighteen basic symbols would be altered to represent different words by adding twelve different marks to the base of each symbol. Thus the symbol for "a" (|) could appear as

┘   └   ┆   ┆   ┆   ┆   ┆   ┆   ┆   ┆









Through the addition of these marks to the foot of each symbol there is a total of 216 possible symbols. In addition, however, to the marks which could be added to the foot, each of the 216 symbols could appear vertically, horizontally, slanted to the right or slanted to the left (e.g. |, —, /, and \) in order to alter the meaning of the symbol still further. Therefore Bright's system contained a total of 864 possible symbols which could be used to represent different words. Bright, however, used only 536 of these symbols in his system. Each of these 536 symbols stood for a word


beginning with the first letter represented by the symbol itself. Thus Bright lists twenty-four words that are represented by the symbol for "a" with its attendant variations:

	Abound		All		Anoint
	About		Almost		Aparrel
	Accept		Also		Appertain
	Accuse		Although		Appoint
	Advance		Alter		Arm
	Air		Am		Art
	Again		Amend		Ass
	Age		Anger		At

If, therefore, the stenographer wished to represent the word "art" he would transcribe the symbol and at a more convenient time translate the symbol back into the word which it represented.

With a vocabulary of only 536 words, however, it would be impossible to transcribe a book by Dr. Seuss, to say nothing of a play by Shakespeare. But Bright's system was not limited to the 536 word vocabulary dictated by the use of symbols, since there were methods by which the symbols could be altered further in order to represent words for which there was no basic symbol. Thus if the stenographer wished to signify a word for which

there was no symbol he might have chosen to express the word by representing the sign for a synonym of the word for which there was a symbol to which he would add the initial letter of the word he wished to represent before the symbol for the synonym. Thus to represent the word "haven" for which there was no symbol the stenographer would write the symbol for water (  ) prefixed by the symbol for the letter "h" (  ) resulting in the configuration  which would represent "haven." Likewise to represent the word "sect" the stenographer would write "religion" (  ) prefixed by the letter "s" (  ) resulting in  which he would afterwards translate into "sect" if he was lucky. In addition to this method of representing words not covered by the basic 536 symbols or by transcribing their synonyms, Bright devised what he called the "dissenting signification." "Dissenting signification" is no more than a method used to denote words by representing their antonyms. This procedure is very much like that which Bright used with synonyms, except that in the case of antonyms the first letter of the word to be represented by an antonym follows the symbol instead of preceding it. Thus to represent a word like "forget," for which there was neither a symbol nor a synonym with a symbol, the stenographer might use its antonym "remember," for which there was a symbol (  ), and add the symbol for "f" to the right side, producing the configuration (  ).

Together with allowing each individual stenographer considerable liberty to alter this system of symbols, Bright's system was none too careful about representing grammatical constructions correctly. Thus plural nouns were indicated by placing a dot to the right of the symbol for the noun ("asses" would have been written ). Dots placed in various positions about symbols for verbs were also used to differentiate the various tenses. A number of arbitrary signs were used to denote prepositions, conjunctions, etc. Comparative and superlative degrees of adjectives and adverbs were not expressed at all, but the word was written in the positive degree, which the stenographer was to translate into its proper meaning according to the sense of the passage. Another complication of Bright's system was that it was written, not from left to right, but in narrow vertical columns from top to bottom. Bright's Characterie was, then, a somewhat unwieldy system compared to latter developments in the art of stenography. But since we know that it was used successfully to pirate sermons it now behoves us to investigate the possible application of Bright's system to Q.

Perhaps the major proponent for the use of Bright's stenography as the method of reporting in Q is H. T. Price. Price presents the two versions of Henry Smyth's sermon (the stolen and the authoritative versions), finding that the sermon which claims to be "taken by Characterie" rep-

resents a reasonably good text of the authoritative version. Thus, on the evidence of Smyth's sermon, Price feels that there "need be no reason to doubt that the Quarto text of Henry V could have been 'taken by Characterie' also." <sup>16</sup> Price then goes on to find what he believes to be signs of Bright's shorthand in the text of Q. He finds that there are twenty instances where Q substitutes a synonym for the correct word of F which can be explained by reference to Bright's method of using synonyms to represent words for which there were no sym-

<sup>17</sup>  
bols:

	<u>Folio</u>	<u>Quarto</u>	<u>Bright</u>
I.ii.105	tombe	grave	tomb by t + grave
I.ii.157	harm'd	hurt	harm by hurt
I.ii.232	history	chronicle	history by chronicle
I.ii.274	our self	our selves	indistinguishable
I.ii.288	widows	wife	both by w + marry
I.ii.312	chide	check	both by c + rebuke
II.i.30	lodgers	lodging	both by l + house
II.i.76	face	nose	nose by n + face
II.iii.42	riches	wealth	riches by r + wealth
II.iii.55	mouth	lips	lips by l + mouth
II.iii.59	close	fast	close by c + fast
II.iv.87	pertain	belongs	both by appertaine
III.vi.14	estimation	reckoning	both by count
III.vi.50	desire	wish	both by desire
III.vi.54	well	good	both by same symbol
IV.i.292	hearts	courage	courage by c + heart
IV.iii.126	none	naught	both by n + some
IV.iii.132	beg	crave	crave by c + beg
IV.vi.6	blood	bleeding	both by blood
IV.vii.59	swift	fast	swift by s + fast

As convincing as this list may seem at first glance, these synonyms do admit to other explanations which are as convincing as Price's explanation in terms of Bright's shorthand. Price does not, however, stop with recording the occurrence of synonyms but goes on to find five in-

stances in Q which can be accounted for by reference to Bright's "dissenting signification," or the use of antonyms to represent words for which there were neither  
18  
symbols nor synonyms:

	<u>Folio</u>	<u>Quarto</u>	<u>Bright</u>
I.ii.287	stand	sit	stand by sit + s
II.i.107	women	men	women by men + w
IV.i.304	nothing	all	nothing by all + n
IV.v.19	go	come	both by same symbol
IV.vii.127	night	day	night by day + n

In all of the cases where Q substitutes antonyms Price points out that "the Folio is undoubtedly the right  
19  
reading and the Quarto makes nonsense."

Next Price notes that

in the specimens of...shorthand that have come down to us the difference between the singular and the plural of nouns is often not noted.<sup>20</sup>

He goes on to state that

there are over forty disagreements between the texts as to the omission or retention of a plural 's'.<sup>21</sup>

Price does, however, mention the difficulty of being sure that aberrations of this kind were the results of Bright's shorthand at work, but he cites the F text at I.ii.288, "Many thousand widows," and the corresponding Q text (I.ii.204), "His mocke shall mocke many a wife out of their deare husbands," and says that

a reading so incoherent could not come from a regular manuscript. Nor would a pirate actor be likely to write in cold blood such nonsense as the Quarto, but Bright's confused grammar might easily give rise to it.<sup>22</sup>

In addition to wreaking havoc with singulars and

plurals, Price notes that Bright's Characterie was often apt to confuse the tenses of verbs. Accordingly we find that Q does frequently confuse the tenses of verb forms as they exist in F:

	<u>Folio</u>		<u>Quarto</u>	
I.ii.53	should	I.ii.38	shall	
II.iii.19	bid	II.iii.14	bad	
IV.i.75	heare	IV.i.34	heard	
IV.vii.99	did	IV.vii.82	do	
IV.vi.17	cryes	IV.vi.15	cryde	

Again Price admits that these cases could have been produced by systems of reporting other than stenography, but he holds that their appearance could have been easily caused by a faulty transcription of a shorthand manuscript, which Bright's system made almost inevitable.

The next point which Price makes is that upon three occasions (III.vi.28, 110 and III.vii.21) Q substitutes the pronoun "her" for the F reading of "his" (F. III.vi.29, 120 and III.vii.62) which can be explained by reference to Bright, who represented "her" by "his" followed by a dot. But here again Q's mistake can be accounted for by other methods of reporting, since the pronouns in Q follow the sense of the passage, and although the F reading is undoubtedly correct, mistakes of this sort could have arisen from the use of other systems as well as from a transcription in Bright's Characterie.

On the whole Price's book gives very little evidence which admits to no other explanation than transcription by Bright's Characterie, but it is surprising to find that so many of the mistakes in Q can be accounted for



by reference to Bright. One thing that Price does not note is that Bright's system was meant to be adaptable to each individual stenographer, and each stenographer was free to alter the system to a certain extent to fit his own needs,<sup>24</sup> which might further account for some of the eccentricities of Q. The most important of Price's arguments is that Q contains many misreadings which could not have been written in cold-blood by a reporter, yet which can be readily explained if they arose from mechanical mistakes of a stenographer transcribing shorthand notes into longhand.

The thesis that Q was a result of piracy by Bright's Characterie has, however, met with less than universal approval. In fact many English and American critics feel a genuine repugnance toward the thesis that any of Shakespeare's quartos were products of shorthand transcription. One of the most ardent objectors to Price's theory that Q represents a shorthand transcription of a performance of F is W. Matthews. Matthews attacks the stenographic hypothesis by examining the nature of Bright's system, which he believes precludes any use of it for such an ambitious undertaking as the piracy of a play. He argues that

in computing the utility of Bright's system we must consider: (1) the tremendous grasp of the English vocabulary required by the stenographer; (2) the degree of mental alertness necessary to assign words to their true Characterall words; (3) the difficulty of learning and of distinguishing

between over 550 words...which have very similar signs; (4) the slowness of the system caused by the method of writing in columns and the necessity of moving the hand backwards to write the initial letters. These four points make it highly improbable, I think, that anyone could have written the system at anything like the speed necessary for taking down even a slow speech. Finally the error quotient of approximately 50 per cent for the synonyms and antonyms, and possibly as much for the pronouns, tenses, plurals and singulars of nouns, etc., together with probability of omissions, make it in the highest degree unlikely that, even if it had been possible to take down speech in Characterie, anything but the most corrupt of transcriptions would have been possible.<sup>25</sup>

Thus, in spite of the fact that there are sermons which are claimed to have been taken down by Bright's shorthand, and the fact that there are numerous mistakes in Q which can be accounted for by reference to Bright, Mr. Matthews believes that the nature of Bright's stenography cannot account for the conditions present in Q.

Although Matthews' objections to shorthand as a method of reporting in Q have been countered by Price<sup>26</sup> and others<sup>27</sup> there are other objections which may be raised against the stenographic hypothesis. First, as Price himself points out, almost all of those things that are used to show that Q was a shorthand transcription can be explained by reference to other methods of reporting. Secondly, Q contains some features which cannot be accounted for by the mechanics of shorthand. These are the frequent anticipations, and recollections of lines and passages. The only way in which these things can be accounted for by the stenographic theory is by laying the blame for them on the actors, who

can hardly be accused of making the quantity of mistakes of this sort which appear in Q. Furthermore, since Bright's system was not based on phonetics, it cannot explain the long passages in French which are phonetically reproduced in Q.<sup>28</sup> On these grounds, then, we are forced to admit that however attractive the stenographic hypothesis may seem there are several insurmountable barriers to accepting it as the sole method of reporting used to pirate Q.

## V

It would seem, then, that we have arrived at a kind of critical impasse in which none of the accepted methods of reporting are able to explain all of the features of Q. Memorial reconstruction in one form or another can explain the rearrangements of the text in Q quite well, but it is hard pressed when it must explain the presence of antonyms, the absence of non-Shakespearean material, the excellence of some of the reporting as well as the exact type of memorial reconstruction that was used. Stenography, on the other hand, can explain the omissions and the substitution of synonyms, antonyms and grammatical aberrations, but it cannot explain the anticipations and recollections. In spite of the general antipathy both in this country and in England toward the stenographic hypothesis, it does seem to account for some of the corruptions in Q which would necessitate a considerable stretching of the memorial reconstruction theory to explain. Thus the existence of antonyms in Q can be accounted for by shorthand by considering them as simple, mechanical errors made by a stenographer transcribing his notes into longhand. Likewise, since Bright's Characterie could produce fairly good reported texts of sermons, in which the percentage of good lines overwhelms the bad, it seems to have been a fairly

satisfactory method of reporting. But, again, shorthand cannot account for the major rearrangements of the text in Q and some doubt has been raised as to whether Bright's system could have kept pace with a play.<sup>1</sup>

Conditions in a play would have differed greatly from those encountered by a stenographer while transcribing a sermon. The dialogue in a play would move rather quickly, perhaps from 125 to 200 words a minute,<sup>2</sup> compared to the slower pace of a minister reading a sermon, and, if stenography was used to report Q, the resulting text would have presumably been even shorter than the present text of Q. If shorthand were used, however, it would account for the correct and nearly correct lines in a more mechanically convincing way than could the use of memorial reconstruction by itself. However, we must conclude that, since Bright's shorthand was a cumbersome system, it could not have produced a text even as incomplete as Q. Bright's Characterie may have been able to produce a text of about 950 lines, which would be approximately one third of the length of F even if we agree with Chambers that the acting version was abridged 1000 lines.<sup>3</sup> If we agree, therefore, that Bright's system could have produced a text of 950 lines, or approximately half the present length of Q, it is possible that the 950 lines of good and substantially good text in Q were produced by means of Bright's Characterie. But even if we accept this hypothesis that Bright's system produced the good parts

of Q, how are we to explain the unmistakable evidence in Q of memorial reconstruction? Again we seem to have reached an impasse, but since evidence can be found in Q to support both the theories of memorial reconstruction and stenography, it might not be altogether absurd to suggest that both methods of reporting were used in the transmission of Henry V from the version of F that was presented on the stage to the printed copy in Q. A shorthand report in which the numerous omissions were made good by means of the reporter's memory, recalling both correct and incorrect matter, could produce a mangled text which would contain evidence of both systems of reporting. Thus it is possible that a stenographer finding that in his transcription he had missed a great deal of material might have used his memory to make good these gaps in his text. Using this hypothesis, it is possible to conceive of a text which explains the amounts of both good and corrupt material without doing violence to either system of reporting. By postulating a shorthand text which was augmented by the reporter's memory we are able to account for 1) the presence of absolute nonsense, 2) antonyms and synonyms, 3) omissions, 4) the fact that there are no non-Shakespearean additions, and 5) the major rearrangements in the order of the text. We are far from asserting that this was, in fact, how Q came to be, but that the postulation of a reporter who used both shorthand and his memory results in a more mechanically

satisfying solution to the problem than either memorial reconstruction or stenography by themselves can.

Notes

## Chapter I

- 1) The third quarto of Henry V bears on its title-page the date 1608. This edition was, however, printed in 1619, and the printer (William Jaggard) for some reason altered the date to that which appears on Q3. For detailed evidence that Q3 was printed in 1619 see A. W. Pollard, Shakespeare's Folios and Quartos (London, 1909), chapter IV.
- 2) "The common divergences of Q2 and Q3 from Q1 are limited to corrections of obvious misprints, with one or two possible exceptions which may be accidental agreements in conjectural amendment" (E. K. Chambers, William Shakespeare [Oxford, 1930] , I, 390).
- 3) Creede may have based his claim to the copyright of Q upon the Famous Victories of Henry the Fift, which he was entitled to print, since he held its copyright. See E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage (Oxford, 1923), IV, 17.
- 4) E. Arber, A Transcription of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554-1640 (London, 1876), III, 37.
- 5) Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, 17.



- 6) Chambers, William Shakespeare, I, 136.
- 7) Arber, III, 63.
- 8) W. W. Greg, Henry V 1600, Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles No. 9 (Oxford, 1957), p.v.
- 9) Gebon appears in the Q counterparts for F. III.vii and IV.v. In the former scene he speaks one line, which is a corruption of a line assigned to Orleans at F. III.vi.91, while in the latter scene Gebon says two words which are corruptions of a line assigned to the Constable at F. IV.v.1. Exactly what or who Gebon was is not very clear, and his appearance may well be one of the truly unanswerable questions that Q raises. H. T. Price, The Text of Henry V (Newcastle-under-Lyme, 1920), pp. 21-22, suggests that Gebon may be a corruption of an actor's name, perhaps that of Thomas Gilburn who is listed in F, but this is by no means certain.
- 10) Alexander Pope, Shakespeare's Works (London, 1725), III, 398, 446.
- 11) For other critics who espouse the first draft theory, see Samuel Johnson, The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare (Philadelphia, 1795), IV, 446-7; J. P. Collier, The Works of William Shakespeare (London, 1842), IV, 460-3; C. Knight, The Works of Shakespeare (New York, 1875), II, 606; and G. Terplanck, The Illustrated Shakespeare (New

York, 1847), I, 145.

12) George Steevens, Twenty Plays of Shakespeare (London, 1766), I, 7.

13) Lewis Theobald, The Works of Shakespeare (London, 1733), I, xxxviii.

14) E. Malone, Shakespeare's Works (London, 1790), I, x; V, 274.

15) E. Capell, Notes and Various Readings to Shakespeare (London, 1779), Part II, 4-5.

16) J. O. Halliwell, The Works of William Shakespeare (London, 1861), X, 280.

17) P. A. Daniel, introduction to "King Henry V: Parallel Texts of the First Quarto (1600) and the First Folio (1623) Editions," New Shakespeare Society Publications, Series II, no. 9, 1877.

18) This and all subsequent references to both Q and F are made to the parallel texts introduced by Daniel and edited by B. Nicholson. To assure correct readings I have also checked all lines cited with W. W. Greg's facsimile of Q and Helge Kokeritz, A Facsimile Edition of the First Folio (New Haven, 1954).

19) Daniel, p. xiv.

20) The Merry Wives of Windsor, 1602; Romeo and Juliet, 1597; Hamlet, 1603; The First Part of the Contention Betwixt the Two Famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster (2 Henry VI), 1594; The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of Yorke (3 Henry VI), 1595; and Pericles, 1609.

21) W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare (Oxford, 1942), p. 9.

## Chapter II

1) Chambers, William Shakespeare, I, 392.

2) Greg, The Editorial Problem, p. 70.

3) IV.ii may not have been completely abridged. Fragments of this scene can be found in Q. III.vii, which may indicate that the two scenes were combined either by an official abridger or by the reporter's memory.

4) See A. W. Pollard, Shakespeare's Quartos and Folios, p. 38; R. D. French, The Life of Henry the Fifth (New Haven, 1918), p. 136; and R. J. Dorius, The Life of Henry the Fifth (New Haven, 1955), p. 157.

5) In Q Burbon is introduced in four scenes (II.iv, III.v, III.vii and V.ii). In F, however, Burbon is not named as a character in any of these scenes, but in the one scene in which he does appear (IV.v) he is specifically named

in the text. What seems to have happened in Q is that the reporter, remembering a French character named Burbon, identified several other French characters with this name as he probably could not recall their proper names. This is made more believable when one recalls the reporter had a great deal of difficulty with French in the first place.

6) Bedford has lines in II.ii and IV.iii.

7) Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, 316.

8) A. Hart, "The Time Allotted for Representation of Elizabethan and Jacobean Plays," RES, VIII (1932), 407.

9) M. Förster, "Shakespeare and Shorthand," PQ, XVI (1937), 27-29.

### Chapter III

1) W. W. Greg, Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: The Battle of Alcazar & Orlando Furioso (London, 1923), pp. 258-9.

2) Both Price, pp. 21-22, and Chambers, William Shakespeare, I, 391, believe that there are bibliographical links between F and Q caused by the use of a plot or actor's part.

3) A. S. Cairncross, "Quarto Copy for Folio Henry V,"

SB, VIII (1956), 67-93.

4) Greg, Alcazar & Orlando, p. 256.

5) W. W. Greg, The Merry Wives of Windsor (London, 1904), p. xxxviii.

6) B. Shapin, "An Experiment in Memorial Reconstruction," MLR, XXXIX (1944), 9.

7) Greg, Merry Wives, p. xxviii.

8) Quoted from R. Crompton Rhodes, "Some Aspects of Sheridan Bibliography," The Library, 4th series, IX (1928-29), 240-241.

9) In computing these figures we have followed the principle that a line with less than two word substitutions is substantially correct, and a line with more than two substitutions is corrupt.

10) It is possible that Exeter may have doubled as the Governor, but it seems unlikely that as a prominent member of the King's party he would have done so.

11) This may have been due also to theatrical rearrangement of the lines.

12) Chambers, William Shakespeare, I, 391.

13) G. I. Duthie, The 'Bad' Quarto of Hamlet (Cambridge, 1941), pp. 30-32.

14) A. Hart, Stolne and Surreptitious Copies (Oxford, 1942), pp. 107-118.

#### Chapter IV

- 1) Price, Förster and C. Dewischeit, "Shakespeare und die Stenographie," ShJ, XXXIV (1898), 170-220.
- 2) Quoted from Förster, p. 9.
- 3) Ibid. p. 9.
- 4) W. Matthews, "Shorthand and the Bad Shakespeare Quartos," MLR, XXVII (1932), 248.
- 5) Ibid. p. 246.
- 6) J. Q. Adams, "The Quarto of King Lear and Shorthand," MP, XXXI (1933-34), 138.
- 7) Ibid. p. 138.
- 8) Ibid. p. 139.
- 9) Sir George Buck's The Third Universitie of England was printed in 1612 and is quoted here from Adams, p. 140.
- 10) Heywood's play If You Know Not Me, You Know No Bodie was printed in its pirated version by Nathaniel Butter in 1605. Heywood emended the play and attacked the pirated version in his collection of Pleasant Dialogues

and Dramas which was published in 1637.

11) Heywood's authoritative edition of The Rape of Lucrece was published in 1608. Whether "copied only by the ear" refers specifically to shorthand has been questioned by several critics (see Duthie, p. 12).

12) G. N. Giordano-Orsini, "Thomas Heywood's Play on the Troubles of Queen Elizabeth," The Library, XIV (1933-34), 313-338.

13) See A. W. Pollard, "The Bibliographical Approach to Shakespeare; Notes on New Contributions," The Library, XIV (1933-34), 351-52.

14) "Brachigraphy men: an allusion with special point for an Elizabethan audience. For such shorthand writers used to lurk in the theatre to take down plays surreptitiously, so that they could be pirated by some publisher." F. L. Lucas, The Complete Works of John Webster (London, 1927), II, 349, n. 30.

15) In the above description of Bright's Characterie I have relied heavily on G. I. Duthie's book Elizabethan Shorthand and the First Quarto of King Lear, (Oxford, 1949) as well as the accounts of Bright's system found in Price, Förster, Matthews and Adams.

16) Price, p. 13.

- 17) The corresponding lines in Q are: I.ii.69, 94, 154, 191, 204, 218; II.i.26, 66; II.iii.33, 42, 46; II.iv.37; III.vi.13, 50, 54; IV.i.118; IV.iii.92, 96; IV.vi.6; IV.vii.57.
- 18) The corresponding Q lines are: I.ii.202, II.i.89, IV.i.129, IV.v.15, IV.vii.99.
- 19) Price, p. 15.
- 20) Ibid. p. 16.
- 21) Ibid. p. 16.
- 22) Ibid. p. 16.
- 23) See also F. I.ii.269, II.i.33, IV.i.108, 123, IV.vi.15.
- 24) Förster, p. 26.
- 25) Matthews, MLR, pp. 254-55.
- 26) H. T. Price, "Letter to the Editor," The Library, XVII (1936-37), 225-227.
- 27) Adams, p. 135-163, and Förster, p. 1-29.
- 28) See Q. III.iv.1-3:

Allice venecia, vous aues cates en,  
 Vou parte bon Angloys englatara,  
 Coman sae palla vou la main en francoy

If one attempts to take this passage at face value he will soon come to the conclusion that it is nothing but



gibberish, but if it is read as a phonetic transcription and if some of the mistakes are corrected it becomes

Alice, venez-cy. Vous avez été en Angleterre et  
Vous parlez bon l'anglais.  
Comment s'appellez-vous la main en Anglais?

which is a reasonable paraphrase of the speech in F,  
with only a few grammatical impossibilities.

#### Chapter V

- 1) See pp. 43-46.
- 2) See notes 8 and 9 to chapter II.
- 3) Chambers, William Shakespeare, I, 391.

## Bibliography

- Adams, J. Q. "The Quarto of King Lear and Shorthand,"  
MP, XXXI (1933-34), 135-163.
- Arber, E. A Transcript of the Registers of the Company  
of Stationers of London; 1554-1640 A. D.. 5 vols.  
London, 1876.
- Bartlett, H. C. and A. W. Pollard. A Census of Shake-  
speare's Plays in Quarto. New Haven, 1936.
- Cairncross, A. S. "Quarto Copy for Folio Henry V,"  
SB, VIII (1956), 67-93.
- Capell, E. Notes and Various Readings to Shakespeare.  
3 vols. London, 1779.
- Chambers, E. K. The Elizabethan Stage. 4 vols. Oxford,  
1923.
- Chambers, E. K. William Shakespeare. 2 vols. Oxford,  
1930.
- Cole, P. R. "The Text of King Henry V," NQ, CLXXXVII  
(1944), 200-203.
- Collier, J. P., ed. Shakespeare's Works. 8 vols.  
London, 1842.
- Craig, H. "The Relation of the First Quarto to the First  
Folio Version of Shakespeare's Henry V," PQ, VI  
(1927), 225-34.
- Dewischeit, C. "Shakespeare und die Stenographie,"  
ShJ, XXXIV (1898), 170-220.
- Doran, M. "The Quarto of King Lear and Bright's Short-

- hand," MP, XXXIII (1935-36), 139-157.
- Dorius, R. J., ed. The Life of Henry the Fifth. New Haven, 1955.
- Duthie, G. I. Elizabethan Shorthand and the First Quarto of King Lear. Oxford, 1949.
- Duthie, G. I. The 'Bad' Quarto of Hamlet. Cambridge, 1941.
- Duyckinck, G. L., ed. The Works of William Shakespeare. 8 vols. Philadelphia, 1859.
- Förster, M. "Shakespeare and Shorthand," PQ, XVI (1937), 1-29.
- French, R. D., ed. The Life of Henry the Fifth. New Haven, 1918.
- Giordano-Orsini, G. N. "Thomas Heywood's Play on The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth," The Library, XIV (1933-34), 313-38.
- Gollancez, I., ed. Shakespeare's King Henry V. London, 1924.
- Greg, W. W., ed. Henry the Fifth 1600. Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, No. 9. Oxford, 1957.
- Greg, W. W., ed. Shakespeare's Merry Wives of Windsor. Oxford, 1910.
- Greg, W. W. The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare. Oxford, 1942.
- Greg, W. W. Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: "The Battle of Alcazar" and "Orlando Furioso". Oxford, 1922.
- Halliwell, J. O., ed. The Works of William Shakespeare. 16 vols. London, 1807.

- Hart, A. "The Time Allotted for Representation of Elizabethan and Jacobean Plays," RES, VIII (1932), 395-413.
- Hart, A. "Acting Versions of Elizabethan Plays," RES, X (1934), 1-28.
- Hart, A. Stolne and Surreptitious Copies. Oxford, 1942.
- Heywood's Dramatic Works. Anon. ed. London, 1874.
- Hudson, H. N., ed. King Henry the Fifth. Boston, 1908.
- Irving, H. and F. A. Marshall, edd. The Works of William Shakespeare. 8 vols. London, 1898.
- Johnson, Samuel, ed. Shakespeare's Works. Philadelphia, 1795.
- Kirshbaum, L. "A Census of Bad Quartos," RES, XIV (1938), 20-43.
- Knight, C., ed. The Works of Shakespeare. 3 vols. New York, 1875.
- Lucas, F. L., ed. The Complete Works of John Webster. 4 vols. London, 1927.
- Malone, E., ed. Shakespeare's Works. 10 vols. London, 1790.
- Matthews, W. "Letter to the Editor," The Library, 4th series, XVII (1936-7), 227-230.
- Matthews, W. "Shorthand and the Bad Shakespeare Quartos," MLR, XXVII (1932), 243-262.
- Mc Kerrow, R. B. Printer's and Publishers' Devices in England and Scotland 1485-1640. London, 1949.
- Morley, M. "Conjectures about Sixteenth Century Steno-

- graphy," NQ, CLXXXIX (1945), 112-114.
- Murray, J. T. English Dramatic Companies. 2 vols.  
London, 1910.
- Neilson, W. A. and C. J. Hill, edd. The Complete Plays  
and Poems of William Shakespeare. Cambridge, Mass.,  
1942.
- Nicholson, B., ed. "King Henry V. Parallel Texts of the  
First Quarto (1600) and the First Folio (1623) Editions,"  
New Shakespeare Society Publications, Series II, no. 9,  
1877.
- Nosworthy, J. M. "Hamlet and the Player who could not  
keep Council," ShS, III (1950), 74-82.
- Pollard, A. W. "The Bibliographical Approach to Shakespeare;  
Notes on New Contributions," The Library, XIV (1933-34),  
351-52.
- Pollard, A. W. Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates.  
Cambridge, 1920.
- Pollard, A. W. Shakespeare's Folios and Quartos. London,  
1909.
- Pollard, A. W. and J. D. Wilson. "Stolne and Surreptitious  
Shakespearian Texts," TLS, March 13, 1919.
- Pope, Alexander, ed. Shakespeare's Works. London, 1725.
- Price, H. T. "Letter to the Editor," The Library, 4th  
Series, XVII (1936-37), 225-27.
- Price, H. T. "The Quarto and Folio Texts of Henry V,"  
PQ, XII (1933), 24-32.
- Price, H. T. The Text of Henry V. Newcastle-under-Lyme, 1920.

- Reed, I., ed. The Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare.  
21 vols. New York, 1803.
- Rhodes, R. Crompton. "Some Aspects of Sheridan Bibliography," The Library, 4th series, IX (1928-29), 233-261
- Rolfe, W. J., ed. Shakespeare's History of King Henry V.  
New York, 1878.
- Shapin, B. "An Experiment in Memorial Reconstruction,"  
MLR, XXXIX (1944), 9-17.
- Singer, S. W., ed. The Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare. 10 vols. Chiswick, 1826.
- Smith, G. C. M., ed. The Life of Henry the Fifth. Boston,  
1904.
- Smith, W. D. "The Henry V Choruses in the First Folio,"  
JEGP, LIII (1954), 38-57.
- Steevens, George, ed. Twenty Plays of Shakespeare. 4  
vols. London, 1766.
- Stokes, H. P., ed. The Life of Henry the Fifth. New  
York, 1892.
- Terplanck, G. C., ed. The Illustrated Shakespeare.  
3 vols. New York, 1847.
- Theobald, Lewis, ed. The Works of Shakespeare. 7 vols.  
London, 1733.
- Upton, J. Critical Observations on the Text of Shakespeare.  
London, 1746.
- Walter, J. H., ed. King Henry V. London, 1954.
- Wilson, J. D., ed. King Henry V. Cambridge, 1947.

Vita

LeRoy Lad Panek, the youngest son of Mr. and Mrs. Lad Panek, was born January 26, 1943 in Cleveland, Ohio. He attended Cleveland and Rocky River, Ohio, public schools, and was graduated from Rocky River High School in June, 1960. After attending Marietta College for four years Mr. Panek received the Bachelor of Arts degree on June 1, 1964. He was married to Judith M. Vago on June 27, 1964. After receiving the Master of Arts degree from Lehigh University he will undertake further graduate study at Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, where he has been awarded a teaching fellowship.