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TO MY WIFE,

TERESA DRUTEN
Shakespeare's play, *Much Ado About Nothing*, was first published in book form in a 1600 Quarto. Twenty-three years later it appeared again in print in the Folio of 1623. There has been much disagreement concerning what text of *Much Ado About Nothing* was used for the Folio edition. Theories hypothesize that the Folio text was set from a playhouse prompt book, from the author's autograph, or from the Quarto. An investigation of the textual differences between the 1600 Quarto and the 1623 Folio establishes a certain amount of acceptability of one of these thoughts over the others. Fredson Bower's, *Bibliography and Textual Criticism*, was especially helpful in establishing the guidelines for such an evaluation.

A survey of the sources for *Much Ado About Nothing* coupled with an understanding of Elizabethan printing methods also adds to the total comprehensiveness of a study of this play.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Charles E. Walton for his guidance and assistance in the course of this investigation, and for his valuable criticism of the material presented. I also deeply appreciate Mr. Richard L. Roahen's critical reading of this study, and for his valuable criticism. I am indebted
to my family and friends who aided me in my work.

July, 1972  

V. L. D.  

Emporia, Kansas
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CHAPTER I

THE ELIZABETHAN'S ATTITUDE TOWARD SOURCE MATERIAL

One should not labor under the illusion that Shakespeare, along with his immediate predecessors, contemporaries, and successors, was a man of measureless creativity coupled with an inexhaustible and novel imagination. The authors of the sixteenth and seventeenth century usually appropriated their plots from fellow writers, past and present, regarding, by their standards, ideas and phrases as common literary property. However, to appreciate fully this Elizabethan attitude toward borrowing from another's work, one must consider the audiences of the time.

The population of Elizabethan London, both inside and outside its walls, did not exceed more than 200,000 and a very small percentage of this number could be understood to have been theatre-goers. The playwright, then, wrote anticipating the wishes of a small, specific citizenry.

---

1 Karl J. Holzknecht, *Background of Shakespeare's Plays*, p. 221.
4 *Loc. cit.*
With such a definite and precise public at their disposal, the competition among companies over acquiring and securing these small, regular audiences demanded that the players yield a plenteous supply of imaginative productions, the fulfillment of which was not unachievable, since the playgoers lacked a fastidious attitude toward their entertainment. They journeyed to the theatre, not so much to be entertained by a totally new and original presentation, as to witness a story dramatized in an interesting and refreshing manner. "For them what was re-presented, if skillfully done, was as good as new." Therefore, the public was not deterred by a common acquaintanceship with the material--play, pamphlet, or tale--as long as the recent version could sustain their ebullient interest. Fortunately, for the authors, it was a period that abounded in material from which they could peruse and select what they wanted and needed.

From Italy, the golden land of romance, poets, painters, and the sciences of knowledge, the Renaissance

---

7Loc. cit.
9Ibid., p. 13.
was pervading all Europe. The people sought the mastery of the Italians—the works of Bandello and Boccaccio as well as those of their French imitators. Thus, it was not long before the English writers began incorporating the foreign authors' works into their own. And they did it with such rapidity and thoroughness that one-third of the old plays from the Tudor line to the Restoration was of an Italian influence. This prevalence of foreign drama was so engulfing that some dramatists attempted to beguile the public into believing that they had adapted their work from a foreign source. These enterprising playwrights could fabricate an Italian atmosphere by the simple introduction of a few Italian names and places. Shakespeare, like his contemporaries, cast his eyes over the literature of Ariosto, Bandello, Boccaccio, and their imitators, and their plots gave him a center from which to operate. It should be noted, however, that, although Shakespeare utilized many foreign works for his sources, his interest did not completely lie within the stories or the plots but within characters.

10Felix E. Schelling, Foreign Influences in Elizabethan Plays, pp. 49-50.
11Ibid., p. 52.
12Loc. cit.
13Ibid., p. 46.
associates appropriated, they exploited to the best of their writing abilities. Since such an attitude toward source material prevailed and is now acknowledged, it is with certainty that the commentators of the twentieth century must accept the conscious and consistent borrowings of Elizabethan authors. However, it is necessary to understand this different world of thought, where

... instead of searching futilely for novelty, their purpose was re-interpretation, transformation, re-expression of old things in the spirit of their own day and of their own individualities ... 14

It is not surprising, then, to find that "they regarded all earlier literature as an inexhaustible mine from which to dig treasure."15 That Shakespeare acquired fame from this "mine" should not cause consternation among even the most idealistic of scholars:

As a fact, originality and imitation are not in the least opposed, but are in healthy cases absolutely correlative and inseparable processes, so that you cannot be truly original in any direction unless you imitate, and cannot imitate effectively, worthily, admirably, unless you imitate in original fashions.16

And as every individual carves out his niche in life upon the accomplishments of his predecessors, so did Shakespeare in an admirable and unprecedented manner.

---

14Holzknecht, op. cit., p. 221.

15Loc. cit.

16Baker, op. cit., p. 15.
The sources of most of Shakespeare's plays are, today, well known by the literary scholar, the exceptions being Love's Labor's Lost and The Tempest. Modern day readers should be thankful that Shakespeare was not encumbered with the task of originating new plots. If he had, his remarkable craftsmanship in dealing with lifelike people and their realistic situations might never have developed into the art that it became. Commenting on this ability,

Dr. Johnson . . . went so far as to say that Shakespeare "has not only shown human nature as it acts in real exigencies, but as it would be found in trials, to which it cannot be exposed." 18

Johnson's observation both exonerated Shakespeare from his use of borrowed resources and applauded his application of style and technique. Thus, one should not dwell upon an author's procurement of material but upon the subsequent manipulations of what he possessed. Shakespeare . . . did not hesitate to condense, repropportion, rearrange, or expand his stories, reverse their conclusion, add episodes from other stories, or invent whatever seemed to him properly effective. 19

Using his proficient methods and versatile techniques, he created originality from what he had obtained.

As to sources, it would be superfluous and conjectural

---

17Holzknecht, op. cit., p. 220.


19Holzknecht, op. cit., p. 229.
to state exactly what Shakespeare did read. Suffice it to say that his reading was diverse and his vocabulary extensive. 20 What languages he could read or speak, one can only surmise. Prouty has little doubt that Shakespeare read both Italian and French and was thoroughly familiar with the works of Bandello and Belleforest. 21 Reinforcing this concept, Attwater 22 and Schelling 23 disclose that there was no English translation of Cinthio's Tale of the Moor of Venice in Shakespeare's time; yet, the parallel between this story and Othello is extremely close. Holzknecht also points out that

In an age nourished, as was the Elizabethan, upon Italian culture and eager for Italian stories in the theatre, it would have been surprising if a popular playwright could not have conducted a search for profitable material in the original. 24

Regardless of how Shakespeare acquired access to his sources, whether in the vernacular or in a foreign tongue, the modern student of English literature should be both considerate and understanding of these sources.

20Ibid., p. 222.
22Attwater, op. cit., p. 237.
23Schelling, op. cit., p. 59.
24Holzknecht, op. cit., p. 228.
CHAPTER II

SOURCES OF MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

In the seventeenth century, there were numerous written versions of the Much Ado plot of Hero and Claudio. Appendix A contains a number of these sources and analogues for this plot. The eight works, which are surveyed in this chapter, have been selected on the basis of their contribution to the origination of the plot or to their availability to Shakespeare. The works incorporated are Chaereas and Callirhoe, Chariton (400); Tirante El Blanco, Juan Martorell (1400); Orlando Furioso, Book V, Ludovico Ariosto (1516); Novelle, Book XXII, Matteo Bandello (1554); Histoires Tragiques, Book III, Francois de Belleforest (1596); The Historie of Ariodanto and Jenevra, Peter Beverly (1566); The Faerie Queene, Book II, Canto IV, Edmund Spenser in 1596; and Die Schoene Phaenicia, Jacob Ayer (1593-1605). These authors produced their masterpieces in Spanish, French, German, and Italian, and many were never translated into Shakespeare's native tongue. Thus, the contention that certain works were available to

25 Much Ado About Nothing will hereafter be referred to as Much Ado.

26 Prouty, op. cit., p. 5.
Shakespeare depends, to some extent, upon one's belief that Shakespeare was acquainted with more than his own vernacular. There is also a second plot, that of Beatrice and Benedict, for which no source has ever been substantiated. However, one such work incorporates sequences that might have inspired Shakespeare in his concept of the two witt­antagonistic lovers--Il Cortegiano written by Baldassare Castiglione (1528). These, then, are the two plots that one must consider: first, the serious love affair of Hero and Claudio, including the deception perpetrated upon them; and second, the comic love affair, more resembling a battle of sexes and wits, between Beatrice and Benedict.

Chaereas and Callirhoe was a Greek production composed in the fourth century by Chariton. Mention of this work is deemed necessary, because it is undoubtedly the earliest source of the plot of the serious lovers who are disunited by outsiders who involve them in a deception. Chariton's works were still solely in Greek during Shakespeare's life, and it is unlikely that the author's grasp of languages included classical Greek. This story commences with the marriage of Chaereas and Callirhoe. Frustrated lovers of the lady, however, plot vengeance to comfort their despair. Chaereas is positioned outside his house by the villains,

---

27Warren E. Blake (trans.), Chariton's Chaereas and Callirhoe.
who have already secured the services of the maid of the
house in admitting a false lover at nightfall. Chaereas
observes the intrigue, storms into his home, mistakes
Callirhoe for the prowler, and seemingly murders her with
a kick. The maid, in terror, immediately confesses the
treachery. Later, while Callirhoe's tomb is being robbed,
she is revived but then kidnapped. Chaereas hears of the
incident and contemplates suicide; he is restrained by his
friend, Polycharmos. After a long search, the two lovers
are happily reunited, and another girl is found for
Polycharmos. Some of the main ingredients of Much Ado
can be seen in this early work. The male lover is duped into
falsely suspecting his lover as unfaithful. However, the
antagonists in this story are former lovers, while
Shakespeare's Don John is motivated out of innate depravity.
Also, a maid of the house is necessary to the action and
knowingly plays her part in the treachery, though
Shakespeare's Margaret is unaware of her involvement in
the schéme. In Chariton's and Shakespeare's work, the male
lovers are the cause of the supposed death of the heroine.
In the end, however, the lovers of both works are reunited,
and wives are found for the best friends—Benedict and
Polycharmos.

Tirante El Blanco was written in the 1400s by Juan
Martorell, published, in Spanish, in 1511, and later
translated into Italian by Manfredi in 1538. By the
seventeenth century, it had not been translated into
English. Tirante El Blanco is in love with Cremesina,
whereas the widow, Reposada, desires Tirante. When Reposada
perceives that she is denied the love that she covets, she
arranges a heinous masquerade. Thus, Tirante is placed in a
position from which he can view the garden. The widow,
then, entices Cremesina and her maid to participate in a
charade in which the maid is to wear the clothes and a black
leather mask of the repulsive Negro gardener; the two are to
show affection for each other. The unknowing Tirante wit­
tesses the deception, is despaired, and in grief later kills
the poor gardener. When the confused Cremesina sends the
maid to question Tirante concerning his actions, the truth
is revealed. Unfortunately, Tirante is leaving on a
journey, and an approaching storm makes his departure
expedient. He returns but dies of a sudden illness, while
the heroine's ensuing grief is fatal. Martorell's piece,
since it was published in the sixteenth century, was the
first contemporary version of the deception plot. The only
real similarity that exists between this work and Much Ado
lies in the use of the heroine's maid in the deception.

28 John Payne's translation of 1890 as reprinted in Furness' New Variorum, pp. 311-326.
29 Ibid., p. 345.
In both pieces, the servants are unaware of their parts as accomplices.

In 1516, Ariosto introduced a story with a similar deception ingredient in Book V of Orlando Furioso. This work was very popular; French prose translations were printed between 1543 and 1582, and verse translations in French were done in 1555 and 1571. If Shakespeare lacked the capability to read the French versions, it is possible that he had access to Sir John Harington's translation, which appeared in 1591. Ariosto's work begins with Rinaldo, a wandering knight, rescuing Dalinda, a maid in distress. The maid, in explaining how she arrived in her predicament, relates the story. Ariodante, who is in love with Geneura, is deceived by Polynesso, who has persuaded Dalinda to dress in her lady's clothes and make love to him from her lady's window. Following this intrigue, Ariodante disappears and is believed dead. It is left to his friend, Lurcanio, to bring the hapless Geneura to justice. She is accused, judged, and sentenced to die if someone does not champion her cause. The final stage of the story occurs with rapidity and decisiveness of action. Ariodante returns, in

30 William Stewart Rose (trans.), The "Orlando Furioso" of Ludovico Ariosto.
31 Geoffrey Bullough (ed.), Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, II, 533.
32 Ibid., p. 62.
disguise, to fight for his lady; but Rinaldo, too, arrives, intercedes, and unravels the prior embroilment, leaving Ariodante to wed Geneura. Although the villain in Ariosto's work, like Chariton's and Martorell's, proved to be motivated by a deprivation of love, Polynesso approaches Don John's Machiavellism. The relationship of Dalinda, the maid, to the perpetrator of the deception also resembles that of Margaret in Much Ado. And, for the first time, these previous minor roles are becoming, more and more, the main focus of the story.33 Other incidents also show a similarity: for the first time the spurious conspiracy materializes at a window; the lady's maid, unknowingly, is included in the deceitful act; and the treachery is finally resolved by a minor character outside the regular plot—Rinaldo in Ariosto's and Dogberry and the watch in Shakespeare's.

Matteo Bandello composed Book XXII of his Novelle in 1554.34 It was translated into French in 1569 by Belleforest, but was not transcribed into English verse until 1890.35 Bandello seems to have appropriated his plot from Ariosto, inasmuch as both stories centered simply on the narration of a story in which the love of the hero and

33Ibid., p. 63.
34Ibid., p. 533.
35Furness, op. cit., p. 311.
heroine is presented more as an accepted fact than a romantic interlude.36 King Pedro returns from a victorious war with a party that includes a friend, Don Timbreo Di Cardona, upon whom he has bestowed much honor. This young soldier meets Fenecia, daughter of Lionato, falls in love with her, and announces his wedding plans. Meanwhile, Girondo, a discomfited lover of Fenecia, has conceived a nefarious crime to discredit the lady Fenecia. Don Timbreo is informed that his lady's virtue is not above reproach and that he can have visual proof of her debauchery if he will station himself outside her window. All that he perceives is Girondo's entering an opening where an awaiting servingman is dressed in Fenecia's garments. The masquerade proves successful, however, and Don Timbreo sends a messenger to change the wedding banns and to accuse Fenecia of infidelity. At the news, Fenecia swoons. Her family revives her and decides to withdraw her from the scene and harbor her for a period of years. Meanwhile, Don Timbreo and Girondo meet at Fenecia's supposed tomb, and Girondo, overcome with grief, confesses his unscrupulousness and is forgiven. The victimized lover, then, relates this admission to Lionato and promises to marry whomever the father will choose for him. A year passes, and Lionato

produces a new bride for Timbreo; the girl, naturally, is a more enchanting Fenecia. With the truth exposed, there is a double marriage of Don Timbreo and Fenecia and of Girondo and Belfiore, who is Fenecia's sister.

The similarities between this work and Much Ado are so extensive that there must be minimal doubt that Shakespeare was acquainted with Bandello's piece or with its translation by Belleforest. Allison Gaw points out that in Shakespeare's and Bandello's works there are numerous incidents extremely close in their similarity. Two of the main characters in both works have parallel names (Bandello's King Pedro of Arragon becomes Don Pedro of Arragon in Much Ado, while Lionato De' Lionati is represented as Leonato), and the location is also the same (Messina). Other parallels include the love suit as it grows between the two young lovers; the heroine is the daughter of Lionato; an intermediary is sent to intercede for Don Timbreo; Girondo, like Don John, attempts to break off the marriage; subordinates are used in the deception at the window; the hero renounces the heroine; the heroine swoons as if dead; there is a mock burial; an atonement is enacted at the tomb; a consent to a later marriage occurs,

37Ibid., p. 1.

38Allison Gaw, "Is Shakespeare's Much Ado About Nothing a Revised Earlier Play?" PMLA, L (September, 1935), 718-719.
precipitating the actual nuptial. The joyful discovery of identities is manifested; a double marriage evolves with Girondo's marrying a relative of Fenecia; and a dance concludes the action. However, if Shakespeare made use of this work as a source, he did not rely upon it alone, because Girondo's character is not that of the total villain, Don John, and there is no maid involved in the masquerade, but rather a servingman disguised in female clothing.

Francois de Belleforest translated Bandello's Novelle as his Histoires Tragiquest in 1569. Book III of this work is the translation of Book XXII of the Novelle. In Shakespeare's time, as mentioned earlier, there was no English version. Belleforest is accurate in his work, but he develops and expands the romantic aspect of the two serious lovers with a wealth of moral and sentimental rhetoric. If Shakespeare were familiar with the French copy, he seems to have shunned Belleforest's romantic expansion. Moreover, in Much Ado, Claudio dwells too much on Hero's station and inheritance to be considered a parallel of the French Don Timbreo.

Another example of the rhetorical elaboration of love

---

39 Furness' own translation of Belleforest as found in Furness' New Variorum, pp. 326-329.
40 Bullough, op. cit., p. 533.
41 Ibid., p. 65.
is observed in Peter Beverly's handling of the Ariosto plot in *The Historie of Ariodanto and Jenevra* (1566). Since it is an English version, this story may have been Shakespeare's source for the Machiavellian character, Polinesso (Don John's counterpart), who is first found in Ariosto's work. This plot is similar to the one in Book V of the *Orlando Furioso*, but deviates from the original in that the deception involves a ring that Polinesso obtains with the help of the heroine's maid. Beverly, like Belleforest, employs love as the essential centerpiece upon which he can administer his romantic orations. And if Shakespeare came into contact with Beverly's story, he was wise enough to avoid the sentimentality of the young lovers.

In 1596, Edmund Spenser produced his version of the Ariosto plot in Book II, Canto IV, of *The Faerie Queene*. Although Spenser introduced some interesting concepts in his version, they are not elaborations of a romantic point of view. Instead, his is an allegorical account of the action and a "... warning against rage, the excess of 'irascible'..."
qualities in the soul. Though Shakespeare may not have read all the books of *The Faerie Queene*, it is not unreasonable to allow that he had come in contact with it.

Sometime between 1593 and 1605, Jacob Ayer composed *Die Schoene Phaenicia*. It existed only in German during Shakespeare's time. Ayer seems to have relied upon Bandello as a source; however, he interestingly expands his work to include a small, but contrasting segment of low comedy involving a pair of mock lovers. This light farce revolves around a clownish figure, Jahn, and his ludicrous attempts at wooing a maid serving the heroine in the story. Other incidents and events in Ayer's work parallel Bandello; and, although the slight humor of Ayer never approaches the comic techniques employed in *Much Ado* by Shakespeare, *Die Schoene Phaenicia* is the only extant dramatic source that contains any reference resembling the contrasting love sequences of Hero-Claudio versus Beatrice-Benedict.

This second plot, involving the comic lovers, is more important to Shakespeare's *Much Ado*. There is little doubt that Shakespeare borrowed his serious love plot from another source or sources, but the inclusion of the comic love

---

45 Bullough, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

46 Translation by Professor Thomas Solly reproduced in Furness' *New Variorum*, pp. 329-337.

affair appears to have been an origination by Shakespeare himself. Discounting Jahn and the maid of Ayer's work, Beatrice and Benedict, or their counterparts, have not been discovered in a previous work of drama. However, a pair did live whose witty retorts concerning the opposite sex may have lent an inspiration to Shakespeare in his pursuance of a contrasting element of wit for Much Ado. This pair, Lady Emilia Pia and Lord Gaspare Pallavicino, are present in Il Cortegiano, a book of manners, written by Baldassare Castiglione in 1528. This work consisted of a "... running dialogue in narrative form dramatically interspersed with gay stories, delicate interruptions, combat or wit...". It was translated in 1561 by Sir Thomas Hoby, and subsequent editions appeared both in 1577 and 1588. Translations were sold in every shop in London, and it is highly probable that Shakespeare would have been familiar with so popular a work. Shakespeare's perusal of this work would almost have been certain when one realizes that Shakespeare surely understood the public craving for

48Charles S. Singleton (trans.), Baldassare Castiglione, Book of the Courtier.

49Mary Augusta Scott, "The Book of the Courtyer: A Possible Source of Benedict and Beatrice," PMLA, XVI (1901), 482.

50Ibid., p. 490.

51Ibid., pp. 488-490.
Italian literature, and that Castiglione's work was mentioned as one of the "... two most commonly read by those who wanted to know a little Italian."\textsuperscript{52} The book deals with four nights of discussion related to the question of what should constitute the person of the perfect courtier. During the ensuing discussions, it is Lady Pia's position to keep the debate centered on that one topic, while Lord Pallavicino's discourse often pursues other issues. As the conversations progress, it is apparent that Lord Gaspare's opinion of women is degradingly low; thus, it becomes Lady Emilia's charge to defend womanhood. Although not lovers, their resemblance to the relationship that exists between Beatrice and Benedict is noticed in one of the young gentleman's speeches:

Moreover, I have also seen a most ardent love spring up in a woman's heart toward a man for whom at first she had not the slightest affection, merely from hearing that many persons thought that the two were in love.\textsuperscript{53}

This event could have been the seed for the incident in Much Ado in which both Beatrice and Benedict experience a change of heart toward each other when they overhear planned conversations that, although false, indicate their love for each other. The book is serious in tone but, as in Much Ado, the highlights occur when one of the antagonists is speaking.

\textsuperscript{52}Ibid.; p. 490.

\textsuperscript{53}Singleton, op. cit., p. 272.
For example, Gaspare remarks:

... but I do say that very learned men have written that, since nature always intends and plans to make things most perfect, she would constantly bring forth men if she could: and that when a woman is born, it is a defect or mistake of nature, and contrary to what she would wish to do: as is seen too in the case of one who is born blind, or lame, or with some other defect; and, in trees, the many fruits that never ripen.54

It should be noted, however, that Gaspare is not a woman hater. He, like his counterpart, Benedict, merely wishes to be assured that women realize their station in a man's world. Disregarding the young nobleman's egotistical suppositions, Lady Pia, like Beatrice, is always prepared to reply to her nemesis:

Therefore, let Signor Gaspare hold to this perverse opinion of his, which arises from his never having found a lady who would look at him, rather than from any fault on the part of women—and go on with your discussions of pleasantry.55

Of these two characters, Gaspare more resembles his parallel in Much Ado, than Emilia does Beatrice in Shakespeare's play. Both male personages are aggressive but likeable; Emilia, however, is a lady at all times and never really approaches the overflowing spirit of Shakespeare's Beatrice. But the substantial consideration lies in the fact that these two individuals of Castiglione's book emerge as the

54Ibid., p. 213.
55Ibid., p. 167.
most memorable participants in the entire debate; the same
development is also exhibited in Much Ado with Beatrice and
Benedict. Wherever Shakespeare received his inspiration
for the Beatrice-Benedict entanglement, whether from fiction
or from the real, rich, educated ladies of the Renaissance,
he seems to have "... taken Lyly as his model and has
tried to reproduce the polished facets of his dialogue." 56

Shakespeare borrowed stories and personages, but the
method in which he molded and handled his characters and
motivated their conduct substantiates an unlimited and
unprecedented genius. Let it merely be said, here, that
the plot which he discovered, whether in Bandello or
Ariosto, was just a "... springboard for his imagination
which was quickened both by the incidents of the story and
also by the general pattern of its human relationships,
and the ethical conflicts implied in or inducible from
it." 57 It is pleasant to think that Benedict and Beatrice
were his own invention; but it is even more acknowledgeable
to recognize Shakespeare at work, weaving his art with
parallelism, symmetry, and contrast. 58 It can be said that
he always borrowed but never copied.

---

56 George Brandes, William Shakespeare, p. 218.
57 Bullough, op. cit., p. 81.
58 loc. cit.
CHAPTER III

THE PATH OF A MANUSCRIPT TO THE STAGE AND THE PRINTING HOUSE

Once a dramatist like Shakespeare had selected a plot from one of his sources, he began to revise and elaborate upon it until a nearly finished product was at hand. More often than not, the resultant manuscript possessed his own peculiar style of handwriting, erasures, marginal notes, punctuation, contractions, and other such eccentricities that would constitute laborious reading. This manuscript was known as the author's "foul papers." Since extensive arduousness was undoubtedly experienced in the reading of this original work, a fair copy was often furnished, which was then, presented to the Master of Revels or to his deputy for licensing. Before authorizing a play, these individuals would examine the manuscript for anything that offended

... decency and good taste like oaths and unchaste, unseemly, and unashamed speeches—discussion of any subject likely to promote discontent or sedition, especially [sic] religion or politics.

60Holzknecht, op. cit., p. 348.
61Loc. cit.
In the last half of the sixteenth century, innumerable proclamations and statutes were put forth by different English rulers tightening this censorship.62

The fair copy of the manuscript, after it had been allowed by the Master of the Revels, was subsequently committed into the hands of the prompter of the acting company who had purchased the play. Another reason for the necessity of a fair copy was to provide the prompter with a very reliable copy from which to work.63 It was his responsibility to scrutinize the script, to amend any careless errors made by the authors, and to assure that the manuscript could be staged.64 Naturally, some authors' works required less supervision.65

After the majority of notable problems were removed from the prompt copy, the manuscript was entrusted to the company scrivener, who reproduced the individual parts for the actors.66 Thereafter, each actor possessed a manuscript containing only his lines and cues. The prompter, then,

62Albright, op. cit., p. 63.

63Ronald B. McKerrow, "The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts," The Library, XII (December, 1931), 264.

64Chambers, op. cit., p. 98.

65Since Shakespeare was also an actor, his manuscripts probably required less scrutiny concerning their stageability.

66Hardin Craig, An Introduction to Shakespeare, p. 9.
assembled an outline plot, indicating divisions of scenes and designating who was to participate in each scene; this document was called a "plat." As the play progressed upon the stage, it is easy to acknowledge that corrections in passages (hard-to-say lines), stage directions, and cues would be entered upon the prompter's copy as necessary. This method of revising would explain some of the errors and differences that later appear in the printed versions of a play.

Although plays were composed only for one reason, that being their production upon the stage, some eventually came to be published as books, when the plays had been procured through some unique methods. The Elizabethans possessed a low opinion of authors who wrote for the stage and believed that as "... profitable as they often were in theatre, plays could add nothing to a man's literary reputation." Indeed, early plays were held with such debasement that Jonson was ridiculed for terming his plays as "works." Since this attitude was prevalent, it was comprehensible that only a minute number of the plays created for the stage

---

67 Loc. cit.
68 The prompter's influence on the manuscripts will be mentioned in Chapter IV.
69 Holzknecht, op. cit., p. 344.
70 Attwater, op. cit., p. 222.
were accorded the honor of being printed. Chambers explained that, between 1586 and 1616, only 237 plays were entered in the Stationer's Register to be published. But there were, no doubt, plays that had been secured and issued through illegal methods, and these would certainly enlarge this list. To re-emphasize, however, the scarcity of printed plays, Chambers also related that of 280 plays with which Philip Henslowe experienced a contact, only forty were published, most without the authors' name. That the plays in print did not often bear their originators' names was not too disturbing. Frequently, the plays were hurriedly created to meet an impending installment, and were executed in such a manner as to exhibit little regard for a critical audience. Surely, the author of such a hurried and often unorganized manuscript as this would feel little remorse over the absence of his rightful claim to authorship. There also existed collaboration between authors on the same work; hence, a feeling of individual accomplishment did not always prevail. On the other hand, a writer like Thomas Heywood held an opposite view concerning the printing of his works:

72Ibid., p. 182.
73Holzknecht, op. cit., p. 345.
74Loc. cit.
It hath been no custome in me of all other men (courteous Reader) to commit my Playes to the Presse: the reason though some may attribute to my owne insufficiency, I had rather subscribe, in that, to their seveare censure, then by seeking to avoyd the imputation of weakenesse, in incurrre greater suspition of honesty . . . .

If some authors expressed only slight or no anxiety that their plays came into print, while others opposed the idea, one wonders how these manuscripts found their ways into book forms.

Those who owned the plays while they were being produced on the stage were not the writers but the company staging the play. And it was not to the benefit of these groups to have their most valuable assets, the manuscripts, reproduced. First of all, if a play were issued in book form while it was still active on the stage, there was the slim chance that a prospective spectator would read the work and not wish to view the story acted. Secondly, and more important, if a play were printed, there was the further danger that another company might obtain a copy and subsequently produce it. Moreover, as formidable as the competition was between companies for their small audiences, they certainly would have possessed no desire to supplement their rivals' repertories. What, then, would have inspired a company to yield its plays to a printer?

---

75 Thomas Heywood's Prologue of Rape of Lucrece.

For many years, plays were printed in one of two ways: with and without authority. There were a number of reasons that initiated the submission of a play to a printer. For example, if a drama were not attracting audiences and a publisher could be found, the play was released.77 On the other hand, a company would often disband and dispose of its assets by selling its plays.78 Moreover, if the actors were experiencing frugal times, they would sell a play, thus obtaining temporary monetary assistance to aid them.79 Such a reason was, no doubt, the cause of an exceedingly large output of printed plays in 1594 when many of the companies were attempting a financial adjustment after the plague.80 It sometimes occurred that a play fell into disfavor with the authorities, whereupon the company would have its play printed to exhibit to the public the play's real worthiness.81 Furthermore, an acting group would have to publish their play in an action of counter-movement if it were stolen.82 They would also sell some manuscripts if they

78Holzknecht, op. cit., pp. 356-357.
79Ibid., p. 357.
81Holzknecht, op. cit., p. 357.
82Loc. cit.
were trying to raise money to expand the company. On the
other hand, the building of the Globe in 1599 and the Fortune
in 1600 would probably have accounted for the surrendering of
certain plays to the printers.\textsuperscript{83} On rare occasions, a group
would yield its publication rights to a certain play as a
tribute to an author's genius.\textsuperscript{84} There is no evidence of
it, but this last reason could have applied to Shakespeare's
group, who held him in high regard. Shakespeare was both
revered by his friends and acclaimed by his contemporaries:\textsuperscript{85}

\begin{quote}
From 1591 to 1616, there were more than two hundred
allusions to Shakespeare and his writings, more
than a hundred different authors quoting or parodying
lines from the plays and poems, and occasionally
mentioning the author by name.\textsuperscript{86}
\end{quote}

However, there were other ways in which plays may have found
their ways into printers' hands:

In Shakespeare's day, the only recognized
property right in a book were those of the
publisher who received from the Honourable
Company of Stationers regulation the booktrade
protection against any infringement by a trade
competitor. No question seems to have been
asked as to how the manuscript was obtained.\textsuperscript{87}

For example, there were three major ways by which a copy of
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a play could be printed without authority of the company that owned it. First, an author might have transmitted a copy of his work to his friends, as Shakespeare did some of his sonnets.\(^88\) There was always the chance that this entrusted copy would be circulated by the acquaintance. And, if the work were seen by the wrong individual, it could accidentally or dishonestly come into the possession of a disreputable publisher.\(^89\) Secondly, an actor could have been a hireling for a publishing company and, having access to his lines, plus a fragmentary view of the others' parts, might, with a good memory, have placed a very sketchy outline on a printer's desk.\(^90\) Although there is no concrete or scientific evidence for this method, Parrott bases the bad quartos of *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Henry IV*, and *Hamlet* upon the theory of an actor's memory.\(^91\) Thirdly, a stenographer or a memorizer might have been dispatched to the theatre to copy the play.\(^92\) Albright explains that stenography was commonly used in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.
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and that it was a regular practice for theatre-goers to attempt to memorize parts of the plays. Moreover, many systems of stenography were taught throughout England between 1580 and 1640. Chambers, however, thinks that the stenography of this period was cumbersome and feels that it relied too heavily upon the stenographer's interpretation of many symbols and characters. But a statement in a Thomas Heywood prologue seems to counteract Chamber's opinion:

... That some by Stenography drew
the plot, put it in print, (scarce one word true)
And in that lameness it hath limp'd so long
The Author now, to vindicate that wrong
Hath took the pains upright upon its feet
to teach it walk: so please you sit and setit.

Even though Heywood claimed piracy by stenography, it is difficult to imagine that a person in the audience, already fearful of detection, was able to take notes over the noise of the audience and the speed of the rhetoric. Some manuscripts were undoubtedly obtained underhandedly, but the vast majority of plays were obtained honestly.
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To maintain printing and publishing within the law, there was some organization. Printers and publishers of this period belonged to a guild called the Stationer's Company, chartered in 1557, and employed by existing governments as a means of controlling what was distributed by the presses. 98 Elizabeth, during her reign, intending to enforce and tighten the control over the emergence of seditious or heretical material, issued an Injunction in 1599. The Injunction forbade the printing of any book without license from herself or one of those whom she appointed for scrutinizing printable matter. 99 Elizabeth's Injunction was the basis for licensing until 1586. In this year, the power of censoring books was empowered to the Archbishop of Canterbury and his deputized professional experts. 100 The Archbishop, or one of his deputies, would be presented a work for examination. If the corrector had any reason to be suspicious of the material, he read it and omitted any section that he considered to be harmful to the state. 101 Since some books, by the nature of their content,


100 Willoughby, op. cit., p. 20.

101 Loc. cit.
carried no suspicion, they were licensed without a reading.\textsuperscript{102}

When the publisher or the stationer, as he was titled, had received a licensed manuscript, he would take it to a warden and have it entered in the Stationer's Register.\textsuperscript{103} If, in some cases, a stationer handed a warden a work that had not been licensed, then, the warden had the alternatives of approving the book himself and hope that it contained nothing seditious, or of inserting the book with a written understanding that it could not go to print until it possessed the expected license or signature of a corrector.\textsuperscript{104}

Once the book was licensed and the owner of the play maintained continued printing of it, there existed a type of copyright.\textsuperscript{105} However, if the book became neglected and sufficient time had passed, the book was, then, available to other publishers for reprinting.\textsuperscript{106} Although the availability of a copyright was present, some works, for one reason or another, were never listed in the Register and, therefore, received no protection.\textsuperscript{107}
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When the publisher presumably had his book licensed and copyrighted, he was ready to take it to the press. The stationer would choose a printer and submit his manuscript to him to be published. Regarding the size and number of the book to be printed, there was little choice. There were only four sizes available, e.g., duodecimo, octavo, quarto, and folio, and a printer could not produce more than 1500 copies of a work. This latter restriction was imposed by the Stationer's Company in 1587. What happened to the manuscripts in the printing offices was interesting.

Shakespeare wrote Much Ado About Nothing between the autumn of 1598 and the summer of 1599, a time settled on because of two facts: Meres, in 1598, did not list the play; and William Kempe, an actor of the King's Men, whose name is designated for certain parts in the play, left Shakespeare's company in 1599. Much Ado was performed on the stage once before it was entered in the Register in 1600. However, the 1600 entry of this play into the Register offers some interesting questions. For example,


109 The printing offices and their handling of the manuscripts will be treated in Chapter IV.
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the Stationer's Register reads:

S.R. 1600(1), Aug. 4. to be staied; the commedie of Muche Adoo about Nothing, a booke.

S.R. 1600 Aug. 23. Ent. A. Wyse and W. Aspley: Muche a Doo about Nothings, by Shakespeare.112

The August fourth entry intends that the play was "to be staied," which is interpreted to mean "not published." Why, then, was the play given the right to be published nineteen days later, while another of Shakespeare's plays, As You Like It, which was also "staied" on the same date, was not published until the Folio of 1623?113 There seems to be more than one possible explanation for this occurrence. One reason for the "staied" entry might have been for the fact that the play was entered prematurely into the Register and was not immediately available for printing.114 A more probable answer, however, might have been furnished by the warden who supplied the entry. It is obvious that the King's Men, Shakespeare's group, was quite concerned about the possible piracy of some of its plays. They appealed to a powerful friend, the Lord Chamberlain, who took it upon himself to forbid the printing of any plays that belonged to

113Furness, op. cit., p. viii.
114Ibid., p. ix.
Shakespeare's company.115 And, in 1599, the Master and Warden of the Stationer's Company were summoned to the palace and were committed for the following reasons as the Stationer's Register shows:

that noe Englishe Historyes be printed excepte they bee allowed by some of her maiesties privie Counsell

that noe playes be printed excepte they bee allowed by suche as have auctorytie116

These entries exemplified a tendency by those in power to curb the number of pirated plays being utilized in the printing shops. In returning to the "staied" entry, it is possible for one to assume that the Warden, seeing a work of the King's Men given to him and remembering the recent admonishment against pirating, might have "staied" the piece until clarification with Shakespeare's company could have been made. Another explanation, however, might have been one that has already been mentioned. For example, the play might have been presented to the Warden without its first having been licensed; therefore, the "staied" notation might have been the King's Men, themselves, who may have placed the "staied" entry, assuring that the printer who bought the copy from the company would have had the copyright.117

115Willoughby, op. cit., p. 17.


117Albright, "To be Staied," p. 456.
Since it was issued to Wyse and Aspley only nineteen days later, it seems that the most logical explanation for this "staled" entry was that which entailed the security of the copyright for the two publishers.

The Quarto of Much Ado was printed for Wyse and Aspley by V. S. (Valentine Simmes). As was sometimes the case, the printer's name was given in the Stationer's Register entry. Since the play had been enacted upon the stage once and since original autograph copies were usually too altered to be sent to the censor, it could be assumed that the Quarto of this play was printed from the fair copy that had been licensed, then used as a prompt book. The reasons for assuming that the manuscript employed for the printing of the Quarto had been utilized as a prompt book were the extensive early stage directions (type of stage cue) along with the names of actors entered in place of the names of characters. However, there is some basis to the theory that the Quarto was set from the first draft of the play by Shakespeare. This hypothesis is construed from the appearance of loose ends, false starts, inconsistencies in the designation of character, substitution of actors' names, and ghost characters. J. Dover Wilson claims that these

118 W. W. Greg, Shakespeare's First Folio, p. 142.
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errors were produced by Shakespeare's revising an earlier play.120 Gaw, on the other hand, refutes Wilson's claims and presents her own explanations of the above regularities.121 Neither view is conclusive. The absence of Shakespeare's foul papers for this play, coupled with the absence of the play from which Much Ado could have been revised, commit the verification of one of these theories to the scholar who discovers the foul papers or the earlier play. As mentioned previously, Simmes owned the printing shop that had the responsibility of the Much Ado Quarto. His shop was considered to be fairly competent in the handling of printing of his time.122 Therefore, one can assume that the compositor or compositors of this shop were fairly accurate in their reproductions. Although it was normal practice, sometimes, for more than one printer to be working on the same manuscript, Ferguson proves that only one was employed on the Much Ado Quarto. His proof lay in the regular treatment of stage directions and the high percentage of certain end spelling (final "e"—73%; "ll" preferred

120Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and J. Dover Wilson (editors), Much Ado About Nothing, pp. 93-94.
to "l"--75%; "y" preferred to "ie"--77%).

After the 1600 publication of Quarto of Much Ado, one does not find mention of the work until 1613. In this year, one discovers that Much Ado was performed twice at a festival celebrating Princess Elizabeth's marriage. That it was performed twice is also an interesting tale. Heminge was the business manager of the King's Men and was paid to produce twenty plays at Court. He evidently tricked the Lord Treasurer by entering the same play under two titles: Much Ado About Nothing and Benedicta and Betteris. That the titles show similarity is evident, but the substantiating evidence was drawn from another discovery. Charles I, who, as a prince, saw both Much Ado and Benedicta and Betteris, later wrote the title, Benedicta and Betteris, opposite the title of Shakespeare's Much Ado. This notation was uncovered in his copy of the Second Folio in Windsor Castle.

Then, in 1623, one of the greatest collections of dramatic writing appeared: the First Folio of Shakespeare's plays, containing all but one of his works. These plays

---
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were collected and published by John Heminge and Henry Condell, the only survivors of the Lord Chamberlain's King's Men company to which Shakespeare had belonged. There were two plausible reasons for the 1623 Folio undertaking which must have been considered a risky investment. First, Ben Jonson had published his works in 1616, and it was only likely that Shakespeare's friends would similarly want to honor their beloved playwright. The other reason, formerly mentioned, was that Shakespeare's popularity as a writer was in a lofty state, making the financial investment much less hazardous.

The task of printing this First Folio was entrusted to Isaac Jaggard and E. Blount, the former a printer, the latter a bookseller. William Jaggard, Isaac's father, was mentioned in the colophon as the printer. The mention of both names gives rise to the question of which Jaggard was in charge of the production. Since William died in 1623, the year when the First Folio was completed, but was blind for some years preceding his death, Isaac was apparently the one in charge of this undertaking. That

126 Holzknecht, op. cit., p. 363.
129 Dawson, op. cit., p. 15.
the Jaggard shop was even chosen was a little surprising, since it was the older Jaggard, who, along with Thomas Pavier, tried to reprint ten Shakespeare or pseudo-Shakespearean plays as new creations in 1619. However, they were apprehended before the crime was committed, and Shakespeare's friends seemed to have forgiven the culprits' overzealousness.

The publication was undertaken by a syndicate of stationers: Jaggard, Blount, Smithweke, and Aspley. It settled on the plays, discovered their owners, and acquired the rights to all of the plays except Pericles. The acquisition of the rights being sustained, the First Folio's printing followed.

It has been said that the First Folio, of all the books of its time, had the greatest care taken with both the obtaining of good copies and their actual printing. Moreover, since there had been reports of false editions circulating, the producers of this work undertook the responsibility of informing the reading public that this new work contained:

The Workes of William Shakespeare, containing all his Comedies, Histories and Tragedies:

130 Greg, Shakespeare's First Folio, p. 9.
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Truely set forth, according to their first Original.

And, to reassure the public, they reiterated this conviction in the epistle of the Folio.

So to have publish'd them, as where (before) you were abus'd with diverse stolne and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of injurious impostors, the espos'd them: even those, are now offer'd to your view cur'd and perfect of their limbes; and all the rest, absolute in their numbers, as he conceived them.

Therefore, the public of the time, to whom this epistle was worded, must have surely considered their purchases to be the originals of Shakespeare. However, no one can really acknowledge what the printers and publishers understood or considered to be a "first Original."

Concerning what text of Much Ado was used for the Folio edition, there is a division of thought. Craig offered the belief that the Folio text was set from a playhouse prompt book.133 Pollard thought that the Folio was set from the manuscript prompt book, but changed his mind and decided that the Folio version was printed from the Quarto, then checked with a prompt book.134 Chambers felt that both the Quarto and Folio were set from the author's autograph.135 Without the original manuscript

133Craig, An Introduction to Shakespeare, p. 106.
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135Chambers, William Shakespeare, I. 152.
extant, there can be no real substantiating proof; but a study of the differences and similarities, in conjunction with the printing methods and spelling habits of the time, tends to establish Pollard's thought as the most acceptable.
CHAPTER IV

A TEXTUAL COMPARISON OF THE 1600 QUARTO AND THE 1623 FOLIO OF MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING, WITH A BACKGROUND ON ELIZABETHAN PRINTING METHODS

It has been previously stated that the 1623 Folio of Shakespeare's works was a book with which much consideration was assumed in the editing. Nevertheless, within the complete Folio of 1623, there are approximately 3,500 palpable errors and 2,000 minor differences. If the compositors had copies of the manuscripts in front of them, and were these men of average intelligence and dexterity, one wonders why these multitudes of discrepancies occurred. It is probably necessary, therefore, to understand what Elizabethan printing entailed.

Printers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were only human in their handling of the manuscripts that they received. They were not necessarily ignorant, clumsy, or amateurish but confronted with primitive conditions and methods. For example, in a print shop, there were a compositor, a pressman, and a corrector; in most cases, probably all the same man--e.g., the master printer.

136 Holzknecht, op. cit., p. 366.
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Moreover, there were many types of errors, both mechanical and psychological, that a printer inadvertently could manufacture while reproducing his copy. The largest category of inconsistencies would be those that were the product of seventeenth century.

When one makes a comparison of texts in Shakespeare's era, he is impressed with the awesome number of variant spellings. Accounting for this discovery is the approach to spelling in the Elizabethan period, which was totally different from those adopted in later centuries. The classical languages were passing, and the English vernacular was experiencing an early and challenging growth. "Orthography . . . was in a state of transition and . . . chaos." 138 Moreover, every pressman utilized his own individual spelling habits. 139 Also, authors tolerated typographical methods involving spelling as long as they did not alter the intended sense of the words. 140 This acquiescence, naturally, afforded the printers even more freedom in their orthographic habits. That the authors or owners of plays were yielding in such matters was fortunate, because it was apparently a normal compositor's belief that

138 Ibid., p. 186.
it would take too long to follow the exact spelling of copy before him. Not all errors, however, were blameless, and there existed many mechanical and psychological reasons for their frequent appearance.

Chambers and McKerrow have demonstrated the basic techniques employed by a printer in setting type. For example, the printer of the period stood before the copy of what he was to reproduce in type. In his left hand, he held a composing stick, a tool that could be filled with a line of type that met the specifications of the box measured for the page size. Before him was his printer's font, where he kept his letters and symbols. The pressman might memorize a line from the present text, then, using the letters from his case, spell out the line in reverse. Thus, by utilizing space types discreetly and by sometimes altering the spelling, he would always have his lines terminate with the same margin. When a line was filled, it was placed in the above-mentioned box, and the printer had a page of type. The top of the type would, then, be worked with an ink ball. The press pushed the paper down on the ink-covered type, and the result was a reproduction on paper. This was the

---
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manner in which a page basically was printed. But along the way there was much room for mistakes.

Taking for granted that the printer was reading from the copy and memorizing approximately one line at a time, it is understandable how his mind might have played subtle tricks on him. For example, once the words were in his head, they could easily have taken on unique forms. A simple mistake, here, could have been accounted for by similar sounding words. For instance, it would have been easy for a printer to place "mistake" for "must take," "should'st tow" for "stowe," "th' attest" for "that test," and "a rivall" for "arrivall." Homonyms like "sight" for "cite" and "write" for "rite" could also have easily resulted. But as simple as it was for the printer's memory to deviate, it was even easier for his fingers to manipulate irregularities. Facing the printer was his case which was constructed with numerous small boxes for each capital and small letter and whatever symbols the pressman might have required. Since speed was somewhat important, the printer probably only glanced at his case while setting type. Thus, it would have been a simple mistake to place one's fingers in the wrong case box. The same error could have occurred if the person whose responsibility it was to

144 Loc. cit.
sort the type pieces into their appropriate case boxes accidentally should have placed some wrong letters into the incorrect boxes.\textsuperscript{145} Furthermore, transposition of letters or even words would happen when, as in typing, the hands moved faster than the eye. In addition, a printer's sight may have failed him if he lost eye contact with the text, causing him to skip words, phrases, or even entire lines; this laxity could also have resulted in his repeating letters, words, or sentences.\textsuperscript{146} Quite often, however, the printer was completely innocent, the fault resting with his tools. For example, a broken letter such as an "e" may have resulted in a printed "a" or "c."\textsuperscript{147} Even after the entire box had been set, there was still room for further error. For instance, the ink ball, rubbed over the type after it was set, inadvertently could have picked up a type completely out of the line, thereby leaving a blank, or it could have raised a space type just enough to leave an impression of the press.\textsuperscript{148} A mechanical error could also have transpired if the paper were shifted while it was being pressed. This movement might have left an uneven side or have omitted
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some letters. Finally, there was a possibility that may have caused a multitude of typographical differences between copies, such as the Quarto of 1600 and the Folio of 1623—namely, the use of a reader by the printer.

It would have seemed likely that, as a printer became advanced in age and his eyes became constantly strained by everyday reading, his sight could have begun to weaken. Often, he would hire someone to read the copy. Albright indicates a fairly general belief in dictation. Her evidence lies within the presence of noticeable discrepancies between texts that could not be explained as physical or mental errors. An example of her evidence lies in numbers like "4" being printed as "four." McKerrow presents corroboration along these lines with words like "something" having been printed for "jingling." At the same time, however, he comments that no early graphic depictions of English compositors show any indication of a reader's presence. He also notes that it would have been extremely difficult for a printer to have used his spaces competently to modify the end of the line if he could not
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precipitate the exact termination of the line.\textsuperscript{153} McKerrow\textsuperscript{154} and Chambers\textsuperscript{155} both agree that the additional expense of the extra man, along with a hindrance to rapid work that would have evolved from reading, would not have made the employment of a reader a profitable venture. However, their conclusions lack supporting concrete evidence and only reveal one side of the controversy. A compositor would have been prepared to know when the end of a line had arrived if the reader were in the habit of citing a line at a time. Furthermore, the added expense would have been of no consequence if the reader were already employed as an apprentice printer, and rapid work could have surely evolved from a reader who possessed an awareness of how the printer worked. But, until more proof is uncovered, it is still a matter of conjecture.

There is no way in which to tell how many variants could possibly exist between the 1600 Quarto and the copy from which it was printed; the author's manuscript of a fair copy of his hand does not exist, or has not yet been discovered. But some valid investigation and comment can be undertaken between the 1600 Quarto and 1623 Folio. As
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mentioned earlier, there were certain differences of opinion as to whether the Folio was printed from Shakespeare's original manuscript, a fair copy used as a prompt book, or from the 1600 Quarto. A close look at the many differences and similarities may help to shed some new light on this question.

If one makes a word-for-word comparison of the two texts, discounting stage directions, character designations, and punctuation, he discovers approximately 1,205 differences.156 These inconsistencies between texts are presented in Appendix B in the order in which they were encountered. At first, the bulk of the number of discrepancies seems to indicate that the Folio was published from a copy different from that used for the Quarto. It seems somewhat incredible that anyone could sustain the belief that anyone's setting from another printed copy could have produced so many variants. However, McKerrow, after much work concerning the printers of the period, concluded that "... they did reproduce [the] text they saw before them."157 When one begins to take note of and to categorize
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the types of differences existing between the texts, he makes some interesting revelations that presuppose the employment of a reader. For example, the initial discoveries show that the majority of the errors are those that could have ensued if the printer were not always in eye contact with the text, e.g., errors of a spelling nature. Of the 1,205 differences discovered between the texts, 222 originated through the use of capitals by the printers of the Folio. Interestingly, though, these capitals were not placed erratically, but, instead, followed a consistent pattern. When referring to a person, the Quarto employs small letters, but the Folio utilizes capitals. So, where the Quarto reads "lady, lord, prince, uncle, brother, and neece," the Folio reproduces them as "Lady, Lord, Prince, Uncle, Brother, and Neece." Only in rare instances does the Quarto capitalize words such as these. Capitalization also occurs when an individual is referred to metaphorically. Thus, the Quarto readings of "lamb, lion, orange, beauty, dog, cow, and bull" become capitalized in the Folio. Since these 222 capitalizations follow a pattern, they may be explained, not as errors, but as a non-uniformity of printing standards some twenty-three years apart.

There are twenty-eight omissions to be found in a tracing of the two texts. Many of these involve no more than a single word, usually an adjective perhaps accidentally left out. Others involve stage directions. Four
omissions, however, apply to more than one or two words and involve the most obvious differences between the two texts.

In the first, the Quarto reads:

And I will breake with her, and with her father, And thou shalt have her: wast not to this end.  
(I.ii. 311-312)

The Folio reads:

And I will breake with her: wast not to this end. . .  
(I.ii. 311)

Here, it appears obvious that the compositor was guilty of eye-skipping and has picked up the wrong "her" in the middle of the line and finished the first line with the last half of the second. "One of the commonest errors made by compositors [was] that of skipping a passage and resuming just after a word which [was] identical with the last word copied."158 The second major omission could also possibly be explained in the same manner. Here, the Quarto reads:

Prince There is no appearance of fancie in him unless it be a fancy that he hath to strange disguises, as to be a Dutchman to day, a Frenchman to morrow, or in the shape of two countries at once, as a Germaine from the waste downward, all flops, and a Spaniardi from the hip upward, no dublet: unlesse he have a fancie to this foolery, as it appeares he hath, he is no foole for fancy, as you would have it appeare he is.  
(III.ii. 30-38)

The Folio reads:

Prin. There is no appearance of fancie in him, unlesse it be a fancy that he hath to strange disguises, as to bee a Dutchman to day, a Frenchman to morrow: unlesse hee

158Albright, Dramatic Publications in England 1580-1640, p. 337.
It is highly improbable that the Folio compositor's eyes could have skipped from the "to morrow" in the third line of the Quarto, down two lines and over one-half of a line to ":un-". Obviously, there has to be another explanation, however, the solution to which could probably lie with the nature of the censorship of the period. Since the lines concerning the "Germaine" and the "Spaniard" exist in the Quarto, it is possible that some kind of intervention may have taken place after 1600. For example, it is very likely that censorship of a political nature, as this exclusion seems to be, could have resulted when the play was introduced at Court in 1613. Since this presentation was given in connection with a festival for Elizabeth's marriage, there would surely have been many foreign dignitaries present. It is known that the Spanish were very sensitive to any type of ridicule. And, to avoid embarrassment, this passage concerning the Spanish was probably omitted. The nature and syntax of the line being as it was, it would have been necessary to cut the passage referring to the Germaine also. A third omission also presents a theoretical explanation. The Quarto reads:

159Ibid., p. 114.
Clau. O what men dare do! what men may do! what men
daily do, not knowing what they do! (IV.i. 20-21)

The Folio reads:

Clau. O what men dare do! what men may do! what
men daily do!

Here, it was highly possible that the Folio printer became
somewhat bewildered with the text because of the repetitious
"do." It is easy to see that both texts end with the word
"do," perhaps causing the printer of the Folio to think that
he had completed the line. The last major omission has the
Quarto reading:

Ke. Write downe maister gentleman Conrade: maisters,
do you serve God?
Both Yea sir we hope.
Kem. Write downe, that they hope they serve God: and
write God first, for God defend but God shoulde goe before
such villaines: maisters, it is prooved alreadie that you are little
better than false knaves, and it will goe neere to be thought so
shortly, how answer you for your selves? (IV.ii. 17-25)

The Folio reads:

Kee. Write downe Master gentleman Conrade: mai-
sters, doe you serve God: ma sters, it is proved alreadie
that you are little better than false knaves, and it will goe
neere to be thought so shortly, how answer you for your
selves?

A large portion of the passage is not present in the Folio
text. Since the content of the missing lines deals with God,
censorship must be given some consideration here. But if
expurgation was the cause, why was it not exercised in the
1600 edition? The reason could have been the Act of Abuses
of 1606, one of the purposes of which was to eliminate
any blasphemous oaths or the irreverent use of the name of
And if censorship were the cause of the omission, then Albright is correct when she notes that the definition of indecency during this period was "individual and whimsical." However, there is the slightest chance that the difference may have followed as a result of eye-skipping. The evidence is extremely slim but existing. In both texts, a repetition is present that could have deceived a fatigued printer. The duplicity is ":maister,"; its reproduction appears twice in both texts. It does involve quite a bit of skipping, but the corresponding punctuation (:) and the duplication of the word (maisters) are so close together that comprehension of the possibility of such a mistake is credible.

To return to the 1,205 errors, one discovers other explainable differences. Repetition counts for two of the errors (the Quarto has "Counte Counte" and "thou thou"), while transposition of letters accounts for four more mistakes such as "hower" for "howre." Twenty-eight errors can be found in the use of the wrong word by the printer; but even these, for the most part, are explainable. For example, the compositor substituted "eate for ease" "four


for r"; "spoke for speake"; "Ballad for Ballet"; "live for liefe"; "said for saies"; "than for then"; "they for thy"; "their for there's"; and "mine for my." Clearly, most of these words are very close to the meaning which was meant, and can be excused on the presumption that a printer's memory could not have been perfect. One must remember that the printer was not memorizing word by word but line by line. However, the capitalizations, transpositions, omissions, repetitions, and wrong words total 273 errors, leaving 921 differences. These 921 mistakes are all in the area of spelling. Once again, one would immediately wonder how an experienced printer, working from another printed copy, could have introduced so many variant spellings. The first assumption would be that this evidence points emphatically for the employment of a reader. However, further investigation of these exhaustive differences refutes this statement. This study has already pointed out that the state of spelling at this time was in utter chaos, and that the printers had their own orthographic habits. Besides spelling individually, a pressman could also have taken license to justify his line of type by varying the spelling of some words. Appendix D categorizes the spelling habits of the printers and seemingly accounts for the 921 spelling errors. Some of the major categories, however, will be discussed. For example, errors involving the use of double letters (rr, ll, ee, and oo) are found 269 times.
Often, these words occur close to the end of a line, probably because the printer felt the necessity of adding or subtracting a letter to maintain an even margin. The inconsistent use of the double letters, which transpires in both texts, seems to advocate such a theory. The Folio or Quarto printer might double a letter in a word (will) one time and drop it (wil) in another. This practice should not be considered an inconsistency on the part of the printer, but rather should be viewed as the entailment of certain printing methods. Line length can also justify the use of abbreviations like "&" for "and." Appendix D shows that the majority of errors point to the printer's spelling: 231 words end with "e's" added at the end; fourteen "w's" are employed for "u's"; "de" is utilized thirty-one times for the verb suffix "ed"; and the "es" plural is substituted twenty-nine times for the "s" endings. That the spelling rules of the printers involved were inconstant is fairly obvious; that they used different copies from which to print, though, is not.

If the words in the dialogue reveal extensive irregularities in spelling, one will be impressed, also, by the variety in character designations. For example, in Act I, there are 101 names that are reproduced with the same spelling, but forty-three that are not; Act II finds 147 names similar with ninety differently spelled; Act III shows 137 parallel, while eighty-seven are contrary; in Act IV
the numbers start to approach the same level with eighty-seven names alike and sixty-eight dissimilar; and in Act V the different spellings of character designations outnumber the similar ones—114 to ninety-eight. That the number of inconsistencies is substantial is not a frightening factor. Both the printer of the Quarto and the printers of the Folio used abbreviated forms for the characters' names. Thus, the Quarto, for the character, Claudio, might print his whole name or a variety of derivatives, such as Cla, Clau, Clad or Claud; the Folio imitates the same procedure but not necessarily at the same place in the text. Other variations which occurred in both texts were: Pedro, prince, prin., prime, pr; Benedicke, Benedick, Bened, Bene, ben, be; Beatrice, beatr, beat, bet; Margaret, marge, marg, mar. Neither of the texts was consistent in its use of one form of abbreviation over another, although an interesting aspect was encountered from time to time. For some reason, perhaps the meticulous attitude of a certain printer, the character designations, in both texts, were exactly alike from ten to fifty consecutive times. Moreover, it was noticeable that errors such as these would appear for varying periods of time, and would often begin in the middle of a page and end in the middle of a page. This method is unusual, since it is doubtful that more than one printer was assigned to the same page of a text. Another interesting note appeared in IV, ii. The actors, Kemp and
Cowley, who played the parts of Dogberry and Verges, had their own names entered in the texts instead of the alias of the characters they represented. This error takes place in both the Quarto and Folio, in only this location. There has been much argument concerning the origination of these real names for the characters. For example, Chambers thinks the designations were inserted by the prompter. However, McKerrow claims that Shakespeare was "... notoriously careless about names of minor characters." And in relation to the substitution of names in Much Ado, it is his opinion that

Dogberry and Verges were so lifelike because they were not merely a constable and watch in the abstract, but actually the Kemp and Cowley whose every accent and gesture Shakespeare must have known...

To support Shakespeare as the originator of the insertions, Gaw points out that of twenty-nine theatrical manuscripts that had been in possession of the prompter of his company for periods varying from four to thirty years, there are only two clear cases of a prompter's additions.

162 Chambers, William Shakespeare, I, 237.
163 McKerrow, "The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts" The Library, XII (December, 1931), 275.
164 loc. cit.
165 Allison Gaw, "Actors' Names in Basic Shakespearian Texts with Special Reference to Romeo and Juliet and Much Ado," FMLA, XL (1925), 534.
There are sixty-seven instances of stage directions in the two texts of *Much Ado*. Act I shows an almost perfect comparison, the only difference lying with an "exit" for "Exeunt." In Act II, the second and third stage directions in the Folio appear to have been added, pointing to a possible later expansion of the music in the play. This growth could have transpired in conjunction with the 1613 presentation of the play. There is, however, an omission in Act II. Stage direction (14) in the Quarto has "Balthasar enter with musicke," while the Folio cites no direction of any type. Perhaps this situation happened because of an oversight on the printer's part, because both texts later (16) have Balthasar involved in an exit. In Act III, the Folio had additions in three places (3), (6), and (14). These insertions are all "exits" of characters who have said their final line for the scene and then left. These introductions were probably helpful cues added by the prompter to aid him in his work. Act IV has no discrepancies. Act V, at stage direction (5), finds the Quarto introducing two characters not mentioned in the Folio. The "brother" and "Sexton" intromitted have no parts here. Stage direction (6) of this Act has only an "Exeunt" in the Folio which materializes after a character's final line in

---

166 These stage directions are listed in parallel in Appendix C. This chart shows that most of these stage directions are exact duplicates.
the scene. The directions (8) and (9) are also interesting from a bibliographical point of view, because in (8) the spelling of the maid's name is "Margaret" and in (9) it is "Margarite." This contrasting spelling is parallel in both texts. In all the Acts, the stage directions are also located in the corresponding places in both works; most close to the left margin, some in the middle, and a few in the right margin. They always coincide, except when the printer, in one or two cases, had to squeeze the stage direction next to or under a line because of a problem concerning margins or space.

Thus, although there exist (counting character designations) over 1400 differences between the texts of 1600 and 1623 of Much Ado, one suggests that the text of 1623 was copied from a printed copy of the 1600 Quarto. Reading and printing from a manuscript copy could produce many of these errors, or the employment of a reader could account for the multitude of spelling variants. But it was probably the printing methods and the chaotic orthography that initiated so many explainable differences. One must remember that the print was set from memory and that the printer was not similar to a modern typist who types single letters or words at a time. If a typist tried to commit a line of work to memory and afterwards type it, there would surely be some omissions and transpositions. Contemporary typists would not make many mistakes concerning
spelling, but that is a rectification made possible by the establishment of orthographic rules and regulations. However, one does not think that the Quarto used for the Folio text had ever been utilized as a prompt book. Surely, Kemp's and Cowley's names would have been removed in the ensuing twenty-three years if the text had been employed as a prompt book. Moreover, a few of the stage directions in both works have characters listed who have no parts, and it is highly unlikely that these designations would have survived in a useful prompt book. There are a few elements presented by this study that support the conception of the theory that a copy of the Quarto was checked against a prompter's copy to bring it up to date before it was handed to a printer. This checking of the Quarto could account for the appearance of the possible late censorship on Germaine and Spanish costumes in Act III, and the use of the term God in Act IV. It could also have been the reason for the inclusion of Jacke Wilson's name for "musicke" in stage direction (13) in Act II. Since the vast majority of differences that have been uncovered between the texts are explainable, leaving little to be considered as real error, the conclusion, most probable, is that the Folio was printed from the Quarto. It is highly possible that, if the Folio were printed from a manuscript copy, there would have been a more recognized inconsistency between words, spellings, and stage directions.
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APPENDIX A
SOURCES AND ANALOGUES OF THE PLOTS OF MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

Hero--Claudio Plot


6. Lost. A play performed at Fontainebleau on February 13, 1564.


12. Lost. *Ariodante and Genevora*. A play performed by Merchant Taylor's Boys in 1583. (Based on Beverly poem?).


Benedick-Beatrice Plot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUARTO*</th>
<th>FOLIO*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governour</td>
<td>Governour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neece</td>
<td>Neece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don</td>
<td>Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neare</td>
<td>neere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leagues</td>
<td>Leagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atchiver</td>
<td>atchiever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homeful</td>
<td>homefull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>find</td>
<td>finde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here</td>
<td>heere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don</td>
<td>Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lamb</td>
<td>Lambe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lion</td>
<td>Lion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indeed</td>
<td>indeede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncle</td>
<td>Uncle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>kinde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>washt</td>
<td>wash'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ladie</td>
<td>Lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>army</td>
<td>armie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neece</td>
<td>Neece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cosen</td>
<td>cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedicke</td>
<td>Benedick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hee's</td>
<td>hee's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bills</td>
<td>bils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challengde</td>
<td>challeng'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncles</td>
<td>Uncles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chalenge</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subscribe</td>
<td>subscrib'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challengde</td>
<td>challeng'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>hee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kild</td>
<td>kil'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indeed</td>
<td>indeede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promised</td>
<td>promis'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neece</td>
<td>Neece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heele</td>
<td>hee'l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lady</td>
<td>Lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warres</td>
<td>wars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vittaile</td>
<td>victuall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 contin.</th>
<th>101 contin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eate</td>
<td>ease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valiaunt</td>
<td>valiant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trencher man</td>
<td>Trencher-man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lady</td>
<td>Lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>souldiour</td>
<td>soudier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>But</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lord</td>
<td>Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lord</td>
<td>Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stufft</td>
<td>stuff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honorable</td>
<td>honourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wel</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neece</td>
<td>Neece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warre</td>
<td>war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedicke</td>
<td>Benedick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>betweene</td>
<td>between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>hee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm</td>
<td>warme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>known</td>
<td>known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>he</th>
<th>He</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vlocke</td>
<td>block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lady</td>
<td>Lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than</td>
<td>then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mad</td>
<td>mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cured</td>
<td>cur'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holde</td>
<td>hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladie</td>
<td>Lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will</td>
<td>You'll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>ne're</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>runne</td>
<td>run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madde</td>
<td>mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niece</td>
<td>Neece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hote</td>
<td>hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approacht</td>
<td>approach'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are you</td>
<td>you are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoyd</td>
<td>avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encounter</td>
<td>encounter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likenes</td>
<td>likeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grace</td>
<td>Grace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>mee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happines</td>
<td>happinesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thinckc</td>
<td>thinke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tolde</td>
<td>told</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>childe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wee</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td>happenie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honourable</td>
<td>honorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lady</td>
<td>Ladie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onelie</td>
<td>onely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suter</td>
<td>Suter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dog</td>
<td>Dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crow</td>
<td>Crow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stil</td>
<td>still</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mind</td>
<td>minde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parrat</td>
<td>Parrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alwayes</td>
<td>alwaies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know</td>
<td>knowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olde</td>
<td>old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bidde</td>
<td>bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lord</td>
<td>Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wil</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lookte</td>
<td>lookt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ladie</td>
<td>Ladie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>sexe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litle</td>
<td>little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onely</td>
<td>onlie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unhansome</td>
<td>unhandsome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thinkest</td>
<td>think' st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now Lesson she's Doost Dost lookt lik't return'd lik't will hir

First Major Omission

"And I wil breake with hir, and with her father And thou shalt have her: wast not to this end,

FOLIO
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Omission - Quarto reads ". . . or in the shape of two countries at once, as a Germaine from the waste downward, all flops, and a Spaniard from the hip upward no dublet..."
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Omission - Quarto reads "not knowing what they do"

This reading left out of Folio

nowe
now
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>49</th>
<th>115</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>115</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grieved</td>
<td>Griev'd</td>
<td>accus'd</td>
<td>accus'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frugall</td>
<td>frugal</td>
<td>excuse'd</td>
<td>excuse'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lovely</td>
<td>lovelie</td>
<td>fals</td>
<td>falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loynes</td>
<td>loines</td>
<td>lack't</td>
<td>lack'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loved</td>
<td>lov'd</td>
<td>valew</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praisde</td>
<td>prais'd</td>
<td>find</td>
<td>finde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>proud</td>
<td>hee</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incke</td>
<td>inke</td>
<td>died</td>
<td>dyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady</td>
<td>Ladie</td>
<td>apparel'd</td>
<td>apparel'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bard</td>
<td>barr'd</td>
<td>moving</td>
<td>moving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>loved</td>
<td>ful</td>
<td>full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only</td>
<td>onely</td>
<td>eie</td>
<td>eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bin</td>
<td>bene</td>
<td>livde</td>
<td>liv'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>Ladie</td>
<td>shal</td>
<td>shall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50</th>
<th>52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>angel</td>
<td>Angel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>princes</td>
<td>Princes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ladie</td>
<td>Ladie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here</td>
<td>heere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady</td>
<td>Ladie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusde</td>
<td>accus'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modesty</td>
<td>modestie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mercie</td>
<td>mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>princes</td>
<td>Princes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td>verie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honour</td>
<td>honor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bastard</td>
<td>bastard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toyle</td>
<td>toile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proudest</td>
<td>proudest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shal</td>
<td>shall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>awakte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>princesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epitaphe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slander</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>knowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beleve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lov'est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
houre  howre  mary
do    doe    don
deny  denie  duckats
sweete sweet  don
ho  goe  burglarie
Weele  Wee'll  masse
approoved  approved
slaundered  slandered
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handes  hand
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Sweete  Sweet
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surely  surelie
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Counte Counte
sweete  sweet
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shal  shall
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comforthe  comfort
we  wee

gentlemen  Gentlemen
maister  Maister
do    doe

Omission - Quarto reads
"Both. Yea sir we hope
Kem. Write downe, that they
hope they serve God: and write
God first, for God defend but
God shoulde goe before such
villaines:"

This reading left out of Folio

prooved  proved
go    goe
go    goe
prince   Prince
lord    Lord
well   wel
lord    Lord
wel    well
quarrel quarrell
thou    y
mine    my
forst   forc'd
Do      Doe
child   childe
toomb   tombe
framde  fram'd

answer  answere
indeed  indeede
boies   boyes
cogge   cog
slander slander
shew    show
sorry   sorry
chargde charg'd

wil    will
shal   shall
part  parte
we    wee
melancholie melancholy
very    verie
angry  angrie
catte   cat
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jeast   jest
howe   how
doo    do
mee    me
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capon Capon
kniffe knifes
find finde
wit wit
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me    mee
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thiers there's
hour    hour
concluded concluded
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she    she
saide said
cared she
cared she
deadly deadlie
bulles Bulls
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company compagnie
bastard Bastard
kill    Kill'd
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hee     he
shal    shall

Ile    Ile
challengde challeng'd

Mary    Marrie
Lady    Ladie
things things
lastly  lastlie
Rightly Rightlie
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answer  answer
go    goe
Counte Count
me    mee
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widesom wisedomes
shallow
brought
slander
Lady
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Omission - Quarto reads
"Enter Leonato, his brother
and the Sexton"

Folio reads
"Enter Leonato"
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>67</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>signior</td>
<td>Signior</td>
<td>lowe</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncles</td>
<td>Uncles</td>
<td>cowe</td>
<td>cow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feate</td>
<td>feate</td>
<td>bleate</td>
<td>beat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>shees</td>
<td>she's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shall</td>
<td>shall</td>
<td>loved</td>
<td>lov'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>maide</td>
<td>maid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>torches</td>
<td>Torches</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shee</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>cosin</td>
<td>Cosin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusd</td>
<td>accus'd</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>wel-nige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusd</td>
<td>accus'd</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>heeres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enforct</td>
<td>enforc'd</td>
<td>promisde</td>
<td>promis'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mask'd</td>
<td>masked</td>
<td>visit</td>
<td>visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brother</td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>undo</td>
<td>undo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undo</td>
<td>undo</td>
<td>marrie</td>
<td>marry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niece</td>
<td>niece</td>
<td>think</td>
<td>think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>doe</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>anie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wil</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honorable</td>
<td>honourable</td>
<td>saie</td>
<td>giddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help</td>
<td>helpe</td>
<td>giddie</td>
<td>unbruid'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission - Quarto reads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Heere comes the Prince and Claudio&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This reading left out of Folio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;and two or three others&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mind</td>
<td>minde</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>Cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forth</td>
<td>forth</td>
<td>worde</td>
<td>word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bened</td>
<td>Benedike</td>
<td>plaie</td>
<td>play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musicl~e</td>
<td></td>
<td>musicke</td>
<td>musick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>stuff</td>
<td>stuff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>reverent</td>
<td>reverend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wel</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sorts</td>
<td>sort</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>mee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enforct</td>
<td>enforc'd</td>
<td>cosin</td>
<td>Cosin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mask'd</td>
<td>masked</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>welnight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promisde</td>
<td>promis'd</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visit</td>
<td>visit</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brother</td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undo</td>
<td>undo</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niece</td>
<td>niece</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>doe</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wil</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honorable</td>
<td>honourable</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help</td>
<td>helpe</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
PARALLEL COMPARISON OF STAGE DIRECTIONS OF THE 1600 QUARTO AND 1623 FOLIO EDITION OF MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

QUARTO

ACT I

1. Enter Leonato governour of Messina, innogen his wife, Hero his daughter, and Beatrice his niece, with a messenger.

2. Enter don Pedro, Claudio, Benedicke, Balthasar and John the bastard.

3. Exeunt Manent Benedicke & Claudio

4. Enter don Pedro, John the bastard

5. exit

6. Enter Leonato and an old man brother to Leonato and a kinsman.

7. Enter sir John the bastard, and Conrade his companion.

8. Enter Borachio

9. exit

ACT II

1. Enter Leonato, his brother, his wife, Hero his daughter, and Beatrice his niece, and a kinsman.
Enter Prince, Pedro, Claudio, and Benedicke, and Balthasar, or dumb John

Dance exeunt

exeunt: manet Clau.

Enter Benedicke.

Enter the Prince, Hero, Leonato, John and Borachio, and Conrade.

Enter Claudio and Beatrice.

exit.

exit Beatrice.

Enter John and Borachio

exit

Enter Benedicke alone

exit

Enter Prince, Leonato, Claudio, and Jacke Wilson.

Enter Balthasar with musicke

The Song

Exit Balthasar

Enter Beatrice

exit.

exit.
### ACT III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scene Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Enter Hero and two Gentlewomen, Margaret and Ursley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Enter Beatrice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Enter Prince, Claudio, Benedicke, and Leonato.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Enter John the Bastard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Enter Dogberry and his compartner with the Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>Exeunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>Exeunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>Enter Hero, and Margaret, and Ursula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>Enter Ursula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>Enter Leonato, and the Constable, and the Headborough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>Exeunt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACT IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scene Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Enter Prince, Bastard, Leonato, Frier, Claudio, Benedicke, Hero, and Beatrice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) exit.

(3) Enter the Constables, Borachio, and the Towne clearke in gownes.

(4) exit.

ACT V

(1) Enter Leonato and his brother.

(2) Enter Prince and Claudio.

(3) Exeunt amb.
Enter Ben.

(4) Enter Constables, Conrade, and Borachio.

(5) Enter Leonato, his brother, and Sexton.

(6) Exeunt.

(7) Exeunt.

(8) Enter Benedicke and Margaret.

(9) Exit Margarite

(10) Enter Beatrice.

(11) Enter Ursula.

(12) exit.

(13) Enter Claudio, Prince, and three or foure with tapers.

(14) Epitaph.

(15) Exeunt.

(16) Enter Leonato, Benedick, Margaret Ursula, old man, Frier, Hero.

(18) Enter Prince, and Claudio, and two or three others. Enter Prince and Claudio, with attendants.

(19) Enter brother, Hero, Beatrice, Margaret, Ursula. Enter brother, Hero, Beatrice, Margaret, Ursula.

(20) Enter Messenger Enter. Mes.

(21) dance Dance
APPENDIX D
CATEGORIZATION OF THE 1,205 DISCOVERED DIFFENCES
OF THE 1600 QUARTO AND 1623 FOLIO
OF MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

222--Capitalizations
2--Repetitions
28--Omissions
4--Transpositions
28--Wrong Words
921--Spelling Differences

1,205 TOTAL

921 Differences in Spelling Categorized

231--An "e" on the end of a word. (e.g. find-finde)
14--An extra "e" in the middle of a word. (e.g. only-onely)
31--"de" for "ed" ending on verbs. (e.g. subscribde-subscrib'd)
130--"y" for "i" or "ie". (e.g. army-armie)
269--double letter used. (e.g. al-all)
13--"t" for "d". (e.g. likt-lik'd)
6--misspelled phonetically. (e.g. antique-anticke)
29--"es" for "s" ending. (e.g. bulls-bulles)
26--Missing letters. (e.g. unhansome-unhandsome)
4--abbreviations. (e.g. Saint-S.)
37--"&" for "and"----"thou" or "that" for "\y"
14--"w" for "u". (e.g. proud-prowd)
104—sound alike vowel combinations. "ou-o" "au-a" "ee-ea" "ou-o" "i-ie" "iou-ou" "ee-ei" "ea-a" "i-e" (e.g. chaunce-chance; honor-honour; peace-peece; thogh-though)

13—seemingly completely misspelled. (e.g. midnight-night; limed-tane)

921 TOTAL