

RALPH CRANE, ELIZABETHAN SCRIVENER,
AND THE 1623 FIRST FOLIO OF SHAKESPEARE'S WORKS

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Department of English and the Graduate Council
of the
Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
John Laddie Somer
August 1960

Approved for the Major Department

Charles Walton

Approved for the Graduate Council

Jurmel L. Bayle

TO
MY MOTHER
AND
IN MEMORY OF MY FATHER

And some imployment hath my vsefull Pen,
Had 'mongst those ciuill well-deseruing Men,
That grace the Stage with honour and delight,
Of whose true honesties I much could write
But will compris's (as a Caske of Gold)
Vnder the Kingly-seruice they doe hold

--Ralph Crane, The Works of Mercy (1620)

PREFACE

The problem of the editing of Shakespeare's works has, for a long time, confronted scholars in the Elizabethan period. During the last few years, much attention has been directed to the possible alterations which a manuscript may have undergone as it traveled from its author to an Elizabethan printing-house. As a consequence, scholars have discovered that the professional scrivener of Shakespeare's time played a highly important role in the Elizabethan theatre and undoubtedly had something to do with many of the changes which a manuscript was subjected to as it left the playhouse and journeyed to the printer. One such scrivener of a prominent and influential stature in the period was Ralph Crane. Little is known about this man, outside of the fact that he wielded an impeccable pen and, on occasion, worked for Shakespeare's company of the King's Men. It has been thought by some that Crane may well have served in the role of scrivener to Heminge and Condell in the printing of their Folio (1623) edition of Shakespeare's plays. I decided that a study of Crane's calligraphic characteristics might prove beneficial to an editor of Shakespeare's works.

I undertook this investigation with the specific intention of analyzing two of Shakespeare's plays as they appear in the 1623 Folio in the light of what I had learned

about Crane's scribal trademarks. There were many interesting sidelights to this problem which I encountered along the way. For example, my first chapter centers wholly around the nature of Elizabethan play manuscripts and the many issues which affected their conditions--i. e., the playhouse and the printing house. Furthermore, and probably of the most importance, I became interested in the puzzle surrounding the printing history of Shakespeare's The Winter's Tale.

I wish to express my appreciation to Professor Charles E. Walton, Department of English, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas, for his suggestions and patience during the preparation of this thesis. Furthermore, I wish to express my gratitude to Professor June Morgan, also of the Department of English, for her genuine interest and helpful suggestions.

August 20, 1960
Emporia, Kansas

J. L. S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE SCRIVENER AND PRINTER: APPRENTICES TO THE ELIZABETHAN PLAYHOUSE	1
II. RALPH CRANE, THE SCRIVENER, AND HIS METHODS OF CALLIGRAPHY	48
III. <u>THE WINTER'S TALE</u> IN THE FIRST FOLIO: CRANE'S "NEW" COPY.	76
IV. RALPH CRANE'S TRANSCRIPT OF <u>THE TEMPEST</u> : A "MODEL" FOR THE 1623 FOLIO?	97
BIBLIOGRAPHY	109

CHAPTER I

THE SCRIVENER AND PRINTER: APPRENTICES TO THE ELIZABETHAN PLAYHOUSE

It has bene a thing, we confesse, worthie to haue bene wished, that the Author himselfe had liu'd to haue set forth, and ouerseen his owne writings; But since it hath bin ordain'd otherwise, and he by death departed from that right, we pray you do not envie his Friends, the office of their care, and paine, to haue collected & publish'd them; and so to haue publish'd them, as where (before) you were abus'd with diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of injurious impostors, that expos'd them: euen 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 conceiued the.

--"To the great Variety of Readers"
Preface to First Folio (1623)

Mass illiteracy was responsible for the professional scrivener in the Elizabethan playhouse. This public servant, for such he was, made his entrance into western culture sometime within the thirteenth century and reached such prominence by the middle of the fourteenth that the ". . . York scribes [had] formed a guild of their own."¹ Even in Elizabethan times, illiteracy was still common, which fact probably accounts for the popularity of stage plays wherein entertainment was obviously oral and visual. One is reminded of Capulet's servant in Romeo and Juliet (1594) who, after receiving

¹H. J. Chaytor, From Script to Print: An Introduction to Medieval Vernacular Literature, p. 17.

a list of guests whom he must invite for his master, cried out in panic:

Find them out whose names are written here! It is written, that the shoemaker should meddle with his yard, and the tailor with his last, the fisher with his pencil, and the painter with his nets; but I am sent to find those persons whose names are here writ, and can never find what names the writing person hath here writ. I must to the learned. . . . (I.ii.38-45)

Thus, it is not surprising to find the scrivener as an important figure of the time. Nor is it unusual, then, to learn that this individual should play a role in the Elizabethan playhouse. In fact, W. W. Greg has assumed that ". . . no company of players could very well carry on without the presence of at least one person capable of wielding a pen with some measure of competence. . . ." ² Strange as it may be, there is no mention of the playhouse scrivener in Henslowe's Diary (1593-1608). ³ However, his eventual discovery was inevitable, and sometime shortly before 1926, C. J. Sisson noticed that Believe as You List (1628) and The Honest Man's Fortune (1625) were copied in the same hand but composed by different authors. ⁴ The only logical conclusion he could arrive at was that the professional scribe had been at work.

²W. W. Greg, "Prompt Copies, Private Transcripts, and the Playhouse Scrivener," The Library, VI, 4 (1926), pp. 149.

³T. W. Baldwin, The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company, p. 124-28.

⁴W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 23.

At this point, one should become acquainted with some basic terms important to this investigation. For example, scrivener or scribe is used to identify one who writes for those who are not literate. This individual, as he functioned in the Elizabethan playhouse, transcribed plays to satisfy specific theatrical situations. Secondly, the individual in the playhouse who was responsible for the care of manuscripts was appropriately called book-keeper. The next important figure, then, was that of the prompter, whose duties concerned the practical handling of the manuscripts (i. e., the casting of a play and its performance).⁵ Two remaining terms, wardrobe-keeper and stage-keeper, are self-explanatory.⁶ With respect to the first three personages, T. W. Baldwin has suggested that all should be identified with the playhouse scrivener.⁷ It is obvious that these distinctions could have been altered upon occasion, resulting in a combination of two or more positions. Yet, one should be cautious in assuming this action to have been the general practice. Even with the aid of an apprentice, a scrivener would be rushed to perform his duties, especially if he were book-keeper, prompter, wardrobe-keeper, and stage-keeper. Nonetheless, one is aware of a strong historical

⁵Baldwin, op. cit., p. 132.

⁶Ibid., pp. 118-47.

⁷Loc. cit.

connection between the scrivener and book-keeper; and it is fairly logical that a scrivener may have been assigned to other tasks, perhaps such as caring for the manuscripts which he transcribed.⁸ With this point in mind, one should, hereafter, refer to the playhouse scribe as book-keeper. Additional scribes, when involved, will be called scriveners.

The problem of the Elizabethan book-keeper is intricate. But one may handle this individual with conciseness by investigating his activities in association with Shakespeare's theatrical company. While there were variations in theatrical practices from company to company, for the most part, Shakespeare's may be considered as a fairly typical example for the period. This company, therefore, from the time of its earliest known book-keeper until the closing of the theatres in 1642, provides one with the names of four personages who occupied this office:

Thomas Vincent	(?1592-1603)
Unknown	(1603-1624)
John Rhodes	(1624-1631/33?) ⁹
Edward Knight	(1631/33?-1642) ⁹

⁸W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 31; also, Baldwin, op. cit., pp. 118-47. Baldwin indicates that Rhodes and Knight held the title of book-keeper, and Greg shows that they were scriveners. See also W. W. Greg, "Prompt Copies, Private Transcripts, and the Playhouse Scrivener," The Library, VI, 4 (1926), p. 149.

⁹Baldwin, op. cit., pp. 124; 128.

The first reference to Thomas Vincent occurs in the list of musicians for The Seven Deadly Sins (1592).¹⁰ He reappears in Taylor's Feast (1599?-1603).¹¹ Baldwin shows that John Taylor mentioned that he was personally acquainted with a Thomas Vincent, who was book-keeper and prompter at the Globe playhouse.¹² In view of this evidence, Baldwin feels confident that Vincent was the book-keeper by 1592, and because of the personnel shortage in the theatrical world, also had to fill in as a musician.¹³ While no manuscripts have been specifically traced to Vincent, there are, within his chronology, however, two plays by unknown scribes. Either one or both, Thomas of Woodstock (1592-95) or Edmund Ironsides (1590-1600?) could conceivably be his.¹⁴ It is to be noted, though, that Vincent's essential appeal stems not from his probable transcriptions, but from his possible business associations. The playhouse hired many "free men" and apprentices to transact mundane duties.¹⁵ It has even been proposed that this was the

¹⁰Ibid., p. 124.

¹¹Loc. cit.

¹²Loc. cit.

¹³Loc. cit.

¹⁴W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, pp. 23-25.

¹⁵Baldwin, op. cit., p. 118.

kind of an introduction to the theatre which William Shakespeare experienced. Undoubtedly, the young poet's talent was soon recognized, and he was considered as a potential dramatist. Regardless of what may have been the case, the most instructive position in the playhouse for a young man such as Shakespeare would have been the office of apprentice to the combined book-keeper-prompter, Thomas Vincent.¹⁶

Of Vincent's successor there is no acknowledged evidence. However, the span of years from 1603 to 1624 is marked by one important event related to this situation. In 1619, Sir John van Olden Barnavelt was composed, and the only extant copy of this play is thought to be its prompt book.¹⁷ This manuscript W. W. Greg identifies as the transcription of Ralph Crane.¹⁸ While this document is undated, it seems likely that this prompt-book was copied shortly after the play had been written. Hence, it is fairly safe to assume that its date is 1619 or 1620. Furthermore, F. P. Wilson has identified three distinct hands in the manuscript--those of Crane, who transcribed the text of the play with sparse stage-directions; of the stage-

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 124.

¹⁷ W. W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, n. "D", p. 100.

¹⁸ W. W. Greg, Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouse, p. 228.

keeper, who added more detailed and practical stage-directions; and of Sir George Buc, Master of the Revels, who wrote a "warning note" and changed and censored a few lines.¹⁹ Hence, it appears likely that there was a book-keeper in the company at this time and that Crane was employed only in the capacity of a copyist. Two plays from this period, The Second Maiden's Tragedy (1611) and The Welsh Ambassador (1621), were also copied by unknown scribes. Perhaps, one or both may be attributed to Crane.

A factual, but disputed phase of the history of the book-keeper in the King's Company concerns the year, 1624, when John Rhodes and Anthony and Edward Knight appear on the list of "Musitions and other necessary attendantes."²⁰ Two manuscripts, The Honest Man's Fortune (1624) and Bonduca (1624), both attributed to the King's book-keeper, singularly are signed Jhon. Baldwin, from a study of the membership of this company, concludes that this signature belongs to John Rhodes.²¹ Furthermore, Believe as You List (1628) contains theatrical revisions in a hand similar to that found in The Honest Man's

¹⁹ Baldwin, op. cit., p. 135; and F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 212.

²⁰ Baldwin, op. cit., p. 120.

²¹ Ibid., p. 128.

Fortune and in Bonduca and, likewise, is signed by Jhon.²² Logically, one would assume this to be the hand of the contemporary book-keeper in the company. Greg, in 1931, did, but later in his The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare (1942), corrected his position and stated that it was unlikely that Jhon is the signature of the scribe, concluding ". . . it is by no means certain that the hand of the manuscript is the same hand of the signature" ²³ He offers no further explanation for his changed opinion; in fact, he acknowledges the date of 1625 for Bonduca which, since Baldwin has shown it to be within the time of John Rhodes as book-keeper, would appear to weaken Greg's assumption. However, Greg, in his latter work, assigns Believe as You List, The Honest Man's Fortune, and Bonduca to Knight, book-keeper from 1631/33 to the time of the Cromwell Revolution.²⁴ Since this Knight is commonly thought to be Edward--although he could possibly be Anthony or even another Knight--the present author will hereafter refer to Edward as the book-keeper for this period.²⁵ As has been earlier shown, apprentices were common to the

²²W. W. Greg, Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouse, p. 289.

²³Loc. cit.

²⁴W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 25; Baldwin, op. cit., p. 128.

²⁵W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 25.

playhouse and, perhaps, Greg has his reasons for thinking that these three manuscripts were copied by Jhon's apprentice, Edward Knight. Indeed, Knight, after completing his transcription, may have handed the manuscript copy to Rhodes, his master, for approval. Were the task efficiently completed, Rhodes would, in turn, have promptly affixed his signature to it as a stamp of approval. This conjecture receives additional support in two more ways. First, one learns from The Life and Times of that Excellent and Renowned Actor Thomas Betterton (1888) that Rhodes was ". . . wardrobe-keeper and prompter to the theatre in Blackfriars."²⁶ In the first place, if Rhodes were so heavily burdened with responsibility, he would surely have delegated some of his duties to an apprentice. Of Rhodes' many tasks, the scribal duties would have required much less theatrical experience than, for example, would the play rehearsals. Hence, the only feasible job which he may frequently have assigned to an apprentice was the transcription of plays. In the second place, Greg calls attention to the play, The Honest Man's Fortune (1625), wherein one "J. Rhodes" was listed among the actors.²⁷ Possibly, Rhodes "the prompter" had long suppressed a desire to act, and with the maturation of his

²⁶Baldwin, op. cit., p. 128.

²⁷W. W. Greg, Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouse, p. 289.

apprentice, had allowed Knight, in this particular case, to rise above mere scribal duties to function as the prompter, thereby permitting Rhodes to gratify an old longing.

The period while Rhodes was book-keeper is filled with important incidents. Around 1625, the time of the plague, after six years of obscurity, Ralph Crane re-appears to transcribe Demetrius and Eranthe.²⁸ His emergence at this time, as scrivener for the King's Men, seems peculiar. Rhodes was obviously their book-keeper, and since he apparently had the leisure in 1625 to act in The Honest Man's Fortune, one concludes that the company had its scribal duties under control. But, of paramount importance in this case is Crane's dedication to Demetrius and Eranthe:

To the honorable

Sir

Kelhan Digbie

Knight.

Worthie Sir.

I know, that to a Man of yo^{ur} religious Inclination, a devine Argument would have byn much more Wellcom; And such a one (good Sir) have I upon the Anvile for you, but it requires some-what a more Consolatorie time to fashion it: Being therefore by the Wise-mans rule (That saies there is a time for all thinges) encouraged, I hope it will not be much in-oportune, after a Season so sad, to present you with a Matter Recreative. Well knowing, that yo^u that know well how to bestow all your

²⁸W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 45.

howes, will (in yo^u release from higher Studies) not think a little peece of time lost, in casting, upon this Comedie, yo^r Smile, and upon him, that (in all dutie) submits it to yo^u generous Acceptance, your Noble Favo^r, as upon one that shall still rejoyce to be esteemed

Your Commanded Beades-man

Novem. 27.

Ralph Crane

1625.²⁹

F. P. Wilson believes that Crane offered this transcript to his patron in hope of financial award.³⁰ Thus, it is seen that Crane had no actual business connection nor occupied any professional office in the company at this time. Yet the mere fact that he was allowed to copy one of the company's plays for his own use suggests a connection that is more intimate than one of mere business. Did he, for example, have a close friend in the company, or was Demetrius and Enanthe an inferior play that was assigned to an old man for transcription so that he might procure a few pounds? By way of an attempted solution, Wilson states that Demetrius and Enanthe "enjoyed much popularity" after the Restoration, and logically assumes that this must also have been true before the Revolution.³¹

²⁹Arnold Glover & A. R. Waller (eds.) The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, II, p. 237.

³⁰F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 209.

³¹Ibid., p. 207.

The fourth and last book-keeper to be considered is Edward Knight. One recalls that Knight first appeared, along with Rhodes, in 1624 in the list of "Musitians and other necessary attendantes." However, he is not established as book-keeper in the records until October 12, 1633, when Herbert, then Master of the Revels, had sent Jonson's Magnetick Lady (1625?) back to the playhouse with a reprimanding note addressed to "Knight, their book-keeper."³² Baldwin, however, thinks that Knight had occupied the post sometime between 1631 and 1633.³³ Aside from the mystery as to whether he or Jhon had transcribed the aforementioned plays, there appears to be nothing more of importance about the activities of this man. As has been shown, each of these individuals was fulfilling the responsibilities of at least two related positions in the playhouse and, in some cases, this abridgement of positions was extended to three (e. g., John Rhodes). Whether or not the play-within-a-play sequence involving Quince in A Midsummer Night's Dream (1595) is of any significance, here, is debatable, yet one is, nevertheless, intrigued by it. Quince, one recalls, has assumed full responsibility for an entire dramatic production. After deciding which play to perform, he assigns the parts and takes over

³²Baldwin, op. cit., p. 122.

³³Ibid., p. 128.

other duties peculiar to the book-keeper, the prompter, and the stage-keeper (I.ii; IV.ii;V). While this combination of related positions was probably not the general rule, the King's Men did resort to this practice in the four cases just cited. As Baldwin points out, if Shakespeare's ". . . first connection with the company had been as prompter's boy . . .," he would surely have understood Quince's predicament.³⁴

One now is better prepared to examine the influence which the book-keeper may have had upon a manuscript as it journeyed from author to press. However, one must again become familiar with the terminology involved. For example, when foul papers or sheets are mentioned, the original copy or author's rough draft is under consideration. Should the foul papers have been in poor condition when reaching the playhouse, the book-keeper would likely have made a transcript of them, a document which will be known hereafter as a scribal fair copy. However, should the author, himself, have copied his own foul papers and neatly arranged them, his manuscript would have been called, simply, a fair copy. Furthermore, one must realize that each actor would not have been given an entire script but, rather, only a copy of his own lines, known as actors' parts. A plot of the play, or summary of the action, was then made for the actors, enabling them to see where their

³⁴Ibid., p. 136.

respective lines correlated with the rest of the drama. In the event that a play became lost, possibly the book-keeper collected these actors' parts and, with the plot, reconstructed an assembled text. Next, the prompt book was prepared as a summation of all the actors' parts, or in reality, the play as it was eventually performed. Private manuscripts were also transcribed upon occasion for sale or as gifts to a patron by various members of a company. Should a play, for any reason, have been stolen or published without the consent of its owners, it was known as a pirated copy. Finally, the printer's copy must be included, since it was obviously the specific copy of a manuscript from which the printer was to set his type.³⁵

Recent scholars have been somewhat concerned by the degenerate condition of the texts of Elizabethan plays. For example, many have discovered that the stage-directions are often the editor's own interpolations into a dramatic text and cannot, therefore, be relied upon as substantial evidence. Again, the careful sectioning of a play into acts and scenes and an elaborate designation of the locale are more than

³⁵W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, pp. 27; 43; 44; 46; 47; 134; Fredson Bowers, On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists, pp. 21, n. 6; E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, III, p. 193; Baldwin, op. cit., pp. 8; 12; 209.

likely to be the fictitious results of this kind of editing.³⁶ However, what is the conscientious scholar to do? The first and most important thing is for him to decide which copy it was that the original printer followed.³⁷ Obviously, his next step is to learn all that is possible about every known text and/or manuscript of the drama concerned. This method involves the study of the histories of the documents and an understanding of their relationship to one another.³⁸ If only one copy of a play remains, the editor's work is greatly simplified. Yet, although he cannot be held responsible for it, his edition may turn out to be a variant from the author's foul papers. Furthermore, if the author should be known, one must make a careful study of the known biographical facts concerning the man. However, most of all, a detailed investigation of the author's times should be undertaken. In addition, one must also examine carefully the conditions of the Elizabethan printing-house. This institution and its inadequacies are of such influence in the degeneration of the texts of Elizabethan dramas that E. K. Chambers has claimed:

³⁶Chambers, op. cit., p. 198.

³⁷J. Dover Wilson, "The New Way with Shakespeare's Texts, II. Recent Word on the Text of Romeo and Juliet," Shakespeare Survey, VIII (1955), p. 81.

³⁸Bowers, op. cit., p. 4.

... the aberrations of the printing-house, even with the author's original text before them, have to account in the main for the unsatisfactory condition in which . . . even the best texts of the plays have reached us.³⁹

Therefore, it is necessary for one to examine the journey of a manuscript from author to printer.

Usually, before a dramatist attempted to compose a play, he first approached the playhouse company with an outline of his story, probably one that was even arranged somewhat by acts.⁴⁰ If this outline were eventually approved, he might then have been paid in advance for the finished product. In 1597, for example, Ben Jonson was paid in advance for a play of ". . . which he showed the plot unto the company."⁴¹ A scheme of this nature would have been especially beneficial in the case of plays devised in collaboration.⁴² After receiving permission to continue, and perhaps his financial advance, an author would then begin his task of composition. His manuscript, quite likely would have been a maize of scribbled notes, abbreviated words, perhaps with arrows indicating the re-arrangement of certain lines, and undoubtedly

³⁹Chambers, op. cit., pp. 197-98.

⁴⁰W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 26.

⁴¹Loc. cit.

⁴²Loc. cit.

would have contained many poorly expressed phrases. Naturally, the condition of the copy would have depended upon the play and the author, for it is a common fact that, with some people, the thoughts flow more freely than with others. Thence, the condition of the author's first copy and the man's industry dictated whether he would re-write his draft of foul papers or let it stand. When these papers were concluded, they would represent for him, in every detail, the play from which he would like a fair copy to be transcribed.⁴³ Possibly, minor writers or men of little theatrical prestige were obliged to prepare their own fair papers for submission to the playhouse.⁴⁴ Yet one should again refrain from stating generalities, for if an author's foul copy possessed a semblance of order, it may very well have been accepted by the company. In the case of Shakespeare or other authors of a comparable status, this exception may have been the rule. Greg, indeed, is of the opinion that Shakespeare ". . . composed fluently and seldom went back over what he had written."⁴⁵ Moreover, he feels that Shakespeare was not the only dramatist to compose in such a manner.⁴⁶ Thus, it would follow that the

⁴³Bowers, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

⁴⁴Baldwin, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

⁴⁵Bowers, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

⁴⁶W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 105.

book-keeper was, thereafter, handed the foul papers and ordered to make fair copies from them. One should bear in mind, however, that these foul copies may or may not have represented the author's first draft of a manuscript. Again, in the case of Shakespeare, this step may not have posed any great problem for the book-keeper. As a shareholder in this company and as an active dramatist, Shakespeare probably spent most of his time at the Globe and would have been readily available to help solve any problems which the scribe may have encountered in a manuscript.⁴⁷ However, an author might have submitted his foul papers to a playhouse because he himself had doubts about the propriety of certain lines or other related stage problems, and may have thought that rehearsals would assist him in solving these problems before settling on the final form of his drama. Such a practice may have occurred in Romeo and Juliet (III.v.176-79) as Capulet implies:

Gods bread, it makes me mad,
 Day, night, houre, tide, time, worke, play,
 Alone in companie, still my care hath bene 48

Wilson has made a probing analysis of this passage and has shown that with the removal of houre, tide, time, the remaining words form a pentameter. As can be seen, all of these words

⁴⁷Bowers, op. cit., n. 7, p. 100.

⁴⁸J. Dover Wilson, "The New Way with Shakespeare's Texts, II. Recent Word on the Text of Romeo and Juliet," Shakespeare Survey, VIII (1955), p. 82.

are synonyms, reminiscent of Day, Night, and Wilson claims Shakespeare "doodled" with each of them, but neglected to scratch out the rejected words, possibly intending to allow the actor to help him reach a final decision and choice.⁴⁹

The next important problem concerning foul papers is related to their ultimate destination. For example, one should ask whether authors possessed them, or if the playhouse company required them. In cases where foul copies were originally presented to a company, one finds the answer to be simple, but in situations in which the authors themselves were required to make fair copies, there is another story involved. It is commonly thought that an author's autograph copy, or at least his legible fair copy, had to be presented to the Master of the Revels for licensing.⁵⁰ However, there are incidents on record in which authors sold their own plays to printing houses.⁵¹ In such cases, it is likely that the author may have made two copies of his play, or that he may even have ". . . begged his fair copy back from the company" ⁵² One is fairly certain, at least, that the playhouse reserved

⁴⁹J. Dover Wilson, op. cit., p. 82.

⁵⁰E. M. Albright, Dramatic Publication in England, 1580-1640, p. 291.

⁵¹Bowers, op. cit., p. 17.

⁵²Loc. cit.

either the author's fair copy or the book-keeper's fair transcription.⁵³ Actually, this behavior is quite obvious. Acting companies were also business organizations and, consequently, were aware of the profits to be derived from publication. The play copies which they needed were the prompt book, the actor's parts, and the plot. Naturally, the fair copy was usually saved for the press or, as a rule, held as a ready source in the case of an emergency.

With respect to publication of a manuscript play, one should not minimize the significance of the scribal fair copy. Since one cannot always be certain which copy was delivered to a printer, he must explore all possibilities. First of all, in the cases in which playwrights were required to furnish a fair copy to the printing house, book-keepers, for the most part, made only slight additions or deletions in the text, affixing their own notes; thereby, they created something which resembled the prompt book.⁵⁴ However, upon occasion, one believes that even the fair copy might have needed a complete re-copying.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, Chambers feels that it would have been a waste of time for the book-keeper, besides making

⁵³W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 27.

⁵⁴Albright, op. cit., p. 27.

⁵⁵F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 209.

available another copy to manuscript pirates.⁵⁶ At the same time, in the production of this scribal fair copy, its progression toward a prompt book would have depended upon the transcriber. For example, should the prompter have copied it, this document would have been an almost finished "book," but were a scribe to have made the initial draft, the prompter, as he would have done in the case of an author's fair copy, would have inserted his changes, for a theatrically inexperienced scribe would have had little concept of what stage additions to incorporate. It is noteworthy, as Greg shows, that scribal copies and autograph manuscripts ". . ." appear in about equal numbers ". . ." in the playhouse.⁵⁷ Regarding Shakespeare and equally prominent playwrights who may have merited the privilege of merely handing in their foul papers, the scribal fair copy could possibly be the most important problem today in the editing of such dramas. Bowers feels that this scribal fair copy, in some cases, was the one which was directed to the printer.⁵⁸ Pollard, in opposition, claims that these particular copies would have been more important to the playhouse for

⁵⁶Chambers, op. cit., p. 194.

⁵⁷W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 25.

⁵⁸Bowers, op. cit., n. 14, p. 117.

their legibility and, therefore, the original author's draft, when available, would have been the one given to the printer.⁵⁹

Further attention should be paid to those fair copies which were required of certain authors by the playhouse company. Granted that this ruling must have been quite flexible, it presents, therefore, a difficulty when one attempts to distinguish which plays by which authors are involved. However, the purpose behind these fair copies is no problem. An author's fair copy would have been very confusing to any reader unacquainted with the play; a fair copy, on the other hand, was intended to establish order in the textual arrangement of the play with a reasonable amount of calligraphical legibility.⁶⁰ However, one cannot be certain that, even with such intentions, a manuscript would turn out to be "theatrically clean." It is rather difficult to believe that an author, while copying his own work, would fail to revise various passages if he felt the urge. One cannot always be confident, therefore, that a prompt book was, at all times, derived from fair papers.⁶¹ The amount of revision in a manuscript would have depended on the extent of the author's desire to have his fair copy become a prompt book. If he so

⁵⁹A. W. Pollard (ed.), Richard II. A New Shakespeare Quarto: The Tragedy of King Richard II. (Q3, 1598), Facsimile, pp. 96-97.

⁶⁰Bowers, op. cit., n. 6, p. 109.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 16.

desired, he most likely would have made a few belated revisions and probably would have expanded some of his stage-directions. It has been fairly well-established, however, that Henslowe expected his "hack-writers" to prepare their own fair copies.⁶² His reason, generally accepted, was to avoid the cost of a scribal transcription. Bowers, however, doubts this theory on the grounds that, in the first place, it would have been one of the regular duties of the book-keeper and, hence, it would not have invoked any additional labor or expense.⁶³ It should not be forgotten that if the book-keeper had other duties, the additional task of preparing fair copies for every play would have become burdensome to him. In Robert Daborne's letter to Henslowe concerning Machiavel and the Devil (1613), one learns that Henslowe refused to accept anything but fair papers from the author.⁶⁴ Likewise, inherent to the letter is the implication that this fair copy would not be adequate enough to serve as a prompt book, but worthy only to present no ". . . extraordinary difficulties to a transcriber."⁶⁵ In the main, it appears, then, that the play company would have

⁶²Baldwin, op. cit., p. 141.

⁶³Bowers, op. cit., n. 5, p. 108.

⁶⁴Chambers, op. cit., p. 195.

⁶⁵Bowers, op. cit., p. 16.

preferred the playwright to make his own fair copy with such exactness that it could be used as the basis for a prompt book, but this, evidently, was not always the case. It has been suggested that if the author's fair copy were not good enough for use as a prompt book, it would have been preserved, nevertheless, for the printer.⁶⁶

By this time, an author would have finished his play, and, following theatrical tradition, he would have been summoned for a reading before the company, a situation reminiscent of the medieval custom of an author's reading his works aloud in public.⁶⁷ Once a manuscript was accepted by the playhouse company, however, it was very much at the mercy of the book-keeper. Any changes which he saw fit to make to prepare it for the stage were, then, inserted. At this point, one is concerned with the problem of which "came first"--the prompt book or the actors' parts? Again, there is no clear-cut pattern to be perceived, but a trend is somewhat noticeable. Bowers, for example, has taken a definite stand and claims that the actors' parts preceded the prompt book.⁶⁸ On the other hand, Greg finds only one example of this practice from the

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 76.

⁶⁷W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 26; and Chaytor, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

⁶⁸Bowers, op. cit., n. 8, p. 112.

period in the play, Orlando Furioso (1591).⁶⁹ He shows that a reference to actors' parts occurs in a letter written by Herbert, Master of the Revels, to Edward Knight:

In many things you have saved mee labour; yet wher
your judgement or penm fayld you, I have made boulde
to use mine. Purge ther parts, as I have the booke⁷⁰

Later, Herbert is reported to have said: "The players ought not to study their parts till I have been allowed of the book."⁷¹ From Herbert's words, one sees that, in this specific case, at least, the actor's parts had been prepared before a copy of the play had been received. Bowers generalizes that all plays entered the playhouse by acts, as the author wrote them, and were not submitted wholly at one time, and supports the theory that the actor's parts were immediately prepared from the scribal fair copy to facilitate the memorization of lines.⁷² Greg feels that actors' parts were drawn up from the author's fair copy or from the prompt book.⁷³ Bowers, however, contends that a play received many revisions during rehearsals and that it was more practical to wait until the play had assumed a static form, or until the Master of the Revels had censored it, before

⁶⁹W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 46.

⁷⁰Baldwin, op. cit., p. 122.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 123.

⁷²Bowers, op. cit., n. 8, pp. 112-13.

⁷³W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 46.

establishing the prompt book.⁷⁴ He indicates that the copy submitted to the censor would have been the scribe's or the author's fair copy. It is understandable that a scribe could not produce copies for each actor in a company when the dramatis personae often included around twenty characters. Yet one is disturbed by the actors' abilities to determine their entrances, exits, and even speaking cues if they did not hold a copy of the entire play before them. Perhaps, the answer lay in an ingenious little device called a "plot." While the only extant examples of this document belong to Alleyn's organization, it is, nevertheless, plausible that they were common to all companies.⁷⁵ Chambers feels they were hung on pegs for all to see.⁷⁶ These documents provided an outline of the play ". . . with occasional notes of action."⁷⁷ All entrances and exits were marked, and the actors' names were listed alongside as an additional aid.⁷⁸ Greg further contends that scenes were also delineated.⁷⁹ Thus, however inconvenient,

⁷⁴Bowers, op. cit., n. 8, p. 113.

⁷⁵Baldwin, op. cit., p. 145.

⁷⁶Chambers, op. cit., p. 194.

⁷⁷W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, pp. 46-47.

⁷⁸Baldwin, op. cit., p. 90.

⁷⁹W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 47.

this plot sufficiently served its purpose as a stabilizer for the entire production. One printed example, "Plot of England's Joy," is known to have been an ". . . advertising summary" for the play, apparently doubling as a program for the audience.⁸⁰ Crompton Rhodes and Wilson claim that from a combination of the actors' parts and the plot, one could, if required, produce a rather sketchy prompt book.⁸¹ However, it is obvious that a number of mistakes could be the result. Both Rhodes and Wilson also believe that this assembled text may have been used by the printer on many occasions, even in the preparation of the First Folio.⁸²

The last official copy of a drama which the playhouse would have required was the prompt book. In Elizabethan times, the theatrical term for this document was, simply, the "book."⁸³ There have been many theories as to who the scribe for this copy may have been. Pollard, on the one extreme, feels that it was the book-keeper's adaptation of the author's fair copy, since there is no evidence to indicate that a scribe ever copied

⁸⁰Baldwin, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

⁸¹W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 47.

⁸²Ibid., pp. 134-35.

⁸³J. Dover Wilson, "The New Way with Shakespeare's Texts: An Introduction for Lay Reader's, III. In Sight of Shakespeare's Manuscripts," Shakespeare Survey, IX (1956), p. 71.

one.⁸⁴ The opposite view is taken by Baldwin, who states: "It was the bookkeeper's duty also to prepare the original manuscript for the prompter, who was himself."⁸⁵ Greg presents both sides of the argument and favors Baldwin rather than Wilson.⁸⁶ This prompt book was obviously the most important version of a play which a company owned. As Bowers points out, it was the experience-tested final draft of the stage presentation.⁸⁷ It was the play as it was performed, whether it resembled the author's original work or not. In appearance, it was of folio size with its sheets ". . . sewn or stabbed together . . ." and it was sometimes kept with the plot of the play.⁸⁸ It was likely to have been divided into acts, the earliest example of which is Barnavelt (1619), copied by Ralph Crane.⁸⁹ Its stage-directions were solely for the prompter, to remind him of the various stage business for which he was responsible.⁹⁰ These directions were not

⁸⁴Chambers, op. cit., p. 193.

⁸⁵Baldwin, op. cit., p. 123.

⁸⁶W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 33.

⁸⁷Bowers, op. cit., n. 8, pp. 111-12.

⁸⁸W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 34.

⁸⁹Ibid., pp. 35-46.

⁹⁰Baldwin, op. cit., p. 126.

supposed to replace the author's, but rather to emphasize and further clarify what was already there.⁹¹ Peculiar, also, to the prompt book was the structural pattern of these stage directions. They were usually short and emphatic (e. g., "Ink: paper ready."), possibly to allow the prompter enough time to attend to properties and to warn performers.⁹² Greg warns, however, that to declare the advance position of stage-directions an indication of a "book" could be misleading, although he adds that this generalization would probably be close to the truth.⁹³ Furthermore, a reasonable mistake by the transcriber of inserting the names of the actor rather than those of a character is also an indication of a prompt book.⁹⁴ For example, in many cases, especially when several minor actors would be concerned, the book-keeper would have placed the actor's name on the copy to expedite his recognition of the cast. But, Albright cautions that occasionally an author in writing a part for a certain actor could unconsciously have written in the actor's name, which, in turn, would have been

⁹¹W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 37.

⁹²Albright, op. cit., p. 298.

⁹³W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 38.

⁹⁴Baldwin, op. cit., p. 126.

an easy mistake for a scribe to follow.⁹⁵ Thence, this peculiarity would occur in either an author's foul or fair copies.

For all practical purposes, therefore, the playhouse manuscript may have consisted of six possible legitimate copies. However, the essay, "The Stationer to the Reader," affixed to the 1647 first folio of Beaumont and Fletcher, is very important. Here, one learns of the copies which actors often had prepared for their "private friends."⁹⁶ While the Gong at Cheese, transcribed by Crane in 1624, is the first known, dated private copy of this kind, Chambers speculates that this practice probably began sometime after the Lord Chamberlain's intervention of 1619.⁹⁷ Should the printer ever have obtained one of these private copies, he would most likely have had no qualms about publishing it without the author's approval.⁹⁸ Furthermore, assuming the date of 1619 as marking the origin of this practice, one sees that Shakespeare's Folio also may have been corrupted by these private manuscripts. An interesting episode concerns John Rhodes or Edward Knight, whichever the case

⁹⁵Albright, op. cit., p. 298.

⁹⁶W. W. Greg, "Prompt Copies, Private Transcripts, and the Playhouse Scrivener," The Library, VI, 4 (1926), pp. 148-49.

⁹⁷W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 45.

⁹⁸Sir Sidney Lee, A Life of William Shakespeare, p. 100.

may have been, when ordered to transcribe a private copy of Bonduca. Apparently, the "original" was lost and the copyist had recourse only to the rough draft in the playhouse.⁹⁹

While this does not indicate that all rough drafts were preserved, it does suggest that a printer could, in certain instances, have obtained a copy similar to the one which Rhodes or Knight employed.

Private copies, however, were not the only spurious manuscripts which may have come into a printer's hands. There were also pirated texts in Elizabethan London.¹⁰⁰ This is not meant to imply that every private or pirated text was a variant of the author's original draft, but, for the most part, one assumes that they were. There were three methods used by the theatrical pirate of this time: stenography, usually by shorthand; the traitor-actor method; and memorial reconstruction.¹⁰¹ Wilson, in a study of the first quarto of Romeo and Juliet (1597), concluded that it was a reported text which had been reconstructed from memory by one or two actors

⁹⁹W. W. Greg, "Prompt Copies, Private Transcripts, and the Playhouse Scrivener," The Library, VI, 4 (1926), p. 155.

¹⁰⁰W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 43.

¹⁰¹W. W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, pp. 72-3; A. Feuillerat, The Composition of Shakespeare's Plays, p. 41; and, Albright, op. cit., p. 290.

who had performed in the production of the actual play in or around the time of its publication.¹⁰² The appeal which such an edition had for the public rests in the fact that it was reconstructed from a current play and, hence, would have been more in vogue than any previous editions.¹⁰³ Greg agrees with Wilson that Q1 of Romeo and Juliet was a pirated edition, but refuses to accept piracy as an important problem in the printing of all copies of plays.¹⁰⁴ An interesting but perplexing aspect of this subject, which also tends to minimize the threat of piracy, is the freedom with which plays were circulated about London. At one time, such men as Charles Reade and Sir Sidney Lee would have argued against a manuscript's freedom on the grounds that the playhouse company would have wished to prevent the publication of their plays unless they would reap a profit from the venture. Recently, however, scholars have concluded that companies probably never hoarded manuscripts, but, instead, only preserved them, and such examples as that of the King's Men's giving Ralph Crane

¹⁰²J. Dover Wilson, "The New Way with Shakespeare's Texts, II. Recent Work on the Text of Romeo and Juliet," Shakespeare Survey, VIII (1955), p. 82.

¹⁰³Albright, op. cit., p. 300.

¹⁰⁴W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, pp. 62, 43.

the right to transcribe Demetrius and Rosalinda seem to verify this theory.¹⁰⁵

The first form of piracy to be considered, then, is stenography. It is easily proved that in Shakespeare's time shorthand was well known. One is aware of three major methods in the period: Timothy Bright's Character (1588); Peter Bale's Brachygraphia (1590); and John Willis's Stenography (1602).¹⁰⁶ Chambers shows that extensive work has been performed upon the bad quartos with shorthand principles in mind, and quite readily one notices that the peculiarities of Bright's system become obvious.¹⁰⁷ It must be observed, however, that these shorthand methods were much more complex than modern ones. They were cumbersome in application and often inaccurate, and they heavily taxed the memory.¹⁰⁸ But in spite of these problems, they were used. Thomas Heywood in his prologue to Queen Elizabeth (1630), complained that the printed text of his play had been stolen: ". . . some by Stenography drew / The plot, put it in print, scarce one word true. . . ." ¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵Albright, op. cit., pp. 290-91.

¹⁰⁶W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 57.

¹⁰⁷Chambers, op. cit., p. 185.

¹⁰⁸Albright, op. cit., p. 315.

¹⁰⁹W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 58.

Nevertheless, F. G. Hubbard maintains that the shorthand of the day was in such a deplorable state that it could not have accounted for the ". . . worst of Shakespeare's quartos."¹¹⁰ An interesting theory is that, during a performance, anyone copying a play by shorthand would undoubtedly have been detected by the members of the audience.¹¹¹ If piracy were as predominant as some scholars claim because of the miserly attitude of the playhouse company, surely the people would have been aware of it. Under such circumstances, a stenographer was taking a great chance. On the other hand, if the opposite were true and companies were not jealously protecting their plays, then piracy, on a large scale, would have been a waste of time. Yet the desire of publishers to place upon the market the acting edition of a current play must have accounted for some piracy, and one remembers that stenography was also being used in Shakespeare's time to pirate sermons and lectures.¹¹² Feuillerat speaks unflatteringly, as well, about the traitor-actor, but this phase of the problem is not especially important. If pirating were a harsh threat at this time, it seems unlikely that an actor would have placed himself in a position open to

¹¹⁰Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 315.

¹¹¹W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 59.

¹¹²Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 315.

scorn and would have gambled upon a possible dismissal from his profession.

The problem of memorial reconstruction, however, is a different matter. As Albright acknowledges, the Renaissance man exercised and trained his memory more than man today, and it follows that if a person made an actual attempt at memorizing a play, he would need only a few visits to a theatre to realize his ambitions.¹¹³ Greg states that, with no previous experience, he himself memorized John Bull's Other Island as an experiment, and after only four visits. He further explains that he could, then, reproduce the dialogue sufficiently to convey the idea of the play. He believes he did as good a job as the man who memorially reconstructed the quarto of The Merry Wives of Windsor (1599-1600?).¹¹⁴ In fact, he feels that memorization would account for the ". . . average quality of the 'bad' quartos. . . ." ¹¹⁵ Such reconstruction, while it may not have been sanctioned, would have been difficult to detect, and, even as late as 1882, a man was acquitted of memorial piracy with the decision that a theatrical manager could prevent a

¹¹³ Ibid., p. 311.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., p. 310.

¹¹⁵ W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 60.

"stenographic or phonographic report," but that anyone had the right to listen and to remember.¹¹⁶

Accordingly, then, from foul papers to pirated copies a manuscript made its way into the printer's shop. However, many exceptions may undoubtedly have occurred--such as, one of the three or four foul copies an author may have written; or a lost, wandering playhouse copy; or an inexplicable extra copy; or numerous other possibilities. Principally, however, scholars now feel that the foul, fair, or scribal fair copy was given to the printer.¹¹⁷ There is one other additional theory which claims that the prompt book may have been used as a printer's copy, as has already been stated. Greg feels that this may have occurred in isolated cases, but adds that the prompt book was far too important a document in the playhouse to have been given away.¹¹⁸

One must enter the Elizabethan printing-house, then, to seek a conclusion to the journey of the playhouse manuscript. Here, attention must be paid to the type of manuscript which the printer had to follow and the impending alterations to

¹¹⁶Albright, op. cit., p. 313.

¹¹⁷W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 33; and Albright, op. cit., p. 291.

¹¹⁸W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 102.

which it would have been exposed.¹¹⁹ For instance, what was the outcome should the document in question have been a prompt book? It is impossible to establish every error to which a manuscript was liable before it finally reached a printed edition. However, the first consideration which it was accorded for printing was its treatment in the hands of the master-printer whose duty it was to decide on the size and kind of type to be used for the text, for stage-directions, and for any other part of the edition that should be readily distinguishable from the text.¹²⁰ Thereafter, the compositor was in charge, and it is with him that the manuscript possibly suffered the most.¹²¹ It is also likely that composing took place in the main printing-house because of better facilities and the possibility of collaboration of other workmen in the shop.¹²² One does not infer, however, that a lengthy work never was parcelled out, upon occasion, to two printing-houses and their compositors, since this kind of maneuvering is attested to in the preface to the 1647 Beaumont and Fletcher Folio:

¹¹⁹J. Dover Wilson, "The New Way with Shakespeare's Texts: An Introduction for Lay Readers, I. The Foundation," Shakespeare Survey, VII (1954), p. 55.

¹²⁰R. B. McKerrow, An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students, p. 240.

¹²¹Ibid., pp. 239-40.

¹²²Albright, op. cit., p. 343.

After the Comedies and Tragedies were wrought off, we were forced (for expedition) to send the Gentlemen's Verses to severall Printers which was the occasion of their different Character.¹²³

Three statements should be made in defense of the printer, however, before one attempts to enumerate his many faults. As can be imagined, many printing-house problems were already latent in the copy from which the compositor must work. If his copy were a previously printed edition or a clean, legible manuscript, one could expect a reasonably perfect job, but unfortunately this was seldom the case. For example, the handwriting itself was a problem in addition to erratic spelling, and as if these were not enough, the Elizabethans notoriously used very little consistent punctuation.¹²⁴ With foul papers, these problems would have existed, no doubt, along with the alterations and deletions which were probably entered into the margins. To appreciate this situation, one should hand his own "foul papers" to a stranger and request that they be read, or better still, read those of the stranger. The printer's problem of translation, while difficult, is not entirely missing, today. As Bowers shows, one can always study a compositor and determine his basic errors, and it naturally follows that one may also examine an author's handwriting in manuscript, when available,

¹²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 34; 343.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 322.

to determine what quirks of penmanship might lead a compositor to a wrong decision.¹²⁵ In fair papers, on the other hand, one would expect many of the organizational and calligraphical tangles to have been eliminated. This is true, but Greg wonders who originally smoothed them out--the author, scribe, or editor of the press?¹²⁶ The second point in a printer's favor, while it illustrates his good nature, probably was responsible for many errors which otherwise could not be justified. One refers to the fact that early printers ". . . seem to have been singularly patient with careless manuscripts."¹²⁷ The third point is explained by J. D. Wilson and is self-evident:

Some years ago I attended a meeting at the Bodleian Library of a class for professors and lecturers in the elements of printing conducted by an expert from the Clarendon Press, who allowed me to try and set up a sonnet of Drayton's in type. I keep the proof which was sent after me and look at it with shame and humility whenever I feel inclined to write contemptuously about Shakespearean compositors.¹²⁸

Greg has been earlier cited for claiming that the press was the source of most errors in a drama, as it passed from

¹²⁵Bowers, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9.

¹²⁶W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, pp. viii-ix.

¹²⁷Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 323.

¹²⁸J. Dover Wilson, "The New Way with Shakespeare's Texts: An Introduction for Lay Readers I. The Foundation," Shakespeare Survey, VII (1954), pp. 55-56.

author and playhouse company into the print shop, and it is no wonder, when one considers the many possibilities for error latent in this establishment. Following is a list of nine possible steps in publication from which a manuscript could receive a new meaning: (1) handling of the manuscript; (2) memory of the compositor; (3) spelling of the period; (4) muscular error on the part of the compositor; (5) foul case or selection of the wrong type; (6) dictation or mispronunciation; (7) italics and their connotations; (8) contemporary punctuation; (9) the correction of a printed copy. Each of these steps should be briefly examined.

In the period of 1550 to 1630, two different forms of writing were employed in manuscripts--English, steadily growing in popularity, was used for the bulk of manuscripts; and Italian which was used only for citations and proper names.¹²⁹ The study of Elizabethan handwriting is important if one is to become familiar with the compositor's reading problems while setting type. For example, as he glanced from copy to press, he was apt to make only a general sweep of the document in his reading, and one knows from personal experience, that a quick glance is often not enough. For example, this "false visual perception" may have produced such words as time for tune or

¹²⁹McKerrow, op. cit., pp. 252-53.

ratifi'd for rarifi'd.¹³⁰ If such mistakes are difficult to comprehend, one must realize that they were the result of Elizabethan handwriting standards. There are many letters in this form of handwriting that may easily be confused. McKerrow cites several such examples--d and n, for example, could have become g and x; furthermore, the final st in many instances could have been confused with ss, and words like case and cast might have proved a problem to the seventeenth century compositor.¹³¹ There are other mistakes in reading, however, apart from the recognition of what one "sees." A word such as Frenchfield, because of its easy and familiar arrangement of letters, could easily be substituted for Frenchified.¹³² Also, word anticipation is another commonly acknowledged source of such error. In Every Man Out of His Humour (1599), the compositor set up affection for affliction (l. 3434), ". . . probably because he caught a glimpse of affection in the line below."¹³³ Another element to be considered is related to the opportunity for omission or doubling of parts when the compositor was distracted for a moment. When he returned to the manuscript, he could easily have focused upon

¹³⁰Albright, op. cit., p. 335.

¹³¹McKerrow, op. cit., p. 254.

¹³²Albright, op. cit., p. 336.

¹³³Loc. cit.

a similar word, but not the one with which he had been previously occupied.¹³⁴ Furthermore, in setting his type, he often tended to memorize several words at a time in order to speed up his work.¹³⁵ Indeed, many of the mistakes may be the direct result of this habit. At the same time, as he selected his type from the case, placing it in his composing-stick, piece-by-piece, many words may have assumed, for him, the following changes--must take because of the allied sound, became mistake; homonym could be substituted, such as sight for cite, or right for write or rite; even synonyms could occur, as in peaceable for placable; and, quite simple to understand would have been his misperception of rare words for words that were more familiar.¹³⁶

Closely related to memory are the irregularities of spelling characteristic to the period. Manuscript spelling comes in such varieties that it is no wonder the printer often did not faithfully adhere to the copy before him.¹³⁷ In Orlando Furioso, the corruption of slawnder to slawnder and sclander within a few lines illustrates such printer's errata.¹³⁸ This

¹³⁴Ibid., p. 337.

¹³⁵McKerrow, op. cit., p. 254.

¹³⁶Albright, op. cit., pp. 340-43.

¹³⁷Ibid., p. 322.

¹³⁸McKerrow, op. cit., p. 249.

orthographic carelessness could obviously change the meaning of a word, a sentence, or even an entire paragraph. One must be keenly aware of its possible occurrence when examining texts and manuscripts of the time. Also, as has been earlier stated, the compositor may have memorized several words at a time in the process of his type setting. If the spelling of a manuscript word disagreed with the spelling which he knew, he would have preferred his form, and it would have appeared on the printed page.¹³⁹ In addition, he would often alter the spelling to ". . . space out or condense a line . . ." to balance his page, adding, doubling, or dropping certain letters within a word.¹⁴⁰ An unskilled compositor, however, would have tended to follow his copy slavishly, as would an experienced man if he were confronted with an unusual word.¹⁴¹ Often contractions, also, presented a problem to the printer. Authors, in writing for actors who were experienced in scanning their lines, tended to ignore the contractions which would produce a perfect line of dialogue; hence, many syllables

¹³⁹J. Dover Wilson, "The New Way with Shakespeare's Texts: An Introduction for Lay Reader's, III. In Sight of Shakespeare's Manuscripts," Shakespeare Survey, IX (1956), p. 75.

¹⁴⁰Albright, op. cit., p. 323.

¹⁴¹J. Dover Wilson, "The New Way with Shakespeare's Texts: An Introduction for Lay Reader's, III. In Sight of Shakespeare's Manuscripts," Shakespeare Survey, IX (1956), p. 75.

that should have been excluded in the printed edition were often retained.¹⁴² Yet the printer's spelling was, on the whole, far more advanced and consistent than the playwright's, whose spelling often differed ". . . from author to author . . . from page to page, even from line to line, in the same author."¹⁴³

The type which the compositor used was stored in the slots of a case specifically reserved for each individual letter, and while he might very well have known the letter he was seeking, through a kind of muscular error, he often reached into the wrong slot.¹⁴⁴ Most probably, this was not the result of false perception of type case, because a skilled compositor would have relied on his habit to "hit the right holes."¹⁴⁵ Naturally, fatigue or mental failure accounts for a major portion of muscular error. McKerrow feels that this accident occurred quite frequently in the printing-house.¹⁴⁶

One is next aware of a common error in the printing-house known as "foul case," a situation involving the careless

¹⁴² McKerrow, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

¹⁴³ J. Dover Wilson, "The New Way with Shakespeare Texts: An Introduction for Lay Reader's, III. In Sight of Shakespeare's Manuscripts," *Shakespeare Survey*, IX (1956), pp. 74-75.

¹⁴⁴ McKerrow, *op. cit.*, pp. 254-55.

¹⁴⁵ Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 337.

¹⁴⁶ McKerrow, *op. cit.*, p. 255.

misplacement of letters. The compositor, upon reaching for a letter in a correct slot, consequently, might pick up a wrong one.¹⁴⁷ For example, the letter g is not closely akin to g, yet in haste, the compositor could confuse the two, thus explaining the occasional that's for that's, or even simpler still, the confusion of l and i, producing falling for falling.¹⁴⁸ Another reason for "foul case" was the over-filling of certain divisions and the impending overflow that forced type into a neighboring slot, and thereby, misplaced it.¹⁴⁹ Spellings like Jacob's ond, obsurd, and favour'd are probably contingent on this error, inasuch as the g section was immediately above the g section in the arrangement of the cases.¹⁵⁰ However, Blades indicates that light could never be considered an error for fight, because the ligature fi would have been used instead of the f which might have been confused with i.¹⁵¹

Dictation also introduced problems that are difficult to detect and solve. In this method, the spelling of the manuscript and, perhaps, even the italics and punctuation would

¹⁴⁷ Loc. cit.

¹⁴⁸ Albright, op. cit., p. 338.

¹⁴⁹ McKerrow, op. cit., p. 256.

¹⁵⁰ Albright, op. cit., p. 338.

¹⁵¹ McKerrow, op. cit., pp. 256-57.

have held no meaning for the compositor.¹⁵² The employment of such a reader would have proved expensive to a sixteenth or seventeenth century printing-house, and none of the pictures of early printing-houses shows such a man, yet with the long working hours and poor artificial light, he may have proved to be most helpful.¹⁵³ Furthermore, while an edition was being run off the press, corrections were being made and, therefore, many later impressions of a page would turn up in a more perfect form.¹⁵⁴ The most important factor involved in this kind of correction concerns the fact that the proof-reader, upon discovering a mistake, may have attempted to make sense out of the error instead of seeking to understand the cause behind it, thereby producing a false correction that doubly confuses a modern editor as he attempts his reconstruction of the work. An example of such error occurs in l. 794 of the Interlude of Impatient Poverty (1560) where the word observed exists, when sense requires obscured. When the proof-reader saw this in his inspection, he immediately perceived it as observed with the ru mistakenly inverted to ur. Thus, he made the change.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵²Ibid., p. 241.

¹⁵³Ibid., pp. 245-46.

¹⁵⁴Chambers, op. cit., p. 197.

¹⁵⁵McKerrow, op. cit., pp. 258-59.

In exploring the subject of the degeneration of Elizabethan play texts, scholars like W. W. Greg, J. D. Wilson, E. K. Chambers, R. B. McKerrow, F. P. Wilson, and others, not content with a mass of variant texts, devised a scientific method for the examination of these dramas. It is mainly from their efforts that modern scholars have come to recognize the importance of the playhouse scrivener in this complex problem.

CHAPTER II

RALPH CRANE, THE SCRIVENER, AND HIS METHODS OF CALLIGRAPHY

A scrivener's fist by nimbleness to race,
To scrape, to forge, to counterfeit a name
--The Rock of Regard (1576), George Whetstone

In 1924, T. S. Graves published an important discovery.¹⁵⁶

In his article, he reproduced a portion of the preface from the 1625 edition of The Works of Mercy, Both Corporeall and Spirituall (1620) by an heretofore obscure figure, Ralph Crane (1550/60?-1632?). Because of the importance of this document to the present investigation, it is necessary to reproduce it, at this point, from Graves:¹⁵⁷

The Citie had my birth: My Father free
Of a much fam'd and Rovall Company,
With good esteeme bore Offices of worth,
My Education past; I then went forth,
And tride the Ayre of diuers noble Counties,
There tasted some free fauors, gen'rous Bounties,
Yet could not find there (as th' euent exprest)
Sufficient grounding for my foote to rest,
With Noah's first Doue (after much flight, much paine)
Vnto my Arke, (my Natiue home againe)
I backe return'd; but could not bring with me
The Oliue-leafe of faire Tranquillitie.

¹⁵⁶T. S. Graves, "Ralph Crane and the King's Players," Studies in Philology, XII (April, 1924), pp. 362-63.

¹⁵⁷One should be aware that the section of this preface ending, "Vnder the Kingly-seruice" appeared in the 1620 edition. In 1625, Crane published The Pilgrimes New-Yeares-Gift, and added to this poetic autobiography information pertinent to the intervening five years. The present text of the preface (above) omits Crane's description of the London plague; ibid., pp. 362-63. See also, F. P. Wilson, "Some Notes on Authors and Patrons in Tudor and Stuart Times," John Quincy Adams: Memorial Studies, p. 560.

Much Variation I have had since then,
 With one blest gift (a ready writers pen)
 The vse whereof (without vaine glory told)
 Is not extinguish't yet (though I am old)
 'Tis not extinct indeed: But yet (alas)
 It's a cas'd Instrument, no sound it has:
 Time hath worne out (with Teares I strike this straine)
 Beliefe of what I can: now young ones raigne.
 Whil'st I (too old to cry about the street
 Worke for a Writer) no Employment meet,
 But all dismayed, and dis-loyfull sit
 As one had neither Pen, nor Hand, nor Wit:
 Or as Ierusalem sad famish'd Mother,
 Feed on mine owne besotten flesh; (no other)
 Quite lost; vnlesse (in this) Speed meet Desire,
 And hap doe answere hope. But I retire
 To shew the Protean-changes, and the Changes,
 My life hath touch'd at; as an Arrow glances,
 And slides from ground to ground, yet neuer hits
 The aynd Marke; so my vnertaine fits
 Obserue with patience, 'twill not hurt at all:
 (Exmerience is a doctrine medinnall.)

First was I seven yeares-seruant, painful Clarke,
 Vnto a Clarke o' th Counsell; & did marke
 Within the copasse of those hopeful yeers
 The Goodnesse, and Nobility o' the Peeres;
 Those Reuerend Lords, those Counsellors of State
 Vpon whose Vertues I must meditate
 While I haue breath: and in my soule adore
 These great Succeeders of those gone before:
Heauen fix the in their Seates: long stand they thus
 Like sheltring Cedars on Mount Lebanon:
 Their Counsels blesse: al their decrees renown the;
 Their Soueraigns honor here: There Glory crown them.

Goe on my Zeale, & praise while thou art able
 Each gracious Second of that honour'd Table:
 And as a thankfull Riuer that doth send
 His Tribute to the Ocean, I commend
 One special sacrifice (with heart sincere)
 Vnto his worth, whom I call'd Master here:
 May his In-urned Bones in quiet rest
 Till the last sounding Trumpe, and then rise blest:
 That (haplesse) thence I slipt (wanting firme hold)
 I sadly sigh the fate; but leau't vtold:
 Onely thus much (that no aspersion bide
 Vpon my front) I did no talent hide.

The Signet and the Friuy Seale was next
 Those deare Collegues, that giue me for my text
 A field of honour, and shall be my Song
 While Fame a Trumpet hath, or I a tongue:
 The Gentlenesse which there I did possesse
 Did make their goodnesse more, my sorrowes lesse:
 But those sweet after-drops of comfort I
 Sometimes receiu'd from thence, are now growne dry:
 Those Conduit-pipes, that did my thirst allay
 Are frozen vp: and now in the highway,
 (Poorer Traueller) wounded, and rob'd I lye,
 Vntill some good Samaritan come by,
 And with the Wine, and Oyle of loy agin
 Set me on Horsback, helpe me to some Inne.

To th' Tribe of Ley, (heau'ns chiefe Miracles)
 I haue done service; with their Oracles,
 Which so Diuine Instinction doth infuse,
 For their bles'd sakes Ile make my soule their Muse
 And pray with the best power, my Zeale affords
 All happy Gifts to crowne their sacred words:
 The Holy Ghost, (in Clouen tongues, and Fire)
 Descend on them, when they good things desire.

But most of all doth my Laborious hand
 'Mongst the renown'd and Learned Lawyers stand
 A Monument; each Office and each Court
 Vouchsafeing me such matter of report,
 That if my voice to th' vtmost world could stretch
 Euen thither should their Fames, & honors reach.

And some impoyment hath my vsefull Pen,
 Had 'mongst those ciuill well-deseruing Men,
 That grace the Stage with honour and delight,
 Of whose true honesties I much could write
 But will con pris's (as a Caske of Gold)
 Vnder the Kingly-service they doe hold. . . .

There was not one that could (for loue) be hir'd
 T' haue but en-sculpt't vpon a peece of stone
 This simple Epitaph which I alone
 Before-hand for my self, had thus compos'd,
 And yet affect to haue it so dispos'd,
 That some resenbrance may remaine of me
 By this my Swan-like, dying Elieie.

Behold a wonder (Friend) oh stay and read,
 And make this spectacle thy President,
 Here buried lies a Man, that is not dead,
 Deaths dart was not with life: death then repent

And cease to vaunt! Thou hast not made him bow,
For (he thanked God) he never liu'd till now.
 Through City, Countrie, Court, Church, Law & Stage
 I haue pass'd thorough in my Pilgrimage,
 Yet here I stand Fortunes Anatomie,
 A spectacle of Times Inconstancy.
 And what's to come (to keepe me from despaire)
 Must rise from you (great Objects of my prayer).

In examining the preface, one notices Crane's boast of ". . . a ready writers pen . . ." that has gained him service "Through City, Countrie, Court, Church, Law & Stage . . ." Graves has especially studied the passage beginning, "And some employ-ment . . . / Vnder the Kingly-service they doe hold." He has announced that this section is an indication of Crane's relationship to Shakespeare's company, the King's Men. In confessing his inability to pursue the subject, Graves suggests that, herein, lies a valuable clue to the riddle of Shakespeare.¹⁵⁸ In 1926, F. P. Wilson, unaware of Grave's previous work, proceeded upon his own initiative to investigate Crane. In his subsequent article, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," he categorizes many of Crane's calligraphical tendencies and explains that Crane was probably a scrivener for this company but not a book-keeper or stage-keeper. In addition, as Graves earlier predicted, Wilson discovered several of Crane's "trademarks" in the First Folio.¹⁵⁹ Therefore, one should

¹⁵⁸ Graves, op. cit., pp. 362-63.

¹⁵⁹ F. P. Wilson, "Some Notes on Authors and Patrons in Tudor and Stuart Times," John Quincy Adams: Memorial Studies, p. 560.

attempt to reconstruct the main events of the life of this important scrivener.

Ralph Crane was born in London, "The Citie," probably in the fifties or sixties, since he himself has admitted that by 1620 he was an old man.¹⁶⁰ In his preface to The Works of Mercy, he claims to have been the son of a well-to-do merchant of "good esteeme" in the Merchant Taylors' Company. However, Wilson has suggested that if Crane's father were the John Crane mentioned in Clode's Memorials, he was certainly not as "respected" as Crane would imply in the poem.¹⁶¹ Apparently, Ralph entered the service of Mrs. Dorothea Osborne, who was probably also his grandmother.¹⁶² He was not hampered by this relationship in his public life, however, because Thomas Lodge, in 1557, hailed one Ralph Crane as a friend and dedicated his Scyllaes Metamorphosis to him.¹⁶³ Crane's first public office was that of "painful clarke" for seven years to Sir Anthony Ashley, a clerk of the council, in whose service Ralph became acquainted with the law.¹⁶⁴ According to his poem, he next

¹⁶⁰ loc. cit.

¹⁶¹ Graves, op. cit., pp. 362-63; also Wilson, op. cit., fn. 1, p. 196.

¹⁶² Ibid., fn. 2, p. 196.

¹⁶³ Sir Sidney Lee (ed.), "Ralph Crane," Dictionary of National Biography, p. 11.

¹⁶⁴ Graves, op. cit., pp. 362-63.

served "The Signet" and the "Privy Seale," where, as Wilson has shown, Lewin Munck was the Clerk at this time.¹⁶⁵ Crane, next, records in his preface his association with the "Tribe of Levy," and mentions the period which follows as his final service with the lawyers.¹⁶⁶ On this phase of Crane's life, Feuillerat has written:

Meticulous by nature, as is shown by the care he took with the smallest details of his florid script, accurate as he had to be in his administrative functions where the slightest error in the wording of a document might have been followed by serious consequences, he had acquired the habit of precision, a habit that may easily become a mania.¹⁶⁷

However, the name of Ralph Crane is so common in this period that it is difficult to be certain that one is always dealing with Crane the scrivener. Therefore, Crane's preface to his own The Works of Mercy becomes an increasingly important document, containing the only concrete evidence one has with which to work.¹⁶⁸ On December 14, 1620, The Works of Mercy was entered in the Stationers' Register under the initials T. M., thought by some to stand for Thomas Middleton. Wilson claims, however, that the poem does not resemble Middleton's

¹⁶⁵ Loc. cit.

¹⁶⁶ Loc. cit.

¹⁶⁷ Feuillerat, op. cit., p. 277.

¹⁶⁸ F. P. Wilson, op. cit., fn. 1, p. 197.

style in any way, and he is confident that the preface, at least, is Crane's.¹⁶⁹ There are three extant copies of this poem—a first edition in the Bodelian Library; a second edition in the British Museum; and an extract of the poem printed in Farr's Select Poetry Contemporary to James I.¹⁷⁰ Sir Francis Freeling, who formerly owned the copy which is now in the British Museum, believes that the first edition was published in 1616.¹⁷¹ If Freeling's reasoning is correct, it seems likely that Crane's preface was made as an addition to a much later printing of the work. Eventually, this poem collected at least three dedications, and counted among its many patrons Dorothy Osborne, John, Earl of Bridgewater, and Levin Munch, Esquire, each of whom received a different and appropriate dedicatory epistle from Crane.¹⁷²

As for Crane's career as an author, Lee believes that he began to write poetry late in life ". . . when he was suffering from much poverty and sickness."¹⁷³ The Works of Mercy has been described as an antithetical arrangement of

¹⁶⁹Ibid., fn. 1, p. 198.

¹⁷⁰Sir Sidney Lee, Dictionary of National Biography, "Ralph Crane," p. 17.

¹⁷¹Graves, op. cit., fn. 3, p. 362.

¹⁷²Wilson, op. cit., p. 197.

¹⁷³Lee, op. cit., p. 11.

seven material and seven spiritual precepts composed in
 ". . . prosaic verse . . . squeezed into a rigid mold with
 the help of facile syncopations."¹⁷⁴ Actually, Crane's
 preface is far more readable than the poem itself.¹⁷⁵
 Obviously, the line, "And some employment both my vsefull
Pen . . .," is most important to an understanding of his role
 as a scrivener. There have been many interpretations of this
 line, but one must recall that, in 1620, Crane modified employ-
ment with some. His self-modesty, here, is most apparent, for
 he is probably referring to his only known transcription of
 this time, Sir John van Olden Barnaveit (1619), which he under-
 took for the King's Men.¹⁷⁶ While it is known that in 1625,
 he had dealings with this company, it can only be conjectured
 that there had been any business relationships between Crane
 and the King's Men from 1619 to 1625.¹⁷⁷ Nevertheless, there
 is evidence to support Crane's calligraphy in many of the plays
 of the First Folio.¹⁷⁸ On the other hand, it is possible that
 he next transcribed The Witch for Middleton, however, one

¹⁷⁴Feuillerat, op. cit., p. 277.

¹⁷⁵Lee, op. cit., p. 11.

¹⁷⁶W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare,
 p. 23.

¹⁷⁷Albright, op. cit., p. 294.

¹⁷⁸Feuillerat, op. cit., p. 322.

cannot be certain, since the suggested dates for this play range from 1620 to 1627.¹⁷⁹ This particular transcription is thought to have been one of a private, "non-theatrical" document which Middleton dedicated to his friend, Thomas Lodge.¹⁸⁰ In 1622, one finds Crane "again" at work for Middleton, this time, in copying "A Song in severall parts," after it had been performed at a feast given by Edward Barkham, the Lord Mayor.¹⁸¹ It is apparent that Middleton must have been satisfied with Crane's work because, in 1624, he hired him, possibly for a third time, and Crane transcribed two copies of A Game at Cheese (MS. Lansdowne 690, and MS. Malone 25), the latter of which is thought to be an example of an "assembled text."¹⁸²

In the year 1625, the Great Plague struck London, sparing Crane's life but reducing him to poverty.¹⁸³ At this point in his career, he began to dedicate poems and plays to numerous

¹⁷⁹F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 208.

¹⁸⁰J. G. MacManaway, "Textual Studies," Shakespeare Survey, II, p. 148.

¹⁸¹F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), pp. 197-98.

¹⁸²W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 45.

¹⁸³Lee, op. cit., p. 11.

patrons in the hopes of a financial reward that would help to relieve his extreme destitution.¹⁸⁴ His first transcript was Demetrius and Eganthe, undertaken in this same year.¹⁸⁵ Wilson describes it in the following manner:

This MS. is perhaps the most beautiful example of Crane's calligraphy that we have. In 128 pages of the text there is hardly an erasure, and the pen never falters.¹⁸⁶

This information should not be surprising, since the copy of Demetrius and Eganthe had been designed by Crane in the first place for his patron, Sir Kelham Digbie ". . . to be pleasing in every respect."¹⁸⁷ The interesting thing about this document is that the King's Men gave Crane the right to copy this play, apparently without expecting any remuneration from him in return for this privilege.

A year later, Crane transcribed one of his longer manuscripts (MS. Rawl. poet. 61) and dedicated it to his friend, John Peirs. It is composed of five individual works,

¹⁸⁴F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 205.

¹⁸⁵W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 45.

¹⁸⁶F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 205.

¹⁸⁷Albright, op. cit., p. 294.

one of which Crane himself wrote.¹⁸⁸ Three years later, in 1628, he copied still another work (MS. Rawl. D. 301) and dedicated it to Lady Anne Cooper, the daughter of his "old master," Sir Anthony Ashley.¹⁸⁹ One other Crane transcription, known as Faultie Favorite, is preserved in the Bridgewater House Library.¹⁹⁰ This document was once considered to be a copy of Crane's own poem, but, as F. P. Wilson has shown, Crane himself claimed nothing but the transcription of this work in 1631, and did not identify its real author. It is, however, dedicated to John, Earl of Bridgewater, and is mentioned by Crane as an "annual tribute."¹⁹¹ Another manuscript (Add. MS. 34752), which contains a dating problem, is entitled Poems by W. A., an individual whom Lee considers to be W. Austin.¹⁹² It was dedicated to Lord Baltimore and probably

¹⁸⁸F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 199. This MS. contains William Austin's "Meditations upon Job;" Francis and Christopher Davison, Joseph Bryan, Richard Gipps, and Thomas Carey, "Certaine selected Psalmes on David (in Verse)"; William Austin's "Certaine deuine Hymnes, or Carrolls for Christmas-daie Together with diuers deuout and zealous Meditations vpon our Saviours Passion;" Ralph Crane's "A Sumarie; and true Distinction between the Lawe, & ye Ghospel;" Massinger's "Londons Lamentable Estate, in any great Visitation."

¹⁸⁹Loc. cit.

¹⁹⁰G. Davis, "The Huntington Library," Shakespeare Survey, VI, pp. 59-60.

¹⁹¹F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 200.

¹⁹²Lee, op. cit., p. 12.

copied after 1624 and before 1632, the year of Baltimore's death. Crane was realizing his age when he copied this manuscript, and in the dedication he expresses his fears that this work may be ". . . his last Oblation ere he die."¹⁹³ However, he did not die until after he had written, but not copied, at least one more work in 1632 (Harl. 3357), which he dedicated to Sir Francis Ashley, a brother of Sir Anthony Ashley. Crane claims to have written all of the poetry contained in this work and expresses the hope that Ashley will later appreciate it.¹⁹⁴ There are, however, three undated transcriptions attributed to Crane which should be examined. First, there is MS. Harl. 6930, which is similar to "A Handfull of Celestiall Flowers," and which contains no dedicatory epistle.¹⁹⁵ Furthermore, it is known that he also copied Ben Jonson's masque, Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue (1619).¹⁹⁶ Finally, there is MS. 12 in the Bodleian Library, which contains songs intended

¹⁹³F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 200.

¹⁹⁴Ibid., pp. 200-01.

¹⁹⁵Lee, op. cit., p. 12; F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 200.

¹⁹⁶W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, fn. 1, p. 25.

for Davenant's adaptation of Macbeth (1672/3) and ". . . thence no doubt in the 1673 quarto of Shakespeare's plays."¹⁹⁷

Scholars have examined this evidence about Crane, sparse as it is, and have pronounced him all things from a professional scribe to the editor of the First Folio! Chambers and Feuillerat, among others, have stated that Crane held a regular position with the King's Men; however, F. P. Wilson thinks that ". . . to call him a stage-manager or the Company's 'book-keeper' would certainly be to go beyond this evidence."¹⁹⁸ Wilson's conclusion appears to be the most logical viewpoint for one to adopt in this case, for Crane, after a lifetime of hardship as a scrivener in many diverse fields, had apparently turned to the playhouse in hopes of employment. Obviously, he was allowed to accept some work in 1619, and it is, furthermore, quite likely that he did have an active role in the preparation of the texts of some of Shakespeare's plays for the 1623 Folio. Possibly from 1619 to 1623, Crane may have been hired to copy some of Shakespeare's plays for the printer.

To become fully acquainted with Ralph Crane, the scrivener, one must understand his calligraphical characteristics.

¹⁹⁷W. W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, fn. 10, p. 391.

¹⁹⁸Sir E. K. Chambers, William Shakespeare, I, p. 109; A. Feuillerat, The Composition of Shakespeare's Plays, p. 137; F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 205.

This problem may be approached in the following categories: (1) legibility of Crane's hand and the cleanliness of his copy; (2) his avoidance and also his use of contractions; (3) his preference for colloquialisms; (4) his spelling traits; (5) his manner of punctuation--hyphen, apostrophe, and parenthesis; (6) his division of plays into acts and scenes; (7) his reconstruction of plays from the actors' parts and from the plot; and (8) his use of stage directions.

At the start, one must realize that Crane was capable of writing in both the English secretary script and the Italian hand with great elegance.¹⁹⁹ His precision and legibility, in fact, have prompted F. P. Wilson to conclude that

. . . a publisher who came by one of Crane's transcripts might reasonably expect from the printer an accurate text, free from literal errors²⁰⁰

Bald acknowledged Crane's skill, but he reserved his highest respect for the unknown transcriber of The Second Maiden's Tragedy.²⁰¹ Such praise is meaningless, however, unless one is familiar with Crane's calligraphic peculiarities. For example, Crane never left a word to a reader's imagination;

¹⁹⁹S. A. Tannenbaum, Shakespearian Scraps and Other Elizabethan Fragments, fn. 2, p. 201.

²⁰⁰F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 211.

²⁰¹R. C. Bald (ed.), A Game at Cheese, p. 28.

he penned each word accurately and completely, with no upward and/or backward flourishes at the end to imply a final letter (i, g, m) that was omitted.²⁰² In the second place, his manner of forming the last two letters of Actus in a consistently perfect draft has caused scholars to consider this trait as a mark of Crane's hand in a manuscript.²⁰³ Moreover, his final g is always distinguishable from his final g, and they could never be mistaken, one for the other.²⁰⁴ It is Crane's distinct Italian g about which F. P. Wilson has shown that the ". . . long flourish above the loop is formed with a separate stroke of the pen."²⁰⁵ Furthermore, Crane's manuscript legibility was assured by his cautious hand that produced no extra minims which would tend to confuse humour with honour, or runk with pink.²⁰⁶

Since Crane's manner of spelling is an additional feature of his style as copyist, one should become familiar with some of his orthographic trademarks. Bald, after a study of Crane's transcription of A Game of Cheese, decided that it's

²⁰²Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 82.

²⁰³F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 202.

²⁰⁴Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 82.

²⁰⁵F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 202.

²⁰⁶Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 83.

is always indicative of Crane since Middleton preferred 'tis in his personal transcription of this drama.²⁰⁷ The word it's occurs ten times in The Winter's Tale, and J. D. Wilson attributes the word to Crane.²⁰⁸ The ha's or h'as for has have also been considered a sign of Crane's hand, yet A Game of Cheese also contains this spelling.²⁰⁹ Furthermore, the colloquialism ga for then was a favorite of Crane's, and Walker has detected its presence in The Winter's Tale; moreover, Shakespeare apparently preferred the full form of the word and none of the following variants: th', 'hen, or ga for then.²¹⁰ Crane, also, had a preference for certain words and was not above substituting them in a manuscript if the opportunity arose. For instance, when Middleton wrote has, does, and you'de, Crane wrote hath, doth, and you'lld. Also, you'ld instead of you'de was an occasional Crane contraction for Middleton's you would.²¹¹ His use of this contraction is unusual, since Crane preferred to use the longer form of a

²⁰⁷R. C. Bald (ed.), A Game at Cheese, p. 34.

²⁰⁸Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 80.

²⁰⁹W. W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, fn. "H", p. 275; also R. C. Bald (ed.), A Game at Cheese, p. 36.

²¹⁰W. W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, fn. "H", p. 275; Alice Walker, Textual Problems of the First Folio, pp. 107-8; A. C. Partridge, "Shakespeare's Orthography in Venus and Adonis and Some Early Quartos," Shakespeare Survey, VII, p. 45.

²¹¹Bald (ed.), A Game at Cheese, p. 34.

word, and in many cases he expanded Middleton's contractions: you'de to you would; they're to they are; Iae to I an or I'am; and 'tis often to it is.²¹² Some scholars believe that Crane always inserted an apostrophe between the two full forms, such as I'am, when expanding a contraction. It has been observed, however, that this practice occurs only once in The Tennesse and once in The Winter's Tale. Consequently, there is some reason for scholars to doubt Crane's hand in either drama.²¹³ Furthermore, Tannenbaum draws attention to Crane's following practices: (a) words such as nee, vee, and shee, he never spells with a double ee; (b) however, he doubles his f's in many words, thus producing fflesh, fflame, and ffeare; and (c) he writes vf for if, approximately three out of four times.²¹⁴

On the other hand, Crane's method of punctuation has been the source for much study and some speculation. A scholar, who attempts to detect Crane's hand in a printer's copy of a manuscript, should count, first, the parentheses which occur within the text. Many scholars have become so interested and, consequently, involved with Crane's use of this mark that they

²¹²Ibid., pp. 34; 105.

²¹³Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 84.

²¹⁴Ibid., pp. 84-85.

have based their arguments entirely upon its presence in a manuscript. While Bald has presented such evidence of Crane's addiction to the mark of parenthesis, he has also admitted that this parenthesis habit is not entirely peculiar to Crane, nor that it is Crane's only punctuation idiosyncrasy.²¹⁵ For the most part, Crane's punctuation is full and careful. For example, one should compare the following lines from Crane and Middleton's copies of A Game at Cheese: (Crane) "Away: make haste; they are coming . . ." (V.1.8); (Middleton) "Awaye, make haste, thire coming . . ." ²¹⁶

In addition to the parenthesis, Crane favors the hyphen and the apostrophe, two other marks which scholars, therefore, have tended to identify only with his transcriptions. In discussing these marks of punctuation, Greg explains that ". . . they were by no means peculiar to Crane."²¹⁷ They are, however, of such prominence in Crane's work that they merit attention. The study of the use of the apostrophe in this age is quite confusing and has been the source of much controversy among scholars. One learns, for example, that in Shakespeare's Venus and Adonis (1593), syncope and elisions were obtained

²¹⁵Bald (ed.), A Game at Cheese, p. 172.

²¹⁶Loc. cit.

²¹⁷W. W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, p. 271.

through spelling, and the apostrophe was not used to indicate the possessive gender of a word.²¹⁸ However, Tannenbaum believes that the apostrophe appears in sufficient numbers in the poem to suggest that Shakespeare had mastered its use. He also shows that Middleton freely used it in his dramas.²¹⁹ While Tannenbaum's concept may defeat generalizations, it does not actually prevent one's considering the apostrophe to be an additional sign of Crane's hand in a manuscript. For example, Greg, in his analysis of The Witch, observes around fifty incidents of what he terms "Jonson's elision."²²⁰ One recalls that Jonson developed a tendency to retain a vowel in writing if, when dropped, it would prove "graphically or phonetically awkward," but he always added an apostrophe, in such cases, to inform his reader that, metrically, he wished the vowel to be excluded.²²¹ As far as one knows, this practice was thought previously to be a characteristic only of Jonson's style, but from Tannenbaum's list of examples, one realizes that Crane, at least after transcribing The Witch (1620-27?),

²¹⁸A. C. Partridge, "Shakespeare's Orthography in Venus and Adonis and Some Early Quartos," Shakespeare Survey, VII, p. 47.

²¹⁹Tannenbaum, op. cit., pp. 77-78.

²²⁰W. W. Greg, "Prompt Copies, Private Transcripts, and the 'Playhouse Scrivener'," The Library, VI, 4 (1926), p. 216.

²²¹Ibid., pp. 214-15.

had also adopted this idiosyncrasy: e. g., they've, are't, we'are, you've, and I'pray.²²²

Finally, Greg in his study of The Witch has classified Crane's use of the hyphen. It is, however, confusing, at this point, to discover that, while this mark is related to Crane, one finds only few examples of Crane's use of it, either in A Game at Chess or in Rometius and Enanthe.²²³ The following situations, then, are the ways in which Crane used the hyphen and illustrations for each case: (1) metrical or emphasis hyphen: "what yong-men can we wish, to pleasure vs" (The Witch; also The Two Gentlemen of Verona); (2) verb and preposition type: "socks-up" (The Witch; The Two Gentlemen); (3) object linked to verb: "valess death pittty-me" (The Witch); (4) substitution for comma between coordinate adjectives: "the poore-sencible Sufferer" (The Witch); (5) used for, or mistaken for, an apostrophe: "One-a-Clock" (The Witch); (6) miscellaneous anomalies: "In the dark-backward and Abisme of Time" (The Witch; The Two Gentlemen; The Tempest).²²⁴

Crane was also fond of the parentheses and frequently employed them in his work.²²⁵ However, as Tannenbaum points

²²² Ibid., p. 217; also Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 84.

²²³ W. W. Greg, "Prompt Copies, Private Transcripts, and the 'Playhouse Scrivener'," The Library, VI, 4 (1926), pp. 214-15.

²²⁴ Ibid., pp. 213-16.

²²⁵ W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, fn. 1, p. 115.

out, the use of this mark was considered fashionable in the age, and he cites Jonson's Postaster (1601), Massinger's The Duke of Milan (1579), and Middleton's A Game at Chess, (1624), as proof.²²⁶ Yet, this mark must also be considered as an indication of Crane's hand in a manuscript.

Crane's ornamental calligraphy probably had much to do with the popularity of capitalization in this period.²²⁷ He used capitals frequently yet consistently, and his copy of The Witch shows him starting each line of dialogue with a capital letter.²²⁸ Partridge's suggestion that Shakespeare also used capital letters in most of the commonly expected places leads one to think that Shakespeare probably would not have resorted to capitals as frequently as did Crane.²²⁹

Aside from Crane's calligraphical characteristics, scholars have also given much consideration to his construction of a manuscript. As a consequence, they have been able to detect a logical growth in Crane's work habits as they are delineated in his theatrical transcriptions. One finds it

²²⁶Tammenbaum, op. cit., p. 77.

²²⁷R. C. Bald (ed.), A Game at Chess, p. 172; W. W. Greg, "Prompt Copies, Private Transcripts, and the 'Playhouse Scrivener'," The Library, VI, 4 (1926), p. 209.

²²⁸Partridge, op. cit., p. 47.

²²⁹F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (1926), p. 212.

necessary, therefore, to become acquainted with the specific traits of this scrivener. F. P. Wilson explains that Crane's known dramatic transcriptions are fully divided into acts and scenes.²³⁰ One recalls that, from the start of the seventeenth century, plays were divided into acts; however, the earliest example of this division occurs in the manuscript of The Second Maiden's Tragedy (1611), at a time that was close to the end of Shakespeare's career.²³¹ Yet, fifteen of Shakespeare's plays are fully divided into acts and scenes in the First Folio. Richard II and 1 Henry IV have been omitted from the following list, because, as F. P. Wilson has clearly shown, they were reprinted from earlier editions which had been already divided:

The Tempest
The Two Gentlemen of Verona
The Merry Wives of Windsor
Measure for Measure
As You Like It
Twelfth Night
The Winter's Tale
King John
King Richard III
2 Henry IV
King Henry VIII
Macbeth
King Lear

²³⁰ Ibid., p. 211.

²³¹ W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 36.

Othello 232
Cymbeline

Wilson feels that act and scene division exists in these dramas because some of the manuscripts from which the printer worked had been previously divided, or because the editor, responsible for preparing Shakespeare's plays for the press, had himself made such divisions.²³² It seems unusual, however, that fifteen of the thirty-five plays in the Folio contain a complete division, when, for the most part, these plays would have been copied from foul or fair copies or from previously printed copies. As it has been shown, Shakespeare's original papers would not likely have been divided at the time of their composition; therefore, either the printer of an earlier edition or the editor of the First Folio may have been responsible for this division.

The important aspects of Crane's handling of stage directions are massing of characters before a scene, his omission of Enter before a scene begins, and his use of Finis at the end of every act, instead of specifically designating the act itself (i. e., Finis actus primus). Nevertheless, Crane's handling of stage directions has constituted a series

²³²F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (1926), fn. 1, p. 212.

²³³Ibid., p. 212.

of problems. For example, J. D. Wilson thinks that Crane refrained entirely from transcribing stage directions.²³⁴

Greg, on the other hand, has shown that Crane's entrances, at least in The Witch, generally occur a few lines in advance of the intended action, but he has to admit that his observation is not always true in a Crane manuscript.²³⁵ With respect for Crane's work on the prompt book of Barnvelt, F. P. Wilson has made the following comment:

The practical directions are added by the stage-manager. In Crane's other transcripts the directions never smack of the theatre. Occasionally, they are descriptive and have a literary flavour.²³⁶

Bald remarks that in MS. Malone 25, which he believes to be an assembled text, the stage directions must have been created at the moment of transcription, either by Crane or by Middleton, because neither the actors' parts nor the stage plot would have provided elaborate stage directions.²³⁷ Furthermore, because it is known that this document was prepared as a private copy, the actual purpose of the transcription itself may have had something to do with the status of the stage directions, and, as F. P. Wilson has shown in connection with Demetrius and

²³⁴Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 76.

²³⁵W. W. Greg, "Prompt Copies, Private Transcripts, and the 'Playhouse Scrivener'," The Library, VI, 4 (1926), p. 210.

²³⁶F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VI, 4 (1926), pp. 212-13.

²³⁷R. C. Bald (ed.), A Game at Chess, p. 42.

Enenthe (also a private copy by Crane), there are no theatrical directions, such as "2 chaires."²³⁸ Therefore, the lack of stage directions in the majority of Crane's transcriptions may not have been due so much to Crane's work habits as to the nature of the manuscript upon which he was working.

There are, however, additional problems concerning Crane and stage directions. For example, he occasionally omitted Enter within initial directions. Greg points out that the First Folio contains Enter, but feels that its presence is due, here, to the printer's influence.²³⁹ Also, at the close of an act, Crane often simply added Finis, but never Finis actus primus, for example. Another debatable, but important characteristic of Crane's transcriptions is his "character massing" before each scene, when all, or almost all, of the necessary characters are listed by name, en masse, before the start of scene in which they are to appear. An example from 2 Henry IV illustrates this method: "Enter Shallow, Silence, Falstaffe, Bardolfe, Page, and Deule (V.1)." Tannenbaum, noting this method in Crane's transcription of A Game of Cheese, has observed that it also occurs in Shakespeare's The Winter's Tale and The Merry Wives of Windsor.²⁴⁰ Greg, in analyzing

²³⁸F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VI, 4 (1926), p. 213.

²³⁹W. W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, p. 240.

²⁴⁰Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 76.

this peculiarity, states that Crane combines the two distinct conventions of the English and continental methods in this transcription. One recalls that the English or native convention marked a new scene only when the stage had become empty. However, the continental convention, which was adopted by Ben Jonson in his 1616 Folio, marked a new scene whenever a change took place in the major characters upon the stage. Greg feels it would have been natural for Crane or for any other scrivener or editor to look to the Jonson Folio as a model, especially if he were ". . . working with a literary rather than theatrical end in view."²⁴¹

A third mechanical characteristic related to Crane is known as "assembly from parts." Bald has recognized Crane's transcription of A Game of Cheese (Malone MS. 25) as an assembled text because of the massed stage directions at the start of each scene, which appear as if they may have been taken from the plot.²⁴² Crane's ability to accomplish this feat has influenced some scholars to connect him with Measure for Measure and The Merry Wives of Windsor, among others.²⁴³

²⁴¹W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, pp. 137-38.

²⁴²R. C. Bald (ed.), A Game at Cheese, p. 37.

²⁴³W. W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, p. 356.

Stage directions most certainly served an author's purpose by making clear the action which he desired for his scenes; to a prompter, they were a means by which he might better control his work; and, to the professional scribe, they must have been a nuisance. It seems doubtful that a professional scribe would ever have studied a play so intensely that he might, thereafter, have made an adequate interpretation of the action and have written his own stage direction. More than likely, however, when an author like Middleton approached a scribe like Crane for a transcription, the author would have prepared, in advance, his desired stage directions for the text. One cannot expect a scrivener to have functioned in the role of a proof-reader. It does not seem possible that Crane would have written a new set of stage directions; probably, he would, on the other hand, have copied the directions which were placed before him, perhaps, re-arranging or shortening them.

Scholars, therefore, have shown Crane's possible connection with the preparation of the First Folio to be worthy of further investigation. They have used for their criteria, in the detection of Crane's calligraphy, the following characteristics, which, by way of conclusion, one may be justified in repeating at this point in the study for the convenience of future reference: (1) legibility of Crane's hand and the cleanliness of his copy; (2) his avoidance and also his use of contractions;

(3) his preference for colloquialisms; (4) his spelling traits; (5) his manner of punctuation with the hyphen, apostrophe, and parenthesis; (6) his division of plays into acts and scenes; (7) his reconstruction of plays from the actors' parts and from the plot; and (8) his use of stage directions.

CHAPTER III

THE WINTER'S TALE IN THE FIRST FOLIO: CRANE'S "NEW" COPY

Plot me no plots! I'll ha' Ralph come out;
I'll make your house too hot for you else.
--The Knight of the Burning Pestle (II.iv)

Shakespeare's The Winter's Tale (c. 1610) was licensed by Buc, Master of the Revels, in 1610, and there is a record of its performance in 1611 in the Booke of Plaies, a theatrical diary of a London doctor, Simon Forman.²⁴⁴ Furthermore, internal testing has indicated that this drama was one of Shakespeare's last works.²⁴⁵ In its time, it was an extremely popular play, having been performed at Court in 1611?, 1613, 1624, and 1634. However, because Restoration taste did not condone Shakespeare's complete indifference to the classical unities, it was not performed again until 1756, when David Garrick drastically rearranged it.²⁴⁶

The Winter's Tale, of all plays in the First Folio, has had an unusually provocative history, mainly with respect to its position in the 1623 publication of Shakespeare's works.

²⁴⁴Hardin Craig (ed.), The Complete Works of Shakespeare, pp. 1215-16.

²⁴⁵W. J. Rolphe (ed.), The Winter's Tale, p. 11.

²⁴⁶Craig, op. cit., p. 1217.

For example, J. D. Wilson has remarked that ". . . The Winter's Tale looks as if it nearly got left out of the volume altogether."²⁴⁷ He has drawn his conclusion from the following set of facts: (1) the drama occurs last in the Folio section under Comedies; (2) it is printed on three quires of paper, each bearing their own special signature; and (3) it has the insertions of a blank page at the beginning and at the end.²⁴⁸ In addition to Wilson's careful description of the physical characteristics of the play within its Folio setting, one is aware of a further important allusion to The Winter's Tale contained in a memorandum from Sir Henry Herbert's Office Book. Herbert, who was at this time Master of the Revels, records the following entry in his book:

For the King's players. An olde play called Winter's Tale, formerly allowed of Sir George Bucke, and likewise by mee on Mr. Heminges his worde that there was nothing profane added or reformed, though the allowed booke was missinge, and therefore I returned it without a fee, this 19^o of August, 1623.²⁴⁹

This passage contains implications which one should carefully consider. If one attempts to reconstruct the events which lead up to the Herbert memorandum, he discovers what actually may

²⁴⁷ J. D. Wilson, "Introduction," Folio Facsimile, The Winter's Tale.

²⁴⁸ Loc. cit.

²⁴⁹ Loc. cit.

have been the situation involving The Winter's Tale in the First Folio printing. In the first place, one sees that Herbert's entry was dated 19^o of August, 1623, three months before the publication of the First Folio. Secondly, it is also clear that Herbert held a conference with John Heminge ("Mr. Heminges"), who, along with Henry Condell, published the Folio. It is equally clear that Herbert did not confer with any member of the playhouse company at this time.²⁵⁰ A reconstruction of the probable situation might reveal the following history of this play.

The playhouse individual responsible for the "keeping" of theatrical manuscripts belonging to the company may have failed to notice the fact of the "missinge booke" of The Winter's Tale when collecting Shakespeare's plays for delivery to the printer. On the other hand, this same individual may very well have known that one copy of The Winter's Tale was "missinge," and was either loath to release the company's only remaining "booke," or was acting on orders from company officials not to part with the only copy. One must consider each of these possibilities, at this point.

First, in the case of the keeper's failure to notice that The Winter's Tale was missing from the collected manuscripts

²⁵⁰ loc. cit.

which were being delivered to Heminge and Condell for use in the printing of the First Folio, one feels that such an oversight might easily have gone undetected until the Folio was nearing completion, as it must have been by the time of Herbert's memorandum. At this time, Heminge and Condell may have taken a first opportunity to examine their industrious project--an examination which probably took place some three months or so before the Folio was released from the printing house. Their inspection of the work revealed to them, in some way, that they were lacking one of Shakespeare's comedies. By any number of means, this fact may have been brought to their attention. At any rate, they made their discovery. Almost at once, then, as Herbert's memorandum suggests, Heminge must have rushed directly to the King's Players to obtain the copy of this overlooked play but, upon arrival, was informed that the copy was "missinge." Herbert's document is especially ambiguous about this matter. For example, one does not know whether missinge implies that the licensed (or "allowed") copy was lost, or that the playhouse, at this point, had not a single copy whatsoever of The Winter's Tale in its possession; hence, their conscious "oversight" in collecting the manuscripts for printing. The evidence would appear to support the former theory, however, since it is obvious that the publishers and playhouse personnel eventually did turn up a copy of this drama.

If, however, the "missing" copy were the licensed or "allowed" copy, one discovers that a completely different situation may have occurred. The playhouse official, for example, may have told Heminge that the licensed copy of The Winter's Tale had been lost or misplaced. One assumes, then, that Heminge probably asked to borrow the unlicensed or remaining copy of the manuscript, which the company had probably used in previous productions of the play. Perhaps, the company did not wish to part with its only manuscript of the drama. Or, equally possible, the company did not wish to confess that it had been careless in the handling of its official, licensed copy. Whatever the reason, Heminge was refused permission to "borrow" this remaining copy. In exasperation and extreme anxiety to guarantee the printing of a complete works of Shakespeare in his forthcoming Folio, Heminge probably made a "bargain" with the King's Men, agreeing to assume full responsibility for a transcription of the remaining document as well as to oversee its licensing at Herbert's office. If one assumes that this explanation may have been the case, he may then conclude that Heminge obtained the services of a scrivener and proceeded to piece out his Folio with the insertion of The Winter's Tale into his nearly completed book (thus, accounting for the presence of the blank sheets before and after the play in the Folio). Having

finished with the transcription which he had requested to be made, Heminge must have returned the copy to the King's Men. It is interesting, at this point, to recall, again, the stage history of this play. One remembers that from 1613 until 1624, the play was not acted by the company. Could it have been that the company was afraid to produce a play for which it no longer possessed an official license? The fact that The Winter's Tale is once again in performance in 1624 would strongly imply that the reconstruction of these events just cited may have been the actual case. In addition, one recalls that the Globe playhouse, belonging to the King's Men, was destroyed by fire on June 29, 1613, during a performance of Henry VIII, and the coincidence of dates, here, is striking; however, one may only suggest the possibility that the "missinge" copy of The Winter's Tale may have been destroyed in the fire which had demolished the "virtuous fabrick."

The main problem, obviously, is to determine the course of events which accounted for the presence of The Winter's Tale in the Heminge and Condell publication. Apparently, it was the outcome of a bargain between printer and acting company, which resulted in a new transcription of this play taken from the remaining copy in the playhouse. One accounts, thereby, for Heminge's attesting to the validity of the contents of the "new" copy, as Herbert's memorandum reveals: ". . . there was

nothing profane added or reformed . . . " in the new draft to cause the transcription to differ from the originally licensed copy. In conclusion, one other solution to this dilemma has been proposed by J. D. Wilson and Crompton Rhodes, who, independently, concluded that new copies of plays were often derived from actors' parts and stage plots, and who, in turn, related this "assembled parts" theory to The Winter's Tale.²⁵¹ On the other hand, Chambers and Greg have doubted the validity of such thought, and prefer to search for a more probable explanation.²⁵² But the most important aspect of this problem is the fact that some individual did make a transcription of the play for Heminge and Condell to publish in the First Folio. A most likely candidate for this task, one who would have welcomed the employment at this time, was Ralph Crane. An investigation of The Winter's Tale as it appeared in print in the 1623 Folio may reveal Crane's hand in the transcription.

In this inquiry, one must first be concerned with the neatness and orderliness of the manuscript copy and its subsequent effect upon the printed edition of the play. It has been previously shown that Crane wrote with impeccable accuracy and that his hand would have presented few, if any, reading problems in the manuscript. One concludes, therefore, that

²⁵¹ Loc. cit.

²⁵² Loc. cit.

if Crane's transcription were the one followed by Jaggerd's compositor in the Folio, the printed play should be free from the printer-scribal type of error, as indeed is The Winter's Tale. J. D. Wilson believes that this "textual tidiness" is indicative of Crane's hand in the text.²⁵³

One should next consider the contractions and colloquialisms in The Winter's Tale. In doing so, he should remember that Crane preferred the latter to the former. As it has been shown, specific words of these classifications are associated with Crane. Such combinations as I an and it is are commonly detected as expansions of the contractions, I'm and 'tis; occasionally, however, Crane did write it's for 'tis. He was also prone to insert the colloquialisms, he's or h'as for has and an for then. Hence, it has been necessary to count the occurrence of these words in this play. The findings are listed below in the following table:

TABLE I

Contractions	No. of Times, <u>KT</u>
<u>it's</u>	6
<u>it is</u>	3
<u>'tis</u>	45
<u>I an</u>	42
<u>I'm</u>	0
<u>he's</u>	22
<u>an</u>	2

It is clear, from the evidence presented, that each example, except for ifis, points to Crane.

The spelling aspect concerning Crane's hand in this drama is at once interesting and complex. One must recall that Crane favored yf over if, yet the latter is used exclusively in The Winter's Tale. However, the spelling of such a small, common word as if could have been easily re-cast by the compositor, almost without thought. In the case of the double ee in Crane's spelling habits, a chart will be most useful at this point. Following, then, is a tabulation of such words to be found in this play:

TABLE II

<u>"ee Words"</u>	<u>No. of Times, <u>HT</u></u>
ne	178
nee	12
ve	70
vee	14
he	121
hee	29
be	120
bee	11
she	70
shee	20

Here, the evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of Crane. In every instance, the spelling form preferred by Crane has been used most consistently. However, some have attempted to minimize the evidence of Crane's hee! by citing the following

spellings from Crane's other manuscripts which differ from those to be found in The Winter's Tale:

Tannenbaum's Listings²⁵⁴

Crane	WT
byn (bin)	beene (bene)
Busynes	Businesse
thels	these
Surfeyt	surfet (surfeit)
I'll	Ile (Ile)
far	farre
we'll	weele
wee'le	wee'l
lest	least
quight	quite
Guesse	Guest
do	doe
cozon	cozen
seaven	seven
dampne	dame
leadd	led
Jelouzie	Iealousie
secrest	secret
answear	answer
Women	Women
ffeare	feare
fflesh	flesh
fflame	flame

Yet, this list is not convincing as proof. Upon examination, one notices two patterns. First, the y's have all been changed to i's, and secondly, the spelling has been shortened and modernized. One recalls that the printers of this time were more advanced and progressive in their spelling than were the authors. Also, Crane was by now an old man, born almost sixty

²⁵⁴Tannenbaum, op. cit., pp. 84-85.

years before the First Folio was published. His spelling would definitely have been somewhat archaic in these fast-changing times, and it is doubtful whether he would have attempted to change his spelling habits to keep up with the trends in orthography. Three facts are to be considered, here: (1) that Crane was old; (2) that the vogue to modernize spelling was strong; (3) that printers were modern spellers. Therefore, while the majority of spelling evidence cannot be used for Crane, it, likewise, cannot be used against him.

One next observes that parentheses are used frequently in The Winter's Tale. Approximately 360 of these telltale marks occur throughout the play. In fact, there are three examples of parentheses within parentheses. Here, again, however, some scholars have attempted to minimize the evidence. Tannenbaum has said of this peculiarity, "Crane was too much of a purist to have been guilty of such a solecism."²⁵⁵ In light of this remark, one should examine the passages in which the parentheses-within-parentheses occur before making a conclusion about Tannenbaum's observations. The first use of the mark to be found in the play is contained in the following example:

Leo. You haue mistooke (my Lady)
Polixenes for Leontes: O thou Thing,

255

Tannenbaum, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

(Which Ile not call a Creature of thy place,
 Least Barbarisme (making me the precedent)
 Should a like Language vse to all degrees,
 And mannerly distinguishment leaue out,
 Betwixt the Prince and Begger:) I haue said
 Shee's an Adultresse (II.i.102-109)

One notices that the speech is most complex and requires some kind of outstanding, spectacular punctuation to clarify its meaning. A modern rendering of this passage would probably be punctuated with dashes instead of parentheses, as follows:

Leo. You haue mistooke, my Lady,
Polixenes for Leontes: O thou Thing,
 --Which Ile not call a Creature of thy place,
 Least Barbarisme (making me the precedent)
 Should a like Language vse to all degrees,
 And mannerly distinguishment leaue out,
 Betwixt the Prince and Begger--I haue said
 Shee's an Adultresse

However, the parentheses appear to order the passage better than the dashes. One is led to think that the punctuation, here, was written in as an aid to an actor in the accurate delivery of this difficult passage. In other words, these parentheses may very well have existed in the manuscript from which the scrivener obtained the "new" copy of the play. In theory, the second example of compound parentheses to be found in The Winter's Tale is similar to the first:

Pol. As thou lou'st me (Camillo) wipe not out
 the rest of thy seruices, by leauing me now: the
 neede I haue of thee, thine owne goodnesse hath
 made: better not to haue had thee, then thus to
 want thee, thou hauing made me Businesses, (which
 none (without thee) can sufficiently manage) must
 either stay to execute them thy selfe, or take
 away with thee the very seruices thou hast
 done (IV.ii.10-16)

Again, the marks seem to be employed for the purpose of influencing the spoken word in a theatrical sense, more than would the comma or the dash. The third and last example of this peculiar marking of the line, however, is of a different nature:

Ferd. Out alas!

You'd be so leane, that blasts of Ianuary
 Would blow you through and through. Now (my fairst Friend,
 I would I had some Flowres o'th Spring, that might
 Become your time of day: and yours, and yours,
 That weare vpon your Virgin-branches yet
 Your Maiden-heads growing: O Prosperina,
 For the Flowres now, that (frighted) thou let'st fall
 From Dyssaes Waggon: Daffadils,
 That come before the Swallow dares, and take
 The Windes of March with Beauty: Violets (dim,
 But sweeter then the lids of Iuno's eyes,
 Or Cytherea's breath) pale Prime-roses,
 That dye vnmarr'd, ere they can behold
 Bright Phoebus in his strength (a Maladie
 Most incident to Maids:) bold Oxlips, and
 The Crowne Imperiell: Lillies of all kinds,
 (The Flowre-de-Luce being one.) O, these I lacke,
 To make you Garlands of) and my sweet friend,
 To strew him o're, and ore. (IV.iv.129-148)

One notices that the punctuation in this passage is so complex that only an individual who had worked in close association with the meaning would have marked it so: i. e., the author, the bookkeeper-prompter, or the actor, himself. Neither Crane nor the printer would have scrutinized the passage and then have punctuated it so elaborately. Most likely, Crane merely transcribed what he saw before him. Therefore, one suspects that this instance of the use of compound parentheses merely reflects Crane's willingness to "follow copy" which was set before him.

Of the six ways in which Crane employed the hyphen, three are to be found in The Winter's Tale. There are fifty examples of the metrical or emphasis hyphen inherent to this play. The following examples illustrate this use: "Watery-Starre" (I.ii.1); "Ynch-think, knee-deepe" (I.ii.223); "Fire-roab'd-God" (IV.iv.29). Also, the verb-plus-preposition appears fourteen times a few examples of which follow: "I would not be a stander-by" (I.ii.337); "This seal'd-vp Oracle" (III.ii.124); "Will come-on very slowly" (V.i.260). Furthermore, one discovers an object linked to a verb by a hyphen: "Shee hath made-me four and twenty Nose-gayes" (IV.iii.45). In addition, miscellaneous anomalies occur over 100 times, of which the following are a few examples: "Why lo-you" (I.ii.144); "was pre-employ'd by him" (II.i.61). This evidence is possibly the strongest indication of Crane's hand in The Winter's Tale to be considered at this point in the investigation.

All one needs to do is to glance at the text of this play in the First Folio to become acquainted with the large number of apostrophes contained therein. However, one should remember that this was a common trend in the punctuation of Crane's day and should not be considered as an exclusive trait of his style of transcribing. It has been shown that Crane occasionally inserted an apostrophe between the expanded form of a common contraction (they've would become they'have). At

this point, one should recall that Crane and Ben Jonson (an equally meticulous individual and one who edited his own Folio) shared this use of the apostrophe. This punctuation example occurs only once in The Winter's Tale: "a Ladyes Verely[']is / As potent as a Lords" (I,ii,62-63). This one case should not be considered as contrary evidence for Crane, however, because a printer, unless he were very careful, might easily have deleted this small mark.

The next of Crane's characteristics to be considered is the division of a play into acts and scenes, manifest in The Winter's Tale. The first act is divided two times; the second, three times; the third, three times; the fourth, four times; and the fifth, three times. When one recalls that no previously printed edition of this play existed, he realizes that the Folio play must have been taken from a transcription of a manuscript that was so-divided. The Winter's Tale is arbitrarily dated as 1610. However, the first play to have been divided into acts, The Second Maiden's Tragedy, did not appear until 1611, and Barnavelt, a Crane transcription, was not divided into acts and scenes until 1619. Hence, one has reason to think that Shakespeare was not responsible for the act-scene division of The Winter's Tale, and were a scribal fair copy prepared, as a consequence, it likewise would not have been so-divided. Therefore, one believes that the act-

scene division which appears in the Folio version of this play and, by indirection, which must have been present in the transcription used in 1623, was introduced by the scribe. This evidence is, indeed, strongly indicative of Ralph Crane's work. It naturally follows that the compositor would have followed Crane's transcription containing these divisions. The fact that there are other plays in the 1623 Folio which are not divided leads one to think that the compositor was not the individual responsible for division in The Winter's Tale except in his natural office of setting type from given copy.

Next, the stage directions in The Winter's Tale are definitely promising as an indication of Crane's hand in the copy. First, one must examine what is termed "massing of characters" before the scene. In this method, all of the characters which appear in a scene are enumerated prior to the opening of the scene. Every scene in this particular play is preceded by "massing of characters," with the exception of two. For example, in IV.iii, before the scene, the stage direction lists only Autolycus; nevertheless, the Clowne enters with no previous warning some 32 lines later, and with no entrance direction at this point. This same situation re-occurs in a later portion of the play (V.ii), when only Autolycus and a Gentleman are "massed" in the

direction which precedes the scene, while a total of six other characters appear during the scene itself (two other Gentlemen, the Shepherd, and the Clowne). Therefore, one discovers that thirteen of the fifteen scenes of The Winter's Tale are preceded by a "massing of characters." It is impossible to determine the nature of the two "un-massed" scenes. In the light of such evidence, one again detects the hand of Crane in the transcription of this play.

Furthermore, one observes that each scene commences with the general stage direction, Enter, and concludes with Exeunt. While Crane did not normally use the direction, Enter, in his transcriptions, at the beginning of a scene, its presence in the Folio copy of this play is attributed to the influence of the compositor. Therefore, one cannot use this term as any kind of proof against Crane. In his favor, rather, is the fact that the only directions in the first four scenes of The Winter's Tale are the two general terms previously stated. Crane tended always to omit stage directions, yet he usually "massed" characters at scene headings. For example, in the second scene of the play, one discovers Leontes, Hermione, Mamillus, Polixenes, and Camillo massed before the scene and directly after Enter. However, Camillo does not actually enter the scene until l. 308, and, then, without a direction. Hereafter, in the play, stage directions for entrances and exits suddenly begin to appear in the text.

Possibly Heminge or Condell, or someone else, decided to check the transcription of the "new" copy and discovered that the scribe had omitted these necessary directions in scenes which he had already finished transcribing. Naturally, the scribe was requested to provide all further stage notations of this kind. Therefore, throughout the remaining portions of this play, one observes that entrances and exits are carefully marked. Here, again, one is confronted with evidence of Crane's mannerisms as scribe.

In addition, there are three instances of advanced stage directions in The Winter's Tale. The Clowne and Shepheard (IV.iv) enter with a direction marking their appearance, for example, four lines before the Clowne is to speak. Also, Florizell, Perdita, Cleomines, and others enter (V.i) as directed, some sixteen lines early. Later, the Shepheard and Clowne reappear, as directed, three lines earlier. It is to be noted that these three examples point out the only instances in this play in which more than one character at a time makes an entrance. In addition to reflecting Crane's hand in the transcription, this method of advanced stage directions is also characteristic of the theatrical document belonging to the prompter.

One finds only seven stage directions in this play, exclusive of the simple Enter and Exeunt designations.

Moreover, all seven directions possess a distinct literary flavor, as the following listing verifies:

(III.11) Enter Leontes, Lords, Officers: Hermione
(as to her Trial) Ladies: Cleomines, Dion.

(III.111.62) Exit pursued by a Bear.

(IV.111) Enter Autolycus singing.

(IV.1v) Heere a Dauce of Shepheards and Shepheardesses.

(IV.1v) Enter Autolycus singing.

(IV.1v) Heere a Dauce of twelve Satvres.

(V.111) Enter Leontes, Polixenes, Florizell, Perdita,
Camillo, Paulina: Hermione (like a Statue) Lords, &c.

To explain this feature, one must reexamine Crane's connection with the theatre. His first probable experience in copying theatrical documents was his work on the prompt book of Barnavelt, which was the first book to have been divided into both acts and scenes. If Crane were so inexperienced in matters concerning a playhouse document, one wonders how it was that he knew enough to make act-scene divisions in Barnavelt at this time. The answer probably lies in the possibility that he was told to make these divisions in accordance with playhouse customs, and since the stage plot itself was fully divided into acts and scenes, it may have been handed to Crane for his use as a guide. Thereafter, one supposes that the meticulous Crane simply added scene divisions as well as the traditional act divisions, since many earlier works had been

given act divisions only. Inasmuch as every play manuscript transcribed by Crane after 1619 bears act and scene divisions, one is inclined to think that Crane must have approved of this method, especially if he had access to the stage plot, which would have been of much aid to him. If Crane did make frequent use of a stage plot while transcribing plays, it is possible that he also transcribed the "massed characters" from this plot before each scene heading which he copied, in addition to the simple entrance and exit designations. Such terse directions in The Winter's Tale as Exit: Bear: Enter Autolycus: sing: Shepherds and Shepherdesse: dance: Twelve Satyrs: dance: Hermione: statue, could have been incorporated into the plot. Each of these directions is necessary to an understanding of the action in the play. Obviously, however, such notes do not communicate much of anything to one unfamiliar with the play. Therefore, it might be natural for a scribe in such instances to reword a direction, but not drastically, in order to convey a more accurate connotation to the reader. This method would also contribute the characteristics of an assembled text to the finished copy of the play. Therefore, if one assumes that Crane depended upon a stage plot while transcribing a play, he realizes that the presence of literary stage directions point to the fact of Crane's hand in the Folio version of The Winter's Tale.

In conclusion, The Winter's Tale was obviously printed from a clean "new" copy in the Folio, manifest in the neatness of Crane's transcription. Furthermore, Crane's customary spelling of I an is consistently represented throughout the play. His favored spelling of we, me, she, he, and be (with a single e) is also a dominant trait of his hand in the manuscript. In addition, all three marks of punctuation which are commonly associated with Crane--the parentheses, hyphen, and apostrophe--are frequently employed in the Folio edition. Moreover, act-scene division and the nature of the stage directions strongly suggest Crane's hand in the transcription of the "new" copy. Faced with this kind of steadily mounting evidence, one thinks that Ralph Crane, or a scrivener who shared many of his scribal characteristics, was responsible for the manuscript copy of The Winter's Tale which served Heminge and Condell for the First Folio text of the play.

CHAPTER IV

RALPH CRANE'S TRANSCRIPTION OF THE TEMPEST:

A "MODEL" FOR THE 1623 FOLIO?

You have others, that labour only to ostentation;
and are ever more busy about the colours and surface
of a work, than in the matter and foundation: for
that is hid, the other is seen.

--Jonson, Timber (1640)

The Tempest, one of Shakespeare's last plays, is similar in style to The Winter's Tale. It is believed to have been written around 1610 or 1611, and there are two Court performances recorded for the play in 1611 and 1613.²⁵⁶ In connection with the publication of the First Folio, this play has also been mentioned with respect to Ralph Crane and his transcriptions, since it is obvious that the Folio text has been set from a legible and clean manuscript.²⁵⁷ Moreover, one observes the presence of an unusual number of words which are commonly found in the Folio in contracted forms (you are, I have, you have, I would, I did, I will, I had, and do not.) To comprehend fully the significance of these expansions of contractions and colloquialisms to the theory of Crane's work in the transcription of The Tempest, one may find the following table of some use:

²⁵⁶Craig, op. cit., p. 1247.

²⁵⁷W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 152.

TABLE III

Contractions & Expansions	No. of Times, <u>Tenest</u>
<u>I am</u>	19
<u>I'm</u>	0
<u>ha's</u>	3
<u>has</u>	3
<u>'tis</u>	19
<u>it's</u>	2
<u>it is</u>	11
<u>em</u>	19

The infrequent use of ha's will be understood when one realizes that has, on the other hand, occurs only three times in the play. In addition, two of Crane's favorite spellings, hath and doth, appear nine and fifteen times, respectively, in The Tenest. Another term, doat, appears upon two occasions. The study of the "ee" words may be best illustrated in the following table:

TABLE IV

"ee Words"	No. of Times, <u>Tenest</u>
<u>be</u>	100
<u>bee</u>	4
<u>me</u>	152
<u>nee</u>	3
<u>ve</u>	62
<u>see</u>	9
<u>he</u>	84
<u>hee</u>	23
<u>she</u>	26
<u>shee</u>	0

The pattern established in both tables strongly points to Crane.

One should bear in mind that The Tempest is not a long play; perhaps, it is two-thirds as long as The Winter's Tale. These instances of Crane's trademarks in transcription, considered proportionately, therefore, are especially significant. Such is the case surrounding the number of parentheses in the text, appearing 89 times in The Tempest. For the length of the play, this number is sufficiently large to indicate Crane's hand in the transcription.

Furthermore, there is one example of "Jonson elision" in The Tempest (I.i.64): "I'am out of patience." However, it should be noted that the only example of this peculiar use of the apostrophe in The Winter's Tale occurs, also, in an early portion of the play, leading one to think that the compositor may easily have overlooked the small mark in both cases, thus accounting for its presence in each play in only a single, isolated instance.

The hyphen is plentifully evident in The Tempest and is used in five of the specific ways in which Crane always employed it. Also, one finds two examples in which an object is linked to a verb: "and peg-thee in his knotty entrails" (I.ii.284), and "and here you sty-me" (I.ii.342). Moreover, the emphasis hyphen is found seventeen times, a few examples of which follow:

"red-plague" (I.ii.366), and "fresh-brooke Mussels" (I.i.453). Miscellaneous anomalies occur 114 times, and are typical of the following examples: "In the dark-backward Abisme of Time" (I.ii.59); "Are like-invulnerable" (III.iii.103). Furthermore, there is the use of the compound epithet plus substantive: "This wide-chopt-rascall" (I.i.60); and a verb is connected with a preposition and substantive on one occasion: "with bemockt-at-Stabs" (III.iii.63).

The Tempest is also fully divided into acts and scenes. However, the fourth and fifth acts consist of only one scene. Act one is divided two times; act two, two times; act three, three times; and this division of the play points to Crane's hand in the transcription.

The stage directions in The Tempest, per se, are distinctive from the directions which occur in every other play in the First Folio.²⁵⁸ To begin with, there is absolutely no massing of characters before the scenes. Only the characters who are to appear at the start of the scene are listed in the initial directions. Furthermore, every character who enters or leaves a scene has a direction to mark his appearance, or departure. An example of both the absence of massing and

²⁵⁸ F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library (September, 1926), 4, VII, p. 213.

consistent Enter and Exit directions occurs in IV.1, when Prospero, Ferdinand, and Miranda are listed before the scene opens. Throughout the following action, the characters come and go, however:

Enter Ariell (l. 36)
Exit Ariell (l. 55)
Enter Iris (l. 66)
descends Juno (l. 80)
Enter Certain Nymphes (l. 138)
Enter Certain Reapers (l. 144)
Enter Ariell (l. 172)
Exit Ariell (l. 196)
Enter Ariell (l. 203)
Enter diuerse Spirits (l. 263)

None of these directions, or any Enter and Exit directions in the play, occurs prior to the action. Moreover, the complex stage directions in The Tempest are exceptionally rich and descriptive, as the following examples will verify:

(IV.1) Enter certaine Reapers (properly habited:) they ioyne with the Nymphes, in a gracefull dance, towards the end whereof, Prospero starts suddenly and speaks, after which to a strange hollow and confused noyse, they heauily vanish.

(III.iii) Solemn and strange Musicke: and Prospero on the top (inuisible:) Enter severall strange shapes, bringing in a Basket; and dance about it with gentle actions of salutations, and inuiting the King, & c. to eate, they depart.

(III.iii) Thunder and Lightning. Enter Ariell (like a Harpy) claps his wings vpon the Table, and with a silent deuice the Banquet vanishes.

These passages are not the only such descriptive stage directions to be found in The Tempest. The following table, listing each

scene and the corresponding number of descriptive stage directions, illustrates this fact:

TABLE V

Scene	Stage Directions
I.i	4
I.ii	3
II.i	3
II.ii	5
III.i	1
III.ii	3
III.iii	3
IV.i	7
V.i	7

As it can be seen, there are 35 of these kinds of directions in the entire play. This is a large number when compared to 45, the total of such stage directions for the eight following plays in the Folio. Furthermore, most of these directions in the later plays are simple when compared with the ones to be found in The Tempest, as the following examples will show:

Enter Angelo with a Chaine (The Comedy of Errors, III.ii)
Musicke for the dance (Much Adoe About Nothing, II.i)
shifting places (A Midsummer Night's Dream, III.ii)
Opens the Letter (The Merchant of Venice, III.ii)

This problem must be approached from two viewpoints. First, The Tempest is one of the later plays and, consequently, is similar to The Winter's Tale. Yet, in the latter, there are only seven literary stage directions. Secondly, The Tempest has an abundance of action, as does A Midsummer Night's Dream.

However, the latter has only sixteen stage directions. From these comparisons, one is led to think that The Tempest, as it stands in the Folio, is an exceptional document. Opposing points of view have been expressed by four major scholars-- S. A. Tannenbaum, F. P. Wilson, J. D. Wilson, and W. W. Greg. Tannenbaum states dogmatically that ". . . there is, in fact, not the slightest shadow of reason for associating Crane's name with the text of The Tempest."²⁵⁹ F. P. Wilson thinks that the literary directions in this play must be attributed ". . . to the dramatist, rather than to a scribe, or the playhouse, or an editor."²⁶⁰ J. D. Wilson, at first, agreed with this theory, but, apparently, as his knowledge of Crane expanded, he reversed his opinion and acknowledged Crane's inherent characteristics in The Tempest.²⁶¹ W. W. Greg explains:

I am inclined to believe that behind the folio text is a manuscript carefully prepared by Crane, in which the author's directions were preserved and elaborated and the marks of stage use (supposing the original to have been used as a prompt-book) eliminated. The question is somewhat complicated by the fact that being the first play in the folio it may actually have been prepared by Crane as a model for the editing of the volume.²⁶²

²⁵⁹Tannenbaum, op. cit., n. 5, p. 201.

²⁶⁰F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), p. 213.

²⁶¹Tannenbaum, op. cit., n. 5, p. 201.

²⁶²W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 152.

Greg's statement presents an interesting problem. Using distinctive characteristics of The Winter's Tale as criteria, one may understand the conditions that prompted such a controversy. As it has been shown, the calligraphic marks in The Tempest are similar to those in The Winter's Tale and, therefore, are indicative of Crane. Also, both plays are fully divided into acts and scenes, another suggestion of Crane. However, here the similarity stops. The Winter's Tale exhibits massing, but The Tempest does not. The former has few stage directions, and those that do exist have a literary flavor. While the stage directions in the latter are descriptive, they are in such an abundance that one finds it difficult to suspect Crane of ever having been the transcriber. Hence, it is obvious that there is a vast difference of opinion among scholars. But, if Crane did have a hand in the printer's copy, one wonders why The Tempest is so different from The Winter's Tale. Perhaps, the answer lies in the assumption that Crane may have been asked to prepare The Tempest ". . . as a model for the editing of the volume."

Logically, one may assume that Heminge and Condell had a pre-conceived plan for their Folio. Also, it is possible that they may have turned to Ben Jonson's 1616 Folio as a model. If so, they may have wanted to adopt the practical characteristics of this publication and make additions and

corrections in format wherever they felt it was necessary. In fact, even Ben Jonson himself may have been consulted concerning the planning of Shakespeare's Folio. One knows, at least, that Jonson eventually wrote a dedicatory poem for this Folio, entitled "To the memory of my Beloued, the Avthor Mr. William Shakespeare: and what he hath left vs." One remembers, also, that Ben Jonson's own 1616 Folio had received some adverse criticism.²⁶³ Undoubtedly, Heminge and Condell themselves would have desired to escape from such criticism in their own publication. It is apparent that by publication time they believed themselves to have been successful. In their "To the great Variety of Readers," which was, most likely, the last item which they prepared for their Folio, one observes the lightheartedness and obvious relief which these men felt. The passage ". . . read and censure. . . but buy it first," illustrates their good feelings after having done a job well. Later in this preface they claim to have presented Shakespeare's plays ". . . perfect of their limbs." Obviously, Heminge and Condell, at this time, felt that they were above reproach. Had they not "collected" every one of Shakespeare's plays? Their comments to the reader also imply that the task had not been simple to accomplish.

²⁶³C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson (eds.), Ben Jonson, IX, p. 13.

At this point, one considers the extent of Crane's associations with Jonson. It is known that Crane had transcribed Jonson's masque, Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue, in 1618/19. Furthermore, both men were, by nature, accurate and precise in their work habits. Indeed, one learns that Jonson himself was considered to be a careful scribe who always displayed a "good hand."²⁶⁴ In addition, the continental act-scene division employed by Jonson in his 1616 Folio had been used, in part, in Crane's transcription of A Game at Cheese for Middleton. One learns, as well, that parentheses were commonly used in Jonson's Folio, and finally, that both Jonson and Crane made use of the expanded form of a contraction and, upon occasion, inserted the apostrophe (Jonson elision). Therefore, it is plausible to think that the two men had a much closer relationship than one has heretofore realized. Perhaps, Crane had even helped Jonson to prepare some of the copy for the 1616 Folio. At any rate, there exists the possibility that Crane may have been employed by Heminge and Condell and, thereafter, requested to edit The Tempest. This would have been no small job, since it may have been intended to establish the precedent for the remaining plays to appear in Shakespeare's Folio. Whatever the plan was for the work, it did not persist for long.

²⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 81.

One notices, for example, that in the Folio, the first word on the top of the verso sheet always appears on the bottom of the recto page as an aid to the reader, and this technique has been employed between The Tempest and The Two Gentlemen of Verona. At the bottom of the concluding page of the former is found The. This kind of a series connection between plays continues only up to The Merry Wives of Windsor, the third play in the Folio. Even in this slight attention to detail, the pre-established pattern has been abandoned. The point is, however, that Crane may have been told by Heminge and Condell how they wished for him to organize a play and how to add all stage directions in a literary manner. In The Winter's Tale, which in all likelihood was a rush job, he was permitted to make his transcript, for the most part, in his traditional way. However, with respect to The Tempest, he may have been given careful instructions for its transcription. Certainly, his hand is apparent in a good many instances. While it is obviously not evident, insofar as Crane's older methods are concerned, one cannot be absolutely certain that the stage directions in The Tempest are not examples of Crane's adhering to the explicit instructions of his employers, Heminge and Condell.

This study has shown, therefore, the importance of a wider knowledge about the role of the scrivener in the complex matter of an Elizabethan play and its ultimate printed goal.

The investigation has enlightened one about the problems related to the playhouse document and, indeed, to the dramatist himself and his acting company, as well. A further investigation of Ralph Crane's hand in the publication of the remaining plays in the Comedies section of the 1623 Folio might very well be continued in the pattern which this present author has established. It is significant, one thinks, that Ralph Crane appears to have transcribed the last play to be included in the Folio, The Winter's Tale, as well as the first play, The Tempest, which opens the work. What lies between these two dramas in the Folio may also prove worthy of future interest.

...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...

Final Bill

The Merchant Ship. In IV Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

William Shakespeare. In II Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.

From Script to Print. A Study in the History of the Book. By P. Wilson.

Chicago:

"The Huntington Library," Shakespeare Studies, VI (1957), pp. 53-63.

Walker, G., The Composition of Shakespeare's Plays. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930.

Wells, J. and Wilson, J. P. (ed.), The Shakespeare Canon and John Fletcher. In 2 Vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.

Wells, J., "Shakespeare's Life and Works," Shakespeare Studies, VI (1957), pp. 151-166.

111

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albright, E. M., Dramatic Publications in England, 1580-1640. New York: D. C. Heath and Company. 1927.
- Alexander, P., Shakespeare's Life and Art. London: James Nisbet and Company Limited. 1939.
- Bald, R. C. (ed.), A Game at Cheese. By Thomas Middleton. Cambridge: University Press. 1929.
- Baldwin, T. W., The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company. Princeton: University Press. 1927.
- _____, Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1947.
- Bowers, F., On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists. Richmond, Virginia: William Byrd Press, Incorporated. 1955. (March, 1942), pp. 246-71.
- Chambers, E. K., The Elizabethan Stage. In IV Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1923.
- _____, William Shakespeare. In II Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1930.
- Chaytor, H. J., From Script to Print: An Introduction to Medieval Vernacular Literature. Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons. 1950.
- Craig, H. (ed.), The Complete Works of Shakespeare. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company. 1951.
- Davis, G., "The Huntington Library," Shakespeare Survey, VI (1953), pp. 53-63.
- Feuillerat, A., The Composition of Shakespeare's Plays. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1953.
- Glover, A. and Waller, A. R. (ed.), The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher. In X Vols. Cambridge: University Press. 1906.
- Gordon, D. J., "Shakespeare's Life and Times," Shakespeare Survey, II (1949), pp. 141-144.

- Graves, T. S., "Ralph Crane and the King's Players," Studies in Philology, XXI (April, 1924), pp. 362-66.
- Greg, W. W., Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouse. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1931.
- _____, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1942.
- _____, (ed.), Henslowe's Diary. In II Vols. London: A. H. Bullen. 1904.
- _____, "Prompt Copies, Private Transcripts, and the 'Playhouse Scrivener'," The Library, VI, 4 (September, 1926), pp. 148-56.
- _____, The Shakespeare First Folio. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1955.
- _____, "Some Notes on Crane's Manuscript of The Witch," The Library, XXII, 4 (March, 1942), pp. 208-22.
- Herford, C. H. and Simpson, Percy and Evelyn (eds.), Ben Jonson. In XI Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1950.
- Lee, S., "Crane, Ralph," The Dictionary of National Biography, V, (1950), pp. 11-12.
- _____, Facsimile of the First Folio Edition of Shakespeare's Plays, (1623). Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1902.
- _____, A Life of William Shakespeare. New York: MacMillan. 1916.
- McManaway, J. G., "Textual Studies," Shakespeare Survey, I (1948), pp. 127-131.
- _____, "Textual Studies," Shakespeare Survey, II (1949), pp. 145-153.
- McKerrow, R. B., An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1928.
- Parsons, H., Shakespearian Emendations and Discoveries. London: Etrick Press Limited. 1953.
- Partridge, A. C., "Shakespeare's Orthography in Venus and Adonis and some Early Quartos," Shakespeare Survey, VII (1954), pp. 35-47.

- Pollard, A. W. (ed.), Richard II. A New Shakespeare Quarto: The Tragedy of King Richard II. (Q3, 1598), facsimile.
- Rolfe, W. F. (ed.), Shakespeare's Comedy of The Winter's Tale. New York: American Book Company. 1898.
- Shakespeare, William, Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. A facsimile edition prepared by Helge Kokeritz and Charles Tyler Prouty. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1954.
- Tannenbaum, S. A., Shakespearian Scraps and other Elizabethan Fragments. New York: Columbia University Press. 1933.
- Thompson, E. M., Shakespeare's Handwriting. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1916.
- Walker, A., Textual Problems of the First Folio. Cambridge: University Press. 1953.
- Wilson, F. P., "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII, 4 (September, 1926), pp. 194-215.
- _____, "Some Notes on Authors and Patrons in Tudor and Stuart Times," John Quincy Adams: Memorial Studies. Washington: The Folger Shakespeare Library. 1948.
- Wilson, J. D., "The New Way with Shakespeare's Texts: An Introduction for Lay Readers. I. The Foundations," Shakespeare Survey, VII (1954), pp. 48-56.
- _____, "The New Way with Shakespeare's Texts: II. Recent Work on the Text of Romeo and Juliet," Shakespeare Survey, VIII (1955), pp. 81-99.
- _____, "The Way with Shakespeare's Texts: An Introduction for Lay Readers. III. In Sight of Shakespeare's Manuscripts," Shakespeare Survey, IX (1924), pp. 69-80.
- _____, (ed.), The Winter's Tale. By William Shakespeare. London: Faber and Gwyer Limited. n. d.