

**1: Editing Shakespeare: An Essay Introducing The Shakespeare XML Project**

*In this episode of Shakespeare Unlimited, Rebecca Sheir interviews Paul Werstine and Suzanne Gossett about the how and why of editing Shakespeare. Since , Paul Werstine has been the co-editor of the Folger Editions, along with Barbara Mowat.*

As always, conspiracy is more fun than consensus, and the doubters have the internet on their side. Scholars have recently fought back against this scepticism, however. The printing of the First Folio, however, raises another, ultimately more interesting, question. But did Heminges and Condell edit the text? Many of the plays existed in a number of versions: Neither Heminges nor Condell had produced a book before, nor would they afterwards. And it is unlikely that the backers of the Folio, the printers Isaac Jaggard and Edward Blount, would have risked putting such an expensive project in their hands. As one expert puts it: But again, would they have been entrusted with such a long and complex undertaking? New technology has changed scholarship. The scholar Eleanor Prosser thus detects "considerable evidence" for the elimination of metrical and stylistic "irregularities" in the Folio: In addition, a range of unusual words are added to the text, words not used elsewhere by Shakespeare. But who was it? G Why do you stand bareheaded? E Pardon me good sir. I doe it for my ease. G I pray you be couered, you are too ceremonious. E I am so well, that me thinks I am in heaven. G If you loue me, put on your hat. The similarities of the passages, as well as the mention of "complexion" suggest a desire to satirise not only the stereotypical courtier, but Florio himself, who had become a groom of the privy chamber in August Hamlet was published later the same year and who was known for his "fiery" "possibly acned" complexion. OSRIC Sir there is newly come to Court Laertes, belieue me an absolute gentleman, ful of most excellent differences, of very soft society, and great showing: But what is especially interesting is that all the lines in this second quotation from Hamlet are deleted from the Folio. There are two, equally uncertain, possibilities as to why. The first is that, thinking he had overdone the satire of Florio, and perhaps needing to make a theatrical cut, Shakespeare erased the passage from the play. The major "although not conclusive" problem with this theory is that Shakespeare was long dead before the text was edited in its Folio form. And in that sense, one acquaintance of theirs was uniquely qualified. John Florio was an accomplished linguist and lexicographer. On the restoration of Catholicism under Mary, the family fled, settling in the Italian Alps. But sometime in the s, the young Florio returned to England and began to make his mark as a scholar and translator. In this, he is matched only by Chaucer and Shakespeare. If Jaggard and Blount were looking for someone to edit Shakespeare, Florio was an obvious choice. And he was seasoned in the pitfalls of book production. He describes how books may "misse their ayme, by the escape of Errors and Mistakes, either in sense or matter, the one fault ensuing by a ragged Written Copy; and the other through want of wary Correction". They had shared a patron, and both knew Jonson. But whether the relationship between them was entirely amicable is unclear. But Shakespeare had died in , and Florio was hard up: But a close reading of the Folio reveals some fascinating evidence. If we look at Hamlet, for instance, we notice that the editor of the Folio introduces a number of unusual words to the text. Thus in Act 1 scene 5, Hamlet instructs his sinews to bear him "swiftly up" to revenge. In Act 5 scene 2, "breed" is changed to "beavy" bevy , again a word never used elsewhere by Shakespeare but which Florio uses three times. And the same can be said of a number of unusual additions to the play "words such as "pratlings", "checking", "detecting", "quicknesse", "diddest", "daintier", "hurling" and "roaming". This pattern of rather recondite substitution can be seen across the Folio. However, while Florio used "demonstrated" only once, he uses "demonstratiue" 20 times. But whereas Shakespeare was never to use the word again, Florio used it 13 times in his translation of the Decameron, published three years before. Time to put it down? And in the Folio-only plays there are several very rare words that again are familiar to Florio: And some words from the Folio can only be found in Florio and not in any other writer "enfoldings", "swaruer". We haue seene the best of our time. Machinations, hollownesse, treacherie, and all ruinous disorders follow vs disquietly to our Graues. Indeed, in King Lear we might almost fancy we can see the lexicographer Florio at work "as Edmond expresses his worship of "nature" rather than nurture: It seems odd that the nefarious Edmond should pause to

admire the word "legitimate". Legitimate" to the Folio text. In other words, uncertainties abound. The obvious candidate would seem to be Ben Jonson: Other evidence exists, too, not least that calling the preface an "Epistle Dedicatorie" is almost a Florio trademark: Of course, objections remain. One response is that Florio had published his translation of the Decameron anonymously, and might have thought it best to lie low, especially if his relationship with Shakespeare had been less than amicable. Here one might say that he could not sabotage the whole project: As Othello says in lines added to the Folio: And yet we have no sure way of knowing. We cannot tell for certain whether the words were written by John Florio or by William Shakespeare. The clown Feste joins in, quoting from the letter that had duped Malvolio into believing Olivia loved him "Why some are borne great, some atchieue greatnesse, and some haue greatnesse throwne vpon them" adding: What is interesting is that Feste was not on stage when Malvolio read the letter, nor when he repeated its contents to Olivia. Moreover, the original letter read: But both the words and the spellings and the grammar are familiar to Florio, whose verbs always agree with their pronouns, who never writes "atcheeue", always "atchieue", who disdains the use of "em", and who uses the word "whirlegigge" five times. He is writing a book about John Florio and Shakespeare.

**2: Every-Day Edits: William Shakespeare | Education World**

*Editing Shakespeare is a complex process, explains Barbara Mowat, who with Paul Werstine edited the Folger Shakespeare Library editions.*

Denmark has a long-standing feud with neighbouring Norway, in which King Hamlet slew King Fortinbras of Norway in a battle some years ago. After the ghost appears again, the three vow to tell Prince Hamlet what they have witnessed. As the court gathers the next day, while King Claudius and Queen Gertrude discuss affairs of state with their elderly adviser Polonius, Hamlet looks on glumly. Claudius also scolds Hamlet for continuing to grieve over his father, and forbids him to return to his schooling in Wittenberg. Learning of the ghost from Horatio, Hamlet resolves to see it himself. Horatio, Hamlet, and the ghost Artist: That night on the rampart, the ghost appears to Hamlet, telling the prince that he was murdered by Claudius and demanding that Hamlet avenge him. Hamlet agrees and the ghost vanishes. The prince confides to Horatio and the sentries that from now on he plans to "put an antic disposition on", or act as though he has gone mad, and forces them to swear to keep his plans for revenge secret. Act II[ edit ] Soon thereafter, Ophelia rushes to her father, telling him that Hamlet arrived at her door the prior night half-undressed and behaving erratically. As he enters to do so, the king and queen finish welcoming Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, two student acquaintances of Hamlet, to Elsinore. Additional news requires that Polonius wait to be heard: The forces that Fortinbras had conscripted to march against Denmark will instead be sent against Poland, though they will pass through Danish territory to get there. Hamlet feigns madness but subtly insults Polonius all the while. When Rosencrantz and Guildenstern arrive, Hamlet greets his "friends" warmly, but quickly discerns that they are spies. Hamlet becomes bitter, admitting that he is upset at his situation but refusing to give the true reason why, instead commenting on "what a piece of work" humanity is. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern tell Hamlet that they have brought along a troupe of actors that they met while traveling to Elsinore. Hamlet, after welcoming the actors and dismissing his friends-turned-spies, asks them to deliver a soliloquy about the death of King Priam and Queen Hecuba at the climax of the Trojan War. His reaction convinces Claudius that Hamlet is not mad for love. Shortly thereafter, the court assembles to watch the play Hamlet has commissioned. After seeing the Player King murdered by his rival pouring poison in his ear, Claudius abruptly rises and runs from the room: Hamlet mistakenly stabs Polonius Artist: Coke Smyth, 19th century. Gertrude summons Hamlet to her room to demand an explanation. Meanwhile, Claudius talks to himself about the impossibility of repenting, since he still has possession of his ill-gotten goods: He sinks to his knees. Polonius, spying on the conversation from behind a tapestry, calls for help as Gertrude, believing Hamlet wants to kill her, calls out for help herself. Hamlet, believing it is Claudius, stabs wildly, killing Polonius, but pulls aside the curtain and sees his mistake. Claudius switches tactics, proposing a fencing match between Laertes and Hamlet to settle their differences. Laertes will be given a poison-tipped foil, and Claudius will offer Hamlet poisoned wine as a congratulation if that fails. Gertrude interrupts to report that Ophelia has drowned, though it is unclear whether it was suicide or an accident exacerbated by her madness. Act V[ edit ] Horatio has received a letter from Hamlet, explaining that the prince escaped by negotiating with pirates who attempted to attack his England-bound ship, and the friends reunite offstage. Hamlet picks up the skull, saying "alas, poor Yorick" as he contemplates mortality. Hamlet and Horatio initially hide, but when Hamlet realizes that Ophelia is the one being buried, he reveals himself, proclaiming his love for her. A foppish courtier, Osric, interrupts the conversation to deliver the fencing challenge to Hamlet. Hamlet does well at first, leading the match by two hits to none, and Gertrude raises a toast to him using the poisoned glass of wine Claudius had set aside for Hamlet. Claudius tries to stop her, but is too late: Laertes slashes Hamlet with his poisoned blade. In the ensuing scuffle, they switch weapons and Hamlet wounds Laertes with his own poisoned sword. Gertrude collapses and, claiming she has been poisoned, dies. Hamlet rushes at Claudius and kills him. As the poison takes effect, Hamlet, hearing that Fortinbras is marching through the area, names the Norwegian prince as his successor. Horatio promises to recount the full story of what happened, and Fortinbras, seeing the entire Danish royal family dead, takes the crown for himself, and orders a military funeral to honour Hamlet.

Sources of Hamlet A facsimile of *Gesta Danorum* by Saxo Grammaticus, which contains the legend of Amleth Hamlet-like legends are so widely found for example in Italy, Spain, Scandinavia, Byzantium, and Arabia that the core "hero-as-fool" theme is possibly Indo-European in origin. The first is the anonymous Scandinavian Saga of Hrolf Kraki. Possibly written by Thomas Kyd or even William Shakespeare, the Ur-Hamlet would have existed by, and would have incorporated a ghost. Consequently, there is no direct evidence that Kyd wrote it, nor any evidence that the play was not an early version of Hamlet by Shakespeare himself. This latter idea—placing Hamlet far earlier than the generally accepted date, with a much longer period of development—has attracted some support. Whether Shakespeare took these from Belleforest directly or from the hypothetical Ur-Hamlet remains unclear. Conventional wisdom holds that Hamlet is too obviously connected to legend, and the name Hamnet was quite popular at the time. He notes that the name of Hamnet Sadler, the Stratford neighbour after whom Hamnet was named, was often written as Hamlet Sadler and that, in the loose orthography of the time, the names were virtually interchangeable. Chamberleyne his servantes ". Hamlet is not among them, suggesting that it had not yet been written. As Hamlet was very popular, Bernard Lott, the series editor of *New Swan*, believes it "unlikely that he [Meres] would have overlooked Other scholars consider this inconclusive. In the booksellers Nicholas Ling and John Trundell published, and Valentine Simmes printed, the so-called "bad" first quarto. Q1 contains just over half of the text of the later second quarto. In Nicholas Ling published, and James Roberts printed, the second quarto. Each text contains material that the other lacks, with many minor differences in wording: Some contemporary scholarship, however, discounts this approach, instead considering "an authentic Hamlet an unrealisable ideal. Colin Burrow has argued that "most of us should read a text that is made up by conflating all three versions Scholars immediately identified apparent deficiencies in Q1, which was instrumental in the development of the concept of a Shakespearean "bad quarto ". The major deficiency of Q1 is in the language: It is suggested by Irace that Q1 is an abridged version intended especially for travelling productions, thus the question of length may be considered as separate from issues of poor textual quality. Irace, in her introduction to Q1, wrote that "I have avoided as many other alterations as possible, because the differences Before then, he was either mad, or not; either a hero, or not; with no in-betweens. Dramatic structure[ edit ] Hamlet departed from contemporary dramatic convention in several ways. The play is full of seeming discontinuities and irregularities of action, except in the "bad" quarto. At one point, as in the Gravedigger scene, [a] Hamlet seems resolved to kill Claudius: The Riverside edition constitutes 4, lines totaling 29, words, typically requiring over four hours to stage. This work specifically advises royal retainers to amuse their masters with inventive language. Osric and Polonius, especially, seem to respect this injunction. He uses highly developed metaphors, stichomythia, and in nine memorable words deploys both anaphora and asyndeton: Hamlet interrupts himself, vocalising either disgust or agreement with himself, and embellishing his own words. He has difficulty expressing himself directly and instead blunts the thrust of his thought with wordplay. It is not until late in the play, after his experience with the pirates, that Hamlet is able to articulate his feelings freely. Written at a time of religious upheaval, and in the wake of the English Reformation, the play is alternately Catholic or piously medieval and Protestant or consciously modern. The ghost describes himself as being in purgatory, and as dying without last rites. Some scholars have observed that revenge tragedies come from Catholic countries like Italy and Spain, where the revenge tragedies present contradictions of motives, since according to Catholic doctrine the duty to God and family precedes civil justice. Dialogue refers explicitly to Wittenberg, where Hamlet, Horatio, and Rosencrantz and Guildenstern attend university, implying where Martin Luther in first proposed his 95 theses and thereby initiated the Protestant Reformation. Thomas de Leu, fl. Hamlet is often perceived as a philosophical character, expounding ideas that are now described as relativist, existentialist, and sceptical. For example, he expresses a subjectivistic idea when he says to Rosencrantz: Hamlet reflects the contemporary scepticism promoted by the French Renaissance humanist Michel de Montaigne. In the first half of the 20th century, when psychoanalysis was at the height of its influence, its concepts were applied to Hamlet, notably by Sigmund Freud, Ernest Jones, and Jacques Lacan, and these studies influenced theatrical productions. Ophelia is overwhelmed by having her unfulfilled love for him so abruptly terminated and drifts into the oblivion of insanity. Lacan postulated that the human psyche is

determined by structures of language and that the linguistic structures of Hamlet shed light on human desire. Eliot, who preferred Coriolanus to Hamlet, or so he said. Who can believe Eliot, when he exposes his own Hamlet Complex by declaring the play to be an aesthetic failure? Rothman suggests that "it was the other way around: Hamlet helped Freud understand, and perhaps even invent, psychoanalysis". He concludes, "The Oedipus complex is a misnomer. If Hamlet is the biological son of Claudius, that explains many things. He is angry with his mother because of her long standing affair with a man Hamlet hates, and Hamlet must face the fact that he has been sired by the man he loathes. That point overturns T. Gontar suggests that if the reader assumes that Hamlet is not who he seems to be, the objective correlative becomes apparent. Hamlet is suicidal in the first soliloquy not because his mother quickly remarries but because of her adulterous affair with the despised Claudius which makes Hamlet his son.

**3: Shakespeare's Plays Were Full of Anachronisms - [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com)**

*Editing Shakespeare Alexander Pope () became notorious for imposing contemporary taste on the language of Shakespeare, highlighting the most remarkable passages with commas on the margins, and relegating what he considered bad verses to the bottom of the page: around 1, lines were marginalized in this fashion.*

The 17th-century folio collections of the plays of William Shakespeare did not have editors in the modern sense of the term. The play manuscripts may have been proofread and prepared for printing by Edward Knight, the "book-keeper" or prompter of the company. The task of proofreading and correcting the actual printed pages of the Folio was left to the compositors and printers in the print-shop, yielding the uneven and often defective text that is the First Folio. Even less is known about the creation of the Second, Third, and Fourth Folios than about the First; see *Folios and Quartos Shakespeare*. In the 18th century, however, interested individuals made the first concerted efforts to bring order to the tangle of textual difficulties that the Folios of the previous century presented. Rowe was the first person to attempt a clean and fully comprehensible text of the plays; but he depended upon a copy of the Fourth Folio and made generally conjectural emendations. He also added full stage directions he was a playwright himself and full lists of *Dramatis personae*, and wrote the first biographical sketch of the poet. Pope was the first to attempt a collation of the quarto texts of the plays, yet he produced what was basically a reprint of Rowe that added little of value. His edition was reprinted in . In his preface, Warburton wrote that his friend Pope "was desirous I should give a new Edition of this Poet, as he thought it might contribute to put a stop to a prevailing folly of altering the Text of celebrated Authors without Talents or Judgment. And he was willing that his Edition should be melted down into mine, as it would, he said, afford him so great is the modesty of an ingenuous temper a fit opportunity of confessing his Mistakes. However, Warburton did allow, rather begrudgingly, some corrections put forward by Theobald and Hanmer: A piece of Justice which the Oxford Editor never did; and which the Other was not always scrupulous in observing towards me. But when they went farther, and appeared to put that authour upon a level with Warburton, "Nay, said Johnson, he has given him some smart hits to be sure; but there is no proportion between the two men; they must not be named together. A fly, Sir, may sting a stately horse and make him wince; but one is but an insect, and the other is a horse still. Johnson in turn relied upon Warburton; his edition is noteworthy mainly for its famous Preface. Appalled by the undisciplined emendations of Hanmer and Warburton, Capell spent three decades collecting and collating the quartos. Isaac Reed revised the Steevens edition again in , and Steevens himself produced one final, volume revision in . He is also noted for his work on the problem of chronology. In the 19th century the text, drawn primarily from Malone and Steevens, was "monumentalized" [6] in the Cambridge edition and its single-volume companion, the Globe edition . It was followed by the New Cambridge edition in , and all modern standard editions inherit primarily from this edition. Others nourished spirits of competitiveness and resentment. Pope made Theobald the first hero of *The Dunciad*. Clark and Wright also produced the single-volume Globe Shakespeare using their Cambridge texts; together, these became the standard for the remainder of the century. The most radical edition in the twentieth century was the Oxford Shakespeare, prepared under the general editorship of Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. It aims to present the texts as they were originally performed, which results in numerous controversial choices, including presenting multiple texts of *King Lear*, a text of *Hamlet* in which the scenes presumably cut by Shakespeare are relegated to an appendix, and an emphasis on the collaborative nature of several of the plays. *The Works of Shakespear. The Canons of Criticism, and Glossary* 7 ed. *The Life of Samuel Johnson*. Michael Dobson and Stanley Wells: *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*.

**4: Hamlet - Wikipedia**

*Shakespeare's editors were essential in the development of the modern practice of producing printed books and the evolution of textual criticism. The 17th-century folio collections of the plays of William Shakespeare did not have editors in the modern sense of the term.*

Browse our full list of Shakespeare Unlimited episodes. Episode 31 Just what exactly does it mean to edit the works of Shakespeare, particularly since we have no surviving manuscript copies? Why is it that new editions of the plays continue to be published? She has also edited the Arden Shakespeare edition of Pericles and is a past president of the Shakespeare Association of America. From the Shakespeare Unlimited podcast series. Published September 9, Garland Scott is the associate producer. At the time that this is being recorded, all 38 plays, as well as the sonnets and poems, that comprise the Folger Library Shakespeare Editions have been available to the public for the past five years. Our guests are two people with the authority to discuss this. Suzanne Gossett is co-textual editor of the Norton Shakespeare. My first question may appear to be self-evident, but I have to ask, if Shakespeare wrote his plays years ago, why do we need new editions? What changes from edition to edition? From the beginning, texts get modernized. For example, the spelling gets modernized. And I understand on a very basic level, that some editions just have more mistakes than others. Well, you mean early That is, what is a mistake for one editor, is not always a mistake for the other, and so you have differences in emendation policies from edition to edition. What does emendation mean? In the new, third edition of the Norton Shakespeare, your introduction looks at the subject, how authentic is the text I am reading? And it also looks at how the play scripts became printed texts. Consequently, we have these printed texts which may, or may not, convey what Shakespeare had in mind at the moment that he was writing. The question then becomes, what does it mean to be searching for an authentic text? There were earlier editors who had in mind, indeed, just as Paul suggested, the idea that they could put down on the page what they were sure Shakespeare meant. I think modern editors have much less, either conviction or self-confidence, you can call it as you like, that we can get back to that magic intentionality and singularity of Shakespeare. We are sticking as close as we can to the texts that we actually have, with, at the same time, the recognition that texts need to be comprehensible. We are, nevertheless, trying to create a comprehensive text, and we will emend, when it is necessary. So Paul, this process Suzanne describes for the Norton Shakespeare, is it similar to what you do with the Folger editions? I would subscribe to precisely what Suzanne has been saying. I could say to help But, just so that you have a sense that not everybody at all points has had such an idea in mind, the Norton Shakespeare first and second editions were based on the Oxford text, that was the most important text done in a hundred years. Pericles is a damaged text. We only have one text of it. The Oxford text was freely called a reconstruction. Should we be reconstructing? So, if we take Hamlet, for an example, Hamlet is notorious for having many different versions, so when you came to a passage of Hamlet where multiple versions exist for the same speech, what do you do? We will have, in the Norton First of all, the Norton is conceived as an electronic edition, from which the print edition is, in a certain sense, a spin-off. And we are going to edit the base texts of all the texts that we have. And in the electronic edition, there will be fully edited texts of all the base texts, including of plays like Romeo and Juliet, which has considerable differences in its two quartos. In the print edition, we will normally, except for Hamlet and Lear, have only one text. In the electronic edition, there will be Q1, Q2, the Folio, and that conjoined edition. I think there are about 12 lines. In the other text, there is a very considerable scene in which Fortinbras goes off. If he was a Victorian, he sort of thought she should probably only sigh. If he was a modern, he probably thought maybe she was kissing Othello. And yet, traditional confluations would pick and choose. So conflation, this is a controversial topic. Paul, how do you feel about it? Well, again, I think, yeah, Suzanne and I are very much on the same page. It used to be that critics and editors thought that they could reconstruct, determine, what the manuscript origins of these were, and what the provenance of, that is where those manuscripts had been, behind those printed texts. And it was out of that kind of conviction of their knowledge of these origins that they were able to put the text together. I mean, if you think you know where each of those texts comes from, then you can make a judgment about

when you should go with one, and when you could go with the other. For example, if you think that the Folio text of Hamlet is a theatrical text, is a playhouse text, then from our knowledge of playhouse manuscripts, one could make certain inferences about how that text came to differ from the 1616 text of Hamlet. I want to talk more with you, Paul, for a moment about the decision-making process that you have to go through. So, could you walk us through what you have to do to make decisions like those? What happens in that case, as far as most editing goes, is that you get the intersection of the two processes that I was talking about at the beginning, of preservation and mediation. And Gertrude, which is the version of the name, is the name that is familiar to people nowadays as a name. And so, in the process of modernization, we end up going with Gertrude. The name, whether you spell it one way or another, is still going to refer to the same character. And so we went with Robin Goodfellow. Paul, the Folger Magazine had an article a little while back where your partner on the Folger editions, Barbara Mowat, said that in many ways, the old definitive text was very largely nothing more than an edition produced by Nicholas Rowe, or is it [different pronunciation] Rowe? First, who was Nicholas Rowe, and when did he produce that edition? He published three editions, two in and one in. And his editing was, and is, extraordinarily influential. He was a playwright in his own time, and that really was what his qualification was to be selected by the publisher, Tonson, to do this edition of Shakespeare. And he introduced certain features of the text that are remarkably persistent. So you get some very unequal divisions. So, he did that. He also introduced dramatis personae lists, or lists of the characters, at the beginnings of the plays, something that not all the plays had, only a few of them had. He put in scene locations; he took it upon himself to say where each of the scenes was taking place. Now, this is a feature that we have given up. He was the first one that did any conflation. We were talking about conflation. And he brought in that speech that Suzanne was talking about, just a few minutes ago, the "how all occasions do inform against me" speech. This is in Act 4, Scene 4 of Hamlet. But he knew of quarto texts, not the 1616 text, but he had a derivative text of that, the quarto text. So, he does deserve a lot of credit, and, I suppose, blame, for where we are in Shakespeare editing today. Paul mentioned Tonson, Jacob Tonson. But you see, they all worked from Rowe, and that went on for about years. Paul, the Folger has the only copy of the quarto for Titus Andronicus in the entire world. Some other quartos just barely survived in two or three copies. How do you think those plays would be different today if all the quartos had been lost? Yes, they would be. So, even Titus Andronicus makes a difference, you know, when Once we found the First Quarto, it turns out, we discovered that the Second Quarto had been printed, reprinted, in part, from a defective copy of the First Quarto, from which certain And so, you had a few lines on one side, you know, on one side of the leaf, gone, and a few lines on the other side of the leaf gone. And so, we were reading that as Shakespeare for hundreds of years. When it comes to editing the plays, is the point of editing to make the plays more comprehensible, or more enjoyable, or should I not even use the word "or"? Is it more of an "and" thing? So Paul, more comprehensible or more enjoyable? Well, we certainly want people to understand Shakespeare. I think, frankly, many students discover they really enjoy Shakespeare when they first see it on the stage. Is that too strong, Paul? Paul, when the Folger decides to make a new edition, what is it that brings on that choice? Is it changes in taste? Is it advances in scholarship? Scholarship does advance, or at least scholarship, it certainly changes. I mean, we have a very different understanding of editing Shakespeare now than we did in the 1950s, and it was in the 1950s that the first Folger edition was done by the then-director of the library, Louis B. Wright, and his executive assistant, Virginia LaMar.

## 5: Re-editing Shakespeare for the Modern Reader - Oxford Scholarship

*Abstract "Editing Shakespeare in Parts" argues that single-text editing is not the most effective response to the pressing need to adjust editorial methods to a theoretically and historically informed understanding of early modern theatrical and textual cultures.*

All other comments or inquiries should be addressed to: Page 1 Preamble

Editing Shakespeare is a daunting task with some unique challenges. For starters, the catalogue of printed FGEs First Generation Editions contains an unusually wide range of discrepant variants with no unequivocal way to resolve the problem of textual authority—even when the stemmatology seems clear. If it were only a matter of accidentals punctuation, orthography, line numbering, etc. However, when lines and whole speeches are added or missing—depending on your point of view , when lexis and semantics can seem contradictory in two different editions, and when whole scenes have been re-sequenced, deciding on a "reliable" some might say convincing solution to the problem of documenting and synchronizing variations is suddenly much more difficult. These problems are compounded by another fact: Ironically, in spite of scholarly training, editors and critics alike have been seduced by the sirens of speculation in these matters. Dover Wilson , we might well ask why so many Shakespearean scholars have felt compelled to speculate about that which is absent, using evidence which is either non-existent or shoddy. Copy-text theory itself is implicated, but so is audience shorthand theory, abridgement theory Irace , revision theory Irace, Jowett , "Lost Archetype theory" Rosenbaum 41 , and two-text theory Blayney to name a few. As Rosenbaum The Shakespeare Wars and others have suggested, the resultant and highly contentious debates have both informed and undermined the history of Shakespearean editorial scholarship. The long history of editing Shakespeare is fraught with arguments about problems of textual authority 1. And the legacy of editorial scholarship has not, as one might have hoped, helped propel us toward any satisfactory solution. For instance, whether by accident or design, most pres print editions give a confident but false impression of a single, monolithic text which is "the" play as it has been received; even variorum editions take a single privileged text as the basis for "the" edition. When faced with "good" and "bad" quartos in Hamlet, for example, and so many significant differences, it becomes apparent that conjectural emendation, speculative stemmatology and reductionist texts are as obfuscating and misleading as much as they are informing and clarifying. Many arguments have been recruited into the service of supporting the inherent literary and editorial superiority of F1, but evidence is not always convincing. Thus it has come to pass that recent editors since the s working electronically and in print have gone beyond the variorum edition by visualizing editorial complexity in many new ways. There are appended, interlocking and conflated editions. Comparative renderings empower the scholarly reader, but one could also argue that they muddy the waters for the neophyte who seeks only the most basic understanding. In conflated renderings the reader might never be aware that variants exist; for some readers this is acceptable, for others, not so. One logistical problem emerging from the complexity of available editions is how to synchronize line numbering across so many textual variants. A second problem is how to markup texts when there are so many textual variants that need to be tracked and synchronized with each other. The paper also briefly discusses some ways to improve the sophistication of word search across all textual variations including modern and translated ones. The SXP re-constitutes the old power hierarchy between editor and reader, shifting it away from the control of editorial expertise over to reader preference and empowerment. In so doing, the SXP makes possible the act of editioning, a continuously ongoing process by which multiple and variant chunks lines or passages of a play—and their correspondent annotations and commentaries—can be infinitely and spontaneously re-combined at will. These reader-controlled mashups automatically update through RSS feeds and other Web 2. Instead of the noun, "an edition" or even "editions," both of which come from the physicality of the book, the SXP makes a case for editioning, a more ethereal process that emerges from the effects of digitization. Since each reader now modifies their own content "edition" according to individual preferences, no two editions at any moment in time would necessarily be the same. Imagine collated or variorum lines, annotations, description of sources, embedded media, critical annotations, and other critical features shifting dynamically, like the pieces of color

in a kaleidoscope. Refresh rates will be as short as a few minutes or as long as a few months, and only in the areas that interested the reader. The SXP signifies a paradigm shift away from the edition as object noun , towards editioning as process verb ; away from a top-down model of scholarly expertise the editor knows best and towards a bottom-up model of collective intelligence the editor merely empowers the reader to make their own editorial choices. Arguably, the material print culture of the book, with its educated and class-based readers, over-determined the power attributed to knowledge producers editors and the consequent disenfranchisement of consumers readers. It is not mere digitization alone that destabilizes this relationship, but the particular way in which Web 2. A local "print" output to paper is merely a snapshot of the mashup at that moment in time. Page 2 Problem 1: Line Numbering The McKerrow-Hinman TLN numbering system takes F1 as the base text and is then forced to distort the line numbering on variant editions in order to retain consistency across different editions. Apart from the inherent awkwardness of this solution, there is the additional problem that the editorial decision of privileging F1 over alternatives is no longer a matter of orthodoxy. Kliman also the inventor of the Enfolded Hamlet, displayed here , Frank N. The contentiously named "bad" quarto of Hamlet Q1 seems to be "missing" lines and entire passages that appear elsewhere--for example, in Q2 and F1 4 although one might also argue that the other texts have a surplus of words and lines. Tracking variations and line numbers is complex and convoluted. Lear too, is notoriously problematic with the substantially different endings in F1 and Q1. The complexity of these FGEs is further compounded by problems inherent in F1 itself, with its own internal set of complications pertaining to multiple compositors and their differing typesetting eccentricities. And beyond that, more complications emerge from errors in pagination and the controversial "interruption theory" which suggests that a false start on F1 was made circa and consequently, some pagination and other errors ensued. The current line numbering systems TLN and act. Why should F1 always be the base text? The answer is not simple. True, the weight of editorial orthodoxy and ideology privilege F1, but the practical fact of the matter is also that cross-referencing these lines in print is a nightmare. All conventional line numbering methods, even Heminge-Condell, are contextually emergent from and dependent on print editions. You can only have one text against which the others are measured. No longer is it true, as Jenkins and Foakes claimed, that "any editor has to choose between variant readings" ; and no longer is it true, as Charles Whitworth observed, that the editor must "fix that which must remain unfixed, fluid, open, ambiguous, always at the mercy, inspired or banal of producers" Rosenbaum describes a variation of this polemic in his discussion of the troublesome complexity of the ambiguous endings in Lear. Current editorial practice requires the flexibility to accommodate user preferences for any base text and a scalability that accommodates the collocation of multiple variations across time, medium and language. This new world of editorial practice requires a new line numbering system and with it, a new way to markup text so that these reader-empowered choices can be properly--and efficiently--enabled. The Shakespeare XML Project SXP explores many ways to do this, but this essay only focuses on three practical responses to these new editorial principles. This alternative method of markup only embeds code is directly related to navigational coordinates act. Wikipedia calls Soundex a "phonetic algorithm for indexing names by sound, as pronounced in English" and as good luck would have it, PhP comes with built-in Soundex functionality! By assigning a unique identifier to each line much like DNA, all similar lines, regardless of the edition or even language in which they are written, share the same unique RLN. Thus, readers who locate a line in say F1 will easily be able to find its equivalents in eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth editions, as well as in films, audio readings and even translations. The Shakespeare XML project allows users to user conventional act. In order to be consistent with the TLN system, each edition starts at 1 and increases incrementally by 1 for each line. First, using Excel, a map is made of each line in each version of each textual variant. The model is fully scalable so an infinite number of textual variants can be added. This mapping records both act. Clusters of similar lines are then colour coded to show they are part if a coherent unit, but each line always remains autonomous in its group. The ten-character string contains upper and lower case letters and numbers. In the example below, the line "You come most carefully vpon your houre. RLNs are not sequential and are randomly generated thus allowing for the infinite insertion or deletion of extra lines between existent TLNs. Here below is what it looks like in F1. Showing the mapping of RLNs to sct. The physical constraints of printed text may have

necessitated the collation of TLNs against some kind of "master copy," so by forced, generally-accepted convention, F1 has been the "gold standard" even though its authority has sometimes been contested and F1 is incomplete. Not so any more. There are many benefits. Why should the logic of the local line numbering in Q1 be sacrificed for the sake of line collation with other editions? In the following F1 example, 6 the line numbering is logical because the line it remains consistent with the actual number of lines you see or "True Through Line Numbering System" TTLN. It looks like this: Enter Barnardo and Francisco two Centinels. Long liue the King. You come most carefully vpon your houre. O you come most carefully vpon your watch, Page 5 Note how Q1 skips from line 3 directly to line 10 in order to remain synchronized with F1, when in fact line 10 in Q1 "1. O you come most carefully vpon your watch," should really be TTLN 4 if it were to be consistent with its internal local line numbering logic. This next example illustrates in a slightly different way, how digital editions remain unnecessarily trapped in the linear model of TLN with one standard base text. A moth it is to trouble the mindes eye: Moreover, if Q1 with all its aberrations were also to be included in an enfolded edition, the overlays would exceed the space limits of the screen or page. The complexity of three overlays, each with differing color and bracket codes, would be difficult to manage. Clearly, as long as F1 or any text remains an invariable, lodestar Copy-text, the TLN system will produce eccentric and illogical line numbering. The planned repository in the Shakespeare XML Project will accommodate an unlimited number of textual variants from any generation of editions even in translation , each textual variant can always begin with line number 1 and proceed continuously. Enter Barnardo, and Francisco, two Centinele. Once assigned, the "family" of lines associated with this line always remains associated by virtue of the shared the RLN; any edition therefore, can easily become the Copytext and any or all other additions will easily map to it. As long as the RLNs are mapped to each other, the reader can scroll down in one version while the other variants dynamically adjust. When collating or juxtaposing editions, the reader no longer needs to know the line or its TLN or act. At the top of the menu, the user can then "lock in" the synchronicity of line numbering between the two versions, or unlock them and scroll them independently. The highlighted lines 40 in F1 and 30 in Q1 are simply the natural highlighting that occurs every 10 lines. Synchronizing the same R: N number across two different textual variations F1 and Q1 This penultimate example illustrates what happens when one or more TLNs are different: Enter Horatio and Marcellus. Find one line and you easily find them all. In this example, notice that Q3 distributes the same single line over two lines, numbers 13 and As well, the SXP will soon have a "zoom" feature uninstalled which will allow readers to browse other lines in the vicinity of any particular line. Here is a slightly different example. All of the following lines are equivalent even though some are expressed as contained in one line and others as two:

### 6: Shakespeare on Page and Stage | Editing Shakespeare Â· Online Exhibits

*William Shakespeare Click for a PDF (portable document format) printable version of this Every-Day Edit activity. Scroll down or click for work sheet text and answer key. Click for our archive of Every-Day Edit activities from previous weeks. Click for Ideas for Using Every-Day Edit in the classroom.*

### 7: How to Cite Shakespeare (with Pictures) - wikiHow

*KING LEAR AND EDITING SHAKESPEARE. 1. Sometimes we commonly assume that the text of a Shakespeare play available in a modern "book store" edition is what Shakespeare actually wrote, and what we read is what he said and meant.*

### 8: Editing Shakespeare | Folger Shakespeare Library

*His shoddy editing irritated Lewis Theobald, a translator and minor dramatist. Theobald's skill as a poet may have been far inferior to Pope's, but his editorial judgement was far superior. Theobald published Shakespeare Restored in , taking Pope to task for his changes and inclusion of dubious sources.*

### 9: Who edited Shakespeare? | Books | The Guardian

*Most strikingly, editing shares with hypertext the threat of diffusing the clear outlines of Shakespeare's work, in the long run, contributing perhaps relatively much towards the history of scholarship but commensurately little to our grasp of Shakespeare.*

*Tradition in En Transition Introduction to humanities by sanchez abad jao The fall of the perfect girl Country folklore, 1920s 1930s The controversy of the present time : Arianism, William Whiston, and the development of Cotton Mathers la The eyes of the gull The Affairs of Men French life and its problems. Corporate attorneys practice guide Getting along with disease-engendered uncertainty in asthma child families Ann-Charlotte Dalheim-Englund, Bayesian modeling using winbugs The face on the cutting-room floor Discovering London for Children (Discovering) Martha mier romantic impressions book 2 Persons With Disabilities Unbounded Non-Cummutative Integration (Mathematical Physics Studies) Keeping Gods word before you Your personal netspy Two sermons preached at St. Marys before the university of Oxford Swanns South Australia. The gathering place Lead the field book Chicken Soup for the Sisters Soul 2 Stockinet knitting graph paper Many consumers reject chain stores Jay Walljasper. Multiple Choice Questions in Basic Surgical Sciences (Butterworths Study Aids) Pa system design guide Building trust in public institutions? Good governance and anti-corruption in Bosnia and Herzegovina Davi Japan (Blue Earth Books: Many Cultures, One World) Entire books Prius 2010 service manual Classic Cadillac (Auto Focus) Orthographic mutineers. Globalisation, surveillance, and the war on terror Mike McCahill In the arms of the sky The birders field notebook Word within a word list 19 Strength assessment nasm corrective exercise chapter 8 Challenges in construction project management Diatomeas y su partes*