Marino, James J. "Parts and the Playscript: Seven Questions." *Rethinking Theatrical Documents in Shakespeare's England*. Ed. Tiffany Stern. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2020. 52–67. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350051379.ch-003>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 12:05 UTC.

Copyright © Tiffany Stern and contributors 2020. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

3

Parts and the Playscript

Seven Questions

*James J. Marino**

The scholars who pioneered modern dramatic bibliography knew very well that early modern plays were divided into acting parts or cue-scripts, but their theories focused on complete texts, the whole rather than the parts.¹ Even now, when Tiffany Stern and Simon Palfrey have returned actors' parts to critical attention, those parts have not been integrated into our standard textual models.² Although individual scholars have made individual efforts to ask how parts and cues illuminate specific textual problems, the default assumption remains that plays were changed wholesale, from top to bottom, and thinking about the parts remains optional rather than obligatory.³ A hypothesis about the three *Hamlets* or two *King Lears* need not consider the cue-structure at all. This is both a mistake in itself and a cause of other mistakes.

It is a mistake in itself because once a script entered the players' repertory, further changes could only be executed through the medium of actors' parts. Players needed both to learn new

cues and to remember not to give or to answer old ones. And they had to master the changed cue-structure well enough not to disrupt live performance. Giving the wrong cue, or failing to answer the right one, could stop a play. Changing a script that actors had already learned imposed specific practical necessities that any revision or adaptation needed to take into account.

One can only safely ignore these pragmatic realities by positing that all rewriting happened before the play entered repertory or else after its theatrical life. If one theorizes that a particular quarto was an unperformed draft, or that the 1623 Shakespeare Folio represents a post-theatrical literary redaction, theatrical parts become moot. Tiffany Stern's argument that the First Quarto of *Hamlet* derives from shorthand does not need to reckon with theatrical parts.⁴ Likewise, Lukas Erne's argument that the so-called bad quartos are theatrical abridgements of longer literary texts can still be advanced if abridgement came before the division into parts.⁵ But relatively few textual theories limit themselves to pre- or post-theatrical revision, especially since so many scholarly editions, including Erne's own edition, now resort to combined hypotheses.⁶ Since the traditional hypotheses of touring adaptation, theatrical revision, and memorial reconstruction no longer seem sufficiently explanatory, editors propose that plays underwent more than one of these transformations.⁷

How players carried out the hypothesized adaptations or revisions, or whether they could carry them out, is routinely ignored. A textual theory that failed to consider the practices of early modern printers or scribes would be rightly dismissed. Theories that ignore the players' working practices are likewise unsound. Hypotheses that do not consider theatrical parts are in fact unacknowledged hypotheses about those parts. They inevitably imply subsidiary claims about the actors' scrolls. Failing to acknowledge those claims shields them from examination, even by the hypothesizer. And scholarly consensus about the provenances of particular dramatic texts should be taken with caution when such consensus ignores the evidence of parts and cues.

Failure to consider cue-structure also leads to particular errors, undermining many of our standard textual models. Arguments for playhouse revision must surely think about parts and cues. Theatrical revision was not infinitely flexible, because an early modern acting script was not equally mutable at every point. Its structure of interlocking, semi-independent scrolls eased certain changes and presented obstacles to others. No change was entirely impossible, if the players were sufficiently determined, but some would be extremely arduous or inconvenient. One cannot intuitively grasp the ease or difficulty of any change if one imagines the play only as a unified text. Those who revised early modern plays clearly understood the practical difficulties of enacting those revisions; scholars need to understand them, too.

And yet arguments about theatrical revision seldom distinguish between changes in the middle of speeches, which an actor might make on his own, and changes to cues, which needed coordination. The old hypothesis that the Folio text of *Hamlet* includes Richard Burbage's actor's gag is two hypotheses. Burbage could add 'O vengeance!' to a soliloquy unilaterally; adding 'O, o, o, o' to his last speech needs Horatio's cooperation. Scholars arguing that shorter quarto texts result from actors eliminating lines in performance must ask whether the dropped lines included cues and explain how the actors who did not get the cues that they expected were to respond. At the furthest extreme, plays performed by actors who worked in teams coordinated by scripted cues are discussed in terms designed for oral literature transmitted by individual story-tellers.⁸

Arguments that a play has been adapted for touring must also consider how the cast could learn a changed set of cues. The crudest versions of the touring-adaptation argument take the relative shortness of the text as *prima facie* evidence of a reduced cast. But, as Scott McMillin's work has shown, abbreviated plays made doubling harder.⁹ And relearning a changed set of cues could make touring harder too, for no clear purpose. Proper attention to cue-structure can strengthen

hypotheses about reduced casts, particularly when the evidence suggests that, for instance, a three-speaker-dialogue has been redistributed between two characters.¹⁰ But other changes to cues would make a part harder to relearn, and thus riskier to perform, without any reduction in cast size or any benefit in performance. Why should Mistress Page and Mistress Ford's parts change so thoroughly in *Merry Wives*, when the changes do not eliminate either Mistress Page or Mistress Ford? Why is Page's part so different? Why would actors going out on tour do this to themselves?

Perhaps mostly damningly, claims of memorial reconstruction often identify particular actors as reporters without asking how well those alleged reporters recall their cue-lines. Such hypotheses usually measure the overall consistency of the actor's lines, but not the actor's cues.¹¹ But early modern players had strong incentives to remember cues and should not be assumed to have remembered the rest of their lines equally well. A player who remembers the bulk of his lines but not his cues is the opposite of what we should expect.

Some actors traditionally named as memorial reporters even seem to make the error that an early modern repertory player was least likely to make, giving one of his own cues to someone else. Scholars have long argued that *The First Part of the Contention between . . . York and Lancaster* is a memorial reconstruction, based on a garbled speech by York in 2.2, and have labelled the actor playing Warwick the reporter.¹² For this to be true, Warwick must give away one of his own cues by mistake in the very speech that is held up as chief evidence of memorial report. York's botched account of his genealogy in the Quarto text ends with the word 'crown,' cueing Warwick. The more coherent Folio speech ends with 'traitorously,' cueing Salisbury instead (TLN 986). Here is the Folio version:

Yorke. . . .

Till *Henry Bullingbrooke*, Duke of Lancaster,
The eldest Sonne and Heire of *Iohn* of Gaunt,
Crown'd by the Name of *Henry* the fourth,

Seiz'd on the Realme, depos'd the rightfull King,
 Sent his poore Queene to France, from whence she came,
 And him to Pumfret; where, as all you know,
 Harmlesse *Richard* was murthered traiterously.

Warw. Father, the Duke hath told the truth;
 Thus got the House of *Lancaster* the Crowne.

Yorke. Which now they hold by force, and not by
 right

(F, TLN 980–989)

And here is the parallel passage from the Quarto:

Yorke. . . . Now sir. In the time of Richards raigne, Henry
 of Bullingbrooke, sonne and heire to Iohn of Gaunt, the
 Duke of Lancaster fourth sonne to Edward the third, he
 claimde the Crowne, deposde the Merthfull King, and as
 both you know, in Pomphret Castle harmlesse Richard was
 shamefully murthered, and so by Richards death came the
 house of Lancaster vnto the Crowne.

Sals. Sauing your tale my Lord, as I haue heard, in the
 raigne of Bullenbrooke, the Duke of Yorke did claime the
 Crowne, and but for Owin Glendor, had bene King.

Yorke. True. . . .

(Q1, C4v)

If the Quarto text represented the Warwick actor's memory of the Folio script, that actor would have to forget whether or not it was his turn to speak. Worse yet, Warwick's next speech in the Folio ends with the cue-word 'crown,' which means a memorial-reporter Warwick would be waiting for York to speak the cue that Warwick himself was meant to say. Two different actors responding to the same cue-word with two different speeches would obviously disrupt performance. But for an actor to wait for someone else to speak the cue he was meant to give would be more disruptive still. Nor would prompting resolve the trouble when the actor thought someone else was being prompted. If the actor playing

Warwick were to make this error on stage, no one would speak at all.

The problem here is not individual scholars' individual errors. These mistakes are pervasive. They are systematic and paradigmatic. We all make them, just as I myself have made them, because of our training. Our only saving grace is that no one catches us, because no one else checks the cue-structure either. That is both a professional mercy and an intellectual problem.

What would a theoretical model of early modern playtexts fully integrating parts and cues be like? I cannot pretend to have developed such a model, which will inevitably be the work of many hands. For now I would like to offer seven initial questions that might shape that model as it develops.

1. *Why do some characters change more than others?* W. W. Greg built his memorial-reconstruction hypothesis on a genuine insight: some characters' roles in early modern plays do change more than others.¹³ Edgar and Goneril in *King Lear* change more than Edmund and Regan. Paris in *Romeo and Juliet* changes modestly but Capulet enormously. Greg's explanation does not bear up under scrutiny, but the phenomenon he saw still requires explanation.¹⁴ The simplest hypothesis is that revisions have centred on some characters more than others. We know that such targeted revisions sometimes occurred. The additions to Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*, for example, focus heavily on the part of Hieronimo, with some changes to the part of the boy playing Isabella.¹⁵ This phenomenon is not an anomaly of failed reproduction, but a basic feature of early dramatic texts. Some roles change more than others because some rolls change more than others.

2. *Whose parts change most?* Greg's theory sought to identify the 'piratical' reporter by focusing on characters whose parts changed least, using *Merry Wives of Windsor*'s Host as the original example.¹⁶ The best question about *The Merry Wives of Windsor* may not be why Mine Host's part changes so little from Quarto to Folio, but why Master Page's part changes so much. Not only do Page's lines and cues change, but also his entrances and exits, including his first entrance.

And when he is on stage other characters' roles must also change, because those characters inevitably exchange cues with him. Page is near the heart of a significant structural intervention in the script. Rather than imagining a failed attempt to transmit *The Merry Wives* entire and unchanged, we might more plausibly hypothesize an intervention or series of interventions centred on specific roles.

3. *How difficult would any change be to make?* Textual theories have often focused on why changes were made, demanding an explanation of the playwright or players' motives. The better question is not why, but how. Questions of motivation are necessarily speculative. Questions of opportunity are subject to demonstration. The question of why something was done to a play cannot logically precede the question of what was done to it. Asking what the players could do with their texts, arranged as those texts were into parts, allows us to measure the relative difficulty or ease of any particular changes. Scripts' division into parts made some changes surprisingly easy, some unexpectedly difficult, and others nearly impractical.

The difficulty of relearning dialogue depends on a number of factors, including the number and frequency of each player's cues. A stichomythia was harder to revise than a monologue. But the most important measure of difficulty is the number of players involved. The more actors who needed to relearn cues, the greater the difficulty of revision and the danger of accidental reversions during performance. Viewed from this perspective, the changes to Hamlet's soliloquies in the First Quarto, over which textual critics have long obsessed, are absolutely elementary. They involve only one actor and no changed cues. Monologues are, as Richard Preiss points out elsewhere in this volume, the easiest places for clowns to improvise, and equally amenable to scripted revision.¹⁷ Hamlet in soliloquy can always speak more than is set down for him, or less than is set down for him, or something rather different than is set down for him, as long as he delivers the last word set down for him. From a practical standpoint the most important line in the 'To be or not to be' soliloquy is 'Nymph, in thy orisons be all my

sins remembered,' which the First Quarto carefully retains. No matter how much Hamlet's First-Quarto soliloquies vary from the Folio or Second Quarto versions, they invariably preserve the cue.¹⁸ *Hamlet's* First Quarto, like all 'bad' dramatic texts, would profit from careful re-examination of the cue evidence.

4. *Which changes needed to be made simultaneously?* The number of actors involved in a particular change also reveals what I would call minimal revision events, interventions to the text that could only be made at once. The changes in Hamlet's soliloquies are one such minimal event: they could have been made entirely independent of any other changes. But other, seemingly less important, changes require more actors. Horatio and the Queen's conversation about Ophelia in the Folio and Second-Quarto *Hamlet* (4.5.1–20) adds or subtracts the additional part of a 'Gentleman' and switches a speech between Horatio and the Queen, requiring two or three actors' involvement (4.5.14–16). The First Quarto offers a completely different dialogue between Horatio and the Queen (scene 14); Horatio's part and the Queen's were demonstrably changed together, perhaps more than once. Similarly, the changes to 2.2 of 2 *Henry VI* would require all three actors, York, Warwick, and Salisbury, to learn new cues. The changes to Page's role in *Merry Wives* necessarily involve a large number of other players, most prominently the actors playing Shallow, Slender, Evans, and Ford, and would indicate a major effort.

Such changes may or may not have been independent of other changes in the same play. Twentieth-century bibliography sought the tell-tale variant, the local detail revealing a global change in the script. One slip of the pen revealed the playwright's working draft; one garbled speech meant the whole play had been memorized. The traditional model presumes that changes were made simultaneously until proven otherwise; a part-based model might reverse that presumption. But a script divided into parts is uniquely amenable to mid-sized revisions. And a repertory company focused on managing and balancing its members' workloads, as Holger Syme has shown in the last chapter, might well count the labour of

relearning parts in that workload, so that not all players would be considered equally available to master new cues at any given moment.¹⁹ The best way to avoid unsupported presumptions is to think rigorously about which changes had to be made simultaneously, and to build any global theories upon those provable local examples.

While scholars have generally been reluctant to view the 1602 Quarto of *Merry Wives* as authorial or Shakespearean, the standard array of explanations – memorial reconstruction, theatrical adaptation, revision for performance at Court – all need to involve agents who thought in terms of parts.²⁰ Whether *Merry Wives* was revised by Shakespeare or adapted by other parties, the changes to Page's role very clearly needed to involve a number of other actors, but not the one playing Falstaff. Falstaff's part also changes significantly, but since he seldom interacts with Page that role was not necessarily revised at the same time. One can neither assume that Page and Falstaff were revised separately nor that they were revised together. The current textual model strongly favours the presumption of simultaneous change, positing the fewest possible interventions over a play's lifetime. This is so, oddly, even in cases such as that of *Merry Wives*, which critics have frequently imagined undergoing both revision and reconstruction, or both adaptation and memorial report. It is considered simpler to hypothesize that a play was revised once than that it was revised twice, but this introduces an unnecessary and unsupported hypothesis. Setting an unknown number to the lowest value possible is as arbitrary as setting it to the highest. If a bicycle's brakes, tyres, and handlebars have been replaced, it may be that some of those components were replaced simultaneously, but it would be illogical to presume so. Early modern plays were likewise divided into semi-independent components amenable to independent revision or replacement. But because the parts were only semi-independent, some changes to multiple parts were demonstrably made at the same time; textual theories must privilege those demonstrable facts.

5. *What changes were most potentially disruptive in performance?* Textual scholars have long assumed that cutting a play is easier than expanding it. Similarly, but not quite consistently, they have focused on the problem of ‘drying’ in performance, of momentarily forgetting one’s lines and, in the terminology of the time, ‘being out’ (meaning, of course, ‘out’ of the part). But when acting a play whose cues have been memorized, revised, and re-memorized, ‘drying’ may be less dangerous than blurting. A player forgetting a line could be prompted by the prompter. A player speaking a speech that was no longer in the script could seriously derail a scene. The returned speech might cue the wrong player to speak next, or cue an earlier version of the scene which the other actors may or may not have learned. And no prompter in the world can unspeak a speech once the audience has heard it. Alternatively, the play might grind to a halt. The only thing worse than not giving the cue is giving a cue no one else on stage can answer.

Cutting a play had practical dangers, because a cut speech’s ghost might return and go unanswered. Adding speeches risked the actor requiring the prompter; cutting speeches risked more substantial confusion, with no safety net. Certainly, early modern playing companies took these risks. But they did not ignore them.

Changing York’s speech in 2 *Henry VI* to end with ‘traitorously’ rather than ‘crown’ may use the cue change to manage performance risk. If one approaches the Folio text as a revision, rather than taking the Quarto as an erroneous copy, the cue change facilitates the change in who is cued.²¹ ‘Crown’ cues Salisbury, ‘traitorously’ Warwick. The danger that Salisbury will speak the next speech from the Quarto script, which is meant to come later in the Folio, is forestalled because Salisbury does not hear the cue. Here it seems that the possibility of an actor answering a cue with an out-dated speech was foreclosed by changing the cue itself.

6. *What were the practical limits on playhouse revision?* This question moves from the demonstrable to the hypothetical, and where one sets the hypothesized limits will materially

change one's answers. How many actors' parts needed to change before those changes seemed impractical in the playhouse? At what point should one presume a literary revision, before or after a play's repertory lifetime, rather than a series of changes made within the repertory system? Changes affecting more than three players' roles at one time are fairly rare, but larger changes do exist. The changes surrounding Page in *Merry Wives* involve at least five actors, among the largest such changes in the surviving Shakespeare corpus. Perhaps this indicates something close to the maximum number of actors who could be asked to re-learn cues; perhaps it exceeds that maximum and indicates changes outside the playhouse, whether literary revision or some garbled form of post-performance transmission.

Neither is it clear how many changes to an individual actor's cues were tolerable or at what point the sheer number of changes suggests an actor has been replaced by a new actor memorizing the part afresh. The most obvious candidates for replacement are boy actors, who would eventually age out of women's parts as their voices changed. The transition to a new boy player presented an opportunity to revise both the boy's role and that of an adult scene partner. The example of Hieronimo and Isabella in the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* is illustrative: rewriting the boy's role makes it easier to rewrite his senior partner's, since the new boy had to learn all his cues from scratch anyway.

The major differences between the Quarto and Folio versions of Mistress Page and Mistress Ford in *Merry Wives* can thus be easily explained by the inevitable casting of new boys, who could learn revised parts, in those roles. But it is not only women's roles that sometimes see major changes to the cue-structure. Page's radically altered role might indicate a part thoroughly rewritten for an experienced actor who could master numerous cue changes. Or it may indicate that the actor playing Page had been recast.

7. *Why does a new character's entrance sometimes shift a scene from textual variance to textual conformity?* Greg

noticed that when his proposed reporter, Mine Host, entered, the Folio and Quarto texts of *Merry Wives* often moved into close agreement. This happens less consistently than Greg first argued, and other character entrances in other plays have the same effect.²² The Nurse, who is surely not a memorial reporter, creates the Mine Host effect once, but only once, in *Romeo and Juliet*, in 2.4.²³ And in 4.2 of *King Lear*, the entrance of a ‘messenger’ or a ‘second gentleman’ bringing news of Cornwall’s death brings the divergent Quarto and Folio texts back to close conformity.²⁴ Even if memorial reconstruction is not happening here, something is.

There are at least two possibilities. The Mine Host effect could derive from separate revisions to relatively small groups of actors’ parts. Romeo, Mercutio, and Benvolio’s parts could only be revised together, but the Nurse’s part did not need to be revised with them. Thus Romeo, Mercutio, and Benvolio can exchange revised cues freely, but need to give the Nurse the old ones. The entrance of a character who was not part of the targeted revision forces a return to the older version of the script. Alternately, players might have been divided into small working groups to study and master script changes together. In this scenario, Romeo, Mercutio, and Benvolio would have memorized their new cues together while the Nurse relearned his with other actors. The Nurse’s entrance would thus still demand a return to unrevised and previously rehearsed cues.

Similarly, *King Lear*’s Messenger or Second Gentlemen enters a scene whose textual changes are isolated to Goneril and Albany’s lines. The Quarto and Folio texts diverge when Albany enters, and converge again when Albany and Goneril begin exchanging cues with the messenger. The revisions have been kept limited and simple, learned by one man and one boy, and when those two actors are joined by a third they immediately revert to the earlier script. Why the messenger’s entrance returns the Folio and Quarto to agreement may be less important than why Albany’s entrance throws them out of agreement.

This explanation for the 'Mine Host' effect extends to Mine Host himself. Paul Werstine points to the way the Quarto and Folio texts of *Merry Wives* 'fly apart' after Mine Host's exit in II.i as one of Greg's strongest pieces of evidence.²⁵ But as in the *Lear* example, the alleged reporter's entrance interrupts a two-character scene. The Host's entrance prompts everyone on stage to closer textual fidelity, but 'everyone on stage' is Page and Ford. Those two characters have been playing a thoroughly rewritten version of the scene.²⁶ Every cue that Ford and Page give each other in 2.1 changes between the Quarto and the Folio. Even when their speeches to each other preserve the same general sense or elements of the same language, the cue words change without fail. That pattern requires those two parts to have been revised in tandem.

Whenever Ford and Page interact directly in this scene, the texts disagree. When they trade cues with other actors the textual agreement increases. Both characters speak cues found in both versions of the text, but not to each other. The textual agreement increases when Shallow and the Host arrive because Page and Ford stop cueing each other while Shallow and the Host are on stage. Page and Ford's parts have been rewritten and relearned together, but that rewriting must work around the other characters who come and go during the scene. As soon as the Host and Shallow depart, Page and Ford's parts immediately diverge again; Page exits in the Folio, but not the Quarto. But this change involves the same two actors whose earlier dialogue has altered. The Mine Host effect is not a sign of a global change to the play but merely a local inconvenience to be worked around as quickly as possible. The script reverts to unrevised text because the Host was not revised when Ford and Page were.

These seven questions do not yield answers about early modern playtexts. In many cases, they lead only to new questions. Early modern plays are far too messy and complicated for any easy solutions. But new questions, and new tools of analysis, may be what the study of early modern dramatic texts most needs. The good news, so late in our discipline's day, is how much work there is left to do.

Notes

- * I would like to thank Richard M. Preiss, Brooke A. Conti, Tiffany Stern, and the members of the Folger Symposium on Theatrical Documents for their assistance with this chapter.
- 1 For a concise and sympathetic history of the New Bibliography, see Gabriel Egan, *The Struggle for Shakespeare's Text: Twentieth-Century Editorial Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010). For other perspectives, see Leah S. Marcus, *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996) and Paul Werstine's seminal essays 'McKerrow's "Suggestion" and Twentieth-Century Shakespeare Textual Criticism', *Renaissance Drama*, 19 (1988), 149–173; 'Narratives About Printed Shakespeare Texts: "Foul Papers" and "Bad" Quartos', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 41 (1990), 65–86; and 'A Century of "Bad" Shakespeare Quartos', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 50 (1999), 310–333.
- 2 See Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern, *Shakespeare in Parts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) and Tiffany Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- 3 For example, Paul Menzer, *The Hamlets: Cues, Qs, and Remembered Texts* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008); James J. Marino, *Owning William Shakespeare: The King's Men and Their Intellectual Property* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 75–106; Matthew Vadnais, "'Speake(ing) the Speech(es)': Reassessing the Playability of the Earliest Printings of *Hamlet*", in *Shakespeare Expressed: Page, Stage, and Classroom in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, ed. Kathryn R. McPherson and Sarah Enloe (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2013), 81–92.
- 4 Tiffany Stern, 'Sermons, Plays, and Note-Takers: *Hamlet* Q1 as a "Noted" Text,' *Shakespeare Survey*, 66 (2013), 1–23.
- 5 Lukas Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, rev. 2013).
- 6 Lukas Erne, ed., *The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 24–25.

- 7 See for example René Weis, ed., *Romeo and Juliet*, The Arden Shakespeare Third Series (London: Bloomsbury, 2012), 105–106, which simultaneously advances touring adaptation, rewriting by a playwright, theatrical abridgement, and memorial reconstruction.
- 8 Lene B. Petersen, *Shakespeare's Errant Texts: Textual Form and Linguistic Style in Shakespearean 'Bad' Quartos and Co-Authored Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- 9 Scott McMillin, 'Casting the Hamlet Quartos: The Limit of Eleven', in Thomas Clayton, ed., *The Hamlet First Published (Q1, 1603): Origins, Form, Intertextualities* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1992), 179–194.
- 10 The theatrical manuscript of Fletcher and Massinger's *Sir John Olden Barnavelt* shows redistributions of this kind. See Paul Werstine, *Early Modern Playhouse Manuscripts and the Editing of Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 168–172.
- 11 See Kathleen O. Irace, *Reforming the 'Bad' Quartos: Performance and Provenance of Six Shakespearean First Editions* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994).
- 12 The Quarto speech is on C4r–C4v, reproduced in *King Henry VI, Part 2*, ed. Ronald Knowles, The Arden Shakespeare Third Series (London: Thomson Learning, 1999), 387–388. Compare *The Norton Facsimile: The First Folio of Shakespeare*, 2nd edn, ed. Charlton Hinman (New York and London: Norton, 1996), TLN 968–986 (all Folio quotations in this chapter are from this facsimile, using the through-line-numbers (TLN) of that edition. For the history of arguments about this speech see Knowles, 122–131, and Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor with John Jowett and William Montgomery, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (New York and London: Norton, 1987), 175.
- 13 See, 'Memorial Reconstruction' in *Walter Wilson Greg: A Collection of His Writings*, ed. Joseph Rosenblum (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1998), 69–84.
- 14 For a seminal critique of the memorial-reconstruction hypothesis, see Laurie E. Maguire, *Shakespearean Suspect Texts: The 'Bad' Quartos and Their Contexts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- 15 Marino, *Owning*, 90–94.
- 16 Greg, 79–82.

- 17 Richard Preiss, 'Undocumented: Improvisation, Rehearsal, and the Clown', in this volume.
- 18 See *The Three-Text Hamlet: Parallel Texts of the First and Second Editions and First Folio*, ed. Bernice W. Kliman and Paul Bertram (New York: AMS Press, rev. edn, 2003) and *The First Quarto of Hamlet*, ed. Kathleen O. Irace (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- 19 Holger Syme, 'A Sharers' Repertory', in this volume.
- 20 For example, Giorgio Melchiori concludes that 'the Quarto is a reported text, a memorial reconstruction of an authorial acting version': *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, ed. Giorgio Melchiori, Arden Shakespeare Third Series (London: Thomson Learning, 2000), 42; John Jowett and the *Oxford Shakespeare* editors argue conversely that the play was memorially reconstructed and then 'subjected to theatrical adaptation and abridgement': Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor with John Jowett and William Montgomery, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (New York and London: Norton, 1997), 340; Richard Dutton's *Shakespeare, Court Dramatist* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) instead argues for the Folio text of *Merry Wives* as an authorial revision for court performance (245–258), which would of course require actors to remaster parts they had previously learned.
- 21 Steven Urkowitz argues for the *Henry VI* plays as theatrical revisions in "'If I Mistake those Foundations Which I Build Upon": Peter Alexander's Textual Analysis of *Henry VI Parts 2 and 3*', *English Literary Renaissance*, 18 (1988), 230–256 and 'Texts with Two Faces: Noticing Theatrical Revision in *Henry VI, Parts 2 and 3*', in Thomas A. Pendleton, ed., *Henry VI: New Critical Essays* (New York: Routledge, 2001).
- 22 Werstine, 'Century', 313–315.
- 23 *An Excellent Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet* (1597), E2r; *The Most Excellent and Lamentable Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet* (1599), E3r.
- 24 *Mr. William Shak-speare His True Chronicle History of the Life and Death of King Lear* (1608), H4r; TLN 2311.
- 25 Werstine, 'Century', 313.
- 26 *Sir John Falstaff and the Merrie Wives of Windsor* (1602), C1r–C2v; TLN 551–769.