

Shakespeare and the Book Trade, 1642-1737: Abstracts

Anthony Brano, Fordham University

“Mangling the Monument: *Antony and Cleopatra*, Woodcuts, and the Theatrical Imagination”

My paper considers how the 1734 editions of William Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra* contributed to nuances in later printing and performance of the play, that the book trade of 1734 directly influenced David Garrick’s production and publication of the play in 1758/9. The play was not printed as an independent work until 1734, during the printing war between the Tonsons (younger and elder Jacob) and Richard Walker, when more copies of *Antony and Cleopatra* became available than at any previous point and for less cost.

During the printing war the Tonsons and Walker relied upon short advertisements printed after the end of the plays to malign the quality of each other’s work. Claims in the advertisements reanimate questions of accuracy both on the part of the printer and the reader. For example, the final paragraph of Walker’s edition of *The Puritan* contains an “N.B.” in which Walker claims the Tonsons’ *Antony and Cleopatra* “is printed from an erroneous Edition, and very incorrect and mangled” and that he will publish “from the Genuine Edition” within a week’s time. Within one week in 1734, two editions of the play appeared in the marketplace that lacked the editorial oversight of Nicholas Rowe, Alexander Pope, or Lewis Theobald’s earlier collected works of Shakespeare.

I will argue in my paper that Walker and the Tonsons’ hurried editions of the play influenced readers’ interpretations. Rowe’s 1709 edition includes a woodcut that depicts Cleopatra’s death. The image shows Cleopatra at her Monument with Alexandria in view. While Walker claims that his text is from the “Genuine” editions, neither he nor the Tonsons’ 1734 editions recreate the woodcut as Rowe’s edition originally presented it in 1709. In the 1734 woodcuts Cleopatra clearly is in a dark room illuminated by an oil lamp, and there is no view of Alexandria. Likewise, the stones of the monument have been replaced by the canopy of a bed. The lesser quality of the 1734 books—imitating Rowe’s edition but with smaller, more rudimentary woodcuts—might have influenced the way readers read and players played.

When David Garrick staged the play in 1758, his lavish production followed cues that seem initiated by the 1734 woodcuts. We know that Garrick and the editor and

Shakespeare Association of America
St Louis, Missouri, 2014

critic Edward Capell worked from a copy of the Tonsons' 1734 edition, and in the accompanying edition to their production, the stage direction at the start of the final scene shifts from "*The Monument*" to "*A Room in the Monument.*" My hypothesis is that the 1734 woodcuts led to a more private staging of Cleopatra's death scene, a scene closer to that of John Dryden's *All for Love* than to the earlier editions of Shakespeare's play.

Francis X. Connor, Wichita State University

Henry Herringman and '*Old Shakespear*': The Physical, Cultural, and Retail Spaces of Shakespeare's Fourth Folio

Early in his career, publisher Henry Herringman successfully defined himself as an influential arbiter of literary taste in post-Restoration London. His dramatic and poetic booklist from the 1660s and early 1670s, anchored and influenced critically by John Dryden's early work, established a canon of poets and playwrights that proved immediately popular. By 1685, when he led a small consortium of publishers to produce the Fourth Folio, Herringman had begun to scale down his publishing and bookselling business as he began to take a more active role in the Stationers' Company. My paper looks at the Fourth Folio in the context of Herringman's earlier career as a literary publisher, with an emphasis on his bookshop's role in cultivating a literary audience. While some of his earliest publications celebrated the Royalist triumph of the Restoration, Herringman would generally focus on modern literature, with an interest in pre-Restoration poetry in the late 1660s a diversion from his focus on contemporary drama and poetry. His Shakespeare folio, along with the folios by the other two members of the Restoration 'triumvirate of wit', [Francis Beaumont &] John Fletcher (1679) and Ben Jonson (1692), published in a far less triumphantly royalist moment, emphasize completeness and textual accuracy; by this time, Herringman had been well-established as a literary bookseller and no longer needed to lean upon political appeals to validate his books. By looking at the Fourth Folio within the career of its primary publisher, I hope to understand how Shakespeare's works fit into the literary and political canons Herringman had begun to construct.

Lukas Erne, University of Geneva

“Shakespeare, the Poet, and the Book Trade, 1640-1700”

Patrick Cheney has taken Shakespeare scholars to task for reducing Shakespeare’s authorial profile to that of a dramatist: he was clearly a dramatist and a poet, or, in Cheney’s phrase, a “poet-playwright.” So in a seminar that focuses on the print afterlife of Shakespeare the dramatist, I propose to play Cheney to the group by reminding us of the poetry.

In the first part of my paper, I aim to investigate the popularity of Shakespeare, the poet, by surveying his poetry books published from 1640 to 1700. It is striking how few editions Shakespeare’s poetry went through: the 1640 Benson *Poems*, one edition of *The Rape of Lucrece* in 1655, and two editions of *Venus and Adonis*, both dated 1675. By comparison, the same period saw the publication of no fewer than sixteen Shakespeare playbooks in quarto as well as two folio editions of Shakespeare’s collected plays (1663/4 and 1685). Similarly, in the latter part of the seventeenth century, a historical moment can be singled out (the Exclusion Crisis) in which interest in Shakespeare’s drama is revived (see Depledge); no such moment can be identified for interest in Shakespeare’s poetry. In Shakespeare’s lifetime and the years immediately following it, Shakespeare’s poetry books had in fact had remarkable economic success: from 1593 to 1639, they received a massive total of twenty-eight editions. During this period, *Venus and Adonis* was by far the most popular Shakespeare title (indeed, the most popular poetry book of its period – see Erne and Badcoe), and even *The Rape of Lucrece* was more successful in the book trade than all of Shakespeare’s plays except one (*1 Henry IV*). In the period from 1640 to 1700, by contrast, no poetry book was among the most popular Shakespeare titles in the print market.

Additional evidence of the popularity of Shakespeare the Poet in his own lifetime compared to his lack of popularity from 1640 to 1700 can be found in the practice of authorial misattribution. In 1599, *The Passionate Pilgrim* attributes to “W. Shakespeare” a collection of twenty poems of which no more than five are now believed to be by Shakespeare. In 1612, the third edition of this miscellany, still attributed to Shakespeare, includes even more non-Shakespearean poems. And in the same year, Shakespearean authorship may have been surreptitiously insinuated on the title page of *A Funerall Elegye in memory of the late Vertuous Maister William Peter*, “By W. S.” In the period from 1640-1700, by contrast, Shakespeare’s name largely seems to have lost its commercial drawing power as suggested by title page misattributions of poetry books.

Shakespeare Association of America
St Louis, Missouri, 2014

With one exception. An intriguing collection of poems, attributed to Shakespeare on the title page, is absent from recent accounts of Shakespeare in print (such as Murphy and Erne). This book, the circumstances of its publication, and what it can tell us the perceived marketability of Shakespeare, the poet, at its moment of publication will be at the heart of the second part of my paper.

Jonathan Holmes, Ohio State University

“Simon Says: The Influence of Pope’s *Taming of the Shrew* on Other Eighteenth-Century Editions”

Alexander Pope’s edition of *The Taming of the Shrew* was the first one to include *The Taming of a Shrew*’s frame ending. As a number of scholars have pointed out, most eighteenth-century editors followed Pope by incorporating some of *A Shrew*’s frame material into *The Shrew*. These editions do not simply present Sly’s final exchange with the Tapster as a passage tacked on at the end of the play; they include other lines from *A Shrew* that change *The Shrew*’s frame narrative in significant ways. Pope’s conflated text introduced a new character, a servant named Simon, who takes control of the lord’s plot to fool Sly. Simon is the lord in *A Shrew*, but Pope’s edition makes him a servant, and the text suggests that he is responsible for orchestrating Sly’s final encounter with the Tapster at the end of the play.

Simon would seem to be an obscure additional character, except that critics continue to show great interest in *A Shrew*’s frame ending. Pope’s conflated text set a precedent that was followed by all other eighteenth-century editions until Malone disentangled the two *Shrews* in 1790, and by then, readers had been encountering Simon and the frame ending in Shakespeare’s play for 65 years. At the same time, the only *Shrews* performed on stage were Lacey’s *Sauny the Scot* or Garrick’s afterpiece, *Catharine and Petruchio*. Anyone interested in Shakespeare’s play had to read it, and for most of the eighteenth century, printed editions of *The Taming of the Shrew* were heavily influenced by Pope’s conflated text. My essay focuses on how Pope’s editorial process—particularly because he used Rowe’s edition as a copy text, which used F4 as a copy text—led to his introduction of Simon into the play. I am particularly interested in the implications of Pope’s editorial decisions not only for his own edition, but also for the majority of subsequent eighteenth-century editions of the play.

Edmund G.C. King, The Open University

“Discovering Shakespeare’s Style: Editing and Connoisseurship in the Eighteenth Century”

The composition of collected editions of Shakespeare’s plays during the eighteenth century was deceptively stable. In the 1709, 1714, and 1728 editions, the Shakespeare “canon” consisted of 43 plays—the 36 works included in the First Folio and the 7 titles added by Philip Chetwind in 1664. The 1725 and 1733 editions included only the 36 First Folio plays, and collections issued subsequently followed their example. Only in 1790 would this state of affairs change, when Edmond Malone added *Pericles* to his edition of the *Plays*.

Beneath this surface continuity, however, lay decades of disagreement. In the prefaces, introductions, and footnotes printed in eighteenth-century collected editions, editors and critics debated the authenticity of dozens of scenes and passages in the Folio plays and argued for the exclusion of whole plays on the basis that Shakespeare had never written them. Others, like Edward Capell in 1768, argued that the Shakespeare canon extended far beyond even the 43 plays included in the 1664 Third Folio. Central to these arguments was the claim by Shakespeare’s eighteenth-century scholar-editors that they possessed the ability to identify and distinguish personal style. As Samuel Johnson remarked in 1778, “Why, Sir, I think every man whatever has a peculiar style, which may be discovered by nice examination and comparison with others” (*Life*, 3:280). When wielded by celebrity editors like Johnson and Alexander Pope, this ability became an authorizing strategy, a way for Shakespeare’s copyholders to market their works and distinguish editions from their predecessors.

In this paper, I will present a typology of these Augustan authorship-hunting strategies, and show how each enabled Shakespeare’s editors (and readers) to accommodate the problem of perceived stylistic inequality in the plays. I will argue that attribution debates during the century closely track the development of a parallel discourse of connoisseurship in the visual arts. Both reflect a desire by eighteenth-century scholarly elites to structure canons (artistic or literary) around their own expertise—the ability to distinguish the “genuine” from the “spurious.” From these debates the collected edition, a canon in miniature, emerged as a pivotal space for the development of these authorizing technologies.

Shakespeare Association of America
St Louis, Missouri, 2014

Bibliography

Cheney, Patrick. *Shakespeare, National Poet-Playwright* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004).

Cheney, Patrick. *Shakespeare's Literary Authorship* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008).

Craig, Hugh. "Style, Statistics, and New Models of Authorship." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 15. 1 (2009) [<http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/15-1/craistyl.htm>]

Cunningham, Vanessa. *Shakespeare and Garrick* (Cambridge: Cambridge, 2008).

Dawson, Giles. "Robert Walker's Editions of Shakespeare." *Studies in the English Drama in Memory of Karl Julius Holzknacht*. Eds Josephine W. Bennet, Oscar Carghill, and Vernon Hall, Jr. (New York: New York U P, 1959), pp. 58-81.

Depledge, Emma. "Playbills, Prologues and Playbooks: Selling Shakespeare Adaptations, 1678-1682." *Philological Quarterly* 91.2 (2012): 305-30.

Dobson, Michael. *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1992).

Dugas, Don-John. *Marketing the Bard: Shakespeare in Performance and Print, 1660-1740* (U of Missouri P, 2006).

Erne, Lukas. *Shakespeare and the Book Trade* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013).

Erne, Lukas, and Tamsin Badcoe. "Shakespeare and the Popularity of Poetry Books in Print, 1583-1622." *The Review of English Studies*, advance access published online 26 April 2013, <http://res.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2013/04/26/res.hgt020>.

Ford, H. L. *Shakespeare 1700-1740, A Collection of Editions and Separate Plays with Some Account of T. Johnson and R. Walker* (Oxford: Oxford U P, 1935).

Hammond, Paul. "The Restoration Poetic and Dramatic Canon." *Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume 4, 1557-1695*. Eds John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002), pp. 388-409.

Hodgdon, Barbara. "Who is Performing in these Text(s)?; or, *Shrew-ing Around*." In *Arden: Editing Shakespeare: Essays in Honour of Richard Proudfoot*. Eds Ann Thompson and Gordon McMullan (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2003) pp. 95-110.

Hooks, Adam G., ed. "Shakespeare for Sale." *Philological Quarterly* Special Issue 91.2 (2012).

Shakespeare Association of America
St Louis, Missouri, 2014

Kastan, David Scott. *Shakespeare and the Book* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001).

King, Edmund G.C. "Fragmenting Authorship in the Eighteenth-Century Shakespeare Edition." *Shakespeare* 6.1 (2010): 1-19.

Kirwan, Peter. "The First Collected 'Shakespeare Apocrypha'." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 62.4 (2011): 594-601.

Marcus, Leah. *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton* (New York: Routledge, 1996).

Massai, Sonia. *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007).

Miller, C. William. "Henry Herringman, Restoration Bookseller-Publisher." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 42 (1948): 292-306.

Murphy, Andrew. *Shakespeare in Print: A History and Chronology of Shakespeare Publishing* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003).

Nash, Andrew, ed. *The Culture of Collected Editions* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

Sabor, Peter and Paul Yachnin, eds. *Shakespeare and the Eighteenth Century* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008).

Scheil, Katherine West. *The Taste of the Town: Shakespearian Comedy and the Early 18th Century Theatre* (Bucknell UP, 2003).

Scouten, Arthur H. 'Shakespeare's Plays in the Theatrical Repertory when Garrick Came to London.' *University of Texas Studies in English, 1944* (1945): 257-68.

Spevack, Martin, ed. *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Antony and Cleopatra* (New York: Modern Language Association, 1990).

Straznicky, Marta, ed. *Shakespeare's Stationers: Studies in Cultural Bibliography* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2013).

Walsh, Marcus. *Shakespeare, Milton, and Eighteenth-Century Literary Editing: The Beginnings of Interpretive Scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997).

