

**2018 SAA Seminar: Taking Notes in/on Shakespeare 1**  
**Sponsored by The Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Publishing**  
**Leader: Scott Schofield, Huron University College at Western University, sschofi4@uwo.ca**

**Faith Acker, Washington DC**  
**faith.d.acker@gmail.com**

**‘[W]hat strained touches rhetorick can lend’:  
Manuscript Extracts from William Shakespeare and Nicholas Hookes  
as Re-purposed in a Mid-seventeenth-century Royalist Miscellany**

In the mid-seventeenth century, a manuscript compiler loosely affiliated with Cambridge University assembled a collection of notes and poems on politics, theology, and (briefly) romance. The volume’s poetical contents are largely indicative of the compiler’s university associations and also his political and theological convictions. Dozens of poems have been included in the collection, including numerous long (and complete) poems from *The Card of Courtship* (1653) and from the printed poetical collections of Edward Benlowes, Richard Crashaw, Edward Sherburne, and others. In stark contrast to these, the manuscript also includes two separate sequences of poetical extracts taken from Nicholas Hookes’ *Amanda* (1653) and from the 1640 edition of William Shakespeare’s *Poems*. The extracts themselves range from four words in length to full poems of up to thirty lines, but the compiler has excised most classical allusions, privileged religious and regal imagery, and drastically shifted the connotations and tones of many poems to reflect his specific interests more closely, often to the complete dismissal of the themes and contexts of the original poems and entire poetical collections. In addition, the methodology behind the treatment of these selected poems by Shakespeare and Hookes in a volume that predominantly prefers entire poems raises numerous questions about the volume and its function. Overall, these two collections of extracts, especially taken in tandem, elegantly demonstrate one early modern scholar’s approaches to texts, to verse collection, to reading in general, and to the practice of finding—and transcribing—short passages relevant to his own personal interests even as he read through sequences of poems that covered far more diverse topics overall.

**Meaghan J. Brown, Digital Production Editor, Folger Shakespeare Library**  
**mbrown@FOLGER.edu**

**Annotating Prospero’s Books:  
Considerations for Early Modern Digital Annotation**

My offering for the seminar will be an exploration of the current interfaces for annotating early modern texts, and the capabilities and affordances required to implement a web-based annotation interface for Miranda<<http://collections.folger.edu/>>, the Folger’s new digital platform. The goal will be to foster a discussion of requirements and best practices for producing digital annotations, and (hopefully) a list of desiderata and use-cases from the symposium participants that can help guide the Folger’s efforts in this direction.

There are currently two major avenues for online annotation interfaces: those that work with texts as the primary object of annotation, and those that base their annotations on the affordances of digital images that are presented in accordance with specific image standards, such as the International Image Interoperability Framework (IIIF). The Folger is interested in exploring both

**2018 SAA Seminar: Taking Notes in/on Shakespeare 2**  
**Sponsored by The Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Publishing**  
**Leader: Scott Schofield, Huron University College at Western University, sschofi4@uwo.ca**

text- and image-based annotation—and any potential for linking the two. This paper will seek to explore a variety of development questions: What features do scholars and students of early modern texts find most useful? What kinds of support does a system of annotation require? How is annotation related (both theoretically and technologically) to current efforts to crowdsource transcription and editing of early modern texts? What types of annotation should an interface facilitate, and how does that facilitation shape the pedagogical and research potential of the interface? What are the current standards and open-source options for annotating early modern texts?

**Mary Grace Elliott, University of New Hampshire**  
**mge1108@gmail.com**

**“I am the man”:  
Double Translation in Twelfth Night**

Roger Ascham, a prominent pedagogue in sixteenth-century England and tutor to Queen Elizabeth I, details the practice of double translation in his 1570 text, *The Scholemaster*. He recommends the exercise as a method for young boys in grammar school to learn proper Latin construction. To perform double translation, Ascham dictates that the student should take a line of Latin, and, “take a paper booke, and sitting in some place, where no man shall prompe him, by him self, . . . translate into Englishe his former lesson” (72). Then, after an hour’s break or concentration on another lesson, “the childe [would] translatt his owne Englishe into latin againe, in an other paper booke” (73). This process would continue back and forth until the translation was to the master’s satisfaction. Shakespeare seems to remember and reference this grammar school practice in *Twelfth Night*, among other plays, particularly when depicting female characters in disguise. Sarah Jane Aiston’s history of early modern women’s education illuminates Shakespeare’s depiction of female characters as existing in a liminal space due to the personal or private nature of their learning (1). For example, she suggests “that historically women have frequently positioned themselves and their organisations mid-way between formal educational institutions and institutions of care and social service” (7). In other words, early modern (and subsequent generations of) women were rarely able to make academic learning their primary concern, even though their intellectual capabilities would certainly allow it. Shakespeare demonstrates this hidden aptitude of women when depicting *Twelfth Night*’s Viola cross-dressed as Cesario. Viola’s disguise is most effective. Because no one in the play ever guesses that she is a woman, she proves that her intellect and language to be equal to that of a man. Viola herself becomes aware of the liminal space she occupies, however, when confronted with the juxtaposition of Olivia’s love for Cesario and her own love for Orsino:

I am the man: if it be so, as ’tis,  
Poor lady, she were better love a dream.  
Disguise, I see thou art a wickedness  
Wherein the pregnant enemy does much.  
How easy is it for the proper false  
In women’s waxen hearts to set their forms.  
What will become of this? As I am man,

**2018 SAA Seminar: Taking Notes in/on Shakespeare 3**  
**Sponsored by The Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Publishing**  
**Leader: Scott Schofield, Huron University College at Western University, sschofi4@uwo.ca**

My state is desperate for my master's love.  
As I am woman, now, alas the day,  
What thriftless sighs shall poor Olivia breathe! (2.2.25-38)

Shakespeare's use here of oxymoron—"pregnant enemy," "proper false"—reflects Viola's liminal existence between man and woman. To the people around her, Olivia and Orsino, she is completely a man, while to herself she is completely a woman. However, her intellect allows her to feel the emotions and responses of both genders. This gender mix is further complicated by the early modern practice of young men or boys playing the women's roles. This back and forth, this double translation, allows Shakespeare to offer a meta-critique of the arbitrary construction of gender itself, the cultural restrictions on women in theatre, and the narrow limitations for creativity in the practice of double translation.

**Laura Estill, Texas A&M**  
**lestill@tamu.edu**

**Owning Shakespeare:**  
**Kemble's and Malone's Annotations**

When you work with early editions of Shakespeare's plays, most likely you have had at least one occasion to curse an earlier owner: that person who had the pages trimmed or who inscribed the title page. Indeed, our bibliographic training often leads us to privilege the (sometimes obscured) origins of a playbook rather than its later moments of use and provenance. This paper explores how two famous book collectors, Edmond Malone (1741-1812) and John Philip Kemble (1757-1823), have shaped our understanding of Shakespeare with the notes they so brazenly left in his texts.

With his collected works of Shakespeare, Malone was pivotal to the development of modern editorial practice. Kemble was an actor-director-manager whose theatrical career was inseparable from his book ownership. Malone and Kemble were two of the premier Shakespeareans of their day, and although their purviews differed (page and stage, to use a hackneyed phrase), their annotations show marked similarities. In this paper, I briefly compare the binding, marginalia, and contents of the Malone and Kemble collections to argue that, for the editor and the actor, engagement with Shakespeare was predicated on book ownership, particularly collecting and personalizing. Malone's and Kemble's collections have shaped the way we understand Shakespeare today—and understanding the last 150 years of Shakespeare scholarship will help us navigate and plot the next 150. Ultimately, when we look to early modern plays, we focus on existing material texts that come to us annotated, bound, and shelved together: we necessarily look to English Renaissance texts through the palimpsestuous layers of owners past.

**2018 SAA Seminar: Taking Notes in/on Shakespeare 4**  
**Sponsored by The Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Publishing**  
**Leader: Scott Schofield, Huron University College at Western University, sschofi4@uwo.ca**

**Lori Newcomb, English, University of Illinois**  
**lnewcomb@illinois.edu**

**Frances Wolfreston Her Notes**

Book historians and Shakespeareans have been taking increasing note of Frances Wolfreston (1607-77), the Staffordshire gentlewoman whose very recognizable signature -- “Frances Wolfreston hor bouk” in a squarish italic, heavily inked -- continues to surface in early modern English books. Her book collection was remarkable by many measures. Shakespeareans note her precocity in collecting Shakespearean poetry and playbooks despite her provincial location, her gender, and the relatively minor stature of Shakespeare in the emerging canon of English literature. Book historians observe how many books from her library are unique survivals, from the first edition of Shakespeare’s first published work, *Venus and Adonis*, to scarce ‘penny godly’ titles. All these scholars, Alison Wiggins has cogently noted, wonder if Wolfreston “should be regarded as a special case, some sort of anomaly” (89).

Certainly, several unusual phenomena conspired to make Wolfreston’s library a preserve for vulnerable and ephemeral texts: her wide-ranging interests and tolerances; her consistency in signing her books; her careful bequeathing of that library to her children for their shared use; and her later descendants’ decision to auction the bulk of the books at Sotheby & Wilkinson in 1856, which yielded a detailed catalogue including some four hundred books that plausibly were hers. Together, these phenomena have added up to rare longevity. Paul Morgan, writing in 1989, was able to locate her signed copies of about a hundred titles from that catalogue, and Arnold Hunt added twenty more in 2010. In a fraction of her playbooks and pamphlets, they noted, were additional reader’s marks in her hand. Starting in 2013, librarian Sarah Lindenbaum realized that the search for Wolfreston’s dispersed library could be renewed using digital tools. Lindenbaum reached out to me, Philip Palmer, and others to locate further copies (see, Moschella *et al*, and [twitter.com/clarklibucla/status/564496207955763200](https://twitter.com/clarklibucla/status/564496207955763200)). Lindenbaum’s database now documents some two hundred publicly-held books with Wolfreston’s signature visible, sometimes barely so. Strikingly, about a third of the newly-identified titles carry further marks in Wolfreston’s hand. The mounting numbers confirm that Wolfreston’s library has left us not only prize titles, but that rare thing, an extensive and well-contextualized case of book use by an early modern woman. It is high time to take new stock of Wolfreston’s books and life. I start, in this paper, with her notes. My central assertion is that Wolfreston’s notes, although scattered, document a robust and self-aware practice of reading specific to plays. Her annotations on plays, beyond recording her personal use, serve to guide other readers, contemporaries and descendants, in reading drama selectively. Wolfreston’s annotations thus claim a certain authority on secular reading that we might not otherwise expect in a middling gentlewoman, and a certain ingenuity in communicating that authority.

**2018 SAA Seminar: Taking Notes in/on Shakespeare 5**  
**Sponsored by The Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Publishing**  
**Leader: Scott Schofield, Huron University College at Western University, sschofi4@uwo.ca**

**Philip Palmer, Clark, UCLA**  
**ppalmer@humnet.ucla.edu**

### **Annotating *Coryats Crudities* in Early Modern England**

When John Donne proclaimed in 1611 he would “read none” of Thomas Coryate’s 939-page European travelogue *Coryats Crudities*, he started (perhaps unwittingly) one of the most persistent myths about the book: that it was too long and too detailed to read, that its author was too ridiculous to be taken seriously. Narrating Coryate’s five-month journey through Western Europe in a strange amalgam of rambling picaresque narrative and exacting eyewitness observation, *Crudities* is best known today for containing over one hundred pages of mock commendatory “Panegyricke Verses”—written by Ben Jonson and John Donne, among others—that preface the travelogue and offer satirical commentary on its eccentric author.

Drawing upon his inspection of over seventy-five copies of the book in North American and British archives, this essay employs copy-specific evidence to revise the many inherited myths and assumptions about *Coryats Crudities*. Rather than according with Donne’s opinion, copies of *Crudities* contain playful marginalia and manuscript verses that suggest a rich seventeenth-century tradition of user-engagement with the text, through which readers participated vicariously in the sociable literary culture of the “Panegyricke Verses.” Complex interactions between the printed text of *Coryats Crudities* and the clever manuscript play surviving in its margins demonstrate how readers collaborated in the book’s construction, imitating and riffing on features of the text such as printed marginalia, errata leaves, direct address, and the “Panegyricke Verses” themselves. Readers thus become key agents in generating new content for *Coryats Crudities* and augmenting the text for new audiences.

**Emily Rendek, University of South Carolina**  
**rendek@mailbox.sc.edu**

### **Remediating the Text: The Author and the Early Modern Commonplace Book**

My seminar paper will be part of my early explorations for the critical apparatus for my edition of Edward Pudsey’s commonplace book. The particular section that I am focusing on will look at other early modern commonplace owners in relation to Pudsey (for example Folger V.a.79 and 80). Current scholarship has misunderstood Pudsey’s use of his commonplace book and also ignores that commonplace books are representative of the circuited nature of reading; scholarship that does mention Pudsey remains immensely focused on Pudsey’s fidelity (or lack thereof) to his source text. In the critical apparatus, I demonstrate that reading is a many-bodied act that results in the creation of hybrid bodies; readers reshape texts for their own purposes, and in producing a new, unique artifact, particularly evident in the case of commonplace books, they create through the act of reading a constant feedback loop, which produces new readers and authors in each evolution. Pudsey’s commonplace book itself reflects a variety of readers spread out throughout the centuries, creating an archive of readers. Pudsey’s commonplace book shows not only how an early modern reader used playtexts to construct a notion of the self but also how by considering commonplace books as the material manifestation of what I call the hybrid

**2018 SAA Seminar: Taking Notes in/on Shakespeare 6**  
**Sponsored by The Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Publishing**  
**Leader: Scott Schofield, Huron University College at Western University, sschofi4@uwo.ca**

book/body, the text of the commonplace book should be considered a single authored work and not merely a knitting together of a variety of other authors' works. Viewing Pudsey as an author not only transforms our understanding of the act of reading but also recuperates his commonplace book as a text to be studied on its own merits as a solely authored work.

**Paul Werstine, King's University College at Western University**  
**werstine@uwo.ca**

**The rise and fall of a crux**

Near the beginning of 3.2 of *Romeo and Juliet*, Juliet delivers the lines "Spread thy close curtaine loue-performing night, / That runnawayes eyes may wincke, and *Romeo* / Leape to these armes vntalkt of and vnseene," according to the 1599 Second Quarto. (The lines do not appear in the savagely truncated 1597 First Quarto.) William Warburton, the fifth of Shakespeare's editors whose name we know, is the first to be provoked to intervention, proposing to William Theobald (the third of these editors) a "th" before "runnawayes," as Theobald records in his 1733 edition, where Warburton is quoted as flattening the metaphor so that the runaway is the sun. Soon the floodgates open as various eighteenth- and nineteenth-century editors print for "runnwayes" "runaway" (Malone), "Rumours" (Hudson), "unawares" (Knight), "rumourers" (Singer), "rude day's" (Dyce), "enemies" (Collier), and "runabouts" (Keightley). For the most part, though, the reading of the early printed text prevails in editions. It is conjectors, rather than editors (although some conjectors are also editors), who are the more outrageous in their substitutions for "runnawayes": *Renomy's* [from *Renommé's* or *rumour's*] (Mason); runagate's (Becket, Hunter, and Muirson, independently); "Luna's" (Mitford); "rumourous" (Singer); "Cynthia's" (Walker); "roving" (Dyce); "sunny day's" or "curious" or "envious" (the Clarks); "(sun away)" (Taylor and Knight), and a dozen and half more from the later nineteenth century. However, only one major twentieth-century editor proposes a new conjectural emendation, John Dover Wilson ("cunningest"), and the 1986 Oxford *Complete Works'* editors, whose work is thick with conjectures, propose none. My paper tries to manage the chaotic response to the crux (sampled here) and to find clues to account for its sudden flourishing and equally sudden disappearance.

**Erica Zimmer, Boston University**  
**mary.eric Zimmer@googlemail.com**

***Taking Note of Gender:***  
***Performance Possibilities and The Merchant of Venice***

How might emerging media support performance-based annotations that capture live productions' dynamic potential while encouraging learners to engage further with Shakespearean texts? Exploring *Global Shakespeares: The Merchant Module* provides a study in possibility. To date, students' work with the module has highlighted the substantial pedagogical opportunities its multiple media may present, not only for renewing the iterative potential of close reading but also for realizing the same through performance.

**2018 SAA Seminar: Taking Notes in/on Shakespeare 7**  
**Sponsored by The Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Publishing**  
**Leader: Scott Schofield, Huron University College at Western University, sschofi4@uwo.ca**

Yet preliminary responses also underscore how any project of this kind must remain alive to resources' limits—and, ideally, work with these to accomplish key goals, along lines that encourage flexibility while preserving structure. Managing digital resources terms' of interaction may prove crucial to their integrated success. Here, Janet Murray's "affordances of the digital" help illustrate how individual tools' features are also their means of delimiting digital vastness. Working with complementary resources may well enrich engagement.

Exploring possibilities in this area has been a hallmark of the *Merchant Module*'s annotative work. Using Annotation Studio in tandem with the broader module platform has allowed each production group to preserve its final scripts—in essence, through an online "book" of scenes that attests to collaborative choices made via a durable record that can itself be annotated further. Particularly as one production's figure may then serve as ground for future interpretation, approaches of this kind appear poised to facilitate ongoing, performance-based dialogue and reflection, while prompting fresh combinations of materials existing and new.