Faith Acker, North Virginia Community College

Collections and Critics: Exclusions and Supplements in Early Eighteenth-Century Collections of Shakespeare's *Works* and *Poems*

For the majority of the eighteenth century, Shakespeare's plays—usually titled 'Works'—were printed as complete sets; the sonnets and narrative poems often followed in what Patrick Cheney calls 'response volumes,' which were often advertised as volumes that would match similarly-sized editions of the plays and complete an owner's collection of Shakespeare's works. In general, the responsive qualities of these volumes have given scholars a sense that the volumes themselves were supplemental: existing to enrich or complete extant collections of Shakespeare's works. In this paper, however, I intend to show that while the producers of these poetical volumes may have intended them as supplements, eighteenth-century book-buyers collected Shakespeare's plays and poems in every conceivable construction. Some owned the plays but ignored the supplemental poems, others carefully assembled matching sets of plays and poems together, and a few 'rogue readers' seem to have ignored the plays altogether and collected only Shakespeare's poems. In some instances, the choice of poems without plays is clearly a deliberate and moral one, as evinced by the absence of plays within an individual's complete library. In other instances, library catalogues reveal that an owner of Shakespeare's poems but not his plays nevertheless owned plays by several other authors, and thus was unlikely to have been morally opposed to works of the stage. Overall, these three configurations of Shakespeare's plays and poems suggest that our modern conception of eighteenth-century tastes, largely drawn from the critical apparati of play-editors such as Pope, Johnson, Steevens, and Theobald, is limited in its scope and does not thoroughly account for the preferences of the educated book collectors or readers in the eighteenth century.

Tamara Atkin, Queen Mary University of London

Collecting the Past: Gathering history in bibliographical writing by John Leland and John Bale

Amongst Shakespeareans, John Bale (1495-1563) is perhaps best known as the author of some not very good plays, of which one, King Johan, seems to have exerted some influence on the development of the history play. Born in Suffolk in the late fifteenth century, Bale spent much of his early career as a Carmelite. But following his conversion in the 1530s, he turned his energies to the writing of Protestant polemic, adopting an acerbic style that earned him the epithet 'bilious Bale'. His commitment to the Reformed cause also informed his bibliographical writing, and his two published catalogues, Illustrium maioris Brittaniie scriptorium…summarium (1548) and Scriptorum illistrium Mairois Brytannie…catalogus (1557-9) are shaped by his apocalyptic views about the periodization of history.

In his writing, Bale expresses dismay at the destruction of monastic libraries, suggesting that '[t]o destroye all without consyderacyon is and wyll be unto Englande for ever, a moste horryble infamy amonge the grave senyours of other nacyons'. But while he may have seen his catalogues as part of an effort, begun by John Leland (c. 1503-52) in his Laboryouse Journey (edited by Bale and published in 1549), to shore monastic fragments against ruin, the project had the paradoxical effect of contributing to the process of their dispersal. This paper explores these writings by Leland and Bale about the post-Dissolution fate of monastic libraries and suggests that their humanist techniques of selection and compilation offer ways of understanding subsequent habits of collection. At the same time, recent methodological approaches to the study of early modern book lists—in particular work by Jason Scott-Warren and Malcolm Walsby, and as exemplified by the PLRE project—can help explain the processes of inclusion and omission that inform Leland and Bale's catalogues. Far from advocating the wholescale preservation of monastic libraries, Bale determined between 'unprofytable chaffe' and 'profytable corne', and the 'precyouse monume[n]tes' saved and recorded in his bibliographical writing reveal the proximity of ideas about literary value to the making and shaping of history.

Aleida Auld, Université de Genève

Collecting Shakespeare in *Poems on Affairs of State*

After decades out-of-print, Shakespeare's The Rape of Lucrece and Venus and Adonis were reprinted in the fourth volume of the miscellany, Poems on Affairs of State (1707). For the first time, the complete narrative poems appeared together in a printed collection by diverse writers. Despite the novelty of this publication, it has not attracted much scholarly attention. One reason why may be that the publisher, James Woodward, described their inclusion as a matter of preservation, foregrounding practical reasons over literary qualities. This paper has two goals: first, to come to terms with the volume as a whole and the place of Shakespeare's narrative poems within it. How unusual is authorial attribution in the volume? What can we make of the organisation of the contents, and Shakespeare's name on the title-page? What readings emerge in light of the surrounding poems? The second aim of this paper is to think about the role of the 1707 miscellany in the canonisation of Shakespeare's poems more generally. Unlike single-author editions, poetic miscellanies may foreground genre over authorship, and so diminish the distinctiveness of any single author. Recent work on miscellanies and the Digital Miscellanies Index has shown that they may also serve as a rough indicator of the popularity of certain poems, and reveal changes in taste over time. But the 1707 edition did not popularize Shakespeare's narrative poems, since it never reached a second edition (although reissued in 1716), and it located them somewhere in the middle of the bunch, rather than in highly visible and conventionally privileged positions at the beginning or end. Nonetheless, I will argue that it canonises Shakespeare and his poems in complex ways, by giving him a special role as author in relation to other writers, and by establishing certain features of and approaches to the poems, that would be influential throughout the first-half of the eighteenth century.

Patricia Badir, University of British Columbia

World Building, the Folger Folios and University of British Columbia

On October 27th, 1960, Dr. Louis B. Wright, director of the Folger Shakespeare Library, was in Vancouver, attending the opening of a new wing of University of British Columbia Library. To mark the occasion, Wright announced a gift of great significance: a permanent loan of a Folger copy of each of the first four folios of Shakespeare's works. While acknowledging that Shakespeare folios have value to Folger Library patrons as objects of bibliographical study, Wright proposed that "the interests of learning [would] be served by putting a few copies on loan at other research institutions which do not have easy access to such material." Only two such loans were ever made (St. Andrews University was the other recipient) and UBC was chosen because of "its growing significance for humanistic education in the Pacific Northwest." However, 25 years later, in 1986, the books were recalled by the Folger trustees. This paper will dig deeper into the story of this loan – the impulse behind the making of it as well as the reaction from the scholarly community that may have provoked the recall. The paper will also consider the importance of the volumes, believed (at least in 1960) to be "the cornerstone and prize of any collection", to the development of the Rare Books and Special Collections at UBC. Of particular interest will be the very recent acquisition of Shakespeare volumes from the collection of Mrs. Elizabeth Rogers, founding member of the Vancouver Shakespeare Society. This research is part of a larger project exploring the world-making abilities of Shakespearean things in British Columbia in the Twentieth Century. The working premise of the project is that as these things move though time and space, they provide for us an alternative way to think about canonicity and disciplinarity, one that opens up in-between places, or worlds between worlds, that can complicate in interesting ways narratives of colonialization and empire.

Claire M. L. Bourne, Pennsylvania State University

Bibliography, Book Design, and Edward Cappell's 'Shakpeariana' Collection

This paper considers the earliest completist effort to collect and record bibliographic information about books by and related to Shakespeare. Between the late 1740s and 1779, Edward Capell bought or sought access to every early edition of Shakespeare that he knew existed. The fruits of these labors survive in the collection of "Shakespeariana" he built, catalogued, and ultimately bequeathed to the Wren Library at Trinity College, Cambridge. Capell's acts of collecting and recording were the first laborious steps in a project to collate (systematically for the very first time) the pre-1623 quartos for a new Shakespeare edition (1768). He used earlier booksellers' catalogues as starting points and appealed to a wide network of contacts for clues about other as-yet-unknown editions that might have been out there. This slow, ad hoc gathering of materials and information required patience and resourcefulness, especially given that Capell's effort to assemble a full picture of Shakespeare's textual corpus also involved finding as many editions as he could of other early modern plays and related texts. But Capell's enterprise was (and is) remarkable not just for his obsessive canvassing for new materials or even for the act of assembling his impressive book collection. It is also noteworthy for the way he recorded his findings in six meticulously organized notebooks (S.b.7-12, Folger Shakespeare Library). This paper focuses on the note-taking system Capell used to encode the bibliographic details of the books he consulted as well as the design protocol he set up across the notebooks to accommodate the piecemeal, serendipitous nature of his research. Essentially, he divided each page into a 2x4 grid with continuous numbers heading each column and letters (a-d) corresponding to each row. This meant he did not need to organize the entries chronologically, alphabetically, or by author. He could transcribe material from a book fifty pages after its bibliographic record and link the two by inscribing the number+letter of the record underneath the passage for easy cross-reference. The attention that Capell paid to the design infrastructure of these notebooks is consistent with the unusual care he took with the typography and physical features of his Shakespeare edition. Indeed, the navigation system that Capell set up in the notebooks created the textual conditions under which he could design an edition of Shakespeare in which collation and other forms of novel textual minutiæ (i.e., the "accidental," or formal features, of the page) were newly mobilized explicitly to readerly advantage.

Emma Lesley Depledge, Université de Fribourg

B[u]y The Bundle: Collecting Shakespeare and his Contemporaries in Restoration London

This paper will explore when, how and (possible reasons) why Restoration stationers and collectors grouped different plays together. I am particularly interested in the ways in which plays published individually were grouped together to be sold by the bundle, or as volumes, and in what such collections can tell us about the status and likely reception of pre-1642 plays and playwrights in the late seventeenth century. I will examine the Term Catalogues, bookseller adverts published on spare pages in playbooks, and surviving sammelbande listed in library catalogues. I hope to be able to offer greater insight into nonce collections issued by stationers like Richard Bentley (c.1645-1697) and to offer analysis of the 'volumes of plays' found in auction lists for second-hand book sales. I also hope to add to existing narratives about Shakespeare's canonisation by situating the collection of Shakespeare in the context of how other pre-1642 dramatists and Restoration dramatists were collected between 1660 and 1700.

Laura A. Estill, St. Francis Xavier University

Competition and Community:
Edmond Malone, Antiquarian Bookbuying, and the Value of a Play

Our concept of early modern drama would not be the same without particular bibliophiles who purposefully collected and passed on playbooks. My larger project, "Collecting Plays, Creating Canon," focuses on two personal libraries of early modern plays—Edmond Malone's and John Philip Kemble's—from the turn of the nineteenth century, when notions of an English dramatic canon that privileges Renaissance and Restoration plays began to crystallize. I contend that book collecting has been foundational to our reception of early modern drama: these collections shape our understanding of performance history, textual studies, publication, and canon formation.

This seminar paper considers the evidence of letters by and to Malone as well as Malone's marginal notes in his books in order to investigate late Georgian attitudes towards bookbuying and early print. I situate Malone in a coterie of antiquarian bookbuyers, including, for instance, Bishop Percy, Isaac Reed, and of course, Kemble. Malone's respect for cataloguers and previous collectors (notably, William Oldys) informs his collecting choices. The notes Malone left in the books he owned signal his interest in provenance, book prices, and the rarity of works, all of which suggests how and why he valued early modern texts.

Malone and his bookbuying contemporaries actively sought work by Shakespeare, first and foremost, then works relating to Shakespeare. I explore the value of early modern plays to these antiquarians, demonstrating that the inflation of certain book prices at this moment (1780-1820) points to the value collectors placed on Shakespeare, and, to a lesser degree, early modern drama by other playwrights. Malone's generation of book collectors were a community of rivals and friends whose interactions varied; however, it was their unspoken consensus that drove up the value of works by or relating to Shakespeare compared to other early texts. Collections by Malone and his peers both reflected and reified notions of canonical literary and dramatic texts and affects our scholarship to this day.

To scholars of early modern theatre and book history, the Malone collection will be well-known: it is now the core of the Bodleian's early modern theatre collection. With his published editions, Malone influenced how we think of Shakespeare and early modern theatre; however, it is Malone's collection itself that mediates even what we can think by preserving selected texts. Ultimately, when we look back to early modern plays, we focus on existing material texts that come to us annotated, bound, and shelved together: we necessarily look to the English Renaissance through the lens of libraries and personal collectors, such as Malone.

Emily Glider, Yale University

Shakespeare in Translation:
***Titus Andronicus* in *Engelische Comedien und Tragedien* (1620)**

The first foreign-language edition of a Shakespeare play appeared in the 1620 dramatic anthology Englische Comedien und Tragedian, thought to have been printed at Leipzig following the departure of the English "touring company" led by Robert Browne and John Green, who returned to London at the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War after almost three decades performing for audiences throughout modern Germany, the Low Countries, and the Habsburg Empire. Englische Comedien und Tragedian, which contains eight plays and seven interludes drawn from the company repertory, including German-language adaptations of Shakespeare's Two Gentlemen of Verona and Titus Andronicus, has been studied as a key document in early modern English theater history and the history of the Shakespeare canon. However, although influential scholarship has addressed Englische Comedien und Tragedian, from Johann Ludwig Tieck, Albert Cohn, and E.K. Chambers's classic work to more recent studies by Jerzy Limon and Willem Schrickx, this research has emphasized evidence of contemporary performance practices, with a focus on repertory, staging practices, practices of translation, and the incorporation of local German-language performance traditions. Much has been said about Englische Comedien und Tragedian as a collection of plays, but little has been said about Englische Comedien und Tragedian as a book.

Why did Englische Comedien und Tragedian appear in print? Who was the projected audience? The publication of an anthology of plays was still a novel idea in England, with the dramatic repertory included in Jonson's 1616 Works ridiculed by contemporaries and the publication of the Shakespeare folio years away. The German book trade, meanwhile, had no existing tradition of dramatic publishing equivalent to the English market for popular "playbooks," and therefore no established audience for printed drama. The 1620 Englische Comedien und Tragedian must have represented a substantial risk for its publishers, not simply as a new genre of print product, but as a dense, 750-page volume that demanded considerable investment to bring to market. However, it seems to have been a success with book buyers, with a second reprint emerging the same year and a third appearing in 1624. This paper poses new questions about the production and circulation of Englische Comedien und Tragedian, with attention to the unique contingencies of the seventeenth-century German book trade and the complex social, cultural, and religiopolitical dimensions of printed drama in this region at this moment in history.

David Harper, United States Military Academy

"Risen from One Source:" Authority and Authorship in Pope's *Shakespear*

In the preface to his 1725-7 Shakespear, In Six Volumes Collated and Corrected by the former Editions, Alexander Pope is keen to distance himself from what he characterizes as the hubristic methods of scholarship practiced by critics – the pedants and scholars he would lampoon in the Dunciad. However, as Pope's preface and project progresses, the roles of "critic" and "editor" become increasingly difficult to separate due Pope's assessment of the state of Shakespeare's textual remains. Pope finds himself obliged to engage in textual criticism as he attempts to collect an "authentic" Shakespeare. In the course of his project, he declares the quartos suspect, comparing two to find "each… has whole heaps of trash different from the other." He next eliminates even the First Folio, finding it "in all respects… far worse than the Quartos." Thus, an editor reluctant to become a textual critic left himself no authoritative texts upon which to base his collected edition.

Despite his declared intent to edit Shakespeare "without any indulgence to private sense or conjecture," Pope's edition is a monument to editorial conjecture. His methodology of degrading "excessively bad" passages to the bottom of the page, and putting his "mark of reprobation" upon others he deems he doesn't have the "authority" to omit, leaves even the most diligent reader confused about what is and isn't "Shakespeare." Here, I am most interested in the sources Pope used in his attempt to repair Shakespeare, editions that he (inconsistently) claims "now hold the place of Originals, and are the only materials left to repair the deficiencies or restore the corrupted sense of the Author." While I will contextualize anew Pope's methodology my main aim is to assess Pope's edition through the lens of his collection and treatment of textual witnesses.

Adam G. Hooks, University of Iowa

Printing like it's 1599: The First Collected Shakespeare

Two decades before William Jaggard printed a collection of Shakespearean quartos in 1619, he published the first collection of Shakespeare's works in print: The Passionate Pilgrime, a slim octavo pamphlet attributed to Shakespeare that included a handful of his (so-called "genuine") poems along with several other Shakespeare-ish poems either attributed elsewhere to other authors, or simply anonymous. For over two centuries, this collection has been marginalized and denigrated within the Shakespeare canon: Jaggard has been characterized as an ill-intentioned, piratical stationer who sought to exploit the value of Shakespeare's name for his own gain. The scholarly focus on "authentic" texts and Shakespearean authorship has led to the neglect of these poems, because the perceived interferences of Jaggard are seemingly so great that the volume has been considered to have no proper critical or editorial value.

But, because of this, no one has actually looked at this artifact, or explored the layered histories of its production and consumption, nor considered the range of manuscript and printed poems, songs, and sonnets incorporated into the volume. This paper will offer a radical reevaluation of The Passionate Pilgrime by delineating a number of observations and posing a number of hard questions about the early histories of the three distinct editions of the book, as well as the subsequent histories created by collectors, scholars, and editors. Looking at, rather than through, this collection of poems (printed on rectos and framed by printers' ornaments) leads to a conclusion that causes us to rethink and redefine what we mean by the terms "poem," "book," and "collection."

Amy Lidster, King's College London

Reading histories: Using the Pavier quartos to examine the history play as a genre

This paper explores how collecting practices – primarily of stationers but also of other readers – can be used to understand the history play as a genre. Most critical accounts of the history play tend to rely on Shakespeare's First Folio to define the genre and its subject matter: the Folio's retrospective classification implies that the genre involves the dramatization of events from the reigns of medieval English monarchs. However, this grouping of plays from one (attributed) dramatist is unrepresentative of the wider range of histories that were performed, printed, and collected during the early modern period.

This paper will concentrate on the 1619 "Pavier quartos" as an example of a collection of mostly historical plays that offer a useful and more representative model of the genre than Shakespeare's First Folio. Drawing on the work of Tara L. Lyons on the seriality and historicity of the Pavier quartos, this paper will consider the strategies of William Jaggard and Thomas Pavier in the selection and presentation of these reprinted playbooks. Clearly, the publication of plays that dramatized a recognizable past was something that interested the stationers (and Pavier, in particular), which is highlighted through the title-pages descriptions of the plays, the presentation of The Whole Contention, and by some of the emendations to the play texts. As a collection, the Pavier quartos offer a more diverse range of histories than those categorized in the First Folio: they feature English monarchical histories, but also citizen-orientated histories and plays that draw on the classical past. They use the term 'history' on their title pages to suggest a true account of the past, but also to mean simply a 'story'. This fluidity in subject matter and terminology reflects wider discourses about 'history' and historical dramatizations during the period, and is further reflected, materially, in the flexible construction of the Pavier quartos as a collection subject to rearrangement, reincorporation, and exclusion. Rather than looking at the Pavier project as a precursor to the Folio, this paper will consider it as a separate and distinctive enterprise that can offer a critical alternative to the Folio for understanding and defining the early modern history play.

Sarah Lindenbaum, Illinois Wesleyan University

Sad, Prity, and Mery: Frances Wolfreston's Shakespeare Quartos

Early female reader Frances Wolfreston (1607–1677) owned a motley collection of twelve Shakespeare quartos (thirteen if you count the Pavier Sir John Oldcastle), from the unique 1593 Venus and Adonis to a 1655 King Lear printed by Jane Bell when Wolfreston was nearly 50. Nine of the quartos are playbooks, while three are narrative poems. According to Kitamura Sae, Wolfreston is one of only 21 women who left their names in pre-1769 works of Shakespeare. The only other two authors so strongly represented in Wolfreston's library are James Shirley and John Taylor. My paper will explore the question of what Wolfreston can tell us about how early women collected and responded to Shakespeare. Where did she acquire the plays? Did she interact with her Shakespeare playbooks differently than the dozens of other playbooks that bear her name? What does the presence of damaged and made-up copies of Shakespeare in her library signify? Is there any evidence to suggest that she owned Shakespeare in folio? My argument will be informed in part by Wolfreston's marks of reading. These "manuscript interventions," to borrow Claire M.L. Bourne's term, include annotations and underlining.

More broadly, this paper informs my current work on a full-length biobibliographical study of Wolfreston's life and library. As a result of Wolfreston's descendants' partial preservation of her library until the mid-nineteenth century and an attendant 1856 Sotheby's auction catalog, we have a rich and rare record of inexpensively printed works from her library that went unmentioned in the wills, probate inventories, and book-lists of other contemporary book owners. Along with Wolfreston's ownership inscription, the auction catalog demonstrates how modern book scholars can continue to reconstruct and interpret dispersed private libraries.

Joshua J. McEvilla, University of Toronto

Collecting and Editing Shakespeare Extracts in 1655

This paper begins by attempting to determine the source editions of the 29 Shakespeare plays that the 1650s journalist and translator John Cotgrave selected for inclusion in his English Treasury of Wit and Language (1655), the "first English drama anthology." Among English Treasury's modest 311 pages can be found 160 quotations from non-apocryphal Shakespeare plays and collaborations, where 18 were Folio-only (first or second), eight quarto or folio, and one quarto and folio. Potentially as many as 13 other bibliographically independent collections of dramatic materials were in Cotgrave's possession. Secondly, the paper pursues a case study of classification and textual principles behind Cotgrave's repurposing of his theatrical leftovers for a reader community more than a decade after the last legal performance of a Shakespeare play in London. Delayed publication sees Shakespeare's great speeches cohabit 202 subject headings with dramatic poems that were never staged and rowdy Jacobean and Caroline comedy held from print till half a decade after the 1642 temporary interdict on public playing in London. I argue that although Cotgrave encases Shakespeare in a culture of repressive antitheatricalism and moralistic remediation, scholars may gain insight into the early meanings of Shakespeare by scrutinizing Cotgrave's repointing and vocabulary changes. Finally I reflect on the significance of Shakespeare's reputation in discovery narratives of Cotgrave's sources, noting that the treasures to be found in early marginalia of a Folger copy represent efforts that supersede the identification of passages by William Oldys (128), John Munro (3), G. E. Bentley (6), Anne Isherwood (23), and McEvilla (1). With the majority of Cotgrave's sources now clearly determined, scholars can reconstruct the library holdings of one copy-owner, a textual editor, to note the absence of certain key dramatic volumes from an otherwise stellar collection of early modern print playbooks. I suggest that Cotgrave's edits of most of 239 plays were of comparable fascination to the owner.

Peter Picetti, University of Nevada, Reno

The Appropriation of Shakespeare in *Poems on Affairs of State* (1707)

Shakespeare's literary capital as poet during his lifetime has been well established—at least through the success of his long poems in print—but after John Benson's 1640 Poems, and the closing of the theaters soon following, audiences preferred his plays categorically more than the poems. Only appearing in print a handful of times before the eighteenth century, Shakespeare's long poems found new light in two editions that seem to piggy back on Rowe's 1709 edition of Shakespeare: Bernard Lintott's 1709 A Collection of Poems and Charles Gildon's 1710 Shakespear: Volume the Seventh). Some recent, good work has sought to explore Shakespeare's canonization after Benson (especially in Depledge and Kirwin's recent collection: Canonising Shakespeare). In that volume, Paul D. Cannan discusses the "antiquarian" value Lintott promotes in his edition as opposes the "more modern and accessible texts" and critical essays that Gildon touts (172).

Broadly speaking, this paper seeks to outline and explore editorial intervention between Benson and the eighteenth century editions of the poems through bibliographical and paratextual details. In addition to tracing the types of framing that Cannan outlines, I hope to build on Adam G. Hook's profitable, bibliographical work in "Royalist Shakespeare: Publishers, Politics and the Appropriation of The Rape of Lucrece (1655)" while exploring other appropriations of Shakespeare in this time period—notably the inclusion of Venus and Adonis and The Rape of Lucrece in the fourth volume of Poems on Affairs of State (1707). While most editions of the long poems aren't as radically altered as the 1655 Lucrece, the continued sociopolitical appropriation of Shakespeare still deserves further study.

Georgianna Ziegler, Folger Shakespeare Library

Nested Boxes: The Inner Worlds of Shakespeare Collections

Libraries hold lots of secrets, not necessarily because they want to, but because there are "so many books, so little time," as the T-shirt says. One important category of information that may not be readily apparent is provenance, or the history of who owned a book. In the realm of

Shakespeare collecting, in particular, there were some famous collectors whose books were purchased by other collectors over time, sometimes for a couple of generations. One example is J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps (1820-1889), who was collecting for the earl of Warwick's library as well as his own; followed by Marsden J. Perry (1850-1935) who purchased much of the H-P library; followed by Henry Clay Folger (1857-1930) who bought some of Perry's books but also acquired H-P books from other sources, including Sir Robert Leicester Harmsworth (1870-1937).

The point is that libraries such as the Folger hold collections within collections, but how is one to track them down? This paper will briefly discuss some of the major Shakespeare collectors, then suggest ways to track down provenance information using resources such as old printed library catalogs, sale catalogs, papers of collectors, and information from current online catalogs, including how to read the provenance statement.