



BREAKING THE RULES: EDITORIAL PROBLEMS IN DEKKER AND MIDDLETON'S *THE HONEST WHORE*, PART I

JOOST DAALDER AND ANTONY TELFORD MOORE

The immediate aim of this article is three-fold: to give a reappraisal of some of the most important evidence relating to the textual history of *The Honest Whore*, Part I (STC 6501, 6501a, 6502); to present new evidence concerning the text of this play; and to assess the relative authority of the play's two principal early editions. Our ultimate aim, though, is editorial rather than purely bibliographical. The most authoritative edition of *1 Honest Whore* now available, that contained in Fredson Bowers' old-spelling edition of *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*,¹ is (as we intend to demonstrate) significantly flawed, and it is hoped that the findings presented here will provide a foundation for future editorial efforts to realise a more accurate and authentic text of this underrated play.

It should also be made clear that this article is, in a sense, a prolegomenon to the forthcoming Revels Plays edition of *The Honest Whore*, Parts I and II, which will be edited by Joost Daalder alone. In other words, this article presents bibliographical material which is too detailed and discursive to be included in the Revels volume, but which is nevertheless essential to a consideration of the textual strategies employed in that edition. At the same time, we hope bibliographers and textual critics will find the article to be of interest in its own right.

At some time between 1 January and 14 March 1604, the theatre manager Philip Henslowe, acting in his capacity as manager of Prince Henry's Men at the Fortune Theatre, recorded a payment of five pounds to

Thomas deckers & Midelton in earneste of ther playe Called the pasyent man & the onest hore.²

The play referred to, the First Part of *The Honest Whore*, must have been completed by 9 November of the same year,³ for on that date it was entered in the Register of the Stationers' Company by Thomas Man, Jr:

Entred for his cōpye vnder the hand of m^r Pasfeild A Booke called. The humours of the patient man. The longinge wyfe and the honest whore.⁴

Printing probably followed soon after, since the title-page of the first quarto edition (Q1) is dated 1604:

1. 4 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 1953-61, second edition 1964), II. All act, scene and line references for *1 Honest Whore* in the present article are keyed to Bowers' second edition.
2. *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. R.A. Foakes and R.T. Rickert (Cambridge University Press, 1961), p.209.
3. As Cyrus Hoy observes, 'Henslowe's records for the Prince's Men end with his entry for 14 March 1604, so that his diary contains no further account of progress on the play for which earnest had been paid' (*Introductions, Notes, and Commentaries to texts in 'The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker' edited by Fredson Bowers*, 4 vols., Cambridge University Press, 1980, II, p.1).
4. Edward Arber, *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London 1554-1640*, 5 vols (London and Birmingham, 1875-94), III, p.275.

THE [logotype⁵] Honest Whore, With, The Humours of the Patient Man, and the Longing Wife. [flower ornament⁶] Tho: Dekker. [pair of ornaments⁷] LONDON Printed by V.S. for Iohn Hodgets, and are to be solde at his shop in Paules church-yard 1604:

At any rate, the play was printed within a year of its composition – a reflection, perhaps, of its popularity. It would appear from the title-page of Q1 that Henslowe's entry recorded the play's title in abbreviated form. It is not inconceivable that the phrase 'The Honest Whore' did not acquire its prime position until some time after composition, perhaps after the character of Bellafront had made her mark with audiences of the play.⁸

Sir Walter Greg noted a more significant disparity between the title-page of Q1 and the entry in the Stationers' Register: the title-page refers to John Hodgets as the publisher, whereas the entry in the Stationers' Register mentions only Thomas Man.⁹ Greg suggests that Man was the real publisher while Hodgets was no more than the bookseller, and cites as evidence the imprint of a later edition in 1605 (Q3): 'are to be solde by Iohn TM Hodgets at his shoppe in Paules church-yard'. The title-page of the second quarto (Q2, 1604) was unavailable to Greg, but his speculation receives some support from the imprint of this edition, since it also refers to Hodgets as if he were no more than the bookseller.

Only four copies of Q1 are known to have survived,¹⁰ although six sheets from this edition (sheets C-D, F-G, I-K) became part of the unique copy of Q3 held in the Dyce Collection at the Victoria and Albert Museum. In physical appearance, Q1 is a perfectly ordinary play-quarto of the period. It has 40 unnumbered leaves, collating A-K⁴, the title-page (with its verso blank) being the first leaf of gathering A. Sheets A-D are signed on the first three leaves only. E-K are signed on all four. The text begins on A2r and runs to K4v. It is set in a pica roman type measuring 82 mm per 20 lines,

5. The word is in fact a logotype (or more precisely, a xylograph); see W. Craig Ferguson, *Valentine Simmes: Printer to Drayton, Shakespeare, Chapman, Greene, Dekker, Middleton, Daniel, Jonson, Marlowe, Marston, Heywood, and other Elizabethans* (Charlottesville, Virginia: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1968), p.55.

6. This ornament is categorised as 'Flower 4' by Ferguson, *Valentine Simmes*, p.49.

7. Classed as Ornament 1a in Ferguson's catalogue (*Valentine Simmes*, p.46). Ferguson notes that these two ornaments were cut off from the ends of a single, larger ornament (p.50).

8. This is not to dispute that Bellafront is a prominent character, but she does, after all, appear in only five of the play's fifteen scenes. What is more, she does not make her first entrance until Act II, and the last sixty lines of the play are devoted, not to her new-found happiness, but to the happy outcome for Candido, the 'patient man'. Such considerations may give some warrant to the conjecture that Bellafront was not, in the playwrights' original conception, the paramount figure suggested by the title. Henslowe's entry, too, indicates that she was meant to share top billing with Candido. Matthew Baird thinks the Henslowe and Stationers' Register entries suggest that the authorial manuscript was entitled 'The Humors of the Patient Man, the Longing Wife, and the Honest Whore' ('The Early Editions of Thomas Dekker's *The Converted Courtesan* or *The Honest Whore*, Part I', *The Library*, Fourth Series, X, 1930, p.59).

9. *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*, 4 vols. (London, 1939-59), II, p.325.

10. These are held by the British Library, the Folger Shakespeare Library, the Henry E. Huntington Library, and the New York Public Library.

with italic type reserved for stage directions, speech-headings, names, etc.¹¹ All pages contain 38 lines (excluding running-title), except C1r, C2r, F1r, F1v, F3r and I1r-4v (39 lines), D4r (37) and F4r (35: end of scene). The opening of the play is announced by a heading, 'ACTVS PRIMVS. SCÆNA PRIMA', but nowhere else in the text is this form of act-heading employed. Act-divisions thus pass unsignalled. Scenes are unheaded, too, except from E2r to H2v, where they are numbered from 'SCENA 7.' (III.i) through to '13. SCE.' (IV.iv). Scene 12 (IV.iii), however, is unnumbered. Eight press-corrections have been found in Q1: three in the C Outer, two in Inner G, and three in Outer K.¹²

The title-page of Q1 mentions only one printer: V.S., i.e. Valentine Simmes. But Q1 was the product of no fewer than three printing shops. Simmes printed the first two sheets, A and B; another printer, possibly John Windet, was responsible for sheets C and D; and sheets E-K appear to have been printed by Thomas Purfoot. Each of these printers is known to have engaged in shared printing on other occasions.¹³

Fredson Bowers' analysis of the running-titles in Q1 (see the Introduction to Bowers' second edition, pp. 3-4) shows that new running-titles were employed by each printing shop. The sequence A-B features two skeleton formes, used in each sheet, as does C-D. Sheets E-K also have two skeletons (numbers 1 and 2) in the following pattern (the letter 'r' signifies a rearrangement of the headlines within the forme; two r's indicate a further rearrangement):

E(i)	E(o)	F(i)	F(o)	G(i)	G(o)	H(i)	H(o)	I(i)	I(o)	K(i)	K(o)
1	1	1	1	2	2	1r	1r	2	1rr	2	2

11. For an account of the type used in this quarto, see W. Craig Ferguson, *Pica Roman Type in Elizabethan England* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1989), pp.10-11, 30-1.

12. The corrections are: chraters/cheaters (C2v, Lv.175); dambe/dambde (C4v, II.i.55); *Fluello*./*Fluello*? (C4v, II.i.65); wooc./wooc- (G2r, IV.i.111); *Cram. Poli. Is*/ *Cram. Poh is* (G3v, IV.ii.41); haue/saue (K1r, V.ii.247); wet/wit (K2v, V.ii.343; sings M/ sings, (K4v, V.ii.510).

13. Simmes may have shared printing with Windet or Purfoot on Le Loyer's *A Treatise of Spectres or Strange Sights* (STC 15448). Purfoot reprinted Thomas's *Seven Sinners* (STC 24005) for Simmes in 1610. (See Ferguson, *Valentine Simmes*, pp.24, 89.) The division of the work was identified by Greg, *Bibliography of the English Printed Drama*, II, p.325, on the basis of running-titles (see following discussion) and signatures. Fredson Bowers observes that the three sections can also be distinguished by their use of medial v and j, and by variations in the printer's measure; see the Introduction to Bowers' edition, p.3. Bowers also notes that the continuous scene-numbering between E2r and H2v occurs only in the section assigned to the third printing shop (p.4 and note). Evidently only the compositor(s) in Purfoot's shop bothered to reproduce the numbering present in the copy manuscript. It is unclear why the scene-numbering in Purfoot's section should vanish after H2v, although there is a little evidence that a short stint by a second compositor began at around this point in the text (see below).

Baird notes that there is a disparity between the catchword on B4v and its referent on C1r (p.57). This occurs at exactly the point where Simmes's stint concludes and the second printer's begins. Baird doubted, however, that the quarto was the work of more than one shop, because the paper used throughout the text was quite uniform (p.57). But as Bowers remarks, uniformity of paper is no evidence against the division of the work among different printers, since it was common for the publisher to supply the paper (p.4, n.2). The printers of the second and third sections were first identified by W. Craig Ferguson in *Pica Roman Type in Elizabethan England*, p.17, although there is a little uncertainty about his conclusions (see the discussion below). Ferguson's type analysis also confirms the division of the work between the three shops.

In Bowers' view, the pattern revealed here suggests that a second press was brought into use during the printing of sheet G. This may have coincided with the introduction of a second compositor, Bowers argues, since the compositor's measure expands from 86.7 mm. to 88-89 mm for G3r-G4r. The measure returns to 86.7 mm. after this, but burgeons again at H2v-4v and I2v-4v (Introduction, p.4). It needs to be emphasised that Bowers' argument here is no more than a plausible hypothesis – a hypothesis, moreover, which we must approach in light of D.F. McKenzie's cautions about equating the number of skeletons with the number of compositors, or seeking 'desirable ratios between compositors and press-crews'.¹⁴ As McKenzie notes (p.27), Bowers himself, as long ago as 1938, had expressed reservations about the use of running-title evidence to ascertain the number of presses employed in the printing of a book.¹⁵

One would perhaps expect that the text of a work that was to be shared by two or more printers would be cast off and set by formes. Such a method would not only allow the printers to determine their exact share of the manuscript and the resulting printed work; it would also enable the formes to be composed and printed in any order¹⁶ – an especially important consideration in a venture involving independent printing houses. There are indeed strong indications that at least five of Q1's ten sheets were set by formes. Valentine Simmes's section, sheets A-B, shows virtually no sign of difficulties in fitting the text into particular pages. The number of lines per page in this section is constant (38), there are very few (and only minor) instances of crowding, and there are no turn-unders or turn-overs. Entry-directions on A4v, B4r and B4v show variation in spacing (between the directions and the body of the text) which *may* reflect attempts to gain or waste space, but this evidence is very slight. Sheet C, D, E, F and I, however, contain clear indications of spacing problems, and it is a reasonable supposition that copy for these sheets was cast off and then set in type by formes. The evidence for the method of composition in each sheet of Q1 is summarised in Table 1, below. Obviously some of this evidence may reflect other factors in the printing process. Ampersands and tildes, for example, were often used by compositors to justify prose lines, and turn-unders and turn-overs were a common means of handling unusually long verse-lines. But in sheets C, D, E, F and I, at least, these features tend to support other, more positive signs of spacing difficulties associated with cast-off copy.

One other thing to bear in mind about the evidence presented in Table 1 is that the general pattern of this evidence may conceal all manner of anomalies in printing-house work practices. For example, sheets where evidence of spacing problems is strongest may have been set only partly by formes, and partly seriatim. As Peter Blayney has pointed out,¹⁷ a compositor who began setting a sheet seriatim might change to forme-setting after a few pages in order to hurry through one or other

14. 'Printers of the Mind: Some Notes on Bibliographical Theories and Printing-House Practices', *Studies in Bibliography*, 22 (1969), p.29.

15. 'Notes on Running-Titles as Bibliographical Evidence', *The Library*, 4th series, XIX (1938), p.331.

16. McKenzie, 'Printers of the Mind', p.41.

17. *The Texts of 'King Lear' and their Origins* (Cambridge University Press, 1982), vol. I, 'Nicholas Okes and the First Quarto', p.91.

forme. The conclusions offered in Table 1, then, are founded on strong probability, not certain knowledge.

In Table 1, pages have 38 lines unless otherwise stated. The phrase 'same-line entry' refers to entry-directions which have been placed on the same line as dialogue rather than being given their own line(s). 'P' indicates a page set entirely in prose, 'V' a page set entirely in verse, and 'P/V' a page of both prose and verse in an approximately equal mixture. 'MV' signals a page of mostly verse (greater than 70%), 'MP' a page of mostly prose.

TABLE 1: Method of composition in Q1 of *1 Honest Whore*

Sheet	Set by	Evidence
A	?	* Crowded entry A4v (P).
B	?	* Well-spaced entries, B4r (P), 4v (P).
C	Formes	* <i>Spacing problems mainly in C Outer.</i> * C1r: 39 ll.; same-line entry (V/P). * 1v: 2 turn-unders; 2 speeches run on (MV). * 2r: 39 ll.; 2 same-line entries; 2 speeches run on; tildes & ampersand (MV). * 2v: 2 turn-unders/overs (MV). * 3r: 2 turn-unders/overs; crowded exit; ampersand & tilde (V/P). * 4r: 'Mistress' abbreviated as 'M', 'Roger' as 'Ro.'; song lyrics possibly abbreviated, l.38; ampersand (V/P). * 4v: 4 turn-unders/overs; same-line entry; 2 ampersands (P).
D	Formes	* <i>Strong correlation between spacing problems and prose.</i> * D1r: 2 prose speeches run on; crowded entry; 3 tildes (P). * 1v: turn-under; speech run on; ampersand (P). * 2r: tilde (P). * 2v: 2 speeches run on; 3 turn-unders/overs; same-line entry; 3 ampersands (P). * 3r: turn-under; 4 speeches run on (V/P). * 3v, 4r, 4v are set in verse.
E	Formes	* <i>Signs of crowding on five pages featuring prose.</i> * E2r: same-line entry; crowded exit; crowded scene-break; 3 turn-unders/overs; ampersand, 2 tildes (V/P). * 2v: 2 turn-unders/overs; 5 ampersands; 4 tildes (MP). * 3r: same-line entry; 2 speeches run on; 3 ampersands; 3 tildes (MP). * 3v: 2 turn-unders/overs; same-line entry; speech run on; 3 ampersands; 1 tilde (P/V). * 4r: 39 ll.; same-line entry; crowded exit; 2 turn-unders/overs; tilde, ampersand (P/V). * 4v: same-line entry; 1 turn-over (MV).
F	Formes	* <i>Signs of crowding on at least three pages.</i> * F1r: 39 ll.; 3 turn-unders/overs; 2 same-line entries; 2 speeches run on; 4 ampersands (MV). * 1v: 39 ll.; crowded scene-break; same-line entry; speech run on; 3 ampersands (MP). * 2r: speech run on (MV). * 2v: speech run on; 4 ampersands, all in prose passages (P/V). * 3r: 39 ll.; speech run on; 4 ampersands and tilde, all in prose passages

		(P/V).
		* 4v: same-line entry; 3 speeches run on; 'Master' abbreviated as 'M'; 2 ampersands, both in one prose speech (V/P).
G	?	* <i>Little evidence of spacing difficulties.</i>
		* G2r: same-line entry (V/P).
		* 3r: same-line entry; crowded scene-break and stage direction; 2 ampersands and tilde, all in one prose speech (V/P).
		* 4v: 1 ampersand (MP).
H	Serialim?	* <i>No firm evidence of cast-off copy.</i>
		* H3r: same-line entry (MV).
		* 4r: 2 turn-unders/overs (MV).
		* 4v: 3 tildes in a prose speech (MP).
I	Formes	* <i>Fairly strong correlation between prose dialogue and signs of crowding. All pages in this sheet have 39 lines, which may or may not be a significant feature as regards method of composition.</i>
		* I1r: same-line entry; 2 speeches run on; 2 ampersands (P/V).
		* 1v: 3 speeches run on (MV).
		* 2r: speech run on; 1 ampersand in prose speech (MV).
		* 2v: same-line entry; 2 turn-unders; speech run on; ampersand and tilde (P/V).
		* 3r: same-line entry; 2 turn-unders (MV).
		* 3v: same-line entry; 3 ampersands, 1 tilde; 'aswel', l.16, a poss. sign of compression (MP).
		* 4r: 2 speeches run on; 1 turn-under; ampersand (MV).
		* 4v: 4 speeches run on; 8 ampersands and a tilde (P).
K	?	* K1r: 1 speech run on; ampersand (V/P).
		* K1v: turn-under (MP).
		* K2v: turn-under (V).
		* K3v: turn-over (MV).
		* K4r: turn-under (MV).
		* K4v: turn-over (V).

The pattern of evidence for casting off revealed in Table 1 suggests that Valentine Simmes felt no obligation to compress or expand the text: he simply set as much of the copy as fitted comfortably into the two sheets for which he was responsible. The most plausible explanation of this is that Simmes was the first printer to work on the copy manuscript, and that only after he had completed his sixteen pages did he pass the manuscript – whole or in part – to one or more of his fellow printers. John Windet (or whoever it was that printed sheets C and D) cast off his section of the manuscript and set it in type by formes. Whether he did so because his portion of the text was strictly delineated, or because setting his section of the quarto by formes fitted in with other activities in his printing shop (e.g., printing of other books), it is difficult to say. The first possibility seems a little more likely, however, because instances of spacing difficulties are found in considerable abundance in both inner *and* outer formes of Windet's two sheets. If there had been no precise constraints on how much of the copy-manuscript he set in print, a good deal of labour would have been saved by casting off copy for only *one* of the formes in each sheet. (The easiest procedure would be for the compositor to set the first page of the gathering, 1r, in type, then to cast off copy for 1v and 2r, set 2v and 3r, cast off copy for 3v and 4r, and set 4v.) It would

appear, though, that the compositor had to watch his spacing in both inner and outer formes of sheets C and D, suggesting that the allotted copy for each page, and (therefore) the total amount of copy to be composed in Windet's shop, were determined from early on in this printer's spell of work.

Thomas Purfoot, setting sheets E-K, seems to have varied his approach. Three of the six sheets produced in Purfoot's shop – E, F, and I – appear to have been composed by formes. The variation may reflect the working practices in Purfoot's printing house. Bowers argues that the use of a single skeleton in sheets E-F could indicate that only one compositor was employed for these sheets, and that this compositor was 'a rather slow type-setter' (p.4). As we have seen, Bowers points out that a second skeleton is introduced in sheet G and that the compositor's measure expands on G3r – two changes which may announce the arrival of a second compositor. It might be argued that the evidence of spacing difficulties summarised in Table 1 points to the opposite pattern – two compositors for sheets E-F, one for sheet G – because casting off copy and setting by formes would be a simple and obvious way of dividing compositorial work between two workmen. But it would be simplistic in the extreme to associate seriatim setting with one compositor and forme-setting with two. In fact, Bowers' suspicion that the second compositor (perhaps in conjunction with a second press) began work in 'the second half of sheet G' (p.4) tallies quite well with the moderate amount of evidence that this sheet was composed seriatim. Perhaps the first compositor set G1r-2v, and the second G3r-4v. The same arrangement may have been adopted in sheet H, where there are few signs of setting by formes, and where, once again, the compositor's measure is wider in the latter pages of the sheet – this time from H2v-4v. In sheet I the compositor's measure again expands (on I2v-4v), but here there is a fair amount of evidence for setting by formes. It is plausible that the compositors alternated pages while still setting up the copy for sheet I by formes. Compositor 1 may have composed the first page of I Outer (I1r) and the first two pages of I Inner (I1v and I2r) before being relieved, in both formes, by Compositor 2.¹⁸

The Second Quarto

The first quarto of the play was followed by a second, Q2, before the year's end (as Q2's title-page shows). That Q2 was the later of the two editions is shown by (a) its

18. Admittedly, this is little more than informed guesswork, and has found no support from other analyses of compositorial practices in Q1. Comprehensive spelling tests of common words, suffixes and prefixes, and a careful analysis of other aspects of compositorial work (such as treatment of speech-headings, punctuation and use of italic type) has failed to find any reinforcement for the theory that a second compositor was responsible for the specified pages or for any other pages in Purfoot's section. Generally, then, it would be risky to assume the presence of a second compositor in these pages solely on the basis of changes in the running-titles, compositor's measure and method of composition. Too many other factors may have influenced those variations. As a further complicating factor, it is not impossible that one or more of the gatherings showing little evidence for forme-setting were actually set by this method. Sheet G, in particular, has a predominance of verse in its first four-and-a-half pages, which may be the real reason for the absence of spacing problems in the first half of this gathering.

reproduction of the corrected states of all eight of Q1's press corrections (those on C2v, C4v, G2, G3v and K2v being on reset pages); (b) the survival of Q1's headlines in sheet E of one copy of Q2 (see below); and (c) the considered and often authorial-looking character of many of Q2's corrections of the Q1 text. (The third point does not in itself establish that Q2 was the later text, but it does give additional support to the first two pieces of evidence.) Q2 has the same collation as Q1. It survives in only three copies. Two of these lack the title-page as well as a number of pages of text: the copy held by the Bodleian Library in Oxford is missing the title-page as well as K3 and K4; and the Folger Shakespeare Library copy lacks the title-page, I4 and K1-4. However, the copy in the Bute Collection at the National Library of Scotland (discovered in time for Bowers to refer to it in the second edition of his *Dekker*) is complete. Inspection of this copy shows that Q2's title-page is identical to that of Q1 in all but two significant details: the Q1 title, '*THE Honest Whore*', was replaced with '*THE Converted Courtesan*',¹⁹ and the imprint was altered to read, 'Printed by V.S. and are to be solde by Iohn Hodggets at his shoppe in Paules church-yard 1604'. As mentioned above, the change to the imprint supports Greg's supposition that Hodggets acted as no more than the bookseller while Thomas Man, referred to in the Stationers' Company entry, was the true publisher.

More striking than these changes to the title-page, though, is the fact that a little over half of Q2's pages were printed using 'standing-type' from Q1. In other words, after the printing of Q1, many of its type-pages were retained in their assembled state, imposed with new running-titles (except for E Inner and E Outer in the Edinburgh copy, which *appear* to retain their Q1 running-titles²⁰) and re-used for the printing of Q2. In some instances entire formes were retained as such for re-printing. In other instances the formes were partly broken up and re-imposed with a mixture of standing-type and reset pages. Still other formes were completely reset. The details of resetting and reimposition are presented in Table 2, where 'R' refers to reset pages, 'S' to standing-type pages, and 'SR' to any page of mixed character.

TABLE 2: Standing-type and reset pages in Q2 of *1 Honest Whore*

A2r-4v	Standing (Title-page S/R)	F Outer	1r R; 2v, 3r, 4v S
B Inner	Reset	G Inner	Reset
B Outer	Reset	G Outer	Reset
C Inner	1v R; 2r, 4r S; 3v SR	H Inner	Standing
C Outer	Reset	H Outer	Reset
D Inner	Standing	I Inner	Standing
D Outer	Standing	I Outer	Reset
E Inner	Standing	K Inner	Standing
E Outer	Reset	K Outer	1r, 4v S; 2v, 3r R
F Inner	Standing		

19. The title-page of Q2 employs the same logotype '*THE*' (Ferguson, *Simmes*, pp.53, 55).

20. The running-titles on E2r, E3r, E3v are badly cropped (see Bowers, Introduction to his edition, pp.6-7). The problem of the sheet E running-titles in the Edinburgh copy is discussed below.

As can be seen from this table, seven of the ten inner formes (including A Inner) were entirely retained in standing type, while the other three were partly retained. Most of the outer formes were completely reset. Each of the standing-type formes must have been unlocked in order to change the headlines and/or to effect alterations in the text of the play. Even the standing-type forme E Inner of the Edinburgh copy, where the Q1 headlines were retained, must have been unlocked for the purpose of substantial alterations on each of its pages – on E1v (II.i.424), E2r (II.i.444, 449, 454, III.i.19), E3v (III.i.102, 117), and E4r (III.i.141). Thus, although eleven of Q2's 41 standing-type pages – A2r, 2v, 3v, 4v, F1v, 2r, 2v, 3v, 4v, I2r, K1v – reveal no textual alteration, not a single standing-type page in Q2 was reimpressed without modification of some kind.

It is difficult to tell what sort of delay occurred between the Q1 and Q2 printings of the standing-type pages. Since printers generally removed the skeleton formes before putting away type-pages they wished to retain, removal of the running-titles may sometimes provide evidence of storage between printings. In the present instance, though, the Q1 running-titles had to be removed to make way for the new 'Converted Courtesan' titles. As far as we can tell from this, the printing of the two editions may have been more or less continuous.²¹ (The anomalous running-titles in Sheet E of the Edinburgh copy may yield more insights into this problem, and they are discussed below.)

There is a good likelihood that Q2 was printed by four rather than three printing shops. The division of work for sheets A-B and C-D appears to have remained the same, but at least part of sheets E and F, originally Thomas Purfoot's responsibility, seems to have been reassigned to another printer, possibly Simon Stafford. Bowers had suspected this reassignment: 'If the unique typography of their running-titles can be trusted, sheets E and F were printed in a different shop from G-K, the reassignment from the division of Q1 being made, perhaps, to speed up production' (Introduction, p.8). His theory is supported by W.W. Greg, and by W. Craig Ferguson, who observes that an 'odd mixture' of type characteristic of the printer Simon Stafford is present 'on sheets E and F'.²² In his recent study of type-fonts in Elizabethan play-quartos, Adrian Weiss claims that Stafford set E and F in both Q1 and Q2.²³ Our own examination of the type suggests that this is incorrect, and that Stafford only worked on (parts of) sheets E and F in Q2. Similarly, Ferguson's unqualified reference to Stafford's type appearing 'on sheets E and F' is misleading: unless we assent to Weiss's belief that Stafford was responsible for sheets E and F in Q1, this printer's type could be found only in E Outer and the first page of sheet F in Q2, for the other pages in these sheets were printed from standing-type. It follows from this that Ferguson's claim that 'both Stafford and Purfoot fully signed their sheets' (p.17) is also inaccurate.

21. Further details of the imposition and arrangement of running-titles in Q2 are given by Bowers, Introduction, pp.6-8.

22. *Pica Roman Type in Elizabethan England*, p.17. Greg, *Bibliography of the English Printed Drama*, II, p.325, identifies three sections in Q1 (A-B, C-D, E-K) and four sections in Q2, although he does not specify the division in the later edition.

23. Weiss also attributes C-D of Q1 to Thomas Creede ('Font Analysis as a Bibliographical Method: The Elizabethan Play-Quarto Printers and Compositors', *Studies in Bibliography*, 43, 1990, p.125).

E4r and F4r, the pages on which the fourth signatures occur in Stafford's section, are (*pace* Weiss) standing-type pages of Purfoot's work. Thus there is no way of knowing – from this play at least – whether Stafford fully signed quarto gatherings or not.

If the responsibility for sheets E and F in Q2 *was* passed on to Stafford, though, the reassignment would mean, as Bowers notes, that 'standing type was transferred on this occasion from one shop to another' (Introduction, p. 8). It is difficult to determine whether the corrections in standing type – e.g., at E2r (II.i.444, 449, 454), E3v (III.i.117), etc. – were made before or after the assumed transfer of the pages. The corrections employ too little type for us to be sure. But as the pages supposedly reset by Stafford – E Inner and F1r – contain so little evidence of authoritative correction or revision, it seems most likely that the alterations in standing-type E Outer and F1v-4v were made in Purfoot's shop.

As if all of this were not enough, Q2 contains yet another curiosity. The text of this edition differs from that of Q1 in numerous ways. By our reckoning, there are more than 500 individual instances of variation, ranging from fairly inconsequential differences in spelling to significant changes in wording and punctuation, and even, in a few places, rephrasing of entire passages. These variations are to be found in both reset and standing-type pages.

There are, then, four unusual features in Q2: its use of standing type, its division amongst four different printing shops, its many textual divergences from Q1, and its new title. It is very likely that all four features are related. Consider, first of all, Q2's standing type. In normal circumstances, type would be distributed soon after it had been printed, and 'would not be kept standing for any book except by a plan conceived before or very shortly after the printing of the first gathering'.²⁴ It is a reasonable guess, then, that Simmes and his cohorts (including, probably, the likely publisher, Thomas Man) intended a second edition of *1 Honest Whore* from the outset, perhaps because they expected larger than usual sales. Bowers, building on this possibility, conjectures that the printers decided to circumvent the Stationers' Company restrictions which, since 1587, had limited edition sizes to between 1250 and 1500 copies.²⁵ With this purpose in mind, they prepared new type-pages for approximately half of the new edition, but made up the other half with standing-type pages from Q1.²⁶ In this way they limited the cost of fresh composition while

24. Fredson Bowers, 'Notes on Standing Type in Elizabethan Printing', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 40 (1946), p.207.

25. Bowers first advanced this theory in 'Notes on Standing Type', p.223; see also the Introduction to *1 Honest Whore*, pp.5-6. For the Stationers' Company regulations governing edition sizes, see Bowers, 'Standing Type', p.211, and Greg, *A Companion to Arber* (Oxford, 1967), pp.43, 95.

26. It may of course be unwise to assume that only half of Q1's pages were retained immediately after the printing of that edition. Greg remarks that 'the random occurrence of the formes that remained intact suggests the possibility, and even the probability, that the whole of the type of [Q1] was at one time standing together' ("The Honest Whore" or "The Converted Courtezan", *The Library*, Fourth Series, XV, 1935, p.57). George K. Hunter notes that one copy of the second quarto of *The Malcontent*, printed by Simmes in the same year as *1 Honest Whore*, has sheet B entirely reset, while the same sheet in all other extant copies was printed from standing type (*The Malcontent*, Revels Plays, Manchester University Press, 1975, p.xxxv). Hunter asks: 'Why would Sims (or anyone else) take the time to reset material that was already in type?' (p.xxxv). Since an accident with *both* formes of the

simultaneously camouflaging the fact that half of Q2's sheets were impressed from type-pages composed for the first edition. Such an unusual arrangement would presumably have required some form of private agreement with the compositors, whose employment prospects were protected by the very restrictions now being evaded. In all probability the alternative title was part of the general camouflage, in which case – and *pace* W.W. Greg – it has no real authority.²⁷ The contradictory imprints of Q1 and Q2, which give the impression that John Hodgets was the publisher of the first edition but not the second, may also have been part of the effort to cover tracks. At no point, either, is there any mention of the person who we suspect was the true holder of copyright, Thomas Man. This was a prudent move, perhaps, considering that Man's father, Thomas Man Senior, was at this time Master of the Company of Stationers.

Significantly, the second quarto of *1 Honest Whore* is not the only second edition bearing Valentine Simmes's imprint to contain large amounts of standing-type. Simmes's second edition of *The Malcontent* (1604) is also only partly reset. So too are Edward Allde's edition of Dekker's own *The Whole Magnificent Entertainment* (Q2, 1604) and Thomas Purfoot's edition of John Marston's *Parasitaster, or The Fawn* (Q2, 1606).²⁸ Bowers suggests that these four editions represent a short-lived endeavour on the part of a small group of printers, publishers and, indeed, authors, to circumvent the Stationers' Company restrictions.²⁹ This theory may be supported by three observations about the circumstances surrounding the printing of the four texts: (1) *The Magnificent Entertainment* and (probably) *1 Honest Whore* were published by Thomas Man the younger; (2) only two authors (or three if we count Middleton) were involved;³⁰ (3) Valentine Simmes and Thomas Purfoot were both engaged in work on two of the editions concerned.

Why, though, did the printers decide to share the work on *1 Honest Whore*? Bowers suggests that they wished to speed up production (Introduction, p.4). This appears to be a common motive for shared printing. For example, soon after the execution of the highwayman Gamaliel Ratsey on March 6, 1605, Simmes shared the printing of an account of Ratsey's life and death (STC 20753) with one or more other printing shops. A second part, *Ratsey's Ghost* (STC 20753a), appeared soon after. Here,

sheet seems unlikely, the answer to Hunter's question may be that the resetting of sheet B was part of a deliberate effort to further conceal the fact that this second edition of Marston's play was, like Q2 of *1 Honest Whore*, substantially a reprint of the first edition. See below for further discussion of the printing of Marston's play.

27. Greg thought the authorial nature of many of Q2's textual variants justified the belief that the new title also originated with the author ("The Honest Whore" or "The Converted Courtesan", p.55). This view is also undermined by Dekker's use of the phrase 'honest whore' at III.iii.100 in Part I, and by the occurrence of 'the honest whore' and similar phrases on several occasions in Part II of the play (I.i.87, III.i.154, IV.i.170, IV.i.251, IV.ii.45-6, V.i.10, and V.ii.377). The phrase obviously became an important emblem of Dekker's dramatic conception, although Bellafront may not have been quite so central to his plans at the outset (see footnote 8).
28. Bowers, Introduction to *1 Honest Whore*, pp.5-6; David A. Blostein, ed., *Parasitaster, or The Fawn*, Revels Plays (Manchester University Press, 1978), pp.51-2; and George K. Hunter, ed., *The Malcontent*, pp.xxvi-xxvii.
29. 'Standing Type', pp.223-4.
30. 'Standing Type', p. 223.

too, Simmes shared the printing with other shops; and this time the publisher was John Hodgets, the stationer entrusted with selling *1 Honest Whore*.³¹ Evidently the printers shared the work on these two pieces of ephemera in order to hasten production and capitalise on public interest in Ratsey's case. Similar desires may have led to the shared printing of *1 Honest Whore*. Haste may have seemed especially important on this occasion, as Simmes and his fellow printers would have been keen to avoid lingering over an activity that broke the laws of their company. However, all such explanations tend to neglect the fact that shared printing was in any case extremely common in Jacobean London.³² It arose, very often, from printers' straightforward need to exercise control over their workloads.³³ Simmes's business was not a large one, even by the standards of the time, and 1604 was the second busiest year of his career.³⁴ It may have suited him very well, then, to farm out work on Dekker's play. Another, even more mundane concern may also have influenced the printers' decision to share. As we have seen, just over half of the printed pages in Q2 – 41 out of 79 pages, to be precise – are reimpressed. Retaining this number of pages in standing-type for a second edition would very probably be a considerable drain on a Jacobean printer's type resources, especially since a compositor's lower case 'would begin to run out of individual lower-case sorts when it was down to between a quarter and a third of its full weight'.³⁵ Limiting each shop's share in the work to no more than six sheets (or the equivalent of five in Q2, if sheets E and F were partly reassigned) may have been seen as a way of alleviating this problem.³⁶

As mentioned earlier, most of the running-titles of Q2 are altered in accordance with the new title of this second edition. The two extremely interesting exceptions to this are the E Inner and E Outer formes of the Edinburgh copy, which *appear* to retain their Q1 running titles, though not – so far as E Inner is concerned, at least – in the same order in which they are used in Q1.³⁷ As we have seen, a single skeleton seems to have been used in Q1 for both formes of E and F, and – in a slightly different order

31. Ferguson, *Valentine Simmes*, p.89.

32. Peter Blayney observes that 'early printers commonly—one might almost say habitually—shared books with one another' (*The Texts of 'King Lear' and Their Origins*, I, p.31).

33. See Blayney, *The Texts of 'King Lear' and Their Origins*, I, p.50.

34. Ferguson, *Valentine Simmes*, pp.22, 25.

35. Philip Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), p.53.

36. Amounts of available type in a particular fount obviously varied from shop to shop, but some idea of the difficulties caused by keeping large numbers of pages in standing type may be gathered from Peter Blayney's analysis of the Nicholas Okes quarto of *King Lear*. In printing the quarto of *Lear*, Okes's fount 'was not really adequate to the task' of seriatim setting, which requires at least seven pages to be in print before imposition can begin (*The Texts of 'King Lear' and Their Origins*, I, p.150). Usually no more than 12, and never more than 16, pages of type were standing at any point during the printing of *Lear* (pp.109, n., 115, 132, 150). See also Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p.53, and Bowers, 'Standing Type', where it is suggested that, in view of the limits on the amount of type which could be kept standing at any one time, 'we should enquire carefully into the circumstances of printing of any edition which uses type-pages from much more than one full gathering of an earlier edition' (p.208).

37. The swash N headline which appears on E3v of the E Inner forme of Q1 is found on E4r in the Edinburgh copy of Q2. The same headline appears in E Outer, too, but on E4v in all extant copies of Q1 and Q2 (Bowers, Introduction, p.7). See below for further discussion.

– both formes of H. This skeleton then suffered further rearrangement before its imposition with I Outer. Bowers remarks on the ‘puzzling’ fact that one headline of this skeleton, the distinctive swash-N headline of E3v, E4v, F4r, F4v, H3v and H4v, does not occur in I Outer, and yet it ‘reappears’, as Bowers puts it (Introduction, p.3), in sheet E of the Edinburgh copy of Q2 – on E4r and E4v. Bowers speculates that the Edinburgh sheet E was begun ‘in error with the Q1 headlines instead of the *Courtesan* titles, either by the printer of Q1 E-K or by the printer of Q2 E-F (if he differed); or perhaps it represents part of a special run to make up a short count in Q1’ (p.7). The first hypothesis is by far the likeliest, but probably not for the reasons Bowers seems to entertain. In other words, perhaps the occurrence of the Q1 sheet E headlines in one or more copies of Q2 was not a matter of ‘reappearance’, as Bowers conjectures. Because of the cropping which affects the headlines on E2r, E3r and E3v of the Edinburgh Q2, it is impossible to speak with certainty about the headlines in sheet E of this copy; but the positions of the swash-N headline, on E4r and E4v, are the same as in sheet F of Q1, which prompts the supposition that standing-type E Inner and reset E Outer of Q2 were printed soon after the two E formes of Q1 – or at least before sheet H of Q1, with its altered headline configuration. Printing of the Q1 E Inner and Q2 E Inner formes bearing the ‘Honest Whore’ headlines could not have been continuous, though, because Edinburgh Q2 contains textual variants on all four pages of this forme (see Appendix). It seems probable to us that these changes were made in the type-pages of E Inner *before* they were passed on to the other printing shop: E Outer, which was completely reset in the second printing house, does not contain any distinctly authorial-looking variants, which suggests that at this point, at least, the compositor(s) in the second shop did not have access to – or at any rate did not consult – the copy containing authoritative corrections. The picture remains unclear in some respects, particularly regarding the survival of the old Q1 headlines in sheet E of one or more copies of Q2, but the circumstances of the printing of this problematic sheet may not have been far removed from the hypothetical procedure outlined above. In any case, the partial survival of the Q1 running-titles encourages speculation that the two editions were fairly close in the press. This is perhaps what one would expect, since from the outset Q1 and Q2 were evidently viewed by the printers as the two halves of a single project.

A third quarto of *1 Honest Whore*, bearing the imprint of Valentine Simmes, appeared in 1605 (Q3). This edition, which survives in a single copy in the Dyce collection, is wholly comprised of standing-type pages of the two earlier quartos. As Fredson Bowers suggests, Q3 ‘seems to have been constructed to use up odd quantities of remainder sheets from Q1 pieced out by Q2’ (Introduction, p.16). Bowers also notes that the two variant formes in Q1, G Inner and K Outer, ‘are represented in the uncorrected state’ in Q3, and ‘the uncorrected state of outer C is preserved only in the sheet in the Dyce Q3’ (p. 16). He adduces this as evidence that the Q1 pages incorporated in Q3 were ‘partly segregated less perfect copies later utilized as remainders’ (p.16). The evidence seems very slim. The one thing that is certainly significant about these press-variants is that they are the only parts of the text where Q3 has any textual authority. Otherwise this edition is no more than a

hotchpotch of pages from Q1 and Q2.³⁸ Since Q3 would have gained new sales with very little additional work, it may represent a further surreptitious effort to capitalise on interest in Dekker and Middleton's comedy while keeping additional expenses to a minimum. A fourth quarto of the play (Q4) appeared, probably in late 1615,³⁹ and a fifth edition, Q5, was published in 1635. Q4 and Q5, both printed by Nicholas Okes, have no textual authority, for Q4 is a straight reprint of Q1, and Q5 a reprint of Q4. The best these quartos can manage is a little 'editorial' tampering.

Thus an editor trying to determine the most reliable early text of *1 Honest Whore* is obliged to concentrate on Q1 and Q2. Which of these two texts, with their shared pages of standing type, their shared printing among three or four different printing shops, and their hundreds of minor and major variants, is likely to provide the more accurate version of the play? In order to answer this question, we must first try to determine the provenance of the texts preserved in Q1 and Q2.

Printer's copy for Q1

Fredson Bowers argues that Q1 was set up from authorial foul papers or a transcript of them (Introduction, pp.2-3). This conclusion may be tenable, but it does not give a wholly accurate impression of the text set forth in Q1. Nor is the evidence which Bowers advances for foul-paper copy thoroughly convincing. First of all, it is true, as Bowers points out, that Q1 contains a number of 'descriptive' stage directions – instructions which bear the stamp of the dramatist's imagination more clearly than that of the theatre. Nevertheless, these descriptive directions do give practical and precise information about staging. The direction on C3v (II.i.0.1-6) is representative:

Enter Roger with a stoole, cushin, looking-glasse and chafing-dish.

Those being set downe, he pulls out of his pocket, a viol with white cullor in it. And 2 boxes, one with white, another red painting, he places all things in order & a candle by the, singing with the ends of old Ballads as he does it. At last Bellafront (as he rubs his cheek with the cullors, whistles within.

The wording and punctuation here (note the afterthoughts of '*And 2 boxes . . . & a candle*') may well reflect the author's early improvisation, but there is nothing in this direction that could not have survived the foul-papers stage of composition – nothing, more particularly, which would have presented any obstacle to the adaptation of the play for the theatre. Similar observations may be made about the detailed, descriptive directions at A2r (I.i.0.1-5) and D1r-2v (II.i.117.1-3). Generally – and despite a fair

38. In Q3, the running-titles of most of the Q2 standing-type pages (i.e., sheets A-B, and H) were changed to read 'The Honest Whore', in accordance with those of Q1. (Sheet E, also retained in standing-type from Q2, keeps the normal Q2 headlines.) The title-page and head-title page, A2r, were both taken from Q2, and they too were brought into line with Q1 as regards the play's title. Apart from these alterations, Q3's pages were printed as they were found in Q1 and Q2. See Greg, "The Honest Whore" or "The Converted Courtesan", pp.58-9, and Bowers, Introduction, p.16.

39. Two copies of Q4 bear the date 1615; the rest are dated 1616. As Greg observes, it seems that 'the date 1615 was rejected and the type altered in the course of printing' (*Bibliography of the English Printed Drama*, p.326). Bowers believes that Q4 was 'probably' printed in 'late 1615' (Introduction, p.17).

amount of fluctuation in the degree of detail they provide – the stage directions of Q1 are practical and reliable guides to what is happening on stage.

Perhaps stronger evidence that authorial foul papers provided printer's copy for Q1 is found in the inconsistencies which Bowers notes in the speech-prefixes for Candido's wife. On the first four pages of Q1 in which she appears (A4v, B1r, B1v, B2r), this character is consistently referred to in the speech-headings as '*Viola*' (and she is named thus in the dialogue at I.ii.13, A4r). From B4r onwards, however (in other words, after I.ii, the first scene in which the character appears), the speech-prefixes announce her as '*Wife*', with one exception, '*Mist.*', on C1v. The switch from '*Viola*' to '*Wife*' looks very much like an authorial change of mind, and this possibility is made all the more likely by a further variation in Q2, where the '*Viola*' speech-prefixes on two pages in Q1 (B1v and B2r) were altered to '*Wife*'. Someone – a workman in Simmes's printing shop, or more likely Dekker – appears to have changed these speech-prefixes (or requested them to be changed) to make them conform with the author's (or authors') final choice of title for Candido's spouse.⁴⁰ But while the variations in the speech-prefixes for this character may well reflect the 'variation of composition', it is by no means clear that such variation could not have survived in a version of the text later than foul papers. These minor changes would hardly have bothered Prince Henry's Company as they prepared the play for performance.

The final piece of evidence which Bowers cites for authorial foul papers is the fragment of continuous scene-numbering between E2r and H2v. As has already been noted, it is only in these pages that scenes are numbered. The numbering begins with 'SCENA 7' (III.i) on E2r and runs to '13. SCE.' (IV.iv) on H2v, omitting only the heading for Scene 12. (Q2 follows Q1 precisely in these details, although just two of the scene-headings – '11. SCE.' on G3r, and '13. SCE.' on H2v – fall on reset pages.) Significantly, the anomalous scene-numbering occurs only in the section of the text (sheets E-K) set by the third printer, Thomas Purfoot. The most logical explanation for this is that the scene-numbering occurred more or less consistently throughout the copy manuscript, and that Purfoot's shop reproduced part of what the other shops had disregarded. But why Bowers should consider this as evidence that authorial foul papers were used as printer's copy is not clear. Scene-numbering is not an obvious sign of foul papers, and the 'preserved fragment' of numbering in this text is more likely to be a result of variation of transmission than variation of composition.

Bowers might have sought further support for his claim in the peculiar repetition which occurs in the last act of the play. At V.i.55-77, Candido's wife is seen imploring the Duke to release her husband from prison. In response, the Duke asks Candido's name, enquires about the details of his (wrongful) imprisonment, and then orders his release. The wife's suit is then interrupted by the entrance of Castruchio (77.1), who

40. There is a slight chance that the variation in these speech-headings may tell us something about the division of the writing between Dekker and Middleton. David J. Lake attributes I.ii, the scene in which Candido's wife appears as Viola, to Dekker. The next scene in which she appears, I.v, where the speech-prefixes term her '*Wife*', may be the work of both dramatists (at least up to line 132). See Lake's *The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays* (Cambridge University Press, 1975), pp.66-90. That the variation in speech-headings could be compositorial in origin seems unlikely in view of the evidence (cited below) that sheet B, where the variation occurs, was set by a single compositor.

upsets the Duke with his news about the marriage of Hippolito and Infelice. Towards the very end of the play, at V.ii.457, Candido's wife is again seen asking the Duke to release her husband. Strangely, the Duke seems to know nothing about the business – 'Haue I thy husband?' (460) – and once again has to be told Candido's name and the circumstances of his arrest. When Candido himself is brought forth, the Duke assures him that he will 'teach our court to shine' (519). The repetition here looks very much like an authorial revision which was never tidied up in the manuscript, and it is doubtful that the Duke's amnesia as regards Candido's plight would have been allowed to stand in the prompt-book. Here, then, is perhaps the strongest evidence for authorial foul papers. Yet the repetition in Act V is just the sort of oversight one would expect in *any* kind of manuscript produced by Dekker, an author who was almost always working at top speed. (In the four years from 1598 to 1602, Dekker was involved in work on no fewer than forty-five plays.⁴¹) In the light of such pressures, we cannot exclude the possibility that Dekker allowed the repetition to stand in a manuscript which he believed to be – or which he hoped would be accepted as – a fair copy: a manuscript which may indeed have been, in nearly every other respect, a well-ordered transcript of his play.⁴²

With the possible exception of this repetition, then, there are no *definite* signs that the printer's copy for Q1 was in the kind of condition normally associated with authorial foul papers. The text exhibits very few instances of 'loose ends, false starts, textual tangles, unresolved confusions' or 'duplicated alternative versions of particular passages'; there is only one *extensive* inconsistency in speech-prefixes; there are no 'ghost characters', and (in comparison with other seventeenth-century play-quartos) there is only a modest number of 'extreme deficiencies in stage directions'.⁴³ Again, there is not 'an exceptional number of obvious errors' such as might be caused by the

41. Gerald Eades Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 7 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941-68), III, p.242. Concerning the apparent drop in Dekker's output after 1602, when Henslowe ceased making regular entries in his diary, Bentley speculates that Dekker might have had unknown patronage, or that many of his plays from this period have been lost (III, p.243).

42. It seems very unlikely that the repetition in Act V was caused by a misunderstanding between Dekker and his collaborator. David J. Lake attributes all of Act V to Dekker alone (*The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays*, p.58).

43. A modern critical edition will certainly require more frequent stage directions than are presented in the early editions, but the instructions preserved in Q1 and Q2 are not markedly inadequate by the standards of the time—even in comparison with a play such as *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, which reveals clear evidence of theatrical annotation. (Anne Lancashire comments on the inadequacies of the stage directions in the manuscript of *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* in her Revels edition, Manchester University Press, 1978, pp.53-4.) The most obvious deficiencies in the stage directions of Q1 and Q2 of *Honest Whore* are as follows: both editions omit an exit for the Duke at I.i.60, and both editions slightly misplace a stage direction at II.i.39. Short directions are mistakenly set as part of the dialogue at II.i.45 and perhaps at V.ii.335, and exeunts at II.i.456, IV.ii.40 and IV.ii.43 should be exits. An exit for a servant is set one line early at IV.i.138 in Q1, and omitted altogether in Q2. Of these eight errors in stage directions, only those at I.i.60, II.i.45 and V.ii.335 could be described as 'extreme deficiencies'. As for speech-headings, there is a minor mistake with an apprentice's heading at III.i.77, and consistent misreadings of Pol's name in speech-headings (and stage directions) at the beginning of IV.ii, at IV.ii.16, 40, 41, 43, IV.iii.51, 66, 68, and 87.

misreading of untidy and much-altered handwriting in foul papers.⁴⁴ The absence of such features in Q1 indicates that it *may* derive from a more finished manuscript than foul papers – perhaps a scribal or authorial transcript of these. Stanley Wells describes a foul-paper manuscript as ‘a script that had not undergone such polishing’ as might have been necessary before it could be held to represent a satisfactory performance.⁴⁵ The manuscript which informed the first quarto of Dekker’s play would, on the contrary, have furnished a perfectly adequate text for the theatre. Deficiencies in the stage directions (cited in note 43) would presumably have been put right during the preparation of the prompt-book, or in rehearsal (such as it was) with the actors.

We have found no clear-cut evidence of preparation of the copy manuscript for the playhouse. On I3r (V.ii.106.1) there is a theatrical-looking stage direction, ‘*Enter Towne like a sweeper*’; and the subsequent speech-prefixes for this character, on I3r and I3v, insist on referring to him as ‘*Tow.*’. The reference is almost certainly to Thomas Towne, a member of Prince Henry’s Company at the time of their performance of *The Honest Whore*.⁴⁶ A theatrical touch, to be sure. But it may be no more than the mark of a playwright who was imagining a particular detail of performance as he worked on his script. It would be a perfectly natural detail for a playwright such as Dekker – a professional dramatist having a long-standing connection with his theatre troupe – to include in his manuscript.⁴⁷ Of course, the appearances of the actor’s name may be thought to strengthen the claims for foul-paper copy, since actors’ names are found in texts (such as the quarto of *Much Ado About Nothing* and the second quarto of *Romeo and Juliet*) that are widely agreed to have been set from foul papers. But in such texts the presence of actors’ names is one feature in a large body of evidence indicating foul-paper copy.⁴⁸ Taken by itself, or in the context of very little evidence for foul-paper copy, it seems a rather shaky foundation for a foul-paper hypothesis, for it is far from impossible that the names may have been retained at later stages in the preparation of the manuscript. The difficulty of associating the presence of actor’s names exclusively with foul-paper copy is demonstrated by the fact that this feature has often been identified as a sign of prompt copy.⁴⁹ Similar remarks may be offered

44. The catalogue of typical foul-paper characteristics presented in this paragraph is borrowed from the Introduction to Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, John Jowett and William Montgomery, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*, The Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p.9.

45. ‘Editorial Treatment of Foul-Paper Texts: *Much Ado About Nothing* as Test Case’, *Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. XXXI, No.121 (Feb. 1980), p.1.

46. Hoy, *Introductions, Notes, and Commentaries*, pp.59-60.

47. See Gerald Eades Bentley, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare’s Time 1590-1642* (Princeton University Press, 1971), pp.30-7. For Shakespeare’s apparent use of actors’ names in his manuscript of *Much Ado About Nothing*, see Sheldon P. Zitner’s recent edition of the play in the World’s Classics series (Oxford University Press, 1994), p.83, and A.R. Humphreys’ Arden Shakespeare edition (London: Methuen, 1981), p.79.

48. See A.R. Humphreys’ Arden edition of *Much Ado About Nothing*, pp.77-9; and Brian Gibbons’ Arden edition of *Romeo and Juliet* (London: Methuen, 1980), pp.13-23.

49. The theatre’s book-keeper was more likely to add actors’ names to the margin of the prompt-book – probably the left-hand margin (see W.W. Greg, *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*, 2nd edn., 2 vols., Oxford, 1969, II, p.213). However, there is no guarantee that this detail of layout would be preserved in a printed text. The occurrence of two actors’ names in an ordinarily laid-out stage direction in the 1602 quarto of Marston’s *Antonio and Mellida* suggests to W. Reavley Gair that ‘the

about the word 'Tabacco', printed on D2r alongside Castruchio's offer of tobacco to Hippolito. Dekker, like the dramatist responsible for the Melbourne Manuscript, was probably quite familiar with the form of stage directions used in the prompt-book.⁵⁰

In short, although the copy manuscript still contained flaws such as the plot repetition in Act V, it was very possibly in a more public, and a more polished, stage of composition than foul papers. At the same time, there are no compelling signs that it was used as the prompt-book – or that the copy for Q1 was a prompt-book prepared from the author's papers. All of this points to the possibility that the manuscript was an authorial or scribal fair copy which was yet to be adapted or annotated for the theatre. Foul papers cannot be ruled out, but that term needs to be used with caution in describing the manuscript lying behind Q1. In some respects, as we have argued above, a 'foul papers' designation is likely to misrepresent the state of the manuscript which was used to set up this edition. Perhaps the best solution would be to borrow Macbeth's phrase and say that the manuscript was both 'foul and fair'. Certainly, it is difficult to insist on a clear distinction between the two categories in describing copy for Q1. This is not a very unusual situation. Similar problems obtain in regard to the first quarto of *Richard II*, for example, where it is difficult to determine whether the text was based on foul papers, 'a non-theatrical transcript of them', or 'well-ordered authorial papers'.⁵¹

Printer's copy for Q2

The question of printer's copy for Q2 naturally focuses on (a) the alterations in the standing type pages from Q1, and (b) the reset pages of Q2, with their many divergences from the text of Q1. To begin with, it is beyond doubt that Q2's reset pages were set up from a copy of Q1 rather than the original manuscript, because the reset pages reproduce a great many of the details of the layout, lineation and typography of the corresponding pages in Q1. The most straightforward explanation of Q2's authoritative variants is that they were entered in this same copy of the first quarto before it was used as printer's copy for the second edition. Bowers argues, however, that authoritative alterations in the reset pages of Q2 are almost entirely

manuscript source for the text was prompt copy' (Revels Plays edition, Manchester University Press, 1978, p.1). For further discussion, see William B. Long, 'Stage-Directions: A Misinterpreted Factor in Determining Textual Provenance', *TEXT*, 2 (1985), pp.121-38.

50. See Antony Hammond and Doreen Delvecchio, 'The Melbourne Manuscript and John Webster: A Reproduction and Transcript', *Studies in Bibliography*, 41 (1988), p.5. R.B. McKerrow thinks that an 'occasional mention' of an actor's name is 'far from unnatural' in the manuscript of a professional dramatist ('The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts', *The Library*, Fourth Series, Vol.XII, No.3, Dec. 1931, p.274).

51. All three possibilities are entertained by John Jowett and Stanley Wells, *Textual Companion*, p.306. The uncertainty is further demonstrated by a short survey of other scholars' views: Andrew Gurr argues that copy for Q1 of *Richard II* was 'a careful and precisely constructed version of the original design' (New Cambridge edition, 1984, p.51); Peter Ure argues for a memorially corrupted transcript of the authorial papers (Arden edition, 1956, pp.xiii-xix); while G. Blakemore Evans accepts the view that the quarto was based on foul papers ('Shakespeare's Text', in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, 2 vols., Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974, I, p.30).

limited to sheet B. This leads him to construct a curious scenario in which the variants in standing-type pages and those in reset pages other than sheet B derive from separate sources:

The fact to be faced is that authoritative alterations appear in standing-type pages but not (except for a few very doubtful cases) in pages subsequently reset. It would appear, therefore, that the corrections and revisions were made in this standing type in the brief interval before the distributed pages were reset... it may have been that Dekker submitted to the publisher a marked copy of Q1 and the publisher in turn sent it to the printers, beginning with the shop that had printed sheets G-K and was to print the same sheets again. This printer passed the marked copy on to the shop that had taken over sheets E-F, and so to the shop printing C-D and finally to Simmes printing A-B. At this time, however, the distributed pages had not been reset; and hence the printers, instead of abstracting the sheets which they were to print again, merely made the necessary alterations in the standing type in their shops and sent on the quarto to the next man. Finally it came to rest with Simmes, who was thus the only printer able to reset his pages, in sheet B, according to the marked copy. (Introduction, p.13)

Bowers acknowledges that there are difficulties with his hypothesis: 'why the marked quarto was not itself broken up and used for copy is quite inexplicable. Moreover, we must take it that the printers made no attempt, once resetting was ordered, to secure the corrected quarto again' (p.13, n.2). The difficulties faced by the hypothesis are considerably more serious than these comments would suggest. Indeed, Bowers' entire scenario is based on a false supposition: it is *not* a 'fact' that 'authoritative alterations appear in standing-type pages but not ... in pages subsequently reset'. We believe that our comparison of the Q1 and Q2 variants, presented below, thoroughly refutes that claim. What is more, if it is agreed that variants in the reset pages *are* often authoritative, the unlikely circumstance of the printers being able to make use of the amended copy of Q1 for Q2's standing-type pages but not for the bulk of its reset pages can be rejected. Bowers himself argued that sheet B (and possibly K3r) of Q2 contains authoritative alterations (Introduction, pp. 11-12), so presumably he would have accepted that there was at least a possibility of this being true for other reset pages. In sum, an editor convinced of the authority of the Q2 variants in both standing-type and reset pages could proceed on the simple assumption that the marked-up copy of Q1 was used as the basis for alterations throughout the second quarto.⁵²

But just how convincing are Q2's variants? And how many authoritative variants occur in the reset pages dismissed by Bowers?

52. The most likely scenario is that each of the printers (with the possible exception of Simon Stafford--see above) was able to keep the marked-up copy of Q1 in his shop while the standing-type pages were being corrected and the reset pages composed; or perhaps the printers broke up the corrected copy of Q1 to enable them to enter authoritative alterations in the standing-type and reset pages of Q2. A further alternative is that Dekker may have annotated unbound sheets of the first edition and distributed them to the printing houses responsible for the corresponding gatherings in Q2. Surplus sheets from Q1 would have been suitable for this purpose.

The authority of Q2

The biggest problem for any editor who shares Bowers' overall preference for Q1 is the fact – recognised by Matthew Baird as long ago as 1930 – that 'in the majority of cases the readings of [Q2] are superior'.⁵³ Baird's statement may give a simplistic impression of the complex relationship between Q1 and Q2, but it seems quite acceptable as an overall assessment. Even in the reset pages, Q2's variants frequently deserve careful consideration. As we have seen, Bowers argues that, for the most part, Q2's authoritative revisions are found only in its standing-type pages, in reset sheet B, and possibly in the single reset page K3r. According to the school of textual theory championed by himself and Greg, this judgement obliges him to adopt Q1 as his copy-text (in respect to 'accidentals' and uncontested substantive readings), but to take substantive variants, where they are judged to be authorial and correct, from the standing-type pages, reset sheet B and K3r of Q2. Substantive variants in reset pages other than those of sheet B should, according to Bowers' reasoning, be rejected as the result of transmissional corruption. There is, to be sure, a good *prima facie* case for regarding standing-type alterations as more authoritative than those in reset pages, for the compositors had to unlock the type-pages specifically for these changes to be made (although, of course, the changes may not always have been rendered accurately). But Bowers' claim that there are only six authoritative variants in the reset pages other than sheet B and K3r (Introduction, pp.11-12) is a serious underestimate. Scrutiny of the variants in the reset pages of Q2 other than sheet B and K3r shows that many more variants in these pages are likely to derive, not from warrantless alteration, as Bowers would have it, but from authoritative – and possibly authorial – emendation. To begin with a fairly minor example, at IV.iii.31 (G4r) the question 'What said he *George* when he pasde by thee?', the last line of a short prose-speech by Candido's wife, is capitalised in Q1 as if it were an independent verse-line. Yet the line seems no more verse-like than the rest of the speech. In Q2 it is begun correctly with a lower-case letter. Bowers adopts the Q1 reading, omitting the Q2 variant from his collation (one of many such omissions, which we have listed in full elsewhere⁵⁴). Another variant occurs in George's response to the question from Candido's wife, which reads in Q1: 'Troth Mistris nothing'. The same phrase on the reset page G4v of Q2 is repunctuated as 'Troth Mistris, nothing'. The change (again, not recorded by Bowers) is not terribly significant, but it is nevertheless likely to be correct. So too are the following Q2 variants, all from reset pages rejected by Bowers:

* In the stage direction at the head of IV.ii (G3r), Q1 gives a character's name as 'Poli', while Q2 gives the correct form, 'Poh'. Q2 corrects the name twice more on G4v (IV.iii.51, 66).

53. Matthew Baird, 'The Early Editions of Thomas Dekker's *The Converted Courtesan* or *The Honest Whore*, Part 1', p.54. W.W. Greg described Q1 as 'an inferior text of Dekker's most successful play' ('*The Honest Whore*' or '*The Converted Courtesan*', p.60).

54. Joost Daalder and Antony Telford Moore, 'New Variants in the First Part of Dekker's *The Honest Whore*', *Notes and Queries*, n.s. 42, 3, 1995, pp.342-4. All variants mentioned in the *N&Q* piece are included in the more comprehensive list provided in the Appendix to the present article.

* At IV.iv.45 (H3r), the Duke's interrupted speech, 'Which to prevent' is wrongly concluded with a full-stop in Q1, but correctly marked with a dash in Q2.

* At IV.iv.35-6 (H3r), the Q1 version of the Doctor's plea reads: 'But be you pleas'd, backward thus for to looke,/That for your good, this evill I vndertooke'. Q2 corrects 'for' to 'far'.⁵⁵

* A little later on the same page, the Doctor speaks, in Q1, of his finger being 'deept in blood' (IV.iv.42). Q2 changes this to 'dipt', a variant which seems preferable to the rather strained Q1 reading. (This Q2 variant is also omitted from Bowers' collation.)

* The Doctor's reference to 'mourning' at IV.iv.80 (H3v) is rendered incorrectly as 'morning' in Q1 but amended in Q2.

* At V.ii.246-7 (K1r) in the uncorrected sheets of Q1, Anselmo speaks of two madmen who 'seldome spend their speech,/But haue their tongues'. Q2 reads 'saue their tongues', an amendment supported by the corrected sheets of Q1.

What is significant about the Q2 variants listed above is that they all occur in reset pages other than sheet B or K3r – that is, in pages where Bowers doubted that Q2 had any authority over Q1. Many more such variants can be found in the comprehensive, page-by-page collation of Q1 and Q2 which is provided in the Appendix to this article.

As will already have been evident, some – in fact, a good many – of Q2's variants go well beyond the capability of a competent printing-house editor or compositor. They are changes, too, which affect (to use the terms in Greg's sense) the substantives *and* the accidentals of the text. A considerable number of these variants are most naturally explained as authorial emendations. A small-scale example of this form of alternative reading occurs at V.ii.74-5, where Q1 has Anselmo remark, rather puzzlingly, 'if you like my plot/Build and dispatch, if not farewell, then not'. Q2 clears up the mystery by simply adding a comma after 'if not'. At V.ii.146, Q2's 'man' – 'the Cittizen is madde at the Country man' – is obviously superior to Q1's 'men', yet it is a change which might not have occurred to personnel in the printing shop. As we have already seen, too, Q2 corrects the speech-headings in two pages of sheet B (B1v and B2r) where Candido's wife is called Viola – another change which is best explained as having originated with the author(s). Each of these corrections reveals a degree of attention to the details and import of the text which one would not normally expect of a workman preparing a humble play-quarto.

Other changes go well beyond mere correction of errors. In the Duke's phrase 'easie arte' at I.iii.31 (B2v), Q2 honours 'arte' with a capital letter. Once again the Q2 variant is overlooked by Bowers, yet it is a significant change which signals, according to the typographic conventions of the time, something more than mere technical skill; for the Duke uses the phrase to mock the Doctor's almost magical expertise. A little later in the same scene, at I.iii.52 (B2v), the Duke's obscure remark in Q1, 'tis well God knowes', is transformed by Q2 into intelligible praise for his servants: 'tis well

55. It is interesting to note that in his first edition of Dekker's *Dramatic Works*, Bowers, adhering to his theory that the variants in most of Q2's reset pages lacked authority, adopted the corrupt Q1 reading here. In the second edition, though, the literary critic in him seems to have got the better of the bibliographer, and he changed to the Q2 reading.

good knaves'. At V.ii.313 (K2r) of Q1, Bellafront, when asked to identify three of the men in disguise, replies: 'The're fish-wiues'. This response seems quite acceptable, as is perhaps shown by the fact that it was reproduced in the two reprint editions of the first quarto, Q4 and Q5. The second quarto, however, takes exception to the Q1 reading, and gives Bellafront's reply as 'Three fish-wiues', a more precise reading which would probably not have been evident to any one not imaginatively involved with the play as a work of theatrical art.

More remarkable are the two changes to a speech by Fustigo at I.ii.119-22 (B1v). In Q1, Fustigo observes that 'cuz' is 'the gulling word betweene the Cittizens wives & their olde dames, that man em to the garden; to call you one a mine aunts, sister, were as good as call you arrant whoore...'. For 'olde dames' Q2 prints the more logical 'mad-caps'. It also replaces 'mine aunts' with 'my naunts'. The latter alteration is evidently an attempt to give Fustigo's speech a more colloquial flavour by introducing, or restoring, the dialect form *naunt* (compare *nuncle*).⁵⁶ A larger-scale alteration occurs on K3v (V.ii.475), where a brief exchange between the Duke and Candido, missing from Q1, is supplied by Q2 – an addition which renders the dialogue far more intelligible.

The reset page K3r contains some of the most extensive changes in Q2. Here, two entire passages (V.ii.395-7 and 401-10) are rewritten, so that in the first passage, for example, Bellafront's Q1 remark, 'Am not I a good girle, for finding the Frier in the wel?' becomes, in Q2, 'Am not I a fine fortune teller?'. The modifications continue in the same vein on the standing-type pages K3v and K4r, at V.ii.413-14, 427, 439-41, 464-5, 475, and 478 (see the Appendix for details). In many instances these changes seem like needless, or at best capricious, embellishment. Yet therein lies their authority: who else would have bothered with such alterations apart from Dekker? (Let us assume it was Dekker who was responsible for these modifications, since he appears to have been 'the senior partner in the collaboration'.⁵⁷) It is also worth noting that a significant number of the substantial changes in the last few pages of the text affect the speeches of Bellafront in her final appearance at the lunatic asylum: V.ii.331-2 (K2r); V.ii.395-7, 400, 401-10, 412, 412-13 (K3r); and V.ii.413-14, 418, 439, 439-41 (K3v). This evidence of special attention being given to the lines of the eponymous heroine in her big scene reinforces the impression of authorial contribution to Q2's variant text. Other substantial alterations to Bellafront's speeches occur on D4r (II.i.300-302), and E2r (II.i.444, 449, 454).

56. See OED, N 3b, *naunt*.

57. Hoy, *Introductions, Notes, and Commentaries*, p.5. A few of these textual renovations make one wonder if Dekker was not, at times, merely cooperating with the printers' wish to create the illusion of a new book. On many more occasions, though, he is clearly taking advantage of the opportunity to improve or correct his text. Incidentally, because Bowers did not have access to the Edinburgh copy of Q2 while working on his first edition of Dekker's *Dramatic Works*, he was unaware of Q2's major alterations in K3r, K3v and K4v. While working on his second edition, however, he was able to consult the Edinburgh copy. In each one of the variant passages contained in these pages--on reset as well as standing-type pages--he adopted the previously unseen Q2 variants for his revised text. At V.ii.379 and 478, he would have found that he had adopted the Q2 reading before having seen it--a reflection, not only of his own insight, but of Q2's frequent superiority.

Confidence in Q2's variants is increased by compositorial analysis of the section of the play printed by Valentine Simmes. There is a reasonable amount of evidence to suggest that this entire section was set by a workman known as Compositor A, a man responsible for part or all of the quartos of *Doctor Faustus* (1604), *Hamlet* (1603) and *Richard II* (1597). Most of Compositor A's known traits – identified in studies by W. Craig Ferguson and Alan E. Craven⁵⁸ – can be seen in Simmes's section of 1 *Honest Whore*. For example, this section regularly features Compositor A's most distinctive characteristic, the use of unabbreviated speech-headings without a final stop. These occur in abundance on all pages except B4r (one instance). Simmes's section also displays another of Compositor A's habits: the tendency to capitalise non-exit stage directions and place them in a central position (instances of this are found on A4r, A4v, B2r, B4r, B4v). Again, Compositor A's practice of setting parenthetical expressions within rounded brackets is seen on seven of the section's fourteen pages: A3v, A4v, B1r, B1v, B2r, B3v, B4r. And this compositor's slight penchant for setting normally-capitalised words without a capital letter is seen in the instances of 'lord' and 'lordship' on A3r and A3v, in 'thurseday' and 'monday' on A3r, in 'flemmish' on B1r, and in the numerous occurrences of 'ile' (rather than 'Ile' or 'Ill') on A3r, A3v, A4r, A4v, B4r, and B4v. Results from spelling tests have proved inconclusive,⁵⁹ but overall, Simmes's section contains sufficient evidence of Compositor A's work to make one feel reasonably certain of his presence in these pages.

One of Compositor A's most distinctive (and worrying) practices is his habit of introducing corrupt readings which are difficult to discern.⁶⁰ Interestingly, this practice appears to have been picked up and corrected on a number of occasions in Q2. A typical example of this is Q1's 'Softly sweete Doctor:' (I.iii.11), a plausible phrase which is nevertheless improved on by Q2's 'Softly, see Doctor_'. A little later in Q1 (I.iii.78), the Duke pictures Infelice hunting 'like some gods in the *Coprian* groves'. Q2 makes the obvious correction of '*Coprian*' to '*Cyprian*'; it also changes 'gods' to 'goddesse' – a renovation which fits the image more exactly to Infelice, but which would probably not have occurred to anyone other than the author of the line. Other authoritative-looking corrections of inconspicuous, Compositor A-style errors occur in Simmes's section at: I.iii.40 ('deadst/midst'), I.iii.41 ('cap/cup'), I.iii.56 ('the/thy'), I.iii.83 ('it/her'), and *perhaps* I.iii.71 ('hurts/haunts'). (Q1 readings are listed first.) Q2's amendment of Q1's 'mine aunts' to 'my naunts' at I.ii.121, discussed earlier, may be a further example of such a correction. It would seem that Compositor A could deceive anyone except the writer whose words he so cunningly misconstrued.⁶¹

58. W. Craig Ferguson, 'The Compositors of Henry IV, Part 2, *Much Ado About Nothing*, *The Shoemakers Holiday*, and *The First Part of the Contention*', *Studies in Bibliography*, 13 (1960), pp.19-29 (incorporated in his study of *Valentine Simmes*); and Alan E. Craven, 'Simmes' Compositor A and Five Shakespeare Quartos', *Studies in Bibliography*, 26 (1973), pp.37-60.

59. Do/doe shows Compositor A's typical preference for the former spelling (Craven, pp.38, 43). Results for other spelling variants produced no clear signs of this compositor's contribution.

60. Craven, 'Simmes' Compositor A', p.55.

61. Q1's 'mine aunts' is just the sort of verbal sophistication singled out by Alan E. Craven as one of Compositor A's most characteristic features ('Simmes' Compositor A', p.60). Compare also 'Ile/I'de', I.iii.66. Craven cites Compositor A's alteration of 'my honor's' to 'mine honor's' in the second quarto of *Richard II* (1598). Admittedly, though, one's confidence in Q2's apparent reparation of

Perhaps enough has been said about Q2's verbal variants to give a clear sense of the authority of this edition. Other superior verbal readings in Q2 can be found at I.v.232 ('carter/courtier'); II.i.27 ('arise, downe, I neuer shall arise'/'arise, I neuer shall'); II.i.35 ('infaith/no faith'); II.i.55 ('dambe', Q1 uncorrected; 'dambde', Q1 corrected, Q2); II.i.117 ('of/to'); II.i.152 ('heard/heed'); II.i.160 ('my/the'); II.i.304 ('passion/fashion'); IV.iii.111 ('praise/phrase' Q2); V.ii.61 ('slights/sleights'⁶²); V.ii.79 ('frighted/frighted'⁶³); V.ii.173 ('his wits/himselfe'); V.ii.464-5; V.ii.478 ('was yet my/was my'); and, probably, V.i.12 ('Doest/Dost').

Q2 is also the superior edition in terms of compositorial accuracy (though of course any number of the corrections listed below may reflect authorial scrutiny of Q1).

* *Omissions of words* appear to be more common in Q1 than Q2, and at several points in the text Q2 supplies Q1's missing words or phrases: 'to', I.v.153; 'and', II.i.14; 'your scurny [i.e., scurvy] mistris heere', II.i.223; 'I', II.i.424; 'it', II.i.176; 'I', II.i.245, 424; 'vp', IV.ii.3; speech-heading, 'Ans.', V.ii.370. Q2 even replaces entire lines omitted from Q1 at V.ii.331-2 and V.ii.475.

* In a few places, Q2 removes Q1's mistaken *interpolations*: 'for' instead of Q1's erroneous 'I, for', II.i.215; 'Father' for 'Nay then, father', V.ii.427; 'was my' for 'was yet my', V.ii.478.

* Q2 corrects Q1's *literal errors* on many occasions throughout the text: 'Bergaine/Bergamo', I.iii.35; 'cap/cup', I.iii.41; 'the/thy', I.iii.56; 'Ile/I'de', I.iii.66; 'patience/patience', I.iv.22; 'tempred/tempted', I.iv.43; 'sufferaence/sufferance', I.v.218; 'twe/two', II.i.7; 'pocker/poker', II.i.14; 'if/of', II.i.30; 'yon/you', II.i.69; 'sault/salt', II.i.110; 'you/your', II.i.182; 'malancholy/melancholy', II.i.204; 'could/would', II.i.288; 'sphers/spheres', II.i.289; 'Is/Its', II.i.325; 'A/I', III.i.19 (Edinburgh Q2 has 'A'); 'here/heres', III.i.102; 'mingle/Ningle', III.i.141; 'enimies/enemies', IV.i.56; 'iusttuction/instruction', IV.i.115; 'iorney/iourney', 'thether/thither', IV.i.144; 'taueren/tauern', IV.ii.27; 'Cisters/Sisters', IV.iii.162; 'lifs/lifts', IV.iv.19; 'Ttch/Ith', 'Inrch/lurch', IV.iv.62; 'wode/woode', IV.iv.86; 'Monastarie/Monasterie', V.i.90; 'disguisde/disguise', V.ii.69; 'stuke/stucke', V.ii.80; 'coullourd/collourd', V.ii.206; 'blould/bloud', V.ii.362; 'placde/placed'; 'youder/

Compositor A-style errors is somewhat eroded by the possibility that the same Compositor set all, or most, of the corresponding section in Q2. Compositor A's characteristic features are readily seen in the reset pages of Q2, and one would probably expect more variation if the Q2 pages had been composed by a different workman. For example, Q2 maintains a high proportion of unstopped, unabbreviated speech-headings (Compositor A's most pronounced habit) on seven of the eight pages of reset sheet B. There is a little variation in the punctuation of speech-headings, with Q2 introducing colons after some abbreviated speech-headings where Q1 had stops (e.g., E3v and E4r), but all other differences between the compositorial features of the Simmes pages in Q1 and Q2 seem insignificant. If Compositor A set all (or most) of Simmes's pages in Q2, it would be reasonable to suppose that he continued to commit the kind of errors that we see him producing in Q1. Interestingly, though, the rate of error in Simmes's section of Q2 is lower than in his section of Q1—a difference which may well reflect the fact that the compositor in the Q2 section (whatever his identity) was working from printed copy rather than a manuscript.

62. OED's first example of the Q2 spelling form dates from c.1340 (*sleight* sb.¹ 6).

63. Bowers prefers the Q1 word, 'frighted', in his edition, and glosses it as 'frighted'. Yet OED has no record of such a form.

yonder', V.ii.466. A few of the Q1 errors here look like common misreadings of secretary hand (the familiar e-for-y error of 'the/thy', the minim error of 'mingle/Ningle', the e-for-o and minim errors of 'Bergaine/Bergamo'). But the great majority are simple missettings of type: foul-case errors ('chraters', 'twe', 'enimies'), turned letters ('youder', 'patieuce', 'lnrch'), omissions ('sphers', 'here'), interpolations ('Itch'), and dittography ('taueren', 'coullourd', 'blould'). Some of Q2's alterations suggest greater care with details of orthography ('iomey/iourney', 'placde/placed').

* Q1 has considerable trouble with *names*, and Q2 corrects a number of its misspellings of these: 'Benedicke/Benedict', I.iii.32, 89; 'Bergaine/Bergamo', I.iii.35; 'Coprian/Cyprian', I.iii.78; speech-heading 'Hell./Bell.', II.i.45; 'herculianian/ Herculanian', II.i.82; 'Lollilo/Lollio', II.i.94; 'Lord Ello/Sordello', II.i.112; 'Bellafronta/ Bellafronte', II.198; 'Poli/Poh', IV.ii.0.1; 'Myllan/Millan', IV.iii.12; 'Chastruchio/ Castruchio', V.ii.52; 'Anselmo/Anselmi', V.ii.149. Once again, most of the Q1 errors here are traceable to simple misreadings of copy: this is especially likely where the compositor is dealing with unfamiliar names.

* Q2 also shows greater care with *punctuation*. Among its many improvements to Q1's pointing the following examples deserve special mention: 'livde, so long' I.i.137; 'Asse', I.ii.132; 'vp', I.iii.22; 'auerre', I.iii.34; 'feasting', I.iii.40; 'all?' I.iii.62; 'them:' I.v.183; 'liues:' I.v.226; 'arise', II.i.30; 'doe', II.i.32; 'presently', II.i.140; 'can', II.i.190; 'mad woman', II.i.224; 'life_' II.i.394; 'course:' IV.i.68; 'day_' IV.i.82; 'then,' IV.iii.16; 'Mistris', IV.iii.32; 'officers?' IV.iii.117; 'fooles', IV.iv.6; 'preuent--' IV.iv.45; 'thither--' IV.iv.89; 'desperate,' V.ii.59; 'dispute,' V.ii.76; 'gudgeons!' V.ii.313; 'here,' V.ii.316; 'friendship:' V.ii.379; 'Frier,' V.ii.387; 'Lord,' V.ii.454; 'Gentle-man' V.ii.499; 'sings,' V.ii.509.

* Q2 often provides more careful pointing for *ellipses*: 'H'az', I.ii.123; 'in's', I.iv.19; 't'would', I.iv.43; 't'will', I.v.29; 'H'as', I.v.50; 'tha'st', I.v.105; 'mou'd', I.v.107; 'hee'le', I.v.166; 'pictur'de', IV.i.52.

* Q2 also corrects a number of Q1's mishandlings of *lineation and prose/verse-setting*: I.iii.19-20, I.v.142-7, IV.iii.31, V.ii.46-9, 59-61.

* Quite often Q2 adjusts *capitalisation* according to the requirements of grammar or lineation: 'And', IV.ii.40; 'is', IV.ii.41; 'Whist', IV.iii.25; 'what', IV.iii.31; 'Giue', IV.iv.1; 'cause', IV.iv.7; 'Whose', V.ii.87; 'Yes', V.ii.109.

With this survey of Q2's superior variants under our belts, we are now in a better position to recreate the circumstances of the printing of the second quarto. As suggested earlier, the printers involved in work on *1 Honest Whore* evidently expected larger than usual sales. From the outset, therefore, they retained at least half of Q1 type-pages in standing type, with the intention of producing a second edition. They were naturally keen to create the impression that Q2 was an entirely – or at least substantially – new edition, so, besides disguising the old work with newly reset pages, they asked Dekker to provide them with some not-too-extensive corrections and alterations to the text. Each of the other editions featuring large proportions of standing type mentioned earlier – Simmes's edition of *The Malcontent*, Allde's edition of *The Whole Magnificent Entertainment*, and Purfoot's edition of *Parasitaster* – also contain authoritative (or authorial) corrections and revisions, which supports the conjecture

that the authorial changes to the second text of *1 Honest Whore* were regarded (by the printers, at least) as part of the camouflage.⁶⁴ It is plausible that the printers themselves asked Dekker to make his corrections and revisions in a printed copy of Q1. This would have saved them much work, not only in deciphering Dekker's amendments, but in locating his changes within the printed text. John Marston may have used the same method in revising his play, *Parasitaster, or The Fawn*: it is probably a copy of the first quarto of the play that Marston refers to when, in the Preface to the second quarto of *Parasitaster* (1606), he claims to have 'perused this copy, to make some satisfaction for the first faulty impression'.⁶⁵ *Parasitaster*, as has been mentioned, was printed by Thomas Purfoot, who produced some of the sheets in both Q1 and Q2 of *1 Honest Whore*.

Judging by the Q1/Q2 variants surveyed above, Dekker seems to have taken advantage of the situation to substantially improve his text at many points in the play. However, it is noticeable that the authorial-looking alterations in Q2 are somewhat denser at the beginning and end of the text (see Appendix). Perhaps Dekker, given licence by the printers to make changes to his play, began conscientiously by entering a fairly large number of alterations and corrections in the first few pages of the printed copy of Q1, but then trailed off in the middle scenes. Towards the end, though, his interest may have reawakened as he considered changes to the all-important final scene. Alternatively, Dekker's improvements of the Q1 text may have been more consistent, but may have received less than consistent attention from the four printing shops involved in producing the second edition.

Whatever the explanation, it can hardly be denied that the corrections and modifications seen in Q2, though often authoritative, are less than consistent in their distribution throughout the text. Of course there is no intrinsic reason why such improvements *should* be evenly distributed. But if external factors did hinder the transmission of authoritative amendments in some parts of the text, then this may have arisen from the pressure exerted on Dekker by the printing schedule. Our reasons for this suspicion are both critical and bibliographical. On the one hand, the scattered and uneven quality of the Q2 changes is in itself suggestive of haste. On the other hand, there is a modest amount of bibliographical evidence to suggest that Dekker was given very little time to work on his revisions before the printing of Q2 commenced. On page B1r in Q1, we find the catchword '*Viola*'. Accordingly, the first word of B1v in Q1 is the speech-heading '*Viola*'. In Q2, however, while the B1r catchword still reads '*Viola*', the speech-heading it refers to on B1v is '*Wife*'. This change is, of course, due to the partial emendation of the wife's speech-headings on B1v and B2r, which we have referred to earlier. But the discrepancy between catchword and referent may also tell us something about the circumstances in which Dekker was expected to make his alterations. The most obvious explanation for the discrepancy is that Dekker began paying attention to the '*Viola*' speech-headings while perusing B1v of Q1, thus overlooking the '*Viola*' headings on A4v, and the '*Viola*'

64. Perhaps this goes some way towards explaining why the changes to *The Fawn* are announced so prominently on the title-page and in the author's preface of the second edition of that play.

65. Quoted in Blostein, ed., *Parasitaster, or The Fawn*, p.42; also see p.43.

headings and catchword on B1r. He therefore amended the speech-heading at the top of B1v in Q1, but did not change the preceding catchword. Then the compositor of the corresponding pages in Q2, reading with little comprehension, simply copied what he found before him in Dekker's marked-up quarto. If the compositor was working from unbound sheets of Q1, the disparity would have been even easier to miss, because this particular catchword and its referent occur on opposite sides of the sheet. If the compositor worked with unbound sheets, Dekker must have, too. And yet that does not seem a very convincing explanation for his overlooking the '*Viola*' speech-headings in B1r, since the authoritative textual alterations in other pages of B Outer – e.g., at B2v (l.iii.52) – suggest that the B Outer sheet did not entirely elude his attention. A tempting alternative theory is that B1r may have been set before Dekker made the changes. There are in fact no definite instances of authorial intervention on B1r or A4v, the two pages where the '*Viola*' speech-headings survive in Q2 – or, for that matter, on *any* page before B1v, the first page of the B Inner forme. But whether we imagine Dekker beginning his amendments eight pages into the quarto, or making alterations after the printing of Q2 had begun, the strong impression is that he had to work quickly. In such circumstances, one would not expect authorial revision to be comprehensive; and indeed, the printers would probably have been satisfied with a moderate number of superficial changes. Fortunately, Dekker managed to achieve a good deal more than that in the time available to him, though the pressures of the printing schedule may have meant that his revisions and corrections were not as thorough as he would have liked.⁶⁶

It should be noted, however, that the foregoing comments have more force in regard to reset pages than standing-type pages. Dekker may have had more time to make alterations in the pages to be retained as standing-type, since the changes to these pages would require no more than the unlocking and modification of already-assembled blocks of type. In contrast, amendments to be introduced into the pages being reset would, ideally, have to be ready before the compositor began the task of resetting. As has been suggested, Dekker may not have been able to supply his amended copy before the resetting work had begun on sheet B.

66. Other discrepancies between the catchwords of Q1 and Q2 afford less interesting information (catchword location and reading are listed first):

* B4v, *George/Geor.* (Q1); *George/Geo.* (Q2). The variation in the speech-heading is in keeping with other instances of the heading on C1r. The break between printing-shop shares at the end of B4v also makes it more risky to hypothesize about the circumstances of printing.

* C4v, *Her's/Cast. Her's* (Q1); *Heer's/Cast. Her's* (Q2). The compositor resetting C4v noticed the correction of 'Her's' to 'Heer's' and amended his catchword accordingly. However, the following page, D1r, where the correction should have been made in the text itself, was retained in standing type, and the error was passed over.

* I4r, *ouer/ouer* (Q1); *oue/ouer* (Q2). Perhaps the letter dropped out during storage between the Q1 and Q2 impressions of the standing-type page I4r; or maybe it was lost when the type was unlocked to make the correction of 'his wits' to 'himself' (V.ii.173).

* Other catchword discrepancies in Q1 are reproduced exactly in Q2: B2v, *It/Inf.* It; C2r, *Pio./Pior.*; D2r, *Hipe./Hip.*; D3r, *I would/I should*; G4r, *Geor./Geo.*; H4r, *Geor./Geo.*; K3r, *a mai-/a Maidenhead*; K4r, *Duke./Duk.*

The pressures which resulted in the printing of Q2 were, then, largely mercenary. Dekker may or may not have been an innocent in the affair, but in either case, from the printers' point of view, his amendments were little more than a commercial necessity. Such a view should not necessarily undermine confidence in the veracity of Q2's variants. But an advocate of Q2 does need to keep in mind that a revised edition which owes its existence solely to a group of stationers' desire for additional profit may have been especially prone to corruption. Since the printers regarded Dekker's alterations to the text primarily as part of the disguise they were establishing for Q2, one should be particularly chary of the assumption that the author's innovations and corrections were followed conscientiously, or that Dekker was able to supervise the incorporation of his changes. Many new distortions may have been introduced in the mechanical process of bringing the dramatist's fresh thoughts to bear on the text. In addition, Q2's numerous corrections of compositorial errors in Q1 (discussed earlier) must be set against the second quarto's own array of compositorial blunders. A glance at the variants found in just one opening, the reset pages B1v-2r (see Appendix) readily demonstrates the variable authority of Q2's alterations in the reset pages. B1v-2r in Q2 contains valuable corrections of speech-headings and manifest improvements in the wording, punctuation and spelling of the dialogue. But Q2 also introduces its own confusions in punctuation, and apes a number of Q1's verbal errors. Generally, the last six sheets of Q2 – sheets E-K (II.i.368-end) – allow more Q1 errors to pass than the first four sheets, and the later sheets also feature more compositorial errors originating from new work on Q2.

An awareness of such factors should help to counter unrealistic optimism about the merits of the Q2 text. At the same time, knowledge of Q2's flaws should not be allowed to obscure the very real strengths of this second edition. For some editors, such as Fredson Bowers, the inconsistency in the density of Q2's corrections and revision has tended to undercut the authority of the edition as a whole. But this inadequacy should not detract from the marked superiority of many of Q2's readings. Given that Q2 contains so many obviously authoritative variants, in both reset and standing-type pages, it is natural to want to reconsider the hosts of Q2 variants which are not 'obviously authoritative' but which nevertheless represent tenable alternative readings. This is one of the areas where Bowers' editorial approach seems weakest, for in regard to the legions of so-called 'indifferent variants' – that is, variants which seem indistinguishable on grounds of sense, metre, authenticity, or aesthetic appeal – he is not prepared to sacrifice the authority of Q1. In this matter Bowers follows Greg, who suggested that 'while there can be no logical reason for giving preference to the copy-text, in practice, if there is no reason for altering its reading, the obvious thing seems to be to let it stand'.⁶⁷ But as T.H. Howard-Hill observes in his article on 'Modern Textual Theories and the Editing of Plays',⁶⁸ there are many situations in which this theory will prove to be not only illogical but positively harmful. It is misguided to think that every instance of an author's revision will be identifiable; many authentic

67. 'The Rationale of Copy-Text', in Greg's *Collected Papers*, p.386. (First printed in *Studies in Bibliography*, 3, 1950-1, pp.19-36.)

68. *The Library*, Sixth Series, Vol. XI, No. 2 (June 1989), pp.89-115.

revising touches will be disguised as just such 'indifferent' variants as Greg considers. (E.A.J. Honigsmann tellingly remarks that 'Whenever we admit the existence of a single authorial substitution in a text we must concede the probable presence of others which will always escape detection'.⁶⁹)

The truth is that there are many points in the text of *1 Honest Whore* where one cannot distinguish between printing-house adulteration of Q2 which should be rejected and authorial corrections or revisions which should be accepted. But if Dekker was responsible for so many of the major, obviously authoritative variants in Q2, then we need to give serious consideration to the possibility that *some proportion* of Q2's indifferent variants are also authorial. At I.iii.70-1 (B3r) of Q1, for example, the Duke observes that 'this place where she so oft hath seene/His [i.e., Hippolito's] lively presence, haunts her [Infelice]'. In Q2, 'haunts' is amended to 'hnrts' (i.e., 'hurts'). Bowers' faith in the authority of the substantial changes in Q2's reset sheet B leads him to accept the Q2 reading. It could be argued that the Q1 variant relates more closely (though perhaps in a rather confused way) to the ghost metaphor of 'His lively presence'. And the turned letter in Q2 bespeaks carelessness or haste at precisely this point in the type-setting. On the other hand, while 'haunts' could quite easily have originated from a minim error in reading 'hurts' in the copy manuscript, it seems much less likely that the compositor of this portion of Q2, working from printed copy, would mistake 'haunts' for 'hurts'. In short, there are things to be said for both readings, and whatever a particular editor's own preferences, neither reading can be entirely ruled out on the basis of critical taste or bibliographical argument. Similarly, at I.iii.44 (B2v) of Q1, the Duke remarks that while Infelice was under the influence of the Doctor's sleeping potion, 'a sencible cold dew' had stood on her cheeks, 'as if that death had wept/To see such beautie alterd'. In Q2 'alterd' becomes 'alter'. Is Death imagined viewing a transformation that has already occurred, or actually witnessing the change as it happens? It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to be sure.

We believe that in cases of indifferent variation such as these, an editor should be prepared to give the benefit of the doubt to the edition which in so many other instances supplies the superior variants: Q2. This approach may be thought to raise some troublesome questions regarding the choice of copy-text. If an editor is to favour Q2 to the extent that he or she deliberately cultivates a bias toward Q2's indifferent variants, should that text also be chosen as the basis for the edition? Or should the editor follow Bowers in selecting the earliest printed edition, Q1, as copy-text? It seems to us that the answers to such questions are, ultimately, quite straightforward, but these answers nevertheless involve the sacrifice of one or two powerful theoretical notions in favour of an approach governed by careful consideration of the specific circumstances in which Dekker and Middleton's play was printed.

The Question of Copy-Text

Before we address the question of whether Q1 or Q2 should be employed as copy-text, it would be well to define what we mean by that problematic term. 'Copy-text', as

69. *The Stability of Shakespeare's Text* (London: Edward Arnold, 1965), p.151.

it is used in the following discussion, refers to that printed text in an ancestral series which preserves the work in the form closest to what the author would have finally preferred; it is this text which is chosen as the basis for a critical, modern-spelling edition. In many cases the copy-text will be the earliest printed text in the series, because this text is 'closest to the ultimate authority of the lost manuscript'.⁷⁰ Once the copy-text is chosen, it is converted into a critical text by means of what Philip Gaskell describes as

a technique of controlled eclecticism whereby the editor, in the light of all the evidence, emends the copy-text by substituting readings from another text or by supplying new ones himself; he does this where he believes that the alterations represent the author's intended text more closely than the copy-text readings, because they correct errors, omissions, or unauthorized alterations.⁷¹

As far as modern-spelling editions are concerned, at least, Gaskell's comments must be taken as referring to those elements of the text which carry meaning. Textual elements which do not carry meaning – such as obsolete spellings, perhaps, or italicization of proper names, or other aspects of 'house style' – will not, in general, be carried over into a critical, modern-spelling edition. Variants which do carry meaning, but which do not appear to have been caused by authorial intervention, will also be excluded from the copy-text.

Gaskell's reference to 'the author's intended text' may be thought to raise difficulties in regard to *1 Honest Whore*. For all its signs of authorial improvement, Q2 does not appear to take us any closer to the theatrical version of the text – the play's principal manifestation. Of course one cannot exclude the possibility that Q2's variants were influenced, in ways no longer evident, by recollections of the play's stage life. But it does seem significant that no authoritative – or even indifferent – variant in Q2 affects the stage business of the play as it is preserved in the stage directions. It just might be, then, that the Dekker of the manuscript behind Q1 and the Dekker of the Q2 alterations had different authorial intentions: the former to produce a script for performance (an 'ante-text' or 'embryo', as C.S. Lewis might have called it⁷²), the latter to improve or vary the printed text for the benefit of the reading public. That seems to us the most plausible hypothesis. Editors may accept or reject it as they please, but in either case they will have to address the question of authorial intention in dealing with the Q1/Q2 variants.

It would be easy, though, to exaggerate the importance of such difficulties in *1 Honest Whore*. While it is true that the exact provenance of Q2's authoritative variants may never be conclusively identified, it also needs to be recognised that, in its stage-business, and in its verbal style, pacing, narrative and characterisation, Q2 is still very much the same play as Q1. The transformation of Q1 into Q2 was by no means as profound as that undergone by *Bellafront*, and only a paranoid editor would 'worry

70. Fredson Bowers, 'Multiple Authority: New Problems and Concepts of Copy-Text', *The Library*, Fifth Series, XXVII (1972), p.85.

71. *From Writer to Reader: Studies in Editorial Method* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), pp.4-5.

72. Lewis used these terms to describe Shakespeare's manuscript in 'The Genuine Text', *Times Literary Supplement*, 2 May, 1935, p.288. His comments are quoted and discussed in T.H. Howard-Hill, 'Playwrights' Intentions and the Editing of Plays', *TEXT* 4 (1988), pp.272-3.

unduly about the difficulties of producing a critical text which, in the overwhelming bulk of its details, represents a 'unified authorial intention'.⁷³

Unified authorial intention – but divided textual authority. In circumstances such as those relating to *1 Honest Whore*, where a second edition reprints large portions of the first edition but also presents multiple instances of authorial-looking revision, textual authority cannot be located in one text only. Although editors of the play should feel confident of achieving a text that embodies a coherent authorial intention, they will not do so by preferring only Q1, or only Q2. Most of this paper has been taken up with the argument that, in regard to its authoritative – and even its indifferent – variants, Q2 is the superior text. In view of the play's divided textual authority, however, is Q2 the best choice for copy-text? Let us try to determine the editorial procedure which best fits the bibliographical facts of the case. Firstly, where there are sound reasons to believe that Q2 variations in meaning-carrying elements of the text (including such variants in punctuation as were discussed earlier) have arisen from authorial alteration, an editor would be wise to incorporate those variations in place of Q1 readings. As regards indifferent variation between the two texts, also, Q2's overall superiority in the sphere of variants justifies (as we have already suggested) giving preference to the readings of the second edition. T.H. Howard-Hill's remarks on this subject encapsulate our own views:

When authority has entered a later print by way of revision ... an editor cannot simply assume that the only authoritative variants introduced by way of revision or correction are those which he has been able to identify as pre-eminently authorial. Nor, on the other hand, can he simply assume that the indifferent variants of the edition that is to supply the authoritative substantive variants to be introduced into the copy-text are wholly or necessarily the products of unauthoritative transmissional variation. They are identified as variants only by comparison with the readings of the copy-text, yet copy-text variants themselves, it must be allowed, are also likely to have arisen from unauthoritative transmissional corruption. For a revision the qualitative possibility of recapturing the author's second, perfecting touches is arguably more important than the minimal protective goal of preserving a greater quantity of his rejected readings in the copy-text.⁷⁴

This seems a sensible corrective to Greg's proposition that the readings of the copy-text should be preferred in such cases (the copy-text here being, in Greg's view, the earlier edition). The 'passive authority of the copy text', as Howard-Hill calls it ('Modern Textual Theories', p.97) is – and should be – defused by a willingness to give the benefit of the doubt to the later, revised text in instances of indifferent variation.

Elsewhere in the same article, however, Howard-Hill argues that 'when it is unlikely that the application of the rationale of copy-text will *appreciably* result in the

73. Hans Zeller's argument (in 'A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts', *Studies in Bibliography*, 28, 1975, pp.231-64) that virtually any authorial change to a work results in an independent version of that work seems to oversimplify the issues involved. See G.T. Tanselle's discussion of this question in 'Recent Editorial Discussion and the Central Questions of Editing', *Studies in Bibliography*, 34 (1981), pp.30-1.

74. 'Modern Textual Theories', p.100.

retention of authorial accidentals ... an editor may be allowed to base his text on the edition of superior authority for the substantives' (p.115). Before we can go any further we need to clear up an ambiguity in Howard-Hill's use of the term 'accidentals' here. The 'essence' of the distinction between substantives and accidentals, he writes earlier in his paper,

is that there are verbal or textual forms that transmit the author's (or an editor's) intentions for the text: these are the 'substantives' or rather, the 'significant' elements of the text. The others are by definition 'insignificant' – which does not mean 'non-significant' or 'without meaning': they are features of the text that an author or editor believes do not transmit the author's intentions or at least do not do so to a significant extent, because an author is often prepared and sometimes eager to relinquish their care to agents (compositors, press-correctors, editors, revisers, and such-like). (pp.95-6)

Howard-Hill later acknowledges, however, that 'On close examination, very few of the textual features regarded as belonging to the class of "accidentals" are non-significant' (p.97). The ambiguity is apparent not only in Howard-Hill's use of the term, but in its general use. As G. Thomas Tanselle says (reporting the views of Tom Davis), 'the trouble essentially is that the definition of substantives as words and accidentals as punctuation and spelling does not coincide with the further definition of substantives as elements of meanings and accidentals as elements of form'.⁷⁵ But if we can read 'accidental' as meaning 'formal elements which may nevertheless be intention carriers', Howard-Hill's useful rule – that an editor should base his or her text on the edition of superior authority for the substantives 'when it is unlikely that the application of the rationale of copy-text will *appreciably* result in the retention of authorial accidentals' – may be thought to highlight a potential flaw in the case for adopting Q2 of 1 *Honest Whore* as copy-text. In other words it could be argued that to choose Q2 – 'the edition of superior authority for the substantives' – as copy text would mean giving priority to the accidentals of a printed text which, in regard to its reset pages, at least, is an additional step removed from the author's original manuscript. Of course, Q2's numerous authoritative variants, in both wording and punctuation, actually take us closer to the author's intentions. But (so this counter-argument goes) there must be many other variants in Q2 which are simply part of the additional layer of corruption caused by the resetting of the text. Common sense informs one that Q2's reset pages are a necessarily less-than-perfect reproduction of another necessarily imperfect printed text.

There is another reason why an editor may be right to be more suspicious of the variations in punctuation, spelling and italicisation, etc., of Q2's reset pages. For despite the fact that these features may carry meaning, and even though there is good evidence that in some places in Q2 such features have been subject to authorial modification, a compositor would nevertheless have been more likely to alter or ignore these elements than to interfere with the wording of his copy. Rightly or wrongly, compositors regarded such features as spelling and punctuation as insignificant formal details. As Moxon insisted, it was '*a task and duty incumbent on the Compositor ... to*

75. 'Recent Editorial Discussion and the Central Questions of Editing', p.37.

discern and amend the bad Spelling and Pointing of his Copy, if it be in English'.⁷⁶ Of course this also applies to Q1, but its significance appears to double in regard to the reset pages of Q2, where spelling and punctuation are an additional remove from that of the original manuscript. In all likelihood, then, Q2's reset pages contain more extensive corruption of spelling and punctuation than the corresponding pages of Q1.

Such are the objections to employing Q2 as copy-text. The strange thing is, though, that *in practice*, an editor's decision to adopt Q2 as copy-text in both standing-type and reset pages would be a safer and more straightforward proposition than choosing Q1. The collation of sheet B in Q1 and Q2, for example (see Appendix), suggests that there would be no danger whatsoever in using the reset pages of this sheet as copy-text, for the reproduction of Q1 here is remarkably accurate, and the variants, when they occur, are often authoritative. Throughout the eight pages of sheet B we can find only fifteen Q2 variants in punctuation and capitalization which would definitely have to be rejected as corrupt.⁷⁷ As noted earlier, sheet B shows a greater density of authoritative revision than other reset pages in Q2. But even in regard to these other reset pages, an editor would hardly be led astray by a firm faith in Q2. On the reset page G3v, for instance – a page where there are many minor variants between Q1 and Q2 in spelling and punctuation but few clear signs of authorial changes in wording – only one Q2 punctuation variant ('it_' at IV.ii.12) can be dismissed outright as mere compositorial corruption of Q1's punctuation. It is the same story throughout Q2: despite the fact that positive (as distinct from ambiguous) signs of authorial revision are not found consistently on all pages of Q2, an editor would be perfectly safe in adopting the second quarto as copy-text. This would mean, of course, that about half the copy-text would be based on standing-type pages from Q1. But as has been noted earlier, Q2's amendments to these pages carry an additional authority because the compositors would have had to unlock the already-assembled blocks of type in order to effect the changes. In all respects then, in its standing-type and reset pages, and as regards its authoritative variations in wording and punctuation, its indifferent variations in all meaning-carrying elements of the text, and even the details of its formal features, Q2 is the best choice for copy-text.

The most important theoretical implication of this judgement is that the editor of *1 Honest Whore* should be prepared to reject one of the most important principles of W.W. Greg's rationale of copy-text. That is, in choosing Q2 of *1 Honest Whore* as copy-text, the editor must disregard Greg's stricture that 'in all normal cases of correction or revision the original edition should still be taken as the copy-text' ('Rationale', p.389). Greg did allow that a revised reprint containing numerous authorial corrections that were incorporated under the personal supervision of the author could be adopted as copy-text. He believed, for example, that the 'largely recast' Folio text of *Every Man in his Humour* would be acceptable as the copy-text for a critical edition of that play ('Rationale', pp.389-90). Clearly, though, revision in *1 Honest Whore* is not as extensive

76. J. Moxon, *Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing* (1683-4), ed. Herbert Davis and Harry Carter (London, 1958), p.192.

77. The variants are: 'hees' Lii.60; 'vs.' 60; 'sister,' 83; 'French-man,' 97; 'meanes,' 106; 'ile' 115; 'coosen,' 131; 'aire' Liii.3; 'it,' 4; 'fast,' 14; 'ile' 96; 'ile' 98; 'nowadaies,' Liv.10; 'man,' 36; and 'ile' 39.

as that found in Jonson's play, and it is extremely doubtful that the adoption of Q2 could be defended under Greg's general precept. However, Greg admitted that there were limitations to his rule:

The fact is that cases of revision differ so greatly in circumstances and character that it seems impossible to lay down any hard and fast rule as to when an editor should take the original edition as his copy-text and when the revised reprint. All that can be said is that if the original be selected, then the author's corrections must be incorporated; and that if the reprint be selected, then the original reading must be restored when that of the reprint is due to unauthorized variation. Thus the editor cannot escape the responsibility of distinguishing to the best of his ability between the two categories. No juggling with copy-text will relieve him of the duty and necessity of exercising his own judgement. ('Rationale', p.390)⁷⁸

As always, then, editors will have to rely on their own discretion. It seems to us that Bowers' mistake, in choosing the first quarto of *1 Honest Whore* as his copy-text, was to allow himself to be guided by a general theory rather than by the facts of the case. We believe that those facts fully justify the choice of the second quarto as copy-text. At the same time, the adoption of Q2 should not excuse the editor from the duty of assessing each disparity between Q1 and Q2 in its own light. Q2 provides the superior text, in our view, but both editions remain vital witnesses in the textual history of this play, and the editor will need to pay careful heed to their competing testimony.

Flinders University of South Australia
Kyoto University, Japan

78. In a further comment about *Every Man in his Humour*, Greg observes that revision and mere reproduction of the quarto text are 'so blended' in the folio text 'that it would seem impossible to disentangle intentional from what may be fortuitous variation, and injudicious to make the attempt'. For this reason, Greg says, 'an editor of the revised version has no choice but to take the folio as his copy-text' (p.390). As we have seen, 'indifferent' variants are one of the key features of the Q1 and Q2 texts of *1 Honest Whore*.

Appendix

Page-by-page collation of the first and second quartos of 1 Honest Whore

The following collation represents an attempt to list all variants between Q1 and Q2, although it is almost inevitable that some variants between the two editions have been overlooked. Since the collation is intended to be comprehensive, it includes not only verbal variants, but differences in spelling, punctuation, italicisation, capitalisation, and placement of stage directions. Differences in lineation, however, are recorded only where they affect verse-lines. This collation reproduces the so-called positional variants, i/j and v/u, but in all but one instance (I.v.106) long-s types are modernised. Pages or sections of Q2 that were set up using standing type from Q1 are indicated with the word 'STANDING'. Reset pages in Q2 are marked 'RESET'. As in the preceding discussion, all act, scene and line references are keyed to the edition of *1 Honest Whore* in Fredson Bowers' *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, 4 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 1953-61, second edition 1964), vol.II.

KEY

* = Q1/Q2 variant

B¹, B² = Bowers, first and second editions

= emendation by Bowers

bold type: variant not recorded by Bowers, or an error by Bowers

A2r

STANDING (A2r-4v, I.i.1-I.ii.58, hee haz<)

A2v

A3r

#*58. *Math. B; Matheo Q2; Mathew Q1*

A3v

A4r

*I.i.137. livde, so long Q2, B (liude); livde so long, Q1

A4v

B1r

RESET (I.ii.58-I.v.114, B1r-C2r)

(Sheet B = I.ii.58-I.v.35)

*I.ii.60. *Fust. Q1, B; Fust: Q2*

*60. hee's Q1, B; hees Q2

*60. verie Q1, B; very Q2

*60. vs) Q1, B; vs,) Q2

*63. *Vio. Q1; Viol. Q2; Wife B*

*63. brother Q1, B; ~; Q2

*67. *Fust. Q2, B; Fust. Q1*

*77. thunder Q2, B; ~: Q1

*83. sister, Q1, B; ~; Q2

*89. me Q1, B; mee Q2

B1v

*94. *Wife: Q2; Wife. B; Viola Q1*

*95. he, Q1, B; ~; Q2

*97. *Wife. Q2 (~), B; Viola Q1*

*97. French-man, Q1, B; ~_ Q2

*100. *Fust. B; Fu. Q1; Fu: Q2*

*101. *Wife. Q2 (~), B; Viola Q1*

*102. mony, Q1, B; ~; Q2

*105. *Fust. Q2, B; ~: Q1*

*106. *Wife. Q2 (~), B; Viola Q1*

*106. meanes, Q1, B; ~_ Q2

*109. *Fust. Q1, B; Fust: Q2*

*110. *Wife. Q2 (~), B; Viola Q1*

*110. and Q1, B; & Q2

*111. any thing; Q1, B; ~, Q2

- *114. *Wife*. Q2 (~), B; *Viola* Q1
 *115. *Ile* Q1, B; *ile* Q2
 *116. *Wife* Q2, B; *Viola* Q1
 *119. *Fust*. Q1, B; *Fust*: Q2
 *119. *It* Q1, B; *it* Q2
 *120. *mad-caps* Q2, B; *olde dames* Q1
 *121. *my naunts* Q2, B; *mine aunts*, Q1
 *123. *Wife*. Q2 (~), B; *Viola* Q1
 *123. *H'az* Q2, B; *Haz* Q1
 *126. *Wife*. Q2 (~), B; *Viola* Q1

B2r

- *129. *roares?* Q1, B; *roares* Q2
 *129. *me* Q1, B; *mee* Q2
 *131. *coosen?* Q1, B; *coosen*, Q2
 *132. *Asse*; *if* Q2, B; *Asse*, *if* Q1
 *133. *Wife*. Q2 (~), B; *Viola* Q1
 *134. *Fust*. Q1, B; ~: Q2
 *134. *sister?* Q1, B; *sister!* Q2
 *134. *forty* Q1, B; *fortie* Q2
 *135. *Wife*. Q2 (~), B; *Viola* Q1
 *I.iii.S.D. *Benedict* Q2, B; *Benedicke* Q1
 *2. *eyes* Q1, B; *eies* Q2
 *3. *aire* Q1, B; ~: Q2
 *4. *carry* Q1, B; *carrie* Q2
 *4. *it*: Q1, B; ~, Q2
 *5. *houre-glasse*. Q1, B; ~, Q2
 *6. *Benedict* Q2, B; *Benedicke* Q1
 *9. *first*) Q1, B; ~,) Q2
 *11. *Softly*, Q2, B; ~_ Q1
 *11. *see* Q2, B; *sweete* Q1
 *11. *Doctor*_ Q2, B; ~: Q1
 *14. *fast*, Q1, B; ~_ Q2
 *19-20. *wey/Mine owne* Q2, B; *wey mine/Owne* Q1
 *20. *scale*, Q2, B; ~: Q1
 *22. *vp*, Q2, B; ~; Q1

B2v

- *26. *marrie* Q1, B; *marry* Q2
 *27. *man*, Q2, B; ~; Q1
 *31. *arte* Q1, B; *Arte* Q2
 *32. *Benedict* Q2, B; *Benedicke* Q1
 *33. *truth* Q2, B; ~, Q1
 *34. *auerre*, Q2, B; ~_ Q1
 *35. *Bergamo* Q2, B; *Bergaine* Q1

- *36. *Infte*. B; *Inf*. Q1; *Inf*: Q2
 #*37. *Infælice* B; *Infælisha* Q1; *Infælica* Q2
 *40. *midst* Q2, B; *deadst* Q1
 *40. *feasting*; Q2, B; ~, Q1
 *41. *cup* Q2, B; *cap* Q1
 *44. *alter* Q2, B; *alterd* Q1
 *47. *newes*_ Q1, B; ~, Q2
 *50. *newes*. Q2, B; ~, Q1
 *52. 2 *Servants* Q1, B; 2 *Ser*. Q2
 *52. *well good knaues* Q2, B; *well God knowes* Q1
 #*54. *Infælice* B; *Infælishæ* Q1; *Infælica* Q2
 *56. *thy* Q2, B; *the* Q1

B3r

- *62. *all?* Q2, B; ~, Q1
 *63. 2 *Servants* Q1 (2 *Ser*), B; 2 *Serv*. Q2
 *66. *I'de* Q2, B; *Ile* Q1
 *71. *hnrts* Q2, B (*hurts*); *haunts* Q1
 *72. *does*. Q1, B; ~: Q2
 *75. *ready* Q1, B; *readie* Q2
 *78. *goddesse* Q2, B; *gods* Q1
 *78. *Ciprian* Q2, B; *Coprian* Q1
 *83. *her* Q2, B; *it* Q1
 *89. *Benedict* Q2, B; *Benedicke* Q1

B3v

- *93. *may* Q1, B; *way* Q2
 *96. *Ile* Q1, B; *ile* Q2
 *98. *Ile* Q1, B; *ile* Q2
 *I.iv.1. *merry* Q1, B; *merrie* Q2
 *7. *nay*_ Q1, B; ~, Q2
 *8. *bloud* Q1, B; *blood* Q2
 *10. *Flu*. Q1, B; ~: Q2
 *10. *nowadayes*. Q1, B; *nowadaies*, Q2
 *11. *Cast*. Q1, B; ~: Q2
 *12. *Pio*. Q1, B; ~: Q2
 *13. *Cast*. Q1, B; ~: Q2
 *13. *hees* Q1, B; *hee's* Q2
 *17. *twere* Q1, B; *t'were* Q2
 *18. *Cast*. Q1, B; ~: Q2
 *19. *of blood* Q2, B; *ofblood* Q1
 *19. *ins* Q1, B; *in's* Q2
 *21. *Pio*. Q1, B; ~: Q2
 *22. *patience* Q2, B; *patieuce* Q1
 *23. *maiest* Q1, B; *maist* Q2

B4r

- *25. vppon Q1, B; vpon Q2
- *29. trie Q1, B; try Q2
- *32. ordinary Q1, B; ordinarie Q2
- *32. breast Q1, B; ~, Q2
- *33. lordes Q1, B; lords Q2
- *34. to Q1, B; To Q2
- *36. anger Q1, B; auger Q2
- *36. man_ Q1, B; man,) Q2
- *37. citizen Q1, B; Cittizen Q2
- *38. hee Q1, B; he Q2
- *39. Flu. Q1, B; ~: Q2
- *39. Ile Q1, B; ile Q2
- *40. playde Q1, B; plaide Q2
- *40. woulde Q1, B; would Q2
- *43. Pio. Q1, B; ~: Q2
- *43. twould Q1, B; t'would Q2
- *43. tempted Q2, B; tempred Q1
- *43. bloud Q1, B; blood Q2
- *45. yeast Q1; ieast B; jest Q2
- *46. Cast. Q1, B; ~: Q2
- *46. Sbloud Q1, B (Sbloid); Sblood Q2
- *46. con-/ceit Q1, B; ~,) Q2
- *48. fretts Q1, B; frets Q2
- *49. Pio. Q1, B; ~: Q2
- *50. Cast. Q1, B; ~: Q2
- *50. Witnes: Q1, B; ~, Q2
- *51. mee: Q1, B; me; Q2
- *53. winne Q1, B; win Q2
- *53. ieast Q1, B; jest Q2
- *I.v.SD. prentices Q1, B; prentises Q2
- *2. you, ... way? Q1, B; you? ..., Q2

- *36. mind Q1, B; minde Q2
- *37. body Q1, B; bodie Q2
- *38. here Q1, B; heere Q2
- *38. passe, Q1, B; ~: Q2
- *40, 43, 47, 56. Cand. Q1, B; Can. Q2
- *41. find Q1, B; finde Q2
- *44. let'em Q1, B (let 'em); let em Q2
- *49. rudenesse Q1, B; rudenes Q2
- *49, 59, etc. I Q2, B; I Q1
- *50. Ha's Q1, B; H'as Q2
- *50. prentice Q1, B; prentise Q2
- *51. kind Q1, B; kinde Q2
- *53. slack Q1, B; slacke Q2
- *54. black Q1, B; blacke Q2
- *54. eene Q1, B; euen Q2
- *55. doe Q1, B; do Q2
- *56. conscionably Q1, B; conscionable Q2
- #*56. 18.s. Q1; 18. Q2; eighteen shillings B
- *59. yardes Q1, B; yards Q2
- *60. tutne, I pray? Q2, B (turne); turne? I pray. Q1
- *61. see- Q1, B (see--); ~, -- Q2
- *62. fewe Q1, B; few Q2
- *64. Ha, ha: Q1, B; Ha, ha, Q2
- *64. merry Q1, B; merrie Q2
- *64. gentleman. Q1, B; ~, Q2
- *67. dost Q, B; doost Q2
- *68. deaffe Q1, B; deafe Q2
- *70. doe Q1, B; do Q2
- *71. be Q1, B; bee Q2
- *72. Signior: Q1, B; ~_ Q2

B4v

- *6. be Q1, B; bee Q2
- *6. house_ Q1, B; ~, Q2
- *8. Prent. Q2 (Prentise), B; prentise Q1
- *12. Prent. Q2 (Pren.), B; prentise Q1
- *13. maister Q1, B; master Q2
- *18. courtlie Q1, B; courtly Q2
- *19. calico Q1, B; callico Q2
- *23. shee Q1, B; she Q2
- *26. browe Q1, B; brow Q2
- *29. twill Q1, B; t'will Q2

C1v

- *74. you: Q1, B; you? Q2
- *77. Gentlemen Q1, B; gentlemen Q2
- *79. Gentle-man? Q1, B; gentlemen, Q2
- *79. here Q1, B; heere Q2
- *81. els Q1, B; else Q2
- *83. penny Q1, B; pennie Q2
- *87. Lawne Q1, B; lawne Q2
- *88. Cand. Q2, B; Can. Q1
- *88. Patience, Q1, B; ~_ Q2
- *89, 114, 156, 165, 167, 170, 176, 178, etc. I Q1, B; I Q2
- *90. Citizen Q1, B; Cittizen Q2
- *95. murren Q2, B; murrê Q1
- *97. Pax, Q1, B; ~_ Q2

C1r

RESET (I.v.36-114, C1r-2r)

- *36, 41. Geo. Q2, B; Geor. Q1

- *98. mistris Q1, B; mistresse Q2
 *99. Gentleman Q1, B; Gentlemen Q2
 #*100. mony heare; B; mony: heere, Q2;
 mony; heare; Q1
 *101. Pray let Q1 (pray), B; *omitted* Pray
 Q2
 *102. quoth Q1, B; puoth Q2
 *103. money Q1, B; mony Q2
 *105. thast Q1, B; tha'st Q2
 *105. an Q1, B; a Q2
 *106. possibill Q1; possibill Q2
 *106. *Homo*, Q1, B; ~ Q2
 *107. mooud; Q1, B; mou'd: Q2
 *109. has Q1, B; haz Q2
 *111. ifaith Q1, B; yfaith Q2
 *111. Gentle-men_ Q1, B; Gentlemen, Q2
 *112. moou'd Q1, B; mou'd Q2
 *115. The (*catchword*) Q2; He Q1

C2r

STANDING (I.v.116-153, C2r)

- *116. of lawne Q2, B; oflawne Q1
 *117. out Q2, B; ~, Q1
 *118. twould Q2, B; would Q1
 *121. We are Q2, B; Were Q1; We're
 #*129. patient 'boue B; patient boue Q1;
 patient, boue Q2
 *129. woe Q1, B; wo Q2
 *132. *George*, Q2, B; ~, Q1
 *142-7. *Prose in* Q1; *verse in* Q2, B.
 *153. to Q1, B; *omitted* Q2

C2v

RESET (I.v.154-217, C2vr)

- *155-6. Come ... me,/I ... man. Q1, B; *one line*
in Q2.
 *155. Come: play't off:to me, Q1, B; Come
 play't off;to me, Q2 (*semi-colon*
indistinct)
 *158. Here Q1, B; Heere Q2
 *159, 164. Oh Q1, B; *Oh* Q2
 *159, 162, 163. I Q2, B; *I* Q1
 *163. me Q1, B; mee Q2
 *163. then (*Turn-under in* Q1; *set as new*
line in Q2.)
 *166. heele Q1, B; hee'le Q2

- *167. So: Q1 (So:), B; So, Q2
 *168. What Q1, B; VWhat Q2
 *168. syr Q1, B; sir Q2
 *169. Why Q1, B; Why Q2
 *169. farewell: Q1, B; farewellr (*sic*) Q2
 *172. and Q2, B; & Q1
 *172. say, Q1, B; ~ Q2
 *173. Farewell Q1, B; Farewell Q2
 *176. our Q1, B; your Q2
 *177. told Q1, B; tolde Q2
 *177. cheaters Q1(c), Q2, B; chraters
 Q1(u)
 *178. madman Q1, B; mad-man Q2
 *180. cry Q1, B; crie Q2
 *181. lye Q1, B; be Q2
 *183. in calme Q1, B; in all calme Q2
 *183. them, Q1, B; them: Q2

C3r

- *187. Therefore Q1, B; Therefore Q2
 *191. rydes Q1, B; rides Q2
 *195. how-/er, Q1, B; ~. Q2
 *198. That Q1, B; That Q2
 *199. knowne, Q1, B; ~ Q2
 *201. S.D. *Exit* Q2 (*placed after 200*), B;
 (*Exit* Q1 (*Placed after 200*))
 *201. S.D. *Castruchio*, Q1, B; ~. Q2
 *202. heare Q1, B; here Q2
 *203. let 'em Q2, B; let'em Q1

C3v

CHIEFLY STANDING

(I.v.218-II.i.10 look<, C3v)

- *218. sufferance Q2, B; sufferance Q1
 *222. groundes, Q1, B; grounds; Q2
 *224. palme, Q2, B; ~: Q1
 *226. liues: Q2, B; ~, Q1
 *228. doest Q2, B; dost Q1
 *232. courtier Q2, B; carter Q1
 *II.i.7. two Q2, B; twe Q1
 *8. I Q2, B; *I* Q1

C4r

STANDING (II.i.10-46 to day<, C4r)

- *14. and Q2, B; *omitted* Q1
 *14. poker Q2, B; pocker Q1

- *16. *hammes* Q2, B; *hames* Q1
- *27. *arise, I neuer shall*. Q2, B; *arise, downe, I neuer shall arise*. Q1
- *30. *of* Q2, B; *if* Q1
- *30. *arise*, Q2, B; ~_ Q1
- *32. *doe*, Q2, B; ~_ Q1
- *35. *no faith*, Q2, B; *infaith*_ Q1
- *38. *Whaat?* Q2, B; *What?* Q1
- *45. *Bell* Q2, B; *Hell* Q1

C4v

- RESET II.i.46 >I lay—81, C4v)
- *50. *Wher's* Q1, B; *VVher's* Q2
- *52. *Gods* Q2, B; *Gods* Q1
- *55. *dambde* Q1(c), Q2, B; *dambe* Q1(u)
- *57. *S.D. fetch* Q1 (*Fetch*), B; *fetches* Q2
- *60. *Saue* Q2, B; *Saue* Q1
- *60. *pretty* Q1, B; *pret-/ty* Q2
- *65. *Fluello?* Q1(c), Q2, B; *Fluello*. Q1(u)
- *67. *geere*: Q1, B; ~, Q2
- *67. *S.D. Enter Roger* B; (*Enter Roger*. Q1 (*at 66*); *Enter Roger*. Q2 (*at 66*).
- *69. *What?* Q1 (*What*), B; *What* Q2
- *69. *you* Q2, B; *yon* Q1
- *70. *Angels* Q1, B; *Anhels* Q2
- *78. *her*. Q1, B; ~: Q2
- *82. *Her's* (*catchword*) Q1; *Heer's* Q2

D1r

- STANDING (II.i.82-262, D1r)
- *82. *Herculian* Q2, B; *herculianian* Q1
- *91. *Malauolita* Q2, B; *Malauella* Q1
- *94. *Lollio* Q2, B; *Lollilo* Q1
- *110. *salt* Q2, B; *sault* Q1
- *112. *Sordello* Q2, B; *Lord Ello* Q1
- *114. *Citizen* Q1, B; *itizen* Q2
- *117. *to* Q2, B; *of* Q1

D1v

- *130. *accurs'd* Q2, B; *a curst* Q1
- *146. *seruant?* Q1, B; ~_ Q2
- *152. *heed* Q2, B; *heard* Q1

D2i

- *160. *the* Q2, B; *my* Q1
- *165. *has* Q1, B; *hath* Q2

- *167. *so?* Q1, B; ~: Q2
- *175. *wench*. Q2, B; ~: Q1
- *176. *haue it* Q2, B; *ha* Q1
- *176. *signiors?* *what?* Q1, B; ~, ~, Q2
- *182. *your* Q2, B; *you* Q1

D2v

- *190. *can*, Q2, B; *can* Q1
- *198. *Bellafronte* Q2, B; *Bellafronta* Q1
- *201. *gurnet?* Q1, B; ~. Q2
- *204. *melancholy* Q2, B; *malancholy* Q1
- *215. *Th'antilop*: Q1, B; *Th'antilop*: Q2
- *215. *for* Q2, B; *I, for* Q1
- *222. *mistresse* Q1, B; *mistris* Q2
- *223. ', *your scurny* [i.e., *scuruy?*] *mistris heere,* Q2, B; *omitted* Q1
- *224. *madwoman*_ Q1, B; *mad woman*, Q2
- *226. *hackney* Q1, B; *hackny* Q2

D3r

- *243. *If you please stay*, *heelee* Q1, B; *Ifyou pl easey heele* Q2
- *245. *If I may* Q2, B; *Hipo*. *If may* Q1
- *247. *non* Q1, B; *none* Q2

D3v

CHIEFLY STANDING

- (II.i.263-95, D3r)
- 263. *I should* Q1-2, B; *I would* Q1-2 *catchword*
- *282. *red* Q1, B; *read* Q2
- *282, 283. *Indeed* Q1, B; *Indeede* Q2
- *288. *would* Q2, B; *could* Q1
- *289. *sphers* Q1, B; *spheres* Q2
- *292. *Will* Q1, B; *VWill* Q2
- *292. *beleeeue* Q1, B; *belieue* Q2
- *292. *Worst* Q1, B; *VVorst* Q2
- *294. *Were* Q1, B; *VVere* Q2
- *294. *next* Q1, B; *nex* Q2

D4r

STANDING (II.i.296-367, D4r-4v)

- *300-302. *but if youle beleeeue/My honest tongue, mine eyes no sooner met you,/But they conueid and lead you to my heart*. Q2, B; *but beleeeue it, I/No sooner had laid hold*

vpon your presence,/But straight mine eye
conueid you to my heart. Q1.

*301. mine Q1, B; my Q2

*304. fashion Q2, B; passion Q1

STANDING, BUT PIED (II.i.315-67?)

*325. Its Q2, B; Is Q1

*327. Is Q1, B; Tis Q2

D4v

E1r

RESET (II.i.368-405, E1r)

*369. and shew Q1, B; & shew Q2

*370. Bawd Q1, B; bawd Q2

*375. Courtezan Q1, B; Courtizan Q2

*371. doe Q1, B; do Q2

*377. vp; Q1, B; ~, Q2

*383. begd, Q1, B; ~, Q2

*385. forrayne Q1, B; forraine Q2

*387. Nations Q1, B; nations Q2

*389. Maydenhead Q1, B; maidenhead Q2

*390. dyde Q1, B; dide Q2

*394. life, Q1, B; ~, Q2

*396. What do you weepe... Q1, B; What,
do you weep, Q2

*396. Story Q1, B; story Q2

*400. rellish Q1, B; felish Q2

E1v

STANDING (II.i.406-III.i.20, E1v-2r)

*424. I Q2, B; omitted Q1

E2r

*444. His weapon left heere? Of fit
instrument, Q2, B; What! has he left his
weapon heere behind him,/And gone
forgetfull? O fit instrument_ Q1.

*449. Or cleaue my bosome on Q2, B; Or
split my heart vpon Q1.

*454. not looke! not bid farewell! Q2, B; not
bid farewell! a scorne! Q1.

*III.i.19. I Q2 (Folger, Bodleian), B; A Q1,
Edinburgh Q2

E2v

RESET (III.i.21-96, E2v)

*30. and Q2, B; & Q1

*30. whoreson Q1, B; whorson Q2

*36. doe Q1, B; do Q2

*40. lip Q1, B; lips Q2

*44. vpon Q1, B; vpō Q2

E3r

*66. *Pren.* Q2; *pren.* Q1

*69. thorow Q1, B; through Q2

*70-2. they shal . . . coxcombe. (*Lineation
differs in Q1 and Q2.*)

*70. Prentices Q1, B; Prentises Q2

*70. shal Q1, B; shall Q2

*71. and fetch Q2, B; & fetch Q1

*73. Doo't: Q1, B; ~, Q2

*76. warehouse_ Q1, B; ~, Q2

*82. guize Q1, B; guise Q2

*84. hope_ Q1, B; ~, Q2

*90. *Exit.* Q1, B; *placed (incorrectly) after
91 in Q2.*

*92. *Fust.* I, when doe you shew those pieces?
Q1, B; omitted Q2

E3v

STANDING (III.i.97-171, E3v-4r)

*98. thrum Q2, B; thrumb Q1

*102. heres Q2, B; here Q1

*117. thump Q2, B; thrum Q1

E4r

*141. Ningle Q2, B; mingle Q1

E4v

RESET (III.i.172-248, E4v-F1r)

*175. gowne Q1, B; Gowne Q2 (*two
instances*)

*175. *Wife.* Q1, B; *Wi.* Q2

*176. You Q2, B; you Q1

*177. prythee, Q1, B; ~, Q2

*178. fine Q1, B; Fyne Q2

*179. fine ... fines Q1, B; Fine ... Fines
Q2

*180. (sweet) Q1, B; sweet, Q2

*181. Without Q2, B; without Q1

*187. gowne Q1, B; Gowne Q2

*191. Theeues Q1, B; theeues Q2

*200. Prithee Q1, B; Prythee Q2

*208. heer's Q1, B; here's Q2

F1r

*215. wil't not_ Q1, B; wil't not, Q2

*216. wel Q1, B; well Q2

*236. Key_ Q1, B; ~, Q2

*241. iest Q1, B; Iest Q2

F1v

STANDING (III.i.249-IV.i.35, F1v-F4v)

F2r

F2v

F3r

*III.iii.19. S.D. Fluello, Q1, B; Fluello, and Q2

*35. house; Q1, B; ~, Q2

*43. th'art Q1, B; thart Q2

*50. then Q2, B; thê Q1

*50. poysons Q1, B; poisons Q2

*52. being slaues Q1, B; ~ slaue Q2

*53. ere Q1, B; e're Q2

*53. blossoms Q1, B; blossom Q2

F3v

F4r

*106. Bel. Q2, B (*Bell*); Bel, Q1

F4v

G1r

RESET (IV.i.36-IV.iii.104, G1r-H1r)

*IV.i.41. coulours Q1, B; couloures Q2

*48. this? Q1, B; ~? Q2

*48. speake, Q1, B; ~. Q2

*52. picturde Q1, B; pictur'de Q2

*56. enimies Q1, B; enemies Q2

*59. plot, Q1, B; plots Q2

*60. Tho 'nere Q1, B; Tho'nere Q2

##62. one; B; ~? Q1; ~? Q2

##68. course, B; ~_ Q1; ~? Q2

*72. rots Q1, B; rotes Q2

G1v

*76. this; Q1, B; ~: Q2

*82. day, Q1, B; ~_ Q2

*83. Death's Q2, B; Deaths' Q1

*97. nere Q1, B; neare Q2

G2r

*112. wooc. Q1(c), Q2, B; wooc. Q1(u)

*115. instruction Q2, B; iusttruction Q1

*120. *seruant* Q1, B; *Seruant* Q2

*136. looke. Q1, B; ~, Q2

*137. *Exit* Q1, B (*'Exit [seruant]' after 138*); *omitted* Q2

G2v

*139. damnation. Q1, B; ~, Q2

*144. Vpon Q1, B; vpon Q2

*144. iorney Q1, B; iourney Q2

*144. thether Q1, B; thither Q2

*145. beats Q1, B; beatst Q2

*157. soule's Q1, B; soul's Q2

*160. mightst Q1, B; mightest Q2

*164. villaine, Q1, B; ~_ Q2

G3r

*184. *Benedict* Q2, B; *Benedict* Q1

*188. to Q1, B; too Q2

*190. go: woman Q1, B; goe woman Q2

*192. fly Q1, B; flie Q2

*198. sound Q1, B; sonnd Q2

*IV.ii.S.D. Poh Q2, B; Poli Q1

*3. vp Q2, B; *omitted* Q1

*3. crackt Q1, B; crakt Q2

*4. seuen Q1, B; seauen Q2

*5. and Q1, B; And Q2

G3v

*12. it, Q1, B; ~_ Q2

*13. wele Q1, B; weele Q2

*13. iustly Q1, B; lustly Q2

*15. pretty Q1, B; prety Q2

*15. beard Q1, Q2 (c; Edinburgh), B; beasd

Q2 (u; Bodleian, Folger)

*16. Tuscalonian: Q1, B; ~? Q2

*19. Wele Q1, B; Weele Q2

*24. cloath Q1, B; cloth Q2

*27. tauerne Q2 (tauern), B; taueren Q1

*28. Phesants Q1, B; Phesantes Q2

40. And Q2, B; and Q141. *Poh* Q1(c), Q2, B; *Pol.* Q1(u)***41. is Q2, B; Is Q1**

*IV.iii.S.D. Candidoes Q2, B; Condidoes Q1

*1. now. Q1, B; ~? Q2

*1. twelue Q2, B; 12 Q1

G4r

*2. presently: Q1, B; ~, Q2

#*3. ready, Q1; ~. Q2; ~? B

*5. Throw Q1, B; Thtow Q2

*9. Setled Q1, B; settled Q2

*12. *Myllan* Q1, B; *Millan* Q2

*15. Enough Q2, B; enough Q1

*16. then, Q2, B; ~ _ Q1

*18. bloud Q1, B; blood Q2

*22. sin Q1, B; sinne Q2

*25. Whist Q2, B; whist Q1

*31. What Q1, B; what Q2

G4v

*32. Mistris_ Q1, B; ~, Q2

*33. Cuckold Q1, B; Cuckhold Q2

*37. Spleene Q1, B; speene Q2

*38. vtred Q1, B; vttered Q2

*43. clothes Q1, B; cloathes Q2

*51. S.D. *Poh* Q2, B; *Pol.* Q1

*61. faith: Q1, B; ~. Q2

*61. come. Q1, B; ~, Q2 (*comma indistinct*)

*64. hum. Q1, B; ~, Q2

*66. *Poh.* Q2, B; *Pol.* Q1**H1r**

*78. cloth, Q1 B; ~. Q2

*81. more, Q1, B; ~. Q2

*90. in't? Q1, B; in't Q2

*96. cry clubs Q1, B; crie clubes Q2

*98. gone, Q1, B; ~. Q2

H1v

STANDING (IV.iii.105-176, H1v-2r)

*111. phrase Q2, B; praise Q1

*112. S.D. Candido's Q2, B; *his* Q1

*117. officers? Q2, B; officers Q1

H2r

*161. corde! Q2, B; ~, Q1

*162. Sisters Q2, B; Cisters Q1

H2v

RESET (IV.iii.177-IV.iv.63, H2vr, friend<)

*IV.iv.*S.D. *Enter Duke: Doctor: Fluello, Castruchio, Pioratto. Q1; Enter Duke : Doctor, Fluello, Castruchio, Pioratto. Q2.*

*1. Giue Q2, B; giue Q1

*1. newes. Q1, B; ~, Q2

*6. fooles, Q2, B; ~. Q1

*7. cause Q2, B; Cause Q1

*11. knees, Q1, B; ~. Q2

*13. prayer, Q1, B; ~; Q2

*14. reuerence. Q1, B; ~: Q2

*19. lifts Q2, B; lifts Q1

*21. And dyed? Q2, B (died); and died? Q1

*21. died my Q1, B; dyed my Q2

H3r

*33. curst Q1, B; curs'de Q2

*35. for Q1, B; far Q2

*36. good, Q1, B; ~ _ Q2

*42. deept Q1, B; dipt Q2

*45. preuent-- Q2, B; ~. Q1

*51. so: Q1, B; ~? Q2

*53. digs Q1, B; dig Q2

*55. sir, Q1, B; ~? Q2

*57. olde Q1, B; old Q2

*62. lth Q2, B; lth Q1

*62. lurch Q2, B; lnrch Q1

H3v

*80. mourning Q2, B; morning Q1

*86. woode Q2, B; wode Q1

*89. thither-- Q2, B; ~? Q1

H4r

*105. away (this night) Q2, B; away, this night Q1

*108. bands Q2, B; bonds Q1

*119. spred Q2, B; sprede Q1

H4v

RESET (V.i.7-79, H4v-I1r)

*9. humbly complaining Q1, B; humbly
complayning Q2

*12. Doest Q1, B; Dost Q2

*15. husbāds, Q1, B (husbands); ~. Q2

*23. you. Q1, B; ~, Q2

*26. peace, Q1, B; ~. Q2

*31. I, Q1, B; I_ Q2

*33. mistrisse, Q1, B; ~: Q2

*34. cryes, Q1, B; cries. Q2

I1r

*45. cunny Q1, B; cunuy Q2

*59. Wife. Q2, B; Wif. Q1

*65. Duke. Q2, B; Duk. Q1

*75. Duke. Q2, B; Duk. Q1

*77. Inck Q1; inck Q2, B

I1v

STANDING (V.i.80-V.ii.35, I1v-2r, none <)

*90. Monasterie Q2, B; Monastarie Q1

I2r

I2v

RESET (V.ii.35-114, I2v)

*36. Hip. Q1, B; Hsp. Q2

*37. Math. B; Ma. Q1; Mat. Q2

*46-49. Then ... here. *verse in* Q2, B; *prose in*
Q1.

*46. plots_ Q1, B; ~, Q2

*47. blown Q1, B; blowne Q2

*47. vp_ Q1, B; ~: Q2

*52. Castruchio? B; ~, Q2, ; Chastruchio, Q1

*59-61. Sonne ... hence *verse in* Q2, B; *prose in*
Q1

*59. desperate, Q2, B; ~_ Q1

*60. downe, Q1, B; ~: Q2

*61. slights Q1, B; sleights Q2

*66. duke Q1, B; Duke Q2

*69. disguise: Q2, B; disguisde: Q1

*72. not Q2, B; nor Q1

*72. too Q1, B; to Q2

*75. not, Q2, B; ~_ Q1

*76-7. *These two lines appear at the
bottom of the page (I2v) in Q1, but are*

*moved to the top of I3r in Q2, due to
prose-to-verse translations earlier on I2v
(at 46-9 and 59-61).*

*76. dispute, Q1, B; ~_ Q2

I3r

*79. fraighted Q1, B (glossing as 'frighted');
frighted Q2

*80. stucke Q2, B; stuke Q1

*87. Whose Q2, B; whose Q1

*92. *Entire line is separate line in Q1, B;
placed on same line as 91 in Q2.*

*97. Lordships Q2, B; Lordshps Q1

*99. *Separate line in Q1, B; printed on
same line as 98 in Q2.*

*106. madmen Q1, B; mad-men Q2

*109. Yes Q2, B; yes Q1

I3v

STANDING (V.ii.115-189, I3v-4r, ime <)

*146. man Q2, B; men Q1

*149. Anselm Q2, B; Anselmo Q1

I4r

*173. himselfe Q2, B; his wits Q1

I4v

RESET (V.ii.189[after 'ime']-230, I4v)

*201. laugh Q1, B; laught Q2

*206. coulour Q1, B; collour Q2

*209. hand, Q2, B; ~; Q1 (?)

*214. ten-peny Q2, B; ten peny Q1

*222. goes Q1, B; goe Q2

*224. sunck Q1, B; sunke Q2

*229. gunpowder Q2, B; gūpowder Q1

K1r

STANDING (V.ii.231-339, K1r-2r)

*247. saue Q1(c), Q2, B; haue Q1(u)

K1v

K2r

*306. little idley Q1, B; littl e idley Q2

*313. Three Q2, B; The're Q1

*313. gudgeons! Q2, B; ~, Q1

*316. here, Q2, B; ~_ Q1

*331-2. you ha good fortune now,/O see, see
what a thred heres spun, Q2 (now_), B; heres
your fortune, Q1.

K2v

RESET (V.ii.340-74, K2v)

*340, 344. *Bell.* Q2, B; *Bel.* Q1

*343. wit Q1(c), Q2, B; wet Q1(u)

*346. heres Q1, B; hers Q2

*348. cheere, Q1, B; ~. Q2

*351. fortune, Q1(?), B; ~. Q2

*351. lyar Q1, B; liar Q2

*353. *them.* Q2, B; (*them_* Q1

*361. Mine! Q1, B; ~_ Q2

*361. sonnes. Q1, B; ~? Q2

*361. Sonne? Q1, B; Sonne Q2

*362. bloud Q2, B; blould Q1

*364. *Line indented in Q2.*

*369. Shees Q1, B; *Ansel:* Shees Q2

*369. marriage, Q1, B; ~ : Q2

#*370. *Ans.* B; *omitted* Q1; *s.b. misplaced before*
line 369 in Q2 (see first note to 369).

K3r

RESET (V.iii.375-413, K3r, calde<)

*379. friendship: Q2, B; ~, Q1

*379. Loues Q1, B; loues Q2

*380. springs Q1, B; *springs* Q2

*381. meete, Q1, B; ~. Q2

*387. Frier, Q2, B; ~. Q1

*388. tame, and Q1, B; ~_~ Q2

389. conquered Q1, B; *conquerd* Q2

*392. families Q1, B; ~, Q2

*393. happy Q1, B; *hapy* Q2

*395-7. Am not I a good girle, for finding the
Frier in the wel? gods so you are a braue
man: will not you buy me some Suger plums
because I am so good a fortune teller. Q1, B1;
Am not I a fine fortune teller? gods me you
are a braue man: will not you buy me some
Suger plums, for telling how the frier was ith
well, will you not? Q2, B2

*400. Pretty soule, Q1, B1; Pretty soule! Q2,
B2

*400. a prety soule Q1, B; a pretty soule
Q2

*401-10. I know you: Is not your name

Matheo.

Mat. Yes lamb.

Bell. Baa, lamb! there you lie for I am mutton;
looke fine man, he was mad for me once,
and I was mad for him once, and he was
madde for her once, and were you neuer
mad? yes, I warrant, I had a fine iewell
once, a very fine iewell and that naughty
man stole it away from me, a very fine
iewell. (Q1, B1)

[‘I know you: Is not your name *Matheo.*’
omitted]

Mat. You.

Bell. Looke fine man, nay? I know you all by
your noses, he was mad for me once, and
I was mad for him once, and he was mad
for her once, & were you neuer mad? yes,
I warrant. Is not your name *Mattheo.* *Mat.*
Yes Lamb.

Bell. Lamb! baal! am I Lamb? there you lye I
am Mutton, I had a fine iewell once, a
very fine iewell and that naughty man
stole it away from me, fine iewell a very
fine iewell. (Q2, B2-- *from 403*)

*412. very rich Q1, B1; golden Q2, B2

*412-13. calde Q1, B1; harke, twas calde Q2,
B2

K3v

STANDING (V.ii.413[>a Maidenhead]-end)

*413-14. and had not you it leerer. Q1, B1;

and that naughty man had it, had you not
leerer [leerer?]. Q2, B2.

*418. then? Q1, B1; then shall he! Q2; then,
shall he! B2.

*427. Nay then, Q1, B1; *omitted* Q2, B2.

*439. didst first tume my soule black, Q1, B1;
first madst me black, Q2, B2.

*439-41. Now make it white agen, I doe
protest,/Ime pure a fire now, chaste as
Cynthias brest. Q1, B1; Now make mee
whiteas before, I vow to thee Ime now,/As

chaste as infancy, pure as *Cynthias* brow. Q2,
B2 (now... white as ... before;).

K4r

*454. Lord. Q1, B1 (*point uncertain*); Lord, Q2,
B2

*456. *Omn.* God giue you ioy. Q1, B; *set on
same line as 455 in Q2.*

*464-5. to haue her husband mad, Q1, B1; to
haue her husband, that was as patient as *Iob*,
to be more mad than euer was *Orlando*, Q2,
B2

*466. placde Q1, B1; placed Q2, B2

*466. yonder Q2, B; youder Q1

*470. *Duke.* Why I know that. Q1, B; *Q2 has
this on same line as 469.*

*475. *Duke.* Why Signior came you
hether?/*Cand.* O my good Lord! Q2, B2;
omitted Q1, B1

*478. was my Q2, B1, B2; was yet my Q1.

K4v

*499. Gentleman Q1, B1; Gentle-man Q2, B2

*509. Musick; Q1[?]; ~, Q2, B

*509. sings, Q1(c), Q2, B; ~ _ Q1(u)