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INTRODUCTION.

I

PREFACE.

The aim of this work is to present the reader with a text of King Lear which will be as near to what Shakespeare wrote as I believe it is possible for us to get. I do not propose to undertake exegesis, or to deal with other literary matters, unless this is necessitated by textual problems. My sole purpose is to establish the text.

There are two substantive editions\(^1\) of the play -- the first quarto edition, published in 1608, and the first folio edition, published in 1623\(^2\). In this Introduction we shall consider the problem of the nature of the copy for each of these editions and come to a conclusion as to which of them has the greater authority; we shall establish the copy-text for the present edition, which is to be an "old-spelling" edition, not a modernized one\(^3\). Having determined on the copy-text, we shall consider what use, if any, is to be made of the other substantive edition.

I would say at the outset that I am very greatly indebted to the work that has been done on the text of King Lear by Dr W. W. Greg. My study of the

---

1. I.e. editions "which are not derived as to essential character from any other extant edition" (Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. xiii): see also McKerrow, Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare, p. 8.

2. Throughout this work the abbreviations Q and F are to be understood as referring to the first quarto and first folio editions respectively.

Q and F texts has led me to practically the same conclusions as those of Dr Greg. We agree in accepting P. A. Daniel's theory of the nature of the copy for F. As regards Q, I am very strongly of the opinion that Dr Greg is right in holding, with Schmidt, that the text which it gives us is a reported text, though I disagree with him as regards the method of reporting. I believe that Dr Greg is right in holding that our text of the play should be solidly based on F but that we must be prepared to make use of Q where there is good reason for so doing. Had Dr Greg ever published a critical edition of King Lear, then probably the only part of the present work that I should have regarded as really necessary would have been the portion in which I argue that the Q text was not transmitted through the agency of a stenographer attending a performance or performances of the play: as it is, I have ventured upon the larger undertaking.

In the course of a lecture given in Amsterdam in 1933 Dr Greg said: "The textual study of Lear involves five distinct though related problems: first, the number and order of the early quartos; second, the differences of reading that exist between the several copies of the earliest of these; third, the manuscript used by the printer of the first quarto; fourth, the

1. Entitled The Function of Bibliography in Literary Criticism Illustrated in a Study of the Text of "King Lear". Published in the periodical Neophilologus (Amsterdam), vol. XVIII (1932-33), pp. 241ff. The quotation given above appears on p. 250.
copy used by the printer of the first folio; fifth, the relation between the quarto and the folio texts, and the procedure a modern editor should adopt". In this Introduction I propose to deal with the third, fourth, and fifth of these problems, upon which critical opinion is divided. The first two of the five problems have been settled, and I propose to say only a word or two about each.

(1) It is now known for certain that prior to 1623 there were two quarto editions of King Lear. The imprint of the one is: "$LONDON, / Printed for Nathaniel Butter, and are to be sold at his shop in Pauls / Church-yard at the signe of the Pide Bull neere / St. Austins Gate. 1608". The imprint of the other is: "Printed for Nathaniel Butter. / 1608.". The first-mentioned of these is frequently referred to as the "Pied Bull" quarto, the other as the "N. Butter" quarto. The classification of the quartos before 1623 into these two editions was made by W. G. Clark and W. Aldis Wright in the Preface to volume VIII of their edition of Shakespeare ("The Cambridge Shakespeare"). In 1885, in his Introduction to Charles Prætorius's facsimile of the "Pied Bull" quarto, P. A. Daniel proved conclusively that that quarto was the first edition, and the "N. Butter" quarto the second. In the critical apparatus in the "Cambridge" edition Clark and Wright had referred to the "Pied Bull" quarto as Q2 and to the "N. Butter" as Q1. After having done so, they became aware of evidence pointing to the proper order, and they referred to it in their Preface:
but they left the matter unsettled. It is now known not only that the "N. Butter" quarto is the second, but also that it was actually printed in 1619: on this matter see A. W. Pollard, Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates, 1920, 1937, Introduction, pp. viii ff., and E. K. Chambers, William Shakespeare, 1930, vol. I, pp. 133 ff.

(2) In the "Pied Bull" quarto, Q1, certain formes exist in more than one state, owing to the activities of a press reader working on each of the relevant formes after printing from it had begun. Hence we speak of "uncorrected" and "corrected" formes. Sheets B, I, and L exist in only one state. In sheet C the outer forme exists in one state, the inner forme in three states. Sheet K has both outer and inner formes in two states. Each of the other sheets has one invariant forme and the other in two states -- the variant formes are D outer, E outer, F inner, G outer, H inner. On the subject of these variations within Q1 students have since 1940 been fortunate in being able to consult Dr Greg's admirable and exhaustive work The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear', A Bibliographical and Critical Inquiry, printed for the Bibliographical Society, 1940 (for 1939). I believe that Dr Greg's work on these variants is final, and I do not propose to deal with the matter except in so far as it affects the problems of the nature of the manuscript from which Q1 was printed and the nature of the copy for F. I
shall assume that my readers have access to and are familiar with Dr Greg's monograph. It will be sufficient at this point to mention that Dr Greg shows that some of the "corrected" readings are restorations of the readings of the copy for Q, while others are conjectural emendations made by the press reader.

Having made these preliminary remarks, we pass to the problem of the nature of the copy for F.

II.

THE COPY FOR F.

In his Introduction to Praetorius's facsimile of Q1, pp. xvi-xxi, P. A. Daniel advanced the theory that the F text of Lear was printed from a copy of Q1 (hereafter referred to simply as Q) which had been brought into general agreement with a theatrical manuscript containing a shortened version of the play. This hypothesis, which is upheld by E. K. Chambers and W. W. Greg, is in my opinion sound. The Cambridge editors

1. Q2 "is known to have been printed from a copy of the first quarto in which sheets D, F, G, H were in the original, and sheets C (probably), E, K in the corrected, state" (Greg, Variants, pp. 188-9). On Q2 see Daniel's Introduction to Praetorius's facsimile of Q1, and M. Doran, The Text of 'King Lear', chapter II. A third quarto was printed by Jane Bell in 1655: it is a reprint of Q2 -- see Daniel's Notice prefixed to Praetorius's facsimile of Q2 (1885). In seeking a copy-text we are, of course, concerned only with substantive editions: see Greg, The Editorial Problem, pp. xiii ff., and McKerrow, Prolegomena, p. 8.
state that F Lear "was printed from an independent manuscript"; and the view that the copy for F was not a printed quarto but a manuscript has been stated recently by Miss Madeleine Doran. Miss Doran's theory is that Q was printed from a Shakespearean autograph manuscript: the copy for F was a transcript of the same manuscript in a revised state.

It is obvious that F is not a simple reprint of Q. Quite apart from the fact that F supplies passages wanting in Q, passages which, except for III ii 79–96, are agreed to be Shakespearean, the two texts differ in great numbers of readings, and very frequently, where they differ, the reading of F is superior to that of Q. Clearly F depends on a source other than Q; and there can be little doubt that that source was a playhouse manuscript, probably a prompt-book.

Q contains certain passage wanting in F. No one doubts that these too are Shakespearean. That is to say, certain passages are omitted from F. F lacks approximately 300 lines which are present in Q. Some of the F omissions may be accidental; but most of the lengthier ones have the appearance of theatrical cuts. They are mainly such passages as an abridger would most readily sacrifice, and some of the excisions leave awkwardnesses in the abridged text which show that it is in fact abridged. Chambers points to F omissions leaving lacunae at I iv 137–152, I iv 228–231, IV ii

2. The Text of 'King Lear' (1931).
31-50, V iii 205-222. We may add that the absence of III vi 17-55 from F renders pointless the words "Then let them Anatomize Regan:" which it retains at III vi 74. Chambers suggests that some F omissions may be the result of censorship -- I ii 139-145, I iv 137-152, III vi 17-55. "But," he goes on, "in the main we probably have to do with ordinary theatrical cutting". Certain passages which are cut concern the French landing in England -- III i 30-42, IV ii 53-59, V i 23-28. One of these, IV ii 53-59, is a passage of recrimination addressed by Goneril to Albany; other such passages of abuse between them are omitted from the same scene at lines 31-50 and 62-69. F omits the whole of IV iii (55 lines): part of this consists of a moving description, given to Kent by a Gentleman, of Cordelia's reaction to the news of her father's misfortunes. F omits two other passages in which characters describe in highly poetic terms the previous behaviour of other characters who are not on the stage -- III i 7-15 and V iii 205-222. Again F omits III vii 97-105 and IV vii 86-98; these are two cuts of the same type, viz. of conversations between retainers at the ends of scenes which have been full and intense, and the cut from III vii reduces the number of speak-

1. All references to acts, scenes, and lines in King Lear are to the numberings of my own text.
2. Op. cit. p. 467. Cf. Daniel, Praetorius's facsimile of Q1, p. xvi -- "That the origin of the F. text was a manuscript copy of the play preserved in the library of the theatre is obvious; equally obvious is it that it was a shortened version": and Greg, Variants, p. 139, where he speaks of "theatrical cutting" in F.
ing parts in the scene by two. Another F omission is of III vi 100-113, lines in which Edgar makes sententious general observations drawn from what he has just witnessed: such a passage would be extremely likely to be cut in an abridgement. It seems quite clear, then, that F shows cutting: Chambers characterises the cutting as "not unintelligent", and observes that the cuts "point, of course, to the use of stage-copy for F".

In IV vii there are in F indications of adaptation for a cast smaller than that required by Q. In this scene Q requires four actors, Cordelia, Kent, a Doctor, and a Gentleman; in F only three are required, Cordelia, Kent, and a Gentleman. The speeches assigned to the Doctor and the Gentleman in Q are all assigned to the Gentleman in F, despite the fact that at some points the text clearly implies the presence of a physician -- e.g. at IV vii 19-20 Cordelia says

Be gouern'd by your knowledge, and proceede I' th'sway of your owne will;

(Both texts agree in the wording). The reference to "knowledge" definitely implies the presence of a medical attendant. Here again, then, we have evidence that the F text depends upon theatrical copy. But there is evidence also, first brought forward by Daniel and amplified by Greg, that F depends directly upon the Q text -- upon the actual printed quarto.

As we saw in section I, certain formes in Q exist in an uncorrected and a corrected state. Some of the corrections were taken from the copy for Q, whatever that was, and some were conjectures of the press

reader. If we find F agreeing with the version of an uncorrected forme of Q in a corruption which is set right, not by conjecture, in the corrected forme of Q, then we are entitled to conclude that F depends upon a copy of Q which contained that forme in its uncorrected state -- unless the corruption is so trivial that we can reasonably postulate the coincidence that two transmitters of the text independently produced an identical corruption.

Daniel noted a case in point at V iii 46-49¹, a passage contained in Q in the outer forme of sheet K. The versions are as follows:

F May equally determine.
Bast. Sir, I thought it fit,
To send the old and miserable King to some retention, Whose age had Charmes in it, whose Title more,

Q uncorr. May equally determine.
Bast. Sir I thought it fit,
To saue the old and miserable King to some retention, Whose age has charmes in it, whose title more

Q corr. May equally determine.
Bast. Sir I thought it fit,
To send the old and miserable King to some retention, and ap- Whose age has charmes in it, whose title more, (pointed guard,

F agrees with Q uncorr. in omitting the phrase "and appointed guard," and in printing the line and a half "To send/saue.....retention," in a single line-space. The metre shows that something is missing, and the words added in Q corr. exactly fill the metrical gap: Greg says of them that "it seems impossible to doubt

1. Introduction, Praetorius's facsimile of Q1, p. xix.
See also Greg, Neophilologus, XVIII, 258; Aspects, pp. 164-5; Variants, pp. 140-1; Editorial Problem, p. 98.
their authenticity\(^1\). The Q compositor must have originally overlooked them, and the press reader must have got them from the copy: as Greg says, "That the press reader invented the half-line to fill a metrical gap is out of the question: he does not do that sort of thing"\(^2\). Now unless we assume that someone involved in the transmission of F independently overlooked the same words -- and this seems completely unlikely -- we must suppose that here F depends on a copy of Q in which the outer forme of sheet K was in its uncorrected state.

We have seen that F depends upon a playhouse manuscript and now we see that it depends also upon a printed quarto. The hypothesis indicated is that originally advanced by Daniel and supported by Chambers and Greg, viz. that F was printed from a copy of Q which had been edited to bring it into general agreement with the playhouse manuscript: in this copy of Q the outer forme of sheet K was in its uncorrected state, and for some reason the editor omitted to introduce the words "and appointed guard," from the playhouse manuscript into his copy of Q. They must have stood in the playhouse manuscript: otherwise, as we have said, we should have to suppose that the person who wrote out the playhouse manuscript and the Q compositor independently omitted the same phrase -- an unsafe assumption. Of course Daniel's hypothesis also postulates that two people, the Q compositor and the F editor, overlooked the phrase: but it is perfectly

\(^1\) Variants, p. 141. \(^2\) Ibid.
easy to assume that a person bringing a copy of Q into agreement with a playhouse manuscript might fail to notice an occasional error in Q. That F agrees with the corrected forme of Q in reading "send" for "sane" and "more," for "more" is not relevant to this discussion: the F editor may have made these alterations from the playhouse manuscript (along with the alteration of "has" to "had" and perhaps of "Sir" to "Sir," ) and failed to make the other, or he may have made these alterations conjecturally -- they are obviously necessary.

Daniel and Greg bring forward evidence that in the copy of Q upon which F depends the inner forme of sheet H also was in its uncorrected state. At IV ii 60 we have the variant "seemes" (F and Q uncorr.) / "shewes" (Q corr.); and at IV ii 79 we have the variant "Iustices" (F and Q uncorr.) / "Iustisers" (Q corr.). In both cases the readings of Q corr. are superior to those of F and Q uncorr., and it is to be presumed that the Q press reader got them from the copy for Q. In the case of "seemes" at any rate Q uncorr. gives perfect sense, and the press reader would in all probability have left it alone had it not conflicted with the copy. In these two cases, then, we have evidence that F was printed from an edited copy of Q in which the inner forme of sheet H was in its uncorrected state: the F editor carelessly omitted to correct the two errors.

1. Daniel, Introduction to Praetorius's facsimile of Q1, p. xix; Greg, Variants, p. 147.
If we find in F a reading which is a reproduction or conjectural emendation of a reading in a corrected forme of Q, the latter reading being a conjecture of the press reader, we have evidence that F depends upon a copy of Q which contained the relevant forme in its corrected state. Greg adduces a case here\(^1\), not noted by Daniel. At I iv 340-341 the texts run as follows: (the passage is contained in Q in the outer forme of sheet D).

F Your are much more at task for want of wisedome, Then prai'sd for harmefull mildnesse.

Q uncorr. y'are much more alapt want of wisedome, then praise for harmfull mildnes.

Q corr. y'are much more attaskt for want of wisedome, then praise for harmfull mildnes.

As Greg points out, the copy for Q must have had "ataskt": the compositor, struggling hard with copy difficult to read, made of it the nonsensical "alapt". "Attaskt", not the reading of the copy for Q, must owe its form to the Q press reader: and the F "at task" must be an emendation of "attaskt" -- "at task" is, as Greg points out, open to suspicion. Apart from the fact that the phrase "at task for" is nowhere else recorded (neither are "ataskt" and "attaskt") we should, as Greg says, "certainly expect a past participle to balance 'praised', as we find in both states of the quarto"\(^2\). We must suppose that F was set up from a

---

copy of Q in which the outer forme of sheet D was in its corrected state, and that for some reason, perhaps illegibility in the playhouse manuscript, the person who prepared the copy for F conjecturally emended the "attaskt" which he found in his quarto.

We saw on p. 6 that Miss Doran maintains in her Text of 'King Lear' that Q was printed from a Shakespearian autograph manuscript and F from a transcript of the same manuscript in a later state. But the variant we have just considered cannot be explained on this hypothesis. The copy for Q read "at taxt": F's "at task" cannot be derived from this, but must be derived from the "attaskt" of Q corr. -- a reading which owes its existence solely to the Q press reader. Surely Dr Greg has vindicated Daniel's hypothesis, and Miss Doran's is disproved.

Daniel cites various other passages in support of his contention that F was printed from an edited copy of Q. A few of these are referred to later in this section; the rest are referred to in the Notes at the end of the work. In addition to common verbal corruptions, we have in Q and F cases of common error in punctuation and line-division. There are cases of

common corruption in Q and F which Daniel does not cite. On the other hand, in some cases in which he holds that F has a corrupt reading derived from Q, F may not be corrupt at all: but this does not alter the fact that his theory of the relationship between F and Q is sound.1

I know of no argument which invalidates the hypothesis of Daniel, Chambers, and Greg as regards the nature of the copy for F. Attempting to prove that F was set up from manuscript copy Miss Doran points out2 that F contains certain corruptions which appear to be the result of the misreading of handwriting at points where Q has the true readings. To take one striking example, at II ii 72 Q reads "Reneag, affirme" while F has "Reuenge, affirme". The sense of the passage tells us that Q is right and F wrong. Miss Doran points out that "Reuenge has every appearance of being a misreading of reneag"3, and she argues thus: "If a compositor had a correctly printed word before him, why should he set an incorrect word whose form in Elizabethan handwriting resembles the written form of the correct word? He might of course misread words in the additional or

2. Text of 'King Lear', pp. 91-5.
3. Ibid. p. 92.
corrected portions written by hand on the printed text, but since the corrector would not have written reneag, for example, above the correctly printed word reneag, the compositor could get the misreading reuenge only from a manuscript. There are half a dozen or more errors in the folio which could have arisen in no other way...."¹ Dr Greg points out that the error may not be graphic. As an example of an alternative possibility he says², "Suppose that the Folio compositor, intending to set "Reneag", accidentally through foul-case substituted a u for the n; he would produce the word "Reueag", which the proof-reader would inevitably "correct" to "Reuenge"." On the other hand, allowing that the error is graphic (as I think it very probably is), we can explain it perfectly well in accordance with the theory that F was printed from an edited copy of Q: the editor saw "Reneag" in his copy of Q, compared it with the playhouse manuscript, misread "Reneag" there as "Reiseng", scored through "Re-neag" in Q, and substituted "Reuenge" clearly written, which the compositor then set up³. Miss Doran ignores this latter possibility, and this completely vitiates her argument in this and other similar cases. By this theory we could explain even absurd readings in F which are apparently graphic errors, Q containing the true readings.

3. Ibid. p. 261.
It may be suggested that F was printed from a manuscript and that at certain points either the person who copied out this manuscript or the F compositor consulted a copy of Q and accepted a corruption from it or tinkered with a corruption in it and so produced another corruption. But the probabilities are against this. Sometimes an error in F seems to allow us to glimpse a line of Q edited according to Daniel's hypothesis. At I i 109 we have "mistresse" in Q and "miseries" in F. The sense of the passage requires "mysteries", which is found in F2. Daniel comments¹: "I suppose the scribe preparing the Qo. for the Fo. edition struck out the end of this word ["mistresse"] and inserted eries in the margin; perhaps the stroke of his pen included the t, or the printer thought it did, and so, instead of misteries, miseries got into the Fo.". Miss Doran², believing that Q and F derive from the same manuscript, holds that in this manuscript the word was badly written, and that both the Q compositor and the transcriber of the copy for F "made of it what they could". But it seems odd that, looking at the same word in the same manuscript, one transmitter should be able to make out the "t" but not the "eries" while another did not make out the "t" but succeeded with the "eries". Daniel's explanation seems very much safer. Again, at II ii 102 Q has "flitkering" and F "flicking". The word required is "flickering", or rather, for metrical reasons, "flickring". It would seem that the person who edited

¹ Praetorius's facsimile of Q1, p. xx.
Q for F stroked out the "t" and substituted a "c", and then struck out the "e". Perhaps his pen-stroke through the "e" accidentally covered the "r" also, or the compositor thought it did so that he set up "flicking". Again, at III iv 61 the two texts run --

Q What, his daughters brought him to this passe, F Ha's his Daughters brought him to this passe? (Ff. 2-3 Has....; F4 Have....). Theobald reads "What, have his....". There is no justification for substituting "have" for "ha's", but I think that we must agree with Theobald in conflating. The line sounds clumsy in both Q and F. Miss Doran holds that Shakespeare may have originally written the line as it appears in Q: when Q was printed from his manuscript (on her theory) the line stood so: in the transcript of the same manuscript which served as copy for F, "ha's" may have been added "to smooth out the line", and the F compositor may have wrongly taken it as a substitution for "What,". But I cannot think that Shakespeare originally wrote the line as it appears in Q: as I have said, it is clumsy, and surely "What," implies a question. There seems little doubt that Q accidentally omits the word "has" or "haue". Are we to suppose that someone connected with the transmission of F independently omitted "What,"? This would be unsafe -- too great a coincidence to be probable. Alternatively to her suggestion above, Miss Doran thinks that "Ha's" may ac-

tually have been intended in the revision as a substitution for "What," and that F is not wrong at all. But again, as I have said, the rhythm of the F line sounds awkward to me. Daniel's theory accounts much better for the state of affairs with which we are dealing: the F editor, altering Q, inserted "ha's" after "What," and the F compositor understood it as a substitution for "What,"¹. If it were suggested in connection with the two earlier cases that the F "miseries" and "flicking" each show simply the accidental omission of a single letter and that these errors have nothing at all to do with the printed pages of Q, I should reply that at any rate it seems to me in the highest degree improbable that, Q having accidentally omitted "ha's", the F compositor should supply it and accidentally and independently omit the preceding word with no copy of Q in sight. Surely in all three cases just examined we can glimpse behind F an edited Q: and so we dispose of the idea that F was printed from a manuscript and that the person who wrote out this manuscript, or the F compositor, occasionally consulted a quarto and appropriated errors or tinkered with errors producing new ones.

Miss Doran suggests² that the editing of a copy of Q by hand would be an awkward and laborious task, and would result in extremely difficult copy for the F compositor. On the contrary, having edited specimen pages in this way, I believe that Greg is

¹. See Greg, Aspects of Shakespeare, p. 139.
justified in his confidence that he "could correct any page of the Quarto so as to serve as copy for the Folio without making it in the least illegible or even difficult for the printer".

I have no doubt, then, that F was printed from a copy of Q which had been brought by an editor into general agreement with a playhouse manuscript (and what is more likely than that this playhouse manuscript was the prompt-book in use by the King's Men at the time when the copy for F was being prepared?). We have seen that sometimes the editor allowed an error in his quarto to stand, and sometimes he tinkered with an error, producing a fresh error. Furthermore, there seems reason to suppose that sometimes he substituted more familiar words for less familiar ones in Q which we must believe to be genuine. Thus at II i 7-8 Q refers to "eare-bussing arguments" while F has "ear-kissing arguments": at III vii 56 Q reads "rash" and F "sticke", and only five lines later we find F with "sterne" for the Q "dearne". It is possible that "bussing" is a misreading of "kissing", with "k" misread as "b" (cf. IV i 37, where Q has "bitt", F "kill") and a minim error. But "rash" could not possibly be a misreading of "sticke" and we must surely accept "rash" as the Shakespearian word -- it is much more forceful and effective than the F reading; in F we probably have editorial replacement of a difficult word by an easier

1. Neophilologus, XVIII, 260.
one. Greg notes other very interesting possible cases of the same thing.  

The provenance of the F text being known, we can now proceed to inquire into the nature of the Q text. But a word of warning is necessary. From what has been said in this section it will be apparent that, as Greg says, "where our two authorities differ we have better warrant for the text than where they agree". Greg proceeds: "For where the folio differs from the quarto its readings -- E. & O. E., i.e. misprints and other textual accidents apart -- must be derived from the authoritative playhouse manuscript, whereas where the two agree we can never be certain that the folio has not carelessly reproduced an error of the quarto". In comparing Q with F in order to discover the nature of the transmission of Q we can be more sure that we are comparing Q with the genuine text when they differ than when they agree. But even when they differ we cannot assume without question that F gives us what Shakespeare wrote. We have to reckon with the "misprints and other textual accidents" mentioned by Greg. Some are obvious: but where an F reading differs from that of Q the F reading may be corrupt and it may not be possible for us to detect the corruption. Consider the various agents who may have introduced alterations into Shakespeare's text: (1) the person who made up the prompt-book (whom for convenience we may designate Scribe F):

the prompt-book was presumably a transcript of Shakespeare's autograph manuscript, and, apart from intentional alterations such as abridgement and reduction of the number of actors required, Scribe P may have introduced errors in copying; furthermore the prompt-book in use in 1622 may not have been in the same state as that in use when the play was first produced -- it may even have been a later transcript of the original prompt-book: (2) the person who edited a copy of Q to serve as copy for F (whom we may call Scribe E): apart from leaving Q errors unaltered, this person emended Q errors conjecturally, sophisticated Q readings, and may have misread the prompt-book and made wrong alterations in Q in good faith: (3) the F compositor and proof-reader may have introduced errors. All this sounds discouraging: as Professor Dover Wilson says, F Lear "does not.....bring us within sight of a Shakespearean manuscript"¹. We must proceed on the following principle: although there is a risk of error, we must at any given point assume that F has, through all the stages of its transmission, preserved Shakespeare's text, unless we can discover grounds for supposing that the contrary is certain or probable. Wherever in this study we compare Q with F and stigmatize Q as corrupt, it should be understood that no reason has been found to doubt the authenticity of the F text at that point.

¹. Introduction to facsimile of Fl King Lear (Faber and Faber).
III

THE COPY FOR Q.

(i)

Q a Reported Text.

Sixty-five years ago the theory was advanced by Alexander Schmidt that the text given in the first quarto of King Lear is a reported text, taken down in shorthand during performance. F. G. Fleay pronounced the quarto a "scandalously incorrect and surreptitious copy". In his Introduction to Praetorius's facsimile of Q1, p. v, P. A. Daniel wrote: "Under what circumstances Q1 got to press, whether with or without any participation or authorization on the part of the poet or of the players is unknown; it most probably was a surreptitious edition". Schmidt, in common with many in his day, regarded all the Shakespearian quartos published before 1623 as "stolne and surreptitious copies". Present-day critics, on the other hand, accept Dr A. W. Pollard's contention that the phrase "stolne and surreptitious" applies only to a limited number of them. Pollard's Shakespeare Folios and Quartos (1909), and his later publications on the same lines, of fundamental importance to modern Shakespearian textual study, represent pioneer work, and adjustments are required in some details. Pollard classified Q Lear as a "good" quarto, and stated that

"Save for the mistakes in the uncorrected sheets the text is satisfactory"\textsuperscript{1}. He did not classify it with the quartos of \textit{Henry V} and \textit{The Merry Wives of Windsor} and the first quartos of \textit{Romeo and Juliet} and \textit{Hamlet}. It is no wonder that he did not do so, for, quite apart from the fact that there is nothing irregular about its entry in the Stationers' Register\textsuperscript{2}, \textit{Q Lear} gives a text of quite a different standard from that of any of these considered as a whole. Yet many scholars do not find it satisfactory. E. K. Chambers says\textsuperscript{3}: "I think that the characteristics of \textit{Q} point to a reported text. It is, of course, a much better version than the bad Quartos of 2, 3 \textit{Henry VI}, \textit{Romeo and Juliet}, \textit{Henry V}, \textit{Merry Wives}, and \textit{Hamlet}.... Possi- bly it was produced by shorthand and not memorization". W. W. Greg\textsuperscript{4} argues strongly that it is a re- ported text, and likewise suggests stenographic trans- mission. J. Q. Adams\textsuperscript{5} argues that it was transmitted by means of Timothy Bright's system of Characterny, the text-book of which was published in 1588.

\textsuperscript{1} Shakespeare Folios and Quartos, p. 76.
\textsuperscript{2} It was entered in 1607. The entry runs: "26 Nov- embris. Nathanael Butter John Busby. Entred for their Copie under thande of Sir George Buck knight and Thwardens A booke called. Master William Shake- speare his historye of Kinge Lear, as yt was played before the Kingses maiestie at Whitehall vpon Sainct Stephens night at Christmas Last, by his maiesties servantes playinge vsually at the Globe on the Bank- syde vjd" (Arber, iii. 366).
\textsuperscript{3} William Shakespeare, I, 465.
\textsuperscript{4} Neophilologus, XVIII, 241-62; 4 Library, XVII (1936-7), 172-83; Variants, p. 138; Editorial Problem, pp. 88-101.
\textsuperscript{5} Modern Philology, XXXIII (1935-6), 139 ff.
Miss Doran, in her book already referred to, rejects the view that Q *Lear* gives a reported text. She argues that it was set up from Shakespeare's original autograph manuscript, and that this manuscript was untidy, containing much marginal addition and presenting the compositor with difficult copy. As we have seen, she argues also that F was printed from a transcript of the autograph, and she holds that this transcript was abridged and revised by Shakespeare. Again, in the Preface to the New Temple edition of the play (1935) M. R. Ridley says (p. xi): "I can see no sufficient reason to assume that the Folio, immeasurably superior though it is from the typographical point of view, can be given the authority of an independent and superior text". Concerning the relationship between the two, he says: "My own guess would be that F was set from a better transcript of a common original than that which was available for Q". This view is to some extent similar to that of Miss Doran, but Ridley's words imply that Q was set, not from Shakespeare's autograph manuscript, but from a transcript of it: and he does not appear to envisage a Shakespearian revision between Q and F, as Miss Doran does. He goes so far as to base his own text on Q: "wherever", he says (p. xii), "the Quarto appears to give tolerable sense it has been allowed to stand, even at the cost of incomplete lines and other roughnesses. Where the Quarto appeared hopeless readings have been admitted from the Folio or from later editors....but the licence has been used as sparingly as possible".
This procedure makes the New Temple edition unique.

I believe that the Q text is a reported text -- that is, that at some stage its transmission was memorial. Now the F text is as we have seen an abridgement -- F lacks some 300 lines found in Q. If we call the full play, of which F is an abridgement, "x", then in my opinion the Q text is a reported version of "x" or of an abridgement of "x" distinct from the F abridgement (Q lacks some 100 lines found in F). I do not believe that Q represents a Shakespearean first draft and F a Shakespearean revision. Thus in passages common to Q and F we may say for convenience that the Q text is a report of the F text (apart from alterations or corruptions introduced into F by Scribe P, Scribe E, the compositor, or the proof-reader). As we consider the evidence pointing to the conclusion that the Q text is a report we shall bear in mind the theory that Q represents a first draft and F a revision, and we shall argue against it.

We now proceed to this evidence which indicates that the Q text is a report. To give us a starting point there are within the first three pages

1. Unless Shakespeare was concerned in the cutting which produced the F abridgement. But even if he was (and he may not have been) it cannot in my opinion be maintained that he made any revisions apart from the cutting.
2. Some of the evidence is referred to by Greg in Neophilologus, XVIII, pp. 252-7, and Editorial Problem, pp. 90-3. But I propose to undertake a fuller survey.
of the text in Q two passages each of which shows a
textual breakdown of such a nature that in my opinion
only the theory of memorial transmission can explain
it. Conditions in these passages resemble conditions
in the undoubtedly reported Shakespearian texts. The
first is at I 135-53, where the two texts run as fol-
lows:

Q Lear. Meane time we will expresse our darker purposes,
The map there; know we have divided
In three, our kingdome; and tis our first intent,
To shake all cares and busines of our state,
Confirming them on yonger yeares,
The two great Princes France and Burgundy,
Great ryuals in our youngest daughters loue,
Long in our Court haue made their amorous soiourne,
And here are to be answer'd, tell me my daughters,
Which of you shall we say doth loue vs most,
That we our largest bountie may extend,
Where merit doth most challenge it,
Gonerill our eldest borne, speake first?

F Lear. Meane time we shal expresse our darker purpose. 35
Glue me the Map there. Know, that we haue divided
In three our Kingdome: and 'tis our fast intent,
To shake all Cares and Businesse from our Age,
Conferring them on yonger strengths, while we
Unburthen'd crawle toward death. Our son of Cornwall,
And you our no lesse louing Sonne of Albany,
We haue this hour a constant will to publish
Our daughters severall Dowers, that future strife
May be prevented now. The Princes, France & Burgundy,
Great Rivals in our yongest daughters loue,
Long in our Court, haue made their amorous soiourne,
And heere are to be answer'd. Tell me my daughters
(Since now we will diuest vs both of Rule,
Interest of Territory, Cares of State)
Which of you shall we say doth loue vs most,
That we, our largest bountie may extend
Where Nature doth with merit challenge. Gonerill,
Our eldest borne, speake first.

Q lacks the passage "while we......preuented
now." (39-44). Did Shakespeare originally write the
speech without these lines, and did he add them in the
course of a revision? I think that we can be confident
that the answer is in the negative. The repetition of
the word "great" in Q lines 44 and 45 is very clumsy, and I should not like to attribute it to Shakespeare even in a first draft. It seems probable that the words "two great" have been added to Q line 44 in order partially to regularise metrical irregularity brought about by an omission. Now if we take it that "while we......prevented now." formed part of the speech from the outset, we shall undoubtedly feel that in line 39 "strengths" is Shakespearian and "yeares" not, for there is an obvious connection between "strengths" and "Unburthen'd" which there would not be between "yeares" and "Unburthen'd". It will be much safer to regard Q's "yeares" as a corruption than as a Shakespearian "first shot". And just as there is a connection between "strengths" and "Unburthen'd", so in lines 38-39 in F there is a connection between "Age" and "yonger"; reading "of our state" instead of "from our Age", Q misses an antithesis which I cannot but believe was in Shakespeare's mind when he wrote the speech once and for all. The succession of pointed contrasts, "Age" -- "yonger", "strengths" -- "Unburthen'd", is surely the very original fabric of the passage, broken down and decayed in Q. And it is not difficult to suggest how the point-destroying reading "of our state" found its way into Q line 38. I suggest that lines 48-49 were in existence when the copy for Q came into being, and that the corrupting agent has mixed up line 38, as it appears in F, with line 49, which, with the preceding line, appears only in F. F lines 38 and 49 would be easy to confuse in the memory: apart from the sim-
ilarity of content, the word "Cares", occurring in both, is a link between them. The confusion would seem to be certainly memorial: Q mixes up lines 38 and 49 so thoroughly that an error of the eye on the part of a scribe or compositor is quite out of the question. I suggest, then, that "of our state" is a memorial anticipation; and further, I suggest that Q's "Confirming" in line 39 is also a memorial anticipation: compare line 137 of the same scene, where "confirmes" is used in both texts in a passage also dealing with the division of the kingdom, a passage which might therefore be confused memorially with this one. The same variant, Q "confirm'd", F "conferr'd", occurs in line 81: we have the same anticipation twice. Admittedly Q's "Confirming" does not give positive indications of being corrupt as "of our state" does -- no loss of point is involved. But nothing is more likely than that in the immediate vicinity of one anticipation we should have another.

Was the passage "while we......preuented now." omitted from the text reproduced by Q deliberately for the sake of abridgement? This is most unlikely. An abridger might cut out the passage and patch up "The Princes, France & Burgundy,"; but, even though "Vnburthen'd" was now lacking, I cannot think that he would deliberately change "strengths" to "yeares" (which is a much poorer reading anyhow). And so we have this state of affairs: the omission ("while we......preuented now.") is immediately preceded by a metrically defective line containing a weak substitution and a probable textual
anticipation, and that in turn is preceded by a line containing another, almost certain, textual anticipation which blunts the point of the passage. The most reasonable hypothesis seems to me to be that we are dealing with a memory which becomes very shaky at line 38 and fails altogether in the course of line 39. We are surely not dealing with a negligent scribe relying on his memory, his eye temporarily off his copy, but with someone in desperate difficulties with nothing but the straw of a failing memory to clutch at. We may reasonably attribute Q's omission of lines 48-49 to his bad memory. We sometimes find in undoubtedly reported texts that a passage is anticipated which is altogether absent from its rightful place. An abridger would gain little by cutting lines 48-49, and since defective memorial transmission is indicated ten lines earlier it is safer to lay the absence of lines 48-49 to its charge than to attribute it to negligence on the part of the compositor.

In the last line but one of the speech Q has another reading which we can confidently declare to be non-Shakespearian. Q has "Where merit doth most challenge it", and F "Where Nature doth with merit challenge". The word "Nature" here is of vital importance: by asking which of his three daughters loves him most Lear is trying to discover in which of them natural affection, the feelings binding kindred together, in a word, Nature, is strongest. "Nature" may be said to be a key word in this play: it is about
"Nature". And here is the word, in a most apt context, in a context which indeed calls for it, as the climax of Lear's first major speech. I have no doubt that this represents Shakespeare's intention from the beginning, and that in line 52 the quarto is corrupt. The conclusion of the speech is wrecked. It might be suggested that the line in Q represents an attempt by a transmitter to "correct" a line which he did not understand; but in view of conditions earlier in the speech, transmission by a defective memory seems a much likelier explanation.

The second passage is at I i 74-94. The two versions are as follows:

Q  And find I am alone felicitate, in your deere highnes loue.
   Cord. Then poore Cord. & yet not so, since I am sure
   Lear. To thee and thine hereditarie ever
   Remaine this ample third of our faire kingdome,
   No lesse in space, validity, and pleasure,
   Then that confirm'd on Gonerill, but now our Ioy,
   Although the last, not least in our deere loue,
   What can you say to win a third, more opulent
   Then your sisters.
   Lear: How, nothing can come of nothing, speake
   Cord. Unhappie that I am, I cannot heaue my heart into my
   mouth, I loue your Maiestie according to my bond, nor more nor
   lesse.
   Lear. Goe to, goe to, mend your speech a little,
   Least it may mar your fortunes.

F  And finde I am alone felicitate
   In your deere Highnesse loue.
   Cor. Then poore Cordelia,
   And yet not so, since I am sure my loue's
   More ponderous then my tongue.
   Lear. To thee, and thine hereditarie ever,
   Remaine this ample third of our faire Kingdome,
   No lesse in space, validitie, and pleasure
   Then that confer'd on Gonerill. Now our Ioy,
   Although our last and least; to whose yong loue,
   The Vines of France, and Milke of Burgundie,
   Strive to be interest. What can you say, to draw
   A third, more opulent then your Sisters? speake.
   Cor. Nothing my Lord.
   Lear. Nothing?
   Cor. Nothing.
Lear. Nothing will come of nothing, speake againe.
Cor. Unhappe that I am, I cannot heaue
My Heart into my mouth: I loue your Maiesty
According to my bond, no more nor lesse.
Lear. How, how Cordelia? Mend your speech a little,
Least you may marre your Fortunes.

Let us begin with line 89. In the first place Q has a preliminary extra-metrical ejaculation ("How"), and in the second place Q has "can" instead of the F "will". In connection with the latter point it is significant that at I iv 130 we have an almost identical line, in which "can" is used in both texts: the Fool asks Lear whether he can make no use of nothing, and Lear replies
Q Why no boy, nothing can be made out of nothing.
F Why no Boy,
Nothing can be made out of nothing.
"Can" is appropriate here, for Lear is stating a general truth; but at I i 89 it is "will" which is appropriate, for Lear is thinking of the immediate result of Cordelia's words. I do not believe that at I i 89 Shakespeare wrote "can" in a first draft and subsequently altered it to "will": for "will" surely expresses the point of the passage as initially conceived. One would have no difficulty in postulating a simple scribal or compositorial substitution here in Q, and "can" occurs in both texts in line 87; but the versions of the two texts at I iv 130 make the theory of memorial anticipation more likely. This anticipation might be attributed to a scribe working with his eye off his copy -- a scribe who knew the play and was prone to confuse similar passages. But the Q line comes almost immediately after a patch of corruption
far too serious to warrant that explanation.

The passage from "The Vines" to "interest" is lacking in Q, and the line immediately preceding this is considerably different in the two texts. I do not think it likely that the line and a half wanting in Q was excised by an abridger who patched up line 82 in consequence, substituting "in our deere loue" for "to whose yong loue". An abridger would not gain sufficient from such a short omission to justify his trouble in adapting line 82. Did Shakespeare first write the passage without line 83 and the first part of line 84, and did he subsequently add these, altering line 82 at the same time? I think that the metre of Q is an objection to this: in Q the words "What can you say to win" form a metrically defective line, and sound clumsy. I cannot see why Shakespeare should be held guilty of metrical incompetence even in a first draft. The most reasonable view seems to me that the speech originally included the piece omitted from Q, and that its omission from Q is the result of defective transmission. And if so, it follows that Q's "in our deere loue" is a perversion, since the omitted words cannot coherently follow that phrase. It seems clear that in Q "not least in our deere loue" is intended as a single connected phrase, and since "in our deere loue" is a perversion one may well regard "not least" with suspicion. The Globe editors and others conflate Q and F in line 82 and read

Now, our joy, Although the last, not least; to whose young love etc.
But in my opinion Q's "the last, not least" is in itself a much inferior reading to that of F. In the latter the double contrast with "last" and "least" isolates "our Ioy", and, throwing greater emphasis upon it, makes it more effective. And it is a very important word in the context. Although Cordelia is the youngest daughter and the smallest and "the least royal in [her] presence", as White puts it\(^1\), she is her father's joy, his darling. The words "last, not least" were a common phraseological formula in Shakespeare's day\(^2\). While this has induced some editors to accept it here, it may well strengthen our suspicion of it. The Q version is commonplace, that of F is not. Schmidt points out\(^3\) that in *Julius Caesar* III i 189 we have "Though last, not least in love", and he suggests corruption in Q *Lear* I i 82 by association with this. But, since the phrase "last, not least" was commonplace, perhaps we need only compare the Q line under discussion with line 75 of the same scene where we have

Q in your deere highnes loue.

F In your deere Highnesse loue.

It seems to me that I i 78-85 was in the Q version memorialy transmitted, that the person responsible forgot line 83 and the first half of line 84, that he remembered line 82 only vaguely, and that he pieced together his fragmentary recollection of line 82 and a

---

3. See Furness, op. cit. p. 15.
phrase taken from line 75, producing a line of his own agreeing with a commonplace verbal formula and rendering the passage rather colourless. If he remembered also something of I i 151 --

Q thy yongest daughter does not loue thee least,
F Thy yongest Daughter do's not loue thee least,

he might, inverting the subject and object, be all the more likely to corrupt Q I i 82 in the manner described. The theory of defective memorial transmission is the only one which to my mind will account for the havoc wrought upon lines 81-84 in the quarto.

In I i 77 we have the variant Q "more richer", F "More ponderous". At first sight Q seems preferable here, since "richer" forms a more obvious antithesis to "poore" than "ponderous" does. Many editions, including the Globe, read "more richer". It is even possible to suggest a reason why Scribe E, or some other person involved in the transmission of the F text, should have altered "more richer". The double comparative and superlative are well known in Shakespeare, but Scribe E may not have liked them. So it might be argued: and Wright suggests¹ that the F "More ponderous" "has the appearance of being a player's correction to avoid a piece of imaginary bad grammar". At I i 215 F has "The best, the deerest", while Q has "most best, most deerest". But, as we shall see, Q may be corrupt there.

¹. See Furness, op. cit. p. 13.
And not only is there a double comparative in F as well as Q at I i 210 ("more worthier"), but at III ii 64 Scribe E has actually substituted "More harder then" (F) for the Q "More hard then is". In view of this we surely cannot hold that Scribe E (or Wright's "player") altered "more richer" to "More ponderous" in I i 77 for grammatical reasons. In any case, "ponderous" is not a word which I can imagine as readily occurring to Scribe E -- I should think that if he really had not liked the double comparative he would have been more likely to alter the line to "More rich then is my tongue". "Ponderous" seems to me a more effective reading, and I believe that Schmidt is right when he says¹: "Light was the usual term applied to a wanton, frivolous, and fickle love; 'light o' love' was a proverbial expression. But the opposite of this, heavy, could not be here employed, because that means uniformly, in a moral sense, melancholy, sad; nor is weighty any better; therefore Shakespeare chose 'ponderous'". I agree with this, except that I do not think it need be supposed that Shakespeare chose "ponderous" after a process of elimination of other words. Again I suggest that in Q we have an anticipation. The person responsible probably associated this passage with two others. In this passage we have the words "poore" and "tongue": compare the following later passages --

¹. See Furness, op. cit. p. 13.
I i 249 F Fairest Cordelia, that art most rich being poore,

Q Fairest Cordelia that art most rich being poore,

I i 229 F But euen for want of that, for which I am richer,
A still soliciting eye, and such a tongue,
That I am glad I haue not,

Q But euen for want of that, for which I am rich,
A still soliciting eye, and such a tongue,
As I am glad I haue not,

I suggest that "more richer" is found in Q at I i 77 as an antithesis to "poore" not because Shakespeare wrote it -- I do not think he did -- but because that antithesis, though with superlative instead of comparative, occurs at I i 249, where Shakespeare did write it.

Now at I i 82 we were certainly not dealing with the work of a negligent scribe prone to take his eye off his copy occasionally and rely on the guidance of an imperfect memory. There we were surely dealing with a struggling memory, the memory of someone who had no documentary assistance to turn to: it stumbled at line 82 and fell down altogether in the omission of line 83 and the first part of line 84. The person responsible has been defeated in this way twice within two pages of the quarto, at I i 39 and I i 82, and, interestingly enough, in both passages he has substituted "confirm" for "confer", probably through anticipation of I i 137 (this suggesting that we are dealing with the same transmitter at both points).

Now the reading "more richer" in Q I i 77 would in itself admit of explanation by the formula of the anticipating scribe; but since Q I i 82 indicates reporting, the condition of I i 77 is most reasonably to be explained as due to reporting. And so are other
readings in the passage with which we are dealing -- readings consistent with that method of transmission. These other readings are -- the connective "but" in line 81, the weaker synonym "win" for "draw" in line 84, the extra-metrical "How" in line 89 (perhaps an anticipation of "How, how" in F line 93), and "Goe to, goe to" for "How, how Cordelia?" in line 93 itself. "Goe to, goe to," occurs again in Q at II 232, where metrical considerations suggest that it is an interpolation.

We have analysed Q II 35-53 and II 74-94 and found evidence of reporting in both passages. In the twenty-line passage lying between these two there are three lines in Q which are consistent with the theory of reporting; and one of them seems to me itself strongly to suggest reporting. At the end of line 67 Q has an imperative "speake?" which is absent from F; but at the end of line 85 F has an imperative "speake." which is absent from Q. Memorial transference seems very likely in Q: both of the lines cited occur at the ends of speeches in each of which Lear questions one of his daughters about the extent of her love for him -- they might easily be confused in the memory. Secondly, line 68 runs thus in the two texts:

Q Sir I am made of the selfe same mettall that my sister is,
F I am made of that selfe-mettle as my Sister,.
Here the Q version is clumsy, that of F compact and firm. I should not like to think that in a first draft
Shakespeare perpetrated such an awkward line as that of Q: and I think it is thoroughly corrupt. And the corruption is memorial. The initial "Sir" is probably derived from I i 54, where both texts have it at the beginning of the line. With Q's "the selfe same" compare the two versions of II ii 133 --

Q This is a fellow of the selfe same nature,  
Our sister speake of,

F This is a Fellow of the selfe same colour,  
Our Sister speakes of.

Again we have an anticipation in Q: I i 68 and II ii 133 are linked by the word "sister", and "the selfe same" in II ii 133 is anticipated at I i 68. To make the matter a little more complex, I suggest that in II ii 133 itself Q contains memorial corruption. The word "nature" is much weaker there than "colour", which is surely the Shakespearian word. But at II ii 92 we have the words "his nature" in both texts, the "his" referring to the "fellow" spoken of in II ii 133. So Q I i 68 anticipates II ii 133, and in Q II ii 133 we have a reminiscence of II ii 92. But we have not yet finished with Q I i 68. Instead of "as my Sister" Q has "that my sister is": here we have textual expansion, which is found in reported texts though it need not of itself indicate reporting: and we have it again in the third of the Q lines to which we referred -- I i 54 begins in F "Sir, I loue you" and in Q "Sir I do loue you". In both cases the expansion results in an objectionable stotting movement. I should not like to explain Q I i 68 by the formula
of the anticipating scribe, for it seems to me that there is too much corruption in the line: reporting seems to me a much likelier explanation.

The stretch of text extending from I i 35 to I i 94 is packed full of memorial corruption in Q: the corruption is too frequent and in places too serious to allow of the theory that we have to do with a scribe who knew the play and who wrote largely from memory instead of using his eyes: and the hypothesis of reporting is inevitable.

Now let us look at I iv 222-234. The versions are as follows:

Q Lear. Doth any here know mee? why this is not Lear, doth Lear walke thus? speake thus? where are his eyes, either his notion, weaknesses, or his discernings are lethargie, sleeping or wakeing; hal sure tis not so, who is it that can tell me who I am? Lear shadow? I would learne that, for by the markes of soueraintie, knowledge, and reason, I should bee false perswaded I had daughters.
   Foole. Which they, will make an obedient father.
   Lear. Your name faire gentlewoman?
   Gon. Come sir, this admiration is much of the sauour of other your new prankes,

F Lear. Do's any heere know me?
This is not Lear: Do's Lear walke thus? Speake thus? Where are, his eies?
Either his Notion weakens, his Discernings Are Lethargied. Ha! Waking? 'Tis not so?
Who is it that can tell me who I am?
   Foole. Lear's shadow.
   Lear. Your name, faire Gentlewoman?
   Gon. This admiration Sir, is much o'th'saouer Of other your new prankes.

F has an omission in this passage: we are not, however, concerned with that here, but with the condition of the Q text where it can be checked against that of F. Nor do I wish to speak of the Q punctuation and lineation yet:
that will come later.

There is no doubt that in lines 224-225 F is right and Q corrupt. Lear never reaches an "or" clause to answer his "Either" -- he breaks off: editors generally print a dash instead of the F full stop after "Lethargied". The Q "or" before "his discernings" betrays a misunderstanding of the passage. Again, the words "sleeping or" make nonsense and involve metrical irregularity. Clearly Q does not represent a Shakespearean first draft here: it perverts the F text in a particularly outrageous manner. There is little doubt in my mind that the person responsible for the perversion has confused this passage with III vi 41, where Q has "sleepest or wakest thou iolly shepheard". This is absent from F: it occurs in the course of one of the passages (III vi 17-55) which, as we have seen, were cut in the stage-abridgement represented by the F text. How did I iv 225 come to be associated with III vi 41 in the mind of the corruptor of Q? We may perhaps suggest something like this: "Either" in I iv 224 suggested "or" to him, and he inserted "or" before "his discernings" in line 225; he remembered that "waking" occurred in line 225, and the fact that he had just set down two alternatives carried his mind forward to III vi 41 where a part of the verb "to wake" is used in a phrase embodying alternatives -- "sleepest or wakest thou"; and so he wrote down "sleeping or wakeing" in I iv 225. I can see no reasonable explanation of this phrase in I iv 225 other than that of memorial corrup-
tion. Can we hold responsible a scribe with his eye off his copy and his memory active? Surely not: the two lines, I iv 224-225, are too seriously damaged. A scribe with his eye temporarily off his copy may corrupt a text: but I should not like to assume such a scribe where the text is absolutely wrecked, as it is here in Q. Is it not more likely that a reporter is responsible? I am convinced that in I iv 224-225 in Q we have to do with a memory desperately and ineffectively straining after words but dimly recollected and very badly misunderstood. And with memorial corruption in my opinion established, I should regard Q's "why" (I iv 222), "sure" (line 225), and "Come" (line 233), as interpolations. "Come sir" also occurs in Q a few lines further up (at I iv 215), and there too it is absent from F, to the benefit of the metre there. The interpolation of ejaculations is frequently found in texts which are undoubtedly reported: so are inversions, and we have inversions in Q in I iv 225 and 233 —

Q sleeping or wakeing; ha!
F Ha! Waking?

Q Come sir, this admiration
F This admiration Sir,

In both of these cases Q combines within a few words two types of corruption found in reported texts: in the first it combines inversion and anticipation, in the second inversion and the interpolation of an ejaculation.
Let us now look at I iv 298-310. The two texts run as follows:

Q old fond eyes, beweepe this cause againe, ile pluck you out, & you cast with the waters that you make to temper clay, yea, i'st come to this? yet haue I left a daughter, whom I am sure is kind and comfortable, when shee shall heare this of thee, with her nailes shee'l flea thy woluish visage, thou shalt find that ile resume the shape, which thou dost thinke I haue cast off for euer, thou shalt I warrant thee.

Gon. Do you marke that my Lord?
Duke. I cannot bee so partiall Gonerill to the great loue I beare you,
Gon. Come sir no more,
F Old fond eyes,
Beweepe this cause againe, Ile plucke ye out,
And cast you with the waters that you loose
To temper Clay. Ha? Let it be so.
I haue another daughter,
Who I am sure is kinde and comfortable:
When she shall heare this of thee, with her nailes
Shee'l flea thy woluish visage. Thou shalt finde,
That Ile resume the shape which thou dost thinke
I haue cast off for euer.

Exit
Gon. Do you marke that?
Alb. I cannot be so partiall Gonerill,
To the great loue I 'beare you.
Gon. Pray you content.

Let us begin with line 310. I think it can be maintained that the Q "Come sir no more" is inappropriate in this context. Albany has begun to remonstrate with Goneril: she stops him with "Pray you content" in F, spoken, I imagine, soothingly and in a conciliatory manner. Her attitude to Albany at this stage of the play is certainly not such as to warrant her being so rude as to say "Come sir no more" to him. Consequently I do not believe that Q gives the version of a first draft here. At II iv 152 Regan says to Lear "Good Sir, no more:" (so F: Q -- "Good sir no more,"). This is entirely appropriate there, and Q I iv 310 in all probability contains an inexact anticipation of it.

Next: in line 307 we have an elaborate piece of textual
expansion. In F we have a metrical line, divided between two speakers: in Q the addition of the words "thou shalt I warrant thee" and "my Lord" totally destroys the metre. An actor playing Lear might well add "thou shalt I warrant thee" on his own responsibility to get a more emphatic effect, and of course reported texts frequently preserve interpolations made in performances. Next: in line 302 Q has "yet haue I left a daughter" while F has "I haue another daughter". The Q form of the phrase is in all probability due to recollection of I iv 251 where both texts have "yet haue I left a daughter". It is interesting to observe that at III vii 79 we have the following variation -- Q yet haue you one eye left F you haue one eye left where the Q reading is metrically clumsy and doubtless contains memorial corruption -- the line has been confused with this same I iv 251. Continuing our analysis of I iv 298-310: where F has "Ha? Let it be so," Q has "yea, i' st come to this?". It is possible that here Q anticipates III iv 47-48 where both texts have "art thou come to this?". In that case we should have to suppose that Shakespeare's version contained a metrically defective line --

To temper Clay. Ha! Let it be so. I haue another daughter,

This is quite possible. But there is another possibility: Shakespeare may have written this --

To temper Clay. Yea, i' st come to this? Ha! Let it be so. I haue another daughter,
Scribe E may have written "Ha! Let it be so," into his copy of Q in such a way that the F compositor thought it was to be substituted for instead of added to "Yea, i'st come to this?". This would be consistent with our views stated in section II. Nevertheless, in the passage with which we are dealing we have within eleven lines the following corruptions: (i) recollection ("yet....daughter"), (ii) textual expansion (line 307), (iii) anticipation (line 310). In addition Q's obviously inferior "make" for the F "loose" in line 300 may be due to recollection of "make" in line 296. I think that there is too much corruption in the Q version of the passage to make the theory of a negligent scribe safe: that of reporting is in my view safer.

Next consider II iv 84-100:

Q Lear. Denie to speake with mee, th'are sicke, th'are They trauelled hard to night, meare Iustice, (weary, I the Images of revolt and flying off, Fetch me a better answer.
Glost. My deere Lord, you know the fierie qualitie of the Duke, how vnremoueable and firtt he is in his owne Course.
Lear. Vengeance, death, plague, confusion, what fierie quality, why Gloster, Gloster, id'e speake with the Duke of Cornewal,and his wife.
Glost. I my good Lord.
Lear. The King would speak with Cornewal, the deare father Would with his daughter speake, commands her seruice, Fierie Duke, tell the hot Duke that Lear, No but not yet may be he is not well,

(The last four lines are given as in Q corr.: Q uncorr. has "speake" for "speak" and "fate," for "father" in the first of these lines; "the" for "his" and "come and tends seruise" for "commands her seruice" in the second; "The fierie" for "Fierie" in the third; and "Mo" for "No" in the fourth. We are not concerned with these variants here, and the fact that I have quoted the readings of Q corr. does not necessarily mean that I regard them all as faithful to the copy for Q. Again, in our quotations we are not reproducing errors of spacing: in the first of the four variant lines Q uncorr. has "Cornewal, the", Q corr. "Cornewal, the").
F Lear. Deny to speake with me?
They are sicke, they are weary,
They have tramail'd all the night? meere fetches
The images of reuolt and flying off.
Fetch me a better answer.
Glo. My deare Lord,
You know the fiery quality of the Duke,
How vnremoueable and fixt he is
In his owne course.
Lear. Vengeance, Plague, Death, Confusion:
Fiery? What quality? Why Gloster Gloster,
I'ld speake with the Duke of Cornewall, and his wife.
Glo. Well my good Lord, I haue inform'd them so.
Lear. Inform'd them? Do'st thou understand me man.
Glo. I my good Lord.
Lear. The King would speake with Cornwall,
The deere Father
Would with his Daughter speake, commands, tends, servise,
Are they inform'd of this? My breath and blood:
Fiery? The fiery Duke, tell the hot Duke that -----
No, but not yet, may be he is not well,

Q omits lines 93-94 and line 98. It would certainly seem to be a case of omission from Q and not addition to F; for line 95 follows line 94 much more naturally than it follows line 92. Are the Q omissions the result of negligence on the part of a scribe or the compositor? I do not think so. It will be noticed that the matter of the second omission refers back to that of the first. We have to do with linked omissions in Q. I do not think we can comfortably assume that a scribe or compositor accidentally omitted two linked passages, separate but close to each other. That would be too great a coincidence to be likely. Nor do I think that a scribe or compositor would omit line 98 because he had omitted lines 93-94: I should rather expect him to go back and insert 93-94, or (more probably) simply to proceed with 98 despite his omission of 93-94 (of which he might well be unaware). Line 98 could stand without lines 93-94 and make sense, though
losing its real point. And I do not think that it is likely that such short omissions are the result of deliberate abridgement. I think it most probable that these omissions are due to reporting. Chambers (William Shakespeare, I, 467) instances this as a case of linked omissions in Q which suggest that the stenographer whom he postulates was sometimes aware of lapses of attention on his own part and "attempted to cover them up". It is also possible, however, that sheer failure of memory in an actor or reconstructor may be responsible for the omission of all the lines in the passage referring to the Duke and Duchess being "inform'd". At any rate there appears to be another memorial corruption in the neighbourhood in Q. With the variation in line 85 compare II ii 150 where Kent says

Q I haue watcht and trauald hard,
F I haue watch'd and traual'd hard,

This is recollected in Q II iv 85. Then in II iv 90 Q has an inversion. There is another inversion in II iv 91, though Q's "what fierie quality," may rather be a vulgarisation -- a substitution of a more commonplace for a less commonplace locution. Again I believe that the passage quoted from Q is too corrupt to be explained by the theory of a careless scribe or compositor: again the theory of reporting seems to me safer.

At IV i 5-12 the two texts read as follows:
Q The lamentable change is from the best, 
The worst returns to laughter, 
Who's here, my father parti, eyd, world, world, O world! 
But that thy strange mutations make vs hate thee, 
Life would not yeeld to age. Enter Glost. led by an old man. 

(In the third line here Q uncorr. has "poorlie, leed", Q corr. "parti, eyd").

F The lamentable change is from the best, 
The worst returns to laughter. Welcome then, 
Thou vnsubstantiall ayre that I embrace: 
The Wretch that thou hast blowne vnto the worst, 
Owes nothing to thy blasts. 
Enter Glouster, and an Oldman. 
But who comes heere? My Father poorely led? 
World, World, O world! 
But that thy strange mutations make vs hate thee, 
Life would not yeelde to age.

In the passage from "But who" to "O world!" F needs re-lining: "But who comes heere?" completes the line begun with "Owes nothing to thy blasts.", and "My Father.... O world!" forms a pentameter. Q omits the passage "Welcome.... blasts." (lines 6-9). This is almost certainly an omission due to imperfect memorial transmission. If it were due to abridgement, or if it were an accidental omission made by a scribe or compositor, we should not expect "But who comes heere?" to be paraphrased as "Who's here,". The Q "Who's here," does not complete line 6 satisfactorily from the metrical point of view, and I do not see any reason to suppose that Shakespeare would write a line so awkward metrically in a first draft. Surely in the Q text a reporter's memory has failed at line 6 and has recovered rather uncertainly at line 9. It may be mentioned that at line 17 of this scene Q has "Alack sir, you cannot see your way". The words "Alack sir" are absent from this line in F, but they are present in both texts in line 45 of the scene: we
presumably have anticipation in Q in line 17 (unless "Alack(e) sir" -- extra-metrical -- in line 45 is not genuine but an unauthorized piece of textual expansion in Q which Scribe E neglected to remove: in which case Q's "Alack sir" in line 17 may also be regarded as a piece of textual expansion).

At IV vi 148-171 the two texts run as follows:

Q Lear. What art mad, a man may see how the world goes with no eyes, looke with thine eares, see how yon Justice railes vpon yon simple theefe, harke in thy eare handy, dandy, which is the theefe, which is the Justice, thou hast seene a farmers dogge barke at a beggar. Glost. I sir.

Lear. And the creature runne from the cur, there thou mightst behold the great image of authoritie, a dogge, so bade in office, thou rascall beadle hold thy bloody hand, why dost thou lash that whore, strip thine owne backe, thy bloud hotly lusts to vse her in that kind for which thou whipst her, the vsumer hangs the coizener, through tottered raggs, smal vices do appeare, robes & furrd gownes hides all, get thee glasse eyes, and like a scuruy polititian seeme to see the things thou doest not, no now pull off my bootes, harder, harder, so.

F Lear. What, art mad? A man may see how this world goes, with no eyes. Looke with thine eares: See how yond Justice railes vpon yond simple theefe. Hearke in thine eare: Change places, and handy-dandy, which is the Justice, which is the theefe: Thou hast seene a Farmers dogge barke at a Beggar?

Glou. I Sir.

Lear. And the Creature run from the Cur: there thou might'st behold the great image of Authoritie, a Dogg's obey'd in Office. Thou, Rascall Beadle, hold thy bloody hand: why dost thou lash that Whore? Strip thy owne backe, thou hotly lusts to vse her in that kind for which thou whip'st her. The Vsumer hangs the Cozener. Thorough tatter'd cloathes great Vices do appeare: Robes, and Furr'd gownes hide all. Place sinnen with Gold, and the strong Lance of Justice, hurtlesse breaks: Arme it in ragges, a Pigmies straw do's pierce it. None do's offend, none, I say none, Ile able 'em; take that of me my Friend, who hane the power to seale th'accusers lips. Get thee glasse-eyes, and like a scuruy Politician, seeme to see the things thou dost not. Now, now, now, now. Pull off my Bootes: harder, harder, so.

The passage from "Thou, Rascall Beadle," to "harder, so." is verse, though set up in prose form in both Q and F. It will be convenient in dealing with this passage to refer to the line-numbers of the passage itself and not of the scene.
Apart from the verse-lining, the F version requires correction in my opinion at two points: in line 12 the Q "smal" is probably correct and the F "great" wrong, and in line 13 for the F "Place sinnes" we must, I think, accept from Theobald the emendation "Plate sinne" (see the Notes on these lines). Except for these points there is no reason to suspect the correctness of the F text.

Q omits "Plate....lips." (lines 13-17). Chambers¹ says that this omission may conceivably be the result of censorship. He is not emphatic about this: and, while the omission may indeed be the result of censorship, it may equally well be accidental. It may be due to defective memorial transmission, like others we have encountered. If we have to do with memorial transmission in Q it would not be surprising if "Plate....lips." were forgotten, for, especially towards the end, it is difficult. Now apart from this omission² there are in the Q version of the passage three different types of corruption which might be due to reporting. We have an inversion in line 4. In line 10, instead of "thou" Q has "thy bloud" which is unmetrical. Greg says³ that the Q reading "seems to contain a recollection of 'hold thy bloody hand' just before". In line 12 where F has "cloathes" Q has "rags":

2. Q has another, small, omission -- "Change places, and" in lines 3-4; but this may easily be due to carelessness in the compositor.
3. Editorial Problem, p. 93.
I think there can be no doubt that F is right here and that the Q reading is an anticipation of "ragges" in F line 15. If we read "rags" at both points its effect at the second point is much weakened: and we not infrequently find in reported texts anticipations of readings in passages omitted from their proper places. Finally, in line 8, instead of "a Dogg's obey'd" Q has "a dogge, so bade", which looks very like an error of hearing. There are several readings in Q which may be errors of hearing. For instance, at IV iv 27 for the F "incite" Q reads, absurdly, "in sight". Miss Doran\(^1\) reminds us that "the printer may have himself unconsciously substituted words similar in sound, just as now one sometimes writes their for there, write for right, and so forth". This would explain "in sight" satisfactorily, but I agree with Greg\(^2\) who finds it "more difficult to believe that it was [the compositor] who converted 'a dog's obeyed in office' (F) into 'a dog, so bade in office' (Q)". The spelling "cosioner" in Q line 12 might also be an error of hearing, but we need not press this. Now even if we take Q's "a dogge, so bade" as an aural error, we may perhaps attribute it to dictation of the copy to the compositor at this point\(^3\). And each of the other corruptions we have noted in this passage of Q might be explained other-

---

1. Text of 'King Lear', p. 125.
2. Variants, p. 94.
wise than as the result of reporting: a scribe, or conceivably the compositor, might be held responsible for the anticipation and recollection; and either a scribe or the compositor might be held responsible for the inversion. But I think it not unreasonable to argue thus: within a passage which in modern editions comprises twenty-four lines we have, apart from a considerable omission, corruption of three types -- inversion, anticipation and recollection, auditory error -- each of which might be attributed to a scribe or the compositor on the one hand or to a reporter on the other: it is unlikely that a scribe or the compositor would within such a short passage perpetrate so many different types of error, whereas the condition of the passage is in perfect accord with what we should expect of a reporter. Further, I must say that, as regards a recollection which results in awkward metrical irregularity, and (especially) an anticipation of a word in a near-by passage subsequently omitted, I find it much easier to hold a reporter responsible than to hold a scribe or the compositor responsible.

At V iii 155-158 the two texts read as follows:

Q Stop your mouth dame, or with this paper shall I stople it, thou worse then any thing, reade thine owne euill, nay no tearing Lady, I perceiue you know't.

F Shut your mouth Dame, Or with this paper shall I stop it; hold Sir, Thou worse then any name, reade thine owne euill: No tearing Lady, I perceiue you know it.

There is no reason to suppose that F's "hold Sir" was added in a revision, for even if we were to read "stople" with Q that word could be scanned as a
monosyllable (cf. Abbott, A Shakespearian Grammar, para. 465). There is no reason to suppose that the absence of "hold Sir" from Q is not an omission. Now, no matter whether we were to read "stop" or "stople" in line 156, "Shut" would be distinctly preferable to "Stop" in line 155. "Stop" here spoils the effect of "stop" or "stople" in the next line. F's "Shut" is doubtless genuine, and Q's "Stop" doubtless an anticipation of the word in the next line -- even if "stople" were correct there, anticipation of it might produce "Stop" in line 155. In line 157 Q's "thing" is infinitely weaker than F's "name" -- a commonplace reading is substituted for an unusual one. In line 158 Q has an exclamation ("nay") which is wanting in F. In no more than four successive lines in Q we have anticipation, omission, vulgarisation, and textual expansion. All are consistent with the theory of reporting. It may certainly be said that they do not necessarily indicate reporting: but would a scribe or the compositor introduce so many corruptions into such a short speech? It is more probable that a reporter would.

Lear's last speech in the play, V iii 306-312 runs thus in the two texts:

Q And my poore foole is hang'd, no, no life, why should a dog, a horse, a rat of life and thou no breath at all, O thou wilt come no more, neuer, neuer, neuer, pray you vndo this button, thanke you sir, O, o, o, o.

F And my poore Poole is hang'd: no, no, no life? Why should a Dog, a Horse, a Rat haue life, And thou no breath at all? Thou'lt come no more, Neuer, neuer, neuer, neuer, Neuer.
Pray you vndo this Button. Thanke you Sir, Do you see this? Looke on her? Looke her lips, Looke there, looke there.
Q omits lines 311-312. Were these lines added by Shakespeare in a revision? If they were in existence from the beginning were they omitted accidentally by a scribe or the compositor? (Surely no abridger would cut out these few climax-exclamations.) Or do we again have to do with a forgetful reporter? In favour of the last explanation it is to be noted that no less than three of the preceding four lines of the speech in Q may be held to show corruption characteristic of reporting. In line 307 we have "of" for the unstressed "haue" -- one of the least questionable examples of possible aural error in the Q text; in line 308 the Q text is expanded to unmetrical dimensions by the introduction of the ejaculation "0" and the enlargement of "Thou'lt" to "thou wilt"; and at the end of line 310 we have a truly horrible quadruple "0", expressing dying groans to the utterance of which Burbadge seems to have been addicted at moments like these -- they occur also at the end of the folio Hamlet. Surely neither here nor there are they Shakespearian. Here, then, we have a six-and-a-half line speech: in Q it shows a probable aural error, textual expansion of a kind likely to have been introduced in performance, and omission. A scribe who preferred recollecting performances to reading his copy might introduce the types of corruption we have here1. But I cannot think that he

1. The quadruple "0" at the end of F Hamlet was introduced by such a scribe. See Dover Wilson, The Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet', vol. I, p. 78.
would corrupt the speech to the extent to which it is corrupted in Q. The Q speech is a mere ruin. Again reporting seems to me to be strongly suggested.

It is also strongly suggested by the Q versions of the following:

I ii 10 Q with base, base bastardie?  
F With Base? With basenes Barstadie? Base, Base?

II iv 116 Q O my heart, my heart.  
F Oh me my heart! My rising heart! But downe.

III i 54 Q Ile this way, you that,  
F in which your pain / That way, Ile this:

V iii 174 Q Thou hast spoken truth,  
F Th'nest spoken right, 'tis true,.

In each of these cases Q has metrical deficiency. And in the second case the Q version results in a total loss of the point of the following speech (present in both texts) with its "downe, wantons, downe". In the second case at any rate, then, Q does not give us a Shakespearian "first shot": and surely it does not do that in the other three either. As we have already said, there is no need to suppose that Shakespeare would be metrically incompetent or slovenly in even a first draft. And I cannot think that the theory of the careless scribe will do, at any rate in the first three cases. What we have to do with is surely the fumbling of a memory with no authentic document to fall back on.

Of the passages discussed so far, some give stronger indications of memorial transmission than others. In particular I think that the first two pas-
sages we analysed give very strong indications of memorial transmission. But as regards fullness and accuracy the relationship of the quarto text of Lear as a whole to the text of the folio is not the same as that between any of the undoubtedly "bad" Shakespearian texts and the corresponding "good" text or texts as wholes. Q Lear is as a whole of a very much higher standard. It might conceivably be suggested, therefore, that the copy for Q was a transcript of a document which in certain passages was defective or illegible, that the transcriber knew the play from performances, and that he did his best from memory at those points, while generally following his documentary authority where it was not defective or illegible. But at very many points all through the Q text we come upon lines containing readings differing from those of F, readings of the same types as those we have found in the passages we have just studied. We come upon lines containing exclamations, vocatives, connectives, etc. absent from the corresponding lines in F, and sometimes causing metrical irregularity: lines containing inversions: lines containing anticipations and recollections: lines containing readings much weaker and less effective than those of F -- weak synonym-substitutions. We find corruptions of these kinds in Q at many points where we do not have serious textual breakdowns and where the theory of reporting is not obviously indicated. But I think we may argue thus: scattered all through the Q text we have many readings
of the same types as those we have found in passages almost undoubtedly reported; therefore, while these readings scattered throughout Q might in some cases be explained otherwise than by the theory of reporting (e.g. by postulating transcription by a careless scribe relying on his memory rather than on his eyes), it is not unreasonable to take them as being in fact the result of reporting. To put the matter in another way: the Q text is characterised throughout by certain types of corruption which might in some places be accounted for by the theory of extremely careless transcription as well as by the theory of reporting. But at some points most or all of these types of corruption are found clustered together in a short passage in which the text is so bad that the theory of reporting is clearly indicated there. This makes it probable that we have to do with reporting throughout.

I propose now to give lists of examples of the various textual characteristics with which we have been dealing.

(a) **Lines in which Q contains exclamations, vocatives, connectives, etc. not found in the corresponding lines in F.**

I i 107 F Let it be so, thy truth then be thy dowre:

Q Well let it be so, thy truth then be thy dower,

I i 162 F Kill thy Physition, and thy fee bestow

Q Doe, kill thy Physicion, / And the fee bestow

I i 179 F Fare thee well King, sithe thus thou wilt appeare,

Q Why fare thee well king, since thus thou wilt appeare,
I i 201 F Will you with those infirmities she owes,
    Q Sir will you with those infirmities she owes,
I ii 14 F Goe to th'creating a whole tribe of Fops
    Q goe to the creating of a whole tribe of fops
I ii 146-7 F When saw you my Father last?
    Edg. The night gone by.
    Q Bast. Come, come, when saw you my father last?
    Edg. Why, the night gon by.
I iv 109 F Truth's a dog must to kennell,
    Q Truth is a dog that must to kenell,
I iv 215 F I would you would make vse of your good wisedome
    Q Come sir, I would you would make vse of that good wisedome
I iv 312 F Tarry, take the Foole with thee:
    Q tary and take the foole with
I v 17 F What can'st tell Boy?
    Q Why what canst thou tell my boy?
II i 23 F Haue you not spoken 'gainst the Duke of Cornwall?
    Q haue you not spoken against the Duke of Cornwall ought,
II i 32 F Fly Brother, Torches, Torches, so farewell.
    Q flie brother flie, torches, torches, so farwell;
II ii 26 F Is it two dayes since I tript vp thy heeles, and beate thee
    Q is it two dayes agoe since I beat thee, and tript vp thy heeles
II ii 29 F Ile make a sop oth' Moonshine of you, you whoreson Cullyenly Barber-monger, draw.
    Q ile make a sop of the moone-shine a'you, draw you whorson cullyonly barber-munger, draw?
II ii 52 F A Tayler Sir,
    Q I, a Tayler sir;
II ii 102 F What mean'st by this?
    Q What mean'st thou by this?
II i 120 F Fetch forth the Stocks?
   Q Bring forth the stockes ho?
II ii 146 F Come my Lord, away.
   Q Come my good Lord away?
II ii 150 F Pray do not Sir,
   Q Pray you do not sir,
II iv 6 F Hah, ha, he weares Cruell Garters
   Q Ha ha, looke he weares crewell garters,
II iv 69 F least it breake thy necke with following.
   Q least it breake thy necke with following it,
II iv 147 F Say you haue wrong'd her.
   Q Say you haue wrong'd her Sir?
II iv 214 F I prythee Daughter do not make me mad,
   Q Now I prithee daughter do not make me mad,
II iv 218 F Or rather a disease that's in my flesh,
   Q Or rather a disease that lies within my flesh,
II iv 227 F Not altogether so,
   Q Not altogether so sir,
II iv 232 F Is this well spoken?
   Q Is this well spoken now?
III ii 12 F Good Nunkle, in, aske thy Daughters blessing,
   Q Good Nunkle in, and aske thy daughters blessing,
III ii 18 F You owe me no subscription. Then let fall
   Q You owe me no subscription, why then let fall
III ii 78 F True Boy:
   Q True my good boy,
   Lear. Thou wert better in a Graue,
   Q Dolphin my boy, my boy, caese let him trot by.
   Lear. Why thou wert better in thy graue,
You sir, I entertaine for one of my hundred;
Q You sir, I entertaine you for one of my hundred,

so, so, we'Il go to Supper i'th'morning.
Q so, so, so, Weele go to supper it'h morning, so, so,

Wherefore to Douer?
Q Wherefore to Douer sir?

Bad is the Trade that must play Foole to sorrow,
Q bad is the trade that must play the foole to sorrow

Cannot be heard so high. Ile looke no more,
Q Cannot be heard, its so hie ile looke no more,

Were all thy Letters Sunnes, I could not see.
Q Were all the letters sunnes I could not see one.

We wawle, and cry. I will preach to thee: Marke.
Q we wayl and cry, I will preach to thee marke me.

Masters, know you that?
Q my maisters, know you that.

Pardon deere Madam,
Q Pardon me deere madame,

I Madam: in the heauinesse of sleepe,
Q I madam, in the heauinesse of his sleepe,

pray go with vs.
Q pray you goe with vs.

Meane you to enioy him?
Q Meane you to inioy him then?

Know my name is lost
Q 0 know my name is lost

I come to cope.
Q I come to cope with all.
V iii 258 F Howle, howle, howle:
    Q Howle, howle, howle, howle,
V iii 316 F He is gon indeed.
    Q O he is gone indeed.

(b) Inversions.

I i 19 F But I haue a Sonne, Sir, by order of Law,
    Q But I haue sir a sonne by order of Law,
I i 104 F Lear. But goes thy heart with this?
    Cor. I my good Lord.
    Q Lear. But goes this with thy heart?
    Cord. I good my Lord.
I i 182 F That iustly think'st, and hast most rightly said:
    Q That rightly thinks, and hast most iustly said,
I i 292 F then must we looke from his age, to receive
    Q then must we looke to receive from his age
I ii 13 F within a dull stale tyred bed
    Q within a stale dull lyed bed,
I ii 58 F When came you to this?
    Q when came this to you,
I ii 70 F But I haue heard him oft maintaine it to be fit,
    Q but I haue often heard him maintaine it to be fit,
I ii 72-3 F the Father should bee as Ward to the Son, and the
    Sonne manage his Reuennew.
    Q his father should be as ward to the sonne, and the
    sonne mannage the reuenew.
I iv 76 F Oh you Sir, you, come you hither Sir, who am I Sir?
    Q O you sir, you sir, come you hither, who am I sir?
I iv 89 F goe too, haue you wisedome, so.
    Q you haue wisedome.
I iv 152-3 F Nuncle, giue me an egge,
    Q giue me an egge Nuncle,
Is it two dayes since I tript vp thy heeles, and beate thee before the King?

Q is it two dayes agoe since I beat thee, and tript vp thy heeles before the King?

You beastly knaue, know you no reuerence?

Q you beastly Knaue you haue no reuerence.

They could not, would not do't;

Q They would not, could not do't,

You beastly knaue, know you no reuerence?

Q you beastly Knaue you haue no reuerence.

They could not, would not do't;

Q They would not, could not do't,

Fye sir, fie.

Q Fie fie sir.

Our flesh and blood, my Lord, is growne so vilde,

Q Our flesh and bloud is growne so wild my Lord,

And bring you where both fire, and food is ready.

Q and bring you where both food and fire is readie.

Good my Lord take his offer,

Q My good Lord take his offer,

What most he should dislike, seemes pleasant to him;

Q what hee should most desire seems pleasant to him,

I tooke it for a man: often 'twould say

Q I tooke it for a man, often would it say

Be by good Madam when we do awake him,

Q Good madam be by, when we do awake him

For thee oppressed King I am cast downe,

Q for thee oppressed King am I cast downe,

Maugre thy strength, place, youth, and eminence,

Q Maugure thy strength, youth, place and eminence,

if euer I did hate thee, or thy Father.

Q if I did euer hate thee or thy father.

Who dead? Speake man.

Q Who man, speake?
V iii 233 F 0, is this he?
   Q 0 tis he,
V iii 283 F are you not Kent?
   Q Are not you Kent?
V iii 293 F I so I thinke.
   Q So thinke I to.
V iii 294 F and vaine is it
   Q and vaine it is,

(c) Anticipations.

I i 160 F Thou swear.st thy Gods in vaine.
   Lear. O Vassal! Miscreant.
   Q thou swearest thy Gods in vaine.
   Lear. Vassall, recreant.
Cf. I i 165 --
F Heare me recreant, on thine allegiance heare me;
Q Heare me, on thy allegiance heare me?
I i 215 F That she whom euen but now, was your obiect,
   The argument of your praise, balme of your age,
   The best, the dearest,
   Q that she, that euen but now
   Was your best obiect, the argument of your praise,
   Balme of your age, most best, most dearest,
Cf. I i 249-250 --
F Fairest Cordelia, that art most rich being poore,
   Most choise forsaken, and most lou'd despis'd,
Q Fairest Cordelia that art most rich being poore,
   Most choise forsaken, and most loued despis'd.

This case has already been referred to (p. 34).
Many editions, including both the Cambridge and
the Globe, read "Most best, most dearest,", follow-
ing Q. But it seems to me very probable that
in reading "most best, most dearest," Q anticip-
ates the passage quoted second. The speeches at
I i 212 ff. and I i 249 ff., by the same speaker, both begin with chains of complimentary descriptions of Cordelia, and might very easily be confused in the memory. The succession of "most"s in I i 249-50 might well be remembered at I i 215. The fact that the passage first quoted is introduced by the words "This is most strange" might further assist the memorial confusion.

I i 234 F Is it but this? A tardinesse in nature,

Q Is it no more but this, a tardineses in nature,

Q is unmetrical here: with its wording cf.

III iv 101 --

F Is man no more then this?

Q is man no more, but this

and III iv 105 --

F vnaccommodated man, is no more but such...

Q vnaccommodated man, is no more but such...

(Q III iv 101 probably anticipates III iv 105.)

I i 238 F Loue's not loue

When it is mingled with regards, that stands Aloofe from th'intire point,

Q Loue is not loue when it is mingled with respects that Aloofe from the intire point (stads

Cf. I i 247 --

F Since that respect and Fortunes are his loue,

I shall not be his wife.

Q Since that respects

Of fortune are his loue, I shall not be his wife.

There seems in Q to be a thorough confusion between I i 238 and I i 247. Q's "respects" in line 238 has the same meaning as F's "regards". It gives excellent sense and in itself gives no
indication of corruption. If either Q or F is wrong (i.e. if we dismiss the theory of a Shakespearian revision) we must balance against each other the alternative possibilities (i) that F is wrong, giving a synonym-substitution by Scribe P, Scribe E, or the composer, and (ii) that Q is wrong. In view of the fact that nine lines later we have in both texts the words "respect(s)" and "loue", I think it is safer to take it that Q contains an anticipation of the former in line 238. Now when we come to line 247 in Q we find "respects of fortune" beside the F "respect and Fortunes". Most editors choose to follow Q here. But I cannot see that its reading is at all superior to that of F: indeed the latter seems to me the better. Furness follows Q in his text: but in his note he says, "If we adopt this [the Q] reading, 'respects' is used like 'regards' in line 238, or in Ham. II, ii, 79, and, of course, with the same meaning as in Ham. III, i, 68. But it is doubtful if the reading of the Ff be not better; it means the same, and the turn of the phrase is certainly Shakespearian". I do not think it means the same, but I agree that the turn of the phrase is certainly Shakespearian. I think also that Furness has put his finger on the cause of the Q corruption. A transmitter of the Q text has in line 247 recollected the content of line 238, where he used the word "respects" with the meaning of considerations. And he has used it again here in the same sense: in F line 247 "respect" means "deferential regard or esteem". I sug-
gest, then, that lines 238 and 247 were thoroughly confused in this person's mind -- at 238 he anticipates F's "respect" in 247 but changes it to "respects" and uses it in the sense of F's "regards" in 238, and at 247 his alteration of "respect and" to "respects Of" is the result of a recollection of his own "respects" in 238.

I i 258 F Can buy
    Q Shall buy
    Cf. I i 262 --
    F nor shall euier see
    Q nor shall euier see

I i 269 F Loue well our Father:
    Q vse well our Father,
    Cf. I v 14 --

F Shalt see thy other Daughter will vse thee kindly,
    Q Shalt see thy other daughter will vse thee kindly,

The earlier and later passages could easily be confused in the memory: both concern the treatment of Lear by Goneril and Regan after the distribution of the kingdom. And it can be said quite confidently that in I i 269 the F reading is appropriate to the context while that of Q is not. The next line makes this clear -- "To your professed bosomes I commit him," (the wording is the same in both texts). Cordelia is in effect saying to Goneril and Regan, "You have said that you love our father -- do so". As Greg says (Editorial Problem, p. 93), "she had yet no ground for supposing they would use the old man ill". The person responsible for the Q
reading was thinking ahead. (The fact that the Q reading is unsuited to the context militates, of course, against the theory that "vse" is the reading of a Shakespearian first draft and "Loue" that of a revision. The use of "professed" in the next line shows quite definitely that the point of line 269 as initially conceived lay in the word "Loue").

I ii 86 F & to no other pretence of danger.
   Q and to no further pretence of danger.
Cf. I ii 91 --
   F without any further delay;
   Q without any further delay

I ii 99 F conuey the businesse as I shall find meanes,
   Q conuey the businesse as I shall see meanes,
Cf. I ii 174 --
   F I see the businesse.
   Q I see the busines,

I iii 27 F prepare for dinner.
   Q goe prepare for dinner.
Cf. I iv 8 --
   F Let me not stay a iot for dinner, goe get it ready;
   Q Let me not stay a iot for dinner, goe get it readie,

I iv 28 F Neuer afflict your selfe to know more of it:
   Q Neuer afflict your selfe to know the cause,
Cf. I iv 299 --
   F Beweepe this cause againe, Ile plucke ye out,
   Q bewepe this cause againe, ile pluck you out,
The fact that "cause" in I iv 299 and Q I iv 288 has different meanings does not invalidate
the suggestion of anticipation. But with Q I iv 286 cf. also II iv 280 and III i 39 in both texts.

II i 4 F That the Duke of [Cornwall,] and Regan his Duchesse Will be here with him this night.

Q that the Duke of [Cornwall] and his Dutches will bee here with him to night.

Cf. II i 14 --
F The Duke be here to night?
Q The Duke be here to night!

II i 10 F 'Twixt the Dukes of [Cornwall,] and [Albany?]

Q twixt the two Dukes of [Cornwall] and [Albany?]
Similarly, III iv 47 F Did'st thou giue all to thy Daughters?

Q Hast thou giuen all to thy two daughters,

Cf. I i 127 --
F With my two Daughters Dowres, digest the third,
Q With my two daughters dower digest this third, and III ii 22 --
F That will with two pernicious Daughters ioyne
Q that haue with 2. pernitious daughters ioyn'd and IV vii 28 --
F these violent harmes, that my two Sisters Haue in thy Reuerence made.
Q those violent harmes that my two sisters Haue in thy reuerence made.

II i 61 F Bringing the murderous Coward to the stake:
Q bringing the murderous caytife to the stake,
Cf. III ii 55 --
F Caytiffe, to pieces shake
Q Caytife in ppieces shake,
II ii 78 F I'ld driue ye cackling home to Camelot.  
Q Id's send you cackling home to Camulet.  
Cf. II iv 2 --

F 'Tis strange that they should so depart from home,  
And not send backe my Messengers.  
Q Tis strange that they should so depart from hence,  
And not send backe my messenger.

The word "home" may have acted as a memorial link between II ii 78 and II iv 1 even though, when he reached II iv 1, the reporter changed it to "hence": but "hence" may conceivably be a misreading of "home" in the copy for Q.

II ii 83 F What is his fault?  
Q what's his offence.  
Cf. II ii 108 --

F What was th'offence you gaue him?  
Q What's the offence you gaue him?

Two passages are thoroughly mixed up in Q, which at line 83 anticipates "offence" in line 108, and at line 108 repeats the present tense of line 83.

II ii 89 F This is some Fellow,  
Q This is a fellow  
Cf. II ii 133 --

F This is a Fellow  
Q This is a fellow

II ii 112 F When he compact, and flattering his displeasure  
Q When he conjunct and flattering his displeasure  
Cf. V i 12 --

Q I am doubtfull that you haue been conjunct and bosom'd with hir,  
(F omits)
II iv 153 F Returne you to my Sister.

Lear. Neuer Regan:

Q Returne you to my sister.

Lear. No Regan,

Cf. II iv 166 --

F No Regan, thou shalt neuer haue my curse:

Q No Regan, thou shalt neuer haue my curse,

II iv 153 is unmetrical in Q and sounds extremely clumsy.

II iv 236 F How in one house
Should many people, vnder two commands
Hold amity?

Q how in a house
Should many people vnder two commands
Hold amytie,

Cf. II iv 258 --

F What need you fiue and twenty? Ten? Or fiue?
To follow in a house, where twice so many
Haue a command to tend you?

Q What need you fiue and twentie, tenne, or fiue,
To follow in a house, where twice so many
Haue a commaund to tend you.

In the F version of II iv 235-6 we have a pointed antithesis, "one -- two": the distinction between "one house" and "two commands" is the kernel of the passage. Shakespeare must surely have intended this in the initial conception of the speech. Q loses the point by reading "a" for "one". Now "in a house" is entirely appropriate in II iv 258, where it is found in both texts. And the two passages are so similar that memorial confusion is very likely -- both are questions concerning Lear's retainers, both contain the words "house" and
"command", and one contains the word "two" and the other the word "twice".

III iv 45 F through the sharpe Hau thorne blow the windes.
    Q thorough the sharpe hathorne blowes the cold wind,
    Cf. III iv 96 --
    F Still through the Hau thorne blowes the cold winde:
    Q still through the hathorne blowes the cold wind,

III iv 154 F this same lerned Theban:
    Q this most learned Theban,
    Cf. III vi 21 --
    Q most learned J u stice
    (F omits)

V iii 92 F to proue vpon thy person,
    Q to proue vpon thy head,
    Cf. V iii 147 --
    F Backe do I tosse these Treasons to thy head,
    Q Heere do I tosse those treasons to thy head.

V iii 97 F If not, Ile nere trust medicine.
    Q If not, ile ne're trust poyson.
    Cf. V iii 228 --
    F her Sister / By her is poyson'd:
    Q her sister / By her is poysoned,
    and V iii 241 --
    F The one the other poison'd for my sake,
    Q The one the other poysoned for my sake,

V iii 130 F The priuiledge of mine Honours,
    Q the priuiledge of my tongue,
    Cf. V iii 144 --
    F And that thy tongue (some say) of breeding breathes,
    Q And that thy being some say of breeding breathes,
V iii 289 F from your first of difference and decay,  
Q from your life of difference and decay,  
Cf. V iii 300 --
F During the life of this old Majesty  
Q during the life of this old maiesty,  
The Q version of V iii 289 gives defective sense and is surely corrupt. In connection with the suggestion that it contains an anticipation of V iii 300, note the word "decay" in V iii 298 (both texts), which might serve as a link-word.

(d) Recollections.

I i 173 F To shield thee from disasters of the world,  
Q To shield thee from diseases of the world,  
Cf. I i 163 --
F thy fee bestow / Vpon the foule disease,  
Q the fee bestow vpon the foule disease,  
Many editors, including the Cambridge and Globe editors and Furness, follow Q at I i 173. Malone regards the F "disasters" as an alteration made by the printer "in consequence of his not knowing the meaning of the original word. 'Diseases,' in old language," Malone continues (see Furness's note), "meant the slighter inconveniences, troubles, or distresses of the world. The provision that Kent could make in five days [see I i 172] might, in some measure, guard him against the 'diseases' of the world, but could not shield him
from its "disasters". So Malone: and the F "disasters" might conceivably be regarded as a "correction" by Scribe E. But in my opinion the occurrence of "disease" in both texts at I i 163, i.e. only ten lines earlier, is ground for regarding I i 173 in Q with suspicion. It is true that "diseases" could in Shakespeare's day bear the meaning referred to by Malone. But when he says that the "provision that Kent could make in five days might, in some measure, guard him against the 'diseases' of the world, but could not shield him from its disasters", he is surely going too far. In Shakespeare's day "disasters" could mean simply pieces of ill luck, misfortunes. It is quite reasonable that Lear should grant Kent five days to equip himself for protection against or mitigation of worldly misfortunes.

I i 240 F Royall King,
Q Royall Leir,
Cf. I i 138 --
F Royall Lear,
Q Royall Lear,

Most editors follow Q at I i 240. They are probably disturbed by the apparent tautology involved in the F version. But there is actually no tautology. "Royal" can mean (I quote C. T. Onions's Shakespeare Glossary) "(of persons, their character, &c.) noble, majestic, generous, munificent". At V iii 177 we have the phrase "A Royall Noblenesse" applied to Edgar, who is not of course a king or prince. And at IV vi 197-8 we have the following --
(Lear.) Come, come, I am a King, Masters, know you that? Gent. You are a Royall one and we obey you.

There is warrant here for the phrase "a royal King".

I i 123 F to lay his Goatish disposition on the charge of a Starre,

Q to lay his gotish disposition to the charge of Starres:

Cf. I i 117 --

F we make guilty of our disasters, the Sun, the Moone, and Starres,

Q we make guiltie of our disasters, the Sunne, the Moone, and the Starres,

I i 128 F had the maidenlest Starre in the Firmament twinkled on my bastárđizing.

Q had the maidenlest starre of the Firmament twinkled on my bastardy

Cf. I i 10 --

F With Base? With basenes Barstadie? Base, Base?

Q with base, base bastardie?

I i 165 F Brother, I advisie you to the best,

Q brother, I advisie you to the best, goe arm'd,

Cf. I i 163 --

F goe arm'd.

(Q omits)

I iv 81 F I beseech your pardon.

Q I beseech you pardon me.

Cf. I iv 62 --

F I beseech you pardon me my Lord,

Q I beseech you pardon mee my Lord,

Cf. also I ii 36.

I iv 210 F For you know Nuncle,

Q For you trow nuncle,

Cf. I iv 120 --
F Learne more then thou trowest,
Q learne more then thou trowest,

I iv 286 F Away, away.
Q goe, goe, my people?
Cf. I iv 269 --
F Go, go, my people.
Q goe goe, my people?

II i 72 F I'ld turne it all
To thy suggestion, plot, and damned practise:
Q id'e turne it all to thy suggestion, plot, and damned pretence,
Cf. I ii 86 --
F & to no other pretence of danger.
Q and to no further pretence of danger.
"Pretence" also occurs in both texts at I iv 68.

II iv 5 F Ha? Mak'st thou this shame ahy pastime?
Q How, mak'st thou this shame thy pastime?
Cf. I i 93 --
F How, how Cordelia?
Q Goe to, goe to,
Q prefixes "How," to I i 89.

II iv 24 F or they impose this vsage,
Q or they purpose this vsage,
Cf. II ii 137 --
Q your purpost low correction
(F omits)
and II iv 3 --
F there was no purpose in them
Q there was / No purpose
The shame
Cf. II iv 5

This shame

F this shame
Q this shame

F How chance the King comes with so small a number?
Q how chance the King comes with so small a traine?
Cf. I iv 249

F call my Traine together. Q call my traine together,
and I iv 260

F My Traine are men of choice, and rarest parts,
Q my traine, and men of chose and rarest parts,
Cf. also II iv 154, 170, 200 and 301.

Infect her Beauty,
You Fen-suck'd Fogges, drawne by the powrful Sunne,
To fall, and blister.

Q
infect her beautie,
You Fen suckt fogs, drawne by the powrefull Sunne,
To fall and blast her pride.
Cf. I iv 296

Blastes and Fogges vpon thee: / Th'.....
Q blasts and fogs vpon the.....

Must be content to thinke you old, and so,
Q Must be content to thinke you are old, and so,
Cf. II iv 141

F O Sir, you are old, Q O Sir you are old,

Blow windes,
Cf. III i 5

Q Blow wind

Bids the winde blow the Earth into the Sea,
Q Bids the wind blow the earth into the sea,

Caytiffe, to peeces shake
Q Caytife in peeces shake,
Cf. I ii 83

F and shake in peeces, the heart of his obedience.
Q & shake in peeces the heart of his obedience,
III iii 14 F I will looke him,
Q I will seeke him,
Cf. III i 50 --
F I will go seeke the King.
Q I will goe seeke the King.
For "look" meaning "look for" see Onions, Shakespeare Glossary, s.v. look, vb. 4.

III iv 20 F whose franke heart gaue all,
Q Whose franke heart gaue you all,
Cf. II iv 246 --
F I gaue you all.
Q I gaue you all.

III iv 29 F That bide the pelting of this pittilesse storme,
Q That bide the pelting of this pittileses night,
Cf. III ii 12 --
F heere's a night pitties neither Wisemen, nor Fiooles.
Q Heers a night pitties neither wise man nor foole.

III iv 47 F Did'st thou giue all to thy Daughters?
Q Hast thou giuen all to thy two daughters,
Cf. I iv 146 --
Q All thy other Titles thou hast giuen away,
(F omits)

III iv 62 F Would'st thou giue 'em all?
Q didst thou giue them all?
Cf. III iv 47, quoted in the preceding citation.

III iv 66 F Now all the plagues that in the pendulous ayre
Hang fated o're mens faults, light on thy Daughters.
Q Now all the plagues that in the pendulous ayre
Hang fated ore mens faults, fall on thy daughters.
Cf. II iv 157 --
F All the stor'd Vengeances of Heauen, fall
On her ingratitude top:

Q All the stor'd vengeances of heauen fall on
her ingrateful top,

III iv 108 F 'tis a naughty night to swimme in.

Q this is a naughty night to swim in,

Cf. III ii 79 --

F This is a braue night to coole a Curtizan:

(Q omits)

III vii 60 F he holpe the Heauens to raine.

Q Hee holpt the heauens to rage,

Cf. III i 8 --

Q Which the impetuous blasts with eyles rage
Catch in their furie,

(F omits)

and III ii 1 --

F Rage, blow

Q rage, blow

IV vi 96 F Ha! Gonerill with a white beard?

Q Ha Gonorill, ha Regan,

Cf. III iv 19 --

F O Regan, Gonerill,

Q O Regan, Gonorill,

IV vii 32 F Was this a face
To be oppos'd against the iarring windes?

Q was this a face
To be exposd against the warring winds,

Cf. III iv 34 --

F Expose thy selfe to feele what wretches feele,

Q Expose thy selfe to feele what wretches feele,
IV vii 79 F

You see is kill'd in him:
Q the great rage you see is cured in him,
Cf. IV vii 15 --

F Cure this great breach in his abused Nature,
Q cure this great breach in his abused nature,

V ii 1 F take the shadow of this Tree
Q take the shaddow of this bush
Cf. II iv 298 --

F There's scarce a Bush.
Q ther's not a bush.

V iii 69 F More then in your addition.
Q more then in your aduancement.
Cf. V iii 29 --

F One step I haue aduanc'd thee,
Q One step, I haue aduanct thee,
"Aduancement" occurs in both texts in II iv 196.

V iii 152 F This is practise Gloster,
Q This is meere practise Gloster
Cf. II iv 85 --

F meere fetches,
Q meare Iustice,

V iii 172 F The Gods are iust, and of our pleasant vices
      Make instruments to plague vs:
Q The Gods are iust, and of our pleasant vertues.
      Make instruments to scourge vs
Cf. I ii 102 --

F Nature finds it selfe scourg'd by the sequent effects.
Q nature finds it selfe scourg'd by the sequent effects,
It should be pointed out that we actually find one or two passages as regards which it seems (at least at first sight) possible to hold that either Q or F contains an anticipation or recollection. Considering our view of the nature of the transmission of the F text it is possible for us to allow that these types of corruption might appear in it. Scribe E was probably connected with the King's Men, and he probably knew the play. He might conceivably, therefore, on occasion, correcting his copy of Q, strike out a reading in it and substitute another, not from the playhouse manuscript but from his memory, which might be faulty and anticipate a later passage or re-collect an earlier one. Thus at II iv 135 the two texts run as follows:

F Then she to scant her dutie.
Q Then she to slacke her dutie.

Now at II iv 241 both texts have the infinitive "to slacke", and nothing is more likely than that Q's "to slacke" in line 135 is an anticipation of "to slacke" in line 241. But at II iv 171 Lear uses the verb "to scant" in both texts. In line 135, it might be suggested, Scribe E may be anticipating this. Again, at III iii 13 the two texts read:

F ther is part of a Power already footed,
Q Ther's part of a power already landed,

At III vii 2 both texts say that the army of France is "landed", and Q's "landed" in III iii 13 may be an anticipation of this word in III vii 2. But at III vii 44 "footed" appears in both texts. In III iii 13,
it might be suggested, Q's "landed" may be correct and F's "footed" may be an anticipation by Scribe E of "footed" in III vii 44. In the first case at any rate, however, the probability seems to me strongly against F being corrupt. Immediately after changing "slacke" to "scant" in II iv 135 Scribe E wrote into his quarto a five-and-a-half line passage which Q had omitted: he must of course have got this passage from the playhouse manuscript: this means that at II iv 135 he was conscientiously comparing his quarto with the playhouse manuscript: and this in turn suggests strongly that "scant" came from the playhouse manuscript. A similar case, involving possible recollection in F instead of anticipation, occurs at I iv 301-2. We dealt with this passage earlier in this section, and we suggested that the Q "yea, i' st come to this?" might be an inexact anticipation of III iv 47-8 where both texts have "art thou come to this?". On the other hand, as we said, the Q "yea, i' st come to this?" might be authentic, its omission from F being the result of a misunderstanding by the F compositor. Now Scribe E wrote in the words "Let it be so", which are wanting in Q. It might be suggested that these words which Scribe E inserted (either in place of or as an addition to Q's "yea, i' st come to this?") are not authentic, but a recollection of I i 107 where they occur in both texts. But I iv 301-2 occur in the course of a passage which is very corrupt in Q: Scribe E must have been invoking the aid of his playhouse manuscript hereabouts, and "Let it be so" must surely have come from there. I would add that
in the lists given above of passages in which I claim that Q contains anticipations or recollections I have not to my knowledge included any cases in which the ambiguity spoken of in this paragraph is present.

Before passing to the next stage of our inquiry, we may sum up the present stage by making some remarks about these lists just set out.

In connection with list (c), consider any given case in which in Q we find the same word or phrase in two passages, this word or phrase appearing in F in the second passage, but a different word or phrase in the first passage. There seem to me to be the following alternatives to regarding the Q reading in the first passage as an anticipation of the common reading in the second:— hypothesis (i) that Shakespeare originally wrote the same word or phrase twice, and in the course of a revision altered it in the first passage; hypothesis (ii) that Shakespeare wrote the same word or phrase twice and that Scribe F, Scribe E, or the F compositor altered it in the first passage intentionally or through carelessness; hypothesis (iii) that in the first passage the Q reading is corrupt, but is not an anticipation -- that is, that we have to do with coincidence. I believe that hypothesis (i) must be rejected in any event: and if all the cases in list (c) are to be explained by the same formula, all three hypotheses must be rejected.

**Hypothesis (i).** In one or two cases in our list, Q readings explicable as anticipations gave positive indications of being corrupt in that they missed
a point obviously intended by Shakespeare from the outset: in these cases at all events we do not have to do with a Shakespearian first draft (Q) and a Shakespearian revision (F). And there are strong objections in any case to the revision theory. These are well stated by Greg in his Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 89.

If the F text of Lear is a revision of the Q text, then the revision was a very detailed one embracing many minutiae. Greg says that "we have no evidence whatever that such persistent and wholesale revision was anything but exceptional in Elizabethan dramaturgy, and further.... it appears particularly unlikely in the work of so fluent a writer as Shakespeare". He goes on: "And when it comes to a detailed examination of the texts [of Lear], I find myself unable to imagine any competent author, least of all Shakespeare -- and moreover Shakespeare, not in his apprentice stage as in Richard III, but at the very height of his powers -- writing the clumsy and tentative lines we find in the quarto, apparently groping after his expression and even his meaning with the hesitancy of a novice. The quarto is, I am convinced, derivative. Nor can I believe that the folio represents a conceivable revision. That Shakespeare should add or delete or recast or touch up is conceivable; but that he should rewrite a play in order to make a lot of verbal alterations is surely not in character....". Greg adds, in a footnote, "Had structural recasting ever necessitated rewriting a play throughout, I have no doubt that in doing so Shakespeare would both consciously and unconsciously have made all
sorts of small alterations in the text, many of which would have seemed to us indifferent and unmotived. But there is no suggestion of any structural necessity for revision in either Richard III or Lear". Chambers holds the same view regarding Richard III, and his remarks apply equally to Lear: he says, "I cannot reconcile with any reasonable conception of Shakespeare's methods of work a revision limited to the smoothing out of metre and the substitution of equivalent words, without any incorporation of any new structure or any new ideas". And he makes another point: "Nor can I think that either Shakespeare or any one else at the theatre would have thought it either worth while or practicable to make actors relearn their parts with an infinity of trivial modifications" (William Shakespeare, I, 296).

Hypothesis (ii). The first point made above against hypothesis (i) applies equally strongly against hypothesis (ii). Again, in some cases a Q reading, explicable as an anticipation, while making sense, is inferior to the corresponding F reading from the literary point of view: and we can hardly, I think, attribute to Scribe P, Scribe E, or the F compositor a reading superior to the Shakespearian one.

Hypothesis (iii). There are cases in which the passage which in Q contains the variation from F is so similar to the later, invariant, passage that memorial confusion is a much safer hypothesis than coincidence. We can see the association-links.
To repeat: if all the cases in our list (c) are to be explained by the same formula, then it must be by the formula of memorial anticipation.

The same arguments can, mutatis mutandis, be applied to recollections. But here there is an additional possibility. Whereas it is not possible to hold a compositor responsible for an anticipation of a passage which does not lie close to that corrupted, it is always possible to hold him responsible for a recollection. At a given point a compositor's sub-conscious mind may throw up a word or phrase he set up even a considerable time before. But with a list of anticipations for many of which the Q compositor cannot possibly be held responsible, we may regard it as at least very unlikely that he is responsible for the recollections of passages a long way back.

We have more than once alluded to the possibility of a careless scribe who knew the play working with his eye off his copy and introducing memorial corruption. In his Manuscript of Shakespeare's "Hamlet" Dover Wilson has shown that F Hamlet contains memorial corruption (and textual expansion) introduced by such a scribe. Now in one or two cases in our lists (c) and (d) above we have what we may call two-way memorial corruption: thus Q corrupts I i 238 by association with I i 247, and it corrupts I i 247 by association with I i 238; it corrupts II ii 83 by association with II ii 108, and it corrupts II ii 108 by association with II ii 83. Then at III iv 47 Q recollects I iv 146, and at III iv 62 it recollects III
47. In such cases as these at any rate we are surely not dealing with momentary negligence by a scribe: surely we are dealing with memory per se.

But finally we are relying on this argument as regards lists (a), (c), and (d): anticipations and recollections, and textual expansion, may admittedly be the result of carelessness in a scribe with an authentic manuscript before him. But at the beginning of this section we examined certain Q passages which gave positive indications of reporting -- these passages were at some stage transmitted by memory unassisted by any authentic document. These passages contained anticipations and recollections, and textual expansion. When therefore at other points we meet anticipations and recollections, and textual expansion, we may not unreasonably postulate reporting there also.

As regards list (b): scribes and compositors are always liable to invert, and in a given case it is possible that Q is right and that F contains an inversion made by Scribe P, Scribe E, or the compositor. And if in a given case Q is wrong, the error does not of course indicate reporting. But frequency of inversion is consistent with reporting: in passages of Q undoubtedly reported there are differences of word-order from F: and the presence of a large number of such differences of word-order elsewhere in Q tends to corroborate (though it does no more) our impression that Q as a whole is a reported text.

From all that has been said in this section, then, I submit that we are entitled to proceed on the
assumption that at some stage the Q text was memorialily transmitted, i.e. that it is a reported text. We must now turn to the question, by what method was it reported?

(ii)

The Theory of Stenographic Transmission.

We have seen (p. 22) that in 1879 Schmidt advanced the theory that the Q text was taken down in shorthand during performance. Chambers thinks that "possibly it was produced by shorthand and not memorization". Greg also holds that it is a shorthand report. He considers this conclusion inescapable, but it is only fair to emphasise that he does not like it: in his Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 96, he says, "I cannot but conclude that some kind of shorthand was employed, however little I like the conclusion". I do not like it either: indeed I think it impossible. Compared with the texts of the acknowledged "good" quartos the text of Q Lear is very bad; compared with those of the acknowledged "bad" quartos it is very good. It is a reported text, but the standard of the reporting is as regards both fullness and accuracy remarkably high on the whole. I do not believe that any of the shorthand systems known to have been available for use in 1608 was sufficiently practicable to have been able to convey from a performance or performances a report of the standard found in Q Lear.

In 1608 there were available three systems of shorthand. These were -- (a) Characterie, invented by Timothy Bright, the text-book of which was published in
1588; (b) Brachygraphie, invented by Peter Bales, the
text-book of which was published in 1590; (c) Steno-
graphie, invented by John Willis, the text-book of
which was first published, anonymously, in 1602. The
systems of Bright and Bales have received satisfactory
critical examination as that of John Willis has not:
but in the following pages I shall consider all three
systems, and show that none of them, if used to re-
port the play from a performance or performances, could
have produced a text of the standard of fullness and
accuracy found in that of the first quarto of Lear.

(a) Characterie.

The opinion has been voiced by some critics
that certain Shakespearian texts were transmitted from
performance by means of this system. Curt Dewischeit,
erroneously believing that all the Shakespearian quartos
contained pirated texts, regarded these as having been
procured, during performances, by stenographers using
Characterie. In our own day, J. Quincy Adams has
argued that the Q text of Lear was conveyed by this
means. Both Dewischeit and Quincy Adams point to
readings in Q Lear which, differing from those of F,
can be readily explained as arising from the use of
Characterie. It cannot be denied that there are such
readings; but they can equally well be explained other-
wise, while on the other hand there are considerations

which render the theory quite untenable.

The cardinal principle of Characterie is that each symbol represents a word. Bright evolved eighteen basic symbols, each corresponding to one or more letters of the alphabet --

| a b c d e f g h i l m |
| k j f l m |
| n o p r s t u v w |

To the foot of each of these he adds twelve distinguishing marks, so that each basic symbol appears in twelve different forms. Thus from \ we have:

\ \ I \ L \ L \ L \ L \ L \ L \ L \ L \ L \ L \\
From \ we have:

\ \ \ \ I \ I \ I \ I \ I \ I \ I \ I \ I \ I \\
And so on. In all we have 216 symbols. Now each symbol may appear vertically, horizontally, slanted to the right, or slanted to the left. For example:

\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \\
Bright therefore has at command a total of 864 symbols (and in addition he has a number of miscellaneous symbols). Actually he does not use all the available varieties of every basic symbol: he uses 24 forms of \, 40 of \, all 48 of \, 32 of \, and so on. In all he utilises 538 characters (apart from the miscellaneous characters). Each variant of a basic character indicates a certain word beginning with the letter indicated by that basic character: and a word which is thus indicated
by a character is called a "charactericall word". The characterical words beginning with the letter "a" may be cited for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characterical Words</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abound</td>
<td>Alter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About</td>
<td>An</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Amend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuse</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Anoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aer</td>
<td>Apparel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Againe</td>
<td>Appertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Appoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also</td>
<td>Asse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although</td>
<td>At</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Bright's system, a characterical word is expressed by its own symbol, and a word which is not a characterical word is expressed by reference to a characterical word with which it may be associated in one or another of certain ways. A word which is not a characterical word and which is a synonym or quasi-synonym of a certain characterical word is expressed by the symbol for that characterical word, and the symbol for the in-
itial letter of the actual word to be expressed is written at the left hand side of the symbol for the characterical word. Thus, for example, "abandon" is not a characterical word: to express it in Characterie one uses the symbol for the characterical word "for-sake" ( \[ \rightarrow \] ), with the basic symbol for the letter "a" at the left hand side -- | \[ \rightarrow \]. Again, neither "rage" nor "fury" is a characterical word: both are expressed by reference to the symbol for the characterical word "anger" ( \[ \rightarrow \] ): "rage" is written \[ \leftarrow \] ----, and "fury" \[ \leftarrow \]. "Belong" is not a characterical word, but "appertain" is ( \[ \leftarrow \] ): so "belong" is expressed by the symbols \[ \leftarrow \].

For the purposes of this method of representation the term "synonym" can be interpreted very broadly: thus, for instance, "haven" is expressed by reference to the characterical word "water", as also is "sea"; "sect" by reference to "religion"; "pullet" by reference to "young"; "retail" by reference to "count"; and so on. The symbols for these examples are:

\[ \begin{align*}
  & | \uparrow \uparrow \text{ haven} \\
  & \uparrow \uparrow \text{ sect} \\
  & \uparrow \downarrow \text{ retail}
\end{align*} \]

| \[ \uparrow \uparrow \text{ sea} \\
| \[ \uparrow \downarrow \text{ pullet} \]

Corresponding to this method of representation by reference to a synonym or quasi-synonym, there is the method of representation by reference to an antonym or quasi-antonym. If a word to be represented is not a characterical word it may be indicated by the symbol
for an antonymous characterical word, with the symbol for the initial letter of the actual word to be represented written at the right hand side. Thus "forget" is not a characterical word: it is represented by the symbol for the characterical word "remember" ( ⊕ ) with the basic symbol for the letter "f" written at the right hand side: ⊕ . Similarly "idiot" is represented by reference to the characterical word "wise"; "ignorance" by reference to "skill"; "evil" by reference to "good"; and so on.

ɪdɪɒᴛ ɪgnɔːrɑns

So we have representation by (i) solitary signification (i.e. of a characterical word by its own symbol), by (ii) consenting signification (i.e. of a non-characterical word by reference to a synonymous or quasi-synonymous characterical word), and by (iii) dissenting signification (i.e. of a non-characterical word by reference to an antonymous or quasi-antonymous characterical word). In each case the term "signification" refers to the symbol for the characterical word involved. In his book Bright gives "A Table of English Words", in alphabetical order: these are non-characterical words, and opposite each is set the characterical word the symbol for which is to be used in its representation.

Following this table is a list headed "Appellative Words". Here we have an alphabetical list of characterical words, under each of which is given an alpha-
betical list of non-characterical words to be expressed by reference to the respective characterical words. The non-characterical words here are words which have some connection with the characterical words. For example, under the appellative words "beast", "bird", "instrument", "fish", and "fruit" we have lists of individual beasts, birds, instruments, fishes, and fruits; under "air" we have breath, exhalation, mist, reek, steam, vapour; under "beat" we have anvil, beetle, hammer, maul, mortar, pestle, stithy; under "cry" we have bark, bawl, clamour, neigh, quest, roar, yelp; and so on. The method of representation of the non-characterical words in this table is the same as that already described: but there is one confusing factor. The symbols for the initial letters of some of the non-characterical words are to be placed at the left of the symbols for the appellative characterical words, of others to the right -- but in the latter no antonyms are involved. For example, under the appellative characterical word "apparel" we have "on the left side" boots, breeches, buskin, cope, greaves, jerkin, mandilion, shirt, and "on the right side" apron, bongrace, kirtle, neckercher, partlet, rail, smock, stomacher. The second of these lists does not contain antonyms of the appellative characterical word. Similarly, under the appellative characterical word "case" we have "on the left side" ambry, box, casket, chest, closet, coffer, hamper, hutch, press, trunk, and "on the right side" bag, bouget, mail, purse, pouch, poke, quiver, shelf, satchel, scrip, wallet.
Various miscellaneous matters may be catalogued quite briefly. The agent termination "-er" is indicated by two dots: thus \( \text{J} = \text{"labour"} \), and \( \text{\'J} = \text{"labourer"} \). The suffix "-ship" is indicated by the symbol for the characterical word "ship": thus \( \text{\'y} = \text{"friend"} \), and \( \text{\'y} = \text{"friendship"} \) (the symbol for the termination is in this case placed under that for the main part of the word). The symbol for "-ship" may also stand for "-hood": "and whether \( \text{\'ship} \), or hood be to be read," says Bright, "the language will plainly deliver. For no man will read either neighbourship, or friendship". Similarly, the character for "virtue" may also indicate "virtuous": the context will indicate which word is meant: "a virtue man" is obviously to be read as "a virtuous man". The plural of a noun is indicated by a dot on the right of the symbol for the singular -- e.g. \( \text{\'} = \text{"age"} \), \( \text{\'} = \text{"ages"} \). A dot on the left side of the character for "this" indicates "thus": \( \text{\'y} = \text{"this"} \), \( \text{\'y} = \text{"thus"} \). In certain cases the comparative or superlative of adjectives is indicated by the context, and the symbol for the positive may be used by itself: if one writes "gold is good than silver" one obviously means "gold is better than silver". As regards tense: the auxiliary "have" is a characterical word ( \( \text{\'} \) ); to indicate "had" a dot is prefixed ( \( \cdot \) ): "did" is indicated by a dot prefixed to the symbol for "do" ( \( \cdot \) ). The "-ed" termination is expressed by this same dot -- e.g. \( \text{\'} = \text{"declare"} \), \( \cdot \text{\'} = \text{"declared"} \). The future is expressed by a dot on the right of the symbol for the verb -- e.g. \( \text{\'} = \text{"shall"} \) or "will declare". The
conditional auxiliary "would" is indicated by the character for "well", the context making the sense plain: "well" is expressed as \[ \text{[well]} \] (\[ \text{w good} \]): for "should" a dot is placed to the right of this (\[ \text{[w]'} \]).

The suffix "-ing" is indicated by two dots underneath the character for the main part of the word: e.g. \[ \text{[learn]} \] = "learn", \[ \text{[learning]} \] = "learning". Bright gives directions for dealing with proper names: some are the same as common nouns and are similarly indicated -- e.g. the name "Day" is indicated as \[ \text{[J]} \], the character for "day"; for other names Bright provides a system of spelling them out in symbols each of which combines two letters: thus \[ \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{[ab]} \\ \text{[ac]} \\ \text{[ad]} \\ \text{[etc.]} \end{array} \right\} \] : one puts "a mark at the side of the first character, to show that it is a name". For numerals Bright uses the symbols \[ \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \end{array} \right\} \] (literal symbols used as numerical ones), and these numerical symbols "take increase by place, as cyphers in arithmetike". As regards punctuation, Bright prescribes that a dot be placed under the character of the word preceding a pause.

*Characterie* is phonetic in so far as different meanings of the same sound are not distinguished: thus the adjective and the verb "fast" are indicated in the same way, as are the words "hole" and "whole". Finally, Bright lays down that the symbols shall be written in columns: each column is to be written from top to bottom.

So much for a summary of the principles and methods of *Characterie*, as stated, sometimes rather too briefly, by Bright in his text-book. It is abundantly
clear that the system is primitive, and cumbersome in the extreme. In the preface to his book *An Abreuiation of Writing by Character*, published in 1618, Edmond Willis, another of the pioneers of English shorthand, says of Characterie that it "did necessarily require such understanding and memory, as that few of the ordinary sort of men could attain to the knowledge thereof". The prodigious strain which it imposes on the memory is one of the salient disadvantages of Bright's system. The practitioner has to remember and keep distinct in his mind over five hundred characterical words with their symbols: this is absolutely essential, and this alone would be a great feat. The character-writer has to be very particular to write his characters at the correct angle: if instead of writing a character vertically he carelessly allows it to appear slanted slightly to the right he will (if Bright uses that particular character slanted to the right) indicate a completely different word from the one he intends. Then all non-characterical words must be related to the relevant characterical words. To remember all Bright's own assignations of particular non-characterical words each to its appropriate characterical word would be a truly tremendous feat. Of course, one would not necessarily have to follow Bright's list of assignations of non-characterical to characterical words. One could use his method, with one's own assignations; and one would be compelled to make one's own assignations in the cases of non-characterical words which do not appear in Bright's list.
Now this necessity for oneself relating a non-characterical word to a suitable characterical word would entail a serious loss of time and it would be extremely exhausting. And Shakespeare, whose vocabulary is so very rich, would present the characteriser with great numbers of words which he would have himself, on the instant, to relate to suitable characterical words. Time and again the stenographer in the theatre, attending a performance of *King Lear*, would have to stop and think: meanwhile the actor would be away ahead. A text of *Lear* taken by *Characterie* during performance could not possibly be anything like so full and accurate as that of the quarto. The system could produce only a mere skeleton synopsis of the play. It may also be pointed out that some words take about as long to write in Bright's symbols as they take to write in ordinary longhand. It takes at least as long to write \( \overline{\overline{\overline{\text{C.a}}} \overline{\overline{\overline{\overline{T \overline{L}}}}}} \) as to write "evil", and at least as long to write \( \overline{\overline{\overline{\text{C.a}}} \overline{\overline{\overline{\overline{T \overline{L}}}}}} \) as to write "well".

Quincy Adams, arguing that *Q Lear* was reported by *Characterie*, cites certain erroneous readings in *Q* which certainly might have been produced by the use of that system. One of the errors which *Characterie* would be most likely to produce would be an erroneous reading which was synonymous or nearly synonymous with the correct reading and which began with the same letter as the correct reading. For example, both "check" and

---

"chide" are related in Bright's table to the characteristic word "rebuke": in order to make sure that the right word was chosen in the transcription of his notes a stenographer would have to prefix to the sign for "rebuke" the signs for the letters "che" or "chi" as the case might be: if only the initial letter "c" was prefixed, it might easily happen that in the transcription of the notes the wrong synonym was chosen.

Now Adams cites instances of the wrong synonym beginning with the right letter in Q Lear1. But Miss Doran deals effectively with this point in a refutation of Adams's article2. I quote a summary of her argument which I have already written elsewhere3. "She has herself found about a hundred and thirty of these synonymous or nearly synonymous variations between Q1 and F. 'Of these,' she says, 'only fourteen are related to a common word in Bright or have the reading in Q which would best represent, in Characterly, the Folio reading'4. Apparently, then, if the Q1 text was taken down by a practitioner of Characterly, he did not know Bright's tables of equivalents. Miss Doran admits that a stenographer 'would not necessarily in all cases conform to Bright's lists'5; but she points out that we must test the hypothesis of Characterly by its own rules, since these variations

1. Modern Philology, vol. XXXI (1933-34), pp. 135 ff..
3. The 'Bad' Quarto of "Hamlet" (1941), pp. 24-5.
5. Ibid. p. 145.
may have arisen at some other stage in the transmission of the Q1 text (regarded as pirated) -- for example, in the actors' mouths. And here we come to a most important point. Of the numberless differences between Q1 and F only some point to Characterie; others are attributed by Professor Adams to the actors. On this Miss Doran says: 'From the point of view of Characterie as the agency of production it is possible to exclude certain synonymous or quasi-synonymous variants as unlikely to occur because Bright does not associate them together. It is not equally possible to exclude from the actor's range the set of variants that may be assigned to the stenographer'. And again: '...the conclusion that Characterie has certainly given rise to a selected number out of the total class of variants which might have come about through any mnemonic agency is clearly inadmissible'.

The general difficulties inherent in Characterie are admirably summarised by W. Matthews in the course of a most useful article: he says -- "in computing the utility of Bright's system we must consider: (1) the tremendous grasp of English vocabulary required by the stenographer; (2) the degree of mental alertness necessary to assign words to their true Charactericall words; (3) the difficulty of learning and of distinguishing between over 550 words (if particles are included) which have very similar signs; (4) the slowness of the system caused by the method of writing in columns and the necessity of moving the hand backwards to write the

2. Ibid. p. 148.
initial letters. These four points make it highly improbable, I think, that anyone could have written the system at anything like the speed necessary for taking down even a slow speech". When it is re-emphasised that, judged as a reported text, Q Lear is remarkably full and accurate, the hypothesis of transmission by Characterie must surely fall to the ground.

(b) Brachygraphie.

Peter Bales's shorthand system, Brachygraphie, is incorporated in his book The Writing Schoolemaster. Whereas Bright's book was published only once, that of Bales was published three times -- in 1590, 1597, and (with a new title -- A New Year's Gift for England) 1600. A brief account of Brachygraphie, by W. Matthews, will be found in the Modern Language Review, vol. XXVIII (1933), pp. 81-3.

Bales's system uses the same basic principle as Bright's, though instead of arbitrary stenographic symbols Bales employs the letters of the alphabet. Beside each letter is placed a dot, a comma, an acute accent, or a grave accent, and each of these four marks may appear in any of twelve different positions about the letter. Thus each letter can assume 48 different forms, though Bales does not use all to capacity. Each symbol, consisting of a letter accompanied by a mark, signifies a word beginning with that letter. The letter "b" will serve as an example:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Bargaine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Banish</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beare</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beate</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Begge</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bellie</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bestowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Blow</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bookle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Betweene</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>By</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Blase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bite</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bloud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Blisse</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Blush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Brittle</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bookle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Borrow</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bottome</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Breake</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Breed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bruse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bruse</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Burne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Busie</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>But</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Only "c" and "s" use all 48 possibilities.)

Bales gives a Table of Brachygraphie, showing along with each symbol the word that it indicates. A word not in the Table of Brachygraphie is to be in-
dicated by the symbol for a word in the Table which is of similar or contrary sense to the required word. To show that one means a synonym or quasi-synonym, one puts "a small downe right stroke" to the right of the symbol: thus, for example, á would indicate a synonym of, or a word like in sense to, the word "also". Bales provides that for greater precision the initial letter of the synonym may be placed on the right of the symbol (presumably instead of the diacritic): thus át would indicate "too". To show that one means an antonym one puts the "small downe right stroke" to the left of the symbol. Bales gives a long alphabetical list of words opposite each of which he sets the "brachygraphy word" by reference to which it is to be indicated in shorthand. It will be amply clear that Bales's stenographic system is not only constructed on the same principles as Bright's but looks indeed like a flagrant plagiarism.

As for miscellaneous matters: Bales notes that the context will tell whether, for example, "worship" or "worshipful" is meant; so the symbol for the former expresses the latter also. Different words of the same sound, like "hear" and "here", are to be expressed in the same way. The system provides for the expression of only the present tense and singular number: Bales declares that "all comparisons, number and tense, I referre to be taken by the sense and helpe of memorie". Numbers are written as ordinarily. Proper names are indicated by brachygraphy if they are also common nouns; otherwise one writes down the first two letters of the name and trusts to memory for its completion. Repeated
words are indicated by inclusion within brackets and by the letter "r" written beside them without any mark about it: thus "too too" is indicated by (á t) r. Bales recommends that circumlocutions be rendered simply: for "he took his journey" one is to write in brachygraphy simply "he rode". The pause at the end of a sentence is to be indicated by a long diagonal stroke. Finally, the symbols are to be written straight on, not in vertical columns as in Bright's system.

The principal imperfections of Bright's system equally characterise that of Bales. The brachygraphy-writer must remember over five hundred different symbols along with their brachygraphy words, and he must be able on the instant to relate any non-brachygraphy word to its appropriate synonymous or antonymous brachygraphy word. Brachygraphie makes the same colossal demands on the memory as does Characterie, and the one system is as grossly impracticable as the other for verbatim reporting. In Brachygraphie the writer must exercise the greatest care in the placing of his dots, commas, etc.: even a very small lapse of judgement or care may make 'b' look like 'b', indicating quite a different word from that intended. Edmond Willis's criticism of Brachygraphie is sound1. Having spoken of Bright he proceeds thus: "Then after him, one Peter Bales devised to write those aforesaid

---

1. An Abreuiation of Writing by Character (1618), sig. A2-A2v.
character words, as they were divided into dozens, by the Roman letter, with certain periods, commas, short tittles, and other markes, which were to be set about each letter in twelve several places to distinguish euerie word in particular, with divers other notes and observations. Which having done, hee changed the name thereof, and called it the Art of Brachygraphy: yet was it not so excellent for the continuance of it in a mans memory, for that it would soone be lost, if a man did but neuer so little neglect either the repeating of the words without booke, or the writing of the. Besides, the places about each letter were so many, and the difficiultie so great, in placing euery period, comma, & tittle in his proper place, that if great care were not taken, a man should write one word instead of another, & take one word for another; for that hee should scarce be able to read his owne writing, much lesse another man: which caused others, and my selfe also to seek for further knowledge therein".

(c) Stenographie.

The shorthand system of John Willis is much superior to the systems of Bright and Bales, and it is John Willis's system which Greg suggests as the means whereby the text of Lear was transmitted. Because John Willis's system is a superior one, the suggestion that it was used to transmit our text must be taken more seriously than the suggestion that Characterie was used. At the same time, Stenographie has not received from Shakespearian scholars (at any rate in published works)
the detailed critical attention which Characterie has received. An extended examination of Stenographie is therefore called for here.

In the Stationers' Register, on 19 April 1602, there was entered to Cuthbert Burby a book which he published in that same year under the title of "The Art of / Stenographie, / Teaching by plaine and certaine / Rules, to the capacitie of the / meanest, and for the vse of / all professions, The / way of compendious / Writing. / Wherevnto is annexed a very easie / direction for Steganographie, / or, Secret Writing". Only two copies of this 1602 publication are known to be extant -- an imperfect copy in the library of the British Museum and a perfect copy in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. Neither in the entry in the Stationers' Register nor in the book itself is there any mention of the author's name; but we know that the work is by John Willis¹, an identification which is indicated by the following facts.

1. The existence of the 1602 volume appears to have been unknown to historians of shorthand until near the end of the nineteenth century. In 1876 W. C. Hazlitt mentioned a copy which he had seen in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, a copy which lacked the appendix on "Steganographie"; Hazlitt said nothing as to the author. The British Museum copy was found by J. Westby-Gibson, who announced his discovery in 1834 in the periodical Shorthand, vol. II, p. 160, referring to the book as being by J. Willis. He proposed a reprint for subscribers, but the project did not receive sufficient support and the reprint never appeared. Drawing attention to the Bodleian copy in Notes and Queries, series 7, vol. ii, p. 306, Ion Keith-Falconer showed in detail that it is the work of John Willis.
In 1617 there was published a volume with the title "The Art of Stenographie, or Short Writing by spelling characterie. Invented by Jo. Willis, bachelor in divinitie"; the title-page informs us that this is the fifth edition, the work being "now newly inlarged". The text of this volume differs from that of the 1602 volume; but the alphabet of characters is the same, apart from one or two, and the main principles are the same. The later text was republished repeatedly\(^1\); and in all its editions the preface refers to the number of years since the author first published his system, all except two\(^2\) indicating 1602. Thus there is a clear case for identifying the 1602 Art of Stenographie as the first edition of John Willis's work. The following facts should also be noted. As we have seen, the anonymous work was entered to Cuthbert Burby in the Stationers' Register in 1602. Burby died in 1607. In the Stationers' Register, 16 October 1609, his widow assigned it, among other items, to William Welby. On 10 October 1617 Welby assigned an Art of Stenographie to Robert Willis, the work being now referred to as by John Willis; and in 1617, as we have seen, the revised version appeared as the fifth edition of the work, with John Willis named as the author. The 1617 volume is to be sold by W. White, but the colophon

1. According to Westby-Gibson's Bibliography of Short-hand (1887) the 6th edition is of 1623, the 7th 1623, 8th 1623, 9th 1628, 10th 1632, 11th 1636, 13th 1644, and 14th 1647. There seems to be no trace of the 12th.  
2. Viz. the 13th and 14th.
tells us that the art is to be taught by Robert Willis. It seems quite clear, then, that the 1602 and 1617 versions of the Art of Stenographie are to be regarded as essentially the same work. At some time between 1602 and 1617 it was revised -- not enlarged, as the title-page of the 1617 edition claims, but abbreviated. Since we cannot say whether the revision was carried out and first published before or after 1608 -- we know nothing of the second, third, and fourth editions -- we must in connection with q Lear consider both versions. Let us first consider the system as it appeared in the 1602 text-book.

The appearance of this text-book marks a turning-point in the history of English stenography. We have said that Willis's system is much superior to its predecessors: it is indeed in certain respects the foundation of modern shorthand. Writing in 1926 A. T. Wright says¹ that "probably there is no system extant as an effective instrument of the art, which is not based to some extent upon principles first enunciated by him in connection with stenography more than three centuries ago". The basic principle of the cumbersome systems of Bright and Bales was, as we have seen, that of a symbol representing a word: John Willis's system is the first alphabetic system, depending on the principle of a symbol representing a letter (or sound, for the system is partially phonetic). This was a tremendous advance. Though he does not mention Bright in the 1602

---

work, Willis must certainly be thinking of his Characterie

when in the Proem he recommends his own Stenographie by

saying: "And touching the easinesse of this Art, as the

preceptes are all apparently short; so the Characters de-

vised for the expressing of all wordes, are few in num-

ber: to wit, but 28, in all. . . . . . . . . And the whole frame

of this worke is so contriued, that the memorie shall

not neede to be charged with a tedious labouring of a

multitude of Wordes and Characters by hart; but enured

onely to exercise order". Willis is doubtless also

tacitly comparing his own technique favourably with

that of Bright when in one of the notes appended to

his first chapter he gives an elaborate (and very

reasonable) defence of the practice of writing the

characters horizontally, as in his system, instead of

in columns "as the inhabitantes of CHINA are reputed
to doe", and as Bright directed: Willis points out,

inter alia, that the horizontal method "is easier for

the Arme, which is less in motion when we write side-

ward, then when we write downward", and that "writing

sideward is more speedily performed, by reason that

more time is spent (though it be not marked) in moouing

the arme to write downward, then sideward".

The shorthand characters given by John Willis

in the 1602 edition are these:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\wedge & a \\
\cap & b \\
\downarrow & d \\
\lt & e \\
\rf & f \\
\end{array}
\]
g (as in "good")
h
i (the vowel, as distinct from j)
j and g (as in "gentle")
k, c (as in "can") and q (as in "technique")
l
m
n
o
p
q
r
s, c (as in "face") and t (as in "nation")
t (as in "time")

u (the vowel, as distinct from u v)
v (the consonant, as distinct from v u)
w
x
y
z

x

The above 26 characters are the "unchangeable particles" -- that is, each always indicates the same letter or sound. It will be seen that the system is based partly on the principle of a symbol for a letter and partly on that of a symbol for a sound: thus, whereas for example | represents both "s" and the soft "c", \ in the 1602 system represents "a" in any of its pronunciations (as for instance in "hat", "pass", and "tame"). The system is phonetic also in that
silent letters are not represented in the shorthand script. A. T. Wright (op. cit. chap. vi) notes it as remarkable "that John Willis, in the first edition of his pioneer work, should have so judiciously applied his knowledge of phonetics to the art of stenography, that for upwards of 230 years no successful attempt was made seriously to exceed the limits he adopted in 1602".

In addition to the 26 unchangeable particles there are two changeable particles, so called because they indicate different letters according to their position. One of these is the small circle, which signifies "h" when joined to |, \(\subseteq\), or \(\supset\), at the bottom right hand corner: thus \(\text{\textcircled{}}\) represents "sh", \(\subseteq\) represents "th", and \(\supset\) represents "wh"; otherwise the circle signifies "th". The other changeable particle is the dot or tittle, which represents any vowel according to its position about the symbol for the preceding letter or group of letters: thus \(\text{\textcircled{}}\) = "ba", \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "be", \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "bi", \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "bo", \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "bu". The vowel positions about the "flat" characters (\(\text{\textcircled{}}\), \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\), and \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\)) are different: \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "ra", \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "re", \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "ri", \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "ro", \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "ru".

In order to represent a monosyllabic word consisting of consonant plus vowel plus consonant, we affix the symbol for the second consonant (written small) to that for the first consonant (written large) in the position relevant to the intervening vowel: thus \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "bat", \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "fen", \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "dim", \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "not", \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "mud", \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "rat", \(\text{\textcircled{}}}\) = "wren".
If a small symbol is affixed to a large one at the bottom right hand corner, it is to be assumed that no vowel intervenes: thus $\bigcirc = "br", \bigcirc = "pl", \bigcirc = "pr", \bigcirc = "gl", \bigcirc = "sl", \bigcirc = "rt", \bigcirc = "rm"$. A small character in this position is said to be in the "apthong" position or to be an apthong affix or simply an apthong; a small character in any of the positions implying a vowel before it is said to be in a "metaphthong" position or to be a metaphthong affix or simply a metaphthong. Characters written large are called "great characters"; metaphthongs and apththongs are "small characters". A sound-group is indicated by a great character with one or more small characters about it: the great character always indicates the first letter or sound of the group -- thus $\bigcirc$ indicates "bat", not "tab", just as $\bigcirc$ indicates "ba", not "ab". If we wish to write a group beginning with a vowel, we must put down the unchangeable particle for the vowel as a great character: thus $\bigcirc = "err", \bigcirc = "an", \bigcirc = "at", \bigcirc = "it"$.

To indicate a group consisting of two consonants plus vowel we write the symbol for the first consonant as a great character, add that for the second consonant to it as an apththong affix, and indicate the vowel by a dot placed in the appropriate metaphthong position about the great character: thus $\bigcirc = "pry"$ (the vowel "y" is indicated as "i"), $\bigcirc = "brow"$ ("ow" is indicated as "o"). To indicate a group consisting of two consonants plus vowel plus consonant, we write the symbols for the
two initial consonants as in the preceding case and affix the symbol for the final consonant to the great character in the appropriate metaphthong position: thus \( √ = "bran" \), \( \text{ʃ} = "plot" \), \( \text{Ʉ} = "glib" \), \( ʃ = "slot" \). In transcribing, then, when we see a great character with both aphthong and metaphthong affixes we take the letters in this order -- (i) that indicated by the great character, (ii) that indicated by the aphthong affix, (iii) the vowel indicated by the position of the metaphthong affix, and (iv) the letter indicated by the metaphthong affix itself.

Now a small character may be affixed to another small character as aphthong or metaphthong: that is to say, aphthong and metaphthong affixes to a great character may themselves have aphthong and metaphthongs attached to them and relating to them. Thus the group "ndl" is indicated by \( \text{Ʉ} \), with \( > \) as an aphthong affix to \( \text{Ʉ} \) which is itself an aphthong affix to \( \text{Ʉ} \).

In this way we indicate monosyllables consisting of initial vowel plus two or more consonants: for example, \( \text{Ʉ} = "arm" \), \( \text{Ʉ} = "armed" \) (indicated as "armd"), \( ʃ = "end" \). A monosyllable consisting of consonant plus vowel plus two or more consonants is indicated as in \( \text{Ʉ} = "rind" \), \( \text{Ʉ} = "firm" \): in these cases the second of the two consonants following the vowel is an aphthong affix to the first, and the two together form a metaphthong affix to the great character indicating the first letter. More complicated examples are to be seen in \( \text{Ʉ} = "blind" \), \( \text{Ʉ} = "storm" \), \( \text{Ʉ} = "strain" \) ("ai" is expressed as simple "a"), \( \text{Ʉ} = "plinth" \),
\( \sqrt{r} = "\text{splint}" \), \( \sqrt{c} = "\text{cradle}" \) (the final "e" is neglected because it is silent), \( \sqrt{c} = "\text{candle}" \). In each case, in deciphering, we take first the great character; then, in order, the aphantong affix, its aphantong affix, and so on; then the vowel indicated by the position of the metaphthong; then, in order, the metaphthong, the aphantong affix to the metaphthong, its aphantong affix, and so on.

The above makes clear, I hope, how any monosyllabic word is represented. A note may be added here on words in which two or more juxtaposed vowels, not at the beginning of the word, are pronounced distinctly, as in "Chloe". Such a word is treated as if it were a monosyllable: "Chloe" is written \( \sqrt{c} \); that is, the unchangeable particle for "e" is placed in the metaphthong position about the great character which indicates "o" before it.

Now let us consider the representation of words of more than one syllable (apart from the special case just mentioned). Willis divides a word of more than one syllable into two parts -- the primary part, consisting of the letter (if a vowel) or the letters coming before the second vowel, and the secondary part, consisting of the second vowel and the letter or letters following it. The primary part is written exactly as if it were a monosyllabic word.

If the secondary part consists only of a vowel (or a vowel followed by one or more silent letters, which are neglected), that vowel is expressed by a dot placed in the appropriate metaphthong position about
the great character. Thus \( \Lambda = \text{"army"}, \quad \mapsto = \text{"duty"}, \quad \cap = \text{"barrow"}. \)

If the secondary part consists of more letters than the second vowel, it may be indicated in more ways than one: the stenographer would naturally adopt the method that seemed most convenient to him in the case of any given word. The various methods are these:

(i) "by Metaphthonge, referred only to the great Particle". E.g. \( \Lambda = \text{"abridge"}, \quad \mapsto = \text{"accord"}, \quad \zeta = \text{"obloquy"}, \quad \cap = \text{"barren"}. \)

In connection with these examples two important points should be noted. First: in the first three examples we see the partial coincidence of joined characters. In the first example \( \Lambda \) consists of \( \textgreater \) joined to \( \Lambda \); in the second \( \Lambda \) consists of \( \Gamma \) joined to \( \Lambda \), and \( \cap \) consists of \( \cap \) joined to \( \cap \); in the third \( \zeta \) consists of \( \Gamma \) joined to \( ( \). These formations are directed by Willis. Secondly: in the last two examples we have, related to the great characters, not only affixed metaphthongs, but also disjunct metaphthongs -- in the one case the disjunct metaphthong is a dot, in the other it is a small character. It is essential to bear in mind that, in deciphering, affixes are always to be taken before disjuncts. In the stenograph for "obloquy", the "i" ( = "y") signified by the dot is to be taken after the \( \Gamma \) in the "o" metaphthong position: and in the stenograph for "barren", the "n" with "e" before it is to be taken after the "r" with "a" before it -- because the "n" is disjunct and the
"r" affixed.

(ii) "by Metaphthonge affixed to a small Particle: which small Particle respecteth the great, either as an affix...(o)r, as a Disjunct". E.g.

\[ \text{daughter} \] = "daughter" (the "au" is treated as "a", and the silent "gh" is neglected). The "t" is a Metaphthong of the "d" in the place of "a", and the "r" is a metaphthong of the "t" in the place of "e".

\[ \text{Arthur} \] = "Arthur". The first "r" is an aphthong of the "a"; the "th" (the circle) is an aphthong of the first "r"; and the final "r" is a metaphthong of the "th" in the place of "u".

\[ \text{separate} \] = "separate". The great character has two metaphthongs, one affixed, one disjunct. As always, the affix is to be taken before the disjunct. The disjunct is composite, consisting of "r" with "t" as a metaphthong in the place of "a".

(iii) "by Disiunctes, whose Vowels come each after other according to the order of the Alphabet". E.g.

\[ \text{lion} \] = "lion". The "n" is in the metaphthong position of "o", and we take the dot representing "i" first after the great character because "i" comes before "o" in the alphabet.

\[ \text{superior} \] = "superior". Taking the great character and its affix first we get "sup". Then we take the metaphthong disjuncts in their alphabetical order, viz. "er", "i" (the dot), "or".
"paralytic". The great character with its affix represents "par". Then we take the disjunct metaphthong in the place of "a", giving "paral". Next we take the disjunct metaphthong in the place of "i" (= "y") which is composite, consisting of "t" with "o" in the "i" metaphthong position.

"characteristic". Of the two compound disjunct metaphthongs we take first that in the place of "a", and then that in the place of "i", according to alphabetical order. Each of the disjunct metaphthongs consists of a character with affixed aphabethong and metaphthong. The great character with affixed metaphthong signifies "car", for "char", and the disjunct metaphthongs signify respectively "acter" and "istic".

"progressive".

"rebellion".

(iv) "by Collaterale great Particles affixed or accompanied with disiunctes as if they were seuerall Wordes, yet ioyned closer togither then seuerall Wordes". E.g.

\( / \, \varepsilon \, \cap \) = "perturbation".

\( \wedge \cap \varepsilon \) = "anthropophagite".

\( \int \wedge \varepsilon \) = "characterise".  

1. Some of the examples I have given in the preceding account are taken from Willis's book, and some are my own.
Hitherto we have been considering the stenographic representation of each word in full (apart from silent letters), or, in Willis's own terms, "how all Wordes may be expressed by Integrall notes": but some words he allows to be expressed by "Defectiues". He divides the "defectiues" into four sorts. First: a word may be indicated by the symbols for only as much of it "as is sufficient to distinguish it from all other wordes" -- e.g. "baptism" may be expressed by the symbols for "bap", "apothecary" by those for "apoth", "governor" by those for "govnor", etc. Secondly: the first or last syllable of a word may be expressed in certain cases by a disjunct aphantong. Certain terminating syllables, which Willis lists, are indicated each by its first letter, and certain others, also listed, each by its last letter. In these cases the disjunct aphantong is placed in the regular aphantong position. For example, \( \text{\&}_r \) = "tragical" ("tragi" plus "c"), \( \text{\&}_r \) "catholic" ("catho" plus "c"). Certain prefixes (viz. "re-", and certain others, listed, beginning with vowels) are signified by the symbol for "r", or a dot, as the case may be, placed under the great character of the word at the left hand side. For example, \( \text{\&}_r \) = "retain", \( \text{\&}_r \) = "impure", \( \text{\&}_r \) = "illumine". With flat great characters the "r" or dot is placed not underneath the great character of the word but to the side: e.g. \( \text{\&}_r \) = "require", \( \text{\&}_r \) = "enriched". It will be observed that with the prefixes beginning with vowels all that is stenographically indicated is that
there is a prefix beginning with a vowel: in deciphering, one supplies the prefix appropriate to the body of the word -- the obvious prefix for "-lumine" is "il-".

Thirdly: some words are indicated only by the first letter. There are five separate categories here. Willis gives lists of words indicated by the first letter as, respectively, a shorthand character, a small roman letter, a small secretary letter, a capital roman letter, and a capital secretary letter. Roman capitals may be combined, as in \( \text{H} \) for "Hermes Trismagistos".

Fourthly: words may be expressed by the shorthand characters for two letters, the two first, or the first and the last, the symbol for the second or last letter being affixed as an apanthong to that for the first. For example, \( \text{\textbackslash n} \) ("ab") = "abound"; \( \text{\textbackslash n} \) (\( \text{\textbackslash plus <} \) ) ("ne") = "necessary"; \( \text{\textbackslash t} \) ("ao") = "also"; \( \text{\textbackslash c} \) ("rt") = "respect". As regards the method of which "also" and "respect" are here examples, Willis prudently directs that the first and last letters must never be two which could occur at the beginning of a word, since then there would be ambiguity.

While Willis himself gives lists of words in connection with some of these methods of representation by defectives, he allows the stenographer freedom to make up lists of his own. Thus in one of the notes appended to the chapter dealing with the third sort of defectives he says, "These words in this Chapter are so assigned to Particles and Letters, as I leave it indifferent to any to vse these words, or other in their steade: because
with Divine words are more usual, with Lawyers other words, with Physicians other, with Poets other, &c.

Willis allows the use of certain "illiteral" characters -- numerals, astronomical signs (the symbols for the planets and the signs of the zodiac), and symbols "used in Books of the Civil Law" (e.g. $^5$ for "paragraph").

It is possible to represent some words by "heterogeneall" characters -- a shorthand particle used along with an ordinary letter, a shorthand particle used along with an illiteral, and so on. For instance, "reason" may be written $\sigma$ is the shorthand symbol for "r" used as the great character; $\sigma$ is an illiteral, the sign for the sun, and it is used in the "e" metaphthong position: thus we have "resun", i.e. "reason". Again, "money" may be indicated as $\odot$ : $\odot$ is the astronomical sign for the moon, and the dot is placed in the "i" metaphthong position -- "mooni" = "money". "Fishmonger" may be indicated as $\times \odot$ : $\times$ and $\odot$, astronomical signs, indicate "fish" and "moon", and the aphthong $\mathfrak{L}$ ("g") is enough to indicate the final "ger". The symbols $\mathfrak{L} \mathfrak{f}$ may be used to indicate "forefather"; the particle $\mathfrak{L}$ ("f") is sufficient to indicate the prefix "fore", and the small roman letter $\mathfrak{f}$ indicates "father" (a "defective" of the third sort).

Willis allows that personal terminations may be omitted: "thou askest" may be indicated simply as "thou ask": the person deciphering will easily supply the termination required. Similarly "an" may be indicated
simply as "a": that "an" is required will be obvious to the person deciphering. In rhymed verse the final word of a second line rhyming with that of a first may be omitted because the person deciphering will be able to supply it from the context.

It is sometimes possible to express a word as a metaphthong of the preceding word. Take for example the words "more you". The initial "y" of "you" is neglected, and the two words together may be written \( \Lambda \) (i.e. "moreu"). Again, take the words "a man asketh it". The "-eth" inflection is neglected, and we may write \( \Lambda \) (i.e. "aman askit")\(^1\). "The man maketh each" may be written \( \Lambda \) (i.e. "theman makeoh"). "Those that are here under heaven" may be written \( \Lambda \) (i.e. "thos tharaterrund evn")\(^2\).

In some words, portions may be represented by defectives of the second sort. Thus "go towards" may be written \( \Lambda \), giving "go t w", since the suffixes "to" (as in "hitherto") and "wards" are among those which can be indicated by the symbols for their initial letters used as aphthongs: that the "to" in "towards" is not a suffix does not mean that this method cannot be used.

1. Willis directs that initial h, w, and y are to be neglected when their sound is "drowned" by the final sound of the previous word.
2. The first symbol consists of \( \Lambda \) plus \( \cup \), with \( \downarrow \) in the "a" metaphthong position; the second of \( \Lambda \) plus \( \uparrow \), with \( \subset \) in the "i" metaphthong position.
3. The last symbol consists of \( \varsigma \) plus \( \cup \) plus \( \subset \).
Willis gives directions for drastic abbreviation of clauses and sentences where *verbatim* reporting is not desired. The stenographer should omit from a clause "Words added without weight of matter". For instance in the sentence "And I heard it with these eares" the last three words may be omitted "because," as Willis observes, "no man heareth without his eares". Common phrases, "that is to say, such as we have often occasion to use", may be indicated by the initial letters of the first few words. Willis goes very far in the extent to which he allows epitome: for example he suggests that where *verbatim* reporting is not required the following lines from Spenser should be indicated simply by the symbols for "At last the Sunne arose":

At last the golden Orientall gate,
Of greatest Heauen gan to open faire,
And *Phoebus* fresh, as Bridegroome to his mate,
Came daunsing forth shaking his deawle haire,
And hurles his glistring beames through gloomie aire.

Some phrases are indicated by special symbols: e.g. 

\[ \bigcirc \bigcirc \] = "the chiefe poynt"; \[ \bigcirc \] = "slaine in battaille".

Well known phrases, such as commonly used quotations from the Bible, may be represented by only the beginning of the phrase with an "&c.". Willis gives full instructions for dealing with phrases repeated twice or more: and he directs the use (albeit sparing) of punctuation marks.

We must now inquire into the utility of this shorthand system for such a task as the *verbatim* reporting of *King Lear* at a performance or performances.
The theory that it could have been used for such a task so as to produce a report of the standard shown in the quarto is not supported by any claim made on its behalf by the inventor of the system. Indeed, what Willis says of the speed with which it could be used in reporting is a strong argument on the other side. We can be quite sure that had the system been capable of reporting verbatim the words of even a fairly fast speaker Willis would have said so, for he speaks quite frankly of what he considers to be the merits of his invention. What he does say about speed in the Proem to the 1602 publication is this: "...he that is well practized in this Art, may write Verbatim, as fast as a man can treateably speake:"

Now the word "treatable" applied to utterance means, according to the New English Dictionary, "deliberate, distinct, clear, intelligible". And in the quotations given the word always signifies a very definite slowness and distinctness: it generally applies to the sort of elocution proper to sermons or religious services. Here are the quotations of the adjective cited in the N. E. D.:

To abyde vpon the tretable sayng of theyre seruyce, be yt neuer so werysom.  
Myrr. our Ladye, 55 (a.d. 1450-1530).

Whether the parsons...doth reade the common service with a lowde, distinct, and treatable voyce.


[The parson's] voyce is humble, his words treatable and slow.

G. Herbert, Country Parson, vi (1632).

All these things with a solid and treatable smoothnesse to paint out and describe.

Milton, Ch. Govt., II Pref. (1641).
The citations of the adverb are:

To vse theyr tongue to say yt tretably and dystynctly, without faylyng or ouerskyppyng of worde or sylable.

Myrr. our Ladye, 53.

You are to utter each word leasurely and treatably; pro-
nouncing every part of it, so as everyone may write...as fast as you speake.

Brinsley, Lud. Lit., 151 (1612).

We may note also the following quotation, where the word is not used of utterance:

In the space of a Minute I have made Twelve Respirations, (when I was very sedate, and drew in my Breath very treatably).

Slare, in Phil. Trans. XVII, 906 (1693).

There can be no doubt that the words "treatable" and "treatably" refer to utterance of exceptional clarity, distinctness, and slowness. Observe the adjectives with which they are coupled in the above quotations -- wearisome, loud, distinct, slow, solid, leisurely -- and the extending phrases -- without overskipping word or syl-
izable, pronouncing every part of each word. It is safe, I imagine, to suppose that the King's Men would not speak very much of the dialogue of King Lear treatably. Yet Willis demands treatable speech for verbatim reporting. And due weight should be placed on the fact that Willis's claim is that a treatable speaker can be reported verbatim by a stenographer "well practized in this Art" -- it requires much practice to do even this. W. J. Carlton draws attention to "the remarkable unanimity with which the early shorthand authors -- however preposter-
ous some of their pretensions -- disclaimed the ability to write verbatim, except after a moderate speaker".

In note (a) to Bk. I, chap. 1, of his 1602 volume Willis comments on the title "Stenographie". It signifies, he says, "a straightened or compendious Writing, by which name I call this Art, because all the precepts thereof are directed thereunto; although it hath other profitable uses, as is before declared in the Proeme of this Booke". In the Proem Willis notes five merits of his system. The first is that much may be written in little space. The speed with which it can be written (we have already quoted the claim made in this respect) is the second. One gets the impression that Willis was not primarily concerned to produce a system capable of verbatim reporting, but rather to produce a system capable of expressing much content in little compass.

The system could doubtless be successfully used to note down the gist of a speaker's argument, using the drastic methods of abbreviating clauses and sentences which Willis allows. It might be used to summarise a speech briefly. But as to verbatim reporting, let us again quote Willis himself: speaking of verbatim reporting (Bk. II, chap. 6, note (a)), he says: "Wherein, if the speaker from whose mouth we note, be very swift of deliuerie, so that he transporteth our imagination beyonde the indeuore of our handes; it shall not be amisse to write only the Verbes & Substantiues, and other Wordes essentiall to the speech deliuered, reserving a space for the rest which are of lighter circumstance, to be supplyed with Penne immediatly after the speech is ended". We can be sure that in many passages in King
Lear, a stenographer present at a performance would find his imagination transported beyond the endeavour of his hands. If the Q text had been transmitted in this way we should certainly expect to find a consistent variation of standard between passages full of passion, presumably delivered impetuously, and passages of calmer mood, presumably delivered more slowly. And yet there is in Q no such consistent variation. Had Willis's system been used to report this play from performance we should expect that, in highly impassioned passages at any rate, only the most important words would have been conveyed by the stenographer, and the rest filled in as seemed to the decipherer necessary to connect the words reported: that is, we should expect to find in Q some passages in which the most important words (or some of them) were right (or nearly right) and the connecting material very inaccurate indeed — perhaps quite different from the authentic wording as found in F. But we do not find this state of affairs. If Q Lear was indeed reported from performance by Stenographie, the stenographer was able to use the system to much better effect than its inventor himself was prepared to allow to be possible, though the latter had certainly no mean opinion of the child of his invention.

Let us examine some impassioned passages and see what this postulated stenographer made of them. In his speeches in III ii Lear reaches a great height of rage. At times in this scene I should think that the words with which the stenographer had to deal must have come forth from the actor’s mouth in a veritable torrent. Yet the
stenographer, supposing him to have existed, has managed to record them with quite remarkable fullness and accuracy. Let us consider the variations between Q and F in these speeches.

**Lines 1-9.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>wind</td>
<td>windes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>caterickes</td>
<td>Cataracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiroanios</td>
<td>Hyrricano's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(drencht,)</td>
<td>(drench'd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The</td>
<td>our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drown'd</td>
<td>drown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>sulphurous</td>
<td>Sulph'rous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>vaunt-curers</td>
<td>Vaunt-curriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>smite</td>
<td>Strike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the</td>
<td>o'th'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>moulds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>makes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q's "drown'd" in line 3 is probably correct and F's "drown" wrong -- the context favours Q (see Notes). If "drown'd" were wrong, it would be explicable as a misreading by the compositor of "drowne" in longhand.

Q has certain mis-spellings, which however do not give words distinct from those of F -- "caterickes", "Hiroanios", "sulphurous", "vaunt-curriers". These are virtually the same words as in F. Even if the stenographer indicated the wrong spellings he has not got hold of wrong words: and the spellings he
indicated may represent correctly the sounds the actor uttered -- except in the case of "Hircanios". In "Hircanios" the compositor may have accidentally transposed the "i" and "can"; or, more probably, the word may be a misreading of "Hiricanos" in longhand, with two minim errors. A stenographer wishing to indicate "cataracts" would probably write only the symbols for "cata": if so, the ending "-ickes" was supplied later during deciphering. Or "caterickes" may be a compositor's spelling, based on his own pronunciation and substituted, while he carried a group of words in his head, for a correct spelling in the copy. So far we need not suppose that the stenographer has erred.

Then we have three errors, each consisting of the omission of final "s" ("wind", "Mold", "make"), and we have "of the" for "o'th". Still the alleged stenographer has managed to get the correct words.

Finally, we have "The" for "our" (perhaps an anticipation, whether by memory or eye, of "the" later in the line), "to" for "of", and -- the most serious error -- "smite" for "Strike".

Even if he were responsible for all these errors, the stenographer has done very much better than Willis's claims for his system would lead us to suppose possible. But, except for "Hircanios" (which may be a compositor's misreading of long-

1. It is suggested on p. 75 that this may be a memorial corruption.
hand), there is not one of these errors which could not with the greatest of ease be attributed to the actor; and the compositor might be called in to relieve him of some of the blame even apart from "Hircanios".

**Lines 14-24.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>taske</td>
<td>taxe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>why then</td>
<td>Then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>haue...ioin'd</td>
<td>will...ioyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>battel</td>
<td>Battailes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0, ho!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We may absolve the stenographer of responsibility for the insertion of "why" in line 18 -- that is probably a piece of textual expansion by the actor.

The words "taske" and "taxe" were in Elizabethan times regarded simply as alternative forms of the same word -- see Greg, *Variants*, p. 154: the actor may easily have substituted the one form for the other here.

The omission of a final "s" in "battel" and of "ho!" in line 24 are trifling errors. The most serious error is the change of tense in line 22.

All these Q readings might well be attributed to the actor, and the last two at any rate might be attributed to the compositor.
lines 37-38.
There are no variations between Q and F here.

lines 49-60.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Powther</td>
<td>pudding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>similur man</td>
<td>Simular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>hast</td>
<td>Ha's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>concealed centers</td>
<td>concealing Continents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>their</td>
<td>then</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stenographer (supposing him to exist) is probably not responsible for the addition of "man" in line 54 -- a stenographer is not likely to note down more than he hears. The addition may be attributed to the actor.

The most serious error in the list is "centers". I do not think that the stenographer can reasonably be held responsible for this. The shorthand symbols for hard and soft "c" are different, and a hard "c" cannot be mistaken by the ear for a soft one. A stenographer would probably indicate "continents" as \( \overline{\overline{\text{conts}}} \) (i.e. "conts\(^\dagger\)\) and "centers" as \( \overline{\text{cents}} \) (i.e. "cents"); the two sets of symbols could not be mistaken the one for the other during the deciphering. I imagine the person responsible for "centers" was the Q compiler: he may have misread the first four

---

1. One of the methods of indicating a plural in Stenographie is by placing two dots above the symbol for the singular.
letters of "continents" as "cent", failed to make out the rest of the word apart from the final "s", and guessed "centers" (although probably realising that that was too short a word). "Their" for "then" in line 60 may also be a misreading of longhand -- "then" misread as "ther" or even "their".

The other errors in Q are very minor ones -- "Powther" for "pudder", "in" for "to", and (with the word right but the inflection wrong) "hast" for "Ha's" and "concealed" for "concealing". I believe that here again there is not a single Q reading for which the actor or compositor might not be held responsible.

lines 67-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>wit begins</td>
<td>wits begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>And</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>That sorowes</td>
<td>That's sorry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"You" in line 71 may be attributed to the compositor -- he may have misread a longhand "yor" as "you". The other Q readings may easily be attributed to the actor.

line 78.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>my good boy</td>
<td>Boy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Q reading is probably a piece of actor's
In dealing with these speeches -- speeches containing some passionate passages and some not altogether easy to comprehend at first hearing -- the alleged stenographer has not once failed to keep up with the speaker, he has not once got lost, he has not once been driven to summarise. We have said that there is not a single Q reading in these speeches which cannot be attributed to the actor or the compositor. Thus an upholder of the theory we are criticising must be prepared to maintain that Willis's system was capable of the word-perfect reporting of passionate speeches -- that a practitioner of Stenographie could, during performance, take down, accurately, all that an actor said in passionate utterance. Not only does Willis himself not make this claim -- he as good as tells us that such a claim cannot be made. Even if we attribute to the alleged stenographer all the errors in these speeches that we can, the fact remains that for the most part his lapses are very minor ones -- the omission or addition of a final "s", the occasional substitution of one small word for another ("the" for "our", "to" for "of", "in" for "to", "that" for "and", "of" for "in"), the substitution of alternative forms ("taske" for "taxe", "hast" for "Ha's"), the substitution of a past perfect for a future, the substitution of a synonym ("smite" for "Strike"). Even if we attribute the greatest possible number of errors to the stenographer, Willis's own remarks on the capability
of his system for verbatim reporting forbid us to suppose that that system could have produced a report anything like so nearly word-perfect as this.

There are certain fundamental defects in Willis's system which make it unsuitable for the exact reporting of fluent speech. To begin with, his alphabet of shorthand characters has a serious fault in that of the 28 symbols no less than 11 involve two (in one case three) distinct movements of the pen. These are the characters ∨ ∧ < L J + > Γ ∨ Z X. For rapid writing all shorthand characters should be cursive. These are not. In the formation of such symbols as these time is lost "though it be not marked". Historians of shorthand draw attention to the unsuitability of these angular characters of Willis's. In his Historical Account of Shorthand (1816), p. 50, Lewis states of Willis that "his great imperfection is the want of simplicity and facility in his alphabet". Willis gives his characters their forms of set purpose. As A. T. Wright points out\(^1\), "The selection of characters by Willis would seem to have been haphazard and unfortunate, were it not clear that he had deliberately restricted his choice by imposing upon himself the whimsical obligation of identifying each of his characters with a portion -- sometimes a very small portion -- of

\(^1\) John Willis, S.T.B. and Edmond Willis, chap. 11.
its corresponding letter in some known longhand alphabet. That was one of his basic principles". Thus for example _J_ represents a portion of G, + of ~, A of ~, and so on. In some cases he refers his particles to Greek and Hebrew letters -- for instance AV represents a portion of the Greek M, and  발견 represents a portion of the Hebrew א. The practitioner of Stenographie, then, starts with the disadvantage of a badly chosen shorthand alphabet. In his Schoolmaster to the Art of Stenography, a companion work (1st edition 1623), Willis realises that the letters which occur most frequently in the language should have the easiest and simplest symbols: but, as A. T. Wright points out (op. cit. chap. 11), "he does not appear to have applied the principle very successfully".

Not only are some of Willis's characters unsatisfactory in themselves: one of his basic principles is, as we have seen, the joining together of characters, and very frequently we find that owing to the forms of the characters the joining is difficult to execute and the resultant compound symbols very clumsy. To make the joins neatly so that the symbols are clearly legible would often take up more time than the reporter of a play would have available. A few examples follow of joins which it is difficult to make both neatly and expeditiously: _J_ is difficult to join to ( in the "e" metaphthong position -- (, as in 'כ)' = "lioness"; _J_ is difficult to join to _L_ in the "a" metaphthong position -- _L_, as in _L_ = "anthropophagite"; _L_ is difficult to join
to \( V \) in the "e" metaphthong position -- \( V \), as in
\[
\int V = \text{"carven"}; \ c \text{ is difficult to join to } \underbrace{\text{ }}_{\text{in}} \text{ the } \text{"a" or "e" metaphthong positions -- } \underbrace{\text{d}}_{\text{=}} = \text{"date"}, \ 
\underbrace{\text{d}}_{\text{=}} = \text{"debt"}; \ c \text{ is difficult to join to } \underbrace{0}_{} \text{ in the } \text{"e" metaphthong position -- } \underbrace{0}_{} = \text{"let"}.
\]

In these examples, and in many others given earlier in this section, it will be seen that often in the formation of compound characters -- a great character with a small character affixed -- the pen must be lifted off the paper. In formations such as \( \times = \text{"check"}, \underbrace{\text{d}}_{\text{=}} \text{"dug"}, \text{ and } \underbrace{\text{g}}_{\text{=}} \text{"good"}, \text{ not only must the hand be lifted but both great and small characters require two distinct pen-strokes. Often of course it is easy enough to make joins without lifting the pen, as in } \underbrace{\text{a}}_{\text{=}} \text{("ab") = } \text{"abound"}, \underbrace{\text{a}}_{\text{=}} \text{="are"}, \underbrace{\text{a}}_{\text{=}} \text{="arm"}, \ 
\underbrace{\text{d}}_{\text{=}} \text{="dim" (in this last case one could write the affix first): but very often it is not, and this is a serious demerit. Again, a stenographer using this system must often add disjunct small characters to great characters, and here of course the pen must always be lifted. I imagine too that a stenographer would often find it necessary to move his hand back, and this is tiring and does not tend to expedition. For example, in writing } \underbrace{\text{g}}_{\text{=}} \text{=} \text{="character", one could write the disjunct group first, but with such a difficult word one would probably incline to tackle it from the beginning and might easily find oneself writing the whole word from right to left.}

Willis gives directions for certain methods of
joining which result in ambiguity. These are cases in which an affixed small character partially coincides with the outline of the great character. He gives \( \text{\textless} \) as \( \text{\textless} + \text{v} \) ("ev"); but it might also signify \( \text{\textless} + \text{'} \) ("ep"). He gives \( \text{\textbar} \) as \( \text{\textbar} + \text{\textbar} \) ("g\text{\textbar}d"); but it might be \( \text{\textbar} + \text{\textbar} \) ("g\text{\textbar}r"). He gives \( \text{\textbar} \) as \( \text{\textbar} + - + \text{\textbar} \) ("g\text{\textbar}d"); but it might be \( \text{\textbar} + - + \text{\textbar} \) ("g\text{\textbar}d"). If one uses the same method with other joinings one produces similar ambiguities: \( \text{\textbar} \) might be \( \text{\textbar} + - + \text{\textbar} \) or \( \text{\textbar} + - \); \( \text{\textbar} \) might be \( \text{\textbar} + - + \text{\textbar} \) or \( \text{\textbar} + - \) or \( \text{\textbar} + - \); etc. To avoid such ambiguities one would have to make some extraordinarily awkward joins: \( \text{\textbar} , \text{\textbar} , \text{\textbar} , \text{\textbar} \), etc. (In one of his examples Willis gives the join \( \text{\textbar} \), i.e. "f\text{\textbar}g"). In a system in which joining is so important the characters should certainly be such as are apt for joining.

Willis's system of affixes and disjuncts is open, then, to serious objections. Now in Bk. I, chap. 11, note (f), he makes this statement: "And though to place Disjunctes about great Characters in wordes of many Syl- lables, might seeme to breede confusion; yet therein will appeare no trouble at all: for, we write Hebrew wordes with small Characters, and Prickes above, beneath, on the side, or within the Letters; which yet are not thought to bring confusion, but great helpe to the Reader". He then proceeds: "But if any inconvenience should arise thereof, it may easily be redressed by the use of collateral great particles."
Willis is not in this note thinking of the question of speed: he is thinking of possible difficulties in deciphering. But we are interested in the question of speed. To write distinctly such shorthand formations as

\[ \check{\cap}_a = "anthropophagite", \]  
\[ \check{\cap} = "pertinacity", \]  
\[ \check{\cap} = "characteristic", \]  
would take up far more time than the reporter of fluent speech could spare for them. But to use the method of collateral great particles would not take up less time:  
\[ \check{\cap}_a \cdot \check{\cap}_a = "anthropophagite", \]  
\[ \check{\cap} \check{\cap} \check{\cap} = "pertinacity", \]  
\[ \check{\cap}_a \check{\cap}_a = "characteristic". \]  
If a stenographer were to rely mainly on this latter method he would not infrequently find himself writing words not very much -- if indeed at all -- more quickly than if he were using ordinary longhand.

The use of Willis's Stenographie involves a constant necessity for neat and legible execution of tiny symbols. It is difficult and tiring to write the small characters clearly -- one cannot just scribble them without incurring the danger of complete illegibility. The pen must be manipulated with great precision. This is especially troublesome when affixed small characters themselves have affixes: but it is a general disadvantage of the system. The pen does not travel along easily: the writer must pay careful attention to small, sometimes even minute, angular details.

He must take great care as to the relative sizes of
joined or juxtaposed characters in order to avoid risk of ambiguity. To take an example: \( \_ = \text{"fire"}\). A stenographer working in haste and guilty of a not outrageous degree of carelessness might make the three lines of the same length: \( \_ \). The decipherer would see that a mistake had been made, and he would be faced with a problem. The incorrect symbol is open to any of the following interpretations: (i) \( \_ + - = \text{"dr"}\); this might as a defective indicate a word beginning with these two letters: (ii) \( \_ + \_ = \text{"df"}\); this might as a defective indicate "deaf", the first and last letters being noted: (iii) \( \_ + - = \text{"fir" or "fire"} \) -- in his 1602 text-book Willis makes no distinction between short and long vowels: (iv) \( \_ + \_ = \text{"fid"}\); this might as a defective indicate "fidelity": (v) \( - + \_ = \text{"rid"} \) or "ride": (vi) \( - + \_ = \text{"rf"}\); this might as a defective indicate "rough": (vii) \( + \_ + - = \text{"sfir(e)"} \); this might as a defective indicate "sapphire", or perhaps "samphire". In addition to making the three lines of the same length, the stenographer might carelessly write the lower of the two horizontal lines aslant: \( \_ \). The decipherer might then take the slanting line as representing "p" (properly / ). Then the following interpretations are possible: (i) \( + / + - = \text{"spire"} \): (ii) \( + / + \_ = \text{"spied"} \): (iii) \( \_ + / = \text{"dp"} \); this might as a defective (first and last letters) indicate "deep": (iv) \( / + \_ = \text{"pad" or "paid"} \) ("ai" is indicated as simple "a"). A decipherer faced with a problem such
as this would be helped towards the correct solution by two things: first, if the stenographer were himself deciphering he might remember the passage; secondly, even if stenographer and decipherer were different persons the context would indicate to the latter that, for example, "fire" would give sense and "ride" nonsense. Nevertheless if the stenographer allowed many of these ambiguities into his notes the task of deciphering would indeed be formidable, and it would be remarkable if no errors got into the transliteration: and as for memory, I doubt whether a stenographer who had gone through the extraordinarily arduous task of reporting a play such as Lear would be likely to carry very much of it away from the theatre in his head.

In the last paragraph we spoke of ambiguity. But the stenographer in his haste might perpetrate worse than an ambiguity: he might actually mislead the decipherer. He might carelessly make an affixed small character a shade larger than the great character. This would often produce nonsense, but sometimes it would produce a genuine word quite different from the word intended. If instead of ⇑ ( = "cock") the stenographer wrote ⌐ he would indicate "cake"; if instead of ⇑ ( = "man") he wrote ⌐ he would indicate "numb"; if instead of ⇑ ( = "Tom") he wrote ⌐ he would indicate "mat" or "mate"; if instead of ⇑ ( = "call") he wrote ⌐ he would indicate "lock"; if instead of ⌐ ( = "black") he wrote ⌐ he would indicate
"cobble"; if instead of \( \top \) ( = "dome") he wrote \( \hat{\bot} \) he would indicate "mad", "made", or "maid"; if instead of \( \bot \) ( = "red", "rede", or "read") he wrote \( \top \) he would indicate "door", and if \( \bot \) he would indicate "race" \((\bot + 1)\) or "raid" \((\bot + \bar{\bot})\). Again it may be said that if the decipherer were a man of any common sense he would realise that for example "cobble" could not possibly be right in the context: knowing Willis's system and realising the pitfalls it presented to the unwary stenographer he might arrive at the correct result; but again it must be emphasised that if this sort of thing were frequent the labour of deciphering would be extremely heavy, and some absurd errors would be likely to get into the transcription.

There is even a danger of misleading the decipherer if certain of the simple characters are written imprecisely. The stenographer may intend to indicate simple "a" \((\wedge)\); instead, he may write \( \wedge \), which represents "an". Similarly, \( \cap = "b", \cap = "bs", \cap = "base"; \cap = "d", \cap = "sir(e)" \((\L + \bar{\L})\); \cap = "side" \((\L + \bar{\bot})\); \cap = "d", \cap = "sir(e)" \((\L + \bar{\L})\); \cap = "side" \((\L + \bar{\bot})\); \cup = "m", \cup = "moss", \cup = "miss" or "mice"; \subseteq = "t", \subseteq = "tr", \subseteq = "tore"; \cup = "v", \cup = "vine" \((\bar{\wedge} + \wedge)\); \cup = "np" \((\bar{\wedge} + \bar{\bar{\wedge}})\) or "nv" \((\bar{\wedge} + \bar{\bar{\wedge}})\); \cup = "pan", "pane", or "pain" \((\bar{\bar{\wedge}} + \bar{\wedge})\) or "pave" \((\bar{\bar{\wedge}} + \bar{\bar{\wedge}})\); \cup = "w", \cup = "win" or "wine".

Yet another danger lies in the possibility, in quick note-taking, of misplacing a dot or a small character so that it occupies the wrong metathong position. The stenographer may want to write \( \mid \), = "say", and in his haste he may write \( \mid \), = "see" or "sea".
Instead of 'i' for "see" or "sea", he may accidentally write 'j', = "sigh". Instead of 'u', = "men" or "mean", he may write 'o', = "mine". Instead of 'j', = "woe", he may write 'o', = "woo". And so on.

In his Proem Willis states that "the whole frame of this worke is so contriued, that the memorie shall not neede to be charged with a tedious labouring of a multitude of Wordes and Characters by hart; but enured onely to exercise order". We have said that in making this statement Willis is probably commending his own system tacitly to the disadvantage of that of Bright. Willis's claim is justified inasmuch as his system, unlike that of Bright, is alphabetic. But Willis does impose a good deal of strain on the memory in connection with his method of representation by defectives of the third and fourth sorts. As regards defectives of the third sort, i.e. representation of a word by the first letter only: he lists twenty-one words to be expressed by the first letter as a shorthand particle, twenty-four to be expressed by the first letter in small roman script, twenty-four to be expressed by the first letter in small secretary script; as for words indicated by their first letters in capitals, roman and secretary, he gives only examples. If one were to use the system exactly as Willis sets it out one would have to commit the three lists mentioned above to memory, i.e. one would have to learn sixty-nine words and along with them the symbols for their representation. As we have seen, Willis in a note allows the individual stenographer to choose his
own words for representation by the first letter. The
stenographer must indeed compile his own lists for re-
presentation by the initial letters in capitals, roman
and secretary, since Willis gives only examples: but
even if we suppose that a stenographer chose to make up
his own lists in all five categories he would still have
to commit them all to memory along with their symbols
or letters. And the stenographer's memory must in this
matter be absolutely accurate, for if in his note-taking
he writes a roman letter instead of a secretary letter,
a capital instead of a small letter, etc., he will in-
dicate a totally different word from that intended.
As regards defectives of the third sort, then, the
stenographer has to commit to memory (if his lists are
full) some 120 words along with their symbols. Then as
regards representation by defectives of the fourth sort,
i.e. representation of a word by two letters, the first
and second, or the first and last: the practitioner must
have lists here also -- of his own making, since Willis
gives only examples. Willis gives $\wedge_n$ ( = "ab") as re-
presenting "abound": a given stenographer may choose to
follow him in this, in which case of course he must use
$\wedge_n$ only for "abound" and not for any other word be-
beginning with "ab"; another stenographer may choose to
use $\wedge_n$ for "abate", in which case he must use it for
that word only. Willis directs that the method of re-
presentation by the first and last letters shall be ap-
plied only to words beginning and ending with vowels (e.g.
\( = "ao", = "also"), or, "if they begin and end with a Consonant [,] the last Consonant [must be] such as neuer followeth immediately the first in the beginning of an English word". Thus for instance Willis gives \( \cup \)
( = "ml") as = "Meruaile". One stenographer may choose to accept this: another may decide to use \( \cup \) for "moral": both must be absolutely consistent.

In note (d) to Bk. I, chap. 15, Willis says this: "Heere further marke, that all the Defectiue notes, intreated of in these two last Chapters the xiiiij and the xv. [i.e. defectives of the third and fourth sorts] may be very well reduced into a Table: (the manner how, is apparant by the Rules) vnto which the Reader may referre what wordes he thinketh best; yet with this regard, that they be wordes vsuall vnto himselfe: or such as being fully written, would be vnhandsome. Which when he hath done, he shall not need to get the wordes of the Table by hart, but by remembriing vnto what kinde of defectiues the word is referred; the Rule itselfe sheweth how the word is to be written. As if I remember that the word Meruaile is placed among the Defectiues, written by the first and last letter, I know by the Rule, that it must be expressed by the Aphthonge particle of the last letter affixed to the first". The point that we must stress here is that the stenographer must "get the wordes of the Table by hart" in order that he may know by which type of defective to represent a given word in it. He must learn up a number of categories of words. We have said that in the
word-list relevant to defectives of the third sort there would be some 120 words. If a stenographer were to make extensive use of the method of representation by defectives of the fourth sort the list would of course be greatly increased. The necessity for learning lists of words is a demerit in a shorthand system: and this demerit Willis's system shares with those of Bright and Bales, though not to anything remotely approaching the same extent. Admittedly a practitioner of Stenographie is not forced to use defectives of the third and fourth sorts: any word may be written in shorthand characters in full or as a defective of the first sort (by noting "so much of [it], as is sufficient to distinguish it from all other wordes"): but then the saving of time made possible by the use of defectives of the third and fourth sorts is not taken advantage of.

In arguing for the theory of stenographic transmission in connection with Q Lear, Greg does not consider the variations between Q and F in the light of the particular possibilities of error inherent in John Willis's system. He gives no indication of whether he has examined the system, and his case cannot stand unless it is shown that the system could have produced the extant result. I have argued above that the Q text of Lear is very much superior to what we should expect judging by Willis's own claims for the possibilities of Stenographie when applied to verbatim reporting: I have argued that
despite its merits the system is very clumsy and has serious defects -- whereas I have shown that if we accept the stenographic theory we must be prepared to claim that the stenographer was capable of word-perfect reporting of passages full of passion and presumably impetuously uttered. But this does not exhaust the arguments which can be advanced against Greg's theory.

It must be allowed that there are errors in Q Lear which could have been produced by the use of Stenographie. But Quincy Adams was able to point to errors which could have been produced by the use of Characterie. There are certain types of error which the use of Stenographie would tend to produce: if examples of these types of error were found to be common in the quarto, and if no other reasonable explanation of them were forthcoming, the Stenographie hypothesis would have a firm foundation; but in every case which I can find in the quarto there is a satisfactory alternative explanation.

We have seen that it is important in using Willis's system to pay careful attention to the relative sizes of the parts of simple characters and to the relative sizes of great and small characters. Writing at top speed one might easily err in these respects. Yet I can find in Q Lear only a very few cases in which this type of error could be held to be exemplified; and in every case there is a satisfactory alternative explanation.
I propose to give a list of these cases and to examine each in turn. But it will be convenient first to dismiss one type of variant which might be included. At I ii 104 we find the readings, Q "discords", F "discord". Now in Stenographie, while the plural may be indicated by two dots placed above the great character, it may also be indicated by the symbol for the letter "s" used in the normal way. Thus "arms" may be indicated by either \( \overline{\underline{a}} \) or \( \overline{\underline{\alpha}} \). Now the use of the second of these methods may sometimes lead to ambiguity. Thus \( \overline{\underline{a}} = "d" \). To indicate "ds" precisely, by this method, one would have to write \( \overline{\underline{\alpha}} \); but a hasty stenographer might easily write "ds" as \( \overline{\underline{\alpha}} \), and all that distinguishes this from simple "d" is the fact that the vertical stroke is slightly longer than the horizontal one. Thus with careless note-taking a "d" might be interpreted as "ds", or a "ds" as simple "d". To revert to I ii 104: "discord" (F) may be represented stenographically as \( \overline{\underline{\alpha}} \overline{\underline{\alpha}} \). This is a striking example of awkwardness in the system. We are concerned here with the second of these compound characters. It is composed of \( \overline{\underline{\alpha}} \) (hard "c") with \( \overline{\underline{\alpha}} \) ("r") in the "o" metathong position and with \( \overline{\underline{\alpha}} \) ("d") as an anphthong affixed to the \( \overline{\underline{\alpha}} \). If the stenographer made the vertical stroke of the \( \overline{\underline{\alpha}} \) slightly longer, the decipherer might decide that "discords" (Q) was meant (taking the second compound character as consisting of \( \overline{\underline{\alpha}} \) plus \( \overline{\underline{\alpha}} \), \( \overline{\underline{\alpha}} \), and \( \overline{\underline{\alpha}} \)). There is a not inconsiderable number of such cases in the play. But I think that these
should be eliminated from the present discussion, for this reason: errors in Q consisting of the presence or absence of a final "s" are very frequent and many of them are not explicable as the one considered above is. For example, at I i 4 we have the readings, Q "kingdomes", F "Kingdome". The second syllable is written, stenographically, \( \overline{\text{d}} \) ("doms"), \( \overline{\text{d}} \) ("dom"). There is no ambiguity here in the two sets of symbols, as there was in the previous case. If a stenographer is to blame for "kingdomes", we must assume that he has inserted a distinct stroke which he should not have inserted: and this is not relevant to the matter we are considering. The position is that in Q errors consisting of the presence or absence of a final "s" are frequent: in some cases this may be due to carelessness of the type with which we are here concerned: in other cases it certainly is not: and in all cases the error may reasonably be referred to the actor or the compositor. We are entitled, then, to ignore this type of error in considering the point with which we are concerned.

Some of the cases in which the Q reading might possibly be explained as having arisen through a stenographer having made characters or parts of characters of the wrong size involve also another type of error which might be referred to the use of Stenographie, and it will be convenient to consider here not only these but also all the other possible examples of this second type of error. As we have seen, one of the defects of the system is that a considerable proportion of the characters
are right-angled. Now in rapid writing it is easy to make a right-angled character appear to be curved, e.g. to write \( \square \) as \( \circ \) which could be taken by the person deciphering to be the character \( \pi \). Again, a right angle may be carelessly made to appear as an acute angle -- e.g. \( \triangle \) for \( \bullet \). There are some readings in Q which might be held to have arisen through the stenographer, intending to indicate the F readings, having made right angles appear as curves or as acute angles.

The list which follows is in my belief (apart from errors in Q involving final "s") a complete list of variants as regards which the Q reading might be explained as having arisen through errors of size and/or angle in the stenograph. (I do not of course include any case in which the Q reading is in my opinion right and that of F wrong.) The list contains 23 variants. Considering that it refers to two types of error (size and angle), it must be allowed, I think, that it is a remarkably short list. And every Q reading contained in it can be attributed to some corrupting agency other than the alleged stenographer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I i 203</td>
<td>Couered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I ii 119</td>
<td>spirituall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I iv 163</td>
<td>in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I iv 217</td>
<td>transforme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. II i 18</td>
<td>aske</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We must now consider each item in this list in turn.

1. Q Coeverd  F Dow'r'd

   Stenographically:  \( Q \rightarrow \) (coverd) or \( F \rightarrow \) (coverd)

   \( F \rightarrow \) (dord)

   The question we are concerned with is, could the stenograph for "Dow'r'd" have been carelessly written so that it could have been interpreted as "Coeverd"? The stenograph for "Dow'r'd" is constructed as follows: \( \rightarrow \) ("d", great character), plus
("r") in the "o" metaphthong position ("ow" is expressed as simple "o"): to the \( \rightarrow \) is added \( \nearrow \) ("d") in the aphthong position. Now suppose we had a careless stenographer working in haste. His pen might have slipped in the course of forming the great character, and he might have produced \( \rightarrow \). He might have made the "r" stroke too long, producing \( \nearrow \). He might have slanted the perpendicular stroke of the final "d", and he might have inadvertently left a small mark at an angle to this "perpendicular" as he lifted his pen off the paper, giving \( \overline{\nearrow} \). This could be interpreted as "covird", which would naturally suggest "couered" to the decipherer. This explanation of the Q word may seem to the reader far-fetched; it seems so to me: nevertheless it is not inconceivable. But it is just as easy -- in fact, I think, easier -- to suppose that the Q compositor's longhand manuscript copy had "douered": the first letter may have been blotted so as to make it totally illegible: and the compositor, able to make out only "ouered", may simply have guessed "couered".

2. Q spirituall  F Sphericall

Stenographically:  
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Q} \quad \rightarrow \\
\text{F} \quad \nearrow \\
\end{array} \]  
(The suffix "call" is indicated defectively by its first letter.)

The stenograph for "sphericall" is constructed as follows: to the great character \( \rightarrow \) ("s") is affixed \( \nearrow \) ("f") in the aphthong position: \( \rightarrow \) ("r") is af-
fixed to the great character in the "e" metaphthong position, and -indent (hard "c") is placed as a disjunct small character in the "i" metaphthong position. Now the stenographer, intending to write the symbol for "sphericall", may have (i) slanted the horizontal stroke of the L ("f") upwards slightly, so that it looked like the symbol for "p" (／), (ii) placed the − ("r") too high, so that it appeared to be in the "i" metaphthong position, and (iii) curved his -indent (hard "c") so that it looked like the symbol for "t" (＜). The result would be "spirit": and a decipherer would, having regard to the demands of the context, conclude that the adjective "spirituall" was meant. On the other hand, "spirituall" could be a misreading of a longhand "sphericall". The copy for Q may have had "sphericall", and the compositor may have misread this as "spirrituall" and guessed that "spirituall" was meant. Or the word may have had too many minim strokes in the copy, so that the compositor took "sphericall" as "spirrituall" and guessed "spirituall". It may be that the person who wrote out the copy omitted the "h". Or the "h" may have been so cramped and badly formed that the compositor could make nothing of it. We may compare II ii 162, where Q corr. has "most". The compositor originally set up (Q uncorr.) "not", misreading "m" as "n". Either he thought he saw "nost" and emended to "not", or the "s" was so difficult to make out that it baffled him.

3. Q in the F i'th'

Stenographically: Q  F
The stenographer, intending to write φ (= "ith"), may have prolonged the final stroke of the φ so that the character looked like ϕ, i.e. "in". The decipherer, taking ϕ to indicate "in th", may have expanded that to "in the" on his own responsibility.

Now it is a characteristic difference between the two texts that F very frequently indicates elisions and Q very seldom does so. Where F has "t'" Q generally has "to"; where F has "th'" Q generally has "the"; where F has "'st" Q generally has "est". Stenographic explanations can be advanced for all of these Q forms. Willis directs that the suffix "to" as in "hitherto" is to be indicated by the symbol for "t", and it would be in perfect accord with his principles to use the symbol for "t" to indicate "to" even when not a suffix. Thus "t", meaning "t'", might be interpreted as "to" by the decipherer. A stenographer might well choose to express "the" defectively as "th"; so that "th", meaning "th'", might be interpreted as "the". Willis directs that verbal endings such as "est" are to be neglected by the stenographer when the context shows the personal ending required: "thou swearest" and "thou swear'st" would both be indicated by the symbols for "thou swear", and in a given case the decipherer might fix on "thou swearest" instead of "thou swear' st". As for the case with which we are primarily concerned, the stenographer might have been in the habit of indicating "in" defectively by simple "i": thus "i", meaning "i'", might be interpreted as "in" -- even on the stenographic theory
the Q form need not have anything to do with errors of size. But after all the uncontracted forms may be explained without any reference to stenography. A scribe or the Q compositor may have expanded the contracted forms on his own responsibility. Alternatively, the actors may have been in the habit of using uncontracted forms: I regard the Q text as a reported text, and actors' corruptions are of course found in plenty in reported texts not transmitted by stenography.

4. Q transforme  F transport

Stenographically: Q ⌈

F ⌈

Attached to the great character, in the "a" metaphthong position, the Q word has \ + | + L ("nsf") and the F word has \ + | + / ("nsp").

In writing the stenograph for the F word the alleged shorthand writer may have (i) made his "s" a little too long, and (ii) made his "p" horizontal. Thus the compound symbol affixed to the great character in the "a" metaphthong position would take the form ⌈, which could be interpreted as "nsf" ( \ + | + L ). Then he may also have written his disjunct metaphthong "t" at a wrong angle -- he may have written instead of c : and ⌈ could easily suggest "rm" to the decipherer. But in an admittedly reported text "transforme" may very well be a synonym-substitution by the actor for "transport".
5. Q aske  F act

Stenographically:  Q \( \hat{\gamma} \)
                    F \( \hat{\epsilon} \)

The stenograph for the Q word consists of \( \hat{\gamma} \) plus \( \hat{\epsilon} \) plus \( \gamma \).

It is conceivable that the stenographer, intending to write the symbol for "act", made two mistakes -- (i) made the horizontal stroke of the \( \gamma \) so short that the decipherer neglected it, and (ii) wrote his \( \angle \) angular instead of curved and did not put in the lower arm (\( \gamma \)). The complete stenograph might then be deciphered as "ask".

Consider the context. F has --

And I haue one thing of a queazie question
Which I must act, Briefenesse, and Fortune worke.

Q has --

and I haue one thing of a quesie question, which
must aske breefnes and fortune helpe;

If the alleged stenographer's "act" looked like "ask" the decipherer may have decided to neglect the "I" in front of "must" (or the stenographer may have missed it out by mistake). But the state of the Q passage may be explained without reference to stenography. The corruption may be due to defective memory in the actor. Only two lines before those we have quoted Edmund refers to "my businesse". When he came to the second of the lines we have quoted his mind may have run forward to II i 125-7 where Regan says
Influenced by the content of this, he may have converted "Which I must act, Briefenesse," (F) into "which must aske brefnes" (Q). Furthermore, the occurrence of "question" in the first of the two lines quoted on the preceding page may have helped to suggest "aske" to him. In addition (or alternatively) he may have had in mind The Taming of the Shrew II i 114, where Petruchio says "my business asketh haste". At any rate it is fully as easy to account for the Q version we are discussing by the formula of memorial corruption as by that of stenographic transmission.

6. Q reuengiue F reuenging

Stenographically: Q

\[ \text{F} \]

The stenographer may have made two mistakes in writing the symbols for "reuenging", both in the disjunct in the "i" metaphthong position: (i) he may have made his \ too short, and (ii) he may have malformed the \ so badly that it looked as if a straight line were intended. The disjunct in the "i" metaphthong position may have appeared thus: \( \vee \); and the decipherer may have taken this for a "v". Alternatively, the stenographer may have intended to indicate "ing" by "in", and his pen may have "kicked" at the end of the \, so that it looked like this: \( \checkmark \); which might be taken for a "v". But after all the actor may
easily have been responsible for the alteration of the suffix.

7. Q houres F yeares
   Stenographically: Q \( \leftarrow \) (ors) ~
   F \( \leftarrow \) (ers)

Writing \( \leftarrow \), the stenographer may have made a curve instead of an angle, and this would produce the Q reading. But it is eminently possible that Q's "houres" is a substitution by the actor. In his Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 91, Greg says: "One form of vulgarization is exaggeration. Gross minds, like immature, seek to impress by overstatement. When Kent, jibing at Oswald, says 'A tailor made thee', he explains:

   a stonecutter or a painter could not have made him so ill, though they had been but two years o'th'trade.

This is sober sense: Shakespeare knows that art is long. But to the actor and to the groundling two years seems an age: so the quarto substitutes 'two hours', which is absurd".

8. Q flechuent F fleshment
   Stenographically: Q \( \leftarrow \)
   F \( \leftarrow \)

The stenographer, intending to indicate "fleshment", may have made his "m" (\( \cup \)) angular (\( \vee \)), so that it indicated "v". But it is fully as easy to suppose that Q's "uent" is a minim-misreading of a longhand "ment".
9. Q ont    F out

Stenographically: Q

F (ot)

If a stenographer, intending to write (ot), made the great character too long at the foot and also straightened the foot out a little, thus, (ot), he might be understood to be conveying "ont", i.e. (plus (plus (ot). But "ont" is a very likely misreading of a long-hand "out".

10. Q seruice    F Farms

Stenographically: Q

F

Writing the symbol for the F reading very carelessly, a stenographer might conceivably make the horizontal stroke of the great character very short; he might make the U angular: and he might extend the |. The symbol might then appear thus: |. This could only be interpreted as "serve" with a short stroke irregularly affixed to the | in the "u" metaphthong position (irregularly, because, while one can have disjuncts in more than one metaphthong position about a great character, one cannot have affixes in more than one metaphthong position). The decipherer might decide to ignore this puzzling irregular affix, and he might expand "serve" into "service". I must say I think this very far-fetched, and "farms" in longhand might easily enough be misread "saruis", i.e. "seruice".
11. Q heeles F heads

Stenographically: Q  (els)

F  (eds)

The alleged stenographer, writing the symbol for "heads", may have made his "d" curved, thus →, so that it looked like "l". But it is equally possible that the (longhand) copy for Q had "heads", and that the compositor misread the "a" as "e" and the "d" as "1". For misreading of "a" as "e" and vice versa cf. II ii 138 where Q corr. has "basest and temnest" and Q uncorr. "belest and contane" (copy "basest and contemne(d)st")? -- see Greg, Variants, p. 159), and V iii 47 where Q corr. has "send" and Q uncorr. "saue". For "d" misread as "l" and vice versa cf. 2 Henry IV II iv 21 where Q1 has "oll" for "old", Love's Labour's Lost V ii 80 where Q1 has "stable" for "stabbe" (= "stabbed"); Romeo and Juliet III i 17 where Q2 has "aged" for "agil" (= "agile"), Hamlet I i 256 where Q2 has "fonde" for "foule" and I iii 131 where Q2 has "beguide" for "beguile".

12. Q traine F number

Stenographically: Q  (tran)

F  (num)

The stenographer, indicating "number" as a defective ("num"), may have made the "n" too small and the "m" too big: ♂. If he also turned the ♂ somewhat to the right and slightly lengthened its right arm (♂) this
might conceivably be interpreted as "tr" ( \( \subseteq \) ), the decipherer supposing that the symbol had been accidentally slanted upwards. The whole stenograph, \( \subseteq \), might thus be interpreted as "traine". Against this must be set the very strong probability that the Q reading is a memorial corruption: the King's followers are referred to as his train in both texts in several other passages (see p. 75).

13. Q Il e F Il'd
   Stenographically: Q \( \subseteq \) F \( \subseteq \)

The stenographer, intending to indicate the F reading, might have made his \( \subseteq \) curved, thus indicating the Q reading. But it is quite possible that the Q composer misread a longhand "d" as "e".

14. Q hested F hefted
   Stenographically: Q \( \subseteq \) F \( \subseteq \)

In writing the symbols for "hefted" the alleged stenographer may have made the horizontal stroke of the "f" ( \( \subseteq \) ) too short, and the top of the "t" ( \( \subseteq \) ) may have covered it completely or almost completely, so that the \( \subseteq \) appeared to be \( \subseteq \). The complete stenograph may have appeared thus, \( \subseteq \), which indicates "hested". But of course the misreading of a longhand "f" as the long "s" is eminently possible.
15. Q struck F stockt

Stenographically: Q \[\text{\textasteriskcentered} + \text{\textasteriskcentered} \text{with \textasteriskcentered} \text{in the "u" metaphthong position}\]

F \[\text{\textasteriskcentered} + \text{\textasteriskcentered} \text{with \textasteriskcentered} \text{in the "o" metaphthong position}\]

It is possible that the alleged stenographer, wanting to indicate "stockt", missed out the final "t" -- the need for it would be quite clear to the person deciphering, the servant (the disguised Kent) having been stocked in the past. "Stock" would be written \[\text{\textasteriskcentered} \text{\textasteriskcentered} \text{with \textasteriskcentered} \text{in the "o" metaphthong position}]. Now if the stenographer produced the lower arm of the \textasteriskcentered a little and lowered the horizontal stroke of the \textasteriskcentered slightly, thus, \textasteriskcentered, he would indicate "struck".

But again an alternative explanation is possible. The speech is assigned to Lear in F and to Goneril in Q. The F assignation requires "stockt" (Kent, Lear's servant, has been stocked), and the Q assignation requires "struck" (Oswald, Goneril's servant, has been struck by Kent). There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the F assignation or of the F "stockt". It is possible that in Q the text of the speech has been deliberately altered ("stockt" changed to "struck") in order to conform with the error in the assignation of the speech. It may be that the process was the other way round. The following seems to me quite possible: in the copy for Q the speech may originally have stood as in F, reading "stockt" and assigned to Lear; but the "stockt" may have been badly written; it may have looked like "strake", suggesting "struck"; and some correcting
hand may therefore have changed the assignation to Gon-
eril.

It is quite possible to suppose that "stockt", in longhand, was misread as "struke". Misreading of "c" as "r" is found elsewhere in Q -- cf. III iv 6, where Q uncorr. has "crulentious", a misreading of "contentious" (F)\(^1\). There are examples of "e" misread as "t": cf. III iv 115, where Q uncorr. has "harte", Q corr. "hare" (the compositor misread "hare" as "hart" and set up "harte"), and IV ii 56, where Q uncorr. has "noystles", Q corr. "noyseles". Examples of "t" misread as "e" occur elsewhere: e.g. Hamlet, III ii 310, where Q2 has "stare" for "start", and Othello, I i 48, where Q1 has "houghhe" for "hought". Misreading of "c" as "u" is also possible: at I ii 129-30, where F reads "my Cue", Q has "mine", which does not make sense: this reading "mine" may well be the result of the Q compos-itor having misread "my cu" as "myne" (cf. III iv 119, Q uncorr. "thu", Q corr. "the"): and if "c" could be misread as "n" it could also be misread as "u", since "n" and "u" are frequently confused.

I think it can be said that the responsibility for the Q reading "struck", with which we are concerned here, need not be attributed to a stenographer.

\(^1\) Q corr. has "tempestious", which is a conjecture by the press reader: see Greg, Variants, p. 164.
16. Q russel F ruffle

Stenographically: Q —— (rusl)

F —— (ruff)

It is eminently possible that, desiring to indicate "ruffle", the alleged stenographer failed to show the horizontal stroke of the "f" (₁), which would therefore appear as "s" (₀). But, as in no. 14, we have to reckon with the probability of the Q compositor having misread "f" in longhand as the long "s".

17. Q their F then

Stenographically: Q —· (ther)

F —·

The stenographer may have carelessly made his "n" stroke horizontal. But a misreading of longhand is possible here too -- "then" misread as "ther". For "n" misread as "r" cf. IV ii 21, where Q uncorr. has "coward" and Q corr. "command".

18. Q iustly F Iustice

Stenographically: Q ——(k)

F ——(k)

Few editors adopt F here. If Q is right, then of course this variant has no place here. But I believe that F may be defended, and I adopt it in my own text. If Q is wrong, the error might be attributed to the use of Stenographic. Willis directs that the suffix "-lie" shall be expressed by its last letter -- presumably by a dot in the "i" metaphthong position ("-lie" = "-ly", and the
vowel "y" is expressed as "i"). Now the stenographer, wishing to indicate "Iustice", may have made his soft "c" symbol ( \( \tilde{c} \) ) so small that it appeared to the decipherer to be a dot. But it is just as likely that "iustly" is a substitution by the actor for "Iustice".

19. Q town F Tower

Stenographically: Q \( \tilde{c} \) (ton)
F \( \tilde{c} \) (tor)

The alleged stenographer may have made the same mistake as in no. 17, but the other way round. He may have slanted his "r" symbol downwards. But again a misreading of longhand is possible. For "r" misread as "n" cf. I iv 260, where Q has "and" and F "are" (Q makes nonsense).

20. Q festuant F festuate (error for festinate)

Stenographically: Q \( \tilde{c} \)
F \( \tilde{c} \) (festinat)

The stenographer may have decided to express "festinate" as a defective -- "festat", i.e. \( \tilde{c} \). Now if he made the right arm of his \( \tilde{c} \) too long, his \( \tilde{c} \) would indicate "ant": and if he made the whole \( \tilde{c} \) group too small, and made it appear to stand in the "u" metapthong position of the preceding great character, the result would be "festuant": \( \tilde{c} \). But Q's "festuant" may equally well be a misreading of a longhand "festinat": with an extra minim stroke, "ina" could easily be misread "uan".
21. Q Edgar F Edmond

Stenographically: Q (Edg) \(\langle + \gamma + \cup \rangle\)

\(\langle \rangle\)

F (Edm) \(\langle + \gamma + \cup \rangle\)

(both as defectives)

Indicating the F name as a defective the stenographer may have made his "m" (\(\cup\)) look angular. But the Q reading can be equally well explained as a slip on the part of a scribe or the compositor -- it may be a wrong expansion of a longhand "Ed." contraction.

22. Q Conspicuate F Conspirant

Stenographically: Q \(\overline{\gamma}\)

\(\gamma\)

F \(\overline{\gamma}\)

\(\gamma\)

It is possible that a stenographer, attempting to convey the F word, made three mistakes: (i) accidentally made a mark at the left end of the "r" in the "i" metathong position about the first great character, so that it looked like a hard "c" (\(-\) as \(-\), i.e. \(-\)), (ii) made the right arm of the "an" (\(\wedge\)) the same length as the left one, so that it looked like simple "a" (\(\wedge\)); and (iii) made the "ant", thus wrongly formed, so small that it looked like a disjunct metathong in the "u" position about the preceding great character. That is, the stenographer may have written \(\overline{\gamma}\), which gives "conspicuate". But the word "conspirant", badly written in longhand, might well be misread as "conspicuat": for "r" misread as "c" of. III ii 49 where Q has "force"; F "feare"; and "an" may easily be misread as "ua".
23. Q truth  F right, 'tis true

Stenographically:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is possible that, trying to convey the F text here, the stenographer failed to get down the words "'tis true". He may have managed only — ( = "right"). And in his haste he may carelessly have reversed the sizes of the characters, making the c appear to be the great character and the—a small character in the apthong position. This would give the decipherer only "tr"; and he might infer "truth", represented defectively.

On the other hand it is at least equally probable that the actor's memory failed, and that he paraphrased the correct version (see p. 54).

These are the only variants that I can find between Q and F where the Q reading can be explained as due to one or the other or both of the two types of stenographic error which we discussed before giving the list, viz. errors of size and errors of angle. Had Stenographie been used to transmit the play from performance I should, I think, have expected more errors of these types. And there is not one Q reading in the list for which an explanation is not forthcoming other than the stenographic one.

Let us now turn to another type of error likely to be produced by the use of Willis's Stenographie. We have seen that Willis includes in his system various methods of
representing words by "defective notes". Among these methods is the indication of a word by its first letter only. A stenographer, to avail himself fully of this method (which would be very helpful in the matter of speed), must have five lists of words indicated by the initial letters in stenographic symbols, roman small letters, roman capital letters, secretary small letters, and secretary capital letters respectively. Now if he knows his five lists thoroughly, keeps to them unfailingy, and deciphers his own notes (or furnishes the decipherer with his lists), all will be well: but if in his haste he carelessly writes -- for example -- a small roman letter instead of a small secretary one he may indicate a word totally different from the one he intends to indicate. If Q Lear contained a large number of words entirely unrelated to the corresponding words in F except that they began with the same letters as these, and if no other reasonable explanation for them were discoverable, then the theory of the stenographic transmission of the Q text would receive very strong support. Now among the variants between Q and F Lear there is a considerable number where the two readings consist of entirely different words beginning with the same letter: but in every case an alternative explanation is possible.

I propose to give a list of all the variants consisting of different words beginning with the same letter. These will be arranged in categories according to the nature of the alternative explanation. It will be understood that I do not include different forms of the same
word -- e.g. "kingdomes" and "Kingdome", "thy" and "thine", "came" and "comes", and so on: for of course no stenographer in his senses would indicate -- for example -- "kingdom" by a small roman "k" and "kingdoms" by a small secretary "k"! What we are concerned with here are quite distinct words beginning with the same letter.

(1) Q readings explicable as misreadings of the corresponding F words in longhand.

Many of the graphic errors suggested below are corroborated by variants between uncorrected and corrected formes of Q itself. The reader is referred to Dr Greg's Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'. Among the types of longhand graphic confusion attested by Q in this way are the following:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a/e</td>
<td>II ii 138</td>
<td>uncorr. belest</td>
<td>corr. basest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II ii 138</td>
<td>uncorr. contaned</td>
<td>corr. temnest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V iii 47</td>
<td>uncorr. saue</td>
<td>corr. send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a/o</td>
<td>I iv 151</td>
<td>uncorr. lodes</td>
<td>corr. Ladies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II i 123</td>
<td>uncorr. hand</td>
<td>corr. home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II iii 17</td>
<td>uncorr. frame</td>
<td>corr. from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III iv 119</td>
<td>uncorr. more</td>
<td>corr. mare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e/i</td>
<td>II ii 129</td>
<td>uncorr. set</td>
<td>corr. sit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II iv 126</td>
<td>uncorr. diuorse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e/o</td>
<td>III iv 127</td>
<td>uncorr. wort</td>
<td>corr. newt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV ii 68</td>
<td>uncorr. now</td>
<td>corr. mew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e/u</td>
<td>III iv 119</td>
<td>uncorr. thu</td>
<td>corr. the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a/n</td>
<td>III iv 107</td>
<td>uncorr. leadings</td>
<td>corr. lendings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e/d</td>
<td>III iv 127</td>
<td>uncorr. pold</td>
<td>corr. pole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V iii 47</td>
<td>uncorr. saue</td>
<td>corr. send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The list of Q/F variants with which we are concerned now follows. Literal confusions of the above types are referred to without further examples. In connection with literal confusions of other types, corroborat-
Live examples are in some cases furnished from other plays: as regards these, I am indebted to Professor Dover Wilson, who has allowed me to consult an unpublished collection of misreadings compiled by him.

One further preliminary word: in dealing with a reported text it is sometimes impossible to say whether a given word is a misreading of the authentic word or an actor's substitution for it -- either explanation is sometimes possible. I readily admit that some of the Q words given below as misreadings may be actors' substitutions. It may be recalled that the heading on p. 165 was "Q readings explicable as misreadings of the corresponding F words in longhand". In some cases a Q word is very much less likely to be an actor's substitution than a misreading, because it does not make any kind of sense in the context. In other cases, in which both Q and F readings make good sense, we cannot be sure whether we have to do with misreadings or actors' substitutions. All I claim is that the following Q words may very well be due to misreading of longhand.

I i 37 Q first F fast We have seen above that the Q composer on occasion confused "r" with "o" and "n", and also "a" with "o" and "n". Presumably therefore he may have confused "r" with "a". He may have misread "fast" as "frst" and expanded this to "first"; or the "a" may actually have appeared to him to be "ir".

I i 58 Q friend F found r/o, e/u: "found" may have been misread as "frend".

I i 162 Q the F thy For e/y misreadings see Dover Wilson, Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet', vol. I, p. 112. The same variant, Q "the", F "thy", occurs at II ii 22,
II iv 167, IV vi 139, V i 50: and at V iii 160 we have Q "th'\", F "the".

I i 219 Q you F your u/r: "yor" may have been misread as "you". The same error appears in Q at II iv 168 and III ii 71.

I ii 39 Q your liking F your ore-looking. The copy for Q may have had "yor or loking". The compositor's eye may have skipped over the second "or", or he may have thought it an error in the copy. The "o" in "loking" may have been blind so that it looked like "i". (On the other hand the Q reading may well be an actor's substitution.)

I ii 119 Q spirituall F Sphericall i/e, t/o. The compositor may have read "sphericall" as "spirituall" and conjectured "spirituall". Or there may have been too many strokes, so that he thought he saw a "u" before the "a", and, reading "sphericall", conjectured "spirituall". In either case the suggestion is that he decided to ignore the "h". Conceivably the "h" was so cramped and badly formed that he could make nothing of it. We may compare II ii 162, where Q corr. has "most". The compositor originally set up (Q uncorr.) "not", misreading "m" as "n". Either he thought he saw "most" and emended to "not", or the "s" was so difficult to make out that it baffled him.

I ii 129-30 Q mine F my Cue The copy for Q may have had "my cu". The compositor may have misread the "u" as an "e" -- he misread an "e" as a "u" at III iv 119 (uncorr. "thu", corr. "the"). He may also have misread the "c" as an "n". In Hamlet at II ii 329 Q2 has "black" for "Blank", and at III ii 2 it has "pronoun'd" for "pronoun'd". The spelling "blacks" for "blanks" is found in Q1 Sonnets, 77, 10. It may be suggested that in these cases we have to do only with the accidental omission of a single letter -- that in Hamlet the copy for Q2 had "blanck" at II ii 329 and "pronoun'd" at III ii 2, and that the compositor accidentally omitted in the first case
"n" and in the second "c". But we have to reckon with the form "blacks" in Sonnet 77 -- a remarkable coincidence with Hamlet II ii 329 if both are cases of the accidental omission of a single letter. I imagine that the copy for Q2 Hamlet had the spellings "blank" and "prononce'd", and that in the first case the "n" was misread as "c" and in the second the "no" as "un". As regards Q Lear, if the copy had "my cu" at I ii 129-30 the compositor could, I think, have misread it as "myne" and set up "mine".

I ii 130 Q them F Tom e/o. The compositor, reading "tem", may have introduced the "h" on his own responsibility. Or the copy may have had "thom".

I iv 105 Q any F all my At I iv 255 Q has "any", F "my". This is presumably a misreading: if the "m" had one stroke too many in the copy for Q it might be taken by the compositor for "an". As regards I iv 105, it is possible that in the copy for Q "all" was missing (or the compositor may have omitted it); and it is possible that Q's "any" is a misreading of "my".

I iv 112 Q gull F gall u/a confusion is very probable. We have already noted the occurrence in Q of u/n and a/n confusion: so presumably "u" and "a" were liable to look like each other in the copy.

I iv 212 Q beit F by it e/y. See remarks on I i 162 on p. 167.

I iv 243 Q thou F then o/e, u/n.

I iv 254 Q We F Woe o/e. The Q compositor may have misread "woe" as "wee" and set up "We".

I iv 260 Q and F are n/r, d/e.

I iv 280 Q thourt disuetur'd F thwart disnatur'd The Q words must surely be a misreading of "thuart disnatur'd" -- the graphic outline is very similar. In the first word the "u" in the copy was presumably closed or nearly closed at the top so that it looked like an "o": and for "a" misread as "u" see I iv 112 above. As regards the second word: for evidence of "n" misread as "u" and "a" misread as "e" see pp. 165-6. The non-existent "dis-
ueur'd" cannot of course have appeared in any stenographer's lists of defectives.

I iv 337 Q now F no, no, The copy for Q may have had "no no". The second "no" may have looked like a "w".

I v 16 Q con F can o/a.

II i 29 Q crauing F cunning r/u, a/n, u/n.

II i 31 Q here F hoa e/o. On r/a see remarks on I i 37 on p. 167. The Q compositor may have read "hoa" as "her" and set up "here".

II i 76 Q Strong F strange o/a. The Q compositor may have read "strange" as "stronge" and set up "Strong".

II i 118 Q threatning F threading The copy for Q may have had "threading". The first "d" may have been misread as "t"; on p. 166 we saw that in the copy "e" was liable to be misread as "t", and on p. 165 we saw that "d" and "e" were liable to be confused. The second "d" may have been misread as "n": "n" is found instead of "d" in Othello I i 173 Q1 "manhood" for "maidhood", Romeo and Juliet I iv 66 Q2 "man" for "maid", Q Lear II iv 208 "bloud in" (F "bloodied"), II iv 260 "deed" (F "need"), V i 63 "countenance" (F "countenance"). Our hypothesized "threading" must have been very carelessly written if one "d" looked like a "t" and the other like an "n".

(The copy for Q may have had "threading": the compositor may have misread this as "threatning", and set up "threatening".) Speaking of the variant Q uncrr. "vntender", Q corr. and F "vntented" (I iv 297) Greg says (Variants, p. 153) "The compositor was apparently guessing at the words in a difficult and obscure passage". Perhaps "threatning" is just a guess.

II ii 71 Q Bring F Being r/e.

II ii 74 Q dayes F dogges a/o. For the confusion of "y" and "e" cf. Troilus and Cressida, in which Q1 has at V i 67 "day" for "dog" and at III ii 167 "age" for "aye".
II ii 151 Q ont F out n/u.
II iii 10 Q else F elfe s/f.
II iv 1 Q hence F home e/o. "No" for "m" is a possible minim-misreading.
II iv 7 Q heeles F heads The Q compositor may have misread "heads" as "heels" and set up "heeles". a/e. For d/l cf. Hamlet I ii 256 Q2 "fonde" for "foule", I iii 131 Q2 "beguile" for "beguile"; 2 Henry IV II iv 21 Q1 "oil" for "old"; Love's Labour's Lost V ii 80 Q1 "stable" for "stabde" (i.e. "stabbed"); Romeo and Juliet III i 17 Q2 "aged" for "agil" (i.e. "agile").
II iv 111 Q Ile F Il'd e/d.
II iv 132 Q depriued F depra'ud This variant should not really be included here. The Q reading given is that of the corrected forme. The uncorrected forme has "deptoued", which suggests that the copy had "depraued" and that "depriued" may contain "a literal error due to the printer" (Greg, Variants, p. 163).
II iv 167 Q hested F hefted s/f.
II iv 210 Q bag F beg a/e.
II iv 281 Q flowes F flawses o/a.

II iv 297 Q russel F ruffle s/f.

III i 55 Q hollow F Holla o/a. The copy for Q may have had "holla": the compositor may have misread this as "hollo" and added a "w" through the influence of the adjective "hollow". (Alternatively the Q reading may be an error of hearing.)

III ii 49 Q force F feare o/e. I suggest that we can also postulate (i) an r/a misreading -- the uncorrected and corrected formes of Q attest r/e, r/o, r/n and a/e, a/o, a/n; cf. also Troilus and Cressida IV v 178, where in Q1 "oath" appears as "earth" (presumably the compositor read "oath" as "erth"); (ii) a c/r misreading -- cf. Troilus V ii 118, where "co-act" appears in Q1 as "court".

III ii 60 Q their F then r/n. The compositor doubtless misread "then" as "ther".

III iv 55 Q blesse F Blisse e/i. So also in III iv 57, Q "blesse", F "blisse".

III iv 137 Q snulbug F Smulkin n/m, b/k. Presumably there was minimal confusion at the end of the word in the copy for Q: and if the "g" is not a pure guess by the compositor there must have been an accidental mark which looked to him like a tail. In any case this variant is not proper to our list, since it is quite certain that no stenographer could have included "Smulkin", far less "snulbug", in his lists of words to be represented by defective!

III iv 179 Q towne F Tower n/r. The copy for Q probably had "towre".

III vi 93 Q uncorr. Take vp to keepe} F Take vp, take vp,. The Q corr. Take vp the King copy for Q probably had "Take vp take vp". The Q uncorr. version is probably a misreading of this, and the version of Q corr. a conjecture of the press reader. See Greg, Variants, p. 167.
III vii 9 Q festuant F festinate (for festinate) With an extra minim stroke "ina" could easily be misread "uan". The copy for Q probably had "festinat". This is another case which is not proper to this list, for quite certainly the non-existent "festuant" could not have appeared in any stenographer's lists of words to be represented by defectives.

IV i 4 Q experience F esperance The copy for Q may have had "esperance". The Q compositor may have read this correctly: he may not have been familiar with the word, and he may have thought that "experience" was meant. Alternatively, the copy may have had "esperence", or the "e" of "esperance" may have looked like an "e" (see p. 165), and there may have been an extra stroke between the "r" and the "e" or "a", so that the compositor thought he saw "esperence" and decided that "experience" was meant.

IV i 42 Q here F hence The Q compositor may have misread "hence" as "heere". We have claimed a c/r graphic confusion already in connection with III ii 49: and as for e/n, cf. II iii 16, where Q uncorr. has "Pies" and Q corr. "Pins".

IV i 51 Q dance F daub u/n. A badly written "b" might perhaps be taken as a long "s" plus "e": the Q compositor may have misread "daub" as "dans" and set up "dance".

IV i 67 Q stands F slaues t/l, n/u, d/e.

IV i 69 Q vnder F vndoo e/o. The "r" in the Q word might be a misreading of "o" or of "e" (see p. 166).

IV ii 52 Q deseruing F discerning e/i, u/n. "Discerning" may have been written "diserning" in the copy for Q.

IV ii 73 Q thrald F thrill'd In the copy for Q "il" may have looked something like an open "a". Alternatively, the copy may have had "thril" with an extra minim stroke between the "r" and the "l" so that the compositor thought he saw an open "a".

IV ii 87 Q tooke F tart o/a, o/r, k/t.
It is possible that, thinking that the copy read "importand", the Q compositor emended this to "important" on his own responsibility. But he may even have thought that the copy read "important". On p. 166 we saw that in the copy "e" was liable to be misread as "t"; and on p. 165 we saw that "d" and "e" were liable to be confused; so it is possible that on this occasion "d" was misread as "t".

The copy for Q may have had "begger".

The Q compositor may have misread "them" as "ther". Or the "m" may have looked like "ir".

It is possible that in the copy for Q the "p" looked as if it had no tail. Cf. I ii 21 where Q has "tooth!" and F "to' th!": Edwards emended to "top the". Cf. also I ii 129 where Q has "out" and F "Pat"; "out" might be a misreading of "pat" if the tail of the "p" were obscured. Alternatively, at IV vi 129 the copy for Q may have had "consumtion": there may have been too many minim strokes, and so the "um" may have looked like "uma" ("um" plus open "a").

The copy for Q may have had "shooe".

The press reader was clearly baffled. This variant does not concern us here: cf. our final remarks on III iv 137 on p. 172.
V i 31 Q to F the o/e. The compositor may have simply neglected the "h", or he may not have been able to make it out.

V i 52 Q Hard F Heere a/e, d/e. The copy for Q may have had "Here".

V iii 44 Q then F them n/m.

V iii 66 Q imediate F immediacie t/c. The copy for Q may have had "imediate", and the third "i" may have been crowded out of sight.

V iii 124 Q are F am r/m.

V iii 136 Q Conspicuate F Conspirant c/r (see III ii 49 and IV i 42 above), u/a (see I iv 112 above), a/n. Of course the non-existent "Conspicuate" could not have appeared in any stenographer's lists of defectives.

V iii 140 Q As F are Final-s/r misreadings are found elsewhere: cf. Love's Labour's Lost III i 182 where Q1 has "Junios" for "junior"; and Hamlet V ii 45 where Q2 has "as sir" for the F "Assis" (modern reading "'ast'es'"). The copy for Q Lear may have had "ar" in V iii 140.

V iii 146 Q right F rule l/t. The copy for Q may have had "rule", and the two minims of the "u" may have been crowded together so that the letter looked like an "i". The compositor may have read "rite" and set up "right".

V iii 186 Q with F we t/e. The Q compositor may have misread "we" as "wt" and taken this as an abbreviation of "with".

V iii 193 Q Father F fault. The copy for Q may have had "falt". We have already had examples in Q of "1" misread as "t"; and "t" is liable to be confused with "r" -- cf. II iv 132, Q uncorr. "deptoued", Q corr. "deprued", copy "deprued"; and III iv 14, Q uncorr. "beares", Q corr. "beates". Thus at V iii 193 the Q compositor may have misread "falt" as "fatz" which he would naturally take as a contraction of "father".
V iii 270 Q your F you r/u. The copy for Q may have had "you", and the compositor may have misread this as "yor" and set up "your". Cf. IV ii 79, Q uncorr. "your", Q corr. "you".

V iii 270 Q murderous F Murderors r/u.

V iii 292 Q foredoome F fore-done m/n. The copy for Q probably had "foredoone".

V iii 294 Q sees F saies e/a, e/i. The copy for Q may have had "sais".

(2) Other errors in Q which may be attributed to the compositor.

(i) Cases of omission of the final letter(s) of a word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I i 58</td>
<td>a as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ii 15</td>
<td>the then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(The Q compositor may have carelessly omitted a stroke over the &quot;e&quot;, or this may have been omitted in the copy.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ii 76</td>
<td>I Ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II iv 33</td>
<td>men meiney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(The Q word might alternatively be a substitution by the actor. If the compositor is to blame, he may have deliberately substituted &quot;men&quot;, not knowing the word &quot;meiney&quot;.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III vi 22</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Passage omitted in F: Q2 now)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV vi 107</td>
<td>euer every</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(In this and the next case but one, the Q compositor may have taken the final &quot;y&quot; for an &quot;e&quot; and deliberately omitted it.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV vi 170</td>
<td>no Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV vi 210</td>
<td>speed speedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V i 9</td>
<td>I In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Cases of omission of a single letter not final.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I i 168</td>
<td>straied strain'd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A compositor may easily omit a single letter accidentally. Alternative explanations are however possible in connection with both of these Q readings. In the first case we may have to do with memorial corruption: at I i 268 Lear says to France, "I would not from your loue make such a stray..." ("stray" occurs here in both texts). Or we may conceivably have to do with straightforward misreading: the copy for Q may have had "straind", and the compositor may have taken the "n" for an "e" (he took an "e" for a "u" at III iv 119 -- Q uncorr. "thu", Q corr. "the"). As regards the second case, the copy for Q may have read "may", but with too few minim strokes so that the "ma" looked like a simple "m".

(iii) Possible cases of misunderstanding of longhand abbreviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I iv 224</td>
<td>weaknes</td>
<td>weakens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is probably not a case of the accidental inversion of "e" and "n" by the Q compositor, for Q punctuates "either his notion, weaknes, or his discernings are lethargie,...". The punctuation suggests that "weaknes" was definitely intended (though the passage is nonsensical in Q). The person who wrote out the copy for Q may have accidentally inverted the two letters, and either he -- looking over his work -- or the Q compositor may then have put in the punctuation which appears in Q. Alternatively, it is possible that "weaknes" is just a slip by the actor. Yet again, it is conceivable that the copy for Q had "weakns" (for "weakens") and that the person who wrote out the copy -- subsequently looking over his work -- or the Q compositor took it that "weaknes" was meant and supplied the punctuation which we have in Q.

IV ii 15  Edgar  Edmond
The copy for Q may have had "Ed".

IV v 4  Lady  Lord
The copy for Q may have had "L".

IV vi initial S.D.  Edmund  Edgar
The copy for Q may have had "Ed".

In connection with the second and fourth of these
variants, it may be allowed that as he carried a
group of words in his head the Q compositor might
substitute Edmund's name for Edgar's and vice
versa even though the correct name was written
in full in the copy.

(iv) Possible cases of corruption in Q through the
influence of neighbouring words.

As will be pointed out, some of the following Q
words may alternatively be misreadings by the
compositor. And in some cases, if corruption
through the influence of neighbouring words is
granted, the actor might be responsible.

I i 145 Q man F mad  Cf. "vnmannerly" in line 144
and "man" at the end of line
145.
Alternatively, Q's "man" may
be a straightforward misread-
ing of "mad": "n" is found
for "d" elsewhere -- Troilus
and Cressida II iii 260 Q1
"boord" for "bourn", Othello
I i 173 Q1 "manhood" for
"maidhood" ("man" appears for
"maid" in Romeo and Juliet Q2
I iv 66), and Lear itself, Q
II iv 208 "bloud in" for
F "bloodied", II iv 260 "deed"
for F "need", V i 63 "counten-
adce" for F "countenance".

I i 277 Q worth F want  Cf. the previous word but one
in both texts -- "worth".
Either the actor or the com-
positor might be responsible.

I ii 130 Q sith F sighe  Cf. the previous word but one
-- "with".

II ii 88 Q That F Then  Cf. "that" later in the same
line.

III iii 24 Q then F The  Cf. the previous word but one
(Q "Then", F "then"), and the
next word but two ("when" in
both texts).

III vii 61 Q heard F howl'd  Cf. "dearne" (Q) later in
the same line (F "sterne").
Alternatively, it is possible
that Q's "heard" is a misread-
ing of "hould". There are
plenty of examples in Q of "o"
misread as "a" -- e.g. II iv
54 "Historica" for "Histerica",
IV ii 65 "dislecate" for "dis-
locate". For confusion between "u" and "a" see the remarks on I iv 112 on p. 169. As for the possibility of "l" being misread as "r", we have evidence on p. 166 of "l" being misread as "t", and we have evidence at II iv 132 of "r" being misread as "t" (Q uncorr. "deptroued" for "depraued"): presumably therefore in the copy for Q "l" and "r" were liable to look rather like each other.

IV i 73 Q firmly F fearfully Cf. "brimme" in the next line. It is possible that the copy for Q read "fearfully", that the compositor's eye caught "brimme" too soon, and that under the influence of "brimme" he changed "fearfully" to "firmly" as he was carrying line 73 in his head. Or the copy for Q may have had "firmly", the actor having changed "fearfully" to "firmly" owing to the influence of "brimme". Alternatively, it is not inconceivable that Q's "firmly" belongs to category (v) to which we are just about to pass. The copy for Q may have had "fearfully", very badly written indeed. The compositor may have misread the first five letters as "firms" (e/i, r/m: for "a" misread as "r" cf. the remarks on I i 37 on p. 167). He may have been able to read the suffix "ly" correctly, but the "ful" may have been totally illegible. Since what he had managed to read, or misread, viz. "firmes" plus "ly", gave him a word, he may have decided to be content with that.

IV vi 122 Q to F the (The word before Q "fichew", F "Fitchew"). Cf. the next word but six -- Q "toot", F "too't". The Q compositor, carrying a group of words in his head, may have anticipated the "to" in "toot". On the other hand it should be noted that five words earlier than the variant we are considering F has "to" which Q omits: so perhaps we have to do with the result
of some other kind of printing-house accident. Alternatively, it is possible that Q's "to" in IV vi 122 is a misreading -- e/o -- with the "n" illegible in the copy or simply neglected by the compositor.

(v) Cases in which the Q compositor may have made out only part of a word.

I i 180 Q Friendship F Freedome The Q compositor may have misread "frend" as "freed" (for confusion between "e" and "n" cf. II iii 16 Q uncorr. "Fies", Q corr. "Fins", and Love's Labour's Lost IV ii 103 Q1 "Vnde" for "Vede"). He may have been quite unable to make out the "ome". He may have guessed "friendship" and set up "Friendship".

Or is the actor to blame? Did he anticipate I ii 103 -- "friendship falls off"?

I iv 296 Q worst F worth Q has "that these hot teares that breake from me perforce should make the worst blasts and fogs vpon the vntented (uncorr. vntender) etc.". F has "That these hot teares which breake from me perforce should make thee worth them. Blastes and Fogges vpon thee: Th\'vntented etc.". I think it not unlikely that the Q compositor had difficulty with this passage, that as regards "worth" he could make out only the first three letters, and that he guessed "worst", having taken the immediately preceding "the" (= "thee") as the definite article.

Alternatively, it seems to me possible that we have to do with memorial corruption by the actor. At IV i 8-9 we have (F only) "The Wretch that thou hast blowne vnto the worst, / Owes nothing to thy blasts (the underlining is mine). This occurs in a short passage omitted from Q, probably owing to defective memory (see p. 47). It sometimes happens in a reported text that words are anticipated from a pas-
sage which is omitted from its proper place.

II ii 103 Q dialogue F dialect The copy for Q may have had "dialect". The compositor may have been able to make out the first four letters correctly, but he may have misread the "e" as "o" (see p. 165). The "ct" may have been totally illegible, and he may have guessed "dialogue". Or he may have misread the "t" as "e" (for confusion of "t" and "e" see p. 166); he may not have been able to make out the "c" at all, and having got "dialo" plus something unknown plus "e" he may have guessed "dialogue". Alternatively, "dialogue" may be an actor's substitution.

III ii 58 Q centers F Continents The copy for Q may have had "continents". The compositor may have managed to deal only with the "contin" and the final "s". He may have misread the "o" as "e", the "i" as "e", and the "n" as "r". In this way he would get "center" plus something unknown plus "s". Since "centers" is a word he may have decided to be content with that and not to bother about the illegible letters.

IV vi 57 Q sommons F Somnet

If the above five Q readings were due to erroneous representation by defectives in stenographic notes it would be curious that they all have so many letters in common with the genuine (F) readings.

(vi) Miscellaneous.

IV iv 2 Q vent F vext The Q reading does not make sense and it is not likely to be an actor's or compositor's substitution -- there seems absolutely no reason why either actor or compositor should think of the word "vent" at this point. A misreading of "x" as "n" hardly seems likely. We may have to do with foul case.
IV vi 253 Q sorrow F sorry  "Sorrow" does not make sense. It is interesting to refer here to II ii 155, where Q uncorr. has "say", Q corr. and F "saw". In his note in Variants, pp. 159-60 Greg points out that "the word say, with the same sense as saw (i.e. saying), had a restricted currency in the first half of the seventeenth century"; he thinks it possible, therefore, that Q uncorr. "may preserve Shakespeare's own reading which was independently normalized by the corrector and by the prompter or folio editor". He says, "One does not quite see why the compositor should have printed a 'y' for a 'w'". It is admittedly not what one would expect as a misreading; yet here in IV vi 253 we have an absurdly ungrammatical "sorrow" for "sorry". Had a stenographer indicated "sorrow" instead of "sorry" we should surely expect that in the process of deciphering the grammar would have been set right. Can it be that in the copy for Q Lear "y" and "w" were liable to look somewhat similar, and that at II ii 155 the compositor read a "w" as a "y" and at IV vi 253 a "y" as a "w"? It may be pointed out that at III ii 73 we have between Q and F essentially the same variant as at IV vi 253 -- Q "That sorrows", F "That's sorry"; and at IV vi 178 we have the variant Q "wayl", F "wawle". Admittedly in both these last-mentioned cases the Q readings might well be actors' substitutions. Still, it is odd that we have no less than four variants between Q and F involving "y" versus "w". If "sorrow" in Q IV vi 253 is not a misreading it must, I think, be regarded as a compositorial aberration.

(3) Cases in which the Q reading is, certainly or probably, a memorial corruption (anticipation or recollection).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>See page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I i 39</td>
<td>Confirming</td>
<td>Conferring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I i 81</td>
<td>confirm'd</td>
<td>conferr'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I i 173</td>
<td>diseases</td>
<td>disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I i 238</td>
<td>respects</td>
<td>regards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i 4</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i 61</td>
<td>caytife</td>
<td>Coward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i 72</td>
<td>pretence</td>
<td>practise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II ii 112</td>
<td>conjunct</td>
<td>compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II iv 5</td>
<td>How</td>
<td>Ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II iv 43</td>
<td>This</td>
<td>The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II iv 85</td>
<td>traueled hard to haue trauail'd all the</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II iv 135</td>
<td>slacke</td>
<td>scant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II iv 153</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Neuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II iv 163</td>
<td>blast</td>
<td>blister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III iv 108</td>
<td>this is</td>
<td>'tis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III vii 60</td>
<td>rage</td>
<td>raine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV vi 160</td>
<td>thy bloud</td>
<td>thou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV vii 79</td>
<td>cured</td>
<td>kill'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V iii 69</td>
<td>advauement</td>
<td>addition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Cases in which the Q reading may be explained as a substitution by the actor for the correct (F) reading.

Alternatively, the compositor may, while carrying groups of words in his head, have made some of the Q substitutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I i 63</td>
<td>shady</td>
<td>shadowie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I i 92</td>
<td>nor</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I i 134</td>
<td>still</td>
<td>shall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I i 138</td>
<td>betwixt</td>
<td>betweene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I i 169</td>
<td>betweene</td>
<td>betwixt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I i 179</td>
<td>since</td>
<td>sith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I i 227</td>
<td>vnchaste</td>
<td>vnchaste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I i 240</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I i 278</td>
<td>pleated</td>
<td>plighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I i 293</td>
<td>ingrafted</td>
<td>ingraffed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I iii 15</td>
<td>dislike</td>
<td>distaste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I iv 68</td>
<td>purport</td>
<td>purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I iv 193</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>nor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I iv 217</td>
<td>transforme</td>
<td>transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I iv 242</td>
<td>great</td>
<td>grac'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I iv 272</td>
<td>harke</td>
<td>Heare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I iv 331</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I v 11</td>
<td>nere</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i 7</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i 16</td>
<td>aske</td>
<td>act (see pp. 152-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i 45</td>
<td>their</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i 51</td>
<td>lancht</td>
<td>latcht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i 106</td>
<td>betray</td>
<td>bewray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II ii 1</td>
<td>deuen (uncorr.)</td>
<td>dawning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>even (corr.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>copy dauen</td>
<td>(i.e. dawn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II ii 1</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II ii 68</td>
<td>those</td>
<td>the holy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II ii 71</td>
<td>their</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II ii 100</td>
<td>graund</td>
<td>great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II ii 125</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>shall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II iv 24</td>
<td>may' st</td>
<td>might' st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II iv 59</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II iv 281</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III i 1</td>
<td>Whats</td>
<td>Who's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III ii 7  smite</td>
<td>Strike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III ii 16  taske</td>
<td>taxe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III ii 50  Powther</td>
<td>pudder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III ii 73  That sorrowes</td>
<td>That's sorry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III iii 8  betwixt</td>
<td>betweene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III iv 53  pottage</td>
<td>Porridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III iv 78  iustly</td>
<td>Iustice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III vi 72  doodla</td>
<td>de de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III vi 76  this hardnes</td>
<td>these hard-hearts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV i 45  Who</td>
<td>Which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV ii 10  desire</td>
<td>dislike (see Notes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV vi 135  should</td>
<td>Shall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV vi 138  that</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV vi 148  the</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV vi 178  wayl</td>
<td>wawle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV vi 239  ile</td>
<td>ice (dialectal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V iii 50  of</td>
<td>on (see Notes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V iii 138  beneath</td>
<td>below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V iii 171  vertues</td>
<td>vices (see Note on IV ii 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V iii 191  The</td>
<td>Their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V iii 224  that</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V iii 231  their</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V iii 232  Iustice1</td>
<td>judgement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This may possibly be a case of memorial corruption. At the end of the line we have the word "tremble" (both texts). Cf. III ii 51-3 where we have "Tremble" and "Iustice" (both texts).
(5) **Cases in which the Q reading may be an error of hearing.**

There are in Q some readings which look like errors of hearing. They may not all be errors of hearing -- a scribe or compositor, carrying a group of words in his head, may on occasion make a substitution such as "write" for "right" -- but some of them may be. The hypothesis which I shall finally suggest as regards the nature of the transmission of the Q text will leave room for the possibility of aural error. Meanwhile the point with which we are concerned is that for the three Q readings given below there are perfectly good explanations other than that they are the result of erroneous stenographic representation by defectives. The first Q reading given could not in any case be explained by this last-mentioned formula, since it consists of two words.

```
IV iv 27  Q    F
    in sight    incite
IV vi 104 argu    Agu
I i 109 mistresse   miseries (for miserries)
```

In the second and third cases it might be suggested that we have to do with misreading again.

(6) **There remain two miscellaneous cases to be considered.**

```
I i 225  Q    F
    may know    make knowne
II iv 184 struck    stockt
```

I suggest that in the first case the Q reading is the result of a misunderstanding on the part of someone concerned in the transmission of Q. This person presumably thought that Cordelia was addressing not Lear but the King of France. I do not think that we can comfortably attribute such an error to the actor of Cordelia's part, nor to the Q compositor. I suggest that after the copy for Q had been written out and before it was sent to the printer some editor looked through it rather hastily and made some alterations which seemed to him to be necessary. This may have been one. (This suggestion will be repeated when we come to deal with the verse line-division in Q.)

The second case is complicated by the fact that in Q the speech is assigned to Goneril and in F to Lear: in each text the assignation and the word with which we are concerned are appropriate to each other. It may be that Q's "struck" is an error consequent on the Q misassignation. Alternatively, the editor of the Q copy, whose existence we have just suggested, may have been
the culprit: looking over the copy he may have misread "stockt" as "struck", or remembering that Oswald had been struck he may have deliberately altered "stockt" to "struck": then, as a consequence in either case, he may have re-assigned the speech.

We have now surveyed all, I think, of the variants between Q and F beginning with the same letter, apart from variants consisting merely of different forms of the same word. We have found that in every case the Q reading can be explained otherwise than by the formula of erroneous indication by defectives in a stenographer's notes. Had the Q text contained a considerable number of readings, different from but beginning with the same letters as those of F, which were not attributable to actors, scribe, editor, compositor, or press-corrector, then the stenographic theory would have been strongly suggested by this test: but the matter is not so.

Another type of error which the use of Willis's Stenographie would tend to produce would be the occurrence in the reported text of words with the same consonants as those of the authentic text but with different vowels. Working at speed a stenographer might easily place a dot or an affixed or disjunct metaphthong too high or too low so that a different vowel was indicated from the one he intended to indicate. This type of stenographic error would result in the appearance of "a" for "e" or vice versa, "e" for "i" or vice versa, and "o" for "u" or vice versa. But these vowel errors are just as likely to be produced by the misreading of longhand.
Certain types of error would tend to be produced by the use of Stenographie. There are readings in Q which exemplify these types of error. In every case, however, an alternative explanation is possible (or more than one). Thus as regards these types of error there is no indication in the Q text that it was transmitted by Stenographie. I think we may go further and say that had the Q text been transmitted by Stenographie we should expect it to show at least some examples of these types of error which were not susceptible of alternative explanation.

This very important point must be re-emphasised: upholders of the stenographic theory must surely allow that other agents than the stenographer have contributed to the corruption in Q: now if we take any long stretch of text in Q and list the corruptions, and if we search for corruptions which cannot be attributed to any other agent, we find that these are non-existent. Consequently, if we are to support the stenographic theory we must be able to claim that the stenographic system used was capable of word-perfect reporting over a long stretch of a difficult dramatic text. I firmly believe that it is utterly impossible to claim this for John Willis's Stenographie.

What have shorthand specialists to say on this matter? In Chapter III of his History of Shorthand Writing (1862) Matthias Levy refers to the piracy of plays in Elizabethan and Jacobean times by shorthand. He
refers to Heywood's well-known complaint --

some by Stenography drew

The plot: put it in print: (scarce one word trew)....

Levy states that the Q1 text of Hamlet is probably a shorthand report -- it cannot be proved, he says, but it is a reasonable view. I am sure that that text is not a shorthand report: but the important point here is that this historian of shorthand, believing Q1 Hamlet to be a stenographic report, is not surprised at the poor quality of the text but is surprised that it is even as good as it is. "There is every probability," he declares, "that this 1603 edition originated with a shorthand writer; and, considering the state of the art at this period, we may well suppose that he may have been 'imperfect'." Levy goes on to say that at the time of the Shakespeare piracies "but two systems were known -- those of Bright and Willis. We exclude Bales, because we do not believe it possible to report a play or anything else by his system. And when we consider the difficulties of the two methods, we cannot wonder at the mistakes made; on the contrary, it is rather surprising to see how much could really be done with them." The writer of these words is surprised that Willis's Stenographie could produce a text such as that of Q1 Hamlet: how very much more astonishing if it were able to produce a text such as that of Q Lear, which as a whole is so very much fuller and more accurate than that of Q1 Hamlet!

In the periodical Shorthand, vol. II (1883-5), p. 175, there appears an account of a discussion fol-
ollowing a paper by Matthias Levy. The preponderating opinion was against the view that in Shakespeare's day the stenographic reporting of a play from performance was a practicable proposition. Dr Westby-Gibson gave an account of the early shorthand systems, "and showed that such systems, whether symbolical or alphabetic, could never have availed to take down the speeches of players, especially as it would have to be done at the greatest inconvenience in the theatres of old times, and in antagonism to the interests of authors and actors". Mr Pocknell was disposed "to agree with those who thought that the systems of that day were incapable of being used for the rapid utterance of actors", and he believed that "if Shorthand was used at all in connection with Shakespeare's plays it was probably in taking down the parts from the 'dictation' of the actors themselves". Levy agreed that "possibly with the Shorthands of the period the writers could not take down every word of a play, but the writers would take down a part and fill in from memory, which would be sufficient for the production of surreptitious copies". I take it that in view of this remark Levy would have claimed it possible that a text such as those of Q1 Hamlet and Q Merry Wives was a shorthand report: but surely his own words must give us to suppose that he would not have claimed the Q text of Lear as such. These men whom we have quoted were eminent specialists in stenography in their day: their judgement must surely have weight with us. In the discussion upon which we have been drawing, reference was
more than once made by speakers to the difficulties they themselves had experienced in reporting plays by the systems they themselves practised: how much greater must have been the difficulties in the early seventeenth century! One speaker, J. G. Petrie, said that his own experience had been that the noise and other inconveniences of the theatre had hindered him from taking a strictly accurate shorthand note of some of Irving's speeches at the Lyceum. So he thought it almost impossible for a shorthand writer to produce an accurate version of a Shakespeare play. Now of course the text of Lear is not "accurate": but the point about "the noise and other inconveniences of the theatre" is an important one. The noise and other inconveniences of the theatre would add to the difficulties of a stenographer attempting to report verbatim, with a primitive and clumsy shorthand system, a long and difficult play. Moreover, the alleged stenographer reporting Lear was presumably working surreptitiously: I find it impossible to believe that he could sit in the theatre in broad daylight and write assiduously during the whole time occupied by the performance without being detected. Dr Greg suggests that the performance reported may have been a court performance -- "at such a special performance a reporter, if he got in, would be more difficult to detect and also more difficult to remove -- and we know that Lear was acted at court" (Editorial Problem, p. 96). To me the idea that Lear was pirated by stenography at
a court performance is quite incredible. Shakespeare's company of actors was under the direct patronage of the King: surely no stenographer would dare to try to purloin the entire text of one of their plays within the court surrounded by powerful friends of the company, even in the presence of the King himself.

We have mentioned some objections to the theory of the stenographic transmission of Q Lear irrespective of the system postulated. In all probability the stenographer could not escape detection. There is no appreciable difference in the standard of the reporting between the earlier and later portions of the play. There is no appreciable difference of standard in the reporting of calm and impassioned speeches. We may add another point: the Q text is not characterised by persistent imperfection at the beginnings of speeches (the stenographer having had to pause to identify and note down the name of the character speaking), nor after stage directions. Apart from objections to shorthand in general, we have set out strong objections to the theory of stenographic transmission by Willis's 1602 Stenographie in particular. Even on the shorthand theory all the Q errors with which we have dealt (and these are not a few) can be referred to actors, scribe, editor, compositor, or press-reader. I can find no errors in Q not attributable to one or another of these. To maintain that the Q text was transmitted by shorthand reporting in
the theatre one must therefore be able to claim that
the system used was capable of the verbatim reporting
of a long and difficult play. But Willis's system is
very cumbersome, quite unsuitable for such a task --
Willis's own claims for it suggest this -- the evi-
dence of shorthand experts corroborates it -- the use
of the system would encourage certain types of error,
but all the Q readings which exemplify these are ex-
plicable otherwise. In short, I believe that the
theory of the transmission of Q by Willis's 1602
Stenographie must be firmly rejected.

Practically all the objections we have noted
to the theory that John Willis's original system was
used in the transmission of Q from performance apply
equally well to his revised system. Indeed the latter
is in some ways even more cumbersome than the other.

The characters in the revised system are the
same as in the original one, except that in the re-
vised system O is used for "h" instead of +, 0
for "q" instead of , and for the vowel "u" in-
stead of : + is used for the combination "cl", and
a symbol is used for the combination "st". It will
be seen, then, that all the two-stroke characters are
retained: the alphabet of the second system is no bet-
ter for rapid writing than that of the first. The
practitioner of the second system has to learn additional
characters for certain combinations of letters, e.g. $
abla = "bd", \ 3 = "bl", \ \varnothing = "ct", \ \downarrow = "dl", \ etc.$ There are thirty of these. In addition there are special signs for a few common terminations. The second system burdens the memory with more characters than the first one does.

Essentially the same method of affixed and disjunct small characters is used in the later system as in the earlier. But in the later system the method is more complicated. For affixed small characters the vowel places about the great character are the same as in the earlier system: but for tittles and disjunct small characters the places are different. For tittles the places are: $\begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \epsilon \\ \iota \\ \omicron \end{array}$ Here there is greater risk of accidentally indicating the wrong vowel than there is in the earlier system. For disjunct small characters the later system allows only three vowel-placings — above the great character for "a", to the right at the top for both "e" and "i", to the right lower down for both "o" and "u": and, for flat great characters (there is actually only one, "r"), $\begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \epsilon \\ \omicron \end{array}$. I can see no advantage in these innovations.

In the second system there is the same difficulty as in the first regarding the partial coincidence with certain great characters of certain affixed small characters: $\begin{array}{c} \mid \\ \mid + \jmath \end{array} = "dagge", \ \begin{array}{c} \mid \\ \mid + \jmath \end{array} = "rugg", \ \begin{array}{c} \mid \\ \mid + \jmath \end{array} = "side", \ \begin{array}{c} \mid \\ \mid + \jmath \end{array}; \ etc.$ It is true that Willis gives a special method of joining "r" to certain great characters, e.g. $\underline{\text{r}} = "firre",$
\[ T = "sirr", \quad \Gamma = "carre", \quad \Upsilon = "sorr", \quad \Upsilon = "pyrre"; \]

but in rapid note-taking it would be difficult to distinguish between, say, \( \Upsilon \) ("side") and \( \Upsilon \) ("sir").

We saw that in the first system some of the characters were very difficult to join together: for instance, how is one to join a small "n" to a large "n" in the "o" metaphthong position? -- it is very difficult to make one's intention clear: \( \backslash = "none" \). In his revised system Willis directs that straight-line small characters are to be joined to straight-line great characters "by a light touch of the pen", thus: \( / = "none", \quad \Upsilon = "pippe", \quad \Upsilon = "poppe", \quad \Upsilon = "fede", \quad \Upsilon = "rogue" \). The light touch of the pen is to join the small character to that part of the great character appropriate to the required vowel. But here again there is a risk of ambiguity. In one's haste one may make the light touch of the pen too heavy and too long; and \( \Upsilon \) might (especially if the small "o" were carelessly made nearly perpendicular) be interpreted as "pod"; \( \Upsilon \) as "pick"; \( \backslash \) as "node".

In his first system Willis made no difference between the shorthand representation of pairs of words such as "mad" and "made", "fan" and "fane". In his revised system he gives various methods of indicating short and long vowels. (1) For words ending in a vowel to indicate a long (double) vowel one puts two light strokes in the place of the requisite vowel: thus \( \circ \) = "læ", \( \bigcirc \) = "laa"; \( L = "frê", \quad L = "free"; \) etc..
(2) For words ending in "ay", "ey", "oy": one puts the symbol for "y" in the appropriate vowel position: thus
\[ \text{\( \cdot \text{ }\)} = "mä", \text{\( \cup \)} = "may"; \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "kë", \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "key";
etc.. (3) For words ending in "aw", "ew", "ow": one puts the symbol for "w" in the appropriate vowel position: thus \[ \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "cō", \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "cow"; \text{\( \cdot \)} = "në", \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "new"; etc.. (4) For words containing a long medial vowel: one distinguishes the long vowel by a dot under the great character: thus \[ \text{\( \cup \)} = "madde", \text{\( \cup \)} = "made"; \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "fanne", \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "fan"; etc.. (5) For words containing medial doubled vowels or medial diphthongs ending in "y" or "w" ("u"): one writes the symbol for the following consonant in the vowel-position of the first vowel or the first element of the diphthong, and under the great character one indicates the second vowel or the second element of the diphthong by / for "a", "o", or "e", — for "i" or "y", ) for "u" or "w". Thus \[ \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "Baal", \text{\( \cup \)} = "meed", \text{\( \cup \)} = "mood", \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "ayme", \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "boyle", \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "browne", \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "feude", \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "bawle". (6) When two distinct vowels, both pronounced, come together in the middle of a word one indicates the first by a dot in the appropriate vowel-position, and then one indicates the following consonant by a small character immediately after the dot: e.g. \[ \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "triall", \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "ruine", \text{\( \text{\( \cdot \)} \)} = "jewell", etc.. (7) When a word ends with two distinct vowels, both pronounced, the first vowel is indicated by a dot in the appropriate vowel-position: if the second vowel is "e", "i", or "o", it is indicated by another dot to the right
of the first dot, higher for "e", level for "i", lower for "o": thus \( \ddot{\text{C}} \) = "Chloe", \( \dot{\text{D}} \) = "Dei", \( \ddot{\text{D}} \) = "Deo": if the second vowel is "a" it is indicated by a second dot above the first dot, thus \( \dddot{\text{D}} \) = "Leah"; if the second vowel is "u" it is indicated by the symbol for "w" directly after the dot, thus \( \dddot{\text{D}} \) = "Diu".

All this makes it possible to attain greater precision than the original system allowed -- provided the stenographer has sufficient time at his disposal to write the symbols accurately (the difference between \( \dddot{\text{D}} \) and \( \dddot{\text{D}} \) is not great, and care must be taken in the placing of the dots): but these new complications certainly do not make it possible to use Stenographie with any greater speed -- the reverse is the case.

In the case of a trisyllabic word ending with a vowel, the final vowel, if "a", "e", or "i", is indicated by a dot placed in the appropriate position about the disjunct metaphthong: e.g. \( \dddot{\text{D}} \) = "Pallida". If the final vowel is "o" it is expressed by a dot at the foot of the disjunct metaphthong: e.g. \( \dddot{\text{D}} \) = "Pallido". If it is "u", it is expressed by the symbol for "w" placed beside the disjunct metaphthong: e.g. \( \dddot{\text{D}} \) = "Pallidu". But if the disjunct metaphthong is "r", all the vowels are indicated by dots placed in their proper places above it: e.g. \( \dddot{\text{D}} \) = "amaro". If a trisyllabic word ends with a consonant, the symbol for this consonant is placed beside the preceding small character -- i.e. the last vowel is, to use Willis's term, expressed
indefinitely: e.g. $\mathcal{J}^x_3$ = "saxifrage" (properly "saxifr"g"), $\wedge^x_3$ = "artichoke" (properly "artichk"). The method of indefinite vowel-representation is, in the case of a word of more than three syllables, applied to the vowels of all the syllables except the first one or the first two: e.g. $\wedge^5_{c^3}$ = "Aristoteles", $\mathcal{J}^x_3$ = "Diogenes"; but where dots have to be used they are put in their proper places about the preceding character: e.g. $\mathcal{D}^{\text{\textperiodcentered}}_{\text{\textperiodcentered}}$ = "Lacedemonian" (the \ indicates "ni"). This method of indefinite vowel-representation in long words is easier and quicker than representing all the vowels properly; but this improvement does not alter the fact that the revised system is itself very cumbersome.

We referred to the strain on the memory and the possibilities of error involved in the original system in the lists of words to be expressed by defectives. The revised system is no better in this respect. In the revised system Willis sets out ten lists of what he calls "Words of Sort": the first nine are of words expressed by defectives, the tenth is of words expressed by symbolicals (symbols other than letters or shorthand characters). The ten lists contain altogether over 300 words. Obviously the strain on the memory and the risk of error which we noted in the earlier system are by no means lessened in the later one. Willis admittedly allows that the stenographer may write any word in the lists in full; but this would in the majority of cases take longer. I should say quite confidently that if
every word were to be written stenographically in full this system most certainly could not be used for the *verbatim* reporting of fluent speech. I do not think that anyone who had examined it would claim that it could.

In the matter of speed, the introduction of the method of indefinite vowel-representation in long words is an improvement in the revised system. Another improvement is that in the revised system Willis allows that a succession of aphthong affixes may be written in any way that is most convenient in a given case: for example, one may write "arm'd" as \( \text{\textasciitilde a}\text{\textasciitilde m}\text{\textasciitilde d} \) instead of as \( \text{\textasciitilde a}\text{\textasciitilde m}\text{\textasciitilde d} \), and "elm" as \( \text{\textasciitilde e}\text{\textasciitilde l}\text{\textasciitilde m} \) instead of as \( \text{\textasciitilde e}\text{\textasciitilde l}\text{\textasciitilde m} \); thus the pen need not be lifted.

There are improvements in the revised system. But the basic principles remain the same. And in various respects the revised system is much more complicated than the earlier one and involves a decrease in the speed with which one can report. Most of the arguments we used against the theory of the reporting of *Lear* by John Willis's original system apply also to his later system. There is no improvement sufficiently extensive to make it possible for anyone who does not believe it possible that Q was reported by the earlier system to believe that it could have been reported by the later one. Indeed the added complications make it to my mind less likely.
(d) A Note on Edmond Willis's Shorthand System.

In 1618 there was published the text-book of another system of shorthand — An Abreuiation of Writing by Character, by Edmond Willis. The question arises, was this system in existence, though unpublished, in 1608? And if so, how widespread was its use?

Prefixed to the book is a dedicatory epistle to Nicholas, Bishop of Bristol, i.e. Nicholas Felton. In this epistle Edmond Willis declares that he has long studied books on shorthand and has himself -- he hopes -- attained to "a more perfect and compendious way of the abbreviatiated writing by Character". He goes on to assert that he has "also long practised the same to my own good, in taking many Sermons from your Lordships mouth by the space of many yeeres". Ten years is of course by no means too many to be called "the space of many yeeres"! Now Willis seems by the words we have quoted to imply that the system he has used for the space of many years is the system presented in this book of 1618. But closer investigation shows that he may not mean quite that.

The dedicatory epistle is followed by a "Preface to the Reader". In the course of this preface Willis says this:

such hath beene my labour and earnest desire for these fourtene yeeres past, to attaine to some perfection in this Art, that I haue not failed to seeke to all men, that haue made any profession of teaching the same in this Cittie. Besides, I thinke I haue written as much with mine owne hand in that kind, as any man in this Cittie; yet could I neuer find any perfection or plainnesse of rule
wherby to manifest it to others, vntill now of late.

And now hauing (by Gods mercy vouchsafed mee) found out a plaine and easie way, whereby the meanest of capacitie, that can but vsa the pen in any reasonable sort, may performe the same, I thought my selfe bound in conscience, not to conceale so excellent and profitable an Art,.....

This quite plainly indicates that Edmond Willis has been studying shorthand for fourteen years and has during that period resorted to all the shorthand teachers he could find: only of late -- only shortly before the publication of his book -- has he managed to reduce his own system to plain and easy rules whereby it can be presented to others. We can think of him, then, as starting to be interested in shorthand in 1604. He goes to a succession of teachers. Presumably he tries the methods of each of them in turn, all the time trying to evolve a better method himself. Ultimately he does evolve a better method, and perfects it: and shortly before 1618 he reduces it to plain and easy rules. It is surely in the highest degree unlikely that by 1608 -- only four years after he began his study of shorthand -- he had perfected his own system and brought it into the state in which we find it in the 1618 text-book. By 1608 he was in all probability still a learner. He doubtless evolved his own system gradually: and what he used to take down sermons with from the mouth of Nicholas Felton1 "by the space of

1. Felton became Bishop of Bristol in 1617. Willis's note-taking of his sermons took place at St. Antholin's in London (see A. T. Wright, John Willis, S.T.B. and Edmond Willis, p. 58).
It is very doubtful, then, whether the system as published in 1618 was in existence in 1608. But even if it was, we can say with confidence that it was not used to pirate Lear with in that year. In the passage we have quoted from the "Preface to the Reader" Willis states that only "now of late" has he been able to reduce his system to rules for the instruction of others. That is to say he has not heretofore taught his system. If Lear was pirated in 1608 by Edmond Willis's system, whether in its final state or an earlier state, it was pirated by Edmond Willis himself. But this is a quite incredible supposition. Edmond Willis was not a professional shorthand writer or teacher; he was a successful merchant tailor by trade (see W. J. Carlton, Bibliotheca Pepysiana, vol. IV, p. 25). In his "Preface to the Reader" Willis says:

For mine owne part, I haue not herein concealed any thing to my selfe by way of reseruation, as if by my booke I would invite men to come to mee to learne, and to teach them some further knowledge therein. No such matter: I praise GOD I haue another calling, wherein God hath placed mee, and to which I doe apply my self, hauing therby (through Gods blessing) sufficient meanes.

Could a declaration of amateur status be clearer? We

1. We are now in a position to see that this must mean less than 14 years.
2. In the dedicatory epistle Willis says that he has practised shorthand "to my own good" in taking down sermons from his Lordship's mouth; he speaks of "that good which by that practice with many I haue received". In the Preface to the Reader he speaks of his system as "profitable" and hopes that "it will become profitable to
simply cannot believe that Edmond Willis himself went to the theatre in 1608 and surreptitiously took down a play in shorthand. And no one else could have used his system, which is therefore as far as we are concerned out of court.

We have spoken of four shorthand systems. These are the only ones which we know to have been published by 1618. There were doubtless other systems. Edmond Willis, having in his "Preface to the Reader" spoken critically of the systems of Bright, Bales, and John Willis, says:

There are others who have Labourd to shew their skill, and with their Bills have be-sprinkled the posts and walls of this Citie; insomuch, that it hath grown into some contempt amongst those that are indidious: for as the old saying is, Good wine needs no bush. And he that is a learned Physician, or skilful Chirurgion, needeth not like a Mountebanke, or Quacksaluer, set vp his stall at the corner of euerie street: so this Art, if it be but once made manifest to the world in print, it will (amongst the wisest sort of me) be soon approved of, or disliked, and then what needs there any further demonstration of it, either by Bills or idle Chalenges?

many thousands in time to come, when one shall be able to read the writing of another man, as well as if he himselfe had written the same". In his 2nd edition Willis says that he has had "much gaine and benefit" from taking down sermons and speeches. Carlton notes (Bibl. Pep. IV, 25) that Levy interpreted this statement as implying that Edmond Willis was one of the earliest professional shorthand writers. But this interpretation is as we have just seen incompatible with other information which Willis gives us about himself: and surely the "good", the "gaine and benefit", which he has derived from taking down sermons is the moral benefit of being able to read and re-read the preacher's words. The "profit" which he hopes will accrue to others from the use of his system is doubtless the same kind of profit.

1. Shorthand.
2. Edmond Willis's own system.
If in 1608 there were shorthand systems in existence other than those of Bright, Bales, and John Willis, we do not know what they were like. I believe that Q Lear could not have been reported in the theatre by means of the systems of Bright, Bales, or John Willis. As regards other systems which may have existed, I can only re-emphasise the considerable objections to the theory of shorthand transmission for Q Lear by any system. And the fact that though Edmond Willis claims that he has resorted to all the shorthand teachers in London he does not in his historical survey of shorthand specifically mention any systems except those of Bright, Bales, and John Willis strongly suggests that the other systems he knew of were not very good -- were not noteworthy as these three, with all their faults, were.

(iii)

Q a Memorial Reconstruction.

The Q text was not printed from Shakespeare's own manuscript, nor from a transcript of that: there was a memorial stage in its transmission -- it is a reported text. It was not transmitted by a stenographer in attendance at a performance or performances in the theatre. Nor can it be explained as a memorial reconstruction made by one actor or a small number of actors who had taken part in the play. In such a reconstruction we should expect the parts of some characters (those played by the reconstructing actors) to be better reported than the parts of the other characters: and we should expect the reporting of the speeches of the other characters to be
better at points where any of the reconstructing actors were on the stage than at other points. But we do not have these conditions in Q Lear: there is no consistent variation in the standard of the reporting of the speeches of different characters. What method of reporting, then, can we reasonably postulate for this text?

The theory I wish to suggest is purely conjectural. I can discover nothing in the Q text which in my opinion can be urged against it: I think it fully accounts for the state of the Q text: and I can find no other theory of which I could make these statements.

In his book The Textual History of "Richard III"¹, Dr David Lyall Patrick advances a theory of the nature of the transmission of the Q text of Richard III which is accepted by Dr Greg in his Editorial Problem in Shakespeare. Dr Patrick shows -- to quote the words of Dr Greg's summary² -- "that the quarto [of Richard III] represents in the first place an acting version, and in the second place an actors' perversion, of the genuine text": this view had been suggested as long ago as 1880 by Alexander Schmidt, but, as Dr Greg points out, Dr Patrick's book gives us "the first serious attempt to prove it". Patrick shows "that the quarto version has been shortened mainly by being adapted to the needs of a restricted cast, and that it exhibits clearly, if 'in a minor degree', most of the familiar features of a report -- such as repetition and anticipation, transposition and substitution, improvisation and vulgarization, which naturally account for the frequent and more or less indifferent variants that are so marked a characteristic

of the texts [of Q and F]. Dr Greg (p. 85) speaks of "the great unevenness of the text" in the undoubted 'bad' quartos. He points out that "though vastly inferior on the whole, that of Romeo and Juliet contains pages, and that of Hamlet speeches, as good as any in Richard III. If," he goes on, "the agency that produced those passages could have operated at a uniform level, it would have had no difficulty in producing our present text. It follows that if individual actors were instrumental in producing the piracies, the company in general could perfectly well have produced from memory the quarto text of Richard III; and like Patrick I am driven to conclude that this is actually what happened."

Now the texts of Q Richard III and Q Lear have certain salient characteristics in common. They have in common "most of the familiar features of a report -- such as repetition and anticipation, transposition and substitution, improvisation and vulgarization", and also a textual standard far above that of the acknowledged 'bad' quartos. The two texts are not completely analogous. Nevertheless I suggest that this view of Q Richard III may be taken of Q Lear also. I suggest that the Q text of Lear is a memorial reconstruction made by the entire company.

Under what circumstances would the company find it necessary to reconstruct the whole play from memory? It might be suggested that the reconstruction was made in London, the company having temporarily lost the original prompt-book, and fearing that the loss would be permanent. Now if the original prompt-book was a transcript of Shake-
Spear's manuscript, with alterations, and if the prompt-book went missing, the obvious thing for the company to do was surely to make a new transcript of Shakespeare's manuscript, with the necessary alterations. It is conceivable of course that Shakespeare had given the company a fair copy made by himself and that it had been possible to turn this document itself into a prompt-book, making the alterations in it itself. If we are dealing with a matter of temporary loss, it is obviously less easy to suppose that two manuscripts of the play went missing at the same time than that one went missing (if Shakespeare gave the company a fair copy he might quite conceivably throw his original rough manuscript away). It is, however, easier to suppose that the memorial reconstruction was made during a provincial tour, the company having left the prompt-book (and the author's manuscript also, if the prompt-book was a transcript) in London. This is what Dr Greg suggests in the case of Richard III.

Sir Edmund Chambers assigns to the composition of Lear the date 1605. Now in his Elizabethan Stage, vol. II, p. 212, he writes: "Ten Court plays were given in the

1. At any rate, either (a) Shakespeare's manuscript or the original prompt-book, if these documents were distinct, or (b) Shakespeare's manuscript, with alterations, used as the original prompt-book, must have been found again, since the F text, as we have seen, depends on a playhouse manuscript, probably the prompt-book in use in 1622-3, and since this 1622-3 prompt-book does not depend on the memorial reconstruction.

2. Editorial Problem, p. 86.

winter of 1605-6, but the dates are not recorded. Three
more were given in the summer of 1606 during the visit
of the King of Denmark to James, which lasted from 7
July to 11 August, and then the company seems to have
gone on tour. They were at Oxford between 28 and 31
July, at Leicester in August, at Dover between 6 and
24 September, at Saffron Walden and Maidstone during
1605-6, and at Marlborough in 1606". It may be that
at some point in the course of this tour the postulated
memorial reconstruction was made.

If Q Lear is a memorial reconstruction made by
the entire company, I would suggest that the actual
method of making the reconstruction may have been that
all the actors met together and dictated their parts in
turn to a scribe (perhaps the book-keeper) who wrote
down what they said as fast as he could\(^1\). The actors
thus virtually gave a performance of the play, and upon
this "performance" the Q text entirely depends. The
actors made such mistakes as they doubtless habitually
made in performances in the theatre -- anticipation and
recolletion, inversion, the introduction of gratuitous
exclamations, vocatives, connectives, etc., synonym-
substitution, vulgarisation, metrical breakdown, omission,
patching.

There are in Q Lear some errors which look like

\(^1\) Cf. the method suggested by Greg for the memorial re-
construction of Orlando Furioso: "All the members of
the group of actors in question who had a working know-
ledge of the play met together and, having secured the
services of a ready writer, proceeded in turn to dict-
ate their parts as well as their memories would allow"
(Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgments, 1922, p. 354).
errors of hearing; and there are cases in which a speech is assigned to a character other than the one who speaks it in F. Greg points out in connection with the respective quartos that "there appear to be no mistakes of the ear or serious confusion between speakers in Richard III: both are found in Lear" (Editorial Problem, p. 94). Later he says (ibid. p. 95), "errors of the ear and misassignment of speeches are blunders that may easily be made by a reporter attending a performance; they are less likely to arise if a body of actors endeavour to reconstruct from memory a play they have been in the habit of performing. We are already being driven to look for an origin of the Lear quarto different from that suggested for Richard III".

But I do not think that the presence in Q Lear of aural errors and misassignment of speeches necessarily invalidates our hypothesis. Let us consider each of these types of corruption in turn.

**Aural Errors.**

Among errors in Q which may be regarded as errors of hearing the following are the most noteworthy.

I iv 165 Q They know not how their wits doe weare,
F And know not how their wits to weare,

I iv 343 Q striuing to better ought, we marre whats well.
F Striuing to better, oft we marre what's well.

In Shakespeare's time the "gh" in "ought" was sometimes pronounced as in the modern English "laugh": see H. C. Wyld, A Short History of English, 3rd ed., p. 193, para. 264, and p. 208, para. 282 (1) (b). Thus someone hearing the word "oft" (i.e. "often") might easily have misunderstood it as "ought" (i.e. "anything"). Note that the Q line is punctuated to accord with the new, and erroneous, reading.
I v 8  Q  If a mans braines where in his heeles,
   F  If a mans braines were in's heeles,
III ii 33  Q  the man...shall haue a corne cry woe,
   F  The man....
      Shall of a Corne cry woe,
      It would seem that "of" has been understood
      as an unstressed "haue".
III iv 23  Q  seeke thy one ease
   F  seeke thine owne ease,
      In Shakespeare's day "one" could be pro-
      nounced either as in modern English or to
      rhyme with e.g. "bone" (Love's Labour's
      Lost. V ii 331-2) and "loan" (Sonnet VI,
      6, 8), without an initial "w" sound. See
III vii 95  Q  throw this slaue vpon / The dungell
   F  throw this Slaue / Vpon the Dunghill:
IV i 60  Q  Stiberdigebit of / Mobing, & Mohing who....
   F  omits.
      Edgar has set out to list "five fiends"
      and, as the Q text stands, "Stiberdigebit"
      is the fifth: the mysterious "Mobing" is
      an unlooked-for sixth. Theobald emended
      "Mobing, & Mohing" to "mopping and mowing".
      If this is right, Q's "Mohing" is pre-
      sumably an aural error. The passage is
      punctuated in accordance with the mis-
      understanding -- the comma which should
      stand after "mowing" has been placed after
      "Mobing".
IV iv 27  Q  No blowne ambition doth our armes in sight
   F  No blowne Ambition doth our Armes incite,
IV vi 80  Q  Bare free & patient thoughts,
   F  Beare free and patient thoughts.
IV vi 156  Q  a dogge, so bade in office,
   F  a Dogg's obey'd in Office.
V iii 307  Q  why should a dog, a horse, a rat of life
   F  Why should a Dog, a Horse, a Rat haue life,
      An unstressed "haue" appears to have been
misunderstood as "of". Cf. III ii 33 above, where the reverse misunderstanding appears to have taken place.

Scattered through Q there are spellings which may perhaps be regarded as the result of mishearing, or as faithful reproductions of popular pronunciations: e.g. I ii 89 aurigular (F Auricular), III ii 2 caterickes (Cataracts), III iv 149 venter'd (ventured), III vi 34 cushings (for cushions: F omits), IV vi 104 argue (Agu), etc..

Believing that Q was printed from a Shakespearian autograph Miss Doran gives two alternative explanations of such errors as we have listed above. One is that they, or some of them, are not aural errors at all: "the printer may," she says, "have himself unconsciously substituted words similar in sound, just as now one sometimes writes their for there, write for right, and so forth". Dr Greg also points out that "of course, as is now recognized, the mental substitutions of a compositor may sometimes have the appearance of mishearings". But, while Dr Greg allows that we could imagine a compositor printing "in sight" even if his copy read "incite", he finds it more difficult to believe -- and I agree -- that it was the Q compositor who changed "a Dogg's obey'd" to "a dogge, so bade". Furthermore, if "Moming" is an error for "mowing" (partaking of the nature of aural error) I think we may in

1. The Text of 'King Lear', p. 125.
2. Editorial Problem, p. 94.
this case at any rate absolve the compositor -- I doubt if such a word as "Nothing" would occur to any compositor. Miss Doran's alternative explanation is that "the printer may have occasionally set from dictation". She goes on: "Although there is no reason to think that this was a common practice, there is proof that it was sometimes done. If light failed, or if the manuscript was particularly difficult to make out, another printer might carry it to the light and read a portion of it aloud". In his *King Richard II: a New Quarto* (1916), p. 35, Dr A. W. Pollard considers the question of dictation to compositors, and concludes that it was probably only an occasional practice, indulged in under exceptional circumstances. "Any general habit of printing from dictation is extremely improbable," he writes, "inasmuch as with only a slight saving of time to the compositor it would have involved the employment of an extra man, nineteen-twentieths of whose time would have been wasted, as a dictator can read quite twenty times as fast as a compositor can set up". On the other hand Pollard admits that "on a dark day, or when difficult copy was sent in, a master printer might easily have taken the manuscript himself to a window or candle and dictated for a few minutes". In his *Introduction to Bibliography*, pp. 241-6, Dr R. B. McKerrow deals fully with the question of whether compositors worked to dictation. He gives the evidence which indicates that it was a not unknown practice, but his conclusion -- it is given as "a mere guess".

but it is a very reasonable guess — is that "dictation was never customary but that it may sometimes have been resorted to": again, he says "I think we must admit the possibility of setting from dictation, though we must beware of assuming it without evidence in any particular case".

There can be no doubt, judging from the compositor's misreadings, that the copy for Q Lear was difficult copy. Dictation to the compositor from time to time is not at all inconceivable. But the hypothesis I am suggesting permits of a safer explanation of errors of hearing in the quarto. I am suggesting that the actors dictated their parts to a scribe, perhaps the book-keeper: obviously this scribe may have misheard or misinterpreted the spoken word at any given point. It might be objected that the book-keeper, having presumably a general knowledge of the play, would be unlikely to perpetrate the more serious errors in our list; but I do not think that this is by any means an insuperable objection. Writing down the whole play from dictation would be an arduous task, and the book-keeper (if it was he) may well have simply written mechanically, as fast as he could, without thinking of the meaning of what he was writing. I do not think that the presence of some aural errors in the text is any argument against the theory that Q Lear gives us a memorial reconstruction of the play, made by the company at large.
Misassignations.

There are certain cases in which Q and F assign speeches differently with which we are not concerned here. In some cases the Q assignation is right and that of F wrong: these are discussed elsewhere:

I i 187 Q Glost. F Cor. See p. 322.
II ii 146 continues to Corn. Reg. See p. 331.

(I do not include I iv 96, where Q has "Kent. Why Foole?" and F "Lear. Why my Boy?". Q is right: F anticipates the speech at line 104: it is not a case of different assignation.)

We have seen that F gives us an abridgment in which the number of speaking characters has been cut down slightly. At IV iv 11 Q has Doct. and F has Gent.. Throughout IV vii F assigns the Doctor's speeches to the Gentleman. We do not have to do here with misassignation in Q:

There are other cases in which we do not have to do with misassignation in Q:

I iv 52, 55, 62, 71 Q servant. F Knigh. or Knight.
I v 47 Servant. Gent.
II iv 2 Knight. Gent.
II iv 58 Knight. Gen.
IV ii 70 and throughout the scene Gent. Mes.
V iii 276 Cap. Gent. (See p. 315).
V iii 296 Capt. Mess. (See p. 316).

1. Two of Q's assignations in IV vii are wrong. At line 21 Q has Doct., at line 23 Gent.. These should be the other way round. The Q compositor may have accidentally inverted the order of these speech-headings.
These are doubtless just different appellations for the same small-part actors.

Passing to real cases of misassignation in Q, we find that for a high proportion of them the compositor may be to blame. In the following two cases he may have simply omitted a speech-heading which stood in his copy:

I iv 227 Q continues to Lear. F Poole.

II iv 160 Q insets the line but has no speech-head- ing

F Le.

At I i 274 Q assigns two speeches to Gonorill. and Regan. respectively. F assigns them to Regn. and Gon. respectively. Here the compositor may have carelessly inverted the two speech-headings.

There is another type of error which a compositor may make in connection with speech-headings. If he has (quite correctly) assigned a pair of contiguous speeches to character A and character B, he may do so also with the next pair of speeches even though his copy assigns them to character A and character C. He will be more likely to assign the A/C speeches to A/B if he has set up a number of A/B alternations just before. The error may be due to his not looking at the A/C speech-headings in the copy but mechanically repeating those he has set up a minute or two before; or it may be due to his eye catching the wrong set of headings (which is especially likely if the A/C headings are both preceded and followed by A/B alternations). I think that the following misassignations may not unreasonably be attributed to the Q compositor:

1. He certainly did this at I ii 36: Q uncorr. no heading, corr. Ba.
2. See footnote on p. 214.
At lines 45 and 49 the Q alternation is Lear./Kent., and that of F is Lear./Knigh.. Apart from three words by Oswald this alternation is preceded by 10 alternations between Kent and Lear. (Since Q heads lines 52, 55, 62, and 71 servant, it is unlikely that Kent. in line 49 is a wrong expansion of Knt. for Knight.).

At lines 115 and 126 the alternation is in Q Poole./Lear., and in F Poole./Kent.. These are preceded by 4, and followed by 4, alternations between the Fool and Lear.

At lines 69 and 71 the alternation is in Q Reg./Gon., and in F Reg./Alb.. These are preceded by one alternation, and followed by two alternations, between Regan and Goneril.

In line 313 Q alternates Lear./Edgar. This may be a repetition of the preceding alternation (Lear./Edg., lines 306, 312).

At lines 322 and 324 the Q alternation is Kent./Duke., and that of F is Kent./Edg.. The Q composer may have repeated the preceding alternation (Kent./Duke., lines 317, 319).

Two cases which look rather more complicated occur at II iv 289-294 and at V iii 223-227.

At II iv 289-294 we have the following assignations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Duke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Reg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Re.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A not inconceivable explanation can be found which will absolve the reconstructing actors of our hypothesis from responsibility for the Q misassignments here. Let us set out the Q and F assignments from line 288 to line
294: (it should be noted that Q omits "Corn. Whether is he going? / Glo. He calls to Horse,"):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Duke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Reg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Glo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Glo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Re.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is conceivable that when writing the play out from dictation the book-keeper (or whoever the scribe was) accidentally repeated "Reg." in line 289 instead of writing "Gon.". If so, his manuscript may have read:

| 288 | Reg. |
| 289 | Reg. |
| 291 | Duke. |
| 293 | Glo. |
| 294 | Duke. |

He may have looked over this subsequently and discovered that he had assigned two contiguous speeches to Regan. He may have adjusted this by transposing the assignations of 289 and 291. The copy for Q may finally have had:

| 288 | Reg. |
| 289 | Duke. |
| 291 | Reg. |
| 293 | Glo. |
| 294 | Duke. |

And the Q compositor may have been the culprit who al-
tered the assignation of line 294 from "Duke." to "Re.": having set up Regan's name at the heads of alternate speeches three times (at the second, fourth, and sixth speeches back -- lines 291, 288, and 284) he may simply have done so again: thereafter he presumably attended to his copy.

At V iii 223-227 the two texts give us the following:

**Q**

Gent. Helpe, helpe, (knife?  
Alb. What kind of helpe, what means that blody  
Gent. Its hot it smokes, it came euen from the heart of-
Alb. Who man, speake?  
Gent. Your Lady sir,......

**F**

Edg. What kinde of helpe?  
Alb. Speake man.  
Edg. What meanes this bloody Knife?  
Gen. 'Tis hot, it smoakes, it came euen from the heart of ---- O she's dead.  
Gen. Your Lady Sir,......

Q omits "Alb. Speake man.", and gives Edgar's "What kinde ......bloody Knife?" to Albany. It is conceivable that in the copy for Q these words were correctly assigned to Edgar: the headings in the copy for Q may have run:

Gent.  
Edg.  
Gent.  
Alb.  
Gent.

The compositor may have altered the first alternation from "Gent./Edg." to "Gent./Alb." owing to his eye having caught the next alternation ("Gent./Alb.") too soon.

There remain two cases in which a difference of assignment between Q and F is accompanied by a difference in the wording of the speech in question. One of these
cases we have mentioned already. Dr Greg speaks of the words having been "altered to fit the speaker" in Q (Editorial Problem, p. 94); but it is also possible that the speaker was altered to fit the words.

At II iv 184-5 the two texts run as follows:

Q

Enter Gon.

Gon. Who struck my servant, Regan I have good hope
Thou didst not know ant.
Lear. Who comes here? O heavens!

F

Enter Gonerill.

Lear. Who stockt my servant? Regan, I have good hope
Thou didst not know on't.
Who comes here? O heavens!

The reconstructing actors may have given the text correctly as it appears in F. The scribe, looking over his work subsequently, may have misread his own "stockt" as "struck", and, remembering that Oswald had been struck, altered the speech-heading from "Lear." to "Gon.", writing in "Lear." in front of "Who comes here?....". He may, going over his manuscript, have read "stockt" correctly, but, remembering Oswald's being struck, and noticing that Goneril had just come on, he may have made the two alterations in speech-heading and dialogue on his own responsibility. Again, it is possible that the actor of Lear's part, dictating, pronounced "stockt" as "stuckt", that his "-t" was indistinct, that the scribe thought he was saying "struck", took that down, and subsequently, looking over the manuscript, altered the speech-heading to conform with "struck". At any rate, I do not think it necessary to suppose that the reconstructing actors were responsible for the misassignment of the speech.
At V iii 82 the two texts read --

Q  

Bast. Let the drum strike, and proue my title good.

F  

Reg. Let the Drum strike, and proue my title thine.

As Greg points out (Editorial Problem, p. 95) the Q version is nonsense -- "a drum can prove nothing but its capacity for noise". The F version makes excellent sense: "proue" is an imperative addressed by Regan to Edmund. Now I suggest that it is possible that the actor of Regan's part (in a moment of aberration, not realising that he was producing nonsense) substituted "good" for "thine", having "good" in his mind from the last line but one, spoken by Albany -- "The let alone lies not in your good will". The scribe, looking over the manuscript of the reconstruction, may have thought that as the line stood it was more appropriate in Edmund's mouth, and so he may have changed the assignation.

We have now surveyed all the cases of misassignation of speeches in Q (except one which we shall mention in a moment), and we have found ourselves able to absolve the reconstructing actors from responsibility for any of them. Thus their occurrence is not necessarily an argument against our hypothesis of the nature of the transmission of the Q text. Having said that, I would make the following admission. The total number of misassignations in Q is not very large: and even if we had to attribute them, or some of them, to the reconstructing actors I do not see that our hypothesis is in danger on that account. It could have happened, I imagine, that owing to shakiness of memory the company
At V iii 52 the two texts read --

Q Bast. Let the drum strike, and proue my title good.
F Reg. Let the Drum strike, and proue my title thine.

As Greg points out (Editorial Problem, p. 95) the Q version is nonsense -- "a drum can prove nothing but its capacity for noise". The F version makes excellent sense: "proue" is an imperative addressed by Regan to Edmund. Now I suggest that it is possible that the actor of Regan's part (in a moment of aberration, not realising that he was producing nonsense) substituted "good" for "thine", having "good" in his mind from the last line but one, spoken by Albany -- "The let alone lies not in your good will". The scribe, looking over the manuscript of the reconstruction, may have thought that as the line stood it was more appropriate in Edmund's mouth, and so he may have changed the assignation.

We have now surveyed all the cases of misassignation of speeches in Q (except one which we shall mention in a moment), and we have found ourselves able to absolve the reconstructing actors from responsibility for any of them. Thus their occurrence is not necessarily an argument against our hypothesis of the nature of the transmission of the Q text. Having said that, I would make the following admission. The total number of misassignments in Q is not very large: and even if we had to attribute them, or some of them, to the reconstructing actors I do not see that our hypothesis is in danger on that account. It could have happened, I imagine, that owing to shakiness of memory the company
found itself in genuine doubt in a few places as to who should deliver certain short and comparatively unimportant speeches. It may even have happened that an error made on a certain occasion was perpetuated in successive performances and so got into the reconstruction which we have in the quarto. Some of the cases we have considered may come into this category. Another case which probably belongs to this category is to be found at V iii 116. The two texts read:

Q  Bast. Sound?  Againe?
F  Her. Againe.  1 Trumpet.
    Her. Againe.  2 Trumpet.
    Her. Againe.  3 Trumpet.

I believe that F omits Q's "Sound?" accidentally, but that that word should be spoken by the Herald and not by Edmund. I believe that in performances the actor who played Edmund may have been in the habit of butting in here, and that this has been perpetuated in the report: see p. 348.

Two of the most striking characteristics of the Q text have still to be dealt with, namely the treatment of verse line-division and the method of punctuation. Conditions of verse-lining and punctuation in Q are such that Greg says (Editorial Problem, p. 95), "We could well imagine that the printer had before him copy that was altogether without punctuation or metrical division": he says further, "Such copy would naturally result from a shorthand report, and I do not know what else would produce it". Let us
deal first with the mislineation and then with the punctuation.

Misleineation.

Misleineation is a persistent feature of the Q text. We find passages of verse, printed as verse, with faulty line-division. As Chambers says\(^1\), "The verse is often put wrong by an initial error, and runs from central pause to central pause, until another error or the end of a speech recovers it. Occasionally it is altogether unmetrical". According to Edward Hubler's reckoning\(^2\), of the verse-lines which Q prints as verse-lines 650 are divided incorrectly, 1580 correctly. In addition to this, several hundreds of lines of verse are printed straight on as if they were prose: and some prose is printed as if it were verse. To quote Hubler's figures again\(^3\), "there are five hundred lines of verse set up as prose, and sixty-one lines of prose set up as verse". Any theory as to the nature of the copy for Q must of course embody an explanation of all this mislineation.

Miss Doran's explanation is completely unsatisfactory. Since she believes that the Q compositor had before him a Shakespearian autograph manuscript, and since she assumes in him fidelity to his copy, she must somehow explain why a Shakespearian autograph manuscript should contain mislineation corresponding to that in the

---

3. Ibid. p. 426.
printed text. As regards "short passages of verse wrongly printed as prose or misaligned, occurring in the midst of correctly printed verse"¹, she has a ready explanation. Such passages, according to her, "appear to have been additional or revisional matter written on the margin in such a way that the printer of the quarto was unable to make out the divisions of the verse"².

It cannot be denied that verse-mislineation in a printed text may be the result of marginal insertion in the copy. "Owing chiefly to the practice of marginal revision", writes Professor Dover Wilson³, "the old texts frequently give us passages of verse incorrectly divided or printed in prose"⁴. But clearly there is a limit to the possible length of such marginal insertions. If we find, as we do in Q Lear, that in some fairly lengthy scenes all or practically all the verse is misdivided or printed as prose, we cannot invoke as an explanation the theory of marginal insertion or substitution. Nor can we reasonably invoke the theory of continuous inter-linear insertion with cancellation of the earlier stratum: in Lear, I iv 196-345 is almost entirely verse, yet in Q it is all printed exactly as if it were prose; the passage would occupy several pages of manuscript; why, during a postulated revision, should Shakespeare take the trouble to cancel the first draft line by line and write the revised version in as interlinear insertion instead

1. The Text of 'King Lear', p. 128.  2. Ibid.
4. See also A. W. Pollard, Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates, 1920, 1937, pp. xxiv-xxvi.
of adopting the simpler plan of writing the new version on fresh sheets of paper? Miss Doran's theory is inapplicable to I iv 196-345. Again, after the exit of Curan, II i is entirely in verse: i.e. it has just under 120 lines of verse. Of these 120, we find that in speeches of two or more verse-lines Q prints only about 20 as verse: the rest are printed as if they were prose. Miss Doran's theory is inapplicable here also. She is herself troubled by these cases, but unfortunately she offers no alternative explanation. She says: "With the two scenes which are largely in verse printed almost throughout as prose (I, iv; II, i) and with the two which are almost entirely misaligned (III, ii; III, vi) it is difficult to deal"¹. But surely this is the heart of the matter. By her hypothesis Miss Doran explains short passages of mislineation and of verse set up as prose, but on her own admission this hypothesis fails to account for lengthy passages of the same nature: and these latter emphatically require explanation. Any theory explaining the mislineation must take into account all the mislineation. An explanation which accounts for only part of the mislineation is suspect even as regards that part. Dr Van Dam is right in saying that "if.....these large passages will not easily yield to her theory, that theory seems to be self-condemned"².

I do not think that we can accuse Shakespeare of having arbitrarily decided to write verse as prose at

². The Text of Shakespeare's "Lear" (Materials for the Study of the old English Drama: Louvain, 1935), p. 3.
certain points in his autograph manuscript, nor of mis-
dividing verse-lines in lengthy passages. Why should he?

Was all the verse correctly divided in the copy for Q, and did the compositor at certain points set it up as prose or misdivide it for some reason? This is Dr Van Dam's opinion¹; it is the explanation offered by Mr Hubler also².

Of the occasional printing of prose as verse in the quarto Mr Hubler gives a reasonable enough explanation. "One can understand," he says³, "how a compositor who had been setting up long passages of blank verse carried the rhythmic pattern of it in his head, and broke up short passages of prose into lines of approximately blank verse length". Again, Mr Hubler says that "it is reasonable to suppose that the compositor, who had to read a bit of his text and carry it in his head while he set it up, read his text not by lines but by clauses, and that he sometimes ended a line with a clause when he should have added a word or two from the next clause to fill out the line"⁴. For example, at I i 261-2 Q reads

Lear. Thou hast her France, let her be thine, For we haue no such daughter, nor shall euuer see etc.

At I iii 4-5 Q reads

Gon. By day and night he wrongs me, Every houre he flashes into one grosse crime or other etc.

In each case the first two words of the second line belong to the end of the first.

But the great bulk of the mislineation and printing of verse in prose form is explained by Mr Hubler as being the result of a desire on the compositor’s part to save space. The quarto was to be as small a volume as possible.

Hubler quotes several passages in support of his contention. For instance he quotes IV vi 280-IV vii 3. This passage appears thus in the quarto:

And woes by wrong imaginations loose
The knowledge of themselues. A drum a farre off.
Edg. Gieue me your hand far off me thinks I heare the beaten
Come father ile bestow you with a friend. Exit. (drum,
Cord. O thou good Kent how shall I lue and worke to match
My life will be too short and every measure faile me.

Corresponding to these seven lines of print the folio has twelve, and a modern edition requires ten — and this is exclusive of the space required for leading above and below the third stage-direction. This passage exemplifies four separate space-conserving devices which Hubler finds to be characteristic of much of the Q text, viz. (i) more than one verse-line is crowded into one line of print, (ii) long lines are bent over into the end of the preceding or following line-space, (iii) short stage-directions are printed in line-spaces already partially occupied by dialogue, and (iv) where stage-directions occupy a line by themselves they are frequently not spaced off from the surrounding dialogue.

Hubler gives other examples of these characteristics.

Again, he draws attention to the way in which Q prints III vi 63-75:

1. F prints IV vii 1-3 as five short lines.
Edg. Tom will throw his head at them, auant you ours, Be thy mouth, or blacke, or white, tooth that poysons if it bite, Mastife, grayhoud, mungril, grim-houd or spaniel, brach or him, Bobtaile tike, or trudletaile, Tom will make them weep & waile, For with throwing thus my head, dogs leape the hatch and all are fled, loucla doodla come march to wakes, and faires, and market townes, poore Tom thy horne is dry. (her Lear. Then let them anotomize Regan, see what breeds about etc.

It is clear that the compositor has appreciated the verse-structure of lines 64-71 ("Be thy mouth....and all are fled"). Except for the last two words of line 71 ("are fled"), he has set up each rhyming couplet as a single line beginning with a capital letter. One may well see here a conscious attempt to save space. In the passage quoted the compositor has in four lines dispensed with spacing between words separated by commas: and he has used the tilde three times, and the ampersand once.

There is no need to enlarge upon the undoubted fact that the printing of verse in prose form saves much space. Miss Doran and Mr. Hubler note an interesting possibility in this connection with regard to a passage on sig. L3v of the second quarto. This quarto is a reprint of the first1, and it is falsely dated 16062; possibly it was intended to pass it off as the first. It may be, then, that the printers of Q2 strove to finish the text on sig. L4 since the Q1 text finished on that page. If so, this may explain the fact that V iii 270-30 are printed as prose in Q2 while they appear in verse form in Q1 (correctly divided except for lines 276-8). The need for just this amount of compression may have become apparent to the Q2 compositor at this point; and

1. See footnote 1 on page 5.
2. See pages 3-4.
it is not easy to explain otherwise why the Q2 compositor, with a printed Q1 before him, should have set up its verse here in prose form. Hubler argues that the Q1 compositor was actuated by the same motive in setting up verse as if it were prose.

Some passages in Q yield easily enough to Hubler’s explanation: others do not. Let us look at the passage which, Hubler tells us, was the first which suggested to him that the Q mislineation might have been the result of an attempt to save space. The passage occurs at II.261-5, and appears thus in the folio:

Lear. Thou hast her France, let her be thine, for we have no such Daughter, nor shall ever see That face of hers again, therefore be gone, Without our Grace, our Love, our Benizon: Come Noble Burgundie. Flourish. Exeunt.

In the quarto the passage is printed as follows:

Lear. Thou hast her France, let her be thine, For we have no such daughter, nor shall ever see That face of hers again, therefore be gone, (Burgundy. Without our grace, our love, our benizon? come noble Exit Lear and Burgundie.

This passage as it appears in Q exemplifies some of the characteristics already noted of the alleged compositorial compression — the printing in a line-space of more material than a verse-line, the turning of the last word of a line into the space at the end of the preceding one, and the use of the tilde. Hubler claims that by this "compression" the Q compositor has saved a line-space. But, as Greg points out in the course of an important article refuting Hubler’s hypothesis, Hubler omitted to

3. Ibid. p. 431.
quote the stage-direction at the end of the passage. In Q the direction "Exit Lear and Burgundie" occupies a line-space by itself, so that the whole passage occupies the same number of line-spaces in Q as it does in F, viz. five. I suppose that Hubler might counter this by suggesting that up to the words "come noble Burgúdy" the Q compositor was trying to save space, but was then defeated by the stage-direction. But there are other passages of mislineation in Q which cannot be explained at all by Hubler's hypothesis -- passages in which Q and F use the same number of line-spaces and in which the Q compositor has made no attempt to save space. One such passage, which is examined by Greg in the course of the article already referred to, occurs at III ii 1-13. It appears thus in Q:

Enter Lear and Foque.

Lear. Blow wind & cracke your cheekes, rage, blow
You caterickes, & Hircanios spout til you have drencht,
The steeples drow'n'd the cockes, you sulphurous and
Thought executing fires, vaunt-ourers to
Oke-cleaning thunderboults, singe my white head,
And thou all shaking thunder, smite flat
The thicke Rotunditie of the world, cracke natures
Mold, all Germains spill at once that make
Ingratuefull man.

Foque. O Nunckle, Court holy water in a drie house
Is better then this raine water out a doore,
Good Nunckle in, and ask thy daughters blessing,
Heers a night pities nether wise man nor foole.

This passage occupies exactly the same number of line-spaces in Q as it does in F -- there is no saving of space in Q. Nor do I think that it can be suggested that the compositor was at all interested in saving space here: if he was, why did he leave such big spaces at the ends of his fourth, sixth, and eighth lines of
Lear’s speech? \(^1\) Had he wanted to save space he could have managed matters so that the words "Ingratefull man" were not left to fill a whole line-space by themselves. As an explanation of the Q lineation in this passage Hubler’s formula simply will not do.

As regards division, the first line of the Q passage is correct. The rest are incorrectly divided and read awkwardly. But the third to the eighth lines, inclusive, may be easily enough scanned as pentameters (the sixth ends with a similar rhythm to that of the ending of the first, and the eighth lacks an initial unstressed syllable in the first foot). Greg believes that in the copy for Q the passage was written straight on as if it were prose. He suggests \(^2\) that the compositor may have been "misled by the unusual scansion of the first line (which ends with three stressed syllables) into thinking he was dealing with prose". At "Thought executing" he decided that the speech was in verse: he continued it as verse, but he did not go back to correct the lining of what he had already set up \(^3\) -- beginning with "Thought executing" he simply counted out a pentameter, then another, and so on to the end of the speech, where however he was left with two words which he had to set up as a line by themselves. Now the Fool’s speech

---

1. In the extract just quoted from Q the typescript does not show the exact spacing of the original. In Q the first three lines of Lear’s speech end at exactly the same point on the page, one under another. But apart from this the typescript does not give a misleading impression.


3. He may have gone back and changed initial small letters into capitals at the beginning of the second and third lines. So Greg suggests (op. cit. p. 179, footnote) -- or alternatively that he had used initial capitals although he thought he was dealing with prose.
which follows is actually prose. It appears in Q as verse. According to Greg's theory it was written as prose in the copy for Q; but the compositor continued his division into makeshift pentameters.

It may perhaps be suggested that the Q lineation represents an attempt at division into verse from the beginning of the passage. Admittedly the second line in Q is, if taken as a pentameter, very clumsy: but it is possible that it is meant to be a pentameter although it has one or two extra unstressed syllables -- it may be scanned

\[ x / (x) x x / (x) x / x / x / \]

You caterickes, & Hircanios spout til you haue drencht.

(The bracketed unstressed syllables may be elided.)

Now if the compositor had correctly divided copy in front of him, why should he (i) treat as prose, or (ii) treat as verse but misdivide, the first part of the passage ("Blow wind....sulpherous and")? Not to save space, since from "Thought executing" at any rate his line-division is controlled by metrical considerations and good-sized spaces are left at the ends of some of the lines. The only explanation that I can see is that behind Q at some stage in its transmission lies a document in which the passage was not divided into verse-lines, and that someone concerned in the transmission of the text has conjecturally and erroneously divided it. It may be that (1) the compositor had before him copy in which the passage was undivided and divided it himself -- that is Greg's theory. Alternatively, (2) the copy for Q was a transcript of an earlier manuscript, the earlier manuscript did not have verse
line-division in this passage, and the person responsible for making the copy introduced it\(^1\). I shall suggest in a moment that possibly (3) the verse was undivided in the copy for Q as originally written out, and that, subsequently, conjectural verse line-division was indicated by some such means as diagonal strokes at the ends of metrical lines or what were taken to be metrical lines. At any rate, behind this passage in Q, at some stage in its transmission, there must lie a document without verse-lining.

The Fool's speech at III ii 10-13, actually prose, appears in Q as verse. And the bulk of III iii -- lines 1-19 -- is prose but appears in Q as verse. The setting up of prose as verse, of course, does the reverse of saving space. Hubler, envisaging correctly lined copy, says, in a passage we have already quoted (see p. 225), that "One can understand how a compositor who had been setting up long passages of blank verse carried the rhythmic pattern of it in his head, and broke up short passages of prose into lines of approximately blank verse length". But if III iii 1-19 appeared correctly as prose in the copy for Q, the compositor, setting it up in verse-lengths, must surely as he proceeded with the passage have known what he was doing -- it is long enough to make this a fair assumption: and if he was anxious to save space why did he do it? According to Greg's theory, the entire copy for Q was without verse

\(^1\) In Editorial Problem, p. 95, footnote, Greg admits this alternative possibility. He says, "Of course punctuation and division may have been introduced by the reporter in making his longhand transcript, but that would not make them less conjectural".
line-division, which was supplied by the compositor(s). This theory explains the lineation of III iii admirably. According to it, the whole of III iii appeared as prose in the copy: there was nothing in the copy to indicate to the compositor whether it was actually prose or verse: he decided that it was all verse, and acted accordingly. Alternatively, in III iii the Q compositor followed the line-division of the copy, and the copy depended on an earlier document without verse-lining, this being introduced by the person who made the copy. Or the whole scene appeared in prose form in the copy for Q as originally written out, and the verse-lining of Q was conjectured, and indicated by diagonals subsequently inserted in the copy, by someone responsible for editing it.

We can readily see how it came to be thought that III iii was a verse-scene from the beginning. The first speech splits up very well into the blank-verse lengths in which it appears in Q:

Glöst. Alacke alacke Edmund I like not this, Unnatural dealing when I desir'd their leave That I might pitty him, they tooke me from me The use of mine owne house, charg'd me on paine Of their displeasure, neither to speake of him, Intreat for him, nor any way sustaine him.

I think that, if presented with an undivided text of the play and asked to divide the verse-lines without documentary assistance, many people would divide this speech as it is divided in Q. Having done so, the person responsible for the Q lineation would naturally assume that Gloucester's second speech was also in verse: and so it is divided as verse in Q, though the "verse" runs
less smoothly than in the first speech, particularly awkward being the lines

Go toe say you nothing, ther's a division betwixt the Dukes, and

Ther's part of a power already landed.

The next, and last, speech in III iii is a verse speech, misdivided in Q. As it appears in Q it scans, though with a good number of extra unaccented syllables:

This curtesie forbid thee, shall the Duke instaly know
And of that letter to, this seems a faire deserving
And must draw me that which my father looses, no lesse
Then all, then younger rises when the old doe fall.

I believe we must accept the theory that, at some stage in its transmission, a document without verse-lining underlies Q; and the Q verse-lining is conjectural.

We have dealt with III ii 1-13 and III iii. There is mislineation of more than one kind in what lies between.

III ii 14-17 is correctly divided. At line 18 Q goes wrong. It prints as one line

You owe me no subscription, why then let fall your horrible

We have spoken of the compositor, or some other person concerned in the transmission of the Q text, counting out pentameters. He counted them out correctly in III ii 14-17: why did he go wrong at line 18? He can hardly have intended the long line just quoted to be a pentameter. He may have intended "You owe me no subscription," to be a metrically incomplete line, and "why then let fall your horrible plesure" to be a pentameter.
The incomplete and complete lines have been stuck together. If the compositor was responsible for the conjectural line-division, it is to be supposed that he decided to set up a \( \frac{1}{2} \) plus 1 line as a single line. If the copy contained line-division, it is to be supposed that the person responsible for the division did not indicate division between "subscription," and "why then", though he intended it. At any rate, "why then ....plesure" may well have been intended as a pentameter. The division having gone wrong here, that of the rest of the speech is wrong -- but as they stand the lines can be scanned as rough pentameters, with five words at the end which must perforce stand in a line by themselves:

Here I ståd your slaue, a poore infirme weak & Despis'd ould man, but yet I call you seruile Ministers, that haue with 2. pernitious daughters icin'd Your high engedred battel gainst a head so old & white

As this, O tis foule.

The next speech (III ii 25-36), by the Fool, begins and ends with prose ("Hee that has....headpeece,"... "for there was....glasse."). In between is a passage of eight short lines in rhyme. The whole speech is printed as prose in Q. We must suppose that, despite the rhymes, the compositor, or whoever else was responsible for the Q lineation, failed to notice that the middle part of the speech was verse.

The lineation is correct after this until we come to Kent's speech at III ii 42-9. This is a verse-speech, and Q prints it as verse, but misdivides it.
It should begin with a complete pentameter, thus (according to the text of Q) --

Alas sir, sit you here? Things that loue night, (L)oue not such nights as these, (t)he wrathfull Skies etc.

In Q it begins with a metrically incomplete line --

Alas sir, sit you here?

Then we have, as a pentameter --

Things that loue night, loue not such nights as these,

It is very likely that a person faced with this speech written straight on as prose, and required to divide it into verse-lines, might, on looking at the beginning of it, decide that "Things......these," formed a pentameter: he would be forced, therefore, to begin the speech with a short line. The remainder of the speech appears thus in Q:

The wrathfull Skies gallow, the very wanderer of the Darke, and makes them keepe their caues,
Since I was man, such sheets of fire,
Such bursts of horred thunder, such grones of Roaring winde, and rayne, I ne're remember
To haue heard, mans nature cannot cary
The affliction, nor the force.

It must be admitted that if this is the result of an attempt at division into blank verse it was a very clumsy attempt. The line "Such bursts....grones of" has the requisite number of regular feet: the two lines following it can be made to scan by accenting the first syllable in each and regarding each as wanting the initial unaccented syllable: and "The affliction....force" is a remnant which has to be put in a line by itself. The line "Since....fire" might conceivably be regarded as a pentameter with each of the first two feet consisting solely of a single stressed syllable, but only at the
cost of even greater awkwardness could the two lines
"The wrathfull........caues" be regarded as blank verse
lines -- and yet they may have been intended for such
by the person responsible for the division, who, we
might suggest, may perhaps on occasion have got tired
of counting out syllables and simply taken as a blank
verse line a group of words occupying approximately the
usual space.

Lear's speech at III ii 49-60, a verse speech,
is set up as verse in Q, but is misdivided: and each
line in Q can be scanned fairly easily as a pentameter.
The next speech, a verse speech by Kent (III ii 60-7),
is set up as prose in Q. This is followed by a verse
speech by Lear (III ii 67-73), in which the Q lineation
is correct until we come to line 70. Here we should
have as a pentameter

The art of our necessities is strange .
But, in the counting out of metrical lines which we are
postulating, the person responsible has taken two fur-
ther syllables into the line --

x / x / x / x x x x / x /

The art of our necessities is strange that can,.
The remainder is divided up into blank verse lengths
thus:

x / x / x / x / x / x / x /

Make vild things precious, come you houell poore,
Foole and knaue, I haue one part of my heart
-- and then, in a line by themselves, come the final
words

That sorrowes yet for thee.

The Fool's speech at III ii 74-7, in verse, is
set up as prose in Q. It is followed by a single-line
speech from Lear. And so the scene comes to an end in Q (III ii 79-96 appears in F only).

In our survey of III ii and iii we have found (1) verse lined as verse but wrongly divided, (2) verse set up as if it were prose, (3) prose divided up as if it were verse. We have found all these types of mislining within three pages of the quarto (sigs. F4v (last line) - G2). In (1) and (3) most of the Q lines would seem to have been intended to scan as pentameters (though many of them sound very clumsy). I can see no explanation for all this other than the theory that at some stage in its transmission the entire Q text was written straight on as if it were prose: in very many passages the verse has been divided correctly (see Hubler's statistics, quoted on p. 222); sometimes it has been divided incorrectly: sometimes it has been left as prose (the person dividing having either failed to realise that it was verse or having simply been guilty of negligence); sometimes what is actually prose has been taken to be verse and divided accordingly.

As we have seen, Greg suggests that the actual copy for Q was undivided and that the line-division of Q was introduced by the compositor, or rather compositors: "We could well imagine," says Greg, "that the printer had before him copy that was altogether without punctuation or metrical division, and that the different treatment it received in the several parts of the play was due to the different degree of skill shown by several compositors" (Editorial Problem, p. 95). I cannot say that I very much like the suggestion that
the compositors were saddled with responsibility for the line-division: this would add greatly to their labour and to the time they would take in setting up the text of the play: it would thus add greatly to the expense of the production of the quarto, and I very much doubt whether the publisher would have considered the added expense justifiable. I regard as more likely a suggestion already made, viz. that as originally written out the copy for Q had no verse line-division, and that this was subsequently indicated, conjecturally, by the insertion of diagonals. It was very often indicated correctly: but sometimes it was not. The person responsible for the division must be supposed to have varied in conscientiousness and efficiency in different passages. I think it is not unreasonable to suggest that he may well have done so. He manages to divide long stretches of verse correctly: at other times he divides it incorrectly but his lines scan smoothly enough: again he divides it incorrectly but his lines are clumsy: yet again he does not divide it at all: and sometimes he divides as verse what is actually prose. In dealing with certain misassignations of speeches in Q we suggested that after the play had been taken down the manuscript was looked over and an adjustment made, conjecturally, here and there: we may now suggest that such adjustments may have been made in the course of a revision of the manuscript the main purpose of which was to insert indications of the verse-lining.

We have quoted Greg as saying that "copy...al-
together without punctuation or metrical division...would naturally result from a shorthand report", and as saying that he does "not know what else would produce it" (Editorial Problem, p. 95). But the type of transmission we are suggesting might have produced it. We are envisaging the actors gathered together and dictating the play to a scribe. It is quite reasonable to suppose that as a general rule the actors dictated their speeches phrase by phrase but not necessarily pentameter by pentameter. The scribe might very easily fail in a given passage to realise that what was being dictated was verse. He would therefore write what he heard continuously as prose. It may be pointed out that the scribe, being presumably connected with the company, would know before he started on his task that the bulk of the play was in verse. But even if, while taking down a given passage, he knew that it was in verse, he might not be able to appreciate the actual verse line-division from the phrase-by-phrase dictation of the actors; and, rather than retard the dictation and taking down of the play by stopping to determine the division, he may simply have written the text continuously as prose. He may even have deliberately decided before starting to take down the play at all that he would write everything straight on as prose and then later go over his manuscript and indicate the verse-lining: for the process of dictating and writing to dictation would be much easier and quicker if actors and scribe did not have to bother about verse line-division.
**Punctuation.**

The punctuation in Q is very odd. As Chambers points out (William Shakespeare, I, 465), "Q has practically no punctuation except commas, even in places where both logic and enunciation require heavier stops". I give here the numbers of occurrences of the various punctuation-marks in Q within the speeches in the stretch of text comprising the first two Acts (the marks at the ends of the speeches are not included). A similar preponderance of commas is to be found in the last three Acts. The numbers of lines given are the numbers of lines of print in Q, excluding stage-directions and catchwords.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act &amp; Scene</th>
<th>No. of lines</th>
<th>Commas</th>
<th>Semi-colons</th>
<th>Colons</th>
<th>Quest. marks</th>
<th>Excl. marks</th>
<th>Full stops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I i</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals.** 1356  1534  20  13  33  10  11

As we have seen, Greg suggests (Editorial Problem, p. 95) that "the printer had before him copy that was altogether without punctuation or metrical
division" and says that "such copy would naturally result from a shorthand report" and that he does "not know what else would produce it". But the state of the punctuation in Q may, I think, be reasonably enough explained by our theory of the transmission of that text. We are postulating a scribe writing from dictation. Punctuation-marks would not be dictated: and, writing in haste, the scribe may as a general rule have simply put in a comma on his own initiative after every group of words. Alternatively, he may have written his manuscript without any punctuation, or with very little, and it may have been punctuated, mainly with commas, during the hasty revision that we have already suggested. Or, thirdly, even after the revision it may have been left without any punctuation, or with very little, and the Q compositor may be responsible for the punctuation in the printed text, or for most of it. At any rate, I do not think that the condition of the punctuation in the Q text conflicts with the theory of the nature of the transmission of that text which I wish to recommend.

We have said that the most probable reason for the whole company finding it necessary to construct a text of Lear from memory is that they found themselves in need of a prompt-book. But I very much doubt whether the manuscript from which Q was printed could itself have been used as a prompt-book. For one thing, it must have been very badly written, judging by the many misreadings by the compositor; and a prompt-book that was difficult
to read would not be of very much use.

There are one or two stage-directions in Q which seem too vague for a prompt-book:

I i 32 ...Enter one bearing a Coronet, ...

III vii 26 Enter Gloster brought in by two or three,

IV iv head Enter Cordelia, Doctor and others.

V iii 40 Enter Duke, the two Ladies, and others.

V iii 222 Enter one with a bloudie knife.

Again, Q is not always consistent in the names by which it refers to characters in stage-directions and speech-headings. Thus in I iii Oswald is referred to as "Gentleman" in the stage-direction at the head of the scene and as "Gent." in the speech-headings: at I iv 42 we have the stage-direction "Enter Steward", and his speech-headings are "Steward" or "Stew." at lines 44, 78, 81, 83: but after his entry at line 330 his speech-headings are "Oswald" and "Osw.". In a prompt-book we should probably expect a uniform designation in the stage-directions and speech-headings. It seems clear that the character is referred to as "Gentleman" in I iii because Goneril calls him her "gentleman" in I iii 1, and as "Oswald" at the end of I iv because Goneril has summoned him with the words "What Oswald, ho". McKerrow suggests (cp. cit.) that non-uniformity in the method of referring to characters in stage-directions and speech-headings might well be found in a text printed from the author's manuscript.

but would not be likely to be found in a text printed from a prompt-book. There is no question of Q Lear having been printed from the author's manuscript; but the phenomenon just referred to suggests that the document from which it was printed was not a prompt-book.

There is other evidence of the same kind. At the head of III vi Q has the stage-direction "Enter Gloster and Lear, Kent, Poole, and Tom". Edgar is at this juncture masquerading as poor Tom: hence the reference to "Tom" in the stage-direction. But we should probably expect a prompt-book to designate him uniformly as "Edgar".

In V ii the direction at the head of the scene refers to "Cordelia with her father in her hand": we should probably expect a prompt-book to read "Lear" instead of "her father". Cornwall and Albany are sometimes indicated by their names or abbreviations of them, but sometimes simply by the word "Duke". At I iv 253 we have the stage-direction "Enter Duke" (i.e. Albany), and his speeches during the rest of this scene are headed "Duke": at II i 84 we have the direction "Enter the Duke of Cornwall", his first speech (85) is headed "Corn.", and the rest of his speeches in this scene are headed "Duke": at II ii 38 Cornwall and Regan are referred to in the stage-direction as "the Duke and Duchess", their speeches in this scene being headed "Duke" and "Reg.": at II iv 121 we have "Enter Duke and Regan" (i.e. Cornwall and Regan), and Cornwall's speeches in this scene are headed "Duke": at the head of III v comes "Enter Cornewell......" and his speeches are headed "Corn.": at the head of III vii we have "Enter
Cornwall......" and again his speeches are headed "Corn."; in IV ii Albany is referred to in his speech-headings as "Alb." (there is no direction for his entry): at V i 17 we have "Enter Albany......" and the speech-headings are "Alb."; and in V iii at line 40 we have "Enter Duke......" and, in the speech-headings, "Alb." up to line 231 and then "Duke". We should expect that in a prompt-book the two Dukes would each be clearly designated and distinguished from the other.¹

In a considerable number of places Q omits necessary indications of entries and exits. This also suggests that it was not printed from a prompt-book. In the following table a list is given of cases in which Q fails in this respect. Where the stage-directions incorporated in my own text differ from those of F they are given in the third column. In some cases F is defective in this matter, but it is not defective to anything like the same extent as Q is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>The Present Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I i 186</td>
<td>om. Exit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ We regard F as depending on a prompt-book. Yet, as Greg notes (Editorial Problem, p. 100, footnote), "there is slight inconsistency in the use of 'Edmund' and 'Bastard' in directions and speech headings": "but," he goes on, "this is more likely due to the influence of Q. Possibly the manuscript had 'Edmund' throughout. (Note that at the end of I. ii where there is an addition in F we find Edm. replacing Bast. as prefix.)". 
I i 265 Exit Lear and Burgundie.

I ii 113 om.

I iv 7 Enter Lear.

I iv 42 om.

I iv 44 om.

I iv 46 om.

I iv 47 om.

I iv 74 om.

I iv 75 om.

I iv 75-6 om.

I iv 89 om.

I iv 91-2 Enter Foole.

I iv 269 om.

I iv 286 om.

I iv 290 om.

I iv 307 om.

I iv 318 om.

The Present Edition

Exeunt Lear, Burgundy, Cornwal, Albany, Glos- 
ter, and Attendants. -- Capell.

Enter Lear and Attend-

ants.

Exit first Knight.

Exit second Knight.

Re-enter second Knight.

Exit second Knight.

Exit third Knight.

Enter Stew-

ard. (after 77)

Exit Steward.

(As in F, but placed after "Foole" in 75 as by Johnson)

(Exeunt)

Enter first and third 
Knights with Foole.

(Exeunt Knights.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>The Present Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I iv 330</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>Enter Steward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I v head</td>
<td>Enter Lear.</td>
<td>Enter Lear, Kent, and Fool. (at head) -- q2. Enter Gentleman. (after 45) -- Theobald.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i 13</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>Exit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i 32</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>Exit Edgar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i 36</td>
<td>Enter Glost.</td>
<td>Enter Gloster, and Servants....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i 42</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>om. Exeunt some Servants. -- Dyce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i 84</td>
<td>Enter the Duke of Cornwall.</td>
<td>Enter Cornwall, Regan, and Attendants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II ii 146</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>Exit. Exeunt all but Gloucester and Kent. -- Dyce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II ii 154</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>Exit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II iv head</td>
<td>Enter King.</td>
<td>Enter Lear, Fool, and Gentleman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II iv 57</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>Exit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II iv 115</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>Exit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II iv 121</td>
<td>Enter Duke and Regan.</td>
<td>Enter Cornwall, Regan, Gloster, Servants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III ii 78</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>Exit. Exeunt Lear and Kent. -- Capell.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enter Edgar and Foole. (after 36)

Enter Poole. (after 37)
Enter Edgar. (after 43)
The Fool runs out from the hovel. (after 39) -- Theobald.
Ditto (after 37) -- Capell. Enter Edgar disguised as a madman. (after 43) -- Theobald.)

Exeunt

Exeunt Kent, Gloucester, and the Fool, bearing off the King. -- Capell.

Exit. -- as in Camb. ed.
(Exit Edgar. -- Theobald.)

Enter Cornwall, led by Regan. -- Theobald.
The Present Edition

| IV ii 25 | om. | Exit. (after "death") |
| IV ii 28 | Exit Stew. | Enter Albany. |
| IV vi 213 | Exit. (after "sir") | Exit. (after "on") |
| IV vii head | Enter Cordelia, Kent, and Doctor. (but five speeches headed "Gent.") | Enter Cordelia, Kent, Doctor, and Gentleman. (Doctor eliminated in abridgment) |
| IV vii 20 | om. | Enter Lear in a chaire carried by Servants |
| IV vii 96 | om. | -- (passage absent) |
| V i 4 | om. | om. |
| V i 39 | Exeunt. (after "word") | Exeunt both the Armies. (after 37) |
| V i 50 | Exit. (after 49) | Exit. (after 49) |
| V ii 4 | om. | Enter Edgar. |
| V ii 11 | om. | Exeunt. |
| V iii head | om. | ...Souldiers, Captaine. |
| V iii 26 | om. | Exit. |

Exit Edmond. (after "Gloster")
(Exit Bastard. (after "Gloster") -- Rowe.)

Exit Steward. Enter Albany. (placed as in Q)
Exeunt Gentlemen.

Enter Albany.
Enter Cordelia, Kent, Doctor, and Gentleman.

Enter Lear in a chaire carried by Servants
Exit. -- as in Camb. ed.
(Exit Gent. -- Theobald.)
Exit Gentleman.
(To a Gentleman, who goes out. -- Globe ed.)

Exit all but Albany and Edgar. (after "ouertake you")
(Exeunt all but Albany and Edgar. (after "speake") -- so Camb. ed.)

Exit Edgar. (after 50) -- Dyce.

Exeunt Lear and Cordelia, guarded. -- Theobald.
F is not perfect in this matter\(^1\): but Q is considerably worse than F is, and, taking this along with the

---

1. In the following cases F is defective and Q satisfactory apart from one blunder and one placing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>The Present Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II iv 282 Exeunt Lear, Leister, Kent, and Poole.</td>
<td>Exeunt.</td>
<td>Exeunt Lear, Gloster, Kent, and Poole. (&quot;Leister&quot; corrected in Q2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV ii 87 Exit.</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>Exit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV vi 185 Enter three Gentlemen.</td>
<td>Enter a Gentleman.</td>
<td>Enter three Gentlemen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other points mentioned, I cannot avoid the impression that the manuscript from which Q was printed could not have served conveniently as a prompt-book. I suggest the following possibility --- that the actors dictated the play to the scribe, who wrote in a great hurry; that after the scribe had finished he looked over his manuscript, principally in order to insert indications of verse-lining --- but he may have taken the opportunity to make one or two conjectural amendments in other respects; and that then his manuscript was transcribed, the transcriptions being adapted for use as a prompt-book. When Q came to be printed it was the rough manuscript which was sent to the printer.

We have seen that Q lacks some 100 lines found in F. Chambers says¹ that "apart from iii. 2. 79-95², most of the Q omissions might well be errors". That is to say, it is possible that the actors had set themselves the task of reconstructing the whole play, unabridged. (Abridgment might of course have been introduced in a prompt-book which was a transcription of the reconstruction.) On the other hand, it is possible that Q itself gives us a slightly abridged text. If so, some of the cuts in Q may be due to a desire not to provoke trouble³. Speaking of the fact that nearly 300 lines of the play rest on the authority of Q alone and 100 on

2. Cf. Chambers, op. cit. p. 466 -- this passage, found in F and absent from Q, "is generally, and I think rightly, taken as an incongruous theatrical interpolation".
3. See Chambers, op. cit. p. 467. He suggests that the omission from Q of I ii 106-11, III i 22-9, and IV vi 163-8, "may have been directed by a censor".
that of F alone, Greg says (Neophilologus, XVIII, 252), "No doubt there are a few accidental omissions in either text. Otherwise the differences can be substantially explained by variant cutting".

Before passing on I would emphasise my awareness that my theory of the genesis of the Q text is highly conjectural in various respects. It is the only theory that I can think of which will account for everything; and that is its only defence. I propose to take it as a working hypothesis in editing the play: but it will be well to state here that as regards the nature of the transmission of the Q text I am confident only of the following points -- (1) that it is a reported text, (2) that it is not a memorial reconstruction made by one or a few actors, (3) that it was not taken down by shorthand in the theatre during performance. All the rest of my theory is pure speculation, and it is not offered to the reader as anything more.

IV

EDITORIAL PROCEDURE.

We have now arrived at a theory of the nature of the copy for each of the two substantive texts of King Lear. According to our theory, the Q text is that of a memorial reconstruction made by the King's Men in a body: Q was printed from a manuscript written out by a scribe from the actors' dictation, the actors having had to rely upon memory alone. F was
printed from a copy of Q which had been brought into general agreement with the prompt-book in use at the time: this prompt-book was presumably a transcript, with alterations, of the author's manuscript -- or a transcript of a transcript of that, and so on. It is obvious that F has very much greater authority in general than Q has.

How are we to arrive at a text which will be as near as we can get to what Shakespeare wrote? We do not propose to modernise, and the first question is, which text are we to take as our copy-text? Since F is of very much higher authority in general than Q is, it would seem quite clear that F must be the copy-text.

Another suggestion might be made. F was printed from a copy of Q edited by comparison with a playhouse manuscript. In a given case in which this playhouse manuscript had the same word as Q but differently spelled, Scribe E may have left the Q spelling unaltered. In that case, if the F spelling is different from that of Q, the compositor is solely responsible for the F spelling. Is there not something to be said, then, it might be asked, for the following editorial procedure? -- printing our text from Q, but accepting from F, with the F spelling, the words different from those in Q, unless there is reason for supposing an F reading to be corrupt. But there are objections to this. Since in the transmission of the text from Shakespeare's manuscript to the printed quarto documentary tradition is completely broken at one stage, it follows that not a single spelling in Q was conveyed from Shakespeare's manuscript. But
we cannot say this of F. The playhouse manuscript which Scribe E used may have contained Shakespearian spellings preserved by Scribe P: and in a given case in which the spelling of a word differs in Q and F it is possible that Scribe E did alter the Q spelling to conform with that of the playhouse manuscript. Where Q and F have the same word but differently spelled, then, we have this position: the Q spelling cannot be that of Shakespeare's manuscript except by coincidence, whereas the F spelling may be that of Shakespeare's manuscript, this spelling having safely survived a process of continuous documentary tradition. Where Q and F differ in spelling, therefore, F must have the preference: in other words, F must be our copy-text.

What use are we to make of Q -- a substantive text but of much inferior authority to that of F? One editorial method open to us is this: to accept F as it stands everywhere except where it can be seen to be wrong without comparison with Q. Where it shows itself to be wrong, we may go to Q for assistance (though in a given case we may prefer to emend F to a reading other than that of Q). This is the method of the conservative editor. The conservative principle is stated by R. B. McKerrow in these words in his *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare* (1939):

...the only possible course is to determine for each play separately the most authoritative text of those which have come down to us from early times, and to reprint this as exactly as possible save for manifest and indubitable errors. (p. 7)

As regards the text it has been my purpose to reproduce as exactly as possible, letter for letter,
and point for point, what is given to us by the extant records, namely by those 'originals' which, considered as wholes, appear to transmit to us most accurately what we may suppose Shakespeare to have written; departing from them only where they appear to be certainly corrupt, as well as in certain purely typographical points....

(p. 20)

In his *Editorial Problem in Shakespeare* W. W. Greg enunciates as follows the conservative principle (which he does not uphold in cases where authority is divided):

> when once an editor has chosen his copy-text, the best results will always be attained by following its readings, except in cases of 'manifest and indubitable' errors (i.e. errors that are obvious in the text itself without reference to any other).

(pp. xxvi-xxvii)

But corruption may not be self-evident. F may contain a corruption, introduced by Scribe P or Scribe E or the compositor: this corruption may not be a self-evident corruption; and the true reading may be preserved in Q, having been correctly remembered by the reporter (the actor of the part in question), correctly written down by the scribe, and correctly set up by the compositor. We must have Q open on our desks all the time -- lying beside F. Where Q gives a reading different from that of F we must face the question of whether the F reading is wrong and that of Q right. I do not see how we can dispense with editorial judgement. We must always be prepared to accept a Q reading instead of an F reading if there seems to us good reason to suppose that the Q reading is the genuine one. The phrase *good reason* must be emphasised. And we must always be able to defend our choice by reference to our theory of the nature of the transmission of the two substantive texts.
Where there is only one substantive text, of course, we must perforce adopt the conservative principle. But where there is more than one substantive text, as in the case of King Lear, we must adopt the eclectic principle. A full and wholly admirable discussion of this matter is to be found in Greg's Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, in the section entitled Prolegomena. -- On Editing Shakespeare (pp. vii-lv).

In my opinion Greg's Prolegomena contain the fullest and soundest statement in existence of editorial principles as applied to Shakespeare.

A comparison of the variants between Q and F Lear reveals the following state of affairs:

(1) In some cases Q is superior to F, and in not all of these cases is F self-evidently corrupt. In these cases we must accept the Q reading, state our reasons for regarding it as superior to that of F, and give an explanation of how the F corruption arose.

(2) In many cases F is superior to Q. This is of course what we should expect, considering our theory of the genesis of the two texts.

(3) In many cases the readings of both Q and F are satisfactory, i.e. the variants are "indifferent". In these cases we must adopt the reading of the copy-text -- the reading of the text of greater authority in general.

Different editors may differ as regards the category to which they would assign a given variant. One must use one's own judgement soberly and with a sense of respons-
In producing my own text I have carefully considered every variant between Q and F. Where the Q reading seems to me superior to that of F I have accepted the former. Not only in all cases in which the F reading seems to me superior to that of Q, but also in all cases in which the Q and F readings seem to me equally good, I have retained the readings of F, the copy-text, the text of greater authority in general. In all cases of doubt F is entitled to the preference.

I have adopted the eclectic principle. But it is of course possible to proceed upon this principle and yet produce an edition which keeps so close to the copy-text that it looks like a conservative edition. It is even possible to proceed upon the eclectic principle and produce an edition which is an exact reprint of the copy-text! This would happen if an editor carefully considered every variant between Q and F, was prepared to accept a Q reading if it seemed to him superior to the F reading even though the latter was not self-evidently corrupt, concluded that in no case was a Q reading superior to the corresponding F reading, and decided that F stood in no need of emendation. Now my text of Lear is not a reprint of F (see category (1) on p. 256). But it is very much closer to F than most modern editions are¹. The number of cases in which a Q reading seems to me superior to that of F is very much

¹ Mention may be made here of Dr G. B. Harrison's edition of Lear in the "Penguin Shakespeare" (1937). It is based as firmly on F as Mr Ridley's "New Temple" edition (1935) is based on Q. The editions of both Dr Harrison and Mr Ridley are (apart from the modernisation of spelling) conservative.
smaller than the number of readings admitted from Q into their text by, for example, the editors of the Cambridge Shakespeare.

At the end of his facsimile reprint of F Lear Professor Dover Wilson gives a list of "Modern Readings", in which he cites departures made from the F text in most standard modern editions. The source of many of these readings is the quarto¹. In my opinion only some of these importations from Q are justifiable. In some cases included in Professor Dover Wilson's list the Q readings seem to me no better than those of F: in some cases the Q readings seem to me definitely inferior to those of F. I propose to indicate in List A below the Q readings in Professor Dover Wilson's list which I do not accept into my own text in place of the F readings². I propose to indicate in List B the Q readings in Professor Dover Wilson's list which I do consider superior to those of F and which I do accept into my own text.

List A.

I i 19 Q sir a sonne F a Sonne, Sir,

We have found inversions in Q in passages undoubtedly reported, and, although there may be inversions in F, we are bound to accept the word-order of F where it differs from that of Q unless there is a good reason for not doing so. I can see no good reason here.

1. It should be emphasised that Professor Dover Wilson says that "it must not be assumed that the inclusion of a reading implies approval or endorsement".
2. Where in List A variant readings are given without annotation the comment is implied that I regard the Q and F readings as quite "indifferent".
The F reading is perfectly possible. Under "world" I i. b. N.E.D. cites "to come into (or to) the world". Admittedly it quotes no instance of "to come to the world" earlier than Burns's Addr. Illeg. Child, iv (1784): but in Shakespeare's Coriolanus V iii 125 we have "thy mother's womb / That brought thee to this world". I think that this latter quotation justifies us in following F Lear I i 21.

The speech in which this line occurs is seriously corrupt in Q, and in this line itself Q lacks the words "Giue me", which are necessary to the metre. Allowing that if we adopt the F "Giue me" and follow Q in omitting "that" we get a line metrically smoother than that of F as it stands, yet the latter is perfectly possible metrically: and there is so much corruption in the neighbourhood in Q that we can hardly abandon our allegiance to F without better reason than can be adduced in this case.

The F reading is perfectly possible, taken as a singular used collectively. Cf. Jonson's Poetaster III v -- "Great Caesar's wars cannot be fought with word" (cited in N.E.D. s.v. word sb. 4).

Both readings are defensible. If we read "doe", then "Loure" and "be" are infinitives: if we read "speake", they are imperatives. Those who prefer "doe" may regard "speake" as an emendation made by Scribe P or
Scribe E: they may say that Shakespeare wrote "doe" and that this emending agent decided that "speake" was required by the context since the point at issue is the daughters' declarations. This is possible. On the other hand it is equally possible that "doe" is an actor's substitution. I can see no argument for "doe" strong enough to justify our setting the copytext aside. On the contrary, this first speech of Cordelia's seems to me more attractive and less commonplace if we have her asking herself what she shall say, and then gently but firmly stilling the question with two commands to herself.

Q issue

N.E.D., s.v. issue sb. III 6, notes that the word is found "Formerly sometimes with pl. issues". It is found in Shakespeare in Henry VIII III ii 291, where the speaker refers to "our issues, / Who, if he[ Wolsey] live, will scarce be gentlemen". Cf. the N.E.D. citation -- 1614 Raleigh Hist. World I. (1634) 92 "There were founded by his Issues many great Cities".

Q to

At the end of I i 85 F has "speake.", which Q omits. It would be a curious coincidence if Shakespeare wrote "speake" twice, Q accidentally omitting it in the one place and F in the other. I believe that in Q we have to do with memorial
corruption: the "speake" at the end of line 85 (F) is anticipated in Q at the end of line 67, and is then omitted from its proper place. If so, we must of course follow F. In both cases where "speake" is omitted -- F line 67, Q line 85 -- there is metrical deficiency: but this need not affect the argument -- Shakespeare often ends speeches with metically incomplete lines.

I i 82 Q the last, not F our last and I regard Q as certainly corrupt here. See pp. 32-4.

I i 92 Q nor more F no more

I i 94 Q it F you

I i 99 Q Happely F Happily

In Shakespeare's day (and before, and after) "happily" was a recognised form of "haply". See N.E.D. s.v. Happily adv. 1. Quotations are given extending from 1377 to as late as 1890. Onions (Shakespeare Glossary, p. 101) notes as regards Shakespearian texts that "in the sense 'perchance, perhaps' the old edd. have haply about twice as freq. as happily", and he gives a number of examples of the latter. See for instance Twelfth Night (F) IV ii 53.

I i 104 Q good my F my good

Both readings are possible. It will be noted that there is another difference of word-order between Q and F earlier in the same line.

I i 127 Q this F the
I i 134  Q turnes  F turne
Under turn sb. V 28 b Phrases, N.E.D. cites the phrase "By turns (also † by turn)". It quotes Elyot (1536) — "Vicissim, by tourne, nowe one, nowe an nother". There is no reason to reject F here.

Q still  F shall
It may be suggested that the F compositor has repeated a word from the previous line and that Q is right. But I think that the F reading is superior to that of Q. "Shall" carries less stress in the F line than "still" does in the Q line, and consequently throws a greater emphasis on "only"; this is very effective, contrasting it with "the rest" in line 136.

I i 135  Q the addicions  F th'addition
There is no reason for rejecting the F contraction of the article here. And the singular, "addition", is perfectly possible: N.E.D. quotes this passage as it appears in F under addition sb. †4.

I i 138  Q betwixt  F betweene
I i 148  Q Reuerse thy doome  F reseure thy state
Along with this we may also consider

I i 163  Q doome  F guift
The content of I i 150-3 can be adduced in favour of "Reuerse thy doome", i.e. reverse the judgement just passed on Cordelia. Certainly in lines 150-3 Kent is concerned about Cordelia. It is conceivable that the F compositor set
"reserue" instead of "reuerse" by mistake, and that a proof-reader, faced with "reserue thy doome", altered "doome" to "state" on his own responsibility. White says (see Furness's note), "Between reverse and "reserve", the difference is only the transposition of two letters; and that change once made by accident, the other would naturally follow by design". But I am not happy about this. For one thing, Q's "doome" is changed in F at line 163 also. For another thing, I do not think that White is justified in using the word "naturally". I cannot help feeling that if faced with "reserue thy doome" the F proof-reader would in all probability have altered "reserue" to "reuerse" even without recourse to the copy: it seems the obvious thing to do. Then in his speech at lines 154-6 Kent is concerned about Lear's safety: he appears to foresee what is actually going to happen (and cf. III iv 160-1): and this suggests that in line 148 he really does want Lear to "reserue [his] state", to "retain [his] royal dignity and power" (Furness) and not divide the kingdom at all. It is quite possible that in line 148 he may be thinking of the whole division of the kingdom, in lines 150-3 of the particular injustice done to Cordelia, and in lines 154-6 again of the whole division of the kingdom. The injustice done to Cordelia is the crowning piece of rashness which provokes Kent to attempt to dissuade Lear from his entire plan.

Now in the old play of Leir, one of Shake-
speare's sources, the King says (Q 1605, sig. B4v -- the underlining is mine):

Cease, good my Lords, and sue not to reverse Our censure, which is now irreuocable.

And on sig. Clv Perillus speaks of "this ruthlesse doome", referring to the disinheriting of Cordella. The source-play, then, contains the elements of Q's "Reuerse thy doome" and not of F's "reserue thy state"; and it contains the elements of Q's "reuoke thy doome" in line 163, against F's "reuoke thy guift". Why should anyone connected with the transmission of F have a rooted objection to the word "doome"? Did Shakepeare originally write lines 148 and 163 as they appear in Q, and subsequently alter them to what we have in F? We have spoken already of the general objection to a theory of revision between Q and F (see pp. 82-3). And since the Q text is a reported one I think it quite possible that the reporter of these two lines (the actor of Kent's part) has been influenced in his phrasing by recollections of the old play. I advance this only as a possibility. But, since I think that the F readings are perfectly satisfactory, and since I suspect that the Q readings are memorial corruptions, I adhere to F.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
I i 152-3 & Q sound/Reuerbs \quad F sounds/Reuerbe \\
I i 155 & Q thy \quad F thine \\
I i 156 & Q the motiue \quad F motiue \\
\end{tabular}
"Doe" here means "go on!". See N.E.D. s.v. do vb. IV 32. It is used thus in Midsummer Night's Dream III ii 237. It is effective here in Lear, and the F compositor may have accidentally omitted it. On the other hand it may quite well be an actor's ejaculation incorporated into the reported text, and, since this is possible, I follow F.

Upholders of Q here may suggest that the F compositor has erroneously repeated "thy" from earlier in the line. But "thy fee" is a perfectly good reading, and I should not feel safe in deserting F for Q here.

F's "That" is quite possible here: it is used in the sense of "because, for the reason that, seeing that" -- a common enough sense in Shakespeare. N.E.D. cites "that conj. II 2 Introducing a clause expressing the cause, ground, or reason of what is stated in the principal clause". It quotes -- 1567 Allen, Def. Priesthood 352 "And S. Augustin excommunicated County Bonifacius that he tooke from the Churche an offender": and al657 R. Loveday Lett. (1663) 83 "Honest J. is ready to beat his wife that she forces his promise to so slothful a performance".
I i 169 Q between F betwixt

It will be noticed that in line 138 Professor Dover Wilson's list of Modern Readings gives Q's "betwixt" in place of F's "betweene", while here it gives Q's "between" in place of F's "betwixt". I think that it would be rather dangerous to suggest that the F compositor made two erroneous synonym-substitutions within 31 lines, the one substitution being the reverse of the other. It is much more probable that the Q readings in both lines are synonym-substitutions by the actor.

I i 173 Q diseases F disasters

The Q reading may well be a memorial corruption: see pp. 71-2.

I i 189 Q towards F toward

I i 193 Q what F hath

The F reading seems to me less commonplace than that of Q. The object of "hath offer'd" is omitted -- "I crave no more than (that which) your Highness hath offered". Burgundy thinks that the offer is still open: this being so, I think that "hath offer'd" is more suitable than the simple preterite.

I i 213 Q that F whom

"Whom" is, of course, ungrammatical. But it may be Shakespearian for all that. In The Tempest V i 76 ff. we have the words "whom, with Sebastian,.....Would have killed your king". Editors generally emend this to "who.....".
The New Cambridge editors call "whom" in this passage in *The Tempest* "compositor's grammar": but it may be Shakespeare's, both there and in the present passage in *Lear*. In the heat of composition Shakespeare might be guilty of a piece of bad grammar.

\[\text{I i 215} \quad Q\] most best, most \[F\] The best, the

The Q reading may be a memorial corruption: see pp. 62-3.

\[\text{I i 222} \quad Q\] Could \[F\] Should

\[\text{I i 231} \quad Q\] As \[F\] That

Both constructions, "such.....as" and "such.....that", are found in Shakespeare. Examples of the latter are to be found in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* IV iv 61-2, *The Winter's Tale* I ii 263, *Julius Caesar* I iii 116-7, II i 130-1. There is no reason to reject this construction in the present case in *Lear*.

\[\text{I i 233} \quad Q\] to haue \[F\] t haue

The apostrophe in F has slipped up into the line above. The only difference, then, between Q and F is in the indication or non-indication of elision. Both are metrically possible.

\[\text{I i 240} \quad Q\] Leir \[F\] King

Q probably has memorial corruption here: see pp. 72-3.

\[\text{I i 247} \quad Q\] respects of fortune \[F\] respect and Fortunes

Q probably has memorial corruption here: see pp. 63-5.
Again Q probably has memorial corruption: see pp. 65-6.

The Q reading is satisfactory -- a variant of "plaited". But the F "plighted" is equally possible: cf. Faerie Queene II, iii, 26 -- "with many a folded plight" (quoted by Wright). W. W. Skeat says: "The word is really misspelt......and should be plite, without gh. Chaucer has the verb pliten, 'to fold', Troilus, ii, 697, 1204. It is clearly a mere variant of 'plait' or 'pleat', though the vowel is difficult to account for". In F, then, we have a current misspelling which was not regarded as wrong; and it must be retained since it may have come from Scribe E's playhouse manuscript and ultimately from Shakespeare's own manuscript.

I accept the F reading because it makes good sense and does not seem to me any less desirable in the context than the reading of Q. The F version of the speech sounds more awkward and stilted than that of Q: but the speech is a sententious one, and it may well have left Shakespeare's pen more rather than less stilted. I follow Schmidt in regarding "Who" as referring back to "Time" and in taking "faults" to be the...
object of both "couers" and "derides".

I 1 281 Q a little  F little

The F compositor may easily have accidentally missed out the "a". But the F reading is perfectly possible: it does not seem to me inferior to that of Q, which may contain textual expansion by the actor.

I 1 292 Q to receive from his age  F from his age, to receive

Both versions are possible: either might have an inversion of the true word-order: and we must in such a case accept the word-order of the copy-text.

I 1 293 Q ingrafted  F ingraffed

Both readings are possible: N.E.D. cites both "ingraff" and "ingraft": see also Onions, Shakespeare Glossary, p. 70 -- "engraffed: implanted, firmly fixed", "engrafted: firmly fixed or rooted".

I 1 299 Q lets  F let vs

I 1 300 Q dispositions  F disposition

The Q reading can be referred to N.E.D. disposition sb. 7 -- "In pl. formerly sometimes = Mental tendencies or qualities...". The F reading can be referred to N.E.D. disposition sb. 6 -- "Natural tendency or bent of the mind, esp. in relation to moral or social qualities;
mental constitution or temperament; turn of mind". Goneril is probably referring to Lear's temperament, to his "long ingrained condition".

i 302 Q on't F of it
It is just as likely that "on't" is a substitution for "of it" in a reported text as that "of it" is a substitution for "on't" in an edited text.

ii 24 Q subscrib'd F Prescrib'd
"Subscrib'd" means "signed away, yielded up" -- see N.E.D. s.v. subscribe 5. "Prescrib'd" means "limited, restricted, confined within bounds" -- see N.E.D. s.v. prescribe 4. The F reading is no less suitable in the context than that of Q is. It might be suggested that Scribe E substituted "Prescrib'd" for "subscrib'd" because he did not know the latter word in a meaning suitable in the context. N.E.D. cites it in the meaning quoted above as rare. But at III ii 18 both Q and F have "subscription" in the sense of "obedience, submission, allegiance", a sense connected with "subscribe" = "yield up". N.E.D. cites this also as rare (see subscription, 6 b). Why should Scribe E pass "subscription" in III ii 18 and not "subscrib'd" in I ii 24? Now at III vii 63 we have the readings Q "subscrib'd", F "subscribe". These occur in an obscure passage, and the exact meaning of "subscrib'd/subscribe" is not agreed upon by all commentators. It may mean "yield(ed)" (see the remarks on III vii 63 below
in this List). Now I ii 24 and III vii 63 are both spoken by Gloucester. It is not impossible that at I ii 24 the actor anticipated the word in III vii 63. The F reading is perfectly acceptable, and that of Q may be an actor's substitution. We must therefore accept the former.

The F phrase is perfectly satisfactory. See N.E.D. s.v. come, viii 45 †b -- "come to = to get at, attain, get possession of: obs."; the 16th century quotations are -- Ascham, 1545, Toxoph. (Arb.) 124 "To come to theyr lyuing"; A. Day, 1586, Eng. Secretary II (1625) 99 "It is requisite you prove, either that you had them by chance......or otherwise, that by some gift you came to them". The Q phrase is less pointed and idiomatic.

I cannot see the slightest reason for abandoning the copy-text's "Has" in favour of Q's "Hath". As regards "heretofore", it is certainly a more ponderous reading than "before", but that is not to say that it is a superior one. I do not think it unlikely that the actor of this part himself substituted "heretofore" for a genuine "before": by this means he gets a fuller mouthful, but the effect is crude and exaggerated. This explanation is in my view no less likely than that "before" is a sim-
plification by Scribe E or the F compositor.

I ii 72 Q declining F declin'd
The F reading is no less possible than that of Q. The contrast is quite effective between sons who are at perfect age and fathers who have fallen off in vigour, who are enfeebled (see N.B.D. decline vb. 10 fig., and Onions, Shakespeare Glossary, p. 54).

I ii 76 Q I F Ile
The Q "I" may stand for "ay". But F seems perfectly acceptable to me.

I ii 85 Q wrote F writ
Both forms of the past participle are possible. See Onions, op. cit. p. 255 -- "write (pa.t. writ, rarely wrote; pa.pple. writ, written, rarely wrote)". The F reading might be regarded as a normalisation by Scribe P, Scribe E, or the F compositor; but it is quite possible that that of Q is a reporter's substitution. It might be suggested that the reporter was influenced by recollection of I ii 44 where in both texts we have the simple past "wrote" in the phrase "he wrote this", the "this" being the same thing as in the later line.

I ii 86 Q further F other
Q probably has memorial corruption: see p. 66.
Surfeit

See N.E.D. — "surfeit sb. 5 The morbid condition caused by excessive eating or drinking; sickness or derangement of the system arising from intemperance; † also applied more widely to fevers or fits arising from other causes". It is used in the wider sense here, and the plural is quite possible if we suppose an ellipsis — "when we are sick in fortune, (our misfortunes being) often the surfeits of our own behaviour, .......". Edmund goes on to refer to our "disasters", and Shakespeare may have written "surfets" with this plural idea already in his mind.

The Starres

F is not only satisfactory in itself but is also more accurate, since a given disaster was supposed to be the result of the influence not of the stars but of certain stars (cf. Furness's note).

On necessitie

The phrase "on necessity" is found elsewhere and is quite satisfactory (see Love's Labour's Lost I i 148, 154). The Q reporter may have been influenced by the phrase "by heauenly compulsion" in the next line.

It is possible to defend Q here. When Scribe E changed Q's "out" to "Pat" his pen-stroke may have accidentally covered the last portion
of "and" so that the compositor thought it was to be deleted. Or the compositor may have accidentally omitted the "and". But we must remember that the interpolation of connectives is one of the characteristics of the reported text as such, and so, since F is satisfactory, I follow it in omitting the "and".

Both readings are possible. See N.E.D. "busy vb. l b refl....Const. inf. (obs.), with, in, about". There is no reason for preferring "about" to "with" here.

The F tense-sequence is quite acceptable. One can quite well say "I read a book the other day. The writer of the book says that......".

The interpolation of exclamations is one of the characteristics of the reported text as such. There is another such interpolation in the preceding line -- "Come, come, when" (Q), "When" (F). Why accept one if not the other? In any case, considering our theory of the origin of Q, we must regard it as very dangerous to think of accepting an ejaculation not in F (unless the ejaculation is profane and therefore likely to have been removed owing to the 1606 Act).

The double negative is quite possible in Shakespeare.
Q till F vntill
Q best, goe arm'd, F best,
Q omits lines 159-64 ("I......Brother?"). This passage includes the words "goe arm'd" (163). It is likely that in Q these words, rescued from a forgotten or cut passage, have been placed by reporter or abridger in a new position.

Q towards F toward
Q Yes F I
Q our F my
Q tell you F haue said
Q Very well F Well
Q my very course F my course

It seems a curious coincidence that the F compositor should accidentally omit two "very"s within so few lines, nor can I see why Scribe E should go out of his way to produce unmetrical lines. Shakespeare may himself have left them so (Oswald's line 12 is extra-metrical). In both instances the Q "very" may well be textual expansion by the actor.

"Be'st" is quite acceptable: cf. 2 Henry VI III ii 295, Antony and Cleopatra I v 59. See E. A. Abbott, A Shakespearian Grammar (1909), para. 298. (This work will hereafter be referred to simply by its author's name.)
"Strucken" occurs in Comedy of Errors I ii 45, Love's Labour's Lost IV iii 220, Julius Caesar III i 209. There is no reason to doubt that it is Shakespearian. See Abbott, para. 344.

I see no reason to suppose that Shakespeare may not have changed his tense, making a simple past follow a perfect.

Inversion being one of the features of the reported text as such, and the Q word-order here being in my opinion in no way preferable to that of F, I retain the latter.

There is no reason to prefer the uncontracted form. (Ours is an old-spelling text, and we are not concerned here with the spelling of the root.)

I think we may say that "grace" is definitely correct and "wit" wrong, the meaning being, as Johnson says, that "There was never a time when fools were less in favour than now, and the reason is that they were never so little wanted, for wise men now supply their place". Q may anticipate "wit" from "wits" in line 165; or
the reporter may have been thinking of Lyly's Mother Bombie, ii 3 (quoted by Malone) -- "I think gentlemen had never less wit in a year".

The contracted form is quite possible even though the passage is prose: in lines 168-70 (prose) F gives the Fool three other contracted forms -- "mad'st", "gau'st", "put'st": Q expands the second of these.

It seems to me quite wrong to read the singular. To adduce in favour of Q the undoubted fact that a man can have but one mother would be absurd. The Fool means that Lear has substituted a son-mother relationship for a father-daughter relationship: he has turned things topsy-turvy, and made two daughters (who should submit to him) into -- as it were -- two mothers (whose province it is to discipline and control him).

Q makes two pentameter lines and divides them as such. F makes the speech prose. There is to my mind no reason to suppose that Shakespeare must have intended the speech to be verse. Q inserts many non-authentic exclamation, connectives, etc., and this "Me thinks" may be an insertion (which has resulted in the passage becoming scannable as verse).
See note on I iv 100 on p. 276. In this case a perfect follows a simple past in F.

This is very probably an exclamation interpolated by the actor.

There is no reason to suppose that "that" is right and "which" wrong. Q's "transforme" gives excellent sense: but I cannot see any reason for supposing that Shakespeare did not write "transport". Goneril is saying that she wishes Lear would "put away" these mental tendencies, humours, moods, which are carrying him away from what he rightly is. Schmidt, who accepts the F reading, supports it by quoting Winter's Tale III ii 157 -- "For being transported by my jealousies / To bloody thoughts and to revenge,.....", and Coriolanus I i 77 -- "You are transported by calamity / Thither where more attends you". In his Shakespeare Glossary Onions cites both of these passages under transport 3 to carry away (i) by violent passion. I think that we might also include under this heading the present passage in Lear.

The "remainders", meaning "those who remain", is found in Cymbeline I i 129, and it is quite pos-
sible here also.

I iv 265  Q that                      F Which
I iv 288  Q the cause                F more of it
Q seems to me to give a more commonplace reading than F. In any case it may be a memorial transference (see p. 66).

I iv 290  Q that                      F As
The relative construction "that.....as" is found elsewhere in Shakespeare: see Abbott, para. 280, where examples are quoted. It is found in Lear earlier in this very scene (lines 56-7) and there is no reason to suppose that its repetition here is erroneous.

I iv 302  Q yet haue I left a       F I haue another
Q probably has memorial corruption here: see p. 43.

I iv 307  Q thou shalt I warrant thee.  F om.
Q my Lord?                      F om.
With Greg I regard these phrases in Q as actors' expansions incorporated into the reported text. See p. 43.

I iv 332  Q Yes                      F I
I iv 345  Q the euent                F the'uent
Scribe B's playhouse manuscript may well have had an elision. (Perhaps the F reading is a compositorial error for "th'euent").

I v 11    Q nere                    F not
I v 17    Q Why what canst thou...my boy?  F What can'st...Boy?
Q probably has textual expansion by the actor here.
I v 35 Q more F mo

II i 39 Q stand's F stand

The Q reading is equivalent to "stand his". But it is quite possible that F is right and that "to him" is understood.

II i 45 Q their thunders F the thunder

I do not think that Q is superior to F here, and indeed I incline to agree with Furness who says "'All the thunder' appears to be a stronger and more comprehensive expression than the thunder of the revenging gods alone".

II i 51 Q lancht F latcht

(The reading "launcht" given in Professor Dover Wilson's list is the reading of Q2.) The modern reading given in the list is Theobald's "lanced", which is a modernisation of the Q word. "Lanch" = "pierce", and gives excellent sense. As far as I know, G. B. Harrison, who reads "latch'd", is the only editor to follow F here; Schmidt, who relies on F a very great deal, regards "latcht" as a misprint. But it seems to me that "latcht" is quite possible. In his Shakespeare Glossary, Onions quotes the line under "latch" (= "catch"), citing also the Q reading; and among the meanings given for "latch" in N.E.D. is "to pull or strike swiftly off, out, up" -- e.g. 1535 Stewart Cron. Scot. (1858) I 383 "Helme and hewmont wer hewin in schunder, Lymnis war lachit hard of be the kne". "Lachit of" (i.e.
"off") means "struck off", and I suppose that we can infer "lachit" itself = "struck". To latch someone's arm is therefore to strike it or cut it. It is a pity that we cannot base our case for retaining F here on a parallel later than 1535 and on a parallel English rather than Scots: but if "lancht" was a commoner word than "latcht", in this sense of the latter, in England in Shakespeare's day, then it is easy to account for a substitution by the actor.

Q but F And

Q caytife F Coward

The Q reading is probably a memorial corruption: see p. 67.

Q could the reposure F would the reposall

I cannot see that "could" is superior to "would" here. As for "reposure" and "reposall", Onions (Shakespeare Glossary) quotes both in the sense of "act of placing (trust)". N.E.D. cites this passage under "reposal" = "the act of reposing (trust, confidence, etc.)", giving the Q reading in brackets. For "reposure" N.E.D. gives the meaning of "rest, repose". F's "reposall", then, is certainly no less good a reading than Q's "reposure".

Q Strong F 0 strange

There is no reason to reject F's "0". "Strong" and "strange" are both possible -- "strong" = "resolute, determined" (cf. Timon IV iii 45),
"strange" = "out of the ordinary, unheard of" (cf. *Hamlet* I v 28). It is possible that another sense of "strange", viz. "not of one's own kin or family", was present in Shakespeare's mind along with that of "out of the ordinary": cf. "I neuer got him" in the next line (*Q* only: see remarks on II i 77 in List B below). The *Q* "Strong" may be a substitution by the actor, or it may be a misreading of "strange".

II i 89  
*Q* is....is  
F is....it's

It is just as likely that the reporter has erroneously made the repetition exact as that *F* is wrong.

II i 99  
*Q* (corr.) the wast and spoyle  
*F* th'expence and wast

*Q* (uncorr.) has "these--and wast". See *Greg, Variants*, pp. 155-6. The uncorrected version shows that the *Q* compositor was trying very hard, and I think we must take it that in the copy for *Q* "wast" was the second of the two nouns: the reason for the inversion in *Q* corr. is not apparent -- as *Greg* says, it may be accidental. The first of the two nouns may have been "spoyle", or, as *Greg* suggests, "spence". "Spoyle" and "wast" are, he points out, "rather tautologous": "expence" and "wast" are preferable. We might read "the spence and wast", regarding *F*'s "th'expence" as a sophistication; but *Greg* ventures to regard it as only "a remote possibility" that Shakespeare wrote "the
spence", and we are safer in preserving $F$ as it stands. At any rate I do not see that we can possibly accept the reading of $Q$ corr., for that was not even the reading of the manuscript from which $Q$ was printed.

Q Twas  $F$ It was

$Q$ (corr.) poyse  $F$ prize

$Q$ (uncorr.) has "prise". See Greg, Variants, pp. 156-7. This passage occurs in $Q$ on sig. D4v. Now there is evidence (see pp. 12-13) that in the quarto used as copy for $F$ the outer forme of sheet D was in its corrected state. Thus we must assume that $F$'s "prize" came from Scribe E's playhouse manuscript and that it is the true reading. "Prize" = "importance": see Greg, op. cit. p. 157.

$Q$ (corr.) lest  $F$ best

$Q$ (uncorr.) has "best". The Cambridge editors read "least", which is what $Q$ (corr.) implies. But in $Q$ we are still on sig. D4v, and so we must assume that in his quarto Scribe E changed "lest" to "best" in accordance with the playhouse manuscript. See Greg, Variants, p. 157. As Greg points out, the $Q$ press-corrector has misunderstood the phrase "from our home", taking it to indicate that the speaker thought it best to answer her correspondence at home (which manifestly she did not) instead of "away from home" (which is what she does mean).
II i 126  Q busines   F businesses
The plural is found elsewhere in Shakespeare -- see All's Well I i 206, III vii 5, IV iii 83, King John IV iii 158. And the verb "craues" in the next line does not necessarily support "busines" against "businesses", for the third plural present indicative ending in "s" is very common in Shakespeare (see Abbott, para. 333).

II ii 15-16  Q action taking knaue, a   F action-taking,
While it is possible that the F compositor carelessly omitted "knaue, a", it is equally possible that the Q reporter repeated these words from earlier in line 15.

II ii 26  Q dayes agoe   F dayes
F is satisfactory as it stands, and the Q reading may well be an actor's expansion.

II ii 29  Q you, draw you   F you, you
F is satisfactory as it stands, and the Q "draw" may well be an actor's repetition of that word in line 27 or an anticipation of the last word in the speech.

II ii 40  Q and   F if
II ii 41  Q you   F ye
II ii 52  Q I, a   F A
F is satisfactory as it stands, and the Q "I" may be an interpolation by the actor.

II ii 53  Q hee   F they
F has a grammatical slip: but that is no reason for supposing that it does not truly represent
what Shakespeare wrote. There is another grammatical error in line 70, where both texts have the plural "rebel" (vb. pres. indic.).

On this we cannot do better than quote Greg, Editorial Problem, p. 91 -- "One form of vulgarization is exaggeration. Gross minds, like immature, seek to impress by over-statement". Having quoted the F version Greg continues: "This is sober sense: Shakespeare knows that art is long. But to the actor and to the groundling two years seems an age: so the quarto substitutes 'two hours', which is absurd".

F is perfectly satisfactory -- cf. Measure for Measure II i 192: "What trade are you of, sir?".

Cf. 2 Henry VI V ii 51 ff., where young Clifford speaks the following lines:

York not our old men spares;
No more will I their babes: tears virginal
Shall be to me even as the dew to fire,
And beauty that the tyrant oft reclaims
Shall to my flaming wrath be oil and flax.

Here certainly -- and doubtless in the Lear passage also -- Shakespeare thinks of anger as a fire or flame in a lamp. In the

2 Henry VI passage young Clifford says in
effect -- the fact that my victims are beautiful will not mitigate my wrath, it will actually keep my wrath in existence, keep it burning as the oil-impregnated wick keeps a lamp burning. May it not be that in the Lear passage Kent means that the flatterers are oil to the flame of their masters' wrath, that they feed it and keep it burning? -- just as when their masters are in, say, a melancholy mood, which is a cold mood, the flatterers are snow to that mood, keep it cold. Q makes excellent sense, but so, I think, does F: therefore I retain the F reading. Q's "Bring" may be a substitution by the actor, or it may be a misreading of "Being" (see p. 170).

II ii 71

Q their F the

There is a reference in this line to the doctrine of the bodily humours and their effect on the state of mind. The colder moods are the moods brought on by an excess in the body of either of the cold humours, melancholy and phlegm. F's "the" is perfectly satisfactory: the speaker is referring to a certain definite class of moods. Q's "their" gives a specific reference to the "Lords", but that is no more necessary in the second half of the line than it was in the first ("Being oile to fire").
These are two distinct words. But Onions, *Shakespeare Glossary*, s.v. *naught*, sb., points out that it is "sometimes confused with *nought* = nothing". This is so here in F; but since a Jacobean reader would not have regarded it as wrong, I retain it.

The Q reading may be a memorial corruption; see p. 68.

Q is in no way preferable to F here, and it may contain textual expansion by the actor.

I do not see why Edgar should not be allowed to speak, with picturesque exaggeration, of elfing all the hairs of his head in knots.

This is answered later in the line by "sometime" in both texts. But Q's exact symmetry in this matter is not necessarily a guarantee of authenticity.

F is quite satisfactory, and the Q reading may be an erroneous repetition from the previous line where both texts have the uncontracted form "thou hadst".

F is quite satisfactory, and Q may have ex-
pansion by actor or compositor.

II iv 70

Q vp the hill  F vpward

F is quite satisfactory. As regards Q, the actor or the compositor has probably been influenced by "downe a hill" (lines 68-9) and made the antithesis more exact.

II iv 79

Q wise man  F wiseman

The same variant occurs earlier, in line 71. Onions points out (Glossary, p. 251) that "wise man" is "nearly always printed as one word in old edd." Since it is not an error, then, I follow F.

II iv 97

Q (corr.) commands her service,  F commands, tends, service,

Q (uncorr.) has "come and tends seruise,". I do not think that more can be said about this crux than Greg says in Variants pp. 161-2. Of one thing we can be sure, viz. that "her" did not stand in the copy for Q: for it could surely not have been misread by the compositor in the first instance as "tends"! I agree with Greg that in all probability "her" is "nothing but a facile guess of the press reader's". If so we cannot, obviously, adopt it into our text. Of course "tends" may not have been the reading of the copy for Q -- it may be a misreading: and since the quarto from which F was printed may have had sheet E, in which this passage occurs, in its uncorrected state (see Variants
pp. 145-6) the F "tends" may be a reproduction of a Q error. But Greg (op. cit. pp. 161-2) gives two possible meanings for the F version as it stands, one from Schmidt, one his own, and I think that we ought to accept F. "Tends" may be an apheretic form of "attends", i.e. waits for (Schmidt); or it may mean "offers" -- "If," says Greg, "we were to punctuate 'commands -- tends -- service', which the folio would warrant, we might interpret it to mean 'commands her service -- nay rather tenders his own!" He points out that "Lear's mood in this speech alternates between peremptory haste and considerate moderation", and says that "it seems not impossible that there is a touch of irony in the latter".

II iv 147 Q her Sir? F her. 
F is quite satisfactory, and Q probably has actor's expansion.

II iv 163 Q blast her pride. F blister. 
Editorial opinion is strongly against F here. Only Rowe, Knight, and Harrison take F as it stands: Schmidt suggests "blister pride". I do not see that "blast" is in any way preferable to "blister": Lear might well call on the fogs to "blister" Goneril's beauty ("pride" may = "braggart beauty" -- see Furness's note, under Schmidt). Indeed "blister" seems to me a distinctly more appropriate word in connec-
tion with the action of fog on beauty than "blast" does. Besides, "blast" is probably a memorial corruption — see p. 75.

But II iv 163 sounds awkward if it ends with "blister", and I agree with Schmidt that we should supply the object from Q. I would go further than he does and read "blister her pride."; this seems more natural than his reading, and in Shakespearian prosody the vowel in final "er" can be elided before a silent "h" plus vowel — see Abbott, para. 465, where other examples are quoted. It seems to me quite possible that the F compositor, having in front of him a quarto in which "blast" had been altered to "blister" by Scribe E, overlooked or forgot to set up the two following printed words, "her pride".

II iv 187 Q if your selues F if you your selues
II iv 190 Q wilt thou F will you
II iv 220 Q an F or
II iv 241 Q you F ye
II iv 284 Q and his F an'ds (for and's)
III i 20 Q be F is

The indicative may be used instead of the subjunctive here since there is no reference to futurity and since no element of doubt is involved.
III i 48  Q your fellow    F that Fellow
Since Kent, who is disguised, has told the
other that he is a "Gentleman of blood and
breeding" in line 40 (missing from F but
doubtless authentic) he cannot be using
"Fellow" in a derogatory sense in line 48.
It must mean "companion". Q's "your" makes
this clear: but it is quite possible that
Shakespeare wrote "that" -- who that com-
panion is that yet you do not know. So, de-
spite the fact that "that Fellow" by itself
might be misinterpreted as "that low per-
son", we must retain it.

III ii 5  Q to    F of
III ii 7  Q smite    F Strike
III ii 9  Q make    F makes
F is quite correct grammatically -- the "s"
plural present indicative is common in
Shakespeare.

III ii 12  Q in, and aske    F in, aske
Q sets this speech as verse: it is actually
prose. The "and" has the effect of making
the "verse" line in which it occurs metric-
ally smoother. But since the speech is not
verse there is no reason to adopt it. It
may well have been interpolated in Q in order
to make the "verse" smoother.

III ii 13  Q wise man nor foole    F Wisemen, nor Fooles
F is perfectly satisfactory, and Q's sing-
ulars may be the result of anticipation of
III ii 40-1 where both texts have "a wise-
man and a fool" (Q a wiseman and a foole
F a Wiseman, and a Foole).

III ii 22 Q haue....ioin'd F will....ioyne
F seems to me not only satisfactory but
superior to Q: "will" of course means "are
willing, desire".

III ii 50 Q Powther F pudder
The modern reading given in the list is
Johnson's "pother", which is closer to Q
than to F. But the F reading is quite
possible: Steevens quotes an occurrence
of "pudder" in Beaumont and Fletcher (see
Furness's note), and N.E.D. gives "pudder"
as an obsolete or dialectal variant of
"pother".

III ii 54 Q simular man F Simular
The word "simular" is both noun and adj-
dective, and Shakespeare may well have used
the noun here. N.E.D. quotes -- 1526 Tin-
dale Prol. Romans a ij b, "Christ...rebuk-
eth the Phareses..., and calleth them ypo-
crites, that is to saye Simulars".

III ii 57 Q hast F Ha's
The F form is quite possible: it may be a
case of the northern "s" ending for the 2nd
person singular.

III ii 71 Q that F And
Q and F have different constructions, but
that of F is no less probably Shakespearian than that of Q.

III ii 77  Q for F Though

III ii 78  Q True my good boy F True Boy

The line is a full pentameter in Q, and not in F: but Lear might well speak a metrically incomplete line just before his exit, and this may be another case of Q's characteristic textual expansion.

III iii 4  Q their displeasure F perpetuall displeasure

The modern reading given in the list is "their perpetual displeasure", originated by Jennens. It is possible that Scribe E inserted "perpetuall" into Q in such a way that the F compositor thought it was to replace "their", whereas it was intended to follow it. But the F reading is perfectly satisfactory as it is, and should in my opinion be accepted. There is an ellipsis: Gloucester means that they charged him on pain of perpetual displeasure (to be entertained by them towards him).

III iii 5  Q nor F or

F is quite satisfactory. Schmidt quotes another case of the sequence "neither.... or", viz. Measure for Measure IV ii 103-4, and a case of "not....or", viz. I Henry VI I iii 78.
III iii 8  Q there's a    F There is
Either is possible in itself, but it is
likely that in Q the reporter has been in-
fluenced by the phrase "a worse matter" in
the next line. The F phrase, "There is
division", occurs earlier, at III i 19, in
both texts, and as far as I know no editor
objects to it there. The fact that there
it is in verse and here in prose does not
seem to me to matter. I hasten to add that
there is no reason to suppose that at III
iii 8 Scribe E has gone wrong through re-
collection of III i 19: F is quite satis-
factory as it stands.
Q betwixt           F betweene

III iii 14 Q seeke him    F looke him
F is quite possible. "Look" used with di-
rect object is found in Merry Wives IV ii 75
and As You Like It II v 31 (both quoted by
Schmidt). The Q reading may be an ordinary
synonym-substitution, or it may be due to
memorial confusion with III i 50 -- "I will
go seeke the King" (both texts have "seeke").

III iii 17 Q bed, though    F bed, if
The modern reading given in the list is
"bed. Though". It makes the sense clearer
if we put a heavier mark than a comma after
"bed". F's "if" might be an erroneous re-
petition of "If" in the preceding line: but
it need not be so, and in itself it is quite
I n i 18-19 Q is Some sträge thing  F is strange things
F is perfectly possible. In his para. 335
Abbott refers to the use of the 3rd person
singular form before a plural subject, say-
ing that "Such passages are very common, par-
ticularly in the case of 'There is'".

I n i v 10 Q (uncorr.) raging  F roaring
Q (corr.) has "roring". Greg suggests (Var-i-
ants, pp. 146-7) that in the quarto used as
copy for F this sheet, G, was in its uncor-
rected state. If so, F's "roaring" must have
come from the playhouse manuscript. And the
reading of Q corr. shows that the copy for
Q had the same word.

I n i v 20 Q gaeu you all  F gaeu all
F is satisfactory as it stands, and Q may
have memorial confusion with I n i v 246 where
both texts have "I gaeu you all".

I n i v 45 Q blowes the cold wind  F blow the windes
Along with this we may take

I n i v 46 Q thy cold bed  F thy bed
It seems very odd that F should erroneously
omit two "cold"s within two lines. As it ap-
ppears in Q the quotation "thorough....wind"
is closer to that in line 96 in both texts
and to the line in The Friar of Orders Gray
-- "See through the hawthorn blows the cold
wind". But in a reported text this may serve
but to make us suspicious: it is perfectly
possible that Shakespeare made Edgar quote less exactly on the one occasion than on the other. And as for "cold" in line 46 in Q, it may well be an interpolation by the actor to get an effective antithesis.

III iv 47 Q Hast thou giuen all to thy two daughters,  
F Did'st thou giue all to thy Daughters?
With this we may consider also

III iv 62 Q didst thou giue them all?  
F Would'st thou giue 'em all?
It passes belief that Scribe E should without the support of his playhouse manuscript have changed "Hast thou giuen all" to "Did'st thou giue all" and then a little later "didst thou giue...all" to "Would'st thou giue...all". It also passes belief that the F compositor, carelessly making synonym-substitutions, should at line 47 have anticipated what Shakespeare wrote in line 62. Unquestionably F is right in both cases, and Q shows memorial corruption by the actor. His memory has transferred the wording of line 47 to line 62; and at line 47 he may have been influenced by a recollection of I iv 146 (omitted by F) -- "All thy other Titles thou hast giuen away". As for Q's "thy two daughters" in line 47, this same insertion of "two" occurs in Q at II i 10, and it may again be a memorial corruption -- see p. 67. There is of course no reason to prefer Q's "them" to F's "'em" in line 62.
 III iv 55, 57 Q blesse (twice)  F Blisse  blisse
F is perfectly satisfactory. See N.E.D.
"blisse vb. 2 trans. To give joy or gladness to (orig. with dative); to gladden, make happy. (In 16th-17th c. blended with bless)". N.E.D. quotes -- 1594 Constable Diana VI x "She stands wotlesse whom so much she blisseth"; 1636 Fitz-Geffray Holy Transport (1881) 189 "To thee, who com'st from heaven to blisse the earth".

 III iv 78
Q words iustly  F words Iustice

The modern reading in the list is Pope's emendation of Q -- "word justly". As far as I know the only editors who base their text on F here are Knight and Delius (1st ed.) who read "word's justice", Schmidt who reads "words' justice", and Harrison who reads "words Justice". I think that the F reading may be accepted. "Words" would seem to be a possessive, though whether singular or plural there is no means of telling. I take F to mean -- keep the justice of thy word(s), i.e. speak justly and do not depart from justice in your word(s). The Q reading is much easier, and it may well be a substitution by the actor for a phrase which he could not understand.

 III iv 97
Q hay no on ny,  F Sayes suum, mun, nonny,
The modern reading given in the list is
that originated by Steevens, which is a con-
flation -- "Says suum, mun, ha, no, nonny".
But I should certainly not venture to trust
a reported text at all in regard to such
jingle-words, and I accept F as it stands.

III iv 98  Q my boy, my boy  F my Boy, Boy
The Q reporter may well be himself respons-
able for making the repetition more exact.

III iv 99  Q Why thou  F Thou
The Q exclamation may be a piece of expansion
by the actor.

Q thy graue  F a Graue
F is perfectly satisfactory, and it looks as
if the Q reporter has substituted a more
commonplace phrase for the correct one.

III iv 113  Q the foule fiend Sriberdegbibit (uncorr.)
fliberdegbek (corr.)
F the foule Flibbertigibbet
Edgar talks of "the foule fiend" elsewhere
in both texts (III iv 44, 49-50, 58, 77, 95,
128): but this is no reason for supposing
that Shakespeare must have written "fiend"
in III iv 113: and indeed it is likely that
the reporter interpolated it here because of
his memory of all these occurrences of the
phrase "the foule fiend".

III iv 142  Q bloud is growne so vild my Lord
F blood, my Lord, is growne so vilde
Inversion being a persistent disease of Q, it
would be most unwise to desert F here.
I do not see why Edgar cannot be allowed to say that Lear's suffering is calling forth tears from him (Edgar) which are spoiling, are interfering with, his counterfeiting.

F is quite satisfactory. Q may be supported by reference to "them" in line 63 and by the plural "Dogs" in line 71: but F may be supported by reference to the singular "thy" in line 64.

The past tense is quite appropriate -- the dogs have done it and are fled.

Schmidt adopts F, referring to Abbott, para. 367, where examples are cited of the subjunctive used indefinitely after the relative: cf. Measure for Measure I ii 178-80. Thus the F reading is quite possible.

F is satisfactory as it stands, and the reporter may have interpolated "attire" into the Q text.

It is highly probable that this is a case of actor's textual expansion in Q.
III vii 42 Q simple answerer    F simple answer'd
F is quite acceptable. To be "simple answer'd" is to be characterised by a simple answer, i.e. to give a simple answer.

III vii 51 Q first answer    F answer
F is quite satisfactory, and Q may again have textual expansion.

III vii 53 Q Douer sir?    F Douer?
Once more Q probably has textual expansion by the actor.

III vii 63 Q subscrib'd    F subscribe
This variant occurs in a very difficult passage. The two texts run as follows:

Q If wolues had at thy gate heard that dearne time
   Thou shouldst haue said, good Porter turne the key,
   All cruels else subscrib'd but I shall see
   The winged vengeance ouertake such children.

F If Wolues had at thy Gate howl'd that sterne time,
   Thou should'st haue said, good Porter turne the key:
   All Cruels else subscribe: but I shall see
   The winged Vengeance ouertake such Children.

It seems to me that the F text makes good sense here, that the Q text gives no better sense, and that there is no reason to reject "subscribe" for "subscrib'd". Let us consider the meaning of the F version.

In the first place, what does "Cruels" mean -- cruel acts or cruel creatures? It seems to me preferable to take it in the latter sense: cf. Sonnet 149 (cited by Schmidt) -- "Canst thou, O cruel, say I love thee not?" A. W. Verity (editor of the Pitt Press edition of _Lear_), who takes "Cruels" to mean "cruel
acts", admits that "the more natural sense would be 'cruel creatures'". "Cruels" in this sense is analogous to "vulgars" = common people (Winter's Tale II i 94), "potents" = powerful people, potentates (King John II i 358), "resolutes" = resolute people, bravados (Hamlet I i 98).

Is "All Cruels else subscribe" part of what Regan would have said to the porter? Verity declares that the F reading, "subscribe", "must be treated as part of what is said to the porter". He says further that "the balance of the sentence would make it more natural to take subscribe as an imperative like 'turn!' than as a 3rd plural present indicative. Furness, who adopts "subscribe", regards it as an imperative: he interprets the passage thus -- "Thou shouldst have said: Good porter, open the gates, acknowledge the claims of all creatures, however cruel they may be at other times". This use of "subscribe" with direct object is admissible: cf. Troilus and Cressida II iii 156 -- "Will you subscribe (i.e. assent to) his thought, and say he is?".

This interpretation is possible. But, still taking "All Cruels else subscribe" as part of what Regan would have said to the porter, it is also possible to regard "subscribe" as a 3rd plural present indicative. To subscribe to something is to yield to it, submit to it (cf. Troilus and Cressida IV v 105-6). The verb may be used here in Lear with some such phrase as "to pity" implied.
Regan may be thought of as saying to the porter, "Let the wolves in: all other cruel creatures yield to compassion in the last resort (e.g. on such a night as this) -- so let us yield to it now". "We are cruel creatures", she implies; let us do what other cruel creatures do". It may be objected that Regan would be unlikely to say to the porter that she -- or he -- or both of them -- were cruel. But it is quite consonant with the mood of this speech of Gloucester's that he should attribute to Regan such self-knowledge and such a cynical avowal of it.

But I do not see that Verity is entitled to say that F's "subscribe" must be treated as part of what is said to the porter. It may be: but why must it be? On the contrary I think that "All Cruels else subscribe" is not part of what is said to the porter. The "but" in line 63 falls into place more naturally if we suppose that Gloucester means -- "All other cruel creatures yield to feelings of compassion under strong provocation: you alone do not: but you and your sister will be divinely punished for your unparalleled cruelty to your father".

If we read "subscrib'd" with Q, it may be taken as a 3rd plural past indicative. "On that night", we may suppose Gloucester to be saying, "all other cruel creatures yielded to feelings of compassion: you alone did not: etc.". But I do not see that this is in any way preferable to
the interpretation just suggested for F, and so I follow F.

IV i 17  Q Alack sir, you            F You
Q may anticipate line 45 where we have "Alack sir" (Q), "Alacke sir," (F).

IV i 21  Q ah                        F Oh

IV i 41  Q gon                       F away
The actor may easily have substituted "gon" for "away" on account of a recollection of line 15 -- "Away, get thee away, good friend be gon," (Q: same wording in F). It might be suggested that it was the folio scribe E who corrupted the text by recollecting this line: all we can say is that, with the playhouse manuscript in front of him, he is less likely to have introduced memorial corruption than the Q reporters are. The fact that we are accepting Q's "Then prethee" at the beginning of the line under discussion (see List B) does not of course mean that we must accept Q's version of the whole line.

IV i 45  Q Who                        F Which
Abbott points out (para. 265) that in Shakespeare "Which is used interchangeably with Who and That". In para. 266 he notes that "who is 'qui', which 'qualis'": and this is in favour of "Who" in our line. But in para. 265 he gives this example of "which" used for "who" --
Then Warwick disannuls great John of Gaunt,
Which did subdue the greatest part of Spain;

(3 Henry VI III iii 81-2).

"Which" is here certainly "qui" and not "qualis".

There is no reason to reject F in Lear IV i 45.

IV i 63
Q thou
F 'thou'

The F abbreviation may signify "thou" and may
therefore be retained in a text which is not
modernised. We should read "thou" in a modern-
ised text.

IV ii 28
Q (uncorr.) My foote usurps my body.
F (corr.) A foole usurps my body.
F My Foole usurpes my body.

Professor Dover Wilson also cites in his list
P. A. Daniel's reading, "My fool usurps my
bed". This reading is also arrived at by
Dr Greg who believes it to have been the read-
ing of the copy for Q and to be correct -- see
his Variants, pp. 171-2, where a discussion
of the passage will be found.

I propose to adhere to F. The passage
occurs in Q on sheet H, and in the copy of Q
from which F was printed sheet H was in its
uncorrected state (see Greg, Variants, p.
147). Thus we can be quite sure that "foole"
("Foole") is correct -- it must have been the
reading of the copy for Q, whence the press
reader derived it, and also of the playhouse
manuscript, whence Scribe E derived it. Did
the copy for Q have "My" or "A", and which is
correct? Greg holds, rightly, that the Q com-
positor cannot have misread "A" as "My". Greg cannot see any reason why the compositor should have substituted "My" for "A", but points out that the press reader may have conjecturally emended "My" to "A", being "puzzled to know what the lady meant by her fool". This is eminently possible -- the Q press reader makes conjectural emendations elsewhere. I must say that I think it not impossible that the copy for Q did read "A" and that the compositor did substitute "My" for it. He misread "foole" as "foote" (there are other l/t misreadings in Q -- see p. 166) and further on in the line he saw, or thought he saw, "my body". It is not impossible that, influenced by "my body", he unconsciously substituted "My foote" for "A foote" -- he may even have made the change consciously, thinking it more likely that, speaking of her own body, the lady would speak of her own foot than that she would speak indefinitely of a foot! It might then be supposed that on the one hand the Q press reader retrieved "A" from the copy, and on the other Scribe E, altering "foote" to "Foole" in accordance with the playhouse manuscript, carelessly omitted to alter "My" to "A" in accordance with the same authority.

But "My Foole" seems to me a superior reading to "A foole". Using the phrase "A foole" Goneril directs attention only to the foolishness of her husband: using the phrase "My Foole" she implies not only that he is foolish but also that
she is duping him (one's "fool" can mean one's "dupe", a person that one fools -- cf. Twelfth Night III i 146, Romeo and Juliet III i 141, Macbeth II i 44, Hamlet I iv 54, Othello I iii 389, Lear IV vi 189). I have little doubt that "My Foole", more pregnant with meaning, is the true reading.

Now what about "body" and "bed"? "Bed" might have been misread by the Q compositor as "body": as Greg remarks, "The letters 'e' and 'o' are frequently confused; while, if the final 'd' had a tail to it, as was not uncommon in secretary script, this might conceivably be mistaken for a 'y'". Greg thinks that "bed" is "perhaps to be preferred on the score of rhythm": for my own part I am not convinced of this, and on the other hand "body" seems to me more forceful. Greg thinks it "more likely that the (Q) compositor should have misread 'bed' as 'body', than that the reader should have miscorrected 'body' to 'bed'". Scribe E may easily have overlooked "body" in his quarto and omitted to correct it in accordance with the playhouse manuscript. And yet I suppose that, the copy for Q being badly written, it is possible that the press reader did misread "body" as "bed", taking the "o" for an "e" and the "y" for a tail to the "d", and did miscorrect it. Since "bed" does not seem to me a superior reading to "body", I propose to give Scribe E the...
benefit of the doubt.

IV iv 26 Q important F importun'd

"Important" here in Q means "importunate": cf. Much Ado II i 63-4, All's Well III vii 21. "Importun'd" is acceptable in the same sense, as a case of the use of the passive participle in an active sense -- cf. 1 Henry IV I iii 183 where "disdain'd" is used in the sense of "disdainful".

IV v 21 Q Some thing F Some things

There is no reason to reject F here. In lines 20-1 ("Belike, Some things, I know not what") Regan speaks disjointedly. As Verity says in his note on this passage, "The disjointed style marks her hesitation in making the request that follows". We may take her to mean, "Perhaps there are some things in this letter which it would be advisable for me to learn". I do not think that it is in the least more likely that Shakespeare wrote "thing" than that he wrote "things".

IV vi 1 Q we F I

F's "I" accords with Edgar's "You" in line 2, and I see no reason for rejecting it.

IV vi 32 Q you F ye

IV vi 130 Q to F om.

F is perfectly satisfactory as it stands. The meaning is essentially the same as that of Q -- it is by giving him the civet that the apothecary is to sweeten his imagination. The
semicolon after "Ciuet" in F is against the compositor having simply omitted "to" accidentally. Of course this semicolon might have been conjecturally inserted by a proof-reader; but this is no more likely than that Scribe E inserted it and deleted "to" in accordance with the playhouse manuscript.

IV vi 139 Q the F thy
F is perfectly satisfactory. By "thy Letters" of course he means "the letters of thy challenge", "the letters in which thy challenge is written".

IV vi 159 Q thine F thy

IV vi 162 Q through F Thorough
Though Q is metrically rather smoother, I see no reason to suppose that Shakespeare may not have written "Thorough". It does not make the line metrically objectionable.

IV vi 190 Q a churgion F Surgeons
F is quite acceptable. "Surgeons" can be pronounced as a trisyllable (surgeons). See Abbott, para. 479. Cf. "gorgeous" in II iv 264, and "sergeant" in Macbeth I ii 3.

IV vi 199 Q nay F Come

IV vi 247 Q (uncorr.) British (corr.) Britsh F English
At III iv 181 we have the readings Q "British man", F "Brittish man"; and at IV iv 21 we have Q and F "Brittish". With reference to III iv 181 Malone writes (1790 ed., vol. 1, p. 352): "This play is ascertained to have
been written after October, 1604, by a minute change which Shakespeare made in a traditional line put into the mouth of Edgar: 'Fie, foh, fum, I smell the blood of a British man.' The old metrical saying, which is found in one of Nashe's pamphlets, printed in 1596, and in other books, was: 'Fy, fa, fum, I smell the blood of an Englishman.' Though a complete union of England and Scotland, which was projected in the first parliament that met after James's accession to the English throne, was not carried into effect till a century afterwards, the two kingdoms were united in name, and he was proclaimed King of Great Britain, 24 October, 1604". (Of course it might be suggested that the passage was originally written before the proclamation of James as King of Great Britain, that it then read "Englishman", and that Shakespeare subsequently changed it. But there is other evidence pointing to a date after October 1604 -- see E. K. Chambers, William Shakespeare, vol. I, pp. 467-70.)

The fact, however, that Shakespeare wrote "British" elsewhere as a compliment to James does not necessarily mean that he wrote "British" in IV vi 247. He may have written "English" through inadvertence, and the actor may have substituted "British" either intentionally, as a correction, or through a recollection of
IV iv 21.

It will be observed that Malone's suggestion is that Shakespeare wrote "British man" instead of "Englishman" in III iv 181 owing to the fact that James was King of Great Britain, not owing to the fact that Lear lived in pre-Anglo-Saxon times and was King of Britain. That "English" in IV vi 247 is anachronistic by no means necessitates the view that it is un-Shakespearian, despite White who says, "'English' is a sophistication doubtless. Shakespeare must have known well enough that in Lear's time there were no more Englishmen in Britain than in America".

I think it quite possible that Shakespeare wrote "English" in IV vi 247, and so I retain it.

IV vi 247 Q death! death. F death, death. The modern reading given in Professor Dover Wilson's list is "death! Death!" (Camb. edd.). I should punctuate so in a modernised edition, but in this old-spelling edition I follow F which is not misleading.

IV vi 256 Q wee'd F we
The Q reading seems to me weaker than that of F.

IV vii 8 Q Pardon me F Pardon
IV vii 21 Q of his sleepe F of sleepe
Furness suggests that in the F version "his"
is absorbed, and he prints "of ' sleep". But F is quite possibly authentic even without this.

IV vii 31  Q Had challengd  \ F Did challenge
F is quite acceptable. This is a case of irregular tense- sequence in a conditional sentence. The reporter has substituted regular sequence. See Abbott, para. 371. The same irregularity of sequence, the other way round as regards principal and subordinate clauses, occurs in Hamlet II ii 516, 519, 521 -- "But if the gods themselves did see her then, / The instant burst of clamour that she made / Would have made milch the burning eyes of heaven".

IV vii 58  Q hands  \ F hand
I do not see that Shakespeare cannot have used the singular here; and "hands" occurs in both texts in line 55 -- so Q may have a recollection.

IV vii 59  Q no sir you  \ F You
Q's "no sir" makes the line metrically perfect, and the F compositor may have made an accidental omission. On the other hand it is not necessary to suppose that Shakespeare made this line (divided between two speakers) metrically perfect; and Q's "no sir" may be an interpolation by the actor.
The singular is quite possible. It means "line of action, course of conduct".

If "conuenient" be pronounced as a trisyllable, the line in Q is metrically preferable to that of F. "Conuenient" is trisyllabic in III ii 56 and IV v 31: but the word can be scanned with four syllables -- cf. Hamlet I i 175 (Q2).

There is no reason why we should not follow F in indicating the metrically desirable elision.

Editors who prefer Q here are presumably influenced by "we" and "our" in the next line. But the F sequence is perfectly satisfactory. Albany demands that the prisoners be handed over to him as commander: he will treat them in accordance with the decision which he and his principal supporters (including Edmund himself, it is to be presumed) shall come to.

The past tense is quite appropriate. Edmund is saying in effect, "Lear's age and title constituted a danger to us, and so I imprisoned him, thus averting the danger". Of course
Lear in prison is of the same age and has the same title: but I think Edmund implies that the danger lay in Lear's being seen by the people and by "our imprest Launces". He implies that if the "imprest Launces" had seen the aged Lear, his white hair and his title would have won them over to his side; whereas, since they cannot see him, they will presumably remain true to their employers.

V iii 71 speech-heading Q Gon. F Alb.

Albany interposes in the squabble at lines 80 and 81: I cannot see why he should not be allowed to do so here also. On the Q assignation see p. 216.

V iii 84 Q thine F thy
V iii 94 Q proue F make (for make)

Delius suggested that "make" here = "make proof", "proof" being understood from "proue" in line 92. But surely this is a case of "make" in the sense given in N.E.D. s.v. make v 1 56 b -- "To show or allege that something is the case". N.E.D. gives the following quotation -- 1555 Watreman Fardle of Facions I v 50, "All whiche their doynges, dooe manifestly make, that thei came of the Aethiopes". Q's "proue" may be simply a synonym-substitution: or it may be a memorial corruption (cf. line 92, and also line 141 -- "To proue vpon thy heart").

V iii 100 Q thy F the
Q makes the line metrically complete. But the words may nevertheless be an actor's interpolation. In my remarks on V iii 116 in List B I shall suggest that this probably is so.

Those who prefer Q here may defend it by pointing out that "strength" and "youth" on the one hand, and "place" and "eminence" on the other, form pairs of words, the two members of each pair being similar in sense. Thus there is a single contrast -- "strength" and "youth" on the one hand, "place" and "eminence" on the other. But why should Shakespeare not have given us parallel contrasts, "strength - place", "youth - eminence"? Furthermore, as Furness points out, "the immediate recurrence of the similar sounds (in Q) is somewhat harsh: strength, youth, place, eminence". The reported text contains many inversions.

Q om. F O,
I can see no reason at all for omitting the "O,". It fits into the metrical structure of the line excellently.

Q thou hast F th'hast
and Q Thou hast F Th'hast
See remarks on V iii 36 above in this List.
In Professor Dover Wilson's list the reading "came", without the "it", is attributed to Fl. This is a slip: "came" is the reading of Ff. 2-4."

V iii 228 Q hath confess F confesses
V iii 249 Q hath F ha's
V iii 258 Q Howle (4 times) F Howle (3 times)
Q may contain actor's expansion.

V iii 276 speech-heading Q Cap. F Gent.

At V iii 27 ff. Edmund tells a Captain to do as instructed in the note he gives him. At V iii 253 ff. we learn that the Captain has been instructed to hang Cordelia. At V iii 276 Lear says that he killed the person who was hanging Cordelia. Presumably this person was the Captain of lines 27 ff. The Captain who speaks in Q at line 276, then, is not the Captain who was on the stage at the beginning of the scene. The same actor may have spoken lines 35b, 39-40 on the one hand, and line 276a on the other -- but as two different characters. I see no advantage in calling the second of these characters a Captain rather than a Gentleman, and so I retain the F speech-heading. It may be that the actor is called a Captain at line 276 in Q because he was a Captain at lines 27 ff. (Cf. the end of Qi Hamlet, where we are told in a stage direction that "Voltemar" enters,
whereas in all probability what happens is that the actor who had played "Voltemar" enters as one of the English ambassadors -- see my 'Bad' Quarto of "Hamlet", p. 136.)

S.D. Q Enter Captaine. F Enter a Messenger.

In Q the Captain who said "Sound trumpet?" at V iii 110 may have gone off at line 257 and may return here at line 295 to announce Edmund's death. This Captain of line 110 is absent from F (cut?). It may be suggested that when the Captain of line 110 was cut, someone else (the Herald? the Gentleman who entered at line 222?) was made to go out at line 257 and -- renamed "Messenger" -- to return with the news of Edmund's death at line 295. But even if in the unabridged play the actor who played the Captain of line 110 re-entered at line 295, he may have re-entered as a "Messenger" -- the original prompt-book may have had "Enter a Messenger." at line 295. So I propose to follow F here, and also therefore in the speech-heading at line 296 -- Q Capt. F Mess.

speech-heading Q Duke. F Edg.

Some editors argue that Q's assignation of the final speech to Albany is correct, he being the person of highest rank left alive. But other editors follow F, in my view rightly. The words "we that are yong" seem fitter for Edgar than for Albany (as suggested in
the Arden and New Hudson editions). Moreover in lines 320-1 Albany asks Kent and Edgar to "rule in this Realme"; his speech is followed by a reply from Kent, and it is natural that this should in turn be followed by a reply to Albany from Edgar. I should not feel safe in rejecting the copy-text here. On the Q assignation see p. 216.

List B.

I i 5 Q equalities F qualities

Some editors -- Knight, White, Schmidt, Furness, Hudson -- read "qualities", but most editors adopt the Q reading, in my view rightly. Q's "equalities" sharpens the point of the passage. Schmidt's note (Zur Textkritik des 'King Lear', p. 12) betrays an excessive literal-mindedness. He says (I quote from Furness's note): "Equalities cannot be right here; at best it can be but equality. Equality cannot be predicated of a part by itself, but only of the relationship of parts to each other; it is therefore essentially a singular idea. We cannot say: 'the equalities of the three parts are perfect', but only: 'the equality'." But Shakespeare is writing according to the light of art, not according to that of logic. "Equalities" gives excellent sense -- the two Dukes have been allotted exactly equal parts of the kingdom, so exactly
equal that not the most careful scrutiny of both parts by either Duke can lead him to choose the other's share as preferable to his own. "Equal-\(\text{it}ies\) are so weigh'd" can, in imaginative writing, mean "their shares are so equally weighed". The phrase helps to bring out the point of the speech, and it sounds thoroughly Shakespearian. F's "qualities" may be a slip on the part of the compositor, or it may be a "correction" by Scribe E, he having been unable to see the point of "equalities". I cannot believe that a reporter, scribe, or compositor, would hit upon a wrong reading which made the passage more pregnant with meaning and more subtle in expression than Shakespeare left it, and less like everyday speech.

I i 34 Q Leige F Lord

"Lord" sounds very tame after "Lords" in the previous line: "Leige" sounds much better. It is quite possible that the F compositor substituted "Lord" for "Leige" owing to his having set "Lords" in the previous line: or Scribe E's playhouse manuscript may have had the abbreviation "L.", and Scribe E may have interpreted this as "Lord" and altered Q accordingly.

I i 73 Q possesses F professes

Different explanations have been given of "the most precious square of sense", and while most editors read "possesses" one or two read "professes". I believe that the majority are right in reading "possesses", and I agree with A. W.
Verity's note in the Pitt Press edition of the play. He takes "the most precious square of sense" to mean "the choicest estimate of sense", following Moberly and, like him, referring to Troilus and Cressida V ii 132 where "square" is used meaning "estimate, judge". Verity writes: "For possesses, the reading of the Quartos, the Folio has professes (repeated by mistake from [71]) -- the difference being 'all joys which the choicest estimate of sense actually has, i.e. feels, is capable of', and 'professes to feel'. I think," Verity continues, "that professes strikes a wrong note, that Regan does not mean to doubt the reality of 'the joys' of sense but to emphasise the fact that she, unlike others, is an enemy to them because she knows the higher joy of loving and being loved by Lear: in fact, the greater 'the joys', the greater her devotion which rejects them utterly for her father's sake". This argument for "possesses" seems to me very cogent, and it is easy to believe that the F compositor set up "professes" owing to the influence of "profess" which he had set up only two lines earlier.

We cannot doubt that these words in Q are authentic. They complete the sense of the speech admirably. The F compositor has been guilty of a careless omission.
"Falls" makes good sense, but the similarity of sound between it and "folly" is unpleasing to some (though by no means all) editorial ears. "Falls" may be attributed to the F compositor; "stoops" may have occurred in the middle of a group of words carried in his head as he set up his types, and he may have substituted "falls" through recollection of "fall" in line 143 -- and perhaps the sound of "folly" was contributory to the error.

The line halts without the "a", and it is easy to suppose that the F compositor carelessly omitted it.

The word is unstressed, and the F reading sounds awkward. The F compositor may have corrupted "nor" into "nere" through recollection of "neuer" in the previous line. He may even have repeated "neuer", and a proof-reader may have conjecturally altered it to "nere" for the sake of the metre. Or Scribe E may have misread "nor" in the playhouse manuscript as "ner" and written "nere" into his quarto.

Presumably two types fell out of the F forme and were wrongly replaced.
Along with this we may consider

Up to this point Lear has passed only one sentence -- he has disinherited and disowned Cordelia. And he has made only one formal vow (which actually is the sentence): at lines 107-15 he has said (I quote F) --

Let it be so, thy truth then be thy dowre:
For by the sacred radience of the Sunne,
The miseries of Heccat and the night:
By all the operation of the Orbes,
From Whom we do exist, and cease to be,
Here I disclaime all my Paternall care,
Propinquity and property of blood,
And as a stranger to my heart and me,
Hold thee from this for euer.

Thus singulars and not plurals are required in lines 167 and 169. Scribe E may have misread the playhouse manuscript and miscorrected Q.

It will be remembered that we have in List A accepted F's "reserue thy state" in line 148 and "reouke thy guift" in line 163, and not Q's "Reuerse thy doome" and "Reuoke thy doome". Now if "reouke thy guift" means "cancel your distribution of the kingdom" (i.e. virtually the same as "reserue thy state") then, since we are following F in lines 148 and 163, we find that Kent does not explicitly ask Lear to refrain from disinheriting and disowning Cordelia. But Kent's words at line 151 ("Thy yongest Daughter do's not loue thee least") can be taken as implying a request to spare Cordelia. And "reouke thy guift" in line 163 may possibly
mean "revoke this additional gift of Cordelia's portion to Cornwall and Albany" (see lines 126-7) -- in other words, do not disinherit Cordelia: in which case Kent does directly attempt to come between Lear's sentence and his power.

I i 187 Q Glost. F Cor.
In this scene in F the speech-heading Cor. indicates Cordelia except at line 161 where it indicates Cornwall. After what has passed it would of course be totally impossible to give line 187 to Cordelia. Cornwall, one of those standing by, might conceivably draw Lear's attention to the approach of the newcomers. But it seems more natural that Gloucester, entering in attendance on France and Burgundy, should announce them to the King. The F speech-heading may be due to an aberration on the part of the compositor.

I i 205 Q On F in
"Conditions" doubtless means "terms of agreement", and in Shakespearian as in modern usage "on" in the appropriate preposition, not "in". Schmidt urges that "conditions" here means "qualities", referring to the "qualities" of Cordelia enumerated in lines 202-3, and he defends "in". But I cannot agree with his interpretation of "conditions" in this context.

I i 213 Q best F om.
As regards sense the F reading is satisfactory: "she that was your object" means "she who excited
love in you". "Object" = "one that excites love or pity or their opposites" (Onions, Shakespeare Glossary): cf. Midsummer Night's Dream IV i 176 -- "The object and the pleasure of mine eye / Is only Helena", etc. But in Shakespeare, as today, the noun is always accented on the first syllable, the verb on the second. For metrical reasons, then, we must accept Q's "best". The F compositor presumably omitted it accidentally.

I i 220 Q Falne F Fall
The sense is in favour of Q here. We might read "Fall" if in the preceding line we read "affections" (Q) instead of "affection" (F). But the past "Falne" seems more natural in the context.

I i 224 Q well F will
The Q reading is definitely the stronger. Scribe E may have misread the playhouse manuscript and miscorrected Q. See note on I iv 1 below in this List.

I i 286 Q not F om.
If F made good sense Q's "not" would be easily explicable as a repetition from line 261. Schmidt accepts F, extracting from it the meaning -- "All our observation in the past is little in comparison with what we may expect in the future, to judge from Lear's treatment of Cordelia" (see Furness's note). We might
accept F and say that in the past Goneril and Regan have not observed Lear's inconstancy much, though now they have striking evidence of it: but this is surely inconsistent with the fact that the sisters are able to make the statements, "he hath euer but slenderly knowne himselfe" and "The best and soundest of his time hath bin but rash". It seems more likely that the F compositor has accidentally omitted "not".

The F reading makes sense: see Onions's Shakespeare Glossary, p. 200 -- "sit, 1, pregnantly = to sit in council, take counsel together, hold a session". But surely this word would be more appropriate in the mouth of Regan, who says "We shall further thinke of it", than in the mouth of Goneril, who says "We must do something, and i'th'heate". This is an argument in favour of the Q reading; and there is another. "Hit" meaning "agree" is not pre-Shakespearian (see Onions, p. 106) and it is doubtful whether it would occur to a reporter, scribe, or compositor. That it is uncommon might be regarded as a possible reason for supposing that Scribe E emended it. I take it that Goneril wants the two of them to act together in agreement at once.

It seems clear that Gloucester re-reads part of the letter, beginning in the middle of a
sentence. It is more effective if he re-reads it exactly. And so from F I accept "Sleepe" but not "wake". F's "wake" may be a substitution for Q's "wakt" by the compositor, owing to the influence of "Sleepe"; or "wake" may be a substitution by Scribe E, he having misread a "d" in the playhouse manuscript as an "e". In view of the latter possibility, and since in any case F usually has "-d" and not "-t" in the preterite ending, I read "Sleepe....wak'd".

I ii 93-5 Q Bast. Nor....earth! F om.
I ii 123 Q to F on
Q gives the correct form of the phrase, to lay something to the charge of someone. F's "on" may be an erroneous repetition of the "on" in line 122 or of that in (F) line 117.

I ii 126 Q Fut, F om.
Many editors accept Jennens's emendation of Q -- "Tut," (Professor Dover Wilson cites this reading in his list). But this petulant noise is not to my mind what we should expect from Edmund. Surely the Q reading indicates an oath -- "(by Christ's) foot" -- and surely its absence from F is due to the purging away of profanity in accordance with the Act of 1606. Craig (Arden ed., pp. 36-7) quotes an occurrence of "fut" in Marston.

I ii 128 Q Edgar; F om.
Unless we adopt the Q reading here there is
no point in F's "Pat: he comes....". The Q "Edgar;" occurs at the beginning of a line close beside the marginal stage direction "Enter Edgar", and this may have confused the F compositor.

I ii 139-45 Q as......Astronomicall? F om.
I iii 17-21 Q Not to be.....abuds; F om.
I iii 25-6 Q I would.....speake, F om.
I iv 1 Q well F will

The sense shows that Q is right. The same substitution of "will" for "well" occurs in F at I i 224.

I iv 20 Q he is F hee's
The speech is a prose one, and the F reading sounds extremely awkward. The contracted form may be a substitution by the compositor while carrying a group of words in his head. Or the playhouse manuscript may have had "he is" run together, the "i" may have looked like an "e", and Scribe E may have read "hees" and altered Q accordingly.

I iv 49 Q daughter F Daughters
Again the sense vindicates Q. The F reading may be a compositorial aberration.

I iv 96 Q Kent. Why Foole? F Lear. Why my Boy?
It is clear from the context that the Fool is addressing Kent in lines 95 and 97-102, and the Q version of line 96 is more natural and appropriate than that of F. The F compositor's eye has caught line 104 instead
of line 96.

I iv 137-52 Q That Lord....snatching; F om.
I iv 157 Q crowne F Crownes
The sense shows that Q is right. The F compositor may have repeated the plural from the previous line.
I iv 174 Q fooles F Foole
The sense shows that Q is right. The F reading may be due to a slip by the compositor. The same comments may be made on the next case.
I iv 193 Q nor crum F not crum
I iv 225-31 Q I would....obedient father. F om.
I iv 254 Q O sir, are you come? F om.
The F arrangement is effective, Lear in his passion shouting "Is it your will, ...." to the newly entered Albany with no preliminary greeting. But I think that Q sounds better, and it is very possible that the F compositor has accidentally omitted half a line.
I iv 301 Q yea, i' st come to this? F om.
See pp. 43-4. Since the Q phrase may have been transferred (inexactly) from III iv 47 by the reporter I have some hesitation in incorporating it into our text. I do so, however, in addition to F's "Ha? Let it be so." (In Professor Dover Wilson's list "yea, i' st come to this?" is given as corresponding to and replacing F's "Ha?").
The resultant sequence is good, and metrical considerations support our text. And our procedure is consistent with our theory of the nature of the transmission of both texts. "Ha? Let it be so" may easily have been accidentally omitted from Q by reporter or compositor; and Scribe E may have written it into Q in such a way that the F compositor thought it was to replace instead of supplement Q's "yea, i'st come to this?".

**I iv 340**

Q (uncorr.) alapt
F at task

(1t is the reading of Q corr. that appears in Professor Dover Wilson's list.) See pp. 12-13. I accept Greg's argument that we should read "atxt", which doubtless stood in the copy for Q.

**II i 2**

Q you Sir,
F your Sir,
An obvious error in F. See Notes.

**II i 69**

Q I should
F should I
The sense is in favour of Q, and so I suppose that the F compositor has accidentally inverted.

**II i 70**

Q I, though
F though
The line sounds very much better in Q. The F compositor may well have overlooked the "I", having just set up "I would".

**II i 75**

Q spurres
F spirits
The sense shows that Q is right. Has the F compositor corrupted "spurres" into "spirits"
by confusion with "profits" in the preceding line? Or has Scribe E misread the playhouse manuscript and miscorrected Q?

Q letter, I neuer got him, F Letter, said he?

I should not like to sacrifice F's "said he?: it comes in very naturally, taking our minds back to the actual words imputed by Edmund to Edgar (lines 69-72). But Q's "I neuer got him" is very effective. It is possible that Scribe E wrote in "said he?: in such a way that the F compositor wrongly thought it was to replace "I neuer got him". I propose to read "Would he deny his Letter, said he? I neuer got him."

Q why F wher

The sense is in favour of Q.

Misreading of "y" as "e" is sometimes found: see Professor Dover Wilson's Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet', vol. I, p. 112. And it is possible that "y" might sometimes be misread as "er": in Sonnets 27. 10, 43. 11, 45. 12, 46. 3, 8, 13, 14, 69. 5, 70. 6, the quarto has "their" and Malone emends to "thy": I doubt if the same mistake could have been made so often unless by misreading. And so I suppose that in Lear II i 78 Scribe E may have misread the playhouse manuscript, taking "why" as "wher", and miscorrected Q accordingly.
Q strange newes    F strangenesse
Again the sense is in favour of Q. Greg (Neo-
philologus, XVIII, 261, footnote 1) says of the
F reading that "it is a compositor's blunder
of the memorial type".

Q thought    F though
It is obvious from the sense required by the
context that a letter is missing in F.

Q (corr.) clamorous    F clamours
Q (uncorr.) has "clamorous". The F reading
is probably a misprint (but see Greg, Variants, 158).

Q Reneag    F Reuenge
The sense shows that Q is right. On the F
error see pp. 14-15.

Q dread    F dead
The sense shows that Q is right. The F com-
positor has accidentally omitted a letter.

Q respect    F respects
The Q singular admirably balances the singular
"malice" at the end of the line. Indeed it is
hard to see how the plural would make sense.

Q His......with,    F om.

Q The King    F The King his Master, needs
The F omission would seem to be a deliberate
cut: and the abridger left himself with an
incomplete line. Q lines 136-40 are incorr-
ectly divided: with corrected lineation line
140 runs thus in Q --

are punisht with, The King must take it ill,.
The first three words conclude the F cut. The
abridger has presumably filled out "The King must take it ill" to "The King his Master, needs must take it ill", thus achieving regular metre despite the $4\frac{1}{2}$ line excision. In patching line 140 he took "his Master" from line 136, the first of the excised lines.

II ii 145 Q For...legges: F om. There can, I think, be no doubt about the authenticity of the line. In its first half it refers to a very important element in Kent's "offence". The F composito would seem to have been guilty of a careless omission.

II ii 146 Q continues to Regan. F assigns to Cornwall. The speaker addresses a lord, and asks him to come away. If the line belonged to Cornwall this lord could only be Gloucester: Oswald is not a lord, nor is Edmund yet. But Gloucester remains after Cornwall's exit. Thus the Q assignation would seem to be correct, Regan addressing Cornwall.

F omits one line (145) and mis-assigns the next one. I am at a loss to account for this patch of corruption unless by supposing a moment of quite unusual absent-mindedness in the composito.

II ii 147 Q Dukes F Duke The sense shows that Q is right. The F composito has presumably carelessly omitted a
letter.

II ii 168 stage-direction Q sleepes. F om.
Such directions are helpful to the reader. No doubt they reflect authentic acting tradition, and I think we are justified in accepting them.

II iii 15 Q bare armes F Armes
"Bare" adds an effective touch to the picture, and the F compositor may have omitted it accidentally.

II iii 18 Q sheep-coates F Sheeps-Coates
The F compositor has made an obvious slip.

II iv 2 Q messenger F Messengers
Lear had sent only one messenger -- the disguised Kent.

II iv 5 Q thy F any
An obvious misprint in F.

II iv 8 Q mans F man
The sense of the passage shows that Q is right.

II iv 17-18 Q Lear. No, no,....haue. F om.
These two speeches are so effective in the context that I cannot think of them as actors' expansion. Observe the climax effect: first a simple "No -- Yes" (lines 13-14), then a longer statement and counter-statement, then a still longer one, and then oaths: it seems to me to bear the stamp of Shakespearian calculation.

II iv 29 Q panting F painting
The sense shows that Q is correct. The F word looks like the result of a minim misreading of a badly handwritten "panting". Perhaps Scribe E misread the playhouse manuscript and miscorrected Q. Or did the F compositor convert "panting" into "painting" while carrying the word in his head?
Q whose F those
Q gives much better sense than F. "Those" may be a substitution by the F compositor, made while he was carrying a group of words in his head. He may have been influenced by the fact that the last word but two is "they".

Q With F Wirh
An obvious misprint in F. Professor Dover Wilson cites "With" from F2.

Q haue F hause
An obvious error in F, as are the next two cases.

Q you F your
Q mothers F Mother
Q her F his
F's "his" might be accepted as equivalent to "its", were it not that Nature is being personified; and Nature is personified as a female in Shakespeare as today. "His" may be a careless substitution by the F compositor.

Q her pride F om.
See pp. 289-90.

Q fickle F fickly
Obviously there is an error in F. F3 emends "fickly" to "sickly"; but "fickle" seems to be required by the context. The compositor may be responsible for the F1 error -- he may have confused "fickle" and "sickly": or
Scribe E may be the culprit — he may have misread the final "e" of "fickle" in the playhouse manuscript as a "y" and miscorrected it in Q. Perhaps Scribe E misread "fickle" in the playhouse manuscript as "sickly" and wrote that word into his quarto; and perhaps the F compositor misread Scribe E’s word as "fickly".

**Il iv 296**  
Q: bleak  
F: high

For "bleak" see N.E.D. — "bleak a. 3 cold, chilly; usually of wind or weather". It might be argued that "high" is more suitable in the context (cf. "ruffle", i.e. bluster). But I cannot help thinking that "bleak" is a curious substitution for a reporter to make on his own initiative. And in connection with the F reading it is suspicious that "high" occurs only four lines earlier ("high rage"); on the whole it seems to me probable that in line 296 the F compositor has substituted "high" for "bleak" owing to a recollection of "high" in line 292.

**III i 7-15**  
Q: teares......all.  
F: om.

**III i 30-42**  
Q: But true......to you.  
F: om.

**III ii 3**  
Q: drown' d  
F: drown

It is conceivable that F is right and that "drown" is in agreement with the imperatives in III ii 1, 2, 6, etc. But the connection between drenching the steeples and drowning the cocks is so obvious that I am fairly sure
that "drown'd" is right and that "drench'd our Steeples" and "drown'd the Cockes" are parallel phrases. The F compositor may have carelessly omitted a letter. Or Scribe E may have misread "drown'd" in the playhouse manuscript as "drowne" and miscorrected Q.

III iv 7  
Q skin, so tis  
F skinso: 'tis

The modern reading given in the list is "skin: so 'tis". Obviously F is wrong, and the Q word-grouping is right.

III iv 10  
Q thy  
F they

The sense shows that Q is correct. The F reading is doubtless a slip by the compositor.

III iv 50  
Q through fire  
F though Fire

The F compositor has obviously omitted a letter.

III iv 51  
Q foord  
F Sword

The sense shows that Q is correct. "Foord" = "ford". The F reading, with "s" for "f", has the appearance of a misreading of handwriting. We must assume that Scribe E misread the playhouse manuscript and altered Q accordingly.

III iv 61  
Q What, his  
F Ha's his

The modern reading cited in the list is Theobald's "What, have his". See pp. 17-18. I think it reasonable to conflate, though I see no justification for reading "have" (F4 "Have his").
Q deeply 
F deerely

The connection with "Wine" is in favour of Q. F doubtless anticipates the next word but one.

Q till the 
F at

Schmidt accepts F here, pointing out that the verb "to walk" can mean to withdraw, to go away: cf. Winter's Tale I ii 172, Cymbeline I i 176. If we take "walkes" in this sense in our passage, then "at" is the appropriate word. But in connection with ghosts, fiends, etc. there is no doubt that to "walk" usually means to "be seen walking, appear" (see N.E.D., walk v.1 9). To use "walk" in its meaning of "go away" in connection with a fiend would be to court misunderstanding. It might be suggested that Shakespeare did this, and that the reporter, taking "walkes" in its usual sense in connection with fiends, substituted "till the" for "at". But I think it more probable that "till the" is correct and that the F compositor has been guilty of a repetition (cf. "begins at....." in the previous line).

Q hath had
F hath

In lines 132-6 Edgar is contrasting his (Tom's) former prosperity with the misery he is enduring and has endured for "seuen long yeare". Consequently "hath had" is appropriate and "hath" is not. Schmidt,
arguing for F, says, "The 'hath had three suits' of
the Qq. probably accords with the fact, but what have
facts to do with madness?" But note the word "But"
in 135: surely in 132-6 "Tom" is concerned with a
contrast between his misery of the past seven years
and prosperity before that. The F compositor has
presumably accidentally omitted a word.

III v 10  Q letter               F Letter which
With "which" following very shortly, as it does in
both texts, F sounds hideous: probably the F com-
positor has anticipated the later "which".

III v 25  Q dearer               F deere
The Q reading is certainly superior. The F read-
ing is probably a compositor's slip.


III vi 68  Q tike                 F tight
The sense of the passage shows that Q is right. The
F reading may be a compositorial aberration -- there
is quite a number of "t"s in the line. Alternatively,
Scribe E may have misread "tike" in the playhouse manu-
script as "tite" and miscorrected Q.

Q trudletaile               F Trouble taile
The "n" indicated by the stroke over the "u" in Q is
necessary. A "trundle-tail" or "trindle-tail" is a
dog with a curly tail. The F compositor may have for-
gotten to put a stroke over his "u". Or Scribe E may
have misread "trundle" in the playhouse manuscript as
"trouble" and miscorrected Q.

III vi 95-113 Q Oppressed....lurke.    F om., except for "Come,
come, away." (99).

III vii 76 stage-direction  Q Draw and fight.    F om.

See note on II ii 168 on p. 332.
These words make the line metrically complete. This does not in itself necessarily mean that they are authentic. But they seem to me to improve the sequence. Gloucester says to the Old Man "Is that the naked fellow?" He is answered in the affirmative, and goes on -- in effect -- "In that case ('Then') please go away: leave me alone with him". F seems to me disconcertingly abrupt. The F composer may well be guilty of a careless omission.

I do not think that the above is invalidated by the fact that in line 15 of this scene, before he is aware of the presence of the Bedlam beggar, Gloucester asks the Old Man to go away.

Q's "armes" goes much better than F's "names" does with "giue the Distaffe / Into my Husband's hands". In his admirable note in the Arden edition, W. J. Craig takes "armes" to mean "the insignia of my sex", and interprets the passage, "I must take the sword out of my weak husband's hands, resigning to him the distaff". It is possible to defend F: according to F Goneril says that she must adopt the name of man and her husband the name of woman,
and then goes on to refer to an exchange of symbols of husband and wife -- she will give Albany the distaff and (this is implied) take from him the sword. It is possible to defend F: but I think that Q gives a superior reading, a reading which knits lines 17-18 tightly: I should not like to say that the reporter or compositor had improved on Shakespeare; and on the other hand Scribe E may easily have misread "armes" in the playhouse manuscript as "names" and altered Q accordingly.

IV ii 31-50 Q I feare......deepe. F om.
IV ii 53-9 Q that not.....he so? F om.
IV ii 79 Q (corr.) Iustisers F Iustices
Q (uncorr.) has "Iustices". In Q we are on sheet H, which in the copy used for F was in its uncorrected state (see p. 11). As Greg points out (Variants, p. 175) F must at IV ii 79 have taken over an erroneous reading from Q uncorr.. Greg proceeds: "The reader's emendation is unquestionably correct, and is supported by III vi 59 [55 in our text], 'False Jus-
ticer why hast thou let her scape' (Q; F absent)."

IV iii The whole scene is omitted from F.
Modern editors generally accept Theobald's reading "fumiter". The F "n" is certainly an error. The form "fumiter" is etymologically correct (O.Fr. fumeterre, med. Lat. fumus terrae). But since we are not modernising we should read "Fenitar", following F except for the "n". Cf. Henry V V ii 45, F Femetary (mod. edd. fumitory): F Henry V may have been printed from a Shakespearian autograph -- see Greg, Editorial Problem, pp. 68-9.

See p. 8. We want, of course, to print the full Shakespearian version, and we do not adopt arrangements in F which are the result of abridgement or stage-adaptation.

The sense shows that Q is correct. Perhaps the word was indistinct in Scribe E's playhouse manuscript and he guessed "desires", altering Q accordingly.

The sense shows that Q is correct.

Again the sense shows that Q is correct (cf. "Appeare" in 18).

The full stop is obviously wrong. I propose to read "Cliffe what". Professor Dover Wilson in his list cites "cliff, what" ("cliffe, what" Q2).

The Q reading seems to me to be definitely superior. It is possible that, carrying a group of words
in his head, the F compositor substituted the more common "enraged" for the less common "enridged" owing to the similarity in sound between the two words. Alternatively, if the playhouse manuscript had "enridged" Scribe E may have misread it (minim error): if the playhouse manuscript had "enridged" Scribe E may have misread it as "enradged" and taken this as "enraged".

Q coyning  F crying
Q is unquestionably correct here. The mad Lear enters with money, real or imaginary, in his hand -- cf. "Ther's your Presse-money" (lines 86-7). It is in connection with this money that he refers to "coyning". Scribe E may have misread the playhouse manuscript and miscorrected Q. Greg (Neophilologus, XVII, 261, footnote 1) thinks that "crying" for "coyning" is "an unlikely misreading in any but the very worst hands of the period": "more probably," he says, "the compositor accidentally set up "coying" and the proof-reader guessed "crying"."

Q white  F the white
F's "the" sounds clumsy and unnatural. Presumably the F compositor has anticipated -- cf. "the blacke ones" in the next line.

Q small  F great
Furness defends F, taking the meaning of line 162 to be "When looked at through tat-
tered clothes, all vices are great". But I feel that Q gives much better sense. Lear is saying that even small vices are clearly visible through tattered clothes, whereas rich clothes hide all vices, even great ones. Scribe E may have misunderstood the passage and conjectured "great" himself.

IV vi 195 Q I and laying Autums dust. F om.
These words go well with the "Garden water-pots" of the previous line; and they seem to me to be too good to be an interpolation by the actor. (In his list of Modern Readings Professor Dover Wilson gives "Gent. Good Sir." as part of the material supplied here by Q1. This is an error: these words are found not in Q1 but in Q2.)

IV vi 202 Q one daughter F a Daughter
Q's "one" forms an effective antithesis to "twaine" in line 204. The F compositor may have substituted "a" for "one" owing to his having set up "a King" earlier in the same line.

IV vi 240 stage-direction Q they fight. F om.

IV vi 247 stage-direction Q He dies. F om.
See note on II ii 168 on p. 332.

IV vi 255 Q manners blame F manners: blame
It is clear from the context that the F punctuation is wrong. The modern reading given in Professor Dover Wilson's list is "manners, blame". I propose to print as in Q, though the comma may well be inserted in a modernised text. At the end of the
line, F (in common with Q) has no punctuation mark after "not": a mark is required there: it may be that the F colon after "manners" should come after "not", and that it has been carelessly misplaced by Scribe E or the F compositor. If this is not the explanation, then I suppose that Scribe E inserted the colon after "manners" conjecturally, misunderstanding the word-grouping of the passage.

As F stands, Goneril says plainly "There is nothing done.". I do not think that this makes good sense in the context. There is no suggestion that she is reproaching Edmund for being dilatory: she says that there will be many opportunities for him to kill Albany -- there is no implication that there have been opportunities which he has let slip. If she is not reproaching him for delay, why should she tell him that there is nothing done -- a fact which he must know? I think we must read "done, if": and to make the structure of the passage clear we should later in the line read "Conqueror." instead of F "Conqueror,". Q "conquerour," (following Pope). The source of the corruption in F is probably Q's initial capital in "If", which may be just an aberration on the part of the Q compositor. Misled by this capital, Scribe
E or the F compositor may have conjectured a full stop after the preceding word.

IV vi 267 Q Indistinguisher F indistinguish'd
The modern reading quoted in Professor Dover Wilson's list is "undistinguish'd" (Q2). I propose to read "indistinguish'd", following F apart from supplying the missing letters which are in Q1.

IV vi 269 Q the sands F rhe sands
An obvious misprint in F. In Professor Dover Wilson's list "the sands" is referred to F2.

IV vii head stage-direction Q Enter Cordelia, Kent and Doctor. F Enter Cordelia, Kent, and Gentleman.

See note on IV iv 11, speech-heading, on p. 340. F (stage-adaptation) gives the Doctor's speeches to the Gentleman. In Q a Gentleman is required as well as the Doctor. Our stage-direction is Enter Cordelia, Kent, Doctor, and Gentleman.

IV vii 13, 17 speech-headings Q Doct. F Gent.
See note on IV iv 11, speech-heading, on p. 340.

IV vii 24 Q doubt not F doubt
The sense shows that Q is correct. The F compositor has accidentally omitted a word.

IV vii 24-5 Q Cord. Very...musicke there, F om.

IV vii 32 Q warring F iarring
The Q word is very much more appropriate
in the context. Cordelia is thinking of the winds as having made war on Lear -- cf. "helme" in line 36 (Q only). She is thinking of Lear as standing up against the hostile elements. "Iarring" would mean "discordant, out of tune", which is not suitable here. Now "iarring" is used earlier in the scene (line 16) in F, and there it is appropriate -- "Th'vntun'd and iarring senses". One is tempted to explain "iarring" in F line 32 as a recollection of that word in F line 16 by either Scribe E or the F compositor.

IV vii 33-6 Q To stand.....helme? F om.

IV vii 43, 51 speech-headings Q Doct. F Gen. See note on IV iv 11, speech-heading, on p. 340. So also with regard to the next item.

IV vii 78 speech-heading Q Doct. F Gent.

IV vii 79-80 Q and yet.....lost, F om.


V i 16 Q Feare me not F Feare not The Q line is metrically perfect, that of F is not. This is not in itself a guarantee that Q is correct (see note on IV vii 59 in List A, p. 311); but I think that "Feare me not" is a superior reading to "Feare not", and we can easily suppose that the F compositor accidentally omitted a word.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V i 18-19</td>
<td>Q Gone. I had....and mee. F om.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V i 23-8</td>
<td>Q where I could....speake nobly. F om.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V i 33</td>
<td>Q Bast. I shall....tent. F om.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V i 46</td>
<td>Q loue F loues The sense shows that Q is right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V i 48</td>
<td>Q the F the (but with the first letter turned) (In Professor Dover Wilson's list the correction is cited from F2.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V iii 13</td>
<td>Q heare poor rogues F heere (poore Rogues) F is obviously wrong. It looks as if Scribe E had misunderstood the passage, taking &quot;poore Rogues&quot; to refer to Lear and Cordelia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V iii 48</td>
<td>Q (corr.) and appointed guard, F and Q (uncorr.) om. See pp. 9-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V iii 55-60</td>
<td>Q at this time....fitter place. F om.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V iii 84</td>
<td>Q attain F arrest Schmidt objects to &quot;attaint&quot; on the score of meaning. He writes (see Furness's note): &quot;Shakespeare does not use the noun attain in the sense of accusation, and the verb in his plays is equivalent to convict of high treason, not to accuse of it. There can be no reference to a conviction in the present passage&quot;. Admittedly Shakespeare does not use the verb &quot;attaint&quot; in the sense of &quot;accuse&quot;: but it can bear that meaning (see N.E.D., attain v. II 7), and it is possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that Shakespeare does here use the noun in the sense of "accusation". Alternatively, he may be using the word in the sense of "conviction". At IV vi 259 Edgar comes into possession of a letter from Goneril to Edmund, from which it is clear that Goneril and Edmund have conspired against Albany's life. Goneril's statement "You haue manie opportunities to cut him off......" amounts to incitement. At V i 40 Edgar gives this letter to Albany and asks him to read it before the battle. By V iii 83 Albany has read it, and is in a position not only to accuse Edmund and Goneril of capital treason but to prove them guilty of it, to convict them of it. In lines 83-5 Shakespeare may mean Albany to say in effect this -- "Edmund, I arrest you on a charge of high treason: I convict you of it and I also convict Goneril of it". If Shakespeare does mean Albany to say this, it may be pointed out that he is inconsistent in making Albany proceed to prove Edmund's guilt by combat. But this inconsistency remains even if we accept "arrest" in line 84, for Albany has the documentary proof and he confronts Goneril with it later on (lines 155-8) -- (and according to F he confronts Edmund himself with it at line 161, though I think that this is probably a mistake: see remarks on V iii 161 below in this List).

When a reporter makes a verbal substitution, his word is not usually a more recondite one than the original word. And the F compositor may quite well have erroneously repeated "arrest" from the
preceding line. Or Scribe E, understanding Albany to refer to a conviction of Edmund and then to proceed to prove him guilty by combat, and not liking the inconsistency, may have indulged in a "correction" on his own responsibility.

V iii 85 Q sister F Sisters
The sense shows that Q is right.

V iii 98 Q he is F hes
F makes the line impossibly awkward.

V iii 108 Q trumpet F Trumpet
An obvious misprint in F.

V iii 110 Q Cap. Sound trumpet? F om.
The absence of this Captain from F may be due to abridgement.

In the proclamation the Herald makes it known that the trumpet is going to be sounded three times. He specifically directs the second and third blasts in F: it seems desirable that the first should be similarly directed. But I do not think that we are safe in assigning this "Sound?" (Q) to Edmund. I think that Jennens is right in continuing it to the Herald. There is no reason to suppose that Q is right in assigning "Againe?" to Edmund: and if the Herald calls for the second (and third) blasts he is the most natural person to call for the first. The F compositor may have accidentally omitted the word "Sound" from the Herald's speech. Or Scribe E's deletion
of the speech-heading "Bast." in Q may have accidentally included part of the "Sound?".

At line 103 of this scene Q, unsupported by F, gives Edmund the words "A Herald ho, a Herald": and here it assigns "Sound?" to him. It seems likely, we have said, that Edmund's interposition in the second case is not authentic; and, as for the first case, it is eminently possible that Scribe E deleted Edmund's speech in Q line 103 because it did not appear in the playhouse manuscript -- it being, perhaps, a gratuitous interpolation by the actor. It is quite possible that on occasion an actor stuck in a word or two without warrant from the "book". Edmund's words in Q line 103 may quite possibly be an interpolation of this kind. The interpolation may have become traditional in performances. And the actor of Edmund's part may have been accustomed to butt in with the "Sound -- Again -- Again" at lines 116-8, again without warrant from the "book". This may seem far-fetched. But if Q were right both in reading the words peculiar to it in line 103 and in assigning "Sound?" to Edmund in line 116 (and Q is cited in both cases in Professor Dover Wilson's list of Modern Readings) it would surely be very remarkable that two interpositions by Edmund in connection with the Herald should have been accidentally
omitted during the transmission of the F text.

V iii 133  Q Despight  F Despise
An obvious misprint in F. We should read "Despite".

V iii 136  Q illustrious  F illustrious
Another obvious misprint in F.

V iii 149  Q scarcely  F scarcely
So here also.

V iii 161  speech-heading  Q Gon.  F Bast.
Upholding the F assignation Knight asks (see Furness's note) "Why should Albany address the question 'Know'st thou this paper?' to Goneril, when he had previously said to her: 'No tearing, lady; I perceive you know it'". On the other hand Edmund, having according to F said "Aske me not what I know", says two lines later "What you haue charged me with, that haue I done". Hudson, adopting the F assignation, says (see Furness's note) "Edmund, with some spirit of manhood, refuses to make any answers that will criminate or blacken a woman by whom he is beloved; and then proceeds, consistently, to answer Edgar's charges". So also Furness -- "[Edmund] refuses to know anything of the letter, but confesses that what he has been openly charged with, that he has done". But it should be noted that Edmund says not only "What you haue
charg'd me with, that haue I done" but also "And more, much more, the time will bring it out". This last line (164) seems to me inconsistent with assigning the second part of 161 to Edmund. From 163-4 I think we can say that Edmund does not wish to keep any of his crimes secret -- he is near death, he has not time to spend making a full confession, but he declares that his full guilt will be revealed in time. Now in 162 Albany says "Go after her.....", i.e. Goneril. F makes Goneril go out at 160. It seems odd that Albany should, after Goneril's exit, question Edmund and receive an answer from him and then say "Go after her, she's desperate, gouerne her". These words sound urgent. Surely we get the best sequence if we suppose that Goneril throws herself out after line 161 and Albany immediately says "Go after her, she's desperate....". And if Goneril goes out, "desperate", at the end of 161 it is obviously suitable that she should speak the latter half of 161. But what of Knight's question, quoted at the beginning of this note? It can, I think, be given an answer, consistent with assigning "Aske......know" to Goneril. At 156 Albany tells her that he perceives she knows it: Goneril replies "Say if I do,.....", horrifying Albany: but she has
only implied a confession: Albany, bent on securing a definite confession, asks her point blank "Know'st thou this paper?": and she goes out refusing to answer: she goes out obviously desperate, and Albany sends attendants after her, to "gouerne her". I think that this is a perfectly coherent sequence, much better than that of F. Scribe E may have made an alteration on his own responsibility, thinking Albany's question to Goneril in 161 inconsistent with his statement to her in 158.

V iii 197 Q my
F our
Q gives better sense than F. When Edgar revealed his identity to his father, he described to him all his adventures since his flight from him. F's "our" may be an accidental compositional substitution.

V iii 205-22 Q Edg. This......slaue. F om.

V iii 232 Q tremble,
F tremble.
The passage does not make sense with the full stop.

V iii 252 speech-heading Q Duke.
F Edg.
(i.e. Albany)

Edgar's words at lines 249-50 suggest that it is to him that Albany has said "Run, run, O run"; and in lines 251-2 it appears to be Edgar that Edmund instructs to take his sword and give it to the Captain. Obviously if it is Edgar who goes to the castle he cannot speak the latter part of line 252. The F misassignation may be
due to carelessness on the part of the compositor. At lines 249 and 251 two consecutive speeches are assigned to Edg. and Bast.: the next two speeches (lines 252 and 253) should be assigned to Alb. and Bast.: but the F compositor may carelessly have repeated the Edg./Bast. alternation (a compositor's memorial error).

V iii 258 Q you are F your are
An obvious error in F.

V iii 278 Q them F him
Q gives the better sense. Lear is surely speaking of people indefinitely or of his enemies indefinitely -- not of the executioner of Cordelia whom he has actually killed.

In some cases not included in Professor Dover Wilson's list it is necessary or desirable to adopt the Q reading or to base our reading on Q:-

I i 188 Q Bugudie F Bugundie
The F compositor has accidentally omitted an "r".

I i 189 Q a F this
Apart from Ridley all editors follow F here. But in my opinion the Q reading gives the passage more point. Even "in the least" Burgundy will want a large dowry since he, a Duke, has had the temerity to set up as rival to a King. It may be that the F read-
ing is a conjectural emendation by Scribe E, he having failed to appreciate the point.

I ii 10  Q bastardie  F Barstadie
A misprint in F.

I ii 122  Q whoremaster man  F Whore-master-man
F several times has supererogatory hyphens. See, below, II ii 61, II ii 97, II iii 16, III iv 79, III iv 120, III vii 58, IV ii 75. The compositor is doubtless to blame.

II i 7  Q eare-bussing  F ear-kissing
It is possible that "bussing" is a misreading of "kissing" -- "k" is misread as "b" elsewhere (see p. 166) and a minim error (u/i) may be added. On the other hand "bussing" is a very pleasing reading, and it is consistent with our theory of the transmission of F to suppose that the F reading may be a sophistication. (It will be noted that F has dropped a letter.)

II i 114  Q natures  F Nature's
The sense shows that Q is right. The F compositor has probably blundered while carrying the word in his head.

II ii 61  Q gray beard  F gray-beard
(At II ii 57 both Q and F have, wrongly, "gray-beard".)

II ii 97  Q silly ducking  F silly-ducking

II ii 167  Q shamefull  F shamefnll
A turned letter in F.

II iii 4  Q vnusuall  F vnusall
The F compositor has accidentally omitted a
letter.

II iii 16  Q wodden prickes  F Wodden-prickes

II iv 60  Q the  F the the
An accidental duplication by the F compositor.

II iv 282  stage-direction  Q Exeunt Lear, Leister, Kent, and Foole.
F Exeunt.
The F direction is inadequate. I adopt the Q direction, with, of course, the correction of "Leister" to "Gloster".

II iv 304  Q wild  F wil'd
F is obviously wrong. Cf. II iv 44 (a line at the beginning of a passage omitted by Q) where F1 has "wil'd" and F2 "wild". There also, of course, we must read "wild". This latter case is cited in Professor Dover Wilson's list.

III iv 12  Q (corr.) this  F and Q (uncorr.) the
In Variants, p. 146, Dr Greg writes: "There is little to choose between the readings, and I can imagine no reason why the [ Q ] corrector should have made the alteration unless 'this' was actually the reading of the copy. If,
therefore, the copy and the playhouse manuscript agreed, the folio must have taken over 'the' inadvertently from the uncorrected state of the quarto. If the playhouse manuscript had 'the', then it is a rather remarkable coincidence that the quarto compositor should have produced the true reading by accident".

III iv 79 Q sweet heart F Sweet-heart

F is definitely wrong.

III iv 115 Q (corr.) squemes F squints
                (uncorr.) -queues

A full discussion will be found in Greg's Variants, pp. 165-7. I am much attracted by his suggestion that F's "squints" may be a sophistication and that the copy for Q may have read "sQueenies" or "sQueenes", one or the other of which may have been the Shakespearian word. I prefer "sQueenies" to "sQueenes", since the Q press reader probably looked at the copy carefully here and since his "m" in "squemes" suggests three minim strokes, i.e. "ni" not simple "n".

III iv 120 Q troth,plight F troth-plaint

III iv 132 Q stock-punisht F stockt, punish'd,

The general word "punish'd" sounds awkward between the two particular forms of punishment, "stockt" and "imprison'd", and I think the Q reading is superior. The F corruption
may be a conjectural emendation by Scribe E; or the compositor may have made the change while carrying a group of words in his head.

III iv 153 Q the house  F th'house
The line scans better without the elision. It sounds awkward with it. The F compositor has probably unthinkingly substituted the contracted article.

III iv 168 Q your Grace  F your grace
"Grace" being here the title and not the common noun, I think we can say that it is likely that the F compositor's failure to supply an initial capital was an oversight.

III vii 2 Q him  F hin
A misprint in F.

III vii 21 stage-direction Q Exit Gon. and Bast.  F Exit
The F direction is inadequate. I propose to read "Exeunt Gonerill and Edmund.", i.e. substantially the Q direction.

III vii 56 Q rash  F sticke
Along with this we may take

III vii 61 Q dearne  F sterne
I agree with Greg that in these two cases the Q readings are original and those of F sophistications. See Editorial Problem, pp. 99-100. I cannot think that either of these Q readings is the sort of word likely to have been substituted by reporter or compositor: reporters andcompositors do not generally substitute
readings more satisfactory from the literary point of view than the genuine ones.

III vii 58 Q hell blacke night    F Hell-blacke-night
We should read "Hell-blacke night".

IV ii 60 Q (corr.) shewes    F and Q (uncorr.) seems
See p. 11.

IV ii 75 Q thereat iraged    F threat-enrag'd
We should read "thereat enrag'd". Sense and metre demand this (essentially the Q) reading.

IV ii 87 stage-direction Q Exit.    F om.
The direction is necessary.

IV iv 18 Q good mans    F Goodmans
The reference is to Lear, and F's "Goodmans" is entirely improper. See Onions, Shakespeare Glossary, s.v. goodman.

IV vi 185 stage-direction Q Enter three Gentlemen.    F Enter a Gentleman.
In Q, "lay hands vpon him" in line 186 is addressed to the other two Gentlemen who enter with the speaker. In F, where only one Gentleman enters, "lay hand vpon him" is left in mid air.

IV vi 200 stage-direction Q Exit King running.    F Exit.
See note on II ii 168 on p. 332.
IV vii 48 Q scald  F scal'd  
F is definitely wrong. Cf. F "wil'd" for "wild" at II iv 44, 304.

IV vii 85 Q Exeunt. Manet Kent and Gent.  F Exeunt  
F finishes the scene here, omitting the conversation at the end between Kent and the Gentleman. Since we are printing the full version, we require the Q direction.

V ii 5  speech-heading  Q Edg.  F Edgar.  
A misprint in F.

V iii 144 Q some say  F (some say)  
For "say" here see Onions, Shakespeare Glossary, say sb.²: "usu. taken as the aphetic form of 'assay', and = smack, flavour, or proof, sample". The word is certainly a noun here. It looks as if Scribe E or the F compositor did not know this aphetic form, assumed that the verb "say" was intended, took "some say" as = "some people say", and inserted brackets.

[Corrigendum.
P. 354: II ii 167 Q shamefull F shamefnll  
This error in F1 is cited in Professor Dover Wilson's list, the correction being given from F2. ]
In one or two places I have put stage-directions in the positions they or the corresponding directions occupy in Q: and at some points I have followed Q in details of lineation and punctuation. All these cases are noted in the critical apparatus.

In his list of Modern Readings Professor Dover Wilson cites some cases in which Q spells a word as we do today, or nearly so, and F otherwise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I i 85</td>
<td>opulent</td>
<td>opilent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I iv 4</td>
<td>raz'd</td>
<td>raiz'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I iv 158</td>
<td>borest</td>
<td>boar'st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II ii 15</td>
<td>(corr.) worsted-</td>
<td>(uncorr.) wosted-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II ii 73</td>
<td>gale</td>
<td>gall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>varie</td>
<td>vary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(mod. razed) (mod. vary)
If we were engaged on a modernised edition we would, of course, accept the Q spellings or the modern spellings based on Q in the above list. But we are not modernising. We have said (pp. 253-4) that since the Q text is a memorial reconstruction no spelling in that text can be a Shakespearian spelling except by coincidence -- for in the transmission of the Q text documentary tradition was completely broken. But on the other hand a given spelling in F may be a Shakespearian spelling which survived from Shakespeare's original manuscript into the playhouse manuscript used by Scribe E: Scribe E may have altered a given Q spelling to conform with that of the playhouse manuscript even although the Q word was not wrong. Now there is no F spelling in the list just set out of which I feel able to say quite confidently that it could not possibly be a spelling correctly transferred by Scribe E from the playhouse manuscript to the quarto which he edited to serve as copy for F. We are of course dealing with theoretical possibility. I do not know that it can be considered likely that Scribe E altered the Q "opulent" to "opilent", for example. The F compositor, carrying the word in his head, may have changed "opulent" to "opilent" in accordance with his own pronunciation. If Scribe E did change the Q "u" to "i"
it may have been a result of misreading of the playhouse manuscript. On the other hand the playhouse manuscript may have had "opilent" and that may have been Shakespeare's spelling. There is thus a theoretical justification for reading "opilent".

Let us look for a moment at the "gale/gall" variant. There is a possibility (though nothing more) that in the early seventeenth century "gall" was a genuine alternative form of "gale". N.E.D. gives one quotation which might bear this out: 1619 Z. Boyd Last Battell (1629) 544 "a gall winde" (cf. ibid. 1256 "a gale winde"). N.E.D. points out that "gall", "gale", here may conceivably represent Sc. gall = "intense, keen, brisk". Perhaps so: but at least we may say that it is not impossible that in Lear II ii 73 F's "gall" is the reading of the playhouse manuscript. This being so, I propose to accept it. But it may be objected that this may mislead the reader, since there is another word altogether with the same form, "gall", a quite common word. Would it not be better to adopt the Q "gale" and avoid any risk of misunderstanding? But if one were to agree to do so the question would arise of where this sort of procedure was to stop. At II iii 13 both Q and F have "president" for "precedent". Now Scribe E's playhouse manuscript may not have had this spelling: Scribe E may nevertheless have left it unaltered in Q, so that it got into F. But "president" is found elsewhere for "precedent": it is found in Q2 Hamlet V ii 247 and in Q1 Richard II II i 130 (both being texts printed from Shakespearian autographs1).

Even if in the case of Lear II iii 13 F owes the spelling "president" to Q, that spelling is not wrong: and it is possible that the spelling of the playhouse manuscript agreed with that of Q. Now are we to change the Q/F "president" to "precedent" because there is a distinct word "president" meaning something totally different? Surely not: for if we did it would simply mean that we were modernising, and if we modernise one reading why not modernise the entire text? Since this edition is an old-spelling edition, I propose to keep to the spelling of the copy-text wherever that seems to me at all possible. By doing so I shall of course be printing many spellings of the compositor, of Scribe E, and of Scribe P: but some Shakespearian spellings may possibly be preserved in direct documentary descent from Shakespeare's own manuscript.

A few words remain to be said finally on my text and on the scope of the critical apparatus.

I see no reason against making the form of each character's name, or of the abbreviation of it, uniform in all his speech-headings. Thus for example in I i F has, for Lear's speech-headings, variously Lear., Lea., and Le.. I print Lear. constantly, and the different spellings of the speech-headings in F are not noted in the apparatus1. Except for this, all de-

1. F varies in Edmund's speech-headings between "Edm." and "Bast.". I use the form "Edm." constantly: see p. 245, footnote. Similarly, where F has "Bastard" in stage-directions I substitute Edmund's name. But the substitution of "Edm." for "Bast." or "Edmund" for "Bastard" is noted in the apparatus.
partures from F in my text are noted in the apparatus. Q is quoted in the apparatus everywhere where there is a verbal variation between it and F. Mere spelling differences between Q and F in the same words are not as a general rule noted. All Q's omissions are noted, and also the variations between the uncorrected and corrected formes, and the errors in line-division. Where I accept the F punctuation in my text and Q has a different punctuation the latter is not as a general rule recorded in the apparatus. But where I depart from the F punctuation both the Q and the F punctuation are quoted in the apparatus even if the Q punctuation is not accepted either.

N.B. The symbol " -- " in my text is to be understood as an ordinary dash.