

# Site-Reading Shakespeare's Dramatic Scores

JOHN F. ANDREWS

During recent decades we've learned from art curators that paintings by Old Masters such as Michelangelo and Rembrandt become much more vibrant once centuries of grime have been removed from their surfaces – once hues that have been obscured by overlays of extraneous matter are permitted to radiate again with something approximating their pristine luminosity. In music, meanwhile, we've learned from conductors like Neville Marriner and Christopher Hogwood that there are aesthetic rewards to be obtained from a return to the instruments and arrangements with which Renaissance and Baroque compositions were initially presented. In theater we've learned from twentieth-century experiments in the revival of Elizabethan and Jacobean plays that an unadorned thrust stage, analogous to the performing spaces on which these works were originally enacted, will do more justice to their dramaturgical intricacy than will a proscenium designed for modes of representation that evolved later in the annals of Western drama. In archaeology we've learned from excavations in London's Bankside that playhouses such as the Rose and the Globe were configured in ways that look quite different from what historians had long induced from documentary evidence. And now in textual analysis we're learning from a fresh scrutiny of the first printings of Shakespeare's scripts that they too look different, and function differently, when we attempt to view them through early-modern eyes and resist the urge to “normalize” or rectify features that have struck later readers as ill-considered, inconsistent, or unsophisticated.

I'm producing THE EVERYMAN SHAKESPEARE, a paperback set of the author's plays and poems,<sup>1</sup> and one of the edition's hallmarks is an effort to restore traits a seventeenth-century booklover would have enjoyed in contemporary issues of these titles.<sup>2</sup>

We all know that spelling and punctuation were only beginning to become standardized by the time that dramas like *The Winter's Tale* were being completed, and thus that some words and phrases could vary a good deal from one stylist, or one situation, to another. Because we've long been aware that “accidentals”<sup>3</sup> such as orthography were subject to scribal and compositorial proclivities, however, as well as to the evolving house styles of Renaissance printing shops, we've been hesitant, when confronted with many of the peculiarities we observe in late Tudor and early Stuart publications, to attribute specific features to the authors whose scripts lay behind the various stages of textual transmission. We've been particularly reluctant to ascribe authorial design to any of the accidentals we observe in works for which there is a paucity of manuscript

evidence to draw upon as a control.<sup>4</sup> And we've been even more careful in our approach to the accidentals in books whose progenitors are believed to have been unconcerned about indifferent details, especially when we have no indication that they were involved in preparing or proofreading the volumes that were typeset from holographs or transcripts of their compositions.<sup>5</sup>

But is it possible that we've been too cautious in our treatment of the spelling and punctuation practices in early-modern printings? Could it be that we've been so anxious to avoid paying too much attention to seemingly inconsequential matters that we've trained ourselves to pay too little? With regard to Shakespeare at least, I'm persuaded that the answer is yes, and that many of us have unwittingly rendered ourselves incapable of perceiving, let alone appreciating, characteristics which are more than likely to be authorial and which are often rhetorically or semantically expressive.

At the risk of being “damnd” for falling into “Caribdis your mother” while I “shun Scilla your father” (*The Merchant of Venice*, 3.5.16-18) – at the risk of reading too much into what may sometimes be nothing more than incidental variations, and variations that reflect copyists and compositors rather than the poet whose artistry we seek to elucidate – I'm prepared to argue that the original printings of Shakespeare's plays and poems contain orthographic patterns that are so conspicuous, so pervasive, and so appropriate to many of the contexts they inform that they are almost certain to be the result of the dramatist's own deliberations. I'm willing to assert, in effect, that for Shakespeare spelling was analogous to a trope, a tool that could be put to a broad range of figurative uses, and one that he habitually employed in conjunction with other spins on a language that in his time was still amenable to an almost limitless application of English.

On the inference that, in a manner that would have endeared him to James Joyce and a company of the more adventurous stylists of our own epoch, Shakespeare reveled in the flexibility a largely unanchored orthography and grammar afforded,<sup>6</sup> and on the assumption that a good deal of the poet's verbal playfulness proved impervious to sea-change and successfully weathered a hazardous voyage into print, THE EVERYMAN SHAKESPEARE adheres to early-modern spelling forms – or adaptations of those forms that conserve their fundamental distinctions from current usage – whenever there appears to be any possibility that what we'd now classify as archaisms or anomalies might have some bearing on how given words were intended to be pronounced, or on what they meant, or could have meant, in the playwright's day. When there is a strong likelihood that alternate versions of the same morpheme could be significant, moreover, the EVERYMAN text replicates the diversity to be discovered in the pages from which all later editions derive.<sup>7</sup>

In many cases this procedure is relevant to the identities of individual *dramatis personae*. One of the heroine's most familiar questions in *Romeo and Juliet* is “What's in a Name?” For a

quarter of a millennium readers – among them prominent actors, directors, producers, and commentators – have been led to believe that Juliet was addressing this query to a Romeo called “Montague.” In fact “Montague” (or “Montagew”) *was* the spelling Shakespeare would have found in the poem from which he drew the bulk of his material for the play. For reasons that will become apparent to anyone who examines the tragedy in detail, however, the playwright changed his male protagonist’s surname to “Mountague,” a coinage that alludes suggestively to a combination of *mount*, a noun and a verb with both erotic and spiritual associations, and *ague*, a violent, quiver-inducing fever.<sup>8</sup> Setting aside an editorial practice that began with Lewis Theobald in the first half of the eighteenth century, EVERYMAN resurrects the sound and sense of the appellation that Elizabethan audiences heard Juliet speak.

Readers of *The Merchant of Venice* in the EVERYMAN collection may be surprised to see that the character other editions identify as “Lancelot” is actually “Launcelet,” a sobriquet which calls attention to the Clown’s lusty “little lance.” Like Launce in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Costard in *Love’s Labor’s Lost*, Peter in *Romeo and Juliet*, Bottom in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, and Dogberry in *Much Ado About Nothing*, to cite but five of the other bumpkins who served as earthy vehicles for an irrepressible Will Kempe, Launcelet is an upright “member of the common-wealth”; in due course we hear that he’s left a pliant wench “with child.”<sup>9</sup>

Readers of the EVERYMAN *Hamlet* will note that “Fortinbras” – as the name of the Prince’s Norwegian opposite is rendered in the First Folio and in most modern editions – never appears in the 1604/5 Second Quarto of the drama. There Hamlet’s foil is “Fortinbrasse.” In the opening scene of Q2 a surname that meant “strong in arms” or “strong-armed” in French is lengthened and inserted into the dialogue to the accompaniment of puns on *brazen*, in the phrase “brazon Cannon,” and on *metal*, in the phrase “vnimprooued mettle, hot and full.” Later in the same title readers of the EVERYMAN set will chuckle over “Ostricke,” the ostrich-like courtier who invites the Prince of Denmark to participate in a fencing match that will draw the action to its close. Only in the final entrance direction for this fastidious fop does Q2 dub the young lord “Osrick,” the name a more dignified character bears in all of the Folio’s references to him and in even those twentieth-century editions of *Hamlet* that claim to base their texts primarily on the Second Quarto.

Readers of the EVERYMAN *Macbeth* will wait in vain for the fabled “Weird Sisters” to arrive; instead they’ll encounter the “weyward” or “weyard” women. Shakespeare knew that in his *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* Raphael Holinshed had used the adjective *weird* to describe the “goddesses of destinie” who accost Macbeth and Banquo on the heath; but, no doubt because he wished to quibble on *wayward*, the dramatist altered the epithet for these deceitful hags to *weyward*. Like Samuel Johnson, who thought punning vulgar and lamented his

predecessor's proclivity to seduction by this "fatal Cleopatra," Lewis Theobald saw no purpose in the playwright's weyward spelling of an adjective that reflects the guile of Macbeth's misleading charmers. He therefore reinstated the "correct" form from Holinshed, and editors ever since have followed suit.<sup>10</sup>

In many instances Renaissance English had a single spelling for what we now regard as two separate words. One example is *humane*, which embraces the definitions that modern English would come to supply for both "human" and "humane." In the Folio printing of *Macbeth* the protagonist's wife expresses a concern that her husband may be "too full o'th' Milke of humane kindnesse" to undertake a deed that will crown his ambition. As she phrases it, *humane kindnesse* can denote several things, among them "humankind-ness," "human kindness," and "humane kindness." The Lady's words are thus a reminder that to be true to his or her own "kind," a human being in Shakespeare's era was expected to be kind in the sense we now limit almost entirely to "humane." To disregard this logic, as the title character and his "Partner of Greatnesse" will discover to their everlasting regret, is to ignore a principle as fundamental to the cosmos as the laws of gravity.<sup>11</sup>

In a way that parallels *humane*, *bad* could mean either "bad" or "bade," *ere* either "ere" (before) or "e'er" (ever), *least* either "least" or "lest," *lye* either "lie" or "lye,"<sup>12</sup> *neere* either "ne'er" or "near" (though the usual spellings for the latter were *neare* or *neere*), *right* either "right" or "rite," *sow* either "sew" or "sow,"<sup>13</sup> *tide* either "tide" or "tied,"<sup>14</sup> and *vaine* either "vain" or "vein."

There were a number of word-forms that operated in Renaissance English as interchangeable doublets. *Travaile* [*travail*] could mean "travel," for example, and *travell* [*travel*] could mean "travail." By the same token, *deere* [*deer*] could mean *deare* [*dear*] and vice versa, *dewe* [*dew*] could mean *due*, *hart* could mean *heart*, and, as we've already noticed, *mettle* could mean *mettall* [*metal*].

An intriguing instance of the equivocal force some word-forms carried in Shakespeare's day is *loose*, which oscillates between "loose" and "lose" when we translate it into modern English. In *The Comedy of Errors* when Antipholus of Syracuse likens himself to "a drop of water, / That in the Ocean seekes another drop" and then says that he will "loose" himself in his quest for a long-lost twin, his words tell us both that he will release himself into a vast unknown and that he will lose his own identity, if necessary, to be reunited with the sibling for whom he searches. On the other hand, in *Hamlet* when Polonius says he'll "loose" his daughter to the Prince, he little suspects that by so doing he will also lose his daughter through a gesture that recalls the folly of Jephtha.

In some cases the playwright employs word-forms that can be construed multifariously, and frequently as words we wouldn't think of at present as being in any respect akin. *Sowre*, for instance, can mean “sore,” “sour,” “sorrowful,” “sower,” or “sure,” depending on how it is employed.<sup>15</sup> In other cases Shakespeare uses word-forms that have individual modern counterparts, but not counterparts with the same potential for multiple denotation or connotation. Thus, although *onely* invariably means “only” in the usual twentieth-century sense, Shakespeare occasionally gives it an extra, figurative twist that would require a deconstructive nonce adverb such as “one-ly” – often symbolizing a virility that is assertively “man-like” – to paraphrase in today's idiom.<sup>16</sup>

In a few instances Shakespeare employs word-forms that have only seeming equivalents in present usage. For example, *abhominable*, which meant “inhuman,” “non-human,” or “sub-human” to the poet and his contemporaries (who traced it, however incorrectly, to the Latin *ab*, “away from,” and *homine*, “man”), is not the same word as our *abominable* (ill-omened, abhorrent). In his advice to the visiting players in the Second Quarto *Hamlet*, the Prince satirizes incompetent actors who imitate “humanitie so abhominably” as to make the characters they depict implausible as real-life men and women. Modern readers who are unfamiliar with the disparity between Shakespeare's word and our own, and who see *abominably* on the page before them, are ill equipped to register the full import of the Prince's sarcasm.

Current English treats as single words a number of forms that were usually represented as two words in Shakespeare's era. What we write as *myself*, for example, and use solely as a reflexive or intensifying pronoun, is almost always *my self[e]* in Shakespeare's works; so also with *her self*, *thy self*, *your self*, and *it self* (where, as usual, *it* does duty as a forerunner of today's *its*). Often there is no decipherable difference between Shakespeare's usage and our own. At other times there is, however, as we realize when we come upon “our innocent selfe” in *Macbeth* and ponder how affected such an expression would sound in modern parlance, or as we note when we see how naturally the self is objectified in the balanced clauses of the Balcony Scene in *Romeo and Juliet*:

Romeo, doffe thy name,  
And for thy name, which is no part of thee,  
Take all my selfe.

Yet another distinction between Renaissance orthography and our own can be exemplified with words such as *today*, *tonight*, and *tomorrow*, which – unlike *yesterday* – were conceived as two-word phrases in Shakespeare's time. In *Macbeth* when the Folio prints “Duncan comes here

to Night,” the unattached *to* can function either as a preposition (with *Night* as its object, and at this juncture as the King’s destination) or as the first part of an infinitive (with *Night* masquerading tropically as a verb). These interpretive possibilities resonate tellingly with the question Lenox asks the title character shortly after the monarch’s assassination: “Goes the King hence to day?” And they anticipate the irony a seventeenth-century playgoer or reader might have detected in one of the most moving of all the protagonist’s meditations:

To morrow, and to morrow, and to morrow,  
 Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,  
 To the last Syllable of Recorded time:  
 And all our yesterdayes, have lighted Fooles  
 The way to dusty death.

Here, by virtue of the playwright’s deft use of parallelism, the route “To morrow” is shown to be identical with “The way to dusty death,” a relationship we miss if we don’t know that for Macbeth, and for the audiences who first heard these lines spoken, *to morrow* was not a discrete word but a potentially multivalent word-pairing.<sup>17</sup>

When we forget that the verbal nuances in Shakespeare’s scripts were initially conceived as words and phrases for people to listen to in the theater, we sometimes overlook a fact that is central to the artistic coherence of a work like *Macbeth*: that the messages a sequence of sounds transmit through the ear are, if anything, even more significant than the signals a succession of letters, punctuation marks, and white spaces convey through the eye. A fascinating illustration of this truth, and of the potential for ambiguous or polysemous implication in practically any Shakespearean passage, may be discerned in the dethronement scene of *Richard II*. After Henry Bullingbrook asks the King if he is ready to resign his crown, Richard replies “I, no no I; for I must nothing be.” Here the pointing in the 1608 Fourth Quarto, the earliest publication to incorporate this multifaceted line into what modern editions designate as Act IV, Scene i, permits each *I* to indicate either “ay” or “I” (*I* being the normal spelling for “ay” in Shakespeare’s day). Understanding *I* as “I” permits corollary wordplay on *no*, which can be heard, at least in its first occurrence, as “know.” At the same time the second and third soundings of *I*, if not the first, can also be heard as “eye.” In the situation in which this speech occurs, that construction echoes a thematically pertinent exhortation from Matthew 18:9 – “if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out.”

But these are not all the meanings *I* can have here. *I* can also represent the Roman numeral for “1,” which will soon be diminished, as Richard explains, to “nothing” (0), along with the speaker’s title, his worldly possessions, his manhood, and eventually his life. Shakespeare was ever mindful that to become “nothing” was, *inter alia*, to be emasculated, to be reduced to an effeminate “weaker vessel” (1 Peter 3:7) with “no thing” or at best “an O-thing.” As the Fool in *King Lear* warns another monarch who has abdicated his appointed station, a man in want of an “I” is impotent and sterile, “an O without a figure.”<sup>18</sup> In addition to its other dimensions, then, Richard’s response is a statement that can be formulated mathematically, and in symbols that adumbrate the binary system behind today’s computer technology: “1, 0, 0, 1, for 1 must 0 be.”

Modern editions usually print Richard’s reply “Ay, no; no, ay; for I must nothing be.” Displaying it in this fashion makes good sense of what the title character is saying. As we’ve seen, however, it doesn’t make total sense of it, and it doesn’t emphasize the King’s paradoxes in the same way that hearing or viewing three indiscriminated *I*’s is likely to have done for attentive observers in Shakespeare’s own age.

English Renaissance society was more attuned than is ours to the oral and aural manifestations of language, and if we want to comprehend, and reify, the drama a diversified culture created we must train ourselves to “hear” the word-forms we see on the pages that supply our most reliable evidence of what Elizabethan and Jacobean theater was like. We must condition our imaginations to acknowledge that for many of what we regard as stable ties between morphemes and meanings – between the letter *I*, say, and the first-person pronoun – there were different linkages – such as the connection between a long-*i* sound and the concepts “ay” and “eye” – that could be just as pertinent to what the playwright was communicating at a given moment.<sup>19</sup>

As the word *audience* may help us to remember, people who frequented the Globe usually spoke of “hearing” rather than “seeing” a play. If we’re serious about analyzing and reanimating the works we know to have been composed for that magic circle, we will learn to do likewise. We’ll reacquire the capacity to listen with our eyes. We’ll do everything we can to renew a skill that atrophied within a few decades of the playwright’s exit: the ability to sight-read a Shakespearean score.

Let us now sample a few sites in *Macbeth* to determine how an activity of this nature might be applied to the artistry in a play with which we’re well acquainted. In 1.3.51-55, Banquo tells the weyward Sisters

My Noble Partner

You greet with present Grace, and great prediction

Of Noble having, and of Royall hope,

That he seemes wrapt withall. . . .

A short while later (line 140), Banquo says “Looke how our Partner’s rapt.” Then in a missive the title character’s wife allows us to overhear at the opening of 1.5, Macbeth himself recounts the effect the witches’ message had on him: “I stood rapt in the wonder of it.”

Within the compass of three brief scenes we hear the same sound thrice. In the first instance, the Folio’s “wra<sup>pt</sup>” relates Banquo’s salutation to a clothing image he has introduced with the question “Are ye fantastical, or that indeed / Which outwardly ye shew?” A similar context informs the second instance. The protagonist having soliloquized about a “rapt” state in which “Function is smother’d in surmise,” Banquo comments that “New Honors come vpon him / Like our strange Garments, cleave not to their mould, / But with the aid of vse” (1.3.136-44). So also in the third instance. When we examine the clause extracted from 1.5, we see that a Thane who describes himself as “rapt in the wonder” of what the witches have predicted for him has been enveloped in the “Ayre, into which they vanish’d.”<sup>20</sup>

To reinforce the sound that associates these passages with one another, Shakespeare has employed an apt convergence of semantically distinct senses.<sup>21</sup> He has thereby portrayed a soldier so wrapped in rapture – so shrouded by the fantasies into which the weyward Sisters have thrust his confused cogitations – that for a pregnant interval he is rendered incapable of normal discourse.

Unfortunately, owing to the ministrations of an influential eighteenth-century editor, only a fraction of the multitudes who have produced or written about *Macbeth* since 1725 have fully appreciated the brilliance with which Shakespeare depicts a hero’s susceptibility to temptation. In 1.3.55 Alexander Pope emended the Folio’s *wra<sup>pt</sup>* to *rapt*. As a consequence, the purchasers of Pope’s six-volume edition and virtually all subsequent readers of “The Scottish Play” have been shortchanged. They’ve been denied a pivotal clue to a drama whose enigmas demand constant attention to the perils of “double sence” (5.7.49).<sup>22</sup>

Thanks to Pope and to all the editors who’ve sanctioned his disambiguating modification of Shakespeare’s script, anyone whose experience of these three passages has been confined to the masks in which the *The Tragedie of Macbeth* is habitually attired in post-Folio reductions of the play has been led to focus on one development – the onset of a nobleman’s “rapt” condition – to the exclusion of another theme of equal if not greater importance – the process by which a magnificent warrior becomes inextricably “wra<sup>pt</sup>” in the lure of “borrowed Robes” (1.3.107).

**L**et’s now proceed to a few of the other homonyms that figure in the Folio *Macbeth*. In 1.3.132-35, during the soliloquy in which he attempts to decide whether “This supernaturall solliciting” is “ill” or “good,” the title character asks

why doe I yeeld to that suggestion,  
Whose horrid Image doth vnfixe my Heire,  
And make my seated Heart knock at my Ribbes,  
Against the vse of Nature?

Since 1709, when Nicholas Rowe altered *Heire* to *hair*, editors have assumed that the Folio spelling in line 132 is either inadvertent or inconsequential. The context calls for “hair,” which is almost certainly what the speaker intends, and “heir(e)” is recorded in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as a variant of that morpheme. But is it not conceivable that Shakespeare went out of his way to challenge our expectations here with a form whose weirdness would be seen in retrospect as an “earnest” of the “successe” Macbeth achieves by yielding to a “suggestion” which goes “Against the vse of Nature”?<sup>23</sup>

In III.iv.12-14, the Folio prints the following exchange between the title character and the First Murtherer:

*Macb.* . . . . There’s blood vpon thy face.  
*Mur.* ’Tis Banquo’s then.  
*Macb.* ’Tis better thee without, then he within.

Here, without giving the matter a second thought, most of today’s editors silently correct the second “then” to “than” and drop the comma that precedes it. Since *then* is the normal spelling in the early texts for the morpheme we know today as *than*, and since “than” is obviously what Macbeth means, the routine procedure is perfectly understandable. In this instance, however, the Folio version of the line is open to an unanticipated and ironically apt secondary construction that will almost immediately come back to haunt the speaker. Once again, in short, there are significant benefits to be gained from an editorial willingness to “vnfixe” a line which is much more interesting – because much more Shakespearean – in its seventeenth-century apparel.<sup>24</sup>

In 5.3.18-20, the title character says

*Seyton*, I am sick at hart,  
When I behold: *Seyton*, I say, this push  
Will cheere me euer, or dis-eate me now.

In this passage, drawing upon a conjecture by Charles Jennens (1773), most of today’s editors replace the Folio’s “dis-eate” with “dis-seat.” In keeping with this substitution, a few twentieth-

century actors, if not many editors, have been won over to a second alteration, “chair” for “cheer,” which was proposed by Alexander Dyce in 1857. What almost no one seems to have noticed is that *dis-eate*, which can refer to indigestion, malnutrition, or regurgitation, operates in this clause as an antonym to *cheer*, which pertains not only to a sense of well-being but to nourishment and to hospitality.<sup>25</sup> Macbeth will soon describe himself as “supt full with horrors” (5.5.13), and he may now be disclosing that what makes him “sick” is a surfeit which has resulted in nausea. In the words of Menteth (5.2.22-24),

Who then shall blame  
His pester'd Senses to recoyle, and start,  
When all that is within him, do's condemne  
It selfe, for being there.

Even without the *s* that editors now add to the Folio spelling of “dis-eate” in 5.3.20, many theatergoers are likely to infer that Macbeth either says “dis-seat” or evokes it. That is by no means inappropriate, because the “push” that threatens to “dis-eate” the tyrant will eventually “dis-seat” him too. Bearing this in mind, a performer who wishes to help audiences apprehend two strands of implication simultaneously might be able to do so with a pronunciation of “cheer” that edges it toward “chair.”

Now for another passage in which Jacobean playgoers might have responded in diverse ways to a verbal pattern with the potential for multiple senses. In 1.7.1-12, as Macbeth is weighing his options, he says

If it were done, when 'tis done, then 'twere well,  
It were done quickly: If th' Assassination  
Could trammell vp the Consequence, and catch  
With his surcease, Successe: that but this blow  
Might be the be all, and the end all. Heere,  
But heere, vpon this Banke and Schoole of time,  
Weel'd iumpe the life to come. But in these Cases,  
We still haue iudgement heere, that we but teach  
Bloody Instructions, which being taught, returne  
To plague th' Inuenter.

In his text of this speech – having decided that the through-line from “Schoole” in line 6 to “teach,” “Bloody Instructions,” and “taught” in lines 8-10 was less emphatic than the leap from “Bank” to “iump” in lines 6-7 – Lewis Theobald changed “Schoole” to “shoal.” It's a small but

bold emendation, and surprisingly few of the editors who have dealt with *Macbeth* since the eighteenth century have ventured to question it. Theobald assumes that when Macbeth speaks the word *Bank* he means either “sandbank,” a synonym for “shoal” (a bar or shallow in a body of water), or “embankment” (a steep shoreline of the type that might parallel a shoal). But *Bank* can also mean a number of other things, among them “bench” (both in a scholastic sense of the word that refers to a classroom bench, and in a legal sense that refers to a seat of justice and to the judicial system generally), “rank or tier of oars” (a nautical sense), “moneylender’s office” (a financial sense that anticipates the modern use of the term for a more complex monetary institution), and “pile of money” (a gambling sense from the game of hazard, where the amounts wagered on a bet were stacked on the card table). Most of these definitions can be paired with pertinent meanings for *School*, among them “classroom,” “school building,” “school of thought,” “academic discipline,” and “experience” (a sense that survives in the expression “school of hard knocks”).

Meanwhile it turns out that *school* and *shoal* were word-forms that overlapped in certain respects, with *shoal* as a variant of the morpheme *school* and *school* as a variant of the morpheme *shoal*. Then as now, for example, both forms could refer to fish who swam together as a “school” or “shoal.” And in all likelihood, depending upon the dialect of a particular speaker, each form could commence with either an “sh” sound or an “sk” sound. In this respect *school* and *shoal* would probably have resembled *schedule*, a word that is now pronounced “shedule” in the United Kingdom and “skedule” in the United States.

A word-form that editors for the last two centuries have perceived as defining one pole of a distinction, then – the sound, if not all the meanings, of *school* – would probably have been accepted in Shakespeare’s time as yet another instance of those linguistic units – like *travaile* and *travell* – that possessed more variability and latitude than their successors were permitted to retain once eighteenth-century dictionaries began “fixing” – both repairing and rigidifying – the protocols of English usage.

How would Richard Burbage have pronounced *Schoole* when he created the role of Macbeth in the early years of the seventeenth century? Is it possible that he gave it a Germanic flavor and said *shule*? Might he have said something that sounded more like *shole*? Or could it be that he spoke it in our fashion – *skool*, or perhaps something closer to *skole* – but did so in the awareness that at least some of those who heard him would associate an *sk*-pronunciation not only with “school” but with an earlier form for “shoal”? We can’t say. But perhaps a modern actor<sup>26</sup> could experiment with various ways of splitting the difference – for example, by rendering the Folio word “shool” – in an effort to offset some of lamentable results of a “dissociation of sensibility.”<sup>27</sup>

Let's draw these reflections to a close with the soliloquy that Macbeth's Lady delivers in 1.5.22-33:

What thou would'st highly,  
 That would'st thou holily: would'st not play false,  
 And yet would'st wrongly winne.  
 Thould'st haue, great Glamys, that which cryes,  
 Thus thou must doe, if thou haue it;  
 And that which rather thou do'st feare to doe,  
 Then wishest should be vndone. High thee hither,  
 That I may powre my Spirits in thine Eare,  
 And chastise with the valour of my Tongue  
 All which impeides thee from the Golden Round,  
 Which Fate and Metaphysicall ayde doth seeme  
 To have thee crown'd withall.

Here the first word that will impress most of us as weyward is “High” in line 28. Why should we not follow the editors of the 1685 Fourth Folio and read it as “Hie”? Because “High” plays on “highly” in line 22 to suggest that the “great Glamys” who hies – hastens – to his wife’s side will do so in a “high” way that befits his excitement over the exaltation the witches have forecast.<sup>28</sup>

But surely the most provocative phrase in this speech is “powre my Spirits in thine Eare” in line 29. The Lady’s syntax encourages us to construe *powre* as “pour,” and of course that is what we read in all modern editions. That interpretation is supported by 4.1.63, “Powre in Soves blood,” and by 1.3.96-98, where we read that

euery one did beare  
 Thy prayes in his Kingdomes great defence,  
 And powr'd them downe before him.

Before we conclude that *powre* was Shakespeare’s sole spelling for “pour,” however, we need to consider 5.2.27-29, where we come across *poure* in Cathnes’ call to

Meet we the Med’cine of the sickly Weale,  
 And with him poure we in our Countries purge,  
 Each drop of vs.<sup>29</sup>

To complicate the issue further, we have 4.1.78-80, where the Second Apparition tells Macbeth

Be bloody, bold, & resolute:  
 Laugh to scorne  
 The powre of man. . . .

Here *powre* appears to mean “power” and only “power” – though the earlier instances of the same spelling for “pour” make us pause for a double-take.

And then, as if to deride us for trying to sort *pour* and *power* into categories that are completely proof against contamination, the Folio serves up 4.1.17-18. There the Second Witch enumerates the ingredients to be mixed into a cauldron that will ensure “a Charme of powrefull trouble.” Every modern edition treats *powrefull* as an idiosyncratic but otherwise unproblematic spelling for “powerful.” But surely the playwright expects us to compare the “trouble” the witches are brewing with the “Spirits” that Macbeth’s Lady has conjured up in 1.5 to “powre” into her husband’s ear.<sup>30</sup>

Here and elsewhere the early printings of Shakespeare’s texts point to a powerful dramatist, an artist whose other gifts were inseparable from the way he prompted his actors and encouraged his audiences to pour full any receptacle that could accommodate a rich medley of verbal associations. In the words of Caliban, he was – and for those who read him aright,<sup>31</sup> he remains – “a braue God, and beares Celestiall liquor.”<sup>32</sup>

#### NOTES

1. THE EVERYMAN SHAKESPEARE (1993- ) is being published by J. M. Dent – originator of The Everyman Library, and now a subsidiary of the Orion Group in London – and co-published by the Charles E. Tuttle Company of Boston. The first four sections of this article are adapted from “The Text of The Everyman Shakespeare,” a preface that appears in each volume.
2. Here I refer primarily to the octavos and quartos that appeared between 1593 and 1622, and to the 1623 memorial collection we now label the First Folio. I recognize that the reading experience the quartos provided was far less formal than the one that would have been afforded by a more elaborate, “literary,” and expensive folio.
3. This term is normally applied to those attributes of a text that are regarded as semantically insignificant – that is, qualities with respect to which inessential variations will have no bearing on the sense of a given passage. In his chapter on “The Treatment of Accidentals” in *Principles of Textual Criticism* (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1972), James Thorpe discusses spelling, capitalization,

italicization, and punctuation, “as opposed to the ‘substantives’ or verbal readings that directly communicate the essence of the author’s meaning” (p. 133). As Thorpe and others are quick to point out, however, many of the items that go into “the formal presentation of a text” are anything but immaterial in their import, because something so seemingly trifling as “the lowly comma is capable of moving mountains of meaning” (p. 131). For one of the most thorough considerations of this much-debated topic, see the essays in *Play-Texts in Old Spelling*, edited by G. B. Shand with Raymond C. Shady (New York: AMS Press, 1984).

4. For Shakespeare, of course, we are limited to half a dozen signatures and a three-page section that is widely, but by no means universally, regarded as his in a single dramatic manuscript. See the analysis of “Hand D” by Scott McMillin in *The Elizabethan Theatre and “The Book of Sir Thomas More”* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987).
5. There is a broad consensus among Shakespeare scholars that the dramatist was meticulous about, and must have taken part in the proof-correcting of, the two narrative poems he issued with florid dedications in 1593 (*Venus and Adonis*) and 1594 (*Lucrece*). There is an equally broad consensus that Shakespeare had little or no interest, and probably no active role, in the publication of even such scrupulously produced dramatic texts as the 1600 first quartos of *The Merchant of Venice* and *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. I find it difficult to believe that a poet who spoke so poignantly about the immortality his sonnets would confer had no desire to see that his dramatic scripts were conveyed to posterity in accurately printed editions. For this reason I suspect that he did take some care for the morrow when opportunity presented itself – to supplant a deficient 1603 quarto of *Hamlet*, for example, with “a true and perfect Coppie” in 1604 – and that after he retired from the theater, had he but “liu’d to haue set forth, and ouerseen his owne writings,” he would have followed Ben Jonson’s precedent and supervised a folio edition of his works.
6. For a valuable discussion of this topic, see Margreta de Grazia’s “Homonyms before and after Lexical Standardization” in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch 1990* (Bochum), pp. 143-56. For a broader overview of the eighteenth-century approach to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English dramatic texts, see de Grazia’s *Shakespeare Verbatim: The Reproduction of Authenticity and the Apparatus of 1790* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).
7. Like every other post-Folio redaction of Shakespeare’s works, the EVERYMAN set is based upon a sequence of compromises. By comparison with the kind of text that Stanley Wells advocates in *Modernizing Shakespeare’s Spelling* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), it looks like an old-spelling edition. By comparison with the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century printings upon which it is founded, it looks like a modern-spelling edition. It is perhaps best described as a hybrid, an exercise in partial modernization that retains more features of the original printings than does the *The Riverside*

*Shakespeare* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974), but shares with that superb compilation an effort “to preserve a selection of Elizabethan spelling forms that reflect, or may reflect, a distinctive contemporary pronunciation, both those that are invariant in the early printed texts and those that appear beside the spellings familiar today and so suggest possible variant pronunciations of single words.” As *Riverside* editor G. Blakemore Evans notes, “Although the forms preserved may in many cases represent scribal or compositorial choices rather than Shakespeare’s own preferences, such an approach nevertheless suggests the kind of linguistic climate in which he wrote and avoids the unhistorical and sometimes insensitive levelling that full-scale modernization (never consistent itself) imposes” (p. 39). Ultimately, of course, it is impossible for even the most meticulous editors to recognize every instance in which they are guilty of “insensitive levelling,” because *any* textual intervention, no matter how minor, is bound to be distorting.

8. The playwright’s principal source was *The Tragical Historye of Romeus and Juliet* (1562) by Arthur Brooke. We can never be positive that it was Shakespeare, rather than a scribe or compositor, who supplied the *Mountague* spelling, but the odds in favor of the playwright would seem to be enhanced by the fact that this is the form the surname takes in all of the early printings, from the 1597 First Quarto through the 1623 First Folio. For anyone who doubts that an alteration of Romeus’ family name was part of a conscious plan, it may be worth pointing out that “Capulet” – spelled “Capelet” and “Capilet” in Brooke – like “Capilet” in *Twelfth Night* (where it applies to Sir Andrew Aguecheek’s mare) and *All’s Well That Ends Well* (where it identifies the Diana whom Bertram believes himself to have ridden) means “small horse.”
9. See *The Merchant of Venice*, 3.5.28-45. All act, scene, and line citations refer to the EVERYMAN edition. Each passage is quoted, however, as it appears in the quarto or Folio printing that lies behind a given text.
10. The word *weird* is to be found nowhere in Shakespeare’s works. There is one *wayward* in *Macbeth*, at 3.5.11 in a Hecat speech that many scholars assign to a playwright other than the author of the rest of the tragedy; further uses of the word or its derivatives appear in thirteen other Shakespearean titles. Only in *Macbeth* do the forms *wayward* and *weyard* occur. We would be required to hypothesize a most unusual scribe or compositor if we were to conclude that one of them, rather than the playwright, was responsible for such a bizarre deviation from Holinshed’s *weird*.
11. For another instance of *humane* that is thematically resonant, see *The Tempest*, 5.1.17-20, where Ariel tells Prospero “your charm so strongly works ’em / That if you now beheld them, your affections / Would become tender.” Prospero asks “Dost thinke so, Spirit?” And Ariel replies “Mine would, Sir, were I humane.” Compare 1.2.265, 284, 345, and 3.3.33 in the same play.
12. Many of the Porter’s jests in *Macbeth*, 2.3.24-48, pun upon distinctions that we now allocate to the spellings *lie* and *lye*. Compare the Clown’s wordplay in *Othello*, 3.4.1-17.

13. In *Coriolanus*, 1.3.55-57, Valeria asks Volumnia and Virgilia “How do you both? You are manifest house-keepers. What are you sowing heere? A fine spotte, in good faith. How does your little Sonne?” Here the dialogue suggests that either the mother or the wife of the title character is sewing, and probably that both are doing so. But the phrasing of Valeria’s question, and the remarks about Martius’ child that ensue, would also have reminded Renaissance audiences of Biblical commonplaces about sowing and reaping: see Job 4:8, Proverbs 6:16, Jeremiah 12:13, Hosea 8:7 and 10:12, and Galatians 6:7. Compare *Othello*, 2.4.72, and see *Hamlet*, 2.1.73-80, where Ophelia’s reference to “sowing” [sewing] introduces a narrative about some unhappy consequences of the figurative planting her father has done in 1.3.
14. In *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, 2.3.37-45, the Folio word *tide* provides the occasion for several exchanges about a “tied” dog who threatens to make Launce lose the “tide.”
15. See *Julius Caesar*, 1.2.177 (where Cassius refers to Casca’s “sowre fashion,” his sour and sore-headed disposition), *Macbeth*, 2.1.55 (where the protagonist addresses a “sowre and firme-set Earth”), and *Othello*, 4.3.95 (where Aemilia speaks of “Palats both for sweet, and sowre”). Compare *Love’s Labor’s Lost*, 1.1.318 (“therefore welcome the sower Cup of prosperie”), *Romeo and Juliet*, 2.4.24 (“so sower a face”) and 3.2.116 (“if sower woe delights in fellowship”), and *The Tempest*, 4.1.20 (“Sower-ey’d disdaine”).
16. In *Much Ado About Nothing*, 3.4.74-76, the bawdy Margaret tells Beatrice “Get you some of this distill’d *carduus benedictus*, and lay it to your heart, it is the onely thing for a qualme.” Earlier (in 3.1.92, during the comedy’s second eavesdropping scene) Hero has referred to Benedick as “the onely man of Italy.” Compare *Julius Caesar*, 1.2.153-54, where Cassius says “Now is it Rome indeed, and Roome enough / When there is in it but one onely man.” This passage prepares us for the irony of 3.1.59-74, where a Caesar who prides himself upon his stoic firmness says that “Men are Flesh and Blood, and apprehensive; / Yet in the number, I do know but One / That unassayleable holds on his Ranke.” In *Macbeth*, 1.7.72-74, after the hero’s Lady has persuaded him to “screw” his “courage to the sticking place,” he tells her “Bring forth Men-Children onely: / For thy undaunted Mettle should compose / Nothing but Males.”
17. As one might expect, there is touching, and usually unintended, ambiguity in the various references to *night* during the Balcony Scene of *Romeo and Juliet*. See 2.1.127-29, where Juliet tells the youth who has just overheard her nocturnal soliloquy “Thou knowest the mask of night is on my face, / Else would a maiden blush bepaint my cheeke, / For that which thou has heard me speak to night.” Later in the same scene (line 159) the heroine admits “I haue no ioy of this contract to night”; soon we hear her utter “sweet goodnight,” however (line 162), and those words reverberate shortly thereafter in Romeo’s “O blessed blessed night” (line 181). Eventually (line 195), in a promise that might be

construed as an unconscious attempt to protect herself against, or atone for, all that she and Romeo have pledged “to night,” Juliet says “To morrow will I send.”

18. See the notes to 1.4.195-207 in the EVERYMAN *King Lear*.
  
19. In *Othello*, 4.2.60-62, the Folio reads “Turne thy complexion there: / Patience, thou young and Rose-lip’d Cherubin, / I heere look grim as hell.” The final line is usually rendered “Ay, here look grim as hell” in modern editions. A similar crux occurs in *The Merchant of Venice*, 4.1.290-91, where the 1600 First Quarto reads “I would loose all, I sacrificze them all / heere to this deuill, to deliuer you.” Most of today’s editions render the first line “I would lose all, ay, sacrifice them all, / Here. . . .” Compare *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, 3.2.237, where the 1600 First Quarto prints “I doe. Perseuer,” the Folio prints “I, doe, perseuer,” and most modern editions print “Ay, do, persever.” For a few of the scores of additional *I/Ay* ambiguities in Shakespeare, see *Antony and Cleopatra*, 3.13.172-73, *Hamlet*, 3.2.79-80, and *Julius Caesar*, 1.2.122-23.
  
20. In this setting, as frequently elsewhere in *Macbeth*, “Ayre” hints at “Heire”; see 1.3.132-35 (discussed below), and compare 3.4.58-60, where Macbeth’s Lady rebukes her husband’s infirmity with a reminder of “the Ayre-drawne-Dagger which you said / Led you to Duncan.” In 3.5.20, Hecat announces “I am for th’Ayre: This night Ile spend / Vnto a dismall, and a Fatall end.” In 4.1.137-38, where he unwittingly curses himself with the imprecation he hurls after the witches, Macbeth says “Infected be the Ayre whereon they ride, / And damn’d all those that trust them.”
  
21. For related play on *rapt/wrapt* see *Timon of Athens*, 1.1.19 (“You are rapt, sir, in some work, some dedication. . . .”) and 5.1.64 (“I am rapt and cannot couer. . .”), and *The Tempest*, 1.2.177.
  
22. This phrase comes from the speech Macbeth mutters after he hears that Macduff was “from his Mothers womb / Vntimely ript.” What the title character has just discovered is that his adversary was not borne – carried – to full term, and was thus not brought into the world entirely by his mother’s own agency. In this instance, the protagonist suddenly realizes, “th’ Equiuocation of the Fiend, / That lies like truth” (5.5.42-43), has taken advantage of an overconfident usurper’s failure to reckon with the potential for duplicity in *borne*, an early-modern word-form that encompassed the meanings a later era would file separately under the headings *born* and *borne*. I beare a charmed Life, which must not yeeld / To one of woman borne.” When twentieth-century editions change *borne* to *born*, imposing an orthographic order that was yet to be codified in 1623, they deny today’s readers an opportunity to experience the kind of “Equiuocation” a buyer of the First Folio would have understood – and enjoyed – with at most a moment’s pause for rumination.
  
23. In 4.1.111-14, in a passage where the Folio’s *haire* is strongly associated with *heire*, the title character addresses the apparitions who parade before him: “Thou art too like the Spirit of Banquo: Down: / Thy

Crowne do's seare mine Eye-bals. And thy haire / Thou other Gold-bound brow, is like the first: / A third, is like the former." Near the end of the tragedy, in a speech (5.5.9-13) that recalls 1.3.132-35, Macbeth says "I have almost forgot the taste of Feares: / The time ha's beene, my sences would haue cool'd / To heare a Night-shrieke, and my Fell of haire / Would at a dismall Treatise rowze, and stirre / As life were in't." Finally, in 5.7.77-78, in a remark that implicitly identifies *haire*s with *heire*s and echoes both 1.3.132-35 and 5.5.9-13, Seyward consoles himself by saying "Had I as many Sonnes, as I haue haire, / I would not wish them to a fairer death." For an example of *hair/heir* wordplay in another work, see *Antony and Cleopatra*, 1.2.194-96.

24. For other instances in which *then* can mean both "then" and "than," see *Antony and Cleopatra*, 4.2.44, *Hamlet*, 3.1.79, *Julius Caesar*, 5.4.28-29, *Macbeth*, 1.5.27-28 and 3.2.4-7, *The Merchant of Venice*, 3.2.160-62 and 3.5.42-45, and *Twelfth Night*, 5.1.370-73.
25. Compare 3.4.30-33, where Macbeth's Lady says "My Royall Lord, / You do not give the Cheere, the Feast is sold / That is not often vouch'd, while 'tis a making: / 'Tis given with welcome."
26. When Stacy Keach played the title role of *Macbeth* in an autumn 1995 production for The Shakespeare Theatre in Washington, he said "school" rather than "shoal" in I.vii.6. During a question-and-answer session that took place near the end of the show's sold-out run, a member of the audience asked Mr. Keach what books, if any, he had read in preparation for the part. Among the titles he singled out for special commendation was *The Masks of "Macbeth"* by Marvin Rosenberg, a professor whose course, Keach said, had been very helpful to an aspiring actor during his undergraduate days at the University of California at Berkeley.
27. T. S. Eliot was referring to something other than the topics in this article when he coined this phrase in a famous essay on "The Metaphysical Poets" – see *Selected Essays, 1917-1932* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1932) – but many of his observations are nevertheless germane to the present discussion.
28. For an instructive counterpart to this quibble on *hie*, we might turn to the 1599 Second Quarto for 3.4.69-97 of *Romeo and Juliet*, where the heroine's Nurse says "Then high you hence to Frier Lawrence Cell, / There stayer a husband to make you a wife: / Now comes the wanton bloud vp in your cheekes, / Theile be in scarlet straight at any news: / Hie you to Church, I must an other way, / To fetch a Ladder by the which your love / Must climbe a birds neast soone when it is darke." Juliet's reply completes the pairing: "Hie to high fortune, honest Nurse farewell." Here again it would seem that Shakespeare used variant spellings to qualify, if not nullify, the semantic distinctions we might otherwise insist upon as our ears take in the word-forms *hie* and *high*.
29. Here *poure*, a spelling which is to be found in several other passages in Shakespeare, occurs on a page that appears to have been set by Compositor B or another *do-go-heere* speller; it is thus possible that

this is that typesetter's spelling for "pour" rather than Shakespeare's. The same compositor seems to have set the page that contains 4.1.63 ("Powre in Sowes blood") and 4.1.80 ("powre of man"), however, so even if he had a mild preference for *pour* he must have been quite tolerant of *powre* forms when he encountered them in his copy. A different Folio workman, either Compositor A or another *doe-goe-here* speller, appears to have set the text for 1.5.29 ("powre my Spirits in thine Eare"). For a study of the Folio compositors that has stood the test of time with remarkable endurance, see Charlton Hinman's *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963). For a valuable update on, and corrective to, several aspects of this monumental achievement, including its roster of compositorial attributions, see Peter Blayney's introduction to the revised edition of Hinman's 1968 facsimile of *The First Folio of Shakespeare* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1996).

30. Perhaps the most fascinating illustration of the malleability of *powre* in Shakespeare occurs in *Antony and Cleopatra*, 2.2.234-38, where Enobarbus says "I saw her once / Hop forty Paces through the publicke streete, / And hauing lost her breath, she spoke, and panted / That she did make defect, perfection, / And breathlesse powre breath forth." In most of today's editions line 238 is printed "And, breathless, power breathe forth." Since *breath* occurs as often as *breathe* in positions that call for a verb, this reading is entirely defensible. But so is "And, breathless, pour breath forth." In the EVERYMAN text of the play, the line is left indeterminate: "And breathless powre breath forth." For other provocative instances of *powre* and its derivatives in *Antony and Cleopatra*, see 1.1.22, 2.5.32-34, 53. For additional Folio instances of *powre* and its derivatives, compare *Othello*, 1.3.102-5, 2.1.78, 2.3.368, 5.2.155, *The Tempest*, 1.2.3, 4.1.38, and *The Winter's Tale*, 1.2.200, 4.4.363-65. For *powre* and its derivatives in quarto printings, where the transmission of Shakespeare's texts would have been influenced by factors other than those that affected the shop where the First Folio was printed, see *Titus Andronicus*, 2.3.61 (where *powre* means "power"), 2.3.163 (where *powr'd* means "poured"), and 3.1.299 (where *powre* means "power"), *2 Henry IV*, 4.4.46 (where *powre* means "pour"), *Hamlet*, 1.5.62 (where *powre* means "pour"), Sonnet 55, line 2 (where *powrefull* means "powerful"), Sonnet 94, line 1 (where *powre* means "power"), Sonnet 100, line 4 (where *powre* means "power"), and Sonnet 150, line 1 (where *powre* means "power").
31. Among the advantages of an editorial practice that preserves as many as possible of the "accidentals" in Shakespeare's earliest publications is the light those details sometimes shed on semantic relationships that would otherwise be difficult to perceive. During the penultimate scene of Act IV in *Coriolanus* – 4.7 in the forthcoming EVERYMAN edition and in Volume 17 of its precursor, *The Guild Shakespeare* (New York: Doubleday [GuildAmerica Books], 1989-92), but 4.6 in most of today's other editions – as news spreads that a vengeful Caius Martius is leading a Volscian army against a now-defenseless Rome, two Senators upbraid the Tribunes who incited the plebeians to demand the banishment of Rome's haughty champion. "We lou'd him," Menenius tells Brutus and Sicinius, "But like Beasts, and Cowardly Nobles, / Gave way unto your Clusters, who did hoote / Him out o'th'

Citty.” A moment later the “Clusters” themselves enter, and Menenius excoriates them: “You are they / That made the Ayre vnwholsome, when you cast / Your stinking, greasie Caps, in hooting / At Coriolanus Exile.” Nowhere else in the canon do we encounter the word *Clusters*. What are we to make of it? And why does Menenius twice employ it to identify a crowd of commoners? A helpful clue is to be found in the Folio text of *Othello*, where the compound the 1622 Quarto renders as “Clisterpipes” is spelled “Cluster-pipes.” Notwithstanding his “small Latine, and lesse Greeke,” Shakespeare evidently knew that the word we now spell *clyster* derived from κλυστήρ, the Greek word for a cathartic. Recognizing that the Greek upsilon could be represented in English by either a *u* or an *i/y* character, the playwright probably realized that *cluster* offered possibilities for wordplay that would not be available to him if he opted for a form like *clister* or *clyster*. So what are the “Clusters” that “did hoote” Coriolanus out of Rome? They are purgatives: foul-smelling, noisy agents of evacuation who acted upon Rome’s unhealthy body politic as diarrhetics. As a consequence of their labors a flatulent “Citty,” having reduced its former savior to a piece of excrement, discharged him in an explosive movement of its urban bowels. For other scatological imagery in *Coriolanus*, see 2.1.46-82 (where *faces* plays on *faeces*, the Latin root of “feces”), 2.3.202 (where *pass* hints at defecation), and 3.1.50-55 (where *y’are bound* alludes to constipation).

32. *The Tempest*, 2.2.126.

---

This article appeared in *Shakespearean Illuminations: Essays in Honor of Marvin Rosenberg*, edited by Jay L. Halio and Hugh Richmond (Newark: University of Delaware Press, and London: Associated University Presses, 1998), pp. 183-202. For a discussion of its implications, and of related topics that emerged during a series of conversations I had with the author, see Ron Rosenbaum, *The Shakespeare Wars* (New York: Random House, 2006), pp. 223, 247-70, 331-32, 519.