

ROWE'S SHAKESPEARE, \ " 1709 \".

McKerrow, Ronald Brunlees and Wise, Thomas James.

The Times Literary Supplement(London, England), Thursday, March 08, 1934; pg. 168; Issue 1675.

Category:Letter

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

ROWE'S SHAKESPEARE, "1709"

Sir—Nicholas Rowe's edition of the plays of Shakespeare was first published, as is well known, by Jacob Tonson in 1709. In the two volumes, a certain number of copies being printed on large paper. It was announced as ready in the Term Catalogue for May-June of that year, the price of the ordinary copies being thirty shillings for the set. A supplementary volume of the poems, with certain dissertations, was issued by another publisher in 1710, but with this we need not concern ourselves.

It is generally supposed that there was no other edition of the book until Tonson reissued it in eight, or, if we include the supplement, nine volumes in duodecimo in 1714. This, however, is incorrect, for there was an intermediate reprint, apparently on small paper only, also in octavo and bearing the same date as the original issue, 1709, though actually, I believe, printed in the following year. This reprint, which must heretofore rank as the second edition, is a very close line-for-line copy of the original, evidently executed by the same printer, in the same type and with the same ornaments, which, with a single exception, are similarly placed. The paper of the two (small-paper) editions is very similar, though that of the reprint seems to be slightly thinner and perhaps a little softer than that first used. The imitation is indeed so close that it must, I think, have been intended that the reprint should be indistinguishable from the original publication, but to any competent bibliographer who places volumes of the two editions side by side, it will be at once evident that the whole work has been recast. I will give later some characteristics by which the two editions can easily be distinguished; but it may be mentioned here, apart from certain, not very numerous, differences in reading, which might of course be due to correction while at press, there are innumerable variations in the internal spacing of the lines. These cause in the verse passages a difference in the pattern of the line-endings, i.e., the amount by which particular lines project beyond their fellows—a sure sign of different settings. Further, the printer happens to have been careless as to whether he used roman or italic query-marks, notes of exclamation, colons, &c. These will be found frequently to vary in the two editions, and it may be remarked that here at least there can be no question of correction, for we may find on the same page in the two editions instances of each edition having the correct (roman or italic) punctuation-marks in certain lines, while the other edition in the same lines has the incorrect ones.

As regards the text little need be said. A few obvious misprints are corrected in the second edition and there is at least one minor emendation which has been adopted by later editors (Unrip's in *Richard III.* l. iv. 212), but there seems to be no clear indication of such general revision as is apparent in the edition of 1714, where there are many changes in punctuation, line division, &c., apart from some evidently intentional variations in reading. On the other hand, there are, as one would expect, a few fresh misprints, though the original, as a whole, has been followed with great accuracy. To the Shakespearean student the most interesting point, apart from the evidence which the reprint affords of the popularity of Rowe's edition, will probably be the fact that a number of readings attributed in the Cambridge and Furness Variorum editions of Shakespeare to Rowe's edition of 1714 really originate in the second edition of "1709." Thus in the first two acts of *Hamlet*, out of nine readings attributed by the Cambridge editors to "Rowe (ed. 2)," by which of course the edition of 1714 is signified, five, namely, "we do acquaint" (l. i. 172), "it has not struck" (l. ii. 4), "of this which" (l. v. 159), "his arm" (l. ii. 464), "struck unto" (l. ii. 587), should be assigned to the second "1709" edition. Further, one reading rightly attributed to Rowe (ed. 2), "in a Wrath" (l. ii. 455), is corrected to "in Wrath" in the reprint.

That the reprint as a whole was set up after the completion of the original edition can be seen by an examination of the ornaments at the head of the various plays. Among other notices, we find that the ornament at the head of *Antony and Cleopatra* in Volume VI. of the first edition is intact, whereas when this same block at the head of Volume IV. of the reprint at the head of *Henry VI.* it is badly cracked. Further, of such sets of the book as I have been able to examine, those which are still in early bindings appear to be of the same edition throughout. But we can obtain a more exact indication of the date of the reprint by comparing the ornaments with those of two books issued by Tonson in 1710, the eleventh edition of the "Works of Abraham Cowley," Volumes I. and II., and the "Poems of Mrs. Katherine Philips," where some of the same blocks occur. This is not the place for a detailed bibliographical proof, but by the help of these books I can, I think, clearly show that Volumes I. and IV. of the "Shakespeare" were printed in or before 1710 and that Volume V. was printed in or after that year. As the existence of the reprint implies a demand, we can assume that the book would be put through the press without unnecessary delay or interruptions, and it seems, therefore, reasonable to date it as a whole in 1710, though, on the present evidence, we cannot, of course, exclude the possibility that the printing of one or more of the volumes of the set may have overlapped either into 1709 or 1711.

The following notes will serve to distinguish the two editions. I give each volume separately, as sets bound in recent times are liable to be mixed. Of course, when single leaves have been added to perfect a copy, nothing but comparison with copies that have not been tampered with will suffice to show whether the correct edition has been used.

Vol. I.—The first edition has an engraved coat of arms above the dedication on sig. A 1. This is absent from all copies of the second that I have seen.

Page 48 is numbered 16 in ed. 2.
P. 13, l. 12 earthy, ed. 1: earthy, ed. 2.
P. 118, l. 1 on *Esquimaux*, ed. 1: *Esquimaux*, ed. 2.

Vol. II.—In the title of *The Merchant of Venice*, T.H.E. is correctly spaced in ed. 1; no space after H (T.H.E.) in ed. 2.
P. 92, l. 12 his wooing, ed. 1: the wooing, ed. 2.

P. 80, l. 11 from foot, *Unbinding him*, ed. 1: *Unbinding him*, ed. 2.
Vol. III.—On sig. F 6 (opening of *Richard II.*) the word KING at the head of the first begins over l. of OLD in ed. 1; over D in ed. 2.
P. 108, l. 9, *Ab. theu*, the Model, ed. 1; *the Model*, ed. 2.

P. 1315, l. 6 from foot, the world is, ed. 1: the world is, ed. 2.

Vol. IV.—On sig. B 2 an ornament with a center (as on B 2 of Vol. I.), ed. 1: cherubs upholding a basket of flowers, cracked in centre, ed. 2.

I am informed that some copies of the first edition have here the ornament of cherubs upholding a basket of flowers (presumably not cracked), the block having apparently been changed in the course of the impression. Such alterations during printing were, of course, not unusual, and in discriminating between the editions it is therefore unsafe to rely upon any single test.

P. 1740, l. 3 from foot, I have half a dozen, ed. 1: I have a dozen, ed. 2.
P. 2017, l. 6 I have, ed. 1: have I, ed. 2.

Vol. V.—On sig. G 4 the type ornaments at head of *Timon* are divided by two columns into unequal portions in ed. 1, that on the left being much the smaller; in ed. 2 the divisions are equal.

P. 2078, l. 20 his'd, ed. 1: his'd, ed. 2.
P. 2310 (misnumbered 311), l. 6 Mack-bell's, ed. 1: Mackbeth's, ed. 2 (the page here numbered correctly).

Vol. VI.—The ornament at the head of *Antony and Cleopatra* is not cracked in ed. 1: it is cracked through the centre in ed. 2.

P. 2694, l. 13 from foot, therein, ed. 1: certain, ed. 2.

P. 2755, l. 7. It is a through-fare, ed. 1: I through-fare, ed. 2.

It may be noted that, at some time or other, a correct, printed both on large and small paper, was issued for pages 27-8 (*Tenper*) and 285-6 (*Othello*) of the first edition. This consists of two leaves, apparently conjoined, and may, if not properly inserted by the binder, appear in odd places. There is one copy known to me where it is bound between pages 480 and 481 of *Madsummer Night's Dream* in Vol. II. It has "Cough" in p. 27, l. 10, instead of "Cough" as originally printed, and "knock" on p. 286, l. 27, in place of "know." The first error was corrected in the reprint of 1710, but not the second.

Yours faithfully,
R. B. MCKERROW.

TENNYSON'S "A WELCOME," 1863

Sir—I have read with much interest Mr. Pollard's article on Tennyson's "A Welcome," 1863, in *The Times Literary Supplement* of February 22. It is pleasing to me to know that now that the old generation of bibliographers is rapidly passing away there is arising a new generation of young men who are fitting themselves to take our places. My lengthy series of bibliographies are almost entirely pioneer work. It is now the duty of the new men to follow them up, and, whenever it is possible, to amplify or amend my records or conclusions. Unfortunately, in my present (I trust not permanent) state of broken health and shattered nerves resulting from two accidents, I cannot write much, but I can in respect of this matter put Mr. Pollard right. His long-run-out article amounts to just this, that he has found that there are three, as he supposes, and not two only, variants of the leaflet, and that the newly identified specimen has an even smaller hollow in the centre of its ornament than the one I record. This variant I have never observed, although I have seen scores of copies of the leaflet. From Mr. Pollard's account of his "discovery" I am led to the conclusion that it is no more than a copy in which the tiny hollow, no larger than the prick of a pin, had become partly filled with printer's ink, with the result that the leaflets pulled afterwards presented an even smaller hollow than that of their predecessors.

I bought my first copy of "A Welcome" very soon after 1880. It had the rule with the solid centre of the diamond. Not until after the appearance of the "remainder" some ten years later did copies with the hollow centre come into the market. These were all fresh and clean, and were accompanied by a "remainder" of the second edition of the "Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington." I discussed them with Mr. George Lillie Craik and with Mr. Samuel Hunt, respectively partner and general manager of the firm of Macmillan, and we arrived at the only reasonable conclusion—namely, that the copies with the solid centre formed the first issue or edition of the leaflet, and that the others formed a second issue or edition. Further, that the demand was so large and so instant that the type was promptly reset, and the second issue or edition was ready in a day or two, and when the copy for the museum was forwarded I chanced that the one picked up for that purpose was one of the latest printed and had the hollow-centred diamond. It is likely that when printing so ephemeral a work the printers would stop work twice merely in order to change a trifling ornament? I still cling to the belief that the account of "A Welcome" given in my bibliography is in every way accurate and sufficiently complete.

When a quotation is given it should be given correctly, and not garbled or distorted in such a manner as to serve an immediate purpose. Mr. Pollard concludes his article thus:—

"He [Mr. Wise] confused matters still further by stating in his bibliography that the only copy in the British Museum has the solid diamond rule, when it has the hollow diamond rule."

I said nothing of the sort. What I did say (Vol. I., p. 171) was this:—

"There is a copy of 'A Welcome,' 1863, in the Library of the British Museum. The Press-mark is C.59.4.26."

This is followed by a brief description of the second issue, or edition, whichever is the more suitable word; and this, in turn, is followed by facsimiles of the two rules.

In spite of Mr. Pollard's assertion to the contrary, I must confirm the statement made in my bibliography that there were two editions of the leaflet. The variations between them are almost too minute to be described verbally, but if the type-pages of the titles be measured it will be found that one is an eighth of an inch taller than the other. And observe the difference in position of the letter *P* in the word *post* in relation to the *T* immediately above it.

THOMAS J. WISE.

In reference to his "Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser," reviewed in this column on February 22, Mr. F. R. Johnson writes: "On page 11 it is stated that the Bright-Leferts-W. A. White copy of 'Three Proper, and witty, familiar Letters' (1580) has its first title-page in facsimile. This is a mistake, for this copy is perfect; the W. A. White duplicate, however, has the imperfections noted in my bibliography. In order that the Bright-Leferts-W. A. White copy of this book may not suffer an unwarranted loss in value as a collector's item, it should be properly recorded as one of four perfect copies known."

© News International Associated Services Limited
Gale Document Number:EX1200046357