

Seminar 2

The Second Folio Revisited

Coordinator: Noriko Sumimoto (Professor, Meisei University)

Members: Mariko Nagase (Associate Professor, Kyushu Institute of Technology)

Tomonari Kuwayama (Associate Professor, Kyoto University)

Atsuhiko Hirota (Associate Professor, Kyoto University)

Guest: Jean-Christophe Mayer (Professor, French National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS) and University of Montpellier)

(In the order of presentation)

<<Summary>>

Whilst the (textual) primacy of the First Folio is beyond dispute and deserves the attention it enjoys, world scholarship is yet on its way to the full appreciation of the Second, also published while the London theatrical world was still active. This seminar has been an attempt to explore what the Second Folio as a material book has to say about itself when approached anew from various disciplinary perspectives. The seminar team has been convinced that the Second yields rich insights into the historical and cultural contexts that generated this particular Folio including its editor(s) and readers. The titles and summaries of each member's paper, in the order of presentation, are as follows:

Mariko Nagase

An undercurrent neoclassical editorial convention in Shakespeare's Second Folio

This paper explored the editorial intention behind F2's omission of stage directions for offstage sounds in the context of the seventeenth-century textual convention in play publication. Whilst F1 retains about 100 directions for 'flourish', 39 of them have been deleted from F2. As to the directions for 'sennet,' amongst 18 found in F1, 6 are absent from F2. Their omissions in F2 have been classified into 'arbitrary changes' by Black and Shaaber and the reasons behind the emendations have never been fully explored. From the fact that F2 was set up from an annotated copy of F1, it is self-evident that the F2 editor(s) intentionally removed the directions. For a clue to the F2 editor's (or editors') motives, this paper turned to an editorial operation which the F1 text had undergone. It has been pointed out that theatrical directions for offstage sounds including 'flourish' and 'sennet' are almost completely absent from the F1 texts of seven plays which are considered to have been set up from the printer's copy prepared by Ralph Crane. The scribe had acquired neoclassical convention of textual editing such as the use of massed entries under the influence of Ben Jonson. Jonson established the system of massed entries on the model of Continental humanist editions of classical Greek and Latin comedies in order to suppress separate stage directions for later entries, exits,

properties and offstage sound effects. Referring to the tendency to eliminate theatricality from stage directions in conventional textual practice of reproducing a literary dramatic text, this paper concludes that the F2 editor(s) applied the convention of suppressing theatrical factors to the texts of F2. Conversely, the excision of the sound directions observed in F2 attests to the neoclassical textual convention of removing the theatrical directions from a reading text.

Tomonari Kuwayama
***Macbeth* and the F2 Editor**

The Second Folio was published in 1632 when the King's Men were still active, only nine years after the publication of the First Folio. This paper uses *Macbeth* as a case study to explore the possibility that some of F2's emendations of F1 derive from authoritative texts or sources used by the company. Such a possibility is suggested by the changes appearing in both F2 *Macbeth* and Davenant's *Macbeth*, which has previously been considered to be based only on F1. Davenant was involved in the King's Men before the closure of the theatres in 1642 and might have had access to company materials other than F1. Those similarities, however, might simply indicate that Davenant collated the Folios when adapting the play, which would show him to be a more cautious adapter than previously thought. This paper also examines the authenticity of F2's emendations from the interpretative perspective, focusing on variant phrases including '[s]wiftest Wine of Recompence' in Duncan's speech in 1.4 and 'the way to [s]tudy death' in Macbeth's tomorrow speech in 5.5. The former, for instance, can be linked to the play's references to alcoholic drinks, especially, its comparison of Duncan's life to wine in 2.3, while the latter is connected to Stoicism, a prevalent theme of the play. In fact, both F1 and F2 *Macbeths* were performed in the seventeenth century, as suggested by the Padua promptbook (F1) dating from the late 1620s and the Smock Alley promptbook (F2) dating from around 1680, which do not alter the above two examples (or their equivalents) while emending other words. It may be more constructive to admit the openness of the play text than to pursue an evasive authenticity.

Atsuhiko Hirota
Hamlet's 'Mobled Queene': The Second Folio and Memories of Texts

This paper is an attempt to explore F2 as a text open to interpretation. For this purpose, I take up F2's change of F1's 'the inobled Queen(e)' into 'the Mobled Queene' found in the Player's speech in *Hamlet* and discuss that this alteration may be considered in the relationship not only between the two Folios but also with reference to earlier texts. Then, focusing on this speech being part of a play-within-a-play recited from memory, I propose the possibility to locate this alteration in the intertextual relations extending beyond *Hamlet*. The 'inobled/mobled' alteration does not follow the often repeated pattern of F2 changing F1's text which F1 shares with Q(s). Instead, all Q1, Q2 and

F2 (as well as later Fs) read ‘mobled’ in contrast to F1’s ‘inobled’. F2’s editor(s) apparently recalled the earlier version(s) in restoring the unusual term ‘mobled’, suggesting that the textual memory is operative at this place. In *Hamlet* – a play particularly obsessed with memory – several levels of memory are in operation. The death of Priam was part of the collective memory for the people of early modern Europe. As a text dealing with this traumatic event prerequisite for the establishment of the Roman Empire, and later the concept of *translatio imperii*, the recited play-within-a-play is in the intertextual network of the Trojan War literature (which the texts of *Hamlet* are part of). The ‘inobled/mobled’ alteration – respectively allowing interpretation – is also interwoven in the textual and hermeneutical history, revealing that the change in F2 can be considered in the context of the memory of Trojan War texts as well as that of early texts of *Hamlet*. This alteration, we might say, is at the crossroads of the memories of texts.

Jean-Christophe Mayer

**Reading Shakespeare in a Seventeenth-Century English Jesuit College:
The Valladolid Second Folio Re-Examined**

The purpose of this article is to show—through a case study—how much the history of the reception and appropriation of Shakespeare in print may profit by altering its focus a little and bringing into the picture other important early editions such as the Second Folio. The copy I have chosen to discuss is one that remained in the library of the English College of St Alban’s in Valladolid, Spain, from the early 1640s to June 1928, when the American book collector Henry Folger bought it. It is now preserved by the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, DC (shelfmark Fo.2, no.07). While not entirely unknown or unexplored, the Valladolid folio has tended to remain in the corridors of Shakespearean literary studies probably because of its Catholic context and of the nature of its annotations. Indeed, its title page bears the certificate of a Jesuit censor and there are a good many marks of censorship inside the book. The censor has been successfully identified as the English Jesuit father William Sankey and there is good reason to believe that Sankey’s expurgation of the folio must have been done between 1641-51. Seventeen out of the thirty-six plays in the Second Folio receive marks of censorship. Words, lines, sometimes whole passages, have been blacked out with an ink pen and only the stubs of the leaves of *Measure for Measure* remain, as the entire play was cut out. Sankey focused particularly on *1 and 2 Henry VI*, and, more predictably, on *King John* and *Henry VIII*. Yet, on closer scrutiny, it appears that he ignored entire passages and that his notion of religious orthodoxy was fluctuating. Despite the Inquisition’s instructions, his deletions can be seen in part as matters of personal taste. Interestingly, a later, eighteenth-century hand has been at work inside the folio as well. Shakespeare was doubtless read within the same Catholic context, but this time the inscriber abandoned Counter-Reformation censorship and adopted another perspective—one which is more appreciative, not only from a confessional, but also from an

aesthetic point of view (five plays are clearly commended and bracketed passages in *Macbeth* are seemingly used to make comments on the state of the English nation). Ultimately, by looking at the marks left by these two reader-inscribers, one gets an important sense of how the appreciation of Shakespeare changed (even in religious communities) over a century. This is why the Valladolid Second Folio is comparatively so precious.

