The Marriage of Good and Bad Quartos
Author(s): Random Cloud
Source: *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 4 (Winter, 1982), pp. 421-431
Published by: Oxford University Press
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2870123
Accessed: 19-03-2019 05:23 UTC

Commentary

The Marriage of Good and Bad Quartos

RANDOM CLOUD

THE REAL PROBLEM WITH GOOD AND BAD QUARTOS is not what the words denote, but why we use terminology that has such overt and prejudicial connotations.[1] Employing moral categories in textual work obliges one to choose: to reject Evil once for all, and to strike out toward Goodness (and toward Shakespeare, who is a Good writer). If we were to call the classes of quarto arbitrarily "gad" and "bood," there would be neither propensity to spurn one for the embrace of the other, nor obvious candidates for salvation and damnation, should we be apocalyptically inclined. And who knows, we might fall into the knowledge that multiple authority is richness—and is that good or bad?

Bad and good tends to structure textual evidence before the reader has a chance to see it. In fact, few readers of Shakespeare's plays of multiple authority ever witness the evidence, for their satisfraction in the plays comes from Shakespeare's editors, who, having deliberated on good and bad, simply proffer the best—for readers to cloister their virtue in.

In defense of their moral integrity, scholarly editions of Shakespeare are accompanied by extensive rationales of text and mind-numbing collations, in which the many bad readings displayed serve to throw into high relief the virtues of editorial selection. The usual practice in such textual notes is to quote as the lemma only the good reading in good modern dress, and parade thereafter the bad readings in their bad Renaissance dress. Inevitably the reader's mind cannot easily skip from the coherently anachronized (or "modernized") edition she is reading, to fragments of a Renaissance text she has not read (and is not encouraged to read—for it is bad). Thus the reader is liable to construe such Renaissance snippets as irregular in "light" of the regularized editorial or-

[1]This paper was originally circulated at the textual seminar, chaired by Paul Werstine, of the International Shakespeare Association, Stratford-upon-Avon, August 1981. The author wishes to express sincerest thanks to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for its generous support.

RANDOM CLOUD is EgRegius Professor of Textual Critischism at the University of Trona.

thography. But this arthritic regularity is of a kind that postdates the originally fluid textual evidence, which is therefore more fairly described as pre-regular. By anachronizing only their good readings, editors talk down to readers, and so turn the bad old texts which they reject in their collations into baby talk or into a freak show.

The crux-by-crux display of textual evidence in footnotes also keeps the bad from being grasped in terms of its own wickedness. Chopped into messes, a bad quarto seems only a series of disconnected one-line boners, never a coherent dramatic shape. If we succumb to the temptation to be curious about it, we see the bad only from the perspective of the prior editorial decision to be good. And so the errors of art and history tag along after the timeless revelations of editorial truth.

Such makework of the con&temporary edition is service for the definitive text. Definitive is good; more significantly, it is exclusive. It functions "ideally" to save the reader from the pains and pleasures of actual multiplicity, even as moral vocabulary gives life shape by repressing it. If bad readings occasionally surface into consciousness from the textual notes, they are merely like the naughty thoughts that bubble up from time to time in good people. From the limited perspective possible in the merely good, the structure of repression behind the bad is invisible. It is the opacity of definitive, exclusive texts that renders their betterness perverse. With few exceptions, like the two accounts of Creation (Genesis i and ii) or the four goodspels, our tradition is unwilling to allow multiple textual authorities to rest as a simultaneous set of existential entities to be encountered absurdly by the reader. The reason for this is not that the "other" versions offer new, even contradictory *facts*, but that the *structure* of such facts shatters the editorial and social paradigms that constrain art. Editors do not—and so readers *cannot*—go in for the *infinitive* text, which we may define as a polymorphous set of all versions, some part of each of which has a claim to substantive status, and possibly presents, by whatever independent means of transmission, an element of Shakespearean dramaturgy. The infinitive text is of particular interest to historically-minded scholars. It may—irrelevantly—be aesthetically better or poorer than later definitive editorial versions of it, all of which, along with the infinitive text, constitute the *infinite* text, which continues to unfold and is virtually too large to be known by an individual.

I coin the term "infinitive" less to lay stress on the precise textual objects of relevance than to make clear the reader's interpretive freedoms, which editing endeavors to diminish and definitively to bind. What most offends me in Shakespeare studies is the pressure to owe allegiance to editorial constricts, which confound art with its interpretation, and which, promising the aesthetic, deliver anaesthetic.

Listen to the fool's reproach! it is a kingly title!

I

I have just been reading in the new Arden edition of *Romeo and Juliet*.[2] The editor seems conscious of the unfortunate nature of the terminology: in the one-

[2]Brian Gibbons, ed. (London and New York: Methuen, 1980).

page preface he puts "good" and "bad" in quotation marks (p. vii). But when he proceeds to his 26-page treatment of "the text" (ominously singular), he speaks of the Good Quarto and the Bad Quarto. The exchange of hesitant quotation marks for assured capitals in the manner of German or eighteenth-century English is daunting. The later stylization not only lends a tone of authority to the Judgment of Value, which is not yet defended, but also conjures up Monolithic Entities which we only swallow or spit out whole. But of course texts are not of uniform nature or quality throughout (as the editor is aware: p. 17); nevertheless, the editorial capitals contradictorally draw our attention away from such subtleties.

At odds with the judgment of the First Quarto as Bad is the repeated acknowledgment in the pages of textual introduction that Q1 is a substantive edition, that it has "independent authority or suggest[s] access to . . . evidence of what Shakespeare wrote" (p. 2). There is another substantive edition, however, Q2 the Good, which the editor adopts for his copy-text. But in choosing the Good the editor cannot do well. He offers the reasonable rationale that the Second Quarto seems to derive directly from a manuscript, Shakespeare's foul papers, and thus reports "what Shakespeare wrote"; whereas Q1 derives, he maintains, through a staged version (and a report of it at that), which thus offers only indirect evidence of "what Shakespeare wrote." He states that Q1 "contains anticipations, recollections, transpositions, paraphrases, summaries, repetitions and omissions of words, phrases or lines correctly presented in Q2" (p. 2). The word "correctly" is interesting here; it shows that the editor has made an irrational leap from the Shakespeare manuscript, which is "correct" by definition, to the arbitrary designation of his chosen copy-text as "Good." For how can we know that Q2 *is* any good without comparing it to the lost manuscript?

His formulation also ignores or forgets that whatever the truth about reports and production behind Q1, there must have been a manuscript that initiated it all, and that this manuscript must bear some relation—of identity or of difference—to the manuscript that underlies most of Q2. The editor implies that they are identical. But will he state it, and can he prove it?[3] And if he cannot, then is the valuation of Q2 as "Good" not a self-confirming but circular projection back onto the evidence from the editorial decision to choose only Q2 as basic copy—and the valuation "Bad" a projection of the decision not to bother much with Q1?

I have been harping on the phrase "what Shakespeare wrote" because it seems to be the most important statement of what the edition seeks to convey. I think that "what Shakespeare wrote" is a narrow focus for the editor of drama, for production can scarcely be less important in dramaturgy than scripting. However, if the editor is grapho-centric, and if the alleged foul papers are the

[3]His excluding another manuscript is implied, not stated. On page 24 he says that Q1 derives from Shakespeare's manuscript. He goes on to say that the reporter responsible for the Q1 manuscript may on occasion remember correctly what the Q2 compositor accidentally omits. Now, the Q2 compositor can "omit" only what is in his copy; it would be wrong to say, for example, that he "omits" *The Tempest*. And if the Q1 reporter "correctly" "remembers" it, then it must have been in the alleged performance (or in an actor's roll, if the reporter was an actor) in order to be "remembered"; and it must derive from the manuscript behind Q2 to be "correct." Thus we see that in such cruxes the editor deems that there is only one authoritative manuscript, and that it is the manuscript in the Q2 compositor's hands. No provision is made for correctly Shakespearean lines in Q1 that are not in the Q2 manuscript but are in some other manuscript.

closest he thinks he can get to what Shakespeare wrote, then I will offer criticism strictly of this position.

II

It can be shown that Shakespeare most likely wrote several versions of the same passage. Here is Q2, page D4^{v}:

Ro. Would I were ſleepe and peace ſo ſweet to reſt
The grey eyde morne ſmiles on the frowning night,
Checkring the Eaſterne Clouds with ſtreaks of light,
And darkneſſe fleckted like a drunkard reeles,
From forth daies pathway, made by *Tytans* wheeles.
Hence will I to my ghoſtly Friers cloſe cell,
His helpe to craue, and my deare hap to tell.
Exit.
Enter Frier alone with a basket.
Fri. The grey-eyed morne ſmiles on the frowning night,
Checking the Eaſterne clowdes with ſtreaks of light:
And fleckeld darkneſſe like a drunkard reeles,
From forth daies path, and *Titans* burning wheeles:
Now ere the ſun aduance his burning eie,

But the editor does not accept what seems to be "what Shakespeare wrote." He eliminates one version and keeps the other for his edition (II.ii.188–91).

Romeo. Sleep dwell upon thine eyes, peace in thy breast.
Would I were sleep and peace so sweet to rest.
The grey-ey'd morn smiles on the frowning night,
Chequering the eastern clouds with streaks of light;
And darkness fleckled like a drunkard reels
From forth day's pathway, made by Titan's wheels.
Hence will I to my ghostly Sire's close cell,
His help to crave and my dear hap to tell. *Exit.*

[SCENE III]

Enter FRIAR [LAURENCE] *alone with a basket.*

Friar L. Now, ere the sun advance his burning eye

His principal justification for the cut is that he supposes that the Friar's version of the speech was "marked in the manuscript for deletion and mistakenly printed" (p. 136). Not all editors can share the view that the manuscript marked this speech for deletion, as some omit the first version and retain the second. In any case the assumption that Shakespeare marked any speech for deletion is not compelling, because if the manuscript is "foul," multiple versions of a speech may be one of its foul characteristics. Editors detect other multiple versions, as here in Q2 (page L3^{r}), Q1 (page K1^{v}), and the Arden edition (V.iii.102).

Why art thou yet ſo faire? I will beleeue,
Shall I beleeue that vnſubſtantiall death is amorous,

O I beleeue that vnſubſtanciall death,
Is amorous, and doth court my loue.

Why art thou yet so fair? Shall I believe
That unsubstantial Death is amorous,

The editor comments that "In Q2 *I will believe* is Shakespeare's first shot, accidentally included by copyist or compositor" (p. 227). Elsewhere he says " 'I will beleeue' is evidently Shakespeare's first attempt, not adequately marked for deletion" (p. 15). As these are variant explanations, it is hard to say which is good and which bad; the former blames the transmitters of the manuscript, the latter the author. The word "adequately" in the second explanation suggests that Shakespeare may have been only half-hearted and indecisive in the cut. The word "adequately" also runs counter to the notion that distorted passages in Q1 are *correctly* conveyed in Q2: the Good seems to be inadequately correct in itself. Holding that the author would be producing his own fair copy, the editor perceptively comments that Shakespeare "might very well leave some lines unfinalized and write on, preferring not to risk losing his poetic impetus" (p. 16). But this raises the idea that maintaining poetic impulse and leaving lines unfinalized are not adequate for foul copy, that "what Shakespeare wrote" is not harmonious with "Shakespeare's writing on." These contradictions stem from setting an editorial standard (projected as a hypothetical fair copy) above the actual literary objects, Q1 and Q2—and of setting art above its material manifestation.

The issue reflects not only on Shakespeare's adequacy, but also on that of his characters. In his textual introduction, the editor suggests that here in Q2 (page I3^{v})—

Then as the manner of our countrie is,
In thy beſt robes vncouered on the Beere,
Be borne to buriall in thy kindreds graue:
Thou ſhalt be borne to that ſame auncient vault,
Where all the kindred of the *Capulets* lie,

—the third line "appears to be a discarded first version erroneously printed" (pp. 15–16). Elsewhere he argues without the tentativeness—"Q2's additional words are a first version accidentally printed" (p. 200)—and so prints this:

Then as the manner of our country is,
In thy best robes, uncover'd on the bier
Thou shall be borne to that same ancient vault
Where all the kindred of the Capulets lie.

But there is no evidence to show that the printing is accidental (which notion implies that the printer did not obey a delete in the manuscript), or that the version edited out was the first version, or even that it is a "version"—that is, the author's attempt to express something which he then tried to express alternatively. We may approach the matter from within the characterization of Friar "I will be brief" Laurence, and see the multiplicity as *his* redundancy, as he expatiates on his fairy-tale solution to Juliet's problems. Look, for example, at the way he talks at the beginning of this same speech (Q2, page I3^{v}), and at the editor's response (IV.i.90–92):

To marrie *Paris*: wendſday is to morrow,
To morrow night looke that thou lie alone,
Let not the Nurſe lie with thee in thy Chamber:

To marry Paris. Wednesday is tomorrow; 90
Tomorrow night look that thou lie alone.
Let not the Nurse lie with thee in thy chamber.

Are we to hold that Shakespeare wrote the second line as a first shot, then rejected its vagueness and settled on the more specific version following, and that again the printer missed the Shakespearean delete mark—or that Shakespeare rushed on, not wasting time with deletions, and that the compositor and the editor have passed over two shots? Once an editor begins to delete what an author wrote in an edition that is trying to offer what the author wrote, there can be no end to improvements.

III

I have drawn into material that is more and more problematic for the editor, and to conclude this present line of argument I should perhaps draw back to less speculative ground in order to lay down a clear principle.

It is reasonable to assume that any single staging of *Romeo and Juliet* that Shakespeare produced would have used only one version of the "grey-ey'd morn" speech, just as did Q1, which is held to reflect an actual production. But that is not to say that what Shakespeare wrote is only one version, or even that he made only one final choice. If the editor eliminates one version, he is no longer governed by the constraints of the alleged "genre" of the manuscript, foul-papers, but of another genre, such as that of fair copy or of prompt copy. If the latter, then Q1 (not just Q2)[4] must swing sharply into prominence before the editor's scrutiny; and then should we not be impressed by the actual assignment of the speech in this substantive evidence (Q1, page D3^{v}), which differs from the editor's assignment?

(breaſt,
Rom: Sleepe dwell vpon thine eyes, peace on thy
I would that I were ſleep and peace of ſweet to reſt.
Now will I to my Ghoſtly fathers Cell,
His help to craue, and my good hap to tell.
Enter Frier Francis. (night,
Frier: The gray ey'd morne ſmiles on the frowning
Checkring the Eaſterne clouds with ſtreakes of light,
And flecked darkenes like a drunkard reeles,
From forth daies path, and *Titans* fierie wheeles:
Now ere the Sunne aduance his burning eye,

Very curiously, the error of speech assignment that the alleged Q1 reporter or the actors have fallen into is Shakespearean—though it must be Bad Shakespeare. And if the editorial stylization was governed by the notion of the genre of fair copy—the fair copy that Shakespeare made (if he did) or would have made (if he did not)—we have begun the chase of the editorial Will-o'-the-wispeare: neither Q1 nor Q2 offers a detailed map for this expedition. Indeed,

[4] "*Enter Will Kemp*" as a stage direction in contrast to "*Peter*" as the speech prefix on Q2, page K3^{v}, suggests either casting during scripting, or use of foul papers as a theatrical manuscript.

there is no assurance that Shakespeare made fair copy, or, for that matter, that his foul drafts were not annotated to serve as promptbooks without there ever having intervened a fair draft.

The editor's rejection of multiple versions of a single speech, when there can be no serious doubt that Shakespeare wrote them both, and little doubt that he did not indicate in writing in the manuscript that one should be deleted, is (on the small scale) curiously like his rejection (on the large scale) of multiple substantive quartos. The problem, it seems, is not the plausible reconstruction of what Shakespeare wrote, but the curbing of the wildness and richness of his writing according to editorial precepts. In such textual features as the two "grey-ey'd morn" speeches Shakespeare's art discloses its artifice, his creation reveals its creating. Continually we glimpse this navel; the matrix it implies is not knowable, but neither is it forgettable, except through the uncreating word of the editors, for whom it is not enough, in Keats's phrase, to be "winning near the goal."

For the editor to leave both versions of the "grey-ey'd morn" speech in a modern edition might make for some awkwardness for readers (as they are presently trained).[5] We can expect, then, that publishers, whose editions must sell, expect their editors to keep their eye on the reader's ease as well as on what $hakespeare wrote—which renders editors cross-eyed as well as myopic, and accounts for their ledgerdomain. But if both versions were retained, the benefits for the reader would be more than commensurate with the difficulty of having to read "what Shakespeare wrote," for the reader would thereby gain some access to the problematic in his art. That Shakespeare could shunt the lines from one character to another is, for example, a most graphic demonstration of how some lines may function impersonally for description; such a perception would put the reader on guard against over-psychologizing the dialogue. Whether or not we think that this is the time and place for such a lesson is scarcely the point, if we are interested in "what Shakespeare wrote." For the multiplicity *is* surely "what Shakespeare wrote," and how can we criticize his text if we cannot see it? The editor, lucky man, has arrived at *his* text; but the reader can make of it only a point of departure.

[5]Although the Riverside editor eliminates one of the "grey-ey'd morn" speeches, he does leave in both of Timon's contradictory epitaphs, shown here in F1 (page hh5^{v}):

Alcibiades readeſ the Epitaph.
Heere lies a wretched Corſe, of wretched Soule bereft,
Seek not my name: A Plague conſume you, wicked Caitifs left:
Heere lye I Timon, who alive, all living men did hate,
Paſſe by, and curſe thy fill, but paſſe and ſtay not here thy gate.
Theſe well expreſſe in thee thy latter ſpirits:

Alcib. (*Reads the epitaph.*) "Here lies a wretched
corse, of wretched soul bereft; 70
Seek not my name: a plague consume you, wicked
caitiffs left!
Here lie I, Timon, who, alive, all living men did hate;
Pass by and curse thy fill, but pass and stay not here
thy gait."
These well express in thee thy latter spirits

Below his text Gwynne Evans provides this note (p. 1474): "these lines bring together two separate epitaphs in Plutarch's account of Timon; since they are contradictory, Shakespeare would certainly have deleted or revised in a final version." Note, however, that Alcibiades calls "*the Epitaph*"

IV

Shakespeare's superfluity is not the only problem; there is also his self-mutilation. If Shakespeare is to be editorially defended, as we have seen, as the cutter of his text, a kind of proto-editor, where can a modern editor draw the line in respecting the "cuts" evidenced by the much shorter text of Q1, which may reflect authorial "cuts"? Once again the Bad Quarto looms before us, wickedly suggesting that its "omissions" of Shakespeare are Shakespearean.[6] Thus, if multiple versions in one text are a cue to editors to cut one version, then single versions of speeches, found in Q2 but not in Q1, might also be taken as cues to cut a version—in this case the only version.

Sometimes, of course, lines appear in Q1 which do not look like précis, filler between cuts, or garbled versions of something present in Q2. The Arden *Romeo* editor has an eclectic attitude toward these, though this is hard to justify on the basis of his idea of the bibliographic relationship between the two quartos. When Q1 reads like this (C1[r])—

> *Benuolio:* The date is out of ſuch prolixitie,
> Weele haue no *Cupid* hudwinckt with a Scarfe,
> Bearing a *Tartars* painted bow of lath,
> Scaring the Ladies like a crow-keeper:
> Nor no without booke Prologue faintly ſpoke
> After the Prompter, for our entrance.
> But let them meaſure vs by what they will;
> Weele meaſure them a meaſure and be gone.

"these." (A reading of Plutarch explains that the second epitaph is a later one by Callimachus.)

On the previous F page we find this text, in which yet another epitaph appears:

> *Enter a Souldier in the Words, ſeeking Timon.*
> *Sol* By all deſcription this ſhould be the place.
> Whoſe heere? Speake hoa. No anſwer? What is this?
> *Tymon* is dead, who hath out-ſtretcht his ſpan,
> Some Beaſt reade this; There do's not liue a Man.
> Dead ſure, and this his Graue, what's on this Tomb,
> I cannot read: the Charracter Ile take with wax,
> Our Captaine hath in euery Figure skill;

Evans renders it thus—

> [SCENE III]
>
> *Enter a* SOLDIER *in the woods, seeking Timon.* [*A rude tomb seen.*]
>
> *Sold.* By all description this should be the place.
> Who's here? Speak ho! No answer? What is this?
> [*Reads.*] "Timon is dead, who hath outstretch'd his span:
> Some beast read this; there does not live a man."
> Dead, sure, and this his grave. What's on this tomb
> I cannot read; the character I'll take with wax;
> Our captain hath in every figure skill,

—and provides this note: "3–4. Some editors treat these lines as part of the Soldier's comment; others explain that he finds two incriptions, one in his own language, the other in a language or an alphabet unintelligible to him. More probable is the conjecture that Shakespeare composed these lines as Timon's epitaph, then had second thoughts about both its wording and its location in the text, but neglected to delete the first version."

I do not see why Timon has to avoid contradiction in death, when he did not avoid it in life.

—and Q2 looks like this (C1[r])—

Ben. The date is out of ſuch prolixitie,
Weele haue no *Cupid*, hudwinckt with a skarfe,
Bearing a Tartars painted bow of lath,
Skaring the Ladies like a Crowkeeper.
But let them meaſure vs by what they will,
Weele meaſure them a meaſure and be gone.

—the editor's text looks like this, incorporating the two unique Q1 lines (I.iv. 7–8):

Ben. The date is out of such prolixity.
We'll have no Cupid hoodwink'd with a scarf,
Bearing a Tartar's painted bow of lath,
Scaring the ladies like a crowkeeper,
Nor no without-book prologue, faintly spoke
After the prompter, for our entrance.
But let them measure us by what they will,
We'll measure them a measure and be gone.

The two lines from Q1 fit well into the Q2 context, but aesthetics cannot prove that they are what Shakespeare wrote. It is hard to imagine anyone else writing them, of course; but if they are Shakespearean, when were they written? If at the same time as the Q2 manuscript and *in* that manuscript, then the editor must hypothesize how they were omitted from the Good and preserved in the Bad. As such transmission runs greatly against the odds, we are forced to admit the possibility that the Q1 manuscript not only "cuts" the text as found in the Q2 manuscript, but also augments it—and with "what Shakespeare wrote." If this is so, we must countenance Shakespeare's writing of *Romeo and Juliet* as extending over some time and running through several different phases, and perhaps in several different manuscripts, each perhaps with its own characteristic aesthetic, offering together several finalities. And if this be so, conflation, which raises content above form, can only confound such layering and such aesthetic differentiation.

By contrast, here is a line in Q1 (page K3[r], ca. V.iii.210) that has no counterpart in Q2 (page L4[v]):

Mount: Dread Soueraigne, my Wife is dead to night,
And yong *Benuolio* is deceaſed too:
What further miſchiefe can there yet be found?

Moun. Alas my liege, my wife is dead to night,
Griefe of my ſonnes exile hath ſtopt her breath.
What further woe conſpires againſt mine age?

The previously-discussed pair of lines looked so good that it seemed they must be Shakespeare's; this, by contrast, looks so bad that it must be an actor's gag.

But even if we accept the editor's opinion that, given the chance, Shakespeare would have deleted the odd epitaph, the Riverside does offer a pertinent example of editorial respect for the contradictions of copy, possibly for "what Shakespeare wrote."

[6]The quotation marks allow for the possibility that Q2 *expands* on Q1.

The mention of Benvolio's death is gratuitous; merely taken up and dropped, it ludicrously breaks the mood of the moment. But no aesthetic argument can prove that it is not Shakespeare's, and in fact there is a very good aesthetic justification of it, a Renaissance justification: that the line is allegorical, that the death of Benvolio is the emblem of all the other deaths, which stem from the death of Good Will. If the line is an actor's gag, the actor may have been Shakespeare.

I doubt that many have thought to defend the allegorical interpretation, because few know of the line's existence; Benvolio's death goes unmentioned in both the Arden text and its textual notes.

> *Mont.* Alas, my liege, my wife is dead tonight.
> Grief of my son's exile hath stopp'd her breath.
> What further woe conspires against mine age?

Enter Mountague. $Q2$–4,F,$Q1$ (*subst.*). 208. now early] $Q3,4,F$; now earling $Q2$; more early $Q1$. 211. mine] $Q2$; my $Q3,4,F$; *var.* $Q1$. 213. is in]

Yet who can prove that the line is not Shakespeare's? Obviously, no one. And therefore is it not impossible accurately to found an edition of *Romeo* on what Shakespeare wrote? We can found it only on what we, with our various aesthetic biases, largely unacknowledged, surmise he wrote. And are not, then, our editions of multiple-substantive texts to a large measure our own wish-fulfillments?

V

Between the problems of over-richness and self-mutilation occurs a third class of readings, those that are in neither text. Of emendation the less said the Better. However, as the editor seems to make a slip in speaking about it, a slip that may touch on the "wish-fulfillment" I just mentioned, I would like briefly to analyze one of his remarks (p. 25): "In modernizing, a number of archaic verbal and grammatical forms have been retained (*washing*, *open-arse*, *nyas*, *phantasimes*, *injuried*, *mishaved*, *lign'd*, *wanny*). . . ." "Retained" is the curious word here. As it is the obligation of an editor to retain the diction of his copy-text, it seems odd that the editor goes out of his way to say that he is doing only what he is supposed to. Perhaps the difficulty resides in the word "forms," suggesting that in the general drift of modernizing the "forms" of this specific diction have been retained, giving us a text like that of the Riverside edition, which as a matter of policy frequently retains archaic spellings in a generally modern-spelling text. But it appears that "forms" cannot mean this. Contrast the editorial readings with those of the quartos:

	Arden	*Q1*	*Q2*
II.i.38	open-arse	open *Et caetera* (D1^{r})[7]	open, or (D1^{v})
II.ii.167	My nyas	Madame (D3^{r})	My Neece (D4^{r})
II.iv.28	phantasimes	fan-/tasticoes (E1^{v})	phantacies (E2^{v})
III.v.180	lign'd	trainde (H1^{r})	liand (I1^{r})
IV.i.100	wanny	[not in Q1] (H3^{v})	many (I3^{v})

[7]This (with a ligature in *a* and *e*, not available on my typewriter) is the reading of the Praetorius facsimile. It is not always a reliable facsimile, of course. But the Riverside gives the same reading as I do, except in roman where my facsimile shows italic. And the Arden gives the italics, but only *a* for the ligature. We can't all be right.

We see that in these cases the editor retains neither the spelling nor the diction. If the forms are retained, therefore, they cannot be from Bad and Good, but may be from a Better edition of the play which was an earlier draft by the editor, of which we seem otherwise to lack evidence, but which, if it existed, would be an important stage of derivation of the editor's (or is it Shakespeare's?) modernized text.

It all comes down to This.

Good and Bad pertains to literary Taste, not properly to literary Objects.

When Good and Bad lies at the Heart of editing, the Eye confounds Art and Taste.

Taste and Art are Contraries, and without Contraries is no Progression.

But if Taste usurps Art, it becomes a Negation, Artifice becomes Artofficial, and Ideology covers Reality.

Improvent makes strait roads; but the crooked roads without Improvement are roads of Genius.