

A REASSESSMENT OF COMPOSITORS B AND E
IN THE FIRST FOLIO TRAGEDIES

T . H. HOWARD-HILL

COLUMBIA, S. C., 1977

A REASSESSMENT OF COMPOSITORS B AND E
IN THE FIRST FOLIO TRAGEDIES

T . H. HOWARD-HILL

COLUMBIA, S. C., 1977

© T. H. HOWARD-HILL 1977

This pamphlet may be reproduced for scholarly purposes by Xerox,
microfilm or like methods without further recourse to the author.

I N T R O D U C T I O N

The present pamphlet contains the text, only slightly revised, of a Working paper submitted to the Seminar on Identifying Folio Compositors, Shakespeare Association of America Annual meeting, 7-9 April, New Orleans. Because of its length only a few sections of the paper could be circulated to the participants in the Seminar and, considering that the extent of the tables would prejudice its publication in a scholarly journal, I have undertaken to publish it in the same form as my Compositors B and E in the Shakespeare First Folio (1976), of which it is an extension. In addition I have in preparation a less rigorously technical article on the effect of the compositor B and E reattributions for publication in The Library which will communicate the substance of the two pamphlets to a wider readership.

University of South Carolina
Columbia, S. C. 29208

T. H. Howard-Hill

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Location of copies	4
REASSESSMENT OF COMPOSITORS B AND E	
INTRODUCTION	5-8
(1) <u>Tit.</u> dd3 ^v , ee2 ^v	8-9
(2) <u>JC</u> 113b	9-11
(3) <u>Tro.</u> *gg3 ^v	11-12
(4) <u>Tim.</u> Gg3	12-13
(5) <u>Lr.</u> ss3	14-16
(6) <u>Lr.</u> ssl	16-20
(7) <u>Oth.</u> ttl-3, vvl-3	21-32
<u>Spellings in Othello</u>	24-25
(1) Elisions with "th".	25
(2) Verbal auxiliary elisions.	25-26
(3) Pronouns with "-ee".	26-27
(4) Other spellings.	28-30
(5) "ie/y" spellings.	30-32
(8) <u>Ant.</u> xx3 ^v -5, 6-6 ^v , yyl	33-38
(1) Elisions with "th".	35
(2) Verbal auxiliary elisions.	35
(3) Pronouns with "-ee".	35-36
(4) Other variant spellings.	36-38
(a) "do't/to't/vndo't".	36-37
(b) Speech prefixes.	37-38
(9) <u>Cym.</u> zz4 ^v , 5 ^v , 6 ^v , 3al, 3	39-48
(1) Elisions with "th".	40
(2) Verbal auxiliary elisions.	40
(3) Pronouns with "-ee".	41
(4) Other variant spellings.	41-48
(a) "do't/to't".	41
(b) Speech prefixes	41
(c) Other spellings	42-48
(10) EVIDENCE FOR E IN <u>OTH.</u> , <u>ANT.</u> , AND <u>CYM.</u>	48-57
(1) Elisions with "th".	49
(2) Verbal auxiliary elisions.	50-51
(3) Pronouns with "-ee".	51-52
(4) "he's/she's" with "-ee".	53
(5) "do't/to't/into't/vndo't" spellings.	54
(6) Other spellings	54-57
(11) TABLE OF HINMAN'S B AND E ATTRIBUTIONS AMENDED	58
Notes	59-60

LOCATION OF COPIES

Copies of this pamphlet were distributed to the following:

1. British Library, London, U.K. WC1D 3DG
2. Bodleian Library, Oxford, U.K.
3. Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, N.Z.
4. National Library, Canberra, Australia
5. Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540
6. H. E. Huntington Library, San Marino, Calif. 91108
7. Alderman Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. 22903
8. Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C. 20003
9. University of Toronto Library, Toronto 5, Canada.
10. Prof. Fredson T. Bowers, University of Virginia, Charlottesville 22903
11. Prof. Robert K. Turner, Dept. of English, University of Wisconsin,
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201
12. G. R. Proudfoot, Dept. of English, King's College, The Strand,
London, U.K.
13. Dr. John F. Andrews, Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C. 20003
14. Dr. James G. McManaway, 5505 Center St., Chevy Chase, Md. 20015
15. Prof. Alan E. Craven, University of Texas, San Antonio, Texas 78285
16. Dr. Peter W. M. Blayney, Trinity College, Cambridge, U.K. CB2 1TQ
17. Prof. John O'Connor, Dept. of English, George Mason University
Fairfax, Va. 22030
18. Prof. S. W. Reid, Dept. of English, Kent State University, Kent,
Ohio 44242
19. Dr. MacDonald P. Jackson, Dept. of English, University of Auckland, N.Z.
20. Prof. Thomas L. Berger, Dept. of English, St. Lawrence University
Canton, N.Y. 13617

A REASSESSMENT OF COMPOSITORS B AND E
IN THE FIRST FOLIO TRAGEDIES

In 1972 the late Andrew Cairncross published an article on B and E which reassigned about 210 pages from compositor B to E, and a few pages by the other compositors also to E, with the effect that E's participation in the setting of the First folio extended from E1^V in Wiv. to 3a1 in Cym.¹ On this showing compositor E was not the apprentice compositor whose first inept attempts to set in type plays from manuscript copy C.J.K. Hinman had chronicled in his Printing and Proof-Reading, but the principal compositor of the Folio. Whereas Hinman assigned B about 445 pages, Cairncross left him with only some 140 pages against E's 281. Apart from the serious implications of the E reassignments for editors concerned with the texts in which he had shared, Cairncross's wholesale reattributions seemed to reflect adversely on the methods hitherto used in compositor determination. Although it is understandable that Hinman did not notice that the A of one section of the Folio was not the same as the 'A' of a later section (in effect, this was a relabelling which did not substantially effect the correctness of Hinman's account of the printing of F1), it was distressing that none of the many investigators of the comedies and histories had noticed the presence there of a compositor whose very discovery by Hinman, and subsequent notoreity, had made him a synosure.

There was some relief in the discovery that Cairncross's methods did

not support the conclusions of which he was so confident. Richard Proudfoot was disturbed by

the sense of parti pris for a particular answer to the questions asked, constantly apparent in the ease with which the very inconsistencies which are used as evidence against Hinman's identifications are turned into positive indications of the presence of E, who is granted a near monopoly of 'unstable usage'. We are left unsure how far we can trust any particular characteristic offered as distinctive of either E or F, simply because we are given no clear picture of the total evidence.²

With the sole intention of determining whether the techniques which had earlier supplied a measure of success in compositor determination remained useful--since at that time I had no interest in compositor E and was reluctant to anticipate the orderly investigation of the Folio compositors which I had initiated in the comedies³--I set about a close study of the evidence Cairncross used for his reassignments between B and E. Although I did introduce some additional tests for these two compositors, I was concerned principally to examine whether Cairncross's data would bear the construction which he put upon it, not to undertake an opposing argument. My conclusion was that Cairncross had successfully identified E in B pages in the tragedies section but that there was no evidence of his hand in the comedies and histories: Hinman's view of E remained substantially unchallenged. But the evidence which Cairncross used to identify E was mainly useless for that purpose. Most remarkably, on the (incorrect) premise that the hitherto unidentified E pages were scattered randomly through the Folio, Cairncross would have found about half the new E pages by making the same number (210) of reattributions without using any evidence for them at all.

What I take to be a substantial contribution to the development of

compositor studies was the distinction of the evidence used into three kinds: (1) Typographical evidence, for which the compositors were not influenced by the style or forms of their copy; (2) Other typographical or orthographical evidence for which the compositors, whilst exercising a certain freedom of judgment traditionally afforded them in respect of orthography, were nevertheless subject to some influence from copy, and (3) Orthographical features influenced by copy. The most valuable evidence for compositor determination is, of course, the first. For compositors B and E observations of the incidence of spaced commas in short lines distinguished the compositors with almost invariable clarity. My tentative conclusions of the correctness of some of Cairncross's reattributions, together with some he had not considered, and a few other attributions from E to B, were supported mainly by the evidence of spacing: whereas compositor B preferred to insert a space after a comma in a short line, compositor E even more consistently omitted spaces.

Notwithstanding the clarity with which the spacing distinguishes the two compositors who share the "do/go/heere" spellings, it is still necessary to validate the conclusions from spacing with a variety of other tests. That is the first purpose of this paper. Furthermore, the distribution of the reassignments to E, and particularly the extension of E's composition unprecedentedly into texts set from manuscript copy (Ant. and Cym.) requires a closer examination than was previously possible, in relation to the facts of printing elaborated by Hinman. And it is necessary, finally, to consider what the implications of these reassignments are for our understanding of E's role in F1 and the editing of the texts in which he shared. Some of the larger considerations will be touched on in the remarks which will introduce this paper. Now, it is necessary to look closely at the reattri-

butions in some detail.

(1) Tit. dd3^V E:=B; ee2^V E:=B

For Tit. which was set from a copy of the 1611 third quarto, spacing clearly confirms B's setting of the first page (cc4) and strongly indicates that he rather than E set ee2^V, the last page. Hinman has it that 'The evidence from spellings in part-page ee2^V is insufficient to permit positive attribution to E (or, by the same token, to B)' (I:385) but neglects to observe that ee2^V is the only page in Tit. attributed to compositor E in which there are only short spellings (do 2675, 2694, changed from the predominant doe/goe of the printed copy, and none of the longer spellings carried over from the Q: this tells strongly for B. The spacing and spellings together support the reattribution, which restores B to his usual case, y, for a sequence of formes which he shared with E at case x. The fact that ee2^V is invariant although the forme-mate, E's ee5, was proofcorrected, affords some modest support to the reattribution. Additional support for depriving E of ee2^V may be taken from the observation that he did not set a last page of a play before ss3 (q.v.): ee2^V shows the tailpiece which B--and the other compositors except E--set at the end of a short last page.

The consistently mixed "do, go, here/doe, goe, heere" spellings make it obvious that the rest of Tit., as Hinman noted (I:202f.), was set by E, the only compositor at work thereabouts who would reproduce copy-spellings alien to his own spelling preferences. However, right in the middle of Tit. as one reads it in F, the consistent non-spaced commas of E give way on dd3^V to a practice which is anomalous and unarguably not E's: 1/19/3; 0/23/2. Page dd3^V was the first page in printing order which Hinman

assigned to E and yet, remarkably, apparently it was not proofread, although the forme-mate, E's dd4, was. That is all the more remarkable since page dd3^v also contains the start of the banquet scene (3.2.1.-38) which, lacking in the early quartos, must have been in manuscript. If E was an apprentice starting work on a dramatic text for the first time, it is not likely that he would be given manuscript copy, or that having set it, it would be left unread and uncorrected (as misprints at l. 1451, 1459 and 1464 indicate).

(2) JC U3b B:=E

The attribution to compositor E of the second column of U3 in Julius Caesar is conceivably the least likely to be accepted, for, with the exception of the banquet scene in Tit., column U3b would be E's first surviving experience of setting from manuscript copy. At this point in the Folio, he has set 14 pages in Tit. from Q copy, for half of which proof variants were noticed by Hinman. The spelling evidence cited by Hinman reveals a clearcut distinction between compositors B and A and, he wrote, 'the spellings in the 5 3/4 pages here attributed to Compositor B contain no non-B spellings whatever (and a total of some eighty characteristic forms)' (I:383).⁴ Even the spacing evidence which first drew attention to the column is not conclusive. Although U3a (0/15/7) and b (0/6/15) are distinguished by contrary spacing, B's pages kk5^v (0/14/13; 0/8/17) and U2 (lj/9/15; 0/14/12) show similar if not as extreme contrast. Nevertheless, on U3b but not on the other pages the spacing variation is associated with variation of speech prefix of the most distinctive kind.

The first page of JC which compositor B set was kk4 where for the character Cassius he used the SP Cas. (8) and Cass. (1) but thereafter, after setting two pages of text in which Cassius had no speeches, his predominant

spelling for the SP was Cassi. (72:13). Page ll3 was set about two thirds through the printing sequence of JC: in col. a there are 10:1 Cassi. spellings, in col. b 11:1 Cas. spellings. Spacing and SP evidence together clearly indicate a change of compositor within page ll3. The second compositor must be E: the B-type spellings and the preference for non-spaced commas together rule out any of the other identified compositors.

(There are a couple of refinements to the reattribution which judgement may endorse. Hinman (II:179) notices that B broke off his setting of ll3 in order to distribute the top 35 lines or so of dd6, as shown by the types common to dd6 and ll3 (2136, 2142, 2144). If B set 1. 2102-7 at the top of col. b to the entrance of the Poet, that would give him his characteristic Cassi. SP, the only one in col. b, and the "Hee'1" elision (2107), possible for E but strongly B-ish. Then, I suggest, E set 2108-52 where the spacing is even more clearly E's (0/3/13). Such a division has the virtue of restricting the us spellings used on account of the shortage of us ligatures to the top of the column, where 10 us occur. The portion of dd6a which B distributed into case y included 3 us ligatures: had B continued setting col. b after distributing it would be surprising that he did not use them. However, if, as I suggest, B took over from E in col. b to set 2153-64, knowing he had distributed ligatures he would use them: there are 4 ligatures, B spacing (0/3/0) and spellings (including the SPs Brutus. and Cass. consistent with other occurrences in B's pages) in this last portion of ll3b).

Since writing the above I have been able to read Professor Fredson Bowers' textual introduction to JC in the International Old-Spelling Shakespeare (forthcoming). Professor Bowers develops Brents Stirling's

thesis that the variation of SP on \mathcal{U}_3 (and kk_3^V , 4) is a reflection of revision in an argument of such weight that \mathcal{U}_3 needs closer examination than can be given at the moment. If the spacing did not support the Cas. SP on \mathcal{U}_{3b} one could readily abandon the column to B and avoid the improbabilities which accompany its reattribution to E. As the foregoing discussion shows, I have not taken account of the possibility that the copy for \mathcal{U}_{3b} was in a hand different from that of most of the copy for JC: my observations were restricted to printing and orthography, and must be provisional and inconclusive. However, I would suggest that all the evidence which pertains to revision in JC has not yet been put forward. However, one can go no further before the publication of Professor Bowers' remarks.

(3) Tro. $*gg_3^V$ E:=B

The original setting of the first page of Tro., $*gg_3^V$ (Norton facsimile, 918; II: facing 231) was assigned to E by Hinman (I:389) apparently on the evidence of the non-B spelling 'Troian' at l. 39 which changed B's favoured 'Troyan' in the 1609 Q which served as copy for the F compositors. But the spacing is strongly non-E (0/216*) and, with the competent typography, suggests compositor B. Moreover, the spellings are not as mixed on $*gg_3^V$ as they are on the other E pages of the group (Group 16 in Hinman); the 'Troian' spelling can scarcely be held against B since, if he set $*gg_3^V$, that was the first time he had encountered the word since he had spelled it 'Troian' in lH6 (m2): he would not meet the spelling in copy again until all the other tragedies were set in type. Reattribution of $*gg_3^V$ --which is consistent with the printing evidence--would remove the anomaly which disturbed Hinman, E's setting of the first page of a play, and make the pattern

of proof correction more consistent. Although E's forme-mate χ_2 was proofread, there is no evidence that *gg3^v was, an anomaly all the more remarkable in that it was the first page of a play. (When finally E was entrusted with the setting of a first page, ss3^v of Oth., it was proofread.)

(4) Tim. Gg3 Bx:=Ex

All the available evidence from the distribution and type suggested to Hinman that E was the compositor most likely to have set Gg3 in Tim., for E and B had collaborated on a long sequence of formes set from their customary cases. But that was from printed copy and the notion that E was incapable of handling manuscript--despite his experience with the second part of the banquet scene in Tit.--led Hinman to stifle his doubts about the improbability of B's moving from case y to set Gg3 at case x, and then returning to case y to set the next forme (II:283). However, the spacing shows with undebatable clarity that B did not set Gg3, a conclusion that even a cursory glance at the typography (especially the typography of the prose) confirms to the practiced eye.

This page is probably a good example of how difficult it may be to detect compositor E--and distinguish him from B--if the "doe/goe/here" spellings he is likely to accept from copy are not in fact present in his copy. In such an event (for I take this to have been true of the Tim. copy) as Hinman's tables demonstrate (I:394), for analytical purposes there is no difference between B and E. The spellings on Gg3 do not support reattribution but neither do they make reattribution impossible. The one peculiarity of Gg3 which is significant for the distinction of the compositors is the concentration of the 'Apermantus' spelling (3) and 'Aper.' SP (5:5). The

paucity of 'Apermantus' (5) and the 'Aper.' SP (1:4) elsewhere relative to 'Apem.' (0:1), 'Apermantus' (16:5) and the prevalent but ambiguously-derived 'Ape.' (65:20) suggests that the 'r' spellings are copy forms; if this is correct then their presence on Gg3 to the exclusion of other variants supports the presence of a second compositor, and particularly one prone to accept copy spellings of words for which spelling preferences were not formed.

(Hinman refers to 'patterned alternations' of SP and some spellings of names in the text of Tim. which 'inevitably suggest different hands' (II:285), a notion which was developed by H. H. Oliver, the editor of the New Arden text (1959+). Although Hinman seemed wedded to the hypothesis (see II:282) he did not indicate the way in which the Tim. copy was divided, and the spellings he cites reveal little more than the kind of variations which are widely recognized to derived from foul papers, together with the struggles of the compositor to settle upon a 'normal' form of SP which he often did not encounter in contiguous pages or formes. Scribal transcripts (like those of Ralph Crane) are marked by just this kind of variation. Professor Oliver, on the other hand, did lay out a tentative division of copy between Shakespeare and a scribe (whom he identified, incorrectly, as Ralph Crane) but he did not indicate the basis of the division other than that the 'hypothesis is based on a study of all the spellings in the play' (p. xix). Mr. Oliver's division of copy does not separate distinctively the spellings to which Hinman drew attention (see 'Apemantus/Apermantus', and Ca./Cap. for 'Caphis', for example) and is not readily acceptable. The division itself does not explain those features of the text which are most puzzling to editors).

KING LEAR IN PRINTING ORDER: E AND B

E	P	SPACING	TLN	CASE	B	P	SPACING	TLN	CASE	FORME=DATE
1q4		0/6/17*	485-602	x	qq3 ^v	0/17/8#	353-484	y		
3	◆	0/1/50	225-352	x						
4 ^v	◆	0/1/34*	603-734	x						
2 ^v	◆	0/8/56	95-224	x	5	0/39/11	735-863	y		
5 ^v	◆	1/4/47*	864-980	x	2	◆ 0/31/9	1-94	y		
6	◆	0/1/48	981-1103	x						[qq1 ^v B=Ham. y
6 ^v	◆	0/5/59*	1104-233	x						[qq1 B=Ham. ◆ y
					rr3 ^v	0/20/10#	1862-986	y		
					4	0/29/15*	1987-2107	y		
rr3	◆	0/3/28#	1745-861	x	4 ^v	0/27/14	2108-233	y		
					2 ^v	0/41/13	1618-744	y		
2	◆	0/4/52	1492-617	x	5	0/38/9	2234-354	y		
1 ^v a	◆	0/3/22	1361-425	x	5 ^v	0/30/6	2355-474	y		
					1 ^v b	0/21/5	1426-91	y		
1	◆	0/4/39	1234-360	x	6	0/33/6*	2475-606	y		
					6 ^v	0/49/13#	2607-738	y		
[10 formes of <u>Tim.</u> set at this point]										
										[ss3 ^v E=Oth. ◆ x
										[<u>Tim.</u> B hh2 ^v 15,
										215
2 ^v		0/0/51	3093-221	x						[ss5 E=Oth. x
3	◆	0/8/31	3222-303	y						[ss4 ^v E=Oth. ◆ x;
										ss3=short page
2		0/7/58	2967-3092	x						[ss5 ^v E=Oth. y
1 ^v		2/7/45	2854-966	y						[ss6 E=Oth. yx
*1	◆	0/4/35	2739-853	y						[ss6 ^v B=Oth. y
15 ¹ p. 12		3/66/627			11 ¹ p. 1		0/375/119			

[P = press variant; * before page signature = new attribution; * after space count = column with many long lines, or short page; diamond = press-variant.]

(5) Lr. ss3 B:=E

From the cancelled *gg3 of Rom. for 26 formes up to ss3:4^V compositor E set from his usual case, x. That he should change cases, and particularly, that he should set ss3 (Lr.) from case y and forme-mate ss4^V (Oth.) from case x, is surprising. Yet a change of case by a compositor within a forme--even though it is unusual and, in the long run, impractical--cannot be held against the present reattribution. The following 2 formes (ss2:5^V, ss1^V:6) were set from both x and y, and compositor E has already set formes dd3:4^V, dd2:5^V, dd1^V:6, ff16:6^V, *gg4^V:2^V from two cases. It is obvious that there was some disruption in composition at this point. Hinman draws attention to the most unusual order in which the formes hereabout were set (II:228-9). Compositor E's previous forme (ss2^V:5 from case x) was the last of the 'intercalary' formes" when B completed Tim., he had 'caught up' to compositor E. Hereafter, E's share of the composition was fully integrated in the normal printing order: he was, as subsequent reattributions show, to become B's regular partner to the last text of the Folio, Cym. However, this is to anticipate, for in Hinman's analysis ss3:4^V and the following two formes, ss2:5^V and ss1^V:6 (each divided between Lr. and Oth.) were to mark the end of E's participation in the composition of the Folio: apart from the rest of the Q-copy Oth. the remaining copy was manuscript, which E was not competent to set.

What of ss3 itself? It is the last page of Lr. Hinman suggested that as the copy had been exchanged between the compositors before in an unusual manner so as to avoid requiring compositor E to set copy too difficult for him (including the first page of Lr.: see II:272-3), 'it looks very

much as if ss3:4^V was skipped over . . . so as to allow B instead of E to set the end of Lear' (II:289). It is true that, with the reassignment of ee2^V (Tit.) from E to B, hitherto compositor E had not set a final page. Nevertheless, the spacing is distinctly not B's (0/3/13; 0/5/18) and comparison of the Q and F text reveals nothing to suggest that the annotated Q copy per se was beyond E's capabilities. Moreover, it is surely significant that of the 25 last pages of texts in the Folio where there was enough space in which to insert the 'satyr' tailpiece (23 of them set by compositor B), only ss3 lacks the tailpiece. Furthermore, there is some confirmation that E set the whole forme from the fact that ss3 and its forme-mate (also set by E) show press-variants indicating that it was proofread. Interestingly, only one of B's 15 pages of Lr. was read and that may have been because its (press-variant) forme-mate (qq5^V) was set by compositor E. On the other hand, press variants survive for 12 of E's pages in this text. Any page which was proofread in the tragedies section was more probably set by E than another compositor.--It is sufficient to add that the spellings are consistent with the reattribution, and offer some support to it. More significantly, both the spellings accepted from copy and the spellings to which the copy forms were altered are similar in kind on both ss2^V, set by compositor E, and on ss3, hitherto attributed to B but now identified as E's.

(6) Lr. ssl B:=E

Arguments similar to those made in connection with ss3 support this reattribution. Strongest testimony for the assignment of ssl to compositor E is the spacing evidence (0/4/35) which so markedly contrasts with the

spacing of the forme-mate, ss6^v of Oth. (0/41/9). Further, unlike the forme-mate, ssl is variant. Although the spellings of ssl are unremarkable in the main, with no readily observed inconsistency (in the SP's for instance) which might aid distinction of compositors, nevertheless, they do not tell against reattribution. There are also mis-spacings which may confirm E's hand in this page (cf. 2270, 2786, 2787, 2806), although they are not so distinctive as to have drawn attention to E in this connection without other evidence.

(Hinman worked on the assumption that for copy the F compositors used a copy of the 1608 'Pied Bull' Q which had been annotated. That notion is difficult to accept (note A. S. Cairncross, 'The quartos and the Folio text of King Lear,' R Eng Stud new ser 6no23:252-8 J1 '55) considering that Q is substantially mislined and the Q/F variants are extensive, but it could be accepted if the direction of the compositors' changes from printed Q copy in Lr. was consistent with changes in Tit., Rom., Ham., and Oth., all set from quarto copy. Now that E is effectively and, I think, finally distinguished from B, I am in a good position to examine the compositorial consistency between texts set from ostensibly similar copy.)

Despite the weight of the spacing evidence, however, there is a strong, apparently insuperable, argument against the reassignment of ssl from compositor B to E. Reassignment would place the two compositors at the same case, y, for forme ssl:6^v, a manifestly unlikely occurrence of which the only other instance in F is special: in forme *gg3^v:4 B at case y set the cancelled first page of Tro.--as B usually did when such a page fell within E's share of the copy--and then relinquished case y to compositor E for the forme-mate. Hinman is absolute:

'A forme set wholly from one case cannot possibly have been set by two compositors at the same time [my italics]' (I:120)

yet *ssl* is the first of 23 attributions from B to E which place both compositors at a single case. Obviously, therefore, forme *ssl:6^V* is not like forme **gg3^V:4*, capable of explanation in light of special circumstances, but marks a new stage in the printing of the tragedies.

At present I can do more than outline the nature of the difficulty: it cannot be resolved without a great deal of intimidating investigation of Hinman's type recurrence evidence. Nonetheless, it is possible to sketch the outline of a possible solution, without asserting that it is borne out by the facts. According to Hinman's 'Tabular synopsis' (II:517), the printing order is:

By By Ex Ex *Ey Ex Ex Ey Ey Eyx *Ey By By By *Ey By
hh2:5^V ss2^V:5 ss3:4^V ss2:5^V ssl^V:6 1:6^V tt3^V:4 3:4^V

(The asterisked E's are reattributions). The following points should be noted. (1) Forme *hh2:5^V* is the last of Tim. (2) Forme *ss2^V:5* in Lr. is compositor E's last intercalary forme. (3) The only copy remaining to be set was the rest of Lr., Oth., Ant., Cym., and Tro., and the preliminary leaves = 60 formes, some two and a half months' work. (4) In the 4 formes which complete quire *ss*, compositor E moves between cases *x* and *y* in a manner which has no counterpart in his share of the tragedies. (5) The last three *ss* formes E set by himself were set from both cases. Since E would normally distribute his own pages, it may be expected that the type evidence would become confused hereabouts: interpretation of type recurrence evidence henceforth would depend on the correct identification of the case or cases into which E distributed his two-cases formes. (6) Hinman notices abnormalities around this portion of the tragedies: "case *x* must have been practically liquidated by the time page *ss6* was finished" (II:295); centre-rule irregularities

in quire tt (II:300), and composition and distribution irregularities of different kinds in the succeeding shared quires. (9) Hinman was convinced and reiterates throughout his discussion of the tragedies section that Compositor E did not participate in the setting of manuscript-copy tragedies. It is possible that the preconception blinded him to the possible implication of the type-evidence, namely, (8) that, with the near-exhaustion of case x, types were transferred into that case from y. Furthermore, the small number of undistributed x and y pages were later distributed indifferently into each case, since to distribute them into either case exclusively would overflow the boxes. Hence--and this is a hypothesis, not a conclusion from evidence--from the end of quire ss there were two cases with characteristic y types. Only close examination will resolve what happened to the characteristic x types; whether, for instance they appear as 'anomalies' in following pages, or whether (what is likely) the x-pages were distributed into another case entirely. Speculation is unfruitful: these and the major question will yield to close analysis of the type of evidence recorded by Hinman. What is unyielding, however, is the strongly-patterned alternation of spacing practices in the formes distinguished for reattribution.

Although there is nothing more to be said about the type-case question at the moment, the pattern of composition revealed by the reattributions is noteworthy. (9) The spacing evidence, which to this point is confirmed for individual reattributions by a variety of other evidence and arguments, is clear witness that E became B's partner through Oth., Ant., and part of Cym. (10) The copy for tt, vv, and xx was divided into unequal stints. For quires tt and vv compositor B set the 'long' stint of 7 pages: he was the more experienced compositor who was only infrequently obliged to make corrections.

For quire xx, compositor E set the 'long' stint, but this was after the setting for F had been interrupted by the printing of the Visitation Summons (see II:320-1). (11) For reasons about which we can only speculate, compositor E set only one page in quire yy, 3 pages in quire zz, and 2 pages in quire aaa: with 3al^v, he relinquished the rest of Cym. to B and with it, the Folio. Perhaps E's 6 pages of the manuscript-copy Ant. showed that he was not capable of setting from manuscript quickly enough to be used with a partner on a regular basis. At any event, the distribution of the pages newly attributed to E at the end of the tragedies section, given to local circumstances, reinforces rather than weakens Hinman's view of E's capabilities as a compositor.

Oth. (14)

OTHELLO IN PRINTING ORDER: E AND B

E	P	SPACING	TLN	CASE	B	P	SPACING	TLN	CASE
ss1 ^v	◆	0/8/30	1-94	x					
4	◆	0/7/39	95-218	x					
5		0/6/75	341-469	x					
4 ^v	◆	0/8/46	219-340	x					
5 ^v		0/4/37	470-599	y					
6		0/3/24*	600-731	yx					
					ss6 ^v	0/41/9	732-845	y	
					tt3 ^v	0/26/12	1495-611	y	
					4	0/39/14	1612-742	y	
tt3		0/5/14	1367-494	y	4 ^v	0/58/13	1743-874	y	
* 2 ^v		0/7/49	1237-366	y	5	0/39/10	1875-2003y		
* 2		0/2/18*	1107-236	y	5 ^v	0/46/6	2004-135	y	
* 1 ^v		0/3/18*	983-1106	y	6	0/33/8	2136-262	y	
* 1		0/6/44	855-982	y	6 ^v	0/37/16	2263-387	y	
					vv3 ^v	0/30/13*	3027-153	y	
vv3	◆	0/3/21	2899-3026y		4	0/41/17	3154-278	y	
* 2 ^v	◆	0/5/32	2769-898	y	4 ^v	◆ 0/42/17	3279-410	y	
* 2	◆	0/0/46	2646-768	y	5	0/38/19	3411-540	y	
* 1 ^v	◆	0/5/32	2517-645	y	5 ^v	0/40/22	3541-671	y	
* 1		0/7/41	2388-516	y	6	0/16/4	3672-86	y	
16p. 7		0/79/566							short p.
1:7					14p. 1	0/526/180			[vv6 ^v B=Ant. y
					3:1				

[P=press-variant page; * before page signature=new attribution;
 * after space count=column with many long lines, or short
 page; diamond=press-variant.]

(7) Oth. tt1-3, vv1-3 B:=E

The first sequence of reattributions, pages tt1-3, vv1-3 in Oth., affords the first substantial opportunity to test the spacing evidence against spellings. Hinman assigned 6 pages to compositor E (ss3^V-6): confirmation of the reassignment from spellings would require the spellings of the 10 new E attributions to be consistent with the spellings of ss3^V-6 but inconsistent with the spellings of the remaining pages of Oth. (ss6^V, tt3^V-6^V, vv3^V-6) which were set by compositor B. For Oth., evidence may be sought not only from the numerical predominance of variant spellings but also in the direction of the respective compositors' changes from the spellings of the annotated quarto copy (Q1 1622).

One would usually expect that the best evidence would be supplied by the most frequently-recurring spellings. However, 'do', 'go' and 'here', although widely dispersed through Oth. and present in Q1 as 'doe', 'goe' and 'here' (the spellings not favoured by B and E), do not serve to distinguish the compositors in Oth. There is bitter irony in the observation that Hinman chose quire tt to demonstrate the consistency of compositor B's spellings of these words (I:183): quire tt contains 5 pages set by compositor E.

There is some value in pausing a moment to consider the likelihood that compositor E's spelling habit should have become, at least for these words and probably for other common words, so like B's that these words no longer serve to distinguish him. At the start of his participation in the setting of the Folio, E's acceptance of 'doe' and 'goe' in his copy was so strong that there are pages of Tit. where the 'doe/goe' spellings predominate over the short spellings (I:203) but, as has been seen, in quire ss of Oth. compositor E

accepted only 6 'doe/goe' spellings from copy in that number of F pages. The direction of E's practice of spelling these words is unmistakable: 'do' and 'go' become absolutely predominant in the last quire of Oth. and E's share of Ant. and Cym. Many years ago I discussed this movement with Dr. Alice Walker who was sceptical of the validity of Hinman's attributions to E. She saw that if 'doe' and 'goe' were not present in E's copy for him to 'tolerate' and carry over into F, or if his practice changed in the course of composing the tragedies, then those words could not serve as discriminants between E and B. Furthermore, it is not generally recognized how rare 'do', 'go', and 'here' are in the non-literary, particularly, the non-dramatic, works which made up the staple of printing-house production in the early seventeenth-century. An apprentice would not have had much exposure to the words and one could expect his spellings to be unsettled. However, neither Dr. Walker nor myself at the time identified what I now take to be the strongest influence on E's spelling and to be responsible for the increasing convergence of E's practice towards B's: distribution.

A modern compositor can distribute handset type quickly because very few words are subject to variations of spelling. That is not true of early seventeenth-century spelling in which even well-established practices may be broken for purposes of justification. A compositor who distributed his own formes would not need to pay close attention to the common words: he knew how he spelled them. A compositor who distributed the work of another compositor must perforce ascertain the spelling of each word before he distributed it. He must spend more time examining the type and distribution is slower. Apprentices become proficient at distribution before they are accomplished compositors because, through distribution, they learn the lay

of the case. It is reasonable to assume that an apprentice compositor would quickly become aware of the peculiar spellings of the different compositors whose work he distributed and that if he distributed a great deal of work by one particular compositor, he would be influenced by his spellings. At the beginning of the tragedies section the apprentice E distributed frequently for both B and compositors A and C: possibly the variation between the 'do/go/here' practices of the compositors, together with the prevalence of the A-form spellings in his copy for Tit., contributed to his tolerance of those spellings. Later, however, after all but B and E had relinquished the Folio, compositor E frequently distributed pages set by B.⁵ (One cannot determine readily just how many B pages E distributed: Hinman believed that B alone set the end of the tragedies section, between Oth. tt and Tro. ¶, and therefore all the distributing was by B also). It was to E's advantage in distribution to adopt B's spellings of words likely to be frequently set and distributed.

The foregoing is speculative and cannot be proved conclusively. Fortunately, the truth or falsity of an explanation of an observed phenomenon does not affect the truth of the observation itself. There can be no doubt that compositor E's practice of spelling 'do/go/heere' consolidated during the composition of the tragedies. It is not necessary to understand why the consolidation occurred.

SPELLINGS IN OTHELLO:

Nevertheless, there are groups of spellings which occur frequently enough to encourage examination. They are (1) elisions of prepositions and "th"; (2) elisions of pronouns and the future auxiliary; (3) pronouns with

'-ee'; and (4) other spellings of which two or more variants exist.

(1) Elisions with "th": Q copy has a good number of forms like "i'the" and "to the" which both B and E render in F as "i'th" and "to th"; indeed there is only one "th" elision in Q which is reproduced exactly in F (to th' ss5^V 478 E) where the elisions are remarkably consistent in style. Since the practice of each compositor is usually the same, and they agree on rejecting the copy forms, there is no evidence here to support the reattributions. On the other hand, the evidence does not tell against them.

(2) Verbal auxiliary elisions: Other parts of the Folio show that compositor E prefers to set "'le" in words like 'hee'le, she'le, wee'le' and 'you'le', and B prefers "'l" (hence, 'hee'l, shee'l, they'l, wee'l' and 'you'l'), and that they both use the "-ee-" in such spellings. In Oth. the opportunity to consider the spellings of copy allows a significant refinement. As the tables below reveal, compositor E prefers to use a single "-e-" in spellings like 'he'le' and 'she'le'.

TABLE SUMMARISING VERBAL AUXILIARY ELISIONS BY FACTORS⁶

OLD E (ss3 ^V -6)		NEW E (tt1-3, vv1-3)		B (ss6 ^V , tt3 ^V -6, vv3 ^V -6)	
F sp. < Q copy	Total	F sp. < Q copy	Total	F sp. < Q copy	Total
-l < -ll	*1	-l < -ll	2	-l < -ll	3:1
-l < -l	*1	-l < -l	0		
-le < -le	*3	-le < -le	3		
		-le < -l	1		
		-le < -ll	1:1		
-ee- < -ee-	*1	-ee- < -ee-	1	-ee- < -ee-	3
		-e- < -ee-	5:1		
, < ^	5	, < ^	0		
, < ,	0	, < ,	8	, < ,	4

Conspicuous on the E side of the table are the "le" forms changed to as well as adopted from copy, and the changes to single "-e-" spellings. Reassignment simplifies the distribution of the variants in a manner which confirms the reattributions. A table which tabulates the spelling factors without regard to the direction of change from copy more clearly distinguishes the compositors' practices and the effects of the reassignments.

TABLE OF FACTORS OF VERBAL AUXILIARY ELISIONS⁷

OLD	E	NEW	E	B	ALL E
-l	*2	-l	2	-l 4	2:2
-le	*3	-le	7:2	-le 0	7:5
-ll	0	-ll	0	-ll 1	1
-e-	0	-e-	7	-e- 0	7
-ee-	*1	-ee-	1	-ee- 3	1:1
'	5	'	11	' 4	15
^	0	^	0	^ 0	0

What is worthy of attention here is that even without taking into account the copy forms and the direction of the changes made from them, we see clearly that E prefers "-le" and "-e-" against B's "-l" and "-ee-". Nevertheless, knowledge that the 2 instances of "-ee-" in E's share of Oth. were taken over from copy makes the distinction between their practices even more obvious. This observation suggested that "-ee-" spellings might yield useful results for purposes of discrimination.

(3) Pronouns with "-ee-": Compositor B's partiality for "-ee-" spellings of pronouns, especially in justified lines, has long been recognized⁸ but I do not recall noticing mention of these spellings as possible B and E discriminants. Tabulation of the selection of "-e-" pronouns in Oth. reveals, however, that the practice of the compositors, at least at this point in F, is distinctive.

TABLE OF F AND Q -E/EE PRONOUNS IN OTH.⁹

F < Q	OLD E	NEW E	B	TOTALS
-e < e	0	6:1	1:1	7:2
-e < ee	6:1	13:6	6	25:7
-ee < ee	0:1	0	5	5:1
-ee < e	0	0:2	7:3	7:5
TOTALS	6:2	19:9	19:4	44:15

It is at once clear that compositor E is reluctant even to accept the long spelling from copy and uses it only in justified lines. It is probably significant--and consistent with the previous observation--that E alters 26 long copy spellings to short ones. The distribution is consistent in both groups of E pages, and contrasts satisfactorily with the distribution of spellings in B's portion of *Oth.*: before the reattributions the contrast was not present. The same observation hold true when the direction of changes from Q copy is ignored in a simpler table.

TABLE OF -E/EE PRONOUNS DISREGARDING CHANGES FROM Q COPY

SP.	E	NEW E	B	ALL E
-e ¹⁰	6:1	19:7	7:1	25:8
-ee	0:1	0	12:3	0:1

The table for "-e/ee" pronouns, like the table for verbal auxiliaries, testifies that even disregarding the direction of changes from Q copy, the raw counts reveal distinctive compositorial practices.¹¹

(4) Other spellings: Fifty-six groups of spelling variants other than those already considered occur in the Oxford Shakespeare Concordance to p. 167-- which is halfway through the concordance: presumably this arbitrary sample will be large enough to provide useful information. Although the distribution and direction of change of the individual spellings is often interesting, the tendency of the data is best revealed by the summary table below.

SUMMARY OF VARIANTS (TO LOOKE) BY STATUS¹²

A: VARIANTS WHICH DISTINGUISH B+E	B: VARIANTS WHICH CONFIRM B/E DIVI- SION BY SIMPLI- FYING DISTRIB.	C: VARIANTS WHICH SHOW NO MATERIAL CHANGE	D: VARIANTS WHERE EX- CLUSIVE B SP. IS DIVIDED OR INCONSISTENCY INTRODUCED
alreadie/y approoue/oue atendants/att- authoritie/y a while/a-while/ awhile courtesie/curtesie/ curtsie couch/-w- endure/i- flie/y flies/-y- gesture/ie- haply/happely/-i- harke/-ea- honestie/y iealousie/iel-/ ielouzie inclining/-y- infirmitie/y its/tis killes/kils kind/e kissd/st laid/-y-	 bene/beene/bin breefe/-ie- ceaze/seize companie/y die/-y- dutie/y find/e heauie/y heere/-e- indeed/e	act/e answer/e beautie/y check/e daies/-y- damm'd/-ed dies/-y- do's/dost/doth eies/-y- fie/y- foule/-w- greefe/-ie- happie/y harm/e heere's/-e- honor/our ladie/y lies/-y-	 crie/y deuill/-i- dog/ge entreat/e/in- he/hah lippes/lips
22	10	18	5 B:=B/E +1

The weight of the evidence is heavily in favour of the reattributions which were first indicated by the spacing evidence: thirty-two groups of spellings support the reattributions whereas only six tell against them. However, even the contrary evidence lacks weight for, of those six groups, only 'deuill/diuell' has a distribution complicated rather than simplified. According to the previous assignments E's portion contained 1 "-e-" form from copy and 1 changed from "-i-" of the Q; compositor B was a confirmed "-i-" speller, having changed 13:5 of the Q's "-e-" forms. Now, however, the strong B practice is divided between E and B and there is inconsistency--one spelling--in E's practice. It would be hard to agree that 'deuill' is strong witness against the reattribution. The other 5 groups in column (d) reveal spellings which were formerly solely B's now divided between B and E: this is not strong evidence against the reattributions since any distinction of compositors on the basis of distinctive and differing spellings must inevitably divide groups in which the variants are not distinctive. The reattributions not so much as destroy B preferences in these instances as identify spelling practices common to the compositors.

(5) "ie/y" spellings: The table above contains a number of groups which show variation of terminal and medial "i" and "y". The incidence of spellings in relation to Q copy is this:

SUMMARY OF VARIATIONS INVOLVING IE/Y¹³

F VARIANT	E	NEW E	B	ALL E	TOTALS	
					B	E
-ie	1	0	0	1		
< -y	11	10:2	9	21:2	9	22:2
-y	4	19:4	27:2	23:4		
< -i-	0	0:1	0	0:1	27:2	23:5
-i-	2:1	3:3	7:1	5:4		
< -y-	3	1	1	4	8:1	9:4
-y-	0:1	4	9:1	4:1		
< -i-	0	2	16:1	2	25:2	6:1

Whether one scrutinizes the directional figures or the raw totals, it is clear that E prefers to spell with terminal "-ie" and B with terminal "-y", although this is not immediately apparent from the totals since compositor E appears willing--according to the directional evidence--to accept compositor B's preferred terminal "-y" spelling when it is in his copy. Equivalent practices are revealed for medial "-i-/-y-" although their figures do not so sharply distinguish the compositors. Nevertheless, these variants support the reattributions which are the subject of the present discussion.

The evidence which has been examined thus far concurs in supporting the new attributions from compositor B to E in *Othello*. Since the selection of evidence was not prejudiced and is comprehensively representative of *Oth.*, there is no need to heap Ossa on Pelion. With some confidence, therefore, attention can be drawn to the 4 pages in the new assignments to E which

survive in variant form, testimony to the special attention paid to the
work of compositor E.¹⁴

ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA IN PRINTING ORDER: E AND B

	P SPACING	TLN	CASE	B	P SPACING	TLN	CASE	FORME-MATE
3 ^v	◆ 0/9/35	744-875	y	vv6 ^v	0/19/13	1-91	y	[vvl E Oth.]
4	0/6/26	876-1005						
4 ^v	◆ 1/3/47	1006-134		xx3	0/28/13	612-743		
5	0/4/34	1135-266		2 ^v	0/34/14	481-611		
				2	0/39/19	351-480		
				5 ^v	0/12/11 [#]	1267-394		
6	◆ 0/8/33	1395-523		1 ^v	0/16/9*	221-350		
6 ^v	◆ 0/5/56	1524-653		1	0/17/17*	92-220		
				yy3 ^v	0/36/17	2308-435		
				4	0/43/21	2436-561		
				3	0/39/9	2176-307		
				4 ^v	0/34/14	2562-688		
				2 ^v	0/49/28	2046-175		
				5	0/44/16	2689-814		
				2	0/36/15	1918-2045		
				5 ^v	0/47/11	2815-946		
				1 ^v	0/36/19	1786-917		
				6	0/39/11	2947-3076		
				6 ^v	0/35/12	3077-204		
	0/11/67	1654-785						
				zz2 ^v	0/9/2 [#]	3597-637		[zz3 ^v B B E ^v Cym.]
				2	0/32/12*	3469-543		[zz5 B Cym.]
				1 ^v	0/41/9	3337-468		[zz5 ^v E ◆ Cym.]
				1	0/41/11	3205-336		[zz6 B Cym.]
								[zz6 ^v E ◆ Cym.]
4	1/46/268			22p.	o	0/726/303		

(8) Ant. xx3^v-5, 6-6^v, yyl B:=E

The group of reassignments in Ant. marks the first sequence of pages in the tragedies which E composed from manuscript copy. If there was doubt that E's participation in the Folio extended beyond quire ss of Oth. it was dispelled when quires tt and vv were examined. Nevertheless, the extension of E's share of a text set from quarto copy affords no warrant for further extension into plays set from manuscript copy, for which there is no precedent for compositor E. The very fact that the direction of compositorial changes from copy could be examined in Oth. gave ground for confidence in the reattributions support from evidence of spelling, but for the present group and the next (in Cym.) no such check is available. Only raw rather than the discriminating 'directional' figures can be used for spellings. Fortunately, however, the raw figures for different groups of spellings cited in connection with Oth. proved adequate to distinguish the compositors, even without the aid of directional evidence.

There is, moreover, another test which should be applied to the groups of reattributions in Oth., Ant., and Cym. With the benefit of the more precise observations made possible for Oth. by the existence of Q, the variations in Ant. and in Cym. must be examined not only for their inconsistency with the pages in each text set by compositor B, but also for their consistency with each other and the variations in Oth. Whereas some inconsistency may not tell against the reattributions--since they may be capable of explanation by reference to the inferential spellings of copy--the substantial consistency of the spellings in the E pages of the three last tragedies should weigh heavily in support of the reattributions. Accordingly, since the goal is the determination of consistency, the evidence surveyed in Ant. (and Cym.) will

be similar to that examined in Oth.

(1) Elisions with "th": Examples of "th" elisions occur on each of the 7 pages reassigned to E, but, unfortunately, only 3 of them are distinctive of E. Nevertheless, it is a significant consequence of the reattributions that they do distinguish E's from B's distinctive forms, as the table shows.

TABLE OF XTH ELISIONS IN ANT.¹⁵

COMP.	xth'	x'th	x'th'	x [^] th'	TOTAL
B	0	1	39:8	1	41:8
E	3	0	13:2	0	16:2
	3	1	52:10	1	57:10

(2) Verbal auxiliary elisions: These elisions too give satisfactory support to the reattributions which, as the table below reveals, shift all E's characteristic "-le" spellings out of B's share of Ant.

VERBAL AUXILIARY ELISIONS IN ANT.

COMP.		TOTAL
B	hee'l 3:1 they'l *1 wee'l 8:2 you'l 4:1	15:5
E	0 they'le *1 weele 4 you'le 6:2	6:1
		21:6

The contrast between B and E's practices is clearcut.¹⁶

(3) Pronouns with -ee: Since the copy is not available for a study of directional changes, the analysis of the frequency of "-ee" in words like

'he' and 'she' is straightforward. In Ant. there are 15:11 'bee/hee/shee' spellings: not one of them falls on a page formerly assigned to B and reassigned to E. (It hardly requires to be mentioned that the short spellings of those words occur frequently throughout Ant., in the stints of both compositors.)

As might be expected, 'he's/she's' follow the same pattern of distribution.

HE'S/SHE'S IN ANT.

SP.	B	E	TOTAL
hee's	6	0	7
shee's	1	0	
he's	0	10	14:1
she's	3	1:1	
TOTAL:	10	11:1	21:1

(4) Other variant spellings: Probably the best confirmation of the correctness of the reattributions is to examine groups of variant spellings randomly. However, only a few spellings--which are those customarily used in compositor determination--occur from text to text in sufficient numbers to make analysis fruitful, and sometimes the best information is supplied by speech-prefixes, which are peculiar to a particular text.

(a) "do't/to't/vndo't": Oth. is useful to supply directional evidence for this group of variants.

TABLE OF -O'T/-OO'T IN OTH. AND ANT.

F VARIANT: OTH.	B ¹⁷	E	ANT.	B	E
-o-	0	3			
<-oo-	0	0	-o-	0	0
-oo-	0	0			
<-o-	8	1	-oo-	14	0

There is not much immediately useful information here. Although B clearly favours the -oo- spelling in Oth. all E's short spellings were taken over from copy and his single change was made in the direction of B's form.

In Ant. only -oo- spellings occur, all in B's pages.

(b) Speechprefixes: There are only 3 groups of frequently-occurring SP in Ant. but their distribution affords convincing confirmation of the reattributions.

SOME SP IN ANT.

SP	B	E
<u>An.</u>	1	0
<u>Ant.</u>	127:17	20:2
<u>Anth.</u>	2	20:2
<u>Antho.</u>	1:1	1:1
<u>Caes.</u>	27:6	1:1
<u>Caesar.</u>	25:1	23:9
<u>Eno.</u>	26:10	20:7
<u>Enob.</u>	20:12	1:4
<u>Enor.</u>	0	0
<u>Enobar.</u>	0	0:2

Compositor B favours 'Ant., Caes./Caesar., Eno./ Enob.', whereas E uses 'Ant./Anth., Caesar., Eno.'

There is no need to pursue the question further: the evidence which is evenly dispersed throughout the play all supports division of the responsibility for Ant. between compositors B and E. Although other spellings testify to the correctness of the reattributions--the only instance of 'kind', for example, occurs on an 'E' page whereas the 4 'kinde' spellings are in B's pages--because of the small number of instances of the variant spellings, at the best they are confirmatory through their consistency with the reattributions rather than conclusive evidence of the necessity of division between the compositors.

CYMBELINE IN PRINTING ORDER: E AND B

P SPACING	TLN	CASE	B	P SPACING	TLN	CASE
4 ^v ♦	0/1/12*	335-466	y	zz3 ^v }	0/35/7	88-219 y
				4 }	0/29/9*	220-334
				3 }	0/36/5	1-87
5 ^v ♦	1/6/37	591-716		5 }	0/40/5	467-590
						[zz2 ^v B Ant.
6 ^v ♦	0/14/26*	843-967		6 ♦	0/47/11	717-842
						[zz2 B
						[zz1 ^v B
						[zz1 B
3 ♦	0/7/49	1472-595		3a3 ^v }	0/48/11	1596-719
				4 }	0/50/16	1720-851
				4 ^v }	0/44/13	1852-978
				2 ^v }	0/67/9	1353-471
				5 }	0/40/8*	1979-2104
				2 }	0/57/9	1223-352
				5 ^v }	0/44/5	2105-221
1 ^v	0/6/33	1097-222		6 }	0/46/7*	2222-347
				1 }	0/36/8	968-1096
				6 ^v }	0/37/5	2348-479
				3b3 ^v }	0/39/11*	3105-236
				4 }	0/56/13	3237-363
				3 }	0/31/21	2980-3104
				4 ^v }	0/49/28	3364-495
				2 ^v }	0/51/12	2862-979
				5 }	0/42/17	3496-627
				2 }	0/43/13	2740-861
				5 ^v }	0/27/23	3628-759
				1 }	0/32/21	2480-611
				[6 ^v]		blank
				1 ^v }	0/42/17	2612-739
				6 }	0/9/12	3760-820
						TP+coloph: short
5p. 4	1/34/157			26p. 2	0/1077/316	

(9) Cym. zz4^v, 5^v, 6^v, 3al^v, 3 B:=E

In Cym.'s 31 pages there are only 5 which the spacing evidence suggests should be reassigned to E, but 4 of those 5 exist in press-variant form: E's work apparently continued to be singled out for particular attention. But after quire zz it is no longer appropriate to refer to E as B's partner and he ceases to set pages in F on the completion of 3al^v.

(1) Elisions with "th": The evidence of these elisions is indifferent since the forms which distinguish the compositors, namely, B's "xth" and E's "x'th" do not occur at all.

TABLE OF XTH ELISIONS IN CYM.

COMP.	xth'	x'th	x'th'	x _Δ th'	TOTAL
B	0	0	61:6	5	66:6
E	0	0	19	0	19
TOTAL	0	0	80:6	5	85:6

(2) Verbal auxiliary elisions: Fortunately, these elisions are more useful for discrimination. As was the case with Ant., the reassignments shift all the "-le" forms out of B's share of Cym.

VERBAL AUXILIARY ELISIONS IN CYM.

COMP.		TOTAL
B	hee'l 4:l shee'l l they'l lwee'l 16:l we'l 0:l you'l 5:l	27:4
E	hee'le 1 shee'le 1 weele 1	3

(3) Pronouns with "-ee": In Cym. there are 21:22 'bee/hee/mee/shee/yee' spellings, all but one of which ('yee' at 916 zz6^v) occur in B's pages. The distribution of the 'he's/she's' spellings follows the same pattern.

HE'S/SHE'S IN CYM.

SP.	B	E	TOTAL
hee's	6:1	0	8:2
shee's	2:1	0	
he's	0:2	1	11:2
she's	6	4	
TOTAL	14:4	5	19:4

(4) Other variant spellings:

(a) "do'/to't": The distribution in Cym. is consistent with that in Ant. and Oth.

SP.	B	E	TOTAL
-o-	0	1	1
-oo-	11	2	13

The previous table for Oth. and Ant. showed that in Oth. compositor E accepted the "-o-" spelling from copy but changed one instance to "-oo-"; in Cym. what may be an analogous situation may be seen. Significantly, however, the reassignment has moved the "-o-" spelling from B's pages: the "-o-" form was not acceptable to B even when it was in copy.

(b) Speechprefixes: Very few of the SP in Cym. vary, an observation

which supports Dr. Alice Walker's judgement (reported by James Nosworthy in his new Arden edition, 1955, p. xii) that copy for F was a scribal transcript. The only names for which variants occur in sufficient numbers to offer a possibility of compositor distinction are Pisanio (:= Pis./Pisa./Pisan.) and Posthumus (:= Post./ Posth./ Posthu./ Posth(u)mus.). But the distribution between the pages attributed to B and E neither confirms nor challenges the reassignments.

(c) Other spellings: Better witness is afforded by spellings which are variant in the first half of the Oxford Shakespeare Concordance--to p. 182-- and fall on the pages reassigned to compositor E.

SUMMARY OF VARIANTS (TO LOVE) BY STATUS 18

A: GROUPS WHICH
DISTINGUISH EXCLU-
SIVE B AND E
SPELLINGS

B: GROUPS WHICH IDEN-
TIFY SINGLE SPELLINGS
COMMON TO B AND E

C: GROUPS SHOWING
NO DISTINCTION
BETWEEN B AND E

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>1. alowd B1/aloud E1</p> <p>2. answer B11/
answere B*1 E1</p> <p>3. assur'd B3:1/
assured E1</p> <p>4. buddes B1/
buds E1</p> <p>5. ceizd E1/seizd B1</p> <p>6. charracters B1/
characters E1</p> <p>7. chastity B2:1/
chastitie E1</p> <p>8. clock B*1 E1/
clocke B1 E1</p> <p>9. cloy'd B1/
cloyed E1</p> <p>10. enforme E1/
informe B2</p> <p>11. enuy B1/enuie
E1</p> | <p>1. act B3 E2/acte
B2:1</p> <p>2. beene B7:2 E*3/
bene B2:1/bin B
11:3 E3:4</p> <p>3. breast B1/brest
B1:1</p> <p>4. <u>Cloten</u> B16:2/
<u>Clotten</u> B5 E1</p> <p>5. does B2/do's B5
E1</p> <p>6. either B4:1 E1:1/
eyther B1</p> <p>7. failing B1/fayling
B1 E1</p> | <p>1. blessed B3 E2/
blest B6 E1</p> <p>2. bloodie B1/
bloody B4:1 E*1</p> <p>3. choose B*1 E1/
chuse E1</p> <p>4. deerest B2:1 E*2/
deer'st B1</p> <p>5. die E1/dye B19:1
E*1</p> <p>6. dram B1 E*1/
dramme B2</p> <p>7. fairest B2 E1/
fayrest B3 E1</p> |
|--|--|--|

A: GROUPS WHICH
DISTINGUISH EXCLU-
SIVE B AND E
SPELLINGS

B: GROUPS WHICH IDEN-
TIFY SINGLE SPELLINGS
COMMON TO B AND E

C: GROUPS SHOWING
NO DISTINCTION
BETWEEN B AND E

12. feed E1/feede
E1

8. foot B2:1/foote
B4 E1

13. greefe B5:1/
griefe E2

14. greeue B2:2/
grieue E1

15. hayle B1/haile
E2

16. happily B2/
hap'ly E1

17. heyres B1/
heires E1

9. harts E1/hearts
B2 E1

8. here B1:3 E1/
heere B5:1 E10:2
(incl. heere=heare)

18. historie B1/
history E1

10. indeed B4:1 E1/
indeede B2

9. honor B16:1 E2/
honour B5 E4:2

19. kist B3/kiss'd
E2

11. lippes B/lips B2
E1

20. Locke B2/lock E1

There are 40 groups of spelling variants which involve spellings which fall on pages which the spacing evidence indicates should be assigned to compositor E. There are 9 groups listed in column C from which it might be expected that the strongest evidence against the reattributions would emerge. In fact, it is very weak. Only 4 of the groups show no distinction between the compositors, that is, they have two spellings which B apparently used indifferently

(disregarding for the moment the question of statistical preference) now each distributed between the composers (eg. 'blessed/ blest, fairest/ bearest, heere/here' and 'honor/honour'). The other 5 groups in column C are those in which the distribution of spellings between the composers and long and short lines does not provide information sufficient to advance the group to another category. (Nevertheless, it is interesting to notice that 'chuse', which elsewhere in the Folio B-type pages has fallen exclusively on those assigned to E, again occurs in his stint). Column B records 10 groups similar to the 4 mentioned above but different in that only one of the two variants is distributed between the composers by the reassignments. Since it is scarcely to be doubted that composers had spellings in common, the observation does not tell weightily against the reattributions. In addition, there is another group with 3 spelling variants which is simplified by the reattributions: the distribution of 'beene/bene/bin' shows that E did not use the "-ee-" spellings, at least in Cym.

Exactly one half of the groups support the reattributions by distributing the occurrences of each spelling variant between the pages allocated by B and E respectively. At first glance this seems to be strong confirmation of the spacing evidence, particularly when spellings known to be characteristic of the composers (e.g. B's 'greefe', E's 'ceizd ') fall on the appropriate pages. Nevertheless, the observation that so many of the variants in this category are represented by a single instance is a reminder that it is generally likely that if one took any two variant spellings, each would be found to occur on separate pages. The question to be resolved, therefore, is to what extent the variants supporting the reattributions occur merely by chance.

No doubt complex calculations could be used to test for the effects of chance. That chance is a factor in compositorial determination from spellings must, I believe, be conceded, but chance alone, one suspects, could not have determined the distribution of the spellings listed in the Summary above. One possible means of testing for chance is immediately available and suitably simple and swift (which computations of probability are not), the use of a test group of pages drawn from Cym. There are 5 pages attributed to E in Cym.; therefore, the test group should be of similar size, but in order to prejudice the test against success, the 5 test pages should be contiguous with the "E" pages (textually, not bibliographically) so that if the variation which exists apparently between B and E is in fact an attribute of the copy, the phenomenon will be represented in the test pages. Additionally, since the willingness of the compositors to change or accept the spellings of the copy (for some of the compositorial spellings may be "copy spellings") is related to the length of their exposure to the particular spellings, there is another argument to favour selecting test pages from the same area of the Folio as the doubtful B/E pages. Accordingly the variant spellings of a test sample comprising pages zz3^v (88-219), zz4 (230-334), zz6 (717-842), 3a2 (1223-352) and 3a3^v (1596-1719) were evaluated in the fashion adopted for Oth. and Cym. previously. To my mind the results--summarized in the following table--are convincing evidence in support of the significance of the spellings which distinguish compositor E in Cym., particularly as other supporting evidence already discussed (ie., "th" elisions, verbal auxiliary elisions, "-ee" and "-eo." spellings, and "-oo-/-o-" variants) was excluded from the analysis.

COMPARISON OF B/E AND TEST SPELLING GROUPS

SPP. IN GROUP		2	3	4	5	6-10	11-20	20+	
TEST:	Not distinctive	1	4	4	2	10	4	10	35
	Distinctive	4	2	2	3	0	0	0	
B/E:	Not distinctive	0	2	2	2	8	1	5	20
	Distinctive	8	5	1	4	1	1	0	20

What is significant here is that although the Test pages have 46 groups of spellings, less than a third of the groups would serve to distinguish compositors. There may be surprise that any of them do considering that the pages were not selected with that object. However, the 11 distinctive groups identify the workings of chance: there are always some distinctive spellings in whatever combination of pages may be selected, just as there are always some common spellings. Two distinctive groups are remarkable: 'kissd B2/ kist T3' occurs also in the B/E pages as 'kissd E2/ kist B2': the 2 'kissd' spellings are on E's 3al^V. Similar coincidence can be seen in 'lippes T2/lips B1': the 'lippes' spellings are both on page zz2.

The comparison with the B/E pages is more illuminating. There, half the groups distinguish B and E, and, although the test and B/E groups of page agree in that half of the distinctive spelling groups involve only 2 or 3 instances, the B/E pages show superior distinctiveness in the groups with many instances. The fact that 17 of the groups identify a single E spelling is very likely a function of the smallness of the E group pages in comparison to the extent of Cym.: E has 5 out of 31 pages. In light of the imbalance between the stints allocated to the compositors there is little point in

attempting to evaluate the respective influences of copy, chance, and smallness of sample size because there is a further test which will help resolve the question. Spellings which were singled out in Cym. as tolerated by and/or characteristic of E should be consistent with the occurrence of those spellings elsewhere in the tragedies section: this evidence will be examined at a later time since it depends to some extent on whether compositor E can be identified in any of the pages of the tragedies usually attributed to the other Folio compositors.¹⁹—The tendency of the evidence cited in connection with Cym. satisfactorily supports the reattributions and it remains now only to discuss--so far as the inevitable differences between texts as diverse as Oth., Ant., and Cym. permit--the extent to which the evidence cited for those texts is consistent.

(10) EVIDENCE FOR E IN OTH., ANT., AND CYM.

The function of the evidence discussed in connection with Oth., Ant., and Cym. is two-fold. First, it serves to confirm the spacing evidence. This is important because--it needs repeating--that attributions made to E in the earlier investigation were made exclusively on the evidence of the contrary practices of spacing internal commas in short lines found in pages assigned to B and E. Although other evidence, including spellings, was used, and the evidence tended to confirm the reattributions, the thrust of the argument in Compositors B and E was to defend B against the disintegrative assaults of Dr. Cairncross. The tendency and integrity of the evidence especially insofar as it related to B was the main burden of that pamphlet, and the application of the evidence to any particular page or section of the Folio was of secondary importance. Consequently, given the pre-eminence of the spacing evidence and the special form of the argument in Compositors B and E, none of the reassignments to E was made from spelling evidence. On that account,

therefore, it was necessary to examine whether the spacing evidence did isolate groups of pages which reveal consistent spelling practices sufficient to distinguish compositors. The second function of the evidence examined for these three texts was to determine what spellings could be used to provide good evidence--usually against compositor B--of compositor E's practices. Although spellings which serve to distinguish compositors also provide descriptive evidence of their practices, the present discussion is not directed towards a description of E's spellings, still less of his treatment of copy. Such an analysis must await the determination of the question of E's presence in pages assigned to the other, non-B type, compositors in the tragedies. However, the spellings distinctive of E in particular texts must be validated by an examination of their consistency from text to text: such a test will remove merely local features which may be attributable to the influence of copy.

(1) Elisions with "th":

COMP.	xth'	x'th	x'th'	x [^] th'	TOTAL
	T O A C	T O A C	T O A C	T O A C	
B	0 0 0 0	42 0 1 0	145 10 47 67	53 2 1 5	373
E	5 1 3 0	1(j) 0 00	35 9 15 19	7 4 0 0	99
Total:	5 1 3 0	43 0 1 0	180 19 62 86	60 6 1 5	
TOTAL	9	44	347	72	472

Compositor E's distinctive spelling is clearly "xth'", but throughout the last pages of his share of the tragedies he consolidated a preference for "x'th'" which he shared with B. There is, nevertheless, positive if not strong consistency here.

(2) Verbal auxiliary elisions:

COMP.	SPELLING	Trag.	Oth.	Ant.	Cym.	TOTAL
E	hee'l	3				
	hee*le	4				
	he'l		1			3
	he'le	1	4		1	5
	shee'l	1	1			1
	shee'le					5
	she'l	1			1	2
	she'le					1
	they'l	1	2			1
		(thei'le)				2
	they'le	1				1
	wee'l	9		1		2
	wee*le	16	1			10
	we'l				4	21
	you'l	1	1			0
	you*le	6	6		2	2
						14
E TOTALS		44	16	7	3	70
B	hee'l	12		4	5	21
	hee*le					0
	he'l	1j				1
	he'le					0
	shee'i	4	3		1	8
	shee'le					0
	she'l					0
	she'le					0
	they'l	5		1	1	7
	they'le	1				1
	wee'l	49		10	17	76
	wee*le					0
	we'i				1j	1
	you'l	19	1	5	6	31
you'le					0	
B TOTALS		91	4	20	31	146

[In "hee*le" there is no apostrophe before Cym., in "wee*le" E never uses an apostrophe, and in "you*le" the apostrophe does not appear before Lr.]

It is interesting to observe in the tables from which the summary above was compiled how compositor E reacts to the unfamiliar elisions which he

found in copy. It took some time before he settled upon a standard form, the "-le" spelling, and abandoned in these spellings his hostility towards "-ee-". Apostrophes, at first omitted, were gradually introduced but one form, 'weele'--which compositor B never used--invariably lacks the apostrophe. The summary table is a fair reflection of E's plasticity: in his pages of the tragedies there are 20 spellings of the kind favoured by B: the 'overlap' is sufficient to diminish the usefulness of the elisions to identify the compositor of a particular page when the forms used almost exclusively by E ("-le") are not present. Compositor B's usage is impressively consistent: he prefers "-ee-" and "-l". The observation that to return the E pages of Oth., Ant., and Cym. to B would import into his practice 21 spellings which he had not previously used in the tragedies is, it seems, good evidence of the consistency of the reattributions.

(3) Pronouns with "-ee":

SPELLING	B=Trag.	<u>Oth.</u>	<u>Ant.</u>	<u>Cym.</u>	Total	E=Trag.	<u>Oth.</u>	<u>Ant.</u>	<u>Cym.</u>	TOTAL
ee	6:28	1:2	4:5	3:9	14:44	0:2				0:2
iee	9:36		0:3	4:3	13:42	0:2				0:2
ee	10:28	5:1	6:3	11:5	32:37	2:3				2:3
shee	2:3	2	5	2:5	11:8	8:2	0:2			8:4
wee	4:13				4:13	1				1
ree	1				1	4			1	5
TOTAL:	32:108	8:3	15:11	40:22	75:114	15:9	0:2		1	16:11

In the tragedies before Ant. compositor E has 10 long spellings in Tit.,

of which 9 were in his Q copy, and 11 spellings in Rom., of which 9 were taken over from Q copy. Thereafter his tolerance of the '-ee' spelling diminished: there are 3 spellings in long lines in his share of Lr. It is interesting to observe that this movement from the longer to the shorter to spellings, which is paralleled by the distribution of 'do/doe, go/goe' spellings in E's pages, is also consistent with the movement between 's/hee's' and 's/he's' noticed in the following section. In addition, the number of spellings in long lines is remarkably small: it appears that compositor E usually did not regard the addition of another 'e' to a pronoun ending in 'e' as a useful device for the purpose of driving out his copy to the full width of his measure. Consequently, the attribution to E of any page which contains numbers of long pronouns should be regarded with scepticism: there are 5 such forms on cc6^v but they are all from copy. Thereafter, until Ham. there are never more than 3 such spellings (on ee4 only, 2 from copy) on a page assigned to E. However, in Ham. pp5 (8 spellings), pp6 (2 spellings), and pp6^v (7 spellings) the frequency of the long pronouns gives ostensible grounds for reattribution from E, to whom Hinman assigned them, to B with whose composition the spacing evidence and some other spellings are consistent. (I have not discussed the possible Ham. reattributions in this paper since the paucity of definitive evidence requires a rather more detailed argument than would be possible here). In the meantime it seems reasonable to conclude that if a page contains an "-ee-" pronominal spelling, it is very unlikely to have been set by compositor E: the distinction between B and E could scarcely be clearer.

(4) "he's/she's" with "-ee":

SPELLING	B=Trag.					Total	E=Trag. ²¹					TOTAL
	Oth.	Ant.	Cym.				Oth.	Ant.	Cym.			
'hee's	20:5	25	2	6	6:1	34:6	11:7	23*	0	0	0	11:7
'shee's	1:1	2	2	1	2:1	6:2	10:6	20	0	0	0	10:6
'he's	23:11	34	4:1	0	0:2	27:14	8	10	11:3	10	1	30:3
'she's	2:1	3	2	3	6	13:1	7:1	10	6:1	1:1	4	18:3
TOTAL	46:18	64	10:1	10	14:4	80:23	36:14	63	17:4	11:1	5	69:19

There are many points of interest in the table above, not the least of which is the apparent variation of E's practice in Oth., Ant., Cym. from the tragedies: whereas in the tragedies E favoured the long spellings 'hee's' and 'shee's' twice as much as the short spellings, there are no long spellings at all in the later tragedies. But the contradiction is a feature of the way in which the data is presented in the table, not of E's practice; when the distribution of these spellings are examined in order of printing there is a distinct movement in E from the long spellings, adopted or changed to from copy, towards the short forms. The last three plays in which E shared demonstrate the culmination of that movement. What is important to notice is that B's spellings are mixed throughout the tragedies whereas E comes shortly to a preponderance of short spellings. Furthermore, the three late tragedies are consistent on each side of the table.

(5) "do/to/t/into/t/vndo/t" spellings:

SPELLINGS	B=Trag.					Total	E=Trag.					Total
	Oth.	Ant.	Cym.				Oth.	Ant.	Cym.			
-o-	3:1	4	0	0	0	3:1	4:1	12*	3	0	1	8:1
-oo-	33:6	39	8	14:1	11	66:7	8:4	32	0	0	2	10:4
TOTAL	36:7	43	8	14:1	11	69:8	12:5	44	3	0	3	18:5

At first glance the distribution, although consistent, is not distinctive. Compositor B uses "-oo-" almost exclusively for these words and E, from the adjusted figures in the asterisked column, appears to favour them almost as strongly although he uses 3 times (from the adjusted figures) as many short spellings than B used. However, 8:3 of E's long spellings in the tragedies are 'too't' and apart from this word he is characterised by a preference for the "-o-" spellings.

(6) Other spellings: Seven groups of spellings occur in each of the distinctive spelling lists for Oth. and Cym. When the counts are adjusted to compensate for the smallness of E's stint in relation to B's, there are clearcut distinctions between the practices of the two compositors. In 'act/e', E is twice as likely to use 'act' and B is 10 times as likely to use 'acte' than E; there is only 1 'acte' spelling in E's stint. In 'answere/e/s' E strongly prefers 'answere/s' to the short spelling, but for the 'been/e/bene/bin' group of variants there is apparently little distinction between the compositors' practices. However, E does not use 'bene' after Rom. from which text 'bin' becomes his dominant spelling: 'beene' is used by E much more for justification. The 'ceiz/e/eth' spellings are E's although the small number of occurrences

makes weak conclusions. Compositor B's preference for 'greefe/s' is overwhelming against E's 'griefe/s' but E has surprising number of "-ee-" spellings in 'greeu'd, greeu'de, greeued, greeues, greeuing, greeuous' and 'greeuously'. It is useful that B does not use 'grieu'd' or 'grieue' in the tragedies. Nothing much can be made of 'hap'ly/happely/happily', but 'kiss'd' is exclusively E's against B's predominant 'kist'. The weight of the figures gives strong testimony to the consistency of the reattributions with what may be observed of the compositors' practices elsewhere in the tragedies.

SOME VARIANT SPELLINGS IN B AND E PAGES OF THE TRAGEDIES

SPELLING	Tro.	Cor.	Tit.	Rom.	Tim.	JC.	Mac.	Ham.	Lr.	Oth.	Ant.	Cym.	Tot.	Tot.	Adj
B		1:1					1	2:1	1	2	2	3	12:2	14	E*
E				2											
B	3				1	2		3:1	1:1	4	0:1	2:1	16:4	20	32
E															
B	7	15			11	6:4	5	6:4	5	2			1	1	2
E	1			1								11	70:8	78	
B					1			0:1	0:1			1	0:1	2:4	6
E	2		3	8:1				2	4	3		2	24:1	25	30
B	1	6:4	3	1	5	4	6:2	3:1	2	4	5:1	7:2	47:9	56	
E	1:1		1	8:2	0:2			3	4:1	0:2		0:2	17:10	27	52
B	1	2:2			3		3:1	2	1	0:1	1	2:1	15:5	20	
E			8	1									9	9	17
B	1	5:7			4	2	1:1	5	4:4	8:2	6	11:3	47:17	64	
E			1	6:2	1			2	8:3	2:3	2	3:4	25:12	37	71
B													0	0	
E			2							1			3	3	2
B	1						1	1		1			4	4	
E									2				2	2	3
B	1	1	1	4:1	3	5	1	12	1	3	2:1	5:2	39:4	45	
E			1		2								3	3	5
B			3		2		3:1	2					10:1	11	
E			7:2	13:1				1	1	4:1	1	3	30:4	34	49
B	1				1	3	2	3:1		3	1	2:2	16:3	19	
E			1	2	1					2	1		7	7	13
B													0	0	
E			1	1								1	3	3	6
B	1									1	1		3	3	
E												1	1	1	1
B								1:1		1		1:1	3:2	5	
E			1	2					1	1:1	1		6:1	7	7
B													0	0	
E										2		2	4	4	5
B										1	2	3	6	6	
E								1					1	1	1

(11) TABLE OF HINMAN'S B AND E ATTRIBUTIONS AMENDED

E < B	TEXT	P	SPACING	B < E	TEXT	P	SPACING
1.	1136	JC					
2.	Gg3	<u>Tim.</u>					0/6/15
3.	ss3	<u>Lr.</u>	◆	*1.	dd3 ^v	<u>Tit.</u>	1/42/5
4.	ssl		◆	*2.	ee2 ^v		0/22/15
5.	tt3 ^v	<u>Oth.</u>		*3.	*gg3 ^v	<u>Tro.</u>	0/21/6*
6.	2 ^v						0/5/14
7.	2 ^v						0/7/49
8.	1						0/2/18*
9.	1						0/3/18*
10.	vv3		◆				0/6/44
11.	2 ^v		◆				0/3/21*
12.	2		◆				0/5/32
13.	1 ^v		◆				0/0/46
14.	1		◆				0/5/32
15.	xx3 ^v	<u>Ant.</u>	◆				0/7/41
16.	4		◆				0/9/35
17.	4 ^v		◆				0/6/36
18.	5		◆				1/3/47
19.	6		◆				0/4/34
*19.	6		◆				0/8/33
20.	6 ^v		◆				0/5/52
21.	yy1		◆				0/11/37
22.	zz4 ^v	<u>Cym.</u>	◆				0/1/12
23.	5 ^v		◆				1/6/37
24.	6 ^v		◆				0/14/26*
25.	3a3		◆				0/7/49
26.	1 ^v		◆				0/6/33
=25½				=3			
			14			0	1/85/26

* These reattributions were not made by Cairncross.

NOTES

¹Cairncross, Andrew S., "Compositors E and F of the Shakespeare First Folio," PBSA 66 (1972), 369-406.

²Proudfoot, G. Richard, "The year's contributions to Shakespearian study: Textual studies," Shakespeare Survey 27 (1974), p. 183.

³Howard-Hill, T. H., "The compositors of Shakespeare's Folio comedies," SB xxvi (1973), 61-106.

⁴Hinman's compositor A here is the familiar A of early studies; only in the comedies is 'A' now to be referred to as 'F'.

⁵Hinman mentions that E sometimes distributed more than he set at II:193, 206, 255, 258.

⁶The table omits vv3 he'le *3019 and you'le 3026 for which there is no Q form, and tt3^v well<we 1587.

⁷This table includes the spellings omitted from the previous table.

⁸See, for example, Alan E. Craven, "Justification of prose and Jaggard compositor B," English Language Notes 3:15-17 S '65.

⁹This table is very selective: "bee" and "shee" were included but not "be" and "she"; therefore, there are diminished counts of -e<e and -e<ee; "he" and "we" were excluded because "hee" and "wee" do not occur; "hee's" and "he's", "shee's" and the verbal auxiliaries ("he'l/hee'l" and the like) are included; for "me" only the e<ee spellings and "wee" are included, therefore there are diminished counts of e<e; and "ye" was omitted because "yee" does not occur in F, and the Q form was "you": the effect of the omission is to diminish the totals of the top two lines and hence to obscure the numerical contrast between the frequency of the short spellings and the relatively uncommon "-ee" spellings.

¹⁰The counts for this line are not absolute since "be, he, she, we ye" and "me<mee" were omitted; it is the proportions which are revealing.

¹¹What it cannot show, of course, is that there are 4 occasions on E pages where the elision is introduced where the copy has the full pronoun + "is": 1130, 1132, 1234 and *1034; there is another instance at *2142, set by B.

¹²The distinction between categories (a) and (b) is not remarkable and conceivably no injustice would be done to the argument if the categories were to be combined. Nevertheless, it seemed useful to list separately a word like "alreadie/already" for which the reassignment of pages resolved spellings formerly distributed between B and E to show that only E altered

the "-y" spelling of copy to the "-ie" spelling. In the (b) category are spellings like "ceaze/seize" where, with reassignment, the "ceaze" form from Q "cease" now belongs to E and the "seize" spelling (from Q "ceaze") alone is B's. The frequency of spelling is too small to allow a conclusion that the particular forms are characteristic of the compositors.

¹³It is possible that if the spellings are separated into mono- and poly-syllabic groups, a useful distinction may emerge.

¹⁴That none of these is in quire tt is somewhat surprising.

¹⁵See Howard-Hill, Compositor B and E (1976), p. 51-2 for a table and discussion of these elisions throughout the B and E pages of the tragedies, and the last section of this paper.

¹⁶The table in Howard-Hill, Compositor B and E (1976), p. 49 shows how strongly characteristic of E is the spelling "weele" without the apostrophe.

¹⁷Excludes "doo't<doe it" =2; only 2 of B's spellings occur in long lines.

¹⁸The list does not include groups of spellings like "doo't/do't" already discussed separately.

¹⁹It is useful to be reminded that this paper--like the previous investigation--is limited to consideration of E only where he was identified by Hinman or distinguished in B-type pages.

²⁰Since justification does not seem to be a significant factor here, the counts do not list spellings in long lines separately.--In the table T=Tragedies other than the following; O=Oth., A=Ant.; C=Cym.

²¹In the tragedies to Oth., compositor B set "he's" or "she's" 64 times, and compositor E 50 times: in order to ease comparisons a count for E's spellings adjusted to compensate for the difference between the number of times each compositor was exposed to "he's" and "she's" in copy is given in the asterisked column.