



莎士比亚作品解读丛书·英文影印插图版

第十二夜

主编 [英] J. M. 洛西恩 (J. M. Lothian) [英] T. W. 克雷克 (T. W. Craik)

Twelfth Night

第十二夜

主编 [英] J. M. 洛西恩 (J. M. Lothian)

[英] T. W. 克雷克 (T. W. Craik)



中国人民大学出版社

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

第十二夜: 英文/[英] 洛西恩, [英] 克雷克主编

北京: 中国人民大学出版社, 2008

(莎士比亚作品解读丛书 · 英文影印插图版)

ISBN 978-7-300-08841-9

I. 第…

II. ①洛…②克…

III. 喜剧-剧本-文学研究-英国-中世纪-英文

IV. I561.073

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字 (2008) 第 201122 号

莎士比亚作品解读丛书 · 英文影印插图版

第十二夜

主编 [英] J. M. 洛西恩 (J. M. Lothian)

[英] T. W. 克雷克 (T. W. Craik)

出版发行 中国人民大学出版社

社 址 北京中关村大街31号

邮政编码 100080

电 话 010-62511242 (总编室)

010-62511398 (质管部)

010-82501766 (邮购部)

010-62514148 (门市部)

010-62515195 (发行公司)

010-62515275 (盗版举报)

网 址 [http:// www. crup. com. cn](http://www.crup.com.cn)

[http:// www. ttrnet. com](http://www.ttrnet.com) (人大教研网)

经 销 新华书店

印 刷 北京鑫丰华彩印有限公司

规 格 148 mm × 210 mm 32开本

版 次 2008 年 2 月第 1 版

印 张 9 插页5

印 次 2008 年 2 月第 1 次印刷

字 数 251 000

定 价 27.00元

版权所有

侵权必究

印装差错

负责调换

PREFACE

THE death of Professor J. M. Lothian in October 1970, not long after his retirement from his personal chair of English in the University of Aberdeen, was much regretted by his friends and colleagues there (as well as by the many elsewhere), who had highly regarded his warmth of personality and his ripeness of judgment. He left incomplete this edition of *Twelfth Night* (a play which he greatly enjoyed), having prepared the text, assembled a collation and commentary, and begun to write an introduction: of this he had completed sections on the sources, date, and text, and was in course of composing his critical discussion of the play.

A few months after his death, at the request of his widow, I collected from her his papers and sent his unfinished work to Mr Peter Wait of Methuen and Company who, after first consulting Mrs Lothian and the general editors Professors H. F. Brooks and Harold Jenkins, asked me in the spring of 1971 to complete the edition. On this work I have been intermittently engaged from that time to the present.

I had at first hoped simply to put into final order the completed parts of Professor Lothian's edition and to expand his critical notes into a finished discussion, so that the 'new Arden' edition could be published as soon as possible and under his name alone. However, once I began to examine his manuscript and to work over the material in detail, I became convinced that, notwithstanding the value of what he had done, further revision was desirable, and that Professor Lothian would himself have undertaken it if he had lived long enough to do so; and therefore, with the consent of Mrs Lothian, the general editors, and the publishers, I undertook it myself. The text of the play remains very much as he left it, following the Folio except when emendation was evidently required, and altering the punctuation no more than was necessary to provide a modernized text. The collation also is very little changed: readings from editions which have appeared since its completion have been added, as have earlier readings where the commentary makes them desirable. The commentary has been thoroughly revised: about one-third of the annotations are Professor Lothian's, about one-third my own, and the remaining one-third are my expansions and modifications of his

(thus making it impracticable to assign, for example by initials, each note to its author). The introduction is completely of my writing, but it includes almost everything that Professor Lothian designed to say: the section on stage performance was not part of his plan; in the other sections his work has been the nucleus of mine, although, as will be acknowledged in the remainder of this preface and in the footnotes, it has undergone considerable alteration because of the generous help given me by other persons.

It is at this point that I would wish to acknowledge the help given to Professor Lothian, but regret that, apart from Mrs Lothian and Mr James George of the University of Aberdeen, I do not know where acknowledgment is due: I therefore hope that his other helpers will take the will for the deed.

The editors upon whose work he and I have drawn most freely are H. H. Furness, M. Luce, G. L. Kittredge, J. Dover Wilson, and M. M. Mahood. To Professor Mahood, of the University of Kent, I am grateful not only for her published work but for sending me further information for which I asked; I am also grateful, for the same reasons, to Professor F. W. Sternfeld, of Exeter College, Oxford, who assisted her by transcribing and editing the songs. I am deeply indebted to Professor Robert K. Turner, Jr, of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, for 'textual' information which extended very far beyond the limits suggested by that term, and also to his collaborator Professor Maurice Charney, of Rutgers University, who is engaged on the 'critical' part of their joint work (as yet unpublished: see Abbreviations) ; they both, with great generosity, sent me copies of their manuscripts, and commented most kindly and helpfully on my manuscripts which I sent them in return. To H. F. Brooks and Harold Jenkins, who have virtually had two editions to oversee, I also wish to express gratitude, on my predecessor's behalf as well as my own, for the unflinching clarity and charity which both of them showed in doing so.

My thanks are also due to Miss F. E. Richardson, of Trent Park College of Education, who brought to her examination of the entry (2 February 1602) in Manningham's diary much more familiarity with Elizabethan handwriting than I possess; to Mr D. S. Fuller, of the University of Aberdeen, for help in connection with the songs; to the library staffs of the British Museum and of the Universities of Aberdeen, Cambridge, Dundee, London (for the photographs of the Folio which served as copy-text for the play) and Oxford (for the photographs which served as copy-text for Appendix I); to those students of the

University of Dundee who performed the play in February 1974 under my direction and that of my co-producer Miss Valerie Reid, and thereby enabled me to learn much about it 'from the inside'; to Mrs Moira Anthony for expert copy-typing, and to Mrs Magdalen Pearce for expert copy-editing. I am, of course, responsible for all errors which may be discovered in this edition, and should be glad to be informed of them so that I may correct them at the first opportunity.

T. W. CRAIK

University of Dundee
December 1974

ABBREVIATIONS AND REFERENCES

I. EDITIONS AND MANUSCRIPT

- F *Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies.* 1623.
- F₂ *Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies.* 1632.
- F₃ *Mr. William Shakespear's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies . . .*
The third Impression. 1664.
- F₄ *Mr. William Shakespear's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies . . .*
The fourth Edition. 1685.
- Douai MS. Douai MS. 7.87 in the Douai Public Library: contains transcripts of *Tw.N.*, five other plays by Shakespeare, and one each by Lee, Dryden, and D'Avenant. See G. Blakemore Evans, 'The Douai Manuscript—Six Shakespearean Transcripts (1694-95)', *Philological Quarterly*, 41 (1962), 158-72.
- Rowe *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear . . . Revis'd and Corrected . . .*
By N. Rowe, Esq. (Vol. 2) 1709.
- Rowe³ *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear . . . With his Life, by N. Rowe, Esq. (Vol. 2) 1714.*
- Pope *The Works of Shakespear . . . Collected and Corrected . . . by Mr. Pope. (Vol. 2) 1723.*
- Theobald *The Works of Shakespeare . . . Collated with the Oldest Copies, and Corrected; With Notes . . . By Mr. Theobald. (Vol. 2) 1733.*
- Theobald² *The Works of Shakespeare . . . Collated . . . and Corrected: With Notes . . . By Mr. Theobald. The Second Edition. (Vol. 3) 1740.*
- Hanmer *The Works of Shakespear . . . Carefully Revised and Corrected by the former Editions. (Vol. 2) Oxford, 1743-4.*
- Warburton *The Works of Shakespear. The Genuine Text . . . settled By Mr. Pope and Mr. Warburton. (Vol. 3) 1747.*
- Johnson *The Plays of William Shakespear . . . To which are added Notes by Sam. Johnson. (Second issue) (Vol. 2) 1765.*
- Capell *Mr William Shakespeare his Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies [ed. Edward Capell]. (Vol. 4) [1767]. Notes, 3 vols. 1779.*
- Var. '73 *The Plays of William Shakespeare . . . with the Corrections and Illustrations of Various Commentators. To which are added Notes by Samuel Johnson and George Steevens. (Vol. 4) 1773.*
- Var. '78 *The Plays of William Shakespeare . . . The Second Edition, Revised and Augmented. (Vol. 4) 1778.*
- Rann *The Dramatic Works of Shakespeare . . . with notes by J. Rann. (Vol. 2) Oxford, 1786.*
- Malone *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare . . . With . . . notes . . . By Edmond Malone. (Vol. 5) 1790.*
- Var. '93 *The Plays of William Shakespeare . . . The Fourth Edition. (Vol. 4) 1793.*

- Var. '03 *The Plays of William Shakespeare . . . The Fifth Edition. Revised and augmented By Isaac Reed. (Vol. 5) 1803.*
- Var. '13 *The Plays of William Shakespeare . . . Revised and augmented by Isaac Reed . . . The Sixth Edition. (Vol. 5) 1813.*
- Var. '21 *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare . . . [with] a life of the poet . . . by the late E. Malone . . . [ed. J. Boswell]. (Vol. 11) 1821.*
- Harness *The Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare; with notes . . . By the Rev. William Harness. (Vol. 2) 1825.*
- Knight *The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspeare. Edited by Charles Knight. Comedies. (Vol. 1) [1839].*
- Collier *The Works of William Shakespeare . . . with the various readings, notes . . . by J. Payne Collier. (Vol. 3) 1842-4.*
- Collier² *The Plays of Shakespeare: The text regulated by the old copies, and by the recently discovered Folio of 1632, containing early manuscript emendations. Edited by J. Payne Collier. 1853.*
- Halliwel *The Works of William Shakspeare . . . from a New Collation of the Early Editions . . . James O. Halliwell. (Vol. 7) 1853-65.*
- Delius *Shakespeares Werke. Herausgegeben und erklärt von N. Delius. (Vol. 6) Elberfeld, 1854-61.*
- Singer² *The Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare . . . revised . . . by S. W. Singer. (Vol. 3) 1856.*
- Dyce *The Works of William Shakespeare. The Text revised by the Rev. Alexander Dyce. (Vol. 3) 1857.*
- Collier³ *Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories Tragedies, and poems. Edited by J. Payne Collier. (Vol. 2) 1858.*
- Staunton *The Plays of Shakespeare. Edited by Howard Staunton. (Vol. 2) 1859.*
- White *The Works of William Shakespeare . . . edited . . . by Richard Grant White. (Vol. 5) Boston, 1859-65.*
- Camb. *The Works of William Shakespeare. Edited by William George Clark . . . and John Glover [Vols. 2-9 edited by W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright]. The Cambridge Shakespeare. (Vol. 3) Cambridge and London, 1863-6.*
- Dyce² *The Works of William Shakespeare . . . Second Edition. (Vol. 3) 1863-7.*
- Globe *The Works of William Shakespeare. Edited by W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright. Cambridge and London, 1864.*
- Keightley *The Plays of William Shakespeare. Carefully edited by Thomas Keightley. (Vol. 2) 1864.*
- Hudson *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare . . . edited by the Rev. Henry N. Hudson. (Vol. 5) Boston, 1881.*
- Wright *Twelfth Night. Edited by W. A. Wright. Oxford, 1885.*
- Deighton *Twelfth Night. Edited by K. Deighton. 1889.*
- Camb.² *The Works of William Shakespeare. Edited by William Aldis Wright. (Vol. 3) 1891-5.*
- Furness *Twelfth Night, or What You Will. Edited by Horace Howard Furness. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. Philadelphia and London, 1901.*
- Luce *Twelfth Night; or, What You Will. Edited by Morton Luce. The Arden Shakespeare. 1906. Fourth edition, revised, 1929.*

- N.C.S. *Twelfth Night, or, What You Will*. Edited . . . by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson. The New Shakespeare. Cambridge, 1930. Second edition, 1949.
- Kittredge *Twelfth Night*. Edited by George Lyman Kittredge. Boston, 1941.
- Alexander *William Shakespeare. The Complete Works . . . edited . . . by Peter Alexander*. 1951.
- Munro *The London Shakespeare . . . edited by . . . John Munro*. (Vol. 2) 1958.
- Ludowyk *Twelfth Night, or What You Will . . . with notes by E. F. C. Ludowyk*. Cambridge, 1963.
- Mahood *Twelfth Night*. Edited by M. M. Mahood. New Penguin Shakespeare. Harmondsworth, 1968.
- Musgrove *Twelfth Night or What You Will*. Edited by S. Musgrove. Fountainwell Drama Texts. Edinburgh, 1969.
- Honigmann *Twelfth Night*. Edited by E. A. J. Honigmann. 1973.
- Turner *Twelfth Night, or, What You Will*. [Edition by Robert K. Turner, Jr, and Maurice Charney; awaiting publication.]
- Charney See Turner.
- Wilson See N.C.S.

2. OTHER WORKS

- Abbott E. A. Abbott. *A Shakespearian Grammar*. 1869, etc.
- Badham Charles Badham. 'The Text of Shakespeare'. In *Cambridge Essays*. Cambridge, 1856.
- Bailey Samuel Bailey. *On the Received Text of Shakespeare's Dramatic Writings, and its improvement*. 1862.
- Becket Andrew Becket. *Shakespeare's Himself Again: or the Language of the poet asserted*. [etc.]. 1815.
- Bradley A. C. Bradley. 'Feste the Jester', in *A Book of Homage to Shakespeare*, edited by I. Gollancz, 1916. Reprinted in A. C. Bradley, *A Miscellany*, 1929.
- Florio John Florio. *Queen Anna's new World of Words, or, Dictionarie of the Italian and English tongues*, [etc.]. 1611.
- D.N.B. *Dictionary of National Biography*. Edited by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee. 1908-9.
- Daniel P. A. Daniel. *Notes and Conjectural Emendations of certain Doubtful Passages in Shakespeare's Plays*. 1870.
- Farmer Richard Farmer. Contributions to Var '73.
- Heath [Benjamin Heath.] *A Revisal of Shakespeare's Text*. 1765.
- Hotson Leslie Hotson. *The First Night of 'Twelfth Night'*. London and New York, 1954.
- Hulme Hilda M. Hulme. *Explorations in Shakespeare's Language*. 1962.
- Jonson Ben Jonson. Edited by C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson. Oxford, 1925-52.
- Lettsom See Walker.
- Lyly *The Complete Works of John Lyly . . . Collected and edited . . . by R. Warwick Bond*. Oxford, 1902.
- MSR *Malone Society Reprints*.

- Mason J. Monck Mason. *Comments on the Last Edition* [Var. '85] of *Shakespeare's Plays*. Dublin, 1785.
- N. & Q. *Notes and Queries*.
- Onions G. T. Onions. *A Shakespeare Glossary*. Oxford, 1911, etc.
- OED *A New English Dictionary upon Historical Principles*. Oxford, 1884-1928.
- RES *The Review of English Studies*.
- Seng Peter J. Seng. *The Vocal Songs in the Plays of Shakespeare: A Critical History*. Cambridge, Mass., 1967.
- Sh. Q. *The Shakespeare Quarterly*.
- Shakespeare's England *Shakespeare's England. An Account of the Life and Manners of his Age*. [Edited by Sidney Lee and C. T. Onions.] Oxford, 1916.
- Singer Samuel Weller Singer. *The Text of Shakespeare* [etc.]. 1853.
- Sisson G.J. Sisson. *New Readings in Shakespeare*. Cambridge, 1956.
- Thirlby Styan Thirlby (1686 ?-1753), contributions to Theobald (1733) and annotations for an unpublished edition of Shakespeare. See Christopher Spencer and John W. Velz, 'Styan Thirlby: A Forgotten "Editor" of Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Studies*, vi (1970), 327-33.
- Tilley M. P. Tilley. *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1950.
- TLS *The Times Literary Supplement*.
- Tyrwhitt [Thomas Tyrwhitt.] *Observations and Conjectures upon some Passages of Shakespeare*. Oxford, 1766.
- Upton John Upton. *Critical Observations on Shakespeare*. 1746. Second edition, 1748.
- Walker W. S. Walker. *A Critical Examination of the Text of Shakespeare* [ed. W. N. Lettsom]. 1860.

The abbreviations of the titles of Shakespeare's plays and poems are those of C. T. Onions, *A Shakespeare Glossary*. All quotations from Shakespeare (except from *Twelfth Night*) use the text and lineation of *Works*, ed. Peter Alexander (1951).

The place of publication, unless otherwise stated, is London.

INTRODUCTION

I TEXT

I THE PRINTER'S COPY

Twelfth Night was first printed in the Folio of 1623; that there had been no quarto edition is implied by the play's being entered in the Stationers' Register (8 November 1623) for Jaggard and Blount, the printers of the Folio, along with fifteen other plays hitherto unprinted.¹ The only authoritative text of the play is accordingly that of the Folio, where *Twelfth Night* is the penultimate play in the first section (Comedies), following *All's Well That Ends Well* and preceding *The Winter's Tale*. It occupies pp. 255-75 inclusive (sigs. Y² to Z⁶; Z⁶^v is blank).

Charlton Hinman has shown that there was some delay in securing for the compositors the copy for both *Twelfth Night* and *The Winter's Tale*. After they had set quire X (taking *All's Well* as far as p. 252) they did not proceed to quires Y and Z (thereby completing *All's Well* and following it with the whole of *Twelfth Night*) but instead set quires a and b (thereby beginning the Histories with the whole of *King John* and, on sigs b⁶ and b⁶^v, the start of *Richard II*).²

The reasons for the delay must be matters of conjecture. It is of more immediate consequence to try to establish the nature of the copy that was eventually provided for the compositor (Compositor B) of *Twelfth Night*.³

The text of *Twelfth Night* has been described as 'unusually

1. E. Arber (ed.), *A Transcript of the Register of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640* (1877), iv, 69.

2. C. Hinman, *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare* (1963), II, 521. Further evidence of the delay over the copy is the fact that the last page of quire Z (Z⁶^v, following the end of *Tw.N.*) is blank, as is the last page of quire Cc (Cc⁶^v, following the end of *The Winter's Tale*). This is unusual in the Folio, where normally plays succeed one another on the following page, whether recto or verso.

3. Hinman, *op. cit.*, II, 480-6; he points out (II, 522) that it was unusual for only one compositor, instead of two, to be employed on a play. He finds no evidence of proof-correction in quire Y (II, 481-2), nor in quire Z apart from the knocking down of three inking space quads (II, 485), which may have been accidental. The fact that the misprints and the wrong numbering of p. 265 (Z1) as 273 are uncorrected likewise suggests that no proof-reading took place before or during die printing.

clean',¹ that is, remarkably free from textual corruption and obscurity, mislining of verse, and wrong attribution of speeches, though it has its share of evident misprints, many of which were corrected in the Second Folio of 1632, and though there are instances where the compositor misread his copy, notably at i. iii. 96 ('coole my' for 'curie by'), ii. v. 145 ('become' for 'borne'), and iii. iv. 70 ('langer' for 'tang'). At i. v. 168 S.D. he printed *Enter Violenta*, because (as R. K. Turner explains²) he had set the page in *All's Well* on which the name occurs (it had been Shakespeare's original name for Diana), and, beginning the typesetting of *Twelfth Night* with Y3^v, he expanded the *Viola* of the stage direction into *Violenta*. The copy's speech-headings, being presumably *Vio.* as they are in the Folio, did not show him his error.

This general cleanness of the text led Wilson³ to conclude that the copy was 'a theatrical prompt-book or a transcript therefrom'; Greg, with some reservations, concurred, as have most later writers on the subject.⁴ Turner, however, argues strongly against the possibility that the copy was a prompt-book, and gives two reasons for believing that it was a transcript of some kind.

1. The ends of Acts i, ii, and iv are annotated *Finis Actus Primus*, etc. (At the end of Act iii the notation was presumably overlooked.) These annotations must derive from copy, since they are almost unknown in the Folio.⁵ Being 'more decorative than functional', they proceed either from author or scribe, and their absence from

1. W. W. Greg, *The Shakespeare First Folio* (1955), p. 296.

2. See Preface, p. x and List of Abbreviations, p. xv.

3. N.C.S., p. 89.

4. Greg, *op. cit.*, p. 296, pointing out that the directions at ii. ii. S.D. (*Enter Viola and Maluolio, at severall doores*) and at iv. ii. 21 (*Maluolio within*) need not have come from the prompt-book but could equally well have been supplied by the author. Cf. W. T. Jewkes, *Act Division in Elizabethan and Jacobean Plays* (1958), p. 177: 'There does not seem to be much dispute that the copy from which the printer worked was probably a prompt-book or a transcript made for the printer.' Jewkes regards the longest directions, such as those at the beginning of i. i, i. iv, and ii. ii, as 'probably originally the author's', while others, such as *Catch sung* (ii. iii. 72), *Musicke playes* (ii. iv. 14), *Musicke* (ii. iv. 50), and *Maluolio within* (iv. ii. 21), 'are possibly the prompter's'. S. Musgrove (ed.), *Twelfth Night* (Fountainwell Drama Texts, 1969), p. 9, says that the copy 'may have been a prompt-book, but the clean text more probably suggests a transcript [i.e., from a prompt-book]'.
5. The only other instances are at the end of Act i of *LLL.*, and at the end of Act i of *Gent.* In the first instance, the *Finis Actus Primus* is a space-filler at the foot of a column and is not from the copy (Q, 1598: cf. Greg, *op. cit.*, p. 223). In the second instance, *Finis* is probably from the copy, a transcript by Ralph Crane (*ibid.*, p. 217).

any texts (including quartos) derived directly from his foul papers shows that they 'did not originate with Shakespeare'.¹

2. Orsino is always *Duke* in the stage directions and the speech headings, but though in the text he is called a duke three times in I. ii and a fourth time in the first line of I. iv, he is elsewhere called a count, twice in I. iii and fifteen times in the rest of the play (from I. iv. 9 onwards). It is most unlikely that Shakespeare or a prompter would normalize the directions and headings while allowing the discrepancy in the text to stand, and much more probable that the normalizing is the work of a scribe.²

Turner maintains that the transcript was not from a prompt-book but from Shakespeare's foul papers. He notes that the stage directions and speech headings are not more characteristic of prompt-book origin than they are characteristic of authorial origin. Greg has stated that the general characteristics of prompt-copy are 'the appearance of actors' names duplicating those of (usually minor) characters, possibly the general appearance of directions a few lines early, and warnings for actors and properties to be in readiness'.³ The first of these characteristics is not found in *Twelfth Night*. The only significantly early entrance-direction (discounting, that is, Maria's insignificant one at II. v. 185, immediately prior to Sir Andrew's 'Nor I neither', with which her entrance coincides) is that of Malvolio at III. iv. 15.⁴ By Greg's own showing

1. They could, of course, originate with a scribe copying a prompt-book and adding them on his own initiative. Turner is establishing that the prompt-book itself can hardly have been their source. He remarks that it was Compositor C who set the two *finises* mentioned in the preceding note and that Compositor B never uses the term except in *Tu.N.*, where he is therefore following copy.

2. Turner points out that it is only when Orsino is being mentioned by others that his title is used; when he is addressed, it is either 'by name or by such general honorifics as "my lord", "your lordship", or "sir"' (unless the Clown is punning on his ducal title when he says 'Put your grace in your pocket', v. i. 30). The copyist may well have understood that he was free to normalize the directions and speech headings but not to tamper with the text (unlike those eighteenth-century editors who consistently changed 'cousin' to 'uncle' every time Sir Toby's relationship to Olivia was mentioned, and who altered 'count' to 'duke' throughout the dialogue).

3. Greg, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

4. This misplaced entry can, I think, be most satisfactorily explained as resulting from the copyist's confusion while transcribing Shakespeare's foul papers. It is notable that the Folio's central placing of the entry makes Olivia's l. 14 into two lines (i.e., its second part returns to the left-hand margin as usually happens when a line is divided between two speakers). Assuming that Shakespeare did not trouble to write in Maria's *exit* (which is implied in Olivia's command), and that he wrote *Enter Malvolio* marginally, the scribe might naturally place that direction centrally and immediately after Olivia finishes speaking to Maria.

the technical directions might equally proceed from foul papers as from a prompt-book.¹ I agree with Turner that some of the directions are less precise than one would expect if the copy were the prompt-book or its transcript: such are *and other Lords* (I. i. S.D.), *and Saylor* (I. ii. S.D.), *and Attendants* (I. iv. 8 S.D.). Olivia's attendants are omitted altogether from I. v (in which Olivia once, and the Clown three times, bids them 'take away the fool'); and Maria at III. i. 85 S.D. is named simply as *Gentlewoman*.² There is a general, and in my opinion highly significant, carelessness about providing entrances and exits, not only for minor characters (Who calls forth the holy father at v. i. 140? Who pursues Malvolio and entreats him to a peace at v. i. 379?) but for major characters too. Malvolio's 'I'll be reveng'd on the whole pack of you!' (v. i. 377) is so obviously an exit-line that it would not need marking in a prompt-book. Maria's exits at III. iv. 14 and at IV. ii. 3 present no problem, being again obviously implied; but those at III. iv. 63³ and III. iv. 202⁴ are different. Similarly Fabian's exit and re-entry at v. i. 314 and 325 are obvious, but what of his unspecified exit with Sir Toby, the Clown, and Sir Andrew at v. i. 206?⁵ The most problematical exit of all is the

1. See p. xix, n. 3, above, and R. B. McKerrow ('The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts', *The Library*, 4th series, xii, 273-5), who says that a man of the theatre would tend to give stage directions 'in the form of directions to the actors (as they might appear in a prompt-book) rather than descriptions of action viewed from the front of the theatre. . . . Probably he would use either type of direction as it happened to occur to him.'

2. Possibly because she has no lines to speak on this occasion.

3. Since Olivia goes to meet 'Cesario', and Maria to fetch Sir Toby, it is desirable that they go out in different directions: possibly this is implied by giving Olivia an *exit* to show that Maria does not accompany her.

4. Since she takes no further part in the scene, Maria obviously goes out, but in the absence of any direction it is uncertain what the others do. Sir Toby and Fabian may either go out or merely retire, though I should have thought, by analogy with III. i. 94-5, 'Let the garden door be shut, and leave me to my hearing', that their presence anywhere on stage would be incongruous with Olivia's intimate dialogue with Viola; it may, of course, be fairly argued that III. i. 94-5 motivates Sir Andrew's jealousy and is introduced for that reason, and also because the dialogue is to continue till the end of the scene.

5. Fabian's exit at this point is by no means positively implied in the text (as is that of the Clown, who has entered supporting Sir Toby). It is arguable that editors introduce it in order to make sense of I. 278 S.D. (*Enter Clowne with a Letter, and Fabian* in F), for, unless Fabian leaves the stage with the wounded knights, he is still on stage, where indeed he has been since the beginning of the scene. I conjecture that Shakespeare originally intended to bring in Fabian (and Malvolio's letter) for the first time at I. 278 S.D., that the existing opening dialogue between him and the Clown, about the letter, was Shakespeare's

Clown's somewhere during II. iii (see commentary at II. iii. 117), where it looks as though Shakespeare decided towards the end of the scene that he should have got the Clown off stage earlier, leaving Sir Toby and Sir Andrew to finish it as they began it, but that he never went back over the scene to write in an exit for him. Doubtless the problem was discovered and solved in performance by Shakespeare's actors, as it has had to be by all actors since, but one would expect the solution, once found, to have been thereupon entered in the prompt-book.

I see in these places signs that Shakespeare was sometimes in two minds during the composition of the play, and these signs furnish more support for Turner's view that his foul papers, not the prompt-book, lie behind the transcript.¹

The almost certain mislining at III. i. 122-7 strengthens the probability that the copy consisted of Shakespeare's foul papers in which the verse was revised *currente calamo* (see commentary).

An alteration of plan, this time involving the use of characters in the plot, seems to occur between II. iii. 173-5 (where Maria resolves that the Clown, as well as Sir Toby and Sir Andrew, shall observe Malvolio's construction of the letter she will drop in his way) and II. v. 1 (where the third watcher is actually Fabian, a new character, who will be put to further use later to perform functions the Clown cannot, as well as to prevent his too frequent appearances).²

afterthought, intended to give the Clown something to be doing on stage before being accosted by Orsino (he could hardly repeat the beginning of III. i); and that in writing the existing opening dialogue he forgot that, later in the scene, while the Clown was to exit and re-enter, Fabian was merely to enter. See n. 2 below.

1. A change of plan involving stage action may also underlie the question of whether Fabian and Viola do or do not leave the stage at III. iv. 277. See commentary.

2. Fabian is specially valuable as a 'straight man' with a twinkle of inner comedy in III. ii and III. iv (Sir Andrew's jealousy, Sir Toby's encounter with Malvolio, the preparations for the duel), and at the very end of the play, with his long speech, he is invaluable. Roy Walker, *Shakespeare Survey*, 12 (1959), 130, footnote 15 (reviewing productions of *Tw.N.* in 1958), remarks that Fabian's lines 'can mostly be plausibly distributed, or returned, to Feste, Sir Andrew and Maria. The opening of the final scene, v. i, is particularly suspect. Why introduce the business of the letter only to leave it aside for some 300 lines, during which Fabian neither speaks nor is spoken to and may or may not be on stage? Was not Maria, rather than Fabian, meant to say "myself and Toby / Set this device against Malvolio here" [v. i. 358-9]?' I think it unlikely that Maria was ever meant to speak verse. For the letter, see p. xx, n. 5, above. See also A. C. Sprague, 'Shakespeare's Unnecessary Characters', *Shakespeare survey*, 20 (1967), 80: 'The indefiniteness of the role all but ceases when we

There must also be considered the inconsistency in the text as to Orsino's title: R. K. Turner states that the two titles are not employed synonymously by Shakespeare, pointing out that in his comedies his dukes always possess the dignity of rule and often of age, whereas his counts are younger and function primarily as lovers rather than as rulers or military leaders. He therefore concludes that Shakespeare 'either elevated or reduced Orsino in rank', and made him a count from 1. iii onwards, the use of 'Duke' in 1. iv. 1 being simply an authorial lapse. I have some difficulty in accepting this view, since Orsino's role as lover is fundamental to the story, and prefer to regard the inconsistency in the text between duke and count as one to which Shakespeare was indifferent, since his Orsino is in the unique position of being both the head of the state (with the power of life and death over enemy aliens like Antonio) and a young man in love.¹ Claudio in *Much Ado*, Bertram in *All's Well*, and Paris in *Romeo and Juliet* all have titled superiors (Don Pedro, the King of France, and the Prince of Verona), whereas Orsino has neither titled superiors nor titled inferiors: it is therefore possible that, in this play alone, Shakespeare did allow the same person to be both duke and count according as he exhibited the different aspects of his personality and office.

2 THE QUESTION OF REVISION

Another alleged inconsistency is the basis of the first of three arguments that Shakespeare rewrote some part or parts of the play either in the course of composition or after its production by his company.

(a) *The song and the dialogue surrounding it in II. iv*

The argument for revision here was forcefully expounded by J. Dover Wilson in the New Cambridge Shakespeare edition,² and, to my mind, no less forcefully refuted by S. L. Bethell in *Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition*.³ Wilson, following

reach the theatre and Fabian is embodied by a particular actor. In the theatre his enjoyment of the comic proceedings not only accompanies but intensifies our own.'

1. Viola's question 'Who governs here?' (1. ii. 24) is a very natural one, and, since Shakespeare's counts never govern, the answer she receives seems the only proper one, in which it would be impossible to substitute 'count'. It may be added that in Riche's story Apolonius is a duke, as was the contemporary Orsino who had recently visited England.

2. N.C.S., pp. 91-5.

3. Bethell, *op. cit.* (1944), pp. 137-44.

and quoting a suggestion originally made by F. G. Fleay in 1876,¹ drew attention to Viola's proposal to serve the Duke as a singer and an instrumentalist (I. ii. 55-9), a proposal which is never realized in the play; he interpreted II. iv. 2-3 as Orsino's request that Viola should sing the previous night's song, and interpreted Curio's statement that the proper singer is not present as Shakespeare's palpable substitution of the Clown for Viola; he also accepted Richmond Noble's conjecture that the substitution occurred because 'on the occasion of a revival there was no boy available capable both of taking such a part as Viola's and of singing', while there was a comedian highly talented as a singer, who was consequently allotted both this song and additional ones.² Bethell rejoined that Viola's proposal in I. ii is merely her means of entering the Duke's service and gives no grounds for assuming that she was originally meant to sing the song in II. iv; that Orsino was not asking her to sing the song but only to have it sung for him; that it is perfectly in character for him to plead where he might have commanded, to remember the song but not the singer, and to expatiate on its beauty to Cesario even though Cesario had heard it on the previous night; and that it is most unlikely that 'the company no longer had a boy-actor who could struggle through a song.' In preferring Bethell's view to Wilson's I rejoice to concur with M. M. Mahood's critical statement (which she amply supports by critical analysis):

There are no awkwardnesses that suggest revision. . . . The scene is a dramatic climax, perfectly conceived and perfectly executed. . . . Shakespeare in fact speaks 'masterly' in this scene, and it is hard to believe that the writing of it was not part of his original inspiration.³

(b) *The use of 'Jove' in the play*

Wilson draws attention to the statute of 27 May 1606 whereby 'For the preventing and avoyding of the great Abuse of the Holy Name of God in Stageplayes, Interludes, Maygames, Shewes,

1. *Shakespeare Manual* (1876), pp. 227-9.

2. Richmond Noble, *Shakespeare's Use of Song* (1923), pp. 80-1, 87. Noble believed this 'final substantial' revision to have taken place between 1603 and 1606, and related the Clown's epilogue-song to the stanza with the same refrains in *Lr.*, III. ii. 74-7, which he regarded as reflecting the novelty and popularity of that song.

3. Mahood, *ed. cit.*, p. 19. Musgrove, *ed. cit.*, p. 10, agrees. Turner likewise judges that the Clown's participation contributes importantly to the mood of the scene, though (like Fleay and Wilson) he is uneasy about the prose (which I think Bethell fully justifies as 'a statement of hard fact: Orsino's passion may