



莎士比亚作品解读丛书·英文影印插图版

罗密欧与朱丽叶

主编 [英] 布赖恩·吉布斯 (Brian Gibbons)

Romeo and Juliet

莎士比亚作品解读丛书·英文影印插图版

罗密欧与朱丽叶

主编 [英] 布赖恩·吉本斯 (Brian Gibbons)

I561.3/Y3

:2

2008.

中国人民大学出版社

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

罗密欧与朱丽叶: 英文/[英] 吉本斯主编

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 978-7-300-08839-6

I. 罗…

II. 吉…

III. 悲剧-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 201121 号

莎士比亚作品解读丛书 · 英文影印插图版

罗密欧与朱丽叶

主编 [英] 布赖恩 · 吉本斯 (Brian Gibbons)

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 3 月第 1 版

印 张 9.25 插页3

印 次 2008 年 3 月第 1 次印刷

字 数 258 000

定 价 27.00元

版权所有

侵权必究

印装差错

负责调换

PREFACE

THIS edition of *Romeo and Juliet* was begun from scratch in 1973, and is based on the first 'good' Quarto of 1599; the 'bad' Quarto of 1597 has been taken fully into account, a number of its readings have been adopted, and its readings have been recorded wherever possible. Only a few notes towards his projected edition were made by John Crow before his much regretted death, and collected by Professor M. M. Mahood. However, Crow's views on a number of editorial problems in the play were expressed in an article, 'Editing and Emending', and I have taken them into account both in letter and in spirit.

Among editions of the play I have learned much from those by Furness, Wilson-Duthie, Kittredge, Alexander, Hosley, Williams and Spencer. I have had the privilege of the friendship of three Shakespeare scholars, Philip Brockbank, Bernard Harris and Robin Hood, during the time I have been at work on this edition, and I am grateful to T. W. Craik for helpful discussion of certain problems of staging the play. Brian Morris was kind enough to read a draft of the Introduction and to comment upon it, and I am very deeply indebted to Harold Brooks and Harold Jenkins for the extraordinary generosity and scholarly excellence of their help and advice. Whatever errors and shortcomings remain are my own responsibility.

University of York
March 1979

BRIAN GIBBONS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Selections from *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. William A. Ringler, Oxford English Texts (1962), are printed by permission of Oxford University Press; those from Brooke's *Romeus and Juliet* are taken from *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, Vol. I, ed. G. Bullough (1958), Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd.

ABBREVIATIONS AND REFERENCES

The abbreviated titles of Shakespeare's works are as in G. T. Onions, *A Shakespeare Glossary*, 2nd edn, 1919. Passages quoted or cited are from the complete *Tudor Shakespeare*, ed. Peter Alexander, 1951.

I. EDITIONS

Q1	<i>Romeo and Juliet</i> . . . Printed by John Danter, 1597.
Q2	<i>Romeo and Juliet</i> . . . Printed by Thomas Creede, 1599.
Q3	<i>Romeo and Juliet</i> . . . Printed for John Smethwick, 1609.
Q4	<i>Romeo and Juliet</i> . . . Written by W. Shakespeare . . . Printed for John Smethwicke [1622].
Q5	<i>Romeo and Juliet</i> Written by W. Shakespeare . . . Printed by R. Young for John Smethwicke, 1637.
F	<i>Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies</i> , 1623.
F2	<i>Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies</i> , 1632.
F3	<i>Mr. William Shakespear Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies</i> . . . <i>The third Impression</i> , 1664.
F4	<i>Mr. William Shakespear's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies</i> . . . <i>The fourth Edition</i> , 1685.
Rowe	<i>The Works of Mr William Shakespear</i> . . . <i>Revis'd and Corrected</i> by N. Rowe Esq., 1709. [A second edition of the above,] 1709. [A third edition of the above,] 1714.
Pope	<i>The Works of Shakespear</i> . . . <i>Collected and Corrected</i> . . . by Mr. Pope, 1723.
Theobald	<i>The Works of Shakespeare</i> . . . <i>Collated with the Oldest Copies, and Corrected; with Notes</i> . . . By Mr. Theobald, 1733.
Hanmer	<i>The Works of Shakespear</i> . . . <i>Carefully Revised and Corrected by the former Editions</i> , ed. Thomas Hanmer, 1744.
Warburton	<i>The Works of Shakespeare. The Genuine Text</i> . . . settled . . . By Mr. Pope and Mr. Warburton, 1747.
Johnson	<i>The Plays of William Shakespeare</i> . . . <i>To which are added Notes</i> by Sam. Johnson, 1765.
Capell	<i>Mr. William Shakespeare his Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies</i> , ed. Edward Capell, 1768.
Steevens	<i>The Plays of William Shakespeare</i> . . . <i>To which are added notes</i> by Samuel Johnson and George Steevens, 1773. [A second edition of the above, revised and augmented,] 1778. [A third edition of the above,] 1793.
Malone	<i>The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare</i> . . . <i>with</i> . . . <i>notes</i> by Edmond Malone, 1790.

- Singer *The Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare with Notes . . . by Samuel Weller Singer*, 1826.
- Knight *The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakespeare*, ed. Charles Knight, 1838.
- Collier *The Works of William Shakespeare . . . with the various readings, and notes ... by J. Payne Collier*, 1842-4.
[A second edition of the above,] 1853.
[A third edition of the above,] 1858.
- Dyce *The Works of William Shakespeare. The Text revised by the Rev. Alexander Dyce*, 1857.
[A second edition of the above,] 1864-7.
[A third edition of the above,] 1875-6.
- Grant White *The Works of William Shakespeare*, ed. Richard Grant White, 1857.
- Delius *Shakespeares Werke. Herausgegeben und erklärt von N. Delius*, 1854-60.
- Staunton *The Plays of Shakespeare*, ed. Howard Staunton, 1858.
- Camb. *The Works of William Shakespeare*, ed. William George Clark and John Glover, 1863-6. [Vol. 28, ed. W. A. Wright.]
- Globe *The Works of William Shakespeare*, ed. W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright, 1864.
- Keightley *The Plays of William Shakespeare. Carefully edited by Thomas Keightley*, 1864.
- Hudson *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare . . .* ed. H. N. Hudson, 1881.
- Furness *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. H. H. Furness (New Variorum Shakespeare), 1871.
- Daniel *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. P. A. Daniel, 1875.
- Craig *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. W. J. Craig, 1891.
- Dowden *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. E. Dowden (Arden Shakespeare), 1900.
- Chambers *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. E. K. Chambers, 1904.
- Durham *Romeo and Juliet* (The Yale Shakespeare), ed. W. H. Durham, 1917.
- Kittredge *The Works of Shakespeare*, ed. G. L. Kittredge, 1936.
- Hoppe *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. H. R. Hoppe, 1947.
- Houghton *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. R. E. C. Houghton, 1947.
- Alexander *William Shakespeare, The Complete Works*, ed. Peter Alexander, 1951.
- Hosley *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. R. Hosley (Yale Shakespeare, revised), 1954.
- Sisson *William Shakespeare, The Complete Works*, ed. C. J. Sisson, 1954.
- NCS *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. John Dover Wilson and George Ian Duthie (New Shakespeare), 1955.
- Munro *The London Shakespeare*, ed. John Munro, 1958.
- Hankins *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. J. E. Hankins, 1960.
- Williams *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. G. W. Williams, 1964.
- Spencer *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. T. J. B. Spencer, 1967.
- Riverside *The Riverside Shakespeare*, textual ed. G. Blakemore Evans, 1974.

2. TEXTUAL COMMENTARIES

- Tyrwhitt Thomas Tyrwhitt, *Observations and Conjectures upon some Passages of Shakespeare*, 1766.
- Walker W. S. Walker, *A Critical Examination of the Text of Shakespeare* [ed. W. N. Lettsom], 1860.
- Daniel *Notes and Conjectural Emendations of certain Doubtful Passages in Shakespeare's Plays*, 1870.
- Crow John Crow, 'Editing and Emending', *Essays & Studies*, 1955.
- Sisson C. J. Sisson, *New Readings in Shakespeare*, 1956.

3. OTHER WORKS

- Abbott E. A. Abbott, *A Shakespearean Grammar*, 1869.
- Brooke Arthur Brooke, *The Tragicall Historie of Romeus and Iuliet, written first in Italian by Bandell, and nowe in Englishe by Ar. Br.*, 1562, reprinted in G. Bullough (ed.), *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, Vol. 1, 1957.
- Chaucer Geoffrey Chaucer, *Works*, ed. F. N. Robinson, 2nd edn, 1957.
- Cotgrave *A Dictionary of the French and English Tongues*, 1611.
- Daniel, *Poems* Samuel Daniel, *Poems and A Defense of Ryme*, ed. Arthur Colby Sprague, 1930.
- E.E.T.S. Early English Text Society.
- Golding *Ovid's Metamorphoses, The Arthur Golding Translation* (1567), ed. John Frederick Nims, 1965.
- Lyly John Lyly, *Works*, ed. R. Warwick Bond, 1902.
- Madden D. H. Madden, *The Diary of Master William Silence*, 1907.
- Marlowe Christopher Marlowe, *Works*, ed. C. F. Tucker Brooke, 1910.
- MSR Malone Society Reprints.
- Nares Robert Nares, *A Glossary ... of Words...* ed. J. O. Halliwell and Thomas Wright, 1882.
- Nashe Thomas Nashe, *Works*, ed. R. B. McKerrow, revised F. P. Wilson, 1966.
- OED *Oxford English Dictionary*.
- Onions C. T. Onions, *A Shakespeare Glossary*, 2nd edn, revised, 1919.
- Partridge Eric Partridge, *Shakespeare's Bawdy*, revised edn, 1955.
- Puttenham George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, in G. G. Smith (ed.), *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, 1910.
- Schmidt Alexander Schmidt, *Shakespeare Lexicon*, 1923.
- Shakespeare's England* ed. Sidney Lee and C. T. Onions, 1916.
- Sidney *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. W. A. Ringler, 1962.
- Tilley M. P. Tilley, *A Dictionary of Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 1950.

4. PERIODICALS

- JEGP *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*.
- MLN *Modern Language Notes*.
- MLQ *Modern Language Quarterly*.

<i>MLR</i>	<i>Modern Language Review.</i>
<i>N&Q</i>	<i>Notes and Queries.</i>
<i>PBS A</i>	<i>Publications of the Bibliographical Society of America.</i>
<i>RES</i>	<i>Review of English Studies.</i>
<i>SB</i>	<i>Studies in Bibliography.</i>
<i>SJH</i>	<i>Shakespeare Jahrbuch.</i>
<i>SQ</i>	<i>Shakespeare Quarterly.</i>
<i>Sh.S.</i>	<i>Shakespeare Survey.</i>
<i>Shaks.S.</i>	<i>Shakespeare Studies.</i>
<i>TLS</i>	<i>Times Literary Supplement.</i>

The Arden Shakespeare

- All's Well That Ends Well: edited by G. K. Hunter*
Antony and Cleopatra: edited by John Wilders
As You Like It: edited by Agnes Latham*
The Comedy of Errors: edited by R. A. Foakes*
Coriolanus: edited by Philip Brockbank*
Cymbeline: edited by J. M. Nosworthy*
Hamlet: edited by Harold Jenkins*
Julius Caesar: edited by David Daniell
King Henry IV parts 1 and 2: edited by A. R. Humphreys*
King Henry V: edited by T. W. Craik
King Henry VI part 1: edited by Edward Burns
King Henry VI part 2: edited by Ronald Knowles
King Henry VI part 3: edited by John. D. Cox and Eric Rasmussen
King Henry VIII: edited by Gordon McMullan
King John: edited by E. A. J. Honigmann*
King Lear: edited by R. A. Foakes
King Richard II: edited by Charles R. Forker
King Richard III: edited by Anthony Hammond*
Love's Labour's Lost: edited by H. R. Woudhuysen
Macbeth: edited by Kenneth Muir*
Measure for Measure: edited by J. W. Lever*
The Merchant of Venice: edited by John Russell Brown*
The Merry Wives of Windsor: edited by Giorgio Melchiori
A Midsummer Night's Dream: edited by Harold F. Brooks*
Much Ado About Nothing: edited by A. R. Humphreys*
Othello: edited by E. A. J. Honigmann
Pericles: edited by F. D. Hoeniger*
The Poems: edited by F. T. Prince*
Romeo and Juliet: edited by Brian Gibbons*
Shakespeare's Sonnets: edited by Katherine Duncan-Jones
The Taming of the Shrew: edited by Brian Morris*
The Tempest: edited by Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan
Timon of Athens: edited by H. J. Oliver*
Titus Andronicus: edited by Jonathan Bate
Troilus and Cressida: edited by David Bevington
Twelfth Night: edited by J. M. Lothian and T. W. Craik*
The Two Gentlemen of Verona: edited by Clifford Leech*
The Two Noble Kinsmen: edited by Lois Potter
The Winter's Tale: edited by John Pitcher

*Second Series

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
ABBREVIATIONS AND REFERENCES	ix
INTRODUCTION	I
1. THE TEXT	I
2. THE DATE	26
3. SOURCES	32
4. THE PLAY	37
<i>ROMEO AND JULIET</i>	79
APPENDIX I The Queen Mab speech in Qi	237
APPENDIX II Extracts from Brooke's <i>Romeus and Juliet</i> , 1562	239

INTRODUCTION

I. THE TEXT

Q1. The First Quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* appeared with the following title-page:

AN / EXCELLENT / conceited Tragedie / OF / Romeo and Iuliet, /
As it hath been often (with great applause) plaid publicquely,
by the right Ho-/nourable the L. of *Hunsdon* / his Seruants. /
LONDON, / Printed by Iohn Danter. / 1597. /

Q2. A Second Quarto appeared two years later, evidently intended to supplant this Bad Quarto. Its title-page reads:

THE / MOST EX- / cellent and lamentable / Tragedie, of Romeo
and Iuliet. / *Newly corrected, augmented, and / amended :* / As it hath
bene sundry times publicquely acted, by the / right Honourable
the Lord Chamberlaine / his Seruants. / LONDON / Printed by
Thomas Creede, for Cuthbert Burby, and are to / be sold at his
shop neare the Exchange. / 1599. /

The statement that Q2 is 'newly corrected, augmented, and amended' means that it is a replacement of the first edition, not a revision of an earlier version of the play. *Romeo and Juliet* Q1 is a Bad Quarto, piratical and dependent on an especially unreliable means of transmission for the text, like the Bad Quartos of the second and third parts of *King Henry VI*, *King Henry V*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Hamlet* Q1 and *Pericles*.¹ The Bad Quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* provoked the publication of a Good Quarto a couple of years later. This is what happened also in the case of *Hamlet*, and probably *Love's Labour's Lost*: for the claim on the title-page that *Love's Labour's Lost* is 'Newly corrected and augmented' indicates that there was a preceding Bad Quarto, although no copy of it survives; it is probable that the publication of this Good Quarto of *Love's Labour's Lost* (1599) was intended as a twin for that of *Romeo and Juliet*, published in the same year; and

1. The history of the modern bibliographical analysis of Bad Quartos is succinctly given in F. P. Wilson, *Shakespeare and the New Bibliography*, rev. Helen Gardner (1970), pp. 80-95; see also Norman Sanders's account in *Shakespeare, A Select Bibliographical Guide*, ed. Stanley Wells (1973), pp. 11-24. On *Romeo and Juliet* see also W. W. Greg, *The Shakespeare First Folio* (1955), pp. 225-35.

Love's Labour's Lost, like the Good Quartos of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*, was printed from 'foul papers', that is, Shakespeare's autograph draft, not a transcription prepared as a prompt-book.

After *Romeo and Juliet* Q1 (1597) and Q2 (1599) there are no further substantive editions, that is, editions having independent authority or suggesting access to new evidence of what Shakespeare wrote. Subsequent derivative editions are Q3 (1609) reprinted from Q2; Q4 (1622) reprinted from Q3, with occasional consultation of Q1; and Q5 (1637) reprinted from Q4. The Folio text is based on Q3 with the exception of a number of passages which follow Q4. These derivative editions exhibit two kinds of change from the substantive editions: errors accumulating through the processes of the printing-house, and attempted corrections, some cogent, some mistaken, but all apparently without authority, none beyond the capacity of a compositor or editor. In these circumstances the fact that the compositor of Q4 made use of a copy of Q1 for occasional consultation when using Q3 as his copy-text indicates a degree of conscientiousness.

Since the hypothesis of memorial reconstruction was first advanced by Greg to explain certain features of the Bad Quarto of *The Merry Wives*,¹ it has come to be accepted that a number of Bad Quartos of Shakespeare's plays were reconstructed from memory by reporters who knew the play on the stage; *Romeo and Juliet* Q1 is such a text. It contains anticipations, recollections, transpositions, paraphrases, summaries, repetitions and omissions of words, phrases or lines correctly presented in Q2. Most of these features are evidence of the faulty memory of the reporters, though certain omissions, and a cut in the required number of players, may indicate that Q1, however abbreviated, derived from a version adapted for acting.²

1. This was in 1910, in an edition of the 1602 quarto of *Merry Wives*.

2. H. R. Hoppe, *The Bad Quarto of Romeo and Juliet* (1948), notes that by contrast with Q2, which seems to have no numerical limitations of players in mind and could 'by judicious doubling' have been enacted 'by perhaps 20 players', Q1 could have been handled 'by about 12'; judging by Q1 stage directions Hoppe thinks the abridged version was for a company with no musicians and few supernumeraries: he instances iv. ii where the 'serving men, two or three' of Q2 are reduced to one in Q1, or iv. iv. 14, where 'three or four with spits and logs, and Baskets' in Q2 are reduced to a 'Servingman with Logs & Coales'. Elsewhere maskers, torchbearers and servants are cut, perhaps to free actors for more important parts. Cuts in the text may have been intended to reduce the duration of the play in performance, which is evidently what happened in the Bad Quartos of *Henry VI* Parts II and III and in the Bad Quarto of *Orlando Furioso* which Greg analysed, *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements, the 'Battle of Alcazar' and 'Orlando Furioso'* (1923).

The tide-page of Q1 declares that it was printed by John Danter. In fact only the first four sheets (A–D) came from his press, and the rest from that of Allde. It has been argued by H. R. Hoppe¹ that the rest of the text had to be printed elsewhere because Danter was raided by the Stationers' Company some time between 9 February and 27 March 1597; his presses were seized and subsequently destroyed, and he was charged with printing *The Jesus Psalter* 'and other things without auctoritie'. Hoppe believes that *Romeo and Juliet* was going through Danter's press at the time of the raid. In discussing the title-page reference to Hunsdon's Men, Hoppe deduces that the Quarto must have been in the press between the beginning of Lent (9 February) and 17 March 1597, when Shakespeare's company ceased to be known by that name.

Recently, J. A. Lavin has argued that it is not evident why sheets E–K must be supposed to have been printed after A–D rather than simultaneously in a shared printing job, as happened in the printing of two books by Greene, shared by Danter and Wolfe. Lavin points out that the title-page date of 1597 is no guarantee that it was not printed in late 1596,² and that its bibliographical features do not necessarily indicate interruption of printing in Danter's shop. The conclusion seems acceptable: the printing was probably done some time between the last months of 1596 and March 1597, in a job shared between Danter and Allde.

Q2 is nearly half as long again as Q1; it offers correct versions of corrupt or garbled passages in Q1 and its characteristics indicate that the copy was the author's foul papers from which the prompt-book was derived. In one extended passage and certain other places the Q2 compositor used Q1 as copy, presumably because of obscurity or deficiency in the manuscript.

An analysis by Paul Cantrell and George Walton Williams³ of the printing of Q2 has determined the shares of the two compositors who set the text, and a study of their work in other books

1. Ibid.; Hoppe's suggestion, that the second printer was Edward Allde, has been confirmed by Standish Henning, 'The Printer of *Romeo and Juliet*, Q1', *PBSA*, lx.

2. 'John Danter's Ornament Stock', *SB*, xxiii. Harold Brooks points out that postdating to make a book seem fresh for as long as possible certainly was practised: the first impression of Oldham's *Satyrs upon the Jesuits* (1681) was certainly on the market in late 1680, probably November. (If *Romeo and Juliet* (1597) was actually published in late 1596 this would strengthen the argument for the play's having preceded *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.)

3. 'The Printing of the Second Quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* (1599)', *SB*, ix.

printed in Creede's shop indicates that both of them were conscientious artisans. Although the New Shakespeare editors of *Romeo and Juliet* describe 'the compositor' as 'slovenly',¹ they also admit that he faithfully reproduces Shakespeare's first and second shots together, as well as words which he found in his copy that do not make sense (due, as they suppose, to a copyist who spelt out *literatim* what he found difficult to read in the foul papers). Indeed it is difficult not to think that this reproduction of anomalies, inconsistencies and duplications in Q₂ indicates a conscientious compositor faithfully following his copy with few serious lapses.

Q₁ AS MEMORIAL RECONSTRUCTION

A feature of Q₁ which indicates that a reporter's² memory is playing a part in the transmission of the text is that speeches which properly appear two acts later are anticipated, an error impossible for a scribe or compositor working his way through the text but quite plausible for someone who has acted in or prompted a performance of the play a number of times, and who confuses two different passages because they are in some way parallel.

For instance in i. v, at the end of the feast, Capulet is bidding goodnight to his guests, full of regret that his celebration has come to an end. Q₂ reads:

I thanke you honest gentlemen, goodnight:
More torches here, come on, then lets to bed.
Ah sirrah, by my faie it waxes late,

but Q₁ at the end of the feast has this:

Well then *I* thanke you honest Gentlemen,
I promise you but for your company,
I would haue bin a bed an houre agoe:
Light to my chamber hoe.

The reporter has remembered lines from Capulet's speeches in III. iv and misplaces them in the earlier scene: in III. iv Paris visits Capulet who frankly wants him to go home and tells him so:

1. *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. J. Dover Wilson and G. I. Duthie (1955), p. 115.

2. It is convenient to speak of 'a reporter' when discussing a particular passage, though different parts of the play may have been reported by different individuals in the group, while some of the reconstruction may have been collaborative. Presumably the Bad Quarto version was assembled by a group who had been involved in the first authentic production and intended to perform the play, with a reduced cast, on a provincial tour.

I promise you, but for your companie,
I would haue bene a bed an houre ago.

Seventeen lines later, almost at the end of III. iv, Capulet says

Farewell my Lord, light to my chamber ho.

Another instance of anticipation is evident with the arrival of the Nurse with news for Juliet. In Q2 she arrives, flustered, in II. v, with the news of Romeo, and makes the complaint

Fie how my bones ake, what a iauunce haue I?

Much later (in III. ii) she brings news of Tybalt's death in shocked distress and exclaims

Ah wheres my man? giue me some Aqua-vitae:

Q1 combines elements from these two speeches in the scene where the Nurse brings news of Romeo; Q1 reads:

Lord how my bones ake. Oh wheres my man? Give me
some aqua vitae.

An instance of anticipation of a passage several scenes away is Romeo's greeting to the Friar at II. iii, where the Q1 reporter remembers the later scene in which Juliet visits the Friar (II. vi). In Q2 Romeo and the Friar share a couplet in II. iii:

Ro. Goodmorrow father.

Fri. Benedicite.

What early tongue so sweete saluteth me?

and in Q2 Juliet greets the Friar in II. vi with the line

Good euen to my ghostly confessor.

Q1 makes Romeo say this line in the earlier scene, spoiling the couplet:

Rom: Good morrow to my Ghosdy Confessor.

Fri: Benedicite, what earlie tongue so soone saluteth me?

In each of these cases the Q1 version crudely damages the tone and mood of the earlier scene by confusing it with the later: so Capulet becomes impolite, the Nurse a tippler, the light poise of Romeo prosaic.

The reporter's faulty memory also causes him to reproduce phrases or lines later than their proper place. In Mercutio's dying speech at III. i Q1 has the line:

Mercutio was slaine for the first and second cause

which recollects a line already given in its proper place at II. iv (II. 25-6 in Q2, I. 27 in Q1); and in the passage later in III. i where Benvolio is narrating the events of the brawl between Mercutio, Tybalt and Romeo, Q1 recollects a Q2 line from Benvolio's earlier narrative of the brawl at the beginning of the play (in Q2 it is I. i. 120):

Q1: While they were enterchanging thrusts and blows.

These instances of recollection involve single phrases or fragments. As it happens, however, both places in III. i also provide more generally illustrative material showing that Q1 is a reported text. Mercutio's dying speech is imperfectly remembered, its fragments are pieced together in a mosaic supplemented by pedestrian paraphrasings. Here is the speech in Q2:

No tis not so deepe as a well, nor so wide as a Church doore,
but tis inough,, twill serue: aske for me tomorrow, and you shall
finde me a graue man. I am peppered I warrant, for this world, a
plague a both your houses, sounds a dog, a rat, a mouse, a cat, to
scratch a man to death: a braggart, a rogue, a villaine, that fights
by the booke of arithmatick, why the deule came you betweene
vs? I was hurt vnder your arme.

The Q1 version is:

I am pepperd for this world, I am sped yfaith, he hath made
wormes meate of me, & ye aske for me to morrow you shall
finde me a graue-man. A poxe of your houses, I shall be fairely
mounted upon foure mens shoulders: For your house of the
Mountegues and the *Capolets*: and then some peasantly rogue,
some Sexton, some base slaue shall write my Epitaph, that
Tybalt came and broke the Princes Lawes, and *Mercutio* was slaine
for the first and second cause. Wher's the Surgeon?

Q1 has misplaced two of the phrases in the Q2 version in an earlier speech (they are the opening and closing lines 'No tis . . . twill serue' and 'why the deule . . . arme') but also anticipates a line which occurs later in Q2, III. i. 112 ('They haue made wormes meate of me'). The middle of the speech in Q1 is not Shakespeare; for his still impatient and headstrong Mercutio, suddenly caught by spasms of physical agony and anguished thoughts, Q1 substitutes pedestrian hack-writing in regular dull rhythm, concluded with a dismally banal sententious couplet. The Q1 version recalls the rough shape and length of the speech, recognizes its dramatic function, but does not reproduce the words.¹

1. The non-Shakespearean element in this speech may be a deliberate substitution (or 'gag') by the actor concerned, obviously without Shakespeare's endorsement.