

SHAKESPEARE'S *JULIUS CAESAR*—A SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MANUSCRIPT

In a small commonplace book now in the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D. C., is contained one of the two extant seventeenth-century manuscripts of an acknowledged Shakespearean play—a Restoration copy of *Julius Caesar* (Folger MS 3.4).¹ Although known to at least two Shakespearean editors,² it has never received any serious editorial or bibliographical notice. In view of the almost religious veneration with which the guesses of men utterly out of touch with Shakespeare's times and language are again and again recorded, the neglect of this comparatively contemporary MS seems difficult to understand. Even the existence of such a MS, apart from any other considerations, should, one might suppose, be of genuine interest to the student of Shakespeare's text. In the study which follows I have sought, without in any sense offering a complete collation, to analyze the MS from the point of view of the bibliographer and at the same time to present a selection of the more important readings for the literary student.

The volume containing the MS is of small octavo size, bound in dark brown calf, the leaves measuring 16.7 by 10 centimetres. The manuscript itself is written in a small, neat, non-professional hand, the usual mixture of Secretary and Italian. The scribe makes very free with abbreviated forms, uses the possessive apostrophe occasionally, employs a peculiar symbol (') for the prefix "con-", and, with few exceptions, levels all final "-ed's" to "d", regardless of the metre. Finally, his "t's" and "l's" are very difficult, sometimes impossible, to distinguish either through failure to cross the "t's" or through the crossing of "l's."³ The

¹ I would like to express my thanks to Dr. J. Q. Adams, Curator of the Folger Shakespeare Library, and to the Trustees for their kind permission to publish the results of my study of this MS.

² There is a note on the front flyleaf of the volume: "Presented, July 5th, 1870, to the library at Warwick Castle, where are preserved, now this volume is added, every known manuscript copy of Shakespeare's plays written before the close of the seventeenth century. J. O. H[alliwell]." S. W. Singer (*Notes and Queries*, April 10, 1858, p. 289) quote two readings from the MS (quoted in the H. H. Furness *New Variorum* edition of *Julius Caesar*, 1913, p. 86; hereafter this volume will be referred to as Furness, *New Variorum*).

³ Thus in i.i.58 he appears to read *cull* for the F. *cull*; iii.ii.231, *will* for *wit* (Ff.2,3,4); and iii.ii.273, *will* for F. *will*.

hand is the same as that used in the earlier parts of the volume. On the whole the transcript is carefully made, very few errors occurring which can be described as mere slips of the pen.

"The Tragedy of Julius Caesar" begins on page [75] recto; on page 74 verso appears a list of the "Dramatis Personae." Immediately preceding this (pages 64-73) is a transcript of Waller's poem entitled "Instructions to a Painter for y^e drawing y^e posture and progress of his Majesties forces at Sea, under y^e com^d and of his Royall Highness together wth y^e battle & victory obtain'd over y^e Dutch June y^e 3.1665." The evidence of this poem would seem to set the date of the *Julius Caesar* transcript at some time in or after 1665, but, judging from the generally homogeneous make-up of the whole earlier part of the volume, I would suggest that it was probably made not long after that year.⁴ "The Tragedy of Julius Caesar" occupies pages [75]-[140], the pagination of the volume ending with page 92. In the upper right hand corner of page [75] the notation, in a later hand, appears "made By Shaksp^r." The word "Shaksp^r," however, has been written over an erased "Dryden" [*sic*]. The Dryden attribution is interesting in view of the considerably discussed D'Avenant-Dryden adaptation of the play.⁵ The transcript breaks off with the sixth line of the last scene (v.v)⁶ and since this falls at the foot of page [140] it seems probable that two leaves of the MS have been lost.⁷ Each page contains on an average about forty lines of text.

The most cursory examination reveals that the MS is not what McKerrow has called a "substantive" text. Nor on the

⁴ It may be observed that we do not know exactly when *Julius Caesar* was revived in the Restoration. Downes (*Roscius Anglicanus*, ed. M. Summers, n.d., p. 8) lists it as one of the "Principal Old Stock Plays" of the King's Company. It does not occur, however, in the list of plays acted by the King's Company between 1660-1662 (see *Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, ed. J. Q. Adams, 1917, pp. 116-18.)

⁵ See Hazelton Spencer, *Shakespeare Improved*, 1927, pp. 363-69, for the best discussion of this problem.

⁶ I have used the Furness *New Variorum* act and scene division and line numbering throughout this study. In all cases where variant readings are given the first reading is that of the First Folio (F.1), unless readings are specifically marked otherwise.

⁷ A single blank leaf follows the *Julius Caesar* transcript. The hand in the remainder of the volume is of a later date (perhaps eighteenth-century) and seems to be connected with the Dryden-Shakespeare attribution noticed above.

other hand is it a mere transcript from a printed edition. The evidence of certain readings shows that it was copied from another MS, the text of which, either directly or more probably at second or third remove, was derived from the Second Folio (1632). A few readings will be sufficient to support this statement: i.ii.182 *intrust* for F. *intreat*; iii.ii.206, *vertue* for F. *Vesture*; iv.iii.314, *I, dost not thou break thy instrument?* for F. *If thou do'st nod, thou break'st thy Instrument*. Each of these, the last being also an example of emendation, indicates a misreading of the copied text, and, taken in connection with an error in speech distribution to be noticed later, seems to point inevitably to a manuscript source.⁸ Evidence that the ultimate source of the text preserved in the MS was the Second Folio is likewise conclusive. In no case does the MS afford a reading agreeing with the Third (1663) or Fourth (1685) Folios which might not have been independently arrived at,⁹ nor does the MS reproduce significant readings which appear only in the Third and Fourth Folios.¹⁰ On the other hand there are several readings which show unmistakable signs of being attempts to correct errors peculiar to the Second Folio. For example: i.ii.202, *hlow* (*glow* F.1; *blow* Ff.3,4) becomes *grow*; i.iii.87, *theser* (*these* Ff.1,3,4) becomes *their*; i.iii.91, *Thewes* (*Sinews* Ff.3,4) becomes *thighs*;¹¹ v.iii.107 *wa'kes* (*walkes* Ff.1,3,4) becomes *wakes*.

One further statement regarding the antecedents of the MS must here be made. It shows definite signs of having been, at

⁸ We can approach this problem in another way. In ii.i.94, which falls at the bottom of page 92, the copyist by mistake wrote out the first two words of the next verse line at the end of line 94 and then repeated them at the beginning of line 95 (page [93]). Since the words involved happen to be part of the manuscript's reading of the famous crux, "For if thou path" (see below), it seems clear that we are here dealing with someone who is merely transcribing what he sees before him, not with someone emending a difficult passage in the printed text.

⁹ The most important agreements are: i.ii.44 that loues] y^t loue (F.4); i.ii.323 disgest] digest (Ff.3,4); ii.ii.75 he is] he's (F.4); ii.ii.78 afear'd] afraid (F.4); iii.ii.72 beholding] beholden (F.4); v.i.48 teethes] teeth (Ff.3,4).

¹⁰ For example: i.ii.162, *with 'em* (Ff.1,2) becomes *with 'em man* (Ff.3,4); i.ii.171, *one man?* (Ff.1,2) becomes *one?* (F.3); i.iii.38, *to the* (Ff.1,2) becomes *up the* (Ff.3,4); ii.i.85, *Cloakes* (Ff.1,2) becomes *Cloathes* (Ff.3,4). The MS follows none of the later readings.

¹¹ I have placed this reading among "errors" because, although it is now received as a genuine reading, the later seventeenth century failed to accept it as such.

some time in its scribal development, connected with actual stage production. Proof of this connection, however, must wait until later.

In making my collation of the MS with the text of the First Folio, I have taken into account only those readings or variants which may be called significant. This at once rules out mere spelling variants,¹² capitalization, absence of final punctuation, et cetera. Nevertheless the total number of variant readings is large and it has seemed advisable, in the interests of clarity and method, to discuss them under eight, perhaps rather arbitrary, divisions: (1) Verbal Variants or Substitutions; (2) Additions; (3) Omissions; (4) Contractions; (5) Expansions; (6) Rearrangements; (7) Changes in Stage Directions; (8) Punctuation. Of these eight classes the first, second, third, and seventh are most important and will have to be discussed in some detail. The others may be more summarily disposed of.

A word of warning, however, should preface this analysis. The figures which are here given under the various classifications have been worked out on the basis of more or less arbitrary rules. Thus they inevitably reflect certain personal decisions and should be understood in general rather than in definitive terms. The particular difficulties incident to each division will be discussed under that head.

(1) *Verbal Variants or Substitutes*. In this class I have placed all those manuscript readings which replace a reading of the First Folio either by another word or by a different form of the same word (changes of tense, person, number, et cetera). Thus *fine workmen* for F.1 *fine Workman* (I.i.16), *ye* for *you* (I.i.46, etc.), and *does* for *doth* (I.ii.9, etc.) constitute verbal variants, and *split* for F.1 *ruin'd* (I.iii.7) or *door* for *Gate* (II.i.68), substitutes. On the other hand, such a phrase as *all I liue by is y^e aule* for F.1 *all that I liue by is with the Aule* (I.i.29) is an example of two omissions, and the phrase *I profess in Banquetting my favour / to all* for F.2 *I professe in Banquetting / To all* is an addition of two words.

This division contains a total of 427 variants.¹³ Of these 356

¹² One or two spellings are perhaps worth noticing: *of* for *off* (regularly); *saiſ* for *safe*; *ſaiſ* for *ſaith* (III.i.157); *washpiſh* for *waspiſh* (IV.iii.54). The last two might almost be taken as evidence of an Irish hand at work.

¹³ This figure does not include the correction by the MS of certain obvious misprints in the First and Second Folio texts.

occur in none of the Folios or later edited texts, and 39 represent readings which were afterwards to be suggested as emendations by eighteenth-century and succeeding editors. Seven appear as readings in the Third or Fourth Folios or in both. In the list which follows I have tried to select only those readings which seem most significant, omitting, except in special cases, singulars for plurals, plurals for singulars (verbs and nouns), altered verb and tense forms, changes of preposition, errors in copying,¹⁴ and agreements with the Second and later Folios.

*I.i.30 Tradesmans matters] trades- / mens business	*-46 you] ye
-55 replication of your] replications of y ^e	-52 cull] cutt (?) *-67
Tyber] Tybers	-71 be not mou'd] now is mou'd -ii.25 that?] this?
-44 Friend, that loues] friends that loue	-45 veyl'd] chang'd *-51
Behaviours] behaviour	-53 be you one.] you are one -59 good]
great	-70 respect] respects -109 for] by (for om.Ff.2,3,4) -133
on] to	-134 was in] went to *-139 his] its -142 giue me] gius
-152 a] some	-160 is as faire] your's as fir ^e -164 the Gods] our gods
-167 Rome, thou hast] shame thou has	-170 of] on *-171 Walkes]
walls	-182 intreat] intrust -190-191 these hard Conditions, as this
time / Is like] y ^e hard 'ditions, w ^h these tim ^{es} / are like	-202 doth glow]
does grow (How F.2)	-205 Ferret] ferris -212 a-nights] at nights
*-213 Yond] yon *-228 whiles] whilst	*-287 and I] if I -299 any
thing] nothing	*-302 and I] if I -302-303 looke you / i'th'face] look in
your face	-323 stomacke] stomachs -336 For who so firme, that can-
not be seduc'd?] for soe being firm they cannot be seduc'd.	-iii.7 riu'd]
split	-15 Incenses] menaces -18 which] it -23 glaz'd] gaz'd
-23 and went surly] but went gently	-34 Vnto] upon -50 pleasing]
pleasant	-55 vnbraced] embrac'd -70 impatience] impressions
-76 pre-formed] perform'd	-87 these] their (theser F.2) -91 Thewes]
thighs	-103 Not Stonie Tower, nor walls of] nor strong wall, nor towers
of	-128 flearing] fearing -141 Is Fauors, like] is favourable like
-154 two or three] 3 or 4	*-173 Is] are
II.i.29 scorning] & scornes	-32 he] it -68 Gate] dore *-82
moe] more	-87 of] or -92 darke] deep -95 For if thou path]
for should thou put	-96 it selfe] himselfe -124 arises] doth rise
-136 range] reign	-150 Creatures] causes -150 staine] sham
*-188 Spirit] spirits	*-215 stricken] strucken -237 is that] it is
-270 me] one	*-271 further] farther -312 or] & -320 this
secret] your hart	-327 Counsels, I will not] secrets, come at length
-356 mortified Spirit] mortifi'd spirits	-ii.4 to night] this night -16
they] you	-38 deaths] death -46 to day] this day *-54 heare]
heard	-65 thy] this -75 Say he is] tell 'em he's -91 imminent]

¹⁴ In this and later lists I have marked those readings with an asterisk which anticipate the emendations of later editors (not including the Third and Fourth Folios).

eminent -96 Your Statue] y^e statues -108 one] men -114 pro-
ceeding,] proceedings -114 this] thus -132 a-nights] at nights
*-142 further] farther -146 earnes] eates *-iii.7 you] thee -iv.5
my] thy -26 which] what -31 take] make -37-38 to- / wards]
to

iii.i.13 our selfe] our selves -17 What] why -40 must] may
-42 Seate] state -48 the lane] a lane -52 base] like -58 more
worthy] no better -73 vnnumbred sparkes] inumber'd (?) starrs -75
doth hold his] that holds its -79 vnassayleable] unaccessable -79
holds on his] holds out y^e -115 pleasures] pleasure -130 State]
stages (States Ff.2,3,4) -132 basis] bases -135 often] oft -140
most boldest, and best hearts] most bold, & noble harts *-180 yee] you
-220 deerer] nearer -232 of] to -274 Caesar] him -277 About
his Funerall] in Caesar's funeral -287 Times] time *-298 with]
by -301 With Ate . . . Hell,] (Alecto . . . hell) *-309 for] to ii.27
mee] you -41 en- / forc'd] infred (?) -74 What does he say] wth
y^t he said -79 We are blest that Rome is rid of him] we are well rid of him
-93 So are they all; all] & so are all y^e rest -101 hae] hath -106
Kingly] Royal -117 backe to me] back again -122 Mark'd] mark
-151 you] me -193 cut] act -197 in] wth -198 Base] bases
-205 what] why -229 loue] loues -229 full well] too well -231
writ] will (?) -236 But] for -253 seuerall] single -273 thou]
thee *-iii.3 vnluckily] unlucky -14 Whether] where -14 going]
a going -38 Away, go.] away, away.

iv.i.3 many] men -8 Who is] he is -17 World] word -17
stand] be -26 Businesse] heaviness -52 surest] soonest -ii.9
or by ill Officers] or in his officers -25 enforced] unforc'd -27 like
Horses hot] like a horse hott -53 them moue] 'em march *-iii.5
slighted off] sleight'd of. *-8 his] its -11 Offices] officers *-17
doth] does -94 riu'd] torn *-95 his Friends] a friends -119 it]
you -158 your selves] your selfe -171 Impatient] impatience
-181 Cassius] Caius -184 of] to *-195 toward] towards -198
Outlarie] outlaw -202 speake] speaks -215 truth I tell] truth, I
will -233 ground] place -236 along by] all along with -238
on] one -250 life] lives -252 a-float] at float -253 serues] runs
-275 Lord] good -311 Boy] pay -314 If thou do'st nod, thou . . .
Instrument,] I, dost not thou break thy instrument? -324 mak'st] makes

v.i.6 warne] warm -21 left] right -21 euen Field] corner field
-24 but I will do so] but it shall be soe *-68 honourable] honourably
-69 worthles] worthy -80 Lucillius, hearke, a word] Lucilius & Messala
a word -98 steeds] stead *-111 incertaine] uncertain *-131
begun] began -139 was] is -ii.7 And] one -iii.8 fell] took
-20 assur'd] secur'd *-21 yond] yon *-28 his] its -42 swore
thee, sauing of thy life] sware y^e sparing of thy life *-47 hilts] hilt
-107 walkes] wakes (wa'kes F.2) *-110 where] if *-114 mo] more
-121 our] your *-iv.22 thee newes] y^e newes -27 Noble] valient
*-35 where] whether

A few of these readings deserve special comment. In i.ii.171 the reading *walls* for *Walkes* seems to have won general acceptance among later editors, including Kittredge. The manuscript reading *gaz'd* for *glaz'd* (i.iii.23) is usually credited to Dr. Johnson; actually, apart from its earliest appearance here, it is the reading of the 1691 Quarto and of at least two of the undated quartos (c. 1684). It is further interesting to see how the MS tries to emend the next few words of the passage to agree with the rather neutral sense of *gaz'd*: "I met a Lyon, / Who *glaz'd* [*gaz'd* MS] vpon me, and went surly [*but went gently* MS] by." In i.iii.141 the MS tries to make something of a difficult Folio phrase: "Is Fauors, like." The MS reading *is favourable like* is at least a move in the right direction and is close to the emendation usually attributed to Rowe, but really first appearing in one of the undated quartos, *Is Fev'rous like*. The MS makes short work of the famous crux in ii.i.95: "For if thou path they natiue semblance on," by the reading later sanctioned, in part at least by Southern, Quincy, Coleridge, and Dyce: *for should thou put*. Apparently the well-known lines in ii.i.149-150 bothered our seventeenth-century reviser: "Vnto bad causes, sweare / Such Creatures as men doubt." By reading *unto bad causes swear such causes as men doubt* he gives a new turn to the lines, throwing the words following "swear" into an appositional phrase modifying "bad causes." Although strictly unnecessary, it is not difficult to understand the reason for the change: a desire for clarity. In iii.i.301 the reading *Alecto* for the Folio *Ate* is best perhaps explained by miscopying, but it is also possible that *Alecto* was substituted as the more "popular" goddess. Just occasionally it seems to me one can catch the pedant's hand at work on the text: for example, the readings *state* for F.1 *seat* (iii.i.42) and the twice occurring plural *bases* for F.1 *basis* (iii.i.132 and *base* iii.ii.198). The same hand is also probably responsible for the apparently learned plural spelling *drackma's* for the Folio *Drachmaes* (iii.ii.253; iv.iii.81), a plural form which was adopted by Rowe and the majority of the eighteenth-century editors.¹⁵

A study of these variants as a whole shows evidence of a more

¹⁵ We should also bear in mind in this connection the unusually complete and painstaking "Dramatis Personae" (see below), and the attempt, not always very consistent perhaps, to divide the play into acts and scenes in the neo-classical manner (see under *Rearrangements*, below).

or less systematic modernization of Shakespeare's language, the same type of change that can be traced on a much slighter scale in the successive Folio texts. The MS regularly alters *mine* to *my*,¹⁶ *thine* to *thy*,¹⁷ *doth* to *does*,¹⁸ *moe* to *more*.¹⁹ Several of Shakespeare's subjunctive forms are changed to the simple indicative.²⁰ Still further evidence of modernization and regularization can be seen in the substitution of *that* for *he* (I.iii.52); *he* for *who* (IV.i.8); *should* for *do* (IV.iii.101). On the other hand the MS very regularly uses *on* for *of* in contexts where it appears curiously archaic.²¹ It also uses a most peculiar form for *a-nights* changing it twice to *at nights* (I.ii.212; II.ii.132); in the same way *a-boat* becomes *at boat* (IV.iii.252).²² In several caes this scribe, or an earlier one, seems to have failed to understand certain of Shakespeare's words or to have considered them outmoded: for example, *riu'd* (I.iii.7; IV.iii.94) becomes *split* and *torn*; *fantasie* (II.i.221) and *Fantasies* (II.i.257) become *phansie* and *fancies*; *earnes*, i.e., grieves (II.ii.146) becomes *eates*; *sparkes* (III.i.73) becomes *starrs*; and *warne* (V.i.6) becomes *warm* (possibly, of course, a misreading). Very occasionally, even, the present scribe can be caught exercising his own tastes. The clearest example of this occurs in III.ii.229 where he first writes *full well* as in the Folio and then crosses out *full* and writes *too* above it. Other examples may be found in I.i.35 and I.iii.165.

(2) *Additions*. The additions in the MS are slight, usually not more than a single word, occasionally a phrase. Since their total number (37) is small, I give a complete list:

I.i.35 not in]	not thou in	-38-39 Holy- / day to see]	holy day to day to see
-ii.89-90 I professe my selfe in Banquetting / To all]	I profess in banquetting my favour / to all	-113 fed]	feds
-146 alone.]	alone	-250 then other]	then y*
before him	-160 is as faire]	your's as fine	-250 then other]
other	-283 What]	but what	*-314 Dinner worth]
-334 dispos'd]	dispos'd too	-iii.13 Heaven]	y heaven
			-67 vse not]

¹⁶ I.ii.250; 304; II.ii.77; IV.27; III.i.314; II.18 (two); IV.iii.58; 110; 320; V.iii.3.

¹⁷ II.iv.50; III.i.227; V.iii.44.

¹⁸ I.ii.9; 38; 165; 202; II.i.105; III.i.32; 66; IV.iii.17.

¹⁹ II.i.82; V.iii.114. ²⁰ I.ii.227; III.ii.26; 68; V.i.56; 141.

²¹ I.ii.170; 233; 329; II.i.343; III.i.187; III.ii.76.

²² A few other miscellaneous substitutions may be noticed: *ye* for *you* (I.i.46; III.4; III.ii.154; 155 (two); 203; IV.ii.45); *you* for *ye* (I.iii.101); *would* for *should* (I.ii.219; III.ii.239); *by* for *with* (I.iii.93; II.i.228); *out* for *forth* (III.ii.47; III.114); *will* for *shall* (II.ii.93); *where* for *whether* (III.iii.3).

use 'em not	-II.i.29 scorning]	& scornes	-36 kinde grow]	kind is
grow	-232 He sayes]	& he sayes	-i.55 and more]	and y* more
-75 Say he is]	tell 'em he's	-III.i.117 And drawing]	and y* drawing	
-182 a thousand]	& (?) 1000	-ii.17 heare.]	hear me.	-38-39 no /
more to]	no more harme to	-178 beare backe.]	bear back, I say back there.	
-266 fire the]	fire all y* (Ff.2,3,4)	-270 Wndowes, any thing]	windowes,	
& any thing	-iii.25 For your]	now for your	-35 and turne]	& then
turn	-IV.i.49 our meanes stretch]	& our best means stretch'd out (Ff. 2,3,4)	-iii.236 marching along by]	marching all along with
No more]	there is no more	-V.i.129 Brutus will go bound]	Brutus / will	
goe ignobly bound	-131 the Ides]	y* y* Ides (that Ides Ff.2,3,4)		

Although none of these additions is of very special interest, the reading in I.ii.89-90 makes good sense of a difficult passage, a passage made doubly unintelligible by the omission of *my selfe* in the Second and later Folios. The manuscript reading in I.ii.314 which was later suggested by Rowe and followed by other eighteenth-century editors, is also worth noticing. In general the added words and phrases seem largely to be the result of an attempt to "regularize" Shakespeare's rather elliptical style or to fill out the metrical line.

(3) *Omissions*. The classification of omissions must be further subdivided into two groups: (1) those omissions involving single words or phrases, and (2) those omissions involving whole lines or groups of lines. The total number of the first division will as usual be worked out in terms of the single word. As might be expected group one contains a large number of omission-variants, 93 in all, a fairly large number of them being words dropped out as the result of careless copying. The list which follows contains only those readings which seem to be of textual interest:

I.i.29 all that I liue by, is with the Aule]	all I liue by is y aule	-30-31
nor womens mat- / ters]	<i>Om. MS.</i>	-ii.246 last cry]
last	II.i.153 or our	
Cause]	our cause	-161 Let vs not leaue]
lets leaue	*-205 for in the]	
for y*	-ii.43 will come.]	will.
-iii.5-6 all / these men]	all	-III.i.41 Most
high, most mighty, and most puisant]	most mighty & most puisant	-276
shall you not]	shall not	-ii.76 of Brutus heere?]
on Brutus.	-79 We	
are blest that Rome is rid]	we are well rid	-iii.37 burne all.]
<i>Om. MS.</i>		
IV.ii.60 our Conference]	conference,	-iii.279 What, thou speak'st]
w*	speakst	-291 I will it not]
Ile not	-314 If thou do'st nod, thou	
break'st thy Instrument,]	I, dost not thou break thy instrument?	-341
<i>Luc. My Lord.] Speech om. MS.</i>	-V.i.83 Cassi Messala.]	<i>Speech om. MS.</i>
-iv.36 bring us word, unto]	bring unto us at (Ff.2,3,4 om. word)	

Only one reading need here be discussed. When the MS drops the *not* from Casca's speech, "Let vs not leaue [*Let's leave MS*]

him out" (II.i.161), a speech made in answer to the suggestion that old Cicero shall be asked to join the conspiracy, it is quite possible that the adaptor had his eye on Casca's next speech (line 173). In that speech Casca reverses his sentiments and remarks, "Indeed, he [Cicero] is not fit." The contradiction in the two statements has been interpreted²³ as showing the vacillating nature of Casca's mind, but perhaps the less subtle, though unmetrical, reading of the MS is nearer to Shakespeare's intention, since it breaks a series of three affirmative speeches with a negatively dramatic preparation for Brutus's final rejection of Cicero.²⁴

The second group of omissions, those of whole lines, et cetera, is of particular importance since from it we gain some indication of the actual text as it was presented on the stage during the middle seventeenth century. In all there are 11 such omissions, not including the lines following v.v.6 where the MS breaks off, varying from a single line to as many as 17 lines. Of these one or two can be explained as mere scribal oversights, but the larger number were evidently deleted for one of three reasons: dramatic, political, or moral. From the charge of having "sallets in the lines" *Julius Caesar* would generally be considered secure, but at some stage in its scribal career the copyist or reviser, in an attempt to make Caesar like Caesar's wife, took exception to two harmless enough passages and excised them: "nor womens mat-/ters" (I.i.30-31); "Braue Sonne, deriu'd from Honourable Loines" (II.i.354). The second deletion, unless indeed it was due to a mere oversight, seems worthy of Bowdler himself.

The political sponge seems to have been busy in the deletion of such lines as: "And groaning vnderneath this Ages yoake" (I.ii.72), and "Some to the common Pulpits, and cry out / Liberty, Freedome, and Enfranchisement" (III.i.93-94).²⁵

Finally, two relatively considerable cuts were made in the interest of the plays and players. The reason for the omission in III.i of lines 209-13, lines in which Antony as he shakes hands individually addresses each of the conspirators, need not be labored

²³ See the quotation from Mark Hunter given under this line in Furness, *New Variorum*, p. 94.

²⁴ Against any "intention" on the adaptor's part we must set the fact that the present scribe is very fond of dropping "not's" for no reason except carelessness. ²⁵ Also possibly the omission of lines 135-37 in III.ii.

with an explanation.²⁶ The second omission occurs in IV.iii.139-55, the scene in which the Poet enters to rebuke the quarreling Brutus and Cassius. That this scene was cut in the eighteenth century we know from the George Garrick prompt-copy of the play now in the Folger Shakespeare Library and from the later Bell edition. From this evidence, therefore, it seems safe to assume that this cut in the MS reflects actual seventeenth-century stage tradition. One further point. Although at line 155 the MS brings on both Lucillius and Titinius, when in line 158 Cassius addresses them he says "and come your selfe" in place of the Folio "yourselves." Consulting the Garrick prompt-copy, we find that in eighteenth-century stage practice only Lucius²⁷ was brought on at this point. Here again, therefore, even though unintentionally, the MS seems to preserve another seventeenth-century stage tradition in spite of a certain amount of "restoration" on the part of the scribe. The bearing which "restoration" of this sort has on the provenance of the MS will be discussed later. The following is a complete list of the lines omitted:

I.ii.72; III.105; II.1.268; 354; IV.54; III.1.93-94; 209-13; II.135-37; 164-67 (prose); III.31-32; IV.iii.139-55.

(4) *Contracted Forms*. Very little need be said of this or the next division (*Expanded Forms*). Of 169 contractions, 106 are due to the scribe's habit, already noticed, of almost always using the "d" for "-ed" regardless of metrical demands. In two cases he happened to contract the form in accordance with some later editorial suggestion: I.ii.344, *glanc'd* for F.1 *glanced*; and III.ii.188, *follow'd* for F.1 *followed*. The other variants are divided, with a few unimportant exceptions, between shortened verb-pronoun-adverbial forms and 'em for *them* (27 times). The MS reading in III.i.129 of *ore* for F.1 *ouer* has been adopted by a number of editors from Pope to W. J. Craig.

(5) *Expanded Forms*. There are only 18 such forms. The following, for metrical and other reasons, are perhaps worth noticing:

²⁶ Compare, however, Collier's corrector who furnishes us with a special stage direction for the hand shaking (J. P. Collier, *Notes and Emendations*, 1853, p. 400).

²⁷ Possibly Lucillius is intended, but there seems to have been considerable confusion over the two names throughout the history of the text. In Bell's acting edition it is Trebonius who enters.

*i.ii.162 'em] them *-ii.186 Let's] let us *-245 vpon's] upon
 us *-265 Y'haue] you haue -iv.iii.78 deny'd] denied -174
 distract] distract'd *-255 wee'l] we will

(6) *Rearrangements*. The rearrangements are of four sorts: (1) transposition of a single word or phrase; (2) transposition of lines; (3) redistribution of dialogue; (4) rearrangement of verse lines. Of the first sort there are 31, 4 of which have been adopted as emendations by later editors:

*i.ii.82 you yet] yet you (Ff.3,4) *-iii.147 Bold, Royall] Royal,
 bold *-iv.iii.262 will we] we will *-v.i.88 am I] I am Notice also:
 i.ii.225 mock'd himself, and scorn'd] scorn'd himself mock'd -iv.iii.325
 what thou art.] w^t art thou?

It is perhaps worth observing that the rather rhetorical four times repeated "him haue I offended" of Brutus's Forum speech (iii.ii.33-38) is regularly given as "him I have offend'd."

There are only two instances of line transposition (i.ii.116-17; 341-42). Neither seems to affect the sense of the original in any serious way, although the second makes awkward reading.

Of the 9 examples of redistribution of dialogue, none is of particular textual interest, two at least arising from corruption of the copy text. Thus in i.iii.49-50 the Folio reads (Casca speaking):

Cassius, what Night is this?
Cassi. A very pleasing Night to honest men.

The MS, however, breaks up the lines as follows:

C: w^t night is this?
 Cask: a very pleasant night
 C: to honest men.

The source of the corruption is evident. The second case (iii.i.27) is again the result of reading an initial vocative as a speech heading. Three lines (27-29) from Cassius' speech are thus given to Brutus, but a speech by Brutus immediately follows. The second example is almost certainly the work of the present scribe; the first reflects, I believe, the influence of an earlier MS.

Since the remaining seven variants throw some light on the assignment of roles among the Commoners and Soldiers I give them in full:

iii.ii.119 2. If thou] if thou (Ff.2,3,4) 148 4 Wee'l] 1 wee'l
 -243 3 Away] 2 away -iii.12 4. I and wisely.] 2 I, & wisely. -31 4.
 Teare him] 2 tear him -v.iv.21 2. Sold.] 1 so: -22 1.Sold. Ile] 2 Ile

In the last class of rearrangements there are 22 examples of altered line division, and one example of prose given as verse (iii.iii.34-35). Six of the 22 anticipate the arrangement adopted by the majority of later editors:

i.ii.74-75 (one line MS); ii.ii.3-4 (one line MS); ii.iv.47-48 (one line MS); iii.i.169-70 (one line MS); iii.ii.57-58 (one line MS); iv.iii.60-61 (one line MS)

(7) *Stage Directions*. In some respects this is the most interesting of the eight classes since certain of the stage directions add a further mite to our scanty knowledge of seventeenth-century stage performances. Before we approach the actual stage directions themselves, however, we should notice that the play has been divided up into acts and scenes on a fairly consistent plan, although occasionally, where we should most expect a scene division, the MS, after the fashion of such MSS, fails completely. The acts are divided as in the Folios. In the list below I have recorded the scene divisions for Act I only, where the MS differs from the Folio:

Following i.i.86 MS reads: Scena 2da / Enter Caesar, [etc.]
 [No scene three marked in MS.]
 i.ii.234 MS reads: Scena 4ta / Brutus Cassius, Casca.
 i.ii.347 MS reads: Scena 5ta
 i.iii.43 MS reads: Enter Cassius, scena 6ta
 i.iii.142 MS reads: Enter Cinna, Scena 7tma

We may here compare the scene divisions of the eighteenth-century editors who followed Pope.²⁸ In agreement with the Folio the MS fails to mark what most modern editions give as ii.iii, and iv; iii.iii; and iv.iii.

Taken as a whole the stage directions in the MS are rather more circumstantial than those of the Folio, another evidence of stage influence. Thus when a character leaves the stage his name is usually given in addition to "Exit." Also in one or two cases the MS corrects the "Red Bull" Latin of the First Folio. In the list of variant stage directions which follows I have not thought it worth while to record verbal variants which do not affect the meaning of the direction. The list includes, therefore, only those additions and omissions which seems to bear on stage action.

²⁸ We may also compare the rather different treatment of Collier's Second Folio reviser (J. P. Collier, *Notes and Emendations*, 1853, p. 396).

*i.ii.32 *Sennet.*] Om. MS. -91 *Shout.*] shouts *-147 *Shout. Flourish.*] shout againe -193] MS adds: manent -233 *Sennit.*] Om. MS. *iii.110 *Thunder still.*] Om. MS. -ii.i.333 *Knocke.*] Om. MS. -369 *Exeunt.*] *Exeunt B: & Caius* -ii.65 *Enter Decius.*] *Enter Decius Brutus* (follows 1.63 in MS) -iv.55 *Exeunt.*] Om. MS. -iii.i.90 *Dyes.*] Om. MS. (Ff.2,3,4). *ii.275 *Enter Seruant.*] *Enter a servant* (follows 1 273 in MS.) iv.i.14 *Exit Lepidus.*] Om. MS. ii.62 *Manet Brutus and Cassius.*] Om. MS. -iii.138] Following this line MS reads: they come forward -179 *and Tapers.*] and taper. -184] MS adds: Drinks. -v.i.81 *Lucillius . . . forth.*] Om. MS. -iii.29 *Pind. Aboue.*] Pin: from above -40 *Enter Pindarus.*] *Pindarus descends.* -50] MS adds: (dies stab'd by Pindarus. -55] MS adds: Exit. -86] MS adds: Exit Messala -108 *Low Alarums.*] Om. MS. *-iv.14] MS adds: Exit Brutus

Several of these stage directions seem to me of considerable importance. Taken together, of course, they help to substantiate earlier evidence that we are here dealing with an actual stage version and not a closet transcript. The most significant direction in these respect occurs (immediately preceding the long cut, lines 139-55) at iv.iii.138, where the MS reads: *they come forward*. This direction is further valuable because it indicates the part of the Elizabethan stage where the Brutus-Cassius quarrel took place. Apparently Knight was correct, and Dyce wrong in contradicting him, when he says in relation to the direction at iv.ii.62, *Manet Brutus and Cassius*, a direction omitted in the MS: "In the Shakesporean theatre Brutus and Cassius evidently retired to the secondary stage."²⁹ The specific direction in ii.i.369, *Exeunt B: & Caius*, is interesting because it supports Capell's suggestion that Lucius leaves the stage at line 344 instead of remaining, as in modern editions, until the end of the scene. In v.iii.40, *Pindarus descends* for the Folio *Enter Pindarus* furnishes more evidence of playhouse influence. The added directions in the remainder of this scene and in scene iv should also be noticed.

(8) *Punctuation*. As in most seventeenth-century play MSS the punctuation is very uncertain, often completely absent. There are, however, a few cases where the pointing of the MS either suggests a new reading of a line or corrects faults in the Folios. Of the first type is the interesting new interpretation given to the Folio lines, "I know no personall cause, to spurne at him, / But for the generall. He would be crown'd" (ii.i.14-15).

²⁹ Quoted in Furness, *New Variorum*, p. 200.

The MS reads: ". . . at him, but for the general he would be crown'd." "General" thus takes on the common Elizabethan meaning of the *mobile* and the line means, "if it were not for the wishes of the common people he would be already crowned," a sentiment which accords well with the behaviour of the "rabblement" in i.ii. In i.iii.74 for the Folio, "Why Old men, Fooles, and Children calculate," the MS drops the comma after "men" and thus indicates a reading of the line similar to that suggested by Blackstone and adopted by a number of later editors. The following variants may also be observed:

*i.i.46 *Pompey many.*] *Pompey? many* -ii.i.255 *Boy: Lucius.*] *Boy Lucius?* -iii.i.160 *him, so.*] *him soe,* -i.i.141 (Which pardon me)] *w^{ch}* (pardon me) (1691 Quarto) -151 *meet you know.*] *meet: you know* *232 *speech.*] *speech* -iii.17 *wisely I say, I am.*] *wisely I say I am* -iv.i.42 *Imitations.*] *imitations;* *-ii.17 *you. let.*] *you, let*

Before we try to draw any final conclusions from the body of evidence so far presented, one important part of the MS still remains to be taken into account: the list of "Dramatis Personae." If it were remarkable for nothing else this list of characters would be uncommon through its very completeness. None of the Folios contains any list of characters, and those in the various seventeenth-century Quartos (all nearly certainly later than the MS) are scant in comparison. The list contains 34 distinct entries, one of them a general entry: "Artizans, Plebians, souldiers & servants." The distinction of "Titanius" as "lieutenant Generall under Cassius" and the designation of Lucilius, Cato Junior, and Messala as "officers under Brutus"; of Volumnius, Clytus, Dardanus, and Strato as "followers of Brutus"; and of Varrus and "Claudio" as "servants to Brutus," all show a careful consideration of the actual roles involved. With one important exception, the order in which the characters are listed is remarkably similar to that in later edited editions. The exception is with the names of Cicero, Flavius, and "Murellus," which appear at the end of the list following the general entry of supernumeraries quoted above. To explain the peculiar position of these names, it is necessary to turn once again to the playhouse origin of the MS text. From the Quartos we know that in presentation Cicero was replaced by Trebonius in i.iii (the one scene in which he appeared), and that Casca took the place of Murellus, who like Flavius speaks only in the opening scene.

The Garrick prompt-copy, however, goes further and cuts out both Flavius and Murellus, substituting Cinna and Casca.³⁰ Thus again, although patently restored, the MS points to another earlier seventeenth-century stage usage. This raises the question of "restoration" in the MS of which we have already had an example.³¹ Any attempt at an answer must involve a short summary of our findings, and so, with Bottom, we may eventually "grow to a point."

We are now in a position to draw some definite conclusions regarding the provenance of the MS and from these conclusions to frame a few conjectures. On the factual side we can say: (1) the MS is not a "substantive" text; (2) it is ultimately derived from the Second Folio (1632) and thus has no textual connection with the Quartos (1682? -1691); (3) it is a copy of another MS and not of the printed text; (4) it was transcribed in or after 1665, but probably not long after; (5) it shows definite signs of playhouse influence; (6) it also shows signs of "restoration" from playhouse influence; (7) it bears the impress of "learning" in the scene division, in the text, and in the "Dramatis Personae"; (8) it gives evidence of a more or less systematic modernization of Shakespeare's syntax and language.

Finally, by way of conjecture, let us examine very briefly the problem of "restoration." Only in one of two ways, it seems to me, can the "restored" parts in the MS be explained. Either the present scribe (or an earlier one) worked with a printed Folio text beside him and restored from that (a supposition merely on the face of it highly unlikely), or the first manuscript transcript was made from a Second Folio marked with the cuts, substitutions of characters, and a large part of the verbal variants,³² a copy in many respects resembling the notorious Collier Second Folio.³³ Of the two suppositions, the second seems un-

³⁰ In Bell's acting edition Casca and Decius Brutus are the characters substituted. See also the remarks of Francis Gentleman on this point (Bell, 1774, p. 5; quoted in Furness. *New Variorum*, p. 13).

³¹ P. 411, above.

³² The scene divisions might have been added at any time.

³³ On the other hand, taking into consideration the large number of verbal variants in the MS and my experience of other seventeenth century prompt-copies, I would suggest that the Second Folio prompt-copy here postulated must have had a more genuine, and less academic, connection with the living stage than did Collier's.

questionably the more probable. It would also explain the detailed "Dramatis Personae," since we must suppose that the list was first compiled in terms of the acted version, omitting the names of Flavius, Murellus, and Cicero. On copying, these names were reclaimed (as was either Lucilius or Titinius in *iv.iii.156*) in an attempt to restore the text to its original, and more literary, form. Why in doing so the restorer chose to omit the longer passages noted under *Omissions* above, it is not easy to understand. Probably, at least in the Poet scene (*iv.iii.140-55*), he thought the text better without them, nor will we argue the point overmuch.

G. BLAKEMORE EVANS

University of Wisconsin