Colby Quarterly

Volume 26
Issue 2 *June*

Article 7

6-1-1990

# Text and Performance: Romeo and Juliet, Quartos 1 and 2

Michael E. Mooney

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.colby.edu/cq

Recommended Citation
Colby Quarterly, Volume 26, no.2, June 1990, p.122-132

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Colby. It has been accepted for inclusion in Colby Quarterly by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Colby. For more information, please contact mfkelly@colby.edu.

# Text and Performance: *Romeo and Juliet,* Quartos 1 and 2

by MICHAEL E. MOONEY

WE HAVE reached the point in the study of Shakespeare's texts where descriptions of "memorially reconstructed," "bad" quartos that "omit" words, phrases, or lines from presumably authoritative, "good" quartos are seen to beg the question.[1] Indeed, we have begun to question the logic underlying the creation of conflated texts, ones that draw eclectically from a play's different quarto and folio versions to create a new text that may represent editorial opinion and literary taste as much as authorial intention and that may be less faithful to any putative, authoritative text than are such "bad" quartos. Recent studies of Quarto and Folio *King Lear* have undermined the notion that the conflated version we use is authoritative, and there are now two texts of *Lear*, each substantially different from the other.[2] Similar versions of *Hamlet's* Q1, Q2, and Folio texts, one assumes, will not be far behind. Work on *Romeo and Juliet* has yet to begin. The play appears in two early and substantive versions: Quarto One (1597), a "bad" quarto or pirated memorial reconstruction put together by actors who apparently remembered only intermittently the correct lines; and Quarto Two (1599), a "good" quarto "deriving ultimately from Shakespeare's holograph."[3] Indeed, the relation between these quartos and the text we now read and see performed raises a number of questions about editorial practice and the nature of a Shakespearean playscript.

Quarto One *does* contain all the traits commonly associated with memorially reconstructed texts: anticipations, recollections, transpositions, paraphrases, summaries, repetitions, and omissions of words, phrases, or lines "correctly"

1. See Steven Urkowitz, "Good News about 'Bad' Quartos," in Maurice Charney, ed., *"Bad" Shakespeare: Revaluations of the Shakespeare Canon* (Rutherford, 1988), pp. 189–206. Urkowitz raises a number of questions about the hypothesis of memorial reconstruction first advanced by W. W. Greg in his edition of the bad quarto of *"Merry Wives of Windsor"* (Oxford, 1910), pp. xxvi–xxviii. H. R. Hoppe, in *The Bad Quarto of* Romeo and Juliet*: A Bibliographical and Textual Study* (Ithaca, 1948), argues that Q1 was set from a manuscript originally compiled by actors; more recent consensual opinion holds that the actors reproduced a version which had been adapted by Shakespeare's company for provincial performance. As my argument will show, some of the cuts found in Q1 rely very closely on the Q2 text or on some form of Shakespeare's manuscript. For a recent summary of textual opinion, see S. Wells, G. Taylor, J. Jowett, and W. Montgomery, eds., *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 288–305.

2. In *The Complete Oxford Shakespeare*; see Wells, Taylor, et al., eds., pp. 510–42, for a synopsis and list of critical works.

3. G. B. Evans, textual editor, *The Riverside Shakespeare* (Boston, 1974); The New Cambridge Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet* (Cambridge, 1984), p. 206. All citations from the play are taken from this edition. Citations from Q1 and Q2 are taken from P. A. Daniel, ed., the New Shakespeare Society edition, *Romeo and Juliet: Parallel Texts of the First Two Quartos* (London, 1874; rpt. 1965).



Published by Digital Commons @ Colby, 1990

presented in Quarto Two.[4] But Q1 also contains a great deal more, and on this evidence it has been recognized that Q1—with its numerous and precise theatrical "cuts"—may well have "derived from a version adapted for acting."[5] There are two distinct issues here, and they need to be carefully separated. The theory of memorial reconstruction undermines the validity of a "bad" quarto by questioning the motives and memory of the actors presumably responsible for the faulty text. It deals a death blow to all scripts posing as texts. The nature of theatrical adaptation, on the other hand, often requires that plays be cut to shorten playing time and to accommodate a smaller cast. Dramatic rather than literary considerations are of foremost importance to an adapter. Faulty memory is one thing, careful adaptation quite another, and to identify Q1 as a "bad" quarto is to confuse the issues. It is not the same thing to "cut" as it is to "omit."

For whatever the problems Q1 shows, it is a unique theatrical document, valid for at least one performance on one stage, at one place and time. In this sense it may well come closer to preserving an actual Renaissance production of the play than any of the later quartos or the Folio. Indeed, Q1 provides important information about the stage it was performed on, the minimal cast necessary to perform the play, the costuming, properties, music, sound effects, special effects, business—and, since an "authorial" text (Q2) is extant, about the kind of theatrical adaptation the play might have undergone.[6] Quarto One is also 2220 lines long and is performable in the "two hours' traffic of our stage" stipulated by the Chorus; for Q1, the playing time is approximate, not conventional. Quarto Two, as its title boasts, is a "Newly corrected, augmented, and amended" version; it also runs for 3052 lines and could not have been played in two hours.[7] Ironically, in the light of its status as an authoritative text, Q2 is not as well printed as Q1.

Because it is "bad," Q1 has generally been neglected, and few readers consult this version of the play. As even a cursory reading of a modern edition's textual apparatus will show, however, Q1 has had a major impact on the received text of *Romeo and Juliet*. Every modern edition of the play uses Q1's rich and full stage directions, and editors repeatedly choose Q1's readings over those present in Q2. As we will see, these choices affect our understanding of the play's themes and characterization. The textual problems raised may be focused if we consider the following statement by one of the play's most recent editors, G. B. Evans,

4. See Hoppe and Brian Gibbons, ed., The Arden Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet* (London, 1980), pp. 2-13.

5. Gibbons, p. 2. Gibbons' comment reveals his textual bias, since which Shakespearean text does not, in a sense, derive from a version adapted for acting? Also see Evans, pp. 207–08, where he points out that Q1, "despite its lack of authority . . . carries us beyond Shakespeare's 'literary' text (i.e., Q2) and tells us something of how the play was realised in a contemporary production." As Hoppe, pp. 94–107, demonstrates, the theatrical adapter was skillful, and his cuts often result in a "dramatic gain" (100). Alfred Hart, in *Stolne and Surreptitious Copies: A Comparative Study of Shakespeare's Bad Quartos* (Oxford, 1942), pp. 119ff., argues that dramatic, and not literary, effectiveness was the adapter's test for retaining passages in a play that needed shortening.

6. See William Montgomery, "The Original Staging of the *First Part of the Contention* (1594)," *Shakespeare Survey*, 41 (1989), 13–22.

7. Hart, pp. 36–37, suggests that Shakespeare's original version of his plays, preserved in the "good" texts, were always cut down to 2000 lines, or "two hours' traffic." Although his suggestion has not won general agreement, it is certainly true for the Q1 version of *Romeo and Juliet*. Hart relies completely on the memorial reconstruction theory. Cf. Urkowitz, pp. 199–201.

whose Riverside (1974) and New Cambridge (1984) editions may be said to represent the current state of affairs:

> the weight of textual authority rests with Q2 . . . [but] . . . it obviously offered very real problems for the compositor, and Q2 contains a substantial number of misreadings. As a result, it has been necessary in some 60 cases, not including the correction of mere typographical errors, to adopt the reading of Q1 or of later quartos or F1 supported by Q1, since, "bad" quarto or not, it is the only other text which may be said to derive independently, however indirectly, from some form of Shakespeare's manuscript.[8]

As Evans acknowledges, the questionable provenance of Q1 has not stopped editors from adopting its readings. My point is that Q1 and Q2 are not only different versions of the same play but also different things. Quarto One derives from a script, a version of the play used for acting. The "cuts" it makes in "some form of Shakespeare's manuscript" are made with such playhouse considerations as playing time and cast limitations in mind. It reproduces a theatrical version of that manuscript. Quarto Two, on the other hand, derives from "foul papers" and may not represent a performed version at all.

The matter goes deeper than this. The assumption that there is an underlying perfect text, recoverable by editors, is itself questionable. It is at odds with the view of a play as a working script, one that can be modified as needed to fit the demands of performance, as is true in most if not all productions. Such a view is of course antithetical to the practice and desire of editors, whose endeavors are based upon the assumption that there is a realizable text that can be reproduced. Bad quartos, rightly judged poor texts, may in fact be superior scripts. In their attempts to provide us with the best version of the play, editors provide us with the fullest text, not necessarily the most accurate script. They have not totally subscribed to Q2, however, and that has allowed four centuries of readers and viewers to hold Juliet's point in their minds:

> Whats Mountague? It is nor hand nor foote,
> Nor arme nor face, nor any other part.
> Whats in a name? That which we call a Rofe,
> By any other name would fmell as fweet, (Q1)

rather than Q2's poorly printed, prosaic version:

> Whats Mountague? it is nor hand nor foote,
> Nor arme nor face, o be some other name
> Belonging to a man.
> Whats in a name that which we call a rofe,
> By any other word would fmell as fweete.

The truth of the matter is more complex, however, since the version of these lines that we read and hold in our minds belongs neither to Q1 nor to Q2, but is the product of the eighteenth-century editor, Edmond Malone, one of the earliest

8. *The Riverside Shakespeare*, p. 1093. As Evans and all other modern editors point out, one section of Q2 (I.ii.46–I.iii.34) was set up directly from Q1. Q1 serves, that is, as copy text for this section of the play. While editors agree that the compositor for Q2 had a copy of Q1 on hand, there is less agreement on the way Q1 was used. See Evans, the New Cambridge edition, pp. 206–12, for discussion. It is generally accepted that Q1 represents the text of the play at a later rather than earlier stage of development than Q2; see Hoppe, pp. 95–107.

editors to conflate different texts in rewriting a passage we now *believe* to be Shakespeare's:

> What's Montague? It is nor hand nor foot,
> Nor arm nor face, nor any other part
> Belonging to a man. O be some other name!
> What's in a name? That which we call a rose
> By any other name would smell as sweet.

## I

THE KIND of textual problem raised by comparing Q1 and Q2 may be illustrated if we note the differences among Q1, Q2, and the New Cambridge versions of I.iv.106–13, when Romeo responds to Benvolio's fear that he, Romeo, and Mercutio will arrive "too late" at Capulet's feast. Here is the speech as it appears in the New Cambridge edition:

> *Romeo:* I fear too early, for my mind misgives
> Some consequence yet hanging in the stars
> Shall bitterly begin his fearful date
> With this night's revels, and expire the term
> Of a despised life closed in my breast,
> By some vile forfeit of untimely death.
> But He that hath the steerage of my course
> Direct my sail! On, lusty gentlemen.

Important to all readings of the play, this speech echoes the opening Chorus's description of the "star-crossed lovers" and anticipates a number of later moments. Here is an important source for the nautical and astral imagery that is repeated in Romeo's vow of love (II.ii.84), in his "defiance" of the "stars" (V.i.24), and in his words just before he drinks the Apothecary's fatal poison:

> O here
> Will I set up my everlasting rest,
> And shake the yoke of inauspicious stars
> From this world-wearied flesh. Eyes, look your last!
> Arms, take your last embrace! and, lips, O you
> The doors of breath, seal with a righteous kiss
> A dateless bargain to engrossing Death!
> Come, bitter conduct, come, unsavory guide!
> Thou desperate pilot, now at once run on
> The dashing rocks thy seasick weary bark!
> Here's to my love! [*Drinks.*] (V.iii.109–19)

Here, in contrast, is the speech in Q2, the "authoritative" text upon which all modern editions are based (with the exception of spelling, I have italicized all the differences):

> *Ro.* I feare too earlie, for my mind mifgiues,
> Some confequence yet hanging in the ftarres,
> Shall bitterly begin his fearfull date,
> With this nights reuels, and expire the terme
> Of a defpifed life clofde in my breft:

By fome vile fofreit of vntimely death.
But *h*e that hath the *ftirrage* of my courfe,
Direct my *fute, o*n luftie *G*entlemen.

And here is Q1, with differences from Q2 marked:

*Ro.* I feare too earlie, for my minde mifgiues
Some confequence *is* hanging in the ftars,
*Which* bitterly begins his fearefull date
With this nights reuels, and expier*s* the terme
Of difpifed life, clofde in this breaft,
By fome *vntimelie* forfet of *vile* death*:*
But he that hath the *fteerage* of my courfe
Direct*s* my *saile, o*n luftie *G*entlemen.

We should note, first of all, that Evans has introduced Q1 readings in this passage. Quarto One readings, that is, have been determined superior. Why? Does Q2's version of these lines contain a number of "misreadings?" Or have these choices been made on the basis of literary consideration? Quarto One, not Q2, supports the sense of fate and the imagery used elsewhere in the play. In Q1, Q2's "yet hanging" becomes "is hanging," "vile fofreit of untimely death" becomes "untimelie forfet of vile death" (a transposition?), and the imperative, "Direct," becomes the active verb, "Directs." Let us also note that Q2's "sute" becomes "sail," and its "stirrage" (for motivation) becomes "steerage" (guidance). Quarto Two maintains the legal metaphors common in the sonnets (*date, expire, term, forfeit, suit*), while Q1 mixes those metaphors with the nautical ones so important to interpretations of the play.[9] Indeed, by mixing these metaphors, Q1 helps to justify the well-known editorial decision to use Q1's "I defie [you] Starres"[10] rather than Q2's "I denie you starres" (V.i.24) and links the passage as well to Romeo's lines in II.ii.84 ff., to Capulet's in III.v.130 ff., and to Romeo's in V.iii.109 ff. "He" is not capitalized in any of the play's early texts (Q1-Q4, F), and this fact has given rise to the suggestion that the agent directing Romeo's course is, among others, Cupid rather than God. It is a suggestion rejected by many editors, who, without authority, make God the fateful, governing force ruling Romeo's affairs rather than the Petrarchan lover's nemesis, Cupid. This is a thicket of misinterpretation, interpretation, and complexity not easily entered and equally difficult to escape from unscathed. It is the result of three centuries of editorial encrustation and suggests the basic instability of Shakespeare's text and the difficulty of building critical arguments upon grounds that are so shifty.

## II

THE DIFFERENT versions of I.iv raise a host of questions about editorial decisions

9. See, for instance, Douglas L. Peterson's "*Romeo and Juliet* and the Art of Moral Navigation," in Waldo F. McNeir and Thelma N. Greenfield, eds., *Pacific Coast Studies in Shakespeare* (Eugene, 1966); and Irving Ribner's " 'Then I Denie you Starres': a Reading of *Romeo and Juliet*," in *Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy* (New York, 1960).

10. Actually, the passage from Q1 has been further altered and conflated with Q2, since it reads, "I defie *my* Starres."

based on "literary considerations," on what are, in effect, aesthetic choices that do not so much attempt to "ascertain what Shakespeare wrote" as seek to "improve" Shakespeare.[11] Other differences between Q1 and Q2 raise equally interesting questions about the logic of the play's characterization.

Let us consider, as a first instance, Q2's rendition of the dialogue in I.iii. 70ff., when Lady Capulet first asks Juliet to think of marriage to Paris:

*LADY CAPULET* Well, think of marriage now; younger than you,
Here in Verona, ladies of esteem,
Are made already mothers. By my count,
I was your mother much upon these years
That you are now a maid. Thus then in brief:
The valiant Paris seeks you for his love.
*NURSE* A man, young lady! lady, such a man
As all the world—Why, he's a man of wax.
*LADY CAPULET* Verona's summer hath not such a flower.
*NURSE* Nay, he's a flower, in faith, a very flower.
*LADY CAPULET* What say you, can you love the gentleman?
This night you shall behold him at our feast;
Read o'er the volume of young Paris' face,
And find delight writ there with beauty's pen;
Examine every married lineament,
And see how one another lends content;
And what obscured in this fair volume lies
Find written in the margent of his eyes.
This precious book of love, this unbound lover,
To beautify him, only lacks a cover.
The fish lives in the sea, and 'tis much pride
For fair without the fair within to hide;
That book in many's eyes doth share the glory
That in gold clasps locks in the golden story:
So shall you share all that he doth possess,
By having him, making yourself no less.
*NURSE* No less! nay, bigger women grow by men.
*LADY CAPULET* Speak briefly, can you like of Paris' love?
*JULIET* I'll look to like, if looking liking move;
But no more deep will I endart mine eye
Than your consent gives strength to make it fly.
*Enter SERVINGMAN.*
*SERVINGMAN* Madam, the guests are come, supper served up, you called, my young lady asked for, the Nurse cursed in the pantry, and every thing in extremity. I must hence to wait, I beseech you follow straight.
*LADY CAPULET* We follow thee. Juliet, the County stays.
*NURSE* Go, girl, seek happy nights to happy days.

There are many characterizing details here. Lady Capulet's banality and sententious couplets suggest her solicitousness, as spurred by her forceful husband; her

11. Richard Hosley, "The Corrupting Influence of the Bad Quarto on the Received Text of *Romeo and Juliet*," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 4 (1953), 1–33, 19. Hosley takes G. I. Duthie to task for choosing Q1 over Q2 readings. See Duthie, "The Text of *Romeo and Juliet*," *Studies in Bibliography*, 4 (1951–52), 329; and, with John Dover Wilson, the Cambridge edition, *Romeo and Juliet* (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 112–18. Among recent modern editors, only Hosley (the New Yale edition, 1954) and George Walton Williams strictly adhere to Q2, though even Williams uses Q1's stage directions.

own (ironical?) failure to be "brief"; her desire to persuade her obedient young daughter by reference to her own age when she was married. There is the Nurse's contrasting, comical, and literalizing idiom, marked by her urging on of the match, her garrulous and contradictory repetition of Lady Capulet's words, and her pleasant acknowledgment that women do grow bigger by men. And there is Juliet's response, indicative of her obedience and yet suggestive of her later determination to love whom she wishes and to deny the superficiality of Petrarchan conceits about love's dart.

There are also a number of details inconsistent with later moments in the play. According to this passage (and Q2), Lady Capulet is approximately twenty-eight years old (based on the conversation at I.iii.10 ff., Juliet is about to turn fourteen; Capulet, based on the suggestion of age given in the discussion in I.v.31 ff., is in his middle to late forties). Such "readerly" details often pass unnoticed in performance, of course. As textual, readerly details, however, they are inconsistent with the evidence present in V.iii., when Lady Capulet, looking on her dead daughter, remarks, "O me, this sight of death is as a bell / That warns my old age to a sepulchre" (206–07). Old age? Do we need to suggest mortality ages in the Renaissance to justify twenty-eight as an old age, or is it truer to our experience and sense of the play to think of Lady Capulet as essentially middle-aged? The question does not come up in Q1, where, in V.iii, consistent with the cuts it makes in this passage, Lady Capulet does not mention her "old age," where, indeed, she does not say a word in response to the sight of Juliet's bleeding body (itself perhaps psychologically valid, since silence might be as meaningful in the context as any words she might speak?). That is, from a logical and readerly view, the text as we have it is inconsistent. Quarto One's "omissions" allow Lady Capulet to be whatever age seems appropriate to make her the mate of Capulet (and allow the cast to use whatever player was available to perform the part?). Should we demand a logic from a literary text that need not be present in a performance script? If so, why is there a problem with Lady Capulet's age? Should we, "knowing the memorial nature of Q1," suspect it of "error at all points?"[12] Even when it resolves inconsistencies present in Q2?

Here is the text of the conversation as it appears in Q1, "cut" by some twenty-four lines:

*Wife*: Well girle, the Noble Countie Paris feekes thee for his Wife.
*Nurce*: *A man young Ladie, Ladie fuch a man as all the world, why he is a man of waxe.*
*Wife*: Veronaes Summer hath not fuch a flower.
*Nurce*: *Nay he is a flower, in faith a very flower.*
*Wife*: Well, Juliet, how like you of Paris loue.
*Juliet*: Ile looke to like, if looking liking moue,
But no more deepe will I engage myne eye,
Than your confent gives ftrength to make it flie.
[*Enter Clowne.*]
*Clowne*: *Maddam you are cald for, fupper is readie, the Nurce curft in the Pantrie, all thinges in extreamitie, make haft for I muft be gone to waite.*

12. Williams, ed., *Romeo and Juliet* (Durham, 1964), p. xiii.

Consistent with the reductions in playing time made throughout the script, these cuts delete material that would not be missed in performance. Lady Capulet may go on too long in Q2's version, and Q1 retains enough of her loquaciousness elsewhere to retain this aspect of her character, just as it deletes the Nurse's third retelling of the anecdote when Juliet fell "forward" (Q1) on her face (I.iii.50–58). Twice is enough to make the point. Here, too, Paris' later absence at the party will not be as glaring as in Q2, since the audience is not reminded of him; and the cast can use the actor playing the role of Paris as a supernumerary, as one of the maskers who come to Capulet's feast.[13] The use of *Clowne* as a speech prefix reminds us, moreover, of the playhouse provenance of Q1: *Clowne* is not just another character, to be renamed *Servingman* in Q2, but a character of a different type, the "Clown" of the company, identified in, of all places, Q2, as Will Kemp (IV.v.99 s.d.), and reintegrated into the play's fiction in the immediately following stage direction as Peter, the Capulet's servingman. Even Q2, that is, recalls a performance of the play in which Kemp played Peter and probably the Servingman. Quarto One similarly identifies a member of the repertory but indicates his theatrical role in relation to the company. As in *Othello*, *Clowne* is not a signifier of a role in the play but a role in the Lord Chamberlain's/Lord of Hunsdon's Servants, a role in the theater company.[14] Both Q1 and Q2 reveal their provenance as theatrical scripts; not until eighteenth-century and later editions is it necessary and desirable to uphold the play's illusion by deleting the reference to Kemp or by silently relegating it to a footnote.

And then there is the matter of Benvolio. As one of the proofs that Q1 is a weaker "text" than Q2, editors cite the radical cuts made in Q1 at the start of the play. In the Q2 version, the feud envelops the whole society of Verona as the servingmen, the youths, the citizens, and the warring Capulets and Montagues enter sequentially to renew the feud and are then stopped in their tracks by Prince Escalus.[15] In Q1, the orchestrated entries of the stratified layers of Veronian

13. Hoppe notes that Q2 seems to have no set number of players in mind, but that Q1 is careful to reduce the number of players to no more than twelve; he cites the reductions in players called for in the stage directions in IV.ii and IV.iv, where Q2's "two or three" becomes a single servingman. As Greg demonstrated in *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements, the "Battle of Alcazar" and "Orlando Furioso"* (1923), bad quartos often cut the text to reduce playing time.

14. See Peter Holland, "The Resources of Characterization in *Othello*," *Shakespeare Survey*, 41 (1989), 119–32; 127. Giorgio Melchiori recognizes that the Servingman was played by the same actor as Peter in "Peter, Balthasar, and Shakespeare's Art of Doubling," *Modern Language Review*, 78 (1983), 777–92.

15. Perhaps the best example of cutting in the play is in the Prince's speech (I.i.72–94). Quarto One reduces the speech to fourteen lines:

> Rebellious fubiects enemies to peace,
> On paine of torture, from thofe bloody handes
> Throw your miftempered weapons to the ground.
> Three Ciuell brawles bred of an airie word,
> By the old Capulet and Mountague,
> Have thrice difturbd the quiet of our ftreets.
> If euer you difturbe our ftreets againe,
> Your liues fhall pay the ranfome of your fault:
> For this time euery man depart in peace.
> Come Capulet come you along with me,
> And Mountague, come you this after noone,
> To know our farther pleafure in this cafe,
> To old free Towne our common iudgement place,
> Once more on paine of death each man depart.

society are reduced to a single stage direction: after Sampson challenges Abram to "draw" (I.i.51), Q1 substitutes, for lines 52–71, the following stage direction: "*They draw, to them enters Tybalt, they fight, to them the Prince, old Mountague, and his wife, old Capulet and his wife, and other Citizens and part them.*[16] What is lost is the sequencing, although Q1's stage direction suggests the action of Q2. What is also lost is Benvolio's famous line, spoken when he intercedes in an attempt to stop the servants from fighting. "Part, fools!" says Benvolio in Q2, "Put up your swords, you know not what you do?" (55–56). This line, like Romeo's premonition at the end of I.iv, is crucial to our understanding of the play and to those who argue that human ignorance is one of the play's basic themes. It is a theme sounded repeatedly. Romeo's question in I.v ("What lady's that which doth enrich the hand / Of yonder knight?" [39–40]) is answered by a servingman who does not know who Juliet is ("I know not, sir").[17] Romeo tries to avoid duelling with Tybalt by telling Tybalt, "I see thou knowest me not" (III.i.58). Romeo drinks the fatal poison and dies, unaware that Juliet is only asleep. At the end of the play, Friar Lawrence needs to provide what is for the audience a long summary of events because the characters, limited in their knowledge, do not know what the audience does.[18]

For many readers and teachers, then, the omission of Benvolio's line is a serious matter. In Q1, in fact, Benvolio's role is generally reduced. By cutting his description of the opening fight (I.i.97–106) to two lines, the adapter simply removes what everyone in the theater has seen. His later description of the duel (III.i.143–66), also drastically reduced in Q1, is, as editors note, not quite consistent with what has happened. Quarto One's shortened version is more truthful and accurate. Perhaps the greatest difference in Benvolio's role in Q1 as opposed to Q2, however, is in the conversation between him and Mercutio at the opening of III.i, where, as Q2 and Mercutio would have it, Benvolio is described as a most aggressive, quarrelsome fellow—a view so antithetical to his traditional role as the play's unsuccessful peacemaker that editors always consider Mercutio to be joking. Quarto One cuts a number of lines in this passage, shortening playing time and, by attenuating Mercutio's charge, converting it into a bit of banter.

And what happens to Benvolio? In Q1 and Q2, Benvolio exits at the end of III.i and does not return. No further mention is made of him in Q2; once out of

16. Hoppe, p. 80, cites W. W. Greg: "Whoever wrote the Q1 stage directions had an intimate knowledge of the play and of the traditional stage business." Also see Harley Granville-Barker, *Prefaces to Shakespeare* (Princeton, 1951), II, 300–49, for a full discussion of the way Q1's stage directions "give life to the rudimentary text, and an actuality to the play that scrupulous editing seems, somehow, to reform altogether." As Hart, p. 421, points out, the reporter here recalls the wording of the plot rather than the sequence of the action: "to them" is commonly found in extant theatrical plots, and often characters in these plots are named in order of rank rather than in the order of their appearance on stage. This view has not been universally accepted; cf. Gibbons, p. 9. Also see Charles B. Lower's valuable analysis of IV.v: "*Romeo and Juliet*, IV.5: A Stage Direction and Purposeful Comedy," *Shakespeare Studies*, 8 (1975), 177–94.

17. The Servingman's improbable answer is omitted in Q1. Here again Q1 solves a problem, since it has always seemed unlikely that one of the Capulet servingmen would not know who Juliet was. In Q1, Romeo's question is rhetorical.

18. See Bertrand Evans' well-known "The Brevity of Friar Lawrence," *PMLA*, 65 (1950), 841–65; and his *Shakespeare's Tragic Practice* (Oxford, 1979).

sight, he is left out of mind. In Q1, however, when "olde" Montague enters in V.iii, he reports the following to Prince Escalus:

> Dread Souereigne, my Wife is dead to night,
> And yong Benuolio is deceafed too:
> What further mifchiefe can there yet be found?

In Q2, only Lady Montague's death is reported, along with a reason:

> Alas my liege, my wife is dead to night,
> Griefe of my fonnes exile hath ftopt her breath.
> What further woe confpires againft mine age?

It is generally assumed that—since neither Lady Montague nor Benvolio dies in the play's sources—Lady Montague's death may be explained by the necessity of using the actor who played her for another role, here, perhaps, some member of the Watch. No such explanation is extended for Benvolio, though the same reasoning may well hold true since Q1 clearly adapts the play with cast limitations in mind. That is, the deaths of Lady Montague and Benvolio in Q1 may be explained theatrically. Quarto Two, on the other hand, keeps no such concern in mind. The reasoning used to explain Lady Montague's death might well be thematic and psychological, but it is inconsistent to justify her death on theatrical grounds. Here, as in all matters of judgment on the relative quality of the "bad" and "good" quartos of *Romeo and Juliet*, two different critical standards should be used.

At the end of the play, of course, Capulet and Montague are struck with sorrow, their strife buried with the "misadventured piteous overthrows" of Romeo and Juliet. Both quartos record that each will raise a statue of the other's child. Capulet asks Montague for his hand, since he can give no part of Juliet's "jointure." Montague, however, can give Capulet "more" by raising a statue of Juliet

> in pure gold,
> That whiles Verona by that name is known,
> There shall no figure at such rate be set
> As that of true and faithful Juliet. (V.iii.297–302)

Capulet responds in kind: "As rich shall Romeo's by his lady's lie, / Poor sacrifices of our enmity!" (303–04). Quarto One, which cuts the lines in the opening Chorus referring to the burying of Capulet's and Montague's "strife," also alters Montague's words in his final speech. In Q1, he will "erect" a statue of Juliet "of pure gold: / That while Verona by that name is knowne, / There fhall no ftatue *of fuch price* be fet, / As that of Romeos loued Juliet." "Of such price" or "at fuch rate," with its suggestion of cost as opposed to esteem? Have Capulet and Montague placed anything but mercantile and monetary valuations on what is theirs? In Q1, it is by no means clear that they have learned anything from their children's "piteous overthrows."

Quarto One's use of the phrase, "of such price," may of course suggest the faulty memory of the reporter. It may also be an interpolated detail, chosen to support a particular interpretation of the play. In this sense, its use here would be

no different from the decision to use Q1's "steerage" and "saile" at the end of I.iv. It would be no different from those later editorial changes which, from Nicholas Rowe and Alexander Pope to the present, have been made on the basis of critical, performance, and interpretative values. For whatever the problems of memorial reconstruction Q1 reveals, it is a good, playable interpretation of *Romeo and Juliet*.