ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA

THE EVERYMAN SHAKESPEARE

William Shakespeare

ANTONY AND
CLEOPATRA

Edited by
JOHN F. ANDREWS

Foreword by
TONY RANDALL

EVERYMAN
J. M. DENT · LONDON
CHARLES E. TUTTLE
VERMONT

CONTENTS

NOTE ON THE AUTHOR AND EDITOR

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE is held to have been born on St George's Day, 23 April 1564. The eldest son of a prosperous glove-maker in Stratford-upon-Avon, he was probably educated at the town's grammar school.

Tradition holds that between 1585 and 1592, Shakespeare first became a schoolteacher and then set off for London. By 1595 he was a leading member of the Lord Chamberlain's Men, helping to direct their business affairs, as well as being a playwright and actor. In 1598 he became a part-owner of the company, which was the most distinguished of its age. However, he maintained his contacts with Stratford, and his family appears to have remained there.

From about 1610 he seems to have grown increasingly involved in the town's affairs, suggesting a withdrawal from London. He died on 23 April 1616, in his 53rd year, and was buried at Holy Trinity church two days later.

JOHN F. ANDREWS has recently completed a 19-volume edition, *The Guild Shakespeare*, for the Doubleday Book and Music Clubs. He is also the editor of a 3-volume reference set, *William Shakespeare: His World, His Work, His Influence*, and the former editor (1974–85) of the journal *Shakespeare Quarterly*. From 1974 to 1984, he was Director of Academic Programs at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington and Chairman of the Folger Institute. He now heads the Shakespeare Guild, which bestows the annual Sir John Gielgud Award for Excellence in the Dramatic Arts.

FOREWORD TO *Antony and Cleopatra*

David Garrick, the eighteenth-century British actor, once said, 'The drama's laws the drama's patrons make,' and so it seems. If there are rules about playwriting, they are broken so often that there seem to be no rules. How often a play that everyone admits is a poor one becomes a hit simply because it pleases anyway, or offers an actor a good, showy part. It used to be common to say of the Lunts, 'Loved them, hated the play.' One would suppose the only rule that cannot be broken or ignored is that a play must have a conflict. An exception is *The Tempest*, which has no conflict; everything happens as Prospero wills it, supernaturally.

There is one rule, however, unwritten perhaps, but taken as Gospel by everyone in commercial entertainment, that even Shakespeare could not break, which is that a play must give you someone to root for. There, I think, lies the problem with *Antony and Cleopatra* and the reason for its tepid popularity in the canon. It is a magnificent creation, superbly constructed. Its historically accurate and humanly real conflict is dramatized with a virtuoso's ease and seeming inevitability. Every scene is interesting and the variety is dazzling. It ranges in scene much more widely and daringly than any other Shakespeare play; indeed it covers the world of its time. It is most innovative in its use of short, cinematic, 'flash' scenes. It is peopled by an enormous cast from every walk of life, all real, powerful, funny, quaint, 'actual' (though Shaw thought Enobarbus 'bogus') and recognizable today. Lepidus says, deep in his cups, 'Your serpent of Egypt is bred now of your mud by the operation of your sun: so is your crocodile. . . . What manner of thing is your crocodile?' Its poetry at its best – 'I am dying, Egypt, dying' – is the best ever written. It offers its leading actors the juiciest of plums. Yet with all this, it is not a play audiences warm to and love.

xiv

xv

The reason, I think, is that Cleopatra and Antony are such loathsome people, monsters of self-gratification, greed, lust — heedlessly and without remorse sending thousands to a terrible death just to satisfy themselves. When Cleopatra dies with her handmaidens, her chief worry is that one of them will bed Antony in Paradise before she gets there. She also schemes to keep half her jewellery from Caesar. Antony calls her a whore, and it does not break our hearts as when Othello calls Desdemona a whore.

What was Shakespeare's view of these characters? What was his purpose in writing their lives? Was he glorifying them, their 'great love', their willingness to lose the world for it? Or was he dramatizing the evils of lust and drunkenness and gluttony and greed? It is almost impossible to answer, but there are clues. When Shakespeare gives beautiful poetry to a character it seems to indicate sympathy for that character. Iago has no poetry; the entire part, the longest in Shakespeare, is in prose. Lorenzo in *The Merchant of Venice* seems a bad man to us today, but he has the most beautiful poetry in the play, 'in such a night as this . . .' (Act V, Scene i), a speech that captures for everyone everywhere the first rapture of love. And in the same scene he makes Shakespeare's glorious tribute to music.

Shakespeare gives us Enobarbus' end and Eros' sacrifice to show us how Antony was loved by his soldiers, and Caesar's apostrophe to show that even his greatest enemy revered him. But I think Shakespeare fails to convince us. We will forgive anyone anything if his cause is noble, but Antony's cause is contemptible and we rarely see him behaving nobly. Mostly we see him behaving foolishly. We feel about him as we feel about anyone who, blessed with great gifts, throws them all away.

If Shakespeare meant for us to admire, love, and weep for Antony and Cleopatra, and if his audience did, then it is we who have changed. Perhaps in Elizabeth's England no one questioned the right of 'great ones' to do as they pleased. The French Revolution was yet a century and three-quarters away.

In 1947 I made my Broadway debut in Katharine Cornell's revival

of *Antony and Cleopatra*. It was a noble production. Godfrey Tearle was Antony, and Kent Smith a perfect Enobarbus. In the cast were Lenore Ulric, Maureen Stapleton, Charlton Heston, and Eli Wallach. Joseph Wiseman was an unforgettable Eunuch. The part is usually cast as a very fat man, but the director, Guthrie McClintic, knew what he was doing. Joe was as thin as a snake and he spoke in a hiss. He was made of pain and hate. When Cleopatra asked him if he indeed had sexual feelings, a lifetime of deprivation came out when he said, 'No, Madam, not in deed.'

I played Scarrus, a messenger part. He comes on cold and describes the Battle of Actium which has just occurred. Imagine a fledgling actor saying this:

SCARRUS   Gods and Goddesses,
  All the whole Synod of them!
ENOBARBUS   What's thy Passion?
SCARRUS   The greater Cantle of the World is lost
  With very Ignorance; we have kiss'd away
  Kingdoms and Provinces.
ENOBARBUS   How appears the Fight?
SCARRUS   On our side, like the token'd Pestilence,
  Where Death is sure. Yon ribaudred Nag of
  Egypt
  (Whom Leprosy o'ertake) i'th' midst o'th'
  Fight,
  When Vantage like a pair of Twins appear'd,
  Both as the same, or rather ours the Elder,
  The Breeze upon her, like a Cow in June,
  Hoists Sails and flies.
ENOBARBUS   That I beheld:
  Mine Eyes did sicken at the Sight, And could not
  Endure a further view.
SCARRUS   She once being loof'd,
  The Noble Ruin of her Magic, Antony,
  Claps on his Sea-wing, and (like a doting
  Mallard),
  Leaving the Fight in heighth, flies after her.
  I never saw an Action of such Shame:
  Experience, Manhood, Honour, ne'er before
  Did violate so it self.

xvi

Before coming on each night I worked myself up through long preparation into shaking hysteria. One night Miss Cornell suggested to me that I try not preparing.

Tony Randall

TONY RANDALL made his Broadway debut performing the role of Scarrus in *Antony and Cleopatra*. A prolific actor whose credits include E K Hornbeck in the play *Inherit the Wind* and the multi-role lead in the film *The Seven Faces of Dr Lao*, he is perhaps best-known for his television portrayal of Felix Ungar in *The Odd Couple*.

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION TO
Antony and Cleopatra

Shakespeare probably wrote *Antony and Cleopatra* in late 1606 or early 1607, shortly after he finished *Macbeth*, the fourth of what we now speak of as his 'major tragedies', and shortly before he began directing most of his efforts to the tragicomic romances with which he would gather his labours to a close between 1608 and 1613. In many ways his treatment of the consolidation of the Roman Empire can be approached as a sequel to the action represented in *Julius Caesar*. That play had appeared in 1599, not long after *Henry V*, the ninth of Shakespeare's ten 'chronicle histories' about the dynastic struggles that decimated late-medieval England, and not long before he began dramatizing the cataclysmic upheavals that would occupy his attention in *Hamlet*, *Othello*, and *King Lear*.

Considered in terms of their position in the playwright's career, the two Roman plays we know today can be said to bracket the artistic period for which he is most widely celebrated. The earlier of the pair, *Julius Caesar*, is sometimes described as the work that charts Shakespeare's ascent to his creative summit as a writer of tragedy. The later, *Antony and Cleopatra*, is often discussed as the drama that signals his transition to 'divine comedy', a new form of theatrical romance that permitted him to explore those values that enable human beings to surmount their trials and seek fulfilment in a sphere that supersedes the vicissitudes of earthly Fortune. In many ways *Julius Caesar* can be seen as an outgrowth of the English history plays, transposing to a more remote, time-honoured venue the same problems that Shakespeare had been pondering in works like *Richard II* and the two segments of *Henry IV*. By the same token *Antony and Cleopatra* can be seen as a foreshadowing of the emphasis on reunion, reconciliation, and

renewal that we've come to admire in 'late plays' like *Pericles, Cymbeline, The Winter's Tale,* and *The Tempest.*

Stylistically, *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra* seem galaxies apart. The former strikes us as clear, focused, and straightforward; it is one of the shortest of Shakespeare's plays, and the elegance of its elocution has carved many of its phrases into our collective memory. The latter, by contrast, is elusive, panoramic, and convoluted; it is one of the lengthiest of Shakespeare's works, and its figurative language is so extravagant and multifaceted that different interpretters can come away from the play with quite disparate readings of its more complex passages. *Julius Caesar* impresses us as the product of an assured craftsman who is just beginning to attain his full scope as a thinker and as a writer of historical drama. *Antony and Cleopatra* strikes us as the achievement of a more mature poet who has scaled the heights several times over and is now beginning to experiment with increasingly innovative techniques in his ongoing quest for loftier realms to survey.

For all their differences, however, *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra* have a great deal in common. They derive from the same narrative source, Sir Thomas North's 1579 English translation of Plutarch's *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans*. They pose philosophical and political questions that would have commanded the interest of Shakespeare's English contemporaries. And they concern themselves with one of the major themes of Renaissance culture: the significance and continued vitality of Europe's Graeco-Roman heritage.

Like many of his fellow artists and intellectuals, Shakespeare was deeply curious about the meaning of the classical past, and he seems to have conceived of *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra* as the central panels of a four-part meditation on 'the matter of Rome'. He had begun his interrogation of Antiquity in the early 1590s with *Titus Andronicus*, a melodrama about a mythical general in the fourth century AD whose torments the playwright portrayed as an adumbration of the collapse of Roman civilization. Yet to come in Shakespeare's corpus, prob-

ably in 1607 or 1608, was *Coriolanus*, a tragedy about a legendary warrior whose agonies in the fifth century BC proved crucial to the flowering of a nascent Republic. Between *Titus Andronicus* and *Coriolanus* came *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, the first an account of the dissolution of representative institutions through the rise and fall of Rome's most famous conqueror, the second a drama about the unification of the Empire through the decline and demise of Mark Antony and the ascendancy of Julius Caesar's nephew and adopted son Octavius.

Just how Shakespeare construed the critical period he anatomized in *Julius Caesar* (44–42 BC) and *Antony and Cleopatra* (40–30 BC) remains debatable, but we can be sure that he was conscious of different ways of looking at it. He would have known, for example, that to Romans such as Cato, Cicero, and Lucan, who brought a republican perspective to the developments that came to a boil on the Ides of March in 44 BC, Julius Caesar was a despot whose disregard of civil liberties had made his assassination imperative. He would also have known that a number of Renaissance literati, among them such distinguished coevals of his as Sir Philip Sidney and Ben Jonson, shared this anti-authoritarian bias against the martial genius who'd crossed the Rubicon and ensconced himself in the Capitol as dictator.

Meanwhile, Shakespeare would probably have been even more acutely aware that the narrator on whom he drew as his principal guide to a pivotal era, a Greek who'd lived in Rome during the most decadent years of the Empire, portrayed Caesar as a *de facto* monarch who had brought a season of respite to a society ravaged by more than a century of civil discord. According to Plutarch of Charonea (AD 46–120), Caesar was an exemplary leader who'd wielded power justly and responsibly and whose one fault, a vanity that made him wish to be crowned king, was a small price to pay for the supervision he provided for a body politic in desperate need of a head. Plutarch's take on the topic was the one favoured by imperial historians such as Livy and Suetonius and by medieval poets such as Chaucer and Dante (who had placed Brutus and Cassius alongside Judas in the bleakest depths of the

Inferno), and Shakespeare would also have found it reflected, implicitly if not explicitly, in many of the official proclamations of a Tudor establishment committed to the maintenance of social and political harmony in the England of his own day. Through exhortations such as the 'Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion', Elizabethans were regularly reminded that monarchy was the only form of government that could ensure domestic tranquillity. What the Apostle Paul referred to as 'the powers that be' were to be revered as ministers authorized by God (Romans 13:1) to shield their people from all the perils of internecine conflict. To rebel against the existing order, then, was to risk a return to the kind of anarchy that had ripped the nation asunder during the fifteenth-century Wars of the Roses, a hall of horrors that Shakespeare had himself depicted in three English history plays on the troubled reign of Henry VI and a fourth drama on the bloody tyranny of Richard III.

In addition to what he found in sources that would have informed his views on the political issues involved in 'the matter of Rome', Shakespeare would also have known a broad range of other literature that addressed the subject in ethical or theological terms. Like all his educated contemporaries, he would have been well versed in Virgil's *Aeneid* (19 BC), a touching and powerful epic about the founding of what would become the Roman *imperium*. He would have been familiar with the critique of Roman Stoicism in Book XIV of St Augustine's *City of God* (AD 426), where the adherents of Rome's most prestigious school of thought are said to be so cold, and so prone to 'ungodly pride', that they are virtually indistinguishable from the self-righteous Pharisees of the Gospels. And he would have had more than a passing acquaintance with previous renderings of the love story that would take centre stage in *Antony and Cleopatra*, among them the relevant tales in Boccaccio's *De Casibus Virorum et Feminarum Illustrium* ('Of the Falls of Illustrious Men and Women', written between 1353 and 1373) and John Lydgate's *Fall of Princes* (1431–38), and the pertinent scenes from Robert Garnier's *Marc Antoine* (1578, translated from French into

English in 1592 by Mary Herbert, Countess of Pembroke) and Samuel Daniel's *Cleopatra* (1594, revised in 1599, and revised a second time in 1607, probably in response to Shakespeare's own tragedy about the lovers).

Meanwhile the playwright would have known the traditional Christian doctrine that the Pax Romana, the 'Universal Peace' that had arrived with Caesar Augustus (as we hear Octavius himself predict in IV.vi.4 of *Antony and Cleopatra*), was an epoch providentially ordained to afford a suitable setting for the advent of another 'Prince of Peace' (Isaiah 9:6). What this meant, in the language of the title-page to a 1578 English edition of Appian's *Civil Wars*, was that the events that led to the Age of Augustus could be discerned in golden hindsight as a 'prophane Tragedie, whereof flowed our diuine Comoedie.' In other words, a sequence that meant one thing to a pre-Christian Roman such as Brutus, Antony, or Octavius could have a radically different import to a later era accustomed to explaining all human history in the light of a divine plan in which even God's enemies were constrained to play a role in fulfilling his designs.

There are in fact biblical echoes in both plays that hint at the cosmic irony this Christian vantage on pagan Antiquity would seem to imply. And it may well be that that angle of vision accounts in part for the phenomenon Tony Randall remarks upon in his delightful and provocative foreword to this volume. For if in some fundamental sense even 'the Noblest Roman of them all' (*Julius Caesar*, V.v.67) is limited by the mere fact that he *is* what the Prince of Denmark's friend Horatio calls 'an antique Roman' (*Hamlet*, V.ii.353), there may be sound reasons for an audience's sense that plays like *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra* provide us, in Randall's words, with no one 'to root for'.

In both tragedies we find ourselves in the presence of grandiose personalities whose behaviour dismays or distresses us. In *Julius Caesar*, for example, we invest a great deal of emotion in Brutus, a man who seems to be unanimously applauded for his virtues, and a man whose lineage can be traced to an ancestor (the legendary Lucius Junius Brutus) who expelled kingship from Rome and

inaugurated the Republic in 509 BC. At a time when survival of the kind of consular government initiated by his forebear appears to be in grave jeopardy, Marcus Junius Brutus is naturally the statesman to whom his concerned compatriots turn for another deliverance. We watch him deliberate over his decision to join a conspiracy that goes against his gentler nature. We observe the scruples he insists upon in his desire to sanctify a deed that must inevitably appear brutal. We approve the integrity with which he seeks to keep his cause pure: free of self-serving motives, free of unnecessary bloodshed, free of demagoguery, free of corruption. We respond to the solicitude he shows his page Lucius. And we see the loyalty he inspires in his comrades and in his courageous wife Portia. At the same time, however, we can't help noticing that Shakespeare's Brutus is a man who often comes across as deficient in feeling, a man who must always have his own way even though he invariably turns out to be wrong, and a man who seems incapable of imagining that he is subject to error. What we find, in short, is a person whose high-minded 'constancy' seems remarkably similar to that of a would-be king whose arrogance blinds him to the fact that, for all the sway he has over others, he is yet 'but a Man'.

Because we keep hearing about Brutus' moral and political stature, our normal proclivity is to assume that in some fundamental sense he really must be the paragon that Mark Antony eulogizes at the end of the play. If, however, we find it difficult to square our perceptions of Brutus with the praise that even his erstwhile adversaries bestow upon him, before we conclude that the fault is in ourselves we should consider the possibility that Shakespeare *wants* us to feel puzzled and uneasy – that an important element of his strategy as a dramatist, indeed, is to make his audience uncomfortable with discrepancies between what a character like Brutus says about himself, or has said about him, and what his thoughts and actions reveal him to be in actuality.

The kind of disappointment we are likely to feel about Brutus, and in different ways about Shakespeare's other Romans, is the

discontent that issues, quite literally, from disillusionment – from our discovery that someone we want to 'root for', a person who appears to be endowed with almost superhuman attributes, is fatally lacking in some quality essential to his or her full realization of a vast potential for good. In Shakespearean tragedy, the defect that vitiates a protagonist's gifts is usually a lapse in self-knowledge (which results in impaired judgement) or a lapse in self-control (which results in perverted will-power) or both. Frequently a failure of reason causes or is accompanied by a breakdown of will; just as often a failure of will (such as a habitual surrender to the inclinations of the flesh) either leads to or is associated with a breakdown of reason. In either situation, the key to a play's effect – to the fulfilment of its 'purpose', as one of Shakespeare's most rigorous drama critics would put it (*Hamlet*, III.ii.19–29) – lies in a judicious audience's ability to respond intelligently and sensitively to all the clues the playwright provides about his characters, and on that basis to perceive any flaws or follies in even the most elevated and engaging of them.

The personages we encounter in *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra* occupy a setting and live in an era that has a great deal of bearing on who they are, how they picture themselves, and what they do. As they note on numerous occasions, the stage they march across is pregnant with consequence, and what is at stake upon it is not just Rome, and not just the Roman Empire; no, for them, and for us as we participate vicariously in their pursuit of the destinies that await them, it is nothing less than what one of Octavius' contemporaries would later refer to as 'the whole world' (Matthew 16:26).

As Brutus observes in one of many such images in these two Roman plays, 'There is a Tide in the affairs of Men' (*Julius Caesar*, IV.iii.220), and the navigator who can crest it to success will enjoy all the benefits of 'Fortune'. Brutus thinks it possible to master that 'Tide,' but subsequent mishaps prove Cassius to be a better judge of its ebb and flow. Later, prompted by Cleopatra, Mark Antony entrusts his expedition to the tide in a less figurative sense; because of his susceptibility to the caprices of his Siren-like

Queen, however, he too founders (see *Antony and Cleopatra*, III.vii–xi). Along the way, like Pompey the Great, who had been overwhelmed by Julius Caesar, a younger and more maritime Pompey falls victim to the earlier Triumvir's even wilier namesake. Meanwhile, in a footnote to the lead story, as might have been forecast, the ineffectual Lepidus fails to regain his land legs after the poor, drunken 'Third part o' the World' is carted ashore from Pompey's galley in II.vii.

What prevails, then, is 'the Spirit of Caesar' (*Julius Caesar*, II.i.165), a spectre that hovers over the last half of the play that bears the first Caesar's name, and one that then becomes embodied anew in the brash youth who methodically dispatches his more senior competitors in *Antony and Cleopatra*.

Near the end of the latter tragedy, as she weighs the meagre options that remain to her after the defeat and death of Antony, Cleopatra says that ' 'Tis paltry to be Caesar: / Not being Fortune, he's but Fortune's Knave' (V.ii.2–3). In these words we hear what might be dismissed as the self-consoling rationalizations of a loser, here a queen who's been compared to a serpent and to a Circean enchantress. There can be little doubt that the Cleopatra Shakespeare gives us is a bewitching, headstrong Dido who has 'unqualited' (III.xi.43) a latter-day Aeneas and made him defenceless against the 'Fullest Man' (III.xiii.85) of the epoch. But that is not all she is, and one of the things we should register in her comment about the emperor who has outwitted her lover is a truth that would have been apparent to the audiences for whom Shakespeare wrote his Roman plays: that the same tide which is now at the flood will eventually recede, taking with it both Caesar and the Empire that he and his minions have so painstakingly moulded out of the 'Clay' (I.i.35) of which mortal kingdoms are composed.

The ruler who enters to consummate his victory at the conclusion of *Antony and Cleopatra* is almost as puffed up with 'Glory' (V.ii.359) as was a previous Caesar who likened himself to 'Olympus' (*Julius Caesar*, III.ii.75) at what he mistakenly believed to be the apogee of his supremacy. There is no suggestion that

Octavius' stay at the top will be as short-lived as that of his predecessor. But in wry, subtle ways the playwright makes it evident to those who serve and observe the new emperor that even so august a Caesar as he has now become is neither omniscient nor omnipotent.

Whether the 'Immortal Longings' (V.ii.279) that have culminated Cleopatra's part in the drama a few moments prior to Octavius' final entry will yield her an eternity in the embrace of the paramour she calls 'the Crown o'th' Earth' (IV.xv.63) – and, if so, what kind of eternity – is a question the play leaves unresolved. The only thing we can assert with certainty is that the grandiloquence of the Queen's exit has assured her 'Greatness' (V.ii.218) an unending succession of apotheoses in the theatre. Like the poetry she speaks, and the rapture her 'Solemn Shew' (V.ii.363) evokes in those she charms (even Octavius is moved to 'Pity' by his last sight of her), Cleopatra's unbowed majesty guarantees that witnesses to her climactic pageant will ever award the palm, not to Rome, but to an 'Egypt' (IV.xv.41) who refuses to render unto Caesar anything beyond the 'Baser Life' (V.ii.290) the 'universal Landlord' (III.xiii.70) has already appropriated to his own uses.

John F. Andrews, 1993

THE TEXT OF THE EVERYMAN SHAKESPEARE

Background

THE EARLY PRINTINGS OF SHAKESPEARE'S WORKS

Many of us enjoy our first encounter with Shakespeare when we're introduced to *Julius Caesar* or *Macbeth* at school. It may therefore surprise us that neither of these tragedies could ever have been read, let alone studied, by most of the playwright's contemporaries. They began as scripts for performance and, along with seventeen other titles that never saw print during Shakespeare's lifetime, they made their inaugural appearance as 'literary' works seven years after his death, in the 1623 collection we know today as the First Folio.

The Folio contained thirty-six titles in all. Of these, half had been issued previously in the small paperbacks we now refer to as quartos.* Like several of the plays first published in the Folio, the most trustworthy of the quarto printings appear to have been set either from Shakespeare's own manuscripts or from faithful copies of them. It's not impossible that the poet himself prepared some of these works for the press, and it's intriguing to imagine him reviewing proof-pages as the words he'd written for actors to speak and embody were being transposed into the type that readers would filter through their eyes, minds, and imaginations. But, alas, there's no indisputable evidence that Shakespeare had any direct involvement with the publication of these early editions of his plays.

What about the scripts that achieved print for the first time in

---

* Quartos derived their name from the four-leaf units of which these small books were comprised: large sheets of paper that had been folded twice after printing to yield four leaves, or eight pages. Folios, volumes with twice the page-size of quartos, were put together from two-leaf units: sheets that had been folded once after printing to yield four pages.

the Folio? Had the dramatist taken any steps to give the permanency of book form to those texts? We don't know. All we can say is that when he fell fatally ill in 1616, Shakespeare was denied any opportunities he might otherwise have taken to ensure that his 'insubstantial Pageants' survived the mortal who was now slipping into the 'dark Backward and Abysm of Time'.

Fortunately, two of the playwright's colleagues felt an obligation, as they put it, 'to procure his Orphans Guardians'. Sometime after his death John Heminge (or Heminges) and Henry Condell made arrangements to preserve Shakespeare's theatrical compositions in a manner that would keep them vibrant for all time. They dedicated their endeavour to two noblemen who had helped see England's foremost acting company through some of its most trying vicissitudes. They solicited several poetic tributes for the volume, among them a now-famous eulogy by fellow writer Ben Jonson. They commissioned an engraved portrait of Shakespeare to adorn the frontispiece. And they did their utmost to display the author's dramatic works in a style that would both dignify them and make them accessible to 'the great Variety of Readers'.

As they prepared Shakespeare's plays for the compositors who would set them into stately Folio columns, Heminge and Condell (or editors designated to carry out their wishes) revised and augmented many of the entrances, exits, and other stage directions in the manuscripts. They divided most of the works into acts and scenes.* For a number of plays they appended 'Names of the Actors', or casts of characters. Meanwhile they made every effort to guarantee that the Folio printers had reliable copy-texts for each of the titles: authoritative manuscripts for the plays that had not been published previously, and good quarto printings (annotated in some instances to insert staging details, mark script changes, and add supplementary material) for the ones that had been issued prior to the Folio. For several titles they supplied texts

---

* The early quartos, reflecting the unbroken sequence that probably typified Elizabethan and Jacobean performances of the plays, had been printed without the structural demarcations usual in Renaissance editions of classical drama.

that were substantially different from, if not always demonstrably superior to, the quarto versions that preceded them.

Like even the most accurate of the printings that preceded it, the Folio collection was flawed by minor blemishes. But it more than fulfilled the purpose of its generous-minded compilers: 'to keep the memory of so worthy a Friend and Fellow alive as was our Shakespeare'. In the process it provided a publishing model that remains instructive today.

MODERN EDITIONS OF THE PLAYS AND POEMS

When we compare the First Folio and its predecessors with the usual modern edition of Shakespeare's works, we're more apt to be impressed by the differences than by the similarities. Today's texts of Renaissance drama are normally produced in conformity with twentieth-century standards of punctuation and usage; as a consequence they look more neat, clean, and, to our eyes, 'right' than do the original printings. Thanks to an editorial tradition that extends back to the early eighteenth century, most of the rough spots in the early printings of Shakespeare have long been smoothed away. Textual scholars have ferreted out redundancies and eradicated inconsistencies. They've mended what they've perceived to be errors and oversights in the playscripts, and they've systematically attended to what they've construed as misreadings by the copyists and compositors who transmitted those playscripts to posterity. They've added '[Within]' brackets and other theatrical notations. They've revised stage directions they've judged incomplete or inadequate in the initial printings. They've regularized disparities in the speech headings. They've gone back to the playwright's sources and reinstated the proper forms for many of the character and place names which a presumably hasty or inattentive author got 'wrong' as he conferred identities on his dramatis personae and stage locales. They've replaced obsolete words like *bankrout* with their modern heirs (in this case *bankrupt*). And in a multitude of other ways they've accommodated Shakespeare to the tastes, interests, and expectations of latter-day readers.

The results, on the whole, have been splendid. But interpreting the artistic designs of a complex writer is always problematical, and the task is especially challenging when that writer happens to have been a poet who felt unconstrained by many of the 'rules' that more conventional dramatists respected. The undertaking becomes further complicated when new rules, and new criteria of linguistic and social correctness, are imposed by subsequent generations of artists and critics.

To some degree in his own era, but even more in the neoclassical period (1660–1800) that came in its wake, Shakespeare's most ardent admirers thought it necessary to apologize for what Ben Jonson hinted at in his allusion to the 'small Latin, and less Greek' of an untutored prodigy. To be sure, the 'sweet Swan of Avon' sustained his popularity; in fact his reputation rose so steadily that by the end of the eighteenth century he'd eclipsed Jonson and his other peers and become the object of universal Bardolatry. But in the theatre most of his plays were being adapted in ways that were deemed advisable to tame their supposed wildness and bring them into conformity with the decorum of a society that took pride in its refinement. As one might expect, some of the attitudes that induced theatre proprietors to metamorphose an unpolished poet from the provinces into something closer to an urbane man of letters also influenced Shakespeare's editors. Persuaded that the dramatist's works were marred by crudities that needed expunging, they applied their ministrations to the canon with painstaking diligence.

Twentieth-century editors have moved away from many of the presuppositions that guided a succession of earlier improvers. But a glance at the textual apparatus accompanying virtually any modern publication of the plays and poems will show that emendations and editorial procedures deriving from such forebears as the sets published by Nicholas Rowe (1709), Alexander Pope (1723–5, 1728), Lewis Theobald (1733, 1740, 1757), Thomas Hanmer (1743–5, 1770–1), Samuel Johnson (1765), Edward Capell (1768), George Steevens (1773), and Edmond Malone (1790) retain a strong hold on today's renderings of the

playwright's works. The consequence is a 'Shakespeare' who offers the tidiness we've come to expect in our libraries of treasured authors, but not necessarily the playwright a 1599 reader of the Second Quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* would still be able to recognize as a contemporary.

OLD LIGHT ON THE TOPIC

Over the last two decades we've learned from art curators that paintings by Old Masters such as Michelangelo and Rembrandt look a lot brighter when centuries of grime are removed from their surfaces – when hues that had become dulled with soot and other extraneous matter are allowed to radiate again with something approximating their pristine luminosity. We've learned from conductors like Christopher Hogwood that there are aesthetic rewards to be gained from a return to the scorings and instruments with which Renaissance and Baroque musical compositions were first presented. We've learned from twentieth-century experiments in the performance of Shakespeare's plays that an open, multi-level stage, analogous to that on which the scripts were originally enacted, does more justice to their dramaturgical techniques than does a proscenium auditorium devised for works that came later in the development of Western theatre. We've learned from archaeological excavations in London's Bankside area that the foundations of playhouses such as the Rose and the Globe look rather different from what many historians had previously expected. And we're now learning from a close scrutiny of Shakespeare's texts that they too look different, and function differently, when we accept them for what they are and resist the impulse to 'normalize' features that strike us initially as quirky, unkempt, or unsophisticated.

The Aims that Guide the Everyman *Text*

Like other modern editions of the dramatist's plays and poems, The Everyman Shakespeare owes an incalculable debt to the

scholarship that has led to so many excellent renderings of the author's works. But in an attempt to draw fresh inspiration from the spirit that animated those remarkable achievements at the outset, the Everyman edition departs in a number of respects from the usual post-Folio approach to the presentation of Shakespeare's texts.

RESTORING SOME OF THE NUANCES OF RENAISSANCE PUNCTUATION

In its punctuation, Everyman attempts to give equal emphasis to sound and sense. In places where Renaissance practice calls for heavier punctuation than we'd normally employ – to mark the caesural pause in the middle of a line of verse, for instance – Everyman sometimes retains commas that other modern editions omit. Meanwhile, in places where current practice usually calls for the inclusion of commas – after vocative and interjections such as 'O' and 'alas', say, or before 'Madam' or 'Sir' in phrases such as 'Ay Madam' or 'Yes Sir' – Everyman follows the original printings and omits them.

Occasionally the absence of a comma has a significant bearing on what an expression means, or can mean. At one point in *Othello*, for example, Iago tells the Moor 'Marry patience' (IV.i.90). Inserting a comma after 'Marry', as most of today's editions do, limits Iago's utterance to one that says 'Come now, have patience.' Leaving the clause as it stands in the Folio, the way the Everyman text does, permits Iago's words to have the additional, agonizingly ironic sense 'Be wed to Patience.'

The early texts generally deploy exclamation points quite sparingly, and the Everyman text follows suit. Everyman also follows the early editions, more often than not, when they use question marks in places that seem unusual by current standards: at the ends of what we'd normally treat as exclamations, for example, or at the ends of interrogative clauses in sentences that we'd ordinarily denote as questions in their entirety.

The early texts make no orthographic distinction between

simple plurals and either singular or plural possessives, and there are times when the context doesn't indicate whether a word spelled *Sisters*, say, should be rendered *Sisters*, *Sisters'*, or *Sister's* in today's usage. In such situations the Everyman edition prints the word in the form modern usage prescribes for plurals.

REVIVING SOME OF THE FLEXIBILITY OF RENAISSANCE SPELLING

Spelling had not become standardized by Shakespeare's time, and that meant that many words could take a variety of forms. Like James Joyce and some of the other innovative prose and verse stylists of our own century, Shakespeare revelled in the freedom a largely unanchored language provided, and with that in mind Everyman retains original spelling forms (or adaptations of those forms that preserve their key distinctions from modern spellings) whenever there is any reason to suspect that they might have a bearing on how a word was intended to be pronounced or on what it meant, or could have meant, in the playwright's day. When there is any likelihood that multiple forms of the same word could be significant, moreover, the Everyman text mirrors the diversity to be found in the original printings.

In many cases this practice affects the personalities of Shakespeare's characters. One of the heroine's most familiar questions in *Romeo and Juliet* is 'What's in a Name?' For two and a half centuries readers – and as a consequence actors, directors, theatre audiences, and commentators – have been led to believe that Juliet was addressing this query to a Romeo named 'Montague'. In fact 'Montague' *was* the name Shakespeare found in his principal source for the play. For reasons that will become apparent to anyone who examines the tragedy in detail, however, the playwright changes his protagonist's surname to 'Montague', a word that plays on both 'mount' and 'ague' (fever). Setting aside an editorial practice that began with Lewis Theobald in the middle of the eighteenth century, Everyman resurrects the name the dramatist himself gave Juliet's lover.

Readers of *The Merchant of Venice* in the Everyman set will be amused to learn that the character modern editions usually identify as 'Lancelot' is in reality 'Launcelet', a name that calls attention to the clown's lusty 'little lance'. Like Costard in *Love's Labour's Lost*, another stage bumpkin who was probably played by the actor Will Kemp, Launcelet is an upright 'Member of the Commonwealth'; we eventually learn that he's left a pliant wench 'with Child'.

Readers of *Hamlet* will find that 'Fortinbras' (as the name of the Prince's Norwegian opposite is rendered in the First Folio and in most modern editions) appears in the earlier, authoritative 1604 Second Quarto of the play as 'Fortinbrasse'. In the opening scene of that text a surname that meant 'strong in arms' in French is introduced to the accompaniment of puns on *brazen*, in the phrase 'brazon Cannon', and on *metal*, in the phrase 'unimprooued mettle'. In the same play readers of the Everyman text will encounter 'Ostricke', the ostrich-like courtier who invites the Prince of Denmark to participate in the fateful fencing match that draws *Hamlet* to a close. Only in its final entrance direction for the obsequious fop does the Second Quarto call this character 'Osrick', the name he bears in all the Folio text's references to him and in most modern editions of Shakespeare's most popular tragedy.

Readers of the Everyman *Macbeth* will discover that the fabled 'Weird Sisters' appear only as the 'weyward' or 'weyard' Sisters. Shakespeare and his contemporaries knew that in his *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* Raphael Holinshed had used the term 'weird sisters' to describe the witches who accost Macbeth and Banquo on the heath; but because he wished to play on *wayward*, the playwright changed their name to *weyward*. Like Samuel Johnson, who thought punning vulgar and lamented Shakespeare's proclivity to seduction by this 'fatal Cleopatra', Lewis Theobald saw no reason to retain the playwright's weyward spelling of the witches' name. He thus restored the 'correct' form from Holinshed, and editors ever since have generally done likewise.

In many instances Renaissance English had a single spelling for what we now define as two separate words. For example, *humane* combined the senses of 'human' and 'humane' in modern English. In the First Folio printing of *Macbeth* the protagonist's wife expresses a concern that her husband is 'too full o'th' Milke of humane kindnesse'. As she phrases it, *humane kindnesse* can mean several things, among them 'humankind-ness', 'human kindness', and 'humane kindness'. It is thus a reminder that to be true to his or her own 'kind' a human being must be 'kind' in the sense we now attach to 'humane'. To disregard this logic, as the protagonist and his wife will soon prove, is to disregard a principle as basic to the cosmos as the laws of gravity.

In a way that parallels *humane*, bad could mean either 'bad' or 'bade', *borne* either 'born' or 'borne', *ere* either 'ere' (before) or 'e'er' (ever), *least* either 'least' or 'lest', *lye* either 'lie' or 'lye', *nere* either 'ne'er' or 'near' (though the usual spellings for the latter were *neare* or *neere*), *powre* either 'pour' or 'power', *then* either 'than' or 'then', and *tide* either 'tide' or 'tied'.

There are a number of word-forms that functioned in Renaissance English as interchangeable doublets. *Travail* could mean 'travel', for example, and *travel* could mean 'travail'. By the same token, *deer* could mean *dear* and vice versa, *dew* could mean *due*, *hart* could mean *heart*, and (as we've already noted) *mettle* could mean *metal*.

A particularly interesting instance of the equivocal or double meanings some word-forms had in Shakespeare's time is *loose*, which can often become either 'loose' or 'lose' when we render it in modern English. In *The Comedy of Errors* when Antipholus of Syracuse compares himself to 'a Drop / Of Water that in the Ocean seeks another Drop' and then says he will 'loose' himself in quest of his long-lost twin, he means both (a) that he will release himself into a vast unknown, and (b) that he will lose his own identity, if necessary, to be reunited with the brother for whom he searches. On the other hand, in *Hamlet* when Polonius says he'll 'loose' his daughter to the Prince, he little suspects that by so doing he will also lose his daughter.

In some cases the playwright employs word-forms that can be translated into words we wouldn't think of as related today: *sowre*, for instance, which can mean 'sour', 'sower', or 'sore', depending on the context. In other cases he uses forms that do have modern counterparts, but not counterparts with the same potential for multiple connotation. For example, *onely* usually means 'only' in the modern sense; but occasionally Shakespeare gives it a figurative, adverbial twist that would require a nonce word such as 'one-ly' to replicate in current English.

In a few cases Shakespeare employs word-forms that have only seeming equivalents in modern usage. For example, *abhominable*, which meant 'inhuman' (derived, however incorrectly, from *ab*, 'away from', and *homine*, 'man') to the poet and his contemporaries, is not the same word as our *abominable* (ill-omened, abhorrent). In his advice to the visiting players Hamlet complains about incompetent actors who imitate 'Humanity so abhominably' as to make the characters they depict seem unrecognizable as men. Modern readers who don't realize the distinction between Shakespeare's word and our own, and who see *abominable* on the page before them, don't register the full import of the Prince's satire.

Modern English treats as single words a number of word-forms that were normally spelled as two words in Shakespeare's time. What we render as *myself*, for example, and use primarily as a reflexive or intensifying pronoun, is almost invariably spelled *my self* in Shakespeare's works; so also with *her self*, *thy self*, *your self*, and *it self* (where *it* functions as *its* does today). Often there is no discernible difference between Shakespeare's usage and our own. At other times there is, however, as we are reminded when we come across a phrase such as 'our innocent self' in *Macbeth* and think how strained it would sound in modern parlance, or as we observe when we note how naturally the self is objectified in the balanced clauses of the Balcony Scene in *Romeo and Juliet*:

> Romeo, doffe thy name,
> And for thy name, which is no part of thee,
> Take all my selfe.

Yet another difference between Renaissance orthography and our own can be exemplified with words such as *today*, *tonight*, and *tomorrow*, which (unlike *yesterday*) were treated as two words in Shakespeare's time. In *Macbeth* when the Folio prints 'Duncan comes here to Night', the unattached *to* can function either as a preposition (with *Night* as its object, or in this case its destination) or as the first part of an infinitive (with *Night* operating figuratively as a verb). Consider the ambiguity a Renaissance reader would have detected in the original publication of one of the most celebrated soliloquies in all of Shakespeare:

> To morrow, and to morrow, and to morrow,
> Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
> To the last Syllable of Recorded time:
> And all our yesterdayes, have lighted Fooles
> The way to dusty death.

Here, by implication, the route 'to morrow' is identical with 'the way to dusty death', a relationship we miss if we don't know that for Macbeth, and for the audiences who first heard these lines spoken, *to morrow* was not a single word but a potentially equivocal two-word phrase.

RECAPTURING THE ABILITY TO HEAR WITH OUR EYES

When we fail to recall that Shakespeare's scripts were designed initially to provide words for people to hear in the theatre, we sometimes overlook a fact that is fundamental to the artistic structure of a work like *Macbeth*: that the messages a sequence of sounds convey through the ear are, if anything, even more significant than the messages a sequence of letters, punctuation marks, and white spaces on a printed page transmit through the eye. A telling illustration of this point, and of the potential for ambiguous or multiple implication in any Shakespearean script, may be found in the dethronement scene of *Richard II*. When Henry Bullingbrook asks the King if he is ready to resign his

crown, Richard replies 'I, no no I; for I must nothing be.' Here the punctuation in the 1608 Fourth Quarto (the earliest text to print this richly complex passage) permits each *I* to signify either 'ay' or 'I' (*I* being the usual spelling for 'ay' in Shakespeare's time). Understanding *I* to mean 'I' permits additional play on *no*, which can be heard (at least in its first occurrence) as 'know'. Meanwhile the second and third soundings of *I*, if not the first, can also be heard as 'eye'. In the context in which this line occurs, that sense echoes a thematically pertinent passage from Matthew 18:9: 'if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out'.

But these are not all the implications *I* can have here. It can also represent the Roman numeral for '1', which will soon be reduced, as Richard notes, to 'nothing' (0), along with the speaker's title, his worldly possessions, his manhood, and eventually his life. In Shakespeare's time, to become 'nothing' was, *inter alia*, to be emasculated, to be made a 'weaker vessel' (1 Peter 3:7) with 'no thing'. As the Fool in *King Lear* reminds another monarch who has abdicated his throne, a man in want of an 'I' is impotent, 'an O without a Figure' (I.iv.207). In addition to its other dimensions, then, Richard's reply is a statement that can be formulated mathematically, and in symbols that anticipate the binary system behind today's computer technology: '1, 0, 0, 1, for 1 must 0 be.'

Modern editions usually render Richard's line 'Ay, no; no, ay; for I must nothing be'. Presenting the line in that fashion makes good sense of what Richard is saying. But as we've seen, it doesn't make total sense of it, and it doesn't call attention to Richard's paradoxes in the same way that hearing or seeing three undifferentiated *I*'s is likely to have done for Shakespeare's contemporaries. Their culture was more attuned than ours is to the oral and aural dimensions of language, and if we want to appreciate the special qualities of their dramatic art we need to train ourselves to 'hear' the word-forms we see on the page. We must learn to recognize that for many of what we tend to think of as fixed linkages between sound and meaning (the vowel 'I', say, and the word 'eye'), there were alternative linkages (such as the vowel 'I' and the words 'I' and 'Ay') that could be just as pertinent to what

the playwright was communicating through the ears of his theatre patrons at a given moment. As the word *audience* itself may help us to remember, people in Shakespeare's time normally spoke of 'hearing' rather than 'seeing' a play.

In its text of *Richard II*, the Everyman edition reproduces the title character's line as it appears in the early printings of the tragedy. Ideally the orthographic oddity of the repeated *I*'s will encourage today's readers to ponder Richard's utterance, and the play it epitomizes, as a characteristically Shakespearean enigma.

OTHER ASPECTS OF THE EVERYMAN TEXT

Now for a few words about other features of the Everyman text.

One of the first things readers will notice about this edition is its bountiful use of capitalized words. In this practice as in others, the Everyman exemplar is the First Folio, and especially the works in the Folio sections billed as 'Histories' and 'Tragedies'.* Everyman makes no attempt to adhere to the Folio printings with literal exactitude. In some instances the Folio capitalizes words that the Everyman text of the same passage lowercases; in other instances Everyman capitalizes words not uppercased in the Folio. The objective is merely to suggest something of the flavour, and what appears to have been the rationale, of Renaissance capitalization, in the hope that today's audiences will be made continually aware that the works they're contemplating derive from an earlier epoch.

Readers will also notice that instead of cluttering the text with stage directions such as '[Aside]' or '[To Rosse]', the Everyman text employs unobtrusive dashes to indicate shifts in mode of address. In an effort to keep the page relatively clear of words not

---

* The quarto printings employ far fewer capital letters than does the Folio. Capitalization seems to have been regarded as a means of recognizing the status ascribed to certain words (*Noble*, for example, is almost always capitalized), titles (not only King, Queen, Duke, and Duchess, but Sir and Madam), genres (tragedies were regarded as more 'serious' than comedies in more than one sense), and forms of publication (quartos, being associated with ephemera such as 'plays', were not thought to be as 'grave' as the folios that bestowed immortality on 'works', writings that, in the words of Ben Jonson's eulogy to Shakespeare, were 'not of an age, but for all time').

supplied by the original printings, Everyman also exercises restraint in its addition of editor-generated stage directions. Where the dialogue makes it obvious that a significant action occurs, the Everyman text inserts a square-bracketed phrase such as '[Fleance escapes]'. Where what the dialogue implies is subject to differing interpretations, however, the Everyman text provides a facing-page note to discuss the most plausible inferences.

Like other modern editions, the Everyman text combines into 'shared' verse lines (lines divided among two or more speakers) many of the part-lines to be found in the early publications of the plays. One exception to the usual modern procedure is that Everyman indents some lines that are not components of shared verses. At times, for example, the opening line of a scene stops short of the metrical norm, a pentameter (five-foot) or hexameter (six-foot) line comprised predominantly of iambic units (unstressed syllables followed by stressed ones). In such cases Everyman uses indentation as a reminder that scenes can begin as well as end in mid-line (an extension of the ancient convention that an epic commences *in medias res*, 'in the midst of the action'). Everyman also uses indentation to reflect what appear to be pauses in the dialogue, either to allow other activity to transpire (as happens in *Macbeth*, II.iii.87, when a brief line 'What's the Business?' follows a Folio stage direction that reads '*Bell rings. Enter Lady*') or to permit a character to hesitate for a moment of reflection (as happens a few seconds later in the same scene when Macduff responds to a demand to 'Speak, speak' with the reply 'O gentle Lady, / 'Tis not for you to hear what I can speak').

Everyman preserves many of the anomalies in the early texts. Among other things, this practice pertains to the way characters are depicted. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, for example, the ruler of Athens is usually identified in speech headings and stage directions as 'Theseus', but sometimes he is referred to by his title as 'Duke'. In the same play Oberon's merry sprite goes by two different names: 'Puck' and 'Robin Goodfellow'.

Readers of the Everyman edition will sometimes discover that characters they've known, or known about, for years don't

appear in the original printings. When they open the pages of the Everyman *Macbeth*, for example, they'll learn that Shakespeare's audiences were unaware of any woman with the title 'Lady Macbeth'. In the only authoritative text we have of the Scottish tragedy, the protagonist's spouse goes by such names as 'Macbeth's Lady', 'Macbeth's Wife', or simply 'Lady', but at no time is she listed or mentioned as 'Lady Macbeth'. The same is true of the character usually designated 'Lady Capulet' in modern editions of *Romeo and Juliet*. 'Capulet's Wife' makes appearances as 'Mother', 'Old Lady', 'Lady', or simply 'Wife'; but she's never termed 'Lady Capulet', and her husband never treats her with the dignity such a title would connote.

Rather than 'correct' the grammar in Shakespeare's works to eliminate what modern usage would categorize as solecisms (as when Mercutio says 'my Wits faints' in *Romeo and Juliet*), the Everyman text leaves it intact. Among other things, this principle applies to instances in which archaic forms preserve idioms that differ slightly from related modern expressions (as in the clause 'you are too blame', where 'too' frequently functions as an adverb and 'blame' is used, not as a verb, but as an adjective roughly equivalent to 'blameworthy').

Finally, and most importantly, the Everyman edition leaves unchanged any reading in the original text that is not manifestly erroneous. Unlike other modern renderings of Shakespeare's works, Everyman substitutes emendations only when obvious problems can be dealt with by obvious solutions.

The Everyman *Text of* Antony and Cleopatra

The only authoritative text of *Antony and Cleopatra* is the one to be found in the 1623 First Folio. From all indications the copy for the Folio printing was Shakespeare's manuscript, probably a clean but not completely polished draft that preceded the theatre company's preparation of a promptbook for performances of the tragedy.

Unlike many of the works that made their initial appearance in

the Folio, the first publication of *Antony and Cleopatra* contains no act and scene demarcations. In this respect it resembles the quarto plays issued during Shakespeare's own lifetime.* The dramatic segments incorporated in the Everyman text are the ones that have been conventional since the middle of the nineteenth century; they correspond to the act and scene divisions in virtually all modern editions of the play.

In a way that sets it apart from most of today's renderings of *Antony and Cleopatra*, however, the Everyman text preserves much of the First Folio punctuation, and many of the Folio spellings, which are now recognized either as distinctively Shakespearean or as peculiar to the nuances of English Renaissance usage. Readers of this edition of the play will encounter such word-forms as *abhomination* ('abomination'), *aboord* ('aboard'), *accedent* ('accident'), *adiew* ('adieu'), *bad* ('bade'), *blew* ('blue'), *breath* ('breathe'), *cestern* ('cistern'), *devide* ('divide'), *Divel* ('Devil'), *hard* ('heard'), *gratious* ('gracious'), *how* ('ho'), *I* ('ay'), *least* ('lest'), *lest* ('least'), *live* ('lieve'), *onely* ('only'), *powre* ('pour' or 'power'), *prays* ('preys'), *reciding* ('residing'), *shew* ('show'), *shrowd* ('shrewd' or 'shroud'), *sowrest* ('sourest' or 'sorest'), *spleets* (splits), *stroke* ('struck'), *then* ('than'), *throws* ('throes'), *travail* ('travel'), *vassails* ('vassals'), *vains* ('veins'), *vild* ('vile'), *waight* ('weight'), and *whether* ('whither').

Everyman also reproduces Folio spellings for a number of the proper names that other modern editions 'correct' by reference to Shakespeare's primary source in Sir Thomas North's 1579 translation of Plutarch's *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans*. The Everyman text keeps such forms as *Adullas* (Adallas), *Archilaus* (Archelaus), *Bochus* (Bocchus), *Camidius* (Canidius), *Celius* (Caelius), *Cleopater* (Cleopatra), *Comageat* (Comagena), *Hirsius* (Hirtius), *Licoania* (Lyaconia), *Mauchus* (Manchus), *Mecenas* (Maecenas), *Medena* (Modena), *Orades*

---

* It should be remembered that in *Antony and Cleopatra*, as in Shakespeare's other plays, the action on the Globe stage would have been continuous, with one scene yielding to its successor in a manner analogous to the rapid shifts in time and locale that we now take for granted in twentieth-century cinema.

(Orodes), *Pausa* (Pansa), *Scarrus* (Scarus), *Sidnis* or *Cidrus* (Cydnus), *Towrus* (Taurus), *Troine* (Toryne), and *Ventigius* (Ventidius). It is conceivable that some of these Folio variants are the result of authorial oversights, compositorial misreadings, or routine typesetting errors. But since Shakespeare normally displays little reluctance to modify the material he finds in his sources – a fact that can be illustrated in *Antony and Cleopatra* by two Folio spellings that all of today's editions adopt, *Thidias* (as opposed to 'Thyreus' in North's Plutarch) and *Decretas* (as distinguished from Plutarch's 'Dercetaeus') – it would seem wisest to assume that most if not all of the Folio's deviations from 'standard' spelling derive from Shakespeare's characteristic exercise of poetic licence.

The same assumption can be applied to dozens of the Folio readings that editors have long regarded as textual blemishes demanding treatment. Some of the anomalies retained and defended in the version of *Antony and Cleopatra* that follows may in fact be corruptions resulting from indecipherable handwriting, compositorial confusion, or other factors in the transmission of Shakespeare's text. At first glance forms such as *fore-tell* (I.ii.4), *fitst* (I.iii.25), *Servicles* (I.iii.3), and *Conlord* (II.vii.4) will strike most readers as mistakes, and no doubt a number will remain unpersuaded that these could really be Shakespearean coinages. But other Folio words and phrases will probably seem so congruent with the contexts in which they occur, and so resonant with larger thematic patterns, that readers will wonder why editors have adhered so inflexibly to the tradition that calls for them to be altered. Among the readings in this second category are *wand* (II.ii.21), *glove* (II.ii.210), *breathless powre breath* (II.ii.238), *stow* (III.xi.56), *Disputation* (III.xiii.9), *toward* (IV.xiv.4), *dislimes* (IV.iv.10), and *suits* (V.ii.103).

If the scholars responsible for what has become the accepted modern rendering of *Antony and Cleopatra* have arrived at a virtual consensus on where and how to emend the dialogue in the Folio printing, they have exhibited equal unanimity in their approach to the play's speech headings and stage directions.

Noting that Shakespeare left a number of details unspecified or unresolved, they have felt free to reassign speeches from one character to another, to eliminate 'mutes' (dramatis personae who are listed in stage entrances but have no speaking parts in particular scenes), and to supply stage exits where they appear to have been inadvertently omitted (in one case for a character the Folio designates as a speaker in two exchanges that occur shortly after the moment when modern editions mark a departure for him). To be sure, there are lacunae, inconsistencies, and loose ends in the earliest text of *Antony and Cleopatra*, and some of them do require editorial intervention. But it can be argued that many of the problems in the Folio version of the playscript are less severe than they seem: they call for sensitive analysis and discussion, but they require less surgery, and surgery of a far less radical kind, than editors have generally presumed. As usual, the Everyman text endeavours to conserve as much as possible of the original contours of the drama.

In a number of instances the Everyman edition accords with other modern printings and alters the language or punctuation to be found in the First Folio. For each of the emendations listed below, the first entry, in boldface type, is the Everyman reading (and the reading to be found in many, if not all, modern editions), and the second is the reading to be found in the Folio.

I.i.	4	**Mars, now** Mars: now
	12	**The . . . World** (The . . . world)
	39	**On** One
I.ii.	58	**Alexas:** ALEXAS.
	133	**compelling** compelling an
	197	**us require,** us, require
I.iv.	48	**Menecrates** Menacrates
I.v.	2	**Mandragora** mandragoru
	21	**Burgonet** burganet
	31	*from Antony* from Caesar
II.i.	51	**Hands.** hands
II.ii.	48	**you;** you,

	51	**Cause?** cause.
	71	**too** to
	72	**must** must,
	93	**Knowledge.** knowledge,
	103	**remember** remember:
	110	**Soldier only,** Soldier, only
	137	**Truths** Truth's
	173	*Exeunt Exit* (so also in III.ix.4, IV.v.17, IV.vii.3, IV.xiv.138)
	206	**Venus** Venns
	212	**Gentlewomen** gentlewoman
	214	**Helm** helm.
	228	**entreated.** entreated,
II.iii.	15	**side:** side
	19	**Fear,** fear:
		o'erpower'd: o'erpower'd,
II.vi.	19	**Man?** man.
	30	**present)** present
		take take)
	54	**casts** cast's
	58	**Composition** composition
	81	*Manent Manet*
II.vii.	10	**greater** greatet
	21	**Mean** mean:
	44	**What** Whar
	122	**off:** of
III.i.	8	**Mesopotamia** Mesapotamia
	15	**serve's** serves
	36	**permit,** permit:
III.ii.	16	**Figures** figure
III.iii.	16	**Dwarfish.** dwarfish
	17	**Gait** gate
III.iv.	4	**it;** it,
	5	**me;** me,
	6	**Honour,** honour:
	7	**vented,** vented
	8	**me;** me,
	29	**Your** You
III.v.	19	**Navy's** navies

III.vi. 39 Lord L.
III.vii. 4 it is it it
     is it? is it.
  5 not not,
III.x. 0 *Enter Enobarbus. Enter Enobarbus and Scarus.*
  14 June (Iune) Inne
III.xiii. 32 alike. alike,
  198 *Exit Exeunt*
IV.ii. 1 No. No?
IV.iv. 13 daff't daft
  24 CAPTAIN ALEX.
IV.xiv. 109 DECRETAS DERCETAS
V.i. 56 to too
V.ii. 16 Queen Queece
  41 Languish? languish
  56 Egypt Egypt.
  101 Waight; waight,
  214 Ballad's Ballads us

In a larger number of instances the Everyman text differs from many, if not most, of today's editions in its fidelity to the reading in the First Folio. For each of the passages listed below, the first entry, in boldface type, is the Everyman version of the text, derived from the Folio, and the second is the emendation to be found in at least some modern editions.

I.i. 17 *a Messenger an Attendant*
  18 MESSENGER ATTENDANT
  22 powreful powerful (compare II.i.6, II.v.33, 53)
  50 who whose *or* how
  53 to night (compare I.i.62, I.ii.40, I.iv.76, II.ii.8, III.xiii.187, IV.i.11, IV.ii.9, 20, 24, 27, 32, 42, IV.iii.1, 8, IV.iv.4, 17, IV.viii.2, 4, 25, IV.x.1)
I.ii. 5 change charge
  19 now some now, some
  34 fore-tell fertile

  65 waight weight (compare I.iv.25, II.vi.32, III.i.36, IV.xv.34, V.ii.101)
  66 Amen, Amen.
  77 Save you, my Lord. Saw you my lord?
  82 Alexias Alexas
  106 Winds minds
  108 *Enter ... Messenger.* omitted
  110 MESSENGER ATTENDANT (so also in line 111)
  114 3 MESSENGER 2 MESSENGER (so also in line 115)
  126 How Ho (so also in IV.xiv.104)
  130 them, them;
  154 Travail travel (so also in II.i.31)
  156 Sir. Sir?
  181 leave love
  186 Have Hath
  193 Quality quality,
  195 Heir hair
  197 Places place is
I.iii. 11 wish wish,
  20 What What,
  25 fitst first
  36 Brows brows'
  43 Servicles services
  77 Adiew adieu
  80 Blood no more? Blood; no more!
  82 by by my
  103 reciding residing (so also in II.ii.37)
I.iv. 3 One Our
  8 Vouchsafe vouchsaf'd
  9 Abstracts abstract
  44 fear'd dear'd
  46 lacking lackeying
  56 Vassails wassails
  57 Medena Modena
  58 Hirsius Hirtius
     Pausa Pansa
  63 daine deign
  75 me we
     Counsel council
  83 knew know

I.v. 1 Madam. Madam?
  3 Time: time
  6 Mardian? Mardian!
  13 in deed indeed
  26 Time. time?
  32 Antony? Antony!
  44 Arm-gaunt arrogant
  46 Dumb dumb'd
     What What, (compare I.iii.20)
  57 man's man
  58 I Ay (so also in II.ii.181, II.vii.26, III.xiii.173, IV.xiv.1, 8, V.ii.263)
  59 borne born (so also in I.v.59, II.ii.10, IV.xiv.43)
  67 again: again
II.i. 2 MENECRATES MENAS (so also in lines 16, 18, 38)
  21 wand wan'd
  27 Lethied Lethe'd
  38 neere ne'er
  39 greet 'gree
  41 wan'd warr'd
  43 greater, greater;
  44 all: all,
II.ii. 7 Antonio's Antonius' (so also in II.v.26)
  24 Sowrest sourest
  71 Shrodeness shrewdness
  110 onely only (so also in II.ii.159, III.iv.1, III.xiii.3, IV.xii.15, IV.xv.18)
  124 not, say not so,
  125 Cleopater Cleopatra (so also in II.ii.223)
     Proof reproof
  160 Least Lest (so also in IV.xv.22, V.i.64)
164–65 Strength / By Land? Strength? / CAESAR By land
  171 Whether Whither (so also in III.i.8)
  193 Sidnis Cydnus
  200 Love-sick. With them love-sick with them;
     Owers oars
  209 divers divers –
  210 glove glow
  229 no 'no'
     hard heard
  238 breathless powre breath breathless, power breathe
  239 Never Never,

  243 Vildest vilest
II.iii. 2 Devide Divide (compare III.iv.12)
  8 – Goodnight OCTAVIA Goodnight
  28 Ventigius Ventidius (so also in II.iii.37)
  33 Battaile battle (so also in III.viii.3, III.ix.2, IV.i.11, IV.ix.3)
II.iv. 6 at at the
II.v. 3 Billards billiards
  10 River river;
  11 off. off,
  12 Tawny fine tawny-finn'd
  28 him. There him, there
  29 blewest bluest (compare IV.xiv.5)
     Vains veins
  79 Call? Call!
  85 Gratious gracious
  94 Cestern cistern
  95 Face to me, face, to me
II.vi. 16 made made the
  19 his is
  32 waigh weigh (compare I.ii.65)
  37 greed 'greed
  42 Impatience: impatience.
  43 telling. telling,
  56 Vassail vassal
  57 Lepidus, thus Lepidus. Thus
  66 Meaning meanings
  68 that of that
  80 Aboord Aboard (so also in II.vi.139)
  117 Sir. Sir?
II.vii. 4 high Conlord high-colour'd
  13 live lieve
  37 Pyramisis pyramises
  85 paul'd pall'd
  94 then he then
  113 beat bear
  126 Spleets Splits
  130 Father father's
132–35 no ... out. MENAS No ... out.
  134 aloud a loud

III.i.
1 stroke struck
4 Army. army
  Orades Orodes
5 ROMAN SILIUS (so also in lines 27, 34)
29 Antony. Antony?

III.ii.
10 Antony, Antony?
  Jupiter? Jupiter.
17 number: number,
35 lest least
59 weep wept

III.iii.
18 ere e'er

III.iv.
7 ,then them
9 look'd (look't) took't
23 your yours
31 soader solder
37 he's has

III.v.
13 would thou hadst World, thou hast
15 grind the grind the one the

III.vi.
13 hither he there
  King kings
16 Phoenitia Phoenicia
17 th'abiliments the habiliments
28 Triumpherate triumvirate
69 Bochus Bocchus
  Archilaus Archelaus
71 Adullas Adallas
72 Mauchus Manchus
74 Comageat Comagena
75 Licoania Lyaconia
94 Abhominations abominations

III.vii.
3 forespoke forspoke
14 Photinus an Eunuch Photinus, an Eunuch,
19 Camidius Canidius (so also, with minor variations, elsewhere)
23 Troine Toryne
35 Militers muleters
51 Action Actium
69 Leaders lead leader's led
73 Celius Caelius
78 Towrus Taurus

  Well, Well
80 With in
  throws throes

III.viii.
2 Lord. lord?

III.x.
20 heighth height
27 his he

III.xi.
19 them that
43 unqualited unqualified
46 cease seize
56 stow tow
57 The Thy
61 Lownes lowness

III.xii.
13 lessons lessens

III.xiii.
9 meered mered
24 a-part apart
27 high battel'd high-battled
44 will. will?
53 Caesar's Caesar
54 embrace embrac'd
69 Shrowd shroud
72 Disputation deputation
87 Divels devils
88 me of late. When me: of late, when
101 The This
108 Boggeler bogler
110 Eyes eyes,
111 Filth, filth
130 a 'a
135 whipp'd. For whipped for
  him, him.
153 Time? time.
160 Caesarian smile Caesarion smite
163 discandering discandying
166 sets sits
197 prays in preys on

IV.i.
3 Combat. combat,
4 Antony: let Antony. Let

IV.ii.
1 Domitian Domitius
44 ,then than

IV.iv.
6–8 Most editions reassign 'Ah . . . this.' to Cleopatra.
29 me, me:
32 Complement compliment

IV.v.
1 EROS SOLDIER (so also in lines 3, 6)
17 Dispatch Dispatch.

IV.vi.
19 mote more
35 do't. I feel do't, I feel.

IV.vii.
13 Hares hares,

IV.viii.
2 Guests gests
18 Mine My (so also in V.ii.221)
24 savouring favouring

IV.ix.
0 *Centery Sentry*

IV.xii.
4 Auguries augurers
10 fowle foul
21 pannelled spaniel'd *or* spannell'd
42 ho? ho! (so also in line 49 and in IV.xiv.127)

IV.xiii.
10 Death to Death. To

IV.xiv.
4 toward tower'd
5 blew blue
10 dislimes dislimns
18 Caesars Caesar
50 Eros? Eros!
82 bad bade (so also in V.ii.13)

IV.xv.
33 Heaviness, heaviness;
53 lived. The liv'd the
57 Countryman. A countryman, a
65 Soldiers soldier's
72 in e'en
90 *of off*

V.i.
0 *Enter Caesar, Agrippa, Dolabella, Menas, with his Council of War. Enter Caesar, Agrippa, Dolabella, Maecenas, Gallus, Proculeius, and others, his council of war.*
26 Friends, friends?
27 Tidings a tidings
28 DOLABELLA AGRIPPA (so also in line 31)
52 yet, yet;
59 leave live

V.ii.
6 Accidents accidents
26 Dependacy dependancy
35 You see GALLUS You see
55 Varlotary varlotry
70 me. me?
80 o'th' O, the
86 Antony autumn
95 nor or
101 Waight; weight.
103 suits smites
106 what, what
108 Triumph. triumph?
153 hir'd? hir'd!
214 a a' *or* o'
220 see't? see't!
226 Cidrus Cydnus
313 wild vild
318 away awry
  and Dolabella omitted
336 Deaths, deaths?
341 Diadem; diadem
342 Mistress mistress;