

2017-12-01

"To You I Give Myself, for I Am Yours": Editorial Giving and Taking in Shakespeare's *As You Like It*

Jennifer Jean Thorup
Brigham Young University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Thorup, Jennifer Jean, "'To You I Give Myself, for I Am Yours': Editorial Giving and Taking in Shakespeare's *As You Like It*" (2017). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 7227.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/7227>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

"To You I Give Myself, for I Am Yours": Editorial Giving and
Taking in Shakespeare's *As You Like It*

Jennifer Jean Thorup

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Brandie R. Siegfried, Chair
Francesca Sborgi Lawson
Bruce Wilson Young

Department of English
Brigham Young University

Copyright © 2017 Jennifer Jean Thorup

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

"To You I Give Myself, for I Am Yours": Editorial Giving and Taking in Shakespeare's *As You Like It*

Jennifer Jean Thorup
Department of English, BYU
Master of Arts

In *As You Like It* 5.4.107-08 we receive Rosalind returning as herself—a woman—no longer in the guise of Ganymede, the “boy” page. Her first lines upon returning are repetitive: “To you I give myself, for I am yours [To Duke Senior] / To you I give myself, for I am yours [To Orlando].” However, comparing Folio versions of these lines produces a provocative variant. In the third and fourth folios, these lines are no longer a repetitious patriarchal pledging, but a tender dialogic exchange—much like vows—between Rosalind and Orlando. While none of our modern Shakespeare editions make a note of this variant emendation, this article traces the editorial history and mystery surrounding *As You Like It* 5.4.107-08 from seventeenth-century editors to our modern ones—with an emphasis on the shift in Shakespeare editing during the eighteenth century—to suggest the variant emendation warrants consideration for text and performance. Furthermore, the article examines the plausibility of the third and fourth folio’s emendation in congruence with Early Modern conceptions of companionate marriage, parental consent, and marriage rites.

Keywords: *As You Like It*, editing, folio, marriage, William Shakespeare

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Brandie Siegfried for taking a student and giving a scholar, to Bruce Young for giving expertise and taking away error, to Francesca Lawson for taking my task and giving her affection, to Andrea for taking a photo and giving her Celia to my Rosalind, to friends and family for taking my endeavor seriously and giving every needful thing, to my mother and father for taking me to theater and giving my ambitions life, and to God for taking me as I am and giving me more than could be dreamt of in any philosophy—Thank You.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Foul or Fair Source Texts	6
Seventeenth-Century Folios and Editorial Fiddling	12
Giving and Taking in Marriage.....	16
The Rei(g)n of Rowe	35
“The Play’s The Thing”	38
Conclusion	41
Works Cited	44

Introduction

During a recent re-reading of Shakespeare's *As You Like It*, I recalled an almost forgotten photograph of a touring fourth folio (F4) saved to my computer. This photo happened to capture the folio's last two pages from *As You Like It*. For sheer pleasure, I decided to upload that image and read the two endings side by side, observing the transformation from the 1685 folio to my 2016 Norton Third Edition. I expected the variance in spelling and stage directions, but what I did not expect was the marked contrast in Act 5, Scene 4, lines 107-08.

Occurring right after Hymen's *Deus Ex Machina* entrance, Rosalind speaks her premier lines as her returned self—a woman—now no longer in the guise of Ganymede, the “boy” page. In my Norton Edition, these lines read:

ROSALIND [*to the Duke*] To you I give myself, for I am yours.

[*To Orlando*] To you I give myself, for I am yours (5.4.107-08).

By comparison, the fourth folio (F4) edition grants:

Ros. To you I give my self, for I am yours.

Or. To you I give my self, for I am yours. (F4 206)¹

While the words themselves are the same, the contrast between assigning Rosalind both lines—with one directed toward her father, and the other directed toward her future husband—and having the lines said in turn by both Rosalind and Orlando presents a provocative variant.

From a performative perspective, this variant perplexed me. Why would The *Norton* Third Edition—one which takes great pains to emphasize performance—choose to give duplicate lines to one character instead of allowing the diversity of two voices? Determined to crack the

¹ F1-4 provides no lineation. In citing lines, I refer to my own lineation of the text with the folio edition followed by the page number.

enigma, I scanned through many publicly available folio versions of these lines and discovered that the 1664 Third folio (F3) matched F4 in its bifurcated lines, but that the 1623 First and 1632 Second Folios (F1 & F2) both showed:

Ros. To you I give my selfe, for I am yours.

To you I give my selfe, for I am yours. (F2 206)

Here, I figured, were the probable source texts influencing the current Norton edition. I settled that Stephen Greenblatt et al. had privileged the First and Second Folio interpretations, but with the addition of stage directions, which—intriguingly—none of the folios had utilized. While it does not surprise me that modern editors would favor F1—seeing that it is the closest edition of *As You Like It* we have to Shakespeare’s original manuscript—what does surprise me is that *The Norton Shakespeare* Third Edition does not note that any previous folio initiated another interpretation, nor that stage directions for these lines do not appear in any of the seventeenth-century folios.

While the Norton editors may not acknowledge that these lines were ever variants, maybe other editors had. With this in mind, I took to the bookshelves and pulled down any and every edition of *As You Like It* I could find. I discovered not only a continuation of Rosalind delivering both lines—all with bracketed stage directions—but a continued lack of notes signifying alternative attributions. I concluded that either Shakespeare’s modern editors are unfamiliar with F3 and F4’s emendations for lines 107-08, or none of them regard the changes as noteworthy.

Part of deeming a text noteworthy stems from considering the text authoritative enough to merit adopting its proposed emendation. According to Fredson Bowers, former Rosenbach Fellow in Bibliography, authorizing and selecting an emendation when there are variants is one of the greatest complexities facing editors of Shakespeare’s works. For Bowers:

When variants appear in two texts of unequal authority, and the reading of the generally superior text is corrupt, an editor should make every effort to recover the true reading from the corruption before accepting from an inferior text a reading which makes sense but which could never have been the word behind the corruption. (Bowers 49)

In this situation, considering F1 to be the generally superior text with possible corruptions, Bowers would argue that an editor of lines 5.4.107-08 should look for a “true” interpretation from F1’s corruption before accepting the sensible emendation from the inferior F3. It seems that modern editors accept this argument on some level since their versions mimic F1, but with the addition of stage directions. However, while modern editors may claim adding stage directions is a legitimate way of “recover[ing] the true reading from the corruption,” these stage directions are neither modern, nor authoritatively endorsed by the folios. They first appear in Nicholas Rowe’s 1709 edition. Because of this, it seems that the current editions of *As You Like It*, at least in regards to this scene and the inclusion of stage directions, more closely resemble the eighteenth-century collections of Shakespeare’s works rather than the seemingly more authoritative seventeenth-century folios.²

While Bowers contends that credit should go to the superior text before ever going to an inferior one, he also assumes that even sensible emendations from the inferior text will likely prove inauthentic to the original intention of the author. I believe this assumption, especially in regards to Shakespeare’s works, to be troublesome. This has been especially illuminated in recent research surrounding the printing and publishing processes of these texts. The fact is that

² In Sonia Massai’s *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor*, Massai considers Rowe’s work the “genuine starting point” and the “crucial watershed in the editorial tradition” (Massai i). She argues this on the basis that the Folios are “gradually deteriorated [texts] through the accumulation of accidental corruption in the printing house.” Gary Taylor’s *Reinventing Shakespeare* similarly notes that eighteenth-century editions “cast the mold of all future editions” (Taylor 70).

without original manuscripts, every “true and originall” edition of Shakespeare’s plays—including F1—is capable of corruption, thus making it difficult to pin down Shakespeare’s original intent. So how does an editor proceed when confronted with two unequal versions of the self-giving scene in *As You Like It* 5.4.107-08? Does she privilege the authoritative F1 despite its status as a “highly imperfect piece of printing?” (Black 707). Will she follow the editors of F3, whom Matthew Black describes as “professional proof-correctors,” though also “responsible for the drollest exhibition of mistaken ingenuity which we have yet uncovered?” (716, 713). Or, does she pick and choose from the versions available to her according to her best guesswork and understanding?

Unfortunately, the guiding principles of editorial emendation are about as varied and nuanced as Shakespeare’s works. In 1842, J. Payne Collier, claimed the editor’s method is clear: “settle the true reading; then form an accurate judgment whether that reading is intelligible; and thirdly, if a note be required, to say no more than is necessary” (Collier 40). While short and to the point, Collier never gives a crisp definition of what a “true reading” entails. Nearly a hundred years later, Fredson Bowers, in his *On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists*, clarifies that editors “need to know everything that is possible to learn about the documents on which one’s text is to be based, their relationship to one another, and, so far as can be determined, their history back to the author’s autograph manuscript” (Bowers 4). This is quite a daunting task considering the history of Shakespeare’s texts and the mystery shrouding their origins. Furthermore, as Ronald McKerrow suggests, an editor “should not in any way be coloured by the preconceived ideas or interpretation of later times” when looking back on the history of these texts (qtd. in Bowers 73). The burden of the Shakespearean editor becomes increasingly more difficult with each passing iteration of methodology for emendation. Yet W.

W. Greg goes to some effort to release the pressure of principles. In his address entitled *Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare*, Greg professes that “emendation is in its essence devoid of principle. At its finest it is an inspiration, a stirring of the spirit, which obeys no laws and cannot be produced to order. In other words, emendation is an art” (Greg 1). For Greg, the finest emendations are not regulated by principles and methods, but by a stirring of spirit, a serendipitous jolt of inspiration. He concedes, however, that for any emendation to be “acceptable,” the editor must be prepared to validate this inspiration by means of sense and appropriateness, and to persuade the reader of the need for such a divergence (Greg 3). In the following pages, I propose to do just that.

In this essay, I will focus on the editorial evolution of lines 107-08 from *As You Like It* Act 5, Scene 4 to persuade that the variants proffer a prodigious reading of the scene, specifically in regards to Rosalind’s relationship with Orlando. In offering a review of the editorial history of this text, I call into play primary historical texts such as Thomas Lodge’s *Rosalynde*, the sixteenth-century folios, early eighteenth-century editions of Shakespeare’s works, as well as performance reviews from both the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In interpreting these sources, I adopt and adapt conceptual frameworks that have emerged recently in bibliography studies, and set them in relation to Early Modern marriage customs to discover whether F3’s variant might prove a sensible and appropriate emendation. Where several editors and critics have apparently dismissed the possibility that these lines reflect an exchange of marriage vows between Orlando and Rosalind, I argue that this variant emendation from F3 and F4 commands consideration. From the vantage of this emendation, we gain unique insight into Rosalind and Orlando’s wedding, such that this moment no longer appears as Rosalind

reaffirming marriage as a hierarchical patriarchal exchange, but rather as a pledged giving and taking between spouses, an intensification of the model of companionate marriage.

Beyond developing a reinterpretation of this marriage scene, this essay strives to persuade that the lines neither authorize, nor de-authorize a single folio text—nor privilege one emendation over the other—but expose the possibility of textual instability and encourage the proliferation of new interpretations for performance.

Foul or Fair Source Texts

I follow Greg in assuming that “criticism must always proceed in relation to what we know, or what we surmise, respecting the history of the text” (Greg 6); however, in Shakespearean studies what we know is often miniscule compared to all that we surmise. Hence, the following sections attempt to review what we know regarding the editorial history of Act 5, Scene 4, lines 107-08 and offer much of what I surmise based on that knowledge. As a narrative, the story of *As You Like It* does not originate with Shakespeare. Most scholars identify Thomas Lodge’s *Rosalynde, Euphues Golden Legacie*, originally printed in 1590, as the inspiration for this Shakespearean play. On a narrative basis, the experiences of Lodge’s Rosalynde and Shakespeare’s Rosalind are remarkably similar: both fall quickly in love, both are banished to a forest named Arden, both find that same love in the forest, both put on male disguises in order to pursue games of courtship with said love, and both reveal their true identities to father and future husband in a climactic scene ending in a supposed marriage. This source text is significant for considering whether Shakespeare might have originally intended Rosalind’s lines to be reciprocated by Orlando or devoutly repeated to both father and future spouse. In considering this, I turn to *Rosalynde, Euphues Golden Legacie*.

Unlike Shakespeare's play, Lodge's novel never invites Hymen to participate in the festivities; Rosalynde comes by herself. Lodge writes that she first "present[s] her self at hir fathers feete, with her eyes full of tears, craving his blessing & discoursing unto him all her fortunes" (Lodge 59).³ It is not until later, after Gerismond (her father) and Rosalynde have reunited, and Rosalynde has explained to him her love for Rosader, that Gerismond turns to Rosader and says, "Rosader, take her, shee is thine, and let this day solemnize" (59). Certainly, this line parallels with Rosalind's "To you I give my self, for I am yours." However, unlike Rosalind, Rosalynde does not give herself to Rosader, but is given by Gerismond and taken by Rosader. The climax of the reveal, then, is not a romantic union, but first, a moment of reunion between father and daughter and second, a patriarchal bestowal from father to future son-in-law.

Without the God of marriage present, Gerismond becomes the authority figure presiding over the couple's union and authorizing the giving of Rosalynde, a central point of reference. This rendition affords, more than any of Shakespeare's following versions, a patriarchal reading—highlighted by Rosalynde's silence, and especially in Gerismond's decree that Rosalynde is Rosader's for the taking. If we are to believe that Shakespeare's original manuscript sought to imitate Thomas Lodge's novel, then we might believe Lodge's emphasis on filial love validates the First and Second Folio renditions of Rosalind pledging herself to the Duke first before pledging to Orlando. Yet I would assert that by clear contrast between Rosalind and Rosalynde's active versus passive roles in the giving and taking, Shakespeare's play, though strikingly similar to Lodge's novel, sustains the possibility of divergence and transformation.

³ Lodge's 1592 novel does not incorporate pagination. For the purposes of this essay, I've noted the EEBO image number that contains these pages. These images refer to the 1592 Bodleian Library copy, which is a reprint of Lodge's 1590 edition.

Perhaps the earliest mention of *As You Like It* comes in the form of clerical registries from 1595-1620, marking a provisional registration for *As You Like It* by a James Roberts in 1600 (Blayney 21). The play's entrance in public print, however, does not appear until 1623, seven years after William Shakespeare's death, and twenty years following the play's first recorded stage performance in 1603. While quarto versions of some Shakespeare plays had been previously dispersed, *As You Like It*, along with seventeen others, makes its first appearance in F1. If there were quarto versions, or distributed manuscripts, we currently have no record of them.

Because none of Shakespeare's original manuscripts survive, scholars such as Greg have looked to documents from other contemporary playwrights⁴ for clues as to what types of manuscripts Heminge and Condell likely collected in producing F1. According to Greg's research, Shakespeare assuredly provided original drafts to his theatre company—drafts lovingly termed “foul sheets,” or “foul papers”—which the company's bookkeepers often altered and manipulated for the purpose of performance. Greg, along with others, supposes these alterations were necessary edits since foul papers—although the closest copies to how the author intended his plays to be performed—were often littered with plot holes, misdirected exits, and irresolute perplexities (Werstine 2, Massai 14). Could these perplexities include a missed speech prefix for 5.4.108?

In her consideration of the original manuscript of *Thomas More*, supposedly written by Shakespeare, Tiffany Stern believes Shakespeare's “foul papers” most certainly would have included speech prefixes. However, it is of interest to note that “Shakespeare wrote the text first and put in the speech-prefixes later, creating a conversational babble, and then parceling it out to

⁴ Greg's hypotheses come from his work with *Bonduca*, published in the 1647 Beaumont and Fletcher First Folio.

different speakers” (Stern 141). Would Shakespeare have missed a speech prefix, and if he did, who would recognize that mistake? Since these plays were written for the purposes of performance, not print, it was the responsibility of bookkeepers, even actors, to tidy up any confusion from the original manuscripts. Promptbooks, then, would likely have included notes regarding delivery of dialogue and movements on the stage, and as Paul Werstine and Sonia Massai suggest, they would “likely be reasonably consistent and unambiguous in naming roles in speech prefixes” (Werstine 2). In regards to Rosalind’s lines in question, a promptbook would prove invaluable since the variant meaning hinges upon its delivery as well as its speech prefix.

Unfortunately, Greg never found any Shakespearean foul papers or promptbooks that matched his definitions, which for some recent critics, like Paul Werstine, Edward Pechter, and Gabriel Egan, hinders his argument that they assuredly existed. Pechter recently claimed that Greg’s “foul papers” and “promptbooks” can only be considered “heuristic rather than empirical categories” (Pechter 132). Gabriel Egan further asserts that the binary between foul papers and promptbooks is unreasonable: “manuscripts do not divide up so neatly” (Egan 83). Nevertheless, scholars since the 1950s have generally accepted, or at least hoped for, the plausibility of such original manuscripts. But, if they did exist, the way Greg believes they did, the question now stands: which type of manuscript— “foul papers” or “promptbooks”—would have been provided for use in printing *As You Like It*? And furthermore, which manuscript type—foul or fair—would prove, if ever discovered, most authoritative in settling the emendation issues in Rosalind’s self-giving lines?

Some scholars, like Greg, believe that theater companies would never give up their promptbooks with production notes to a publisher because of censor licensing; they would offer their stash of foul papers (Werstine 25). However, Greg entertains the possibility that some texts,

including *As You Like It*, might have been printed from promptbooks, or some sort of transcript, especially if the foul papers were not legible enough for publication. Fredson Bowers refers to these types of transcripts as “intermediate texts,” and argues that

it could well have been expedient, in lieu of the author’s fair copy, for a theatrical scribe to make an intermediate transcript of them for consideration, revision, submission to the censor, copying of the parts, or sometimes for marking and cutting in preparation for the final prompt book. And if this were so, it is likely preserved as a duplicate and thus given to the printer. (Bowers, *The Dramatic Works* 20-21)

It appears that at least two recent editors of *As You Like It* align with Greg and Bowers’ hypotheses, entertaining that the copies given to the printer might have derived from promptbooks.⁵ On the other hand, Werstine claims that “a number of the last half-century’s editors have departed from Greg’s 1955 view that some other texts (including *As You Like It*) were printed from either ‘promptbooks’ or transcripts of them, and have argued instead that the printer’s copy for these were transcripts of ‘foul papers’” (Werstine 30).

Without empirical evidence proving that Jaggard’s press received copies of foul papers instead of promptbooks, the question as to whether Shakespeare intended Rosalind to deliver both lines, one to her father and the other to Orlando, or intended the lines to be recited in turn becomes slippery. Certainly one camp of scholars would cling to Shakespeare’s foul papers as those copied for Jaggard’s press because they assume foul papers to be final drafts from the author’s hands, innocent of eventual, erratic, editorial emendations. Others, myself included, would follow McKerrow’s assertions that believing Shakespeare gave his theater company a finalized manuscript contradicts his character as an actor and playwright. It appears to me that

⁵ See Michael Hattaway’s 2000 New Cambridge and Alan Brissenden’s 1993 Oxford editions of *As You Like It*.

notes made by bookkeepers during performances would not have been mere tidying up and clarifying, but authorized and expected co-creation. As McKerrow puts it,

Shakespeare as an active member of a theatrical company would, at any rate in his younger days, have been concerned with producing, not plays for the study, but material for his company to perform on the stage, and there can be little doubt that his lines would be subject to modification in the light of actual performance, as well as to later revision. . . . Such alterations may have been made by the author himself, or if he was not available, they may have been made by others. He may, or may not, have regarded them as improvements: he probably merely accepted them as necessary changes, and it is quite likely that he never bothered about whether they introduced inconsistencies into what was originally conceived as a consistent whole. (McKerrow 6-7)

Furthermore, those who see bookkeepers' additions as negating a promptbook's authority as source text, would have to disagree with Greg's observation that in Shakespeare's case, "the book-keeper [would be] able too, to consult the author at need" (qtd. in Werstine 24). If this is the case, a found promptbook would be equally, if not more, valid as an original manuscript because bookkeepers' promptbooks, with edits and all, would likely be authorized by the author himself and most akin to the original performances.

While it would be nice to know both what Shakespeare had originally written and how the first actors playing Rosalind delivered these climactic lines, without actual foul papers or promptbooks we are left with more rather than fewer questions. However, in continuing with Greg's emendation advice, we press forward with what we know, which for now, is the folio texts. Given that *As You Like It* lacks extant manuscripts or quartos as methodological prompts, we are left to evaluate seventeenth-century editors, and their emendations, to clarify and

supplement our understanding of the variants in Rosalind's self-giving lines. This is problematic since, as Greg puts it, the lack of previous source material opens a "happy hunting ground" for possible mishaps by the "irresponsible editor, since his fancy can seldom be shown to conflict with textual logic" (Greg 8). Yet the possibility for mishap lies not only with the irresponsible editors, but in the hastiness of compositors and printers.

Seventeenth-Century Folios and Editorial Fiddling

F1 attributes both lines of "To you I give my selfe, for I am yours" to Rosalind, but does not distinguish to whom these lines are delivered, nor in what order. Did F1 mean Rosalind to deliver duplicate lines to two different recipients? Were the lines accidental duplications? Or did an F1 printer, compositor, or editor accidentally miss the speech prefix "*Orl.*" in front of the second line? While most scholars from the eighteenth century onward hold F1 as the text closest to Shakespeare's original works, and thus most likely to mimic how the plays were performed during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries (a proposal only heightened by the argument that Heminge and Condell were original actors of these plays), recent studies in book history and the printing process advance the hypothesis of likely corruption of even the First Folio. Which is to say, a misprint in regards to 5.4.107-08 is quite possible, even probable.

After manuscripts were collected, they were proofread, edited, and compiled by compositors. Fredson Bower's research proposes that F1 used two different compositors that he refers to as Compositor A and B. In comparing their styles and techniques, Bowers remarks that they are strikingly different. "Compositor A was the more conservative and accurate, and B was more slapdash, more prone to omit words, and also to alter his text both through memorial failure and his attempts to improve it" (Bowers 56). Bowers further believes that because *As You Like It* is published for the first time in the folio, "it will suggest to an editor that the proportion of

necessary editorial emendation will be higher in the type set by compositor B than that set by A” (56). Thus, at least according to Bower’s research, a slapdash compositor prepping *As You Like It*, could easily have omitted the word “Orl” from the second line, or just as easily forgotten stage directions (although stage directions were rare). However, B. D. R. Higgins argues that scholarship has been gravely mistaken in believing that the Folio was badly proof-read. He asserts that compositors were systematically checking and justifying type, spacing, and routinely correcting proof pages (Higgins 37). Still, even Higgins admits that compositors occasionally “eye-skipped several words or lines by inadvertently jumping between two similar words in their copy-text” (37).

With 5.4.107-08 having two lines repeated back to back, it would not surprise me if a compositor either accidentally repeated the line, or even mistakenly eye-skipped over the intended speech prefix assigned to the second line. While repetitions and dittography are not uncommon in Shakespeare’s published works,⁶ we rarely find two full lines duplicated back to back. This makes 5.4.107-08 unique as well as perplexing. Why give Rosalind two identical lines? In considering duplications and repeated words, Paul Werstine speculates that “the sheer variety of ways used by playhouse personnel to indicate deletion may well have confused printers and may account for reproduction of duplicate passages in print” (Werstine 188). Yet, if Rosalind’s second line was meant to be deleted entirely, the question now stands: who would she give her self to? The Duke or Orlando? How would a compositor choose? While certainly precarious, the possibility of inaccuracy does not end with proofreading. Even if the compositors

⁶ Paul Werstine’s notes repetitions in *Anthony and Cleopatra*, Q1 *Love’s Labours Lost*, Q2 *Romeo and Juliet*, and Q2 *Hamlet*. Both he, and Tiffany Stern, highlight Romeo’s final lines in 2.2 to be almost identical to the ones Friar Lawrence delivers in the beginning of 3.1. See also *Love’s Labours Lost* (Q 4.3.298-300, 347-45).

had proof-read perfectly, the process of taking those proofs through the press also invites the possibility of error.

Matthew Black expounds on the printing process in his article “Shakespeare’s Seventeenth Century Editors” by arguing that most arbitrary changes in the folio come from printers, not editors. As he describes, a printer would first memorize a portion of his copy. Then, he would turn to the type-case, and letter by letter, make up a line, placing it in the form. Black notes that this is all done “presumably without another glance at his copy, unless he was conscious of forgetting” (Black 709). However, once again, Higgins considers this accusation based on the faultiness of memory a hasty one. He asserts that the printing houses would proof-read and double check those proofs even after the first page was pulled from the first imposed form (Higgins 37). In other words, printers would take their first printed page and double check to make sure it was accurate before pressing forward with multiple prints. While I agree with Higgins that it may be a bit hasty to assume that—just because this process was laborious and memory dependent—a printer wouldn’t pay careful heed to proof-checking his work, the fact that this process of compositing and printing lends itself to mistakes opens another rationale for the editorial emendations of Rosalind’s lines that would emerge later in F3 and F4.

Nine years after the publication of F1, Smethwick and Aspley, two publishers who also worked on F1, decided to publish a second impression of Shakespeare’s comedies, histories, and tragedies. The publishers may have sought re-publication for multiple reasons: a need to re-popularize their product, or a nagging need to update and correct the previous version. In any case, for one reason or another, Smethwick and Aspley decided to release a new folio. On the surface, F2 appears a basic re-print of F1. However, in his research comparing edits between folios, Matthew Black finds that the highest frequency of editorial changes actually occurs

between the first and second folios as compared with all others (Black 710). While Black hails F2's unknown editor as an ingenious poet obviously attuned to history of the classics and performance visualization, Sir Sidney Lee, one of Shakespeare's biographers, sees F2's emendations as "arbitrary and needless and prove the editor's incompetence" (qtd. in 708). Whether F2's editor was incompetent or ingenious seems irrelevant for the purposes of Rosalind's self-giving lines since it appears this editor chose not to make any edits from F1's version. Because of this, scholars may brush over F2 in this regard because it appears a simple repeat of F1. Still, the fact that this new editor chose not to emend any part of these lines, especially in regards to staging practice, is suggestive.

Matthew Black's article speaks of this anonymous second folio editor and his emendations as if he were an intimate acquaintance. He spends a good deal of space praising the editor's often unappreciated initiation of stage directions. Specifically, Black notes that in regards to *Richard III* 4.1.92-95—the Duchess of York's speech—this editor "wrote the directions in the margin of the copy of the first folio which he was preparing for the printer, indicating that they were to be set up in italics, one after each of the three first lines of the speech, like any other stage directions" (715). This imbedded string of directions indicates the multiple people to whom the first lines of the speech should be addressed. Sonia Massai believes seventeenth-century readers of playbooks often read pen in hand, correcting and perfecting the text with marginal comments that would influence the next edition (Massai 14). However, in regards to the scene from *Richard III*, Black believes that these marginal notes, likely cramped and handwritten, were mistakenly all smooshed together in the first line by F2's printing

composer.⁷ This marginal mistake would not be rectified until the fourth folio. While this information seems insignificant for Rosalind's unchanged lines in F2, it strikes me as odd that this same editor, who carefully noted a need to emend stage directions in *Richard III*, would not exert the same care for Rosalind's duplicate lines. Perhaps this editor did not have prior knowledge for stage directions in this instance, or perhaps there weren't stage directions to begin with. Either way, assuredly, this F2 editor regarded F1's version of Rosalind's lines as adequate enough to not merit emendation.

This is not what we receive with the editors of F3 or F4. In 1664, thirty-two years after the second folio, the infamous editor of F3—responsible for adding seven additional plays to the folio, of which only *Pericles* proved authentic—felt inclined to split Rosalind's repeated lines, giving one to Orlando. It is in this version that we read:

Ros. To you I give myself, for I am yours.

Orl. To you I give myself, for I am yours.

Unprecedented, F3 gives us Rosalind pledging her self to Orlando and Orlando responding in kind. Could F3's bifurcation, especially in its resemblance to marital vows, be an acceptable emendation given the customs surrounding marriage in Early Modern England and the pattern set in Shakespeare's other texts, or does this reciprocation contradict filial duty?

Giving and Taking in Marriage

In her article "The Father and the Bride in Shakespeare," Linda Boose asserts that the Early Modern marriage ritual wedded not only the couple, but their communities together. She interprets the marriage ceremony, prescribed in the 1559 *Book of Common Prayer*, as consisting

⁷ The first folio notes the Duchess of York saying, "Go thou to Richmond, and good fortune guide thee; Go thou to Richard, and good angels tend thee..." The second folio reads, "Go to Richmond, to Dorset, to Anne, to the Queen, and good fortune guide thee." The fourth folio restores, "Go thou to Richmond and good fortune guide thee; [to Dorset]."

of the anthropologist Arnold van Gennep's three phases: separation, transition, and incorporation. In this manner, the separation between Father and Daughter acts as the first rite of passage before the transition phase of consummation, and the ultimate phase of incorporation into a new family unit (Boose 325). Because of this, she argues compellingly that Rosalind's lines are rightfully directed first to Duke Senior, not Orlando. For Boose, the ritualistic language of "to you I give myself for I am yours" must act as a vow of incorporation, initially given to Duke Senior and finally to Orlando. For if Rosalind is "to be incorporated into a new stasis [that of wife], she must have one from which to be separated; she must be reunited as child to her father before she can be joined to her 'child's father'" (Boose 328). Because of this, Boose would certainly side with F1 and F2's interpretation of Rosalind's self-giving lines.

However, does F3 and F4's making Rosalind's lines reciprocal vows somehow contradict the integrity of the play or that of the Early Modern wedding ceremony? I do not believe so. While I admire Boose's desire to elevate the bond between Father and Daughter reflected both in Shakespeare's plays and in the 1559 *Book of Common Prayer* wedding ceremony, I find that F3 and F4's emendation equally fits with Shakespeare's theatrical pattern, the integrity of Rosalind's character, and Early Modern marriage customs.

The essential distinction between F1/F2's lines and F3/F4's is the subtraction of Rosalind's vocal pledging to Duke Senior and the addition of Orlando's own reciprocal pledging to Rosalind. It is true that the ceremony laid out in the 1559 *Book of Common Prayer*—which Shakespeare's audience relied on as a model of understanding Protestant covenants—includes the traditional giving away of the bride by her father. It specifically notes that "The minister asks 'Who giveth this woman to be married unto this man?'" after which, the form dictates that "the minister receiving the woman at her father or friend's hands, shall cause the man to take the

woman by the right hand, and so either give their troth [pledge] to other” (“The Form of Solemnization”). While F1/F2’s lines resonate with the transition from daughter to wife seen in *The Book of Common Prayer*, F3/F4’s emendation emphasizes the exchange of marital vows also present in the wedding ritual. Furthermore, F3/F4 affords us a new understanding of Rosalind’s relationship with Orlando. By placing Orlando as the initial receiver of Rosalind’s self-giving lines, the emendation displaces the reunion between Rosalind and Duke Senior as the primary purpose for Rosalind’s return (perhaps her entire journey into Arden), and instead propels the focus toward the wedding—her union with Orlando.

The very momentum of the scene—and perhaps the entire play—rushes toward Rosalind’s reveal and the fulfillment of the intended weddings. While Rosalind may have entered Arden hoping to reunite with Duke Senior, her intentions shift when Orlando appears. This is especially notable in 3:4, where Rosalind briefly alludes to having reunited with Duke Senior in the forest, but neither she, nor Shakespeare, spend much time on it.

ROSALIND: I met the Duke yesterday, and had much question with him. He asked me of what parentage I was. I told him, of as good as he, so he laughed and let me go. But what talk we of fathers when there is such a man as Orlando? (3.5.31-34)

Rosalind skips quickly through her reunion with her father to arrive at what she most wishes to discuss with Celia, Orlando. If Rosalind and Duke Senior’s reconnection is of the utmost importance to her purpose in Arden, or the thing most necessary for her ultimate marriage venture, she doesn’t seem preoccupied by it. The majority of her time as Ganymede is spent securing Orlando’s love, not reconnecting with her father. Orlando, at least in this case, displaces Duke Senior. F3 and F4’s emendation imitates this displacement and preserves Rosalind’s eagerness characterized in earlier acts. By entering with an initial vow to Orlando, Rosalind

proceeds with unhalted momentum toward the wedding ceremony, and when Orlando returns the vow word for word, he solemnizes it.

In her book, *Courtships, Marriage Customs, and Shakespeare's Comedies*, Loreen Giese characterizes the marriage ceremonies as reciprocal, for “while vows differed slightly from contract to contract ... the marrying couple usually echoed each other word for word” (Giese 123). This description of matching word for word seems to fit with the editorial emendation in F3, adding to the affordance of these lines as marital vows. Furthermore, the content of the lines, the emphasis on the action of giving and receiving, calls attention to what, for Giese, “made the marriage”—that of giving and taking in mutual agreement (125). Essential to this agreement was the feature of vocal pledging, or what seventeenth-century Oxfordshire preacher, William Whately termed “making sure” (qtd. in Cressy 269). Thus, Orlando’s repetition of Rosalind’s lines assures her that he shares her pledge.

While Shakespeare’s other plays do not provide us exact repetition in turn as seen in F3 and F4’s emendation, we still see Shakespearean couples alluding to giving and taking in regards to marriage through vows. In *Measure for Measure* 5.1.496, a scene similar to that of *As You Like It*, the Duke hurriedly proposes to Isabella with a command to “Give me your hand, and say you will be mine.” Later, in line 540, the Duke promises Isabella “what’s mine is yours, and what is yours is mine.” Similarly, in *Much Ado About Nothing*, Claudio alludes to an exchange of selves in 2.1 when he promises Hero: “Lady, as you are mine, I am yours. I give away myself for you and dote upon the exchange” (*Much Ado About Nothing* 2.1.266-73). While we do not hear Isabella or Hero return these pledges—like Orlando in F3/F4—Duke and Claudio’s motions to exchange selves, property, and all else, certainly resonate with Rosalind and Orlando’s giving

of selves in F3 and F4's emendation, and coincides with Early Modern ideas regarding companionate marriage.

A common way of understanding marriage in the period was as a reflection of Adam and Eve's uniting flesh of my flesh and bone of my bones (Genesis 2:22), a reciprocal pairing. As Alan Macfarlane explains in his book, *Marriage and Love in England 1300-1840*, "the married couple are partners and companions; separated from kin, from children, from friends, yet united with each other, they form an indivisible and mutually supportive pair" (Macfarlane 176). It is important to note, that Macfarlane's description places the relationship between spouses above that of kin, even of fathers. This concept is not new, as seen in Genesis 2:24 where man is told to "leave his father and mother and shall cleave unto his wife." But what about the woman? Is she to abandon her devotion to her father in order to cling unto her husband, or is she expected to maintain filial and marital devotion?

In Shakespeare's *Othello*, at least, the understanding is that the bride should leave her father to devote herself to her husband. Although Brabantio, Desdemona's father, rages against Othello for taking his daughter without consent, when Desdemona reminds him of her "divided duty"—that her mother had "prefer[ed] [him] before her father"—Brabantio seems to accept her argument and offers to "give thee with all my heart" (*Othello* 1.3.180-95). This sense of "divided duty" also appears in Cordelia's explanation that she can only love Lear "according to my bond, no more no less" (*King Lear* 1.1.90-91), that "when I shall wed that lord whose hand must take my plight shall carry half my love with him" (1.1.98-100). Lear is far less accepting of Cordelia's petition than Brabantio is of Desdemona's. Yet for both Desdemona and Cordelia, it seems clear that they believe filial devotion should not extend past spousal devotion. Certainly, as seen in the F1 and F2 emendation where Rosalind delivers both lines, there is a privileged

filial devotion. Yet, even then, the culminating promise is that of Rosalind to Orlando.

Ultimately, I would argue, both renditions of Rosalind's lines—that of her pledging first to Duke Senior and then to Orlando, as well as that of Rosalind and Orlando mutually pledging—retain the traditional transition, or displacement, of Father for Husband. Still, what F3 and F4's emendation uniquely emphasizes is the reciprocity and equality of companionate marriage.

The priority in companionate marriage, especially as seen in Early Modern literature describing it, is one of mutuality and equality: a combination of two halves. This concept is reiterated in poems by Phillip Sydney, Edward de Vere, George Peele, Fulke, Greville, Christopher Marlow, Robert Greene, Nicholas Breton, and Walter Raleigh. Commenting on those poems, Macfarlane notes that, “almost always there was the theme of love as the total union of flesh with flesh, mind with mind, heart with heart, soul with soul, until the separateness and loveliness were overcome and the two halves made whole” (185). This two-becoming-one concept is explicitly stated in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* by Friar Laurence when he alludes to marriage as when “holy church incorporate two in one” (*Romeo and Juliet* 3.1.38). Contrary to popular belief, this two-in-one, companionate marriage model was not merely idealized in literature, but actually practiced in Early Modern England. Letters exchanged between husband and wife, and between those already betrothed, show tender affection; they allude to marriage as the union of two people, a yoking.

During 1538-1539, while absent on trial, Arthur Plantagenet (Lord Lisle) exchanged copious letters with his wife, Honor. In these letters, he addresses her as “Mine Own,” “Sweetheart,” and signs himself – “your loving husband.” In response, Honor Lisle hails him as “Mine own sweet heart” and signs, “By her that is both your and her own” (qtd. in 196). Honor considers herself both her own and also her husband's, a somewhat shared self. This idea is

further confirmed in a letter from a friend of Arthur and Honor, who writes, “because ye be both but one soul though ye be two bodies, I write but one letter” (qtd. in 196). These letters spotlight the companionate nature of Honor and Arthur’s relationship. Even a century later, the Duchess of Newcastle, Margaret Cavendish writes of the love shared with her husband as multifaceted and whole. She refers to this love as “an uniting love, as the love of soul and body, a pious love, as the love to heaven, all which several loves did meet and intermix, making one mass of love” (Cavendish 394).

This companionate style of marriage is clearly present in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when the Folios in question are being emended. However, the model comes to full fruition even in the late eighteenth century, when playhouses and publishers are returning their sights to Shakespearean texts. The widely popular *New Whole Duty of Man* maintained that “wives become partners; they are friends and companions to their husbands, not slaves, nor menial servants; and are to be partners in their fortunes: for, as they partake of troubles and afflictions, it is just that they should share their fortunes” (*The New Whole Duty* 229-30). By reading F3 and F4’s emendation as a vow exchange in the context of Early Modern companionate marriage, we find Rosalind and Orlando pledging not only themselves to each other, but everything that comes along with it—property, affliction, status, and affection. However, what strikes me is the explanation for this giving, “for I am yours.” The understanding is that Rosalind will give herself because she is already Orlando’s and vice versa. They recognize each other as half of themselves.⁸

⁸ Aristophanes’ speech from Plato’s *Symposium* proffers that mankind’s natural form began as an androgynous being. He states that humans’ “natural form had been cut in two, each longed for its own other half, and so they would throw their arms about each other, weaving themselves together, wanting to grow together...love is born into every human being; it calls back the halves of our original nature together; it tries to make one out of two and heal the wound of human nature.”

In Sir Thomas Overbury's *Characters*, published in 1614, he describes a good wife as "one that to her husband is more than a friend, less than trouble; an equal with him in the yoke...he without her but half of himself" (qtd. in Macfarlane 175). Furthermore, in his *Preparative to Mariage*, Henry Smith explains that all things are common between the couple: "for they two are one. He may not say as husbands are wont to say, that which is thine is mine, and that which mine is mine owne, but that which is mine is thine, and my selfe to" (Smith 67). This notion of halves—and selves—and the question of an equal giving and taking of them, not only emerges in letters between husband and wife, but repeatedly appears in Shakespeare's plays, including *The Merchant of Venice* 3.2 where Portia describes her love for Bassanio. "One half of me is yours, the other half yours—Mine own I would say—but if mine, then yours, And so all yours" (*Merchant of Venice* 3.2.16-18). Here, it appears that Bassanio possesses all halves since "all is yours," but considering the shared unity of companionate marriage, where the couple becomes an androgynous whole, I would argue that Portia recognizes the blurred line between herself and Bassanio and puns on the situation. For if one half of their whole is hers, the other is Bassanio's, and both give of their selves (or halves) to the other, then both Portia and Bassanio possess all. As Bassanio "come[s] by note to give and to receive like one of two contending in a prize," Portia reciprocates by committing "myself and what is mine to you and yours is now converted" (3.2.140-41,166-67). I see F3 and F4's emendation affording a similar moment for Rosalind and Orlando by mimicking this ritual of giving and taking through spoken vows. Rosalind gives of herself—the part which is already Orlando's—and then Orlando receives and gives in return. This type of exchange hinges upon allowing Orlando vocal response to Rosalind's pledge, something he does not receive in F1/F2.

Considering that this moment in Act 5 is Orlando's first glimpse of Rosalind returned, and possibly his first realization that Ganymede has been Rosalind all along, these lines are a fulfillment of a play's worth of longing and sexual tension. It seems to me that Orlando, the one who has been pledging his love to Rosalind on trees, should have something to say in return when his lady finally appears. Perhaps now that Rosalind is back in her feminine form, Orlando reverts back to his tongue-tied disposition from Act 1. And yet that interpretation would make Ganymede's efforts in preparing Orlando to wed Rosalind come to naught, an odd result given that they had already practiced and performed a mock wedding ceremony with an exchange of vows.

Many of the on-stage marriages in Shakespeare's plays follow *The Common Book of Prayer's* ceremony, including the mock wedding scene in Act 4, Scene 1 of *As You Like It*. In this scene, Rosalind—as Ganymede—insists that her cousin, Celia, play the part of priest in performing a marriage between Ganymede (Rosalind) and Orlando. As Rosalind urges, the exchange of vows begins with the bride and groom joining hands and the priest asking the groom, "Will you, Orlando, have to wife this Rosalind?" (4.1.111) To which, Orlando confirms with "I will." *The Book of Common Prayer* prescribes the same, with the clergyman then turning to the bride and asking the same question, to which she would answer with "I will." However, Rosalind, as "a girl goes before the priest," does not wait for Celia's prompt, but just interjects that she will take Orlando as her husband (118). This eagerness to wed Orlando in Act 4, Scene 1 matches the F3/F4 emendation where Rosalind's first uttered speech after returning is her vow. With Orlando matching this vow with his own, he confirms Rosalind's bestowal of self. Whether this confirmation also secretly assures Rosalind that Orlando recognizes this moment as a remembrance of their previous vow exchange, thus accepting her into his heart as both Rosalind

and Ganymede, is open for interpretation. However, I feel that the F3 emendation, read with Act 4, Scene 1 in mind, affords that reading.

While some scholars have wondered if the mock wedding scene in Act 4, Scene 1 has legitimate merit, thus negating the need for an exchange of vows in Act 5, Ann Cook and B. J. Sokol have suggested that this mock wedding cannot be valid because of the genders of the participants—in other words, Ganymede’s being a boy and Celia’s being a woman. Furthermore, Sokol argues in *Shakespeare, Law, and Marriage* that “a *contract per verba de futura*,” like the one given by Orlando and Ganymede in Act 4, “could be conditional, with, for example, a condition relating to payment of a marriage portion or the agreement of a parent” (Sokol 17). Meaning, the mock wedding scene’s vows in future tense (“I will”) might act as a type of betrothal, or promise of a future contract, but not an official wedding, despite “I will” being the exact wording prescribed in *The Common Book of Prayer*. However, what Sokol believes is that the marriage, presumably, should not occur until Rosalind (not Ganymede) acts as the bride, and Duke Senior gives his blessing. In that moment, the vows should switch to present tense—“To you I give myself”—and the wedding will be official.

The scholarly discussion regarding what constitutes an official marriage ceremony pings back and forth between those who believe parental consent was required and those who saw the mutual agreement between the couple as enough. This argument sits at the center of the emendation decision between F1/F2 and F3/F4’s interpretation of Rosalind’s self-giving scene. In John Stockwood’s 1578 sermon, *A Bartholomew Fairing*, Stockwood taught that “children are not to marie, without the consent of their parentes, in whose power and choice it lyeth to provide wives and husbandes for their sonnes and daughters” (qtd. in Cook 73). Even in *As You Like It*, Sir Oliver proclaims that women “must be given, or the marriage is not lawful” (*As You Like It*

3.3.59). Ann Cook, Loreen Geise, David Cressy, and others, on the other hand, have debated that the exchange of mutual, verbal agreements—also known as spousals—were all that the law required for a couple to be officially married.

As a whole, Shakespeare's plays, unfortunately, elude siding one way or the other. In some plays, such as *Romeo and Juliet* and *Measure for Measure* (specifically regarding Claudio and Juliet / Mariana and Angelo), Shakespeare clearly highlights the validity of marriage without parental consent, based solely on mutual vows. However, in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, both marriage scenes in *Much Ado About Nothing*, and arguably in *Merchant of Venice*, we see father figures playing direct roles in giving their daughters away. The understanding is that while a marriage could not legally proceed without the bride's consent, neither Hero, Hermia, nor Portia, should marry without the blessing of their father. Furthermore, marriage is understood, at least in part, in economic terms, a contract meant to be drafted and signed by the patriarchal figures.

This is seen most potently in *Much Ado About Nothing*. Before Claudio "gives of himself" to Hero, her father promises to give not only Hero, but "with her my fortunes" (*Much Ado About Nothing* 2.1.266). This is reiterated during the first wedding scene when Claudio asks Leonato, "Father, by your leave, will you with free and unconstrained soul give me this maid, your daughter?" (4.1.25). When Leonato agrees, Claudio questions what gift, perhaps monetary or material, should be given in return for Hero's hand (26). The reciprocal giving and taking emphasized in companionate marriage has shifted. Here, Leonato gives Hero, and Claudio receives her by offering a gift of equal value to Leonato. The mutual agreement is between Claudio and Leonato, not between Claudio and Hero. This argument is further substantiated in the final wedding scene when all that Claudio needs in order to receive his supposedly "new" bride is the consent from Leonato:

LEONATO: This same is she, and I do give you her.

CLAUDIO: Why then, she's mine. Sweet, let me see your face. (5.4.54-55)

This bride is Claudio's because Leonato has given her, not for any other stated reason. For Hero, the plans and stipulations of her marriage(s) are made for her by men. While Hero may affirm her consent by stopping Claudio's mouth in 2.1 and going along with the Friar's plan, she never pledges it vocally. Nevertheless, the question remains whether parental consent was required for official marriage ceremonies, or simply recommended. Could Rosalind, or any other Shakespearean heroine, acceptably give of herself?

Recent feminist criticism⁹ has chided the giving of the bride as a patriarchal establishment to keep order; men speaking to other men via the instrument of women. The issue is that the woman acts passively, but is materially significant for economic, political, and kinship bonds. Undeniably, the giving of the bride is honored in *The Book of Common Prayer's* matrimonial ceremony when the father bestows his daughter's hand. However, scholars like David Cressy note, that the bride's hand is first given to the priest—or God—not directly passed from Father to Husband (Cressy 339). Thus, while the father may give his daughter to be married, he does not bestow her directly to the new husband. The priest beckons the groom to take the bride by the right hand and begin their pledges. Still, the giving is between men. Could Early Modern marriages be simultaneously companionate as well as patriarchal?

This patriarchal giving and taking looms in Thomas Lodge's *Rosalynde* and also emerges in many Shakespeare plays, most prominently in *Much Ado*. Cressy argues that nothing in record shows that Early Modern women felt objectified by the custom. On the contrary, in Robert Burton's *The Anatomy of Melancholy* he seems to conclude that women preferred not to appear

⁹ See Gayle Rubin's "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex."

“unruly,” “wanton,” and “malapert” by choosing their own husbands (Burton 582). Explicitly, he contends that the woman “should rather seem to be desired by a man, than to desire a man herself” (582). This very well may be true, but Cressy points out that since Anglican apologists felt compelled to justify the process, there must have been at least some objection (Cressy 340). Apologist Richard Hooker urged that the ancient custom of “delivering up of the woman, either by her father or some other...putteth the women in mind of a duty whereunto the very imbecility of their nature and sex doth bind them, namely, to be always directed, guided, and ordered by others” (qtd. in 339). A Restoration churchman, Anthony Sparrow aligns with Hooker’s interpretation, remarking that “it cannot be fit, that a woman whose chiefest ornament is modesty and shamefastness, should offer herself before the congregation to marriage to any person, but should rather be led by the hand of another, and given by him” (qtd. in 340). The apologies made by these churchmen are the very arguments which have fueled castigation from modern feminist critique.

Cressy attempts to pacify the custom’s misogynistic appearance by arguing that the actual “rubric makes clear...that when a bride is ‘given,’ she is given to be married; she is given to God...it signaled permission rather than possession” (339). Furthermore, he believes that the opinions of the apologists were not universally shared. Specifically—in his analysis of William Gouge, another English clergyman’s writings—Cressy finds that “the foundation of marriage...was ‘reciprocal affection’ between the intending parties. Parents and kinsman should make their suggestions, of course...but without ‘mutual liking,’ [as] Gouge insisted, the marriage should not proceed” (261). Thus, while the father’s “giving away” of the bride was customary, it was not essential, nor of ultimate importance for authorizing marriage. And yet, it is still present

in some of Shakespeare's plays and still presently important to our discussion of Rosalind's self-giving scene.

Can Shakespeare be both for a patriarchal exchange and a companionate form of marriage? Is there a reason his marriage scenes vary in this regard? Perhaps, for a playwright, the type of marriage scene depends on context and character. For me, his contradiction affirms that Shakespeare recognized that some marriages emphasized the intimacy and reciprocity of the couple, while others were exchanges through which families made alliances—and in these cases, the intimacy/reciprocity is secondary to other needs. Not all of Shakespeare's marriages, nor all marriages in Early Modern England, were companionate—however, many were. And for Shakespeare, it appears he uses a companionate model most often in plays where a feisty heroine is meant to be admired—such as in *As You Like It*.

Rosalind is certainly feisty. Perhaps even more so because she has been empowered by her masculinized persona as Ganymede. In a sense, assuming her role as Ganymede actually masculinizes Rosalind—perhaps enabling her to be not only true to her real feelings, but surprisingly forward with them. Owen Felltham's *Resolves: Divine, Moral, and Political* exposes contemporary opinions regarding emboldened, masculinized women. He writes, “when a woman grows bold and daring, we dislike her, and say, she is too like a man: yet in our selves, we magnifie what we condemn in her. Is not this injustice?” (Felltham 47). Felltham's critique of this opinion leads me to believe that it may have been typical for the times, though not universally shared. In many of Shakespeare's plays, in fact, such “bold and daring” women put on the very likeness of masculinity through cross-dressing and never seem to be punished or disliked for it. However, this societal dislike of masculine women—if it was in fact a common

view in the period—opens up another possibility for why later editors chose to return to an F1/F2 emendation of Rosalind’s lines over F3/F4’s.

As stated before, these lines are Rosalind’s first speech in her returned feminine form. She returns to her female clothes, and perhaps rightfully to her modest conduct. Contrasted to an emboldened Rosalind—one who eagerly ushers in vows with Orlando—the deferent, filial Rosalind from F1/F2 reflects a bowing to patriarchy. She shows that she has stepped down from her masculinized persona as Ganymede and become a proper lady; she has returned to Rosalind. Certainly, this interpretation makes Rosalind more palatable to a traditionally patriarchal audience. However, I think it important to note that Rosalind is not described as returning in her “woman’s cloathes” until Nicholas Rowe’s 1709 version. Yet seventeenth-century editors might have believed it was implied since costumes were the main signifiers of gender for the all male cast. If Rosalind had returned, the actor would likely need to dress in feminine costume to signal this change to the audience. Yet even if Rosalind abandons her masculine dress, I don’t believe she completely sheds her Ganymede-boldness. It is after this that she offers the play’s epilogue—usually delivered by the male of highest authority—and it is here that she gives herself to Orlando.

Contrary to Anthony Sparrow’s discretion, Rosalind (in all editions) does offer herself, and contrary to Robert Burton, it doesn’t seem to make her less desirable. Perhaps this is because while Rosalind gives of herself, she does not entirely shun her father’s wishes or the custom of giving the bride away. While F3 and F4’s emendations remove the initial pledge to Duke Senior, all variants show Rosalind desiring Duke Senior’s permission and honoring the customary giving of the bride. Before Hymen ever enters the scene, before the “real” Rosalind appears, Ganymede

verifies both Duke Senior's consent and Orlando's acceptance. In the beginning of 5.4, we find the following discourse:

ROSALIND: Patience once more whiles our compact is urged.

You say if I bring in your Rosalind,

You will bestow her on Orlando here?

DUKE SENIOR: That would I, had I kingdoms to give with her.

ROSALIND: And you say you will have her when I bring her?

ORLANDO: That would I, were I of all kingdoms king. ...

ROSALIND: I have promised to make all this matter even.

Keep you your word, O Duke to give your daughter;

You yours, Orlando, to receive his daughter. (*As You Like It* 5.4.5-20)

Rosalind's dialogue here exudes confirmation and clarification. She is careful not to leave anything misunderstood. She emphasizes that Duke Senior will "bestow her on Orlando" and "give" his daughter—a quizzical inquiry for one who would give of herself. Furthermore, she repeats Orlando's promise to "receive [Duke Senior's] daughter." But the action of this giving is not Duke Senior passing Rosalind to Orlando. On the contrary—after Rosalind hears Duke Senior's consent, Rosalind asks Orlando: "and say you will have her when *I bring her?*" (emphasis mine). In this manner, she upholds the tradition of giving the bride away while still remaining in charge of her plan and herself. Rosalind is not passively shuffled around between the men; she drives the action. Even so, she will not proceed without assurance that Duke Senior will approve and Orlando accept.

As an independent adult, the spunky Rosalind does not require her father's consent—and yet she seeks it. Certainly there is a natural desire to have her father, whom she loves, happily

approve of the man she adores. And yet there might also be an economical reason for why Rosalind would desire her father's consent. Perhaps especially because Orlando is the second son, Rosalind knows that their livelihood depends upon her inheritance. This inheritance of course is tenuous, considering that she and her father have both been stripped of their positions and banished to Arden. But maybe there's an ounce of hope that things may one day be restored. This of course is what happens in the end of the play—Duke Senior regains his kingdom, and promises it to Rosalind and Orlando. But how could Rosalind predict this in the beginning of Act 5? She doesn't, but it still seems to be a present hope for both Duke Senior and Rosalind as evidenced in his promise that he would give Rosalind to Orlando "had I kingdoms to give with her" (5.4.8). Without Duke Senior's approval, Rosalind and Orlando could still marry. But it is unlikely that Duke Senior would be as generous with his kingdom if he resented the match. Hearing this type of emotional and economic approval, Rosalind may feel more confident pressing forward to her wedding vows.

This yearning for parental consent is not unprecedented in Shakespeare's plays. It is similarly presented in *The Tempest*, where Ferdinand and Miranda eagerly want to exchange vows, but also desire parental approval. In 3.1 Miranda weeps at the thought that she cannot give herself to Ferdinand.

FERDINAND: Wherefore weep you?

MIRANDA: At mine unworthiness, that dare not offer

What I desire to give, and much less take

What I shall die to want. But this trifling, ...

I am your wife if you'll marry me; ...

FERDINAND: My mistress, dearest,

And I thus humble ever.

MIRANDA: My husband, then?

FERDINAND. Ay, with a heart as willing

As bondage e'er of freedom. Here's my hand.

MIRANDA: And mine, with my heart in't. (*Tempest* 3.1.77-90).

Interestingly, right before this exchange, Prospero gives consent to the marriage in an aside to the audience (75), confirming his approval, but not to Miranda or Ferdinand. Thus, Shakespeare allows the audience to feel calm and confident in the match, but not necessarily the lovers. Like Miranda, Ferdinand also appears to regret not having parental consent. He later apologizes to Alonso for marrying Miranda without his permission ("I chose her when I could not ask my father for his advice"). While both desired a father's permission, the lack of one did not stop them from taking each other's hands in marriage. Like Rosalind, Ferdinand and Miranda take matters into their own hands. This confirms what scholarship has supposed, that a marriage is made by reciprocal giving and taking in both word and flesh by the couple, without need of either father's voice, though often with desire of it.

The father's voice may not be required in *The Book of Common Prayer's* ritual, but what about his presence? The majority of scholarship points to the action of handfasting as a primary gesture of consent in the marriage ceremony, specifically the joining of hands by the bride's father. Of course, there are multiple instances where handfasting occurs without the presence of a father in Shakespeare's marriages. It appears as Ferdinand offers his hand to Miranda, and when the Duke commands Isabella to give him her hand before accepting his proposal. Similarly, Rosalind honors this ceremonial gesture in the mock wedding scene by beckoning Orlando give her his hand before Celia officiates. However, in *The Book of Common Prayer*, handfasting

clearly acts as both the preparatory gesture and parental consent to the ceremony about to begin. It acts the same for Rosalind's self-giving lines in Act 5.

While the folios differ on Rosalind's pledges, they all agree that Duke Senior rightfully should join the couples' hands. Immediately before Rosalind's "to you I give myself," Hymen, the god of marriage, beckons the Duke to "receive thy daughter; / Hymen from heaven brought her—/ Yea, brought her hither That thou mightst / join her hand with his / whose heart within his bosom is" (*As You Like It* 5.4.103-04). Perhaps the Duke's "receiving" only validates Linda Boose's argument that Rosalind must be received by her father before she can be given to Orlando, but perhaps it also makes F1 and F2's consecutive pledge to Duke Senior redundant and unnecessary. Considering Hymen as the priest over this ceremony, this moment closely resembles the "giving of the bride" via handfasting set forth in *The Book of Common Prayer*. However, that would mean that directly following this handfasting gesture should come the mutual pledging between Bride and Groom. F3/F4 provide this; F1/F2 do not. Perhaps the F3 editor was on to something.

Margaret Maurer considers this specific handfasting gesture in her article, "Facing the Music in Arden: 'twas I, but 'tis not I." She discovers that not only did the F3 editor shift the attribution of Rosalind's second set of lines, but he adjusted Hymen's penultimate line regarding hands (Maurer 504). This editor changed Hymen's original F1 speech from:

Yea, brought her hither,

That thou mightst joyne his hand with his,

Whose heart within his bosome is (F1 206)

to what seemingly all subsequent editions of Shakespeare have adopted: "That thou mightst joyne her hand with his, whose heart within his bosom is" (F3 206). This shift from "his" hand to "her"

hand—often attributed to the fact that Shakespeare’s actresses were boys—does more than clarify genders. As Maurer concludes, the change, “in effect bid[s] the Duke to join Orlando’s hand with Rosalind’s rather than Orlando’s with Hymen’s or with that of a Rosalind who might be considered, because that is how, to some extent, she appears, a he” (Maurer 504). F3’s purpose, then, is to emphasize and clarify the handfasting gesture, which Maurer believes Rosalind’s self-giving lines should do as well. She asserts that one possible reason F3’s editor changed Rosalind’s lines was to further impress the importance of Rosalind and Orlando joining hands (504). Considering the significance of handfasting in Early Modern wedding ceremony, this argument seems valid. Still, while subsequent editors, including our modern ones, keep F3’s emendation of “her” instead of “his” in Hymen’s speech, after F4, most (if not all) return Rosalind’s lines to their F1/F2 repetition—one addresses Duke Senior and one addresses Orlando. By applying the “his” to “her” emendation, modern editors (including the Norton editors) seem to have granted some authority to F3, but, I would argue, not enough.

The Rei(g)n of Rowe

Regarding Rosalind’s self-giving lines, F4 echoes F3’s decisions. It also marks an end of an era for Shakespeare editing. As the last folio printed during the Seventeenth century, F4 remains the final, complete collection of Shakespeare not attributed to a named editor. As Sonia Massai notes, what we find in the eighteenth century is “the rise of a self-conscious proprietary stance towards the dramatic text,” and it begins with Nicholas Rowe’s *The Works of Shakespear* in 1709 (Massai i). No longer are readers purchasing Shakespeare’s works according to “true original copies,” but buying Shakespeare recast by Rowe, Johnson, Pope, Theobald, Warburton, and Capell sold through the Tonson publishing cartel. In the seventeenth century, editing Shakespeare comes down to selling plays. In the eighteenth, it’s about selling books.

Much of this is due to the publishing business. As Gary Taylor addresses in his *Reinventing Shakespeare*, “the Tonsons were sole or part publishers of all the great Shakespeare editions of the first two thirds of the eighteenth century. . . . the Tonsons decided who would edit Shakespeare, in the period that cast the mold of all future editions of his work” (Taylor 70). Their trick was to resell Shakespeare, not simply as a folio reprint, but a credibly revised edition by a well-known contemporary writer or actor. These popular new editors would presumably bring something new to the texts—such as Rowe’s preface detailing Shakespeare’s life—but they would also bring something better than all other contemporary publications, which were, of course, not to be trusted.¹⁰ The Eighteenth century reinvents the Bard and subsequently redefines the process of editing his works. Considering the subsequent editions from 1733-1821, Taylor observes that

legitimate succession was based, literally, upon its immediate predecessor; each editor created his own edition by marking up a copy of the previous edition, deleting some of his predecessors’ observations, adding his own, adding or subtracting emendations, and then dispatching the palimpsest to the printer. (129)

Following this logic, Capell (1768) imitates Johnson (1765), who imitates Warburton (1747), who imitates Theobald (1733), who imitates Pope (1725), who imitates Rowe (1709). Despite his being the first to add character lists and divide the text into scenes and acts, scholars¹¹ consistently agree that Nicholas Rowe used F4 as a copy text. Because of this, scholars—like Edmund C. King—definitively assume “it would be F4, rather than the First Folio, that would

¹⁰ *The Works of Shakespeare. Volume the Second*. London, 1735 contains myriad advertisements warning against other publications of Shakespeare’s works that are not to be trusted. The advertisement on page 84 calls out R. Walker’s collection attributing *Oedipus* to Shakespeare.

¹¹ Sonia Massai, Gary Taylor, Adam Hooks, Annibel Jenkins, and Edmund King all assert that Rowe’s 1709 edition is based upon F4.

form the basis for Shakespeare's texts for most of the next century," that is, until Johnson upholds F1 as the most authoritative in the preface to his 1765 edition (King 121). However, if this were the case, Nicholas Rowe's 1709 version of Rosalind's self-giving lines should copy F4's emendation—dividing the lines between Rosalind and Orlando; they do not. Contrary to what scholars believe—at least in regards to these lines—Rowe does not copy F4, but instead returns to the F1/F2 emendations.

Like most editions, Rowe keeps F3/F4's reference to Rosalind's hand as "her" instead of "his," but he returns both lines to Rosalind. While this appears to mirror F1/F2, Rowe adds his own distinctive mark. Neither F1 nor F2 ever designates to whom Rosalind's lines are delivered. Rowe is the first to add directions of "[To Duke Senior]" and "[To Orlando]" at the end of each line (Rowe 165-66). He is also the first to designate that Rosalind returns in "woman's cloathes." The special attention to stage directions, entrances, and exits is likely a result of Rowe's fame as a playwright. While some, like J. Payne Collier, criticize Rowe as "guilty of serious offences of omission as well as of commission," the 1709 rendition is clearly supported by subsequent editors (Collier 7). Rowe's seminal emendation is adopted by every editor after him, even Samuel Johnson, who touts the First Folio as most authoritative.¹² It is this version of Rosalind's self-giving lines—not F1's—that influences our modern editions. By returning to the F1/F2 emendation and adding clarifying stage directions, Rowe re-casts the mold for interpreting *As You Like It* 5.4.107-08.

But why move backward? Why negate F3's emendations as plausible variants? Does F1 carry enough authority to override F3/F4 in every regard? Rowe's reasoning remains a mystery. Perchance, his explanation might sound something like *The scene is always performed according*

¹² We even find "Ros. (to the Duke) To you I give myself, for I am yours. (to Orlando) To you I give myself for I am yours" in Charles Johnson's 1723 adaptation *Love in a Forest* (see Tomarken 130).

to the F1/F2 variant. I would wager that Rowe was not unfamiliar with theatrical productions of Shakespeare's plays, though it is highly unlikely that he saw a performance of *As You Like It* before 1709.¹³ Edward Tomarken notes that from "1603 onward, we have no record of any version of it appearing on the stage until Charles Johnson's adaptation, *Love in a Forest*, of 1723" (Tomarken 4). Considering the closure of theaters in 1642 and the strict censorship laws that lasted until 1695, it is unlikely that scripts based on F3 (1664) or F4 (1685) were ever performed. Thus, if we are to believe—despite the clear possibility of mistakes at every stage of the printing process—that F1/F2's rendition is an accurate representation of how actors portrayed this scene in 1603, then Rosalind and Orlando have likely never recited reciprocal vows on stage. Rosalind pledging to both Duke Senior and Orlando, on the other hand, has become par for the course, even praised in first hand accounts from eighteenth-century theatre reviews and personal correspondences. Thus, while Nicholas Rowe feasibly did not cite performance as reason to keep Rosalind's lines mirroring F1/F2, subsequent editors—especially our modern ones—assuredly do.

"The Play's The Thing"

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the stage had direct influence on the page—theatre bookkeepers were constantly tweaking and adapting the text for performance. In regards to the eighteenth century, however, Gary Taylor sees text having a far greater influence on performance. He writes:

the practice of theatrical adaptation, initiated during the Restoration, coupled with
Tonson's technique for appropriating reputations, meant that for over a century the finest

¹³ There was only one theater company open in London between 1682-1694—Betterton's The United Company at Drury Lane Theater.

practitioners of the English language, from Dryden to Pope to Johnson, contributed to the public remodeling and transmission of Shakespeare's plays. (Taylor 71)

With theaters reopening, censorship bans lifted, and women allowed on the stage, the eighteenth century saw a boom of Shakespeare performances. Between 1603 and 1723 *As You Like It* did not appear on stage, or at the very least, we have no record of it. However, in the later half of the eighteenth century, it becomes ranked as one of the most performed productions.¹⁴ Seeing that Gary Taylor supposes Nicholas Rowe's 1709 entire edition was "seasoned to contemporary taste," and "incorporated material...which apparently represented the text as performed in the Restoration theatre," I believe looking to eighteenth-century performances of *As You Like It* may bring to light possible reasons why eighteenth-century editors, especially Rowe, chose to revert Rosalind's lines back to F1 (74, 82-83).

Surprisingly, many reviews from the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries note actresses' delivery of *As You Like It* 5.4.107-08. Though far more renowned for her performance of tragic heroines, Sarah Siddons's delivery of Rosalind's self-giving lines apparently had great effect on her audience. In a letter from Anna Seward to Miss Sophia Weston, dated July 20 1786—Seward praises Siddons for her dignified tenderness:

One of those rays of exquisite and original discrimination, which her genius so perpetually elicits, shone out on her first rushing upon the stage in her own resumed person and dress; where she bent her knee to her father, the Duke, and said— 'To you I give myself—for I am yours;' and when, falling into Orlando's arms, she repeated the

¹⁴ Charting the performance of Shakespeare's comedies, Jeanne Addison Roberts notes that during the 1739-40 and 1760-61 seasons, *As You Like It* ranks second with 121 performances, just behind *Merchant of Venice* with 134. Neil Shroeder ranks *As You Like It* 8th out of twenty-nine plays produced, with 179 performances between 1751-1800 (see Tomarken 7).

same words, — “To *you* I give myself—for I am *yours!*” (*Letters of Anna Seward* 165-66)

Although this letter is a mere correspondence regarding Seward’s late expedition to town, she spends a good deal of it commending Siddons’ delivery of these very specific lines. She goes on applauding:

The marked difference of her look and voice in repeating that line, and particularly the last word of it, was inimitably striking. The tender joy of filial love was in the first; the whole soul of enamoured transport in the second. The extremely heightened emphasis on the word *yours*, produced an effect greater than you can conceive could result from the circumstance, without seeing and hearing it given by that mistress of the passions. (166)

What strikes me about this letter is that Anna Seward treats Sarah Siddons’s performance as if it were her “exquisite and original discrimination” to repeat the lines with varied emphases—that somehow, this way of delivering the lines was a “marked difference.” Shouldn’t this be surprising given that our privileging of F1/F2 leads me to believe these lines had never been performed differently? Perhaps Siddons’s emotional delivery simply brought them to life.

Sarah Siddons’s own biographer, James Boaden, alludes to these lines in his praise of Siddons’s *Rosalind*. He attributes the repetition of lines delivered to different recipients as “the poet’s language,” but adds that “the meaning is expanded by the discrimination of look and tone and action— ‘To you I give myself, for I am yours’” (Brereton 544). Like Seward, Boaden hails Siddons for making Shakespeare’s lines more meaningful. Yet what exactly is the meaning of these lines? Why did the eighteenth-century editors, actresses, and audience members cling to this *Rosalind* kneeling to her father and throwing herself into her husband’s arms?

This question begs further research, research I look forward to pursuing. However, for the purpose of this article, I will simply venture that the emendation fit with the social, political, and theatrical climate of the day. For it is during this time that David Garrick is pushing to bring original texts back, performing plays “as written by Shakespeare” (qtd. in Taylor 119). And, it is during this time that this moment of restoration—between Rosalind and Duke Senior—was considered poignantly symbolic of the political Restoration of 1660 (Tomarken 9). Finally, it is also during this time that contemporary taste ruled the theatre. Perhaps swapping Rosalind’s eager vow exchange for a tender reconnection with her Father provided a more moral and palatable scene for Protestant taste. In this, I am not completely certain, but I am certain that the performance of this self-giving scene, somehow, continues to grab attention even into the nineteenth century.¹⁵ And, although my research is preliminary, I have found zero references to any actress—in any century—performing Rosalind’s lines as a reciprocal vow between Rosalind and Orlando.

Conclusion

This isn’t surprising; it shouldn’t be. If not a single modern edition of *As You Like It* mentions that these lines have been, or could be performed as, reciprocal vows between Rosalind and Orlando, what are the chances a script might? Since 1709, F3/F4’s emendation has been snuffed out. Somewhere along the way, someone decided it was not valid enough, original enough, or authoritative enough to merit even a footnote, and that decision has stuck. But are we satisfied with a one “right” interpretation?

¹⁵ Helen Faucit, Lady Martin refers to Mr. Macready’s 1842 revival of the play on Drury Lane with Mrs. Nisbet as Rosalind. While *The Times* criticizes Nisbet for “betray[ing] an inward heaviness of heart” (*The Times* 525), Faucit praises Nisbet’s delivery of Rosalind’s self-giving lines as “pregnant with feeling” (Faucit 390): “What other could so well express the surrender which a loving daughter here makes of herself to the lover” (390).

In their General Textual Introduction to the *Norton* Third Edition, Gordon McMullan and Suzanne Gossett urge that “quite often, there may be either *no* ‘right’ reading or *more than one*” (McMullan and Gossett 76). They seem to believe that there is something worthwhile in continuing to add upon Shakespeare, to considering possibility in regards to editing:

Each time you add something to a volume called ‘Complete’ you make it *more complete*, but the fact that you needed to add something to complete a volume already claiming to be ‘complete’ has the effect of determining the very possibility of completeness. For editors of Shakespeare, this is unavoidable—and to be celebrated, not resented. (76)

In general, Greenblatt, McMullen, and Gossett’s edition celebrates this. It emphasizes that there is no definitive authorial text that rules over all others. As Catherine Silverstone, Norton editor of *Titus Andronicus*, points out, there is

no call for fidelity to some (unknowable) original text and authorial intention. Rather, it is a call to acknowledge the often intensely collaborative work on the part of authors, editors, typesetters, and proofreaders, sometimes over long periods of time, through which some texts come into existence and continue to be (re)made. (Silverstone 67)

Silverstone assures her readers that changes made by editors would be noted in “a list of textual variants,” that Greenblatt, Gossett, and McMullan advise ten textual comments per play to be referenced in print edition and expanded upon digitally (64-65). No comment recognizing F3’s emendation of Rosalind’s self-giving lines appears in either form.

Why not? Perhaps Greenblatt et al. believes, as the Folger Library believes, that “*As You Like It* was published in the 1623 First Folio and that text serves as the source for *all subsequent editions* of the play” (The Folger, emphasis mine), that we are to stay as close to that original and “not adopt a traditional emendation if it appears to us to be the product of editorial preference

rather than necessary for sense” (McMullan and Gossett 85). Perhaps they are right; perhaps F1’s emendation is the way Shakespeare intended Rosalind’s lines, or at least the closest iteration to it. Perhaps F3’s editor merely followed some jolt of serendipitous inspiration, or even some great error, in adding the prefix “*Orl.*” But we cannot know for sure. In the meantime, I believe that considering all variants and texts might help us to piece together a slightly more nuanced and truthful sense of the past.

Editing Shakespeare—in any century—has proven no easy task. As Gordon McMullan and Suzanne Gossett consider, “editing is always negotiation, and it is always compromise” (91). I would argue that F3’s emendation of 5.4.107-08 merits compromise, that it should receive a textual note in future editions. I also hope the emendation may be available for future directors and actors on the stage. For without acknowledging it, we miss out on interesting performative and textual possibilities. We miss out on seeing this moment as an intensification of companionate marriage. We miss out on the possibility that Rosalind may be feisty enough to give of herself, and that Orlando may be tender enough to give in return.

Works Cited

- Black, Matthew W. "Shakespeare's Seventeenth Century Editors." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 76, no. 5, 1936, pp. 707-17. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/984756.
- Blayney, Peter W. M. *The First Folio of Shakespeare*. Folger Library Publications, 1991.
- Boose, Lynda E. "The Father and the Bride in Shakespeare." *PMLA*, vol. 97, no. 3, 1982, pp. 325-47. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/462226.
- Bowers, Fredson. *On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists*. University of Pennsylvania Library, 1955.
- , general editor. *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*. 10 vols. Cambridge UP, 1966.
- Brereton, Austin. "The Stage Shakespeare." 1908. *As You Like It from 1600 to the Present: Critical Essays*, edited by Edward Tomarken, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997, pp. 539-46.
- Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. Oxford, 1632.
- Capell, Edward. "Notes to *As You Like It*." 1779. *As You Like It from 1600 to the Present: Critical Essays*, edited by Edward Tomarken, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997, pp. 235-50.
- Cavendish, Margaret (Duchess of Newcastle). *CCXI Sociable Letters Written by the Thrice Noble, Illustrious, and Excellent Princess, The Lady Marchioness of Newcastle*, 1664.
- Collier, J. Payne. *Reasons for a New Edition of Shakespeare's Works Containing Notices of the Defects of Former Impressions, and Pointing out the Lately Acquired Means of Illustrating the Plays, Poems, and Biography of the Poet*. 1842. Updated ed., AMS Press, 1973.

- Cook, Ann Jennalie. *Making a Match: Courtship in Shakespeare and His Society*. Princeton UP, 1991.
- Cressy, David. *Birth, Marriage & Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England*. Oxford UP, 1999.
- Egan, Gabriel. "The Provenance of the Folio Texts." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's First Folio*, edited by Emma Smith. Cambridge UP, 2016, pp. 68-85.
- Faucit, Helena, Lady Martin. "Some Of Shakespeare's Female Characters." 1891. *As You Like It from 1600 to the Present: Critical Essays*, edited by Edward Tomarken, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997, pp. 343-94.
- Felltham, Owen. *Resolves: Divine, Moral, and Political*. 10th Impression. Printed for Andrew Clark and Charles Harper. Benjamin Billingsley and Samuel Crouch, 1677.
- The Folger Shakespeare Library Online Edition of *As You Like It*. <http://www.folger.edu/as-you-like-it>.
- "The Form of Solemnization of Matrimonie." *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of England*. Richardi Iugge and Johannis Canwood, 1599, pp. xbi-xbii.
- Giese, Loreen L. *Courtships, Marriage Customs, and Shakespeare's Comedies*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Greg, W. W. *Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare*. The Folcroft Press, 1928.
- Higgins, B. D. R. "Printing the First Folio." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's First Folio*, edited by Emma Smith. Cambridge UP, 2016.
- Hooks, Adam. *Selling Shakespeare: Biography, Bibliography, and the Book Trade*. Cambridge UP, 2016.

- Jenkins, Annibel. *Nicholas Rowe*. Twayne Publishers, 1977.
- Johnson, Charles. "Love in a Forest." 1723. As You Like It *from 1600 to the Present: Critical Essays*, edited by Edward Tomarken, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997, pp. 81-132.
- Johnson, Samuel. "The Plays of William Shakespeare." 1765. As You Like It *from 1600 to the Present: Critical Essays*, edited by Edward Tomarken, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997, pp. 133-224.
- King, Edmund C. "Editors." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's First Folio*, edited by Emma Smith. Cambridge UP, 2016.
- Letters of Anna Seward: Written between the Years 1784 and 1807 in Six Volumes*. Vol 1. George Ramsay and Company, 1811.
- Lodge, Thomas. *Rosalynde. Euphues Golden Legacie Found after his death in his cell at Silixedra. Bequethed to Philautus Sonnes, noursed vp with their father in England. Fetcht from the Canaries by T. L. Gent.* Abel Ieffes for T. Gubbin and Iohn Busbie, 1592.
- Macfarlane, Alan. *Marriage and Love in England 1300-1840*. Blackwell, 1986.
- Massai, Sonia. *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor*. Cambridge UP, 2007.
- Maurer, Margaret. "Facing the Music in Arden: 'Twas I, But 'Tis Not I.'" 1996. As You Like It *from 1600 to the Present: Critical Essays*, edited by Edward Tomarken, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997, pp. 475-509.
- McKerrow, Ronald B. *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare: A Study in Editorial Method*. Clarendon Press, 1939.
- McMullan, Gordon, and Suzanne Gossett. "General Textual Introduction." *The Norton Shakespeare*. 3rd ed. Gen. ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Norton, 2016, pp. 75-91.

Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, histories & tragedies, published according to the true originall copies. William Jaggard, Edward Blount, L. Smithweeke, and W. Aspley, 1623.

Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, histories & tragedies, published according to the true originall copies. The second impression. Smethwick, J., Aspley, W., Hawkins, Richard, and Meighan, Richard, 1632.

Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, histories, and tragedies. Published according to the true original copies. The third impression. And unto this impression is added seven playes, never before printed in folio. Viz. Pericles Prince of Tyre, The London prodigall, The History of Thomas Ld. Cromwell, Sir John Oldcastle Lord Cobham, The Puritan Widow, A York-shire tragedy, The tragedy of Locrine. Phillip Chetwinde, 1664.

Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, histories and tragedies: published according to the true original copies. Unto which is added seven plays, never before printed in folio: viz. Pericles Prince of Tyre, The London prodigal, The history of Thomas Lord Cromwel, Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, The Puritan widow, A Yorkshire tragedy, The tragedy of Locrine. The Fourth ed. H. Herringman and R. Bentley, 1685.

The New Whole Duty. The New Whole Duty of Man, 24th ed. 1792.

Pechter, Edward. *Shakespeare Studies Today: Romanticism Lost.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Roberts, Jeanne Addison. "Shakespearean Comedy and Some Eighteenth-Century Actresses."

1983. *As You Like It From 1600 to the Present: Critical Essays*, edited by Edward

Tomarken, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997, pp. 556-71.

Rowe, Nichoals. *The Works of Shakespear.* Vol 2. Tonson, 1735.

Rubin, Gayle. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex." *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, edited by Rayna Reiter. Monthly Review, 1975.

- Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It. The Norton Shakespeare*. 3rd ed. Gen. ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Norton, 2016, pp. 1625-83.
- , *King Lear. The Norton Shakespeare*. 3rd ed. Gen. ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Norton, 2016, pp. 2331-2570.
- , *Measure for Measure. The Norton Shakespeare*. 3rd ed. Gen. ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Norton, 2016, pp. 2181-2239.
- , *Much Ado About Nothing. The Norton Shakespeare*. 3rd ed. Gen. ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Norton, 2016, pp. 1406-62.
- , *The Merchant of Venice. The Norton Shakespeare*. 3rd ed. Gen. ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Norton, 2016., pp. 1339-93.
- , *Othello. The Norton Shakespeare*. 3rd ed. Gen. ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Norton, 2016, pp. 2084-2158
- , *The Tempest. The Norton Shakespeare*. 3rd ed. Gen. ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Norton, 2016 pp. 3215-66.
- Silverstone, Catherine. "Textual Editing." *Contemporary Theatre Review*, vol. 25. no. 1, Feb. 2015, pp. 64-67.
- Smith, Henry. *A Preparative to Mariage*. Thomas Orwin for Thomas Man, 1591.
- Sokol, B. J. and Mary Sokol. *Shakespeare, Law, and Marriage*. Cambridge UP, 2003.
- Stern, Tiffany. *Making Shakespeare: From Page to Stage*. Routledge, 2004.
- Taylor, Gary. *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History, from the Restoration to the Present*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989.
- The Times*. 3 October 1842. *As You Like It from 1600 to the Present: Critical Essays*, edited by Edward Tomarken, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997.

Tomarken, Edward. "As You Like It from 1600 to the Present." *As You Like It from 1600 to the Present: Critical Essays*, edited by Edward Tomarken, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997, pp. 3-75.

Werstine, Paul. *Early Modern Playhouse Manuscripts and the Editing of Shakespeare*. Cambridge UP, 2013.

Wingate, Charles. "Shakespeare's Heroines." 1895. *As You Like It from 1600 to the Present: Critical Essays*, edited by Edward Tomarken, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997, pp. 395-410.