

# BIBLIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES OF GEORGE CHAPMAN'S *MAY-DAY* (1611) PRINTED BY WILLIAM STANSBY

Akihiro YAMADA

T. M. Parrott's edition of *May-Day* appeared in 1914, forty years after Shepherd included the play in his *Works of George Chapman : Plays*. Like most of Chapman's comedies, *May-Day* has not drawn the scholars' attention, and Parrott's edition, even half a century after its publication, still keeps the honour of being the latest edition. However, Parrott in editing Chapman's plays paid no attention to the bibliographical significance of the old quartos in general. He seems to have collated only four copies of the 1611 quarto of *May-Day*. An editor of today would not do this.

The present article has been prepared with a similar object as was intended in my articles on *Monsieur D'Olive* and *The Gentleman Usher*.<sup>1)</sup> And in this paper likewise I shall discuss the nature of the printer's copy, list the press-variants in the quarto, try a compositorial analysis, and suggest the compositorial habits of the printer. I shall also come to refer to some of Chapman's authorial spellings.

## I

### THE NATURE OF THE PRINTER'S COPY

Nothing is known about the circumstances of the publication of *May-Day*. The sole information of its publication comes from the title-page:

---

(1) Cf. A. Yamada, "Bibliographical Studies of George Chapman's *Monsieur D'Olive* (1606) Printed by Thomas Creede", *Studies in English Literature* (English Number 1963), Tokyo, 1-48; A. Yamada, "Bibliographical Studies of George Chapman's *The Gentleman Usher* (1606) Printed by Valentine Simmes", *Shakespeare Studies*, ii (1963), Tokyo, 82-113.

My work was greatly facilitated by the use of microfilms supplied by the British and American libraries of the quarto of 1611. My debts are due to the trustees and the librarians of these libraries for kind permission and co-operation to make their material embodied in this article.

A further mention should be made that part of this article has been prepared with the assistance of a Research Grant for 1964/65 from the Japanese Ministry of Education. (この研究の一部は昭和39年度科学研究費の援助を得て行われたものである。)

MAY-DAY. / A vvitty Comedie, / diuers times acted at the / Blacke Fryers. /  
 [rule] / Written by GEORGE CHAPMAN. / [rule] / [device McKerrow 252] /  
 [rule] / LONDON. / *Printed for Iohn Browne, dwelling in Fleetstreete / in Saint  
 Dunstones Church-yard.* / 1611.

The printer appears, from the device on the title-page and the ornamental initials used at the beginning of each act, to have been William Stansby. The device had once been John Wolf's and, as Greg writes, it "probably came to Stansby from John Windet in 1610."<sup>2)</sup> No entry in connexion with this quarto of 1611 is found in the Stationers' Registry. But as late as on 11 June, 1659, Richard Marriot transferred the right for the play, either in whole or in part, to Moseley,<sup>3)</sup> who in 1660 advertised 'May Day, a Comedy written by George Chapman'. Anyhow, John Brown published the play in 1611 without entry.

As the stage direction at the very beginning of the play, 'Chorus Iuuenum cantantes & saltantes' (A<sub>2</sub> 3) suggests, the play must have been intended evidently for performance by a Boy Company at the Blackfriars.

The text is divided into five acts with the 'Finis' indication at their ends. Each act is also divided, though not numbered, into scenes by rules. The text of each act begins with an ornamental initial, and that of each scene with a large capital. The act-scene-division is in good order: nothing anomalous is in the play in the matter of division. Although Chapman may have been responsible for the act-division, it is not very likely that he also divided each act into scenes.<sup>4)</sup>

The character-names and speech-prefixes in the play are as a whole very regular and do not suggest any great possibility of the printer's copy being the author's original manuscript. But a careful examination of speech-prefixes has rendered an evidence for a possibility of the author producing the printer's copy. There are four confused speech-prefixes:

1. 'Ang.' (D<sub>3</sub> 38), which should be *Lor* [enzo].
2. 'Innoc.' (G<sub>4</sub> 26), which should be *Lio* [nell].
3. 'Lod.' (K<sub>2</sub> 27), which should be *Leo* [noro].
4. 'Lod.' (K<sub>4v</sub> 11), which should be *Quint* [iliano].

All of these confusions may not come from the printer's carelessness but from his copy. There are also four ambiguous speech-prefixes:

1. 'Amb.' (I<sub>4v</sub> 29) = Honorio & Gasparo.
2. 'Amb.' (K<sub>1</sub> 5) = Honorio & Gasparo.
3. 'Omnes.' (K<sub>1v</sub> 22) = Aurelio, Leonoro & Quintiliano.

(2) W. W. Greg, *The Bibliography of the English Printed Drama*, vol. I, no. 297, note 2.

(3) Cf. *ibid.*, no. 297.

(4) Cf. *infra*, 20.

4. 'Ambo.' (K<sub>4</sub> 37) = Aurelio & Æmilia.

Inaccurate and unspecified speech-prefixes like these usually suggest a possibility of the author's manuscript. And these are even in Latin and are exactly what one can find in *Monsieur D'Olive* as characteristics of Chapman's manuscript.<sup>5)</sup>

More positive evidence for the authorial manuscript comes from an examination of stage-directions, the profusion of which enables us to consider, almost to the full extent, the nature of the copy behind the quarto of *May-Day*. The variety seems to extend from one end of the authorial characteristics to the other end of the book-keeper's characteristics. These directions, apart from exits and bare entrances, are as follows:

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| A. | { | 1. 'Enter Lucretia and Temperance, / seuerall wayes.' (B <sub>4</sub> v 18-9).                                 |
|    |   | 2. '(Enter Æ-/milia, Lionell, Francischina and another woman.' (K <sub>1</sub> 22-3).                          |
|    |   | 3. '(Enter Gasparo an old Clowne.)' (A <sub>4</sub> v 1).  |
|    |   | 4. '(Enter Lorenzo with his/glasse in his hand, and Angelo with a pot of painting.)' (E <sub>4</sub> v 13-4).  |
|    |   | 5. '(He sits downe, and muf-/fles himselfe in his cloake.)' (G <sub>1</sub> 34-5).                             |
|    |   | 6. '(Enter Leonoro muffled in his cloake with Lyonell.' (G <sub>1</sub> v 36).                                 |
|    |   | 7. '(Enter Quintiliano, Giouenelli, and/Fannio in their doublet and hose.) (G <sub>2</sub>                     |
|    |   | 24-5).   |
| B. | { | 8. '(Enter Quintilliano and a drawer with a cup of wine & a/towell.)' (G <sub>2</sub> v                        |
|    |   | 15-6).   |
|    |   | 9. 'Enter Lodouico and Lucretia, with Rapiers/fighting.' (H <sub>3</sub> 28-9).                                |
|    |   | 10. 'Enter Aurelio with Angelo, shifting his Apparell.' (H <sub>4</sub> 14).                                   |
|    |   | 11. '(Enter Angelo and/Francischina in disguise.)' (I <sub>2</sub> v 18-9).                                    |
|    |   | 12. 'Enter Aurelio, Leonoro, Quintiliano, and Innocentio, /in a maske dancing.' (K <sub>1</sub> v 10-11).      |
|    |   | 13. '(Enter Temperance stealing along the stage.)' (G <sub>2</sub> 12)   |
|    |   | 14. 'Enter Quintiliano, Leonoro, Innocentio, Lionello, / Fannio, with Musicke.' (G <sub>4</sub> 18-9).         |
| C. | { | 15. 'Enter Lorenzo and Angelo running.' (H <sub>2</sub> 8).  |
|    |   | 16. '(Enter Lorenzo and after him Angelo.)' (H <sub>2</sub> v 5).  |
|    |   | 17. 'Enter Quintiliano, Innocentio, Fannio, Taylor, Taylors/sonne, he Reades a bill.' (D <sub>4</sub> v 15-6). |
|    |   | 18. '(He stands close.)' (G <sub>2</sub> v 28).  |
| D. | { | 19. '(He spits. ' (H <sub>4</sub> 11).   |

(5) Cf. A. Yamada, "Bibliographical Studies of George Chapman's *Monsieur D'Olive* (1606) Printed by Thomas Creede", *Studies in English Literature* (English Number 1963), 5. There are in *May-Day* four instances of Latin directions, viz. 'Chorus Iuuenum cantantes & saltantes.' (A<sub>2</sub> 3), 'Interim, Intrat Lorenzo, ...' (A<sub>2</sub> 5), 'Exiturus.' (C<sub>2</sub>v 20), and 'Exit cum filio.' (F<sub>1</sub> 24), all of which resemble or really are what can be found in some other plays by Chapman.

- 20. '*He spits againe.*' (H<sub>4</sub> 12).
- 21. '*They dance.*' (K<sub>1v</sub> 28; K<sub>2</sub> 13).
- 22. '*They dance againe.*' (K<sub>2</sub> 2).
- E. { 23. '*Enter Lorenzo and Angelo. (Francisco aboue)*' (F<sub>3</sub> 1).
- 24. '*Enter Lodouico with a ladder of ropes, Aurelio, / (Æmia aboue.)*' (F<sub>3v</sub> 13-3).
- 25. '*Lorenzo within.*' (G<sub>4v</sub> 35).
- 26. '*Enter Aurelio and Æmia, aboue.*' (H<sub>1v</sub> 16).
- F. { 27. '...Papers in his hand.' (A<sub>2</sub> 5).
- 28. 'A purse of/twenty/pound in/gold.' (B<sub>2</sub> 13-6, margin).
- G. { 29. 'Hold vp the/bracelets.' (D<sub>2</sub> 9-10, margin).
- 30. '*Kisse her.*' (I<sub>2v</sub> 21; K<sub>1</sub> 35).

The first group of these (A : 1-2) contains such unspecified and ambiguous phrases as 'seuerall wayes' and 'another woman', which most positively suggest the characteristics of an authorial manuscript.

The second group (B : 3-12) contains descriptions mostly of the outward appearance of the characters concerned. These descriptive directions generally point to the working of either the author or the book-keeper. No body can, with confidence, be in favour of any part.<sup>6)</sup> But in view of the pattern of some directions like 4 and 6 with descriptive explanations between character-names, and also in view of the innumerable references to disguises in the play, it seems to be more likely that these directions, most of which are more or less of the same nature and of similar pattern, are intended by the author to help the understanding of the play, and indeed they are quite helpful.

The third and the fourth groups (C : 13-16, and D : 17-22) again are both authorial. If taken up independently of the text, some of these directions might appear to reflect the book-keeper's additions to the author's original directions.<sup>7)</sup> Particularly so do the directions 13, 14, and 15. But the phrasing like 'stealing along the stage' 'with Musicke' or 'running' is so homogeneous with 'with Rapiers /fighting' (B : 9) or 'shifting his Apparell, (B : 10) that here again one may well take these three directions as authorial. Indeed it would be more probable for the book-keeper simply to write 'Musicke' than 'with Musicke'.

The fifth group (E: 23-26) again suggests the authorial characteristics. Of course, such theatrical terms as 'aboue' or 'within' do not necessarily reflect the working of a theatrical expert on the dramatic manuscript.<sup>8)</sup> Here, '(Francisco aboue)' is a little too early entry for her, who is required only at F<sub>3</sub> 30 (30

(6) Cf. W. W. Greg, *The Shakespeare First Folio*, 132-4.

(7) Cf. *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

(8) *Ibid.*, 122.

lines later). But it cannot be anticipatory, because it is the only one entry given to the character at F<sub>3</sub> 30. In other words, presumably it was Chapman who gave the entry to Francischina. Again, '*Æmilia aboue.*' is given to *Æmilia* some 16 lines too early. Both of these 'aboue' directions are distinguished from the main directions by being supplied with round brackets, for which Chapman perhaps must be responsible. 'Lorenzo within' also seems to be authorial: the character-name is not abbreviated and the direction 'within' is properly located between the speech-prefix and the speech. A book-keeper would have marked the 'within' somewhere else.<sup>9)</sup>

Finally the last two groups (F: 27-28; G: 29-30) are of a little different kind. They may suggest the possibility of either the author or the book-keeper as their origin. 'Papers in his hand.' is required 33 lines later at A<sub>2</sub>v 14, where Lorenzo says 'Here haue I put her face in rime...' and read his verse. Likewise 'A purse of / twenty/pound in / gold' is required some 170 lines later at B<sub>4</sub>v 3-4, where Innocentio says he has 'some twenty marke or twenty pound in gold' in his purse, and at B<sub>4</sub>v 6 where Quintiliano asks him to 'giue me your purse Sir'. And this direction is printed in roman and even in the margin to distinguish it from the entrance direction centralized in italic in the text page at B<sub>2</sub> 13-4. The 'Papers...' direction at A<sub>2</sub> 5, though not in the margin, is also printed in roman to distinguish it from the main part of the forgoing direction which is, as usual, in italic. Anyhow, any of these two directions (i. e., 27-8) appears to be, in McKerrow's words,

the mention, at the time of the entry of a character, of properties which he will require later in the scene, but either must not or need not exhibit to the audience at the time of entry.<sup>10)</sup>

It is a warning which a prompter would be likely to give to a character at the time of his entrance. The author, if writing his manuscript in a prompter's state of mind, might also give this sort of warning to his character, but that this is his usual practice is less likely. One of the three imperative directions (group G: 29) also is printed in the margin—this time, in italic. Angelo, seeing Francischina come out of doors, assumes a shop-keeper and cries, 'D'ee lacke gentlewoman, d'ee lacke...wrought smocks, bracelets...' (D<sub>2</sub> 9-11). The action as is suggested by the marginal direction, therefore, could possibly be required by the speech, and so left unspecified by either the author or the book-keeper. So, the specification of the action appears, though not very strongly, to be the book-keeper's rather than the author's. The two other imperative 'Kisse her' may be due to either the author or the book-keeper.

As it is now clear, the book-keeper's markings, if such they are, are only

(9) Cf. *Monsieur D'Olive*, sig. C<sub>1</sub>v 1.22; A. Yamada, *op. cit.*, 7-8.

(10) R. B. McKerrow, "The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts", *Library*, iv Ser., Vol. xii, No. 3 (Dec., 1931), 271.

found in the first third of the play. And to my mind, only one of them (i. e., No. 28 'A purse...gold') seems to bear a high degree of probability of the book-keeper at work on the printer's copy. In other words, almost all of the stage directions seem to be due to the author.

Further examinations of the text have proved that the copy behind the quarto of *May-Day* was prepared not so much by the book-keeper as by the author.<sup>11)</sup>

Entrances and exits were found missing or being incomplete here and there.<sup>11)</sup> The book-keeper need not be too attentive to exits, because most of them are required by the actor's speech. But in *May-Day*, there are half a dozen of them which the action may not require. They are 'Exit [with Francischina]' (B<sub>2</sub>v 6), '[Exit]' (E<sub>4</sub> 27), '[Exit Temperance]' (G<sub>1</sub>v 28), 'Exit [with Lionell]' (G<sub>2</sub> 5), '[Exeunt]' (H<sub>2</sub> 7), and '[Exit with Æmilia]' (I<sub>3</sub> 12). The book-keeper must be very careful about entrances; nevertheless there are two 'above' entrances missing. An entrance must be given to Aurelio and Æmilia above at H<sub>2</sub>v between ll. 20-21, and another to Æmilia above at I<sub>3</sub> between ll. 4-5. I do not know whether or not it is common to find the 'above' entrances missing in the printed dramatic text. But oddly enough, towards the end of *Monsieur D'Olive*, a few 'above' entrances are also missing (at G<sub>3</sub>v 4, 14 and probably G<sub>3</sub> 14).<sup>12)</sup> An incomplete entrance direction is found at K<sub>3</sub> 31 in *May-Day*. If an entrance is not given to Temperance there, it is impossible for the character to give a speech at K<sub>4</sub> 11. Thus, evidence from these entrances and exits leads us to suppose a great probability of the printer's copy originating with the author. Nevertheless, the concentration of these missing and incomplete directions on the pages of the second half of the play allows one to expect a slight possibility that the book-keeper may have become less attentive to the details of the copy he was reading through.

Again, rather towards the end of the play, an anomaly is to be found. Lorenzo at K<sub>1</sub>v 31 converses with Angelo and Honorio, and says, 'Gramercy Angelo; but Signior Lorenzo, mee thinks...' This 'Lorenzo' is an obvious mistake for 'Honorio', which to correct is the book-keeper's job. Both of these anomalies are probably due to the author, the printer, or the transcriber if any such were employed for the printer's copy.<sup>13)</sup> In any case, there will be no chance for the book-keeper to be connected with these anomalies.

(11) Missing entrances: —H<sub>2</sub>v between 20-21 and I<sub>2</sub> between 4-5; incomplete entrance: —K<sub>3</sub> 31; missing exits: —E<sub>3</sub> 1, E<sub>3</sub>v 18, E<sub>4</sub> 27, F<sub>2</sub>v 6, G<sub>1</sub>v 28, G<sub>4</sub> 15, H<sub>1</sub> 6, H<sub>2</sub> 7, H<sub>2</sub>v 19, I<sub>1</sub> 30, and I<sub>3</sub> 12.

(12) Cf. A. Yamada, *op. cit.*, 6 and 40.

(13) There is in our play another anomaly. In the masque in the last scene, Quintiliano is talking with his wife Francischina:

*Quint.* Looke that you keepe promise with me Ladie,  
when will thy husband be from home?

The absence of the directions for sound effect in the masque in the last act (K<sub>1</sub>v ff.) probably could offer a contribution to the supposition of the authorial manuscript as the printer's copy.

Now, from all these discussions, no one possibly can infer that the copy the printer used was a prompt-book or a manuscript prepared for performance.<sup>14)</sup> That the book-keeper added a few notes of his own probably could not be denied. But they are completely insufficient for performance of any sort.<sup>15)</sup>

The question still remains as to who then took pains to prepare the copy for the printer to use.

In spite of some anomalies noted above, the text is generally clean. And there is an admirable persistence of uniformity in the abbreviated speech-prefixes and in the character-names in the stage directions. Moreover, a remarkable feature of *May-Day* is that each act is divided into scenes which in no place disturb the action of the play. Judging from the printed texts of the plays by Chapman, such an indication of the division into scenes throughout a play does not appear to be Chapman's practice, although he seems sometimes to have been responsible for the act-divisions in his plays.<sup>16)</sup> And it is true that instances of the division into scenes in the Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatic works

---

*Fran.* Not so soone as I would wish him, but whensoever  
you shall be welcome.

*Quint.* [*unmasking*] I very kindly thanke you Lady.

*Fran.* Gods me, I tooke you for Signior *Placentio*.

Now, this 'Placentio' renders the humorous context meaningless. It must obviously be a mistake for 'Innocentio', Francischina's servant. And this error, it seems to me from the graphical possibility, was due to the printer (or the transcriber). In any case, neither the author or the book-keeper has anything to do with this error.

Another anomaly also will be found in respect of the stage direction on D<sub>4</sub>. The quarto reads:

*Lor.* ...but come lets to our disguise, in

which I long to be singing.

*Ang.* Ile folow you presently. *Exit.* Signio *Lodouico*.

(*Enter Lodouico and Giouenelle.*)

*Lod.* How now *Angelo*?

Obviously the exit must be given immediately after Lorenzo's speech, and the entrance immediately before Angelo's address to 'Signio *Lodouico*.' But this rather seems to be due to the printer's careless distribution of the lines.

(14) Cf. Jewkes, *Act Division*, 258: "this text was printed from a promptbook, or from an author's manuscript which had been prepared for performance", which is utterly wrong.

(15) T. M. Parrott in his edition (*Comedies*, ii.750) writes on the marginal direction 'A purse' at B<sub>2</sub> 13-6 (i.e. l. i. 278 in his edition), "This seems to show conclusively that Q was printed from a stage copy", which, it seems to me, is a little too rash.

(16) Cf. A. Yamada, *op. cit.*, 4. No instance of the scene-divisions throughout a play is to be found in Chapman's plays. It is only the third act of *Eastward Ho* (1605) and the first act of *Sir Giles Goosecap* (1606) that are divided into scenes. *Eastward Ho* is a collaboration of several dramatists and *Sir Giles Goosecap* is even an anonymous play, Chapman's authorship of which has long been discussed.

are comparatively few. Consequently, no satisfactory remarks on the general features of this matter may be possible. However, in order to deduce a possible origin of the scene-division in *May-Day*, one may refer to *Bonduca*. It is divided into acts only, but the folio of 1647 adds a division into scenes. As Greg writes, this “suggests a playhouse addition, unless it was introduced at the time of printing”<sup>17)</sup>. In the case of *May-Day*, likewise, either the book-keeper or the printer is conceivable. The book-keeper may have indicated the scene “by a line across the column” “with a view to the construction of the ‘plot’ ” when he was reading through the author’s manuscript, as indeed is the case with *The Captives*<sup>18)</sup>. Or the indication may have been introduced by the printer, who was very consistent in following a certain pattern of composition: he used an ornamental initial at the beginning of the first speech in the first scene, and a large capital in other scenes. Moreover, he is thought to have been responsible for the location of the entrances. Two different patterns are observable very regularly throughout the play. Namely, every entrance after the rule (which is, according to the Elizabethan practice, the indication of the division into scenes) is always printed in italic and centralized in a broad space, while others appearing elsewhere in the text are printed, always enclosed within round brackets, in italic likewise but in the narrow space at the end of a speech or even in the middle of it. It is unlikely that this was due to some markings originating with the book-keeper or someone else related to the play-house, because such an entrance would be very unpractical for prompting. Therefore, the origin of the location of the entrances can only be sought nowhere other than in the printing-house. Unfortunately, at present, I have no means to examine the usual practice of Stansby’s work-shop in connexion with this matter. But, however meticulous the printer was about the pattern of composing the dramatic text, he would be less willing, it seems to me, to waste time in trying to divide each act of his copy into scenes by the rule; the book-keeper’s intervention in the author’s manuscript is more likely. It may be that the general cleanness of the text with careful punctuation and the great consistency in the abbreviated form of the speech-prefixes can urge us to suppose a transcriber behind the printer’s copy. If we could know more about Chapman’s autographs and say with confidence that there is in *May-Day* an absence of Chapman’s spellings, our natural inclination would be to postulate the intervention of a scribal work in the printer’s copy. Unfortunately my compositorial analysis has rendered no reliable clue to Chapman’s characteristic spellings. The realisation in the analysis that presumably only one compositor was responsible for all the spellings in the

---

(17) W. W. Greg, *op. cit.*, 144.

(18) Cf. *ibid.*, 143, note 1.



quarto has rendered it impossible to check what might be thought of as Chapman's spellings.<sup>19)</sup> Their number, however, is, it seems to me, fairly big. And it would probably be a little difficult to explain the cleanness of the text by the postulation of a scribal intervention. A natural inference, then, is that Chapman's manuscript, which was quite legible whether it was foul papers or a fair copy, was probably what the printer could use.

Now the accumulative evidence leads to the conclusion that Chapman submitted to the company of children at the Blackfriars his manuscript of *May-Day* which was quite legible for the book-keeper, who, reading through it with a view to preparing a prompt-book, could save his pen to a large extent, only adding a few notes on small properties at the beginning, and probably introducing the division into scenes throughout the play for the 'plot', without being troubled about some loose points. In spite of the book-keeper's markings, the manuscript Chapman submitted to the company was left, for some reason, unfinished as a prompt-book, for which the book-keeper must probably have made a fresh endeavour. Thus, the manuscript, like most of foul papers bearing the book-keeper's markings, was put away from stage use and, after several years of lethargy at the Blackfriars, handed over to the printer.<sup>20)</sup>

## II

### PRESS-VARIANTS IN Q (1611)

Copies collated: BM<sub>1</sub> (British Museum, 644. d. 47), BM<sub>2</sub> (British Museum, C. 12. g. 5 (4) [tail cropt in sheets I and K]), BM<sub>3</sub> (British Museum, Ashley 379), Bod<sub>1</sub> (Bodleian Library, Mal. 241 [head very slightly cropt]), Bod<sub>2</sub> (Bodleian Library, Douce 249), CSMH (Huntington Library), CtY (Elizabethan Club of Yale University), Dfo (Folger Shakespeare Library [tail very seriously cropt in sheets I and K]), Dyce (Victoria and Albert Museum, 2039. 18. L. 14. [head very slightly cropt]), Glas (University of Glasgow Library), ICU (University of Chicago Library), IU (University of Illinois Library [tail very slightly cropt]), MH (Harvard University Library [tail and head very slightly cropt in sheets I and K]), MWiW-C (Chapin Library, Williams College [head, tail & marginal note seriously cropt]), NLS (National Library of Scotland [tail seriously cropt in sheets I and K]), NN (New York Public Library), Pforz (Carl H. Pforzheimer Library [head cropt]), TxU (University of Texas Library [tail slightly cropt]),

(19) Cf. *infra*, 28-30. If more than two compositors could be detected in a compositorial analysis, it might be possible sometimes to infer with some certainty what might be the authorial spellings. Cf. also A. Yamada, "Bibliographical Studies of George Chapman's *The Gentleman Usher* (1606) Printed by Valentine Simmes", *Shakespeare Studies*, ii (1963), 103-6.

(20) Cf. Jewkes, *Act Division*, 258: "this text was printed from a prompt-book, or from an author's manuscript which had been prepared for performance".

Worc (Worcester College Library, Oxford [tail very slightly cropt in sheet I]).

N. B. A film of the copy in the Library of Congress (PR 1241. L6 vol. 143) has been unavailable because of its physical condition; the Rare Book Division of the Library wrote in a letter to me that their copy was "too fragile to be handled for microfilming."

Press-variants:

SHEET A (inner forme)

*Corrected:* BM<sub>1-3</sub>, Bod<sub>1-2</sub>, CSMH, CtY, DfO, Dyce, Glas, ICU, MH, MWiW-C, NLS, NN, Pforz, TxU, Worc.

*Uncorrected:* IU.

		<i>Corrected.</i>	<i>Uncorrected.</i>
Sig. A <sub>2</sub> ,	1.18.	bosome : What	bosome ; what
	19.	you doe?	you not do
	20.	wheresoeuer	wheresoever

SHEET C (outer forme)

*Corrected:* BM<sub>1</sub>, BM<sub>3</sub>, Bod<sub>1-2</sub>, CSMH, CtY, DfO, Dyce, ICU, IU, MH, MWiW-C, NLS, NN, Pforz, TxU, Worc.

*Uncorrected:* BM<sub>2</sub>, Glas.

		<i>Corrected.</i>	<i>Uncorrected.</i>
Sig. C <sub>3</sub> ,	1.9.	disgracings?	disgracing?
	11.	of	o f [f in the margin] <sup>(21)</sup>

SHEET D (outer forme)

*Corrected:* BM<sub>1-3</sub>, Bod<sub>1-2</sub>, CSMH, CtY, DfO, Dyce, Glas, IU, MH, MWiW-C, NN, Pforz, TxU, Worc.

*Uncorrected:* ICU, NLS.

		<i>Corrected.</i>	<i>Uncorrected.</i>
Sig. D <sub>2</sub> <sup>v</sup> ,	1.11.	loue-squire.	loue-squire,
	16.	and Ile... as you	[respaced] <sup>(22)</sup>
Sig. D <sub>3</sub> ,	1.11.	slander;	slander,
	15.	tickil'st	ticki'st
	16.	auoid	auod
	18.	Citie,	Citie

SHEET D (inner forme)

*Corrected:* BM<sub>1-3</sub>, Bod<sub>1-2</sub>, CtY, DfO, Dyce, Glas, IU, MH, MWiW-C, NN, Pforz, TxU.

*Uncorrected:* CSMH, ICU, NLS, Worc.

(21) This seems due to the deterioration of the type, and occurs only in six copies (BM<sub>1</sub>, CSMH, DfO, Dyce, MWiW-C and NLS).

(22) In one copy only (NN).

(23) In four copies only (Bod<sub>2</sub>, DfO, IU, and TxU).

	<i>Corrected.</i>	<i>Uncorrected.</i>
Sig. D <sub>1</sub> <sup>v</sup> , 1. 2.	<i>Angelo.</i> )	<i>Angelo.</i>
33.	waie	waies
Sig. D <sub>4</sub> , 1. 1.	fludgs.	fluds.
12.	Eringos,	Eringes,
Sig. & catch-word.	D <sub>4</sub> Lod	[deteriorated] <sup>28)</sup>

## SHEET E (inner forme)

*Corrected:* Bod<sub>2</sub>, CSmH, CtY, Dyce, ICU, IU, MH, MWiW-C, NLS, NN, TxU.

*Uncorrected:* BM<sub>1-3</sub>, Bod<sub>1</sub>, D<sub>Fo</sub>, Glas, Pforz, Worc.

	<i>Corrected.</i>	<i>Uncorrected.</i>
Sig. E <sub>1</sub> <sup>v</sup> , 1. 33.	not, my	not. My
Sig. E <sub>3</sub> <sup>v</sup> , 1. 1.	him-	him-
3.	Snaile,	snaile,
4.	he triumphes	hetriumphes
5.	as curiously	ascuriously
6.	sweepers)	sweepers,
7.	beautifull	beautifull)
7.	lips.	lipst.
13.	world.	worl.
15.	one by one to it	one to by one it
22.	<i>Lorenzo</i>	<i>Loreuzo</i>
Sig. E <sub>4</sub> , 1. 5.	imagine	Imagine
11.	neither	nerther
34.	case:	case
35.	case	case:

## SHEET I (outer forme)

*Corrected:* BM<sub>1-3</sub>, Bod<sub>1-2</sub>, CSmH, CtY, D<sub>Fo</sub>, Dyce, Glas, ICU, IU, MWiW-C, NN, Pforz, TxU, Worc.

*Uncorrected:* MH, NLS.

	<i>Corrected.</i>	<i>Uncorrected.</i>
Sig. I <sub>1</sub> , 1. 9.	nicknames	nickname
9.	ben an	bene na
15.	<i>Temperance:</i>	<i>Temperance,</i>
34.	were best for	wbest for
Sig. I <sub>2</sub> <sup>v</sup> , 1. 6.	of the	of the the
9.	<i>Cla-</i>	<i>Cha-</i>

## SHEET K (outer forme)

*Corrected:* BM<sub>1-3</sub>, Bod<sub>1-2</sub>, CtY, D<sub>Fo</sub>, Dyce, Glas, ICU, IU, MH, MWiW-C, NN, Pforz, TxU, Worc.

*Uncorrected:* CSmH, NLS.

	<i>Corrected.</i>	<i>Uncorrected.</i>
Sig. K <sub>3</sub> , 1. 16.	heire	heir
Sig. K <sub>4</sub> <sup>v</sup> , 1. 4.	complexion,	complexionn

All of these corrections are self-evident and may require no explanations. Besides these, however, the types of sig. C<sub>4</sub>, l. 33 'Sir, this' seem to have been respaced in seven copies (i. e., BM<sub>1</sub>, Dyce, ICU, IU, MH, NN and Pforz), and the last letter in the types of sig. C<sub>4</sub>, ll. 33-4 'e-/uer' to have dropped out after their deterioration in two copies seen (i. e., BM<sub>2</sub> and Bod<sub>1</sub>). The types of sig. H<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup>, l. 11 'of such miads' also seem to have been respaced in the course of printing in five copies (i. e., CSmH, Glas, ICU, MH and MWiW-C).

## III

## THE COMPOSITORIAL ANALYSIS

Neither a spelling test or a punctuation test has been successful in detecting more than one compositor working for the quarto of 1611. As a whole, no dividing line has been able to be drawn between two groups of words of different spelling, although a little disturbance of the spelling in some words could be noticed. A few instances that follow are of most conspicuous nature (abbreviation: a/a'=Lieutenant/Lieutenant, b/b'=sir/Sir, c/c'=s' —and S' —/s— and S— in swearings like S'fut or slud):

Sheets & Sig.		A								B								C							
		1	1 <sup>v</sup>	2	2 <sup>v</sup>	3	3 <sup>v</sup>	4	4 <sup>v</sup>	1	1 <sup>v</sup>	2	2 <sup>v</sup>	3	3 <sup>v</sup>	4	4 <sup>v</sup>	1	1 <sup>v</sup>	2	2 <sup>v</sup>	3	3 <sup>v</sup>	4	4 <sup>v</sup>
Words	a													1	2	1	1	1							
	a'													-	-	-	-	-							
	b					-	-	-	-					-	-	-	-				-	-	-	-	-
	b'					7	6	6	5					3		1	2	1			1		1	3	4
	c									-	2			1	-		-						-		
	c'									2	-			-	2		1						2		

D								E								F							
1	1v	2	2v	3	3v	4	4v	1	1v	2	2v	3	3v	4	4v	1	1v	2	2v	3	3v	4	4v
								2	2	1													
								-	-	-													
-	4	1	-	-	1	4	-	3	-	1	3	3	-	6	6	3	7	7	2	2	1		1
6	1	-	2	2	-	-	5	2	6	7	-	1	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
								5	2	1												1	
								-	-	-												1	

G								H								I							
1	1v	2	2v	3	3v	4	4v	1	1v	2	2v	3	3v	4	4v	1	1v	2	2v	3	3v	4	4v
				3	1	3	2	1	1							-	-	-	1	1	1	1	
				-	-	-	-	-	-							2	4	1	1	-	-	-	
		1	10	3	4	4		3	1	4	2	2		2	1	1	3	1			1	10	8
		-	-	-	1	-		-	-	-	1	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	
1		1	2	3	1		1	3						1	1		1		2		1		
-		-	-	-	-		-	-						-	-		-		-		-		

  

K							
1	1v	2	2v	3	3v	4	4v
		2				-	-
		-			1		1
8	4	6	3	5	3	1	3
-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
					3	1	1
					-	-	-

Now, why 'Lieftenant' (in sigs. B, E, G and I) was changed to 'Lieutenant' (in sigs. I and K), or why 'Sir' (in sigs. A-E) to 'sir' (in sigs. D-K) or 's—' and 'S—' (in sigs. B-E) to 's'—' 'S'—' (in sigs. B, and E-K) is simply unexplainable. Each form for itself is very constant, and the change from one to another in each case is so remarkable that one may suspect the work by more than two compositors. In reality, however, it seems to me that there is no perceptible relation between these changes: sheets or pages where they take place have nothing to do with one another. And no other evidence leads to the possibility of the work in *May-Day* of more than two compositors with apparently different preferences for particular spellings.

On the other hand, an examination of the measurement of the composing stick in each sheet can suggest that something disturbing the regular process must have been introduced around sheets H and I, and also sheets I and K. From sheets A to H, except the title page that is sig. A<sub>1</sub>, the composing stick generally measures about 84–86 mm, whereas that in sheet I measures 92–94 mm and that in sheet K 85–87 mm. Moreover, as Greg has already pointed out, in sheets I and K "there are usually two lines more to the page than elsewhere".<sup>24)</sup> Each page in these sheets usually contains 38 lines, whereas from sheets A to H, it usually contains 36 lines.

An examinations of the style and measurement of the running-titles suggests

(24) W. W. Greg, *The Bibliography of the English Printed Drama*, vol. I, no. 297, note 1.



compositor finished the composition of, presumably, the whole of sheet E and wished to use a skeleton forme for one of its formes, both of the skeleton formes I and II had been still in use, one for D outer being still on the press and the other for D inner waiting in readiness for the press. Thus, the compositor prepared a new skeleton forme III, and, on finishing the printing of D inner, could lay E inner on the press, restoring the normal printing order in a sheet — the inner followed by the outer forme. By introducing the new skeleton forme III at point b, the compositor seems to have made a new start, as it were, of the balanced work between composition and printing. But at point c, just as at point a, again composition got a little ahead of printing: skeleton formes I and II were both in use, and the skeleton forme III could serve the turn. At last, at point d, composition was a great deal ahead: skeleton formes I, II and III were all in use, the first being still on the press and the rest two waiting in readiness for the press.<sup>26)</sup> The compositor had to prepare another new skeleton forme IV, which was first used for H inner. If and as long as the same rate of the composition speed had held, further demands for new skeleton formes might have been expected. The rate, however, was apparently reduced in sheets I and K. The composing stick in sheet I was so widened that each line could contain 5–6 more letters. Also in sheet I, like in sheet K, there are usually two more lines to a page than elsewhere in our quarto. As in sheets A–H a page usually contains 36 lines, and about 50 letters are printed in a line. From these figures, a simple arithmetic will prove that sheet I contains 46–53 more lines (that is about one and half more pages) than any of sheets B–H. Similarly, sheet K, which has two more lines to a page, contains 16 more lines (that is about half a page). This obviously reduced the rate of composing the page in sheets I and K, and prevented the compositor, it is easy to understand, from preparing another new skeleton forme in the course of printing of sheets I and K.

From all noted above, one may conclude that one compositor, one press, one press-man and four skeleton formes were employed for the 1611 quarto of *May-Day*.

#### IV

#### THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COMPOSITOR

##### 1. *Spellings*.

The compositor of *May-Day* seems to have preferred such forms as *we*, *he*, *me*, *be*. He goes astray very rarely from his ordinary habits.<sup>27)</sup> He uses the long

(26) From this, it may be suggested that Stansby's stock of the types used for the quarto of 1611 was larger than what twelve quarto pages required

(27) Namely, *wee*:— I<sub>3</sub> 2, and 3; *hee*:— C<sub>3</sub>v 5, D<sub>3</sub>v 36, E<sub>3</sub>v 25, 27, 28, E<sub>4</sub> 5, 20, 26, F<sub>1</sub>v 18, 29, F<sub>2</sub> 8, F<sub>2</sub>v 25, G<sub>2</sub>v 32, and H<sub>4</sub>v 22; *mee*:— D<sub>2</sub> 36, D<sub>2</sub>v 13, E<sub>1</sub>v 11, F<sub>2</sub> 28, G<sub>2</sub> 10, H<sub>4</sub>v 29, K<sub>1</sub>v 31, and K<sub>4</sub> 1; *bee*:— D<sub>4</sub>v 18, F<sub>2</sub>v 24, G<sub>2</sub>v 2, I<sub>2</sub> 22, and I<sub>2</sub>v 15.

form *shee* fairly often.

His preference for such forms as *Ile* and *'tis* is also strong.<sup>28)</sup>

He seems to use both forms of *do* and *doe*, and *go* and *goe*.

He also uses '&' and some contracted forms like 'ē' and 'ō'.<sup>29)</sup>

Another characteristics of the compositor is a liberal use of apostrophes in abbreviated words. Particularly interesting is the "s" form for 'his', 'is' and 'us'.<sup>30)</sup>

An examination of the frequency of the individual words could probably suggest the compositor's preferences, which may be listed as follows (\* signifies 'practically invariable' and -\* 'almost invariable'):

a [=of, on]	* only
-* Alas	- soule
alwaies	* t'ee
* any	* th'art [=thou art]
ath'	thats
* be	then [=than]
* Citie	'tis
* company	trie
'em [=them]	* 'twas
* faith	* 'twere
* fie	* very
* finde	* we
he	* y'are
* Ile	* yfaith
ith'	* yong
* marry	
-* me	* -our-
* meere	&
* mercy	ē, ō

Though being subject to correction, this list probably could make a contribution to a checklist of William Stansby's printing-house spellings.

A compositorial analysis of *The Gentleman Usher* has suggested the scattering of some authorial spellings in the pages composed by two men.<sup>31)</sup> When more

(28) Namely cf. *Ile*:- A<sub>2</sub>v 7; *Tis*:- B<sub>4</sub>v 5, 23, and D<sub>1</sub>v 35; *tis*:- B<sub>1</sub>v 29, B<sub>2</sub> 26, B<sub>3</sub> 25, D<sub>2</sub> 15, E<sub>2</sub> 2, F<sub>4</sub>v 3, and G<sub>1</sub>v 27.

(29) Namely, 'ornamēts' (D<sub>2</sub> 7), 'heauē' (H<sub>3</sub>v 21), 'cōpany' (I<sub>1</sub>v 3), 'employmēt' (I<sub>1</sub>v 3), and 'gētle' (K<sub>1</sub>v 9).

(30) Namely, for 'his':- away's (I<sub>2</sub>v 37), break's (C<sub>3</sub>v 23), cut's (C<sub>2</sub> 9), in's (E<sub>1</sub>v 24), and on's (B<sub>4</sub> 9); for 'is' following the common noun:- question's (E<sub>2</sub>v 25), roome's (K<sub>1</sub>v 12), wine's (G<sub>2</sub>v 26), and word's (G<sub>2</sub> 31); for 'us':- among's (F<sub>2</sub>v 8).

(31) Cf. A. Yamada, "Bibliographical Studies of George Chapman's *The Gentleman Usher* (1606) Printed by Valentine Simmes", *Shakespeare Studies*, ii (1963), 103-6.



than two compositors are responsible for a book, it may not be impossible sometimes to detect some of the authorial spellings, only if the compositors are apt to come under the influence of the spellings in their copy. But when only one compositor is responsible, it might be practically impossible to differentiate his spelling habits from the authorial spellings in his copy. Nevertheless, what has been suggested in my study of *The Gentleman Usher*<sup>32)</sup> probably could offer us a clue to the authorial spellings in *May-Day*.

The substitution of 'i' with 'y', which is one of the features of spellings in *The Gentleman Usher*, is to be found also in *May-Day*. They are as follows:

- \* ayre (G<sub>2</sub> 27)
- \* bayte (d) (E<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup> 11, E<sub>4</sub> 21)
- clyent (G<sub>2</sub> 20)
- coyle (C<sub>1</sub><sup>v</sup> 2)
- coyning (D<sub>1</sub><sup>v</sup> 7)
- \* dye (B<sub>1</sub> 1)
- \* dyeted (A<sub>2</sub> 24)
- \* eyther (I<sub>1</sub><sup>v</sup> 22)
- fayle (G<sub>2</sub> 3, H<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup> 20)
- \* fayre (D<sub>2</sub> 10, D<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> 25, H<sub>4</sub> 24)
- Gyant (B<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> 12)
- \* hayre (D<sub>4</sub> 15, H<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 10)
- \* lowlynesse (A<sub>4</sub> 25)
- \* lye(s) (A<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> 8, A<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup> 5, B<sub>1</sub> 31, B<sub>4</sub> 19, C<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 30, G<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 31, E<sub>1</sub><sup>v</sup> 24)
- Lyon (B<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> 11)
- \* Lyonell (G<sub>2</sub> 17)
- \* nayle (K<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 1)
- Ordeying (A<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 28)
- \* Pyes (D<sub>4</sub> 12)
- \* sayes (A<sub>3</sub> 22, D<sub>3</sub> 17, E<sub>1</sub> 28, E<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 3, F<sub>1</sub> 35, F<sub>3</sub> 2)
- sayle (G<sub>1</sub><sup>v</sup> 26, 27)
- \* spoyld (I<sub>2</sub> 36)
- \* tayle (E<sub>4</sub> 24)
- \* tryed (A<sub>4</sub> 26)
- \* voyce (I<sub>1</sub> 1)
- whyniard (A<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> 35)

Those marked with asterisks are also printed elsewhere in their ordinary spellings. Of course they do not necessarily represent the authorial spellings: some of them may reflect the compositorial characteristics. To reach the final conclusion, we have to wait for the information as to the compositorial characteri-

---

(32) Cf. *ibid.*, 105-6.

stics of Stansby's work-shop.

Besides these words of the i:y substitution, some thirty other words of unusual spelling are to be found. They may be listed in groups as follows:

- a)
  - compleate [=complete] (B<sub>4</sub> 28)
  - extreames [=extremes] (B<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> 30)
  - theame [=theme] (B<sub>1</sub> 5)
- b)
  - rore [=roar] (K<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 27)
  - vprore [=uproar] (H<sub>2</sub> 15)
  - \* cote [=coat] (C<sub>1</sub><sup>v</sup> 31)
  - \* throte [=throat] (K<sub>4</sub> 20)
- c)
  - \* shoude [=should] (I<sub>3</sub> 21, I<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup> 9)
  - \* woud(e) [=would] (A<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 36, C<sub>1</sub> 14, C<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> 6, 16)
- d)
  - bith [=by the] (I<sub>1</sub><sup>v</sup> 11)
  - disausterous [=disasterous] (K<sub>3</sub> 24)
  - \* eene [=even] (B<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 20, H<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 29)
  - \* enemy [=enemy] (B<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup> 3)
  - gesse [=guess] (E<sub>4</sub> 2)
  - \* God [=Good] (A<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 7, 7, 9, C<sub>4</sub> 10)
  - gossaue [=god save] (B<sub>2</sub> 29, B<sub>3</sub> 25, B<sub>4</sub> 34, B<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 13, E<sub>1</sub><sup>v</sup> 11)
  - \* moe [=more] (E<sub>2</sub> 26)
  - parlee [=parley] (A<sub>3</sub> 2)
  - seauen [=seven] (D<sub>1</sub> 31, E<sub>1</sub><sup>v</sup> 30)
  - shoes [=shows] (K<sub>2</sub> 27)
  - \* sprede [=spread] (A<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> 7)
  - \* steed [=stead] (H<sub>4</sub> 10)
  - \* tho [=though] (C<sub>4</sub> 30)
  - trewell [=trowel] (D<sub>2</sub> 4)
  - \* troe [=true] (F<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> 2, G<sub>2</sub> 4)
  - \* twise [=twice] (B<sub>4</sub> 9)
  - wee' [=with ye] (C<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 34)
  - wilbe [=will be] (G<sub>4</sub> 31)
  - wurse [=worse] (C<sub>2</sub> 5)

Those marked with asterisks are printed elsewhere in the play also in their ordinary spellings. Each of the first three groups has its own general rule which relates the graphic to the phonetic expression. Unless it be the compositor's, the rule could be applied to other words in order to guess the greatest possible variety of word-forms under the category of these three groups. Most of the words in the fourth group, it seems to me, reflect the printer's copy: they are

not so much the compositor's as the author's spellings. For a conclusive list of these authorial spellings, again, we have to wait for further suggestions regarding the compositor of *May-Day*, which to expect is obviously beyond our scope at the present stage.

## 2. Punctuation.

The compositor of *May-Day* seems to have had a certain kind of established punctuation habits. As is the case with the compositors of *The Gentleman Usher*,<sup>33)</sup> his punctuation habits appear sometimes to have connexions with the grammatical construction of sentences. The following examples may illustrate the variety in his use of colons and semi-colons in the middle of sentences.

### (a) Colons:

#### i. Preceding adverbial clauses.

1. theill...fall into contempt of you : for there is no vertue can scape the accompt of baseness...(B<sub>4</sub> 29-31).

[Other similar examples: A<sub>3</sub> 4, B<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 10, etc.]

2. Ile tell some other time : least now your presence Might dumbly tell it...(H<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup> 28-9).

#### ii. Preceding adverbial phrases.

1. [thou will be] waited on continually by an old beldame: not to keep thee company, but to keep thee from company: (C<sub>2</sub> 14-5).

#### iii. Preceding relatives (with preposition).

1. To sweet Mistris *Franciscina* : with whom I heare thou art ready to lye downe, (A<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup> 4-5).
2. this *Tarrasse* at our backe gate is the only place we may safely meete at : from whence I can stand and talke to you. (C<sub>3</sub> 34-6).
3. thou shalt first drinke and wench it : to which end we will carouse a little, (E<sub>1</sub><sup>v</sup> 29-30).

#### iv. Preceding simple conjunctions in a sentence.

1. it appeares it was no fault of hers : but the man that would take no deniall. (A<sub>3</sub> 4-6).
2. thou look'st to haue had him fall on his knees,...or begge his life at thy hands : or else turn'd Queene *Dido*, and pierce his tender heart with sword full sharp; (C<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> 10-12).
3. my father plies my haunts so closely : and vses meanes by our maide to entrap vs, (C<sub>3</sub> 33-4).

#### v. Preceded by adverbial phrases.

1. but to fold vp thy selfe like an Vrchine, and lye a caluing to bring forth a husband : I am asham'd to thinke on't : (B<sub>1</sub> 30-32).

#### vi. Preceded by subjects accompanied with modifiers.

1. The holy institution of heauen;  
Ordeyning marriage for proportiond minds,  
For our chiefe humane comforts; and t'encrease

(33) Cf. *ibid.*, 106-9.

The loued images of God in men:

Is now peruerted to th'increase of wealth; (A<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 27-31).

(b) Semi-colons:

i. Preceding adverbial clauses.

1. thats my fault; for if I be in once, I shall loose all I haue about me. (B<sub>4</sub> 34-5).

[Other similar examples : A<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> 32, B<sub>4</sub> 2, etc.]

2. any other man she saies, might better aduenture with the least thing chang'd about 'em then you with all; as if you were the onely noted mutton-monger in all the Citie. (D<sub>3</sub> 24-7).

ii. Preceding adverbial phrases.

1. vpon mine Anueill... I will mallet you and worke you; coyning crownes, chickins, bracelets, and what not out of you; for procuring you the deere gullage of my sweete heart mistresse *Francischina*. (D<sub>1</sub><sup>v</sup> 6-9).

iii. Preceding the participial construction.

1. Cf. quotation (a), vi, 1.
2. Cf. quotation (b), ii, 1.

iv. Preceding relatives.

1. and then will his sonne Signior *Aurelio*, and his man *Angelo*, be abroad; at which houre if you will be at the backe gate...you may linger there till I call you. (D<sub>1</sub> 10-13).
2. and [I] lay downe softly by her; when... in the very coldnesse and dulnesse of my spirit, I fell sodainly a-sleepe. (K<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> 23-7).

v. Preceding noun clauses in the correlative construction.

1. disguise is worne thread bare vpon euery stage, and so much villany committed under that habit; that 'tis growne as suspicious as the vilest. (D<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup> 11-3).

vi. Preceding simple conjunctions in a sentence.

1. Fit, fit obseruance for this May-morning; Not the May-Moneth alone, they take when it comes; Nor the first weeke of that Moneth; Nor the first day; but the first minute of the first houre, of the first day. (A<sub>2</sub> 7-13).
2. I thought it rudenesse to wake her; and...attended her leasure at my ease, (K<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> 21-3).

[Cf. also quotation (a), vi, 1.]

vii. Preceded by adverbial phrases or clauses.

1. We must bring riches forth, and like the Cuckoe Hatch others egges; Ioyne house to house, in choices Fit timber-logs and stones, (A<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 32-4).
2. When thou wilt Lieftenant; No better time then now, (B<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup> 10-11).
3. Now for your behaiour; let it be free and negligent, (B<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup> 35-6).

viii. Preceded by appositional noun phrases.

1. for an old man to make a yong man cuckold, is one of *Hercules*

labours... To make youth rampant in age, ... to take a man downe at his owne weapon; to call backe time in one, and thrust him headlong vpon another. (F<sub>3</sub> 11-6)

As is seen from these examples, colons and semi-colons seem to be interchangeable. Commas, it is of course evident, may replace them. Of this there are so many examples. Sometimes round brackets may be found also to take the place of these commas, semi-colons, and colons.

The average number in the page of our compositor's punctuation marks is 63.8, which means that his punctuation is fairly heavy. Commas and periods predominate. Colons and seimcolons are comparatively few. Our compositor seems to have used queries, both roman and italic, as frequently as possible. He also uses round brackets for parentheses. He uses one italic exclamatory mark (F<sub>1</sub> 33), four dashes (E<sub>1</sub> 34, F<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> 5, G<sub>2</sub> 27, and K<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup> 24), and a few black-letter periods.

### 3. *The Style of Composing a Page.*

One of the most conspicuous features is our compositor's use of an ornamental initial to each act, and of an ordinary initial to each scene. His another characteristics would be to print the entrance direction immediately following the scene division, which is indicated by a rule across the page, at the centre and, if necessary, in the turned pyramidal form, and to print other entrance directions, long or short, either in the middle of a speech or at the end of it, and that always in round brackets. He prints all exits to the right of the text. All of these directions, including character-names concerned, are printed in italic. Speech-prefixes are also printed in italic with indention. Italics are also used for Latin and for some proper nouns.

Our compositor's pattern of act-division seems to have been the '*Actus Prima, Scæna prima.*' form with a comma in the middle, although only the first two acts are headed by '*Scæna prima.*' (A<sub>2</sub> 2 and B<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> 17).<sup>34)</sup>

To conclude, it has been suggested in Section I that the copy for the 1611 quarto of *May-Day* was Chapman's autograph manuscript, which the book-keeper, wishing to put it to stage use, read adding a few notes about properties like 'Papers' and 'a purse', but had for some reason to leave unfinished as a prompt book. Section II has listed, as usual, all the variants found in a collation of all the extant copies known to us. In these variants, however, nothing seems to be of great importance. The compositorial analysis in Section III has suggested that only one compositor was responsible for the whole of the quarto. An examination of the running-titles has been able to work out the press-work.

(34) Sig. A<sub>2</sub> provides us with '*Actus prima, ...*' with a small 'p', whereas sig. B<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> with '*Actus Secundi, ...*', with a capital 'S' which I think would be his normal practice.

Lastly in Section IV, the compositor's characteristics have been discussed, and some suggestions regarding Chapman's spellings have been proposed. Both of these problems cannot be solved so easily; nay, they would probably be the more difficult in *May-Day* because only one compositor is responsible for the quarto and no means can be expected to check the characteristics of his spelling preferences with the unusual spellings that occur in every sheet. My suggestions regarding these problems, therefore, cannot be necessarily conclusive. My hope is only that however provisional they might be, the lists of these compositorial and authorial spellings would come to some use in future.