

A Question (not) to be Askt: Is Hand D a Copy?

By Gerald E. Downs, © 2007

Near in time to the printing of the Shakespeare First Folio, Sir Edward Dering of Surrenden, Kent, commissioned a scribal copy of both parts of *Henry IV*, evidently abridging them for performance as one play.¹ Scenes from *1 Henry IV* were transcribed from the 1613 fifth quarto, including Falstaff's impersonation of the King in conversation with Prince Hal at 2.4.401-07,² where the scribe wrote:

. . . whie being sonne to me art thou so poynted

at: shall the blessed sonne of heaven prove a micher: and
+
eate blackberryes: a question not to be askt: there is a

thing Harry: which thou hast often heard of . . . (Folio 20, 295-99)

Writing down the left margin, another penman (presumably a proofreading Sir Edward) adds lines to be inserted between 'askt:' and 'there', as indicated by the corresponding, interlined cross: "+ shall the sonne of England proove a theife? / and take purses? a question to be ask't." Together, the lines reproduce the Q5 reading:

. . . why being sonne to me, art

thou so pointed at: shal the blessed sonne of heaven prove a mi-

cher, and eat black-berries? a question not to be askt. Shall the

sonne of England prove a theefe, and take purses? a question to

be askt. there is a thing Harry , which thou hast often heard of . . .

The marginal manuscript addition corrects an error described by James Willis: "Omission is most often caused by the recurrence of an entire word within a fairly short compass."³ A scribe returning to his text looks for the last word (or phrase) he has copied: if his eye falls instead on a second occurrence of the same word, everything following the first occurrence will be omitted, through the word's second occurrence. In the example above, the omission is marked to be reinserted after *askt* and it ends with *askt*.

Restoration of an omission may restore sense, as shown by Polonius's lines in the Second Quarto and First Folio texts of *Hamlet* at 2.2.211-213: ". . . I will leave / him and my daughter" (Q2); "I will leave him, / And sodainely contriue the meanes of meeting / Between him, and my daughter" (F). Because Ophelia is not present, the Q2 lines must be incorrect: F shows that a line has been omitted in the quarto by a scribe or compositor skipping from the first to the second 'him' (or 'him and').

When a later addition is made to a manuscript that cannot be compared to another copy, eye-skip may yet be inferred by the same criteria. If the interpolation ends with a word that also occurs in close proximity within the text, restoration of an omission is the likely reason for the added material. Problematic text made good by such an addition increases the likelihood of restoration; but for a text in seemingly good order, eye-skip will be less certain if the repeated word of the addition is plausibly coincidental. For example, Falstaff's uncorrected speech in the Dering Manuscript is sensible and the added lines could have been conceived after the writing of the body of the manuscript. Had there been no other text of *1 Henry IV*, restoration of omission could not have been confirmed. Yet even in the most doubtful instances a significant probability for eye-skip is established by empirical evidence. Properly positioned identical words in a text and an addition have a bibliographical utility that has been neglected as an aid to understanding the nature of the most famous theatrical document of the Elizabethan era.

The manuscript play *The Book of Sir Thomas More*, now preserved in the British Library (Harley MS.7368), has intrigued scholars with its many puzzling features and its surprising number of contributing playwrights.⁴ Of greatest interest is the possibility that Hand D (folios 8^a, 8^b and 9^a), is Shakespeare's holograph, as first proposed by Richard Simpson.⁵ Investigation of the possibility has been affected by what R. C. Bald in 1949 called "a widespread inclination on the part of scholars and general public alike to be convinced" (45). That bias may have deterred study from a crucial question: is Hand D that of a composing author or that of a copyist making a transcript? The answer may be sought irrespective of the claims and counter-claims regarding Shakespeare's authorship of the scene.⁶

In *The Elizabethan Theatre and "The Booke of Sir Thomas More"*, Scott McMillin reports that "Hand D's three pages have always been recognized as 'foul papers' – that is, pages of first-draft writing which turned out to be usable without copying" (144). This statement does not account for the few scholars to whom I will call attention for denying that the pages are first-draft writing. Similarly, Giorgio Melchiori, in "Hand D in 'Sir Thomas More': an essay in misinterpretation,"⁷ takes for granted that both the initial inscription of the Hand D pages and the alterations made in the course of inscription and thereafter in Hand D are authorial.⁸ Melchiori divides the manuscript alterations into three groups: 1) those made *currente calamo*; 2) later authorial "corrections of single words"; and 3) larger additions "by the author himself" (102). Yet there is no unbroken tradition of acceptance of these changes as authorial. In attending to the possibility raised in earlier scholarship that the alterations classified by Melchiori as authorial may instead be scribal, I do not begin with the expectation that all will be self-evidently so. However, if a great majority of the thirty or so alterations belong to well-known categories of scribal error, Melchiori's assumption that Hand D is an author's lines as he wrote them may be in need of reassessment.

This analysis begins with what has been historically the most challenging passage in the Hand D pages, where C, a theatrical book-keeper (perhaps among other of his possible occupations), becomes Hand D's first editor. Here Hand C crossed out two and a half lines by Hand D (235-37 in Greg's 1911 edition),⁹ including the interlineated phrase 'in in to yo^r obedienc', all of which he replaced with a mere 'tell me but this.' The Oxford *Textual Companion*¹⁰ transcription of the passage reads:

transcription, and it must be stressed that the strength of his case depends on the presence of the word *obedience* both at the end of the addition and in the body of the text.

Another scholar in print shortly after Greg's 1923 transcript of Hand D¹³ was Levin L. Schücking, who concludes his "Shakespeare and *Sir Thomas More*"¹⁴ by observing that there are "some points in the script which, to say the least, allow as well of the explanation of its being a copy, none that force us to take it for the original" (59). His footnote bears directly on 'deletions and corrections made *currente calamo*,' the group Melchiori describes as "the most numerous (twenty-one alterations) and the least relevant." (1985, 102). Yet if the question is whether Addition IIc is a copy, Schücking's analysis suggests these alterations are important:

[A] very high percentage of the mistakes in the text are due to a sort of anticipation during the writing The deleted 'sh,' line 150, seems to be 'Shro' in the next line . . . 'ar,' 157, see 158: 'what ar'; 'But,' 159, see second part of the sentence: 'but not men'; 218, 'in,' see: 'you wer in armes'; 225, 'le,' see: 'only lent'; 230, 'ar,' see: 'as you are'; 252, 'why you,' see 253: 'why you must.' . . . Does this point to the writer's composing while he wrote? (59n)

The anticipation in this group of corrections is striking in context. Other errors not listed by Schücking may in no case be exclusive to an author, as demonstrated in these lines:

193: The single letter 'D' in a speech heading is corrected to 'Bett.' No clear choice can be made between author and transcriber for anticipating 'Doll.' However, because Doll answered More's last speech, a scribe may have begun mechanically to reproduce the same sequence of speech headings.

195 and 202: 'y' and 'yo' follow 'yo^r' in their respective lines. These errors are probably more typical of transcription, when words may be repeated inadvertently.

251: 'to' is crossed out for metrical reasons according to Melchiori (1985, 102), but 'To any German province, ~~to~~ Spain or Portugal' is overlong in any case. A putative scribe may have repeated 'to', taking it inadvertently either from the beginning of the line or from the line above: 'to ffraunc or flanders'.

264: 'vs' is struck out following 'letts.' This seems likely of a scribe alternating between text and copy. An original *let us* or *let's* could have led to a necessary correction that, according to Greg (1911, 78n.), no one made until the modern period.¹⁵

234: 'that' at the beginning of the line is erased, according to Melchiori for a "change of sentence structure" (1985, 102n. 3). But the preceding lines, ". . . and those same hands / *That* you like rebels lift against the peace / Lift up for peace, and your unreverent knees" (231-33, italics mine), could lead a copyist anticipating a grammatical parallel to write another 'that' before discovering his error. These examples do not strongly suggest D as the original author; nor does Melchiori convincingly argue that "corrections of single words" are authorial: ". . . yo^r interlined for a deleted *their* (l. 260) makes good a previous slip; stylistic improvement accounts for w^f interlined above a deleted *and* at l. 198 and for & written over and replacing *his* at l. 226 . . ." (1985, 102).

Acceptance of Greg's assumption has led scholars to elaborate on Melchiori's third heading, "additions by the author to the original text," with attempts to recapture D's creative process, as demonstrated by the ingenuity of Melchiori himself at line 144, where Lincoln answers an insult to the rioters with 'prentisses symple downe wth him':

On second thoughts [D] squeezed in between the speech heading 'Lin' and the beginning of the speech the words 'how say yo^u' and, interlined just above the last part of the addition, 'now prenty' The speech has therefore been taken . . . as 'How say you now, prentices? Prentices simple! Down with him!' Nobody has thought of taking 'prenty' . . . as a cue-word representing the beginning of the original speech, 'prentisses'. In this case the additional sentence 'how say you now' would be addressed directly to the Sergeant . . .

Lincoln. How say you now: prentices simple? 145

Down with him! (1985, 102-3)

According to the Oxford editors, "Melchiori's explanation, that 'prenty' is 'a cue-word representing the beginning of the original speech', seems to us implausible" (462). Certainly, a substantive should not be cut from the text without good reason. Although Melchiori is correct to note that 'prenty' is interlined, 'now' is in the margin, and the two words are not quite aligned. These facts suggest an explanation of the added words consistent only with transcription.

If three lines began with *Prentices*, an inattentive copyist may easily have skipped from the first occurrence to the second, thereby omitting the first line. On noticing his error he would have corrected it by interlining 'prenty' in the rapidly narrowing space and continuing in the margin before the second 'prentisses' with 'how say you now'. Finally running out of room, D turned up 'now'—as implied by both Melchiori and the Oxford editors—where it was nearly even with the interlined 'prenty' (which is in fact directly above 'prentisses' in the manuscript, thus satisfying the empirical requirement for eye-skip). My putative scribe's exemplar, containing the entire addition made later to the transcript, would have looked like this:

seriant	you ar the simplest things that ever stood in such a question	
Lincoln	prentisses how say you now	145a
	prentisses symple downe with him	145b
all	prentisses symple prentisses symple	146

In yet another telling addition relevant to this investigation, line 160 originally read, 'all weele not heare my L of Surrey'. D subsequently added 'all no no no no' / Shrewsbury shr'. C later crossed out the second 'all' as redundant, leaving the revised lines to read: '*All.* We'll not hear my Lord of Surrey. no, no, no, / no, no! Shrewsbury! Shrewsbury!' However, Melchiori correctly observes that a few lines later (at 171-72),

‘all’ is used in consecutive headings to indicate two groups of speakers. Recognizing the same intention for the interpolated speech, he modernizes it as:

All [or *Some*]. We’ll not hear my lord of Surrey! (160)

All [or *Others*]. No, no, no, no, no, Shrewsbury, Shrewsbury! (1985, 104)

This explanation is surely correct, yet the addition need not have been the author’s afterthought, as Melchiori believes. The physical evidence alone establishes a probability of eye-skip: the first word of the addition is identical to the first word of the line before. Omission becomes even more likely when we realize that a scribe would not expect consecutive speech headings reading ‘all’. After transcribing the first line his eye would naturally fall to the heading for the next speaker. Thus evidence of eye-skip restoration in three of four Hand D ‘multiple-word’ additions suggests that the pages are transcribed.¹⁷

Another alteration of one word in need of reconsideration as possibly a scribe’s creation after mistaking the grammar or syntax of his copy is the change in line 236 from ‘wars’ to ‘hurly’, in spite of John Jones’s description of Shakespeare at work:

The untidiness is also a question of Shakespeare’s relation with himself – as we saw when he wrote the word ‘wars’ twice in two lines and, realizing what he had done, struck out the second ‘wars’ and substituted ‘hurly’. Here is a man composing fluidly, making the slips that go with speed, and we can confidently read his mind.¹⁸

Assuming that the phrase ‘in in to yo^r obedienc’ was interlined later than alterations made *currente calamo*, the manuscript at the moment of the deletion of ‘warrs’ will have originally read:

. . . o desperat ~~as~~ as you are 230
wash your foule mynds w^t teares and those same hands
that yo^u lyke rebells lyft against the peace
lift vp for peace, and your vnreuerent knees
~~that~~ make them your feet to kneele to be forgyven
is safer warrs then euer yo^u can make 235
whose discipline is ryot, why euen yo^r ~~warrs~~
cannot pceed but by obedienc what rebell captaine 237
as mutyes ar incident, by his name
can still the rout who will obey ~~th~~ a traytor

The verse is regular, excepting the fifteen syllables of line 237, where a ‘long line as oratorical device’ seems less likely than the corruption perceptively described by van Dam. Still, after line 237a is reinstated (‘In, in to your obedience! What rebel captain,’) two anomalies remain. First, end-of-line alterations need not have been made *currente calamo*: ‘wars’ may have been deleted after some reflection when D, following the orator’s many uses of *you* and *your*, took the rioters as antecedent to ‘your wars’. Not understanding More’s use of an ‘ethical dative’ *you* (where *your wars* means *any war*), D was induced to substitute ‘your riot’ as more appropriately descriptive of the ‘rout.’ The author contrasted obedient soldiers to an undisciplined mob, but D’s change of subject from ‘any war’ to ‘this hurly’ contradicts More’s elaborate oration:

moor	Yo ^u that have voyce and Credyt w ^t the m v nvmber	
	Comaund them to a stilnes	175
Lincolne	a plaigue on them they will not hold their peace the deule	
	Cannot rule them	
moor	Then what a rough and ryotous charge haue yo ^u	
	to Leade those that the deule Cannot rule . . . 179	
	and twer in no error yf I told yo ^u all 218	
	yo ^u wer in armes gainst God . . .	
	he god hath not he only lent the king his figure 225	
	&	
	his throne his sword, but gyven him his owne name	

When More asks, ‘What rebel by his name can still the rout? Who will obey a traitor?’ he echoes words that had led to Lincoln’s admission of his inability to control the mob and recalls that only representatives acting in the name of the king may rightfully be obeyed. If ‘there is no addition [ranking official] but a rebel / to qualify a rebel’ (241-42), a ‘riot proceeding by obedience’ is antithetical to every word More speaks. But now the scribe, having replaced hypothetical ‘wars’ with a real ‘hurly’, is stuck with obedient rioters. His solution is the second anomaly; to ‘qualify a rebel’ by the (hypermetric, unordained) addition ‘captain’, a promotional possibility that More expressly denies. As van Dam suggests, ‘captain’ looks to be another end-of-line elucidation gone awry. Recognition of both the misplacement of ‘in, in to your obedience’ above line 236 and the misunderstanding of the author’s phraseology in the same line makes C’s later deletion of the muddled passage much more understandable.

My argument for possible scribal transcription has been anticipated in a way in the case made by those who observed that Hand D is scarcely distinguishable from Hand C, which is widely recognized as that of a scribe. In “Shakespeare’s Hand in *Sir Thomas More*: Some Aspects of the Paleographic Argument,”¹⁹ Michael L. Hays remarks:

Because the manuscript itself provides sufficient data for all these hands distinguished by Greg . . . his distinction between hands C and D might profitably be reappraised. Greg based his distinction . . . on a slight difference in the tendency to form a single letter one way rather than another. (249-50).

Ramsey adds that “no thorough study exists to show that Hand C and Hand D are distinct hands, so reference to ‘Hand D’ begs a paleographical question” (1991, 151). After taking note of another well-known Greg pronouncement that, except for Shakespeare, “it can be shown that D was not written by any dramatist of whose hand we have adequate knowledge . . . ,”²⁰ Scott McMillin revisits the issue:

Greg was excluding from consideration the one dramatic writer whose hand resembles that of Hand D Indeed, this identification was generally taken for granted before Greg’s edition of 1911 dismissed it out of hand. In 1975 it was again mentioned by Michael Hays, and it has most recently been set forward by Anthony Petti²¹ What Greg overlooked was . . . the fact that the hand belonged to a dramatist. For it is Hand C that bears a resemblance to Hand D.

Doubts will spring to the minds of Shakespeareans everywhere. How could an author have misunderstood his own passage . . . (at l. 237)? (154-55)

Such problems are easily resolved if the lightly studied hypothesis is adapted to a scribe returning later to his transcript: D (now C) would have misunderstood only what he copied badly in the first place. The question must then revert back to handwriting analysis, where McMillin may rightly see a reluctance to investigate:

Not the handwriting but the experts are the most interesting topic here. For some reason a difference between C and D hardens into fact without being described. . . . The experts who established the difference between C and D were certain they saw a real distinction, but they were also certain of another difference between C and D. They were certain that D was a playwright and C was a functionary. Moreover, they became certain, if only after patient study, that the playwright was Shakespeare. Thus the distinction . . . became tinged with the difference between genius and scribe (157).

Paul Werstine has recently observed that advocates of D as Shakespeare caught in the act of composition have never tried to maintain that any one kind of evidence offered in support of the identification has been sufficient to sustain it – not the paleographical, nor the spelling, nor the literary-psychological. Nonetheless, advocates have argued that instances of these kinds of evidence, however weak they may be, converge to support each other and thus collectively convince us that D is Shakespeare. If instead the Hand D alterations point to a copyist transcribing another’s lines, as I have argued, then the very possibility of this convergence of evidence is threatened. If D is such a scribe, the number of possible penmen is not limited to known dramatists, as Greg had assumed. Therefore

the paleographical case based on resemblances between Shakespeare's handwriting and Hand D (universally acknowledged as inadequate to demonstrate identity) is weakened by an expanded, yet undetermined candidacy. Further, the paleographical argument cannot be reinforced by reference to stylistic features linking D's transcribed lines to Shakespeare's canonical plays. After all, even if the scribe is suggested to be Shakespeare himself, he is not, according to the analysis just offered, copying his own verse. The same objection may be made to argument basing the identity on the few analogies between D's spelling and Shakespeare's. If Shakespeare acts merely as a scribe, his own spelling will occur naturally in a transcript; but the stylistic features of the canon will not be imported into a transcription of another's work.

By the same analysis pointing to Hand D as a scribal copy of another's work, any stylistic argument in favor of Shakespeare as the author of the pages — relying as it does on admittedly inconclusive correspondences between canonical verse and the lines in Hand D — must stand alone. It cannot be buttressed by paleographical or spelling evidence, which is the scribe's. Thus the claim, that different classes of weak evidence somehow converge to make a strong case for Shakespeare as D, cannot be maintained by reordering the arguments. The identification of the author of Hand D should remain an open question. The evidence supports instead the strong probability of a scribe having trouble accurately transcribing lines that he could not himself have composed.

¹ *The History of King Henry the Fourth*, facsimile edition, eds. George Walton Williams and Gwynne Blakemore Evans (Charlottesville: U P of Virginia, 1974). The manuscript was transcribed ca. 1623-4, for Sir Edward Dering.

² Line numbers of Shakespeare play references are to the Arden Second Series.

³ James Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism* (Chicago: U of Illinois P, 1972) 112.

⁴ Apparently the play, an episodic chronicling of the rise and fall of the famous martyr, was never acted and never printed before Alexander Dyce's 1844 edition. The damaged manuscript is a fair copy from which two or three leaves were removed during revision that added seven leaves and two scraps. In his transcript, *The Book of Sir Thomas More* (Oxford: The Malone Society, 1911, and 1961 with a supplement by Harold Jenkins), W. W. Greg called the play's scribe S, and later identified him as Anthony Munday. The additions are in various hands (Hand C, Hand D, etc.). The corresponding penmen may be identified by letter (C, D).

Addition I is a leaf in Hand A, identified as that of Henry Chettle by Dr. S. A. Tannenbaum in *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore: A Bibliotic Study* (New York: 1927). His insistence that B is Heywood was predicated on a resemblance first noted by Greg, who called the identification "risky" in a review of Tannenbaum in *The Library*, IV, 9 (1927), 210. The identification has met very strong opposition and Dr. Tannenbaum's demonstration that Kyd is C is not convincing. Addition II comprises three scenes in three hands on three leaves inserted to replace deletions and the missing pages; IIa is a page in Hand B, IIb is a scene in Hand C, that of an unidentified playhouse scribe; and IIc is a three-page scene in Hand D, thought by many to be William Shakespeare's holograph. Additions III and V are scraps cut from one leaf consisting of single speeches in Hand C, pasted to the manuscript. The scraps are described by Giorgio Melchiori in "The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore: A Chronology of Revision," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 37 (1989), 291-308. Addition IV is a four-page scene in Hands C and E (Thomas Dekker). Addition VI is an episode by Hand B. A seventh hand is that of Edmund Tilney, Master of the Revels from 1579 to 1609, whose commentary apparently accompanied a rejection of the play's license. These features of the manuscript have motivated a large, unfinished study of every aspect of the play, including the date and authorship of the original and its revisions.

For a history of the study and further discussion, see *Shakespeare and "Sir Thomas More"; Essays on the Play and Its Shakespearean Interest*, ed. Trevor Howard-Hill (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1989). R. C. Bald gives a good introduction to the play in "The Booke of *Sir Thomas More* and its Problems," *Shakespeare Survey* 2 (1949), 44-65. Scott McMillin's *The Elizabethan Theatre and "The Book of Sir Thomas More"* (Ithaca: Cornell U P, 1987), includes an extensive discussion of Hand D, Ch. 7, 135-59. For later dissent from an alleged consensus that Hand D is Shakespeare's, see Paul Werstine, "Shakespeare More or Less: A.W. Pollard and Twentieth-Century Shakespeare Editing," *Florilegium*, 16 (1999), 125-45.

⁵ *Notes and Queries*, 4th Series, v111 (1871), 1.

⁶ Sir E. Maunde Thompson's paleographic case, *Shakespeare's Handwriting* (Oxford: 1916), was refined and combined with supporting argument in *Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More: papers by A. W. Pollard, W. W. Greg, E. Maunde Thompson, J. Dover Wilson, and R. W. Chambers* (Cambridge: 1923).

⁷ *Shakespeare Survey*, 38 (1985), 101-114.

⁸ Besides the scholars from early in the twentieth century whom Melchiori needed to recognize, others who have recently suggested that Hand D may be a transcript are Paul Ramsey, "The Literary Evidence for Shakespeare as Hand D in the Manuscript Play *Sir Thomas More*: A Reconsideration," *The Upstart Crow*, IX (1991), 131-55, and Michael L. Hays, "Shakespeare's Hand in *Sir Thomas More*: Some Aspects of the Paleographic Argument," *Shakespeare Studies*, VIII, (1975), 241-53.

⁹ All line numbers are adjusted to this edition.

¹⁰ *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*, eds. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).

¹¹ Eds. Vittorio Gabrieli and Giorgio Melchiori (New York: Manchester U P, 1990).

¹² *The Text of Shakespeare's Hamlet*, (London: 1924), 369-70.

¹³ W. W. Greg, "Special Transcript of the Three Pages", in *Shakespeare's Hand*.

¹⁴ *The Review of English Studies*, 1 (1925), 40-59.

¹⁵ This irrelevant example should not have been included in the list: first, the correction is not in a contemporary hand; second, the *letts us* usage is not an error, as pointed out in correspondence by Tom Reedy on the "Forest of Arden" newsgroup.

¹⁶ Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906.

¹⁷ The final multiple-word addition, 'alas alas' at line 245, seems not to be restored omission. Melchiori suggests of 'to slip him lyke a hound; [sayeng] say nowe the king' that when D saw his own deletion (of 'saying') he was inspired to use a short line and that the interpolation was "to complete the first part of line 245, envisaging a metrical arrangement that in modern spelling should be rendered as:

244 And lead the majesty of law in lyam [leash]

245a To slip him like a hound. Alas, alas!

245b Say now the king.

246 As he is clement if th'offender mourn . . ." (1985, 106)

This explication has little merit beyond the reinforcement of Melchiori's other "short line" suppositions. Alternatively, though not insistently, I envision a scribe who, recognizing the cause of his faulty anticipation 'sayeng', tried to protect others from the same confusion. The preceding lines easily cause 'say' to be mistaken as another verb in the series having the subject 'you.':

. . . youle put downe straingers

kill them cutt their throts possesse their howses

and leade the matie of law in liom

to slipp him lyke a hound; ~~sayeng~~ ^{alas-alas} say nowe the king 245

as he is clement, yf thoffender moorne

shoold so much com to short of your great trespas

as but to banysh yo^u, whether woold yo^u go.

A playgoer would not immediately know, without histrionics, that the imperative *Say* begins a new, complex sentence; nor that *the king* is (grammatically) the new subject of ‘should come to banish’. Accordingly, the theatrical scribe may have inserted the practical full-stop ‘alas alas’. Even though all interpolations are purposeful, no conjecture works well enough against C’s rejection of the extrametrical ‘alas alas’ to form part of an argument.

¹⁸ *Shakespeare At Work* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford U. P., 1995) 25.

¹⁹ *Shakespeare Studies*, VIII, (1975), 241-53.

²⁰ *Collected Papers* (200).

²¹ *English Literary Hands From Chaucer to Dryden* (Cambridge: Harvard U P, 1977). Petti suggests that “Hand C may be that of a leading dramatist, and the resemblance it bears to Hand D . . . should not be completely ignored The apparent revision of Hand C might be Hand D’s written somewhat later” (91).