

## Punctuation and Interpretation in *Richard II*

**Anthony Graham-White**

The punctuation of any edition of a play is a set of hints to actors and directors, hints that they are free to accept or ignore. Whether or not they are consciously aware of the punctuation, it mediates their approach to the text. Recent editors of Shakespeare state that they are keeping the punctuation as light as possible in deference to his own practice, but they are nevertheless constrained by our conventions of using it to mark a variety of grammatical constructions. Since Shakespeare writes complex sentences, using punctuation to parse them leaves little possibility of using it for any other purpose. While such modern punctuation may help actors to an initial understanding of the text, they are apt to treat it casually in delivery, for the conventions of speaking and dramatic expression diverge from grammatical markings.

John Russell Brown has written:

Modern editors usually punctuate to reveal the syntax as clearly as possible to a silent reader. This practice gives a cool and synthetic impression which is far from the dynamics of thought and speech. The experiment of reading aloud will show that the grammatical punctuation which is clear on the page can be labored and metrically confusing in stage performance. Before rehearsals begin some theatre directors have the whole play typed out afresh, using only the very minimum of punctuation--chiefly full stops to separate the sentences . . .<sup>1</sup>

---

Anthony Graham-White is a former editor of *TJ* and is the author of *The Drama of Black Africa* (1974). He is at work on a book on punctuation in English Renaissance dramatic texts and its significance to the actor.

Yet what is a sentence? Modern editors divide Shakespeare's speeches into far more sentences that are to be found in the quartos, or in the First Folio. And it is the punctuation of these early editions--and of the "good" quartos in particular--which is the greatest potential aid to the actor in the rhetorical shaping of the speeches and in suggesting the changing feelings of the speaker.

We do not know where the punctuation of the quartos and First Folio came from. First, we know too little about the provenance of the scripts that served as copy for the printed texts. Second, it was the compositors' prerogative to alter the punctuation, to regularize it as they saw fit.<sup>2</sup> But since grammatical parsing was not the standard followed, one compositor's predilections might differ from those of a fellow worker setting other pages of the same text. Compositors of the Folio, or more probably whoever prepared the copy for them, seem to have undertaken thorough revision of the punctuation. Where the Folio can be compared with quartos that the compositors are known to have used as copy-text, it is evident that the Folio was rather fussily over-punctuated, in part it seems to mark the poetic form--in particular, adding "too many commas at the caesuras with some consequent loss of rhythmical flexibility"<sup>3</sup>--and in part to clarify the sense for the readers by, for example, marking off subordinate clauses and phrases.

Given the uncertainties about the punctuation in the earliest editions and the different principles followed by that of modern editions, John Russell Brown has suggested that ". . . a reader should maintain a total skepticism about the punctuation of any text he reads, whether original or edited."<sup>4</sup> A scholarly interpreter will find this hard enough to do, but it is impossible for an actor, for he has to make decisions on how to deliver the lines, and on what knowledge and feeling his character should invest in them. Whatever the blanks and imponderables in the external evidence of copy provenance and printing, the internal evidence--the punctuation itself--is there in the quartos and First Folio, and actors will find it more helpful for performance than the punctuation of nineteenth- and twentieth-century editors. Scholars too, even if they rest in skepticism, will note that differences in punctuation suggest nuances in the interpretation of character, and occasionally different meanings.

I am hardly the first person to make such an argument. In 1911 Percy Simpson devoted a book, *Shakespearian Punctuation*, to the argument that Shakespeare's punctuation "was mainly rhythmical."<sup>5</sup> A little oddly, perhaps, he attempted to support his argument that the punctuation was not logical but rhythmical by sorting examples into categories which are grammatical for the most part, such as "comma between accusative and dative." In 1948 a German scholar, Richard Flatter, published *Shakespeare's Producing Hand: A Study of the Marks of Expression to be Found in the First Folio*, which is a discussion of particular passages. Simpson and Flatter both look only at Shakespeare and, indeed, only at the Folio. Thus, they deprived themselves of evidence from other playwrights and did not look at the sometimes more theatrical pointing of the quartos.

Simpson's book had immediate influence on two editors. The eminent scholar A. W. Pollard edited *Richard II* just after Simpson's book appeared. He believed that Shakespeare punctuated set speeches with care and of Richard's "Ile give my jewels for a set of Beades" speech he wrote that the First Quarto's "colons and commas take us straight into the room in which *Richard II* was written and we look over Shakespeare's shoulder as he wrote."<sup>6</sup> In 1921 Cambridge University Press launched its New Shakespeare series of individual plays, with John Dover Wilson as co-editor or editor until the series was completed in 1966. Following modern conventions of using punctuation for syntactic clarification, but impressed with the meaningfulness of some of the punctuation in quarto and Folio, he invented a new mark, a period between two spaces, to mark places where there seemed to be significant but non-grammatical punctuation--an innovation that has not been copied.

Scholars no longer write in such impressionistic terms as Pollard used, and Dover Wilson's over-speculative emendations brought discredit upon his practices. Fredson Bowers, Samuel A. Tannenbaum, and Gary Taylor each characterize his editing as "fantastic" guesswork.<sup>7</sup> The long championing of the expressive nature of Elizabethan punctuation by an editor who has recently been described as "infamous" and "tarnished"<sup>8</sup> has only encouraged skepticism about the value of analyzing Elizabethan punctuation.

The work of analytical bibliographers in the last several decades has uncovered the complexities of Renaissance book production. For example, the supposed two compositors who worked on the First Folio "split and multiplied into at least nine men."<sup>9</sup> Perhaps ironically, the more that is known of the circumstances of printing, the less it has seemed possible to say of the author's intentions, for the variables intervening between author and reader have multiplied.

In the last twenty years, however, there has been increasing interest in Shakespeare in the theatre, of his time and of ours. Moreover, in the same period critical theory has emphasized the impossibility of knowing any text except through the interpretation of the reader. Playscripts, and the poetry of most ages, can be seen as paradigmatic of that process; they have long been seen as not only dependent on the interpretation of that special kind of reader, the performer, but designed to be completed by the embodiment of performance. And, as Seymour Chatman wrote years ago, it is "difficult to distinguish the poetic style from the interpretation and performance style, unless we are prepared . . . to deal in potentials rather than actualization. But potentials may be all that really exist 'in' the poem as text."<sup>10</sup> Moreover, in the last few years this emphasis on the indeterminacy of the text and the work of the analytical bibliographers have come together in an emerging doctrine of the independent validity of Shakespeare's "good" quartos and of the Folio.<sup>11</sup> It is timely, then, to analyze what hints an actor might find in their punctuation, and to argue for the value of that punctuation which may well be closer to playhouse practice, that of the quartos. In G. Blakemore Evans' words, "if not

Shakespeare's, it was at least the work of his contemporaries, men in whom the rhythms and special emphases of his language were alive and immediately felt."<sup>12</sup>

Certainly the punctuation of Elizabethan playscripts is very different from that of modern editions. Punctuation marks did not have the same functions in Elizabethan texts that they do now. Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century grammars commonly refer to commas as marking a short pause; a colon, a pause twice as long; and a period a "full pause" at the end of the sentence.<sup>13</sup> The colon is far more commonly used than it is today. A school textbook of 1587, *The Petie Schole* by Frances Clement, defines it as a "middle pause . . . holding for the voice likewise at the pause of silence in expectation of as much more to be spoken, as is already rehearsed . . ."<sup>14</sup> In other words, it is akin to a strong suspensory pause. The semi-colon is to be found in some sixteenth-century texts--and appears infrequently in *Richard II*--but is first defined in grammar only in 1634, where Charles Butler defines it as between a colon and a period.<sup>15</sup> He goes on to say, "it continueth the tenour or ton' of the voic' to the last woord . . ."<sup>16</sup> These definitions of the colon and semicolon, which emphasize their impact upon intonation, demonstrate how careful we must be not to equate the functions of punctuation marks with their modern grammatical functions. Rather, the comma, semicolon, and colon should be seen primarily as markings of increasing strength, usually indicating pauses, but fluctuating in their use from author to author and compositor to compositor.<sup>17</sup>

Given, the problematic provenance of the punctuation in Elizabethan dramatic texts, the variations in personal practice, and the rapid development of punctuation itself, to seek to establish the rules of a system, as Percy Simpson did, is a chimerical endeavor. It is, in any case, more immediately useful to directors and scholars alike to examine how the punctuation works in a particular play, alert to the common practices of the time as they are set out in the grammars and as they may be inferred from the plays themselves, but equally alert to the particularity of each instance.

*Richard II* is a good choice to examine for the possible helpfulness of the punctuation for both bibliographic and dramatic reasons. The First Quarto was based on a manuscript "close to the author's own copy," in the phrase of the play's most recent editor, Andrew Gurr.<sup>18</sup> Perhaps it was Shakespeare's own fair copy of his foul papers.<sup>19</sup> Gurr calls the quarto "a more meticulously finished product than most of the early Shakespeare quartos." Looking at its punctuation, Peter Alexander classed the First Quarto of *Richard II* and the Second Quarto of *Hamlet* with the 144 lines of *Sir Thomas More* that (it is generally agreed) is in Shakespeare's own handwriting and thus gives us the one example of his punctuation.<sup>20</sup>

Dramatically, one would expect the punctuation of most play quartos of the period to make more apparent than a modern editor's the rhetorical shaping of speeches. For example, when Richard appears on the castle walls to parley with the rebels, he delivers 19 lines of rebuke before he reaches a

period. He ends these lines by wishing pestilence upon the descendants of those

That lift your vassaile hands against my head,  
And threat the glorie of my precious crowne.<sup>21</sup>

The last phrase sums up how he perceives kingship and in the First Quarto climaxes those 19 lines. But editors since, beginning with the Folio, have divided those lines into two or more sentences. An actor can still choose to build to "threat the glorie of my precious crowne," but the punctuation no longer leads him there.

*Richard II* is a particularly rhetorical play and Richard is the most self-conscious among the play's speakers. More important, Richard goes through great character change. I believe the punctuation aids the actor to convey the different emotions through which Richard passes and that at particular moments it lends weight to the choice of one of several possible emotional attitudes. Differences in punctuation from speech to speech or scene to scene might, of course, be due not to emotional change in the character or the playwright's tone but to differing preferences of the compositors. But I have taken care, when making direct comparisons of speeches or scenes, that in the First Quarto they were set by the same compositor. For example, I.i and I.iv were set by the same man. And the scene of greatest emotional change for Richard, III.ii, in which he returns from Ireland, was set throughout by the other compositor to work on the Quarto.<sup>22</sup>

The Quarto is a striking example of what Simpson called "light stopping." That is, periods are used very sparingly. The ends of speeches are marked with periods, but periods within speeches are rare. Where modern editors place periods, the most usual markings of the Quarto are colons, inviting the speaker to consider what follows the colon as parallel to, or in apposition to, or building upon, or summing up the sentiments or arguments that preceded the colon. The punctuation commonly treats a speech as a single rhetorical unit and encourages the actor to do so too. For example, in the first three scenes of the play--the challenges of Mowbray and Bullingbrooke, the Duchess of Gloucester's long laments, and the banishment of Mowbray and Bullingbrooke --only 9 periods appear within speeches, in 408 lines.<sup>23</sup> In this, the Quarto differs from both the Folio and modern editions. For example, in the first scene, the Quarto uses 2 periods within Mowbray's 22-line reply to Bullingbrooke's accusation of treason; in the same speech the Folio uses 3, two recent editions use 6, and another 9.<sup>24</sup>

Even a brief speech can illustrate how this "light stopping" emphasizes a speech as a single rhetorical unit. The opening exchange of the play is between Richard and Gaunt and ends with a 5-line speech by the king. The First Quarto presents it as follows:

Then call them to our presence face to face,  
 And frowning brow to brow our selves will heare,  
 The accuser and the accused freely speake:  
 High stomackt are they both and full of ire,  
 In rage, deaf as the sea, hastie as fire.

The colon is crucial. It suggests that the last two lines are not a personal comment added after a public order, but are the climax of the speech, building our expectations of the two antagonists, who enter at this point. The two commas in the final line are also important. Richard has opened the play with three brisk speeches and with these two commas he decelerates; they, together with the rhyme, give weight to his final line. The slight suspensory pauses the commas suggest round off the first "beat" of the scene (to use an actor's phrase). The Folio punctuates similarly at the two points I have commented on.<sup>25</sup> Yet all three of the recent editions I used for comparative analysis--Riverside, New Cambridge, and Oxford--placed a period before the final couplet, and only Oxford retained a comma after "in rage" in the final line. In addition, all three placed a period or semicolon after the initial "Then call them to our presence," thus undermining the formality of the public order that is suggested by the regularity with which a doublet appears in each of the first three lines and by their firm endstopping. Nor do I think it over-subtle to find a deliberate ambiguity suggested by the Quarto punctuation. Richard seems to be imagining himself frowning brow to brow and facing them down--as, indeed, he does later in inserting himself between the combatants and banishing them--whereas if "our presence" and "our selves" are set off by punctuation from "face to face" and "frowning brow to brow," then those phrases become descriptive of the two antagonists and Richard becomes a passive listener.

Ultimately, I am implying, the punctuation affects character interpretation. Yet, of course, the punctuation is ancillary to interpretation, something an actor can choose to use. Whoever plays York does not need an exposition of the punctuation to see that York is distracted and disorganized when he finds himself, as regent, in charge of putting down Bullingbrooke's rebellion. Nevertheless, he may find that the punctuation has hints for him on the phrasing of his speech on how "a tide of woes/Comes rushing on this wofull land at once." It is full of caesural punctuation in a play where it is notably sparse. There are 11 commas internal to the 23 lines of the speech (i.e., not at the line-ends); even more significant, also within the lines are such strong stops as 4 colons and 1 semicolon. The speech also contains a rare exclamation mark, three question marks, and a parenthesis. The last line--"All is uneven, and everything is lefte at sixe and seaven"--is comic in the way that the early comma and caesura and the extra syllables show his speech petering out, as his resolution is to do.<sup>26</sup> (All three recent editions, despite that fact that the lineation in the Folio echoes that of the First Quarto, relineate the last

few lines of York's speech, producing short lines and then a regular last line.) The dithering of York, reflected and conveyed in the punctuation, is contrasted with almost as long a speech at the opening of the next scene by his counterpart among the rebels, Northumberland, in which the only punctuation is at the line-ends, conveying a firm assurance York obviously lacks.

The assistance that the Quarto's punctuation gives to an actor may be exemplified in the speeches of Richard II himself, for he goes through a gamut of emotions. In the opening scenes he sees himself as in control. The speech in which he banishes Mowbray and Bullingbrooke proceeds vigorously, without a single period in the 17 lines he addresses to them, not even as he turns from the rationale for and general decree of banishment to the sentencing of Bullingbrooke, a point at which the Folio and recent editions place a period. The only punctuation marks are commas and colons at the end of some of the lines. After the public scenes of the Mowbray-Bullingbrooke dispute, we next see Richard in a domestic scene with Aumerle and Greene. Here the colons and enjambments that are so frequent in the building of his pronouncements in the public rhetoric of those earlier scenes disappear. A casual ease is suggested by the regularity of the pattern: lines uninterrupted by internal punctuation and each ending with a comma.<sup>27</sup>

When Richard returns from Ireland, he musters his rhetorical powers. In his first speech he calls upon his kingdom's earth to fight against his enemies. Recent editors punctuate its 23 lines with as many as 8 periods.<sup>28</sup> There are none in the Quarto except for that which ends the speech. The heaviest Quarto punctuation comes in the first 8 lines--two colons, two semicolons, and an enjambment<sup>29</sup>--as thought to help the speaker gain rapid rhetorical build, after which he can glide, as it were, through the list of actions he would like the earth to take.

Almost immediately he launches into another long speech, of 27 lines, comparing himself to the sun. He spins out this extended analogy with ease, in lightly marked lines with no periods.<sup>30</sup> Before the final couplet, the flow of each line is interrupted only twice by internal punctuation, each time stressing what Richard finds most repugnant; in each case a caesural pause emphasizes the words on either side of it. Richard says that when the sun

. . . fires the proud tops of the easterne pines,  
 And dartes his light through every guilty hole,  
 Then murthers, treasons and detested sinnes,  
 The cloake of night being pluckt from off their backs,  
 Stand bare and trembling at themselves?  
 So when this theife, this traitor Bullingbrooke,  
 Who all this while hath reveld in the night,  
 Whilst we were wandering in the Antipodes, . . .

Here "murthers" and "treasons" are particularly emphasized because of the very early position of the caesura in the line; and treason is again emphasized by building from, or perhaps correcting, "this theife" to "this traitor."

After bad news upon bad news, Richard's seeming confidence collapses in his most famous speech, "Lets talke of graves, of wormes, and Epitaphs. " The speech is built on the same chains of parallel metaphors as the two opening speeches of the scene. The punctuation, however, has changed. In 34 lines, there are within the lines 25 commas and one colon. (For comparison, in the 50 lines of the opening speeches there are only 6 commas and one period within the lines.) The caesural commas fall fairly regularly, usually after four syllables.<sup>31</sup> The most irregularly placed caesurae mark, by isolating words at the end and beginning of their respective lines, Richard's fear--and, indeed, his future. One is

And nothing can we call our owne, but death

and the other

All murdered, for within the hollow crowne<sup>32</sup>

The punctuation helps to slow the speech, until it ends in the simplicity of monosyllables, monosyllables thick at first with consonants, as though the emotion the words embody were hard to speak. Then, after the one polysyllabic word in the last three lines, whose length stresses its ironic use, the small words of the last line slip out easily, as if they represent psychological release for Richard.

I live with bread like you, fele want,  
Taste grieffe, need friends, subjected thus,  
How can you say to me, I am a king?

As my comments on these lines suggest, punctuation is only one of the stylistic devices by which poetic and emotional shaping are achieved.

Finally, I would like to stress that actors will find the punctuation more suggestive in the First Quarto than in the Folio. First, because the Folio uses more periods, perhaps to make speeches easier for readers to follow, it diminishes both the rhetorical sweep of the speeches and the significance of those points within speeches where the Quarto does use a period. Second, because the Folio adds many grammatical and caesural markings, the kind of contrast in punctuation that I have pointed out between Richard's speeches when he first returns from Ireland and when he talks of graves and worms and epitaphs becomes blurred.



At many particular points the Folio seems less dramatic. Two examples occur in the 20-line one-sentence speech that Mowbray delivers after being banished. It includes the lines

The language I have learnt these forty yeares,  
My native English now I must forgo,  
And now my tongues use is to me, no more  
Then an unstringed violl or a harpe,

where the comma in "is to me, no more" may well be a pause of emphasis or emotion, as the enjambment into which it leads--the first in the speech--suggest. The Folio reads

The Language I have learn'd these forty yeares  
(My native English) now I must forgo,  
And now my tongues use is to me no more,  
Than an unstringed Vyall, or a Harpe,

which is undramatically fussy, and where the opportunity for the actor that the comma before "no more" represents is absent. Recent editions follow the Folio in shifting the comma to the end of the line. Mowbray's 20-line speech ends with

What is thy sentence but speechless death?  
Which robbes my tongue from breathing native breath.

The Folio, followed by recent editors, moves the question mark to the end of the last line. This may be logical, but what actor would end this speech without rounding it off (as the rhyme also suggests) and answering the question to which Mowbray knows the answer all too well?

My last example of how the dramatic richness of the First Quarto's punctuation is leached away in the Folio is the Bishop of Carlisle's prophecy to Bullingbrooke of future civil wars. In the Quarto every line is end-stopped, even though the phrases invite enjambment, and even though there are enjambments earlier in his speech, preceding the prophecy. To take just three lines, the Quarto reads

Disorder, honor, fear and mutiny,  
Shall heere inhabit, and this land be cald,  
The field of Golgotha and dead mens souls,

The Folio removes the commas after "mutiny" and "cald." One may suppose that the Quarto, in end-stopping these lines, is indicating the oracular weight that Carlisle is giving each phrase.

Modern editions, of course, make further modifications that reduce the dramatic suggestiveness of the punctuation still further. To give a single example, the long scene in which Richard returns from Ireland ends with him saying

Discharge my followers, let them hence away,  
From Richards night, to Bullingbrookes fair day.

The Folio has slightly different punctuation, but marks the same places. However, recent editions mark only two (or in one case, three) of the four caesurae and line-ends. Thus they destroy the balanced finality of Richard's command.<sup>33</sup> Despite their choice of the First Quarto of *Richard II* as copy-text, the punctuation of recent editors is far closer to that of the Folio. They are unnecessarily far from the principle that each proclaims of following the "light stopping" of the Quarto.

Whether the punctuation of any early edition of Shakespeare reflects authorial intentions is unprovable. One editor of a recent New Arden edition, Anthony Hammond, believes "we have passed safely through the period when scholars believed that the pointing of F was Shakespeare's, and the subsequent period when it was held that, while not Shakespeare's, at least the punctuation of early editions was rhetorical in intent, and thus served the function of a sort of stage-direction, indicating to the actor how to speak the lines."<sup>34</sup> Yet in the same series and in the same year, another editor, A. R. Humphreys, writes that "while punctuation in print was normally the compositor's responsibility, and doubtless was so here, the effect in *Much Ado* is often felicitous enough to suggest that Q's compositor was intelligently interpreting Shakespeare's intentions. . . . However much or little Q's punctuation is actually Shakespeare's, it often serves his dramatic purposes expressively, and when it does so it is worth preserving."<sup>35</sup> As these contrasting statements demonstrate, the issue of what significance to find in the punctuation of Renaissance dramatic texts remains unsettled. Because of its very lack of claim to authority, the punctuation in modern editions usually escapes analysis, yet "for scholars, directors, and actors alike, to alter rhythm is ultimately to alter meaning."<sup>36</sup> If it seems that I have been over-ingenious in the interpretation of some passages--as A. W. Pollard seems to have been to me--that does not necessarily invalidate the general argument that the Quarto's punctuation is dramatically suggestive. If it is so, then readers may wonder whether that quality is serendipitous or intentional; actors and directors will find it worthwhile to consider what effect the punctuation suggests, both in its general characteristics and in particular instances.

*University of Illinois*  
*Chicago Circle*

## Notes

1. *Discovering Shakespeare* (London: Methuen, 1981) 85.
2. Probably, too, to modernize. Punctuation practice was rapidly changing and compositors of the Folio might be working from a quarto published—in the case of *Richard II*—twenty-six years earlier.
3. Mindele Treip, *Milton's Punctuation and Changing English Usage, 1582-1676* (London: Methuen, 1970) 20.
4. Brown 85.
5. (Oxford: Clarendon Press) 8. Simpson looked back to even earlier analysis, notably to three brief commentaries by Alfred E. Thistleton on three of Shakespeare's comedies, published 1900-1903.
6. *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates* (Cambridge: UP, rev. ed., 1920) xxi.
7. Gary Taylor, "Inventing Shakespeare," *Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft West, Jahrbuch*, 1986, 33; Samuel A. Tannenbaum, "The New Cambridge Shakespeare and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*," *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, 13 (July 1938) 151; Fredson Bowers, "The Historical Collation in an Old-Spelling Shakespeare Edition: Another View," *Studies in Bibliography*, 35 (1982) 254-55.
8. Taylor 33.
9. MacD. P. Jackson, "Two Shakespeare Quartos: *Richard II* (1597) and *1 Henry IV* (1598)," *Studies in Bibliography*, 35 (1982) 173.
10. "Comparing Metrical Styles," in *Style in Language*, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok (Cambridge: Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1958) 166.
11. A notable example is *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of "King Lear"*, ed. Gary Taylor and Michael Warren (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984). Cf. Ted-Larry Peabworth's protest against editions of Donne that have "anachronistically reflected the assumptions of print culture when working with a body of poems that circulated throughout their author's lifetime only in manuscript" and in various versions ("Manuscript Poems and Print Assumptions: Donne and His Modern Editors," *John Donne Journal*, 3, No. 1 [1984] 1).
12. "Shakespeare Restored—Once Again!," in *Editing Renaissance Dramatic Texts, English, Italian, and Spanish: Papers Given at the 11th Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, University of Toronto, 31 Oct-1 Nov, 1975* (New York: Garland, 1976) 50.
13. The quoted phrase is from George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589), in *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, ed. G. Gregory Smith (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1904), II 77.
14. 25. No copies of the first edition of 1576 have survived.
15. Cf. Richard Hodges, *Most Plain Directions for True-Writing (1653)*. Hodges places the semi-colon between the comma and the colon.
16. *English Grammar*, ed. A. Eichler (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1910) 59. Butler advocated spelling reform, including a marking in place of a final silent E.
17. A question mark was often used to stand for an exclamation mark, and is so used in Q1 *Richard II*.
18. Introduction to the New Cambridge Shakespeare edition (Cambridge UP, 1984) 51. The next quotation from Gurr is from the same page.
19. John Jowett and Gary Talor consider this likely. "Sprinklings of Authority: The Folio Text of *Richard II*," *Studies in Bibliography*, 38 (1985) 198-99.
20. "The Text of *Hamlet*," *Review of English Studies*, 12 (1936) 391. For a recent challenge to the belief that the revision to *Sir Thomas More* is in Shakespeare's hand, see Scott McMillin, *The Elizabethan Theatre and "The Book of Sir Thomas Moore"* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP, 1987).
21. Q1 citations are from *Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto: A Facsimile Edition of Copies Primarily from the Henry E. Huntington Library*, ed. Michael J.B. Allen and Kenneth Muir (Berkeley: U of California P, 1981). In citing Q1 and F, long Ses are not recorded and U, when used to represent V, is changed to V.
22. Ii and I.iv were set by S, III.ii by A. Charlton Hinman, Introduction, *Richard II*, Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles No. 13 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966) xiv.

23. I have not counted question-marks, all of which seem rhetorical in these scenes, as ending sentences.

24. The recent editions, to which that phrase consistently refers in this paper, are *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974); *The Complete Oxford Shakespeare*, ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986); and the New Cambridge Shakespeare *Richard II*, ed. Andrew Gurr.

25. F has semi-colons after both "speake" and "rage."

26. A compositor sometimes had to squeeze extra material onto a sheet, due to faulty judgment in casting off copy. This could lead to deliberate mislineation, with extra syllables in lines. The most obvious signs of this, such as 38 lines instead of the normal 37, do not appear on this sheet. See Hinman's discussion of Q1 in "Shakespeare's Text—Then, Now and Tomorrow," *Shakespeare Survey*, 18 (1965) 28-32.

27. There is one comma within a line and in Richard's final speech, as he prepares to visit the dying Gaunt, there is a colon.

28. A full comparison of punctuation in different editions is as follows:

Q1	20 commas, 2 semicolons, 3 colons, 1 period.
F	19 commas, 3 semicolons, 3 colons, 5 periods.
Riverside	22 commas, 2 semicolons, 0 colons, 6 periods.
Oxford	18 commas, 1 semicolon, 0 colons, 8 periods, 1 dash.
Cambridge	14 commas, 0 semicolons, 0 colons, 8 periods.

In Q1 what at first appeared to be a period after the first half-line a magnifying-glass showed to be a heavily inked comma.

29. Enjambment is not, strictly speaking, a punctuation mark. Yet if punctuation is being used primarily to regulate rhetorical flow, then it is as important to note when an expected stop is absent as when it is present. This is particularly so in *Richard II*, where the majority of the lines are end-stopped.

30. There is a question mark, but it is obviously rhetorical and should probably be read as closer to an exclamation mark. The passage in which it occurs is quoted in this paragraph.

31. The effect is thus quite different from the speech of York which I analyzed earlier, which is also heavily punctuated within the lines.

32. If we are to believe M.R. Ridley, "Many readers must have noticed that the actor frequently does not deliver his lines in the least as his modern text has carefully prepared them for him, but reverts—often no doubt from his actor's just instinct, and not from consultation of the Folio—to the delivery that Shakespeare intended for him, and indicated as his intention" (Introduction, Arden edition, *Anthony and Cleopatra* [London: Methuen, 1954] xiv). I am not sure that I can share his optimism about the astuteness of readers and the instincts of actors. Yet John Gielgud's delivery of "Lets talke of graves . . ." is close to Q's punctuation. Most notably, he places a caesural pause before "but death," whereas recent editions omit the comma Q places there, and while modern editions commonly place a period after "all murdered," his delivery suggests a dash (a mark not used in Q1), which is closer to Q's comma.

33. The punctuation of final couplets is particularly striking throughout the play, for the strong sense of form they show. They include the following exchange at the end of the long scene in which Richard in effect surrenders himself to Bullingbrooke:

*Richard.* Set on towards London, Cosen is it so?

*Bullingbrooke.* Yea my good Lord:

*Richard.* Then I must not say no.

34. Introduction, *King Richard III* (London: Methuen, 1981) 51.

35. Introduction, *Much Ado About Nothing* (London: Methuen, 1981) 80.

36. Michael J. Warren, "Repunctuation as Interpretation in Editions of Shakespeare," *English Literary Renaissance*, 7 (Spring 1977) 168.