

EMENDING *THE CHANGELING*

THE CHIEF POINT OF REFERENCE IN THIS PAPER will be the standard edition of the text by N.W. Bawcutt (London, 1958), which will be compared with his Scolar Press facsimile of the 1653 Quarto in the British Library (press-mark 162.k.10) published in London in 1973 and with other books as appropriate.

In an earlier article written after I had completed my own edition for 'New Mermaids' (1990), I analysed elaborately Bawcutt's handling of punctuation in his text.¹ I came to a number of conclusions, which may be summarized as follows:

(1) Bawcutt seemed to labour under the not unusual misapprehension that the punctuation in Q is, in general, authoritative enough to be worth adopting in most cases;

(2) yet he does not follow that punctuation consistently, introducing his own — grammatical — punctuation as he sees fit;

(3) the resulting punctuation in his edition is a curious mixture which does not enable the non-expert to judge whether any particular mark has 1653 'authority' or not, whether it is meant to make rhetorical sense (seemingly the function of the 1653 punctuation) or to serve as a guide to the syntax, etc.

Bawcutt's approach in the area of punctuation seems to me more seriously at fault than it is when he introduces substantive emendations involving words. Nevertheless, we can see some of the same tendencies at work. In general, his text is conservative to an extent which stretches credulity, although at times the conservatism is quite warranted; yet his adherence to the 1653 text is not consistent. In this case, however, the resulting shortcomings are not as detrimental as in the area of punctuation, in that the emendations are usually very defensible, and the evidence in Q is honestly and meticulously presented. Rather, one feels that if errors are acknowledged to exist in Q to the extent that Bawcutt concedes, there is a strong probability that there are other errors as well — which he does not contemplate or admit and which an editor should either rectify in a modernized text like Bawcutt's or at the least propose as likely emendations in the notes.

There is yet a third important area of emendation in which my views differ at times substantially from Bawcutt's, that of lineation. However, since this is a separate issue on the whole, and a matter of style rather than content, I shall not discuss it here except that it needs to be stated that Bawcutt's lineation too seems to me often unduly conservative.

Bawcutt, then, is too reluctant to depart from an imperfect text. As he says (pp.xvii-xviii), his text 'aims to follow the quarto as closely as possible'. In principle I agree that this is a worthy aim. Where the only more-or-less authoritative text at one's disposal seems to be adequate, it is sensible not to depart from it. On the other hand, we must be careful not to assume that there is something particularly sacred about a text simply because it was printed in 1653, and editors will inevitably disagree as to where it is 'possible' to follow such a text, particularly if it is admitted — as Bawcutt does wherever he emends Q — that it is not perfect. We must remember that the Q printing was not checked by Middleton or Rowley. It is not known either how much copying occurred between the original writing (1622) and the printing.² In principle, a good many errors may be expected.

What kind of substantive errors does Bawcutt concede? There are a fair number of instances where Q seems to him at fault in an apostrophe or letter, necessitating emendation to procure the likely original reading. Thus in I.i.100 (Bawcutt's text) Q has 'Wilt', which Bawcutt — persuasively — alters into 'Will't'.³ It will be realized that such an alteration is by no means trivial. Not only does 'Will't' represent two words instead of one, but if the error is admitted here, then similar errors may be suspected elsewhere, and it is not a long step from (for example) 'Wilt' vs. 'Will't' to 'there's' vs. 'there is', etc. Some of Bawcutt's emendations which involve just one letter are, of course, quite significant — for example, his 'he' for Q 'she' in III.iii.134. Indeed, some changes *within* words are nothing short of drastic — especially IV.ii.54 'chins and noses' for Q's 'sins and vices'. Here several letters are emended.

It is curious, then, that Bawcutt is generally very reluctant to accept that there may be times when one or more actual *words* may be superfluous in Q, or (as I believe is much more likely and frequent) are wrongly omitted. Yet it is not as though the text does not force Bawcutt into accepting this sort of error. Thus, as a rare example of the former category, he rightly reads 'What' in I.i.128 for Q's 'And what' (which, as he suggests, is no doubt caused by repetition from the previous line). And there are several good emendations in the second category, like 'the nearest' for Q's 'nearest' (surely metrically defective), and 'Not that I want it not, for I do piteously' (III.iv.114), where Q omits the second 'not' (probably because the first 'Not' was confused with it in copying though sense and metre require it).

It is obvious that Bawcutt's substantive emendations themselves indicate that Q is certainly not faultless and that, where an editor sees good reason for doing so, he or she should supply other emendations along the same lines as those which we have just considered. In what follows, I shall propose what appear to me desirable emendations which do not occur in Bawcutt's text — and also consider some rare instances where the emendations which he does introduce seem to me wrong. (On the whole his emendations appear to me correct,⁴ and certainly in the right direction; my complaint is generally that he should have been more daring.) My aim is thus to list and discuss (to an extent that I could not do in my own edition) those instances where Bawcutt and I have a difference of opinion as to the substantives that a modernized, edited text should contain.

1. I.i.4, 'Why should my hopes or fate be timorous?' For 'or' read 'of'. Bawcutt himself raises the possibility, and compares I.i.111, where Q's 'or' is definitely (as all pre-Bawcutt editors had agreed) an error for 'of'. There is obviously no point in talking about a *fate* which is timorous, and it seems absurdly timid to retain 'or'.
2. I.i.21, 'I know 'tis against me. || Against you?'⁵ For "'tis' read 'it is' (Dyce). The emendation makes for satisfactory metre, not only accentually (which is often a matter for argument) but also syllabically (which is more important, given the prosody of these authors). The change is surely minor otherwise, as there is not much formal difference; errors of this kind are common.
3. I.i.82, 'By the hand royal, that's your part, lady.' For 'that's' read 'that is' (Dyce). Cf. item 2.

4. I.i.117-18, 'There's scarce a man amongst a thousand sound, | But hath his imperfection . . .' For 'sound' read 'found'. It surely makes better sense to say that there is hardly a man amongst a thousand who has not *some* imperfection than to claim that amongst a thousand *sound* men there is scarcely a single one who is not somehow unsound. And long 's' could easily have been confused with 'f'.
5. I.i.180, 'No, by Saint Jacques, I came behind him.' Here I think (with Dilke *et al*) that Q's 'Jacques' should be retained; it will suggest a disyllabic word to a modern audience, which the line needs.
6. I.i.189, 'He's hot preparing for this day of triumph.' For 'this' read 'his' (Dyce). Surely the meaning is that Piracquo is preparing for *his* day of triumph, the wedding which will be 'within this sevensnight' (190), not for *this* day (which is not one of triumph). The error no doubt resulted from anticipation (cf. 'this' in the next line); it could at least as easily have arisen as, for example, 'she' for 'he' in III.iii.134 — an error in Q which Bawcutt acknowledges.
7. I.ii.86-8, 'And if your pains prove but commodious, to give but some little strength to his sick and weak part of nature in him . . .' For 'his' read 'the'. No doubt confusion occurred in copying as a result of the appearance of 'sick' and 'him'. In Q the lines are printed as though they were verse ('And . . . | To give . . . | And weak . . .'). Possibly this division occurred prior to the printing of Q, in which case the compositor may as readily have been misguided by 'him' in the next line as by 'sick' immediately following. Anyhow, 'his' is not idiomatic and unlikely to be authorial.
8. I.ii.124, 'I'll warrant you I make him fit to bear office . . .' Emend to 'I warrant you I'll . . .', a post-Bawcutt reading proposed by G.W. Williams in his edition of the play (see my reference in note 2). Williams seems to me right in suggesting that Q's version (adopted by Bawcutt) is 'obviously corrupt' and 'results from compositorial anticipation' (a type of error frequent in Q). Williams' text is in fact often superior to Bawcutt's, in my view.
9. I.ii.188, 'mark now, Tony, there a fool . . .' For 'there' read 'there's' — surely far more idiomatic than Q's all-too-readily-made error.
10. I.ii.209, 'Go to your charge, Lollo, I'll to mine.' For 'Go to' read 'Go you to', as proposed (post-Bawcutt) by T.W. Craik.⁶ The emendation is not absolutely essential but seems likely because of the contrast between 'you' and 'I' and because the next line has 'Go you to your madmen's ward . . .' Here anticipation appears to have led to the *omission* of a desirable word. Craik also may be right in thinking that the line is meant to be verse (and isn't, without this extra syllable).
11. II.i.46-7, 'Yet such a one pluck'd sweets without restraint, | And has the grace of beauty to his sweet.' For 'pluck'd' read 'plucks'. All editors prior to Bawcutt accepted this emendation, which is obviously required by 'has' in 47. Q has 'pluckt' — clearly an understandable but significant slip.
12. II.i.135-40:

She lies but with another in thine arms,
He the half-father unto all thy children

135

In the conception; if he get 'em not,
 She helps to get 'em for him, and how dangerous
 And shameful her restraint may go in time to,
 It is not to be thought on without sufferings.

140

This passage is notorious for its difficulty. I believe it makes sense, however, if we add from Q the phrase which Bawcutt omits after 'for him' in 138, viz. 'in his passions' ('and how dangerous' becomes then a separate half-line). In my words, Tomazo describes to his brother Alonzo how, if Beatrice receives any sexual pleasure from him, 'it will be because her mind is on another, that person being the half-father of every child which she conceives from you physically; if he does not actually beget them, she helps — through you — to beget them for him, as the passions of love-making will in effect be his. And if she attempted to restrain herself under these conditions, it is painful to consider how dangerous and shameful her behaviour may eventually become.'

13. II.ii.27, 'The honourablest piece 'bout man, valour.' For "bout" read 'about' (Dilke). Q's reading results in a final trochee and a very jerky rhythm, while 'about' (formally very close) creates a regular endecasyllabic line.
14. II.ii.41, 'And now I think on one: I was to blame'. I agree with Williams that Q's 'too blame' is correct: 'This construction, historically the dative infinitive, was misconstrued in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; "to" was spelled "too" and "blame" was taken as an adjective (*OED*, "blame," 6).' As he points out, in III.iv.96, also, we need 'too blame' (not 'to blame' as in Bawcutt).
15. II.ii.88, 'To a hard face, 'tis not so unpleasing'. For "'tis" read 'it is' (Dilke); I cannot see how this line can otherwise be read as having five feet.
16. II.ii.122-24, '. . . you would say then | I fail'd, and us'd not reverence enough | When I receive the charge on't.' For 'receive' read 'received', as the syntax obviously requires. There may have been confusion here between a 't' indicating past tense and the 't' of 'the', as well as between 't' and 'e'.
17. III.iii.33-4, 'When you have a taste of the madman, you shall (if you please) see Fools' College, o' th' side'. For 'have' read 'have had', and for 'o' th' side' read 'o' th' other side'. Bawcutt admits that in IV.iii.166 we must read 'which have made', not just 'which made', and the addition of 'had' here is of no greater magnitude. It makes English of an otherwise hardly comprehensible sentence, and a copyist could easily have omitted 'had' from the combination 'have had'. Similarly the absence of 'other' in Q looks like a clear case of omission. There is no doubt that the asylum has two separate wards; someone might easily start with 'o' th'" and then forget 'other'.
18. III.iii.43, 'Alack, alack, 'tis too full of pity'. For "'tis" read 'it is' (Dyce). This produces five feet in an endecasyllabic line; cf. items 13 and 15 above.
19. III.iii.131-32, 'Try but one arrow; if it hurt you, | I'll stand you twenty back in recompense'. For 'I'll' read 'I' at the end of 129 and 'Will' as the first word of 130. Dyce's simple emendation secures a decasyllabic line in 131, with five feet.
20. III.iii.181-83, 'What should I fear, | Having all joys about me? Do you smile, | And love shall play the wanton on your lip'. I agree with Ellis that we need 'Do

you but smile' in 182. The added 'but' appears to make for better prosody, but especially for better English; yet more importantly, Lollio, in quoting from this speech in 227, has 'Do you but smile', and it is unlikely that we must see him as inventing the addition.

21. III.iv.64-6, 'Do you place me in the rank of verminous fellows, | To destroy things for wages? Offer gold? | The life blood of man! Is anything | . . .'. In the belief that De Flores may be 'slightly incoherent', Bawcutt stays with Q. But there is no real reason why De Flores should be incoherent or the metre be defective as well as the sense. Whatever the punctuation, we need 'For' to precede 'The' in 66. De Flores' chief point here is that gold should *not* be equated with the life blood of man.
22. III.iv.68-71, 'I could ha' hir'd | A journeyman in murder at this rate, | And mine own conscience might have slept at ease, | And have had the work brought home.' The phrase 'slept at ease' is not in Q. I think it is unwarranted. As A.H. Gomme suggests in his edition (*Jacobean Tragedies*, London, 1969), it is possible to transfer 'And have had' from 71 without metrical loss there, and substitute it for 'slept at ease'. I would then add another 'had' to 'might have' to help both sense and metre, so that we read: 'And mine own conscience might have had, and have had | The work brought home. I'm in a labyrinth . . .'. This correction stays much closer to Q than 'slept at ease' does. (The second 'have' is of course pronounced so as to form one syllable with the following 'had'.)
23. III.iv.76-7, 'For my fear's sake, | I prithee . . .' Q has 'fears'; I suggest this represents a plural form here ('fears'), as De Flores refers to 'fears' in 85.
24. III.iv.91, 'This must not be betwixt us. || The Man talks wildly.' For 'betwixt' read 'twixt', which fits the metre better; 'betwixt' no doubt resulted from repetition of 'be'.
25. III.iv.151-53, 'I shall rest from all lovers' plagues then; | I live in pain now: that shooting eye | Will burn my heart to cinders.' Read: 'I shall rest from all plagues then; | I live in pain now: that love-shooting eye | Will burn my heart to cinders.' Q is obviously corrupt — in particular 'that shooting eye'. 'Lovers', in error for 'love', could easily in copying have found its way into the preceding line (151), where no such word is wanted. We do, however, need a 'love-shooting eye' (Beatrice's) in 152. The alterations involved are slight but significant and necessary.
26. IV.i.104, 'I will not question what 'tis, but take it.' If we read 'it is' (Dilke) for 'tis', we get a prosodically comprehensible line with five feet and a weak final syllable. Surely it is by now clear that the several Q errors of this nature are monotonously similar — for example, 'tis' for 'it is' as here and in items 2, 15 and 18 above, or 'that's' for 'that is' in item 3. Obviously slips of this nature can very easily occur in copying (particularly if the copyist pays no attention to the metre), and equally obviously an effort must be made to rectify such mistakes, for there is no question but that the dramatists did count their syllables and did think in terms of feet even if tension between speech rhythm and the iambic base is frequent in their verse.

27. IV.ii.70, 'I should have a brother in your place'. For 'have' read 'have had', as required by both sense and metre; 'had' could very easily have been omitted in copying. Cf. item 22 above, where also 'had' appears to have been omitted, and also after 'have'.
28. IV.iii.1, 'O heaven! Is this the waiting moon?' Several emendations have been suggested for Q's unsatisfactory 'waiting', but the best is clearly Williams' 'waxing', which is very close in form to 'waiting' but has a more logical meaning: Isabella refers to a moon which grows bigger and therefore increases lunacy.
29. IV.iii.213-14, "'Tis perfect; well, fit but once these strains, | We shall have coin and credit for our pains.' Craik suggests that we should add 'we' after 'fit', and I agree. A copyist could easily have left out 'we', particularly after 'well'; it produces a decasyllabic line with five feet; and it improves the sense in that 'fit we' corresponds grammatically with 'We shall have', whereas 'fit' is a less logical imperative address to Lollo.
30. V.i.13-5, 'Sure the devil | Hath sow'd his itch within her; who'd trust | A waiting-woman?' For 'who'd' read 'who would' (Dyce) — another instance of the unabbreviated form giving a line which makes prosodic sense: decasyllabic and with five feet.
31. V.i.45-7, 'I will be ready with a piece high-charg'd, | As 'twere to cleanse the chimney: there 'tis proper now, | But she shall be the mark. || I'm forced to love thee now.' Craik proposes the deletion of 'now' after 'proper' in 46, and clearly this first 'now' is superfluous and results from confusion with 'now' in 47. Errors due to anticipation are common in Q. De Flores means that it is common to use a gun when attempting to put out a chimney-fire; hence the presence of a gun near Diaphanta's chimney will be appropriate — but she will be its target.
32. V.i.93, 'Dog at a house of fire . . .' Obviously 'on' should replace 'of' to create idiomatic and unambiguous English; the error 'of' was no doubt due to anticipation of the 'f' in 'fire'.
33. V.i.102, 'She 'scap'd a mine twice . . .' Beatrice refers to Diaphanta avoiding disaster on two occasions. I agree with Craik that 'mine' is unsatisfactory and unlikely. His 'ruin' is plausible because a copyist could easily have misread that as 'mine' and because 'ruin' fits both the sense and the metre.
34. V.ii.22, 'Some river must devour't, 'twere not fit.' For 'devour't' read 'devour it' (Dyce) to create a decasyllabic line with five feet. Another typical instance of the kind of error commented on in item 26 above.
35. V.ii.52-3, '. . . I have not left | A good wish for you, nor any here.' We need another 'for' before 'any' to create a decasyllabic line with five feet; 'for' could easily have been omitted, especially in a line containing, just before, both 'for' and 'nor'. It is difficult to see why any editor should refuse to make so obvious an emendation.
36. V.ii.64-5, 'Name but the manner I shall ask forgiveness in | For that contemptuous smile upon you.' The earliest editors realized that Tomazo is obviously not apologizing for a contemptuous smile on Vermandero's face, but for *his own smile*. Therefore Dilke suggested the addition of 'I cast' between

- 'smile' and 'upon', and Dyce preferred 'I threw'. Both emendations fit the sense and would create a normal endecasyllabic line with five feet. I think that Dyce, however, is more likely to be correct, as in 57-8 preceding Vermandero had said: 'Throw no scornful smile | upon the zeal I bring you . . .'
37. V.iii.13, 'At my first sight of woman? — She's here.' For 'she's' read 'she is' (Dyce), which produces a decasyllabic line of five feet. Cf. comments in item 26.
38. V.iii.14-5, 'How do I? | Alas! How do you? You look not well.' Craik suggests the insertion of 'sir' after 'Alas'. This would not only create a regular decasyllabic line but throw into relief the first 'you' (i.e. 'it doesn't matter so much how *I* am, but how *you* are'). The emendation is clearly highly plausible, and it is worth mentioning that Beatrice goes on to use 'sir' in her next speech (line 17), where it metrically seems in fact less desirable.
39. V.iii.46, 'Your ticklish heel on't; there was a visor'. For 'on't' read 'on it' (Dyce), resulting in an endecasyllabic line with five feet. Cf. item 26.
40. V.iii.52-3, 'He's now become your arm's supporter, your | Lip's saint!' Q has 'arms' and 'lips'; I think, with Williams, that we should read 'arms" and 'Lips", as De Flores supports more than one of Beatrice's arms, and he is the saint of both of her lips. Williams may be right in thinking that 'arms" is wanted also in the sense that the supporter is 'the man or beast that stands beside the shield of arms in heraldic blazoning'.
41. V.iii.55, "Twould turn him to a villain. 'Twas witness'd'. For "'Twas' we need 'It was' (Dyce) to turn the line into one which is endecasyllabic and has five feet. Cf. item 26.
42. V.iii.66, 'I have kiss'd poison for't, strok'd a serpent'. Here 'for it' (Dyce) would create an endecasyllabic iambic line, although 'for't' is sustainable on the assumption that there are three iambs followed by two trochees. That seems less likely than that a simple emendation is required. Cf. item 26.
43. V.iii.107, "'Twas but one thing, and that — she's a whore.' Read "'Twas but one thing, and that she is a whore.' De Flores means that there was but one thing to be confessed, i.e. the murder of Alonzo, and additionally that Beatrice is a whore. There is thus no need for Bawcutt's punctuation and its implied pause. The prosody requires 'she is' (Dyce); otherwise the line is not decasyllabic, and even harder to 'scan'. Cf. item 26.
44. V.iii.113, 'Take your prey to you, get you in to her, sir.' We should read 'into' (preposition) with Q, as there is an allusion here to sexual ingression (Beatrice and De Flores, Alsemero says, are again to rehearse their 'scene of lust', 115).
45. V.iii.134-36, 'How is my cause bandied through your delays! | 'Tis urgent in blood, and calls for haste; | Give me a brother alive or dead'. I think 'my blood' is needed because it gives us a decasyllabic line; it could easily have been overlooked — especially after 'my' in the previous line; and it gives good sense (though 'urgent in blood' is not impossible). It is very possible that in 136 we should read 'or alive', which seems metrically preferable — but otherwise it is weak and superfluous. Perhaps the line is octosyllabic, with 'broth'r' and four stresses.

46. V.iii.163-64, ‘. . . now we are left in hell. | We are all there, it circumscribes here.’ As Bawcutt indicates, all editors before him had ‘circumscribes us’, and the post-Bawcutt consensus seems to be that that is correct. It is difficult to see what sense the verb ‘circumscribes’ here would make without a direct object, and the line lacks a syllable without it.
47. V.iii.197, ‘That last chang’d on us! Here’s beauty chang’d.’ With Dilke, I read ‘Here is’; it is likely that the line is ‘headless’, starting with emphatic ‘That’ — but I prefer monosyllabic ‘on’s’ to the emphasis on ‘us’ that we would be forced into with retention of ‘Here’s’.

I do not wish to deny that some of these emendations could be matters for dispute. However, I trust that many of them will be accepted and that it will be seen that Bawcutt’s edition is much too conservative in its attitude to Q.

It remains to add that there are several ‘minor’ misprints that he does not record. He does not record that ‘at’ in ‘at once’ (IV.iii.2) is from Dilke, and absent in Q. This is probably just an oversight. However, other omissions of Q readings in the *apparatus criticus* seem intentional, like Q’s ‘motrow’ instead of ‘morrow’ in III.iii.148. Q’s misreadings are in fact important in *all* instances, and a lengthy edition like Bawcutt’s should note them,⁷ for if, for example, ‘r’ and ‘t’ were confused in one instance they may have been elsewhere. My main contention, though, is that *in general* Q does not warrant any such confidence in its readings as Bawcutt’s edition displays and that an editor should carefully think of possible alternatives in many cases if the intention is — as in Bawcutt’s and my case — to do justice to what Middleton and Rowley are likely to have written.

Joost Daalder,
Flinders University of South Australia.

NOTES

1. See my 'Punctuating *The Changeling*', *Bibliographical Society of Australia and New Zealand Bulletin* 13 (1989, published 1990): 11-26.
2. Bawcutt suggests (p.xvi) that Q's source was 'probably a transcript from theatrical prompt-copy'; however, G.W. Williams, in his edition of the play (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966), contends that the text has been set not from authorial foul papers or a promptbook but probably from a fair scribal transcript (written in secretary hand) of the authors' foul papers. In my view, the matter remains unresolved, although no doubt a transcript was made c.1650.
3. In his edition Bawcutt scrupulously states whether emendations – those adopted and those he thinks only worth mentioning – were first thought of by him or by others. He gives very full information, including precise references to previous editions etc. Thus I offer the names of textual scholars other than him only where it is necessary to do so because the information is absent from Bawcutt, and I assume that otherwise readers will check relevant details in Bawcutt when they wish to. Only in the case of post-Bawcutt publications do I supply bibliographical details in this paper.
4. Most of them had been accepted by numerous editors preceding him and are obviously necessary and logical. I feel, in fact, that Bawcutt should have trusted the good sense of his predecessors more often than he has.
5. I use | to indicate a division between verse lines, but || where there is a division between two speakers.
6. See his 'Notes on the Text of Three Passages in *The Changeling*', *Notes and Queries* 222 (1977): 120-2, and 'Further Proposed Emendations in *The Changeling*', *Notes and Queries* 225 (1980): 324-7.
7. The important point here is that the length is clearly related to the scholarly – as distinct from 'popular' – approach adopted in this edition.

Copyright of Full Text rests with the original copyright owner and, except as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, copying this copyright material is prohibited without the permission of the owner or its exclusive licensee or agent or by way of a license from Copyright Agency Limited. For information about such licences contact Copyright Agency Limited on (02) 93947600 (ph) or (02) 93947601 (fax)