

Authorial Revision or Compositorial Tampering?  
Notes on Minor Changes in the 1596 Quarto of *The Faerie Queene*,  
Books I-III

Toshiyuki SUZUKI

Unlike previous modern editions of *The Faerie Queene* founded on the 1596 quarto, the second and revised Longman edition of the work based its text for Books I-III on the 1590 quarto.<sup>1)</sup> The Longman editors' decision on the copy-text was made chiefly because the second quarto (1596) is for the most part a reprint of the first (1590) except for some major revisions—the addition of a stanza to Book I (I.xi.3) and the replacement of the last five stanzas at the end of Book III by three newly composed ones.<sup>2)</sup> However, in addition to these revisions, the 1596 quarto contains throughout the three books a considerable number of minor changes both substantive and accidental. The very number and extent of such changes seem to have led the earlier editors to a highly doubtful assumption that "it [1596] was printed along with a fresh installment of the *Faerie Queene*, very probably under the author's supervision. . . ." (Var. 1: 516). Against this assumption Frank B. Evans suggested, on the ground of his compositor analysis of the entire six books of 1596, that "Spenser may well have sent ahead the necessary copy [of 1590 marked with revisions] and entrusted his publisher with the reprinting" (61-62).<sup>3)</sup> This implies that Spenser neither supervised the reprinting nor read the proofs because he was in Ireland while the reprint was in press. In fact, other bibliographical and textual studies have adduced sufficient evidence to show that the 1596 quarto was hurriedly and carelessly printed.

Claims for priority of 1590 over 1596 had been made by some Spenserian scholars before the publication of the second Longman edition. In 1980, for example, in a review of A. C. Hamilton's first Longman edition (1977) and Thomas P. Roche's Penguin edition (1978), Oliver Steele deplored their choice of copy-text; Hamilton simply reprinted J. C. Smith's Oxford text (1909) according to the publisher's policy, and Roche also adopted a 1596 copy, possibly regarding "the Variorum [1932-38] editors' choice of 1596 as a conclusive warrant for his own decision" (268).<sup>4)</sup> Steele says that neither of these editions presents a sound text of the poem and goes on to examine the editorial assumptions of the earlier editions on which they depended. He

demonstrates cases in which he finds the *1590* readings better than the *1596* readings, and, often referring to R. B. McKerrow's *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare* and W. W. Greg's "The Rationale of Copy-Text",<sup>5)</sup> criticizes J. C. Smith's editorial decision as well as those of later editors. As Steele suggests (277), apart from the major revisions mentioned above, the number of alterations made by Spenser himself is far smaller than the earlier editors supposed. In other words, many of the *1596* readings at variance with *1590* seem to have been brought about by compositors' or proof-readers' tampering.<sup>6)</sup>

The editorial policy of the second Longman edition states that relatively minor revisions possibly made by Spenser are "not always adopted but are recorded in the Textual Notes" (23). However, the textual notes are given in a minimal style without any explanation for the text editors' decision, though authorial revisions of some significance are noted in Hamilton's commentary. The reader interested in textual matters might well question what made the editors choose the particular readings cited in the textual notes. My purpose here is to supplement the textual notes with commentary as well as bibliographical evidence and illustrate the rationale behind the editors' choice between the *1590* and *1596* readings. Since variants discussed have to be selective on account of limited space, I will confine myself to the so-called substantive variants excluding the cases of obvious misprint.

## 1. Overview of accidental variants

A statistical overview of variant readings between the two texts of *1590* and *1596* would suffice to get a grasp of the quality of each text as well as the extent to which alteration are made in *1596*. The table below shows the number of changes of spelling and punctuation.<sup>7)</sup>

Table 1 Accidental variants

	Book I	Book II	Book III	Total
Spelling	2,303	2,726	2,643	7,672
Punctuation	226	341	215	782

Though *1596* was set, in the main, from a copy of *1590*, the influence of the printer's copy on the compositors seems to have been very slight, and changes in accidentals are found in great number. Qualitative analyses of the *1596* compositors have revealed that they swept away spellings characteristic of Spenser such as 'blood', 'doe', 'litle', and 'mynd(e)', which had abounded in the *1590* text. Spellings of rhyming words in *1596* are more carefully adjusted so that they also become eye rhymes. It is probable, however, that the adjustment was made more often by the compositors than by the poet, for they show a disposition to change the original and authorial spelling of rhymes according to their own spelling habit. In this connection, it is worth noting

how they dealt with what Hereward T. Price called 'metrical spelling' — the kind of spelling adjusted to the meter of a poem by adding or removing an extra syllable as the meter requires.<sup>8)</sup> According to Price, the compositor had to strictly follow the copy-spelling, for example, as to the alternative between the full form 'amazed' and the contracted form 'amaz'd/amazd', or between the full form 'to inueigle' and the elided form 't'inueigle'. Spenser himself seems to have been careful about proper use of metrical spellings, for he cited for correction in the errata to *1590* some faulty forms that cause either an excess or a lack of a syllable in a line. Despite occasional improvements, however, the *1596* compositors far more often changed metrical spellings for the worse so that hypermetrical or catalectic lines remain sporadically in their text.

Most of the *1590* punctuation is of course transmitted intact to the *1596* edition. Generally, *1590* places the comma for breath and to set off a verb and its object, a subject and its predicate, a verb or noun and a modifying prepositional phrase, and so forth. The punctuation of *1590* can be roughly described as rhythmically or rhetorically oriented. In contrast, that of *1596* is grammatically oriented. One conspicuous change made in *1596* is that the comma is replaced by the colon or semicolon, or otherwise altogether omitted, particularly at the end of the line.<sup>8)</sup> It also attempts to clarify syntactical units of the sentence structure and tends to remove the comma for breath, though quite a few of such commas survived into the later editions.<sup>9)</sup> The Oxford and Variorum editors tend to claim that those subtle changes in punctuation grammatically or metrically improve the readings and that they afford evidence that Spenser elaborately revised. However, in view of the liberties the *1596* compositors took with accidentals, it is more probable that they resulted from the compositors' arbitrary or even erroneous alterations.

## 2. Overview of substantive variants

A breakdown of numerical data of substantive variants between the two old editions is given in the following table.

Table 2 Substantive variants

	Book I	Book II	Book III	Total
Misprints in 1590	23	27	33	83
Doubtful readings in 1590	11	16	21	48
Misprints in 1596	59	69	55	183
Doubtful readings in 1596	5	4	2	11
Errata not corrected in 1596	26/57	13/40	6/13	45/110
Misprints common in 1590 & 1596	0	2	2	4
Sp's (possible) revisions in 1596	27	72	51	150
Total	151	203	170	524

Variants are frequently found throughout the three books, but the number of possibly authorial revisions is only 150 out of the total of 524, which is much fewer than the previous editors considered. Alterations of single words or phrases comprise the great majority of substantive variants, but as we will see, they do not always serve to literally refine or euphonically improve the original readings. They are mostly alterations of articles, conjunctions, prepositions, pronouns, singular-plural numbers, tense, and word order—the kind of changes that compositors are prone to make. In terms of poetical and literary effects, they vary from those involving meter and rhyme to those affecting interpretation of the lines.

The number of misprints in *1596* is also noteworthy; this second edition corrected 83 misprints originating in *1590*, but it neglected to correct about a half of those cited in "Faults escaped in the Print" appended to the latter.<sup>10)</sup> Moreover, it introduced 183 new misprints. This alone would make one doubt the earlier editors' supposition that Spenser elaborately read proofs of the second edition.

### 3. Authorial or Compositorial?

A textual editor's judgment as to whether a variant is of authorial or compositorial origin depends on his or her interpretation of the lines where it occurs. In addition, any interpretation involves the editor's literary or aesthetic taste as well as assessment of bibliographical evidence. As Greg frankly admits in his "Rationale of Copy-Text," the procedure for distinguishing between authorial revision and unauthorized variation is inevitably subjective (31-32). One criterion for testing the authority of variants is then literary improvement or refinement, but the Oxford and Variorum editors often make somewhat questionable assumptions of the authorial hand in indifferent or insignificant changes. Discussions of such controversial variants follow below, sorted by grammatical or prosodic categories along with a minimum of context. Variants are bold-faced for emphasis.

#### (1) Conjunctions

The following is one of the variants that Steele discusses in his review mentioned above.

##### I.i.2.1

*1590*    **And** on his brest a bloodie Crosse he bore,

*1596*    **But** on his brest a bloudie Crosse he bore,

The preceding stanza describes the Red Cross Knight as "Full iolly knight he seemd, and faire did sitt" (I.i.1.8). J. C. Smith, the Oxford editor, notes, "The reading of 1596 brings out finely the contrast between the 'jolly' appearance of the Knight and his dedicated purpose" (2: 501), and F. M. Padelford, the Variorum editor, quotes this, fully supporting Smith's view (1: 544). However, Steele argues that Smith's

interpretation of 'jolly' in its most common sense as 'mirthful' or 'joyful' is inappropriate to the context of the first two stanzas and that it should be interpreted as 'brave, nobly daring, excellent, admirable, handsome' (273-274). He sees no contrasts between the knight's 'jolly appearance' and his Christian dedication. He rather finds it quite natural for the jolly-seeming knight to bear the 'bloudie Crosse' on his armor (275). As he concludes, the 1596 reading is an example of a common type of compositorial substitution. Incidentally, Steele considers a large number of minute or indifferent substantive changes in 1596 to be compositorial tampering (277).

Another minute alteration, a change of part of speech from a conjunction to an article, is found a few stanzas later in the description of Una and a milk-white lamb she leads on a string.

I.i.5.1

1590 So pure **and** innocent, as that same lambe,

1596 So pure **an** innocent, as that same lambe,

Smith adopts 1596 on the ground that the 1609 folio edition, textual authority of which has never been established, reads 'So pure an Innocent', taking 'innocent' as a noun. However, it should be noted that 1609 tended to make conjectural and often erroneous emendations on its copy of 1596 and that the change might have been one example of such sophistications. On the other hand, Padelford notes, "The change of 'innocent' from an adjective (1590) to a substantive (1596) heightens the poetical quality of the comparison" (Var. 1: 544). Whether it really heightens the poetical quality of the comparison would be a debatable question, while the synonymy 'pure and innocent' in 1590 seems rhetorically no less effective and natural. As a matter of fact, Spenser often uses synonymous words to clarify and amplify the meaning of 'pure'. To cite a few examples from *The Faerie Queene*: "But all of Diamond perfect pure and cleene" (I.vii.33.5); "For it is chaste and pure as purest snow" (II.ii.9.7); "As for pure chastitie and vertue rare" (III.iv.3.4); "Pure and vnspotted from all loathly crime" (III.vi.3.4).

What is obvious from the editors' comments is that they both presuppose that the change is Spenser's revision. Yet, wouldn't it be more reasonable to suppose, however, that it was merely a result of the 1596 compositor's careless error — an omission of the letter d in 'and' — as it appears at first glance?

## (2) Personal Pronouns

Many changes in personal pronouns that are either erroneous or justifiable can be seen in 1596, but whether they are made by the author himself is not always discernible. The distinction of 'thou' and 'you' in the second person is the case in point.

I.i.31.5-6

1590 Of such (saide he) I chiefly doe inquire,

And shall **thee** well rewarde to shew the place,

1596 Of such (said he) I chiefly do inquire,  
 And shall **you** well reward to shew the place,

The Red Cross Knight in *1590* addresses Archimago, disguised as a hermit, using the second person singular, though on meeting him the knight had returned a courteous salutation to him. Smith simply notes, "The plural pronoun is more courteous than the singular. There is a similar change of 'thy' to 'your' in I.ii.22.5" (2: 502). Obviously, he assumes that the *1596* change is authorial, but the possibility of the compositor's correction cannot be entirely denied. As Herbert W. Sugden notes in his *Grammar of Spenser's Faerie Queene*, the distinction between 'thou' and 'you' is not consistent in *The Faerie Queene*, nor is there any perceptible reason for occasional shifting from one to the other and vice versa (27).<sup>11</sup> Sugden goes on to say, "That Spenser made some effort to keep up the distinction between 'thou' and 'you' is evident from a number of changes in these two pronouns made in the edition of 1596" (27). However, his argument here is not very convincing, because the exact number of such changes is not particularly high. In fact, the two cases Smith notes and another at III.Pr.4.2, where Spenser addresses Queen Elizabeth as "Thy selfe thou", are all that we find throughout the three books.<sup>12</sup>

(3) Word order

Transposition of words is another kind of common error or tampering a compositor tends to make.

I.v.7.9

1590 **And hewen helmets** deepe shew marks of eithers might.

1596 **And helmets hewen** deepe, shew marks of eithers might.

We may safely assume that this is a simple correction of the word order made by the *1596* compositor who found the *1590* word order anomalous, and yet Smith notes, "This is one of those slight changes of order, made here for the sake of grammar, but more often for the sake of rhythm, which reveal the poet's own hand in 1596 more conclusively than more conspicuous alterations." (2: 503) Padelford follows Smith again and quotes this note. Let us cite a few examples of such transposition which they also claim to be made by the author in the interest of a smooth line.

III.ii.8.5

1590 Which **to proue, I** this voyage haue begonne.

1596 Which **I to proue,** this voyage haue begonne.

III.ii.30.5

1590 And downe againe **her in her warme bed** dight,

1596 And downe againe **in her warme bed her** dight;

Padelford calls the latter variant "another felicitous emendation that betrays the poet's own hand" (3: 422), but generally speaking, rhythmical improvement of lines is by no means beyond the capability of a compositor. Smith records twelve other similar cases of transposition, which he invariably ascribes to the author.<sup>13)</sup> However, only a few of these changes are favorable to grammatical or rhythmical improvement. Others can be justly described as indifferent. See, for example, the one at II.vi.12.9, where 1590 reads "To bud out faire, & **throwe her sweete smels** al arownd" and 1596 "To bud out faire, and **her sweet smels throw** all around".

#### (4) Tense

The 1596 changes of the tense from present to past and vice versa are not uncommon and they often cause irregularities in the tense sequence. As Sugden notes, the historical present is very frequently used to vivify the narrative style in *The Faerie Queene* (122), but in a direct speech the discourse is given generally in the past tense. For instance, Prince Arthur tells Una his personal history consistently in the past tense.

I.ix.15.6-8

1590 From that day forth I cast in carefull mynd,  
To seeke her out with labor, and long tyne,  
And neuer **vowd** to rest, till her I fynd  
1596 From that day forth I cast in carefull mind,  
To seeke her out with labour, and long tyne,  
And neuer **vow** to rest, till her I find.

Padelford notes in defense of the 1596 reading, "The change to the present tense was either a subtle improvement, implying that the vow is constantly renewed, or 'vow' may be an infinitive coordinate with 'seeke'" (1: 548). However, neither interpretation is convincing. We may safely take Hamilton's gloss on 'neuer vowd to rest' as: 'vowed never to rest' (116).

The alteration found in the following description of the deluded Red Cross Knight contrasts to that of the preceding instance—a change from the present to the past tense.

I.i.49.3-5

1590 He **starteth** vp, as seeming to mistrust,  
Some secret ill, or hidden foe of his:  
Lo there before his face his Ladie is,  
1596 He **started** vp, as seeming to mistrust,  
Some secret ill, or hidden foe of his:  
Lo there before his face his Lady is,

In *1590* probably the poet-narrator momentarily shifted the tense to the historical present in harmony with the sentence to follow, whereas the *1596* compositor, unaware of the original design, regularized the tense sequence. This may be compared with the case of II.ii.21.1, where *1590* reads "The noyse thereof **cald** forth that straunger knight," and *1596* "The noyse thereof **calth** forth that straunger knight." There is no sensible reason for the change, and it would be attributed to the compositor's error. A similar confusion of tense created by *1596* is found at III.vii.13, where the present, past, and present perfect tenses are mixed.

III.vii.13.4-7

*1590* The sight whereof did greatly him adaw,  
 And his base thought with terrour and with aw  
 So inly smot, that as one, which **hath gaz'd**  
 On the bright Sunne vnwares, doth soon withdraw

*1596* The sight whereof did geatly him adaw,  
 And his base thought with terror and with aw  
 So inly smot, that as one, which **had gazed**  
 On the bright Sunne vnwares, doth soone withdraw

This mixture of tenses causes no grammatical problem at all, but *1596* erroneously altered 'hath gaz'd' to 'had gaz'd', i.e. from the present perfect to the past perfect.

##### (5) Diction

As mentioned before, the modern editors of Spenser's text have often attributed in-different changes to the author by offering more or less questionable interpretations of them. They seem to have assumed that the compositor would never take liberties with operative words crucial in interpreting the text. They are theoretically right in their assumption, but in practice they underestimate the compositor's behavior toward his printer's copy; he might do far more than he is required, as the following instance illustrates.

I.vii.37.5-8

*1590* A goodly person, and could menage faire,  
 His stubborne steed with curbed canon bitt,  
 Who vnder him did **amble** as the aire,  
 And chauft, that any on his backe should sitt;

*1596* A goodly person, and could menage faire,  
 His stubborne steed with curbed canon bit,  
 Who vnder him did **trample** as the aire,  
 And chauft, that any on his backe should sit;

Smith believes that this change also reveals the poet's hand in *1596* and justifies it by



adding that such a wild-spirited steed would not amble (2: 504). The *OED* defines 'trample' as 'walk or tread heavily' (*v.* 1) and quotes the lines from Morris's Globe edition of *The Faerie Queene*,<sup>14)</sup> which based its text on 1590 but adopted in this instance the 1596 reading. But the word 'trample' seems incongruous with the phrase 'as the aire', which the *OED* glosses as 'a breeze, or light wind, etc.' (I. 8). In order to move like a breeze a horse should 'amble' or tread at an easy pace. If we read the description of the horse in its proper context, we can see that Smith's comment is irrelevant. Spenser originally intended the ambling of the fierce horse to emphasize Prince Arthur's skill in riding and his horse's obedience to its master. It is difficult to believe that this change in 1596 originates from the author himself. Spenser regards equestrian skill as "a science / Proper to gentle blood" (II.iv.1.7), which he exemplifies in Sir Guyon, "Who taught his trampling steed with equall steps to tread" (II.i.7.9). When Braggadocchio steals and rides this "valiaunt courser" of Sir Guyon's, it scorns "to tread in dew degree, / But chaufd and fom'd, with corage fiers and sterne / And to be easd of that base burden still did erne" (II.iii.46.7-9).

The compositors of 1596 sometimes assume editorship with no authority whatsoever and tamper with the original readings for no apparent reason. We can see, for instance, the scene of Amavia's suicide in Book II, where such a tampering occurs.

II.i.39.3-4

1590 And soone arriued, where that sad pourtraict  
Of death and **dolour** lay, halfe dead, halfe quick,  
1596 And soone ariued, where that sad pourtraict  
Of death and **labour** lay, halfe dead, halfe quicke,

Both Smith and Padelford reject the 1596 reading, as did most eighteenth-century editors from Ralph Church onward,<sup>15)</sup> who cited to support 1590 the phrase 'death and dolor' in "Of death and dolor telling sad things" (II.vii.23.5) and in "But dread of death and dolor do away" (II.viii.7.7). What is notable about these lines is that alliteration of 'd' is conspicuous, and the same applies to other lines where the word 'dolor' appears: "Her wretched days in dolour she mote waste" (III.ii.17.8); "That nought but deth her dolour mote depart" (III.iv.6.5); "Twixt dolour and despight halfe desperate" (III.xii.43\*.3). Hamilton's second edition comments on 'labour' in 1596 that it may have been suggested by Amavia's search for Mordant, her husband, by her efforts to release him from Acrasia's power, or by her labour in child-birth (165). It might have been simply that the printer-corrector found "sad pourtraict / Of death and dolor" redundant and felt the need for replacement. As he conclusively notes, however, the alliteration demands the 1590 reading.

Sometimes the earlier editors follow their copy-text despite their suspicion of the compositor's tampering. In Book II, when the Palmer sees Prince Arthur fighting without his sword and driven to a serious plight in the battle with Cymochles and

Pyrochles, he hands Sir Guyon's sword to Arthur and says:

II.viii.40.3-4

1590 And said, fayre Sonne, great god thy right hand blesse,  
To vse that sword so **well**, as **he it** ought.

1596 And said; faire Son, great God thy right hand blesse,  
To vse that sword so **wisely** as **it** ought.

The editors think that the change is editorial and not authorial, since 1590's 'as well as he who owned it' is superior in meaning to 1596's 'as wisely as it ought to be used,' and they see no reason why the former should be changed (Smith 2: 508; Var. 2: 511). Nevertheless, both Smith and Padleford adopt 'wisely' in their editions. This is one of many cases in which they follow their copy-text despite their suspicion of the printer's tampering.

As Sugden notes, Spenser's predilection for the antique was notorious among contemporary critics (11). According to him, the archaism of *The Faerie Queene* "resides (1) chiefly in vocabulary, (2) to a high degree in spelling, (3) to some extent in the inflections, and (4) slightly in the syntax" (10). However, archaic diction in such words as 'reams' for 'realms', 'thrist', for 'thirst' and 'wordly' for 'worldly' that had survived 1590 were almost completely effaced from 1596. It is inconceivable that Spenser deliberately modernized old diction in reprinting, and therefore the practice can be mostly ascribed to the printer. It may be that the compositors simply took those words as misprints of their copy or mere spelling variants. Generally speaking, replacement of an archaic or obsolete diction by a more current word brings about a slight change in sound, but rarely affects the meaning of the line.

One change that could have been a revision by the author is seen in the description of Archimago, disguised as the Red Cross Knight, confronting Sansloy. Here a current word is replaced by an archaic one.

I.iii.34.9

1590 So bent his speare, and **spurd** his horse with yron heele.

1596 So bent his speare, and **spurnd** his horse with yron heele.

As Hamilton notes, 'spurnd' is an obsolete form of 'spurd', having the same meaning.<sup>16)</sup> Padelford refers to "sharpely gan to spurne / His fomy steed" (III.i.5.4), where the word constitutes a b-rhyme sequence of the stanza: 'turne', 'spurne', 'burne' and 'returne' (Var. 1: 545).<sup>17)</sup> Obviously, Spenser used the obsolete form according to the requirement of the rhyme scheme, and therefore the use of 'spurne' here does not attest to his preference for this form. Moreover, neither 'spurne' nor 'spurned' appears anywhere else in the two editions of *The Faerie Queene*, whereas 'spurd' and 'spurred' appear elsewhere three times, all occurring in non-rhyming positions.<sup>18)</sup> In the stanza

immediately preceding the line under discussion, Sansloy's fierce horse "the sharpe yron did for anger eat, / When his hot ryder spurd his chauffed side" (I.iii.33.5-6). It seems that Spenser avoided the repetition of 'spurd' and added at the same time a slight touch of archaism at I.iii.34.9.

#### (6) Wording

Variants in longer phrases and clauses are discussed in this section. The focus of discussion shifts from the authority of the change to the reasons for the change, for most of alterations can be safely taken as authorial correction in view of the adeptness with which they are made. The first instance is part of the conversation where Contemplation preaches pilgrimage to Jerusalem to the Red Cross Knight.

I.x.62.7-9

1590 What need of armes, where peace doth ay remaine,  
(Said he) and **bitter battailes all are** fought?  
As for loose loues **they'are** vaine, & vanish into nought.

1596 What need of armes, where peace doth ay remaine,  
(Said he) and **battailes none are to be** fought?  
As for loose loues **are** vaine, and vanish into nought.

The first of the 1596 changes is possibly Spenser's revision. It explains more clearly why there will be no need for arms, but the replacement of the 1590 reading erases the memory of bitter battles the knight has hitherto fought. In other words, Contemplation looks back on the past in 1590, while in 1596 he looks forward to the future prospect. As Smith notes, the deletion of 'they'are' in 1596 improves the meter (2: 504), but it introduces a grammatically defective construction. It might have been the compositor's omission (Var. 3: 423).

Among the most discussed is the change from "Sometimes she [Phaedria] laught, **as merry as Pope Ione**" to "Sometimes she laught **that nigh her breth was gone**" at II.vi.3.4. Recording John Upton's commentary (Var. 2: 242), the Variorum editor suggests the possibility of Spenser's attempt to avoid reference to "the controversial subject of the female Pope Joan" (2: 509). There is no need to recount these notes in detail. It suffices to note that the reason for removing the proverbial expression of the time still remains a mystery.

A subtle change in wording is also made in Glauce's suggestion to Britomart that they disguise themselves as men of arms.

III.iii.53.1-4

1590 That therefore nought our passage my empeach,  
Let vs in feigned armes our selues disguise,  
And our weake hands (**need makes good schollers**) teach.  
The dreadful speare and shield to exercize:

1596 That therefore nought our passage may empeach,  
 Let vs in feigned armes our selues disguise,  
 And our weake hands (**whom need strength shall teach**)  
 The dreadfull speare and shield to exercize.

Smith says that the reason for the change is obscure (2: 510), and Padelford thinks that Spenser probably revised the line in the interest of euphony though in the process he destroyed the syntax (Var. 3: 423). The period at the end of the line in question is obviously a mistake, as he notes — otherwise, the lines make sense and are grammatical. Concerning the reason for the change, Hamilton refers to Joseph Candido,<sup>19)</sup> who points out in his essay the contradiction with III.ii.6, where she tells her life story to the Red Cross Knight, ". . . from the howre / I taken was from nurses tender pap, I haue beene trained vp in warlike stowre, / To tossen speare and shield, and to affrap / The warlike ryder to his most mishap." If Spenser's reason for changing the original reading was to clear up the contradiction, he did not altogether succeed in doing so.

Unlike the case of Pope Joan, the legendary female pope, the reason for the excision of Sir Thopas, the Chaucerian figure, is plain.

III.vii.48.2-4

1590 To weet the mightie *Ollyphant*, that wrought  
 Great wreake to many errant knights of yore,  
**Till him Chylde Thopas to** confusion brought.

1596 To weet the mighty *Ollyphant*, that wrought  
 Great wreake to many errant knights of yore,  
**And many hath to foule** confusion brought.

Endorsing John Upton's commentary, Hamilton notes, "Revision was needed because Chaucer's tale breaks off before Child Thopas slays Ollyphant" (359). Yet in fact, it is not certain whether Sir Thopas is meant to slay the giant in the future, for Chaucer intended his interrupted tale to be a parody of popular romances of his time.

The Variorum edition never fails to quote Smith's notes; "Spenser has remembered, or been reminded, that Ollyphant reappears in [III.xi.]" (3: 425). If Ollyphant had been brought to destruction by Sir Thopas as the Squire of Dames told Satyrane in the earlier canto, the giant could not have still been alive and chasing a young man in the later canto. It is more likely, therefore, that Spenser revised the text to remove this inconsistency or anachronism.

#### (7) Rhyme and meter

The compositors can meddle not only with rhyme spellings and metrical spellings but also with rhyme and meter themselves if modification is relatively easy. However,

since a change of a rhyming word in one line directly affects rhyme fellows in other lines, compositors would not usually bother themselves about rhymes.

In the following passage, where Phaon (Phedon in *1596*) tells Guyon how he was assaulted by Occasion and her son Furror, the change extends to all the rhyming words in the c-rhyme sequence.

II.iv.17.6-9

- 1590* So me weake wretch, of many weakest **wretch**,  
 Vnweeting, and vnware of such mishap,  
 She brought to mischief through **her guileful trech**,  
 Where this same wicked villain did me **wandring ketch**.
- 1596* So me weake wretch, of many weakest **one**,  
 Vnweeting, and vnware of such mishap,  
 She brought to mischief through **occasion**,  
 Where this same wicked villain did me **light vpon**.

This change is undoubtedly Spenser's revision, but the *1596* readings are not necessarily better because they are authorial. Smith comments, "A striking instance of author's correction in *1596*. Spenser seems to have shrunk from the forms 'trech', 'ketch'" (2: 506). His surmise that the poet may have avoided the archaic forms 'trech' and 'ketch' is dubious, for according to Sugden, "if the customary form of a word provided no rime [sic], Spenser resorted to a dialectical, colloquial, or archaic form which would rime" (12). It is true that 'trech' occurs only here in *The Faerie Queene*, but 'ketch' is also used at II.i.4.5, where it reads "To ketch him at a vauntage in his snares." Furthermore, at III.vi.37.3 the form is made to rhyme with 'fetch' at the first line of the stanza. The reason for the change then seems other than what Smith supposed.

Spenser probably thought 'occasion' would suit better than 'guileful trech' or deliberate trick with evil intent. The change seems to lessen, however, Phaon's anger and hatred toward them. To rhyme with 'occasion', Spenser replaced 'weakest wretch' by 'weakest one' at line 6, but it spoils the alliteration and disturbs the rhythmical repetition.

It would be worth noting that in *1590* there are seven places where imperfect rhymes occur and that all but one were left intact in *1596*.<sup>20)</sup> Some editors believe that these occasional imperfect rhymes may have been intentional and others think otherwise. For instance, on analysis of them Smith supposes:

It seems as if, borne along on the swell of his metre and the easy flow of his imagination, two words identical in sense and metre but different in sound rose to the poet's mind almost simultaneously; and the one which he meant to reject slipped nevertheless from his pen, having been (we infer) the first to

occur. (1: viii-ix)

According to Smith then, the imperfect rhymes originated from the author, but he is inconsistent in how he treats them in his edition; he left them untouched on four occasions and corrected them on two. Padelford, on the other hand, seems somewhat skeptical about the origin of the imperfect rhymes, but is bold enough to correct all of them, adopting conjectural emendations made by various older editors (Var. 2: 507).

Though Smith's inference sounds plausible, it should be remembered that the compositor might also have been inclined to inadvertently substitute metrically equivalent synonyms for the words he sees in his copy, as the *1590* compositor probably did at II.ii.7.7, where 'chase' falls out of the b-rhyme sequence of the stanza.

Which to her Nymph befell. Vpon a day,  
 As she the woodes with bow and shaftes did raunge,  
 The hartlesse Hynd and Robucke to dismay,  
*Dan Faunus* chaunst to meet her by the way,  
 And kindling fire at her faire burning eye,  
 Inflamed was to follow beauties chace,  
 And chaced her, that fast from him did fly; (II.ii.7.2-8)

It is likely that the compositor set the synonymous but non-rhyming word instead of 'pray' in the sense of 'prey'.

The only instance of the *1596* revision that removes an imperfect rhyme is seen toward the end of Book III.

III.xii.27.1-3

*1590* So soone as they were in, the dore streight way  
 Fast locked, driuen with that stormy blast,  
 Which first it opened; **nothing did remayne.**

*1596* So soone as they were in, the dore straight way  
 Fast locked, driuen with that stormy blast,  
 Which first it opened; **and bore all away**

This is a rather simple but clever paraphrase by Spenser, who attempted to correct with the least change in meaning. Syntactically, however, the failure to adjust the punctuation marks makes the sentence structure of the revision unclear.

The compositor may have attempted to edit the original reading with the intention of smoothing out imperfect rhymes, when he found it easy to do so. Here is an instance of erroneous correction probably made by the compositor.

II.x.49.6-9

*1590* Thenceforth this land was tributarie made

T'ambitious *Rome*, and did their rule obay,  
 Till *Arthur* all that reckoning **defrayd**;  
 Yet oft the Briton kings against them strongly swayd.  
 1596 Thenceforth this land was tributarie made  
 T'ambitious *Rome*, and did their rule obay,  
 Till *Arthur* all that reckoning **did defray**;  
 Yet oft the Briton kings against them strongly swayd.

A quotation from Smith's note will suffice to explain how the compositor made such an error; "Here at least the printer of 1596 is seen to have assumed the editor. He betrays himself by losing the rhyme-scheme, rhyming line 8 with lines 2, 4, 5, 7 instead of 6, 9" (2: 509).

#### 4. Editorial approach of the new Longman edition

As demonstrated above, there are many 1596 alterations that can be reasonably suspected of being from the compositor's hand among the variants hitherto believed to have been due to authorial revision. Nor do obviously authorial revisions always turn out to produce literary refinement. Given such a mixture of revision and tampering, an editor should make a consistent and judicious decision as to which of the variant readings to adopt in his or her edition. It would be worthwhile to review the procedure Greg suggested for adopting authorial revision and rejecting unauthorized variation.

Granting that the fact of revision (or correction) is established, an editor should in every case of variation ask himself (1) whether the original reading is one that can reasonably be attributed to the author, and (2) whether the later reading is one that the author can reasonably be supposed to have substituted for the former. If the answer to the first question is negative, then the later reading should be accepted as at least possibly an authoritative correction (unless, of course it is itself incredible). If the answer to (1) is affirmative and the answer to (2) is negative, the original reading should be retained. If the answers to both questions are affirmative, the later readings should be presumed to be due to revision and admitted into the text, whether the editor himself considers it an improvement or not. (31-32)

If Greg's procedure were to be followed faithfully, an editor should adopt every obvious authorial revision into the text he or she is editing and reject every alteration suspected of being due to compositorial tampering. The resultant text cannot help but be an eclectic composite of an earlier edition and a later and revised edition. Thus Greg's instruction in incorporating revision into the copy-text and eliminating

corruption from it shows due respect for the author's intention in both editions. On the other hand, however, such an eclectically conflated text is one that the author did not actually write. Textual critics who consider the process of literary composition important might criticize it as misrepresenting the history of the text.

It is precisely this incongruity of the presence of revised later readings mixed here and there in a text based on the original edition that the editors of the new Longman *Faerie Queene* tried to avoid. They generally refrained from incorporating minor revisions possibly made by Spenser and attempted as far as possible to produce an edition closer to his original intention in 1590 than to his second thoughts found scattered throughout the first three books of 1596. In an endeavor to reconstruct what Spenser initially wrote and to produce a clear text to represent it, they relegated most of the minor authorial revisions to textual notes and commentaries. Thus they renounced unrestricted and sometimes arbitrary conflation of different textual documents in the past, attaching most importance to the integrity of the text of 1590. Consequently, their edition is more faithful to their copy-text and less liberal in emendation than Greg's procedure.<sup>21)</sup> However, their editorial practice is not necessarily a decisive departure from the long-standing Greg-Bowers theory of textual editing but is rather an attempt at a flexible application of it. Their editorial approach is author-oriented, as against the notion of text as 'social construct' which Jerome McGann and others have advocated since the 1980s.<sup>22)</sup> In this respect, it is in line with the orthodox Greg-Bowers school, which never claims, after all, that there is any uniform and rigid method of editing but makes allowances for critical judgment.<sup>23)</sup>

#### Notes

- 1) Hamilton, A. C., ed. *Edmund Spenser: The Faerie Queene*, Text ed. Hiroshi Yamashita & Toshiyuki Suzuki (2001).
- 2) For details of the textual situation of the old quartos see Textual Introduction to the new Longman edition. It should be noted that 1590 was probably set from Spenser's own manuscript, whereas 1596 was virtually a page for page reprint of the former except for the major revisions.
- 3) F. B. Evans, "The Printing of Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* in 1596," *Studies in Bibliography*, 18 (1965) 49-67.
- 4) Oliver Steele, "Recent Editions of the *Faerie Queene*," *Philological Quarterly*, 59:3 (1980) 268-299.
- 5) R. B. McKerrow, *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare* (1939); W. W. Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-text," *Studies in Bibliography*, 3 (1950-51) 19-36.
- 6) See Textual Introduction to the new Longman edition, 21.
- 7) The statistical data given in Tables 1-2 are based on *A Textual Companion to The Faerie Queene 1590*, ed. by Hiroshi Yamashita, Haruo Sato, Toshiyuki Suzuki & Akira Takano (1990).
- 8) Hereward T. Price, "Author, Compositor, and Metre: Copy-spelling in *Titus Andronicus* and other Elizabethan Printings," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 53 (1959) 160-



187.

- 9) For an analysis of transmission of punctuation from 1590 to 1596 see Toshiyuki Suzuki, "The punctuation of *The Faerie Queene* Reconsidered," *Treatises and Studies by the Faculty of Kinjo Gakuin University*, 179:40 (1999) 151-171.
- 10) For a detailed analysis of the errata see Toshiyuki Suzuki, "A Note on the Errata to the 1590 Quarto of *The Faerie Queene*," *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, 38:2 (2005) 1-16.
- 11) Sugden's chief source of linguistic data is 1596.
- 12) Sugden also refers to the interchange between 'ye' and 'you'.
- 13) In addition to what Smith records, there are two more cases of transposition: II.v.31.5 and II.xii.Ar.2
- 14) Richard Morris & John W. Hales, ed. *The Complete Works of Edmund Spenser* (1869).
- 15) Ralph Church, ed. *The Faerie Queene*, 4 vols. (1758).
- 16) For details see *OED* Spurn, v.<sup>2</sup>
- 17) *OED* quotes III.i.5 from the 1590 *FQ* under the heading 'Spurn'.
- 18) They occur at: I.ii.14.8; I.iii.33.6; III.i.18.4.
- 19) "The compositional History of Cantos ii and iii in Book III of the *Faerie Queene*," *A N&Q* (1977) 6:50-52.
- 20) For the six uncorrected imperfect rhymes refer to: II.ii.7.7; II.ii.42.6; II.iii.28.7; II.viii.29.7; III.vi.40.6; III.vii.34.2.
- 21) cf. Speed W. Hill, "The Texts of Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*: Greg Redivivus?" *Text: An Interdisciplinary Annal of Textual Studies*, 15 (2002) 372-84.
- 22) See, for example, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (1983). For a survey of current debates of textual criticism see D. C. Greetham, *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction* (1994) 335-346.
- 23) See Thomas Tanselle, "Historicism and Critical Editing," *Studies in Bibliography*, 39 (1986) 1-46.

#### Works Cited

- Church, Ralph ed. *The Faerie Queene*. 4 vols. London, 1758.
- Evans, Frank B. "The Printing of Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* in 1596." *Studies in Bibliography*. 18 (1965): 49-67.
- Greenlaw, E. C. G. Osgood & F. M. Padelford, ed. *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition*. I-VI. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1932-38.
- Greetham, D. C. *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction*. New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1994
- Greg, W. W. "The Rationale of Copy-text." *Studies in Bibliography*. 3 (1950-51):19-36.
- Hamilton, A. C., ed. *The Faerie Queene*. London: Longman, 1977.
- , ed. *Edmund Spenser: The Faerie Queene*. Text ed. Hiroshi Yamashita & Toshiyuki Suzuki. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education, 2001.
- Hill, Speed W. "The Texts of Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*: Greg Redivivus?" *Text: An Interdisciplinary Annal of Textual Studies*. 15 (2002): 372-84.
- McGann, Jerome. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.
- McKerrow, R. B. *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.
- Morris, Richard & John W. Hales, ed. *The Complete Works of Edmund Spenser*. London:

- Macmillan, 1869.
- Price, Hereward T. "Author, Compositor, and Metre: Copy-spelling in *Titus Andronicus* and other Elizabethan Printings." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*. 53 (1959): 160-87.
- Roche, Thomas P., Jr. & Patrick O'donnell, Jr., ed. *The Faerie Queene*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978.
- Smith, J. C., ed. *The Faerie Queene* 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.
- Steele, Oliver. "Recent Editions of the *Faerie Queene*." *Philological Quarterly*. 59:3 (1980): 268-299.
- Sugden, Herbert W. *The Grammar of Spenser's Faerie Queene*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania, 1936
- Suzuki, Toshiyuki. "The punctuation of *The Faerie Queene* Reconsidered." *Treatises and Studies by the Faculty of Kinjo Gakuin University*. 179:40 (1999): 151-171.
- . "A Note on the Errata to the 1590 Quarto of *The Faerie Queene*." *Treatises and Studies by the Faculty of Kinjo Gakuin University*. 169:38 (1997): 105-129. Revised in *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, Georgia UP, 38:2 (2005): 1-16.
- Tanselle, Thomas. "Historicism and Critical Editing." *Studies in Bibliography*. 39 (1986): 1-46.
- Yamashita, Hiroshi, Haruo Sato, Toshiyuki Suzuki & Akira Takano, ed. *A Textual Companion to The Faerie Queene 1590*. Tokyo: Kenyusha, 1993.