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FOREWORD

The present study describes and illustrates nine variant title pages and three variant "Effigies" leaves found in the Second Folio of Shakespeare, and discusses the bearing of these variants upon the bibliography of Shakespeare and Milton. The study is based upon data from 124 extant copies. A differentiated list of Second Folios and their present location, and an account of Second Folio values have also been included. It has been thought best, since some private owners dislike publicity, and since the list is not a Census, to substitute for the names the general location of private copies. I shall be grateful for reports of other Second Folios unknown to me, or of any Shakespeare Folios not listed in the previous monograph on the Lehigh Folios (Lehigh University Publications, Vol. I, No. 2, March, 1927).

My cordial thanks are due to the unfailing courtesy of the many college and university librarians both in England and America, and equally of private owners and book dealers who have made this study possible by sending me reports, or opening their folios to my inspection. Especially is it a pleasure to acknowledge the great kindness of Mr. William Andrews Clark, Jr., and the Henry Huntington Library in sending photosatic reproductions from all of their many Second Folios. To the New York Public Library, which, thanks to the acumen and zeal of Mr. James Lenox, has one of the two finest collections of Second Folio variants in the world, I am most indebted, not only for the basic data of this
study, but for the assistance of its able staff of librarians. To my colleagues and friends of the Lehigh Institute of Research, and the Lehigh University Faculty, President C. R. Richards, Dr. N. M. Emery, Dr. Lawrence H. Gipson, and Mr. Howard Seavoy Leach, Librarian, I am indebted for assistance in preparing and publishing the manuscript. Among the book dealers Mr. W. H. Royce, and Gabriel Wells, Mr. E. Byrne Hackett of the Brick Row Book Shop, Mr. Percy E. Lawler of The Rosenbach Company, and Mr. Ernest Dressel North have given valuable assistance and advice. To Mr. M. S. Borowsky I am indebted for aid with the watermarks, and to Mr. and Mrs. Ney L. McMinn, of Northwestern University, for research in the British Museum. Finally, I am under great obligations to Dr. Samuel Tannenbaum who has made many valuable suggestions, and who has given the manuscript the benefit of his expert and painstaking revision.
I

The Bibliographical Status of the Second Folio

The first efforts toward a bibliography of the Second Folio of Shakespeare may be found in the publications of Mr. James Lenox of New York, and of Mr. Justin Winsor of Boston. During the years (1870-6) when Mr. Lenox was describing his remarkable set of Second Folio variants, all of which are now in the New York Public Library, Mr. Winsor was compiling his pioneer account of Shakespeare quartos and folios. Sir Sidney Lee, taking up the work where Mr. Winsor had left it, published (in his Census and Introduction to the Oxford Facsimile, 1902) a study which may be said to have placed the bibliography of the First Folio upon a new basis. He did not, however, carry further Mr. Winsor’s investigations of the Second, Third, and Fourth Folios. Fresh ground was broken in America in 1909 when Mr. George Watson Cole published the results of his monumental labors in the E. Dwight Church Catalogue. In the same year appeared Mr. Alfred W. Pollard’s complementary account of Shakespeare’s quartos and folios.

1 The American Bibliopolist, June, July 1870.
2 Bibliography of Original Quartos and Folios of Shakespeare, Boston, 1876.
and misleading. It is unfortunate that in the section on "Shakespeare" the Short Title Catalogue is deficient, since for many years to come it is destined to be regarded as authoritative. Nothing could be more ungracious than to greet the appearance of this great work with carping criticism. Only those who have made bibliographical researches know what immense labor has been entailed in compiling this invaluable guide to English printing, and how difficult it is to fight one's way through one's own bibliographical inaccuracies — to say nothing of the errors wilfully, or unintentionally inserted by typists, or printers who, possessed of the modern passion for uniformity, can scarcely be prevailed upon to reproduce faithfully the spelling and punctuation of original titles and imprints. The misleading statements about the Second Folio in the Short Title Catalogue, however, may be traced to their source in Pollard's Shakespeare Folios and Quartos, especially pages 143-5, and since the compilers of rare book catalogues have frequently been led astray by these errors it may be worth while to present, in the course of this study, the necessary additions and corrections.

Now, it is well known to book dealers, collectors, and bibliographers that the rarity or value of a Second Folio varies according to its title-page; that the copies issued for Robert Allot are, to use Mr. Pollard's phrase, "in an overwhelming preponderance",¹ and are therefore, commonly held in less esteem than copies bearing the names of the other four publishers, William Aspley, Richard Meighen, Richard Hawkins, and John Smethwick. It is not gener-

¹ Shakespeare Folios and Quartos, p. 155.
ally realized, however, that there are Allot variants as rare as these; and Allot copies are still being listed and sold indiscriminately by dealers in rare books. No bibliographical study is available which prints and illustrates all the variant titles, or explains the relation of these various titles to one another, or gives evidence of their respective rarity; nor has it been shown which title-pages first came from the press. I have caused to be reproduced here five varieties of the Allot title-page, which, when placed together and compared with the title-pages of the other four publishers, cast light upon all of these problems and help us to formulate (with a considerable degree of probability) what happened in Thomas Cotes' shop during the printing of title-pages for the Second Folio.

Furthermore, these interesting variants have a special bearing upon another bibliographical puzzle which has excited controversy. There is, in addition to the title-page, another variant leaf in the Second Folio, namely the "Effigies" leaf (normally A5 among the ten preliminary leaves). This page bears two unsigned poems, the first under the caption "Upon the Effigies," and the second just below this, is headed "An Epitaph on the Admirable Dramaticke Poet W. Shakespeare". This epitaph, it will be recognized at once, is the famous poem written by John Milton in celebration of England's "Deare Sonne of Memory, great Heire of Fame".

This "Effigies" leaf is doubly noteworthy; first, as the link binding together the two greatest names in English letters—a tribute to Shakespeare from the pen of the young Milton; and secondly, as the
earliest English verses of Milton to appear in print. Because the Second Folio of Shakespeare is, therefore, an editio princeps of Milton, the collector should make sure that the "Effigies" leaf is present in his folio. It will also be of importance for him, as I shall show, to determine what variant of this leaf he possesses. Curiously enough, it has not been realized that there are three variants of this "Effigies" leaf, all exhibiting compositors' changes in type and spelling. I shall designate these variants A, B, and C. The writers who participated in the "Effigies" controversy, which raged through three volumes of Notes and Queries, apparently never realized that they were dealing with a larger bibliographical problem—to wit: that there are three variants of the "Effigies" leaf and that the sheet containing the verses on one half bears the title-page on the other half, the versos of each leaf being blank. To this controversy I shall return later.

Now, by considering these two problems together, the existence of five variant Allot title-pages and of three variant "Effigies" leaves, we are enabled to explain both, and to bring all these variants and their implications into the field of exact bibliography.

II

THE TITLE PAGES OF THE SECOND FOLIO

It may be well first to review briefly the preliminary steps taken before the printing of the Second Folio of Shakespeare's plays in 1632. As with the First Folio, a cooperative group was formed for the Second by Thomas Cotes, the printer, and five book-
sellers, Robert Allot, William Aspley, Richard Hawkins, Richard Meighen, and John Smethwick. The first step was to acquire the rights to the plays held by the printers and publishers of the First Folio, 1623. By the end of 1630, Cotes had secured all the rights of the Jaggards and of Pavier, and Robert Allot the sixteen plays formerly held by Edward Blount. Since Aspley and Smethwick, who had contributed rights to the First Folio were still living, they naturally continued their interests in the Second. The two remaining booksellers, Hawkins, and Meighen, each of whom had acquired one play, Othello and The Merry Wives, respectively, were also allowed shares. In accordance with a custom prevailing at that time the copies printed for each of the five booksellers had a distinctive title-page which bore in the Imprint his name and address. The proportion of the total edition assigned to each publisher seems to have corresponded to the importance of his rights. Robert Allot, being the largest contributor, with 16 plays, was the chief publisher, and received not only the first, but also the largest share, as is still witnessed by the fact that the majority of Second Folios extant bear his name. Richard Meighen's share seems, correspondingly, to have been the least. Title-pages with his imprint are so rare that Mr. Winsor and Mr. Lenox did not know of their existence.

An examination of the Second Folios in the New York Public Library, and a rereading of Mr. Lenox's account of them in The American Bibliopolist, 1870, reveal that he succeeded in collecting four variants of the Allot title-page. Mr. Lenox seems to have been determined to secure all the known variants of Folio
imprints; and his collection affords an excellent opportunity to study his singular method of acquiring variant leaves and duplicates of rare leaves, which he inserted (sometimes loosely, sometimes by binding or pasting) in his Folios. His set of Second Folios, however, as has been stated, lacks the rarest (the "Meighen") issue, and also the one we shall call Allot 3.

**THE FIVE VARIANT ALLOT TITLE-PAGES**

I have reproduced herein, from photostats, the five variant Allot title-pages, numbering them one to five in what I believe to be the order of their printing. We may assume, with a high degree of probability, that the order of the title-pages follows the order of improvement, since it is readily demonstrable that the compositor or compositors tried to correct in every succeeding title-page mistakes made in the preceding one. This assumption acquires a certainty with the demonstration of typographical links between successive title-pages.

**ALLOT TITLE NUMBER I. "Coppies".**

The first attempt at a title-page for the Second Folio was the Allot title-page which bears in the sixth line the word "Coppies" with two p's, and which is therefore known in bibliography as the "Coppies" issue.¹

This first form was glaringly deficient because the compositor left insufficient space between the title

and the imprint for the Droeshout portrait of Shakespeare, and when he imposed the plate upon his title-page, the bottom of the portrait completely overlapped the word "London" in the imprint, and crowded the Droeshout signature on the plate into the line bearing the publisher's name. The first trial state of the "Coppies" issues is best exemplified by the Church copy (Plate 1) now in the Huntington Library. Two other exemplars, however, namely, the Gray and the New York Public Library copies, show how the printer tried to correct this unsightly crowding by shifting the plate higher. In so doing he succeeded in slightly improving the previous crowding of the lines, but did so at the expense of cutting through the lower edge of the words "The Second Impression" above the portrait; and all but the lower edge of the word "London" still remained obscured by the engraving.

I have been able to list eight exemplars of the "Coppies" title-page. This is not, however, though it is sometimes said to be so, the rarest of the Allot title-pages. The rarest is Number 2, which is also the rarest of all Second Folio title-pages.

**Allot Title Page Number 2 ("Coppies")**

After a relatively small number of Second Folios had been issued with the "Coppies" title-page, the printer abandoned his first form and set up a second form, in which, however, he retained a few of the original types; for example, the crude initial $W$ in

---

1 Reproduced in Winsor's *Bibliography*, 1876, Plate 63.
MR. WILLIAM
SHAKESPEARES
COMEDIES,
HISTORIES, and
TRAGEDIES.
Published according to the true Originall Coppies.
The second Impression.

Printed by Tho. Cotes for Robert Allot, and are to be sold at his shop at the sign
of the blacke Beare in Pauls Church-yard. 1632.
“William”. His changes in this second form are, however, numerous and apparent. (Plate 2.) He used a different r in “Mr.”, omitted the comma after “Histories”, changed “Coppies” to “Copies”; used an Italic I instead of the capital J for “Impression” and also a ligated double s. In the imprint he used a different font for “London”, omitted the period after the abbreviation “Tho”; and printed Pauls in italics, omitted the hyphen in “Church yard”, and placed a comma (instead of a period) after it. And he took pains to allow sufficient spacing for the Droeshout plate between the title and the imprint. But he made one obvious new blunder. The title-page came forth with the letters d and r interchanged in the word “according” (6th line), printed “accodring”.

It is questionable whether many Second Folios were issued with this “accodring” title-page. Mr. Lenox’s copy, bought at the Bliss sale in July, 1858, for £30 5s, and now in the New York Public Library, is the only one recorded by bibliography; and it may be, as Mr. Pollard and Mr. Cole suggest, merely a single uncorrected proof; in which case this copy, known in Bohn’s revision of Lovtides,1 and elsewhere, as the “Bliss” copy, is unique. There is, however, reason to believe that there may be others extant, since owners and book dealers might easily have overlooked this single error.

But if the Bliss copy is unique, as we shall have to believe until another Allot 2 is forthcoming, it is

Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories and Tragedies. Published according to the true Original Copies. The second Impression.

Printed by Tho. Cotes, for Robert Allot, and are to be sold at his shop at the signe of the blacke Beare in Paul's Church yard, 1632.
the rarest of the *Second Folio* title pages.¹ I shall show later that Mr. Pollard’s note on this variant in the *Short Title Catalogue* (p. 517-18) is incorrect.

**ALLOT TITLE-PAGE NUMBER 3 ("COPIES")**

Allot 3 is the only one of the five Allot variants which is not in Mr. Lenox’s collection. It is represented here (Plate 3) from the very fine *Second Folio* in the library of Columbia University. This title-page is identical in type and text with Allot 2, with the single exception that the printer has discovered and corrected his “accodring” blunder, a change that did not call for a resetting of the entire form. Allot 3, unlike Number 2, is not unique, but may be considered as the second rarest of the Allot titles. Of the 124 *Second Folios*, I have been able to study, only three possess this variant.

We have, then, in Allot titles 1, 2, and 3, a first form, soon abandoned, then a second form, then a single correction of the second form. These three efforts to print a correct Allot title-page are linked together by the presence in them all of the same crude *W* in “William” and of other identical types, and by the use of a small *b* in “blacke Beare”. In all of them, too the word “Shakespeare” is 6¼ inches long.² These are certain marks of identification.

¹ Winsor, in his account of *Second Folios*, calls attention to an undated note attached to the Grenville Copy in the British Museum describing an “accodring” copy belonging to Mr. Tiffin, printerseller of the Strand. It is impossible to discover whether this is the Bliss copy or a second exemplar. There is no record of “accodring” copies at auction in *Book Prices Current*, English or American.

² The reproductions are here, of course, reduced.
MR. WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S
COMEDIES, HISTORIES AND
TRAGEDIES.
Published according to the true Original Copies.
The second Impression.

LONDON,
Printed by Tho. Cotes for Robert Allot, and are to be sold at his shop at the signe of the blacke Beare in Paul Church yard, 1632.
Allot Title-Page Number 4 ("Copies")

After copies of the Second Folio with these three Allot title-pages had been issued in varying lots, the compositor began all over again; and this time in No. 4 he set up an improved third form that sufficed not only for all succeeding Allot copies, but for those of the other four sharers, Aspley, Hawkins, Meighen, and Smethwick. Subsequent changes in all succeeding Second Folio title-pages differ in type and text only where changes were necessary, namely in the two lines of the Imprint below "London".

This standard title-page, Allot 4, differs from Allot 1, 2, and 3 throughout. "Shakespeare" is spaced out to 6 1/2 inches; the comma is restored after "Histories", as in Allot 1; and the words The second Impression are printed (as in Allot 1) with a J, instead of an Italic I, and with a non-ligated double s. But they are not identical in type, the capital T's in "The", for example, being different. "London" also appears in a different font. Among the readily noticeable changes in type and text in the Imprint are the new capitals: C in "Cotes" and "Churchyard", R in "Robert", and P in "Pauls". Most noticeable of all, however, are the capital B, instead of the small b in "Blacke", and the omission of the words "at his shop".

When, therefore, book-dealers or bibliographers refer to Allot copies of the Second Folio as the most common issue, they should hereafter specify which Allot issue they have in mind. Allot folios with title-page No. 4 are the most common; and they can be readily identified by this simple test: a single p in
Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies. Published according to the true Original Copies. The second Impression.

London,
Printed by Tho. Cotes, for Robert Allot, and are to be sold at the signs of the Blacke Bear in Paul's Church-yard. 1632.
"Copies", "according" spelled correctly, a capital B in "Blacke" and the omission of "at his shop".

**Allot Title-Page Number 5 ("Copies")**

Allot title-page number 5 differs from number 4 only in the restoration of the words "at his shop". It was apparently not until a large part of Allot's share had been issued that the omission of these words, which had been included in Allot 1, 2, and 3, was noticed. The typesetter merely moved part of his line to the right and part to the left to make room for "at his shop".

For purposes of comparison and easy identification, the variant readings of the five Allot title-pages are printed here together:

Allot 1 "Coppies" First Form with "Effigies"

Mr. William | Shakespeares | Comedies, | Histories, and | Tragedies. | Published according to the true Originall Coppies. | The second Impression. | London, | Printed by Tho. Cotes, for Robert Allot, and are to be sold at his shop at the signe of the blaeke Beare in Pauls Church-yard. 1632.

Allot 2 "Copies" Second Form with "Effigies"

Mr. William | Shakespeares | Comedies, | Histories and | Tragedies. | Published according to the true Originall Copies. | The second Impression. ¹ | London, | Printed by Tho Cotes, for Robert Allot, and are to be sold at his shop at the signe of the blaeke Beare in Pauls Church-yard, 1632.

¹ A ligated double s in Impression.
MR. WILLIAM
SHAKESPEARES
COMEDIES;
HISTORIES, and
TRAGEDIES.
Published according to the true Original Copies.
The second Impression.

LONDON,
Printed by Tho. Cotes, for Robert Allot, and are to be sold at his shop at the signe
of the Blacke Beare in Pauls Church-yard. 1632.

PLATE 5
THE HAGEN COPY, THE LIBRARY OF WILLIAM ANDREWS CLARK, JR.
Allot 3 "Copies"  Second Form (corrected) with "Effigies" B  Rare

Identical with Allot (2) except that "according" is spelled correctly.

Allot 4 "Copies"  Third Form with "Effigies" C  Common

Mr. William | Shakespeares | Comedies, | Histories, and | Tragedies. | Published according to the true Originall Copies. | The second Impression. | London, | Printed by Tho. Cotes, for Robert Allot, and are to be fold at the signe | of the Blacke Beare in Pauls Church-yard. 1632.

Allot 5 "Copies"  Third Form (corrected) with "Effigies" C  Rarer only than Allot 4

Identical with Allot 4 except that in the Imprint "at his shop" is inserted after "fold".

Allot 4 and the Aspley, Hawkins, Meighen, Smethwick Title-Pages

We may next notice the fact that the third form, Allot 4, was employed for all subsequent Second Folio title-pages, i.e. for Allot 5, and the Aspley, Hawkins, Meighen, and Smethwick issues (Plates 5, 6, 7, 8, 9). The text above the portrait and "London" below the portrait are the same in all of them. The only differences are in the addresses of the publishers in the two lines of the imprint below "London". We may observe in all of these the improved W in "William", the same 6½ inch line spacing for "Shakespeares" (with no difference in type). The battered M in "Comedies", a very good identification test, ap-
MR. WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S COMEDIES, HISTORIES, and TRAGEDIES.
Published according to the true Original Copies.
The second Impression.

LONDON, Printed by Tho. Cotes, for William Aspley, and are to be sold at the signe
of the Parrot in Pauls Church-yard. 1632.
pears in all *Second Folio* title-pages after Allot 4; this is also true of the imperfect base line of the second *I* in "Histories", as well as of the *T* in "Tragedies*. The *second Impression* is also identical throughout. In fact, a letter for letter comparison will show that there is not a single change from the Allot 4 form in the Allot 5 title-page or that of Aspley, Meighen, Hawkins, and Smethwick, except always in the two lines of the imprint below "London", where changes in address were called for.

The variations in the addresses are evidences of resetting. In Allot 4 and Allot 5 "sold" is printed "fold", a mistake not present in Allot 1, 2, 3. In the succeeding Aspley, Hawkins, Meighen, Smethwick addresses "sold" is correctly printed. The *C* types in *Cotes* differ in Aspley, and Meighen, and Hawkins. That of Hawkins is like that in Smethwick.

We may now point out certain errors in Mr. Pollard's *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos* (1909) which have undoubtedly misled bibliographers and compilers of sales catalogues. The first of these also appears in the note to item 22274 in the *Short Title Catalogue* (1926). These errors have not been corrected in the list of errata inserted before the "Preface" to the former work.

On pages 155 (lines 33-35) and 144 (line 6) Mr. Pollard, referring to the "accodring" copy (Allot 2) in the Lenox collection says that it is "obviously only an uncorrected proof" of what he terms "Variant A" or, "more probably a copy struck off after an accident to the form carelessly repaired and subsequently corrected to Variant B". Variant A, as printed by Mr. Pollard, and also as No. 22274 in the
MR. WILLIAM

SHAKESPEARES

COMEDIES,

HISTORIES, and

TRAGEDIES.

Published according to the true Originall Copies.

The second Impression.

LONDON,

Printed by Tho. Cotes, for Richard Hawkins; and are to be sold at his Shop in Chancery Lane, near Sergeant's Inn. 1632.
Short Title Catalogue, is identical with the imprint on the "Coppies" title-page, Allot 1, but Mr. Pollard makes no reference to the unique spelling of "Coppies" in this variant. "Variant B", as printed by Pollard and also as No. 22274a in the Short Title Catalogue is our Allot 4. If Mr. Pollard had had an opportunity to examine Allot 2 ("accodring"), he would have perceived at once that it was printed from a new setting of type (a few of the old types being retained), and is not an uncorrected proof of A or B—his A (Allot 1) coming from a first form, and his B from a third form. Moreover, his "variant A" is, contrary to Mr. Pollard, and the Short Title Catalogue, not "the commonest variant"—that distinction belongs rather to "Variant B" (Allot 4) which is the only one which may be said to be in "overwhelming preponderance" among extant copies of the Second Folio. Mr. Pollard omits any mention of Allot 3 and Allot 5.

Especially unfortunate is the printing on page 144, lines 12-13 of the imprint of "Variant B" (Allot 4). By some bedevilment of the typist, the printer, or the proof-reader, the imprint reads "and are to be sold at the signe of .he (sic) Blaek Beare". I have found no such reading in any of my 52 exemplars of Allot 4—all of these copies have "the" quite correctly printed. I venture the opinion, therefore, that no extant copy reads "he Blaek Beare". If titles with "he Blaek Beare" do exist, why has Mr. Pollard not so reproduced it in No. 22274a of the Short Title Catalogue, where the imprint of Allot 4 is correctly given as "the Blacke Beare"? The Metheun facsimile of the Second Folio, issued in the same series
MR. WILLIAM
SHAKESPEARE
COMEDIES,
HISTORIES, and
TRAGEDIES.
Published according to the true Originall Copies.
The second Impression.

LONDON,
Printed by Tho. Cotes, for Richard Meighen, and are to be sold at the middle
Temple Gate in Fleetstreet. 1632.
with Mr. Pollard’s *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos*, has “the Blacke Beare”.

An example of the way cataloguers have been misled by this mistake may be found in the Karslake-Jaggard *Book Auction Records* July 2, 1922-23 (p. 670) (also *English Book Prices Current* 1923 p. 713). The note describing the Masters-Farmer-Haggard-Carysfort copy, bought by Rosenbach at Sotheby’s for £500, and now in the possession of William Andrews Clark, Jr., says “There is a slight variant in the imprint of ‘the Blacke Beare’ instead of the usual ‘he’ Blacke Beare’.

An error of a similar nature occurs in line 23, p. 144 of Mr. Pollard’s book. Mr. Pollard asserts, correctly, that the colophon is identical in all copies; but no such colophon as he prints here will, I think, be found, for he has put a final e on “Smethwick” and, has omitted a comma after “Aspley”. If Mr. Pollard will consult the colophon of his Methuen facsimile of the *Second Folio*, he will find no such reading as he gives in lines 23-24, p. 144, of *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos*. In all *Second Folio* colophons the reading is:


The cataloguer mentioned above was also misled by this error, for he adds in his note, “the name ‘Smethwick’ in the colophon has in this copy no final e”. Thus cataloguers are led to think that they have variants, and owners of Second Folios communicate to me these data as proof that their copies are unique.
Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies.
Published according to the true Original Copies.
The second Impression.

London,
Printed by Tho. Cotes, for John Smethwick, and are to be sold at his shop
in Saint Dunstan Church-yard. 1633.
I add a list of other corrections to Pollard’s pages 144-145:

Page 144—

Line 26 end line omitted after “according”.
  “28 “1-45, 48-100” should read “1-46, 49-100.”
  “43 no comma after “Author” in any one of the three variants.
  “50 “23-28” should be “20-38”.

Page 145—

Line 4 “John” should be “Iohn”.
  “9 “60-59 (95)” should be “69-59 (95)”.
  “12 “Richmonde” should be “Richmond”.
  “18 “Tragedy” should be “Tragedie” (of Julius Caesar).
  “20 “Tragedy” should be “Tragedie” (of King Lear).
  “21 “333-359” should be “330-359”.

We may now turn to the correlative problem of variants in the “Effigies” leaf in the Second Folio, which bears Milton’s “Epitaph on Shakespeare.”

III

Milton’s Epitaph on Shakespeare

Milton’s “Epitaph”, which first appears in print on the “Effigies” leaf of the Second Folio, is believed to be the product of his years at Cambridge, and is characterized by Mark Pattison as “the only original and unprompted utterance of the young poet’s admiration and sympathy”.¹ It is not, properly speaking, a sonnet, either in form or style, but a conventional sixteen line tribute in couplets, after the manner of the 17th century epigrammatists. Professor

¹ Milton’s Sonnets, 1904, pp. 77-82.
Trent thinks that it is "worthy to rank among the greatest of epitaphs and the greatest of tributes".\(^1\)

It is questionable whether Milton wrote the lines to order for the *Second Folio* in 1632, since in the first edition (1645) of his collected poems he has himself affixed the date "1630" to the title.\(^2\) This date is not of itself evidence against the Epitaph’s having been written for this Folio. Masson\(^3\) offers the attractive conjecture that Milton first penned these verses upon the fly-leaf of his copy of the *First Folio*, but Masson gives no evidence for his statement, and there is no known copy of such a Folio extant. What a treasure for bibliophiles such a folio would be today!

In the study published in 1926, Professor Garrod rediscovered what W. E. Baxter had called attention to during the "Effigies" controversy in *Notes and Queries* (11th series, VIII, Oct. 18, 1913, p. 317), namely, that Milton revised this Epitaph twice, once for the *Poems* of Shakespeare (1640) and again for the 1645 edition of his own poems. As Professor Garrod has given the variant readings (op. cit., p. 10) of the 1640 and 1645 versions, and as the two versions are reproduced here (Plate 13) it is unnecessary to tabulate them in detail. He is in error, however, in saying (p. 8) that "Milton’s verses disappear from the Fourth Folio". The printer of the *Third Folio* moved the verses to a different position among the preliminary leaves, and thus separated them from the

---

2. I cannot accept the partial doubt Professor H. W. Garrod throws upon this date in his attempt to show possible borrowings of phrases from contemporary writers (*Essays and Studies*, Oxford, 1926, XII, p. 14) especially in view of his final statement (p. 15): "the borrowings of poets are a process almost as mysterious as their originative creations; and I would not tie Milton to any single set of associations".
"Effigies" poem. In the *Fourth Folio* they appear headed by the word "Epitaph" (printed in letters an inch high) above Hugh Holland’s lines on the verso of leaf 5. Since Professor Garrod makes no reference to variant "Effigies" leaves in the *Second Folio*, we may begin the discussion of this part of our study by listing all of the 17th century issues of the "Epitaph."

There are eight variant versions of this poem: (1) "Effigies" A; (2) "Effigies" B; (3) "Effigies" C; (4) Shakespeare’s *Poems* 1640; (5) Milton’s *Poems* 1645; (6) *Third Folio* of Shakespeare, 1663-4; (7) Milton’s *Poems*, 1673; (8) *Fourth Folio*, 1685.

Of these 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8 are Folio versions, differing merely in compositor’s changes in spelling and punctuation, each succeeding version being printed from its immediate predecessor.

Numbers 4, 5, and 7 are Poems versions, Milton’s first revision occurring in 4, and his second revision in 5; 7 differs from 5 merely in one compositor’s change.

"EFFIGIES" A IN THE SECOND FOLIO

"Effigies" A is the earliest of the three variants in the *Second Folio* since it is the companion of the earliest of the Allot title-pages, the "Coppies" variant, (the leaves of the title-page and "Effigies" verses forming one sheet). In all but one of the nine extant exemplars in my list, the "Effigies" leaf is associated with a "Coppies" title-page; and I know of no instance of a "Coppies" title-page with a B or C "Effigies" variant. In the case of the Durning-Lawrence
Vpon the Effigies of my worthy Friend, the Author Master William Shakespeare, and his Workes.

Preface, this Life's Shaddow is, To see The truer image and a livelier he Turne Reader. But, observe his Comicke Vaine, Laugh, and proceed next to a Tragicke Straine, Then weep; So when thou findest two contraries, Two different passions from thy rapt soule rise, Say, (who alone effect such wonders could) Rare Shakespeare to the Life thou dost behold.

An Epitaph on the admirable Dramaticke Poet W. Shakespeare.

What needest my Shakespeare for his honours bones; The labour of an Age, in piled stones Or that his hallow'd Reliques should be hid Under a starre-ypointed Pyramid?

Deare Sonne of Memory, great Heire of Fame; What need'st thou such dull witnesse of thy Name? Thou in our wonder and astonishment Hast built thy selfe a lasting Monument:

For whilst it to th'shame of slow-endevouring Art, Thy easie numbers flow, and that each part, Hath from the leaves of thy unvalued Booke, Those Delphicke Lines with deepe Impression tooke; Then thou our fancy of her selfe bereaving, Doft make us Marble with too much conceiving, And so Sepulcher'd in such pompe doft lie,

That Kings for such a Tombe would wish to die.
copy in which "Effigies" A occurs with the later Aspley title-page, Sir Edwin is of the opinion that it has been "inserted" in his Folio.\(^1\) It would be unsafe, however, to base bibliographical conclusions exclusively on the presence of specific title-pages with specific "Effigies" leaves, unless we found evidence of many copies of definite combinations, for during the centuries of wear and tear, of rebinding and of restoration, almost any combination, or order of title-pages and "Effigies" leaves may now be found.\(^2\)

But if my previous deductions are correct, only "Effigies" A (Plate 10) has the distinction of bearing the very first English verses of Milton to appear in print; its presence in a Second Folio, regardless of title-page, should measurably enhance the value of every such copy. It is by no means, as W. F. Prideaux, Durning-Lawrence\(^3\) and, following them, Seymour de Ricci\(^4\) have asserted, "a cancel leaf"—but merely the companion of the "Coppies" title-page in the printer’s first form. In a subsequent section of this study dealing with the paper and watermarks, I shall offer additional confirmation of this fact.

"Effigies" B and C

A letter for letter examination of the three "Effigies" variants reproduced herewith (Plates 10, 11, 12) will reveal that they are printed throughout in

\(^{1}\) 11th S., VIII, p. 141.
\(^{2}\) In the Library of Congress copy, which contains "Effigies" B, the title-page, Allot 4, has been supplied from a smaller copy. The Frederickson-Lehigh copy (without genuine title-page) and the Utterson copy in the Boston Public Library are unusual in containing both "Effigies B and C"—the C in each case, as I believe, having been added by dealers who feared that B was a facsimile.
\(^{3}\) op. cit. 11s VIII, p. 196, 232.
Vpon the Effigies of my worthy Friend, the Author Master William Shakespeare, and his Workes.

For tailor, this Life's Shadow is, To see
The truer image and a lively be
Turn Reader. But, observe his Comic Vaine,
Laugh, and proceed next to a Tragicke Straine,
Then wepe; So when thou findest two contraries,
Two different passions from thy rapt soul arise,
Say, (who alone effect such wonders could)
 Rare Shake-sppeare to the life thou dost behold.

An Epitaph on the admirable Dramaticke Poet, W. Shakespeare.

Hat neede my Shake-sppeare for his honor'd bones,
The labour of an Age in piled stones
Or that his hallow'd Reliques should be hid
Under a starry-pointing Pyramid?
Dear Sonne of Memory, great Heire of Fame,
What needst thou such dull witness of thy Name?
Thou in our wonder and astonishment
Hast built thy selfe a lasting Monument;
For whilstst to this shame of slow endeavou'ring Are
These hasty numbers flow, and that each part
Hath from the leaves of thy unvalued Bookes;
Those Delphicke Lines with deep impression sear
Then thus our fancy of her selfe bereaving,
Dost make us Marble with too much conceiving,
And so Sepulcher'd in such pompe doest lie,
That Kings for such a Tombe would wish to die.

“Effigies” B
Lehigh University
three different fonts. "Effigies" B was set up in the second form with Allot titles 2 and 3; and "Effigies" C in the third and final form, with Allot 4, 5, Aspley, Hawkins, Meighen, and Smethwick.

The familiar "archer" head piece (which appears also in the First Folio), with the broken upper right hand corner, is, however, common to all three. Perhaps the most noticeable differences in these three versions are these: the block letter S in "Spectator", the first word in the first poem, differs in all three; B and C have a similar block initial W for "What", the first word of Milton's poem, but that of A differs. A and C agree in having "Shakespeare" (line 13) printed in Roman, whereas in B it is in Italics. A and B have a similar W before "Shakespeare" in line 13, but in C it is a double V. A and C have "Comick" (6th line), B reads "Comick". Among many typographical differences, "Passions" (line 9 is printed with a different kind of double s in all three; the first f in "Effigies" (line 1), is different in each of the three variants, etc. These are only the most obvious differences; the reader will easily find many others.

The difference, however, which gave rise to the "Effigies" controversy, is found in the line 17—i.e., in the fourth line of Milton's "Epitaph." In the earliest variant (A), the line reads:

"Vnder a starre-ypointed Pyramid?"

in B and C

"Vnder a starre-ypointing Pyramid?"
Upon the Effigies of my worthy Friend, the Author Master William Shakespeare, and his Workes, -

Peccator, this Life's Shaddow is; To see
The truer image and a livelier be
Turne Reader. But observe his Comicke vaine,
Laugh, and proceed next to a Tragick straine,
Then weepe; So when thou find'st two contraries,
Two different Passions from thy rapt Soule rife,
Say, (who alone effect such Wonders could)
Rare Shakespeare to the life thou dost behold.

An Epitaph on the admirable Dramaticke Poet, W. Shakespeare.

What neede my Shakespeare for his honour'd bones,
The labour of an Age in piled stones
Or that his hallow'd Reliques should be hid
Under a Starre-pointing Pyramid?
Desire Sonne of Memory great Heire of Fame,
What needst thou such dull Witnessse of thy Name?
Thou in our wonder and astonishment
Hast built thy selfe a lasting Monument:
For whilst it to th' Shame of slow-endavouring Art
Thy easie numbers flow, and that each part,
Hath from the leaves of thy unvalued Booke,
Those Delphicke Lines with deepe Impression tooke
Then thinke our fancy of her selfe bereaving,
Dost make us Marble with too much conceiving,
And so Sepulcher'd in such Pompe dost lie
That Kings for such a Tomb would wish to die.
The "Effigies" Controversy

The "Effigies" controversy arose from a communication by Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence to Notes and Queries in which he maintained that his Second Folio contained a unique version of Milton's "Epitaph" in that it read "starre-ypointed" instead of "starre-ypointing". "Starre-ypointed" pyramid means, I may add, a pyramid pointed by a star, or, as J. T. Curry suggests, "like some of the Egyptian obelisks which have received this decoration since they were transferred to Europe"; whereas "starre-ypointing" pyramid means a pyramid pointing to the stars. The gist of Durning-Lawrence's argument is that the common form, "starre-ypointing", is "utterly absurd and hopelessly ungrammatical", "the despair of the literary world for centuries", "because y like the German ge, is a prefix of the past participle." Milton, the scrupulous scholar, he contends, could not possibly have been guilty of writing "starre-ypointing", and must have written the correct form "starre-ypointed". Moreover, said Durning-Lawrence, Milton wrote it that way for a deliberate purpose, namely, to signal to the initiated that Bacon wrote Shakespeare's plays, "a pyramid with a star upon its apex meaning a Beacon (pronounced 'Bacon', as in 'Bacon, great Beacon of the State'). The leaves so printed however, were issued only to those to whom Bacon's secrets were entrusted".

Into the further absurdities of this argument we need not go; but we may call attention to the astonishing distribution of it. Shortly before his death in

---

2 op. cit., VIII, p. 294-5.
1914, Durning-Lawrence not only sent to the 1000 principal libraries in the world, but caused to be circulated by the hundred thousand, his pamphlet, *Milton’s Epitaph to Shakespeare*. He sent it to 15,000 newspapers, “with the result”, as he says, “that about 10,000,000 copies have been circulated and another 10,000,000 were circulated in abbreviated form”. No one, therefore, should have difficulty in locating this learned treatise, but since librarians have some trouble to find it, we may suspect that they have properly classified it with “curious” literature. Yet for one reason we are grateful for this pamphlet: it contains an excellent full page photo-facsimile of Sir Edwin’s rare leaf, which turns out to be our “Effigies” A.

Sir Edwin’s first contention that this leaf is unique was quickly disposed of by reports to *Notes and Queries* of another copy in the library of Queens College, Oxford, and of still another one in the New York Public Library. Toward the close of the controversy, Mr. Charles Herpich of New York pointed out that eleven years before (September 6, 1902) he had called attention, in *Notes and Queries*, to the New York Public Library’s variant. In spite of Durning-Lawrence’s publicity methods, however, only these three exemplars of “Effigies” A were forthcoming. Yet there were two others close to his hand, one in Trinity College, Cambridge, and another in Trinity College, Dublin. I have been able to add six more to the list, but there are doubtless others as yet unnoticed or unlocated.

Now, if we believe with Durning-Lawrence and others in the controversy that “starre-ypointing” is
“hopeless”, and if we wish to give Milton a clean bill of grammatical health, we may contend that “starre-ypointed” was the original spelling in Milton’s manuscript from which the compositor set up “Effigies” A; and that “starre-ypointing” of the B and C variants is an error of the compositor who set up the second and third forms. But the point is not so easily settled. As against the grammarians whom Durning-Lawrence summons to his aid, Skeat informs us (in his Etymological Dictionary) that “y was prefixed not only to the past participle but also to the past tense, to the infinitive, or indeed occasionally to any part of the verb, without appreciably affecting the sense”.

In the second place, there is damaging proof that Milton was content with “starre-ypointing”. If we compare “Effigies” A, B, and C, we discover that the differences between them are solely those of typography and spelling, not alterations of the text. That Milton was dissatisfied with the first three versions of his “Epitaph” seems obvious from the revision he made for the fourth version in Shakespeare’s Poems, 1640, also printed by Cotes. It is certain that Cotes did not reprint the verses from a Second Folio “Effigies” page, but from a new version revised by Milton himself. Professor Garrod’s inferences here from what he calls “misprints” (p. 10) are beside the point since he assumes that there was such a thing as correct spelling at this period; and that compositors adhered to a uniform spelling. Milton’s autographs of this period show no uniform spellings.

1 op. cit. VIII, p. 141; 196.
In this 1640 revision, as Professor Garrod’s list also indicates, the “Epitaph” appears for the first time with Milton’s initials I. M. The word “Part”, line 10, has been changed to “heart”; “dull” (6th line) has been changed to “weak”; “lasting monument” (8th line) has become “live-long Monument” (perhaps Milton desired a spondee); and “herselfe” (13th line) is now “ourselwe”. These are unquestionably author’s, not compositor’s changes, but the 4th line, in spite of these thoughtful revisions, still reads “Under a starre-ypointing Pyramid”.

When Milton gathered his own poems for a first collected edition five years later, in 1645, he revised the “Epitaph” again. He replaced the elaborate title of the 1632 and 1640 versions with the simple and valuable “On Shakespeare, 1630”—thus giving us the date of composition. Aside from the dropping of many final e’s we find “neede” changed to “needs” (line 1). The first revisions “weak”, “live-long”, and “star-ypointing”, Milton still retained, but he was dissatisfied with the substitution of “ourself” for “herselfe” (line 13) and changed the word again to “itself”. If he was still worried over “starre-ypointing”, he showed no sign of it, for he had another opportunity to correct it when (in 1673) he sent his second edition to the press. In this sixth version there are no changes whatever from that of 1645, except that “witness” (line 6) appears with a double instead of a single s—obviously a printer’s addition. The Fourth Folio, printed eleven years after Milton’s death, has “starry-pointing”.

We may conclude, then, that the variant “Effigies” leaves in the Second Folio are not the result of any
An Epitaph on the admirable Dramaticke Poet, William Shakespear.

What needs my Shakespeare for his honoured bones,
The labour of an age in piled stones,
Or that his hallow'd relics should be hid,
Under a starre-pointing Pyramid?
Deare Sonne of Memory, great heir of Fame,
What needs thou such weakes witnessse of thy name,
Thou in our wonder and astonishment,
Haft built thy selfe a live-long Monument:
For whilst to the shame of flow endeavouring Art,
Thy easie numbers flow, and that each heart,
Haft from the leaves of thy unvalu'd Book,
Those Delphick lines with deepe impression tooke.

Then

Thou our fancy of our selfe bereaving,
Doft make us marble with too much conceiving,
And so Sepulcher'd in such pomp doth lie,
That Kings for such a Tomb would wish to die.

I. M.

On Shakespeare, 1630.

W
Hat needs my Shakespeare for his honour'd Bones,
The labour of an age in piled Stones,
Or that his hallow'd relics should be hid
Under a Star-pointing Pyramid?
Dear Son of Memory, great Heir of Fame,
What needst thou such weak witness of thy name?
Thou in our wonder and astonishment
Haft built thy self a live-long Monument.
For whilte to the shame of slovenly endeavoring Art,
Thy easie numbers flow, and that each heart
Haft from the leaves of thy unvalu'd Book,
Those Delphick lines with deep impression took
Then thou our fancy of it selfe bereaving,
Doft make us Marble with too much conceiving,
And so Sepulcher'd in such pomp doth lie,
That Kings for such a Tomb would wish to die.

Then
cryptic intention on Milton’s part but are changes introduced by the printer in setting up three times the “Effigies” leaf in conjunction with his three forms for title-pages, the differences in Effigies A, B, and C being compositors’ changes, author’s changes having been postponed until 1640 and 1645.

IV

The Paper and the Water Marks of the Title Pages and “Effigies” Leaves

Contributory evidence of the relation of the title-pages to the “Effigies” leaves is furnished by an examination of the paper and the water-marks of the Second Folio.

The Second Folio, like the First, was printed upon crown paper of good quality, but, unlike the First, was made up from odd lots of paper bearing many different watermarks. (Extant quartos of the period testify to a similar practice in other printers’ offices). Moreover, no effort was made to keep the sheets in any given order; they were frequently turned over and exchanged end for end in transportation so that watermarks in the Folio are frequently upside down. In the title and “Effigies” leaf, which form a single sheet, the watermark may be found sometimes in the title-page, sometimes in the “Effigies” leaf.

In all Second Folios of the first three Allot issues, the title-pages Allot 1, 2, and 3, and the accompanying Effigies A and B, are printed upon extraordinarily thick sheets of paper, almost the consistency
of parchment. No other paper of such weight occurs elsewhere in these Folios, or in the later issues of the Second Folio. This paper bears the following crown watermark:

![Crown Watermark](image)

In the New York Public Library, Allot 1, and in Gabriel Wells’s and Columbia University’s Allot 3 the watermarks occur in the portrait of the title-page, the corresponding “Effigies” leaves being unwatermarked. The three “Effigies” B leaves that have become separated from their original title-pages — those in the Boston Public Library, in the Library of Congress and in Lehigh University — are also unwatermarked. On the other hand, the single example of the Allot 2 title in The New York Public Library, which occurs without its companion “Effigies” B, is unwatermarked.
Professor Pollard (op. cit., p. 138) notes that 17th Century printers frequently used a special paper for pages that were to bear engravings. In the First Folio title-page they selected a half sheet differing in weight, texture and wire lines, from that in the bulk of the volume. The Second Folio titles reveal a similar, but not identical procedure. The printers still chose a special paper—the very thick sheets with the small crown watermark (No. 1)—while printing the first two forms, but they used a whole instead of a half sheet and printed upon it also the "Effigies" poems. When the perfected third form had been composed, they drew from another stock of special paper bearing a very large crown watermark (No. 2), which appears, as the case may be, either in Allot 4 and succeeding titles or in the corresponding "Effigies" C:
One of the puzzling and suspicious things to bibliographers and compilers of rare book catalogues has been the presence of these thick leaves in *Second Folios*. Because the sheets with water-mark 1 did not take as clear and black an impression as the thinner paper of the rest of the folio, they look like facsimiles and have occasionally been declared to be so. There are several instances of *Second Folios* offered at auction sales or in book catalogues and described as possessing the title or "Effigies" leaf, or both, in facsimile.\(^1\) For example, the Columbia University copy, extraordinarily large and uncut, sold as having the "Effigies" (the B variant) in facsimile. Another cataloguer put on a bolder front and advertised his copy as "one of the few in which the 'Effigies' leaf was printed on thicker paper".\(^2\) This cataloguer, though he probably did not possess valid reasons for his faith, hit upon the truth. The thick leaves are the early variants. The British Museum's experts, called in by Durning-Lawrence, agreed that these sheets were original and contemporary.\(^3\) The difficulty has been a real one, as doubtless no dealer has happened to have in stock for comparison at any one time *Second Folios* with all three varieties of "Effigies" or nine varieties of title-page, or took the trouble to compare them if he had; and the same is true of bibliographers. Even Mr. Cole, who consulted 21 copies, supposed that "Effigies" A in the New York Public Library was identical with "Effigies" B in the Boston Public

---

\(^1\) *English Book Prices Current*: 1896, no. 188; 1904, nos. 3827, 5503; *Book Auction Records*, 1925-1926.

\(^2\) E. B. P. C., 1908, p. 238.

\(^3\) op. cit. 11th S. IX, p. 11; see also Winsor's description of Boston Public Library copy. No. 2.
We can only conjecture as to the total number of Second Folios which finally issued from Cotes's press. Captain Jaggard's estimate is as good as any, though his total of First Folios extant is too high.

"The first edition (the First Folio) probably consisted of 500 copies of which about half are certainly known to survive. Of these 250 copies, exactly one-fifth appeared at auction in the twenty years 1886-1906. The second edition of 1632 doubtless consisted of 1000 copies, of which probably one-half survives, for in the same twenty years, 1886-1906, there appear at auction 111 copies." (N. & Q, 118, viii p. 12.)

My canvas of Second Folios, which does not pretend in any way to completeness, has located the 124 copies listed below. Since the list is not in any sense a complete census, and many private owners do not wish publicity, I have omitted the names of the owners and have printed only the city or state where these copies were found and have added the letters p.o., (i.e. private owner) after it. I have given, however, the names of libraries, institutions, and booksellers. If Captain Jaggard's estimate is correct, I have recorded here nearly one-fourth of the extant copies. Although this list is, perhaps, indicative of
the relative portion of varying issues likely to be found in the future, no absolute conclusions may safely be drawn from it. It may, however, be useful as a partial finding list, and accredited scholars may, of course, have further knowledge of the private copies with permission of the owners.

**ALLOT I WITH "EFFIGIES" A**
The Gray Copy, Cambridge, Massachusetts (p.o.)
The Henry Huntington Library
New York Public Library
Queens College—Oxford
Royal Society (Sotheby’s May, 1925)
Trinity College—Cambridge
Trinity College—Dublin
Philadelphia (p.o.)

**ALLOT II**
New York Public Library (inserted into a copy with Allot 4 and "Effigies" C present)

**ALLOT III WITH "EFFIGIES" B**
Columbia University
Indianapolis Public Library
Gabriel Wells¹

**ALLOT IV WITH "EFFIGIES" C**
*British*
British Museum (2)
Eton College
Edinburgh University
Glasgow University (Hunterian Museum)
Lambeth Free Library
Leamington Public Library (without "Effigies" leaf)
Maggs Brothers (3)

¹ Recently sold to a Philadelphia collector.
Myers & Company
Metheun Facsimile
Shakespeare's Birthplace Library (2)
Trinity College—Cambridge
Victoria-Albert Museum (Dyce)

American
Boston Public Library (2) (one with "Effigies" B and C)
Bowdoin College
John Carter Brown Library
Charleston Library Society (South Carolina)
Cincinnati, Ohio (p.o.)
William Andrews Clark, Jr.
J. F. Drake & Co.
Grolier Club (New York)
Henry Huntington Library
Lehigh University
Library of Congress (with "Effigies" B)
Lowell, Massachusetts (p.o.)
Minneapolis, Minnesota (p.o.)
The Pierpont Morgan Library
Morristown, New Jersey (p.o.) (2)
Newport, Rhode Island (p.o.)
New York City (p.o.)
New York City (p.o.)
New York City (p.o.)
New York Public Library
New York Public Library (Astor)
New York Public Library (Ann King)
Ohio Wesleyan University
Western Pennsylvania (p.o.)
The Rosenbach Company (2)
University of Texas (2)
Toledo Museum of Art
Washington, D. C. (p.o.)
Worcester, Massachusetts (p.o.)
West Virginia (p.o.)
Yale University (2)
ALLOT V WITH "EFFIGIES" C

British
Birmingham Public Library
Bodleian—Oxford (2)
British Museum
Glasgow University
Maggs Brothers
The Royal Library, Windsor Castle
John Rylands, Library—Manchester
Victoria & Albert Museum (Forster)
Victoria & Albert Museum (Jones)

American
Boston, Massachusetts (p.o.)
William Andrews Clark, Jr.
Detroit, Michigan (p.o.)
Henry Huntington Library
City Library of Lowell, Massachusetts
University of Michigan
Philadelphia (p.o.)
The Pierpont Morgan Library
The Newberry Library
New York Public Library
The Rosenbach Company (2)
Wellesley College
Gabriel Wells

ASPLEY WITH "EFFIGIES" C

William Andrews Clark, Jr.
Grosvenor Library (Buffalo)
Henry Huntington Library
Mrs. Durning Lawrence (with "Effigies" A only)
New York Public Library
New York (p.o.)

HAWKINS WITH "EFFIGIES" C

The Brick Row Book Shop¹

¹ Recently sold to a New York collector.
William Andrews Clark, Jr.
Henry Huntington Library
The Pierpont Morgan Library
New York Public Library
The Players Club (New York)

Meighen with "Effigies" C

Henry Huntington Library
The Pierpont Morgan Library
Gabriel Wells

Smethwick with "Effigies" C

British Museum
Chapin Library—Williams College
William Andrews Clark, Jr. (2)
Harvard University
Henry Huntington Library (2)
New York Public Library
Ernest Dressel North

Copies without Title-Pages, but with "Effigies" C

Buffalo, New York (p.o.)
The Century Association, New York
Henry Huntington Library (2)
Lehigh University (with "Effigies" B and C)
New York Public Library
Trinity College, Melbourne, Australia

Copies Lacking Title-Page and "Effigies"

Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania (p.o.)
California State Library
Denver, Colorado (p.o.)
National Library of Scotland
Victoria & Albert Museum (Forster)
From this list we may observe that the New York Public Library and the Henry Huntington Library lead the world, each possessing seven of the nine variant issues of the Second Folio, the former lacking Allot 3 and Meighen and "Effigies" B, the latter Allot 2 and 3 and "Effigies" B, the Second Folios of the former, counting duplicates, totaling nine, the latter, ten.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allot 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allot 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allot 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allot 4</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allot 5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspley</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meighen</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smethwick</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total           | 124   |

VI

THE VALUE OF SECOND FOLIOS AND NOTABLE COPIES

Before 1800 the highest price recorded for a Second Folio seems to have been that brought by Thomas Allen's copy, which was sold in 1795 for £4-4-0 and in 1799 for £5-10-0. Steevens remarked that "the Second Folio is commonly rated at two or three guineas," but his copy, an Allot 5, inscribed by Ben Jonson and also by Charles the First (who wrote in it "Dum spiro spero. C. R.")) was bought at auction by King George III for £18-18s, and is now, through
an interesting interchange, in the Royal Library at Windsor Castle. In recognition of the courtesy of Dr. Burney, who desisted from further bidding when he learned that the king wished to acquire it, George III gave Dr. Burney a substitute Second Folio, a "Coppies" issue (Allot 1). When the officials of the British Museum bought Dr. Burney's collection, they sold (February, 1819) this "Coppies" folio as a duplicate. As the disposal took place before the days of scientific bibliography, the British Museum authorities, noting perhaps the unsightly Allot 1 title-page, and already possessing Allot issues in the Library, and thinking possibly that all Allot titles were of equal importance, naturally decided to dispense with this one. It passed to Henry Foss and from him to J. Lilly, the book-dealer, from whom Mr. James Lenox purchased it and subsequently gave it to the New York Public Library. Thus a treasure, the rare "Coppies" Second Folio, containing "Effigies A", the first print of Milton's English verse, once owned by King George III, passed through these strange vicissitudes of provenance from London to New York, and the British Museum is without a "Coppies" variant in its collection today.¹

The lack of this rare variant is the more remarkable in view of another opportunity recently offered the British Museum to obtain it. In May, 1925, the Royal Society, in spite of some protest, sold through Sotheby's a collection of valuable printed books, donated to it in 1666 through the influence of John Evelyn by Henry Howard, afterwards the sixth Duke

¹The provenance cited above of the N. Y. P. L. "Coppies" issue is authenticated at every step by signed witnesses in the Folio; see also Winsor, op. cit. Second Folio no. 19.
of Norfolk. Previous to the sale the President of the Society invited the British Museum to purchase at its own valuation any of these books. The Museum accepted the offer, chose certain items, but allowed the Second Folio to pass to Sotheby's. This volume, once in the library of the grandfather of Henry Howard, the famous Earl of Arundel, is another "Coppies" issue, as may be seen from the reproduction of the title-page in Sotheby's catalogue. The four Second Folios now in the Museum are two copies of Allot 4, one of Allot 5, and one Smethwick.

In 1813 the Roxburgh Copy brought £15. In 1835 Barton bought a copy of Rodd for £16 16s. The Crawford Copy in 1854, large and fine, brought £28. Later Halliwell paid £31 10s for an Aspley issue. The unique Bliss "according" copy brought £30 5s in June, 1858, and the Holland copy £36 in 1860. In 1864 a "Coppies" issue advertised as "the purest and largest copy known", 13¾ x 9¼ inches, brought (in the Daniel Sale) £48, the highest price for a Second Folio before 1870. Daniel had paid £28 1s for it at the Neville Holt sale. This copy was sold again in 1895 for £540. This list of prices, taken from Lowndes and Winsor, gives a good idea of the increase in Second Folio values during the nineteenth century, and proves that there was as yet little discrimination as to imprints or issues, since in these lists in most cases these elements are not specified.

Discrimination among Allot issues has been particularly slow in developing, and has been greatly hampered by the careless recording of folios in cata-

---

1 London Times Literary Supplement. April 23, 30, May 7, 1925. In the issue of April 23, M. H. Spielmann called attention to the typographical peculiarities of the title-page.
logues and book auction records. No systematic method of describing copies has been adopted, and only in comparatively few cases have the titles and imprints been fully or accurately reproduced. Compilers have been content to give the title without the imprint, or only a part of the imprint, or only the title and the colophon; and sometimes have omitted even these. No complete or reliable record, therefore, can be drawn from either the English or American Book Prices Current and similar volumes. The colophons, usually given in full, are of no value whatever in determining variant issues of the Second Folio, because they are all alike; but the full title and the full imprint, with accurate spellings, are indispensable.

The varying prices as recorded below for the Allot 1, "Coppies" folio, clearly indicate that little discrimination has been shown in estimating its value, though due weight must, of course, be given in every case to the condition of the volume. As was demonstrated, especially at the Clawson sale, only rare books in the finest condition receive the full benefit of the increase in value.

**Allot 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Sotheby to Harvey</td>
<td>£540(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Sotheby to Ellis</td>
<td>£100(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>American Art Association</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Sotheby to Quaritch</td>
<td>£33(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Sotheby to Sotheran</td>
<td>£92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) 13\frac{3}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{4} \text{ inches "largest and probably finest copy known."}  

\(^2\) "Only three with this variant known".  

\(^3\) Imperfect.
Allot 2

There is no sales record of Allot 2, "accodring" folios, other than the Bliss copy for which Mr. Lenox paid £30 5s.

Allot 3

As the spelling and punctuation of the records cannot be absolutely relied upon, I give with hesitation the following sales prices of what were in all probability copies of Allot 3. Prices indicate that this variant is not recognized as the rarest of the Allot issues after Allot 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Seller</th>
<th>Buyer</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Puttick</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>£103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Sotheby</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>£87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Sotheby</td>
<td>Gorton</td>
<td>£70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Sotheby</td>
<td>Dobell</td>
<td>£46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Sotheby</td>
<td>Quaritch</td>
<td>£355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allot 4

The range of prices for the commonest issue of the Second Folio, Allot 4, is very great. The highest auction record that I have been able to discover was brought by the large and perfect copy sold at Anderson's in 1925 for $3600, and subsequently resold to a private owner for $5000, a figure that Sawyer and Darton in their attractive English Books, 1475-1900, just published, state has never been reached. J. F. Drake & Company list a good copy in a recent catalogue (No. 190) for $3500.

Allot 5

Copies of Allot 5, though not rare, are not sufficiently numerous to make them of equal value with

---

1 E. P. Dutton, 1927, I, p. 168. These writers price a fine copy of the Second Folio in the stock of one of them at £450—but do not mention the imprint, nor give any statement as to what the rare Meighen imprint, the only Second Folio variant they mention, is worth.
Allot 4. The highest price I have found is $2,950, paid at Anderson’s auction in 1918. This copy was subsequently sold to a private owner for a larger sum.

**Aspley**

Aspley titles which have sometimes been advertised as the rarest of the imprints, have sometimes brought higher prices than the rarer Meighen issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Raines</td>
<td>£250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>£155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Quaritch</td>
<td>£130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>£490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Dobell</td>
<td>£125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hawkins**

Titles printed for Richard Hawkins, apparently are less rare than those for Aspley and Meighen. The high price for the Morant copy sold in 1903 may be explained by the sales note attached to it: “Referring back to the last 80 copies of the *Second Folio* sold within 15 years there was no copy among them with the Hawkins title. There were no less than six Smethwicks, two Aspleys, one Meighen. It is believed that only two other copies are known with Hawkins’ imprint.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>£65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Morant</td>
<td>£850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Leighton</td>
<td>£215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Raines</td>
<td>£250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>£155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Quaritch</td>
<td>£130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>£495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Dobell</td>
<td>£125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pickering and Chatto offered within the last year a copy with the "Verses" in facsimile for £450, which has subsequently passed through the Brick Row Book Shop to a New York owner for a higher sum.

**MEIGHEN**

The four prices at auction for the Meighen imprint, which is now generally recognized as the rarest of *Second Folio* titles, can hardly be called excessive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Tregaskis</td>
<td>£10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>£164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Ryley</td>
<td>£230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>£420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 1919 Edwards has offered a sound and complete copy measuring 13 x 8½ inches for £400; and in 1925 Maggs Brothers offered an imperfect one for £175.

**SMETHWICK**

As the sales records of Smethwick issues are more abundant, only the highest prices have been given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Quaritch</td>
<td>£30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>£690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Robson</td>
<td>£350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Quaritch</td>
<td>£615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Lyle</td>
<td>£250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>£200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Quaritch</td>
<td>£205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high prices of £690 and £615 for Smethwicks at the opening of the century may be explained by

---

1 Last two leaves in facsimile.
the note attached to the latter: "Not more than three or four copies are known with this imprint". Subsequently numerous copies newly discovered have depreciated the value. It would seem from the lists above that at certain times each of the Aspley, Hawkins and Smethwick issues had been considered in turn the rarest title. Mr. Ernest Dressel North in a recent catalogue (No. 83) offered a Smethwick for $3850.

Two interesting association copies of the Smethwick issues are in existence, the *Second Folio* with David Garrick's Bookplate, and the *Second Folio* expurgated by the Inquisition. The Garrick copy, which was bequeathed by Garrick's widow to George Frederick Beltz, is defective, having the Verses and title in facsimile, last leaf torn, and two other leaves repaired. It was sold at Hodgson's miscellaneous sale (November 26-27, 1908) for £14 10s. Subsequently this volume was sold again on March 25, 1925, to Quaritch by Puttick for the sum of £420—an indication of how intrinsic and association values have increased since 1908.

The copy censored by the Inquisition was acquired a few years after its publication in 1632 by the Library of the English College of Valladolid,¹ and remained there until 1913 when it was sold at Sotheby's for £200. The expurgations consist of erasures, and the excision of the whole of *Measure for Measure*. The volume measures $13\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ (cf. Sotheby's Catalogue July 7-8, 1913 (No. 584)).

Prices for *Second Folios* today, in the still somewhat indiscriminate market, range from $1500-$5000.

¹ See Lee's articles to *The Times*, April 10, 11, 1922.
The Bodleian's Exhibition *Catalogue* puts the value between £1000-£1350; but the last figure, £1350, is based upon a curious mistake made by Sir Sidney Lee in his *Life of Shakespeare*, 1925—p. 571. "The highest price paid at public auction (for a Second Folio) is £1350; which was reached at the sale in New York of Robert Hoe's Library on May 3, 1911; the copy bore Allot's imprint." Anderson's catalogue, however, shows that this folio brought 1350 dollars instead of pounds, and therefore, is not in any way a record price. (Number 2979. Hoe sale, April 24 (not May 3) 1911.)

Dealers have complained that *Second Folios* have lately been a drug upon the market, but prices in private transactions have shown recently an ascending scale, no doubt because of the eagerness of new book collectors in America. In any case the collector who wishes to add a *Second Folio* to his treasures should take care to see exactly what he is purchasing among the many *Second Folio* issues of varying value. It would seem obvious that the highest sums should be paid only for the rarest variants. There is little doubt that when dealers and purchasers begin to discriminate more closely, prices will be not only adjusted, but appropriately, or, from the purchaser's viewpoint, inappropriately advanced.