



Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet: an explanation of the differences in quarto one and two

Marijn Boomars
November 2019

Thesis advisor:
Kristy Mannell



**Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*:
an explanation of the differences
in quarto one and two**

Marijn Boomars

November 2019

Thesis advisor

Kristy Mannell

Table of contents

Table of contents.....	1
Introduction.....	3
Shakespearean theatre	3
Memorial reconstruction	4
Revision theory.....	6
Theatrical adaptation	8
Theatrical adaptation for the provinces.....	9
Method for analysis of the quartos.....	11
The plays.....	12
Prologue of act 1	12
Act 1 scene 1.....	13
Act 1 scene 2.....	14
Act 1 scene 3.....	15
Act 1 scene 4.....	16
Act 1 scene 5.....	17
The prologue of act 2	18
Act 2 scene 1.....	19
Act 2 scene 2.....	20
Act 2 scene 3.....	21
Act 2 scene 4.....	22
Act 2 scene 5.....	23
Act 2 scene 6.....	24
Act 3 scene 1.....	25
Act 3 scene 2.....	26
Act 3 scene 3.....	27
Act 3 scene 4.....	28
Act 3 scene 5.....	29
Act 4 scene 1.....	30
Act 4 scene 2.....	31
Act 4 scene 3.....	32
Act 4 scene 4.....	33
Act 4 scene 5.....	34
Act 5 scene 1.....	35
Act 5 scene 2.....	36

Act 5 scene 3.....	37
Conclusion	38
Bibliography.....	43

Introduction

Shakespeare has been able to amaze us for centuries. His plays can make us feel sad, happy, angry, desperate, and all the other emotions a human being could possibly feel. His characters are so realistic that after the play the audience feels like they genuinely know them, often better than their own neighbours. *Romeo and Juliet* in particular draws the audience in so much that I have yet to find a person who did not tear up during the death scene of those star-crossed lovers.

However, we do not only enjoy Shakespeare's work, but he also confuses us. Part of the reason for this is the existence of multiple versions of some of his plays. The printed versions of his masterpieces vary greatly and thus questions arise how these could have emerged. In this research project I will focus on quarto one and two of *Romeo and Juliet*, and I will try to figure out the reason for the differences between these quartos. Hence my focus question: how can I explain the differences between quarto one and two? To answer this question I will answer the following sub questions: how do the existing theories explain the differences between the first two quartos of the play *Romeo and Juliet* and why are some lines and words different? There are many theories around this main question, which I will explain in my introduction. I will describe both the evidence that supports these theories as well as the evidence that contradicts them.

As there is no academic consensus about which of these theories is correct, I aim to discover which of the existing theories is the most reliable by comparing the two quarto versions word by word, looking for differences and trying to explain why these differences are there. Comparing the differences in the two quartos in this manner has never been done before, which makes this research unique. Whilst analysing I want to be completely impartial towards all theories and therefore I will search for evidence for all the theories by noting down the reason for every difference in a table in order to get numeral proof for one of the existing theories. In this manner I hope to achieve a definite answer to how the differences in quarto 1 and 2 of *Romeo and Juliet* came to be.

Shakespearean theatre

Romeo and Juliet was probably performed at the Theatre until 1597.¹ The Theatre was a theatre not quite like any we encounter in our daily life. It was an outdoor theatre, which meant that the actors would get wet if it rained. The excitement of the theatre attracted a range of people from all walks of life. The cheapest places would cost you a penny, which would get you a standing spot in the yard. The

¹ Erne, L. (2007). *The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

yard was the space around the stage and that was in the open air as well.² However, not only the lower classes were interested in the theatre; the higher classes also enjoyed it enormously. They would sit in the most expensive seats, which were in the Lord's Rooms. Royalty did not go to the theatre, but that did not mean that they did not like it. Queen Elizabeth I and King James I simply summoned a company of actors to their courts to perform.³

Women were not allowed to perform as actresses in this time, so men had to play the female roles. Young men whose voices had not yet broken played most female parts; it was possible, however, for an older actor who specialized in comedy to play some comical female roles. For example, an older actor might have played Juliet's nurse.⁴

Companies invested greatly in the costumes of the characters. Costumes were deeply important to the audience as they gave crucial information about the character: their gender, their age and their status. Nobility often left their servants their clothes in their will. The servants could not wear the clothes they had inherited as there were laws concerning which clothing you could wear if you had a certain status. Hence, the servants would sell the clothes to companies who could use them as costumes. It also happened that companies wanted something particular as a costume and they would have it made by a tailor.⁵

Although the costumes were very elaborate and impressive, the settings were very minimal. Nothing, except the scenery the plot needed, was used.⁶

Memorial reconstruction

Alfred W. Pollard first developed the idea that some first quartos were of lesser quality because actors had written them down from only their faulty memories of the texts. Some quarto versions created in this way include *Romeo and Juliet*, *King Henry V*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Hamlet* and *Pericles*. Pollard introduced the term "bad quarto" for these versions. This theory has been very influential and as a result the first quartos have long been looked down on as inferior versions of the plays.⁷

² Folger Shakespeare Library. (2008). *Shakespeare's theatre*. [online]. Available at: <https://www.folger.edu/shakespeares-theater> [Accessed 25 July 2019].

³ <https://teach.shakespearesglobe.com/fact-sheet-audiences> [Accessed 25 July 2019].

⁴ Folger Shakespeare library. (2008). *Shakespeare's theatre*. [online]. Available at: <https://www.folger.edu/shakespeares-theater> [Accessed 25 July 2019].

⁵ <https://teach.shakespearesglobe.com/fact-sheet-costumes-and-cosmetics?previous=/library> [Accessed 25 July 2019].

⁶ Folger Shakespeare library. (2008). *Shakespeare's theatre*. [online]. Available at: <https://www.folger.edu/shakespeares-theater> [Accessed 25 July 2019].

⁷ Pollard, A. (1909). *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos: A Study in the Bibliography of Shakespeare's Plays 1594-1685*. London: Methuen and Company.

Scholars quickly tried to identify the actor that wrote down these quartos. W. Greg was one of the first to claim that he had found conclusive evidence about who the reporter was (the actor that wrote the quarto down) of quarto one of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. He noted:

‘the comparative excellence of the reporting of those scenes in which the Host is on the stage even where he takes no prominent part in the conversation. Mine Host appears in eight scenes of the folio text, and all these are preserved in the quarto likewise.’⁸

In other words, the actor who reported the play would naturally know his own lines – that of the character he played – better than any other. That part will be far more accurate and thus closer to the ‘correct’ text found in the Folio. Greg found this evidence by comparing the text of quarto one with the text of the Folio. Other scholars began to apply this method to the other bad quartos of Shakespeare. In *Romeo and Juliet* it has been suggested by Hoppe that the actors who played Romeo and Paris were the reporters for this quarto one.⁹ Irace agreed with this claim, but added Mercutio to the reporters.¹⁰ However, to Erne and many others this argument seems very unlikely due to meagre evidence. The correlation between quarto 1 and the Folio is not that much greater for Mercutio, Romeo and Paris than it is for Benvolio and Tybalt.¹¹

Yet, just because we cannot identify the reporter(s), we should not consider this theory impossible. As Werstine observed:

‘Heywood does not find it necessary to identify a particular actor or any other particular individual as the one who ‘copied [his plays]... by... eare’ in order to entertain the possibility that his texts were transmitted in this way.’¹²

Werstine and others still regard this theory as valid, because there is good evidence to believe that memorial reconstruction played a part in the process of making quarto one. From now on I will refer to the reporter(s) simply as the reporter, but obviously there might be more than one. The correlation between quarto one and two becomes vague, especially during intense scenes of stage fighting or something similar. Quarto one describes these scenes more with stage direction while in quarto two the events become clear through the lines of the characters. This is perfectly understandable, because during the fuss of such scenes the lines were considerably harder to remember for the reporter. Besides,

⁸ Greg, W. (1910). *Shakespeare’s ‘Merry Wives of Windsor’, 1602*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

⁹ Hoppe, H. (1948). *The Bad Quarto of ‘Romeo and Juliet’: A Bibliographical and Textual Study*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

¹⁰ Irace, K. (1994). *Reforming the ‘Bad’ Quartos: Performance and Provenance of Six Shakespearean First Editions*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

¹¹ Erne, L. (2007). *The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

¹² Werstine, P. (1990). *Narratives about Printed Shakespeare Texts: “Foul Papers” and “Bad Quartos*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

in the theatre these lines were less important if the action was impressive.¹³ Blayney therefore argued that we should not see a reporter as a pirate who deliberately tried to remember as many lines as possible to write them down for profit, but simply as people who did their friends a favour. Actors wrote down the play as accurately as they could remember it, but did not earn extra money by doing so.¹⁴

In conclusion, we should no longer use Pollard's term 'bad quartos', as more and more scholars do not agree with this characterization of the quarto texts. However, to abolish his theory of memorial reconstruction in its entirety would be wrong, as it is a valid way of understanding how these quartos may have been created.

Revision theory

As early as the eighteenth century scholars have theorised that quarto one is an early draft of quarto two. Although most supporters of revision theory now think it is the other way around, it is still impressive that this theory has been around for such a long time. The theory enjoyed a revival in the 1970s and 1980s, mostly focusing on *King Lear*. However, academics quickly applied this theory to other plays as well.¹⁵ This theory is clearly explained by Randall McLeod:

'We must countenance Shakespeare's writing of *Romeo and Juliet* as extending over some time and running through several different phases, and perhaps in several different manuscripts, each perhaps with its own characteristic aesthetic, offering together several finalities.'¹⁶

Shakespeare himself, McLeod argues, revised his plays and this led to the confusion between quarto one and two. Shakespeare may have written both, with one simply written earlier than the other.

As earlier stated, quarto one was first considered to be the early draft. However, most supporters of revision theory now see quarto two as the early draft, because in quarto two we often find repetitions of lines and false starts. For example, in quarto two, Act II, Scene II ends with Romeo saying:

'Would I were sleepe and peace so sweet to rest
The grey eyde morne smiles on the frowning night,
Checking the Easterne Clouds with streaks of light,
And darknesse fleckted like a drunkard reeles,
From forth daies pathway, made by Tytans wheeles.
Hence will I to my ghostly Friers close cell,

¹³ Erne, L. (2007). *The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

¹⁴ Blayney, P. (1997) *The publication of playbooks*. New York: Columbia University Press.

¹⁵ Erne, L. (2007). *The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

¹⁶ McLeod, R. (1982) *The Marriage of Good and Bad Quartos*. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 33/4.

His helpe to craue, and my deare hap to tell.'

In the same quarto the next scene begins with Friar Lurance:

'The grey-eyed morne smiles on the frowning (night,
Checking the Easterne cloudes with streaks of light:
And fleckeld darknesse like a drunkard reeles,
From forth daies path, and *Titans* burning wheelles:'

The Friar repeats part of Romeo's speech in the following scene, as you can see by the text that is in bold. This repetition must have been a mistake. This is even more likely, because in quarto one these lines are missing while the rest of Romeo's text is almost identical as shown here:

'I would that I were sleep and peace of sweet to rest.
Now will I go to my Ghostly fathers Cell,
His help to craue, and my good hap to tell.'¹⁷

In quarto one this mistake has been cleared up and hence we can convincingly argue that quarto two is the early draft.

Moreover, the influence of Arthur Brooke's narrative poem, *The Tragicall Historye of Romeus and Iuliet*, is very much present in quarto two, but not in quarto one. We see a similar choice of words and a very comparable order of events in quarto two, but this is not the case in quarto one. It seems as if Shakespeare removed the similarities with Brooke's poem while revising quarto two. This again would suggest that quarto one derives from quarto two.¹⁸

Last but not least, some lines in quarto one occur completely out of the blue and without context. For instance, in Act I, Scene II of quarto one, Paris says:

'Of honorable reckoning are they both'

It is completely unclear to whom Paris refers to with 'they', but by looking at the lines that come before this line in quarto two, we can figure out who the 'they' are.

¹⁷ Irace, K. (1994) *Reforming the 'Bad' Quartos: Performance and Provenance of Six Shakespearean First Editions*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

¹⁸ Erne, L. (2007). *The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Capulet. But Mountague is bound as well as I,
In penaltie alike, and tis not hard I thinke,
For men so old as we to keepe the peace.
Paris. Of honourable reckoning are you both,'

Only because of the detail and context provided by quarto two we can identify the 'they' as Montague and Capulet. In quarto two the 'they' changes to 'you', because Paris directly answers Capulet. However, whether it is you or they, in quarto one this line cannot be understood. This would again suggest that quarto one derives from quarto two. Shakespeare had to cut lines and perhaps did not always pay enough attention to make sure that all lines remained coherent.¹⁹

However, some scholars, like the editors of the Oxford University Press, do not believe in this theory, because they do not believe that quarto one was written by Shakespeare at all. Quarto one, they argue, does not follow Shakespeare's writing style and thus, quarto one could not be the revised version of quarto two. They looked at other certified revisions by Shakespeare and found the style of writing in quarto one and more specifically, the use of blank verse to be widely divergent from other revised works of Shakespeare.²⁰

Looking at both the evidence supporting and contradicting this theory, we should still consider this as an important theory that could explain some of the differences between the quartos.

Theatrical adaptation

Supporters of the theory of theatrical adaptation consider quarto one to be a script that was created to fit the needs of the audience and the company. As Michael E. Mooney explains:

'Quarto One is also 2220 lines long and is performable in the "two hours' traffic of our stage" stipulated by the Chorus; for Q1, the playing time is approximate, not conventional. Quarto Two, as its title boasts, is a "Newly corrected, augmented, and amended" version; it also runs for 3052 lines and could not have been played in two hours.'²¹

¹⁹ Chambers, E. (1930) *William Shakespeare: A Study Of Facts And Problems Vol I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

²⁰ Erne, L. (2007). *The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

²¹ Mooney, M. (1990) *Text and Performance: Romeo and Juliet, Quartos 1 and 2*. Colby Quarterly: Vol. 26.

Quarto one must have needed to be made shorter, because otherwise it would have been too long for the audience. Hence, cuts needed to be made. Shakespeare probably even counted on the fact that shortening his play was necessary.²² This does not mean that this quarto is the bad one. Again Michael E. Mooney:

'The theory of memorial reconstruction undermines the validity of a "bad" quarto by questioning the motives and memory of the actors presumably responsible for the faulty text. It deals a death blow to all scripts posing as texts. The nature of theatrical adaptation, on the other hand, often requires that plays be cut to shorten playing time and to accommodate a smaller cast. Dramatic rather than literary considerations are of foremost importance to an adapter. Faulty memory is one thing, careful adaptation quite another, and to identify Q I as a "bad" quarto is to confuse the issues. It is not the same thing to "cut" as it is to "omit"²³

These cuts were (well) considered and were needed.

However, there is something odd in quarto one which could be evidence against this theory. In a manuscript that was supposed to be shorter so that it could function as a script, it is noteworthy that specific sections in quarto one are (almost) longer than quarto two. This is not what we would expect in a script in which so much was erased in order to make it shorter, and undercuts the validity of the theatrical adaptation theory.²⁴

Theatrical adaptation for the provinces

This theory is very closely linked to the theory discussed above, but differs slightly. Scholars who support this theory consider quarto one as a version that was used for touring the provinces. This was a very common thing to do for companies in London, but it is not known for certain that a different script was used.

Supporters of this theory often argue that quarto one needed less players, which was ideal as there were always fewer actors touring in the provinces. However, other scholars, like Erne, do not agree: Shakespeare's company match the required number of roles in quarto one, so quarto one does not need fewer actors than actors that were available to the company.²⁵

²² Orgel, S. (2002) *The Authentic Shakespeare*. London: Routledge.

²³ Mooney, M. (1990) *Text and Performance: Romeo and Juliet, Quartos 1 and 2*. Colby Quarterly: Vol. 26.

²⁴ Erne, L. (2007). *The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

²⁵ Erne, L. (2007). *The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Thinking about this theory practically, you can quickly see how much work and trouble it must have been to remember both the lines used in London and the ones used when touring. This would already be very difficult if an actor had to do this for one play, but if you had many lines from other plays to remember as well, this would have been almost impossible. Companies would probably use the memories of their actors more sparingly.²⁶

Secondly, Leslie Thomson has shown that the stage directions of quarto one imply that quarto one required to be played in a playhouse in London: a balcony for the balcony scene with Romeo and Juliet is imperative. Most of the playhouses in the provinces would not have different floors in their playhouse. We can therefore conclude that quarto one could not have been played in the provinces.²⁷

This particular theory has a lot of evidence against it, but the idea that quarto one is a theatrical adaptation is very interesting. This hypothesis could be very valuable in explaining the differences between quarto one and two; the theory of quarto one being a version for the provinces is a possibility as well, even though there is a lot of contrary evidence.

²⁶ Erne, L. (2007). *The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

²⁷ Thomson, L. (1995) *“With patient ears attend”*: *“Romeo and Juliet” on the Elizabethan stage*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Method for analysis of the quartos

As described before, I will compare quarto one and two to look for evidence for all the theories discussed above and try to find evidence for all of the theories, because I want to be completely impartial towards all theories. I will note down the reason for every difference in a table in order to get numeral proof for one of the existing theories. In this manner I hope to achieve a definite answer to how the differences in quarto 1 and 2 of *Romeo and Juliet* came to be.

While reading and analysing the play, I will place the lines of quarto one and two in such a way that the corresponding lines are next to each other, thus making it easy to read and compare. To be able to do so, I sometimes have to cut a line in two pieces in one quarto to make it comparable to the line in the other quarto. On the other hand I sometimes have to put words that were hyphenated in the original text back together, to be able to place the lines next to the other quarto

I highlighted the lines or words in the play that I discuss in my research paper. I have used colour coding, so it is easy to see which theory is supported by what evidence. Pink marking stands for the theatrical adaptation theory, yellow for the memorial reconstruction theory and blue for the revision theory.

It is not possible to discuss every single difference, because there are just too many and it is sometimes impossible to explain every difference. However, I aim to discuss two to three pieces of evidence in every single scene.

The plays

Prologue of act 1

The first important thing that catches my eye is the difference in form: the prologue of quarto two is written as a Shakespearean sonnet, while the prologue quarto one is not. Quarto two follows the rhyme scheme of a Shakespearean sonnet: abab cdcd efef gg²⁸. However, quarto one is written in the following rhyme scheme: abab cdcd eeff. This difference might be explained by the theatrical adaptation theory: the prologue of quarto two was written in sonnet form, but this could not be used for the prologue of quarto one as this needed to be shorter. The sonnet was merely beautiful, but not necessary for the plot and the audience: they would probably not have realized the prologue was a sonnet immediately and thus it did not have any added value. However, the audience would have caught on to the fact that the prologue rhymed and therefore that was useful to maintain in quarto one. I rule out faulty memory here as quarto one continues to rhyme even when it is no longer a sonnet. This would indicate careful consideration of the modification of these lines.

Quarto one is written in past tense, while quarto two is written in present tense. I highlighted the verbs that differ in tense in blue. This could be evidence for the revision theory: Shakespeare started writing the prologue of *Romeo and Juliet*. He 'saw' the plot in his head being played: he knew how the plot would develop and was playing with ideas for puns and specific lines, but he had not yet written any of it. The plot of *Romeo and Juliet* unfolded in his head in present tense and hence he wrote it like this. Later, after he had written the play and he started revising it, he knew exactly what would happen in his play as he had already finished writing it. Shakespeare might have accidentally changed the tense of these verbs, due to the different stage of writing, or he might have decided he liked the past tense better while revising.

²⁸ Poetry Foundation (2007). *Shakespearean sonnet*. [online]. (Last updated 2015). Available at: <https://www.poetryfoundation.org/learn/glossary-terms/shakespearean-sonnet> [Accessed 5 August 2019].

Act 1 scene 1

As soon as this scene begins, the differences begin. In quarto one, two unnamed serving men enter the stage, but in quarto two these men have names: *Sampson and Gregorie*. In performance the audience does not need to know names of these men. They are not characters with an important role and therefore knowing their names would only be confusing. This is a completely different story for quarto two, if we assume that this quarto was meant to be read. It would be confusing not to have names: while reading these quick and witty lines it is very important to keep track of which of the servants is speaking. This is more difficult to do when reading and thus with names it is easier to see who is speaking than with only a number. This evidence speaks in favour of the theatrical adaptation theory.

Secondly, once the fight between the Capulets and the Montagues erupts, quarto one simply states what happens in the fight. Nobody has any lines until order is restored once again. In quarto two it is not clear what happens in the fight, we only know what everybody says during it. This suggests memorial reconstruction. The reporter on the stage would have heard so much noise: the other actors, the swords clashing into each other, the audience, so hearing the lines would be almost impossible. Hence, they are missing.

In this entire scene, lines have been eliminated in quarto one that are present in quarto two. The remainder of the lines is more or less the same. From time to time lines are placed differently, but most of the time it is only a matter of lines missing in quarto one. This is evidence for the theatrical adaptation theory, because of the need to shorten the script. Due to the similarity of the remaining lines I do not think that this is evidence supporting memorial reconstruction.

Act 1 scene 2

In my introduction I discussed some evidence from this scene, concerning how it begins. Quarto one begins with the line spoken by Paris:

'Of honorable reckoning are they both,'

It is not clear whom Paris is talking about: who are the 'they' in this sentence? Quarto two begins with Capulet talking about Montague and himself and Paris answers him with:

Par. Of honourable reckoning are you both,'

We only understand whom Paris is talking about through Capulet's earlier lines. The difference in pronoun can be explained by the fact that in quarto two Paris answers directly to Capulet and thus Paris needs to include Capulet in the pronoun. This is evidence for the revision theory: Shakespeare wanted to cut these lines. Perhaps he did not like what Capulet said, but did not notice that without those lines Paris' line becomes inexplicable. Quarto one is therefore the revised version of quarto two.

Act 1 scene 3

Firstly, in quarto 1 an interesting line of Lady Capulet is removed:

‘I was your mother, much vpon these yeares’

Juliet is not yet fourteen, but Lady Capulet says here that she, at that age, was married and had already given birth to Juliet. Lady Capulet must have been eleven or twelve when she married and now thirteen years later would be around the age of twenty-four or twenty-five. Lady Capulet is still quite young. By eliminating this line in quarto one, any actor can play this part: the actor does not have to be young. This cut allows more leeway in the casting of Lady Capulet, which would be convenient in a company with only so many actors. This evidence strongly suggests the theatrical adaptation theory.

In this scene quite a few lines have been cut from quarto one. The build-up and the remaining lines in quarto one are so similar to quarto two that these cuts can not be explained by bad memory. This, again, suggests the theatrical adaptation theory, because of the need to make the script shorter.

Act 1 scene 4

To analyse this scene, we must start at the stage directions that state who enters at the opening of the action. In quarto one, Romeo, a page and maskers enter. These maskers must be Mercutio and Benvolio as they have lines later in the scene. In quarto two it is specified that these characters enter, but instead of one page, five or six extras enter. These are, except for Horatio, mute roles. Following quarto one there would have been four actors on stage, according to quarto two there should be eight or nine actors on stage. Looking at the limited number of actors present in a company in this time, eight or nine actors on a stage would be nearly impossible, not to mention uneconomical. The actors playing the mute parts would be better off preparing for their next scene behind the stage. Four people on a stage with only one mute role would be much more practical for a renaissance company. This would imply that quarto one is a theatrical adaptation.

In blue we see two lines that are unusual: these lines are present in quarto one, but do not have any similar lines in quarto two. In quarto one, Benvolio states two things they ought not to do, making it an enumeration. However, in quarto two, Benvolio only says they should not dress up like Cupid. It could well be argued that the little speech of Benvolio given here is prettier in quarto one, especially in literary terms. Shakespeare could have added these lines when revising quarto two, because he felt it would be nicer this way. This is evidence for the revision theory.

Lastly, in Mercutio's speech we see a difference that is quite striking. In quarto two, Mercutio says that Mab drives over the neck of a soldier and as a result the soldier dreams of cutting throats. In quarto one, Mab gallops over the nose of a soldier, but this gives the same effect. The link between riding over a neck and then dreaming about cutting throats makes more sense, because it concerns approximately the same body part. The link between the neck and throats is easier to catch than the connection between the nose and throats. Noting that in the previous example in the speech Mab tickles someone's nose, the reporter could easily have made a mistake and said that in this example Mab again does something to the nose. This suggests that this is a mistake and puts forward the memorial reconstruction theory.

Act 1 scene 5

This scene starts differently in each quarto: in quarto two we start the scene with the stressed servants preparing the feast. This is skipped in quarto one. This part of the scene requires three actors, immediately continuing with six other speaking roles entering and a few mute parts (in quarto one). The three servants would not have enough time to change into more luxurious, noble clothes and so they could not play one of these parts. This would have been really difficult for a company of this time, as they would have problems to have enough actors for the rest of the scene: a company only had a limited amount of actors they could afford to pay. The part of the servants is probably eliminated in quarto one to make sure that actors could immediately put on their clothes for the feast. This supports the theatrical adaptation theory, because it keeps the limitations of companies in mind.

Later in the scene, Romeo is shattered when he finds out that Juliet is a Capulet. However, in quarto one, Juliet is apparently not a Capulet anymore, but a Montague. This is obviously not the case: Romeo just makes a mistake. The reporter must have gotten confused when he wrote this scene down and made Juliet a Montague. Such a mistake is easily made, considering all the names and titles in the play. This suggests the memorial reconstruction theory.

The prologue of act 2

In quarto two, act two starts again with a prologue. However, after this prologue we do not see this occur again. It seems as if Shakespeare wanted to make this a pattern throughout the play, but later decided that he would not. The reason why he did this we shall probably never know. In quarto one, this prologue is not present. If we say quarto one is the revised version of quarto two then Shakespeare knew that the other acts did not have a prologue in the beginning. He decided that he would delete this prologue, so that the audience and/or reader would not expect prologues in front of the other acts. The first prologue was kept. This prologue covers not just the content of the first act, but also the content of the entire play. This might be the reason that Shakespeare decided to keep it in, so that people knew what to expect of the play. Another reason might be that Shakespeare really liked this prologue and found it a waste to remove it. Personally, I think that the first reason is more likely to be why this prologue remained. This is evidence for the revision theory.

Act 2 scene 1

Not very far into the scene Mercutio repeats something that Benvolio has just said in quarto one. Mercutio is ordered by Benvolio to implore Romeo, but Mercutio returns this request and asks Benvolio to do the same while immediately saying he will look for Romeo as well. This is strange and confusing. In quarto two Benvolio asks Mercutio to seek Romeo and says he will too. This makes sense. The reporter probably got confused over who said which line and placed Benvolio's line by Mercutio's. This evidence supports the memorial reconstruction theory.

In the end of this scene we see something noteworthy again: the last two lines are said by different characters in the different quartos. This is important, because it results in a different tone of the ending of the scene. In quarto two Mercutio states that he no longer wants to be outside and then asks Benvolio to come with him, Benvolio agrees and they leave. Before Mercutio and Benvolio left Benvolio had to give permission, Benvolio ends as the dominant one in this scene. However, in quarto one Mercutio decides that Benvolio and he will leave, because he wants to. Mercutio does not have to ask permission to Benvolio: Mercutio is dominant over Benvolio. This makes more sense with his tone of his speech earlier in the scene, because he was witty, sarcastic and already ruled over Benvolio once. I have highlighted this in dark blue. Mercutio decides here what will and will not anger Romeo and so what he can and cannot say. Shakespeare must have noticed that the tone of the scene was more consistent if Mercutio said those last two lines. Consistency in a scene is always relevant, because it makes it more realistic and easier to relate to. This suggests the revision theory as Shakespeare would only have noticed the difference in tone when he was redrafting his play.

Act 2 scene 2

The first big difference in this scene is quite far into the scene. In quarto one some of the dialogue between Romeo and Juliet is missing, but nothing vital is discussed that is needed to understand the scene. In quarto one the lines that are needed to make sure that the scene fluently proceeds are still present. In quarto one it is still made clear that Juliet hears something inside and that she must see what or who it is. Therefore we can conclude that these lines are consciously cut. This scene is quite long and to ensure that the play did not take longer than two hours cuts were needed. This evidence supports the theatrical adaptation theory.

Act 2 scene 3

In my introduction, I discussed some evidence present in this scene for which we have to look back at the scene before. In act two, scene two of quarto two Romeo says something which is repeated by the Friar in the next scene. In scene two Romeo is talking about the morning when it becomes clear throughout the rest of the scene that it takes place at night time. This does not make sense. The Friar states these lines about the morning when from the rest of the scene we can also conclude that it is in fact daytime. In quarto one the Friar says this at the same moment in the scene. The placement of these lines by Romeo's must have been a mistake. In quarto one this mistake has been cleared up and thus we can convincingly argue that quarto two is the early draft of quarto one. This evidence speaks in favour of the revision theory.

Secondly, the Friar uses different possessive pronouns in a line in his speech. In quarto one the Friar refers to his own bed, while in quarto two the bed belongs to Romeo. In quarto two the Friar is surprised 'to bid good morrow to' Romeo's bed as being up so early is not the standard for Romeo. Seeing Romeo so soon worries the Friar: the Friar thinks that Romeo would only get up at this time if something was wrong. It could be possible that the Friar was indeed talking about his own bed as quarto one suggests, but then the setting of the scene must be different. The setting of this scene is in some sort of garden or green house, because the Friar is putting flowers and plants in his basket. This could not be done in the bedroom of the Friar. The setting, that the possessive pronoun of quarto one suggests, does not agree with the context from the rest of the scene. Hence, 'my' must be a mistake; this could be easily mixed up with 'thy' due to the fact that if you do not think about this pronoun too much, you do not immediately realise the mistake that is made. The reporter obviously did not overthink this and simply wrote down 'my bed'. This is evidence supporting the memorial reconstruction theory.

Act 2 scene 4

This scene begins with Mercutio and Benvolio discussing why Romeo did not come home yesterday evening. Mercutio thinks that Romeo went to Rosaline, but Benvolio assumes that Romeo went to a duel with Tybalt as Tybalt sent a letter to the father of Romeo in which he probably challenged Romeo. However, it is striking that in quarto one Mercutio seems to change his opinion multiple times. Mercutio, just like in quarto two, starts by saying that Romeo probably went to Rosaline, but then tells Benvolio that Romeo's father got a letter from Tybalt. This suggests that Mercutio now thinks that this is the reason why Romeo did not come home. However, later in the scene Mercutio teases Romeo about Rosaline, as this is according to him the reason why Romeo did not return home. In quarto one Mercutio has two theories concerning Romeo whereabouts the night before while Benvolio has none. This is strange. In quarto two Mercutio and Benvolio both have an opinion and disagree. This is more logical. Hence, we can conclude that the line highlighted in yellow belonged to Benvolio, but the reporter accidentally put Benvolio's line by Mercutio's. This is therefore evidence for the memorial reconstruction theory.

Contradictory evidence can be found in the incredibly funny conversation between Romeo and Mercutio. They fire pun after pun at each other. However, one of these puns is lost in quarto one, because the lines in which the clue is explained is cut in this quarto. Mercutio and Romeo are talking about the reason why Romeo did not return home the previous night. Mercutio hints that he thinks that Romeo went to Rosaline and spent the night with her. The sexual hint is clearly communicated in the lines above the pink lines. In the pink lines Romeo pretends not to understand the sexual meaning of Mercutio's remark. This makes the pun clear by pointing out the double meaning. However, in quarto one the pink lines are cut and thus the double meaning does not become very clear. This is probably inaccurate cutting: this is probably not done in a revision phase as Shakespeare must have critically looked at his writing then. Cutting a line which made a pun unclear would probably not have happened in this phase. Cutting with less focus and attention would more likely have happened in the phase in which the play was made into a script. This had to happen quickly and speed is always combined with less attention and therefore more inaccuracies are likely. This is evidence supporting the theatrical adaptation theory.

Thirdly, at the end of the scene in quarto one many of the Nurse and Romeo's lines are missing. In this passage Romeo and the nurse talk about their plan and Paris. Nothing really important to the plot is discussed nor is something funny said. Therefore, these lines could be cut without a problem: this is evidence for the theatrical adaption as the play needed to be shortened.

Act 2 scene 5

This scene differs enormously throughout: a lot of lines are missing and there are few corresponding lines present. This means that a lot of lines present in quarto two do not have a relatively similar line in quarto one and vice versa. However, both quartos follow the same format: Juliet is waiting for her Nurse to come back, the Nurse comes back, but does not want to reveal what Romeo said while Juliet is begging her for the news. Finally the Nurse tells Juliet what Romeo said and where they will marry. In quarto two the part of the scene in which the Nurse refuses to tell Juliet what Romeo said is longer than in quarto one. Due to the fact that the scene differs hugely, but does have the same intent, I see this as evidence for the revision theory. Shakespeare wanted to keep the meaning of this scene intact, but was not happy with the execution in quarto two. Therefore, he partly rewrote this scene in quarto one.

Act 2 scene 6

This scene is completely different in both quartos: there almost no corresponding lines and the order in which the characters speak is different and the message the characters want to transfer is dissimilar. The scene is so different that the link between quarto one and two is not obvious. Thus, this is neither evidence for the memorial reconstruction theory nor for theatrical adaptation. A reporter makes mistakes; he gets confused over certain words or whose line it was. However, the reporter would never change a scene this drastically. Neither could this be evidence for the theatrical adaptation theory: the play needed to be swiftly cut into a script so it could be performed soon. Even though the scene in quarto one is shorter, what the person who made the play into a script wanted to achieve, it would be a waste of time to rewrite a scene. He could simply cut lines to shorten to scene; this is less time consuming. The only logical reason is that Shakespeare was not happy with this scene and decided to rewrite it. Hence, this is evidence for the revision theory.

Act 3 scene 1

Firstly, in quarto two Tybalt enters in the company of Petruchio and so called others. However, in quarto one Tybalt enters on his own: he is the only Capulet. In quarto one this scene required fewer actors. This suggests that quarto one was adapted for the stage. The fact that Benvolio announces Tybalt as a Capulet, singular, in quarto one in contrary to the Capulets in quarto two strengthens this argument.

Secondly, in quarto two, Tybalt accuses Romeo of doing him injuries and then commands Romeo to turn and draw, to which Romeo responds with the line:

‘I do protest I neuer iniuried thee,’

In quarto one, Romeo’s response is the same, but Tybalt’s line is different. Tybalt does not accuse Romeo of doing him injuries, but simply states that words will not solve the problem: Romeo has no choice but to fight. Thus, the following line of Romeo gets a little bit lost in quarto one as Romeo refers to the injuries he is accused of, but Tybalt did not accuse Romeo of doing him injuries in quarto one. The reporter must have forgotten the exact lines of Tybalt and forgot the injuries in his line. It seems as if the reporter could only remember part of the clue:

‘therefore turne and draw.’

and changed the command of quarto two into a reply of Romeo’s earlier refusal to fight. The command to draw was preserved in quarto one. This is evidence for the memorial reconstruction theory.

Act 3 scene 2

This scene is not particularly interesting for analysing the differences between the quartos, because there are no major dissimilarities, except the number of lines. The scene follows the same pattern in both quartos: Juliet is looking forward to her wedding night, but then the Nurse enters with dreadful news. Juliet at first thinks that Romeo is dead, but later finds out that Tybalt is murdered by Romeo. The Nurse condemns Romeo for this deed which angers Juliet as she will not hear a word against Romeo. Juliet then wonders why Romeo murdered Tybalt and it seems as if she is starting to get angry at him for this, but she realizes that if Romeo did not kill Tybalt Romeo would have died instead. Next Juliet finds out that Romeo is banished which she finds even worse than Tybalt's death. She decides to cry for Romeo when her parents have stopped crying for Tybalt. The scene ends with the Nurse promising Juliet that she will find Romeo, so Juliet can still spend her wedding night with him. This makes Juliet happy and she asks the Nurse to give Romeo a ring. This order can be seen in quarto one and two. The only difference is length: quarto one is much shorter. Quarto one was shortened in order to perform it in roughly two hours. This is evidence supporting the theatrical adaptation theory.

Act 3 scene 3

The major difference in this scene is the length of the Friar's monologue. He is giving a speech in which he tries to convince Romeo not to commit suicide. This message is clear in both quarto one and two. However, his monologue is longer in quarto two than in quarto one and thus we can conclude that this evidence for the theatrical adaptation theory.

Act 3 scene 4

This very short scene does not include many differences. However, the difference in length is noteworthy: quarto one is shorter than quarto two. This supports the theatrical adaptation theory.

Act 3 scene 5

Firstly, the first time the nurse is different in the two quartos. In quarto two the Nurse enters and then Romeo finally decides to leave the room and go, because of the Nurse's warning. Within the scene this is very logical, because Romeo and Juliet are clearly delaying the moment Romeo has to leave by talking about him leaving. Without the warning Romeo's sudden decision to leave would be unrealistic. However, this is what happens in quarto one: Romeo just said his goodbyes and then the Nurse enters. This removes the tension resulting from the message of the Nurse as Romeo and Juliet already said their goodbyes. Hence, the placement of the lines of the Nurse must be a mistake of the reporter.

Later in the scene, we see evidence that supports the theatrical adaptation theory. In quarto one Juliet says:

Iu: Good father heare me speake?

And then the stage direction states that she kneels down to beg her father to stop the marriage. In quarto two Juliet states:

*Iu. Good Father, I beseech you on my knees,
Heare me with patience, but to speake a word.*

Here the lines need to clarify that Juliet crouches down to her knees, because apparently the writer expects you not to see it. This quarto seems to be written specifically for reading purposes. In quarto one this is missing, because the writer knew that this line would be unnecessary for an audience. Quarto one must therefore be meant for the stage.

Thirdly, this scene is shorter in quarto one, but includes all vital information. Thus, we can conclude that this is evidence supporting the theatrical adaptation.

Act 4 scene 1

The most noteworthy thing in this scene is the length. Quarto one is shorter than quarto two, but quarto one does not miss any important information. This is evidence for the theatrical adaptation theory.

Act 4 scene 2

In quarto two more people are supposed to enter than in quarto one: with the beginning in both of the quartos Capulet, his wife and the Nurse are on stage and are later joined by Juliet. In quarto two, two or three serving men are present at the start of the scene while in quarto one only one serving man is accompanying the Capulets. Quarto one already eliminated one to two actors. However, by making the serving man leave after his conversation with Capulet, there are never more than four people on stage in quarto one with this scene. This could be very convenient if this play was played by small company such as Shakespeare's. This is evidence for the theatrical adaptation theory.

Act 4 scene 3

This scene differs a little bit in multiple lines, but the only major difference is again the length. The monologue of Juliet is much longer in quarto two than in quarto one. This evidence supports the theatrical adaptation theory.

Act 4 scene 4

This short scene does not contain many differences, except the length. Quarto one is shorter than quarto two. However, no vital information is missing in quarto one. Therefore, this must be evidence in favour of the theatrical adaptation theory.

Act 4 scene 5

The first thing I notice in this scene is a line that in quarto two belongs to Lady Capulet, but in quarto one is part of Paris' lines and is slightly different. In quarto two Lady Capulet uses four adjectives to describe the horrible day on which she thinks Juliet died, while in quarto one Paris describes with three adjectives that he is a man you should feel sorry for. Even though the four adjectives of Lady Capulet are beautiful as they express how sad she feels, a tricolon, which Paris uses in quarto one, always comes across stronger. This line is stronger if it is Paris', because everyone can perfectly well believe that the death of a daughter is the most awful thing a parent can experience, but for Paris the sadness is less obvious. This was an arranged marriage which means that Paris was not necessarily in love with Juliet or loved her, but married her for her status and beauty. Paris has to specify that he is absolutely shattered by Juliet's death, which he does in this beautiful, dramatic line. Thus, this line is stronger if it contains three adjectives, instead of four, and belongs to Paris. Shakespeare must have revised this line and rewrote it. This evidence supports the revision theory.

Secondly, it seems as if a mistake was made in quarto one in a line of a minstrel. In quarto one the musician says that if the servant will make them sing, the musicians will hear him. It is quite vague what the minstrel means by this: does he simply establish the fact that they will hear the servant Peter (in quarto one the servant does not receive a name, but in quarto two he is called Peter) try or is he incredibly sarcastic? This is neither clear nor funny. However, in quarto two the response of the musician is very witty: he responds to a question of Peter, which also seems forgotten in quarto one, whether he will hear Peter. The musician turns this around: if the servant will the minstrels sing, Peter will hear them, because they will then be singing. This pun gets completely lost in quarto one. The reporter must have forgotten the question of Peter and must have accidentally changed the musician's line. This is evidence for the memorial reconstruction.

In the last highlighted lines Peter says in both quartos that he will put away his dagger and beat the musicians with his wit. However, the lines in quarto one say this more beautiful than in quarto two. In quarto two Peter is talking about his iron wit and iron dagger, while in quarto one it is his iron dagger and his wooden wit. This is stronger as Peter wants to clarify the difference: he will not attack the musicians with violence, but with words. By also using different materials to describe these different means to attack, the contrast is clearer. Shakespeare must have changed this. This is evidence in favour of the revision theory.

Act 5 scene 1

The first piece of evidence can be found in one of Romeo's lines. Romeo has just heard that Juliet died and decides that he wants to end his banishment. In quarto one it is specified again that he is now in Mantua, but in quarto two it is simply said that he will leave from here. On stage it would be very convenient if Romeo would repeat his current location, so Romeo's change of cities would not become too confusing. It was already mentioned several times in the play that Romeo was banished to Mantua, but a repetition of this information, with all that happens in the play, would do no harm. Especially as there would not be any stage; no decor that would reveal that Romeo was going from one city to another. Quarto two was, however, meant for reading: you could simply read back a little if you got confused about Romeo's locations. Therefore, it was not necessary for Romeo to state his current location. This is evidence for the theatrical adaptation theory.

Secondly, the response of Balthasar to Romeo's statement that he wants to go to Verona is different in the quartos and thus tells us something about Romeo's emotional state after Juliet's death. In quarto one Balthasar expresses more fear for Romeo: his looks are extremely disturbing and the possibility that Romeo will do something dangerous comes across stronger. Therefore, Balthasar refuses to leave Romeo. In quarto two it seems as if Balthasar merely warns Romeo not to do anything dangerous: this suggests that Romeo is showing less sadness than in quarto one. The emotional impact of Juliet's death on Romeo seems bigger in quarto one. In this scene Shakespeare would have wanted to show how devastated Romeo was after Juliet's death: his world has collapsed. Shakespeare must have rewritten these lines to ascertain that the excruciating impact of Juliet's death would be as clear as possible. This evidence supports the revision theory.

Act 5 scene 2

The length of this scene is different in the quartos: the scene is shorter in quarto one than in quarto two. It would not be strange to cut this scene to the bare minimum in quarto one if you needed to cut lines to ensure that the play would not take too long as this scene is not specifically interesting, but only needs to give certain information. The audience needed to understand that a terrible misunderstanding was about to happen: Romeo did not receive the letter in which was explained what truly happened to Juliet. This becomes clear in quarto one. In quarto two Shakespeare could spend more lines on this scene, because there was no time limit for how long reading the play could take. The difference of length point towards the theatrical adaptation theory.

Act 5 scene 3

Firstly, in one of the stage directions, props seem to have been forgotten in quarto one: the Friar only brings a light to the graveyard, when aiming to save Juliet. In quarto two the Friar does bring tools with him in order to open the tomb. It is completely unbelievable that the Friar would not have brought any tools to open the tomb, since he obviously knew that these were needed: he even asked Friar John in the previous scene in quarto one to bring him a spade and a mattock. Those were clearly going to be used to open the grave. This stage direction also contradicts one of the watches' lines later in the scene:

1. Captaine hears a Fryer

with tooles about him,

This shows that the Friar should have brought tools with him. It seems as if the reporter forgot these props in the stage directions, but did remember the lines that indicate the presence of these props. This is evidence for the memorial reconstruction theory.

The second piece of evidence again concerns the Friar; the Friar urges Juliet to hurry up and get away with him from the grave, so they will not be suspected of the murders of Paris and Romeo. The Friar is really scared for the latter, but this becomes clearer in quarto one because of the highlighted line. This line specifically states what he is afraid of. Due to the absence of this line in quarto two, this is not as clear. This is a shame, because this sentiment beautifully shows how far the Friar's good intentions go: he wants the conflict between the Capulets and the Montagues to end, but he also does not want to sacrifice himself for that cause. Getting arrested is obviously too much to ask. This evidence supports the revision theory.

Thirdly, in quarto one two lines are omitted that are present in quarto two. These two pink lines suggest that Juliet's mother is quite old. This contradicts with her words in act 1 scene 3 of quarto two from which we could conclude that she is in her twenties. Therefore, it is more plausible to think that these are her feelings after losing her daughter for the second time. However, any reference to age, whether actual or emotional, limits the casting possibilities. A slightly older actor could not play this character anymore. A reference to an 'emotional' age is also confusing for the audience, because they do not have the time to analyse Lady Capulet's age to come to the conclusion that she must be in her twenties, but that she just feels really old. It is far easier not to include any references to age in a script. This is why these lines are missing in quarto one: for the convenience of the company and the audience. This is evidence for the theatrical adaptation theory.

Conclusion

By analysing the differences in quarto one and two of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, this research paper aims to find an answer to which theory explains the multiple versions of Shakespeare's play best.

The memorial reconstruction theory implies that quarto one is based on quarto two: quarto one was written down from memory by an actor, who acted in the company that performed quarto two. This reporter, however, did not have a flawless memory and so differences between the quartos emerged. The role or roles this/these reporter(s) played remain unclear: no conclusive evidence points to specific part(s). Because of this theory, quarto one was very long thought of as the 'bad' quarto due to bad morals associated with the deed of the reporter: he supposedly 'stole' Shakespeare's work and made money out of it. Over the years, more and more scholars started to disagree with this connotation: the reporter probably had neither malicious intent when writing the play down nor did he earn any money by doing this. Hence the negative term 'bad' quarto is being used less and less. This does not mean the theory has lost all its validity: the differences between the two quartos could still be explained by a reporter's faulty memory.

The revision theory is based on the belief that Shakespeare did not stop revising his plays, but that it was a continuous project. Quarto one and two were both written by him, but quarto two was simply the earlier version. This is revealed in a number of false starts and repetitions in quarto two.

The theatrical adaptation theory considers quarto one a script, but quarto two a document that was meant to be read. A play could not take much longer than two hours, so in order not to go over this time constraint, cuts were necessary. Quarto two did not have any time limit and thus more lines could be present in this version. These different purposes for the quartos could explain the differences between the two quartos.

The provinces theory differs only slightly from the theatrical adaptation theory discussed above. This theory deems quarto one not just a script that could be used for any occasion, but a script written especially for touring in the provinces. I did not find any evidence for this theory and therefore do not consider this theory as a serious possibility.

On the next page I have categorized the evidence found along the lines of the four theories above; as mentioned I didn't find any evidence for the theatrical adaptation for the provinces theory.

Theories	Part of the play	Page play	Page thesis
Memorial reconstruction	Act 1 scene 1	3	16
	Act 1 scene 4	16	19
	Act 1 scene 5	21	20
	Act 2 scene 1	22	22
	Act 2 scene 3	30	24
	Act 2 scene 4	32	25
	Act 3 scene 1	43	28
	Act 3 scene 5	58 & 59	32
	Act 4 scene 5	76	37
	Act 5 scene 3	84	40
Revision theory	Prologue of act 1	1	15
	Act 1 scene 2	8	17
	Act 1 scene 4	14	19
	Prologue of act 2	22	21
	Act 2 scene 1	23	22
	Act 2 scene 3	29	24
	Act 2 scene 5	37-40	26
	Act 2 scene 6	40-41	27
	Act 4 scene 5	74	37
	Act 4 scene 5	76	37
	Act 5 scene 1	77	38
	Act 5 scene 3	85	40

Theories	Part of the play	Page play	Page thesis
Theatrical adaptation theory	Prologue of act 1	1	15
	Act 1 scene 1	2	16
	Act 1 scene 1	2-8	16
	Act 1 scene 3	13	18
	Act 1 scene 3	11-14	18
	Act 1 scene 4	14	19
	Act 1 scene 5	17	20
	Act 2 scene 2	27	23
	Act 2 scene 4	33	25
	Act 2 scene 4	37	25
	Act 3 scene 1	42	28
	Act 3 scene 2	47-51	29
	Act 3 scene 3	55	30
	Act 3 scene 4	56-57	31
	Act 3 scene 5	62	32
	Act 3 scene 5	57-65	32
	Act 4 scene 1	65-68	33
	Act 4 scene 2	68 & 69	34
	Act 4 scene 3	70-72	35
	Act 4 scene 4	72-73	36
	Act 5 scene 1	77	38
	Act 5 scene 2	79-80	39
	Act 5 scene 3	87	40

I found evidence for all the theories discussed above, except for the theatrical adaptation for the provinces theory. As I explained above this theory is not supported by any evidence found; I will therefore not consider this theory valid. Looking at the table of evidence, it is obvious that most evidence supports the theatrical adaptation theory. I consider this theory most believable: both the secondary sources I read about all theories and the analysis of the play point in the direction of this theory. It was customary for plays to be approximately two hours long: keeping the attention of your audience for much longer is not feasible. Quarto two could never have been performed in two hours and thus quarto two is simply too long for the stage. I therefore believe that the main reason for the widespread differences between the two quartos is the fact that they were written for entirely different purposes. Another practical issue supports this theory as well. The number of actors varies vastly between the two quartos, which can again be explained by the theatrical adaptation theory: quarto one requires less people in the play than quarto two. A company did not consist of very many actors, so a company could not have six mute roles in a scene. This conveniently does not happen in quarto one, because Shakespeare was aware of the limitations of the company. In quarto two however this would be possible because it was written for reading and so there are no limitations to the number of characters per scene.

However, I do not think that this theory can account entirely for the differences between the two quartos. I think these came to be through a combination of nearly all theories. The theatrical adaptation theory assumes that Shakespeare must have gone through his play again in order to cut many lines. However, I find it hard to believe that a creative mastermind such as Shakespeare could read through his play to cut lines without making some changes here and there. I do not think any artist could do this, because perfection will never be achieved: you can always make your work just a little bit better. Lines and conversations can be wittier, sharper and funnier. I think that Shakespeare made little improvements in the play during the cutting process, which means the theatrical adaptation theory actually led to the revision theory being partly true. However, the revision theory establishes this as the reason for all the differences in quarto one and I do not agree with this; I do think that it explains some of the differences. Shakespeare did not only cut and improve his play during this process: he also made sloppy cuts every once in a while, probably because shortening a play was extremely dull work. The sloppy cuts cannot be explained by the revision theory and point therefore in the direction of the theatrical adaptation theory.

As to the memorial reconstruction theory: I think the published version of quarto one is based on memorial reconstruction, but according to me it is impossible that memorial reconstruction would have led to such an extreme reduction of the number of lines in quarto one, compared to quarto two.

It is not plausible that the script of quarto one was given to the publisher by one of the players, because none of the players had the entire script: they usually only received their own lines in writing. It is therefore logical that a reporter wrote the play down from memory and that this somehow ended up at the printer. I think it is wildly implausible that a reporter would have forgotten more than 25 percent of the lines spoken and therefore do not agree with the fact that the reporter wrote down the play of quarto two, which the memorial reconstruction theory implies. In my opinion the reporter had nothing to do with quarto two: he tried to write down the version behind quarto one, the version which had already been adapted for theatrical purposes. However, due to the defects of the human memory, a few mistakes slipped into quarto one. The memorial reconstruction theory as presented in most secondary literature has lost its validity through the analysis of the differences between the quartos, but is valid as an add-on to the theatrical adaptation theory.

We will never be completely certain as to the origin of the different quartos of William Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, but by painstakingly comparing and analysing the two versions, I have come to the conclusion that, even though there is not one definite answer, most evidence points in the direction of the theatrical adaptation theory. I do, however, think that the revision and memorial reconstruction theory have played an important part in the creation of the different quartos: not on their own, as quite a few Shakespeare experts believe, but as supporting theories for the theatrical adaptation theory.

Bibliography

- Erne, L. (2007). *The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Folger Shakespeare Library. (2008). *Shakespeare's theatre*. [online]. Available at: <https://www.folger.edu/shakespeares-theater> [Accessed 25 July 2019]
- <https://teach.shakespearesglobe.com/fact-sheet-audiences> [Accessed 25 July 2019]
- <https://teach.shakespearesglobe.com/fact-sheet-costumes-and-cosmetics?previous=/library> [Accessed 25 July 2019]
- Pollard, A. (1909). *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos: A Study in the Bibliography of Shakespeare's Plays 1594-1685*. London: Methuen and Company
- Greg, W. (1910). *Shakespeare's 'Merry Wives of Windsor', 1602*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Hoppe, H. (1948). *The Bad Quarto of 'Romeo and Juliet': A Bibliographical and Textual Study*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- Werstine, P. (1990). *Narratives about Printed Shakespeare Texts: "Foul Papers" and "Bad Quartos"*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Blayney, P. (1997) *The publication of playbooks*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- McLeod, R. (1982) *The Marriage of Good and Bad Quartos*. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 33/4.
- Irace, K. (1994) *Reforming the 'Bad' Quartos: Performance and Provenance of Six Shakespearean First Editions*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.
- Chambers, E. (1930) *William Shakespeare: A Study Of Facts And Problems Vol I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mooney, M. (1990) *Text and Performance: Romeo and Juliet, Quartos 1 and 2*. *Colby Quarterly*: Vol. 26.
- Orgel, S. (2002) *The Authentic Shakespeare*. London: Routledge.
- Thomson, L. (1995) *"With patient ears attend": "Romeo and Juliet" on the Elizabethan stage*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Poetry Foundation (2007). *Shakespearean sonnet*. [online]. (Last updated 2015). Available at: <https://www.poetryfoundation.org/learn/glossary-terms/shakespearean-sonnet> [Accessed 5 August 2019].



Marijn Boomars
November 2019