

Shakespeare for the ‘Triers’

Richard Hawkins and Q2 *Othello* at the Serjeants’ Inn¹

JENNIFER YOUNG

ABSTRACT

In 1630 the Stationer Richard Hawkins began selling an edition of Shakespeare’s *Othello* from ‘his shoppe in Chancery-Lane, neere Sergeants-Inne’. This edition, identified by modern scholars as Q2, is remarkable as the first edition to fully conflate existent quarto and folio texts of a Shakespeare play. Scholars have remarked on the process that brought Q2 into being — but the question of why a 17th century publisher/bookseller would invest the time and money to create such an edition remains to be answered. This article decenters the author to reconsider Q2’s place amongst the people and ideas of the area in which it was published and sold: the Serjeants’ Inn in the heart of the Inns of court area of London. The article examines how Hawkins fashioned the books sold in his shop to entice this local readership. Literary and textual evidence from the Quarto is then reconsidered in the light of this new readership, providing new insights into the construction of this unique quarto and its place in modern editions of *Othello*. This article also highlights the extent to which individual members of the book trade in the early 17th century engaged with local readerships and the value of second-plus editions to the market.

¹ Many thanks to the Literature and Creative Writing Research Group and the FLAS ECR Network at the University of Greenwich for funding that supported this research. Thanks also to the respondents at The Early Modern Inns of Court and Circulation of Text Conference, (King’s College London 2019) for their helpful feedback on the paper that was the foundation of this article.

The 1630 edition of William Shakespeare's *The Tragedy of Othello the Moor of Venice* is an outlier amongst early modern Shakespeare in print. It does not follow the editorial tradition in which subsequent quarto and folio editions developed in separate, parallel tracks that preserved the historical differences between the two. Instead, the 1630 *Othello* (hereafter referred to as Q2) contains evidence across all five acts of its two textual predecessors: the 1622 first quarto and the 1623 First Folio. These variants appear *'passim'* throughout the play and range in extent from single words and phrases to more than thirty passages of anywhere from one to twenty-two lines', making it the earliest surviving instance of a conflated edition of a Shakespeare play (Hinman 377). Charlton Hinman's 'The "Copy" for the Second Quarto of *Othello* (1630)' revealed a substantial process behind the unique make up of Q2. Numerous comparisons and decisions were made between the Q1 and F1 texts, and then these choices were either copied directly into the copy of Q1 or, in the case of longer passages, transcribed onto slips of paper that were then inserted into the copy text quarto.

Q2 is therefore a record of hundreds of choices made between 'equally appropriate and equally Shakespearean' Q1 and F1 readings. However, because it lacks the proximity of first editions to a writer's copy, Q2 is predominately used by editors and textual scholars as supporting evidence in discussions of authorized variants and readings (Sanders 206). For example, even though he found it 'not the least bit authoritative' the editor M. R. Ridley advocated use of the 'eclectic' Q2 for determining the 'true' text of the play (Ridley 232). In his essay 'The Second Quarto of *Othello* and the Question of Textual Authority' Thomas L. Berger examined the quality of fifteen Q2 readings in order to assess how the quarto could 'help (or hinder)

a determination of the “text” of *Othello*’ (32). And while Hinman’s research revealed the compelling process of Q2’s construction, his interest in Q2 was focused on demonstrating the Quarto’s lack of independent textual authority in order to challenge its use in scholarly editions. In the examples above, as well as the numerous instances where Q2 is silently included in modern editions, interest in Q2 extends only so far as what it can tell us about Shakespeare’s intentions for *Othello*. This is not unreasonable in the context of editorial practice. However, broader discussions now being undertaken by studies in cultural geography and history of the book are illuminating textual narratives of transmission and reception beyond questions of authorial intention and modern editorial practice. Zachary Lesser’s *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication* for instance, has shown how shifting the focus from author-centered studies of intention to publisher/bookseller’s contributions as pivotal ‘primary readers and interpreters’ could reveal new narratives of local transmission and reception (23). Such a shift is necessary even for a second-plus edition like Q2 *Othello* where Shakespeare’s authority and intentions for the play continue to dominate its textual narrative, leaving other questions about Q2’s unique makeup and its place in the local landscape of the early modern book trade unconsidered.

While textual scholars recognize Q2 as the work of a ‘careful contemporary’, it is anachronistic to think this 17th century agent shared the same focus on creating the most Shakespearean text of *Othello* that drives modern editorial practice. As such, the compelling question of why this text came to exist in the form and the place that it did remains ripe for examination within a localized book history approach. This article therefore shifts focus from the connections between Q2 and its playwright to the

Quarto's place in the social-cultural landscape of the neighborhood where it was published and sold: the shop of the Stationer Richard Hawkins 'neere the Serjeants' Inn in Chancery Lane'.² In *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication*, Zachary Lesser demonstrated that play texts were chosen and fashioned by publishers to appeal to a particular niche market of local clientele (2). It stands to reason that Hawkins's decision to publish Q2 was similarly informed by his knowledge of his current and anticipated customers. The textual narrative that follows resituates Q2 *Othello* in Hawkins's publication output by gathering a range of literary and textual evidence from his dramatic and non-dramatic publications including paratexts written by the Stationer and his authors. Highlighting common themes of legal and literary/poetic language across these texts will connect Hawkins's repertoire, including Q2 *Othello*, to the interests of his local niche market in the Inns of Court area. As a case study of one stationer and his publication output, this research is not representative of all stationers or the entire book market of the time. Regardless, examining the relationship between these texts, historical records of Hawkins's business and the neighborhood in which he lived and worked will offer new insights into the particular origins of Q2 and the contemporary influences that helped shape this unique play quarto. It will also highlight the additional knowledge to be gained by decentering the author and studying second-plus editions like Q2 in the locale and time of their production while adding to our knowledge of individual stationer practice.

² In transcriptions, tall 's' is modernized, other original spellings are maintained and spacing around punctuation is modernized for consistency.

On 1 March 1628, the *Stationers' Register* records that the rights to 'Orthello the More of Venice' were transferred from Thomas Walkley to Richard Hawkins (Arber 4, 194). Two years later, sometime in 1630, Hawkins began selling quartos of what is now known as the Q2 of *Othello* from his shop on Chancery Lane. It is Hawkins's first Shakespeare publication — he would go on to become part of the syndicate responsible for the Second Folio — but he was not new to the book trade nor to Chancery Lane.³ The earliest surviving imprint bearing Hawkins's name is the first edition of Elizabeth Cary's *The Tragedy of Mariam* (STC 4613, 1613). It describes his shop 'in Chancery Lane, neere vnto Sargeants Inne'. Imprints of all subsequent publications over the next twenty-two years of Hawkins's career as publisher, bookseller, and bookbinder until his death in 1635, connect Hawkins's shop to Chancery Lane and the Sergeants' Inn.⁴ An accounts book detailing rents collected by the Serjeants' Inn from 1621 to 1658 shows that the Inn had a string of tenants in properties on both sides of their main gate on Chancery Lane. The accounts book's first entry separates payments by properties to the south and the north of the gate and lists 'Richard Hawkins bookbinder' as renting the last shop in a row of eight properties to the north of the Gate and 'adjoyning the Rolls' (PRO 30/23 2). In addition to helping to pinpoint the precise location of Hawkins's shop, the accounts of rent collected reveal the first connection between Hawkins and the Serjeants: he was

³ See Jennifer Young, 'Minding their Fs and Qs: Shakespeare and the Fleet Street Syndicate' in *Historical Networks in the Book Trade*, Ed. John Hinks and Catherine Feely, (Routledge, 2016).

⁴ There are 2 minor but interesting variants: 'adjoyning to Sarjeants Inn gate' (STC 1683, refers to a brief period when he paid rent on two properties on the street) and one from 1628 (STC 1341) which refers to him as 'dwelling' at the same address.

not only ‘neere’ them, he was known by name and profession to at least the Serjeants who took turns collecting the rents.⁵

Because the Serjeants’ Inn differs in structure and population from the Inns typically discussed in relation to early modern drama, it is useful to take a moment and consider Hawkins’s landlords. The Serjeants’ Inn, also known as the ‘Order of the Coif’ for the white linen cap that was part of their formal dress, was a society of the most senior level of law practitioners. Members were originally chosen from amongst those who had risen through the hierarchy of the other Inns of Court to the highest rank of Bencher or ‘master of the Bench’.⁶ Nominees were appointed by the crown on the advice of the Chief Justice of the Court of Common pleas (Prest 16). These members had unique rights to Petition the court of Common Pleas and it was from this select group that the common law judges for the rest of the country were chosen.

When a member of the Inns joined the Serjeants, they were expected to move out of their old Inn and into the Serjeants’ Inn— a move symbolized by the dramatic ringing of the bells of their old Inn as if marking a death. As a result, the population of the Serjeants’ Inn was markedly different from the other Inns of Court and Chancery. Consisting of only the most senior members, it was generally an older cohort and because members all migrated from other Inns as fully-formed lawyers, there were no

⁵ Evidence of connection between rent collection and actual members of the Inn in the accounts shows Serjeants taking turns with the accounts book, naming themselves in an entry where they reconcile the accounts and hand over the book to a new member (PRO 30/23). There are also collections of entries notated with ‘pay to mee of’ by each entry of payment.

⁶ The typical progression was inner barrister, outer or utter barrister, reader, and then Bencher. A useful description of the stages and their roles can be found in Winston, *Lawyers at Play* pp. 30-33.

students living or working in this Inn. We can therefore imagine it lacking much of the energy and activity depicted in diaries and anecdotes of the Inns' student population typically cited in studies of early modern drama. With education of students not a focus, the Serjeants' Inn lacked the typical schedule of moots and lectures of other Inns, and as the *Records of Early English Drama* reveals, there are no dramatic performances at the Serjeants' Inn. Lack of on-site performance, as we shall see, does not necessarily denote a lack of interest in plays or the creative potential of language. Comprised of senior and established professionals, it is also a wealthier membership. As the biographies of some Serjeants' from the time suggest, they were often already wealthy and connected men.⁷ It is perhaps not surprising then that it was also expensive to become a Serjeant. A significant investment was required just to be admitted: all new Serjeants were required to hold a large feast, to gift gold rings to their friends, to provide liveries to members of their household and servants and to make a payment of £500 to the King. Despite its costly beginnings, the post was also potentially lucrative: those who became judges would travel the circuit and could 'expect to be paid either £1 or £2 for an appearance in court' (Megarry 621). In addition, many Serjeants held other posts: many were MPs at some point in their careers, while others held positions within the crown government.

The list of other businesses run by Hawkins's neighbors around the gate supports this profile of a higher class of men living in proximity. Alongside Hawkins, the Serjeants' Inn accounts book list as tenants in shops near the gate a barber, glover, girdler, sempster, spurrier, chandler, haberdasher, and ribbon seller. It is a row of

⁷ Studies of a number of prominent Serjeants suggest these connections might have had a hand in their getting their appointments. See for example, *ODNB* entry for 'Sir Richard Hutton *bap.* 1561, *d.* 1639' by Wilfred Prest.

shops not aimed at providing essentials but accessories — particularly indicators of status. In short, it is a row of shops for gentlemen and gentry.⁸ Surviving portraits of Serjeants from the 16th and 17th century — the fact that they have portraits also being a mark of status — depict these men as well-presented in their judicial fashions: often shown in robes, ruff and coif. Attention to looks seems to matter in this class of Inns man as even the biographer of Serjeant-at-law Sir Edward Coke feels it is necessary to point out Coke’s ‘well-kept beard’ (Boyer *ODNB*).⁹ This desire for Inns men like the Serjeants to be seen as a ‘cut above’ will be revisited shortly in another aspect of Inns’ life.

Proximity, however, does not guarantee patronage. Fortunately, textual evidence from Hawkins’s publications also suggests that his shop was patronized by higher status Inns men like the Serjeants-at-law. Hawkins’s 1623 publication of John Penkethman’s translation *A Handful of Honesty or Cato in English* (STC 4861) is dedicated to ‘the Masters, Benchers, and Presidents of the *Honourable Houses of Court and Chancery*’ but first makes special mention of ‘the judges and patrons of Law and Equitie’ (STC 4861, A3r). Penkethman expresses a particular interest in the judges in his preface by likening his intended readers to the Roman orator Cato:

Who being first a Pleader high in grace,

At length possessed the chiefe Iudges place;

⁸ The page is entitled ‘A Rentall of the shoppes belonginge to serieants Inne in Chancery as ther are now lett this year 1621’ (PRO 30/23 2). Changes to ownership of the shops in these lists were infrequent during the years Hawkins is listed (1621-1635). There are also periodic references in the accounts to the Inn paying for repairs to the shops and the street in front, suggesting the SI were attentive landlords and that this was a good place to rent a shopfront and run a business.

⁹ Perhaps at some point visiting the shop of the barber Adam Palmer.

[...]

Nor surely is that Appellation due,

in this worst age, to any more then you. (A3v, ll. 9-10, 13-14)

By noting Cato's career trajectory from 'Pleader' to judge and then arguing that his readers are due equal 'Appellation', Penkethman identifies and then flatters the select group within the Inns of court that have risen to the highest position in the practice of law. A review of Penkethman's broader publication output shows the author had a practice of dedicating or tailoring publications to very specific groups located near the shop in which they were sold.¹⁰ Penkethman's localised approach to marketing and selling his writing, his highlighting of judges on a publication sold just near the gate of the Serjeants' Inn, and the fact that for a time he resided just behind Hawkins's shop 'at the Rolls', suggests Penkethman was familiar with the area and its residents and recognized Hawkins's shop as a place that the judges would frequent (Hewins *ODNB*).

Additional examples, though more subtle in their approach, include points of marketing and presentation that also indicate connections with the Serjeants. Drawing on the Inn as a home of many of the nation's judges, the description on the title page of Hawkins's 1625 publication of *Animadversions upon Lillies grammar or Lilly Scanned* (STC 25867) notes that the grammatical problems discussed within were 'Gathered out of the Inquiries, and *Disputes of the most judicious GRAMMARIANS*',

¹⁰ See for examples particular to upper class readers, *The Epigrams of P. Virgilius Maro [...]* (STC 24825, 1624), *Cato In English Verse [...]* (STC 4862, 1624), and more general shaping to readers: *Artachthos or A New Book declaring the Assise or Weight of Bread [...]*. (STC 19598, 1638), *The Purchaser's Pinacle* (STC 19600.8, 1629).

hinting at a select group of the most discerning Latin scholars. In this case, it can also be read as a pun on the profession of many in the nearby Inn.

In a similar manner, Markham Gervase's *Hobsons Horse-load of Letters: or A president for epistles* (STC 17360, 17360a), published by Hawkins in 1613 and again in 1617, also pays particular attention to a higher status of reader. A quarto collection of letters meant to be used as examples in writing for situations ranging from 'serious Negotiations, [to] wanton merriment' the book is marketed on its title page to men 'of what qualitie soeuer'. However, the title page makes sure to highlight the additional selling point that the collection is also 'not vnworthy the eyes of the most noblest spirits'. These lines are set apart by a thin border above and below and also surrounded by a generous amount of white space, allowing the title page to emphasize this particular appeal to the highest class of reader; a class that amongst the hierarchy of the Inns around Hawkins's Chancery Lane shop, would likely include the Serjeants.

Hawkins's personal contributions to texts he publishes and sells in his shop also reveal a strategy of connecting with these elite, judicious readers. Alongside his rights to *Othello*, Hawkins recorded his claim to three other plays in 1628 that he would go on to publish: *Philaster* (STC 1683, 1628), *The Maid's Tragedy* (STC 1679, 1630), and *A King and No King* (STC 1672, 1631) (Arber 4, 194).¹¹ Unlike his publications

¹¹ Hawkins is characteristic of the 'second-plus' edition publishers and booksellers noted by Farmer and Lesser ('Canons and Chronologies' 26). In addition to Q2 *Othello* each of these other printed play texts is a subsequent edition: *Philaster* (Q3 & Q4), *The Maid's Tragedy* (Q3), *A King and No King* (Q3). Hawkins's last play quarto before the 1628 group was *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall* (STC 25145, 1618). Hawkins's venture into drama at this time coincides with a market surge in selling identified by Farmer and Lesser ('Canons and Classics' 22).

of Penkethman and Gervase's work, the playwrights Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher were no longer alive to contribute to Hawkins's editions of their plays. As sole publisher with no possibility of direct authorial input, Hawkins had the most to gain — and lose — from the publications.¹² As a result, the connections to the exclusive readership of the Inns that appear in the paratexts to these editions can be confidently attributed to Hawkins's strategy to market to these readers. For example, the title pages of *Philaster*, *The Maid's Tragedy*, and *A King and No King* prominently identify their playwrights as "Gentleman" or "Gent". Because all men called to the bar were allowed to take the title 'Gentleman', reminding readers of Beaumont and Fletcher's status as university educated, and especially Beaumont's status a member of the Inner Temple, forges a connection between the authors and the various local law practitioners who lived and worked around Hawkins's Chancery Lane shop.¹³

The fashioning of these quartos as gentlemen's plays aimed at similarly gentle readers is more explicitly expressed in Hawkins's epistle to *Philaster* which instead of being addressed simply to 'readers' is directed by the Stationer to 'THE VNDERSTANDING / GENTRIE' (A2r). In this context Hawkins's description of them as 'understanding' reinforces the sense of inclusion: readers will understand his position because they are already a part of this exclusive group. Remembering that as

¹² See further Lesser *Renaissance Drama* and Peter W. M. Blayney, 'The Publication of Playbooks' in *A New History of Early English Drama* Ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan, 383-422. Evidence of the printer Augustine Matthew's contributions suggest his role was limited to printing the copy text with no visible evidence of him putting his personal stamp on these texts beyond his name in the imprint. See Jennifer Young, *Reading Shakespeare for Collaboration*, King's College London, 2012, unpublished dissertation, 132-4.

¹³ Winston 34.

a tenant of the Serjeants's Inn Hawkins was known by name and profession to at least some of the Serjeants makes it possible to read an additional level of connection into this address and suggest that it is possible he has these particular local Inns men in mind.

Beyond the title, attention to this audience also appears in the preface itself. Here, Hawkins employs a convention for his new edition promoted as 'The Third Impression' on the title page by arguing that while earlier quartos were 'swarm'd with errors' his is much improved. Textual scholars usually interpret such messages as straight-forward bookselling strategy for stationers of 'second-plus' editions like Hawkins's *Philaster*. However, Hawkins's reasoning takes an interesting turn when he credits the understanding gentry with the text's improvement. To do this, Hawkins fashions a series of images that conform to traditional marketing techniques but would also resonate in a distinct way with members of the Serjeants' Inn. Early in the preface, Hawkins suggests that his edition will be received with 'no lesse acceptance with improouement of [by] you likewise the Readers' (A2r, 9-10). In the world of stationers, 'readers' would mean what we expect – a broad reference to the 'Great Variety' of potential consumers of a printed text.¹⁴ However, in the world of the Inns, 'Reader' was a title that referred to a senior member of the Inns of Court who demonstrated their skill and knowledge by delivering a series of lectures on statute law. Successful readers could rise to become leaders of their Inn or 'Benchers'. Most relevant for our purposes, after a series of 2-3 readings, these men were eligible to

¹⁴ As a member of the stationer syndicate who would produce the 1632 Second Folio edition of Shakespeare's plays, Hawkins may have been familiar with John Heminge and Henry Condell's dedication at some point, though the desire to have as large a clientele as possible was likely a practical concern long before any encounter Hawkins had with the First Folio dedication or Shakespeare in particular.

become Serjeants-at-Law. It is therefore likely that any Serjeants who might visit Hawkins's shop were at some point in their careers this litigious type of Reader.

The above is the first of a series of phrasings in this preface that takes on an additional meaning when considered from the perspective of an Inns man. For example, Hawkins puts great stock in the impressions and knowledge of his readers, crediting them with improving the quality of the text during their repeated study and critique of the play. A play, Hawkins claims, is like 'pure Gold, which the more it hath been tried and refined, the better is esteemed' (A2v, 1-3). Readers, Serjeants-at-Law, and justices were regularly required to consider and critique existing laws and arguments as part of their professional practice. To emphasize their role and abilities, Hawkins refers to his readers as 'the skilfull Triers and Refiners' (A2v, 7). 'Triers', as Adrian Johns notes in *The Nature of the Book* is a term that could simply mean a critical reader (58). However, in the 16th and 17th century the term could also refer to those who pass judgement in a more official capacity, and it is not unreasonable to suggest that members of the law profession would be aware of this usage ("Trier," *OED* def. n. 1). The same may be said of Hawkins's description of the work of the triers as 'the infallible stamp of your iudicious censure' (A2v, 9-10).¹⁵ Describing it as 'censure', Hawkins further reinforces the litigious context of their judgement being 'judicious' by connecting it to additional law terminology. A similar relationship between Inns men and poetic critique is depicted in the Praeludium to Thomas Goffe's *The Careless Shepherdess* (revised production c.1638, published 1656) Where the

¹⁵ The *OED* notes a use of 'infallible censure' in 1567 *Baldwin's Treatise of Morall Phylosophy* ("censure," def. n. 1a).

character Spark, an Inns of Court man, chastises a country gentleman, establishing it as the realm of people of certain background:

Spar[k]. Dare you presume to censure Poetry?
 ‘Tis the Prerogative of the wits in Town,
 ‘Cause you have read perhaps a Statute-Book,
 And been High-Constable, do y’ think you know
 The Laws of Comedy and Tragedy?’ (B2r, 37 - B2v, 3).¹⁶

A final reference may be an attempt to poke fun at an emerging point of contention amongst the Serjeants. Hawkins describes his desire for their approval as being ‘(like a gainefull Office in this Age) eagerly sought for’ (A2v, 10-11) which could be a veiled comment on what was becoming a frequent occurrence in the Reign of Charles I of nominating new Serjeants from lower ranks of the Inns. This practice that resulted in men of ‘litle (sic) note or name’ suddenly being admitted to the otherwise exclusive Inn, was a point of contention amongst the nobler ranks of the Inn (Whitlock 588, Dugdale 112-3). Hawkins’s use of this image suggests an awareness of the nuances of Inns hierarchy, and of the concerns and controversies amongst the Serjeants and other law practitioners who lived and worked nearby.

With their well-honed skills in critique and analysis, Hawkins’s readers from the Serjeants’ and other Inns of Court were already quite used to having their opinions deferred to. By fashioning his preface and title pages to connect with the language and the culture of the Inns, Hawkins was able to capitalize on his knowledge of his

¹⁶ Date of revised production from DEEP.

clientele to develop a textual credit that originated in the status of his prestigious readers. The evidence from Penktheman, Gervase and Hawkins's paratexts suggests that the authors and the Stationer drew on the idea of an upper echelon of Inns men to market their texts. Scholars have commented that members of the Inns were also aware of their places in the legal hierarchy. Recognizing Hawkins's clientele as part of an upper stratum of judges and Inn members resonates with the observation that as the 17th century progressed and the legal profession expanded, there becomes a split in the perceived prestige of law practitioners: dividing the higher branch barristers (Upper barristers, masters of the bench, sergeants) from the more practical 'lower branch' of solicitors and Attorneys (Winston 25).¹⁷

Identifying this group as a niche market for Hawkins is a key point of connection between the Inns, Hawkins's repertoire, and Q2 *Othello*. Wilfred Prest and more recently Jessica Winston in her monograph, *Lawyers at Play*, highlight engagement in a variety of literary activities by members of the Inns as a way for those in the legal professions to distinguish themselves amongst the growing number of Inns members (Winston 10 and Prest *Rise* 208). Winston identifies literary activities such as the translation of classical texts and the writing of poetry in forms such as Senecan drama, Ovidian epyllia, satirical epigrams, and lyric poetry as the kinds of creative

¹⁷ A similar distinction between elite and work-a-day members of a profession is the opening point of Hawkins's edition of *Animaduersions vpon Lillies Grammar, or Lilly Scanned* (STC 25867, London: Richard Hawkins, 1625). It begins with explaining the difference between a 'Grammatista' and a 'Grammaticus' (A3r, 17) where a Grammaticus not only taught 'but also did examine, and discusse all the difficulties in Poets, Historians, Orators, Philosophers, &c.' (A3v, 1-3). Grammaticus is also described as 'a learned Scholar, or Criticke, whom we now call a Philologer' (A3v, 7-9). The analogy that 'they differ in effect as much as a Fidler, and an exact Musitian' (A3v, 11-12) rings with the same distinction of a more refined class of practice as the upper branch and the Serjeants.

pursuits these men used to associate themselves with an upper stratum of Inns member. Gravitating towards these kinds of writing, Prest suggests, stems from the fact that classical learning was increasingly becoming a mark of social status (*Rise* 208). Serjeant-at-Law Sir Edward Coke's practice of writing poems in Latin to commemorate significant events such as his son's wedding may suggest a desire for a creative outlet as well as the wish to display his classical education (Boyer ODNB).¹⁸ As Prest reminds us, lawyers were historically perceived as 'unlearned men' and to combat this stigma, members of the Inns sought 'to distance themselves from their colleagues by the public cultivation of such extra-legal accomplishments and activities (Preston 208).¹⁹ In other words, producing these kinds of status-symbol literatures could help position them as erudite and distinct from the received stereotype.

Such aspirations may contribute to the existence of texts like that of the Serjeant-at-law Robert Callis. The son of a yeoman from Lincolnshire, Callis lacks the connections and education enjoyed by Serjeants-at-law like Sir Edward Coke (Orr ODNB). Nevertheless, as author of the satirical tract, *The Case and Argument Against Sir Ignoramus of Cambridge* (1648), a response to George Ruggle's Latin satirical play *Ignoramus*, Callis participated in the Inn's literary trend of writing satirical rebuttals (Orr ODNB). Unlike Coke, Callis is not recorded as having attended university before he matriculated at Grey's Inn, so in the competitive and hierarchical environs of the Inns it may be that Callis entered the intellectual competition of

¹⁸ Boyer also notes that Coke was familiar with a range of classical authors including 'Virgil, Cicero, Tactius, Ovid, Sallust and Seneca' (ODNB).

¹⁹ See also Winston 10.

satirical response as a way to position himself above his modest educational background.

Both Prest and Winston are focused on Inns men who were also authors. However, the emphasis on ‘public cultivation’ cited above suggests that consumption as well as creation could serve to raise the status of a lawyer. This may account for the presence in Hawkins’s repertoire of texts like Penkethman’s *Cato* and Wise’s *Animadversions upon Lillies grammar* that, while not written by members of the Inns, still engage with these genres and attempt to identify this group of upper-class lawyers in their paratexts. The same also seemed to apply to drama. Michael Neill notes that for men of the Inns ‘the appreciation and judgment of works of dramatic art had become an essential accomplishment’ (346). Being caught applying your ‘judicious censure’ to the right book, as Hawkins suggests in his preface to Beaumont and Fletcher’s *Philaster* is a desired practice and may have gone some way to placing an aspirational lawyer amongst the ‘understanding gentry’ as if they had composed a poem themselves.

An awareness of creative writing as an activity many of the upper branch of lawyers were participating in as writers or as consumer/critics, may have motivated Hawkins to write his own short poems to use in marketing of two of his publications:

The STATIONER to the DRAMATOPHILVS.

A Play and no Play, who this Booke shall read,

Will iudge, and weepe, as if ’twere done indeed.

(*A King and No King*, 1631)

The Stationers Censure.

Good Wine requires no Bush, they say,

And I, No Prologue such a Play:

The Makers therefore did forebeare

To haue that Grace prefixed here.

But cease here (Censure) least the Buyer

Hold thee in this a vaine Supplyer.

My Office is to set it forth

Where Fame applauds it's reall worth.

(The Maid's Tragedy 1630, A1r)

In the first instance, these epigrams from Hawkins's editions of *A King and No King* (STC 1672, 1631) and *The Maid's Tragedy* (STC 1679, 1630) utilize a conventional appeal that entices potential readers by connecting these printed play texts to previous iterations in commercial performance. 'The Stationer to the Dramatophilus' seeks to persuade potential buyers that reading the text will provoke the same experience as seeing it performed on stage. 'The Stationers Censure' wants to soothe potential readers' worries that even though the edition is missing a prologue (which would be expected in performance) the printed text will live up to its theatrical reputation. But as in Hawkins's preface to 'The Understanding Gentry' in *Philaster*, Hawkins demonstrates a more localized knowledge of his readership. Here, Hawkins utilizes the language of the law and the world of the Inns to give his poems a legal subtext. 'The Stationer to the Dramatophilus' again recalls the Serjeants' positions as the source for decision and critique. By suggesting that those who read the play '*Will*

judge, and weepe, as if 'twere done indeed' Hawkins puns on both their professional titles as well as the fact that they will ultimately 'judge' the play. Repetition of the idea of 'censure' from the *Philaster* preface in his title 'The Stationers Censure' is also an opportunity for Hawkins to imitate the role he has seen his clientele take on as his readers and in their professional lives. This imitation of the creative practice of the Inns men also appears in the form Hawkins chose for his poems. Winston cites such short, pithy epigrams as a form practiced by literary men of the Inns, making Hawkins's own epigrams a more creative act of textual fashioning.²⁰ He is, therefore, not just speaking to his readers — he's using a form they might associate with the interactions of their own elite social group.

Both poems also seek to engage the reader by responding to an anticipated or actual concern of a customer in ways that reflect literary practices identified by Winston. Hawkins's choice of subject matter in 'The Stationer to the Dramatophilus' for example, where he considers the effect of reading a play verses seeing a play — an argument vital to his livelihood and still discussed in current scholarship — resonates with Winston's conclusion that members of the Inns used such 'literary play' (12) to 'navigate their own changing status and that of their institutions at times when the size and role of the profession were in transition' (9). In particular, the opening premise of 'The Stationers Censure' that 'they' say *Good Wine requires no Bush, ... And I, No Prologue such a Play*' frames the poem as the response to a previous discussion. This approach is characteristic of the conversational mode of 'answer

²⁰ See Jessica Winston, 'Lyric poetry at the early Elizabethan Inns of Court: forming a professional community' in *The Intellectual and Cultural World of the early modern Inns of the Court*. Ed. Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring and Sarah Knight. Manchester UP, 2011. 223-44.

poems’— another genre identified by Winston as popular with the Inns men for its contributions to the social discourse and communication that helped Inns men shape and solidify their community (84-86).²¹

Adrian Johns reminds us that ‘the reading of a book could ... be substantially affected by the perceived conduct, and above all the perceived character of the stationer that produced it’ (138). Through his poems, ‘The Stationer to the Dramatophilus’ and ‘The Stationer’s Censure’, Hawkins presents himself not simply as a stationer, but one who shares an appreciation for poetry and poetry writing with his clientele. In these examples Hawkins seeks to align himself with the trends and language of the upper branch of lawyers. In the process of presenting himself as similarly ‘understanding’ to this group, however, he cannot presume to be doing exactly what they are doing without risking dispelling the notion that their creative practices distinguish them from the less exalted. While book historians may intellectualize that stationers were ‘the judge of judges’ within their own profession, reality required a more measured approach (Johns 137). This situation may explain why Hawkins’s ‘The Stationers Censure’ has a second usage of ‘censure’ that is a moment of self-restriction. The poem’s turn, ‘*But cease here (Censure) lest the Buyer | Hold thee in this a vaine Supplyer*’, connects the Stationer with the analysis and critique associated with practicing the law already discussed. But at the same time, the poetic voice is careful to ‘censure’ himself against putting his own opinion and writing skills too forward and potentially risking that the buyers will see his efforts as a vanity project: an act that could be considered presumptuous to the elite Serjeants as well as damaging to Hawkins’ stationer credit.

²¹ See Also Winston 2011, page 233.

For elite members of the Inns in Hawkins's neighborhood, poetry and creative writing were a way to extend or even advance their professional lives. The evidence above suggests that Hawkins recognized this trend, and by incorporating language commensurate with culture and practices of the Inns of Court into his paratexts, developed a strategy that identified and communicated with this local clientele. Turning our attention back to Q2 *Othello*, however, the quarto's paratexts contain no pithy epigrams, or dedications to the understanding Gentry or careful Triers of any sort. The title page of Q2 – listing the title, the author and that the play is 'As it hath benee diuerse times acted at the Globe, and at the Black-Friers, by *his Maiesties Seruants*' covers all the expected information, but lacks the additional textual fashioning seen in Hawkins's other play quartos. What Q2 *does* have is the collection of choices between Q1 and F1 texts that resulted in Q2.

A range of language and themes in Shakespeare's *Othello* would have already made the play a potentially good match for Caroline audiences. For example, Martin Butler observes an interest in 'misplaced trust and misused power' and 'evil counselors' as themes that reflected the political climate of James I's court in the early 1620s (6, 16).²² *Othello* also contains a range of words that conjure ideas of law and court: including variations of 'law', 'censure', 'judge' and 'prove' which, much like the word choices Hawkins employed in his paratexts, would have resonated with Inns of Court readers. But there are also additional variants particular to Q2 that reflect

²² See also Mario DiGangi's 'A Beast So Blurred: The Monstrous Favorite in Caroline Drama' in *Localizing Caroline drama*. 157-182.

Hawkins's attention to the interest in classical education and literary pursuits of the upper branch already discussed.²³

For example, in his study of Q2, Charlton Hinman describes, though he does not cite any examples specifically, a particular Q2 addition as 'undoubtedly a harder reading' than that provided in both Q1 and F (382). Collation of Q2 with Q1 and F1 reveals a set of Q2 variants that suggest when Q1 and F1 readings were both logical and Q2 preferred a Folio over the Quarto variant, it frequently reflects a preference for the more imaginative or harder reading Hinman identified.²⁴

1.3.392

To get this place, and to **make** up my will (Q1, D2v, 7)

To get his place, and to *plume* up my will (F1, TLN 739)

To get this place, and to *plume* up my will (Q2, C3v, 17)

2.3.317-8

This **braule** between you and her husband (Q1, F3r, 35-6)

This **broken joynt** between you, and her husband (F1, TLN 1446-7)

This **broken joynt** betweene you and her husband (Q2, E4v, 31-2)

²³ The variants that follow are part of a larger set of collations of reprint editions of 4 different plays published by Hawkins between 1628-1631: *The Maid's Tragedy*, *A King and No King*, *Philaster*, and *Othello*. The interpretations of these variants and categories that resulted and are presented here are based on patterns in textual variants across this repertoire. The complete collation tables are available in the Appendix to the unpublished dissertation *Reading Shakespeare Through Collaboration: Agency, Authority and Textual Space in Shakespearean Drama*, Jennifer Young (King's College London, 2012).

²⁴ I argue elsewhere for Richard Hawkins as the textual agent behind the Q2's conflation. See Chapter 3 'Richard Hawkins and Q2 *Othello*' in Young 2012.

3.3.118-19

As if thou then hadst shut up in thy braine,

Some horrible **counsell** (Q1, G3r, 5-6)

As if thou then hadd'st shut up in thy Braine

Some horrible *Conceite*. (F1, TLN 1721-2)

As if thou then hadst shut up in thy braine,

Some horrible *conceit*: (Q2, F3v, 35-6)

3.4.178

But I shall in a more **convenient** time, (Q1, I3v, 18)

But I shall in a more *continue* time (F1, TLN 2338)

But I shall in a more *continue* time, (Q2, H3v, 13)²⁵

In each of these examples the extra step was taken to include the F1 reading into the Q1 copytext. The choices in each instance reflect a move towards, if not a 'harder' reading, at least a more poetic or imaginative one. In the particular example of 2.3.317-8, there is the added possibility of a choice meant to resonate with Hawkins's law audience. In choosing F1's 'broken joint' over Q1's 'braule' to describe the fracturing relationship between Cassio and Othello, Q2 offers a possible allusion to a 'jointure' — a term that could refer to a general relationship as well as a more legally binding tenancy (*OED* 'Jointure', n. def.1, 3). Whether they chose to read it as the legal arrangement or not, Q2's choice of 'joint' moves the line's meaning from the

²⁵ Act, scene and line numbers refer to E. A. J. Honigmann's Arden 3 edition of *Othello*. Italics are mine.

rough and tumble of a physical encounter, to a more intellectual arrangement of consensual agreement that prominently featured in the world of Hawkins's niche readers.²⁶

Similar preference for harder or more imaginative readings may also be the inspiration for these two readings that are unique to Q2, including one of the most famous variants in Desdemona's song at 4.3.39:

5.2.233

But what serues for the thunder? **pretious** villaine. (Q1 M4v, 7)

But what serues for the Thunder? | **Precious** Villiane. (F1, TLN 3530-31)

But what serues for the thunder? *pernitious* villaine. (Q2, M2r, 33)

4.3.39

The poor Soule sat **singing**, by a Sicamore tree. (F1, TLN 3011)

The poore soul sate *sighing* by a sicamour tree, (Q2, K4r, 2)

Not satisfied with the Folio's obvious "singing" and having no alternative from Q1, Q2 provides "sighing" as an alternative that is potentially more visual and also anticipates the ballad as would appear in the later publication of *Percy's Reliques* in 1765.²⁷

²⁶ Many thanks to Penelope Ng for pointing out the law connection in this example.

²⁷ Honigmann prints the ballad as it appeared in *Percy's Reliques* in his long notes for his Arden 3 *Othello* (339).

As discussed earlier, members of the upper branch of the Inns, eager to present themselves as more sophisticated than the work-a-day solicitor, drew on performance of the knowledge gained from their grammar school and university educations that were steeped in classical knowledge and poetry. This type of preference for elevated language, also known as *Lectio Difficilior*, presents another connection by calibrating the copytext where possible to an interest in nuanced poetic language. Sensitive to the refined sensibilities his readers possessed (or at least sought to look as if they possessed), these variants may reflect Hawkins's understanding that including the more imaginative choices where possible might help to give the quarto an extra touch of literary refinement.

Such interest in a more imaginative, poetic sounding language resonates with Alan Farmer and Zachary Lesser's observation of a perceived difference between the Elizabethan and Jacobean plays and the Caroline plays that were on the stage and in print when Q2 was published (34). The 17th c. publisher/printer John Okes for example, suggests that earlier plays exceeded current drama in matter and subject, but confesses 'we have better for Language in these our exquisite and refined Times' (A3r, 11-12). Sir Edward Coke — created Serjeant-at-law in 1606 — described English as 'copius and significant...' and 'as able to express anything in as few and as apt words as any other nature language' (Boyer *ODNB*). Caroline readers, writers and their stationers saw themselves as living in a moment where English had become a language of finesse and mastery of expression.

Affection for 'exquisite' language combined with the upper branch's interest in performing the knowledge obtained in their classical education makes another feature

of Q2's variants relevant. Alongside poetry, rhetoric was another natural feature of both early modern humanist education and training in the law. To this end, some Q2 variants reproduce basic rhetorical structures or devices. For example, preferences between Q1 and F1 variants in Q2 *Othello* reveal interest in the rhetorical balance of parallels and various forms of repetition.

2.1.68

Tempests themselues, **by** seas, and **houling** windes, (Q1, D3v, 33)

Tempests themselues, **high** Seas, and **howling** windes, (F1, TLN 830)

Tempests themselues, **high** seas, and **houling** winds, (Q2, C4v, 36)

3.3.207

Iag. They dare shew their husbands: their best conscience,
Is not to **leaue** vndone, but **keepe** vnknowne.
(Q1, G4, 27-28)

Ia. They dare not shew their Husbands.
Their best Conscience,
Is not to **leaue't** vndone, but **kept** vnknowne.
(F1, TLN 1819-21)

Iag. They dare not shew their husbands: their best conscience
Is not to **leaue't** vndone, but **keepe't** vnknowne.
(Q2, G1r, 18-19)

2.1.68 and 3.3.207 show a preference for the repetitive sounds of alliteration and assonance.²⁸ Hawkins's choice of F1's more descriptive "high Seas" over Q1's "by seas" accepts the alliterative "h" sound capitalized on in F1's pairing of "high" and "houling". This decision also complements the highly alliterative nature of the rest of Cassio's speech (which continues with a repetition of "c" and "g" sounds: "The guttered rockes, and congregated sands, | Traitors ensteep'd, to clog the guiltlesse Keele," (2.1.69-70; Q2, C4v, 37-38). In Iago's line at 3.3.207, combining the "leave't" of F1 with Q1's "keepe" creates previously non-existent assonance within the adjoining phrases. Q2's introduction of "t" at the end of "keepe" extends the similarity further by creating both visual and rhythmic parallels between the ends of both phrases: "leau'e't vndone" and "keepe't vnknowne".²⁹ The same result appears in the combination of Q1 and F1 readings in Roderigo's line at 4.2.195:

Rod. ...**it is** not very well, | by this hand, I say **tis** very scuruy, (Q1, L1v,16-17)

Rod. ...nor | **tis** not very well. Nay I **think it is** scuruy: (F1, TLN 2909-10)

Rod. ...nor **t'is** not very | well; I **say t'is** very scuruy, (Q2, K2v, 22-23).

Combining the single use of "tis" from both Q1 and F1 creates a new parallel phrasing of repetition.

²⁸ See also Q1 and F1 variants at *Othello* 3.3.122.

²⁹ Neither Arden 3 nor the Oxford *Complete Works* (3.3.208) acknowledge this variant's origin in Q2. However, both see this emended conflation as "Shakespearean" enough to include in their editions, categorizing this addition as one of "those kinds of leaps on which the best emendations depend" (Berger 34).

Preferences for *Lectio Difficilior* and the balance and order of parallelism seen above reflect a valuing of the ‘stylistic elegance’ that was highly prized by Caroline audiences (Neill 357). A final element, Q2’s approach to the vocative case might also connect to the classical oratory practiced by men of the Inns of Court. Writers and readers of the Inns, brought up on classical stories like those of Ovid and Seneca in their grammar school educations, might expect the formal yet effusive emotion of the vocative case in a tragic story like *Othello*. Perhaps to reinforce the rhetorical decorum of the play, Q2 retains the multitude of “O” interjections — twenty-one on the first three pages of Act five alone — many of which introduce vocative exclamations such as “O braue *Iago*”, “O murderous slaue, O villaine”, and “O notable strumpet” (L1r, 33; L1v, 30; L2r, 10). One notable exception to Q2’s preference for the high emotional tone, occurs at 5.2.85 where Desdemona’s Q1 line “O Lord, Lord, Lord.” is omitted, putting Q2 in agreement with the Folio and the occasional modern editor (Q1, M2r, 36; Q2 L4r, 14-5).³⁰ Retaining the use of the vocative in this selective way, the Q2 attempts a balance between expressing the cathartic passions of tragedy and a desire for formalized restraint. Michael Neill identifies a similar preference for a ‘discreet’ drama in the commercial theatres of the time. Caroline playwrights ‘writing for the pleasure of a select and informed audience’, a group that included men of the Inns of Court, ‘had dissociated this power to imitate the passions ... from the rant and bombast of the previous age’ (346, 356).³¹

³⁰ Dyce reproved Collier for including it in his edition referring to the effect as “not a little comic” and “disquietingly vulgar” (Ridley 182).

³¹ Neill notes that some audiences did continue to ‘yearn for more robust styles’ (356).

We could argue that one of the motivations for Hawkins's trying to elevate the language of Q2 and his other play texts, as well as his own ventures into poetry writing in his paratexts may be this preference for 'exquisite' writing that was grounded in the training in rhetoric at the heart of classical education. This preference cannot be completely removed from the trend that certain members of the Inns were now using similarly refined acts of writing and translation as a designation of status. How accurate such assessments were in reality is beyond the scope of this article, but the consistent participation in the idea by Hawkins's publication repertoire and the interests of the upper-class Inns of court readers and authors already discussed offers a connection between the Q2 and the social and cultural history of the area near the Serjeants' Inn.

While the Serjeants were Hawkins's closest potential clients, they were likely not his only clientele. The Stationer's continued presence on Chancery Lane for twenty-two years, including a brief expansion into a second property several shops over, makes it unlikely that he relied solely on the small subset of the Serjeants Inn to keep his business viable. As Winston and Prest's studies of literary pursuits at the Inns demonstrate, this trend was visible across the Inns of Court, suggesting that Hawkins's 'Triers and Refiners' could include individuals from any Inn who sought to distinguish themselves from the general population. The existence of such a cultural trend also poses the possibility of there being those who were not Serjeants or barristers yet aspired to be part of the upper professional or hereditary classes and might present themselves as 'Triers and Refiners' by purchasing the books Hawkins aimed at this exclusive group.

A potential readership beyond the Inns is also visible in the earlier publication history of *A King and No King*, *Philaster*, and *Othello*. Hawkins acquired the rights to publish all three plays on March 1, 1628 from the publisher/bookseller Thomas Walkley (Arber 4, 194). At the time of their transfer, Walkley had already published first editions of all of three plays, and in the case of *King* and *Philaster* second editions as well.³² Zachary Lesser has identified the three plays as part of Walkley's repertoire of 'courtier's merchandise' — texts engaged with 'matters of high politics, court factions and parliamentary debate' (157). Meant to entice members of the Court and Parliament who passed by Walkley's Britain's Burse shop on their journeys between the City and Whitehall, Walkley's texts were selected for their appeal to a niche market interested in 'the immediate and pressing political questions of the moment' (208). Publication of these play texts as part of Walkley's repertoire, particularly the multiple editions of *King* and *Philaster*, confirms that the plays found an audience among this clientele.³³ Thus, when Hawkins secured the rights to publish these plays — his first venture into drama in a decade — he invested in titles with a proven record of success with a readership that could extend his clientele beyond the Inns to the Court and Parliament in Westminster.³⁴ Moreover, as many MPs and courtiers

³² Walkley published first quartos of *Othello* in 1622, *King* in 1619 (STC 1670) and *Philaster* in 1620 (STC 1681) and second quartos of *King* and *Philaster* in 1625 (STC 1671) and 1622 (STC 1682) respectively.

³³ For more on the trend of publishing second-plus editions of Elizabethan and Jacobean classics, in the Caroline period, see Alan Farmer and Zachary Lesser 'Canons and Classics: Publishing Drama in Caroline England' in *Localizing Caroline Drama: Politics and Economics of the Early Modern English Stage, 1625-1642*. (Palgrave, 2006).

³⁴ There is an interesting similarity in the time between the final Walkley editions and publication of Hawkins's editions. There are six years between the publications of Walkley's *Philaster* (1622) and Hawkins's (1628), six years between Walkley's quarto of *A King and No King* (1625) and Hawkins's (1631), and eight years between the Walkley Q1 *Othello* (1622) and Hawkins's Q2 (1630). Taken in isolation fact that Hawkins secured the right to *Philaster* in 1628 and then published an edition that same year suggests haste to publish, but in the context of the other two texts in the

were also members of the Inns, this additional readership conveniently complemented the interests of his existing clientele. Thus, the potential shared readership of Walkley and Hawkins's repertoires makes the case for an even larger clientele for Hawkins's business that could further explain its longevity. It also re-presents Hawkins's textual engagements with the 'Triers' discussed in this article as a supplemental, 'micro' marketing strategy that added the nuance of an elite, local literary trend to a broader, existent client base. Such a multi-faceted approach to the publication of second-plus editions of Jacobean plays demonstrates their perceived value as a versatile and profitable component of the early modern book trade. It also poses the possibility of further sophistication within early modern publishers' repertoires by suggesting the possibility of targeted sub-sets of readers within niche markets.

By contextualizing Q2 in the details of the people, places and ideas of its publication, this article situates Q2 *Othello* — an edition that is an outlier in narratives of Shakespeare in print — within a narrative of the early modern Inns of Court, offering further insights into the influences that shaped this fascinating example of early modern textual transmission and increasing our knowledge of the London book trade of the 1620s and 1630s.

Evidence from historical records and from Richard Hawkins's publication output identifies connections between the Stationer and the local readership near his bookshop on Chancery Lane. Hawkins's knowledge of Caroline readers of the Inns of

Walkley/Hawkins transfer, it is consistent with the gap between publications seen with the other two plays.

Court, and particularly his landlords at the Serjeants' Inn, is visible in references to the professional and leisure activities of this population that appear in his paratexts and in those written by other writers in his publication repertoire. In each instance, evidence suggests a strategy of appealing to a section of the Inns of Court that meant to distinguish itself from the general population of law practitioners. In particular, Hawkins and the writers he publishes draw on the literary interests of this group as refined producers and consumers of literature who also applied the skills of analysis and critique that were central to their profession and to their roles as amateur literary critics.

This new group of readers in turn offers an additional perspective from which to interpret Q2's presentation of Shakespeare's tragedy. For instance, Q2 variants associated with 'harder readings' have previously been interpreted as evidence that Caroline textual agents viewed Shakespeare's language as archaic.³⁵ However, in the context of Hawkins's out-ward looking marketing strategy, preferences for *Lectio Difficilior* and other 'exquisite' language highlighted above suggest a less author-centered rationale for these choices. Thus, the origins of Q2's unique makeup may be less about Shakespeare than previously thought, and more about addressing contemporary cultural trends.

Being a Caroline text shaped to the interests and tastes of the locale of Hawkins and the Inns, may also help answer the question of the seemingly contradictory language of the Q2 title page. Making no claims to a new impression, the title page on first look

³⁵ See E. A. J. Honigmann, *The Texts of Othello and Shakespearian Revision* (1996) Appendix F, 168-71.

seems to ignore the heavily constructed text underneath. However, Martin Butler and Michael Neill's work on Caroline theatre audiences — of which Inns men were a significant part — describes amongst upper class playgoers a trend of theatrical connoisseurship. In the manner of modern 'theatre people' these enthusiasts would compare not only one play against another, but performances of different actors in the same role (Neill 344, Butler 107). In the context of this development in theatrical culture specific to the time of Hawkins and Q2, the title page's claim of *Othello* being performed at both the Globe and the Blackfriars might signal more than places of performance, as might be read into an Elizabethan or a Jacobean title page, but refer to the versions that would play at the two theatres.³⁶ Hawkins may have been signaling to his elite clientele that fans of the Globe and the Blackfriars performances could find elements of both versions in the pages of this quarto. The possibility of such a strategy suggests that Caroline readers may have had a more sophisticated approach to drama in print than previously considered.

Looking beyond scholarly narratives that reduce Q2 to a resource for uncovering Shakespeare's vision of *Othello* thus reveals a narrative of local connection that is more in line with the London theatre and book trade of the 1620s and 1630s than modern interests in canon and authorship.³⁷ At the same time, this new knowledge

³⁶ In this case it might also imply changes connected to versions performed at indoor and outdoor theatres. cf. Sarah Dustagheer, *Shakespeare's Two Playhouses: Repertory and Theatre Space at the Globe and Blackfriars, 1599-1613*. CUP 2017.

³⁷ For an example of a syndicate of publisher/booksellers participating alongside Hawkins in this trend of 'perfecting' Shakespeare for a local audience, see Jennifer Young 'Minding Their Fs and Qs: Shakespeare and the Fleet Street Syndicate: 1630-1632' in *Historical Networks in the Book Trade* (Routledge, 2016), pp. 83-100 and for a more detailed study of the editorial interventions made by these syndicate members in their subsequent quartos and the 1632 Second Folio see 'Chapter 4 Publisher Collaboration 2: Shakespeare and the Fleet Street Syndicate (1630-1632) in

should not extinguish Q2's value to modern editing of *Othello*. As Thomas Berger points out, the Q2 agent is still closer to Shakespeare and his text than any modern editor, making his readings helpful in getting an early modern response to Q1/F1 variants. Moreover, Sonia Massai's observation that publishers regularly 'perfected' texts for the press by making changes to elements that were innately linked to the 'fictive world of the play' affirms that the contributions of a textual agent like Hawkins can reflect simultaneous interest in the artistic project and the market (*Rise* 5, 11).³⁸ Thus, Q2 variants can still be used to support modern editors' interpretations of Shakespeare's text, but with the understanding that they are informed by Hawkins's attention to a specific market of readers. Such a shift provides a more substantive rationale for including Q2 variants in modern editions that also enriches the broader narrative of *Othello*'s transmission and reception.

Q2's place in Hawkins's wider publication repertoire also advances our understanding of individual stationer practices within the London book trade. In the case of Richard Hawkins, we see a Stationer that is intent on refashioning texts to appeal to the interests of an especially focused niche market. Hawkins's attention to his local clientele of the Serjeants' Inn and other upper branch members of the Inns affirms that stationers' could dedicate significant resources and attention to fashioning even reprint editions to address the additional literary, cultural and vocational currents of local clientele. Hawkins's repertoire also shows the extent to which bookseller/publishers might integrate their businesses into their geographical location

Jennifer Young, *Reading Shakespeare for Collaboration*, King's College London, 2012, unpublished dissertation (monograph in progress).

³⁸ Massai identifies 'inconsistencies in speech prefixes, stage directions, and dialogue' as particular interest of these annotating readers (*Rise* 11). See also Massai *Rise*, 'Introduction', 1-38.

— positioning book trade agents and their publications as active participants in the diverse life of early modern London to the level of a neighborhood or street. In conclusion, further study of localized publication of reprint editions as seen in Hawkins’s repertoire is an opportunity to expand our knowledge of early modern literature and the book trade, but it can also remind scholars of early modern culture more generally that members of the book trade were not simply tradesmen, they were also engaged members of their community.

Works Cited

- Arber, Edward. Ed. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640 A.D.* 5 vols. London, 1875; repr. New York: Peter Smith, 1950.
- Beaumont, Francis and John Fletcher. *A King and No King*. London: Richard Hawkins, 1631.
- . *The Maid’s Tragedy*. London: Richard Hawkins, 1630.
- . *Philaster or Love Lies Bleeding*. London: Richard Hawkins, 1628.
- Berger, Thomas L. “The Second Quarto of *Othello* and the Question of Textual “Authority””. *Othello New Perspectives* Ed. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Kent Cartwright. London: Associated University Presses, 1991, 26-47.
- Boyer, Allen D. “Coke, Sir Edward (1552-1634), lawyer, legal writer, and politician.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. November 14, 2018. Oxford University Press. Web. 1 July 2020.

- Butler, Martin *Theatre and Crisis 1632-1642*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Cary, Elizabeth. *The Tragedy of Mariam*. London: Richard Hawkins, 1613.
- Dugdale, William. *History and Antiquities of the Four Inns of Court*. London: Kearsly, 1780.
- Farmer, Alan B. and Zachary Lesser 'Canons and Classics: Publishing Drama in Caroline England' *Localizing Caroline Drama: Politics and Economics of the Early Modern English Stage, 1625-1624*. Ed. Adam Zucker and Alan B. Farmer. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. 17-42.
- Gervase, Markham *Hobson's Horse-load of Letters: or A president for Epistles*. London: Richard Hawkins, 1613.
- Goffe, Thomas. *The Careless Shepherdess A Tragi-comedy*. London, 1656.
- Hawkins, Richard. *The Stationers Censure. The Maid's Tragedy*. By Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher. London, 1630.
- . "The Stationer to the Dramatophilus" *A King and No King*. By Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher. London, 1631.
- Hewins, W. A. S., and Anita McConnell. "Penkethman, John (fl. 1623-1668), accountant." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. September 23, 2004. Oxford University Press.
- Hinman, Charlton. 'The "Copy" for the Second Quarto of *Othello* (1630)'. *Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies*. Ed. James McManaway, Giles E. Dawson, Edwin E. Willoughby. Washington: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948, 373-389.

- Johns, Adrian. *The Nature of the Book Print and Knowledge in the Making*.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- “jointure, n.” *OED Online*. Oxford UP, March 2020,
www.oed.com/view/Entry/101563.
- Lesser, Zachary. *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication Readings in the English Book Trade*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Massai, Sonia. *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Megarry, Robert. *Inns Ancient and Modern: a topographical and historical introduction to the Inns of Court, Inns of Chancery, and Serjeants’ Inns / Being a revised and somewhat Amplified Version of the Selden Society lecture for 1971 by Robert Megarry*. London: Selden Society, 1972.
- Neill, Michael. “Wits Most Accomplished Senate”: The Audience of the Caroline Private Theatres. *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 18.2 (1978): 341-360.
- Okes, John, “The Printer to the honest and High Spirited Gentlemen of the never decaying Art, called the Gentle Craft”. *A Shoo-maker a Gentleman*. By William Rowley. London, 1638.
- Orr, D. A. “Callis, Robert (c. 1577-1642), barrister.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. September 23, 2004. Oxford University Press.
- Penkethman, John *A Handful of Honesty or Cato in English*. London: Richard Hawkins, 1623.
- Prest, Wilfred. *The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts 1590-1640*. London: Longman, 1972.

---. *The Rise of the Barristers: a Social History of the English Bar 1590- 1640.*

Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.

Serjeants' Inn, Chancery Lane: Records. Domestic Records of the Public Records office. 1611-1883. National Archives, Kew, PRO 30/23/2/1.

Shakespeare, William. *Othello*. Ed. E. A. J. Honigmann. Arden ser. 3. London:

Thomson. 1997.

---. *Othello*. Ed. M. R. Ridley. London: Methuen, 1958.

---. *Othello*. Ed. Norman Sanders. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

---. *The Tragoedy of Othello, the Moore of Venice*. London, Thomas Walkley, 1622.

EEBO

---. *The Tragoedy of Othello the Moore of Venice*. London: Richard Hawkins, 1630.

EEBO

---. *The Tragedie of Othello, the Moore of Venice. Mr. William Shakespeares*

Comedies Histories & Tragedies, published according to the true original

copies. London: Isaac Jaggard and Edward Blount, 1623. *Internet*

Shakespeare editions (New South Wales).

“trier, n.” *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, March 2020,

www.oed.com/view/Entry/205946.

Whitlock, Baird W. *John Hoskyns, Serjeant at Law*. Washington D.C.: University

Press of America, 1982.

Winston, Jessica. *Lawyers at Play: Literature, Law, and Politics at the Early*

Modern Inns of Court. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2016.

Wise, Thomas. *Animaduersons upon Lillies grammar, or Lilly Scanned*. London:

Richard Hawkins, 1625.

