Letras

Revista do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras
Universidade Federal de Santa Maria

n. 67

Letras, v. 33, n. 67, p. 3-36, jul./dez. 2023 - DOI:10.5902/2176148586123 - ISSN 2176-1485
Artigo Original
Submissão: 14/12/2023 Aprovação: 14/12/2023 Publicação: 22/03/2024

Estudos sobre Shakespeare

Transeditions: Shakespeare's two french english lessons

Transedições: As duas lições de francês e inglês de Shakespeare

Gary Taylor

Florida State University

Dedicated to Louise Rothschild Graumann, Dutch
Resistance fighter, concentration camp survivor,
and my high school French teacher

Abstract: Editions translate. Translations edit. Although these principles apply to all editions and translations, they are particularly conspicuous in some transeditions, like Jerome's Latin Bible, or Shakespeare's *Henry V. Shakespeare's* play survives in two very different versions: a quarto text published in 1600 (*The Chronicle History of Henry the fift*) and the posthumous 1623 folio *Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies* (*The Life of Henry the Fift*). Both texts contain a comic scene in which a French princess, with the help of her French attendant, begins to learn English. But of the 697 words of this scene in *The Life,* only three appear together in the same order in the same speech in *The Chronicle History*. Nevertheless, in both texts the scene dramatizes translation—and mistranslation. Both Katherine and Alice make comic mistakes; but both texts also contain other mistakes that cannot be plausibly attributed to the characters, seeming instead to have been introduced by compositors in the printing house or by copyists preparing the manuscripts those compositors were given. Can we distinguish the deliberate mistranslations from the accidental ones? Abridgement from expansion? Shakespeare's own mistakes in French from the mistakes made by those who transmitted his texts? If so, how?

Introduction

Translations edit. Editions translate. The single most influential book in European history, Jerome's Latin Bible, is a translation, but also an edition, a combination I call a transedition. We can say of Jerome, as Régis Augustus Bars Closel says of Portuguese translations of Shakespeare's plays, 'As an edition, the translation . . . is part of the history of the text.'[1] Unfortunately, mainstream

[1] Closel, 'Edition / translation,' in *Shakespeare / Text: Contemporary Readings in Textual Studies, Editing and Performance,* ed. Claire M. L. Bourne (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2021), 97.

editorial theory in modern European vernacular literatures seldom acknowledges the importance of translation to editorial practice, or recognizes that translation 'challenges one of the organizing categories of our disciplines, the idea of national or single-language literature.'[2]

Henry V has more translation dialogues than any other Shakespeare play.[3] But only one scene in that polylingual play is entirely dedicated to translation: in the middle scene of the middle act, a French princess begins to learn English from her French lady-in-waiting. Although Shakespeare also theatricalized language-learning in *The Taming of the Shrew* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor,* those other scenes represent the acquisition of Latin, the dominant language of Humanist education. *Henry V* instead dramatizes the translation of vernacular languages, of two competing mother tongues, which are also cousin tongues, with a long, fraught, intimately intertwined history.[4] *Henry V*'s embodiment of language-learning is the only scene in Shakespeare's canon written-to-be-performed almost entirely in a foreign language.—Or rather, the only two scenes, because this translation scene survives in two very different early versions: one in *The Chronicle History of Henry the fift*, published in a quarto of 1600,[5] and the other in *The Life of Henry the Fift,* included in the 1623 folio collection of *Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies.*[6] Both versions begin with the word 'Alice' and end with the word 'diner.' But of the 697 words of dialogue in this scene in the folio *Life,* only three ('grace de Dieu') appear together in the same order in the same speech in the quarto *Chronicle History*.

The relationship between these two versions of the scene has been disputed since Alexander Pope's 1725 edition of Shakespeare's plays, and those disputes have been entangled in a larger quarrel about the relationship of the short quarto and long folio texts of *Henry V,* which is itself only one battle in the larger intellectual war about alternative versions of Shakespeare plays.[7] But in this central scene of *Henry V* those debates about the theory and practice of editing are inextricably intertwined, in a manageably small space, with debates about the theory and practice of translation. Every text of the scene, since 1600, is and must be a transedition: an edition that entails translation, a translating that entails editing. The dialogue of the two characters is entangled in the dialogue between two languages and the dialogue between two early texts. Thinking of the scene in translational terms may clarify some of the editorial issues.

My analysis begins ('Bilingual Authorship') by examining the history of editorial scholarship on the scene and its authorship, starting with early claims that Shakespeare could not have written the language lesson, which then morphed into larger claims that *The Chronicle History* belonged to a category of systematically unreliable 'pirated' texts—a theory that dominated Shakespeare

2 A.E.B. Coldiron, 'Inside the Kaleidoscope: Translation's Challenge to Critical Concepts', *PMLA* 138.3 (2023), 428.

3 Dirk Delabastita, '"If I Know the Letters and the Language": Translation as a Dramatic Device in Shakespeare's Plays,' in *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation,* ed. Ton Hoenselaars, rev. edn. (London: Bloomsbury, 2012), 35.

4 For this larger context, see Arid Butterfield, *The Familiar Enemy: Chaucer, Language, and Nation in the Hundred Years War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); A. E. B. Coldiron, 'French Presences in Tudor England,' in *A Companion to Tudor Literature*, ed. Kent Cartwright (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 246-60; Deanne Williams, *The French Fetish from Chaucer to Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

5 *The Cronicle History of Henry the fift* (STC 22289), sig. C3-C3v. The title page has 'CRONICLE', but the head-title and all running titles spell the word 'Chronicle', as do both reprints. I refer to this version of the play, throughout, as '*Chronicle History* '. The most accessible, useful, and reliable of many facsimiles is the British Library copy at https://www.bl.uk/treasures/shakespeare/homepage.html.

6 *The Life of Henry the Fift,* in *Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies* (STC 22273), sig. h6[r]. I refer to this version of the play, throughout, as "*Life*". An accurate, curated digital facsimile of the Bodleian Library copy (Arch. G c.7) can be accessed at http://firstfolio.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/.

7 Gabriel Egan, *The Struggle for Shakespeare's Text: Twentieth-Century Editorial Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 100-128.

editing for more than two centuries, but has recently been strongly challenged. Consequently, I start with the hypothesis that both the quarto and folio texts of the language lesson should be considered legitimate, unless and until some specific detail of either text can be convincingly identified as an error. In the second section ('Performance and Translation') I look at both versions of the scene from the perspective of early modern performance practices—including the routine 'translation' of adolescent male actors into female characters, and the intersemiotic translation of visual into verbal signals—and the ways in which editors ignore or misrepresent these complex transactions. In the final section ('Correcting and/or Translating'), I focus on verbal differences between the two texts/scenes from the perspective of three related editorial questions: Can we distinguish dramatizations of erroneous translation from unintended errors by scribes, printers, or Shakespeare himself? Can dramatizations of corrected translation be differentiated from authorial revisions of a bilingual dialogue based on French and English dialects now more than four centuries old? Does Shakespeare's singular insularity, so uncharacteristic of the other major figures of premodern English literature, enable unexpected access to a suppressed minority language community?

Bilingual Authorship

In 1710 Charles Gildon, in a critical essay appended to Nicholas Rowe's ground-breaking edition of Shakespeare's plays, complained that it was 'extravagantly silly and unnatural' to have Katherine speak French: 'why [Shakespeare] shou'd not allow her to speak in English as well as all the other *French* I cannot imagine.'[8] What Gildon considered natural was a monolingual English text. (Without knowing it, Gildon was wishing that Shakespeare's play was more like its predecessor and source, the anonymous *Famous Victories of Henry the fift,* in which the French princess does indeed 'speak in English as well as all the other *French*'.) Fifteen years later, Alexander Pope, the second modern editor, called the scene 'ridiculous' and was 'sorry' that he could find no evidence, 'from any of the editions, to imagine it interpolated' by someone other than Shakespeare.[9] But in 1744 Sir Thomas Hanmer confidently denied Shakespeare's authorship entirely, ejecting from his text 'that wretched piece of ribaldry' as a 'spurious' addition 'foisted in by the Players . . . to please the vulgar audiences by which they subsisted.'[10] The influential critic John Upton agreed that the scene was 'rightly omitted' by Hanmer.[11] The first French translation of the play in 1776 also followed Hanmer's lead. Pierre Le Tourneur's transedition 'may have done more to enhance Shakespeare's worldwide reputation than anything since the First Folio.'[12] In the main body of his text, Le Tourneur omitted the

[8] Gildon, 'Remarks on the Plays of Shakespeare,' in *The Works of Mr. William Shakespeare. Volume the Seventh* (London, 1710), 350. This volume was a supplement to Rowe's six-volume edition of Shakespeare's *Works* (1709), the beginning of the modern editorial tradition.
[9] Pope, ed., *The Works of Shakespear* (London, 1725), III: 437.
[10] Hanmer, ed., *The Works of Shakespear* (Oxford, 1744), I: iii-iv.
[11] Upton, *Critical Observations on Shakespeare* (London, 1746), 278.
[12] A. E. B. Coldiron, '"Universal" Shakespeare? Transnational Reception as Synecdoche', in *How To Do Things with Shakespeare: New Approaches, New Essays,* ed. Laurie Maguire (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 265.

scene entirely, without any note or indication of its presence in the early editions.[13] He did include the scene in an appendix, where he noted 'Cette Scène n'est point de Shakespear: tout concourt à le prouver' ('This scene is not by Shakespeare: everything concurs to prove it').[14] Hanmer, Upton, and Le Tourneur all found the scene unsatisfactory, and believed that Shakespeare did not write it.

Samuel Johnson was the first editor or critic to defend it. His 1765 edition was published soon after England's defeat of France in the Seven Years War, and Johnson's famous Preface is famous in part for its attack on French neoclassical aesthetics. In his commentary note on this scene, Johnson admitted that it 'is indeed mean enough when it is read,' but—invoking the dialogue's theatrical appeal—he saw no reason to doubt Shakespeare's authorship: 'the grimaces of two *French* women, and the odd accent with which they uttered the *English,* made it divert upon the stage.'[15] Johnson's *Dictionary* defined 'GRIMACE' as 'A distortion of the countenance from habit, affectation, or insolence,' exemplified by a sentence from *The Spectator* ('The French nation is addicted to *grimaces*'). Johnson's second definition was simpler: 'An act of affectation.'[16] If we translate the 'grimaces' of Johnson's commentary note into physical 'affectations,' we can immediately see the target of his critique: the comic posturing of pretentious artificiality fits his praise of the scene as an accurate representation of '*French* servility and *French* vanity.'

Johnson contrasted Shakespeare's alleged authorial acuity in capturing 'the *French* spirit' with the inaccuracy of the French language in the earliest editions of Shakespeare's play. He thus became the first modern editor to quote, or to acknowledge, the massive textual differences in this scene between the quarto *Chronicle History* (which had not been reprinted since 1619) and the folio *Life* (the basis for all texts of the play from 1623 to 1765). Johnson's commentary quoted 'the first sentence of this dialogue' from the quarto version:

> KATE. Alice venecia, vous aves cates en, vou parte fort
> bon Angloys englatara, Coman sae palla vou la main en francoy.

Johnson's transcription-quotation of the first three sentences in 'the old copies' (at the bottom of the page) differs dramatically from Johnson's editorial text of *Henry V, (*printed at the top of the page). His editorial text is based on *The Life*, rather than *The Chronicle History*.

> Cath. *Alice, tu as esté en* Angleterre, *& tu parles bien le language.*
> Alice. *Un peu, Madame.*
> Cath. *Je te prie de m'enseigner ; il faut, que j' apprenne à parler. Comment appellez vous la main en Anglois?*

[13] Le Tourneur, tr., *Shakespeare Traduit de l'anglois, dédié au roi* (Paris, 1776), vol. 11, p. 84.
[14] Le Tourneur, *Shakespeare Traduit*, 11:213.
[15] Johnson, ed., *The Plays of William Shakespeare*, 8 vols. (London, 1765), IV: 414. Notably, Johnson's 'made' (rather than 'makes') suggests that he never saw the scene performed; he seems to be conjecturing about the reactions of audiences in Shakespeare's time.
[16] Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language*, 2 vols. (London: Knapton *et al.*, 1755), n.p., vol. I, sig. 10Q. Readers usually find entries in the *Dictionary* by the alphabeticized running titles, in this case 'GRI'.

I will return, later in this essay, to Johnson's juxtaposition and interpretation of these variants, but first it is important to recognize that Johnson's contrast here between his own representations of the quarto and folio texts is a foundational moment in the editorial history of *Henry V.* Pope had been the first editor to compare the two early versions systematically; he could find no evidence that the language lesson had been interpolated, but he concluded that the quarto version of the whole play was Shakespeare's original text, which had been 'very much enlarged and improved by the author.'[17] Hanmer, Upton, and Le Tourneur denied Shakespeare's responsibility for any version or aspect of the scene. Johnson instead denied Shakespeare's responsibility *only for the quarto version,* attributing all its variants to 'the strange negligence with which they were printed.'[18] Johnson thus recognizes the importance of the fact that the translation is also a printing, a manufactured material object, an artifact with its own history, its own agents, and its own agency: it is itself a thing, which contains translations of other physical things (body parts) into words. 'What is the relationship between translation and things?'[19]

Johnson did not specify who did the printing, and it is not even clear which of the three early quartos he was quoting. But in 1778 Johnson's friend Edmond Malone made Johnson's contrast between the quarto and folio versions more explicit: he conjectured that 'the imperfect and mutilated [quarto] copies of this play. . . were surreptitious; and that the editor in 1600, not being able to publish the whole, published what he could.'[20] Edward Capell combined Johnson's 'strange negligence' with Malone's 'surreptitious,' imagining a 'mangl'd' performance which was subsequently 'pirated, by some scribe of profound ignorance, set to work by the printer' of the 1600 quarto.[21] Thus began the modern editorial tradition, which continues in our own time. *The Chronicle History* was attributed to a shifting combination of such non-authorial agents: an illicit shorthand reporter or note-taker in the audience, a memorial reconstruction by one or two piratical actors, an abridgement by the Lord Chamberlain's Men (either for a provincial tour, or for London performances allegedly limited to two hours' duration). All these theories link *The Chronicle History* to early performances; all deny that Shakespeare generated most, or any, of its variants. When I began my own post-graduate career,two centuries after Malone and Capell articulated their theories about *The Chronicle History,* my 'three studies' in the text of *Henry V* accepted their view that the quarto was surreptitious, imperfect, mutilated, and pirated.[22] Subsequent major editions of the play by Gurr, Craik, McEachern, Rasmussen, Mardock, Marchitello, and Loughnane differ significantly from my Oxford Shakespeare editions in the 1980s, yet they all presuppose a similar

[17] Pope, *Shakespear,* 3: 429.

[18] The *Chronicle History* was first printed in 1600 by Thomas Creede for Thomas Millington and John Busby; in 1602 it was reprinted by Creede for Thomas Pavier; in 1619 (falsely dated '1608') it was reprinted by William Jaggard for Pavier. The most scholarly modern editions are *The First Quarto of King Henry V,* ed. Andrew Gurr, The New Cambridge Shakespeare: The Early Quartos (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), and James D. Mardock, ed., *Henry V* (Internet Shakespeare Editions: Victoria, BC, 2014), which includes a transcription and a modern-spelling edition of both '1600 Quarto version' and '1623 Folio version'. Both Gurr and Mardock identify the language lesson in *Chronicle History* as scene 7. I use Gurr's edition for scene-line numbers.

[19] Tal Goldfajn, 'Tanga, Tunic, Cleaver: On Things in Translation,' *PMLA* 138.3 (2023), 454.

[20] Malone, 'An Attempt to Ascertain the Order in which the Plays attributed to Shakspeare were written,' in *The Plays of William Shakspeare,* ed. Isaac Reed *et al.* (London, 1778), I: 290.

[21] Capell, *Notes and Various Readings to Shakespeare* (London, 1783), 2: 4-5.

[22] Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, *Modernizing Shakespeare's Spelling, with Three Studies in the Text of 'Henry V'* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), 39-164. My view differed from the tradition only in attributing a small but important number of quarto variants to Shakespeare's own revision of the play for performance. 'Three Studies' formed the basis for my two editions of the play: *Henry V* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982) and *The Life of Henry the Fifth* in the Oxford Shakespeare *Complete Works,* gen. ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), 638–71.

binary opposition between an early, complete authorial manuscript (the printer's copy for 1623) and a later, abridged manuscript representing theatrical performances (the printer's copy for 1600).[23] As James Mardock summarized the situation in 2014, 'Nearly every textual scholar today believes the Quarto to have been shortened from the fuller text that is linked to the Folio, rather than the Folio's copy text having been expanded and derived from the shorter version.'[24]

That may have been true a decade ago, but it is no longer accurate. In 2016 Richard Dutton magisterially demonstrated that commercial plays were regularly expanded for court audiences, and that Shakespeare's plays were selected for royal occasions far more frequently than the plays of any other playwright; his prime example of courtly expansion in the Shakespeare canon was the folio text of *Henry V*.[25] In 2019, Murat Öğütcü extended Dutton's evidence, suggesting that some features of the folio text seem to have been written specifically for a 1605 performance at the court of King James I.[26] In 2022-23 I published another 'three studies' in the texts of *Henry V,* challenging the assumptions I had accepted in 1979. The first establishes that 'In both printed versions of *Henry V,* the speech prefixes for a character in one scene are consistently and identically different than the speech prefixes for the same character in that character's only other scene', which proves that the manuscripts behind the two printings must have been related, materially and stemmatically: their relationship 'cannot be an aural connection', and consequently the quarto cannot be the result of memorial reconstruction or spectators taking notes of what they heard in a performance.[27] The second demonstrates that, where the two texts overlap, the quarto is consistently closer than the folio to Shakespeare's sources, a pattern explicable only if the 1623 text was 'expanded and derived from the shorter version' published in 1600.[28] The third provides new evidence that four scenes of the folio *Life* include material specifically written by Shakespeare for the 1605 performance.[29]

In other words, the *Chronicle History* cannot be what the New Bibliography called a 'bad quarto'. During the last quarter-century memorial reconstruction got gutted by Laurie Maguire and Paul Werstine, the latest version of shorthand reporting was systematically refuted by Terri Bourus, and Michael Hirrel and Steven Urkowitz undid the latest abridgement claims.[30] This multipronged and cumulative discrediting of the theory of 'bad quartos' does not mean that the 1600 quarto text

[23] Andrew Gurr, ed., *King Henry V*, The New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, rev. 2005); T. W. Craik, ed., *King Henry V*, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Routledge, 1995); Claire McEachern, ed., *The Life of King Henry the Fifth*, Pelican Shakespeare (New York: Penguin, 1999); Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen, eds., *The RSC Shakespeare: Complete Works* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2007); Mardock, ed., *Henry V;* Howard Marchitello, ed., *Henry the Fifth*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*: *Third Edition*, gen. ed. Stephen Greenblatt *et al.* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2015); Rory Loughnane, ed., *Henry the Fift*, in *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Complete Works: Critical Reference Edition,* gen. ed. Terri Bourus, Gabriel Egan, John Jowett, and Gary Taylor, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 2:2301–85. Act-scene-line numbers to the folio *Life* cite Loughnane's edition.

[24] Mardock, ed., *Henry V,* 'Textual Introduction', para. 22. Accessed 1 September 2023. Mardock's modern edition of the quarto is the best currently available.

[25] Dutton. *Shakespeare, Court Dramatist* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), esp. 173-99.

[26] Öğütcü, 'Masculine Dreams: *Henry V* and the Jacobean Politics of Court Performance', in *Performances at Court in the Age of Shakespeare*, edited by Sophie Chiari and John Mucciolo (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 79-91.

[27] Gary Taylor, 'Play Manuscripts, Vectors of Transmission, and Shakespeare's *Henry the fift*', *PBSA* 116: 3 (September 2022), 354-55. doi.org/10.1086/721096

[28] Gary Taylor, 'Shakespearian Magnitudes', *Shakespeare Quarterly,* 73 (December 2022), 252, 265-79. doi.org/10.1093/sq/quac058

[29] Gary Taylor, 'One Book to Rule Them All: "The King James Version" of Shakespeare's Plays', *Shakespeare,* 19:4 (September 2023), doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2023.2251940. (The language lesson is not one of the four scenes I discuss there.)

[30] Maguire, *Shakespearean Suspect Texts: The 'Bad' Quartos and Their Contexts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Werstine, 'A Century of "Bad" Shakespeare Quartos,' *Shakespeare Quarterly* 50 (1999), 310–33; Bourus, *Young Shakespeare's Young Hamlet: Print, Piracy, and Performance* (New York: Palgrave, 2014), esp. 69-95; Hirrel, 'Duration of Performance and Lengths of Plays: How Shall We Beguile the Lazy Time?', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 61 (2010), 159-82; Urkowitz, 'Did Shakespeare's Company Cut Long Plays Down to Two Hours Playing Time?', *Shakespeare Bulletin,* 30:3 (2012), 239-62.

(of the whole play, or the language lesson in particular) is error-free. Early modern technologies of manual textual transmission, by quill pen or metal type, were all subject to what John Jowett describes as 'the kingdom of error'.[31] But we can recognize the 1600 edition of *The Chronicle History* as what Bourus—explicitly invoking feminist descriptions of motherhood—calls a 'good enough quarto.'[32] Good enough, that is, for Shakespeare to have written.

The Chronicle History is hard to explain as a corrupt abridgement. If someone were simply seeking to shorten the play, this language lesson, not essential to the plot, could easily have been omitted entirely, and it often has been eliminated in revivals.[33] No eighteenth-century cast list includes Alice, which is usually interpreted to mean that the scene was, in that period, always cut; it also disappears in many surviving nineteenth-century promptbooks and acting editions.[34]

If the quarto is not an abridgement, then the folio represents (as Pope concluded) a deliberate authorial expansion and revision. That means that editors should apply to *Henry V*'s two versions the theories and practices of 'authorial philology,' with its focus on 'the author's intentional desire to change the text' and 'the corrections made during the gestation or revision of a work.'[35] In this case, in particular, that means Shakespeare correcting and revising his French. If Shakespeare revised the version of the scene in the quarto *Chronicle History* in order to produce the version in the folio *Life,* then an example of interlingual translation is, also or primarily, an example of intralingual translation. The linguist Roman Jakobson foundationally defined intralingual translation as 'rewording,' or 'an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language.' If Shakespeare was responsible for both versions of the language lesson, then his revision constituted a 'rewording' of his original 'by means of other signs of the same language.'[36] And, as in the language lesson and most early modern language-learning, that rewording may have resulted from his interaction with others, who knew that foreign language better than he did: other members of the acting company, or the Lord Chamberlain who licensed plays for performance and chose which plays could be performed at court, or other Londoners who had, like Alice, 'been in' the country where that foreign language was spoken.

Performance and Translation

In the early modern theatre, the language lesson was not distinguished as a 'scene' by scenery or lighting, but by motion on a physical platform: one set of actors/characters/bodies leaves the platform, another set enters and begins to speak, and their scene continues until they leave the platform and are no longer visible to the audience. In both texts, Katherine begins and ends the

[31] Jowett, 'Shakespeare and the Kingdom of Error,' in *Critical Reference Edition,* ed. Bourus *et al*., I:xlix-lxiv.
[32] Bourus, 'The Good Enough Quarto: *Hamlet* as a Material Object,' in *Shakespeare & The First Hamlet,* ed. Bourus (Oxford: Berghahn, 2022), 90-108.
[33] Emma Smith, ed., *King Henry V,* Shakespeare in Production (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 153.
[34] William P. Halsted, *Shakespeare as Spoken: A Collation of 5000 Acting Editions and Promptbooks of Shakespeare,* 12 vols. (Ann Arbor: American Theatre Association, 1977-79), vol. VI , SS450c.
[35] Paola Italia and Giulia Raboni, eds., *What is Authorial Philology?* (Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2021), ix, xvi.
[36] Jakobson, 'On linguistic aspects of translation' (1959), in *The Translation Studies Reader: Fourth edition,* ed. Lawrence Venuti (New York: Routledge, 2021), 157.

translation scene: she speaks the first word and the last. This fits what Pierre Bourdieu and other linguistic analysts tell us about conversation: disparities in power, or 'social capital,' determine who can speak, and when.[37] In fact, in the quarto *Chronicle History* the princess begins the scene with an imperative summoning her subordinate (the French equivalent of 'Alice, come here'). By contrast, the initial ambiguous vocative 'Alice' in the folio *Life* might also be played or read as a summons, but it is punctuated as an opening interpellation in a declarative sentence, and it permits a shared entrance of the two women rather than a superior's command to approach.

Moreover, in the folio *Life* Alice corrects Katherine's praise of her language skills. The subordinate acknowledges Katherine's social superiority ('madam' = '*madame*', a French word also used in England, often specifically to address royalty), but 'a little' ('*un peu*') is more ambiguous. It may be an example of the traditional topoi of modesty and humility expected in women and translators and women translators—a modesty appropriate in this case, because in both versions Alice initially forgets the English word 'elbow,' and mispronounces some of her English. Alice's added 'a little' might also convey a subordinate's reflex caution (what Johnson diagnosed as 'servility'). But however an actor or auditor interprets it, the interruption adds to Alice's individuation, giving her a vocal and social character before the translation-lesson begins. It also initiates the scene's rapid back-and-forth turn-taking, which here creates the effect of well-practiced, comfortable exchange between two women. That intimacy is also suggested by Katherine's added 'I pray you to teach me'. The princess could command; instead, she politely asks.

In both texts, the scene's initial stage direction calls for the entrance of two women with proper names, 'Katherine' and 'Alice.' In both texts, the social superior immediately addresses her inferior by name ('Alice'). But in both texts the social inferior does not reciprocate, and in fact never in the play uses the proper name of her superior; Alice instead addresses Katherine as 'madam(e)' (an acknowledgement of her higher rank). Henry, as a king, can use the princess's proper name, and he does so repeatedly in the play's final scene.[38] These social rituals would have been immediately familiar and intelligible to an English audience, even if they did not know French, because they also operated in England. Moreover, the names 'Alice' and 'Katherine' were used in both early modern English and early modern French. The scene's first spoken word is the proper name 'Alice'. The male French aristocrats are identified, throughout the play, only by their titles: King, Dauphin, Constable, [Duke of] Burgundy, [Duke of] Orleans, etc. This scene, which is the first to give a personal proper name to a French character, is also the play's first scene in which an aristocrat speaks prose. Like the proper names, the prose immediately establishes that this is not a formal court scene, and that Katherine is not performing a carefully constructed public persona. Also, in both texts, this is the only woman-to-woman relationship in the play—and the two women are not sisters (like Kate and Bianca in *The Taming of the Shrew*) or cousins (like Rosalind and Celia in *As You Like It*) or mother-and-daughter (like Juliet and Capulet's Wife in *Romeo and Juliet*). Unlike

[37] Lynne Magnusson, *Shakespeare and Social Dialogue: Dramatic Language and Elizabethan Letters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

[38] Although Katherine's name is not spoken in either version of the language lesson, her marriage to Henry V was dramatized in *The Famous Victories of Henry the fift* (and probably in other plays), and her coffin and body were visible in Westminster Abbey. The epilogue of *2 Henry IV* promised that 'faire Katharine of Fraunce' (19.22) would appear to make the audience 'merry' in the sequel; Shakespeare could anticipate that many members of the original audiences of this comic scene would have known who she was. Henry identifies her as 'Katherine' four times in the final scene (*Chronicle History,* 19.3, 21, 94, 97), and when they are alone he repeatedly calls her Kate. (The same pattern in the use of her name occurs in *The Life.*)

Shakespeare's other portrayals of a young woman and her female servant (Portia and Nerissa in *The Merchant of Venice,* Julia and Lucetta in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona,* Juliet and the Nurse in *Romeo and Juliet*[39]), this young woman belongs to a royal family, and the servant is herself a lady.

Katherine and Alice have an upper-class gendered social relationship, like that between Elizabeth I and her Ladies of the Privy Chamber and the Bedchamber.[40] Queen Elizabeth certainly knew that Catherine Valois was her great-great-grandmother: after the death of Henry V, the widowed Catherine had married Owen Tudor, a fertile conjugation that founded what would become the Tudor dynasty. Whether or not *Henry V* was performed for Elizabeth, Shakespeare and his actors would have had good reason to *hope* for, and make the play appealing for, such a court performance: the patron of their company, the Lord Chamberlain, was responsible for choosing which plays the Queen saw, and Shakespeare's were more popular with contemporary royal families than those of any other early modern playwright.[41] Any court audience would have included the Queen's inner circle of Ladies—who, like the Queen, were multilingual and would have recognized the genealogical importance of Catherine. Moreover, the princess's stumbling elementary language-learning would have flattered Queen Elizabeth, who was fluent in French—indeed, fluent enough to have written her own translation of Marguerite de Navarre's *Le Miroir de l'âme pécheresse* when she was only eleven years old; she presented a copy of the manuscript, in her own handwriting and in a cover she had embroidered herself, to her stepmother, 'quene Katherin' (Parr), Henry VIII's sixth and final wife.[42]

Earlier that year (1544), Elizabeth had been officially restored, by Act of Parliament, to the royal succession; this legal, public legitimation of her status as a potential heir to the English throne meant that Princess Elizabeth immediately became 'a desirable royal bride' and the object of multiple diplomatic overtures.[43] Over the next four decades, Elizabeth was courted by a French king and by two French dukes who were brothers of a French king. She would have well understood Katherine's situation in Shakespeare's play, especially when Katherine says, 'it is necessary that I learn to speak [it]' (*il faut que j'apprenne à parler*). But that phrase is present only in the folio *Life.* The quarto *Chronicle History* provides no explanation for Katherine's desire to learn English. For those who knew her story, it was obvious that at some point she learned English, and London audiences in the late 1590s would also have been aware of the many French political refugees who had learned English after fleeing from France. So *The Chronicle History*'s version of the scene would not have been puzzling. Indeed, it would have been satisfying: for centuries after 1066, the English had felt it necessary to learn French, and Deanne Williams persuasively interprets *Henry V* as the 'ultimate reversal of the Norman Conquest.'[44] However, the folio *Life* amplifies the significance of Katherine's decision to learn English. She does not simply desire to learn English: she must ('il

[39] Williams mistakenly identifies Alice as Katherine's 'nurse' (*French Fetish,* 197). For the very different role played by sixteenth-century wet-nurses, see Terri Bourus, '"Speak'st thou from thy heart": Performing the Mother-Nurse and Clown-Servant in *Romeo and Juliet,*' *Skenè: Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies,* 8.2 (2022), 169-95.

[40] See Anna Whitelock, *Elizabeth's Bedfellows: An Intimate History of The Queen's Court* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013).

[41] Dutton, *Shakespeare, Court Dramatist, 36*

[42] *Elizabeth I: Translations,* ed. Janel Muller and Joshua Scodel, 2 vols (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), I: 23-126.

[43] David Starkey, *Elizabeth: The Struggle for the Throne* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2000), 50.

[44] Williams, *French Fetish,* 219. In both texts, in the scene following the language lesson a male French aristocrat describes the English invaders as 'bastard Normans' (Sc.8.5; 3.5.10).

faut'). In the folio (but not the quarto), the preceding scenes had characterized the English victory at Harfleur as a rape: Henry's 'unto the breach' (3.1.1) has been interpreted sexually, and there is no ambiguity in his threats against the city's 'fresh fair virgins' (3.3.83), its 'pure maidens' falling 'into the hand / Of hot and forcing Violation' (89-90), its 'shrill-shrieking daughters' defiled by the 'foul hand' of an English soldier (103-4). In that folio context, the folio Katherine's 'il faut' can easily be read or heard as evidence that Katherine is a victim of English sexual violence.[45] What's more, the preceding folio Chorus had already declared that the French King offered Henry 'Katherine his Daughter.'[46] Whether given away by the French king or taken away by the English king, in the Folio Katherine has no control over her political future. In both versions, most members of an English audience would have known what awaits her.

Nevertheless, both versions of the scene give Katherine some agency and some curiosity. The play does not tell us that she has been ordered or compelled to learn English. Unlike Kate in *The Taming of the Shrew,* her father has not hired someone to teach her a foreign language; unlike William in *The Merry Wives of Windsor,* she is not being publicly forced to demonstrate to her elders that she has been dutifully learning what her teachers require. Instead, what we see and hear is Katherine taking the initiative, choosing as her teacher a woman (and a subordinate) that she already knows. *She* asks the questions, identifying what *she* wants to learn first, and *she* decides when she's had enough. Katherine is recognizing and preparing for a diplomatic role familiar to women in pre-modern European royal families; specifically, she has every reason to expect an English husband, whether by negotiation or conquest, and in either eventuality her ability to speak for herself and for her native country will depend on being bilingual.

In the folio *Life,* that prospective husband speaks the last words in the preceding scene, immediately before Katherine's entrance (3.3.120-27); in such circumstances, the character leaving the stage from one door often briefly overlaps with the character entering from another, in a way that allows audiences to see and think of their connection.[47] And that exit of a crowd of English men just before Katherine's entrance may be echoed, in *The Life,* by the entrance of a crowd of French men just after her exit. In that following scene, in the folio but not the quarto, the French King commands nineteen named French lords to attack Henry's army (3.5.40-45). *The Life* implies that they were all onstage. That would have been possible only if the actors and extras representing Henry's army at Harfleur had, during the language lesson, changed their costumes enough backstage to indicate mute French noblemen at court rather than mute English soldiers on campaign. While Katherine onstage is translating French into English, offstage a group of Englishmen was being translated into Frenchmen. The longer version of the language lesson in *The Life* provides more time for those costume changes.

The translation of English actors into French characters is both synecdochal and intersemiotic, as is the theatre more generally. In the early modern transvestite theatre, a wig, face-paint, and a

[45] See for instance Lance Wilcox, 'Katherine of France as Victim and Bride', *Shakespeare Studies* 17 (1985), 65, and Helen Ostovich, '"Teach you our Princess English?" Equivocal Translation of the French in *Henry V*', in *Gender Rhetorics: Postures of Dominance and Submission in History,* ed. Richard Texler (Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1994), 153.

[46] *Life,* sig. H5r (3.0.30).

[47] Terri Bourus, 'Editing and Directing: *Mise en page, mise en scene*', in *Stage Directions and the Shakespearean Theatre,* ed. Gillian Woods and Sarah Dustagheer (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 181-3.

costume tell the audience that the adolescent male performer in front of them is impersonating a young and desirable woman; the genre of his costume indicates her high social status; a coronet would more specifically identify a member of the royal family; pearls might have been used to signal virginity; his speaking of French words, his French 'tongue,' establishes her nationality. Just as a wig and dress and make-up stand, as part-for-whole, for the imagined femaleness of Katherine, so the French of Katherine and Alice stands, as part-for-whole, for the imagined foreignness of all the play's historically Francophone characters.

We might think of the intersemiotic translation of English boy actor into French woman as theatrical rather than editorial. But the first editorial list of Dramatis Personae prefaced to *Henry V*, provided by Nicholas Rowe in 1709, separated the play's men from the play's women, and that anachronistic gender segregation (based on eighteenth-century theatrical practice) organized editorial paratexts well into the twentieth century. Thus, the character of the unnamed English 'Boy' was identified as male and 'Katherine' as female, even though the two roles might originally have been doubled by the same adolescent male actor.[48] Recent editions organize their character-lists by distinguishing English characters from French ones, but the paratext still often presupposes an anachronistic gender binary. In the 2015 Bedford Shakespeare, for instance, a photograph of 'Miriam Silverman (as Alice)' tutoring 'Rachel Warren (as Katherine)' is spliced into the middle of the scene.[49]

Although women have been performing Shakespeare's female roles since the Restoration, the 1975 Royal Shakespeare Company production, directed by Terry Hands, seems to have been the first in England to cast French actresses to play Katherine and Alice.[50] According to Yvonne Coulette, the casting made the women's 'foreignness, their separation from the other characters . . . all the more real'; Ludmila Mikaël, performing outside of France for the first time, 'had the strange feeling that [she] was defending [her] language in front of an English audience.'[51] By contrast, in Nicholas Hytner's 2002 production of *Henry V* at the National Theatre, 'the French sported stage French accents' and the production 'juxtaposed the higher-ranking English characters, whose speech was normatively marked by prestige phonetic variations, to lower class and foreign characters, who were just as conventionally marked by lower status and put-on stage accents.'[52]

Again, these translations of texts into gendered foreign bodies and voices may seem intersemiotic and theatrical rather than editorial. But editors and translators must decide whether to retain in their texts the Anglophone name 'Katherine' (as in 'Katharine Hepburn') or translate it into French 'Catherine' (as in 'Catherine Deneuve') and the spelling will affect how some readers interpret and how some actors pronounce her name. French translations nationalize the spelling,

[48] Ton Hoenselaars, 'Shakespeare: Colleagues, collaborators, co-authors,' in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Contemporary Dramatists*, edited by Hoenselaars (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 98.

[49] Russ McDonald and Lena Cowen Orlin, eds., *The Bedford Shakespeare: Based on the New Cambridge Shakespeare Edition* (Bedford, 2015), 839. For another such paratextual photograph of an actress, see Rory Loughnane, ed., *The Life of Henry the Fifth*, in *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Modern Critical Edition*, edited byTerri Bourus, Gabriel Egan, John Jowett, and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 1530.

[50] For a fuller description and analysis of this scene in the 1975 production (revived in 1977), see Gary Taylor, *Moment by Moment by Shakespeare* (London: Macmillan, 1985), 117-24, and plate 2 (opposite p. 128).

[51] Sally Beauman, *The Royal Shakespeare Company's Production of Henry V for the Centenary Season at The Royal Shakespeare Theatre* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1976), 95.

[52] Sonia Massai, *Shakespeare's Accents: Voicing Identity in Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 40.

and so do a few modern editions.[53] But most Anglo-American editions still retain 'Katherine' in stage directions, speech prefixes, dialogue, and dramatis personae lists. And that is not the only proper name that forces modern editors to choose between French and English. In *The Life* the first battle scene calls for '*Scaling Ladders at Harflew*' (h5r; 3.1.0.2); since 1709 English editors have systematically translated that last word, here and elsewhere, in both versions of the play, as '*Harfleur*'. The same applies to 'Roan' (—>Rouen), 'Louer' (—>Louvre), and 'Calis' (—>Calais). But very few have translated the much more important battle location, 'Agincourt', to 'Azincourt' (though Loughnane did so).

Keeping the English spelling of French proper names might be defended as a conservative editorial commitment to preserving Shakespeare's intentions. But with very few exceptions, even the most scholarly texts of Shakespeare's plays and poems present his work in modern punctuation and spelling. This has been standard editorial practice since the seventeenth century. The great twentieth-century bibliographer and editorial theorist W. W. Greg complained that the editorial tradition 'does quite seriously misrepresent Elizabethan English . . . To print *banquet* for *banket, fathom* for *fadom, lantern* for *lanthorn, murder* for *murther, mushroom* for *mushrump, orphan* for *orphant, perfect* for *perfit, portcullis* for *perculace, tattered* for *tottered, vile* for *vilde, wreck* for *wrack*, and so on, and so on, is sheer perversion.'[54] To make Shakespeare more intelligible and digestible for modern readers, the dialect of English spoken in London in his lifetime is silently subjected to a translation, a regulated transformation from one linguistic system into another, from early modern English into contemporary standard British or American or mid-Atlantic English (or contemporary standard French). Most scholars think of this as 'modernization' rather than 'translation.' But the modernization of spelling imposes throughout the play or throughout the complete works a single standard spelling for each word, rather than the enormous variety of spellings found in sixteenth-century English manuscripts and even in the early printings of Shakespeare's plays and poems. Its regularity thus silently misrepresents the entire linguistic system of early modern English. The modern spelling also implies a completely anachronistic modern pronunciation, concealing Shakespeare's original sound-effects.[55]

If the difference between source-language and target-language is too great to be bridged by a spelling or punctuation change within the text itself, the editorial paratext translates the old word into a new one. Sometimes editions combine changes in spelling with paratextual definitions: since 1709, the English 'Dolphin' used consistently in the earliest texts has almost always been translated to the French 'Dauphin'—but more recent editions also explain that French spelling in the text by translating it in the paratext into 'prince' or 'French prince'. Which language does 'dauphin' belong to? Which spelling is a translation?

On the basis of Shakespearian transeditions and practices like these, in 2009 I proposed that we should 'reconceptualiz[e] editorial theory as a specialized subset of translation theory.'[56] However,

[53] Shakespeare, *Complete Works,* ed. Wells and Taylor; Loughane, *The Life*.
[54] Greg, *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare,* 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954), 51.
[55] For the use of original spelling to guide original pronunciation in performance, see David Crystal, *The Oxford Dictionary of Original Shakespearean Pronunciation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).
[56] Taylor, '*In Media Res:* From Jerome to Greg to Jerome (McGann)*,*' *Textual Cultures,* 4: 2 (2009), 98.

at that time I focused entirely on intralinguistic translation. Of course, 'intralinguistic' begs the question of what constitutes 'the same language': how foreign, how alien, one historical dialect of English is to speakers of another historical dialect of English depends on the gap between dialects, and that gap is not just temporal but cultural and geographical. For many twenty-first century monolingual Anglophone adolescents, any Shakespeare play confusingly mixes two languages, one incomprehensibly foreign, another recognizably their own (or misrecognized as their own). Like the difference between a dialect and a language, the 'differences between intralingual and interlingual translation seem to be more a question of degree than of kind.'[57]

In fact, though, the texts editors edit and translate are not always or necessarily monolingual. From the beginning, drama in England was not just drama in English; playtexts continued to mix English, Latin and French throughout the sixteenth century; the theatre was repeatedly compared to the Tower of Babel.[58] Shakespeare's plays, in their earliest printed editions, are never English-only, because they all contain Latin stage directions. Most modern transeditions retain the Latin directions, but some—in the effort to make Shakespeare more intelligible for modern readers—translate them into English.

Hanmer, in denying Shakespeare's authorship of the language lesson, asserted that the whole scene was 'not intelligible for an English audience.'[59] That might well be true for uneducated modern English *readers.* But Hanmer's claim underestimates the number of French and Francophone inhabitants of London in 1599: as Marvin Carlson has demonstrated, early modern 'audiences were themselves macaronic.'[60] Hanmer also ignores the well-documented power of Elizabethan actors. Fynes Morrison, visiting Munich in 1592, attended a performance by a traveling troupe of English actors, and recorded in his diary that 'the Germans, not understanding a worde they sayde, both men and women, flocked wonderfully to see theire gesture and Action, rather than heare them, speaking English which they understood not.'[61] If English actors could communicate across a language barrier in Frankfurt for a full performance, they could certainly do so in London for one short scene.

Finally, Hanmer overlooks Shakespeare's careful construction of the scene for his performers and his audiences. In the quarto *Chronicle History,* all the English words being translated into French are simple singular nouns with physical and material referents visible to the spectators: hand, arm, neck, chin, elbow, foot, gown. Each can be indicated by simple onstage gestures. The lesson begins with 'hand,' which then allows that hand to be used to point, unambiguously, at all the other objects (arm . . . gown). The folio *Life*, while changing and expanding the scene, retains this structure and all the objects indicated in the quarto.

What this means is that the scene, ostensibly about learning English, in practice 'turns out to be a kind of lesson in French.'[62] Although critics since Samuel Johnson have agreed that

[57] Karen Korning Zethsen, 'Intralingual Translation: An Attempt at Description,' *Meta: journal des traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal,* vol. 54, (2009), 795.
[58] See Janet Dillon, *Language and Stage in Medieval and Renaissance England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
[59] Hanmer, *Shakespear,* I:iii.
[60] Carlson, *Speaking in Tongues: Language at play in the theatre* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006), 41.
[61] Charles Hughes, *ed., Shakespeare's Europe: Unpublished Chapters of Fynes Moryson's Itinerary* (London: Sherratt and Hughes, 1903), 304.
[62] Jean-Christophe Mayer, 'The ironies of Babel in Shakespeare's *Henry V*', *Representing France and the French in Early Modern English Drama,* ed. Mayer (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), 151.

the play criticizes and mocks the French, and French women in particular, 'the basic effect' of a scene spoken almost entirely in French is, as Michael Saenger points out, 'to show the audience a more France-like France than they are accustomed to experiencing on stage'—and to create the impression/illusion of 'Catherine's profound Frenchness'.[63] An English audience is taught a few French words: *main, bras, menton, col, coude, pied* and *robe.* (Again, the folio *Life* expands the number of French nouns, including plural *doyts* and *ongles*.) The lesson begins when Katherine asks a question in French, which Alice answers with an English word; Katherine asks the same question twice again during the scene, and each time Alice answers with an English word, so it is easy enough to infer that Katherine's French question must mean something like 'What is the English word for [French word X]?' or 'How do you say [French word X] in English?' An audience also learns several French-English cognates. Having begun with the recognizable name 'Alice,' the scene ends with the recognizable noun 'diner' ' (a common early modern English spelling for 'dinner'). Exclamations like 'Oh' and 'Jesu' are instantly recognizable, as are 'chevaliers' and 'million'.

The comic climax, which precedes diner/dinner, also plays with cognates. Alice translates French *pied* as English 'foot,' which in addition to its normal anatomical sense was also early modern English slang for female or male genitalia.[64] Alice then mistranslates, or mispronounces, the English equivalent for the French word *robe*: 'gown' becomes, repeatedly, 'con' (*Chronicle* 7.22-25) or 'Count' (*Life* 3.4.44-50).[65] English listeners could have associated either spelling with slang words referring to the vagina: con, cony, country, cunny, and cunt.[66] Even 'cunt' was less shocking from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century in England than it is now, appearing in street names ('Gropecunt Lane'), Latin vocabulary lists and medical textbooks.[67] Thus, without knowing a word of French, English audiences could have appreciated the unintentional sexual significance of the combination of 'foot' (male genitals) and 'con' (female genitals). But Katherine's horrified reaction to the two words—her longest speech in the play, in either version—tells even a monolingual English listener that the words were and are equally scandalous in French. With a little help from the performers, or from the person next to them, most modern English auditors will recognize the aural similarity between the English noun 'foot' and the French verb *foutre,* and between French '*con*' and English 'cunt.' Are the connections between these different sequences of letters, these different pronunciations, intralingual or interlingual? Both the noun *con* and the verb *futre* (fotre, foutre) were Anglo-Norman words.[68] Are the French and English separated by language? Or are they united by their bodies, by the desire to unite their bodies, the need to conjugate? And then to go to dinner?

And how is an editor to translate the transgressive language of these translations? Although

[63] Saenger, *Shakespeare and the French Borders of English* (New York: Palgrave, 2013), 112, 66.

[64] Gordon Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature,* 3 vols. (London: Athlone Press, 1994), I: 524-5. Since all the other translated words in the scene are nouns, it would be easiest to interpret 'foot' as a noun, too.

[65] The English word 'gown' is innocent enough, though the French *robe* (*Chronicle History*) may already have been associated, in the English slang phrase *bona roba,* with prostitution (Williams 1:127); that suggestion would have been especially strong if the French pronunciation of *robe* was disyllabic, as suggested by the spelling 'roba' in *The Life* (3.4.43). Loughnane emends folio 'roba' to quarto 'robe'.

[66] Williams, *Dictionary,* I:289-90, 297-300, 316-17, 350-53.

[67] Jenni Nuttall, *Mother Tongue: The Surprising History of Women's Words* (London: Virago Press, 2023), 22-3.

[68] See 'con[1]' and 'futre[1]' in *Anglo-Norman Dictionary (AND[2] Online Edition)*: Aberystwyth University, 2021, https://anglo-norman.net. Jean-Michel Déprats defines *foutre* as 'cum', a noun that would better fit the succession of nouns throughout the scene in both versions: see 'A French History of *Henry V*', in *Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad,* ed. Ton Hoenselaars (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 84.

John Florio included 'cunt' in his 1611 multilingual dictionary, *Queen Anna's New World of Words* (dedicated to the wife of King James I), by the eighteenth century it had fallen out of the acceptable lexicon.[69] Johnson's *Dictionary* did not include 'fuck' or 'cunt'. But he and his contemporaries knew and used those words, and given the prestige of French among eighteenth-century English elites Johnson and many of his readers surely also knew the equivalent French *foutre* and *con*. So too did *Bell's Edition of Shakespeare's Plays,* which condemned the scene as 'disgraceful to the author, and the piece.'[70] Not incompetent or ridiculous: disgraceful. The meanings were also presumably self-evident to the many eighteenth and nineteenth century productions that omitted the entire scene; certainly, Shakespeare's obscenities were clear to the productions and acting editions between 1872 and 1943 that included the scene but deleted from it the speeches translating 'foot' and 'gown.'[71]

No modern scholarly edition omits the scene, or the sexual puns, but editors differ widely in their paratextual translations. The Folger Shakespeare Library does not provide an explanation on the facing page (the usual location for such commentary), but instead relegates it to an appendix, forcing readers to abandon Shakespeare's text in order to go searchiing for the editorial post-text: 'These words apparently sound to her like the French words *foutre* and *con.* Cotgrave's 1611 *Dictionary of the French and English Tongues* defines *foutre* as 'to leacher' (i.e., to play the lecher) and defines *con* as 'a woman's etc."[72] This is scholarly but euphemistic. The New Oxford Shakespeare, by contrast, explains, in its foot-of-the-page commentary, that the words 'sound like the French *foutre,* 'fuck,' and *con*, 'cunt."[73] This may be admirable *sang froid*, but it also undoes the verbal camouflage that the scene carefully constructs, which allows the audience and actors to *think* the obscenities without having to *speak* or *hear* (or *read*) them.

More generally, the scene forces an editor to ask what kind of French the scene wants, in either version, to represent. Certainly, this is not the regulated, standardized, decorous 'prosthetic tongue' developed in mid-sixteenth century France by a combination of Humanist printing and government patronage-cum-censorship, a purification that culminated in the institutionalization of linguistic policing by the Académie Française in 1635.[74] In Shakespeare's lifetime different French dialects competed with one another, in both France and England, and not until the end of the seventeenth century did the French of Paris and Versailles become dominant on both sides of 'the perilous narrow ocean' invoked by *Henry V*'s Prologue.[75] Shakespeare did not speak Dr. Johnson's French, any more than he spoke Dr. Johnson's English. What we find in both versions of Shakespeare's language lesson is not academic French, textbook French, or even book French; it is closer to *le français de la rue* (street French). Katherine begins by praising Alice's ability to speak (*parle*) English, which she aspires to speak (*parler*) herself. Shakespeare brings on stage, and quotes, Latin books in *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Titus Andronicus.* But there are no French or English books in this scene, no dictionaries, no grammars, no reading or writing. Alice is immediately identified as qualified to teach English

[69] Nuttall, *Mother Tongue,* 44.
[70] *Bell's Edition of Shakespeare's Plays* (London and York, 1774), IV, 39.
[71] Halstead, *Shakespeare as Spoken,* SS451a.
[72] Barbara Mowat and Paul Werstine, eds., *Henry V,* updated ed., Folger Shakespeare Library (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2020), 242.
[73] Loughnane, ed., *Life,* Pro.22 (p. 1565).
[74] See Katie Chenoweth, *The Prosthetic Tongue: Printing Technology and the Rise of the French Language* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019).
[75] Peter Rickard, *A History of the French Language* (London: Routledge, 1989), 81-119.

simply because she has been in England. The assumption here, as in sixteenth and seventeenth century language-learning, is that you can only master a foreign tongue by spending time abroad, conversing with the natives; next best is to be taught by recent immigrants, whose mother tongue was foreign; if you must use a book, learn from a conversation manual, the dominant genre of early modern language textbooks.[76] The French textbook most often reprinted in England in Shakespeare's lifetime was Claudius Hollyband's *The French Littleton,* and Anny Crunelle-Vanrigh has argued plausibly for Hollyband's influence on *Henry V*—and especially in words and passages present only in the folio *Life*.[77] It is hard to explain why memorial reconstruction or a note-taker in the audience should discriminate against parts of the scene indebted to Hollyband. The absence of Hollyband's influence in the 1600 edition, and its presence in the 1623 edition, is more easily explained by assuming that, after writing a first version of the scene, Shakespeare looked (was perhaps encouraged by someone else to look) at a popular French textbook to expand and improve it.

Unfortunately, *le français de la rue* has not guided the editorial tradition's translations of Shakespeare's French. Since the early eighteenth century, most editors have interpreted both texts of the language lesson, but especially the quarto version, from the perspective of post-1635 official continental book-French. Judged by the standards of that library, the scene has been found guilty of an embarrassing number of errors. But Shakespeare's translation lesson was written, and rewritten, in a diffeent dialect (demotic French), designed for a different medium (the early modern stage), and aimed at the tongues of professional actors and the ears of mixed audiences. Whether working with the unfamiliar sign-systems of early modern French or early modern English, editors need to know how to translate a text—interlinguistically, intralinguistically, and intersemiotically—before they can determine whether and how to correct it. Not surprisingly, the best editorial work on the scene, in both versions, has come from recent French translators and scholars who teach English literature in French universities.[78] By comparison with most Anglo-American Shakespeare editors, bilingual or polylingual Francophone translators have a more complex and sophisticated view of early modern French, making them better equipped to distinguish translation from correction.

Correcting and/or Translating

In both versions of *Henry V*, the student, like all students, makes mistakes, which have to be corrected by the teacher.[79] Because the scene embodies an exercise in learning to speak, rather than write, a foreign language, the student's mistakes are mispronunciations of English. In the quarto

[76] John Gallagher, *Learning Languages in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 55-100.

[77] Crunelle-Vanrigh, '"Fause Frenche Enough": The French in Shakespeare's *Henry V',* in *Multilingualism in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, ed. Dirk Delabastita and Ton Hoenselaars (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2015), 61-90.

[78] Crunelle-Vanrigh, 'Fause Frenche'; Dirk Delabatista, 'A Great Feast of Languages: Shakespeare's Multilingual Comedy in *King Henry V* and the Translator,' *The Translator*, vol. 8, no. 2 (2002), 303-340; Jean-Michel Déprats, "I cannot speak your England': Sur quelques problems de traduction d'*Henry V'*, in Patricia Dorval and Jean-Marie Maguin (eds), *Shakespeare et la France: Société Française Shakespeare. Actes du Congres 2000. Actes des congress de la Société Française Shakespeare 18* (Paris : Société Française Shakespeare, 2000), 69-83; Jean-Michel Déprats (tr.) and Gisèle Venet (ed.), *William Shakespeare : La Vie du Roi Henry V,* Édition bilingue (Paris: Gallimard, 1999); Jean Fuzier, '"Ie quand sur le possession de Fraunce": A French crux in *Henry V* solved?', *Shakespeare Quarterly,* 32 (1981), 97-100; Jean-Claude Sallé, ed. and trans., *Henri V*, in *William Shakespeare: Oeuvres Completes: Histoires*, 2 vols. (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1997), I, 745-941.

[79] For early modern examples, see Gallagher, *Learning,* 21, 92, 93, 184-7.

Chronicle History (7.14), she says 'bilbow' (for *elbow*). In the folio *Life,* she makes more mistakes: 'bilbow' (for *elbow*) again, but also 'ilbow', plus 'arma' (for *arm*), 'sin' (for *chin*), and 'Maylees' (for *nails*). No one will be surprised by the student's mistakes: they may sound funny, but they are understandable. But Shakespeare does not limit the mistakes to the student. In both versions of the scene, the teacher begins by mispronouncing the first English word she speaks (which should be 'the') as 'de'; she continues systematically mispronouncing it, and the student faithfully repeats her teacher's error. Surely, this 'mistake' has to be a deliberate authorial pattern, accurately but separately reproduced by different printers more than two decades apart. Shakespeare might have observed this routine mispronunciation by French speakers of the most common word in the English language (and in his own works), but he might also have learned of it from Jacques Bellot's *Familiar Dialogues for the instruction of the[m], that be desirous to learne to speake English, and perfectlye to pronoun[n]ce the same.* Bellot explains to Francophone students how to pronounce English words; for the English definite article 'the', he provides the phonetic spelling 'de'.[80] In *The Chronicle History* the teacher also comically mispronounces her second English word, *hand* ('han'), followed by *arm* ('arma'), *chin* ('sin'), and *gown* ('con'). In *The Life,* the author or editor or compositor spares Alice the misspellings/mispronunciations of *hand, arm,* and *chin,* but adds 'fingres' (for *fingers*) and 'nick' (for *neck*); the folio also worsens the mispronunciation of *gown* (as 'count', which makes it easier for English audiences to hear 'cunt'). In both texts, student and teacher both get one thing wrong ('de'); in both, the teacher occasionally corrects the student, but also praises her; in both, the student makes the most mistakes.

We can certainly read or hear these errors of teacher and student as evidence of Shakespeare's misogyny and/or nationalism. 'Female or French teachers,' the scene may be understood to show, 'are as farcically stupid as female or French students.' But the scene can also be read more charitably. The teacher in this case is herself a non-native student (how long since she's been in England?), and most people who have learned a new language as a teenager or adult will sympathize with both teacher and student. Moreover, as editors and translators we can read or hear these scripted mistakes as a recognition of two different kinds of error: those of the author/speaker/tongue (production defects) and those of the copyist/listener/ear (transmission defects).

From that perspective, we can return to that foundational editorial moment, in 1765, when Samuel Johnson contrasted the version of the scene in the folio with the 'strange negligence' of the version printed in the quarto. I quoted Johnson's editorial text of *The Life* earlier, but we can now look at it differently:

> Cath. *Alice, tu as esté en* Angleterre, *& tu parles bien le language.*
> Alice. *Un peu, Madame.*
> Cath. *Je te prie de m'enseigner ; il faut, que j'apprenne à parler. Comment appellez vous la main en Anglois?*

[80] Laetitia Sansonetti, '"An pettie tanes, Ie parle milleur": Speaking Foreign Languages in Shakespeare's *Henry V* (1600; 1623)', *Études Anglaises*, 73:4 (2020), 478-9. Bellot's *Familiar Dialogues* (London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1578), STC 1851, was printed by a French immigrant to whom Richard Field of Stratford-upon-Avon was apprenticed; Field subsequently married Thomas's French widow Jacqueline. Vautrollier also published several editions of Hollyband's *The French Littleton* (1576-83), his *Treatise for the Declining of Verbes . . . the Second Chiefest Worke of the French tongue* (STC 6762, 1580; reprinted by Field in 1599 and 1604), and his *Flourie Fielde of Foure Languages* (STC 6735, 1583); Field also printed editions of *The French Littleton* (1591-1602), and John Eliot's *Ortho-epia Gallica* (STC 7574, 1593), which has been identified as a minor source for *Henry V.* Shakespeare could easily have had access to these books through Field.

Johnson's text (above) is not at all a transcription of the 1623 text (below).

> Kathe. Alice, tu as este en Angleterre, & tu bien parlas
> *le Language.*
> *Alice. En peu Madame.*
> *Kath. Ie te prie m'ensigniez, il faut que je apprend a par-*
> *len: Comient appelle vous la main en Anglois ?*
> (*The Life,* h6[r])

Johnson's edited version includes what most modern scholars would identify as substantive emendations of eight words in thirty-four words of dialogue (parles bien, Un, de, m'enseigner, j'apprenne, parler, Comment): that is, 24% of Johnson's text here represents editorial correction. No passage of thirty-four English words in *The Life* contains such a high proportion of editorial correction; indeed, I have not found any sequence of thirty-four English words in the Shakespeare canon that has been so heavily emended.

Johnson has also modernized the text according to the conventions of his time, supplying accents, elisions, and regularized spellings. Johnson makes no distinction between editing (the recording of variants and the correction of errors) and translation (the transformation of an old dialect into a modern one). Nor did any of his predecessors or most of his followers.[81] As a result, we continue to contrast massively improved and explained editorial texts of the folio *Life* with unedited, or minimally edited, texts of the quarto *Chronicle History*.[82] Moreover, almost everyone since the eighteenth century has read the edited *Life* before they read (if they ever read) the unedited *Chronicle History*. This makes it easy to continue to doubt or deny Shakespeare's authorship of the variants in the quarto version.

But before we can properly evaluate the distinctions between the two versions, we need to attend to the distinctions between reading and listening. That visual/aural contrast is important for all Shakespeare's plays, but particularly indispensable for the editing and translating of this scene. For Shakespeare's language lesson to be performed, an English boy actor needed to speak French that would be convincing to Elizabethan listeners, including those who knew no French at all. None of the other plays of Shakespeare or the Lord Chamberlain's Men requires a command of sustained spoken French by even one, let alone two, boy actors. Shakespeare, as both an author and a shareholder of the acting company and a co-owner of its new theatre, might reasonably have taken special pains to make the task manageable for the company's apprentices.

The traditional editorial interpretation of the relationship between the two versions is that, as originally written (the folio *Life*), this scene was too difficult for the boy actors, and was

[81] The first edition to have attempted a systematic distinction, in collation and commentary, between emendation and modernization was *Henry V,* ed. Taylor (1982), 176-80; as I acknowledged, I was there indebted to the assistance of Jean Fuzier and François Laroque (v). Because the Oxford Shakespeare *Complete Works,* ed. Wells and Taylor, was the first to include both a modern-spelling (1986) and on old-spelling edition (1987), I was forced to make a systematic distinction that other editions (modern-spelling only) could, and still often do, elide.

[82] For example, in the most recent Arden edition (ed. Craik, 1995) the fully edited and modernized *Life,* with textual apparatus and expansive commentary on the page (113-371), is followed by a reduced-size photofacsimile of the quarto, in an appendix, without paratext (373-99). Likewise, *The Cronicle History of Henry the Fift,* ed. Graham Holderness and Bryan Loughrey (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993) in the 'Shakespeare Originals' series, advocates for the importance and authenticity of the quarto, but prints an unemended and unmodernized (and at times unreliable) transcript, followed by a small-type appendix of minimal commentary.

consequently shortened in performance (the quarto *Chronicle History*). But it makes at least as much sense to suppose that Shakespeare's first draft (*Chronicle History*) was a cautious experiment, and that he felt confident enough to expand it (*Life*) only when his two boy actors had shown they could master its unusual requirements—or when the Master of the Revels, Edmund Tilney, indicated that the French, here and elsewhere in the play, would need to be revised and improved for a court performance attended by the Queen.[83] Shakespeare probably could not have expected his apprentices to be accomplished readers of printed French, and in any case what he needed was for them to memorize and recite a version of French specifically created for aural comprehension by London audiences in 1599. What was crucial, for the actors as well as the fictional Katherine, was the ability to *speak/parle* a foreign language. And that was also crucial for learning languages, a process which in early modern England was not scholarly or solitary but 'oral, aural, and sociable'; would-be French speakers attended French churches to *hear* French spoken (by immigrants).[84] Although adult actors in early modern theatres typically learned their lines in solitude and had few full-cast rehearsals, small groups of actors who appeared in a scene together do seem to have rehearsed their lines and movements together, and in particular boy actors were typically tutored by older, more experienced mentors.[85] That would have been especially important in this scene. Shakespeare himself might have coached them. But whether or not he trained them face-to-face and voice-to-ear, it would make sense for him to write their speeches in a way that would help them *pronounce* the unfamiliar French words (just as Bellot taught French immigrants how to *pronounce* unfamiliar English words). When editors denigrate the scene in *The Chronicle History* as 'a rough phonetic transcription,'[86] they are in fact describing what Shakespeare knew that his apprentice actors would need, using a 'similar kind of phonetic spelling' to that used for 'the dialecticized English of Fluellen, Macmorris and Jamy'.[87]

Early modern French pronunciation manuals confirm the pronunciations implied by numerous non-standard spellings in the quarto: vou, milleur, alones, owye, franca, francoy, englatara.[88] But although such spellings seem to be a design feature, not a flaw, the printed quarto text does contain indisputable transmission errors. For instance, *coude,* the French word equivalent to English *elbow,* occurs three times in the quarto, in three successive type lines, spelled 'code', 'cudie', and 'tude' (7.10-11). It can have served no dramatic purpose for Alice and Katherine to pronounce the word differently each time, and each of these three spellings could easily result from a scribe or compositor misreading 'cude.' (The word appears only once in the folio *Life,* where it is misrepresented, in yet another way, as '*coudee*'. [89])

[83] For Tilney's influence on revisions for court performance, see Dutton, *Shakespeare, Court Dramatist*, 46-56; for *The Life of Henry the Fift* as an expanded text for court performance, Dutton, 190-99, and Taylor, 'One Book' (though neither discusses variants in this French scene).

[84] Gallagher, *Learning,* 5, 3.

[85] For special pre-performance preparation of boy actors, see Tiffany Stern, *Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 10, 68. Leslie Thomson demonstrates that Elizabethan and Jacobean commercial acting companies did have 'partial' or 'small group' rehearsals of individual scenes or episodes: see *From Playtext to Performance on the Early Modern Stage: How Did They Do It?* (New York: Routledge, 2023), esp. 66-76.

[86] Gurr, *Quarto,* 94.

[87] Saenger, *French Borders,* 121.

[88] Crunelle-Vanrigh, 'Fause Frenche', 72-73.

[89] *Life,* 3.4.18. Loughnane retains the folio reading, but does not cite any parallels for the French spelling or the implied pronunciation; the repeated 'ee' is almost certainly a simple scribal or compositorial error of dittography, which was corrected by the 1632 second folio and all subsequent editions.

Both versions of the scene contain a higher frequency of transmission errors than the scenes in English. The *New Oxford Shakespeare*, for instance, emends the old-spelling text of *The Life* twenty-three times in this scene; the most recent Arden edition emends that folio scene forty-one times.[90] But neither of those modern editions believes that the 1623 text was based on memorial reconstruction or on shorthand reporting or 'fast note-taking' by spectators attending multiple performances. Consequently, there is no reason to invoke such mythical agents of error for the *Chronicle History,* either. As the mathematics of information theory demonstrates, our ability to decipher a written text depends, in large part, on our ability to predict which word, or which letter, should come next.[91] An English scribe or compositor unfamiliar with French would be ill-equipped to predict the next letter in a French word, or the next word in a French sentence, and consequently would make many more mistakes than the same scribe or compositor copying a text in English. Unsurprisingly, early modern printers were notoriously incapable of printing foreign-language material without many errors.[92] Thomas Creede, who printed the 1600 edition of *The Chronicle History,* did a poor job printing books containing foreign languages—as the errata lists in his other books demonstrate.[93] The existence of such errata lists might, of course, be taken as evidence of his scrupulous commitment to accuracy. But errata lists very rarely appear in printed plays—and *not* because plays were better printed than religious, historical, philosophical, scientific, geographical, educational or lexigraphical tomes, or even 'serious' literature by classical or continental writers. In fact, the reverse is true. Plays, like other genres of popular trivial entertainment, were not considered important enough to warrant the extra cost of high standards of textual accuracy. Between 1594 and 1616 Creede printed, in whole or part, forty-five editions of dramatic texts, broadly defined, but few of them have any paratextual materials at all, and only one has anything like an errata list.[94] That sole exception is not a commercial play, as its title-page makes clear:

THE
MAGNIFICENT
Entertainment:
Giuen to King *Iames,* Queene *Anne* his wife,
and *Henry Frederick* the Prince, vpon the day
of his Maiesties Trvumphant Passage (from
the Tower) through his Honourable Citie
(and Chamber) of *London,* being the
15. of March. 1603. As well by the English as by the Strangers: VVith
the speeches and Songes, deliuered in the seuerall
Pageants.

[90] Loughnane, ed., *Life,* 2340-42; Craik, ed., *King Henry V,* 221-4.
[91] C. E. Shannon, 'Prediction and Entropy of Printed English,' *Bell System Technical Journal,* 30: 1 (1951), 50-64; James Gleick, *The Information: A History, a Theory, a Flood* (New York: Pantheon, 2011), 229-30.
[92] Gallagher, *Learning,* 79, 94.
[93] Akihiro Yamada, *Thomas Creede: Printer to Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Tokyo: Meisei University Press, 1994), 147-49, 163, 165, 167-73, 177-78, 182.
[94] *DEEP: Database of Early English Playbooks*. Ed. Alan B. Farmer and Zachary Lesser. Created 2007. Accessed 19 September 2023. <http://deep.sas.upenn.edu>. None of the eight other playbooks linked to John Busby or Thomas Millington (named, with Creede, on the titlepage of the 1600 quarto) includes an errata list.

Creede was only one of five printers of this big, ambitious, authorized volume describing a publicly-funded ceremonial royal event.[95] On the book's final page, a single unsigned postscript paragraph addressed 'To the Reader' includes (but is not limited to) an acknowledgement that 'Some errours wander vp and downe in these sheetes, vnder the Printers warrant'. The fact that the 'Printers' are identified in the third person suggests that this paragraph was written by the publisher or by the primary author and collector, Thomas Dekker, rather than the owner of the printshop that manufactured this page. (Creede himself did not print this part of the book.) In any case, this paragraph identifies only five specific errors, and concludes 'Other faults pardon, these I thinke are the grossest.'[96] The most recent scholarly edition of *Magnificent Entertainment* identifies an additional thirty-nine errors, most of them in foreign-language passages.[97]

Creede's failure to provide an errata list for *The Chronicle History* is typical of the genre and the industry: in Shakespeare's lifetime, only two commercial plays were printed with a list of corrections, and both those exceptions postdate 1600.[98] The plays printed by Creede and most of his contemporaries were, predictably, much less accurate in printing foreign words and passages than English words and passages, and a mixture of English and foreign words was even more likely to confuse a compositor (who was always setting words into type upside-down on a composing stick). In fact, Creede gives us the opposite of an errata list: instead of retrospectively printing a list of corrections to sheets that had already been printed, Creede retrospectively printed new errors. The second edition of *The Chronicle History* was printed by Creede in 1602 for a different publisher (Thomas Pavier), but neither the printer nor the publisher corrected any of the wrenched French of this scene. Instead, Creede's second attempt is worse than the first: 'rehersera' becomes 'rehearsera' (7.13) and 'diner' (7.29) becomes 'dinner', in both cases imposing a more clearly English spelling on the intended French word.[99] The third edition, printed (allegedly and possibly for Pavier) in 1619 by the Jaggard shop that would later print the Shakespeare folio, made new mistakes of its own: turning a full stop into a comma at the end of a speech (7.5) and a comma into a full stop in the middle of a sentence (7.20), in one line replacing 'Ma foy' with the nonsensical 'May foy' and then 'Angloys' with 'Angloy,' (7.18), and in the final line miscorrecting 'Aloues' (a misreading of 'Alons') by inserting an unmistakable space in the middle of the word, producing 'A loues' (early modern English for 'he loves', which results in an intelligible English sentence that make no sense in its French context: 'He loves a dinner').[100] These two reprints establish that, even when they had a legible printed text in front of them, English compositors would misread unfamiliar French as familiar English, and set it as such. For the first edition, the compositor was working instead from a manuscript, where letter forms were almost certainly more ambiguous than those in a printed text.

[95] Malcolm Smuts, 'The Whole Royal and Magnificent Entertainment', in *Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture*, ed. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Clarendon, 2007), 498-500.
[96] Thomas Dekker, *The Magnificent Entertainment* (London, 1604), STC 6510, sig. I4r.
[97] Smuts, 'Magnificent Entertainment', 501-3. (This total does not include press-variants, where errors were corrected during the printing process, listed by Smuts on pp. 503-4.)
[98] Dekker's *Satiromastix* (1602), sig. A4v ('Ad Lectorem', probably provided by Dekker, correcting five misprints) , and Day's *Isle of Gulls* (1606), sig. H4v (one correction, printed below 'FINIS').
[99] *The Chronicle History of Henry the fift* (STC 22290), sig. C3r, C3v. For a digital facsímile see 'Shakespeare in Quarto' at https://www.bl.uk/treasures/shakespeare/homepage.html
[100] *The Chronicle History of Henry the fift* (London: STC 22291), sig. C3v. See 'Shakspeare in Quarto'.

The 'strange negligence' of the printers *of The Chronicle* History is, in fact, not at all strange in the context of cheap printing of passages in a foreign language. Moreover, there is no evidence that Shakespeare personally proofread or oversaw the printing of *any* of his plays, so we cannot expect the author to have compensated for the failures of the printer. With this context in mind, we can return to the beginning of the language lesson in the quarto, cited by Samuel Johnson:

> *Kate. Allice* venecia, vous aues cates en,
> Vou parte fort bon Angloys englatara,
> Coman sae palla vou la main en francoy.
> (*Chronicle History,* C3[r])

Compare this transcription of the quarto with my earlier transcript of the folio:

> *Kathe. Alice, tu as este en Angleterre, & tu bien parlas le Language.*
> *Alice. En peu Madame.*
> *Kath. Ie te prie m'ensigniez, il faut que je apprend a parlen: Comient appelle vous la main en Anglois?*

The quarto systematically sets prose as verse, so in this respect the French scene is no different from the English ones, and probably reflects a systematic printer's decision or error.

Ignoring lineation, the most conspicuous difference between the two texts is their length. The folio *Life* contains thirty-four words-for-speaking between the initial name 'Alice' and the end of the scene's first question; the quarto *Chronicle History* contains only twenty. The quantitative difference in these opening lines is characteristic of the two versions (of the scene and of the play) as a whole; also typically, the quarto opening makes sense without the material unique to the folio. Both versions are intelligible: there is nothing obviously erroneous or unintentional about the absence of that folio material from the quarto.

Predictably, both texts contain what seem to be errors made by a manuscript scribe or a printing-house compositor. Just as the folio mistakenly prints 'parlen' instead of the correct 'parler' (a common r/n error), the quarto mistakenly prints the English word 'parte' for the correct French 'parle' (a common t/l error). Likewise, both texts use 'e' for terminal -ez, and the second word of the quarto ('venecia') seems to be a misreading of 'vene ici' or 'vene ci' (for modern French *venez ici,* 'come here'). For anyone with even an elementary understanding of French, one notable difference between the two texts here is the second person pronoun. *The Chronicle History* consistently uses the formal 'vous' in this scene, whereas *The Life* uses both 'vous' and the informal 'tu'. In that respect, the folio's French is clearly more ambitious than the quarto's. But the quarto actually reflects early modern French conversation manuals, where 'incidences of the "tu" form are relatively rare, even where elite characters are dealing with social inferiors, probably in order to ensure that readers would not end up accidentally causing offense.' In fact, on the rare occasions when 'tu' is used in those conversation textbooks, 'it is often in the context of insulting an inferior.'[101] *Vous*

[101] Gallagher, *Learning,* 106-7.

(or its English equivalent *you*) 'was the unmarked pronoun of address, the norm'.[102] The quarto might have avoided 'tu' in order to prevent an audience from misunderstanding the relationship between the two characters. In *King Henry the Eight* (*All is True),* in a comparable Shakespearean scene between Anne Boleyn and 'an old Lady' at court, both women consistently address each other with 'you' (= *vous*).[103]

Another immediately notable difference between the two texts is the quarto 'Coman' instead of the correct French 'comment'. The folio here has 'Comient', but the medial 'i' can easily be explained as a scribal or compositorial misreading of mid-word minims—an exceptionally common type of error in early printed books. By contrast, 'Coman' is consistently used in the quarto (three times in this scene), and cannot be explained as a simple misreading. But 'coman' better represents, for an English reader, the correct pronunciation: in French, the terminal 't' is silent, and the vowel in the second syllable sounds more like English 'a' (as in 'ma') than English 'e' (as in 'men'). The same is usually true of the quarto 'vou' for 'vous': when the French pronoun is followed by a consonant (as in 'vou parte' and 'vou le'), the terminal 's' is not sounded, and so it is omitted. Notably, the quarto switches to the spelling 'vous' later in the scene, when the terminal 's' would be sounded because the pronoun is followed by a vowel: 'vou*s a*ue*s e*ttue en Englatara'.

That later phrase confirms that something is wrong in the first line of the quarto's language lesson. In 'vous aues cates en', the terminal 's' in 'aues' should, by the scene's rule for this letter, be omitted because followed by the consonant 'c'. The third word in that phrase ('cates'), beginning with a consonant, also does not make any discernible French sense, and recent editors have emended 'cates en' to 'quatorze ans' (Gurr, 'fourteen years') or 'quarante ans' (Mardock, 'forty years'). But both these solutions leave the terminal 's' in 'aues' anomalous. Besides, it is not clear why Alice's age is relevant to the next sentence ('you speak English well'): speaking English was not common for Frenchwomen of any age. It does not seem likely that the royal princess would ask a fourteen-year-old for English lessons—unless the princess is herself younger than fourteen, and recognizing her attendant's seniority. Historically, Catherine was fifteen when the battles of Harfleur and Azincourt were fought, and twenty when she married Henry, but neither text of the play (or of *Famous Victories*) hints at the chronological gap between Agincourt and the peace treaty. Making Alice 'forty' is more plausible, and in the opening entrance direction for this scene the folio *Life* identifies her as '*an old Gentlewoman*' (rather than 'Alice'). But the *Life* does not contain the clause that Gurr and Mardock have emended, nor does the folio dialogue in this scene or the final scene say anything about Alice's age.[104] Mardock's emendation of the quarto dialogue thus seems to depend on a stage direction variant unique to the folio text. Mardock's assumption is undermined by the evidence that the folio version was written after, rather than before, the quarto version. The folio's 'an old Gentlewoman' might represent an authorial revision. But if Alice was visibly 'old' from the moment she appeared on stage, there was no reason to specify her exact age in the dialogue. As emended by Mardock, Katherine stupidly tells Alice something that Alice obviously already knows.

[102] Penelope Freedman, *Power and Passion in Shakespeare's Pronouns* (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007), 1.
[103] *All Is True,* ed. Will Sharpe, in *Critical Reference Edition,* ed. Bourus *et al.*, II: 2782-4 (2.3).
[104] For differences between the final 'Katherine-Henry-Alice' scene in quarto (19.23-76) and folio (5.2.98-244), see Michael M. Wagoner, 'Un-Silencing Inessential Texts: Listening to the Women of *Henry V* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*', *Shakespeare* (forthcoming).

I think it's more likely that 'cates' is another example of an English compositor seeing a common English word (*cates,* meaning 'delicious foods, delicacies')[105] instead of an unfamiliar string of letters belonging to a foreign word: 'ettud' (studied) or 'ete' (been) or 'este' (an early modern form of '*été*') or 'estes' (an early modern form of '*été*' when the verb is governed by a plural noun or pronoun, like 'vous'). Any of these emendations would explain the terminal 's' in 'aues'. We should not always assume that the two texts intend the same thing, but the folio has 'este', and—all else being equal—it seems simpler and more probable to assume that both texts meant to say the French equivalent of 'you have been'. The emendation 'estes' best explains the misreading 'cates', which would indicate that *The Chronicle History* ('estes') and *The Life* ('*este*') here differ only in the spelling of the French past participle of the same verb.

Either 'este' or 'estes' (both spellings representing modern French *été*) would make it unnecessary to emend the following word 'en': 'you have been in' makes good sense. But that still leave the quarto's first sentence unsatisfactory: a word seems to be missing at the end of the first sentence/line, a noun to complete the prepositional phrase begun by 'en'. Later in the scene, the word at the end of the corresponding phrase ('vous aues ettue en . . .') is the noun 'Englatara', and here at the beginning of the scene that same word 'englatara' occurs, just below that hanging 'en', at the end of the next line. But at the end of the second type line 'englatara' makes no sense: modern editors of the quarto are forced to emend 'angloys englatara' to 'anglais *d'*Angleterre' (Gurr) or '*l'*anglais *d'*Angleterre' (Mardock). For modern editors and readers, it makes sense to say 'the English of England', distinguishing it from the global English spoken elsewhere (American English, Caribbean English, Australian English, Nigerian English, Brazilian English, etc). But in 1599 or 1600—as the immigrant John Florio noted in 1578—English was 'a language that wyl do you good in England, but passe Dover, it is worth nothing'.[106] Which is to say: 'englatara' does not make sense at the end of the second type line, but seems required at the end of the first type line. Such printing errors at the end of adjacent lines are not as common as minim misreadings ('mm' misread as 'mi', etc.), but they do occur, and they are more likely to occur when a compositor does not understand the language he is setting into lines of type. In fact, all modern editors since Lewis Theobald in 1733 identify a string of similar errors in this scene in the folio, where four consecutive speech prefixes are placed opposite the beginning of the wrong line.[107]

The last line of this speech in the quarto ('Coman sae palla vou la main en francoy') does not make good sense in modern French. But the initial construction appears twice elsewhere in the quarto scene, with slight differences in spelling ('coman sa palla vow' and 'coman se palla vou'). The folio consistently removes the reflective construction (sae/sa/se) but it is clearly deliberate in the quarto, and though it is not idiomatic in modern French the reflective verb (normally used in naming oneself) makes sense here because the 'main'/'hand' in question belongs to a person as much, or more, than their name does. Here, on its first occurrence, since 'Angloys' and 'englatara' have just been mentioned, they may be implied: how do you call [in that language you speak well,

[105] "cate, n.[1]". *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, September 2023, https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/9889583749. This plural form appears four times in the Shakespeare canon, and Petruccio puns on it when addressing Kate in *The Taming of the Shrew,* Sc.5 (2.1), 184, 285.
[106] *Florio His firste Fruites: wich yeelde familiar speech* (London, 1578), 50.
[107] For a full discussion of errors in *The Life*, see Taylor, 'Playhouse Manuscripts,' 356-8.

in that country we have been discussing] this [the body part that I am gesticulating with], which in French is "la main"? This is undoubtedly awkward on the page, but in performance the actor's body could make it clear enough; indeed, the scene systematically depends upon the actors' bodies to illustrate their words, just as communication more generally depended upon 'the bodies from which speech emanated'.[108] Moreover, Alice's response assumes the same construction, repeating the French 'La main', followed by the honorific vocative 'madam', followed by her attempt at English ('de han'). An editor might reconstruct the intended text of this first speech (with brackets indicating emendations of printer's errors) like this:

> *Kate. Allice* vene [ci], vous aues [etes] en [englatara], vou [parle] fort bon Angloys, coman saepalla vou la main en francoy.
> *Allice.* La main madam de han.

A modern-spelling text would then read:

> *Catherine. Alice,* venez-ci. Vous aves été en Angleterre; vous parlez fort bon Anglais. Comment s'appelez-vous « la main » en Français?
> *Âlice.* La main, madam: "de han".

A commentary note might then translate the exchange into English, for the benefit of modern Frenchless Anglophone readers:

> *Catherine.* Alice, come here. You have been in England; you speak good strong English. How do you name this [*indicating her own hand*], 'la main' in French?
> *Alice.* 'La main', madame [*indicating her hand*]: de han.

Alternatively, instead of being an awkward misconstruction, the quarto's odd 'en francoy' might simply be an authorial Freudian slip. The French princess Catherine is thinking 'how do you say X in English?'—but the *playwright* writing this scene must have been repeatedly thinking 'how do you say Y in French?' Personally, I find the Freudian slip a more plausible explanation, and I am therefore inclined to emend 'francoy' to 'angloys' rather than to explain it away with a laborious gloss: 'Comment s'appelez-vous la main en Anglais?'

Of course, editors of the quarto version will continue to dispute which words should be emended, just as editors of the folio version have done for centuries. I have focused here on the beginning of the scene because Johnson did, because Johnson made the decisive wrong turn in the editorial history of this scene, and because a full examination of the quarto's French can only be provided in the context of a full-scale critical edition of the *Chronicle History*.[109] But even in that context, uncertainties will remain. We will never be able to say with complete confidence which

[108] Gallagher, *Learning*, 101.
[109] My old-spelling and modern-spelling editions of *The Chronicle History* will be included in *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Complete Alternative Versions,* gen. ed. Terri Bourus, Gabriel Egan, and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).

anomalies in the French of the quarto or the folio originate with Shakespeare and which originate with a scribe or compositor or (in the case of the folio) a posthumous editor like John Florio or Ben Jonson, or a posthumous publisher like the cosmopolitan Edward Blount. What we *can* say is that Shakespeare's French in both versions is more oral than bookish, more demotic than academic, and more insular than continental. None of that should surprise us. Unlike the two other most canonical pre-modern English poets, Chaucer and Milton, there is no evidence that Shakespeare ever left the island where he was born, or even left England itself. He was, in fact, more insular than most of his literary contemporaries: Thomas Watson, Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Lodge, Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser, Samuel Daniel, Ben Jonson, and John Donne all traveled abroad. Thanks to the British Empire, Shakespeare would eventually retrospectively become a global literary superstar, but in his lifetime he wrote only for the inhabitants of England. However, that population was not homogeneous. He commuted between the cosmopolitan port city of London and the rural market town of Stratford-upon-Avon, stopping on the way at the college town of Oxford.[110] Like other professional actors, he took shows on the road to stately homes, town halls and innyards. Famously, he listened to the voices of aristocrats and apprentices, juxtaposing the verse and silk of monarchs and gods with the coarse weave and prose of Quickly, Pistol, Bardolph, Nym, three soldiers and a boy. Like Prince Hal, Shakespeare recognized these different forms and classes of English speech as separate languages, and was 'so good a proficient' that he could 'drink with any tinker *in his own language*' (*1 Henry IV* 2.5.14-15; my emphasis).

Shakespeare also listened to, and attempted to mimic, the hybrid voices of England's minority immigrant communities: in *Henry V,* those included the Welsh English, the Scots English, the Irish English, and the French English. Crunelle-Vanrigh has explained many of the linguistic peculiarities of both versions of the language lesson by showing that 'Shakespeare when he wrote the French scenes of *Henry V* was thinking of the French of England and not merely of the continental variety recorded in language manuals.'[111] The 'French of England'[112] was originally a blend of Norman French and Anglo-Saxon English, but by the late sixteenth century it had evolved into what is now sometimes called insular French or Anglo-French. Whatever we call it, the French-in-England language/dialect was not institutionalized in dictionaries or grammars or language manuals; unlike the modern hybrids that we call 'Franglais' (since 1964) or 'Spanglish' (since 1933), it was not captured in audio recordings and analyzed by sociolinguists. The French spoken by French immigrants living in late sixteenth-century London was recorded, if it was recorded at all, only in plurilingual popular texts like *Henry V.*

Whereas any connection between Shakespeare and a printed language manual is conjectural, Shakespeare indisputably knew French immigrants in London. Four neighborhoods in Elizabethan London had large French Huguenot populations: Southwark, East Smithfield, Blackfriars, and St. Martin le Grand.[113] Shakespeare had strong connections with two of these four. In the late 1590s Southwark was the site of three playhouses—the Rose, the Globe, and the Swan—and most

[110] For Oxford, see Lena Cowen Orlin, *The Private Life of William Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 246-8.
[111] Crunelle-Vanrigh, 'Fause Frenche', 79.
[112] Fordham University. The French of England Project, https://frenchofengland.ace.fordham.edu/.
[113] Charles Giry-Deloison, 'France and Elizabethan England,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 14 (2004), 224.

scholars agree that Shakespeare wrote *The Life of Henry the Fift* for the opening of the Globe in 1599.[114] Richard Field, a fellow native of Stratford-upon-Avon, moved to London in the late 1570s, becoming an apprentice working and living in an Anglo-French printing house in the Blackfriars; in 1589 he married the widow Jacqueline Vautrollier, a French Huguenot refugee who had come to London with her French husband Thomas in about 1560; in 1593 Field published the first book with Shakespeare's name on it, *Venus and Adonis*.[115] Later, Shakespeare lodged for some time with another Huguenot family, Christopher and Marie Mountjoy; Christopher had been born in Crécy in about 1560, and emigrated to London by 1582.[116] From at least 1593 to 1612 Shakespeare was personally linked to London's extensive Francophone population networks.

Modern critics usually describe the language lesson as part of *Henry V*'s war between fixed, competing national languages. Modern transeditions presuppose that binary: they follow the posthumous folio *Life* in printing English in roman type but French in italic, so that the two languages are graphically, visually, materially distinguished. But in the quarto *Chronicle History* there is no such distinction: the language lesson, and the other patches of French words in the play, are printed just like the English words. And in performance, French belongs—in either version—to the play's representation of the 'intimate otherness' of different English language communities, all overlapping and interacting in polylingual London.[117] French-in-England is just one of 'Shakespeare's Englishes.'[118] Katherine and Alice are, from that perspective, no more foreign than Fluellen/Llewellyn and Mackmorrice/Mac Muiris.We might compare the language spoken by French immigrants in England to the Québécois French spoken in the Canadian province of Quebec: a language disrespected both by Parisian imperial elites (who regard it as a debased colonial dialect) and by the Anglophone Canadian majority (who regard it as an intrusive foreign language).[119] Like many twenty-first century immigrants—including those in England, France, and the United States—the French refugees in sixteenth-century England (who tended to cluster in London) were subjected to nationalist, religious, and linguistic prejudices.[120] And like Shakespeare's Catherine, they were subject to the 'identity flux' of ethnic and linguistic minorities.[121]

Unlike Joseph Conrad, Vladimir Nabokov, and Samuel Beckett, Shakespeare did not write masterpieces in a foreign language. Not even the most rabid bardolators consider the brief language-learning scene in *Henry V* an achievement comparable to *Lord Jim* or *En attendant Godot* or *Lolita*. Nevertheless, Shakespeare's decision to invent a scene almost entirely in French did produce something stylistically distinct from anything else in his canon. 'Is one a different

[114] The 1599 date relies heavily on the Choruses (present only in *The Life*) and the multiple references to Ireland (also present only in *The Life*). I argue that the *Chronicle History* could have been written and performed earlier, after 2 *Henry IV* but as late as October 1598: see Taylor, 'One Book'.

[115] Carol Chillington Rutter, 'Schoolfriend, publisher and printer Richard Field,' in The Shakespeare Circle: An Alternative Biography, ed. Paul Edmondson and Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 161-73.

[116] David Kathman, 'Living with the Mountjoys', in Shakespeare Circle, ed. Edmondson and Wells, 174-85.

[117] For 'intimate otherness', see Saenger, *French Borders,* 22.

[118] See Margaret Tudeau-Clayton, *Shakespeare's Englishes: Against Englishness* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020).

[119] See Leonore Lieblein, '"Cette Belle Langue": The "Tradaptation" of Shakespeare in Quebec,' in *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation,* ed. Hoenselaars, 255-69.

[120] Steve Rappaport, *Worlds Within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 54-60. Although most of the French immigrants were Protestant fleeing Catholics violence, they were often suspected of being either secret Catholics or radical Protestants.

[121] Justin Rudelson and William Jankowiak, 'Acculturation and Resistance: Xinjiang Identities in Flux', in *Xinjiang: China's Muslim Borderland,* ed. S. Frederick Starr (New York: Routledge, 2015), 299-319.

poet when writing in different languages?' A.E.B Coldiron asks; 'A different person?'[122] Modern bilingual and trilingual writers answer that 'different aspects of my self are contained in different rooms of language'.[123] Samuel Beckett famously declared that he began writing in French '*parce que c'est plus facile d'écrire sans style,*' or because 'you couldn't help writing poetry in' English: 'English because of its very richness holds out the temptation to rhetoric and virtuosity.'[124] Shakespeare's two French language lessons are both uncharacteristically unrhetorical, unmetaphorical, unpoetic. Seemingly effortlessly, they structure a scene and create two characters and a relationship; they deploy Shakespeare's gift for creating dialogue, his fascination with language and with puns, his attention to bodies and movement and sound, his comic playfulness. As Shakespeare promised his audiences, these characters, in performance, 'make [us] merry'. These scenes come and go without fanfare, without calling attention to their own construction. They are—in a play famous for straining after aggressive, sublime, world-historical *übermenschlich* achievement—relaxed, modest, femme. In either version, this little prose *pas de deux* may be the most modern dialogue that Shakespeare ever wrote.

Acknowledgment

This essay is indebted to Terri Bourus, Anne Coldiron, Gabriel Egan, Michael Saenger, the anonymous reviewers of an earlier version of this essay, and to Jornada Shakespeare 2022, where for the first time in my career I was entirely surrounded by professional translators: unpretentious, learned, dedicated, generous, funny, and inspiring—just like 'Lou' Graumann.

References

ANGLO-NORMAN DICTIONARY (AND^2 Online Edition): Aberystwyth University, 2021, disponível em: https://anglo-norman.net. Acesso em: 01 fev. 2022.

BATE, Jonathan; RASMUSSEN Eric. eds. **The RSC Shakespeare**: Complete Works. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2007.

BEAUMAN, Sally. **The Royal Shakespeare Company's Production of Henry V for the Centenary Season at The Royal Shakespeare Theatre**. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1976.

BELLOT, Jacques. **Familiar Dialogues Dialogues for the instruction of the[m], that be desirous to learne to speake English, and perfectlye to pronoun[n]ce the same.** London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1578, STC 1851.

BELL'S EDITION OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS. London and York, 1774.

[122] A. E. B. Coldiron, 'Visibility now: Historicizing foreign presences in translation,' *Translation Studies,* 5: 2 (2012), 193.
[123] Luc Santé, 'Living in Tongues,' in *The Best American Essays 1997*, ed. Ian Frazier (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997), 130.
[124] Ruby Cohn, *Back to Beckett* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 58.

BOURUS, Terri. **Young Shakespeare's Young Hamlet**: Print, Piracy, and Performance (New York: Palgrave, 2014.

BOURUS, Terri. 'Editing and Directing: **Mise en page, mise en scene', in Stage Directions and the Shakespearean Theatre**, ed. Gillian Woods and Sarah, Dustagheer. London: Bloomsbury, 2017, 163-87.

BOURUS, Terri. '**The Good Enough Quarto**: Hamlet as a Material Object,' in Shakespeare & The First Hamlet, ed. Terri Bourus, Oxford: Berghahn, 2022, 90-108.

BOURUS, Terri. 'Speak'st thou from thy heart": Performing the Mother-Nurse and Clown-Servant in Romeo and Juliet,' Skenè**: Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies**, 8.2, 2022, 169-95.

Terri; EGAN, Gabriel; JOWETT , John; and TAYLOR, Gary. gen.eds., **The New Oxford Shakespeare**: Complete Works: Modern Critical Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

BOURUS, Terri; EGAN, Gabriel; JOWETT , John; and TAYLOR, Gary. gen.eds., **The New Oxford Shakespeare**: Complete Works: Critical Reference Edition, 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

BOURUS, Terri; EGAN, Gabriel; and TAYLOR, Gary. gen.eds., **The New Oxford Shakespeare**: Complete Alternative Versions (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming) British Library, 'Shakespeare in Quarto' disponível em: https://www.bl.uk/treasures/shakespeare/homepage.html.

BUTTERFIELD, Arid. **The Familiar Enemy**: Chaucer, Language, and Nation in the Hundred Years War. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

CAPELL, Edward. **Notes and Various Readings to Shakespeare**. London, 1783.

CARLSON, Marvin. **Speaking in Tongues**: Language at play in the theatre. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006.

CHENOWETH, Katie. **The Prosthetic Tongue**: Printing Technology and the Rise of the French Language. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019.

CLOSEL, Régis Augustus Bars. 'Edition / translation,' in Shakespeare / Text: **Contemporary Readings in Textual Studies, Editing and Performance**, ed. Claire M. L. Bourne. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2021, 84-101.

COHN, Ruby. **Back to Beckett**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.

COLDIRON, A. E. B. '**Canons and Cultures**: Is Shakespeare Universal?', in How To Do Things with Shakespeare: New Approaches, New Essays, ed. Laurie Maguire. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.

COLDIRON, Anne Elizabeth Banks. 'French Presences in Tudor England,' in **A Companion to Tudor Literature**, ed. Kent Cartwright. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010, 246-60.

COLDIRON, Anne Elizabeth Banks. 'Visibility now: Historicizing foreign presences in translation,' **Translation Studies**, 5: 2 (2012), 189-200

COLDIRON, Anne Elizabeth Banks. 'Inside the Kaleidoscope: Translation's Challenge to Critical Concepts', **PMLA** 138.3, 2023, 419-35.

CRAIK, Thomas Wallace. ed. **King Henry V**, The Arden Shakespeare. London: Routledge, 1995.

CRUNELLE-VANRIGH, Anny. '"Fause Frenche Enough": The French in Shakespeare's Henry V', in **Multilingualism in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries**, ed. Dirk Delabastita and Ton Hoenselaars. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2015, 61-90.

CRYSTAL, David. **The Oxford Dictionary of Original Shakespearean Pronunciation**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

DAY, John. **The Isle of Gulls.** London, 1606, STC 6412

DEKKER, Thomas. **Satiromastix**. London, 1602, STC 6520.7.

DEKKER, Thomas. **The Magnificent Entertainment**. London, 1604, STC 6510.

DELABATISTA, Dirk. 'A Great Feast of Languages: Shakespeare's Multilingual Comedy in King Henry V and the Translator,' **The Translator**, vol. 8, no. 2, 2002, 303-340.

DELABASTITA, Dirk. "If I Know the Letters and the Language": Translation as a Dramatic Device in Shakespeare's Plays,' in **Shakespeare and the Language of Translation**, ed. Ton Hoenselaars, rev. edn. London: Bloomsbury, 2012, 31-52.

DÉPRATS, Jean-Michel. "'I cannot speak your England": Sur quelques problems de traduction d'Henry V', in Patricia Dorval and Jean-Marie Maguin (eds), **Shakespeare et la France**: Société Française Shakespeare. Actes du Congres 2000. Actes des congress de la Société Française Shakespeare 18 Paris : Société Française Shakespeare, 2000, 69-83 .

DÉPRATS, Jean-Michel, 'A French History of Henry V', in **Shakespeare's History Plays**: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad, ed. Ton Hoenselaars. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, 75-91.

DEPRATS, Jean-Michel (tr.), and VENET, Gisèle (ed.), **William Shakespeare** : La Vie du Roi Henry V, Édition bilingue. Paris: Gallimard, 1999.

DILLON, Janet, **Language and Stage in Medieval and Renaissance England** (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

DUTTON, Richard. **Shakespeare, Court Dramatist** (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016)

EDMONDSON, Paul; WELLS, Stanley. ed., **The Shakespeare Circle**: An Alternative Biography Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

EGAN, Gabriel. **The Struggle for Shakespeare's Text**: Twentieth-Century Editorial Theory and Practice Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

FARMER, Alan B.; LESSER, Zachary. ed., **DEEP**: Database of Early English Playbooks 2007. http://deep.sas.upenn.edu.

FLORIO, John, **Florio His firste Fruites**: wich yeelde familiar speech (London, 1578), STC 11096

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY, The French of England Project, https://frenchofengland.ace.fordham.edu/.

FREEDMAN, Penelope. **Power and Passion in Shakespeare's Pronouns** (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007)

FUZIER, Jean. '"Ie quand sur le possession de Fraunce": A French crux in Henry V solved?', **Shakespeare Quarterly**, 32, 1981, 97-100.

GALLAGHER, John. **Learning Languages in Early Modern England**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

GILDON, Charles. 'Remarks on the Plays of Shakespeare,' in **The Works of Mr. William Shakespeare.** Volume the Seventh. London, 1710.

GIRY-DELOISON, Charles. 'France and Elizabethan England,' **Transactions of the Royal Historical Society** (6th series) vol. 14, 2004.

GLEICK, James. **The Information**: A History, a Theory, a Flood. New York: Pantheon, 2011.

GOLDFAJN, Tal. 'Tanga, Tunic, Cleaver: On Things in Translation,' **PMLA** 138.3, 2023, 454-70.

GREG, Walter Wilson. **The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare**, 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.

GURR, Andrew. ed., **King Henry V**, The New Cambridge Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, rev. 2005.

GURR, Andrew. ed., **The First Quarto of King Henry V**, The New Cambridge Shakespeare: The Early Quartos. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

HALSTED, William P. **Shakespeare as Spoken**: A Collation of 5000 Acting Editions and Promptbooks of Shakespeare, 12 vols. Ann Arbor: American Theatre Association, 1977-79.

HANMER, Thomas. ed., **The Works of Shakespear**, 6 vols. Oxford, 1744.

HIRREL, Michael. 'Duration of Performance and Lengths of Plays: How Shall We Beguile the Lazy Time?', **Shakespeare Quarterly** 61, 2010, 159-82.

HOENSELAARS, Ton. 'Shakespeare: Colleagues, collaborators, co-authors,' in **The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Contemporary Dramatists**, edited by Hoenselaars. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

HOLDERNESS, Graham; LOUGHREY, Bryan, ed. **The Cronicle History of Henry the Fift, Shakespeare Originals**. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993.

ITALIA, Paola; RABONI, Giulia eds. **What is Authorial Philology?** Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2021.

JAKOBSON, Roman. 'On linguistic aspects of translation' (1959), in **The Translation Studies Reader**, ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 2000.

JOHNSON, Samuel. **A Dictionary of the English Language**, 2 vols. (London, 1755)

JOHNSON, Samuel. ed. **The Plays of William Shakespeare**, 8 vols. (London, 1765)

JOWETT, John. 'Shakespeare and the Kingdom of Error,' in **Critical Reference Edition**, ed. Bourus et al., I:xlix-lxiv

KATHMAN, David. 'Living with the Mountjoys', **Shakespeare Circle**, ed. Edmondson and Wells, 174-85

LE TOURNEUR, Pierre(tr.). **Shakespeare Traduit de l'anglois**, **dédié au roi** (Paris, 1776)

LIEBLEIN, Leonore. "Cette Belle Langue": The "Tradaptation" of Shakespeare in Quebec,' in **Shakespeare and the Language of Translation**, ed. Hoenselaars, 255-69

LOUGHNANE, Rory. ed., Henry the Fift, in **The New Oxford Shakespeare**: Complete Works: Critical Reference Edition, gen. ed. Terri Bourus, Gabriel Egan, John Jowett, and Gary Taylor, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 2:2301–85

MAGNUSSON, Lynne. **Shakespeare and Social Dialogue**: Dramatic Language and Elizabethan Letters (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

MAGUIRE, Laurie. **Shakespearean Suspect Texts**: The 'Bad' Quartos and Their Contexts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

MALONE, Edmond. 'An Attempt to Ascertain the Order in which the Plays attributed to Shakspeare were written,' in **The Plays of William Shakspeare**, ed. Samuel Johnson and George Steevens, 10 vols. (London, 1778)

MARCHITELLO, Howard. ed., **Henry the Fifth, in The Norton Shakespeare**: Third Edition, gen. ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton, 2015)

MARDOCK, James D. ed., **Henry V** (Internet Shakespeare Editions: Victoria, BC, 2014)

MASSAI, Sonia. **Shakespeare's Accents**: Voicing Identity in Performance (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020)

MAYER, Jean-Christophe. 'The ironies of Babel in Shakespeare's Henry V', **Representing France and the French in Early Modern English Drama**, ed. Mayer (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), 127-41

MCDONALD, Russ; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. eds., **The Bedford Shakespeare**: Based on the New Cambridge Shakespeare Edition (Bedford, 2015)

MCEACHERN, Claire. ed., **The Life of King Henry the Fifth**, Pelican Shakespeare (New York: Penguin, 1999)

MORRISON, Fynes. **Shakespeare's Europe**: Unpublished Chapters of Fynes Moryson's Itinerary, ed. Charles Hughes (London: Sherratt and Hughes, 1903)

MOWAT, Barbara; WERSTINE, Paul. eds., **Henry V,** updated ed., Folger Shakespeare Library (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2020)

MULLER, Janel; SCODEL, Joshua. ed., **Elizabeth I**: Translations, 2 vols (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009)

NUTTALL, Jenni. Mother Tongue: **The Surprising History of Women's Words** (London: Virago Press, 2023)

ÖĞÜTCÜ, Murat. 'Masculine Dreams: Henry V and the Jacobean Politics of Court Performance', in **Performances at Court in the Age of Shakespeare**, edited by Sophie Chiari and John Mucciolo (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 79-91

ORLIN, Lena Cowen. **The Private Life of William Shakespeare** (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021)

OSTOVICH, Helen. "Teach you our Princess English?" Equivocal Translation of the French in Henry V', in **Gender Rhetorics**: Postures of Dominance and Submission in Hstory, ed. Richard Texler (Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1994), 147-61

OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY (Oxford University Press, September 2023)

POPE, Alexander. ed., **The Works of Shakespear**, 6 vols. (London, 1725)

RAPPAPORT, Steve. **Worlds Within Worlds**: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

RICKARD, Peter. **A History of the French Language** (London: Routledge, 1989), 81-119

ROWE, Nicholas. ed., **The Works of Mr. William Shakespear**, 6 vols. (London, 1709)

RUDELSON, Justin ; JANKOWIAK, William. 'Acculturation and Resistance: Xinjiang Identities in Flux', in **Xinjiang**: China's Muslim Borderland, ed. S. Frederick Starr (New York: Routledge, 2015), 299-319

RUTTER, Carol Chillington. 'Schoolfriend, publisher and printer Richard Field,' in **The Shakespeare Circle**: An Alternative Biography, ed. Paul Edmondson and Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 161-73

SAENGER, Michael. Shakespeare and the French Borders of English (New York: Palgrave, 2013)

SALLÉ, Jean-Claude. ed. and trans., Henri V, in **William Shakespeare**: Oeuvres Completes: Histoires, 2 vols. (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1997)

SANSONETTI, Laetitia. "An pettie tanes, Ie parle milleur": Speaking Foreign Languages in Shakespeare's Henry V (1600; 1623)', **Études Anglaises**, 73:4 (2020), 472-92

SANTÉ, Luc. 'Living in Tongues,' in **The Best American Essays 1997**, ed. Ian Frazier (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997), 123-31

SHAKESPEARE, William. **The Cronicle History of Henry the fift** (London: Busby and Millington, 1600), STC 22289

SHAKESPEARE, William. **The Chronicle History of Henry the fift** (London: Pavier, 1602), STC 22290

SHAKESPEARE, William. **The Chronicle History of Henry the fift** (London: T.P., '1608' [=1619]), STC 22291

SHAKESPEARE, William. **Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies** (London, 1623), STC 22273

SHANNON, Claude Elwood. 'Prediction and Entropy of Printed English,' **Bell System Technical Journal**, 30: 1, 1951, 50-64

SHARPE, Will. ed. **All is True**, in Critical Reference Edition, ed. Bourus eII. 2743-2829 2016.

SMITH, Emma. ed. **King Henry V, Shakespeare in Production**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

SMUTS, Malcolm. 'The Whole Royal and Magnificent Entertainment', in **Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture**, ed. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino. Oxford: Clarendon, 2007, 498-506.

STARKEY, David. **Elizabeth**: The Struggle for the Throne (London: Chatto and Windus, 2000)

STERN, Tiffany. **Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan**. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

TAYLOR, Gary. ed., **Henry V.** Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.

TAYLOR, Gary. **Moment by Moment by Shakespeare**. London: Macmillan, 1985.

TAYLOR, Gary. 'In Media Res: From Jerome to Greg to Jerome (McGann),' **Textual Cultures**, 4: 2, 2009, 88-101

TAYLOR, Gary. 'Play Manuscripts, Vectors of Transmission, and Shakespeare's Henry the fift'. **PBSA** 116: 3, September 2022, 343-78. DOI: doi.org/10.1086/721096.

TAYLOR, Gary. 'Shakespearian Magnitudes', **Shakespeare Quarterly**, 73. December 2022, 246-79. DOI: doi.org/10.1093/sq/quac058.

TAYLOR, Gary. 'One Book to Rule Them All: "The King James Version" of Shakespeare's Plays', **Shakespeare**, 19:4 (September 2023), doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2023.2251940.

THOMSON, Leslie. **From Playtext to Performance on the Early Modern Stage**: How Did They Do It? New York: Routledge, 2023.

TUDEAU-CLAYTON, Margaret. **Shakespeare's Englishes**: Against Englishness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

UPTON, John. **Critical Observations on Shakespeare**. London, 1746.

URKOWITZ, Steven. 'Did Shakespeare's Company Cut Long Plays Down to Two Hours Playing Time?', **Shakespeare Bulletin**, 30:3, 2012, 239-62.

WAGONER, Michael M. 'Listening to First Quartos: The Women of Henry V and The Merry Wives of Windsor', Shakespeare (forthcoming).

WELLS, Stanley; GARY, Taylor. **Modernizing Shakespeare's Spelling, with Three Studies in the Text of 'Henry V'** Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.

WELLS, Stanley; GARY, Taylor. gen. eds., **William Shakespeare**: The Complete Works Oxford: Clarendon, 1986.

WERSTINE, Paul. 'A Century of "Bad" Shakespeare Quartos,' **Shakespeare Quarterly 50** (1999), 310–33.

WHITELOCK, Anna. **Elizabeth's Bedfellows**: An Intimate History of The Queen's Court London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

WILCOX, Lance 'Katherine of France as Victim and Bride', **Shakespeare Studies** 17 (1985), 61-76.

WILLIAMS, Deanne. **The French Fetish from Chaucer to Shakespeare**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

WILLIAMS, Gordon. **A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature,** 3 vols. London: Athlone Press, 1994.

YAMADA, Akihiro. **Thomas Creede**: Printer to Shakespeare and his Contemporaries (Tokyo: Meisei University Press, 1994).

ZETHSEN, Karen Korning. 'Intralingual Translation: An Attempt at Description.' Meta: journal des traducteurs / **Meta: Translators' Journal**, vol. 54, (2009), 795-812.